OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

FIFTH SESSION—TWELFTH PARLIAMENT

---

5 GEORGE V., 1915

VOL. CXIX.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE FOURTH DAY OF FEBRUARY TO THE ELEVENTH DAY OF MARCH, INCLUSIVE.

Publications gouvernementales
Bibliothèque Champlain
Université de Moncton
Moncton, N.-B., CANADA

OTTAWA
PRINTED BY J. DE L. TACHÉ, PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1915.

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR ROBERT LAIRD BORDEN

G.C.M.G., P.C., K.C., LL.D.

AT THE OPENING OF THE

FIFTH SESSION OF THE TWELFTH PARLIAMENT

1915

THE CABINET

FORMED OCTOBER 10, 1911

President of the Privy Council and Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs (Prime Minister)	Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Laird Borden, G.C.M.G., P.C., K.C., LL.D.
Minister of Trade and Commerce	Hon. Sir George Eulas Foster, B.A., D.C.L., LL.D., K.C.M.G.
Without Portfolio	Hon. Sir George Halsey Perley, B.A., K.C.M.G.
Minister of the Interior and Superintendent General of Indian Affairs	Hon. William James Roche, M.D., LL.D.
Minister of Public Works	Hon. Robert Rogers.
Minister of Railways and Canals	Hon. Francis Cochrane.
Minister of Finance	Hon. William Thomas White, B.A.
Postmaster General	Hon. Th. Chase Casgrain, LL.D., K.C.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries and Minister of the Naval Service	Hon. John Douglas Hazen, B.A., B.C.L., K.C.
Minister of Justice	Hon. Charles Joseph Doherty, K.C., D.C.L., LL.D.
Minister of Militia and Defence	Major General Sam. Hughes.
Secretary of State and Minister of Mines	Hon. Louis Coderre, LL.B., K.C.
Minister of Labour	Hon. Thomas Wilson Crothers, B.A., K.C.
Minister of Inland Revenue	Hon. Pierre Edouard Blondin., N.P.
Minister of Customs	Hon. John Dowsley Reid, M.D.
Without Portfolio	Hon. Albert Edward Kemp.
Without Portfolio	Hon. James Alexander Lougheed, K.C., Senator.
Minister of Agriculture	Hon. Martin Burrell.

NOT OF THE CABINET

Solicitor General	Hon. Arthur Meighen, B.A., K.C.

Clerk of the Privy Council ..... R. Boudreau.

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Speaker ..... Hon. THOMAS SIMPSON SPROULE, M.D.

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees.... ALBERT SEVIGNY, ESQ.

Clerk of the House ..... THOS. B. FLINT, M.A., LL.B., D.C.L.

Sergeant-at-Arms ..... Lieut.-Col. HENRY R. SMITH, C.M.G., I.S.O., J.P., A.D.C.

Editor of Debates ..... ALBERT HORTON.

Associate Editor of Debates and Reporter ..... THOS. P. OWENS.

Reporters of Debates :—

English : A. C. Campbell, George Simpson, Robert C. Dunbar, C. S. Blue, F. W. S. Galbraith, Earl C. Young, H. E. Oliver (substitute).

French : J. O. Marceau, Alphonse Desjardins.

Secretary of Debates Branch : C. W. Boyce.

Select Committee on Official Report of Debates.

Messieurs Burnham, Descarries, Devlin, Sir George E. Foster, Gray, Hanna, L. A. Lapointe, Lavallée, Lemieux, Marcil, Sir George Perley, Rainville, Jas. Reid, Schaffner and Taylor.

Chairman : Jas. D. Taylor, Esq.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

FIFTH SESSION, TWELFTH PARLIAMENT.

1915

ACHIM, HONORÉ—Labelle.
AIKINS, SIR JAMES ALBERT MANNING—Brandon.
ALGUIRE, DUNCAN ORESTES—Stormont.
AMES, HERBERT BROWN—Montreal, St. Antoine.
ARMSTRONG, J. A. MACDONALD—York, Ont., N. Riding.
ARMSTRONG, JOSEPH E. —Lambton, E. Riding.
ARTHURS, JAMES—Parry Sound.

BAKER, GEORGE HAROLD—Brome.
BALL, R. J.—Grey, S. Riding.
BARKER, HON. SAMUEL—Hamilton East.
BARNARD, GEORGE HENRY—Victoria, B.C.
BARRETTE, JOSEPH ARTHUR—Berthier.
BÉLAND, Hon. HENRI SÉVÉRIN—Beauce.
BELLEMARE, A.—Maskinongé.
BENNETT, RICHARD BEDFORD—Calgary.
BENNETT, WILLIAM H.—Simcoe, E. Riding.
BEST, JOHN A.—Dufferin.
BICKERDIKE, ROBERT—Montreal, St. Lawrence.
BLAIN, RICHARD—Peel.
BLONDIN, Hon. PIERRE EDOUARD—Champlain.
BOIVIN, GEORGE HENRY——Shefford.
BORDEN, RT. HON. SIR ROBERT LAIRD—Halifax.
BOULAY, HERMÉNÉGILDE—Rimouski.
BOURASSA, J. BOUTIN—Lévis.
BOWMAN, JAMES—Huron, E. Riding.
BOYCE, ARTHUR CYRIL—Algoma West.
BOYER, GUSTAVE—Vaudreuil.
BOYS, W. A.—South Simcoe.
BRABAZON, GERALD H.—Pontiac.
BRADBURY, GEORGE HENRY—Selkirk.
BRISTOL, EDMUND—Toronto Centre.
BRODER, ANDREW—Dundas.
BROUILLARD, OVIDE—Drummond and Arthabaska.
BUCHANAN, WILLIAM ASHBURY—Medicine Hat.
BUREAU, JACQUES—Three Rivers and St. Maurice.
BURNHAM, JOHN H.—Peterborough, W. Riding.
BURRELL, HON. MARTIN—Yale-Cariboo.

CARDIN, PIERRE JOSEPH ARTHUR—Richelieu.
CARRICK, JOHN JAMES—Thunder Bay and Rainy Riv.
CARROLL, W. F.—Cape Breton, South.
CARVELL, FRANK BROADSTREET—Carleton, N.B.
CASGRAIN, HON. THOMAS CHASE—Quebec County.
CASH, EDWARD L.—Mackenzie.
CHABOT, JOHN LEO—Ottawa.
CHAMPAGNE, ALBERT—Battleford.
CHARLTON, WILLIAM ANDREW—Norfolk.
CHISHOLM, ALEXANDER W.—Inverness.
CHISHOLM, WILLIAM—Antigonish.
CLARK, HUGH—Bruce, N. Riding.
CLARK, MICHAEL—Red Deer.
CLARKE, ALFRED HENRY—Essex, S. Riding.
CLARKE, W. A.—Wellington, N. Riding.
CLEMENTS, HERBERT SYLVESTER—Comox-Atlin.
COCHRANE, HON. FRANCIS—Nipissing.
COCKSHUTT, WILLIAM FOSTER—Brantford.
CODERRE, LOUIS—Hochelaga.
COPP, ARTHUR BLISS—Westmorland.
CROMWELL, FREDERICK ROBERT—Compton.
CROTHERS, HON. THOMAS WILSON—Elgin, W Riding.
CRUISE, ROBERT—Dauphin.
CURRIE, JOHN ALLISTER—Simcoe, N. Riding.

DAVIDSON, AVARD L.—Annapolis.
DELISLE, MICHEL SIMÉON—Portneuf.
DEMERS, MARIE JOSEPH—St. John and Iberville.
DESCARRIES, JOSEPH A.—Jacques Cartier.
DEVLIN, EMMANUEL B.—Wright.
DOHERTY, HON. CHARLES JOSEPH—Montreal, St. Anne.
DONALDSON, SAMUEL J.—Prince Albert.
DOUGLAS, JAMES M.—Strathcona.

EDWARDS, JOHN WESLEY—Frontenac.
ELLIOTT, GEORGE A.—Middlesex, N. Riding.
ETHIER, JOSEPH ARTHUR CALIXTE—Two Mountains.

FISHER, JOHN HENRY—Brant.
FORGET, SIR RODOLPHE—Charlevoix & Montmorency.
FORTIER, EDMOND—Lotbinière.
FOSTER, ARTHUR DE WITT, Kings, N.S.
FOSTER, HON. SIR GEORGE EULAS—Toronto North.
FOWLER, GEORGE WILLIAM—Kings and Albert.
FRIPP, ALFRED ERNEST—Ottawa.

GARLAND, W. F.—Carleton, Ont.

GAUTHIER, LOUIS JOSEPH. St. Hyacinthe.
GAUTHIER, LOUIS PHILIPPE—Gaspé.
GAUVREAU, CHARLES ARTHUR—Témiscouata.
GERMAN, WILLIAM MANLEY—Welland.
GIRARD, JOSEPH—Chicoutimi and Saguenay.
GLASS, S. FRANCIS—Middlesex, E. Riding.
GORDON, DAVID ALEXANDER—Kent, E. Riding.
GRAHAM, HON. GEORGE P.—Renfrew, S. Riding.
GRAY, WILLIAM—London.
GREEN, R. F.—Kootenay.
GUILBAULT, JOSEPH PIERRE OCTAVE—Joliette.
GUTHRIE, HUGH—Wellington, S. Riding.

HANNA, A. E.—Lanark, S. Riding.
HARTT, THOMAS A.—Charlotte.
HAZEN, HON. JOHN DOUGLAS—St. John City and County.
HENDERSON, DAVID—Halton.
HEPBURN, BERNARD RICKART—Prince Edward.
HUGHES, JAMES JOSEPH—Kings, P.E.I.
HUGHES, HON. SAM.—Victoria, Ont.

JAMESON, CLARENCE—Digby.

KAY, WILLIAM FREDERICK—Missisquoi.
KEMP, HON. ALBERT EDWARD—Toronto East.
KNOWLES, WILLIAM ERSKINE—Moosejaw.
KYTE, GEORGE W.—Richmond, N.S.

LACHANCE, ARTHUR—Quebec Centre.
LAFORTUNE, DAVID A.—Montcalm.
LALOR, FRANCIS RAMSAY—Haldimand.
LAMARCHE, PAUL EMILE—Nicolet.
LANCASTER, EDWARD A.—Lincoln and Niagara.
LANCTÔT, ROCH—Laprairie-Napierville.
LAPOINTE, ERNEST—Kamouraska.
LAPOINTE, LOUIS A.—Montreal, St. James.
LAURIER, RT. HON. SIR WILFRID—Quebec East, Soulanges.
LAVALLÉE, JOSEPH OCTAVE—Bellechasse.
LAW, BOWMAN BROWN—Yarmouth.
LEMIEUX, HON. RODOLPHE—Rouville.
LESPERANCE, DAVID OVIDE—Montmagny.
LEWIS, EDWARD NORMAN—Huron, W. Riding.
LOGGIE, WILLIAM STEWART—Northumberland, N.B.
LOVELL, CHARLES HENRY—Stanstead.

MACDONALD, EDWARD MORTIMER—Pictou.
MACDONELL, ANGUS CLAUDE—Toronto South.
MACLEAN, ALEXANDER K.—Halifax.
MACLEAN, WILLIAM FINDLAY—York, Ont., S. Riding.
MACNUTT, THOMAS—Saltcoats.
MCCOIG, ARCHIBALD BLAKE—Kent, W. Riding.
MCCRANEY, GEORGE E.—Saskatoon.
MCCREA, FRANCIS N.—Sherbrooke.
MCCURDY, FLEMING BLANCHARD—Shelburne and Queens.
MCKENZIE, DANIEL D.—Cape Breton, N.
MCLEAN, ANGUS A.—Queens, P.E.I.
MCLEAN, HUGH HAVELOCK—Sunbury and Queens.
MCLEOD, HARRY F.—York N.B.
MCMILLAN, JOHN ANGUS—Glengarry.
MARCIL, HON. CHARLES—Bonaventure.
MARCILE, JOSEPH EDMOND—Bagot.
MARSHALL, DAVID—Elgin, E. Riding.
MARTIN, MÉDERIC—Montreal, St. Mary's.
MARTIN, WILLIAM MELVILLE—Regina.
MEIGHEN, HON, ARTHUR—Portage la Prairie.
MERNER, JONATHAN JOSEPH—Huron, S. Riding.
MICHAUD, PIUS—Victoria, N.B.
MIDDLEBRO, WILLIAM SORA—Grey, N. Riding.
MOLLOY, JOHN PATRICK—Provencher.
MONDOU, A. A.—Yamaska.
MORPHY, H. B.—Perth, N. Riding.
MORRIS, JAMES—Châteauguay.
MORRISON, A.—Macdonald.
MUNSON, CHARLES ARTHUR—Northumberland, Ont., W. Riding.
MURPHY, HON. CHARLES—Russell.

NEELY, DAVIS BRADLEY—Humboldt.
NESBITT, EDWARD WALTER—Oxford, N. Riding.
NICHOLSON, DONALD—Queens, P.E.I.
NICKLE, WILLIAM FOLGER—Kingston.
NORTHRUP, WILLIAM BARTON—Hastings, E. Riding.

OLIVER, HON. FRANK—Edmonton.
OSLER, SIR EDMUND BOYD—Toronto West.

PACAUD, LUCIEN TURCOTTE—Megantic.
PAPINEAU, LOUIS J.—Beauharnois.
PAQUET, EUGÈNE—L'Islet.
PARDEE, FREDERICK FORSYTH—Lambton, W. Riding.
PAUL, WILLIAM JAMES—Lennox and Addington.
PELLETIER, HON. LOUIS PHILIPPE—Quebec County.
PERLEY, HON. GEORGE HALSEY—Argenteuil.
PORTER, EDWARD GUSS—Hastings, W. Riding.
POWER, WILLIAM—Quebec West.
PROULX, EDMOND—Prescott.
PUGSLEY, HON. WILLIAM—St. John City.

RAINVILLE, JOSEPH HORMISDAS—Chambly and Verchéres.
REID, JAMES—Restigouche.
REID, HON. JOHN D.—Grenville.
RHODES, EDGAR N.—Cumberland.
RICHARDS, JAMES W.—Prince, P.E.I.
ROBB, JAMES ALEXANDER—Huntingdon.
ROBIDOUX, FERDINAND JOSEPH—Kent, N. B.
ROCHE, HON. WILLIAM JAMES—Marquette.
ROCHON, GÉDÉON—Terrebonne.
ROGERS, HON. ROBERT—Winnipeg.
ROSS, DUNCAN CAMPBELL—Middlesex, W. Riding.

SCHAFFNER, FREDERICK LAURENCE—Souris.
SCOTT, FRANK STEWART—South Waterloo.
SEGUIN, PAUL ARTHUR—L'Assomption.
SEVIGNY, ALBERT—Dorchester.
SEXSMITH, JOHN A.—Peterborough, E. Riding.
SHARPE, SAMUEL—Ontario, N. Riding.
SHARPE, WILLIAM HENRY—Lisgar.
SHEPHERD, FRANCIS HENRY—Nanaimo.
SINCLAIR, JOHN H.—Guysborough.
SMITH, WILLIAM—Ontario, S. Riding.
SMYTH, WILLIAM ROSS—Algoma, E. Riding.
SPROULE, HON. THOMAS SIMPSON—Grey, E. Riding

STANFIELD, JOHN—Colchester.
STEELE, MICHAEL—Perth, S. Riding.
STEVENS, HENRY HERBERT—Vancouver.
STEWART, DUGALD—Lunenburg.
STEWART, THOMAS JOSEPH—Hamilton West.
SUTHERLAND, DONALD—Oxford, S. Riding.

TAYLOR, JAMES DAVIS—New Westminster.
THOBURN, WILLIAM—Lanark, N. Riding.
THOMPSON, ALFRED—Yukon Territory.
THOMSON, LEVI—Qu'Appelle.
THORNTON, CHARLES JONAS—Durham.
TOBIN, EDMUND WILLIAM—Richmond and Wolfe.
TREMAIN, HADLEY B.—Hants.
TRUAX, REUBEN E.—Bruce, S. Riding.
TURGEON, ONÉSIPHORE—Gloucester.
TURRIFF, JOHN GILLANDERS—Assiniboia.

VERVILLE, ALPHONSE—Maisonneuve.

WALKER, HENRY JOSEPH—Northumberland, Ont., E. Riding.
WALLACE, THOMAS GEORGE—York, Ont., Centre.
WARNOCK, DAVID—Macleod.
WEBSTER, JOHN—Brockville.
WEICHEL, WILLIAM GEORGE—Waterloo, N. Riding.
WHITE, GERALD VERNER—Renfrew, N. Riding.
WHITE, WILLIAM HENRY—Victoria, Alta.
WHITE, HON. WILLIAM THOMAS—Leeds.
WILCOX, OLIVER J.—Essex, N. Riding.
WILSON, CHARLES AVILA—Laval.
WILSON, GORDON CROOKS—Wentworth.
WRIGHT, WILLIAM—Muskoka.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

CONSTITUENCIES OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

FIFTH SESSION, TWELFTH PARLIAMENT

1915

ALGOMA, EAST—William Ross Smyth.
ALGOMA, WEST—Arthur Cyril Boyce.
ANNAPOLIS—Avard L. Davidson.
ANTIGONISH—William Chisholm.
ARGENTEUIL—Hon. George Halsey Perley.
ASSINIBOIA—John Gillanders Turriff.

BAGOT—Joseph Edmond Marcile.
BATTLEFORD—Albert Champagne.
BEAUCE—Hon. Henri Sévérin Béland.
BEAUHARNOIS—Louis J. Papineau.
BELLECHASSE—Joseph Octave Lavallée.
BERTHIER—J. A. Barrette.
BONAVENTURE—Hon. Charles Marcil.
BRANDON—Sir James A. M. Aikins.
BRANT—John Henry Fisher.
BRANTFORD—William F. Cockshutt.
BROCKVILLE—John Webster.
BROME—George H. Baker.
BRUCE, N. RIDING—Hugh Clark.
BRUCE, S. RIDING—Reuben E. Truax.

CALGARY—R. B. Bennett.
CAPE BRETON NORTH AND VICTORIA—Daniel D. McKenzie.
CAPE BRETON, SOUTH—W. F. Carroll.
CARLETON, N.B.—Frank Broadstreet Carvell.
CARLETON, ONT.—W. F. Garland.
CHAMBLY AND VERCHÈRES—J. H. Rainville.
CHAMPLAIN—Hon. Pierre Edouard Blondin.
CHARLEVOIX—Sir Rodolphe Forget.
CHARLOTTE—Thomas A. Hartt.
CHATEAUGUAY—James Morris.
CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY—Joseph Girard.
COLCHESTER—John Stanfield.
COMOX-ATLIN—H. S. Clements.
COMPTON—F. R. Cromwell.
CUMBERLAND—Edgar N. Rhodes.

DAUPHIN—Robert Cruise.
DIGBY—Clarence Jameson.
DORCHESTER—Albert Sevigny.
DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA—Ovide Brouillard.
DUFFERIN—John A. Best.
DUNDAS—Andrew Broder.
DURHAM—Charles Jonas Thornton.

EDMONTON—Hon. Frank Oliver.
ELGIN, E. RIDING—David Marshall.
ELGIN, W. RIDING—Hon. Thomas Wilson Crothers.
ESSEX, N. RIDING—Oliver J. Wilcox.
ESSEX, S. RIDING—Alfred H. Clarke.

FRONTENAC—John Wesley Edwards.

GASPÉ—Louis Philippe Gauthier.
GLENGARRY—John Angus McMillan.
GLOUCESTER—Onésiphore Turgeon.
GRENVILLE—Hon. John Dowsley Reid.
GREY, E. RIDING—Hon. Thomas Simpson Sproule.
GREY, N. RIDING—William Sora Middlebro.
GREY, S. RIDING—R. J. Ball.
GUYSBOROUGH—J. H. Sinclair.

HALDIMAND—Francis Ramsay Lalor.
HALIFAX—Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Laird Borden. A. K. Maclean.
HALTON—David Henderson.
HAMILTON EAST—Hon. Samuel Barker.
HAMILTON WEST—Thomas Joseph Stewart.
HANTS—Hadley B. Tremain.
HASTINGS, E. RIDING—William B. Northrup.
HASTINGS, W. RIDING—Edward Guss Porter.
HOCHELAGA—Louis Coderre.
HUMBOLDT—David Bradley Neely.
HUNTINGDON—James Alexander Robb.
HURON, E. RIDING—James Bowman.
HURON, S. RIDING—J. J. Merner.
HURON, W. RIDING—Edward Norman Lewis.

INVERNESS—Alexander W. Chisholm.

JACQUES CARTIER—Joseph A. Descarries.
JOLIETTE—J. P. O. Guilbault.

KAMOURASKA—Ernest Lapointe.
KENT, N.B.—F. J. Robidoux.
KENT, ONT., E. RIDING—David Alexander Gordon.
KENT, ONT., W. RIDING—Archibald Blake McCoig.
KINGS AND ALBERT, N B.—George W. Fowler.
KINGS, N.S.—Arthur De Witt Foster.
KINGS, P.E.I.—James J. Hughes.
KINGSTON—Wm. F. Nickle.
KOOTENAY—R. F. Green.

LABELLE—Honoré Achim.
LAMBTON, E. RIDING—Joseph E. Armstrong.
LAMBTON, W. RIDING—Frederick Forsyth Pardee.
LANARK, N. RIDING—William Thoburn.
LANARK, S. RIDING—Adelbert E. Hanna.
LAPRAIRIE-NAPIERVILLE—Roch Lanctôt.
L'ASSOMPTION—Paul Arthur Seguin.
LAVAL—Charles Avila Wilson.
LEEDS—Hon. Wm. T. White.
LENNOX AND ADDINGTON—Wm. J. Paul.
LÉVIS—J. B. Bourassa.
LINCOLN—Edward Arthur Lancaster.
LISGAR—William Henry Sharpe.
L'ISLET—Eugène Paquet.
LONDON—William Gray.
LOTBINIÈRE—Edmond Fortier.
LUNENBURG—Dougald Stewart.

MACDONALD—Alexander Morrison.
MACKENZIE—E. L. Cash.
MACLEOD—David Warnock.
MAISONNEUVE—Alphonse Verville.
MARQUETTE—Hon. William James Roche.
MASKINONGÉ—A. Bellemare.
MEDICINE HAT—Wm. A. Buchanan.
MÉGANTIC—L. T. Pacaud.
MIDDLESEX, E. RIDING—S. Francis Glass.
MIDDLESEX, N. RIDING—George A. Elliott.
MIDDLESEX, W. RIDING—Duncan Campbell Ross.
MISSISQUOI—Wm. F. Kay.
MONTCALM—David A. Lafortune.
MONTMAGNY—D. O. Lesperance.
MONTMORENCY—Sir Rodolphe Forget.
MONTREAL, ST. ANNE—Hon. Charles J. Doherty.
MONTREAL, ST. ANTOINE—Herbert B. Ames.
MONTREAL, ST. JAMES—Louis A. Lapointe.
MONTREAL, ST. LAWRENCE—Robert Bickerdike.
MONTREAL, St. MARY—Méderic Martin.
MOOSEJAW—William Erskine Knowles.
MUSKOKA—William Wright.

NANAIMO—Francis H. Shepherd.
NEW WESTMINSTER—James Davis Taylor.
NICOLET—Paul E. Lamarche.
NIPISSING—Hon. Francis Cochrane.
NORFOLK—Wm. A. Charlton.
NORTHUMBERLAND, N.B.—William Stewart Loggie.
NORTHUMBERLAND, ONT., E.R.—Henry Joseph Walker
NORTHUMBERLAND, ONT., W.R.—Charles A. Munson.

ONTARIO, N. RIDING—Samuel S. Sharpe.
ONTARIO, S. RIDING—William Smith.
OTTAWA CITY { Alfred E. Fripp. / John Leo Chabot.
OXFORD, N. RIDING—Edward Walter Nesbitt.
OXFORD, S. RIDING—Donald Sutherland.

PARRY SOUND—James Arthurs.
PEEL—Richard Blain.
PERTH, N. RIDING—H. B. Morphy.
PERTH, S. RIDING—Michael Steele.
PETERBOROUGH, E. RIDING—John A. Sexsmith.
PETERBOROUGH, W. RIDING—John H. Burnham.
PICTOU—Edward Mortimer Macdonald.
PONTIAC—Gerald H. Brabazon.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE—Hon. Arthur Meighen.
PORTNEUF—Michel Siméon Delisle.
PRESCOTT—Edmond Proulx.
PRINCE ALBERT—Samuel J. Donaldson.
PRINCE—James W. Richards.
PRINCE EDWARD—Bernard R. Hepburn.
PROVENCHER—John Patrick Molloy.

QU'APPELLE—Levi Thomson.
QUEBEC CENTRE—Arthur Lachance.
QUEBEC EAST—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier.
QUEBEC WEST—William Power.
QUEBEC County—Hon. Th. Chase Casgrain.
QUEENS, P.E.I. — { Angus A. McLean. / Donald Nicholson.

RED DEER—Michael Clark.
REGINA—William Melville Martin.
RENFREW, N. RIDING—Gerald Verner White.
RENFREW, S. RIDING—Hon. George Perry Graham.
RESTIGOUCHE—James Reid.
RICHELIEU—P. J. A. Cardin.
RICHMOND N.S.—George W. Kyte.
RICHMOND AND WOLFE—Edmund William Tobin.
RIMOUSKI—Herménégilde Boulay.
ROUVILLE—Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux.
RUSSELL—Hon. Charles Murphy.

ST. HYACINTHE—Louis J. Gauthier.
ST. JOHN CITY—Hon. Wm. Pugsley.
ST. JOHN CITY AND COUNTY—Hon. J. Douglas Hazen.
ST. JOHNS AND IBERVILLE—M. Joseph Demers.
SALTCOATS—Thomas MacNutt.
SASKATOON—George Ewan McCraney.
SELKIRK—George H. Bradbury.
SHEFFORD—George Henry Boivin.
SHELBURNE AND QUEENS—Fleming B. McCurdy.
SHERBROOKE—Francis McCrea.
SIMCOE, E. RIDING—William Henry Bennett.
SIMCOE, N. RIDING—John Allister Currie
SIMCOE, S. RIDING—W. A. Boys.
SOULANGES—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier.
SOURIS—Frederick Laurence Schaffner.
STANSTEAD—Charles Henry Lovell.
STORMONT—Duncan O. Alguire.
STRATHCONA—James M. Douglas.
SUNBURY AND QUEENS, N.B.—Hugh H. McLean.

TEMISCOUATA—Charles Arthur Gauvreau.
TERREBONNE—Gédéon Rochon.
THREE RIVERS AND ST. MAURICE—Jacques Bureau.
THUNDER BAY AND RAINY RIVER—John James Carrick.
TORONTO CENTRE—Edmund Bristol.
TORONTO EAST—Hon. Albert E. Kemp.
TORONTO NORTH—Hon. Sir George Eulas Foster.
TORONTO SOUTH—Angus Claude Macdonell.
TORONTO WEST—Sir Edmund Boyd Osler.
TWO MOUNTAINS—Joseph Arthur C. Ethier.

VANCOUVER CITY—Henry Herbert Stevens.
VAUDREUIL—Gustave Boyer.
VICTORIA, ALTA.—William Henry White.
VICTORIA CITY—Geo. Henry Barnard.
VICTORIA, N.B.—Pius Michaud.
VICTORIA, ONT.—Hon. Sam. Hughes.

WATERLOO, N. RIDING—William George Weichel.
WATERLOO, S. RIDING—Frank Stewart Scott.
WELLAND—William Manley German.
WELLINGTON, N. RIDING—W. A. Clarke.
WELLINGTON, S. RIDING—Hugh Guthrie.
WENTWORTH—Gordon C. Wilson.
WESTMORLAND—Arthur Bliss Copp.
WINNIPEG—Hon. Robert Rogers.
WRIGHT—Emmanuel B. Devlin.

YALE-CARIBOO—Hon. Martin Burrell.
YAMASKA—A. A. Mondou.
YARMOUTH—Bowman Brown Law.
YORK, N.B.—Harry F. McLeod.
YORK, ONT., C. RIDING—Thomas George Wallace.
YORK, ONT., N. RIDING—J. A. Macdonald Armstrong.
YORK, ONT., S. RIDING—William Findlay Maclean
YUKON TERRITORY—Alfred Thompson.

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—REVISED EDITION.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Speaker: HON. THOMAS SIMPSON SPROULE.

Thursday, February 4, 1915.

The Parliament which had been prorogued from time to time to the 4th day of February, 1915, 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 the Governor General's Secretary announcing that His Royal Highness would proceed to the Senate Chamber at 3 p. m. on this day, for the purpose of formally opening the session of the Dominion Parliament.

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

Mr. Speaker, His Royal Highness 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:

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the House having attended His Royal Highness in the Senate Chamber, His Royal Highness was pleased to deliver 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:

During the months which have elapsed since the outbreak of war, the people of Canada have given most abundant and convincing evidence of their firm loyalty to our Sovereign and of their profound devotion to the institutions of the British Empire.

Since I last addressed you, a Canadian Expeditionary Force of more than thirty thousand men has been safely despatched across the Atlantic, and after arriving in the British Islands has been engaged in completing the necessary training before proceeding to the front. Notwithstanding the unusually severe weather conditions which have prevailed in the British Islands, the training has proceeded satisfactorily and it is anticipated that the force will very shortly take its place in the field of action.

The earnest and resolute spirit of patriotism which animates the whole Dominion has evoked a magnificent response to the call for service beyond the seas. Large additional forces have been organized from which further contingents are ready to be despatched as soon as the necessary arrangements for receiving them and completing their training can be consummated.

Notwithstanding the inevitable disturbance of trade which was created by the outbreak of war on so vast a scale, the financial and business conditions of the Dominion have shown great stability, and on the whole the country has adapted itself to the new conditions in a very effective way.

My advisers will submit for your consideration measures rendered necessary by the participation of this Dominion in the great task which our empire has undertaken in this war.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

The accounts for the last fiscal year will be laid before you immediately and the estimates for the next fiscal year will be submitted without delay. You will be asked to make the necessary financial provision for effective aid in the conduct of the war.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:
Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

The strong unity of purpose which inspires His Majesty's Dominions gives us the firm assurance that the cause for which this war has been undertaken will be maintained to an honourable and successful issue. I commend to your favourable consideration the measures which will be submitted to you for aiding that great purpose, and I pray that the Divine blessing may be vouchsafed to your deliberations.

On motion of Sir George Foster it was ordered that the Speech of His Royal Highness the Governor General to both Houses

of Parliament be taken into consideration on Monday next, and that this order have precedence over all otner business except introduction of Bills until disposed of.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In the absence of the First Minister, I beg to move:

That a special committee be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees of this House under Rule 10; said committee to be composed of Sir Robert Borden, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Messrs. Reid (Grenville), Casgrain, Pugsley, Stanfield and Pardee.

Motion agreed to.

BILL INTRODUCED.

Bill No. 1, respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—Sir George Foster.

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 Hon. Louis Philippe Pelletier, member for the Electoral District of Quebec County, by resignation.

Of Pierre Edouard Blondin, Esq., member for the Electoral District of Champlain, consequent upon his acceptance of an office of emolument, to wit: Minister of Inland Revenue.

Of Hon. Wilfrid Bruno Nantel, member for the Electoral District of Terrebonne, consequent upon his appointment as a member and deputy chief commissioner of the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Of James McKay, Esq., member for the Electoral District of Prince Albert, consequent upon his appointment as a judge of the Supreme Court of Saskatchewan.

Of Thomas Beattie, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of London, by decease.

Of George A. Clare, member for the Electoral District of South Waterloo, by decease.

I accordingly issued my several warrants to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out new writs of election for the said electoral districts respectively.

[Sir G. E. Foster.]

NEW MEMBERS.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that during the recess the Clerk of the House received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery certificates of the election and return of the following members:

Of Hon. Pierre Edouard Blondin, member for the Electoral District of Champlain.

Of Hon. Thomas Chase Casgrain, for the Electoral District of Quebec county.

Of William Gray, Esq., for the Electoral District of London.

Of Frank Stewart Scott, Esq., for the Electoral District of South Waterloo.

Of Joseph A. Descaries, Esq., for the Electoral District of Jacques Cartier.

Of Arthur Bliss Copp, Esq., for the Electoral District of Westmorland.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

Hon. Pierre Edouard Blondin, for the Electoral District of Champlain, introduced by Sir George Foster and Hon. C. J. Doherty.

Hon. Thomas Chase Casgrain, for the Electoral District of Quebec county, introduced by Sir George Foster and Hon. C. J. Doherty.

Frank Stewart Scott, Esq., for the Electoral District of South Waterloo, introduced by Sir George Foster and Mr. W. G. Weichel.

On motion of Sir George Foster, the House adjourned at 3.35 p.m. until Monday next.

Monday, February 8, 1915.

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

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery certificates of the election and return of Samuel James Donaldson, Esq., member for the Electoral District of Prince Albert.

INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS.

William Gray, Esq., for the Electoral District of London, introduced by Hon. T. W. Crothers and Mr. J. E. Armstrong.

Arthur Bliss Copp, Esq., for the Electoral District of Westmorland, introduced by the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. F. B. Carvell.

Samuel James Donaldson, Esq., for the Electoral District of Prince Albert, introduced by Hon. Robert Rogers and Hon. W. J. Roche.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Report of R. A. Pringle, K.C., Commissioner appointed to investigate into the payment of subsidies to the Southampton Railway Company, together with the evidence, etc., taken before the Commissioner. —Hon. Frank Cochrane.

Report of the Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway, for the year ended March 31, 1914.—Hon. Frank Cochrane.

Report of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, for the year ending March 31, 1914.—Hon. Frank Cochrane.

Report of the Postmaster General for the year ended March 31, 1914.—Hon. T. Chase Casgrain.

Report of the Minister of Agriculture for the year ended March 31, 1914.—Hon. Martin Burrell.

Report of the Department of the Naval Service for the year ended March 31, 1914. —Hon. J. D. Hazen.

Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, for the year 1913-1914.—Hon. J. D. Hazen.

Fifth Census of Canada, 1911—Agriculture, vol. IV.—Sir George Foster.

Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce for the year ended March 31, 1914—Parts I, II, III.—Sir George Foster.

Report of the Department of Labour for the year ended March 31, 1914.—Hon. T. W. Crothers.

Report of the Registrar of Boards of Conciliation and Investigation for the year ended March 31, 1914.—Hon. T. W. Crothers.

Report of the Department of Public Works, Vol. I, for the year ended March 31, 1914.—Hon. Robert Rogers.

Copies of Orders in Council as follows:

P. C.. No. 2175, dated August 21, 1914, re extra rates of pay for service in submarine vessels.

P. C. No. 2251, re rates of pay and allowances for petty officers and men volunteering for war service.

P. C. No. 2960, re scheme of separation allowance for the dependents of those serving in H.M.C. ships.

Radiotelegraph regulation 106 concerning the wave length for use by Canadian licensed ship stations during the period of hostilities.

Amendments to the radiotelegraph regulations, Nos. 103 and 104.

P. C. No. 260, re establishment of rank of mate in the Royal Canadian Navy.—Hon. J. D. Hazen.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN presented an approved Minute of Council appointing Hon. W. J. Roche, Hon. J. D. Reid, Hon. A. E. Kemp, and Hon. T. C. Casgrain a committee to act with the Speaker of the House as a commission under the provisions of the 11th chapter of the Revised Statutes of Canada, an Act respecting the House of Commons.

POLLUTION OF NAVIGABLE WATERS.

Mr. GEORGE BRADBURY (Selkirk) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 5, respecting the Pollution of Navigable Waters. He said: The Bill is similar to the one I have had before the House during the last two sessions, excepting that I have made a small amendment with a view to meeting some of the objections that were raised by hon. gentlemen from different parts of Canada. By the Bill as now presented the Government will have power to take any water—river, stream or lake—out of the operation of the Bill when they see fit to do so. Otherwise the Bill is the same as the one I introduced last year.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

EXPORTATION OF NICKEL.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York) moved for leave to introduce a Bill to regulate the exportation of nickel, etc. He said: The object of the Bill is to regulate the export of nickel and so to control the supply as to prevent the enemy from getting any of it in a time of war like this. It is drafted very much on the same lines as the Bill introduced some years ago to control the export of natural gas and electrical power.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not sure that a Bill of this char-

acter would not require a previous resolution, but that would be a matter for the consideration of Your Honour. But, so far as the general subject of the Bill is concerned, it has received the very careful and prolonged consideration of the Government. The arrangements which have been made with regard to the exportation of nickel have received the unqualified and absolute approval of the British authorities, and especially of the committee which has been formed in Great Britain for the purpose of dealing with the exportation of any materials or supplies which might be of use to the enemy.

Mr. SPEAKER: I judge that this Bill would so affect trade as to come under rule 50, which provides:

No Bill relating to trade, or the alteration of the laws concerning trade, is to be brought into this House until the proposition shall have been first considered in a Committee of the Whole House, and agreed unto by the House.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: The Bill to regulate the export of natural gas and electrical power was introduced without any previous resolution by Sir Charles Fitzpatrick in 1906. It did not get through, and was reintroduced by Sir Allen Aylesworth at the next session. In both cases the Bill was given its first reading without any preceding resolution, so that the procedure of the House bears me out absolutely. As this Bill is exactly on the same lines as the Bills introduced by the two former Ministers of Justice, I think I am quite within my rights in moving the first reading; but if Your Honour decides that I must proceed by way of resolution, I shall certainly bow to your decision, but in that case we shall be changing the procedure of the House.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The matter might stand, so that Mr. Speaker may look into it.

Motion stands.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

The House proceeded to the consideration of the Speech of His Royal Highness the Governor General at the opening of the session.

Mr. W. G. WEICHEL (North Waterloo) rose to move that an Address be presented to His Royal Highness the Governor General offering the humble thanks of this House to His Royal Highness for the gracious speech which he has been pleased to make to both Houses of Parliament. He said:

Mr. Speaker, it would be folly on my part not to admit that I am to a certain extent embarrassed to-day in trying to perform the task that has been assigned to me. I fully appreciate the courtesy, the broad-minded spirit of British fair play, which accompanies this honour, yet I realize that the same is not to myself, but to the constituency I have the honour to represent in this House, to the worthy, frugal, energetic and industrious citizens of North Waterloo. On behalf of my constituents, I desire to express to the right hon. the Prime Minister my deep appreciation of the generous impulse which prompted him at this momentous period of our country's history to confer on my humble self this great honour, an honour I can assure you that is highly prized and doubly appreciated.

Before proceeding with my remarks allow me to convey to His Royal Highness the Governor General and his estimable consort our deepest feelings of respect and gratitude for the kindly courtesy and good will they have on each and every occasion exhibited towards the Canadian people. The untiring zeal and activity displayed by His Royal Highness in connection with the mobilization and departure of the first expeditionary force, and the kindly interest he has displayed in the welfare of the militia generally, as evidenced by the sacrifices he has made to travel long distances to inspect and encourage them, have been highly appreciated by a grateful nation. His presence in Canada during this critical period is highly desirable, and his advice to the Canadian Government has been of inestimable value.

The thanks of the Canadian people are due to Her Royal Highness for the keen interest she has shown in Red Cross work for the Canadian forces, and for her generous assistance towards the Belgian relief funds. Her kindly Christmas gift to each officer and man of the expeditionary force consisting of a card of greetings and a block of maple sugar, was highly appreciated. Apart altogether from the pleasure afforded to the Canadian troops, and the realization that this gift meant that the highest lady in the land had not forgotten them in their uncomfortable surroundings at Salisbury, this presentation of one of the native products of the Dominion has had a very great effect, in that it has called

the attention of the British people to one of the most delicious of our native products and will serve to encourage an industry heretofore too much neglected.

Ruthlessly awakened from our long slumber of false security, we are called upon to-day to desert for a time at least the doctrine of peace that has taken firm root amongst all peace-loving people throughout the world, and to devote our energies towards the adoption of measures to tide us over the present existing crisis—one that not only affects our own Dominion of Canada, but will have a tendency to cement the bonds of imperial unity throughout the whole Empire. Certain measures to meet the existing situation will be introduced in this House by the Government this session. We are confronted with a situation that demands the co-operation of every member occupying a seat in this chamber, that demands courage of a high order, a courage born of conviction that we are in the right, and that to falter and hesitate would be fatal to the country's and the Empire's best interests. All eyes to-day are focused on Europe. As the awful drama of war unfolds itself from day to day, bringing us tidings of the terrible conflict that is being waged by the contending forces in the field, of the destruction, the havoc, and the suffering that are caused by this Armageddon of the nations, we can scarcely believe it possible that we are living in the twentieth century, a century that was ushered in under the most auspicious circumstances, and that gave promise of being an era of peace on earth, and good will towards men.

It is a stupendous struggle, a struggle that will undoubtedly change the map of Europe, that has cast its blight and shadow on millions of happy homes, that is causing untold misery and suffering to those who are least able to bear it, that has practically ruined one country, exposing its citizens to untold privations and miseries, and may be the cause of ruination and disaster to others before the war is over. Never has the world witnessed such a catastrophe, such awful carnage, such ruthless disregard of the rights of others.

The anxiety felt by the Canadian people is intense, as our very existence is at stake. Newspapers are eagerly sought after, bulletin boards are surrounded day and night by innumerable numbers eagerly reading the news from the front announcing in short, concise sentences the daily progress of the tremendous struggle that is going on in far-off Europe.

For years we trusted in arbitration; peace societies throughout the world worked harmoniously one with the other, and men who did not know the situation as it really existed claimed that there was no cause for alarm; the warnings of those who knew were held up to ridicule, and the possibilities of such a stupendous struggle were absolutely discounted. When the blow fell on that memorable day last August, people respected as they never respected before the late Lord Roberts' prophetic words prior to the war, when in ringing tones that could be heard from one end of England to the other, he warned the nation of the impending struggle, and they now realize that he was right and that they have lost in him through death one of the great and illustrious men of the British Empire.

They were pleased beyond conception, however, that Lord Kitchener was given absolute command of the Empire's forces —his very presence at the helm inspires confidence—that General French took command in the field—and he has since demonstrated to a thankful people that the trust confided in him was not misplaced—and a sigh of relief went up from the whole nation when at the outbreak of hostilities the First Lord of the Admiralty with confidence stated that the bulwark of the nation—the British Navy—was ready. And was it a vain boast? The silent victory on the seas is the answer—commerce uninterrupted—business as usual—with the enemy's navy bottled up, and her commerce practically at a standstill.

Never before in the Empire's history has the truth that "the strength of the nation lies in its sea power" been better exemplified than during the last five months; and British subjects throughout the world have every reason to be thankful to those men who had the courage of their convictions, who saw that trouble was bound to come, and who were ready and prepared for it when it did come.

This is a war that was not desired by Great Britain. The causes that brought it about are familiar to all of you and need not be discussed to-day. But from the evidence produced we are assured that the statesmen of England tried by every means in their power to avoid an armed conflict. Every art known to diplomacy, to bring about a better understanding, and to preserve the peace, was exercised, but to no avail. And now that the die is cast,

feeling and knowing that we have a just cause, there will be no hesitation on the part of the people living within the Empire, who are determined to at once and forever take issue with those who proclaim the doctrine that might is right, and who favour military autocracy, as against the doctrine of true democracy.

As we value our self-respect let us face the responsibility with proper seriousness, courage and high resolve, and at the same time let us not be deceived regarding the importance of the task we have undertaken, nor be misled by vain glory into underestimating the strain it will be on our powers.

The war has to a certain extent created a situation throughout the whole world which is not very desirable. Pessimists to-day are having their innings and are talking about business depression and hard times. True, there is a tightness in the money market,and it would be folly for me to say that Canada along with all other countries of the world is not feeling the pinch as well. A great deal of blame for the present conditions has been credited to the war. War or no war, a readjustment and a necessary one, was bound to come; in fact, it was already under way before there were real signs of the impending catastrophe. Prosperity reigned supreme for many years, and men believed that depression and hard times were permanently done away with, men lost their heads and recklessness in business matters took the place of good, sound common sense.

Then some men wise in their generation, who can see ahead of the times, realize that the pace is too fast, and that prosperity has made the nation extravagant, and they begin to doubt. Discounts are refused, and men start to hoard money and speculation receives a check; panic follows; and in trying to extricate themselves during this transition period the people learn by hard experience that the situation created is an awkward one.

The war simply hastened readjustment; but it did something else besides. For a while it shut up the world's stock exchanges, which, to a certain extent, saved the situation, it made big national banks stagger, made business and commerce nearly stand still, shipping was demoralized and insurance took a place as a high priced luxury. The so-called credit machine of the world was broken, and men realized as they never did before how much after all the different nations depend on one another. Depending largely on British capital this upheaval in the world's money markets naturally had its effect on Canada.

Thanks to the energy and wisdom exercised by our Finance Minister and the Government, however, working in co-operation with the Canadian banking system, and keeping in close communication with the British authorities, panic and disaster were averted in this country. Eight important measures were put into force which no doubt you are familiar with, and which had a marked effect in steadying the position in the Dominion.

One of the most gratifying features in Canada to-day is the agricultural position. Although the western harvest was not so large as in the previous year, the increased price obtained will more than offset the difference in the yield. Crops and other farm products were excellent, and prices very satisfactory. Considering the war it is reasonable to expect a heavy demand for grains and foodstuffs in 1915.

Europe is not in a position to produce her regular crop during the coming year, owing to much of the land formerly used for productive purposes being now used as battlefields, and naturally extraordinary demands will be made on Canada. The wise farmer is he who has increased his acreage, as prices will probably remain high for another crop year.

We must recognize that some of the main business interests of the country are vitally affected by present conditions. We have built railroads and developed the country, knowing for a certainty that the soil would have to produce what was necessary to pay interest and principal on these vast loans. The age of construction of large works of importance in Canada helped to create the prosperous times of the past few years, but the production from the soil and natural resources, which after all is where all wealth is drawn from, was not sufficient, and did not keep pace with the other. Production is what we need from our natural resources, and let us hope that the farmer will take full advantage of the situation created; and the stimulation of agricultural production should help materially to solve the problem of the high cost of living, the overcrowding of cities, and consequent unemployment.

Considering the enormous expenditures involved in this country, and the difficulties we have had to cope with owing to the war, it is surprising that Canada has stood the strain so well. In fact, I believe I am not overestimating when I state that we have

weathered the storm almost better than any other country in the world.

A great deal has been said recently regarding the wholesome general tone of Canadian affairs, based not so much on what we might call tangible facts as on the prevailing public confidence throughout our Dominion in the natural resources regarding the production of the soil, mines, forests and waters, and in the ability of our citizens to deal intelligently and successfully with the immediate or any other emergency.

Considering the great strain to which the financial fabric was subjected, our monetary institutions, banks and trust companies are stronger to-day than before the war broke out, and have come through the strenuous situation practically unscathed. The balance of trade which formerly was against the Dominion, and heavily so, is now being steadily reversed. The ablest business authorities in Canada are now advocating production, and more production, as the surest and speediest means of assurance of industrial independence. We have here at home all the resources essential to our welfare, and our first economic duty is to develop our own opportunities.

We are anxious for the war to cease—anxious that peace may be restored, and many are the opinions and theories that have been advanced regarding it. But, Sir, theories and opinions, as a writer recently stated, will not end the war; it will be determined by the strength of British arms, funds and confidence. Once rid of the craze for armaments and relieved of this curse that has held Europe in thraldom for years, business will naturally receive a new impetus by directing money formerly used for armament purposes into regular business channels.

What we need now in Canada is mutual confidence. We are to-day richer in all those things that satisfy human wants than ever before in our history. Confidence must be restored, extravagance must be lessened, the pace we have been going must be curbed, and the lessons learned by hard experience will no doubt be of mutual benefit to us all.

The one great remedy for present conditions is: buy goods made in Canada. If you cannot buy what you want here, then buy Empire-made goods. Loyalty and patriotism as applied to goods made in Canada and the production of our Canadian resources are the two things needful for the country at the present time. Why should we buy goods of American and European manufacture when Canadian workmen to-day are producing goods that are a credit to the Canadian people? What an opportunity for the Canadian shoppers to show their loyalty to their own country in times like these. Proud should we be of the excellent quality of our farm products, of the splendid workmanship of goods of Canadian manufacture; and every citizen who has the best interests of the country at heart should make new resolutions from this day forth—should instil into the minds of the men, women and children, that patriotism and loyalty are as much needed to-day in these things as they are in the graver issues which are being decided by force of arms. I have listened on several occasions to the Minister of Trade and Commerce delivering addresses along this line. He is enthused with the idea of "made in Canada" and "buy in Canada," and his advice on one occasion that labour and capital, the maker and the consumer, should co-operate, is one that will appeal to all men of good judgment.

So let us not forget in the future when we go shopping to insist upon it that we receive goods of home manufacture, that we buy Canadian clothes, made by Canadian workmen, that we insist on Canadian-made shoes, that we do not wear anything but Canadian underwear, that we buy shirts and collars made in a Canadian factory, that we furnish our homes with furniture made in Canada, that we use Canadian machinery; in short, that we be patriotic and loyal by buying Canadian-made goods, and that now and at all times in the future we shall uphold the industries of Canada, so as to give our workmen employment. The results of this policy will after a few months be apparent to all. The Minister of Trade and Commerce aptly described the position of Canadian industries some time ago, when delivering an address to the Toronto Board of Trade, when he stated that our ports and our transport systems and our factories were well equipped, wisely built, and efficient, and that all we have to do now is to keep them going. Orders for army equipment from the Canadian, English, French and Russian Governments have immensely supported the industrial position in this country, and have proven to be a great stimulus to lagging trade.

I am sure that the business men of Canada appreciate the ardour of the Government in securing for Canadian industries the large orders which have been placed indiscriminately throughout Canada, and in

such a way that all classes of people have been highly benefited, and the business situation throughout the country greatly improved.

With the seas cleared of the enemy and commerce again reinstated; with the sign hanging out, "Business as usual"; with the markets of England, France and other nations offering avenues for unprecedented business owing to the war, the Canadian manufacturer and the Canadian farmer should be in a position to increase their export trade, as the opportunities for such to-day are in my estimation better and greater than ever before in our history. I am a firm believer in getting after export business, but I am a stronger believer than ever in getting after the home market in our midst. Nothing can be gained by our standing idle and being pessimists. Let us do our best to meet the unique situation of the present, and there will be good reason for congratulation in after years. As a writer recently stated, "such action means the maintenance of the national workshop, national credit, and national satisfaction." Let us be optimistic, even more so now than ever before in our lives.

Think of poor, unhappy, heroic little Belgium; a few months ago a prosperous, thriving community, secure in the belief that her neutrality would not be violated; to-day her homes destroyed, her priceless works of art ruined, her historic buildings demolished beyond repair, and her people stretching forth their hands in mute appeal to us for help. Think of the unhappy homes in England, France, Russia and Germany; think of the wives and mothers who weep because the husband and son will never return; think of the little children made orphans by the cruel hand of war; and then let us thank God that we live in Canada, and that peace virtually exists on our shores, even though the Empire is at war.

I, for my part, Sir, feel that I am fortunate to live under the protection of the Union Jack. Its silken folds remind me of the freedom that I am enjoying in this country under British institutions—and I know what it means to be a British subject. I am proud of the fact that I was born in Canada, and that I have the same opportunities as all others to make the best of my citizenship in this country of unrivalled resources. To be a British subject is in my estimation a great asset, and I consider it a great privilege to be a conscious fibre of that compacted force.

Although born in Canada, I am of German origin; and, needless to say, along with many hundred thousand other people living here at the present time, I feel keenly the situation that developed five months or so ago in Europe. For a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak to the members of this House about our German-Canadian fellow-citizens—knowing as I do that I am going to touch on a delicate subject, but also aware of the fact that I am speaking to broad-minded men who desire above everything else the unification of all races throughout Canada to-day into one harmonious whole. For many years you have had in your midst a great many people of German origin, thirfty and frugal in their habits, possessed of energies and business abilities that have aroused the admiration of all classes in Canada. They have always been looked upon as desirable citizens, thousands of them have settled in this fair country along with immigrants from every other part of the globe, and very few of them would leave Canada to-day for any other country of the world should opportunity offer. Since the outbreak of hostilities a few—a very few—newspapers in Canada have been trying to discredit and cast suspicion on the German-Canadians of this country, but, be it said to the credit of the great majority of the Canadian people and of the press of Canada, these insinuations have not carried any weight, and the spirit of British fair play and justice is just as much alive to-day in the hearts of the English, the Scotch, and the Irish, as it was during the days of peace.

Mr. Speaker, I am not here to-day to make any apology for the German-Canadians in Canada; but this I do say, and am pleased to say it with all the energy that I can command at the present moment, that the people of German origin in this country are loyal to their King and loyal to the Empire, and that they have since the outbreak of hostilities given ample evidence to this effect, and evidence of such a nature as cannot be denied. True it is that in certain isolated cases some have been indiscreet, and naturally have had to suffer for their indiscretion; but the rank and file of the German-Canadians in Canada to-day are as true as steel, and, as I stated, are daily giving evidences of their loyalty to the flag and to the Crown. The liberties possessed by

those of English, Irish, Scotch, and French descent are theirs as well, and they appreciate to the fullest extent British laws and institutions which guarantee to them freedom of speech and liberty of conscience. Should the German-Canadian, in Canada, be asked to forget the land of his forefathers, its traditions and past history? Let me ask him of Scotch descent, will he ever forget the land of the heather and the rugged scenery of the highlands immortalized in song and poetry by the beloved Scotch poet Burns? Does not the heart of him who boasts of Irish blood beat faster when he thinks of the land of the Shamrock, the "Emerald Isle," with its hallowed associations and pleasant memories? Would it not be too much to ask the French-Canadian to forget the history and glorious traditions of old France? Would an Englishman ever think for one moment of renouncing the land of Shakespeare, Milton and Bacon?

Sir, I would not give a snap of the fingers for the man who denies his ancestry and who is ashamed of the name his father and mother gave to him.

German-Canadians are proud of the race from which they spring; proud of the progress that country has made in science, in art, in music, in literature, in philosophy, in chemistry; gratefully remembering the splendid literary works of Schiller and Goethe; proud of the wonderful compositions of Mendelssohn, Mozart, Haydn, Bach, Liszt and Wagner. But, Sir, they are not proud of the violation of the neutrality of Belgium, of the burning of Louvain, nor of the destruction of the Rheims cathedral. German art, German music, German science, is one thing; but Prussian militarism is another; and the reason why so many people of German origin have left their old fatherland was to escape military domination; and to-day they are just as eager and anxious as you are for the obliteration of this curse which has been weighing so heavily on Europe for so many years.

Sir, it is easy to understand why Canadians of British breed answer the call. The French-Canadian to-day is a natural participant in the present conflict, and besides is grateful for liberty of religion and customs under British rule. But, Sir, is there not a fuller meaning in this spectacle of men going from the German communities of Waterloo, Huron, Bruce and Perth? For them the call is not of the blood; it is duty that calls, and gratitude to the mother country for the many blessings they have enjoyed for so many years in this the land of their adoption. Shoulder to shoulder with all other Canadians, no matter of what nationality they may be, they will do their duty, realizing to the fullest extent that this is a fight for liberty and for future existence—and, let us hope, for the eradication of militarism from the world.

A few weeks ago, Sir, when the twin cities of Berlin and Waterloo responded so nobly to the Canadian patriotic fund, they esteemed it a high privilege to engage in a cause so just and praiseworthy. With them patriotism meant duty in the highest sense. At the same time, they felt keenly the privilege to do that duty, and by the inspiration of it they stand stronger to-day than ever before for the country's unity.

Imperial sentiment has been diffused amongst the people of the mother country during the past quarter of a century to a remarkable degree. Wherever the Union Jack floats security and justice prevail. Peace, order, security and liberty are safe as long as love of country burns in the hearts of the people. A great statesman once said that liberty is responsibility, and responsibility is duty, and that duty is to preserve the exceptional liberty we enjoy with the law, for the law, and by the law. India has made wonderful progress under British rule, and order, peace, and progress have been firmly established in that country. There is, thank God, no servitude under the Flag, and the native of Africa is guaranteed justice and security for his own person and for everything that he may have in his possession. Pillars of strength are Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, and in this crisis during the past five months, our far-flung Empire has been welded together with bands of steels as never before.

When the call came the nation rose as one man. What mattered it whether differences of opinion about other issues existed? They realized that this was a battle of right against might, and all other questions of minor importance were laid aside, and perfect unity and harmony prevailed from one end of the Empire to the other.

Can the unity of the British Empire be better described than by the spectacle that is presented to us in South Africa to-day; only a few years ago our bitterest enemies, to-day joining hands with all the other parts of the Empire in maintaining that freedom under British institutions which

they have been privileged to enjoy, and which has not been found wanting? General Botha is honoured to-day by all men who love to pay tribute to greatness, and his name will be recorded in history along with the many other illustrious names that have added to the Empire's prestige.

Sir, what would be our fate should France be beaten, Belgium put out of existence, and perhaps Holland and Denmark erased from the map? What stirred England to action? It was the moral issue that appealed to the British people, and they would not go back on their word to defend the neutrality of Belgium. As Prime Minister Asquith stated, "It was only when we were confronted with the choice between keeping and breaking solemn obligations—the discharging of a binding trust—that we threw away the scabbard; bound were we by obligations that we could not decline." The preservation of Belgium's national life was the object for which we strove; and how nobly the little kingdom acquitted herself will never be forgotten by the Allies who owe a great debt of gratitude to the heroic nation which can never be paid in its entirety.

Liberties that we have prized and that have been handed down from generation to generation will have to give way to a new doctrine that might is right should the teachings of Nietsche, Treitschke and Bernhardi prevail; the very existence of the democratic institutions which we have learned to revere and love would be threatened. Mr. Bonar Law, the Opposition leader in the British House of Commons, spoke true words when he said: "We are fighting for our nation's existence—for everything which nations have always held dear. But we are fighting for something more: we are fighting for the moral forces of humanity; we are fighting for the respect of public law and for the right of public justice, which are the foundations of civilization; we are fighting for right against might." Frenzied armamentism and militarism cannot and should not not have a place in the civilized world to-day. The tension in a country like Europe must be terrible, and the financial burden almost overpowering.

All right-thinking people regret that we are placed in this position to-day, and we shudder at the consequences entailed. The task, however, which we are called upon to perform is great and noble, and is intimately connected with the progress, prosperity and morality of mankind. One thing we are certain of: that the guilt for this war does not lie at England's door. She stands to-day for freedom, for the rights of small states and for the sanctity of treaties. Yet I realize that in the distant future a great change will come over the nations of the world when the great principles for which we are fighting, liberty and true democracy, emerge victorious. Germany and all other countries in Europe, loosed from the galling yoke of militarism, will then be free to turn their thoughts to higher things than armaments and the principle that might is right. The whole world will long for peace, and woe to the man or nation that harbours thoughts of conquest. Sick and tired will the world be of the whole wretched business—of the slaughter of the bravest and best of its young men, and of the demolition and destruction of beautiful buildings and works of art that have been prized for centuries. The twentieth century should be devoted to the higher things of life. The whole world should be brought to the conception that war is an unnecessary evil, that it blights and destroys nations instead of building them up, and that we should foster the ideals of liberty and justice in the highest sense, that we should work and struggle for the elevation of the human race, and for the betterment of conditions of the masses of the people, this fulfilling the Master's message of peace on earth, good will towards men.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my sorrow—and I am sure all the members of this Parliament will join me—in the loss we have sustained through the death of several of our esteemed members.

Yonder is a seat which for years was occupied by one of Canada's prominent business men. He was, like myself, of German descent, but a Canadian among Canadians, proud of his ancestry and prouder still of his own country. Optimistic regarding Canada's future, and a great admirer of British institutions, George A. Clare will be missed in this chamber—missed by his colleagues and friends, irrespective of party. Of him it may be truly said, in the words of Lessing: "The most agreeable of all companions is a simple, frank man, without any high pretentions to an oppressive greatness; one who loves life and understands the use of it, obliging alike at all times; above all of a golden temper and steadfast as an anchor. For such a one we gladly exchange the greatest genius, the most brilliant wit, the profoundest thinker."

We mourn the loss of London's former representative, the kindly-disposed, genial and whole-souled Major Thomas Beattie. To know him was a pleasure, and his memory will always remain green in the hearts of his friends who knew him best.

Our friends of the Opposition, in the death of the late member for Westmorland, the Hon. Mr. Emmerson, have lost a valuable and honoured associate and the House one of its most faithful members. To them our sympathies are extended.

Canada is grateful to her soldiers who are to-day so valiantly upholding the honour of our country in far-off Europe, and also to those who are preparing to go in the near future. What an object lesson it is to those who predicted the disintegration of the Empire. The thanks of the Canadian people are due the men who gave their time in training and equipping over thirty thousand troops and despatching them to Salisbury Plain in such a short space of time. It was no sinecure, no easy matter, and it reflects great credit on all who with devotion to duty performed their part of the great work. All honour to the members of this House who have enlisted. The hopes and prayers of the Canadian people are with them all in their struggle for right and liberty, and may a kind Providence bring them back again to the land of the Maple Leaf, to their loved ones at home, and to their own firesides, with the knowledge and conviction so beautifully expressed by a Canadian poetess:

> We wear no haughty tyrant's chain,
> We bend no servile knee.
> When to the mistress of the main
> We pledge our fealty.
>
> She binds us with the cords of love,
> All others we disown;
> The rights we owe to God above,
> We yield to Him alone.
>
> May He our future course direct
> By His unerring hand,
> Our laws and liberty protect,
> And bless our native land.

Mr. H. ACHIM (Labelle) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, had I been inclined to-day to indulge in lengthy considerations, the very conciseness of the speech from the Throne, the tone of which strikingly recalls that of a military oration, would have reminded me that this is the time for deeds, not for words.

However, it seems difficult to abstain from glancing back somewhat wistfully at the programmes of former sessions of this Parliament replete with measures of a nature to stimulate our economic progress, measures which in several cases have been carried out, while others necessarily must await the coming of better days. Our beloved country which was striding at a young giant's pace along the highway of progress, has been checked, it must be admitted, in its ascending march. But thank God, though at rest it is not dead by any means; for a moment at a standstill, it may be compared to the fighter who, with every muscle strained, takes in the situation and gathers his whole strength to overcome the obstacle. The obstacle which confronts us in the shape of the most unjust of wars, we shall overcome or destroy.

That staunch faith in our future, is inspired in me, Mr. Speaker, by the admirable way in which our people have undergone the strain of those six months of warfare. Of the various countries engaged in this war, is it not our own that has been the less affected from the economic standpoint?

The country districts in my province—and if my information be correct, the fact repeats itself elsewhere—have not given way under the impact, and it is certainly in such places that the motto: "Business as usual" is most thoroughly adhered to. Our country folk bear the brunt of recent developments with a serene face; they are not fearful of the present and look to the future with that assurance imparted by a conscience of youth and vigour.

"It's an ill wind that blows no good," and the increased demand for cereals and foodstuffs consequent on the war has brought about a rise in prices beneficial to them; while at the same time, by fostering the peaceful arts in the midst of bloody warfare, they are preparing to meet future demands by increased production in 1915.

The mechanic, the city workman, who is not so secure against temporary stringency as is the small farmer or capitalist, naturally were harder hit, but they hail with joy the rise of new industries, the necessary outcome of the new order of things. While factories have closed down, others have been started. The "Made in Canada" campaign, so energetically pushed on by this Government will no doubt cause other industries to spring into existence and instil patriotism into business ventures.

Those orders for supplies which have been directed our way through the skill of our representative in London and his business

agents sent by this Government to the countries adversely affected in their industries, have determined, and will continue to determine an influx of capital beneficial to the workingman.

Am I warranted in hoping that this condition of things in the country districts as well as in the manufacturing centres, will have the effect of rendering bolder Canadian capital, of instilling optimism into the management of our banks, and of getting us out of that period of stagnation which might have been fatal to us?

Our banks have been spared the risk of being subjected to a run at the opening of the war, through the wise policy adopted by the hon. Minister of Finance dispensing them of the obligation of exchanging their notes for gold; and while congratulating the hon. minister on a measure which assuredly has safeguarded the credit of Canadian institutions, I shall take occasion of it to invite our financial instutions to show greater liberality in their dealings with the public.

I happened to pass shortly in front of the monument which the gratitude of a whole people has dedicated to Cartier, and noticing that the pedestal was still without the bust of that great man, and meditating over that fine work interrupted by the war, the thought suggested itself to me that this great work of Confederation which he has bequeathed to us with the co-operation of his illustrious colleague, Sir John Macdonald, was also when the war broke out on the point of receiving its finishing touch in the full bloom of that national prosperity of which Cartier had laid the foundations as with the hand of a sublime architect.

However, even though the monument be unfinished, it is not broken for all that: the triumphant form of the great man will be seen and honoured on the slopes of Mount Royal; in the same way the work of building up this country is merely interrupted, and nothing will prevent the twentieth century from being the century of Canada.

And now, Sir, however, appropriate it may be to praise the man behind the plough or the man handling the tool, and though it behooves us to glory in those who remain at home and ensure the continuity of our economic life, is there a single hon. gentleman whose first thought is not for those who have left or who are about to leave for this great war; for those who have spilt or are ready to spill their blood, so as to enable those remaining to carry on their labours safely.

From every quarter our boys have answered the bugler's call; from the shores of the Pacific to those of the Atlantic, from the valley of the St. Lawrence to that of the Red river, they have taken their place under the folds of the Union Jack. All have answered: Present. With pride we have seen them depart, and presently we shall witness the departure of others. Happy to live under a monarchy which combines a greater measure of liberty than the freest republic, with the stability of monarchial institutions, they have said to themselves that if the Empire is worth while living in, it must perforce be worth while defending.

Accordingly, the appeal to arms could not be left without an answer in the precincts of this House, and the vacant seats which I see near by inspire me with greater pride than grief; for I realize that their occupants of yesterday, exchanging the gown for the sword, have courageously assumed command of their regiments. So that we have nothing to envy to countries older than ours; it is not only in London, in Paris or in Brussels that members of Parliament are willing to affront death on behalf of a great cause. Honour then to the representatives of Simcoe, of York, of Thunder Bay and of Brome. If the warm remembrance of their colleagues can be a solace to them in the performing of their tedious daily tasks, and uphold their courage in action, let me tell them that we are proud of them.

But it is not only around me that war has made vacant seats, and not far from the hon. leader of the Opposition, on the front row, I do not see any longer the hon. member for Beauce. The declaration of war found him in the enjoyment of perfect bliss, unwilling to depart from that country of Belgium so dear to his heart, and I cannot but admire the ease with which he passed from the realm of romance to that of warfare. Accustomed as he was to be on the firing line of his party, he was incapable of changing, and he remained in the front rank; and I fancy he must be there, with a smiling face and a sharp tongue, wage war in laces as it were. He has received the baptism of fire, possibly that of blood, and I feel proud of it for my province.

Not a single one of these men has thought of arguing over his rights or his duties; not one of them has endeavoured to find out a clause of the constitution behind which he

might find refuge. They all of them have thought with the civilized world that the allies were on the side of right and justice; they applied for powder and ammunition, and I cannot blame the Government for having given them what they pay for so generously with their blood.

Let us pay a tribute, in passing, to that distinguished regiment which is fighting for its lady and its King, the Patricias, whose blood has already reddened the soil of France, and whose war cry "for Canada and the Empire" has already caused the enemy to tremble.

Neither have those remaining here shown indifference. Departing soldiers had left to our charge their beloved ones; it would have been intolerable that the latter should have been made to suffer on account of the patriotism of their natural protectors. Accordingly, contributions were in order, and money poured into the patriotic funds to such an extent that to-day those who have gone to the front need not any longer worry about those intrusted to their care whom they have left at home. In this connection as well, our people have done their duty.

On the other hand, the youthful volunteer has not been forgotten, and on his behalf there has been organized associations of women and girls, workshops wherein under the inspiration of patriotism, persons recruited from all classes of society work together in the accomplishment of a common task. The shop girl is there cooperating with the society woman, and while their hands are busily engaged, their lips, I surmise, utter prayers for the success of our arms. May I be allowed to do homage to the graceful fingers handling the needles as well as to the sunburnt hand which holds the rifle: both are inspired with the same patriotism. Free contributions by individuals and by this Government, such is the nature of our interference in the present conflict. Though our little country is not in immediate danger, should we wait until it has been invaded to rise to its defence? Is there any one of us, in this deadly struggle, who has not lived through the hours of the drive on Paris as mournfully as if the German hordes had been overrunning our own soil? Once the enemy is victorious on the continent, and is master of the British Isles, it will be too late to take up arms for the defence of the country.

We realized that Canada could not remain indifferent to the dangers threatening the Empire, and it may not be out of place to quote here the words uttered by the hon. member for Kingston at the opening of the session of 1912-13 when, referring to the stand taken by the right hon. Prime Minister concerning the relation of the colonies with the mother country, he said: "There is, however, one view which he clearly expressed and it was that if Canada assumed some responsibilities, it would be under the condition of being consulted by the leaders of the nation." What form shall that consultation take it is not incumbent on me to say. However, the reiterated statement made by the right hon. Prime Minister, as well as those of a more recent date from the mouth of the hon. Minister of Justice, seemed to justify the belief that it will be a consultation of the representatives of the nation who are responsible to the people. If we are to assume any constitutional obligation involving our participation in the wars of the Empire, the policy advocated by the right hon. the Prime Minister, is the only one in accord with the principle of representation. But should there not be made a distinction between this war and all previous wars in which the Empire was engaged? Current events plainly show that our people know what use they should make of their liberty towards promoting the welfare of the Empire whenever circumstances warrant it. And that war having no parallel in history, cannot, according to my view, constitute a precedent involving a change in our political status, an alteration of the constitution.

I suggested a moment ago that defending the Empire under present conditions was equivalent to defending our own territory. But since every country is made up of its soil and its inhabitants as well, there is another force, invisible that one, and wholly moral, which is necessary to its maintenance, I mean the traditions of the people.

All that we have learned to love, all that we have learned to respect is found within the folds of the Union Jack and the Tricolour. Our tongue, our civilization are threatened simultaneously with those of England and France: we are defending them and a French-Canadian cannot witness without a thrill the alliance of those two nations, to one of which we owe our wholesome political institutions, while from the other we have received those characteristics of the Latin races which we deem second to none.

While France defends her territory, England defends the treaties, and being unable to continue the part of peace-maker which she had assumed in Europe, she shows that while preferring peace to war, she has not forgotten how to carry on the latter.

4 p.m.

And in connection with the part of peace-maker assumed by Great Britain, was it not Mr. Barthou, an eminent French statesman, who, a few years ago, stated that at the time of the Agadir incident, had it not been for the diplomatic intervention of England, France would have been forced into a war with Germany.

This time, having failed in her effort to avoid such a misfortune, the mother country will not at any rate have it said that force takes precedence of right, and the stand taken by that strong and inviolate nation in extending her hand to the wounded and mutilated Belgium is one of the finest deeds recorded in human history.

May I be allowed, Sir, to halt for one moment before that country and to express to its people and to its King how highly they are esteemed and admired in this country of ours? The impartial historian will state no doubt that it was this nation of 7,000,000 people, by rising in opposition to the German colossus, gave the Allies time to get ready.

It is not my intention to recall here the opening war operations; but the whole world has witnessed that entrancing event: the German army started on its way to Paris, and nothing seemed capable of stopping it; when suddenly a man appears, a knightly King backed up by his whole people, both of whom, the Sovereign and his people, are inspired by the love of country and the sense of honour. At this unexpected juncture: a sovereign who in this twentieth century keeps faith with treaties, Germany hesitates, the Belgians strike out, Germany wavers. In vain, later on, having recovered from their surprise will the Germans dash forward, in vain will they destroy fortresses and burn down unprotected cities, the heroic defensive of the Belgians has brought out to the knowledge of the world the weak points of the German war machine. France and England have mobilized their troops and the triumphal drive of the invader will slow down, and bye and bye be turned into a retreat which closely resembles a riot.

Belgium with its citadels, Belgium with the bravery of its noble children has been a surprise to the world, possibly it has saved Europe. A large proportion of civilians have taken refuge in London where they have been most cordially received, but, if I am allowed to express a wish, my desire would be that Canada extend a helping hand to those unfortunate people.

All are aware that previous to taking their place in the military annals of the world, that small people ranked high in the economic scale. No doubt, and it is my hope as well as theirs, many of them will be desirous of rebuilding their homes and of returning to the spot where their ancestors have tilled for centuries past. Others, I am told, are thinking of settling in Canada. I understand the province of Ontario has started a movement towards promoting their settlement here; Quebec will not lag behind, neither should the Dominion Government leave anything undone to help the provinces in their immigration work.

It so happens that I have in my county a settlement by the name of Namur where a number of Belgians have been living and prospering for some twenty-five years. The soil of that township is not of the richest to be found in my constituency, but that small community, through the application of scientific methods of culture and good management, has accomplished marvels. The whole northern part of my province and some other provinces, would offer to those immigrants numberless opportunities, and their presence here, their good example, would be a precious boon.

A country where co-operative credit and other associations are flourishing, a country where intensive farming is carried on, Belgium having become an exporter, has scored great successes in the markets of the world, and the cash balance in its favour fills its coffers with gold. Belgium is to-day a money lender which has $100,000,000 in Russia as against $10,000,000 here. Should a few of its people immigrate to this country, would they not draw to the Dominion some of that capital of which we are so much in need?

Our past policy of immigration has not always escaped warranted criticism in the past, and I do not propose deploring very much its forced interruption; but I think sound public opinion in this country would rejoice at seeing a current of Belgian immigration directed towards our borders. By favouring such a move this Government would be doing something helpful to Canada; while at the same time fulfilling its duty towards

those people to whom only peoples of antiquity can furnish a parallel.

While extending a friendly welcome to all those who are disposed to come here, I wish to proclaim to the whole nation that we are just as anxious as they are themselves to see the day when her soil will be rid of the German hordes and when Belgium, bleeding and mutilated, but by no means conquered, shall once more lift her head, made younger by the consciousness of her glorious and immortal deeds.

That expected triumph, the termination of that war which we are longing for, will in a large measure no doubt, be due to our land forces, but even in a greater degree to the allied fleets of France and England. As new developments come to light, it is more and more apparent that the main factor in the final result will be the navy.

As a matter of fact, all strategists, all economists agree that the final result will not depend on particularly striking and brilliant achievements, but on the power of holding out possessed by the armies in presence, a quality which is inseparable from the possession of large means of revictualling.

Of course, I am not unmindful of the brilliant victories of the British fleet off the coast of South America or in the North sea; but I say that the greatest service our seamen did in that war was in ridding the seas of the German ships which infested them, and in carrying out with lightning rapidity that blockade which, by isolating Germany, has secured for us a new ally, famine, which will decimate the enemy more effectively than the sword or the gun.

That is why I see in the navy a token of victory, and let every British subject cry out with pride and confidence: "Britannia (still) rules the waves."

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Quebec East): Mr. Speaker, in common with every member of this House, I certainly commend very highly the tone of the addresses to which it has been our privilege to listen from the members for Waterloo (Mr. Weichel) and Labelle (Mr. Achim). I concur in every word that has been said in grateful tribute to their Royal Highnesses, the Duke and Duchess of Connaught, in the trying times in which we are living. Certainly the conduct of both their Royal Highnesses has been such as to gain our admiration for their devotion to the Empire and to Canada.

I wish to associate myself with the mover of the address (Mr. Weichel) in his touching tribute to our colleagues who have been called away by death, Messrs. Emmerson, Clare and Beattie. They were men whose memories will be green in this House for many years to come.

The hon. member for Labelle supplied what I am sure had been an omission on the part of the hon. member for Waterloo by referring to the absence from this House of the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Beland). We all regret his absence from this House, but we are sure that he is fulfilling a great duty at the seat of war. Reference was also made to the absence of other members who are to-day at the front, fighting for their country, and whom we hope to see in their seats again at no distant date, with the tokens of victory.

But, Sir, to my mind the one thing remarkable in the debate to-day is that the motion for an Address in reply to a speech from the Throne devoted altogether to the proposition that the war must be continued, should come from one of His Majesty's subjects of German origin. If there be anything significant, anything which justifies the very eloquent periods of my hon. friend from North Waterloo, it is the very fact that he, a British subject of German origin, should speak as he speaks and occupy the place which he does. There could be no better justification, if justification were needed, of British institutions. In the trying times in which we live the situation of our German fellow-citizens must certainly be a trying and painful one. "Blood is thicker than water," is an English proverb of universal application, and people of British origin certainly apply it to others as they claim it for themselves. No one in this country would think of claiming from our fellow-subjects of German origin the same measure of sacrifice which we expect from others; but all that could be expected from our German fellow-citizens towards the end which we all have at heart has been done by them, and well done and cheerfully done.

It is some six months since His Royal Highness called the Canadian Parliament in extra session in order to consider and to enact such legislation as might be required on account of the terrible war which had just broken out in Europe, and the effect of which is felt to-day over the whole world. Again we meet, this time according to a process ordered by the constitution, to transact the regular business of the

country; but unfortunately the regular business of the country is far outweighed by the necessities and terrible responsibilities of the war. Although we can rejoice that the terrible movement of the German army which was in progress while we were here in the month of August last has been baffled and most victoriously repulsed—that movement, the object of which was the occupation of Paris and the crushing of France—still, notwithstanding this early triumph, we must recognize that the horizon is still dark and very much clouded, and unfortunately we cannot see any sign on the horizon which would lead us to hope for an early return of peace. At the outset of the hostilities one man there was who had a clear vision of what was impending, and that man was Lord Kitchener when he stated that the war must be a long protracted struggle, and that perhaps three years would not see the end of it. Many there perhaps were at the time who were inclined to think that this was a pessimistic view, and who believed and hoped that the events would falsify it. And, considering the weapons, the terrible engines of destruction which the application of the discoveries of modern science has added to the art of war—if I may degrade so far the word art—and considering also that European militarism has forced millions of men into armies, perhaps the supposition was not unnatural that, whichever side might win, the struggle must be short and decisive, as it had been in 1866 in the war between Prussia and Austria, and as it had been in the war of 1870 between Prussia and her allies and France. Such was undoubtedly the view of the Kaiser and the German staff, and if they gave any heed to the defence which was forecasted by the word of Lord Kitchener, they evidently felt they could afford to ignore it, supposing they could win before such a defence could be successfully organized. This was the first mistake of the Kaiser, and the first time that Lord Kitchener showed his prescience. It is a historical fact that, when the German armies were mobilized at the end of July last, there was not a man in those armies, from the Kaiser and the German staff down to the lowest corporal and the youngest private, who was not convinced that in four weeks at most they would be in Paris, and France would lay prostrate at their feet. They came within sight of the citadels of Paris, within hearing of their bells, when the sudden movement of the armies under Generals Joffre and French threw them back upon the Marne and from the Marne to the Aisne. The Germans were thrown back to the Aisne; but—let us be sincere with ourselves—though defeated, they were neither routed nor crushed. That was in the early days of September and from that time to this the German armies have been unable to penetrate the lines of the Allies, unable to reach the new goal they had set for themselves after they were driven back from Paris: Calais, on the English channel. The most famous regiments of the Prussian army were in vain thrown against the lines of the Allies, and the flower and pride of the German army were sacrificed, I will not say wantonly, although that might be justified. But let us be frank with ourselves. Though, since the month of September the Germans have been unable to pierce the allied lines, yet the Allies have not yet been able to drive the Germans out of France and Belgium and back across the Rhine. The prognostications of Lord Kitchener seem to be verified. It seems probable that the war will become a process of attrition, and that the sacrifice of human lives to this Moloch of war of which we have a daily account, will go on for weeks and months, and the months may lengthen into years. On both sides there have been successes and reverses, and on both sides the blood of men has flowed in torrents. If this were an ordinary war, the very circumstances to which I have just referred would justify the hope of an early opening for peace. If this were an ordinary war, I repeat, some friendly mediator might step in between the combatants and ask them to desist, to listen to the voice of peace. But this is not an ordinary war.

It is useless at this time to argue about the war; but we can never forget that the struggle which has been going on in Europe for the last six months is a contest between two principles: the principle of liberty and the principle of dominance. If there ever was any doubt upon this point in the mind of anybody, that doubt has been removed by the German professors, German publicists, and German journalists, who have attempted to lay before the civilized world the causes of the war. Though they pretended that Germany was not the aggressor, they plainly showed that the thought at the

back of the head of the Emperor of Germany and, I am afraid, in the minds of the people of Germany themselves, was that Germany was superior to all the rest of the world, that it was her destiny to rule, and rule, as they imagined, for the benefit of mankind. They have made it abundantly clear that if the Allies should be defeated in this war the result would be the annihilation of Belgium as an independent nation, the dismemberment of France, the degradation of England to the rank of a second-rate power, the absorption of Holland, and the dominance of Europe by a military despotism. The full significance of the struggle has been more than once declared by the Kaiser himself in this formula: "There is no will but my will, there is no law but my law—the law which I myself lay down." This means that if Germany were to be victorious in this war, a setback for years and perhaps for centuries would be given to the conquests for freedom, for progress, for the advance of democracy, for the elevation of the race, which have been won by the practical good sense of England and by the idealism of France.

If any proof were needed of those conquests, the proof is supplied by the conduct of the dominions, the colonies and the dependencies all over the world which acknowledge British sovereignty. It is a well-known fact that German publicists and German military writers have prophesied that whenever a continental war should come England would be powerless to take part in it; that the moment the first shot was fired England would be torn by internecine factions; her possessions beyond the seas would sever their connection. We must not be surprised at this conclusion of those who believe that the only rule of government is force. But German publicists have yet to learn that there is a greater force than force, and that the British Empire, resting upon the basis of freedom is more durable than the German Empire resting upon the basis of blood and iron. If anything could open their eyes it would be the spectacle of British colonists from all over the world taking their places behind England in the struggle in which she is now engaged. Such a spectacle is well calculated to cause wonder and surprise to the apostles of German "Kultur" and to give hope and joy to those who believe that our system, for which men die, is not a system under which a man, no matter who he be, can say, "There is no will but my will, there is no law but my law—the law which I lay down." It is a system under which the law is laid down by the joint action of the King and the people—the law to which the King himself is subject as much as the lowest of his subjects. Such is the spectacle which has been presented to the world in this war, and it is in many respects a spectacle which gives us British subjects a just right to feel proud.

During the recess my right hon. friend the Prime Minister and some of his colleagues have expressed the view, not in a way to which I take exception, that the British system as it exists to-day ought to be altered so as to give the Dominions a voice in all questions of peace and war. If I mention the matter to-day it is not because I intend here and now to enter into any controversy upon it, though the subject be highly controversial first, from the point of view of the Imperial authorities, who have more than once in recent times stated that in their opinion such an assumption would be perilous, and also in the view of the Dominions, who, if they were to assume such a power, must assume also very heavy burdens in time of peace as well as in time of war. But, I repeat, I do not intend at this moment to enter into any controversy. The task which is weighing upon us is heavy enough not to increase it by the introduction of subjects which may be not only controversial but which at the time may not be practical. The time will come when peace will be restored, and then will be the time to discuss these and many other problems which will have to be taken up by all British peoples. In the meantime, for my part, I hardly believe that any system that can be devised, or that can be reduced by legislation to any complete form applicable to the daughter nations of the Empire, can ever have the same inspiring grandeur, or the same patriotic efficiency, as the action of the Dominions all over the world—the voluntary, spontaneous action of all those Dominions—in lining themselves up behind England in the hour of her trial.

Conscription has never met with any favour in the British Isles. It has never been consistent with the genius of the British people to use the strong arm of the law to fill up the ranks of her army. England is the least military of the nations of Europe. She has long given

up the mania for conquest which has been the bane of so many strong nations, and which may yet prove the undoing of Germany. She has not been engaged in any aggressive war since the Seven-Years War, and while the great nations of the continent were devoting their strength, wealth and energy to armaments and military preparations, while they were taking the largest portion of the youth of the country as it came to manhood from productive labour and placing it in camps and barracks, England never forced a single one of her subjects into the army. She kept all her people busy producing and accumulating, with the result that when she was forced into war—forced, I say, and I say advisedly—though her armies were not numerous in comparison with continental armies their prowess in the field never caused her to regret that she had kept to the voluntary system. She was able, out of her wealth, to finance the whole of Europe in the most gigantic struggles, even in that against Napoleon himself, with the result that generally she came out victorious. There is reason to suppose that compulsion against communities will have the same result as compulsion against individuals, and there is further reason to hope that when the victory has been won—for we have no doubt as to the ultimate victory in the war—there will be a movement amongst all civilized peoples to put an end to armaments and to ensure a lasting era of peace. Let me repeat that it is a struggle between freedom and domination. Into this struggle our people have thrust themselves with all the energy at their command, and all subjects of the King in this country have done, as I believe, their share, and are prepared to do more if need be to attain the end.

The speech from the Throne is confined altogether to the question of the war. Nothing else is mentioned in it. The speech simply says that:

> My advisers will submit for your consideration measures rendered necessary by the participation of this Dominion in the great task which our Empire has undertaken in this war.

Already there is on the Order Paper a motion by the Prime Minister to provide something like $100,000,000 to that end. Let me say at once that we who sit on this side of the House and who represent His Majesty's Loyal Opposition took our course at the outset of hostilities when we declared that we would support the Government in their war policy. We conceived that it was our duty to do nothing to embarrass the Government, but on the contrary, to do everything in our power to facilitate the task, the heavy task, which had been placed in the hands of those to whom, for the time being, the Canadian people had entrusted their fortunes. We have acted upon this principle all along, and again we are prepared to act accordingly. We meet the summons of His Royal Highness in the same spirit to-day, in the month of February, as we met it in the month of August last. We are prepared to give to the Government, to those who for the moment have the confidence of the Canadian people under our constitutional system, the support to which they are entitled for the attainment of the great end which we all have in mind.

But whilst we are prepared to do nothing more than, perhaps, we should do, at the same time we are entitled to have from the Government a full statement of the expenditures which they have made out of the $50,000,000 which was placed at their disposal last August. The Canadian people have been generous with their money; they continue to be generous with it; but whilst we are prepared to believe, as indeed we do believe, that mistakes have been made in the manner in which the money has been expended, that errors of judgment have been committed, of those mistakes and of those errors of judgment we are not disposed to be critical.

It would be hardly possible to expect that in the case of the expenditure of some fifty million dollars no mistakes would arise; it is perhaps more than we can expect from human nature; but we cannot close our eyes to the fact that not only have mistakes been made, but frauds have been committed which have resulted in injury to the health of our troops, and impairment of their efficiency. These frauds have been regarded as so gross and so criminal that the Minister of Militia himself, not more than two or three weeks ago, stated, not once but three or four times at different places in the country, that if he knew the man who supplied the boots, which have been the cause of so much disease, and sickness, and suffering to our soldiers on the plains of Salisbury, that man would deserve to be shot. The honour of the minister is at stake, and so is the credit of the country. It is not impossible to discover the responsible parties. Up to the present the minister is responsible, and it is for him to take the necessary measures to vindi-

cate himself. We have been told that a commission of three members has been appointed by the Government to investigate this particular matter, and not later than ten or twelve days ago it was stated that the minister himself, not satisfied with this inquiry, had instituted a departmental investigation to ascertain the true facts. I do not know if this is all that is intended to be done by the Government; but let me say that the fullest light should be thrown upon this matter, so that the people of Canada may know where the responsibility lies. No member on this side of the House intends to be critical, and for my part I certainly have no such intention; but assuredly we are all gravely concerned that the health and comfort of those brave men who are risking their lives in the cause of the Empire shall have every protection that we can afford. I would say to my hon. friend the Minister of Militia, were he in his seat, that in certain quarters the blame is cast upon him. It is said that the fact that the boots which were supplied to the troops were not what they ought to have been; is not the fault of the workmanship or of the material supplied, but the fault of the specifications furnished to the manufacturers. The Shoe and Leather Journal, which is a semi-monthly trade journal published in Toronto, in its issue of the 1st of January, states:

> Practical shoe manufacturers give credit to the firms who already have executed Government orders. They say that the shoes were made according to specifications, broadly speaking, and in the case of the supplies for the first contingent, under the most trying circumstances. But the specifications are generally not thought to be those for the 'fighting' shoe. The sole is not heavy enough, and it is not hobnailed or quilted, nor is the heel reinforced by a steel plate. The shank is too narrow and not strong enough to stand spade work. The uppers are not heavy enough in all cases, though sometimes they are sufficiently heavy, but not pliable. In short, the specifications are for a shoe that does very well for use in Canada for parade or training purposes, but which does not answer for wear in England, much less in Europe.

In the same issue of the Shoe and Leather Journal is an interview with Mr. W. V. Matthews, manager of the manufacturing department of the well-known firm of Ames-Holden-MacCready, in which he says:

> 'Those shoes were never meant for foreign service,' said Mr. Matthews, 'as the Government well knew that their specifications called for shoes that did not at all resemble the standard army patterns generally endorsed by Great Britain and European nations. It was not the intention of the Government to set a new style in army footwear for nations that had learned by practical experience what was best suited for war use.
>
> 'There is an army shoe,' said Mr. Matthews, picking up an English army model, real service style, 'which is the only make that will stand the wear and tear of actual service conditions. A pair of them weight 65 ounces. The shoes supplied to the Canadian Government would not weight more than 38 ounces, which is about 18 ounces to 20 ounces more than the weight of an ordinary pair of men's welts. You cannot observe both shoes and say they were meant to give the same service. It is ridiculous.
>
> 'The shoes supplied members of the first contingent were meant to be used by the soldiers while in training to accustom their feet to heavier footwear. The immediate change from light welts to shoes of the army patterns as used in Europe would have crippled most of the volunteers in a week. Knowing that it would be months before the Canadian force went to the firing line, the Government saw fit to specify shoes such as were ordered, and, speaking generally, they received good value from the Canadian manufacturers who shared in the business. Speaking for our firm, we received an order for 62,500 pairs, or about one-fourth of the entire quantity. Not one pair has been returned or complained about. It is quite possible that some manufacturers may not have been so fortunate.'

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that for my part I am not altogether satisfied with the statements made in this interview. Neither am I prepared, upon that statement, to condemn the Government. There are in it assertions which seem to be somewhat contradictory. I cannot think, for example, that the shoes which were ordered by the Government were not intended for use on foreign service, and were only intended to accustom the feet of the men to the use of the heavier boot of the English soldier. Until I get further information on the subject I am disposed to doubt this statement. I am not prepared, as I say, at the present moment to condemn the Government; but I do say that this is a matter which ought to be thoroughly inquired into, and upon which the fullest information should be given to the Canadian people. The atmosphere is filled with various assertions to the effect that the men who were sent to the front were not properly equipped. But I will not refer now to anything but the defect in the boots, which has been so widely discussed in the press of Canada and of England that it cannot be passed over in silence. I say again that I refer to the matter now, not for any party purpose, but in order that we may have the truth and the whole truth about it, so that we may know upon whose shoulders to place the responsibility, and thus guard against the

recurrence of such mistakes or offences. I refer to the matter now in order that our men who are already at the front—and some of whom have already given up their lives on the fields of France for the Empire—may be enabled to give their whole energy and vigour to the noble cause they are fighting to uphold.

I do not say this in any carping spirit. I do not want to make any political capital out of it. I am as much a party man as any man in this House, but I should despise myself if I were to attempt to make political capital when the country is in such danger as it is in at the present time. The desire is simply to have everything done that can be done in order that the men whom we send to the front may discharge their duties with the greatest credit to themselves and the greatest benefit to the country and to the whole Empire. This is the spirit which animates those who sit around me here. As I stated a moment ago, so I repeat, we ask for nothing but information, and we hope that upon this and all points the information to which we are entitled will be abundantly afforded.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with what has been so well and so eloquently said by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), with regard to the great service rendered by His Royal Highness the Governor General to this country and to the whole Empire by his presence in Canada, by his occupancy of that high position and by the very keen, unfailing, indefatigable interest which he has taken in everything that concerns Canada's part in this war, the proper equipment of our troops and their despatch to the front under proper conditions. I have more reason and better opportunity to know of the interest which His Royal Highness the Governor General has thus taken than have most hon. members of this House, and it was with peculiar pleasure that I listened to the observations of my right hon. friend as well as to the remarks of the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Weichel) in that regard.

I desire also to associate myself with what my right hon. friend has said as to the speeches delivered by the mover and seconder of the motion now under consideration. The presence of these gentlemen in this Assembly and the duty they have been called upon to discharge to-day, and which they have so worthily and eloquently discharged, is at once an exemplification of the principles upon which our Empire is based and of the appreciation of those principles by those in whose countries they are applied. The fact that we have listened to such eloquent and patriotic speeches as those of the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Weichel) and the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Achim) is of itself a great tribute to those principles. My hon. friend from North Waterloo has spoken of the part which has been taken by the citizens of German descent in the upbuilding of this Empire and particularly in the upbuilding of this Dominion. We have had good reason to know and understand, especially since the outbreak of this war, the patriotism, the loyalty, the devotion of the citizens of German origin to this country. As my hon. friend has well said their position was not free from embarrassment, but their appreciation of the land from which they came, of its institutions and of all it represents in the world, has been wholly consistent with their loyalty to the land of their adoption and the institutions of our Empire. We have those in Canada who although of German descent, were born in Canada and are Canadians as we are ourselves, understanding as we do with perfect appreciation the liberties which are ours of right. We have also in this country those who were born in Germany or in Austria-Hungary, who have been asked to come to Canada as immigrants and to join with us in the task of upbuilding this Dominion. So far as the first-named are concerned, not a word need be said; the earnestness and the zeal with which they have joined in all that appertains to the welfare of the Dominion and of the Empire in this war speak for themselves. So far as the others are concerned, I repeat what I said in August last when we were considering matters connected with the war, that those of German birth and those born in the Empire of Austria-Hungary who have come to this country to be citizens of Canada have with very few exceptions borne themselves worthily and well. I believe that I can speak with peculiar knowledge as to this because it has been part of my public duty to make myself acquainted with their sentiments and with the part which they are taking at this juncture of our affairs.

5 p.m.

My hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Achim)

represents here a race which was the pioneer race in this Dominion, a race which has shown a perfect understanding and appreciation of the principles of liberty upon which this Empire is based. My hon. friend's presence here to-day and the eloquent speech from him to which we have listened are in a like manner a tribute to the appreciation by that race in Canada of the liberties which all the citizens of Canada enjoy regardless of creed or of race.

My hon. friends have spoken, and so has my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, of the loss which the members of this House have sustained in the death of those who have passed away. The late Mr. Emmerson had a long career in public life and took a very prominent part in the debates of this House, where his industry and his earnestness in all that he undertook were very notable. I join with my hon. friends in extending to the relatives whom he has left behind the sympathy of all the members of this House which I am sure is freely extended. My good friends, George Clare and Major Thomas Beattie, have also passed away since we last met. They did not take an active or prominent part in the debates of this House, but they were men who had a long experience in public affairs. I have already expressed appreciation of my association with them in public life and of the fine qualities which they made manifest as members of this assembly. They did not often speak, but when they did address the House it was with a knowledge and an earnestness which commended all that they had to say to the consideration of every member.

I have not one word to say in criticism of the observations which my right hon. friend has made to this House with regard to certain matters upon which he felt it desirable to make comments. So far as my own observations during the recess are concerned, I did not discuss the subject to which he has called attention otherwise than by alluding to the probable influence which the events of the past six months may bring to bear upon that question when it does come to be considered. I am very much of the same opinion as my right hon. friend in a good deal of what he has said to-day in that respect. I for one am the last man in this House who would be disposed to favour or to advocate any system which would deprive the self-governing dominions of the Empire of the rights and liberties which they possess in respect of the control of their own affairs. As to what I have said in the past in that respect, I do not think that I ever went beyond what my right hon. friend himself said some eighteen years ago, when, on the other side of the ocean, he declared to those who held the reins of power in the United Kingdom: If you desire our aid, call us to your councils. That very shortly expressed an idea in his own mind at that time—and, I daresay, still in his own mind—and beyond that I do not think I have ever gone in any of my utterances regarding this question.

My right hon. friend has also spoken of the expenditure by the Government of the sum of money voted for war purposes. I agree at once that it is the undoubted right of this House to have the fullest information as to that expenditure, and, if any mistakes or errors in judgment have occurred, to learn of them in order that they shall not be repeated in the future. My right hon. friend has spoken of rumors in the press with regard to the boots which were furnished to the first Canadian contingent, and, I dare say, to those who have been enlisted for service beyond the seas required. So far as I am aware, those boots were ordered in the very early stages of the war upon specifications which were prepared in the Department of Militia many years ago and which have been the authorized specifications of that Department ever since. It may be that if time had permitted it would have been desirable to adopt a stouter type of boot, but I should like to tell my right hon. friend that I have it upon the authority of a man who should know whereof he speaks that in the South African campaign the type of boot used in the British army which has been so highly commended to my right hon. friend, was not found specially suitable for the Canadian forces engaged in that war. I have taken a keen interest in this question of boots and have discussed the matter with a great many persons who were supposed to know what was the best type of boot for such a purpose. I found that there was a great difference of opinion as to what was the best type of boot. Many different specifications have been presented to us and many different types have been considered. The French and British types of boots were placed before me, and I had it pointed out to me in a very forcible way—and in a way that commended itself very much to my

judgment—that the type of boot used in the French army might, for the purposes of our men going to the front, be worthy of consideration as possessing certain qualities which would make it more useful than the British boot to which my right hon. friend has referred. For many weeks a committee has been considering the best type of boot to be used, and I understand that one has been decided upon which will prove very serviceable.

My hon. friend speaks of illness or disease having been occasioned on Salisbury Plain by the use of the boots which were supplied. I am bound to say that I have no information of that kind, and if my right hon. friend possesses information to that effect I shall be very glad indeed to have him furnish it to the Government. Every one knows that the weather conditions which during the past few months have prevailed throughout the British Isles, and particularly on Salisbury Plain, have been of an unusually severe character, and I doubt very much indeed whether the type of boot supplied to the British army, to the French army, or to any other army, would have withstood the effects of the conditions to which our men were necessarily but unfortunately subjected during their sojourn upon Salisbury Plain. However, as I have said, my right hon. friend is quite within his rights when he desires and insists upon having full information as to the expenditures which we have made and as to any mistakes or errors in judgment, if any such have occurred; and I for one will most heartily concur in any effort which he may direct to that very worthy end.

My right hon. friend and those who have preceded me in this debate have alluded to the appalling war which has raged in Europe for the last six months or more, and it is not necessary or desirable at this moment that I should refer, except in a general way, to the causes which brought it about. Germany has appealed to the civilized world for judgment as to the causes of the war, and the world has already given judgment against her. John Bright said in the British Parliament many years ago that the moral law was not written for men alone in their individual character, but was written as well for nations. The war has been brought about through the violation of that principle by the military autocracy of Prussia, in so far as they desired to impose upon the rest of their world their ideas of militarism,

their lack of regard for weaker nationalities, and the principle, openly avowed, that treaties are binding only in so far as the necessities of any State may permit, and that the State itself, in exercising its military power, shall be the sole judge of that necessity.

One observation which I desire to make in connection with the causes of the war is this. Germany's ally, Italy, did not join in the war because it was a war not of defence, but of aggression; thus is Germany answered by her own ally. The ex-Prime Minister of Italy not long ago in the Italian Parliament made it very clear not only that Italy regarded the war as a war of aggression, but that the war itself was contemplated and planned by Austria and by Germany as far back as 1913. I desire to place upon the pages of "Hansard" three or four lines which make that to my mind absolutely plain. He said:

> I answered Marquis Di San Biuliano thus: 'If Austria goes against Servia a 'casus foederis' evidently does not exist. It is an action she accomplishes on her own account. It is not defensive, because nobody thinks of attacking her. It is necessary to declare this to Austria in the most formal manner hoping that Germany will act to dissuade Austria from a very dangerous adventure.

That adventure was not carried out in 1913, but was carried out in 1914, and those of us who have sought to make ourselves acquainted with the trend of events during the six months which preceded this war will have learned, as I certainly have learned, that every indication in financial circles, every indication by which men throughout the world form their judgment as to the stability or otherwise of peaceful conditions, everything that transpired during the six months that preceded this war pointed to the fact that some great event was coming in the immediate future; and the testimony that that event had been planned back as far as July 1, 1913, comes, as I have said, from Italy, the ally of Austria. I know that every hon. gentleman in this House had made himself acquainted with the Yellow Book which has been issued by the French Government and in which is set forth a copy of a most remarkable secret report obtained by the French ambassador at Berlin and transmitted by him to his own Government as far back as November, 1913. Some of the passages of that secret report, very brief passages, may usefully be quoted in order that we may

understand this also, that the war which did come in August last was a war which Germany and Austria intended to force if the other nations of Europe were not prepared to submit to their domination. From this secret report to the German Government I quote the following:—

> It is our sacred duty to sharpen the sword which has been placed in our hand, and to hold it ready for our defence as well as to strike our enemy. The idea that our armaments are a reply to the armaments and policy of the French must be instilled into the people. The people must be accustomed to think that an offensive war on our part is a necessity if we are to combat the adversary's provocations. We must act with prudence in order to arouse no suspicion, and so as to avoid the crises which might damage our economic life. Things must be so managed that under the weighty impression of powerful armaments, of considerable sacrifices, and of political tension, the outbreak of war (Losschlagen) shall be considered as a deliverance, because after it would come decades of peace and of prosperity, such as those which followed 1870. The war must be prepared for from a financial point of view. There is much to be done in this direction. The distrust of our financiers must not be aroused, but nevertheless there are many things which it will be impossible to hide.

I gather from the press that the German Government have denied that any such report was made; but having read it carefully, those who have made themselves acquainted with the tendency of thought in Prussia and throughout Germany during recent years, might seem to find upon its face a veritable hall-mark of authenticity.

The attempt has been made in the German propaganda throughout the world and especially in the United States of America to make it appear that Belgium and Great Britain had already violated the neutrality of Belgium before the German army invaded that country. What are the facts? The facts are that a certain conversation took place between British officers and Belgian officers which was of so informal a character that no note of it, as Sir Edward Grey has declared, remains or ever was in the British foreign office. What was the conversation? To what did it relate? It related simply to the part that Great Britain should take and must in honour take if Belgium should be first invaded by Germany. And the German propaganda, sent out to the world, and especially to this continent, declares that the neutrality of Belgium was thus violated. Suppose a burglar had broken into a house, clubbed the inmate into insensibility and robbed him, and was caught redhanded in the act; suppose that afterwards he raised a plea of self-defence and to support that plea of self-defence produced a letter found upon his victim in which a neighbour had said that if an attack were made upon the house he and his sons would come to the rescue. That is the plea which Germany puts forward to-day. It is absurd on the face of it and it would be laughable if it were not associated with so grave a tragedy as that which has been before the world during the past six months.

I have spoken before of the aims and ideals of Prussian militarism. Germany's action in forcing this awful war has received the condemnation of the world and no less severe is the condemnation of the methods by which her forces have carried it on. Prussian militarism has taught its armies to employ means and methods, relentless and remorseless, which seem to have been designed to deprive the nations with whom they are contending not only of their material but of their intellectual and moral resources. Cities, towns, villages, hamlets without number destroyed; thousands of houses looted and fired to conceal the crime; non-combatants slaughtered without cause and without provocation; ancient cathedrals, historic churches, renowned seats of learning, works of art, all destroyed without cause apparently, and without provocation; hostages selected whose lives were forfeited upon the least fault committed by those over whom they could have no control—all this has been made apparent to the world, and the world has pronounced judgment upon it.

I have spoken of France and Belgium, but some of our own kinsmen across the sea have had a taste of these methods of warfare. What of the women and children mangled and slain at Scarborough, Hartlepool and Whitby? It is well for Canadians, when estimating the causes that have led us to take part in this war, to remember that but for the protection of the British navy, men and women born under our fair Canadian skies, non-combatants, might have been torn and mangled by shells from German ships, inspired by the same motives of hate and of frenzied revenge. Those prompt and ready to shower shells upon unfortified towns and helpless non-combatants did lately meet a British squadron in the North Sea, and we are proud indeed to remember that the men of the navy acquitted themselves well and worthily, and in accordance with the ancient traditions of the fleet, so that the enemy ships intending to repeat the ravages occasioned by the first raid, quickly

turned their prows to the shelter of their mine-fields.

But a more extraordinary development of the spirit of terrorism has recently startled the world. Apparently by the latest pronouncement of the German Government, we must understand that merchant ships are to be sunk by submarines without an opportunity for the crew to escape. It has been announced that Germany's proposals extend to all waters surrounding the British Islands, and that merchant ships with noncombatants on board may be sunk by submarines in direct violation of all recognized usages in warfare and of every instinct and dictate of humanity. It has been a rule of war upon the sea that a captured merchant ship should be taken into port and condemned by due process of law. The practice of the nations has not been uniform as to exceptions to that rule. Some have established an exception by reason of convenience, and others by reason only of necessity. No criticism has been made of the action of German ships in the Atlantic or in the Pacific which have sunk British merchant ships, because as Germany has no nearby port, there was no opportunity to take those ships into port to have them condemned by forms of law. But I am not aware that any civilized nation has ever before established or adopted the principle that a merchant ship with noncombatants on board might be sunk without giving them an opportunity to escape. That proposal strikes the world in a startling way. And not less startling is an incident which came to our attention through the press not long ago, that in the British channel a torpedo was fired at a hospital ship, so marked and designated that there could be no failure to know that it was a ship used solely for hospital purposes. I venture to think that the Government of Germany, in adopting measures of this character, is in fact, as has been very well said by one of the great journals of the United States, waging war not against Great Britain, but against the world, and the world I hope will know how to deal with a policy and with measures of that character.

My right hon. friend has said, and said truly, that this war is a conflict of ideals. On the one hand there is the ideal of liberty and justice, the ideal of respect for the sacred obligation of treaties, the ideal of regard for the rights of the smaller nations, the ideal of modern democracy; and on the other hand, there is the doctrine that force is above all right, and indeed constitutes the highest right; that the power of the nation must be expressed and asserted in militarism and used for further extension of territory, wealth, and influence; the conception that the Prussian militarism, and the German culture which it dominates, shall also dominate the world. There cannot be any doubt as to the issue of such a conflict.

In August last we decided that Canada should take her proper part in this war. Thirty-one thousand men are to-day in the British Isles or in France; one thousand are at Bermuda; and nearly ten thousand are doing garrison duty in Canada. Nearly fifty thousand men have been enlisted in order that they may in the first place stand as an armed force for the protection of this country and of our people, and secondly, that they may go forward from time to time, as there shall be need, to the end that this war shall be brought to an honourable and triumphant issue. Our proposal, which has been disclosed to the country since the last session of Parliament, was this; that in addition to the men who had gone forward from Valcartier to Salisbury Plain, 30,000 men should be enlisted and put in training, and that from that force there should go forward from time to time as the British authorities might be prepared to receive them, further expeditionary forces; and that upon the despatch of any such further expeditionary force men should be enlisted here in Canada to take their place. The number was subsequently increased to fifty thousand, and I am glad to inform the House that the response to the demand for men to perform this noble and patriotic duty has been all that any of us could have desired or hoped. Our achievement in that regard is only to be limited by the need, and we feel assured—we have good cause to be assured by what has already taken place in France—that these men when they go to the front will do their duty, will stand with the other troops of the Empire and with our Allies in a determined and patriotic endeavour to bring the struggle to a victorious issue.

The unity of purpose which has inspired, not only this Dominion, but the whole Empire, speaks for itself. I had the opportunity some few weeks ago of reading a

debate which took place in the Council of India. It was upon a motion proposed by one of the native members of the Council, and I invite all hon. gentlemen in this House who have the opportunity, to read that debate. I venture to say that, having read it, they will agree with me that in its sentiment, its strong and earnest patriotism, and its excellence of diction, it will compare favourably with any debate whether in the Imperial Parliament or in the parliament of any of the dominions. You say that India regarded participation in this war as a duty? India put her case on a much higher plane. India asserted her right to take part in this war and was proud that she possessed that right. And throughout the King's dominions, every race, every tribe, the smallest possession, the remotest island, have all tendered their aid. So far as the whole Empire is concerned, the situation was well summed up by the late Admiral Mahon in a letter which he wrote in October last to a friend in England shortly before his death. In it he says:

> But the testimony to the uprightness and the efficiency of her imperial rule, given by the strong adhesion and support of India and the Dominions, is a glory exceeding that of pitched battle and overwhelming victory.

In the path of Germany's ambition to dominate the world has stood our Empire, and the chief bulwark of the British Empire is the British Navy. I repeat that it has done its work worthily and well. I am sure that none of us can appreciate all that has been involved and is still involved in that silent winter vigil in the North Sea. No deeds of the Vikings ever surpassed the courage and endurance of these sailor heroes.

As my right hon. friend has well said, be under no misapprehension as to the character of this war. The struggle is formidable and the task tremendous. Germany's military power has amazed the world. On the one frontier and on the other she has held back the forces of the allied nations. She strove to make her military power commensurate with her ambition of world-wide dominance. We have but held our own for many months. When our armies now being organized take the field we may hope with confidence for greater things. In that connection it is appropriate that I should read to the House a despatch which I have just received from Mr. Harcourt, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and which is in these words:

[From Mr. Harcourt to the Governor General.]

London, February 5, 1915.

Nearly four months have now passed since the first Canadian contingent arrived in the United Kingdom. It was recognized on its arrival that Canada had sent a fine body of men constituting a most valuable addition to the Crown's fighting forces. Training has been continued in the time that has since elapsed and is now practically completed under unprecedented conditions of climate, which have involved discomfort in spite of every effort on the part of His Majesty's government to alleviate the hardships which have been borne by the contingent with a cheerful resolve that augurs well for their endurance of the arduous conditions of actual active service.

The contingent was inspected by His Majesty the King on Thursday last, and His Majesty was much gratified at the marked general improvement since he last inspected them, and at the spirit of eagerness and loyal enthusiasm which fills all ranks. The contingent will shortly join their Canadian comrades of the Princess Patricia's Light Infantry at the front. These are acquitting themselves in a manner worthy of the great Dominion to which they belong, and some of them have already given their lives for the great cause for which the Empire is now fighting.

Six months ago Great Britain declared war on Germany, taking her place besides the allies in the greatest war ever yet waged.

The object of Germany was to dominate first Europe, and eventually the world. This result she hoped to achieve firstly, by overwhelming and crushing France by a rapid advance through Belgium, whose neutrality she shamefully violated, and then by dealing with Russia at her own leisure. She was to have the assistance of Austria against Russia after the former had crushed Servia out of existence.

This programme for which Germany had made the most elaborate preparations, she proceeded to more or less successfully carry out, until her armies in France arrived at the line of the Marne river; here, however, the tide of invasion reached its high water mark, and it has since been driven back to the line of the river Ainse. The battle front now extends from Ostend in a line due south to Soissons, and thence southeast to the Swiss frontier at Basle. On the western frontier this line has remained stationary for several months. In the eastern theatre of war Germany has met with no greater success and the Russians everywhere more than hold their own. The great effort essential to the success of Germany has been foiled, and except for one success in East Prussia she has gained no single victory, she has lost two and a quarter millions of her best and bravest soldiers, and any fresh effort will now have to be made with greatly inferior and disheartened troops. Thanks to the work of our navy, Germany is now feeling economic pressure in many ways. In Austria there are still considerable forces in the field but her troops have suffered severe reverses both from Servia and Russia, and she can no longer be counted upon by Germany as a really powerful ally. Of even less account is Turkey, who has suffered severe defeats from Russian forces, and results have been the same for her as regards British forces in Mesopotamia and on the Suez Canal within the last few days. In a far dif-

ferent position are Great Britain and her allies. The soldiers of France and Belgium, fully confident in the justice of our cause, are burning to clear the soil of their native countries of the hated invaders. Russia, whose troops have throughout fought with indomitable courage, is preparing herself for further great efforts. At sea the British navy is supreme and has recently inflicted a severe defeat upon the German navy. Aided by our gallant Japanese allies, most of the German colonies have already been captured. The power of Great Britain and her allies increases daily in strength, whereas the power of their enemies is distinctly on the wane. The existing situation has been brought about without the vast resources of the British Empire having yet been called into play.

The splendid contingents from our overseas dominions, from Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Newfoundland, etc.,—in fact from every quarter of the globe—have not yet with the exception of the Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry, been engaged.

The above with the new armies now perfecting their training in England should exercise a preponderating influence on the ultimate decision.

(Signed) Harcourt.

It is only just in connection with that to pay a tribute to the valour of the British army in France and to that of all the allied forces. I had the opportunity of reading a very intimate account of the retreat from Mons, and I venture to say that no successful retreat was ever conducted under greater difficulties or in the face of more overwhelming odds. The greatest victory ever won shed no more splendid lustre on the British army than the valour, the heroism and the endurance displayed during that retreat.

The Princess Patricia regiment now at the front has acquitted itself with credit, and we remember that one who is very dear to a member of this House is serving in that regiment. We hope and pray that our colleague (Mr. Michael Clark) will always have good news of his son. The first Canadian Expeditionary force will soon be at the front. We believe, indeed we are sure that they will so bear themselves that Canada will have just cause to be proud. Some have already given their lives, as Mr. Harcourt has said, for the cause of freedom and justice, and I am reminded of some lines that were written by an Englishman, who for many years has lived in Canada, during the South African war, when news came that some of our men had fallen.

Half mast your flags? Nay, hoist them to the head,
You reap the harvest where you sowed the corn.
See, from the far graves of your gallant dead,
An Empire born.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

As has been said, there are vacant seats in this House—seats of those who have gone forth to fight for the Dominion and Empire. The absence of these men in that cause speaks more eloquently than any words I could utter. God grant that we may see them once more with us when victory has been attained. I have had occasion during the last three or four months to write letters to my good friend, Dr. Beland—I hope they have reached him, although I do not know—congratulating him on the service which he has given in Belgium; and I have had some communications which I had the pleasure of transferring to my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition and which sets forth the hope that he may be released and may have his freedom at no distant date.

A great Belgian prelate has spoken in eloquent terms of the ordeal through which his country has passed and of the spirit of patriotism which thereupon swept over that country in strong tide. The words are so splendid and eloquent that I think it not amiss to give them to the House. I am alluding to the pastoral letter of Cardinal Mercier which has been published already in part in this country:

"God will save Belgium, my brethren, you cannot doubt it; nay, rather, He is saving her. Across the smoke of conflagration, across the stream of blood, have you not glimpses, do you not perceive signs, of His love for us? Is there a patriot among us who does not know that Belgium has grown great? Nay, which of us would have the heart to cancel this last page shattered nation? When in her throes she exult in the brightness of the glory of this shattered nation? When in her throes she brings forth heroes, our Mother Country gives her own energy to the blood of those sons of hers. Let us acknowledge that we needed a lesson in patriotism. There were Belgians, and many such, who wasted their time and their talents in futile quarrels of class with class, of race with race, of passion with personal passion.

Yet when, on the second of August, a mighty foreign power, confident in its own strength and defiant of the faith of treaties, dared to threaten us in our independence, then did all Belgians, without difference of party, or of condition, or of origin, rise up as one man, close-ranged about their own king, and their own government, and cry to the invader: 'Thou shalt not go through!'

At once, instantly, we were conscious of our own patriotism. For down within us all is something deeper than personal interests, than personal kinships, than party feeling, and this is the need and the will to devote ourselves to that more general interest which Rome termed the public thing, 'Res publica.' And this profound will within us is patriotism."

When the spirit of Canada was searched by the thrill of the first great call to de-

fend our Empire, we also were conscious of an influence and an emotion infinitely more commanding and compelling than that of the material interests which had so closely absorbed our attention. Wherever the peril was most truly realized there the response to the call was most clearly manifest.

We happily have been spared the tempest of death and fire and destruction which has devastated Belgium, but we have seen and we shall still see our best and bravest go forth to battle in a righteous cause for which some shall yield up their lives. With the searching of spirit which has come to us in these solemn days we have seen and felt the soul of the nation profoundly moved; stirred as never before in all our history.

The events of the past six months mark a new stage in our nationhood; a new chapter in the book of our destiny has been opened. The strength of our Empire bound by the ties of liberty and autonomous self-government, has been tested and it has held firm and true. In no respect have the expectations of the Prussian autocracy been more utterly disappointed and falsified than in this. From these great Dominions have gone and will still go forth the free manhood of a great Empire to fight for a cause which involves not alone our institutions, our freedom and our destiny, but those of the world. Fighting in such a cause we do not, we dare not, doubt the issue.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to keep the House for any lengthy period in debating the Address; but if I abstain from lengthy speech it is not because I consider that the Empire being in a state of war at all puts upon Parliament the duty of abdicating its proper functions. The duty of Parliament in regard to the Address is to debate that Address with a view to helpfulness in the matters to which it refers, and I should think myself lacking in my duty if I left unsaid anything I ought to say because the Empire is in a state of war.

I wish to endorse very emphatically the remark made by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister to the effect that in the fact that the Address has been moved by a member of German extraction and seconded by a member of French extraction we have a remarkable evidence of the greatness of the flag under which we live and of all that flag stands for. I wish that the fact of what has happened in this House this afternoon could be brought to the attention and careful thought of those who dictate the policies of the great German Empire. I certainly believe that if the thinkers of that nation brought unbiased minds to the consideration of the facts it would shed a flood of light upon them which probably they will not get from any other source until the Allies have finished the lesson they are giving them along rather different lines.

I wish also to join in the congratulations offered by my right hon. friends on both sides of the House to the mover and the seconder of the Address. If I dwell particularly upon the speech of the mover, it is because I am more familiar with the language in which he spoke than with the language of the seconder. My hon. friend from Waterloo (Mr. Weichel) discharged a task of very great delicacy and difficulty with very great ability. I wish to congratulate him upon the courage and the adroitness with which he discharged that task. He need not have apologized, I am sure, in a free country such as this, for anything that he said. He seems to feel it a little, having to speak in favour of the great German people from whom he derives his origin. Well, for his encouragement, I would like to tell him that the men I most admire in the last hundred years of British politics are men who opposed their nation when at war, even speaking from within that nation. The greatest men in British politics within that period, in my opinion, were Richard Cobden and John Bright, and I think the events of the present war go far to justify my opinion. It is the happy position of our Empire today that we are engaged in a war in which there is practically no difference of opinion throughout the whole length and breadth of that Empire. It is no small part of our strength that we know and believe we are right and that the whole moral and material force of the Empire is behind the army and navy of His Majesty King George. There have been wars in which that was by no means the state of things even in the old land. One of these wars was the Crimean and it seems to me to be not only a legitimate but a most helpful advantage to be derived from a debate such

as this, and from a condition of war such as we find ourselves in, that we can learn the lessons that the past has to teach us. When the Crimean war was fought there were only three or four men of prominence in England who had the courage to oppose that war. The Crimean war was fought to bolster up what every one knows to-day is past bolstering up, to bolster up the rottenest thing that exists on the face of the earth—rottener even than German Imperialism—the Turkish Empire. We fought Russia to keep up Turkey. There is nobody talking of fighting Russia to keep up Turkey to-day. The fact is, the Russian bear and the British lion are both concentrated on that old bird, and when the two animals have finished with it there will not be very much of the old bird left. Let me point out that the wise men of Crimean days were Richard Cobden and John Bright, who said then that Turkey was rotten, and lost their seats in Parliament for saying it—but did not lose any of their greatness or of the lasting admiration of their countrymen. I lived a few years later to waken one fine morning and read the speech of the late Lord Salisbury in which he said, in his large, cynical way, that we now find that in the Crimean we "had put our money on the wrong horse." Everybody, of course, is in favour of the bag-and-baggage policy in regard to Turkey to-day; but when Mr. Gladstone introduced that phrase it was not safe for him to walk along the streets of London, and he had his windows broken in Harley street—because of the tremendous need of bolstering up the Turkish Empire. I offer these historical observations to encourage my hon. friend from Waterloo to get, if the need ever should arise, an even larger degree of courage than that for which we admire him.

There are a few observations in his speech which I am sure he will forgive me for adverting to. He referred to those who knew that this war was coming. Well, the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) did not know it, for he told us last summer that the war had come upon us with such alarming suddenness that it had taken all of us by surprise. No one in the British Government knew it was coming, for Mr. Lloyd George has told us since the war broke out that Germany and England were on better terms than they had been for fifteen years before, that no member of the Cabinet expected war, and that he himself had been about to go away on a holiday. So, those who knew that the war was coming were really mortals of such insignificance that their opinions did not count, and we never heard of them until my hon. friend referred to them to-day in the somewhat vague way which I have indicated.

I wish to endorse what the hon. gentleman has said as to the greatness and importance of the work done by the British navy. His words of admiration were so strong that the work of the navy would seem to have been something of a surprise to him. Well, it was not a surprise to some of us. I am one of those who never particularly admired Germany from some points of view. Neither did I ever fear her, nor did I ever doubt what would happen to her navy if she ventured it against the British navy. The difficulty is our navy has not enough to do: its difficulty is in finding the German navy. I hope I am not trenching on dangerous ground; I fear I am not as adroit as my hon. friend, but come more directly to my subject; but if he talked navy to this extent, I shall not be breaking any truce in following his example.

My hon. friend showed wonderful independence of mind, as my hon. friend the Minister of Finance did in his speeches throughout the country, in adopting a very large portion of the teachings of one of the men whom I have already mentioned here this evening; I mean the teachings of Richard Cobden. If he reads Cobden's speeches my hon. friend will find that he dwelt continuously upon the need of a country in the following of a wise economic policy seeing to its production. Well, as a very humble follower of that great man, I must claim not any originality but faithfulness to my teacher in having preached for years this doctrine of more production being needed for Canada, and you can understand that when my hon. friend the Minister of Finance takes up the tale in the country and my hon. friend the hon. member for North Waterloo takes it up in this House, my heart rejoices that at last Cobden has come into, at least, some of his own. And I have no doubt that in the case of such very young men as my two friends opposite, he will come into more of his own, because they are both very good learners, and in this matter they are certainly following a very great teacher. Of course, there is this about it, the hon. member for North Waterloo has to go a great deal farther in his

study of Cobden than he has yet gone, because after talking in a way that filled me with hope about increase of production, he went on to say a word or two about the "made in Canada" campaign. That was most disappointing to me. I do not think he has chosen a hopeful time to introduce that phrase into Parliament, any more than the Government in their documents have done so for I think the phrase is hinted at in some of the documents that have been put out in recent times by the Department of Trade and Commerce. I think, I say, that he has not chosen a hopeful time for introducing this phrase into Parliament. In the first place, it savours of the phrase "made in Germany," and I am a sufficiently good subject of the British Empire not to want to copy any of Germany's ideas at the present moment. I do not want to copy her fiscal ideas, anyhow; I do not want to copy her phrases. Let it be remembered, Sir, that this "made in Germany" idea takes you to the root of the whole matter; it takes you to the very defect in the German character which it is costing the world a good deal of trouble to correct. Of recent years Germany has not only been frightening off the goods of foreign nations; she has actually been trying to teach her people not to use the words of foreign nations; she has been cleansing her dictionaries of all foreign words. Facilis descensus Averni—get rid of foreign words, Germany said; keep out foreign goods. There is your pan-Germanism; there is the wrong spirit which has been instilled into the German people. I want to call attention to the fact that in the very document which my right hon. friend the Prime Minister quoted, the French Yellow Paper, in so many words the privileges conferred upon the Yunkers by protection in Germany are referred to, as at least one of the contributory causes of this war. That will be found by careful students of this French Yellow document. I do not know what my hon. friend the Minister of Finance thinks about this cry of " Made in Canada." It is not a very good method of raising revenue and I am sure my hon. friend must be giving a great deal of thought to the raising of revenue in these times. If there is one thing that is now exercising the mind of the Minister of Finance night and day, whenever he is awake, it is the question of raising revenue. If we go too far with the policy of my hon. friend the hon. member for North Waterloo, whatever is my hon. friend the Minister of Finance to do? only one course is open to him—but we will touch upon this matter, perhaps, in the debate on the Budget. If we get everything made in Canada, what is my hon. friend going to do for revenue from the tariff? Even at the present time it is not expanding as he would like to see it expand, and I think it was very wrong on the part of the mover of the Address to put these obstacles in the way of my hon. friend the Finance Minister at this particular time. Having regard to the subsequent portions of the debate, I think that the last thing I should have mentioned as an article that could be made in Canada would have been boots; I would not have said anything about boots and shoes at that moment anyhow. I do not, however, want to go further into that question. It appears that protection is a very delicate institution; its shoes may be all right for times of peace, but protection cannot stand the strain of war. I always thought protection to be a pretty seedy thing, and the light the war is throwing upon it is not improving its appearance.

There is one part of the mover's address upon which I wish to congratulate him heartily, because he spoke very sincerely, from the fullness of his heart, and I am sure that a very large number of people will be speaking in the same way before this war is over. He referred to one of the tasks in front of the Allies as the eradication of militarism. Here again he is a most hopeful disciple of Cobden. I congratulate him, and I congratulate Cobden, so long gone, upon the increase of his following. I was glad to hear that opinion endorsed by my right hon. friend and leader. I was much interested in the passage between my two right hon. friends on this question of our participation in the affairs of Empire in this very connection. I think that most certainly one of the results of this war will be that a large portion of the civilized world will seek above all other things a way past these gigantic armaments which have been and which are to-day the curse of the world. There is an old friend amongst our Latin proverbs to which there cannot be any harm in referring in this connection; the point was raised by my hon. friend anyhow. No one to-day, I think, who has any regard for his own reputation will rise before any serious body of his fellow-countrymen and say that there is any sense left in the old Latin doctrine: to be prepared for war is the best way to maintain peace. If there had been anything in that, Mr. Speaker, we had surely arrived at the millennium just before

this war broke out. The fact of the matter is that this is one of the most important lessons that we can learn from the war. We on this continent of all men ought to take our share in teaching this lesson as one of the lessons of the war.. We are in the happy position of being the citizens of one great nation to the north of the forty-ninth parallel, having another great nation to the south of us. If armaments were the way to keep the peace, the three thousand-mile boundary line between these two great nations should be studded with fortresses from end to end, but we have not a fortress on the whole of that line, and we are just about to celebrate one hundred years of peace between these two great nations. We have a right, therefore, to point to that condition of affairs and to say to the backward nations of Europe: we have arrived at a better condition of civilization upon this continent and it is for you to come up to our platform and live in the more enlightened society which you can find on this side of the Atlantic.

The little dispute between my two right hon. friends might very well be left as they left it; but I was very much interested, as one who has studied the question of Imperial federation, in what I venture to call that little dispute. I was struck, when I read the Prime Minister's speeches, with his reference to the fact, by way of a very mild prophecy, that he was still hankering after a closer connection, by Imperial legislation or arrangement, with the mother country. I must say that the answer of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition this afternoon was perfect in argument and perfect in form in every way. The defence of the Prime Minister for having made his remark was very good, so far as a tu quoque defence can ever be. He defended the remark, which, after all, was a very harmless one, by stating that my right hon. friend and leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had made a similar remark eighteen years ago. I reflected that it is just possible that a successor of my right hon. friend's might make that remark eighteen years from now, and if that is all that ever comes from this scheme I cannot see, from such harmless remarks at such long intervals, any great chance of a gigantic scheme of Imperial federation being evolved. I have, on previous occasions, dwelt on this question at considerable length, and do not propose referring to it further.

There was so little of a debatable nature either in the address or in the speeches which we have heard this afternoon that, as I said to begin with, I did not rise to make any lengthy remarks. There are, however, one or two plain things that as a plain man I may be allowed to say. In my judgment, as in the war session last summer and in the interval that has elapsed from that session until now, so now, there is one paramount duty before Parliament and the country, and that paramount duty is to get behind the men in the trenches and to keep behind them. That I think to be the paramount duty of Parliament and the country. If we wanted any encouragement along these lines, we should find it by looking at what is going on in the Imperial Parliament. If we needed further stimulation along these lines we should certainly find it in the people of the old land and of the whole Empire, and we should find it in the remotest hamlets of this Dominion of Canada. I am pleased to testify, as coming from the West, that if you call a meeting anywhere there you find but one spirit at the present time: whether the meeting be for the support of the Belgian relief fund, the Patriotic fund or the Red Cross, we find every man, woman and child in arms impressed with this thought, that we are in the presence of a gigantic task and that nothing must be allowed to distract our attention from that task.

There is one rule of conduct which, as far as I am concerned as a member of this Opposition, I have laid down for myself, and that is to do nothing and say nothing that will interfere with our presenting a united front to the common foe. That is the primary duty of the Opposition as it is the primary duty of Parliament and of the country. There are, however, subsidiary duties which lead up to the discharge of the main duty, and I take it that the Address raises these subsidiary duties in a very acute form. The first of these duties is one which we shall discuss more fully upon the Budget itself: It is that of raising money; and the second is the duty, which devolves more particularly upon the Government, of expending money. With regard to the amount that the Government proposes to raise, I think I can say for the gentlemen on this side of the House that no challenge will be offered to their policy. Whatever they ask for, whatever is necessary for carrying out Canada's share in the great war in which we are engaged, we, of the Opposition, shall offer no objection. If wrong methods, according to our views, are used to raise the money, as I said to begin with, I do not conceive that war leads Par-

liament to abdicate any of its functions, and certainly we shall not be debarred from offering reasonable and I would hope helpful criticism of the methods of the Government in raising the money where we conceive them to be wrong.

In regard to the spending of the money, my right hon. leader hinted this afternoon that a very large sum has disappeared since last summer and that the Opposition and the country are entitled to all information which can be given with prudence by the Government as to how that money has been spent and how it has been husbanded. We cannot forego our right of reasonable criticism upon any acknowledged facts of the spending of the money; to forego such criticism would be to share the responsibility for the spending of it, and that responsibility we must absolutely decline. We are at one with the Government in the policy of spending; but if there has been waste, if there has been misappropriation, which is vastly worse than waste, we decline all responsibility. In that connection the Government alone are responsible, and at the proper time they will be brought into judgment by the people and the Parliament of Canada for any proved waste or misappropriation. I think that if one is engaged in putting out a burning building, to use a homely illustration, and gets some help to do it, one would not be too critical, if plenty of water were going on the building, if a little escaped to one side; but if some one comes along who is responsible for the putting out of the fire in the building and diverts some of the water that should be putting out the fire into his own garden plot, then that will be a case for criticism, that will be a case which the Government should look into and remedy at the earliest possible moment. However, at this juncture, having stated our position, that we decline the slightest responsibility for any such proceeding, I woud personally deprecate anything on the part of the Opposition in the way of partisan strife or the very appearance of partisan strife.

But let me say, and say very strongly, in this connection that the Government have very distinct duties as well as the Opposition. The Government must so conduct their business at this time, whether in or out of Parliament, whether in discussion or in organization, as not to provoke partisan strife or partisan criticism on the part of the Opposition. It is no use blinking our eyes to certain facts. Parliament has not been in session for six or seven months, and I do not propose to blink my eyes to some happenings to which I think it necessary in the public interest that reference should be made. The most violent form of partisan strife that can possibly be initiated in any country is a general election. I think everybody will agree that partisan discussion is at its best in a general election—or at its worst. Perhaps I ought to correct that: Perhaps it finds a lower level still in the literature that is issued prior to an election. With regard to party literature, I want to claim before this House and the country that we on this side have an absolutely clean sheet. From the moment that war broke out the bureau was closed. So far as I am concerned, I have never seen a document emanate from it since that time, of a party nature or of any other nature. Where is the laugh of my hon. friends now?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh.

Mr. CLARK: Can they produce a leaflet or a document? Not a single one. And I should be wanting in common manliness if I did not assert it. I am going to state something else now that is of a very different nature. When I was coming down on the train to this session of Parliament, there was handed to me a bunch an inch and a quarter thick of literature that had emanated from another bureau. I was surprised beyond measure, for I had seen nothing of it to that moment. It was handed to me with the statement that it had gone out in bunches in the fall of last year. Now, I want to say very plainly that to send such literature out in the fall of the year was simply to provoke party strife, and I trust there will be no need to make another complaint of this kind. I was amazed at the size of the full line of documents, which was entirely out of keeping with what I conceived to be the duty of the hour. A very remarkable thing is that the date of those documents synchronized with the irresponsible cries of certain shallowbrains in Toronto and elsewhere, that we ought to have another general election. I want to tell this House very plainly that, so far as I have been able to observe, at least eighty per cent of the business and common-sense people of this country were disgusted with the whole procedure. I do not know what there was in it. I do not believe for a moment that

my right hon. friend the Prime Minister had any cognizance of that literature, or that he ever dreamt of a general election. I decline to believe it. How could I believe it in the presence of such an address as we had from him this afternoon, breathing the highest patriotism, the utmost sympathy with the men at the front?

And I have another reason for not believing that. For my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) went up to Toronto about that time, and in an interview on this question stated, if the papers correctly reported him, that the idea of a general election had never entered the head of the Prime Minister. So that in declining to believe this of the Prime Minister I am well supported by the declaration of the Minister of Public Works. I notice that, with that rugged honesty which we all admire in him, he did not say anything about what had entered his own mind. He went bond for the Prime Minister, but he did not go bond for himself, and it was just himself that we should have liked to hear from. For I want to point out to him in perfect good nature that he is a little suspect in these matters, and naturally he is suspect since his confession in the House that however humble his gifts might be, it would certainly be admitted that he knew something about winning an election. I do not want to probe the matter any further, or to ask whether the idea of a general election ever entered his own mind. I think a great deal of that talk existed purely in the yellow journals of his party. Perhaps they respected my hon. friend on account of this reputation, and perhaps they had regard to the fact that that reputation received a little bit of a shock in Manitoba last summer. I do not know, but I am clear in my own mind that all that talk is mischievous and detrimental to the best interests of the country and of the Empire, and I trust we shall hear no more of it. The very talk of an election is a distraction from the single duty that ought to present itself to every citizen of the British Empire. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance knows that the business interests of this country do not require an election at the present time, and he ought to have curbed any tendency to issue such literature. I know he knows, because there was a period about a year and a half ago when he read a lecture to my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition for mentioning the very word general election at a time when the business of the country was in such a state that it could not stand a general election. With his long parliamentary experience the Minister of Finance chided my erring and youthful right hon. friend for mentioning such a matter. Are the affairs of this country better now than they were then? Would the Minister of Finance say so? I think not, and if he would not there is all the more need to repeat the lecture to the people who are responsible for his party's literature last autumn. The fact is that all this talk was most distracting and most hurtful to the common interest. The whole question of defence and of our Imperial connection, the whole question of Canada's future in regard to these questions of peace and war, is necessarily put in the melting pot by the war itself. We shall all of us be wiser to deal with these questions when we have the events of the war fully before us. For this reason alone, all partisan political strife should be laid on one side. Just think of a man talking of a general election who has any common sense of responsibility, and knows anything about our western country, who knows what a number of Germans have just come from Germany and settled in the West. The canvassing which would be done among these people in the event of a general election would be most hurtful to this nation and to the interests of the great Empire to which we belong.

I want to quote a single sentence from a speech of the very highest ability which was made by my hon. friend the Solicitor General before the Canadian Club of Winnipeg the other day, and I think I may leave it as a text not only for every member of this House, but for the thought of every citizen of Canada at this time. In a speech in which the whole question of the war was dealt with in a masterly fashion, and which it was my pleasure to read and to reread, this sentence occurred:

> For the balance of our lives the best measure of our worth will be how we behaved in this war.

That is an admirable sentiment, admirably expressed. I could conceive no greater duty than for my young friend, for whom I have the profoundest respect, to take that as a text for his speeches wherever he goes, and as a text for repetition. It is just to the extent we live up to that doctrine that we shall discharge our duties as citizens of the greatest Empire the world has even seen. The people of Canada today know they are living in an Empire of

brave men, and they want to be ruled by a brave government. They want to be ruled by a government who sees its one duty and allows nothing to distract it from that duty. We with our Allies have pledged our honour, our blood, and our money to put the expatriated people of Belgium back upon their native soil. We have given pledges and hostages that we shall restore the sacredness of international treaties, that we shall put in honourable position the pledged word of peoples. Is this task not big enough for us? I take it that it is a task worthy of our Empire, and one that will tax all its resources. It is worthy of the Government of this Dominion and of the Dominion itself, and so long as the Government is true to the task it will have the strong and undivided support of hon. gentlemen who sit on this side of the House.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): I do not know whether a private member should venture into this discussion, especially after the experience I had this afternoon. I was answered almost before I had stated fully the case, and then was sent to the guillotine. But, nevertheless, I do intend to say that it is my purpose, both on my own account and on account of the constituency that I represent, to do anything and everything I can to uphold the hands of the Government in acting on behalf of Canada, while backing up the Mother Country in this great struggle and that we are prepared to do anything and everything possible to secure, first of all, the rights of ourselves and the rights of the Allies, and then to bring about peace. In that connection I intend to look into the situation from a somewhat different angle, perhaps from the angle of Canada and the angle of America rather than from the angle from which most of us have been looking at it, and that is the situation in Europe. What is the supreme danger in this situation as far as we as a community on this American continent are concerned? It is this, that if Germany were to triumph, if we were to neglect our duty or to fail to play our part in this fight, we would be in danger of losing our parliamentary institutions. Just for a moment I want to trace the history of the parliamentary or democratic government that we enjoy in the Mother Country and in America.

Three hundred years ago, almost to this very year, England began to feel the misgovernment that came from an irresponsible and arbitrary sovereign, and while he at first experienced no great trouble resulting from his arbitrary conduct, still the people of England finally rose against him and the movement for responsible parliamentary government was begun. His son lost the confidence of the people of England, and was executed, and on the day that Cromwell came to power parliamentary government was established in England and great progress was made. Then there was a revulsion, a backward movement for a time, but after the interregnum there was an Act passed by Parliament, called the Act of Succession, and the important point about that is that for the first time the King of England was given a parliamentary title to his Crown. Various measures of progress were made in the next and the last century which eventuated in this that we had parliamentary government in which the voice of the people ruled, we had a wider distribution of political authority amongst the constituencies, and up to a short time ago we had almost complete parliamentary government with one thing lacking, and that has been accomplished by this present parliament in the Mother Country. Now the House of Commons is supreme and the irresponsible House of Lords has been made to respect the voice of the people as expressed in the House of Commons. To-day, for the first time in three hundred years, we have absolute and unlimited parliamentary control in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and the people rule.

Gradually that principle has been extended to the Dominions beyond the seas, to Canada, to Australia, and to South Africa. We have now practically a free constitution, free parliamentary government, and the rule of the people prevails in almost all portions of the Empire, certainly within the Dominions, and nowhere in any greater degree than in the Mother Country. All that has taken three hundred years to accomplish, and the final result has only been attained within the life of the present Parliament sitting in Great Britain. We have parliamentary government with a King whose title is from Parliament, from a House of Commons that is directed by the people, by the democracy, and a House of Lords that must bow to the will of the people as expressed in the House of Commons. For the first time in the history of the world full and unlimited parliamentary

government exists in the old land. We have extended that system to the Dominions; we have it here. Perhaps we will have a responsible Senate in this country before long, and when we have we will have complete parliamentary government in Canada.

Passing from that, I wish to look at this question from the point of view of the American continent. Our neighbours to the south of us, one hundred and fifty years ago almost, began to work out a democratic government or a parliamentary government, in their country, and they succeeded largely in doing so. They have democratic institutions there. They have a constitution and while it is limited it is based largely on the principle of parliamentary government and of the popular will being carried out. But just to show how it is connected up with this situation, and to make my point clearer, I want to bring the attention of the people of Canada and the United States to the menace that the military system of Germany is to these democratic institutions that we have on this continent, that we have in Canada, and to make my point I am going to read just a few sentences from Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg speech delivered in 1863:

> Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.
>
> Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure.

After four score years' experience of democratic government in the United States, Abraham Lincoln said that it was a question whether these institutions could long endure because of the dissension that existed within the Union at that time. If they were in danger then from an internal dissension I say they are in greater danger to-day in view of this menace from Germany. The last sentence of that speech—and it is the greatest little short political speech in history, it is a classic, it is a cameo in the way in which it is cut—is in these words:

> From these honoured dead we take increased devotion to that cause, for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

If that menace threatened the great American Republic almost fifty years ago, if government of the people, by the people, for the people, was menaced then through internal disorders, much more so is that system of popular government menaced to-day if the Germans should succeed, because they are against government by the people, for the people. They are in favour of a government that is irresponsible. They are in favour of a parliament made up largely of landowners and noblemen not responsible to the people and if Germany should succeed in this attack that she is making on England and the Allies, she intends to turn the world upside down with respect to government, and to substitute an aristocratic government, an irresponsible king and an irresponsible chamber, even though it be called a House of Commons, composed of landowners and the nobility. It is this which not only menaces Europe, but menaces the democracy of the United States; it is one of the menaces that Lincoln foresaw when he made that prophecy in 1863. I avail myself of the opportunity of my position in this House to appeal to those who speak our language, living to the south of us, to remember that they are as much concerned in maintaining democratic institutions and parliamentary government as we are, and that the great menace to them, as well as to us, lies in the military autocracy that the Germans are preaching. I believe it is our duty as public men to point out that the great democratic people of America should be upholding with us the idea of parliamentary government. And, Sir, I appeal not only to the Americans, but even to the German people themselves. They have been threatening since this war began to impose German "Kultur" and the German military system on us. Suppose we meet that by saying: We will try and help to get you free parliamentary institutions; and, if Germany had free parliamentary institutions and democratic government as we have, there would be no menace such as to-day beclouds the entire world. We ought to try and impress upon these missionaries who are now in the United States preaching the German "Kultur" system, that the only honourable thing for Germany to do is to adopt parliamentary democratic government and abolish the autocratic system. There it is where peace lies, and it is from that angle we should seek for a way to appeal to the great mass of the German people, and to tell them that permanent peace will only come when the parliamentary system prevails in Ger-

many as it does in Great Britain and the United States. That is the duty of the hour; that is the duty of every public man. I regret that we have not made as much as we should have made of that appeal, and I regret also that our friends in the British Parliament have failed to see the great importance of it. There is now opportunity for us all to embark in this missionary work, and to endeavour to educate the Germans along these lines. The speech of my hon. friend from Waterloo (Mr. Weichel) to-day was along that line, and the Germans of the Fatherland must be impressed when they hear the Germans of Canada saying that they value above all things parliamentary government such as we have it in this country. The glory of England to-day is that after a struggle of three hundred years parliamentary government has been established, although it is perhaps right to say that it has only seen its full fruition in very recent years.

I believe that our friends in the United States are sympathetic with us; I believe that the great majority of them are with the Allies, although sometimes people think they should have declared themselves a little more emphatically on this struggle than they have done heretofore. The President of the United States seems to take the position that they should be strictly neutral; but let me point to a certain document, bearing on the history of the United States, which I have been reading very carefully of late, and which is interesting in view of the present situation. The most significant thing in this publication of the historical documents of the United States, apart from the Gettysburg speech, is this resolution, which was passed in Congress in 1898:

9 p.m.

Whereas the abhorrent conditions which have existed for more than three years in the island of Cuba, so near our own borders, have shocked the moral sense of the people of the United States, have been a disgrace to Christian civilization, culminating, as they have, in the destruction of a United States battleship, with two hundred and sixty-six of its officers and crew, while on a friendly visit in the harbour of Havana, and can no longer be endured, as has been set forth by the President of the United States in his message to Congress of April eleventh, eighteen hundred and ninety-eight, upon which the action of Congress was invited, therefore,

Resolved, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, first, that the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent.

Second, that it is the duty of the United States to demand, and the Government of the United States does hereby demand, that the Government of Spain at once relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba and withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters.

Suppose that were paraphrased to read: Whereas the abhorrent conditions which have existed for more than six months in Belgium have shocked the moral sense of the people of the United States, have been a disgrace to civilization and should no longer endure, be it resolved that it is the duty of the United States to demand and it does demand that Germany at once relinquish its government and authority in the Kingdom of Belgium, would not that be a grand stroke for democracy and civilization? I am making no charge against our neighbours to the south of us, and I want specially to avoid that, but I believe, in view of their past record, it would not have been out of place if the American people through their Government had already expressed their dissidence from what is taking place in Belgium, and their condemnation of the abhorrent conditions that have prevailed in that country since the war started. I believe, Sir, before the war is over, the United States will have to join with the Allies, and Canada, and Australia, and South Africa, and the whole English-speaking world, in asserting the principle that whatever is abhorrent to parliamentary government will not be permitted to continue in any country, whether in Europe or America, because of the danger there is in it to free parliamentary institutions.

When I have said that, I have said practically all that I have to say to the House to-night. If we wish to help the cause of peace, if we wish to stop war, to prevent it being again the menace it has been in the past, I believe we must seek to make more prevalent parliamentary institutions and democratic government. The great military systems that have been built up since nations first existed have been built up by autocratic rulers and irresponsible assemblies associated with them. Where there is democratic government, especially where there is parliamentary government in its fullest sense, such military systems are impossible. England is the world's leader in parliamentary government, and there is no menace there to human rights. That is the whole case. We may talk of the war, and of how we are to uphold the men in the trenches—and we must do everything in

that direction that is necessary and in that we shall be supported I am sure by the Canadian people—but to abolish war we must extend democratic and parliamentary government. And we ought to make it clear in some way that we expect that our neighbours to the south will help us in attaining this end. They did intervene in Cuba, and with good results. They have helped to clean up things in other portions of the American continent, their action being based largely upon the assertion of democratic government and the rights of the people. And the voice of America is yet to be heard, and will be heard at its loudest and strongest in that direction. And we can appeal also to Germans in the United States, and especially to Germans in our own country, to find a way to convey to the German people the glad tidings of democracy and parliamentary government. And I believe that when the German people come to see the mistake of the political system under which they have lived and of following the Kaiser and his irresponsible associates,they will look for the cure in the establishment of complete parliamentary government. I should like to see this phase of the matter discussed in this House with a view to making some impression on the German people in the direction I have indicated.

Now, having made that statement and that appeal with a view to finding a ground upon which the people of America can stand together in upholding free institutions, I only wish to say further that I believe that this House ought to support the Government to the fullest extent in carrying on this war, even to the spending of our last dollar in upholding the cause which we all have at heart. For that cause is the cause of freedom, of Christianity, of humanity, of human uplift. We must be ready to lose everything rather than to lose our self-respect, our belief in our own ideals. And I believe the people of Canada will sustain the Government in everything they shall do in that direction. But, as has been said, we must have careful administration. We do not care what the cost is, but we want absolute efficiency. The country will back up the Government in seeking efficiency, and Canada will give her last dollar and her last man to uphold the cause of parliamentary government and democratic institutions.

[Mr. W. F. Maclean.]

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to continue the debate at length but rather to take advantage of the opportunity afforded under the rules of the House to mention one or two matters that it seems advisable to discuss at this time. I am sure every member of this House has felt more deeply within the last six or seven months the responsibility resting upon him as a representative of the people of this country. That sense of responsibility is deepened by our coming together in this Parliament at this juncture in our history. And I am sure that the addresses of the right hon. gentlemen who lead the two great parties in this House have been of such a character as to appeal to us with especial force at this time.

I desire to thank the right hon. gentleman who leads this House for the kindly reference he has made to the occupant of the vacant seat next to my own, one of my closest friends in the House, the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Beland). And I am glad to know that while that hon. member has been in communication with some of us, the Prime Minister had him in mind and has been taking steps to relieve him in the position in which he has been placed in Belgium. We have to-day members of this House who are at the front, but there is only one member of the Canadian Parliament who up to this time has been wounded in the cause of liberty. It will be recalled that Dr. Beland quite voluntarily entered upon the service, which came to him in connection with his profession, of treating the wounded in the hospitals in Antwerp. In the course of that occupation he was wounded, but fortunately, not seriously. And while we sit here to-night, calmly and peacefully deliberating on what we should do to play our part in this Empire war, our friend and comrade is in the stricken city of Antwerp, perchance a prisoner of the Germans and in any case in such a position that those of us who have been his friends—and indeed all the members of the House are his friends—realize very seriously indeed, if they have never realized before, how closely this war has come home to us.

In that connection, I am glad that the consensus of opinion in this House to what has been expressed by the right hon. gentlemen who have spoken on either side—that whatever the amount may be that is sought by the Government in order to carry out our re-

sponsibilities to the Empire, that amount will be furnished by this Parliament without regard to party or to any differences of opinion on political matters in Canada. And I was pleased that the Prime Minister very frankly said that the House and the country were entitled to the fullest possible information with regard to the expenditures already made. I should regard it as most unfortunate if anything should occur in the administration of the country's funds in connection with the war which would in any way tend to lower the high ideals which we would like to see maintained by every Canadian from one end of this land to the other. Nothing would so retard the recruiting of men for the war and lessen the enthusiasm of our people as the knowledge that there was partisanship in the awarding of contracts or improprieties in the purchase of supplies. If Canada has the high ideals on this question which, I am sure, every one of us would like to see her entertain, could anything be more debasing, could anything more surely bring down the tone of our people in this serious juncture in our history, than the knowledge that partisanship was dominating the public expenditure instead of the governing motive being the considerations of the country's best interest and our duty to the common cause? I trust that hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches who have the responsibility for this matter will see that its importance is impressed upon the subordinates in the various departments.

My hon. friend and leader referred to the expenses in connection with the purchase of boots for the soldiers, and repeated the assertions which have been made in that regard in the public press of the country. I should like to call my right hon. friend's attention to the circumstances in connection with the purchase of horses. It is asserted broadly throughout the country that horses which were procured in the Maritime provinces and taken to Valcartier were found unsuitable and unfit for service; so much so that many were turned loose in the fields and were not taken on board the vessels and shipped to the other side. If that assertion is true, the country should know of it. As it is, the facts in regard to the purchase of horses and of boots are of the greatest possible importance, and I trust that the fullest information in regard to them will be brought down. I make this reference not in any partisan sense, but merely for the purpose of calling the attention of the Government to the assertions which are being made throughout the country in regard to these matters.

There is another matter to which I wish particularly to call the attention of the Government. In addition to the expenditures which are being made directly by the Government in this country, it is well understood that a very large amount of money is being spent among the various industries of Canada in the purchase of war supplies of different kinds. It is said that these purchases are being made under the direction of a special committee of council, under whose control the whole matter is placed. As a matter of fact, large orders for supplies and munitions of war have been given to various industries in Canada and are being manufactured here, and orders amounting to millions of dollars have been placed in the United States. It is well understood that the prices paid for these articles are not parsimonious prices. It is well understood that the Government—whether the home Government or the foreign governments who desired these munitions—have not quibbled about the actual cost of the articles so long as they obtained them. In all contracts let by the Canadian Government for supplies required to be manufactured, there is, under our law, what is known as the "fair wage" clause, which controls the wages paid to the men who construct or manufacture these articles or supplies. But in regard to a great many of the articles which are being manufactured for the old land and for other governments—I refer more particularly to those which have been purchased for the British Government, such as munitions of war—there is a necessity for the Government's taking steps, if the conditions which exist in connection with several industries in the Maritime provinces are any indication of the situation in other portions of the country, to see that the fair wage clause is imposed upon contractors at the time the contracts are let. I should like to call the attention of the House to a resolution which is the basis of what is known as the fair wage clause in Government contracts. It was passed in the year 1900 on the motion of Sir William Mulock, then Postmaster General, and is as follows:

> That it be resolved, that all Government contracts should contain such additions as will prevent abuses which may arise from the subletting of such contracts, and that every effort should be made to secure the payment of such wages as are generally accepted as current in each trade for competent workmen in the district where the work is carried out, and that this House cordially concurs in such policy, and

deems it the duty of the Government to take immediate steps to give effect thereto. It is hereby declared that the work to which the foregoing policy shall apply includes not only work undertaken by the Government itself, but also all works aided by grant of Dominion public funds.

I turn to the report of my hon. friend the Minister of Labour for the year 1914, where I find the following with reference to these contracts:

In most of the contracts to which this policy applies, the minimum wage rates to be observed are specified in the contract. In other cases a general clause is inserted that all mechanics, labourers, or other persons employed in connection therewith shall be paid 'such wages as are generally accepted as current for competent workmen in the district, and if there is no current rate in the district, then a fair and reasonable rate, and shall not be required to work for longer hours than those fixed by the custom of the trade in the district where the work is carried on except for the protection of life or property, or in the case of other emergencies. The policy of the Government in respect of the insertion of the fair wage schedule or general fair wages clause is followed in the construction of public works of many different kinds in all parts of Canada, and also in the manufacture of certain classes of Government supplies, the operations covered by this policy amounting in the aggregate to many millions of dollars.'

Then it goes on to say:

In addition to the preparation of fair wage clauses for Government contracts, the Department of Labour has been called upon to furnish fair wage conditions for insertion in contracts for railway construction to which Parliament has granted financial aid either in the form of subsidy or guarantee.

So that these contracts for munitions of war and other supplies, if let directly by the Government of Canada, would contain the fair wage clause to which I refer. But it has been said—and this matter has been discussed in the country—that to contracts which have been let not by the Dominion Government directly, but by the committee of Council acting for foreign governments, the fair wage clause does not apply, the contracts not being let directly by the Government of Canada. Having regard to the fact that these are British Government contracts, I wish to point out in this connection that a resolution was passed on February 13, 1891, in the Imperial House of Commons under which it was provided that the fair wage clause should be included in all their contracts. The resolution was in the following terms:

That in the opinion of this House, it is the duty of the Government, in all government contracts, to make provision against the evils recently disclosed before the Sweating Committee, to insert such conditions as may prevent the abuse arising from sub-letting, and to make every effort to secure the payment of such wages as are generally accepted as current in each trade for competent workmen.

I submit, therefore, that it is open to the Committee of Council or to any other committee appointed by the Government to deal with supplies or munitions required by other governments, and particularly by the Imperial Government, and to insert in each contract a fair wage clause similar to that inserted in Dominion Government contracts, thus protecting the workingmen of Canada at this juncture and securing for them fair hours and reasonable wages.

I do not wish to go into the details of this matter further than to say that cases have come to my knowledge where industries engaged in the manufacture of munitions of war have reduced the wages of their employees as much as twenty-five per cent. This may have been due to other causes arising from the depression existing before the war began, but I submit that any contractor carrying out a contract for supplies for the Imperial Government should be asked by council to submit to the same fair wage schedule to which he would be subject if he were working for the Dominion Government.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: To what munitions of war does my hon. friend refer?

Mr. MACDONALD: Shells, more particularly.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not think the Committee of Council deals with that; the matter is controlled by a committee constituted altogether outside this Government, which is acting for the British Government in that respect.

Mr. MACDONALD: That may be so, but it is understood that the principal committee to which I refer, that is, the one concerned with the manufacture of shells, was nominated by this Government.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Nominated, I think, in the first instance, by the Minister of Militia.

Mr. MACDONALD: I brought the question up for the purpose of asking the Government to see that by either the Committee of Council that is to deal with the matter or by any other committee that has been selected by them to overlook or deal with Imperial contracts, the fair wage clause, which would be

placed in a contract if it were placed by the Imperial Government for work to be constructed in England or by the Canadian Government for work to be constructed in Canada, would be inserted in these contracts for the protection of the employees.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not very familiar with the work of the committee which consists of a number of business men throughout the country who undertook to ascertain whether or not these articles could be manufactured in Canada; the only way in which the matter has come to my knowledge is that with respect to, I think, one firm representations were made on behalf of labour interests, to the effect that the rate of wage was not quite adequate. I think there are about 60 firms or companies engaged in this work. So far as I remember, there were complaints in regard to only one, and that was not in the Maritime provinces. The representations that were received were communicated to the chairman of the committee, and he was asked to give consideration to them and to get into touch with the particular firm or company with reference to which complaint had been made.

Mr. MACDONALD: I am glad to know that my right hon. friend is in a position to deal with these cases when they arise. If a formal request with reference to a particular case is necessary in order to enable my right hon. friend to remove the difficulty, I can supply that by correspondence. My object would be attained if I had assurance from my right hon. friend that he will see that the request I have made in regard to this matter is carried out and the fair wage schedule is observed by those various committees just as if they were contracts with the Federal Government.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not quite sure as to our power to insert the fair wage clause in such contracts; the principals for whom we are acting would have to be consulted. Any representations that are made will be given the best consideration in our power.

Mr. MACDONALD: There is a fair wage schedule in regard to Imperial Government contracts, which was, in fact, the basis of the fair wage schedule in Canada; so between the two the difficulty ought to be avoided, and it ought to be possible to guarantee the employees of these various industries of the country a continuation of their employment at reasonable wages and without an increase in the number of hours.

I was very glad to see, in an address delivered in the Maritime provinces, that my eloquent friend Mr. Rowell, leader of the Opposition in Ontario, whose activity in his public addresses upon the subject of the war has been most worthy of comment and whose ability in dealing with the various phases of this question has been attracting the attention of the Canadian public, had ventured to say that he hoped that one result of this war in the after days, when the readjustments would necessarily take place and peace would come after victory had perched upon our banners, would be the inclusion of the colony of Newfoundland in the Dominion of Canada. In 1866 and in 1867 the fathers of Confederation saw the importance and desirability of including the whole of British North America in the federation which was then formed and which has existed without that colony during the ensuing years. The machinery for the inclusion of that colony is provided in the British North America Act. One does not need to enter into a discussion as to why it was never perfected. In 1884 an occasion arose when Newfoundland came to the Government of that day; and I may say, speaking without any partisanship, that hon. gentlemen on both sides and the press of this country have agreed that it was a most regrettable fact that the Government of that day was so parsimonious in dealing with the older colony that they prevented Newfoundland from entering into Confederation at that time. Conditions, it would seem as days go by, would point to the probability of the whole federation being rounded out within a short time by the inclusion of Newfoundland. When one contemplates the ambitions and ideals of the fathers of this Dominion and when one realizes that this most ancient colony within the Empire is but the outpost of this Dominion, that it stands as a sentry almost guarding the great St. Lawrence; that here in Canada, in order to ensure safety of navigation on the St. Lawrence in summer and from Nova Scotia in the winter, we have to maintain in this colony, which has no rights in this Dominion, our life-saving stations and lighthouses and all the provisions necessary for safe navigation; that we have there a colony with very great wealth in minerals and timber and fisheries; and that, having regard to that unity and nationality within the Empire which will become all

the more necessary and all the more important when one views the position of this war and its consequences, I would like to impress upon the House and the country the suggestion made by Mr. Rowell, and to say to the Prime Minister that if it is feasible under existing conditions, or conditions which may be imminent within a very short time, to negotiate with that ancient colony, he should not be niggardly in dealing with it; and I am quite sure that those of us on this side of the House would regard my right hon. friend as doing that which was eminently proper and right if he dealt generously with the people of the colony when an opportunity to bring it into Confederation arose. I regard the duty of Canada in that respect as one not merely of importance to Canada as a whole, but of the utmost importance to the Empire, having regard to its permanence and perpetuity in the days yet to come.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I wish to make a correction of a statement I made a few moments ago. My hon. friend the Minister of Labour tells me that representations did come to him with respect to one of the firms or companies in the Maritime provinces. I also understand that arrangements are likely to be made for such a clause as my hon. friend alludes to being included in any contract if necessary.

Motion agreed to.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That the said Address be engrossed and presented to His Royal Highness the Governor General by such members of this House as are of the Honourable the Privy Council.

Motion agreed to.

ESTIMATES FOR 1915-16.

A message from His Royal Highness the Governor General transmitting estimates for the year ending March 31, 1916, was presented by Hon. W. T. White, read by Mr. Speaker to the House, and, on motion of Mr. White, referred to the Committee of Supply.

THE BUDGET.

Hon. W. T. WHITE (Finance Minister): I beg to announce that it is my intention to bring down the Budget on Thursday. If my right hon. friend desires the adjournment of the debate on that day, we shall be very glad to meet his wishes.

Mr. WILLIAM PUGSLEY: Matters are evidently going to move pretty rapidly in the way of getting into the Estimates, and if my right hon. friend has no objection I should like to have laid on the table of the House before the Estimates are considered the names of the agents or subagents or assistants who have been appointed on the recommendation of this Government or of any minister to make purchases for the British Government of ammunition and other war supplies both in the United States and Canada. If I were to move for this information in the ordinary way, I should probably not get it until too late to be made use of. I have information that agents appeared in the city of New York representing the British and Canadian Governments—the same gentlemen in each case—and made purchases for the British Government of war supplies in very large quantities, and I think it is highly desirable that the Government should submit the names of the agents. I may also say in this connection that a communication has appeared, emanating ostensibly from the Government, claiming that certain persons falsely represented themselves as agents. The whole matter is one of very considerable interest, and I should be very glad if my hon. friend would consider giving the House the names of these agents without my having to make a motion in the ordinary way.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have no recollection of our having appointed agents to purchase for the British Government. So far as I recollect, they appointed their own agents; but I will make inquiries on the subject, and if there are any names to be mentioned I will submit them to the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I shall be very glad if my right hon. friend will do so, and I shall be pleased to give him the information I have on the subject. Certain gentlemen undoubtedly did represent themselves to be agents of the British Government, and the same gentlemen were also agents of the Canadian Government in other purchases, and induced manufacturers to deal with them as representing both the Canadian and the British Governments. I understand that vast quantities of ammunition were purchased through these gentlemen.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Does the Minister of Finance propose to give shortly a statement of any sums advanced by the

Treasury under the legislation passed in the special session of August, enabling the Government to make advances on securities?

Mr. WHITE: Under the Finance Act of last session advances may be made to banks on approved security. Is that the legislation my hon. friend refers to?

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. WHITE: I shall consider whether we shall lay upon the table particulars respecting advances so made to banks, but if my hon. friend would like to inform himself as to the particulars in the meantime, I shall be very glad to give him any information available. What I have in mind was whether I shall bring down full information. I believe it was not done before.

Mr. MACLEAN: I would like to inquire further if when the Minister delivers his financial statement on Thursday, or before that, he proposes to give to Parliament some statement generally, or with some particularity, showing the war expenditures under the vote of $50,000,000 made last year. I understood the Prime Minister to say this afternoon that he would give Parliament that information, and it will be necessary that we should have it some time soon. Possibly the Minister proposes to make that statement in his Budget. If not, we should have it shortly.

Mr. WHITE: It is not my intention to give details of war expenditure in the Budget. That would be quite an undertaking, but my right hon. friend the Prime Minister this afternoon promised to bring down the information, as I understood, and no doubt he will have it in charge.

Mr. MACLEAN: We would like to know whether the full amount of the $50,000,000 is expended.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No, the full amount has not been expended, and I may say that further information in regard to it will be laid on the table of the House within a day or two in printed form.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, the House adjourned at 9.50 p.m.

Tuesday, February 9, 1915.

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

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Joseph Adelard Descarries, Esq., for the Electoral District of Jacques Cartier, introduced by the Hon. T. Chase Casgrain and Hon. Louis Coderre.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

The Civil Service List of Canada, 1914.—Hon. Louis Coderre.

Report of the Secretary of State of Canada for the year ended March 31, 1914.—Hon. Louis Coderre.

Statement of Governor General's Warrants issued since the last session of Parliament on account of 1914-1915.—Hon. W. T. White.

Statement of Expenditure on account of Unforeseen Expenses, from August 18, 1914, to February 4, 1915.—Hon. W. T White.

Auditor General's Report for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1914.—Hon. W. T. White.

Report of the Ottawa Improvement Commission for the year ended March 31, 1914.—Hon. W. T. White.

Statement of the receipts and expenditures of the Royal Society of Canada for the year ended April 30, 1914.—Hon. W. T. White.

Statement of Civil Service Superannuation and Retiring allowances for the year ended December 31, 1914.—Hon. W. T. White.

Shareholders in Chartered Banks as of date December 31, 1913.—Hon. W. T. White.

Public Accounts of Canada for the year ended March 31, 1914.—Hon. W. T. White.

ELECTION OF DEPUTY SPEAKER.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That Albert Sevigny, Esq., member representing the electoral district of Dorchester, be appointed Chairman of Committees of the Whole House.

He said: Mr. Sevigny is a young member of this House, and young also in years. Since his entrance into the House he has displayed qualities which admirably adapt him to fill the important position for which he is now proposed. He combines a perfect knowledge of that language which is his mother tongue with an excellent command of English, and it is with every confidence that I submit his name to the House as the selection for Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not rise with any intention at all of opposing the election of the hon. member for Dorchester

to the chairmanship of the Committee of the Whole House. I am prepared to agree that Mr. Sevigny is a young member well qualified in many ways to fill that position. But what will the electors of Dorchester say when they hear that Mr. Sevigny is no longer to champion the policy he was elected upon? Like yourself, Sir, Mr. Sevigny when elected will be an arbiter between the two parties in this House. The moment he takes the Chair to preside over the deliberations of this House he is supposed—and I hope the supposition will not be a vain one—to be absolutely without politics.

It is said that he will not be able to take part in any political fight. In this I hope he will not follow in the footsteps of his predecessor, who did not scruple to take part in any political fight although occupying the position that the hon. member for Dorchester is going to occupy. But I believe that, if the electors of Dorchester are in the same frame of mind that they were in at the time of the general elections in 1911, they will be very much aggrieved when they hear that the young man to whom they gave their entire confidence then, and who was pledged to obtain in this Parliament the repeal of the Naval Service Act, will henceforth make no effort in that direction. Henceforth not a word will be heard from the hon. member for Dorchester against the Naval Service Act.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What will the Government do without him?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not know, however, that the position which he is about to occupy will change his attitude very much in this respect because the hon. member for Dorchester is entitled to the compliment that the moment he came into this House where he happened to sit upon the side of the Government, his views on the Naval Service Act underwent a very severe change. If my memory serves me, one of the first things the hon. gentleman did after he entered this House was to give notice of a Bill to repeal the Naval Service Act; but I am not aware that he ever presented such a Bill. I think he made one inquiry, whether it was the intention of the Government to repeal the Act or not, but as yet they have not done it. Be this as it may, whatever the change of heart of my hon. friend may be, it is apparent that henceforth he is to allow the Naval Service Act to be applied without being able to utter a word against it. I give credit to my hon. friend for having had a change of heart in this respect, and if he again goes before the electors of Dorchester he will understand that after all the straight path is the best, and that it is better in Opposition as well as in Government to do the best that is to be done for the country.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I entirely agree with one of my right hon. friend's observations, namely, that the electors of Dorchester on any future occasion will be very much of the same mind as they were in 1911, and I think—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Good-bye to the Naval Act, then.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That it may be said of my hon. friend from Dorchester that he has at least made as much progress in accomplishing the repeal of the Naval Service Act as my right hon. friend did after 1896 in destroying that protection against which he made so many vows. If my right hon. friend has seen fit to introduce the subject of changes of opinion upon public questions, I can only say that my hon. friend from Dorchester has a long record to fill up before he shall be able to emulate my right hon. friend.

Motion agreed to.

ABOLITION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT BILL.

Mr. ROBERT BICKERDIKE (St. Lawrence, Montreal): moved for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Criminal Code. He said: I want to say that capital punishment is murder, and that it is morally indefensible in any Christian land. It is a relic of the dark, pestilential days of Nero.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that the hon. gentleman is starting on a course that will take him away from the well-understood rule of the House that a simple explanation only is in order at this stage.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: I was just coming to that, Sir. I think I am safe in saying that the time has arrived when it is the bounden duty of this Government and Parliament to give consideration to this grave question, which is daily growing in importance all over the world—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Not just now.

Mr. BICKERDIKE:—especially in the Christian nations. The purpose of the

Bill is to abolish capital punishment in the Dominion of Canada and to substitute life imprisonment for the different crimes for which capital punishment is provided under our present Criminal Code. The opinion has gained ground very rapidly of recent years that the death penalty is nothing more or less than legalized, brutal murder. I am aware that there are a number of members of this House who look upon capital punishment as a deterrent. I hope that I shall be able to prove, when the Bill comes up for its second reading, that it is not a deterrent. If we were honest in saying that it is a deterrent, then all executions should be made as public as possible; and if they are to be regarded as an object lesson to the community, then we should have a hanging bee in the public square. If capital punishment is to be regarded as an object lesson, then we had better have this exhibition where every man, woman and child will be able to see all the ghastly proceedings. I trust that every hon. member of this House who votes against my amendment will feel a sense of personal guilt if Canada continues to stand before the world as a barbarous country.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the hon. gentleman is not confining himself to an explanation of the Bill.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: Any further remarks I have to offer, with your permission, I will defer until such time as the second reading is called.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member, it appears, has not a copy of his Bill at hand, and therefore it will be obliged to stand.

Motion allowed to stand.

STEAMBOAT RATES BILL.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 3, to amend the Railway Act. He said: The Bill is very similar to the one I introduced last year requiring steamship companies to file their rates of toll and tariff arrangements with the Railway Board. At the present time steamships run in connection with railways are required to file with the Board of Railway Commissioners their rates, tolls and tariff arrangements, while all other steamboats, of which we have 8,500 in Canada, are allowed to make use of our inland waters and to charge the producers, manufacturers and shippers whatever tolls they wish.

They are perfectly free to call at any port, or at no port, as they choose. One clause of this Bill brings the steamships under the jurisdiction of the Railway Board. Another clause gives the Railway Board control over privileges granted by railway companies to shippers and manufacturers. Certain privileges are granted to speculators, such as enabling a man buying 25,000 bushels of grain at Winnipeg and shipping it, to hold it up in transport at Port Arthur or elsewhere, thus monopolizing the rolling stock of the railway and interfering with transportation. Certain privileges are also granted to municipalities immediately outside some of our large cities, where railway men are directly interested in real estate, and where they are apt to have the trains stop. The Bill provides that matters of this kind shall be placed under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission, so that a remedy may be applied.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

EXPORTATION OF NICKEL BILL.

MR. SPEAKER'S RULING.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Bill on the Order Paper to regulate the exportation of nickel was reserved yesterday for my ruling. After a careful consideration of the Rules of the British House of Commons and of the Canadian House of Commons, I have reached the conclusion that this Bill is of such character that it should come under Rule 50, which provides:

> No Bill relating to trade, or the alteration of the laws concerning trade, is to be brought into this House, until the proposition shall have been first considered in a Committee of the Whole House and agreed unto by the House.

It appears to me quite clear that a Bill to regulate or restrict the export of nickel is a Bill relating to trade within the meaning of this rule (Bourinot, p. 633). Mr. Speaker Cockburn held that the term 'trade' included exporting goods, and in 1911, upon the question of the introduction of the Bill to amend the Electricity and Fluid Exportation Act, Mr. Speaker Marcil held that it was a Bill relating to trade within the meaning of Rule 50, and must be introduced upon resolution, and last year the Bill relating to the exportation of petroleum was introduced upon resolution (Journals of the House of Commons, volume 46, page 125, and Journals of the House of Commons, volume 49, page 157).

It is true that the Bill to regulate the export of electric power and natural gas, chapter 16 of the Statutes of 1907, was introduced, in 1906, by Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, and in 1907 by Sir Allen Aylesworth, without a resolution, but in both instances this would seem to have been the result of inadvertence, and no exception was taken to what I conceive to have been an irregularity.

I would also point out that in the session of 1911 the House decided that it was necessary with respect to three Bills—one relating to the importation, etc., of white phosphorus matches, one relating to the importation, etc., of explosives, and the other to the importation, etc., of opium—that they must be introduced upon resolution.

HORN EXTRADITION CASE.

Mr. P. MICHAUD (Victoria, N.B.): I draw the attention of the Prime Minister to the following, which is published in the Ottawa Citizen of this morning:

Machias, Me., Feb. 8.—Werner Horn, who maintains that his recent attempt to blow up the Canadian end of the international railway bridge near Vanceboro was an act of war, tonight retained Daniel T. O'Connell, of Boston, as counsel. The attorney will look after Horn's interests in connection with the effort of the Canadian Government to obtain the extradition to the Dominion of the man who claims that he was formerly an officer in the German army.

Horn is now serving a sentence of thirty days in the county jail here for damage to property on the American side of the border caused by the explosion.

Does the Prime Minister know anything about this serious incident, and has he taken any steps in the matter?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Government of course has information of the incident. The Department of Justice has the matter in hand, and has taken the necessary measures with regard to extradition.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

TRANSCONTINENTAL INVESTIGATION COMMISSION.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What was the total expenditure in connection with the Transcontinental Investigation Commission?

2. How much was paid to F. P. Gutelius for his services in connection with the said investigation, including travel and outlay?

3. What was the date of his appointment to the said commission, and how many days was he employed in connection with the sittings of said commission?

4. Was the said F. P. Gutelius in the employ of the Intercolonial railway during any part of the time that he was acting on the said commission? If so, did he receive any remuneration during that time from the Intercolonial railway, and how much?

5. What is the gross amount that has been paid to the said F. P. Gutelius for his services in connection with the said commission, and also as general manager of the Intercolonial railway since the date of his appointment to December 31, 1914?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. $65,668.18.

2. Services, $25,870. Travel and outlay, $1,595.48.

3. (a) January 29, 1912; (b) 398 days.

4. No.

5. (a) $27,465.48, gross amount; (b) amount paid Mr. Gutelius for services by the Intercolonial Railway, between May 1, 1913, and December 31, 1914, $33,303.33.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—GUYSBOROUGH BRANCH.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Did the Department of Railways and Canals survey a branch railway in Guysborough county during 1914?

2. Has the survey been completed?

3. Has a report been made to the minister?

4. What is the name and post office address of the engineer who had charge of the work, and what are the names and post office addresses of the members of his staff, and the daily or monthly wages paid to each?

5. How many men were employed on said survey, and what are their names, post office addresses and rate of wages?

6. What is the total cost of said survey to date?

7. What is the maximum grade between the town of Guysborough and the Straits of Canso, as ascertained by said survey?

8. What is the maximum grade between Sunny Brae and the town of Guysborough?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes.

2. No.

3. No.

4. Four location engineers: J. M. Millar, Halifax; D. J. Bergin, Moncton, in charge reconnaissance engineer; J. H. Congdon, Dartmouth; H. S. Clarke, St. Catharines, Ont. Rate, $150 per month. There were employed on the staffs of these engineers from time to time at the rates mentioned per month:

J. A. Rankins, Port Hawkesbury, N.S.	$ 90
H. L. Currie, Fredericton Jct., N.B.	75
R. R. Beebe, Moncton, N.B.	90
G. R. McGrane, Montreal, P.Q.	45
H. Taylor, Fredericton, N.B.	45
F. G. McLellan, Moncton, N.B.	50
H. McAnn, Moncton, N.B.	35
J. M. Wortman, Salisbury, N.B.	45

Ernest McCully, Hawkesbury, N.S.	$ 35
H. N. Bradley, Montreal, P.Q.	75
F. H. Rowe, Moncton, N.B.	60
F. N. Chadwick, Ottawa, Ont.	60
S. W. Kennedy, Toronto, Ont.	90
R. L. Waycott, Hawkesbury, N.S.	90
C. A. McNearny, Halifax, N.S.	75
P. Buteau, Montreal, P.Q.	60
L. A. Johnson, Westmount, P.Q.	50
C. G. Reade, Teddington, Eng.	50
S. S. Jones, Montreal, P.Q.	45
L. W. W. Sass, Montreal West, P.Q.	45
W. M. Killally, Montreal, P.Q.	35
J. O. Leblanc, College Bridge, N.B.	30
W. O. Hearn, Moncton, N.B.	35
C. H. Patterson, Salisbury, N.B.	50
Geo. Bishop, Dorchester, N.B.	45
W. H. Crandall, Moncton, N.B.	50
F. Boileau, Moncton, N.B.	50
A. W. Fraser, Halifax, N.S.	50
Geo. E. Dowling, Aspen, N.S.	75
John A. Jackson, Chatham, N.B.	50
H. W. Humphrey, Moncton, N.B.	30
R. B. Herrington, Salisbury, N.B.	45
V. H. Carruthers, Grand Falls, N.B.	60
A. A. Burke, Lo, Moncton, N.B.	45
R. D. Huddart, New Glasgow, N.S.	50
J. H. Hart, Hawkesbury, N.S.	45
R. E. Wortman, Salisbury, N.B.	35
J. McNeil and team, Hawkesbury, N.S.	100
Angus McDonald, Hawkesbury, N.S	35
Bruno Desserault, Ste. Geneviève de Batiscan	60
E. Hart, Hawkesbury, N.S.	30
W. Yorke, Parrsboro, N.S.	35
Alex. O'Brien, Antigonish, N.S.	35
W. Nevin, Halifax, N.S.	30
B. Belliveau, College Bridge, N.S.	40
F. Wheaton, Parrsboro, N.S.	60
D. McWhirter, Moncton, N.B.	30
B. Hart, Hawkesbury, N.S.	35
J. Duff, Hawkesbury, N.S.	35
W. Cunningham and team, Boylston, N.S.	125
J. R. McDonald and team,, Guysborough Co., N.S.	125
G. W. Torry and team, Guysborough Co., N.S.	125
D. R. McDonald, Guysborough Co., N.S.	40
N. Hattie, Guysborough Co., N.S.	40
W. Cummins, Guysborough Co., N.S.	40
J. Kirke, Pictou, N.S.	40
A. Hudson, Pictou Co., N.S.	40
C. Smith, Pictou Co., N.S.	35
T. McKean and team, Guysborough Co., N.S.	125
G. Scranton, Guysborough Co., N.S.	35
N. McMullen, Pictou Co., N.S.	40
J. Fraser, Pictou Co., N.S.	40
A. W. Cameron, Pictou Co., N.S.	40
E. B. Cameron, Pictou, Co., N.S.	40
G. Tait, Guysborough Co., N.S.	40
E. McKeen, Guysborough Co., N.S.	40
F. Mills, Guysborough Co., N.S.	40
N. Gunn and team, Pictou Co., N.S.	125
A. Mason, Guysborough Co., N.S.	40
B. Gunn, Guysborough Co., N.S.	40
E. McDonald, Guysborough Co., N.S.	40
H. McIsaac, Guysborough Co., N.S.	30
Allan Grant, Hawkesbury, N.S.	35

5. Seventy-seven men, including the four location engineers. See No. 4, for names and rate of wages.

6. $20,553.60 to January 31, 1915.

7. Six-tenths per cent.

8. Six-tenths per cent.

H.M.C. SHIPS NIOBE AND RAINBOW.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Referring to the following statement on page eight of the report of the Department of Naval Service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1914, viz.:

'Owing to the decision of the Government not to continue H.M.C. ships Niobe and Rainbow in full commission, the course of exercises and training for these ships has been discontinued, and they are at present manned by nucleus crews.'

At what date was the decision referred to in the above paragraph arrived at?

2. Was the said decision expressed in an order in council, or other written document or memorandum?

3. If so, will the full text of the said decision be laid before Parliament?

Mr. HAZEN: No formal action or decision of this sort was taken and no order in council in reference thereto was passed, but owing to the gradually decreasing number of men on these vessels it was found necessary to take the ships out of full commission and place them on a nucleus basis.

CLOSE SEASON FOR LOBSTERS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What reply was given by the Government to the application of the lobster packers of the Maritime provinces, asking for the close season for lobster packing during the year 1915?

2. Was the question submitted to the Fisheries Advisory Board?

3. Has a decision been reached? If so, what is the decision?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. That before it would be feasible to consider such an application it would be necessary for the department to have before it a a practically unanimous request from the canners and fishermen as well in favour of the proposal.

2. No.

3. Yes. That lobster fishing will not be prevented and that lobster canneries will be licensed as usual.

CANADA SHIPPING REGISTRY.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. How many vessels of all kinds were withdrawn from the Canadian Shipping Registry since July 1, 1914?

2. What is the gross tonnage of such vessels?

3. What are the countries to the registry of which such vessels were transferred?

4. What is the number and tonnage of all vessels added to the Canadian Shipping Registry since July 1, 1914?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Twenty-two vessels of all kinds.

2. Gross tonnage 28,791.

3. Three to Newfoundland; three to Barbados; one to France; fourteen to United States of America; one to Spain.

4. One hundred and twenty-seven steamers of 45,026 gr. tons; 67 sailing of 20,816 gr. tons; total 194 vessels of 65,842 gr. tons.

ST. JOHN VALLEY RAILWAY.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. Is the Intercolonial railway operating any portion of the Valley railway, so called, in New Brunswick? If so, between what stations?

2. Is the said railway being operated by the Intercolonial railway between Fredericton and Gagetown? If not, why not?

3. Is not the railway completed between Fredericton and Gagetown for a distance of about thirty miles?

4. Is the present operation under the statutes and leases made in 1912?

5. What proportion of the gross receipts, under present arrangements, goes to the railway company and the province of New Brunswick?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes; between Fredericton and Centreville.

2. No; not required under the statutes.

3. Not completed to statute requirements.

4. No.

5. The gross receipts are not proportioned between the railway and the province.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—BATHURST HARBOUR SPUR LINE.

Mr. TURGEON:

Is it the intention of the Minister of Railways and Canals to build a spur from the Intercolonial railway at Bathurst to the harbour at the earliest practical moment?

Mr. COCHRANE: The matter is under consideration.

BATHURST HARBOUR DREDGING.

Mr. TURGEON:

1. What is the lowest depth of water at low tide at present in Bathurst harbour?

2. Is it the intention of the Department of Public Works to proceed further with dredging in Bathurst harbour during next season?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. There is a depth of 14 feet, at low water, in that portion of the channel which has been worked over.

2. It is not customary to give such information until the Estimates are submitted to Parliament.

Mr. TURGEON:

What was the amount of dredging by cubic yard done by the contractors in Bathurst harbour during the months of May, June, July, August, September, October and November, 1914, and what amount of money was paid to them for each month?

Mr. ROGERS: The Northern Dredging and Construction Company in 1914:

	Removed cubic yards.	Paid.
May	8,154	$ 1,908 04
June	56,841	13,300 79
July	78,972	18,479 45
August	66,505	26,646 13
September	70,543	19,703 42
October	65,682	*12,000 00
November	43,751	.....
		$92,037 83

* On account.

Mr. TURGEON:

What is the amount of dredging by cubic yard done in Bathurst harbour by the Government dredge Restigouche during the summer of 1914?

Mr. ROGERS: The Government dredge Restigouche removed 87,407 cubic yards during the summer of 1914.

MIZONNETTE LIGHTHOUSE.

Mr. TURGEON:

1. To whom was the contract awarded for the building of the lighthouse at Mizonnette, Gloucester county, N.B., and what was the price of contract?

2. Was the contract awarded to the lowest tenderer?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Samuel Gammon, carpenter and builder, of Bathurst, N.B., $2,700.

2. Yes.

ANTIGONISH-SHERBROOKE MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. WILLIAM CHISHOLM:

1. Has the contract for the mail service between Antigonish and Sherbrooke, N.S., been awarded? If so, to whom and at what figure?

2. When were tenders called, and up to what date were they received?

3. Who were the persons tendering for said service and at what figures respectively?

4. If the contract has not been awarded, why not?

Mr. CASGRAIN: Tenders were invited and were due at the department on the 11th December last. Seven out of a total of nine tenderers asked permission to withdraw their tenders. In these circumstances the department considered it in the public interest to invite tenders again, and instructions have been given to that effect.

MAIL BAG LOCKS.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. How many padlocks for mail bags have been ordered by the Post Office Department

from the 1st of January, 1914, to the 1st January, 1915?

2. What is the name of the firm to which said contract was awarded and the price paid?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. No order for locks for mail bags was given by the Post Office Department from the 1st January, 1914, to the 1st January, 1915. Ten thousand locks were ordered during the previous year, 1913, but as they were not satisfactory they were rejected and returned to the contractor, who was requested to replace these locks by locks that would meet with the approval of the department. These locks have been delivered during the period above mentioned.

2. The Ontario Equipment Company, of Ottawa, and the price paid was seventy-five cents per lock and eighteen cents for each key.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. Sinclair.—For a copy of all correspondence, petitions, departmental recommendations and other papers and documents in the Department of Marine and Fisheries relating to the definition of a 'coasting voyage,' as defined in the Canada Shipping Act since the revision of the Statutes in 1886.

Mr. Turgeon.—For a copy of all accounts of the transfer of the storm signal at Shippigan, N.B., from its former position on land to the public wharf, showing the total cost of said transfer during the months of October and November in 1911.

Mr. Lemieux.—For a copy of all papers, petitions, letters and telegrams exchanged between the Quebec Board of Trade and the Department of Railways and Canals concerning the circulation of trains on that section of the National Transcontinental railway between Cochrane and Quebec city.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden the House adjourned at 3.45 p.m.

Wednesday, February 10, 1915.

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

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill No. 4, respecting The Alberta Central Railway Company.—Mr. Michael Clark.

Bill No. 5, respecting The Athabasca and Grand Prairie Railway Company.—Mr. Green.

Bill No. 6, respecting the Brantford and Hamilton Electric Railway Company.—Mr. Barker.

Bill No. 7, respecting the British Columbia and White River Railway Company.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill No. 8, respecting the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company.—Mr. Green.

Bill No. 9, respecting the Essex Terminal Railway Company.—Mr. Wilcox.

Bill No. 10, respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. E. M. Macdonald.

Bill No. 11, respecting the Hudson Bay, Peace River and Pacific Railway Company, and to change its name to 'Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway Company.'—Mr. W. H. Sharpe.

Bill No. 12, to amend The Independent Order of Foresters Consolidated Act.—Mr. Glass.

Bill No. 13, respecting the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill No. 14, to ratify and confirm a certain agreement between the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Oliver.

Bill No. 15, respecting certain patents of Duncan Donald McBean.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 16, respecting The Title and Trust Company, and to change its name to 'Chartered Trust and Executor Company.'—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill No. 17, respecting The Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. W. H. Sharpe.

ABOLITION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT BILL.

Bill No. 18, to amend the Criminal Code—Mr. Robert Bickerdike (St. Lawrence, Montreal)—introduced and read the first time.

TITLE TO REAL ESTATE BILL.

Mr. GEO. E. McCRANEY (Saskatoon) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 19, to amend the Criminal Code. He said: The Bill is to protect purchasers of real estate who have paid in full for lands and are unable to get title. It is intended to apply particularly to cases where the person selling has bought under an agreement of sale and still owes money on the lands which he has sold and has no title except the agreement. It frequently happens that such a vendor does not use the money which he receives from his sale in getting title, but uses it for some other purpose. For this reason the man to whom he has sold and who has paid the purchase money cannot get title to the land nor can he get back the money which he has paid for it. It is obvious that, until such a vendor has

himself acquired title, the moneys which he receives, unless devoted to that purpose, should be treated as trust moneys. The purpose of the Bill is to fix them with that character. It is an accepted principle of law that a person who has title to lands, sells them under contract, and has received the purchase money, holds the lands in trust for the purchaser until he gives title. The Bill would require him to hold the moneys in trust for the buyer if he could not give title. The Bill proposes to add a subsection to section 390 of the Criminal Code respecting criminal breaches of trust, as follows:

Every one who contracts to sell real property and has not in himself the title which he has contracted to give to the purchaser, shall hold any moneys received by him on account of the purchase price, in trust for the purchaser, unless such moneys have been paid by the vendor in acquiring such title. Any violation of this subsection shall be deemed a criminal breach of trust within the meaning of this section.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

WAR CONTRACTS—PURCHASE OF BOOTS.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. From what firms have the boots supplied by the Militia Department for the first expeditionary force been purchased?
2. By whom have they been reported upon?
3. What is the price to be paid for them?

Major General HUGHES:

1. From Ames, Holden, McCready Ltd., Montreal, $3.85 per pair; Tetrault Mfg. Co., Montreal, $3.85 per pair; The Slater Shoe Co., Montreal, $3.85 per pair; Louis Gauthier Co., Quebec, $3.85 per pair; John Macpherson Co., Hamilton, $3.85 per pair; Hartt Boot and Shoe Co,. Fredericton, $3.66 2-3 per pair; Amherst Boot and Shoe Co., N.S., $3.80 per pair.

2. The boots were inspected as follows: Those of Ames, Holden, McCready and Slater Shoe Co., by J. Prenter and W. Wilson; those of Tetrault Mfg. Co., by W. Silver and A. E. Baldwin; those of L. Gauthier Co., by W. Jacques. This inspection was made in the contractors' factories. Boots made by the John Macpherson Co,. Hartt Boot and Shoe Co. and Amherst Boot and Shoe Co., were sent direct to Valcartier camp without previous inspection at the factory.

3. Answered by 1.

[Mr. McCraney.]

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has an investigation been made regarding the quality of the boots supplied to the Department of Militia and Defence for the use of the Canadian volunteers?
2. If so, who made this investigation and has the inquiry been closed?
3. Will the results of the inquiry be laid before Parliament?

Major General HUGHES:

1. Yes.

2. Board appointed by the Minister of Militia. The inquiry has been closed.

3. Yes.

REGISTRATION OF ALIENS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

How many aliens were enrolled at the various Government offices opened for that purpose since the 4th of August, 1914?

Major General HUGHES: Quebec, 8,845; Ontario, 7,571; New Brunswick, 52; Nova Scotia, 1,300; Manitoba, 5,521; Saskatchewan, 1,416; Alberta, 2,350; British Columbia, 1,310; Yukon Territory, 55; total, 28,420. Internments, 1904. Grand total, 30,324.

INSPECTION OF PICKLED FISH.

Mr. HAZEN:

1. What are the names, addresses and salaries of officers appointed in Nova Scotia under chapter 45, 4-5 George V, 'An Act to provide for the Inspection and Branding of Pickled Fish?'
2. How many barrels and packages of fish were inspected during the year 1914?
3. Have rules and regulations been prescribed for the carrying out of the provisions of the said Act?
4. Will the Minister of Marine and Fisheries attach a copy to the replies to the foregoing?

1. None have been appointed up to the present.

2. None, as the Act does not come into operation until May 1, 1915.

3. Yes.

4. Copy of regulations filed with clerk of the House.

ALBERTA OIL LEASES.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. What was the total amount received by the Dominion Government for oil leases in Alberta during the years 1913 and 1914?

Mr. ROCHE: 1. The total amount received by the Dominion Government for oil leases in Alberta during the years 1913 and 1914 was $1,445,130, made up as follows: During 1913, on Dominion lands, $266,838.48; on school lands, $22,216.40. During 1914, on

Dominion lands, $1,052,669.35; on school lands, $103,405.77.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. Buchanan: For a return showing how much money was spent amongst the merchants of the city of Medicine Hat for government relief, to whom payments were made, and the total amount in each case.

Mr. Buchanan: For a return showing the quantity of coal imported into Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba, respectively, from the United States in 1914, and the amount of duty collected in each province for coal imported during 1914.

SEED GRAIN FOR WESTERN FARMERS.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN (Regina) asked for leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing the question of supplying seed grain to the farmers of the western provinces.

And leave having been granted,

He said: I have no apology to offer for bringing this question to the attention of the House at this early stage in the session. That the matter is of great importance and urgency cannot be disputed. It has been the policy of all governments in Canada to supply seed grain to the farmers of the West in case of need. That has been done on two or three occasions during my residence in western Canada. In 1908 and on previous occasions seed grain was supplied to farmers on unpatented lands, under certain restrictions. The Government, however, proceeded on the assumption that men who had not yet got their patents for their homesteads were really wards of the Dominion, and for that reason no question whatever was raised as to the proper policy to be pursued by the Dominion Government, no matter which party was in power. I desire to put before the House briefly some of the facts in connection with the conditions at present obtaining in western Canada, in order to show to the Government, to the House, and to the country, that the supply of seed grain, not only to men who reside on unpatented lands, but to men who reside on patented lands, is necessary for the development of the province of Saskatchewan in the year 1915.

It is a well-known fact that a large portion of the province of Saskatchewan—I refer particularly to the southwest portion—was drouth-stricken during the year 1914, with the result that very little crop over a large area of that part of the province was harvested. During last summer, before we held our short session of Parliament in the month of August, I went through the western part of Saskatchewan from Swift Current, southwest and then east from almost the Alberta boundary, and the whole country for at least a hundred miles had the appearance of a desert. The wind that blew off that portion of the country felt almost like the wind from a desert. There was practically no crop there at all. This condition of affairs was known to the provincial governments of western Canada and also to the Dominion Government as early as the month of October, 1914, and certain steps very properly were taken by the Dominion Government and by the provincial governments of Saskatchewan and Alberta to relieve the need that existed among the farmers of that drouth-stricken area. There is no question to-day that certain relief has been given by the provincial governments and that certain precautions have been taken by the Dominion Government for the purpose of supplying seed grain to that drouth-stricken area; but a difficulty has arisen with respect to farmers who reside outside that drouth-stricken area or on patented land. In addition to the large area which I call the drouth-stricken area, there are other portions of the province of Saskatchewan, smaller in extent, which require assistance by way of seed grain during this year. There are portions of the country not very many miles from the city of Regina in which I reside. Only the day I left Regina to come down to this session of Parliament I had two requests in my mail for seed grain, one from a group of farmers who reside within twenty miles of the city of Regina and the other from a group of farmers who reside within forty miles of that city. I mention these instances only to show that the drouth-stricken area is not the only portion of Saskatchewan which requires seed during the present year. There is a great demand for seed grain throughout Saskatchewan outside of this drouth-stricken area.

Yesterday I received a letter addressed to myself from an organization of rural municipalities with headquarters in the city of Saskatoon. I have no doubt that other hon. members on both sides of the House from western Canada have received similar letters. The letter reads as follows:

At a meeting of representatives of the following municipalities, namely, 374, 343, 310, 280, 345, 375, 373, 313, 252 and 344, of district No. 5, Saskatchewan Association Rural Municipalities held in Saskatoon, the following resolution was unanimously passed:

'That this representative meeting of municipal officers strongly urge on the Dominion Government to supply seed grain to all farmers, in need of same, for seeding season of 1915.

That letter has to do with a large territory. There are, I think, ten municipalities mentioned, which would cover an acreage of about 2,073,600 acres of land. Each municipality in the province of Saskatchewan consists of nine townships so that there are ninety townships represented by that letter, and the need apparently is great in that locality. I find also that only yesterday or the day before a delegation of three or four members of the Regina Board of Trade waited upon the Dominion Government with a view to urging upon it the necessity of taking some immediate action on this question. Seed time will be upon us in a few weeks; the people are anxious as to what will be done; some farmers are without seed grain at the present time, and immediate action is necessary to relieve the doubt that exists and to give the farmers in that section seed grain in order that they may properly produce and harvest a crop in 1915.

I am informed—I do not know whether it is correct or not—that the Department of the Interior has on record over 6,000 applications for seed grain from the province of Saskatchewan outside of this drouth-stricken area altogether. That number does not include applications for seed grain from the province of Alberta and Manitoba; and if my information is correct, the number is very much in excess of 6,000.

The worst feature of the situation as it exists in the province of Saskatchewan to-day is that the farmers from north to south and from east to west outside the drought-stricken area have been deceived with regard to the attitude of the Dominion Government in respect to this matter of supplying seed grain. It may be an open question whether that is the case or not; but I have only to say that since the month of October the people in the district in which I reside, and I believe the people throughout the length and breadth of the province of Saskatchewan, believed that the Government were going to supply grain to farmers on patented and unpatented lands without the drouth-stricken area. That belief was strengthened by official information sent out by men high in the employ of the Dominion Government. I have here a copy of a letter which, in the month of October, 1914, was sent broadcast throughout the province of Saskatchewan from the office of the Commissioner of Immigration of the city of Winnipeg. In this particular letter no exception is made whether a farmer resides in the drouth-stricken area or not, or whether on patented or unpatented land. The letter is as follows:

In answer to your letter of recent date, asking for an advance of seed grain, I have to inform you that this department is making arrangements to supply bona fide settlers, who have lost their crop this year and are unable to obtain seed, with good clean seed next spring, delivery to start about the middle of February. This seed will be furnished at cost, cleaned and sacked, and thoroughly inspected by inspectors of the Department of Agriculture, and security therefor taken by a lien on the unpatented land of the settler.

Here is the important part of it:

In the case of the settler having only patented land, a note must be given for the amount so advanced.

Therefore the Government during the months of October, November and December of last year was satisfied with the notes of farmers who had patented land. The Government were particularly generous at that time.

Lien or notes will be repayable on or about January 1, 1916, with interest at five per cent per annum.

The farmer during those months thought he was getting a square deal from the Dominion Government.

When making application give correct description of your land, state whether it is unpatented, homestead, pre-emption, purchased homestead or script. Should you have only patented land, say so and give exact location of same, state also how much encumbrance against the land, if any. Wheat, oats and barley are the only grains which will be distributed and in sufficient quantities to sow land you have under cultivation and ready for seed.

No limitation put upon the quantity.

I am enclosing you herewith an application form, which, if you will carefully fill out and return to me, will have due consideration.

What I wish the House to note is that the Government in that letter of October, 1914, says that it will supply seed grain for the year 1915 without any limitation whatever. It also states that in cases of patented lands where the Dominion Government would not have control of the title could not exercise the right of lien as provided for by the Dominion Lands Act, an ordinary note would be taken with interest at five per cent per annum, such note payable January 1, 1916.

The last point in the letter is that all that any settler, whether on patented or unpat-

ented lands and whether inside or outside the drouth-stricken area, had to do in order to secure seed grain, was to send in his application to the Dominion Lands Office in Winnipeg. With that letter in circulation throughout the province of Saskatchewan, it was a fair assumption for the agriculturist in that country to go upon that he would get seed grain from the Government. The result of that is this—that many farmers, being pressed by wholesalers, machine companies and ordinary creditors, sold their seed, and so have not a bushel to-day. I live in Regina, and for three months, when any person asked me if he was going to get seed grain, I said: Of course, the Dominion Government is going to supply seed to all bona-fide settlers who have lost their crops,. for statements to that effect have been published in their party newspapers throughout western Canada, and in official documents. No exception at all has been made; and even though you have been farming in the West for twenty-five years, and have got a section of land, you are going to get seed grain. So, as I have said, many have sold their seed and have not a bushel to-day. And they have been put in that position by these letters sent out from the Winnipeg office of the Department of Immigration. I have here quotations from newspapers that circulate largely in the province of Saskatchewan. I find that in the minds of the people who were doing business for this Government, and in the minds of the editors of party newspapers, and also in conversations that took place amongst ordinary men, there was never any doubt, until the 11th of January, 1915, that the present Dominion Government was going to supply seed grain this year to every person in the province of Saskatchewan who required it. First, let me quote from the Saskatoon Star of the 24th of November last. This appears in large type at the top of the column and on the first page:

Now is the time to put in demands for seed grain from government for next year.

M. A. MacInnes, Dominion Lands Agent, issued a statement yesterday, asking all farmers in need of seed grain in this district not to delay their application. The flow of grain is passing through Saskatoon very heavily now, he stated, and while the heaviest movement was in full swing was the best time for the purchase of seed grain by the government; it was desirable that all applications be forwarded as early as possible in order that the government might be able to find out how much seed grain it will be necessary for them to secure. This is the advice also handed out by Mr. Lindsay, the government's chief buyer.

Applications hitherto received at the Dominion Lands office have been numerous and each day shows an increase. The stream of applications was materially heavier towards the end of last week than at any previous time during the present season.

The last statement on the subject in this issue of the Star is the following:

'Whoever has an application to make', said Mr. MacInnes, 'tell them to make it right away, so that the government will know how much to provide.'

There can be no doubt about that statement. As late as November 21, I find a long statement in the Saskatoon Star, in the same kind of type and at the head of the column on the front page, as follows:

Seed grain supplied by Dominion Government alone; stock is ready. Considerable misapprehension on the part of many people throughout the province resulting in delay.

Some have been applying to the provincial authorities, which is wrong and wastes time. Applications should be made to lands office.

Let me read a paragraph or two of this article:

Many of the farmers of Saskatchewan are losing much valuable time owing to a misapprehension which seems to have arisen. They have been led by some means to believe that the Provincial Government is handling the supply of seed grain to the farmers who need it. This is an entire error. The Saskatchewan Government has nothing to do with it, and all applications or communications with regard to the supply of seed or feed should be addressed to the proper representatives of the Dominion Government. Farmers should direct their inquiries and applications to the agent of the Dominion Lands in their particular land office district.

Mr. M. A. MacInnes, Saskatoon Dominion Land agent, showed by his correspondence yesterday that the needy farmers, or many of them, are losing time, because of the fact that they have been addressing their inquiries and applications to Premier Scott and other members of the Saskatchewan Government. One farmer in particular wrote asking Premier Scott if the Provincial Government intended to supply seed grain to the northern part of the province, as well as to the southern. As a matter of fact, the Provincial Government is not handling the purchase or distribution of seed grain in any way, and the only thing that the members of that government can do is to turn the letters over to the Dominion Lands offices and notify the farmers that they have done so. This is all a waste of much time which could be saved, and the business of arranging for supplies of seed grain could be greatly facilitated if the farmers would address their inquiries and applications to representatives of the Dominion Government, who are authorized to handle the matter.

And a little further on is this statement:

Thus far the local Dominion Lands office has on file thousands of letters touching the seed

grain question, and in totalling up the amount applied for up to the present, it was announced that approximately a quarter million bushels of all grains is needed in the Saskatoon land office district. The Dominion Government is not only helping with regard to the land which failed to produce a crop last season, but is anxious to see that every farmer gets grain enough to seed every acre he can possibly get under crop for the coming year.

I do not mean to argue that the Government is responsible for every item that appears in one of its party newspapers. But it is responsible for the letter sent out by its commissioner in Winnipeg on which these articles are largely based and by reason of which the people have been led to believe that they were going to get seed grain.

It came as a shock when, on January 11, a letter was circulated throughout the province of Saskatchewan, sent out by the Commissioner of Immigration in Winnipeg, in which he withdraws altogether, in meaning if not in direct terms, the letter of October 14. We were led to believe, in October, November and December, and even up to the middle of January, that we were going to obtain seed grain in abundance, whether we were on patented or unpatented lands, and whether inside or outside the drouth-stricken area. Here is the letter, which, as I have said, was a shock to the people:

Arrangements have been made to supply seed grain to all who have lost their crop, whether on unpatented or patented land, in the following area:

Then it describes the drouth-stricken area as described by the Department of the Interior. At any rate, for three months the position was taken by every person in Saskatchewan, including the Dominion Government officials, that seed grain would be supplied, and I say we had a right to go on that assumption. If the man occupying the position of Commissioner of Immigration in Winnipeg sends out statements which the people of the province or others cannot rely upon, where are we to look for correct information? The Government cannot urge such an excuse. This letter which, as I say, came as a shock to the people, said that the supply of seed grain would be confined to the people in the drouth-stricken area. I have copies of letters here addressed to applicants by the Commissioner of Immigration, in reply, apparently, to requests sent in by men outside the drouth-stricken area. The first is a letter dated January 12, addressed to Mr. J. W. Whittaker, Salvador. This gentleman is within the drouth-stricken area, but, unfortunately for him, is on patented land. The letter says:

In answer to your letter to the Department of Agriculture, Regina, I have to state that this department is only making an advance of seed grain to needy homesteaders on unpatented land and who lost their crop through some calamity. All others will require to look to their local municipality or to their Provincial Government for assistance in the matter of seed grain.

That contains a mis-statement of fact, because the letter referred to says that: "the department is only making an advance of seed grain to needy homesteaders on unpatented land, and who lost their crop through some calamity." So far as the drouth-stricken area is concerned, that is not correct, because they were then supplying seed grain in the drouth-stricken area to the holders of both patented and unpatented lands.

I have another letter here of the 19th of January, from the Commissioner of Immigration to Mr. D. B. Martin:

Referring to your application for an advance of seed grain, I have to inform you that this department is only making an advance of seed grain to those in your district who are on unpatented land.

I note from your application that you only hold patented land, and it is with regret, therefore, I have to inform you that your application cannot receive consideration. You will require to look to your local municipality or to your Provincial Government for assistance in the matter of seed grain.

The position in certain parts of that province to-day, owing to the people having been misled, is one of confusion, even of chaos. The records of the department and the records of the Department of Agriculture at Regina and Edmonton would indicate that there are thousands of applications from farmers outside the drouth-stricken area in both provinces for seed grain, perhaps more in Saskatchewan than in Alberta. These men have all been led to believe that they would get seed grain. They have gone on that assumption, and to-day I say they are entitled to seed grain.

I have here a book which I obtained since coming to Ottawa a few days ago, published by the Dominion Department of Agriculture, called "Patriotism and Production." It is a very admirable publication and contains many statements of value to the people of Canada, whether members of the agricultural population or otherwise. In looking over that book I find, over the signature of the Minister of Agriculture, this statement:

Should the war continue into the summer of this year the food production in Europe cannot approach that of normal years. Looking at the situation in even its most favourable light there will be a demand for food that the world will find great difficulty in supplying. Canada is responding promptly to the call of the motherland for men and equipment. Britain needs more than men, she must have food,—food this year and food next year. We are sending of our surplus now. We should prepare for a larger surplus this year and next year. The government is strongly impressed with the desirability of increasing the crop acreage in Canada. The Canadian farmer, earnestly bending all his energies to increase the food supply for the Britisher at home and the British soldiers at the front, is doing his share in this gigantic struggle of the Empire.

I would urge the farmers to do their share in helping to assist the people of Great Britain, who for many years have borne the burden of a heavy tax for the maintenance of a great navy, in preventing them from suffering want or privation.

From the standpoint of whether it is proper agricultural policy to encourage men to put in grain on all land, irrespective of whether it has been summer-fallowed or not, I shall say nothing as I am not a farmer. The fact remains that the Dominion Government and the provincial Governments, during the six months since the commencement of this terrible war, have been urging the farmers throughout Canada, especially western farmers, to increase their production. With what result? The Commissioner of Immigration in Winnipeg, Mr. Bruce Walker, whose letter I have referred to, has said that in western Canada there will be 40 per cent more land ready for crops this spring than in any other year in the history of western Canada. I think his figures are exaggerated. My information is that there will be 10 per cent or 12 per cent more land ready for cultivation when the spring ploughing is done for 1915 than was under crop in any other year in Canada. That is in Saskatchewan. Providence last fall favoured the farmers of western Canada with climatic conditions conducive to getting land ready for crops. Any person who had any available land has it ready for the spring of 1915. The work has been done by the farmers of western Canada, they have not credit with the banks to borrow money to buy seed, they are looking to the Government to supply seed, and, without raising any question of party politics, as I have no desire to do anything of that kind, I earnestly entreat the Dominion Government to take this question up and to act on it at once. Seeding time will be on us in six weeks or two months. It may be a question whether the Government can readily obtain seed in western Canada; but an effort should be made right away. We have been priding ourselves in Canada during the last ten years on being the greatest wheat-producing colony in the Empire. We pride ourselves on our great production of wheat and other grains and say that we are the greatest agricultural colony in the Empire. The farmers of western Canada and of all Canada have done the work; they have acted on the suggestion made by the Dominion and Provincial Agricultural Departments, they have made all the land they possibly could available for crops for the season of 1915. Now give them the seed they are entitled to, the seed you promised them in October and November; and give them an opportunity to show in 1915 that we are worthy of the title we have taken to ourselves during the last number of years, namely that of being the bread basket of the British Empire.

Hon. W. J. ROCHE (Minister of the Interior): Being a western man myself, I can sympathize with the farmers in the West, more especially in what is known as the drouth-stricken area in the southern portions of the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. I sympathize with the hon. gentleman, who, as a representative of the province of Saskatchewan, in his efforts to secure, in so far as we can possibly concede the legitimate demands of these farmers, the seed grain which is necessary to seed down land which is already prepared for crops. The hon. gentleman has referred to the history of the seed grain question in years gone by. It is true that this Government has been in the habit of looking more especially after the homesteaders, inasmuch as we have regarded them in the light of wards, and we have been in the habit, to a limited extent, where they have had crop failures, of advancing seed grain to them, taking a lien against the homestead, which, of course, was good security, as we had the title to the land in our possession. In 1908 the question assumed much larger proportions, and, as a result of negotiations between the then Minister of the Interior and the provincial governments of the West, very much larger demands were made on the Dominion Government. At that time the provincial governments desired the Dominion to advance money, not only in the case of lands not patented, but also on lands that were patented. The then Minister of the Interior took the position, and quite properly so, that this Government

had nothing to do with land that had already been patented, and that the subject came under the jurisdiction of the Provincial Government. The Provincial Government rather reluctantly submitted to that decision, and undertook the distribution of seed grain to those who were the owners of those lands. It was done in this way: the Dominion Government loaned Saskatchewan and Alberta, at 5 per cent, the money necessary to supply seed for the farmers residing on patented lands. The system adopted in the two provinces differed. The province of Saskatchewan took a lien against the land, and passed legislation at the following session of the legislature by which that lien was given priority over any existing mortgages. The Provincial Government alone could do this, the Dominion could not. As a result of that legislation, I understand, they took a lien, not only upon the land, which would be a first lien, but also upon the crops and upon any other personal property of the person owning the land. But in Alberta not only did they do that, but they levied and collected the money by way of taxes, with the result that up to about the first of this year the province of Alberta had repaid the Dominion all but about $3,000 of what they had borrowed for that purpose. It seems to be the best manner in which they could possibly collect money by taxation. To be sure, Alberta had not borrowed nearly the amount that Saskatchewan had. The province of Saskatchewan, on the other hand, had not undertaken to collect it by way of taxes, and I think, as a matter of fact, the practice was that they have collected only when there was a transfer of land, with the result that at the first of this year Saskatchewan, out of the advances we made to them—I think it was in the neighbourhood of $1,000,000—still owes us between $300,000 and $400,000.

Their method of collecting was therefore not nearly so effective as that of the province of Alberta. I perfectly understand the position. It is only natural that the Government should not want to be put in the position of a landlord; for many people thinking that the Government would not be harsh in its method of collection would take advantage of it. This has actually been done. The result is that these delinquents have not paid to the province of Saskatchewan, and the province of Saskatchewan has not paid to us, the moneys we advanced in 1908, nearly seven years ago.

The hon. gentleman has referred to a conference held last summer between some members of this Government and representatives of the Provincial Government of Saskatchewan. I first heard of this conference in the latter part of December, and therefore cannot vouch for what took place there. But I understand that the Provincial Government made the proposal that they would look after both homesteaders and non-homesteaders, and give them relief in the shape of road work. They drew up a plan under which a single man would receive about $60, and a married man about $100. They did not limit this assistance to those who were not owners of their lands. Assistance was to be given to both owners and non-owners, but was confined entirely to those in the drouth-stricken area. There is prima facie evidence that the conference referred to the drouth-stricken area only, and I am informed that that was what my colleagues had in mind when they entered into this arrangement with the Provincial Government. The Government of Saskatchewan had in mind at that time the farmers of the drouth-stricken area only. My information is that this area was set aside after consultation with the Mounted Police and members of the Provincial Government. Our assistance has been given mainly to the farmers of that area because we were informed that they had practically no crops whatever, though undoubtedly odd farmers here and there have had fair crops.

It is true that a great many applications have been made to the Government since then outside of that area. Perhaps the farmers were prompted to ask for assistance by certain articles in the press. It may be that Mr. Walker's letter of October last was not as definite as it should have been. The hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin) interpreted it to mean any farmer could get seed grain from the Government, whether the owner of his land or not, and whether within or without the drouth-stricken area. That, I maintain, was not the idea in Mr. Walker's mind when he wrote the letter. I admit that his letter did not specifically mention that the assistance was to be confined to the farmers in the drouth-stricken area, but on the other hand it did not say that assistance would be given to those outside that particular area; and since our assistance has been practically confined to the farmers within that area, I think it is only fair to assume that it was those in that area only who were to be assisted. I know that there have been

applications from farmers living outside that area, not only from Saskatchewan and Alberta, but from Manitoba as well. The province of Manitoba is looking after farmers who own their land and had no crop last year. I also understand that the Government of Saskatchewan some years ago passed a Municipal Seed Grain Act by means of which municipalities were empowered to advance seed grain to needy farmers. It is stated that municipalities and private individuals cannot get any credit from the banks this year. That may be true, particularly as regards private individuals. Applications for assistance have come in from Manitoba, perhaps in consequence of the difficulty of getting credit, but my reply has invariably been that the intention of the Government is to assist only the farmers of the drouth-stricken area. It was never intended to distribute seed grain promiscuously. If we had done that farmers who had had a good crop would have been applying to the Government for a loan at a cheap rate of interest. We should have been flooded with applications.

Manitoba has had for years a law empowering municipalities to advance seed grain to needy settlers within the municipal bounds. That Act is to be enlarged this year, so the papers say, so 3 p.m. that not only will the municipalities be able to make such advances, but the Provincial Government will get behind the municipalities and advance the money. We feel that Manitoba is acting wisely. The Provincial Government there is looking after its own people, and our efforts are confined to the homesteaders between the two lakes where a number of people are located who have not yet patents for their land. Up to the 25th of January we had received some 6,000 applications from people who reside outside the drouth-stricken area, and I am informed that many of these have done just as the hon. member for Regina says: taking advantage of the high prices they sold their grain, and now are applying to the Government to supply them with seed grain. Just to get a little ready money they sold their grain. It matters not whether they had a poor crop or not. Undoubtedly some of the farmers applying for assistance had fair crops, some of them very good crops. Some who have applied for seed have frankly stated that they had as much as 1,500 acres of land prepared for seed. Fancy the owner of three sections being unable to finance the seed for that land! I cannot believe it myself. I know that the banks have been very cautious in the past in advancing farmers money for that purpose, but I also know that my colleague the Finance Minister has been in touch with the head offices of our Canadian banks. He asked them to loosen up, to let the farmers have more credit. As a result of this intercession by the Finance Minister, the presidents of our Canadian banks instructed their western branch managers to meet all legitimate demands. The head offices in the East state they are quite willing to advance money on fair security.

Then, as to the delay in coming to a decision how far this relief should be extended. I may say, in the first place, that I have had an interview with Hon. George Bell, provincial treasurer for the province of Saskatchewan, as to the security we should receive for any advances we might make. We expected advances on patented lands to be secured in the same way that the Provincial Government was secured by their legislation of 1908. In justice to the Provincial Governments of Alberta and Saskatchewan, I must say that they have given us their written consent to give our lien, in the case of such advances, priority over all other existing encumbrances.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: Do I understand that the position taken by the Dominion Government was that they should have a first lien upon patented lands, with priority over all existing encumbrances and mortgages, for the amount of seed grain supplied to each farmer?

Mr. ROCHE: That is the position. That was the position of the Provincial Government in 1908. I have in my possession letters and telegrams received from the Provincial Governments. I might as well read one I received from the Premier of Alberta last evening. We sent out an agreement to be signed by the respective governments asking not only for preferential legislation in favor of our liens for our seed grain advancement, but also to include the relief which we had been giving destitute settlers. Mr. Sifton replies:

> Agreement received; provision as to payment of expenses satisfactory; perfectly satisfactory as to seed grain. If words 'relief other than seed grain' confined to feed for horses putting in crop, that also will be satisfactory.

I do not know whether the hon. member

for Regina is in sympathy with our liens being given preferential treatment but this government of his friends in Saskatchewan and Alberta have signified their willingness to pass that legislation. The question resolves itself into this: Are we to enlarge the area; are we to go outside of the drouth-stricken area, or are we going to pass upon every application from every man, every farmer, who has sold his grain and now applies to the Government for aid? That is rather a large proposition. Already our expenditures under this head have amounted to a large amount. Up to the 31st March this year our estimates for seed grain and relief amount to somewhere in the neighbourhood of $5,800,000 which amount will be supplemented next financial year for relief to the extent of $3,000,000 or $4,000,000. The expenditures, if we were to act upon the applications that are being made to us at the present time, would amount to in the neighbourhood of $11,000,000. That is a pretty serious expenditure for this Government to assume especially during a time of financial stringency. We do not think it is a reasonable request to be called upon to satisfy all these applications to share in the distribution of seed grain, but I have instructed Mr. Bruce Walker that we would advance seed grain within the drouth-stricken area on patented lands as well as unpatented lands and that as far as applications outside of that area are concerned we would give them close scrutiny and investigation and where it was found that farmers are in much the same position as those in the drouth stricken district and have no crop we would be perfectly willing to advance seed grain to them. Close scrutiny has been given to this matter within the last fortnight or more. I think we will be able to meet all the legitimate demands that are being made upon this Government, but we certainly cannot be expected to meet the demand where men who own two, three or four sections of land, have sold their grain and now apply to the Government to advance them money for seed grain.

We have had to supply not only seed grain but also provisions to keep a number of these people alive during the winter months, such as groceries, the necessaries of life and fuel and for relief of this kind we have expended $2,500,000 which is included in the $5,800,000. In addition to that the farmers say: What is the use of giving us money to purchase seed grain, or giving us seed grain unless we have our stock in condition to put that grain in? We recognize the validity of that argument and we shall supply them with feed for stock during the months in which they will be engaged in putting in their crop. I think that we have been dealing very generously and very reasonably with the requests that have been made to this Government. I believe that I have touched upon all the points that the hon. member for Regina has brought up, but if there is any other question that any hon. gentleman would desire to ask I will be perfectly willing to answer it. We all recognized that this is a very frightful condition of affairs in western Canada, that they have had during this past year an area some five hundred miles north by south and one hundred and fifty miles east by west within which there have been practically no crops at all. It has been quite a setback to that country and it has been represented to us that unless we can meet the demands of the farmers there, a great many of whom have prepared their land in anticipation of having a large crop this year, the responsibility will rest upon the Dominion Government. We are quite willing to assume the responsibility that we think properly belongs to us but we are keeping this assistance within the drouth-stricken area except as before explained and in doing that I think we are assuming a pretty large obligation. But notwithstanding that, we are willing to go farther and, if after close investigation, applications that have been sent in are found to be just as deserving, if the people have had no crops last year, if they have no money to secure seed grain and have no credit to secure the money, we are quite willing to treat those people with the very same consideration as that with which we are treating those within the restricted area.

Mr. GEO. E. McCRANEY (Saskatoon): This question of the supply of seed grain is not a question of a gift from the Dominion Government to the farmers in the West, nor is it a question of a gift from the Provincial Government. It is a question as to which credit shall be used for the purpose of getting the grain, whether it shall be the credit of the Dominion, or the Provincial Governments. In either case there will be security for the advance made. At this date in the month of February it is rather more a question of time, of opportunity to purchase, than it is a question as to whether the Provincial Government or the Domin-

ion Government shall take security from the farmers upon making the advance. The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Roche) has spoken as though there was a misunderstanding between the members of the government of Saskatchewan and of this Government as to the area that would be supplied with seed grain. I think I am safe in saying that if there has been any misunderstanding, there has been no misunderstanding in the province of Saskatchewan in relation to it. There has been no member of the Provincial Government who believes that the assistance of the Dominion Government was to be restricted to the area in the south-western part of the province. There has been no misunderstanding in the minds of the people at large throughout the province on that point and there has been no misunderstanding in the minds of those who are closest to this Government and who belong to the Conservative party. My hon. friend from Regina (Mr. Martin) has quoted articles published in the Saskatoon Star, which is the Conservative organ of the district. The city of Saskatoon and that district are not within this area of drouth so that any observations which that paper made editorially or by way of news could not have reference to the drouth area but were addressed to those who live outside of it. The Saskatoon Star of the 3rd of December, 1914, has an editorial showing the sort of invitation which was sent out by this Conservative organ to the farmers of the Saskatoon district, and you will notice that there is no restriction in it as to whether those who require seed grain live on patented or on unpatented land:

> The Government's Prompt Aid.—There will be general appreciation of the fact that the Dominion Government is rising to the occasion in the matter of extending aid to the western farmers who lost their crops in the drouth of last summer.

A further editorial appearing in the Star, as late as the 30th of December last, contained this statement:

> At the big storage elevator at the edge of this city, hundreds of thousands of bushels of seed grain are being accumulated, and no man who files his application for a supply for spring seeding need be short. Farmers who are without seed grain and who may not have the means of procuring any should at once make their wants known. Application should be made at as early a date as possible and every farmer should sow every available acre of land. Grain prices are sure to be high next fall.

This shows the character of the appeals made by the organ of the Conservative party to the people.

The Conservative candidate in the last election in the riding of Saskatoon was Mr. Donald Maclean, a gentleman who has received the Conservative nomination for the next election whenever it will be held. His understanding of the matter is apparently the same as that which has been put forward by the Saskatoon Star. On the 8th of January last Mr. Maclean addressed a meeting of Conservatives in the city of Saskatoon and his explanation of the delay in supplying seed grain was, that it was due to difficulty on the part of the Dominion Government in getting assurances from the provincial Government that the Dominion Government would be given satisfactory security for the advances made. Mr. Maclean's statement would go to show, however, that the distribution of seed grain would be general, and that it would be made both within and without the drouth area and on either patented or unpatented lands. In that speech which was published in the Saskatoon Star, Mr. Maclean said:

> Overtures were then made to the provincial governments of this province and Alberta, and they were told that if they would guarantee to legislate so that the Dominion Government could take liens upon patented lands as security for the advances, the Dominion Government would undertake the supplying of all seed grain that the farmers needed.

There is a general statement made by Mr. Maclean without any restriction whatever, and apparently any question as to security to be provided to the Dominion has been removed. According to the statement of the minister, the Dominion Government is to be given a first lien on the land, which I think is quite fair, and it removes the only difficulty which seemed to arise in Mr. Maclean's mind at that time, in the way of the Government carrying out what he believed to be its policy as to the distribution of seed grain which Mr. Maclean must have been informed of by the friends of the Government. Later on, Mr. Maclean gave an interview in the city of Saskatoon, which was quoted in the Winnipeg Free Fress of February 2nd last. He had evidently found out in the meantime that the Government had changed its policy, and that they wanted to restrict the supply of seed grain to the drouth area. This is the statement of Mr. Maclean, who as I say, is now the accepted candidate of the Conservative party in the Saskatoon electoral district, and who retains the view, which had evidently been impressed upon him, before the change of policy on the

part of the Government. Mr. Maclean said in part:

The problem now is a financial one. It is not a question of which government is willing or which government is unwilling, but which government is able. Obviously, the Dominion Government is in a better position to borrow the large sum needed to supply feed and seed than provincial governments. The municipalities are helpless and the banks are doing nothing. Consequently, the Dominion Government is being bombarded from all sides to come to the rescue. It is a question of finding the money and the grain. It may not be the business of the Dominion Government to supply the seed and feed, but it looks as if no one else can do it.

This matter has also been dealt with by the Saskatoon Board of Trade. On the 6th of January the Saskatoon Board of Trade sent the following telegram to the Department of the Interior:

It is stated by Walker of Winnipeg that only those on unpatented homesteads will be given seed or feed grain. Surely this is incorrect. Wire immediately so that we may contradict.

There is a letter confirming that telegram, which I need not read, and the answer of Mr. Cory, the Deputy Minister of the Interior, is quoted in the letter of the 15th of January written by the Board of Trade to Mr. Cory. Mr. Cory's answer was dated the 12th of January and is as follows:

Your wires 6th and 7th and letter 6th. Arrangements being made whereby it will be possible to advance seed grain and relief to needy settlers who own their lands.

This despatch from Mr. Cory on the 12th of January, places no restriction as to area, on patented or unpatented lands. On the 21st of January the Saskatoon Board of Trade wired Mr. Cory:

Bruce Walker's letter to farmers, dated 13th, emphatically states seed will only be given to those on unpatented lands who lost crop and that all others must look to their municipalities or provincial governments. This flatly contradicts your wire dated the 12th. Such conflictions causing serious general unrest. Please wire us something to publish that will finally remove all uncertainty.

This telegram is quoted in the Phoenix of January 30, 1915, and up to that time no reply had been received. Notwithstanding the attitude of the Saskatoon Star and its statements to the public that there was no use sending a delegation to the provincial Government, on the 4th of February, 1915, the Star came out with an article headed: 'How the provincial Government is dealing with the seed grain question; Mr. McNab's letter,' and then it says a circular letter signed by Mr. McNab showing how the provincial Government is dodging the

question of assisting in supplying seed grain in the case of needy farmers, is being sent around. It will be noticed that from having been most positive that there was no use applying to the provincial government for seed grain, the Saskatoon Star, which is one of the culprits in the whole matter, turns around and tries to make out that it is the provincial Government that is dodging the issue, and when as a matter of fact if there is any dodging it is being done by the Ottawa Government.

As I said a little while ago, it is not a question of the Dominion Government or of the provincial Government or of the municipalities giving so much money to the West; it is a question which government will lend the farmers so much money, for which it will have ample security. The important point to-day is not that, but the opportunity to buy seed grain at the present time as compared with several months ago. It will cost to-day at least fifty per cent more to buy seed grain, in consequence of this policy of uncertainty and delay on the part of the Dominion Government in dealing with this question than it would have cost if the seed grain had been purchased some months ago. If the provincial government had understood three months ago that they were to take hold of this question, the necessary grain could have been purchased much more cheaply and supplies of grain would have been available which are not available to-day. Like my hon. friend from Regina (Mr. Martin), I have received telegrams asking me to use my influence in having certainty instead of uncertainty with reference to this question.

This discussion has come up at an opportune moment. I wish that the statement of the minister had been more satisfactory than it is, because his own friends have produced the situation. He has said that some will be dealt with who have patented lands outside of the area, but there is a discrimination which gives no certainty to any one who may desire to rely upon the promise of this Government to make advances of seed grain.

Mr. W. A. BUCHANAN (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I am in a position to complain or not, because if the statement of the Minister of the Interior is carried out, my district will be satisfied. Unfortunately for me, I represent a district that is almost entirely within the drouth-stricken area of the province of Alberta. The

farmers there have been carried through this winter by the assistance of the Dominion Government. I am prepared to pay tribute to the Dominion Government for the assistance which they have given to the settlers in my district. I am not prepared to go the length of saying that this assistance has been administered in the fairest possible manner to the people of that country; but at the same time I think the Government deserve credit for having come to the assistance of the people and for providing means whereby they can exist and remain in the country. If I understand the Minister of the Interior aright, the people of that district are to be provided with seed grain no matter whether they are on unpatented land or on rented land or even on land which has been purchased, because in many cases where land has been purchased, the farmer is in just as bad a position as the man who is on homesteaded land whether patented or unpatented.

There seems to be an impression throughout Eastern Canada that that district is worthless; that it is not worth while paying attention to on account of there being such a severe crop failure. I desire to remove that impression, and to say that during the time I have lived in the southern part of Alberta that district has produced splendid and profitable crops; but, owing to conditions of pioneering in a new country, lack of transportation facilities and difficulties due to commencing farming with very little capital, the prosperity of the people has been impaired, and they were not in a position to finance themselves through a complete crop failure. There are parts of that district, which I consider to be within the drouth-stricken area, where farmers to-day are told that they cannot get seed grain. I have a letter in my possession from Diamond City, a place northwest of the city of Lethbridge, in the drouth-stricken area, a point from which no grain was shipped last fall, and the writer informs me that he was refused a supply of seed grain whereas other farmers surrounding him are receiving seed grain. I intend to hand this letter to the Minister of the Interior, because I think this case should be investigated, and this particular farmer is certainly entitled to seed grain. Any farmer in the constituency of Medicine Hat who asks for seed grain, unless he has accumulated some wealth, is entitled to seed grain, because the entire district is within the drouth-stricken area,

The inability of many farmers to receive seed grain this year is due to some of the banks of this country. I want to be candid in saying that some of the banks in this country, since the war commenced and since this depression came upon us, have been of no assistance whatever to farmers who have securities which they could offer to these banks. In that way many men who anticipated that they could secure seed grain through their own resources, have been unable to do so on account of the fact that they could not get any advances whatever from the banks. I have been told this by men who have assured me that they could offer gilt-edged security. If I remember aright, the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett) made a similar statement in that city. It is on account of this fact that the demand is now coming in to the Government for advances of seed grain from people who, I believe, ordinarily would not seek advances, because out of their own resources they cannot secure assistance which they could have secured in other years. It is the duty of the Government under such circumstances to look after those people, no matter whether they are in the drouth-stricken area or not. In my own district I am satisfied that there is at least a ten per cent increase in the land under cultivation for crops next year. That is in a district which did not have any crops last year, where the people were absolutely discouraged and down-hearted; but at the same time they have cultivated more land than they had last year and are prepared to raise a crop this year, and, from the conditions that exist in southern Alberta, I believe we have never had better prospects for a crop than we have at the present time. If we get a crop, with the prevailing prices, all the obligations the farmers have undertaken with the Government of the Dominion of Canada will be met, provided that the machinery companies, the banks and others do not get after the farmers first and take everything.

Now, I desire to add one observation with regard to this area which I represent and within which I reside. I would like to mention the question of feed for stock. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) has been an advocate of mixed farming in western Canada. Others have given those farmers the same advice. The farmers have followed that advice to a very large extent, and in my district there has been a large increase in live stock during recent years. But on account of the drouth there has been no feed whatever for that stock. In October last I communicated with the Commissioner

of Immigration in Winnipeg in regard to the matter, and he intimated that he had forwarded the following wire to the Superintendents of Relief:

> The Government will provide baled hay for farm stock only where it is necessary and in moderate quantities.

Now, this is entirely satisfactory; but that promise is not being carried out, and as a result farm stock is being lost, especially cows. As farmers are not able to purchase feed or get it from the Government their farm stock is being destroyed. It is most important for the cause of mixed farming that the Government should carry out the promise made by the Commissioner of Immigration in October last which led the farmers to believe that they should have feed for their stock. I hope the Minister of the Interior will see to it that the necessary instructions are given to furnish feed until the farmers can provide it themselves.

As to the prospects of that country, I am satisfied there is more optimism among the farmers in the drouth-stricken area than can be found in many communities that had good crops last year. Many of these farmers come from states in the American Union where they had to face adverse conditions in the early stages of agricultural development. They believe in the future of that district; they believe the district will come out all right. I am satisfied if the Government come to the assistance of these farmers this year with a supply of seed grain, then, with prospects—which were never better—for a good crop and for high prices, the farmers will establish themselves on a firm footing which will make them satisfied with their new homes in western Canada.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): My hon. friend who has last spoken (Mr. Buchanan) comes from a constituency entirely within the drouth-stricken area. I come from a constituency no part of which is within the drouth-stricken area. I have a few words to say with regard to the remarks of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Roche). Like the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney), I am not entirely satisfied with the statement made by the hon. minister, for it seemed to me to consist mostly of qualification. I should like to have some definite statement made. The hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin) in introducing the motion, referred to the fact that some farmers who now wanted seed had sold grain. The Minister of the Interior makes quite a point of that. Had my hon. friend from Regina been a farmer, he would probably have explained the matter a little differently. I know men who are wanting seed grain, not in the drouth-stricken area but in other parts of the country, who, though they have grain, have not grain fit for seed. In the locality in which I live, where we were not drouth-stricken though our crop was a little light, none of the people are asking for seed grain, but we will have difficulty in finding amongst us seed oats that will grow. That will, perhaps, explain the position with regard to the farmers who have sold oats and still want seed. The same is true with regard to wheat. These people who are so badly drouth-stricken may yet have a little wheat, but it is not fit for seed. The case is not quite so bad with wheat as with oats. Rather poor wheat will grow, but it is madness to sow very poor oats. I hope the Minister of the Interior will bear these points in mind when he is considering this question. In the constituency of Qu'Appelle there are only two localities of which I have information as to the need of seed. In one of these, a very small district, the people have a little grain, but none fit for seed. They may have sold a few bushels, but in doing so they did not sell seed grain. Of course, if they had creditors, those creditors would not be willing to remain unpaid if these people had grain to sell.

I desire to draw the attention of the Minister to another matter. In most of the places where seed grain is required, the demand arises on account of drouth. But in one locality in my own constituency, the trouble arises through a complete destruction by hail. I grant you that in cases of this kind it has not been usual to give seed grain, but I think that the Minister of the Interior, in considering this question, must not entirely ignore the localities in which the destruction is due to hail. It is true that when grain is destroyed by hail, the destruction is generally confined to a narrow strip of territory. In the locality to which I refer, one block was hailed out.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Do not you have provincial hail insurance?

Mr. THOMSON: Yes, we have provincial hail insurance where the law is adopted by the municipality. In these particular localities there is no hail insurance in force; the men of whom I speak have received nothing at all. I grant you, under ordinary circumstances they could procure their own seed

grain, but under present circumstances, I do not think they can. The same thing would apply to municipalities. Under ordinary circumstances, municipalities might supply the seed grain required, but under present circumstances they cannot do so. I am not here to blame the banks; I think the situation they have to face is a serious one. I understand, however, that the banks are refusing to supply money to municipalities for such purposes as this. I am not sure that we can blame the banks for that, they have a heavy load to carry. I do not think the argument of the Minister of the Interior is good when he seeks to show from the action of the Saskatchewan Government that it was not their intention to supply grain to any except those in the drouth-stricken area. It may be true that public works which went on in that province were only carried on in the drouth-stricken area, and it is also true, I presume, that the Government here have not received requests for ordinary relief of the people except in the drouth-stricken area. That, however, has no application to the question of seed grain, especially as matters stand now in regard to finances. And I think the minister must consider the financial situation. He is bound to consider all these things, and considering these things, I think he must come to the conclusion that, though the demands may be very great, he will have to very freely interpret the promise made here to-day in order to fulfil his duty. There are many localities outside the drouth-stricken area in which, if he fulfils his duty as a minister, he will supply the requirements so far as seed grain is concerned. I shall be pleased to furnish him with information as to localities in my constituency that I think require seed, and I trust he will give them favourable consideration, as I trust he will give favourable consideration to all localities requiring seed, remembering that the financial situation is not such as ordinarily faces us, but that men who, under ordinary conditions could get seed on their own credit cannot get it now.

Mr. D. B. NEELY (Humboldt): Mr. Speaker, I am surprised to learn that the Government have decided to limit the area in which they propose to give help in the matter of seed grain to the settlers of the West. I remember that during the months of November and October of last year a number of my constituents who are not in what is understood as the drouth-stricken district of Saskatchewan, wrote to me with respect to the question of getting seed grain for the coming year and I immediately laid their communications before the Commissioner of Immigration at Winnipeg, Mr. J. Bruce Walker. I have not his reply at hand, but I remember very well that in every instance Mr. Walker directed that these settlers should communicate with him directly and should give full particulars as to whether they resided on patented or unpatented land, as to the amount and nature of seed they would require, etc. Copies of his reply to these settlers came to me, and therefore my memory is sufficiently clear for me to speak plainly and absolutely on the point. It appears that the Government changed their mind and are now going to limit the aid proposed to be given in all areas except certain prescribed areas known as the drouth-stricken districts of the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. If the Government carry on this policy it certainly will have the effect of leaving a great many settlers in various parts of the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, outside of what is known as the drouth-stricken district, without any provision for seed grain this coming spring. While in certain areas of Saskatchewan there was practically a complete crop failure, there were many other limited areas, a number of them in my own constituency, where, while there was not a complete crop failure, the amount and quality of the crop were so poor that the settlers in those instances find themselves quite without any provision for furnishing themselves with seed for the coming spring. If the Government propose to be parsimonious in dealing with the settlers in these scattered and more or less limited districts, then I say there will be dozens and scores of settlers in various parts of Saskatchewan, outside the drouth-stricken area, who will, in the coming spring, be unable to seed their ground. This is a serious situation and requires heroic treatment by the Government. It certainly is not a time when this Government or this country can afford, through the lack of seed grain for the farmers of the western prairies, to have a shortage in our grain crop. I am sure that every member in the House will agree with me in that statement. It is in the interests not only of the farmers on the plains but of the whole of Canada and of the British Empire, that every acre of land in Canada, from east to west, that can be

put under cultivation, that can be made to produce a good crop during the present season, should be under crop. I have received numbers of communications from the heads of municipalities to which this matter has been referred by the provincial Government of my province in which they say that, notwithstanding all the efforts that they may put forth to relieve the needy settlers in those municipalities, they find themselves quite unable to cope with the situation and unless either the Dominion or provincial Government come to the assistance of these settlers, as one telegram which I have received within the last two or three days states, 'there will be many thousands of acres of well-prepared land which will lie idle.' That, Sir, is a situation too serious to contemplate and no consideration of a few isolated cases throughout these provinces where, by a more generous policy on the part of this Government, men would obtain seed grain who were not deserving of that consideration and assistance, should lead this Government or any government, at this crisis in our country's history, to restrict the policy of generous aid to any needy settler who, without that aid, will not be able to grow a crop during the coming season.

I was not in the House to hear all the explanations of the situation given by the Minister of the Interior in reply to the hon. member for Regina. I did not hear him give any adequate explanation of the reason why the Government have changed their attitude and their policy on this seed grain question since it first came under their consideration last August and September. I have no desire to give any reason or suggest any motive for this change of mind, but I would like the Minister to tell us frankly why the Government's policy was so generous last October and is now so parsimonious. I have before me a copy of the Saskatoon Star, dated Tuesday, October 13. We are used to unofficial reports these days, and this is one of them. Though not official, it is given a prominent place on the front page under the heading 'Dominion Elections, November 19.' That is to say, whether the people of this country were well advised or not, there seems to have been a suspicion in the minds of some editors in the West, and I presume in the East, of the possibility of an occurrence in this country which we generally describe as a general election. I do not suggest that the Government's generous policy of last October had anything to do with this widespread suspicion in the minds of the people that a general election was impending, but I fail to see why, if a generous policy was necessary in the interests not only of the western settler but of Canada and the whole Empire in October last, there should be any change of policy between that time and now. The western farmer who is unable to purchase seed grain this year is in a more unfortunate position than a farmer similarly situated in any previous year. It is a well-known fact that the banks of western Canada are not treating the farmers generously this year. In days gone by the farmer who had a good name and needed ready money could go to his bank and secure an advance to purchase seed grain, but in the present crisis he cannot do so. Nor are our municipalities in a position to obtain money by the sale of debentures at the present time; and unless this Government can relieve the situation I see no prospect of many farmers in different districts in Saskatchewan and Alberta getting any crop this year.

The Minister of the Interior stated that it would take some $11,000,000 to meet all the demands that have come in for seed grain. As I understand it, we are to be asked to vote this session $100,000,000 for war purposes, and I am sure that no man on either side of the House will demur at voting such an amount, no matter what the present financial stringency may be. But what better aid could be given in this crisis of our Empire's history than for the Government to see that every farmer who is unable to purchase his own seed grain shall be in a position to grow grain which will help feed the armies of the Allies in Europe. If $11,000,000 is necessary for that purpose, the money could not be better spent; and if this were done the Government would be helping not only the settler who needs aid, but Canada and the whole Empire, and the cause for which our soldiers are fighting so faithfully at the present time. How could the money be better spent than in supplying the multitudes who to-day are unable to purchase bread, with bread produced on the many hundreds of thousands of acres of land that are ready for crop on our western prairies, but will not be put in crop unless this Government furnishes the seed.

Hon. ROBERT ROGERS (Minister of Public Works): I do not propose to occupy

the attention of the House beyond a moment or two, but I wish to correct a wrong impression that appears to prevail among hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Neely) is apparently anxious to know why the Government should have changed the policy they adopted last August. Let me say that we have not changed that policy in any respect, except to extend it in a most generous and reasonable manner. Perhaps I can best correct my hon. friend by reading a letter of instruction to Mr. Bruce Walker, written after this matter had been fully considered by certain members of the Government and Mr. Perry of the N.W.M.P. We had Mr. Perry here, and certain other gentlemen from Saskatchewan and Alberta, as far back as the middle of August, 1914, to discuss what measures of relief should be taken. After the matter had been fully considered, the following letter

4 p.m.

was directed to Mr. Bruce Walker, and made public in the press of western Canada in order that every settler in the West should understand the true position, exactly what the Government had in mind in coming to the relief of the drouth-stricken area.

Dear Mr. Walker,—After my consultation with you the other day and our representatives residing in the district which this year has been so seriously affected by drouth, it has been decided that it would be well to divide this territory into five districts, said districts to correspond as closely as possible with the present land agency districts of Moosejaw, Swift Current, Maple Creek, Medicine Hat and Lethbridge. Where it is found that the area affected extends further north than is contained in the land districts above outlined such areas shall be included within the district immediately south for the purposes of carrying out our policy of relieving the suffering and destitute settlers. A supervisor shall be appointed for each of these districts who will have authority to take charge under yourself of the disposition of the supplies to be furnished by the department and to take general charge of all questions as they arise from time to time in the particular district for which he has been appointed. In case of necessity it may be advisable to appoint an assistant to the supervisor in order that there may be every expedition in the carrying out of our policy. This will probably be necessary in the cases of Medicine Hat and Maple Creek, which districts are particularly affected at the present juncture. Under these supervisors the officers of the North West Mounted Police, the agents of Dominion Lands, sub-land agents and homestead inspectors will have authority to inquire into cases and to make the necessary arrangements to relieve the suffering and destitute in their respective districts.

Further, it has been decided that orders for goods shall be confined to the merchants doing business in the said districts and in all cases purchases should be made as far as possible from the merchants that the settler has been doing business with in the past. Of course it will be the duty of the supervisors and their assistants to see that all merchants shall treat the settlers fairly in regard to prices, and that in any case or cases where any merchant is charging or attempting to charge more than legitimate prices no further orders will be placed at his disposal. It is hoped that by this method there will be no discrimination in favour of any particular individual merchant and the usual channels of trade will not be interfered with in any manner or form.

In your instructions to the supervisors, care should be taken to designate the particular class of goods that will be placed at the disposal of the settlers as well as pointing out clearly to them the necessity of outlining to the recipients the exact nature of the assistance rendered. The supplies to be furnished should be confined exclusively to provisions for the family, feed for hogs and poultry, and fuel. The same arrangements at present in force with respect to seed grain shall obtain with reference to advances of goods of the nature above suggested, and must be considered as a lien upon the holdings of the settler.

I think this answers the hon. member for Regina who endeavoured to raise the point that last year we were willing to take a note and that now we were taking a lien upon everything they possess. This is the public position as represented by the Government and as laid down for the people of the West in dealing with the matter.

All deserving settlers in destitute circumstances are to receive relief, and it is not considered necessary that they must be bona fide possessors of homestead or pre-emptions in order that assistance shall be rendered to them. This should be clearly pointed out to each recipient so that there may be no misunderstanding as to the nature of the assistance rendered by the Government. Furthermore, it should be clearly understood that only cases of absolute necessity are to be favourably considered by our officers and every care should be taken that the action of the department shall be protected in this regard.

Action is to be taken immediately. Please make all requisite arrangements at once.

That was the letter of instructions given to Mr. Bruce Walker as far back as August 19, 1914, and no change has taken place in so far as I am aware in respect to that letter save and except what has been stated here by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior to-day with regard to the manner in which he proposes, under a certain arrangement, to extend this assistance in some individual cases outside of the stricken area. But I cannot understand how hon. gentlemen opposite should have the idea that there was any misgiving in re-

spect to the instructions issued by the department for dealing with this question.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: How does the minister explain the letter that was sent broadcast throughout the West in October, November and December, 1914, two months after the letter which he has just read, and which letter has nothing to do with anything at all except the question of relief in the drouth-stricken area?

Mr. ROGERS: I do not understand my hon. friend's question. That letter is entirely in keeping with the letter of instructions I have just read. It was dealing entirely with this drouth-stricken area and with no other part.

Mr. MARTIN: How does the minister explain the letter of October, 1914, which was sent broadcast throughout the West, in which Mr. Bruce Walker, Commissioner of Immigration, stated in as plain English as he could that an advance would be made if applied for in any place in Saskatchewan and that in the case of a man who had patented land all the security that would be required would be a promissory note with interest at five per cent?

Mr. ROGERS: I have not read such a letter myself, I never heard of it before and I do not think such a letter exists because Mr. Bruce Walker was dealing with the district he was appointed to deal with as laid down when he received the letter of the 19th August, 1914. Another statement was made by the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney) to the effect that the member of the provincial Government had no such understanding as that which appears to exist in the minds of the members of the Dominion Government in respect to this distribution of seed grain and assistance to the settlers in the drouth district. Shortly after this letter of instruction was issued to Mr. Bruce Walker we had a visit from Hon. Walter Scott, Premier of Saskatchewan, and Mr. Bell the provincial treasurer, who came to us to discuss this and various other matters at that particular time. I am going to quote you what Mr. Scott had to say to the press after our interview and it was taken by Mr. Dafoe and sent out and published in the press of western Canada. It is as follows and is dated September 2:

> Premier Scott of, Saskatchewan, and Hon. G. Bell, Provincial Treasurer, were in Ottawa to-day conferring with members of the Government regarding the supplying of seed grain to farmers in a portion of the southwestern section of the province, whose crop this season had been almost a complete failure. They asked that the Government advance these men seed grain in order to tide them over in their failure.
>
> 'Every man who has land ready for seed next spring,' said Premier Scott at the conclusion of the conference to-night, 'can be assured that he will have seed provided to put in crop.'

I think that makes very clear the distinct and definite understanding which Mr. Scott and Mr. Bell had. There was no question about it. There was no consideration of any other district save and except the one which was laid down on the map which was before us for our consideration. We have had mention to-day of a circular letter issued by Mr. McNab, Minister of Agriculture for the province of Saskatchewan, and I must confess that I am surprised at the contents of Mr. McNab's letter because he could very easily have got correct information from his leader, Hon. Walter Scott, if he had taken the trouble to consult him in respect to his understanding of the matter after his visit to Ottawa in this connection. In regard to the districts outside of the stricken area, Mr. McNab says and properly so, that the Government of Saskatchewan, following the example of the Government of Manitoba, had adopted legislation whereby power was vested in the different municipalities to render assistance in individual or general cases as they might see fit with respect to seed grain. What I am surprised at in Mr. McNab's letter is that he did not consult his leader and obtain a better understanding of the true facts and the real position of the question of the assistance that it was proposed to render and that was suggested and discussed with Mr. Scott and Mr. Bell when they were here. Then there would have been no misunderstanding; there should be no misunderstanding. We all agree, we all desire to render the greatest possible assistance within our power, and the Minister of the Interior today has undoubtedly made a very generous statement as to how far we are going to carry out this policy with a view of assisting the settlers. When we were visited by Mr. Scott and Mr. Bell, the amount that would have been necessary to supply seed grain was estimated at something like a million and a half or two million dollars. To-day you have the statement of the Minister of the Interior that this is going up now to eight or ten million dollars, or even eleven million dollars, and I think that proves the very contrary of the statement

of my hon. friend (Mr. Neely), and it shows that we undoubtedly are a great deal more generous to-day than we ever thought of being when we discussed the matter in the autumn of last year. However, that is immaterial. I for one, as a western man, with my other western colleagues in the Government, have been pressing that the fullest possible relief in the power of the Government should be given to the western farmers. I think it ought to be admitted in all fairness that the statement of the Minister of the Interior makes it abundantly clear that we are endeavouring to carry out a policy which will be of great advantage to the people of western Canada and to the entire satisfaction of every reasonable-minded man in that portion of the Dominion.

Mr. D. WARNOCK (Macleod): For the past three months I have been among the farmers of Southern Alberta, meeting them individually in their homes and collectively in their association meetings, and I am in a position to give the House some first-hand information in regard to the seed grain question, especially as it effects Southern Alberta. Since the outbreak of war, the farmers have been deluged with literature and lectures, urging them to go in for increased production. There is not a farmer in Southern Alberta who does not wish to increase his production; there is not a farmer who does not realize that increased agricultural production would in this crisis be a splendid thing for the Empire, and not only for the Empire, but for Canada and the farmers themselves. It is not lectures or advice that the farmers require at this time; it is financial assistance, and the greatest problem that the farmers in the drouth-stricken district have is to find ways and means of procuring seed for this coming spring. And, Sir, notwithstanding the long explanation of the Minister of Public Works, it is very evident that some one has blundered in this matter. The indecision of those entrusted with formulating a policy of seed grain assistance has led to a great deal of disappointment and much valuable time has been wasted. As the member for Saskatoon pointed out, the price of seed grain has materially increased and is getting higher every day, and unless prompt steps are taken by the Government this grain will be at an almost prohibitory price. In October last it was understood that every farmer in the drouth-stricken area would be provided with seed grain. There were letters written which led farmers to expect that assistance. In the month of January the deputy relief commissioner visited the farmers in my own district and led them to understand that all would be assisted, and many applications for seed grain were handed to him. A little later, the farmers were notified by letter that only those living on unpatented lands would be assisted. Here is a sample of these letters over the signature of J. Bruce Walker, Commissioner, and it is dated Winnipeg, January 25, 1915:

Re Seed Grain.

Sir,—Replying to your application for an advance of seed grain, I have to inform you that this government is only making advances of seed grain to those in your district who are on unpatented land. I note from your application that you only hold patented land and it is with regret that I have to inform you that your application cannot receive favourable consideration. You will require to look to your local municipality or to your provincial government for assistance in the matter of seed grain.

Your obedient servant,

J. Bruce Walker,
Commissioner.

The Deputy Seed Grain Commissioner had visited the district in which the gentleman who received this letter lived, and I think that district is within the prescribed area, it being in the Macleod district, which would be included in the Lethbridge land district. The Deputy Seed Grain Commissioner had visited that area in January and had received these applications, and had led the farmers of that district to expect assistance. I may say that this was not the first crop failure the farmers of that district had met with. In 1913 they suffered severely from hail, and last year their crop was almost a total failure. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that so far as I know not one farmer now asking for assistance in that district sold grain; they had no grain to sell.

As to holders of patents not receiving assistance, I would like to explain to the House that in my opinion patentees are in a worse position than homesteaders. It has been customary for homesteaders, as soon as they receive their patents, to at once apply to a loan company and borrow every dollar procurable. They do this so that they may reimburse the storekeepers and others who had carried them while they were fulfilling the homestead regulations. They also purchased horses and equipment to go on breaking more land, and so these patentees are often really in a worse position than the homesteaders who have not

received their patents. I was pleased to hear the Minister of the Interior say that he had discussed with his colleague the Minister of Finance the question of the banks advancing money, and that the Minister of Finance had taken the matter up with the bank presidents who had communicated with their western managers requesting them to give settlers every assistance in their power. But I want to say that the western banks will change their methods very much indeed if they grant any assistance to a farmer who has already secured a loan from a loan company, and has given that company a first mortgage. It is utterly impossible for any man in that position to get a loan from a western bank at the present time. If the Minister of Finance can make these banks more generous, or compel them to change their methods, he will confer a very great boon on that western country. I think every one will admit that the time has come when the prosperity of every city, town, and village; every railway and every industry, is absolutely dependent upon the prosperity of our rural population. The time has come when the prosperity of our country is dependent upon the permanent development of agriculture. The manufacturers of the East realized that. We had the unique spectacle in November last of representatives of the manufacturers journeying to Winnipeg to meet representatives of the western farmers. The manufacturers wished the co-operation of the western farmers in putting before the Government a scheme to bring under cultivation another million acres of raw land. They proposed that they should ask the Federal Government to advance fifty million dollars for that purpose. A joint committee of representatives of the farmers and of the manufacturers was formed. That committee on visiting Ottawa had a conference with the Prime Minister and his colleagues, and were informed that the matter would be given consideration. I believe they were promised that a commission would be appointed to investigate agricultural conditions, but so far as I know nothing more has been done up to the present time.

The prevailing opinion among all classes of business men in the West, irrespective of their political affiliations, is that until the province of Alberta, for which I am speaking on this occasion, is given control of its natural resources, it is the duty of the Federal Government to assist in developing agriculture in that province. A great deal is heard of the 'back to the land' movement; and if we are going to try to bring the people back to the land, the best method is to improve the conditions under which men and women in the rural districts are living to-day. If we have better agricultural conditions, there will be less talk of rural depopulation. No finer opportunity was ever presented to any government than the opportunity now presented to the Federal Government to assist in building up and developing agriculture. Soil conditions never were better. A very large area is prepared for seeding in the spring. We have had an unusual amount of moisture; the ground is thoroughly saturated; and if the Government of Canada will assist these farmers with seed grain, I am sure the benefit will be prompt and, I hope, lasting. If these farmers are assisted now it will put them on their feet and enable them to go on and succeed. I wish to say earnestly that, if these men on patented lands in particular are not assisted this coming spring, instead of their having an increased area under crop, the area in many districts, including my own, will be decreased. It is the bounden duty of the Federal Government to advance seed grain to the farmers and to give them every encouragement. What if it does take $11,000,000 ? We have given $45,000,000 to a railway company; we have been handing out millions of dollars in other ways, and I feel sure that we shall get prompt returns from the farmers if they are provided with seed grain this year. I would ask the Government to take prompt steps to provide that seed grain, even if it costs twice eleven million dollars.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): It must be impressed very strongly on the minds of hon. members the tremendous nature of the task that confronts the Government, and the necessity of going forward with that task with the intention of seeing it through to substantial success. It is satisfactory to have the explanations of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Roche) and of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers). In the face of their explanations, it might be said that there was no good ground for the uncertainty that has prevailed in the minds of the people of the West who are particularly interested in this matter. The very fact, however, that the Commissioner of Immigration in January sends out a circular letter which contradicts specifically the terms of his letter of October, gives substantial grounds for the question as to how far the Government is

going to implement its promise of October. It is an officer of the Government who has raised the question in the minds of the people, and it is for the members of the Government in this House on this occasion to set at rest that question.

The Minister of Public Works specifically stated that from the beginning it was the intention to restrict the area of assistance to certain land districts which he mentioned, and such adjoining territory as might properly be included. To show again that there was ground for misunderstanding, the Saskatoon land district is not one of those which the minister mentioned. The southern part of that district adjoins the districts which he mentioned; but it is quite evident from what appeared in the public press, and from the statements of the gentleman who was chosen to represent the Government, that in that district it was the general understanding of the people that their requirements would be met as well as those in the districts to the south.

Now, it is not because we desire to question the good faith of the Government that this matter has been brought forward today; it is for the purpose of being assured that the matter will be dealt with fully and completely as circumstances will permit. My hon. friend from Macleod (Mr. Warnock) and other hon. gentlemen have stated, in terms that I think cannot be improved upon, how important the question is, and the good results that will flow from dealing with it in a satisfactory manner. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior used expressions which did not restrict the aid to be given to a certain specified area; when he said that the Government would consider the granting of aid to the holders of patented lands outside of the drouth-stricken area. Then the question came up at once—and this is the point which it is very desirable should be settled beyond any question and at the earliest possible moment—how far does the Government intend to go in that connection? It has been said that the banks will come to the rescue; that the municipalities have the responsibility, or that the Provincial Government must take care of these matters under certain conditions. If it is to be the banks, if it is to be the municipalities, if it is to be the provincial governments, the limit to which this Government will go, or the limit to which these different authorities will have to go in order to relieve the situation, should be specifically laid down. There should not be any question of doubt about it. If arrangements are made with Provincial Governments, with the banks, with the municipalities, or with any other authority, and if there is to be a division of authority and responsibility, that division should be made without delay. If there is to be no such division of authority, if the Dominion Government is not to expect the banks, the municipalities, or the Provincial Governments to take part in this matter, then it is for the Dominion Government to say so and to live up to its promises.

We do not wish to raise this question in any spirit of criticism or with any desire to hamper the Government, but to impress upon Parliament how important the question is from a national standpoint that the details of the matter should be worked out so that justice shall be done to all parties concerned, and that no part of the country and no section of the people shall fail of the assistance required because of lack of understanding between the different authorities concerned or in regard to the exercise of authority by this Government. And, I repeat, if a misunderstanding has existed, or exists up to the present time, it is because of the Government itself and not because of its critics.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): I do not intervene to find the slightest fault with the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Roche). I should like to offer to him and to the Government my sympathy; and I would extend that sympathy to the people of the West. I offer to the Government my sympathy in their having to deal with a problem of such magnitude at a time when money is so scarce and the nation is taken up, as we all know, with an affair of overpowering size and importance outside our own boundaries. I have risen for the purpose of making one or two observations which I think may convey practical suggestions to the minister which he might find useful to consider and possibly to act upon. I have the good fortune to represent a constituency which is inhabited by a very large number of highly intelligent settlers. They have shown their intelligence by coming to a part of the country where, in the thirteen years that I have known it, no large portion of the community has suffered by either hail or drought. I could mention other ways in which they have shown their intelligence, but refrain for the present. I have had, nevertheless, a couple of letters from limited areas in my constituency. One of these refers to a fact to which my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Thomson) al-

luded—that some people are in difficulties at the moment through having been hailed out and not being insured. The other letter pointed out what is very well known to us all who live in the West, that it was a very dry year all over the western provinces. The drouth affected one limited portion, at any rate, of even the Red Deer constituency, favourable though its location. Now, in the presence of these facts which I do not think can be gainsaid, I hope the Government has not followed too arbitrarily the line in defining what they understand to be the drouth-stricken area. If I followed the hon. Minister of the Interior correctly, he seemed to confine his promises to an area exclusively within the southern limits of Alberta, for example. That is what I understand him to mean by drouth-stricken area. I would therefore ask the minister in all sincerity to remember that there are isolated cases outside Southern Alberta of people who have been affected by the drouth, and there would appear to be no good reason why they should be arbitrarily excluded from the Minister's careful and, I trust, favourable consideration. I offer that suggestion sincerely and somewhat hopefully. As a matter of fact, while we may regard this question from the point of view of the settler with whom we all sympathize, yet in this House we ought to regard it very largely from the point of view of the results which are likely to be obtained. And I should like to point out to the minister that he would have a better guarantee of results for grain advanced in an area so generally successful in its crop as that which I have the honour to represent than he would in the southern district, where, I am afraid, drouth is rather frequent. I was reassured by the statement of my hon. friend from Medicine Hat (Mr. Buchanan) on that subject, but I have heard others say that the hot winds there are so prevalent, that a crop in four years is all that they can look for. I would suggest to the Minister that it might be a bad investment for a nation to put seed grain into that region. At any rate, I would suggest that it might be possible to make inquiries of the individual settlers who are being relieved to find how often they have been stricken by drouth. I sometimes have had a doubt whether the policy of what I might call pushing settlement, has not been carried too far in southern Alberta. I have often wondered whether it would not have been better if large areas in that region had been left to be ranged by cattle. However that may be, I think it would be well worth the Minister's consideration whether he could not, through his numerous agents, institute inquiries in each case of relief, if possible, as to how far he is likely to get results from advancing seed grain in specific cases and how often the people he is helping to put seed into the ground have been stricken with drouth in the years immediately past. To keep a man putting seed into an area that will only grow grain once in four years is of very questionable benefit either to the man or to the country.

That is one suggestion I should like to make. Then, I should like to be allowed to press the idea with which I opened—that the Minister might extend his idea of the drouth-stricken area, somewhat anyhow. I sympathize with him in the difficulties of the situation; they are very great. The price of grain is a tremendous aggravation of the case and increases very much the difficulties of the Administration. Nevertheless, with a view to the results, I would press upon the Minister that he should not close his mind absolutely to isolated cases outside of what he appears to have regarded as the drouth-stricken area. If he opens his mind to this extent and wants to know where he can help some people outside of southern Alberta with the utmost certainty of good results, I shall be glad to tell him of one or two limited localities in the riding I have the honour to represent.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Solicitor General): One would not be a loyal representative of any constituency of western Canada who did not feel very deeply concerned as to the situation of that country in regard to seed grain. Nor, indeed, could one endowed at all with human sympathy, no matter from what part he came, be doing his duty if he did not exercise it to the full in the extension of relief.

The hon. member who has just taken his seat has made remarks which we on this side of the House cannot but appreciate. We feel perhaps more keenly and directly than they the responsibility of the situation, particularly the financial difficulty involved. I rise not to add anything to what the Minister responsible has said or to the Government policy, but only because the hon. member who has just sat down and hon. members who preceded him did not seem to fully comprehend the effect of the Minister's

statement. But I fear that, in the matters in which they were astray, if the Minister was not explicit it is impossible for me to be more so. The occasion is fraught with unusual difficulty from several causes. In the first place the year before last in our country was not an auspicious year. The crops on the whole were bountiful, but only ordinarily so, in the districts most affected by the drouth of 1914; but the prices received were not proportionate to the cost involved. The prices were not equal to those received in previous years and this year. Following that a season of excessive drouth prevailed, extending from our own older province of Manitoba westerly to the Rockies, and most pronounced in the southern portions of Alberta and Saskatchewan. That was, of course, the initial, the foundation cause of the trouble. But upon that there was heaped this situation that at a time of financial depression caused not only by the war but by other conditions and intense indeed before the war commenced, the banks assumed an attitude that added indeed to the difficulties of the settlers; the banks assumed such an attitude, whether justifiably or not I cannot inquire, which has resulted in their not being of the assistance to the farmers that they have been in previous years and not being, in the opinion of a very great many, of the assistance that they ought to have been last year. The duties or responsibilities of the Government were great on account of both these conditions. However, in the province of Manitoba, from which I come, even this unusual situation was not such as to involve extraordinary responsibility upon this Government. It is a matter of congratulation to us from that province—and in this I am sure that I shall be joined by the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Cruise) and the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Molloy)—that even although we had suffered to a considerable extent from last year's drouth and although, as a result of that, there are large areas in that province to which assistance must undoubtedly be extended, an appeal to the Dominion Government is not yet essential in regard to patented lands. As to the two other provinces the situation is different. A similar situation arose there once before. As the minister has pointed out a drouth, although not to the same extent, occurred in 1908. That was met by the Government of the day by advances to the provinces, the provinces supplying the grain to the settlers and becoming responsible to this Government. But so great and so fraught with difficulty was the situation this year that the remedy of 1908 could not be applied and it became necessary for this Government to extend the line further and to decide to what limit it could go, because it was determined to go to the utmost limit in the power of the Government in meeting the demands of the western settler. The Minister of the Interior has defined the line between the responsibilities of the Federal Government and the responsibilities of provincial governments and municipalities in those two provinces and I believe that we, representing the western provinces, should be grateful to the representatives on both sides of the House from all the provinces of Canada because no criticism has been made of the very liberal extension of the responsibilities assumed by this Government as compared with the responsibilities assumed by the Dominion Government in years gone by. We from the West believe, and I am sure that in this I shall be joined by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), that the Government of the day has gone far and assumed a very great responsibility in carrying the line of demarcation as far as it has in regard to relief to the western settlers. Now how far has the line been carried? It is pointed out that when the situation first arose the Government of the day determined that there were certain areas that were so deeply involved and were so striken that to those areas at least relief must be extended not only in the way of seed grain but in the way of supplies of the necessaries of life. Those areas were taken care of first, the unpatented lands and the patented lands, the unpatented, of course, being those for which this Government would be more directly responsible. But later on, as evidenced by a letter read by the hon. member for Regina, the Commissioner of Immigration at Winnipeg declared that the Government had decided to go further, to go beyond that stricken area. In this connection I have some fault to find with the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin), and I include in my complaint the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely). I think I have discovered in the remarks of both these gentlemen one cause and a very great cause, for the added difficulties the Government is in, difficulties for which they are not responsible, but for which I am not so sure the hon. member for Regina is not responsible. The letter of the

Commissioner of Immigration of October 21, that has been so much discussed, is not worded, perhaps, as a lawyer would word it; but at all events its meaning is reasonably clear and its meaning in regard to the points referred to by the hon. member for Regina is perfectly clear. It will be remembered that the hon. member for Regina said that after reading that letter, after having had it shown to him by various farmers in his constituency, he assured them that in it no distinction was drawn and that, without respect to person, or area, the Government would give seed grain to any man who asked it. He assured them that they would be quite justified in selling their wheat because the Government of Canada had undertaken to be responsible for seed grain if they did not have it. Was he justified in giving that assurance to his constituents? What is there in the letter to justify it? Was he acting fairly with the Government of Canada or with his constituents? Does the letter say that the Government of this country would be responsible for seed grain to any man who was without it, whether on patented or unpatented lands? It says nothing of the kind. The letter is written after the Government has been catering to the necessities of those who have lost their crop by drouth within certain specified areas. Under those circumstances the letter says:

> In answer to your letter of recent date, asking for an advance of seed grain, I have to inform you that this department is making arrangements to supply bona fide settlers, who have lost their crop this year and are unable to obtain seed, with good clean seed next spring, delivery to start about the middle of February.

Then he goes on to say in a subsequent paragraph that the applicant should state in his letter whether his land is unpatented or patented, and if patented the encumbrances upon it. The hon. member for Regina went on to say that the Government was in an exceedingly generous mood at that time, and that they offered to advance this man seed grain no matter where he came from and what his condition, so long as he asked for it, and so long as he gave his note at 5 per cent. But did the Government offer there to give it to any man who had not seed grain? 5 p.m. He had first to be a bona fide settler; secondly, he had to be in the position that he had lost his crop in 1914, that he had not sold his crop; thirdly, he had to be in the position that he could not obtain seed grain elsewhere.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: I did not say that I had ever advised any man to sell his grain. I said that by reason of this letter men had sold their grain, and that a reasonable interpretation of the letter was that the Government was supplying seed grain to any man in the prorvinces who had lost his crop, whether on patented or unpatented land and whether within the stricken area or not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am only too glad to receive the correction of the hon. member, because I recognize that his statement needed correction, and very badly needed it. The hon. member for Regina did say that many had come to him and said that they had sold their grain, and that he justified them in selling their grain and pointed to the Government's letter as making good to them the grain they had so sold. I say to the hon. member that he had no mandate and no warrant in that letter to make such a statement. The hon. member for Regina goes further. He says that the generosity of the Government was evidenced by the fact that they were willing to supply seed grain and to take nothing but an oath. Now, I draw his attention to the fact that Mr. Bruce Walker in the latter part of his letter states that the applicants must in their application state whether their land, if patented, is encumbered—it could not be encumbered if unpatented—and if encumbered, what encumbrances are against it. I ask the hon. member what would be the use of that information if we were not going to take a lien on the land?

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: How does the hon. gentleman explain the statement, that as far as patented lands are concerned the only security asked for in the application is the promissory note at 5 per cent payable on a certain date?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I answer, that is not in the letter. It does not say that that will be the only security asked for. It says, that will be asked for, and then says, tell us what encumbrances are against your land. I do not need to observe to the House that the hon. member for Regina has not yet answered my question as to what value to the commissioner the information would be as to whether the land was encumbered or not if they did not intend to have anything to do with the land. I earnestly hope that the hon. member for Regina was not joined by too many of his colleagues on that side of the House in

interpreting the contents of that letter to their constituents. It is a fact that, as a result of something, the applications for seed grain have come in very late and very precipitously. It is a fact that taking what care the Government could and making all investigations within its power, and, as the result of that care and those investigations, having procured such a supply of seed grain at a very moderate price as they felt would be sufficient, Notwithstanding that, later on and right up to the end of January, 1915, large numbers of applications poured in. I believe the Minister of the Interior said some 9,000. It may be there is some explanation of that. It may be that because of an industrious circulation of a wrong interpretation of the letter of October 21st, men in the province who had never hoped to look to the Government for assistance were induced to look for assistance at that late date, and that in consequence all these applications came in.

However, the main question now is what is the Government doing, where does the Government's responsibility end and where does the responsibility of others begin? The hon. minister has stated—and it did not seem to be caught at all by the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely)—that the Government was in no way restricting its responsibility geographically within those provinces. That is to say that the relief of the Government, in the way of seed grain and for feed for horses for putting in the seed, extended to places beyond the stricken area. The minister also stated the conditions under which that relief would be extended; that in cases beyond the stricken area where the farmer had suffered the previous year as the farmer in the drouth-stricken area had suffered, and where, as a result, he could not procure seed grain elsewhere, the Government was prepared in those cases to mete out to him the same relief as to the farmer of the stricken area. That is, wherever the farmer could place himself in the same position as to causes and conditions as the farmer in the stricken area, then he placed himself in the same position as to remedy. I do not know that a fairer policy could be agreed upon. I do not think the hon. member for Red Deer or the hon. member for Edmonton will say that the line could possibly be drawn, having regard to the responsibility of precedent, more generously than it has been done. There is not a definition of locality; but the causes must be the same, the conditions must be the same as to the possiblity of getting relief elsewhere, and, being the same, the farmer is in the same position as to remedy I do not wish to be understood as arguing that beyond the pale of the relief so extended there will not be many deserving cases, many cases such as those described by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle, where the farmer though he may have had some remnant of a crop in 1914, had not grain of such a quality that he would dare to use it as seed in 1915. There may be some cases such as that which are deserving cases; possibly just as deserving as those to which relief must be granted, but the line must be drawn somewhere and there are responsibilities upon other institutions, upon other governments, upon municipalities and units as well as upon this Government. And I believe all will agree that under the very unusual and overpowering circumstances of the time, when the calls upon the treasury of Canada are unprecedented, the Government has met the situation in a generous spirit, and in a spirit that every reasonable man should accept.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia): It was not my intention to say anything on this debate, because fortunately in my part of the province of Saskatchewan we had a fair crop. Up to the present I have not received a single letter from a constituent on the subject of seed grain. But it seems to me at this stage of the debate that there is some uncertainty about the position of the Government. The Solicitor General has explained it pretty well. We all know that he has a wonderful faculty of drawing nice distinctions in law or in anything else, but will the ordinary farmer who has not seed for his next crop be able to follow the nice distinctions in this letter that my hon. friend draws? Mr. Walker stated absolutely that those who were on patented lands would be asked for a note. I do not think it is worth arguing about whether, in addition to that, they give security on their land or not. If the Government want additional security, well and good; I think they are quite entitled to it. Here is the position: Farmers want seed grain; they were all led to believe by this letter of Mr. Walker's that they would get seed grain. I have a copy of Mr. Walker's letter, and there is absolutely nothing said in it about a restricted area. There is nothing said to the effect that it

will be confined to farmers who are living on homesteads the patents for which have not been issued. According to this letter any farmer on earth would be justified in saying that if he had lost his crop last year he could get seed grain from the Government. The Solicitor General says that the municipalities and the provincial governments must assume responsibility in the matter of seed grain. It is no time now to come forward and say that the municipalities and the provincial governments must assume responsibility for seed grain.

After the members of the provincial Government in Saskatchewan came down here last fall and had an interview with the members of this Government, they went home with the understanding, which was perfectly satisfactory to them, that they would attend to a certain amount of relief in the stricken area in the province of Saskatchewan, and they have expended over a million and a quarter of dollars in carrying out that work. They understood absolutely that the Dominion Government would attend to all matters of seed grain, and that they were not going to be called upon in that connection. Members of this Government asked the members of the provincial Government if they would pass certain legislation which would give this Government the right to a first security for the amount of any seed grain that they advanced to the settlers. The Saskatchewan Government said they would be pleased to pass the necessary legislation; they are quite willing to do that to-day and will do it.

To come forward now and say that the provinces and municipalities must assume responsibility in connection with this seed grain is altogether unfair. Had the Governments of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta known last August, September or October that they were going to be called upon to provide seed grain, or if the municipalities had known that they would be required to assume this responsibility, it would have been an easy matter then to have secured the seed grain. To-day, I doubt if it is an easy matter. On the other hand, it would be a most difficult matter for these authorities to secure the necessary seed grain. We ought to have a straight and definite statement from this Government that in all deserving cases it will undertake to supply seed grain. It is not a gift; it is only a loan of the money. I know it is a large sum, and I know that the Government have a falling revenue and tremendous expenses to meet otherwise, but if they want to follow up the argument that they have been putting forward for the last six months in favour of increasing production, let me ask how they are going to increase production if they allow two or three million acres to go without seed. Seed must be procured in order that we may get the benefit of next year's crop. Where is the seed to come from? Taking into consideration this letter, copies of which Mr. Bruce Walker sent out by the thousand all over the country in October last, it is up to the Government to supply every deserving case, and I would like to have a statement from the Minister of the Interior as to whether they will do so. I understand the Solicitor General, acquiesced in by the Minister of the Interior, to say that outside of the restricted area, throughout Saskatchewan, Alberta or Manitoba, if there is any farmer in the position of a farmer in the stricken area, his case will be examined into, and if it is found that he lost his crop last year he will get seed grain. That is satisfactory as far as it goes but there will be many cases, such as were mentioned by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Thomson), where they have had a certain amount of crop but where the grain is absolutely unfit for seed. If it was absolutely unfit for seed the revenue that the farmer got from the crop will not enable him to buy good seed especially now when, I do not suppose, wheat could be delivered to the farmer under $2 a bushel, or perhaps $1.75, or $1.80.

I think the Minister of the Interior should give us a definite statement that they will not throw this responsibility on the municipalities or on the provincial governments. They are not in a position at the present time to secure millions of dollars to get the necessary seed grain to give to the farmers. They have no organization for that purpose. The Minister of the Interior and the Minister of Agriculture have an organization already handling this very subject. Why then divide the responsibility? The responsibility cannot be divided and have any success in handling this question. What is done has to be done by this Government. They have the organization, they are in shape to do it and if they have not the money they can get it much more easily than the provincial governments or the municipalities can.

I say again that this letter of Mr. Walker led every farmer in the country to believe that if he had not seed grain to sow the

land that he had ready he could get it from the Government. It may be that, technically speaking, as was pointed out by the Solicitor General, there are some loopholes to enable you to place another interpretation upon this letter. But this Government have led the farmers to believe that they were going to give them seed grain if they did not have it. Take security for it if you like, take a lien on the land and get the necessary guarantee from the provincial government to give your lien priority over all other encumbrances on the land—take or get that if you want to, but give the farmer the seed. If you do not give it to him he is not going to be able to get any seed grain. You have led him to believe that he would get it and if he does not get it the responsibility is on this Government and there will be the loss of many millions of dollars if we have not a good crop next year. It will be a severe loss because the price next fall, whether the war stops to-morrow or goes on a year or two, will be high. It is the duty of this Government to give seed grain to every farmer who has not got it otherwise, charge him the price of it and take the necessary security. This Government will not lose a dollar. They get their money back with five per cent interest. We heard the Minister of the Interior say what the banks were going to do. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Medicine Hat (Mr. Buchanan) that if they do what the Minister said they might do there will be a tremendous change in their policy. I doubt if they will do very much in advancing money to farmers. They have never done it in the past, and I think it would be a poor reed for the farmer who has no seed grain to rely upon. I do not think they will all get it if that is the case. This is a serious matter. The Government has spent millions of dollars on this question as it is and all we ask is that they may go a little farther and carry out exactly what everybody will naturally take to be the meaning of this letter that Mr. Bruce Walker sent out broadcast over the whole country—Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta—in which no distinction was made with reference to the restricted area. Take the security if you wish, but do not have divided responsibility, for it will not work, and it is too late if it did work. If you are going to make a success of this, the Federal Government will have to deal with the whole question of seed grain and if this Government does not take action in the light of this letter, they will be held responsible by the people who are not able to get seed.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT (Calgary): I rise in the first place to express my appreciation of the attitude on this question taken by the members who come from the older provinces. Prima facie there is no duty on the Federal Government to supply seed grain for patented land in any province of Canada. That is clear. In the province of Ontario this Government is not asked to supply seed grain, nor yet is it asked to do so in the province of Quebec. For once I am entirely in accord with my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) when he says that this Government has approached this problem as one of great magnitude, recognizing that it is a question that must be dealt with in the very best possible way, having regard to the conditions that exist and to the precedents by which it is more or less bound.

Unfortunately, owing to causes about which it would not now be proper to inquire, the western provinces do not own their natural resources, and have, in my judgment, parted with them for a very insufficient compensation. Having regard to these conditions, the Federal Government having assumed responsibility for the administration of the public domain in these provinces, feels that in accordance with the precedent adopted in days gone by it should meet the existing situation and deal with it. That being so, the question as to what should be done in this particular case is a matter for consideration, and I am bound to say that I am very much reassured by the statement of the Minister of the Interior this afternoon. I did at one time feel owing to the documents to which attention has been directed this afternoon, that possibly some one had been misled or that there had been a change of policy on the part of the Administration. Such I now know is not the case. After all, it is no longer a theory but a condition that confronts us, and the question is as to how the Government is going to discharge the duty it has taken upon itself, in the light of the circular sent out to the settlers and which indicated that in so far as seed grain was concerned, the Administration proposed to supply seed grain solely within the stricken area, whether the settlers lived on patented or unpatented land. At first it was only supposed to be on unpatented land, their duty being only to homesteaders. But, in order

that their might not be divided authority within that area, the Government very properly assumed the duty of dealing with those who live on patented and unpatented land. I think they are dealing with the situation fairly, especially since the Minister of the Interior has announced that he was prepared to extend the same treatment to those who are similarly situated beyond that stricken area. I think he went as far as he possibly could, and I would like to adopt the language of the member for Red Deer to this extent, that I hope the minister will not be too censorious or critical, but that where he finds areas that have been devastated by drouth or hail, he will extend to them the same treatment as he has to that area which is represented in this House by the hon. member for Lethbridge.

The condition is really a very serious one. Sometimes I think the members of this House who represent eastern constituencies little realize the conditions brought about in some parts of western Canada. In some districts the land has been swept as clean as a floor, and where once there was vegetation there is now nothing but the driest dust. It is even true that the children of the farmers in some instances have been suffering from the pangs of hunger, almost starvation, and under these circumstances the Government relief is absolutely needed to encourage the settlers within that area and to enable them to have their land bear crops next year. As the hon. gentleman from Macleod has said, we have had more snow and moisture this winter than we have had for many years, and I have every reason to believe that next year we will reap abundant harvests within that very area where in the past succeeding crop failures have occurred. Even if the Government should expend several millions more than was anticipated at first, it seems to me that this duty devolves upon them fairly. I think we in the West have every reason to feel grateful for the spirit of toleration with which hon. gentlemen who come from other provinces have dealt with this question in this time of great stress in the West.

Motion negatived.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, the House adjourned at 5.35 p.m.

Thursday, February 11, 1915.

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

[Mr. R. B. Bennett.]

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister) presented the following report of the special committee appointed to prepare and report, with all convenient speed, lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees of the House during the present session:

No. 1.

ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Messieurs

Aikins (Sir James),
Barker,
Barnard,
Bennett (Calgary),
Bennett (Simcoe),
Blondin,
Borden (Sir Robert),
Boys,
Bristol,
Bureau,
Carvell,
Charlton,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Coderre,
Crothers,
Demers,
Descarries,
Devlin,
Doherty,
Fripp,
German,
Kay,
Lafortune,
Lamarche,
Lancaster,
Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Lemieux,
Maclean (Halifax),
Marcile (Bagot),
Munson,
Nickle,
Northrup,
Porter,
Rainville,
Robidoux,
Ross,
Sévigny,
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Tremain, and
Wilson (Laval).—40.

No. 2.

ON RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES.

Messieurs

Achim,
Aikins (Sir James),
Armstrong (Lambton),
Arthurs,
Baker,
Barker,
Barnard,
Barrette,
Béland,
Bellemare,
Bennett (Calgary),
Bennett (Simcoe),
Bickerdike,
Blain,
Boivin,
Boyce,
Boyer,
Boys,
Brabazon,
Bradbury,
Bristol,
Buchanan,
Bureau,
Carroll,
Cash,
Chabot,
Charlton,
Clark (Red Deer),
Clements,
Cochrane,
Cockshutt,
Copp,
Cruise,
Currie,
Delisle,
Descarries,
Devlin,
Donaldson,
Douglas,
Edwards,
Elliot,
Ethier,
Fisher,
Forget (Sir Rodolphe),
Fowler,
Fripp,
Gauthier (Gaspé),
Gauvreau,
German,
Girard,
Gordon,
Graham,
Green,
Guilbault,
Guthrie,
Hartt,
Henderson,
Hepburn,
Jameson,
Kemp,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lalor,
Lamarche,
Lancaster,
Lanctôt,
Lapointe (Kamouraska),

Lapointe (Montreal, St. J.), Law, Lemieux, L'Espérance, Macdonald, Macdonell, Maclean (York, O.), MacNutt, McCraney, McCrea, McCurdy, McKenzie, McLean (Queens, P.E.I.), McLean (Sunbury), McLeod, Marshall, Martin, (Regina), Middlebro, Molloy, Morphy, Murphy, Neely, Nesbitt, Nickle, Northrup, Oliver, Paquet, Pardee, Porter, Pugsley, Rhodes, Schaffner, Sharpe (Lisgar), Sharpe (Ontario), Smith, Smyth, Stanfield, Stevens, Sutherland, Taylor, Thomson (Qu'Appelle), Thornton, Tobin, Tremain, Turgeon, Turriff, Wallace, Weichel, White (Renfrew), White (Victoria,Alta.), Wilson (Laval), Wilson (Wentworth), and Wright.—117.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of twenty-five members.

No. 3.

ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS.

Messieurs

Ames, Armstrong (York, O), Ball, Blondin, Boulay, Bourassa, Boyce, Boyer, Boys, Broder, Bureau, Burnham, Carrick, Carvell, Chisholm (Antigonish), Clarke (Wellington), Davidson, Devlin, Ethier, Forget (Sir Rodolphe), Fripp, Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe), Gauvreau, Girard, Glass, Gordon, Guthrie, Hepburn, Hughes (Victoria), Jameson, Kemp, Knowles, Lachance, Lamarche, Lavallée, Macdonell, McLean (Sunbury), McLeod, McMillan, Marcil (Bonaventure), Martin (Montreal, Ste.M.), Mondou, Morris, Morrison, Murphy, Pacaud, Papineau, Paul, Perley (Sir George), Porter, Proulx, Reid, (Grenville), Robb, Ross, Scott, Sharpe (Ontario), Shepherd, Steele, Stewart (Hamilton), Thoburn, Tobin, Turriff, Walker and White (Renfrew).

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of ten members.

No. 4.

ON STANDING ORDERS.

Messieurs

Achim, Alguire, Armstrong (Lambton), Barrette, Best, Boulay, Burrell, Chabot, Cromwell, Doherty, Fortier, Hazen, Knowles, Kyte, Maclean (York, O.), MacNutt, McCoig, McCraney, Marcile (Bagot), Michaud, Morris, Paquet, Paul, Reid (Ristigouche), Rhodes, Roche, Scott, Seguin, Sharpe (Lisgar), Stanfield, Turgeon, Verville, and White (Leeds).—33.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of seven members.

No. 5.

ON PRINTING.

Messieurs

Bickerdike, Bowman, Brabazon, Brouillard, Cardin, Chabot, Clark (Bruce), Clarke (Wellington), Currie, Douglas, Elliot, Graham, Gray, Lavallée, L'Espérance, Martin (Montreal, Ste. M), Middlebro, Murphy, Nicholson, Roche, Stevens, Verville, White (Victoria, Alta.), and Wilson (Wentworth).—24.

No. 6.

ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Messieurs

Aikins (Sir James), Baker, Bennett (Simcoe), Blain, Boys, Carvell, Casgrain, Chisholm (Antigonish), Chisholm (Inverness), Clarke (Essex), Clarke (Wellington), Clements, Crothers, Davidson, Edwards, Fisher, Foster (Kings, N.S.), Fowler, Fripp, Garland, German, Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.) Kyte, Lalor, Lancaster, Maclean (Halifax), McCoig, McCraney, McCrea, McKenzie, McLeod, Marshall, Martin (Montreal, Ste. M.), Martin, (Regina), Meighen, Merner, Michaud, Middlebro, Molloy, Mondou, Morphy, Morrison, Murphy, Neely, Nicholson, Nickle, Northrup, Pardee, Proulx, Pugsley, Reid (Restigouche), Rhodes, Robidoux,

Rogers,
Sinclair,
Smyth,
Stanfield,
Stewart (Lunenburg),
Tobin,
Tremain,
Truax,
White (Leeds), and
Wilcox.—63.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of twenty-one members.

No. 7.

ON BANKING AND COMMERCE.

Messieurs

Aikins (Sir James),
Ames,
Armstrong (Lambton),
Armstrong (York, O),
Baker,
Ball,
Barker,
Barnard,
Bellemare,
Bennett (Calgary),
Best,
Bickerdike,
Boivin,
Boyce,
Bristol,
Broder,
Buchanan,
Burnham,
Cardin,
Carrick,
Carvell,
Charlton,
Clark (Bruce),
Clark (Red Deer),
Cockshutt,
Copp,
Currie,
Demers,
Edwards,
Fisher,
Forget (Sir Rodolphe),
Fortier
Foster (Kings, N.S.),
Foster (Sir George),
Fowler,
Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe),
Glass,
Graham,
Gray,
Guthrie,
Hanna,
Henderson,
Hughes (Kings P.E.I.)
Hughes (Victoria),
Jameson,
Kay,
Kemp,
Knowles,
Law,
Lemieux,
L'Espérance,
Loggie,
Macdonald,
Macdonell,
Maclean (Halifax),
Maclean (York, O.),
McCraney,
McCurdy,
McLean (Sunbury),
McLeod,
McMillan,
Marshall,
Martin (Rgina),
Meighen,
Middlebro,
Nesbitt,
Nickle,
Northrup,
Osler (Sir Edmund),
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Pardee,
Perley (Sir George),
Porter,
Power,
Pugsley,
Rainville,
Rhodes,
Robb,
Roche,
Ross,
Sexsmith,
Sharpe (Lisgar),
Sharpe (Ontario),
Sinclair,
Steele,
Stewart, (Hamilton),
Stewart (Lunenburg),
Sutherland,
Thompson (Yukon),
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Thornton,
Tobin,
Turriff,
Verville,
Warnock,
Webster,
Weichel and
White (Leeds).

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of twenty-one members.

No. 8.

ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Messieurs

Achim,
Alguire,
Armstrong (Lambton),
Armstrong (York, O.),
Arthurs,
Ball,
Best,
Boivin,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Broder,
Brouillard,
Buchanan,
Burrell,
Cash,
Champagne,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Chisholm (Inverness),
Clark (Red Deer),
Clarke (Wellington),
Cromwell,
Cruise,
Currie,
Delisle,
Donaldson,
Douglas,
Edwards,
Elliot,
Fortier,
Foster (Kings, N.S.),
Garland,
Gauthier (Gaspé),
Gauvreau,
Girard,
Glass,
Gordon,
Graham,
Guilbault,
Hanna,
Hartt,
Henderson,
Hughes (Victoria),
Kay,
Lanctôt,
Lewis,
Lovell,
MacNutt,
McCoig,
McCrea,
McLean (Queens. P.E.I.),
McMillan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marshall,
Meighen,
Merner,
Molloy,
Morphy,
Morris,
Morrison,
Munson,
Neely,
Oliver,
Pacaud,
Paquet,
Paul,
Proulx,
Richards,
Robb,
Roche,
Ross,
Schaffner,
Scott,
Seguin,
Sexsmith,
Sharpe (Lisgar),
Sharpe (Ontario),
Sinclair,
Smith,
Steele,
Stewart (Lunenburg),
Sutherland,
Taylor,
Thoburn,
Thompson (Yukon),
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Thornton,
Truax,
Turriff,
Walker,
Wallace,
Warnock,
Webster,
Weichel,
White (Renfrew),
Wilcox,
Wilson (Laval),
Wilson (Wentworth), and
Wright.—98.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of twelve members.

No. 9.

ON MARINE AND FISHERIES.

Messieurs

Alguire,
Barnard,
Boulay,
Bradbury,
Cardin,
Casgrain,

Chisholm (Inverness), Clarke (Essex), Clements, Copp, Fowler, Gauthier, (Gaspé), Hazen, Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.), Jameson, Kyte, Lafortune, Lapointe (Montreal, St. J.), Loggie, McCurdy, McKenzie, McLean (Queens, P.E.I.), Morrison, Nicholson, Pardee, Power, Robidoux, Shepherd, Sinclair, Stevens, Stewart (Lunenburg), Taylor, Truax, Turgeon, Wallace, and Wilcox.—36.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of ten members.

No. 10.

ON MINES AND MINERALS.

Messieurs

Arthurs, Carrick, Carroll, Chisholm (Antigonish), Cochrane, Cockshutt, Devlin, Douglas, Foster (Kings, N.S.), Garland, Green, Guilbault, Hartt, Hepburn, Lalor, Law, Lemieux, Lewis, Loggie, Lovell, Macdonald, McMillan, Marcil (Bonaventure), Merner, Mondou, Nesbitt, Osler (Sir Edmund), Richards, Sexsmith, Shepherd, Smith, Smyth, Thompson (Yukon), Turriff, and Walker.—35.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of ten members.

No. 11.

ON FORESTS, WATERWAYS AND WATER-POWERS.

Messieurs

Ames, Barrette, Béland, Bellemare, Blain, Bourassa, Bowman, Brabazon, Champagne, Charlton, Cochrane, Coderre, Cromwell, Cruise, Davidson, Donaldson, Ethier, Green, Henderson, Michaud, Munson, Osler (Sir Edmund), Perley (Sir George), Richards, Rogers, Stewart (Hamilton), Thoburn, Warnock, Webster, White (Victoria, Alta.), Wilson (Laval), and Wright—32.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of ten members.

No. 12.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Messieurs

Burnham, Descarries, Devlin, Foster (Sir George), Gray, Hanna, Lapointe (Montreal, St. J.), Lavallée, Lemieux, Marcil (Bonaventure), Perley (Sir George), Rainville, Reid (Restigouche), Schaffner, and Taylor.—15.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of five members.

No. 13.

ON THE LIBRARY.

Messieurs

Béland, Borden (Sir Robert), Boyer, Broder, Casgrain, Clark (Bruce), Copp, Crothers, Doherty, Foster (Sir George), Laurier (Sir Wilfrid), Lemieux, Lewis, Meighen, Pardee, Pugsley, and Sévigny.—17.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, the report was concurred in.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That the Select Standing Committees of this House shall severally be empowered to examine and inquire 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.

Motion agreed to.

THE PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN 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, viz.: Messrs. Bickerdike, Bowman, Brabazon, Brouillard, Cardin, Chabot, Clark (Bruce), Clarke (Wellington), Currie, Douglas, Elliot, Graham, Gray, Lavallée, Lespérance, Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's), Middlebro, Murphy, Nicholson, Roche, Stevens, Verville, White (Victoria, Alta.), and Wilson (Wentworth), will act as members, on the part of this House, on the said Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

THE LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to inform their Honours that this House has appointed Messrs. Béland, Borden (Sir Robert),

Boyer, Broder, Casgrain, Copp, Clark (Bruce), Crothers, Doherty, Foster (Sir George), Laurier (Sir Wilfrid), Lemieux, Lewis, Meighen, Pardee, Pugsley and Sévigny 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 on the Library.

Motion agreed to.

THE PARLIAMENTARY RESTAURANT.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That Messrs. Fripp, Pardee, Ross and Stanfield be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in the direction of the restaurant, as far as the interests of the Commons are concerned, and to act as members of the 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.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Correspondence respecting the control of the export of nickel.—Sir Robert Borden.

Memorandum respecting the work of the Department of Militia in respect to the European war.—Major General Hughes.

Report of the Department of Indian Affairs for the year ended March 31, 1914.—Hon. W. J. Roche.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill No. 20, respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Bradbury.

Bill No. 21, respecting The Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Blain.

Bill No. 22, respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—Mr. Guilbault.

Bill No. 23, respecting the James Bay and Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Girard.

Bill No. 24, respecting The Ottawa and New York Railway Company.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 25, respecting The South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Smith.

Bill No. 26, respecting The Southern Central Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Green.

Bill No. 27, respecting The St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 28, respecting The Toronto Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Smith.

Bill No. 29, respecting The Van Buren Bridge Company.—Mr. Michaud.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 30 to amend the Railway Act.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

He said: I ask leave to introduce this Bill in view of the fact that it does not appear to be the intention of the Government, so far as we know, to introduce this session, the excellent Bill which they brought forward last year to amend the Railway Act. I propose to take two of the clauses of that Bill in the hope of having them made law this session. One relates to the capitalization of railways and will have the effect of giving control of such capitalization to the Railway Commission. The other provision gives municipalities the right to associate themselves with railway companies in the construction of bridges, so that the public may have a right of way for ordinary traffic over the bridge in addition to its use for railway purposes.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

EXPORTS OF NICKEL.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN:

1. What were the exports of nickel, month by month, from July 1, 1914 to end of that year or any portion thereof; also the countries of destination.

Mr. REID:

1. The exports of 'Nickel, fine, contained in ore, matte or speiss', that is, the actual weight and value of metallic nickel contained in ore, etc., the produce of Canada, each month from July 1, 1914, to December 31, 1914, and countries of destination, were as follows:

	Lb.	Value.
To United Kingdom:		
July	1,037,603	$ 155,263
August	421,838	64,273
September	1,937,351	283,308
October	1,144,477	156,139
November	628,871	93,587
December	791,351	118,996
To Germany:		
July	48,121	$ 6,737
To United States:		
July	4,007,593	$ 400,759
August	3,130,100	313,010
September	1,242,940	124,359
October	1,523,297	152,328
November	2,104,495	210,540
December	2,343,128	234,307

ROSTHERN, SASK., CUSTOMS.

Mr. McCRANEY:

What are the average monthly receipts of the subcollector of Customs at Rosthern, Saskatchewan, during the present fiscal year?

Mr. REID: $204.23.

SASKATOON CUSTOMS COLLECTOR.

Mr. McCRANEY:

Who is collector of Customs at Saskatoon and when was he appointed?

Mr. REID: Allan Sproat, Acting Collector; employed January 4, 1915.

HORN EXTRADITION CASE.

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. Is the Government or the Department of Militia aware that an international bridge over the St. Croix River has been partially destroyed by dynamite by a German subject?

2. If so, what proceedings have been taken against him by the Canadian Government?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. The Government is informed that the bridge has been partially destroyed by an explosive—whether by dynamite is not known. The Government is further informed that the individual named Horn who caused the explosion claims to be a German subject.

2. Extradition proceedings charging the offence under Sec. 510 (c) of the Criminal Code.

I.C.R. ICE CONTRACTS.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. How many persons or companies have tendered to furnish the Intercolonial Railway with ice at Lévis and Campbellton?

2. What are their names and residences?

3. What is the amount of the tender in each case and the point of delivery of such ice?

4. Who obtained the contracts?

5. For what amounts were such contracts awarded?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Nine.

For the ice required at Levis, offers were received from the following:

J. A. Boulay, and E. Levesque, Sayabec, P.Q., 95c. per net ton delivered and packed in ice house; 75c. per net ton freight charges not paid. J. A. Couture and E. Bolduc, Levis, P.Q., 97c per net ton delivered and packed in ice house; 64c. per net ton freight charges not paid. P. Paquet, Fils, St. Romuald, P.Q., 75c. per net ton freight not paid and transportation for men to be furnished by railway. Ulric Begin, Levis, P.Q., 70c. per net ton freight charges not paid and transportation for men to be furnished by railway. Ed. Bernatchez, Montmagny, P.Q., 70c. per net ton packed in ice house, but railway to haul ice free of charge from Montmagny. Xavier Emond, Fils, St. Romuald, P.Q., 65c. packed in ice house, but railway to haul ice free of charge from St. Romuald.

For the ice required at Campbellton, offers were received from the following:

H. Pritchard, Campbellton, N.B., $1.45 per net ton delivered at Campbellton station. W. J. Price, Campbellton, N.B., $1.24 per net ton, delivered and stored in ice house. Thos. Ellsworth, Campbellton, N. B., $1.05 per net ton delivered and stored in ice house.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Answered by No. 1.

4. For Levis the award was originally made to J. A. Couture and E. Bolduc at 64c. per ton, but, as these parties desired to supply ice from a point in the St. Lawrence river which the District Superintendent refused to approve, the same not being considered wholesome, they declined to award; and the contract was re-awarded to the next lowest tenderers, Xavier Emond, Fils, of St. Romuald, P.Q., at 65c. per net ton.

For Campbellton the award was made to Thos. Ellsworth at $1.05 per ton.

5. Answered by No. 4.

LAKE TEMISCOUATA POSTAL SERVICE.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

What are the reasons alleged by the Postmaster General for refusing to open a post office on the northeast shore of Lake Temiscouata, and to grant a subsidy to a new company which has been organized for the purpose of establishing communications between the two shores of said lake, thereby aiding to develop this important district of Lake Temiscouata and Des Squatecks, in support of which two requests are said to have been made to the Postmaster General by Dr. Dubé and F. X. Bélanger of Notre Dame du Lac, and Fraserville?

Mr. CASGRAIN: If the inquiry has reference to a request for the establishment of a post office under the name of 'Saint Dominique du Lac,' two miles northeast of Notre Dame du Lac, on the opposite side of Lake Temiscouata, the department has been unable to see its way to authorize the cost of service, considering the estimate of $150 a year to be excessive for a tri-weekly service from Notre Dame du Lac post office, which is only two miles away. Moreover, it is estimated that the revenue of the proposed office would amount to only $50 a year.

However, in an endeavour to obtain a reasonable offer, the department is inviting tenders for the service.

I.C.R.—FISH TRANSPORTATION.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

How many refrigerator cars containing shipments of fresh fish only were transported from Mulgrave, N.S., to Montreal, attached to the regular daily express train running between said points, known as The Maritime Express, during the months of November and December, 1914, and January, 1915?

Mr. COCHRANE: Fourteen cars were carried on the Maritime Express during the months of November and December, 1914, and none in January, 1915.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. E. M. Macdonald: A return showing if any official statement was given on behalf of the management of the I.C.R. to the effect that wages would be paid in their absence to the employees of the railway who volunteered for active service; if so, when and by whom. If any order has been made by the Railway Department providing for such payment, and if so, when the said order was made.

Mr. C. A. Wilson: For a return showing: 1. How many persons have been made prisoners of war since the declaration of war between the Allies, Germany and Austria? 2. Where have they been kept captive? 3. The name of each place of detention, and the name of the officer in charge of such place of detention?

Mr. Buchanan: For a return showing: 1. How much money has spent amongst the merchants of the city of Medicine Hat for government relief? 2. To whom payments were made and the total amount in each case?

Mr. Chisholm (Antigonish): For a copy of all petitions, letters, telegrams and correspondence regarding a proposed daily mail service between Lower South River and South Side Harbour, Antigonish County, and improved postal accommodation for the residents of the last named district.

Mr. Lemieux: For a copy of all papers, letters telegrams, etc., concerning the purchase of the property known as the Carslake Hotel, in Montreal, for post office purposes.

Mr. Maclean (Halifax): For a copy of all correspondence which has passed between the Auditor General and the Militia Department, or any other department of the Government service, in regard to the expenditure under the war appropriation Act.

Mr. Chisholm (Antigonish): For a return showing the names and addresses of all persons in Antigonish county to whom the bounty under the Fenian Raid Volunteer Bounty Act has been paid; the names and addresses of all persons from said county whose applications have been rejected, and a list giving names and addresses of all applications from said county whose applications have not yet been disposed of.

Mr. Buchanan: For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, Orders in Council, petitions and any other documents in connections with the removal of Edward N. Higinbothan from the position of postmaster at Lethbridge, Alberta.

Mr. Buchanan: For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, accounts, Orders in Council and other documents in connection with the distribution of relief to the settlers in the drouth affected districts of Alberta.

Mr. Proulx: For a copy of the petition, papers, documents and letters in connection with the incorporation of the Dominion Trust Company, incorporated by Special Act of the Parliament of Canada in 1912, being Chapter 89 of 2 George V.

Mr. Proulx: For a copy of all the correspondence exchanged between the Department of Justice and the Government of the province of British Columbia, or any of its members, with regard to a certain Act passed by the Legislature of the said province in 1913, being Chapter 89 of 3 George V., entitled: "An Act respecting the Dominion Trust Company."

Mr. Turgeon: For a copy of all tenders received by the Post Office Department for the mail service between Caraquet and Tracadie, Gloucester County, N.B., on the 15th day of January last, with the names of the tenderers, the respective amounts of the tenders, and the name of the new contractor.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier: For a copy of all petitions memoranda from commercial bodies or other parties in relation to the immediate construction of the Georgian Bay Canal, and of all correspondence in connection with the same since September 21, 1911.

Mr. Turriff: For a copy of all invoices, accounts, statements, letters, telegrams, correspondence and other documents in connection with the purchase of drugs, bandages, medical supplies and other goods purchased by the Government or any department of the Government, from J. E. Powell, or from the Carleton county drug store of Hintonburg.

THE BUDGET.

PROPOSED WAR TAXATION.

Hon. W. T. WHITE (Minister of Finance) moved.

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the House to go into Committee of ways and means.

He said: In the Budget speech of August last I dealt with the commercial and monetary conditions resulting from the outbreak of war then prevailing and their probable effect upon the finances of the Dominion. With respect to the latter, I stated at the time that I put forth my views with much diffidence because it was not possible to make a forecast with any measurable degree of certainty. In presenting my statement of to-day I shall deal first with the subject of our revenues and expenditures, actual and estimated, for the current fiscal year which ends on March 31 next. In August I pointed out that we were certain to experience a sharp decline in revenue due to decreased importations attributable to the shutting-off of our trade with the enemy, the interruption and increased risk of ocean traffic, and above all the cessation of Canadian borrowings

abroad and its effect upon our purchasing power as a community.

This forecast has been realized in ampler degree than was at the time expected. Taking the ten months of the year which have already elapsed, that is to say from April 1, 1914, to January 31, 1915, the Dominion's revenue from all sources has totalled, in round figures, $109,500,000. This compares with $139,000,000 for the corresponding period of the last fiscal year, a decline of nearly thirty millions. Entering into details we find that of this heavy loss in revenue the falling-off in customs accounts for nearly twenty-eight millions; in excise two hundred thousand and in miscellaneous items a million and a half. Since the outbreak of the war the contraction in customs revenue has been fairly constant in monthly amount representing about one-third of the returns for the corresponding period of the previous year. As regards excise the additional duties imposed by the August Budget have had the effect of counteracting the heavy losses which would otherwise have been experienced.

Upon the basis of these figures for the ten months' period and having regard to the present action of the revenue-producing services, we estimate that the revenue of the Dominion for the fiscal year ending March 31 next, computed upon the present basis of duties, would amount to $130,000,000. The figures for the previous year having been $163,000,000, this year's loss of revenue would reach a total of thirty-three millions.

So far as the expenditures of the year are concerned, I stated in August that it would be the policy of the Government, in the interest of employment, to maintain as far as possible the programme of public works then under construction, but that new works would not be undertaken until the financial outlook became clearer and we should have in view the source of funds from which to meet the expenditure. This policy we have endeavoured to carry out. For the ten months ended January 31, the current expenditure has reached $102,000,000 and the capital and special $37,000,000. These figures compare with $93,000,000 and $47,000,000, the outlays under the headings in question respectively for the same period of the previous year. The drop in capital and special expenditure is due to the fact that railway subsidy payments have been much less during the present year. For public works and undertakings, our disbursements have been greater than they were last year.

For the whole of the present fiscal year we estimate our current expenditure will be $140,000,000 and our capital and special expenditure $50,000,000. Summarizing the estimated results we have the out-turn of the year, stated concisely, as follows:

Current expenditure	$140,000,000
Capital and special (other than war) expenditure..	50,000,000
Total	$190,000,000

Our revenue on the present basis being estimated, as I have stated, at $130,000,000, we should have to meet for this year a deficit of ten million dollars on current account plus the entire amount of our capital and special expenditure, a substantial part of which we have in the past been able to defray out of current revenue, a balance only having been provided by borrowing. Included in our ordinary expenditure is an amount of $2,500,000 which will be required this year for the relief of distress in the drouth-stricken districts of Saskatchewan and Alberta. In addition we are making provision for about seven and a half millions or more to be expended in the purchase of seed-grain.

I have still to deal with the expenditure representing the cost of organizing, training, equipping, transporting and maintaining our forces enlisted for active service in defence of the Empire. In connection with the War Appropriation Bill presented by him at the August session, the Right Hon. the Prime Minister presented an estimate of $30,000,000 covering expenditure until March 31 next for the mobilization, equipment, transport and maintenance of an overseas contingent of 25,000 men and pay of detachments of troops on active home service. Such was the patriotic spirit and enthusiasm with which the call to arms was received throughout the Dominion and such the vigour and expedition with which the mobilization, organization and training of the troops was conducted by the Militia Department that within six weeks after the close of the session Canada had despatched a contingent of 33,000 men fully armed and equipped as her first contribution in this war to the ranks of the Empire's army. To-day there are nearly 50,000 troops in active training throughout Canada, their number being increased daily by enlistment. From this body as a permanent nucleus, constantly replenished by recruitment, further contingents will be sent forward from time to time as practicable. The estimate

of expenditure presented in August was of course inadequate to meet the enlarged programme, and the special war expenditure during the present fiscal year will probably reach the total amount of the appropriation, viz., $50,000,000. The expenditure to date has been $38,000,000.

Taking all the foregoing into consideration, the increase of Canada's national debt for the year would probably aggregate $110,000,000. In this I am, of course, including our expenditure for war.

In addition to the expenditures to which I have referred, the Dominion has made advances on investment account under statutory authority and has met its sinking fund obligations as usual, the funds required to be found for these purposes aggregating $5,000,000. We also provided for the retirement of £1,700,000, or $8,500,000 in currency, of yearling Treasury Bills which matured in November last.

The House will from the statements I have made gather that the task of finding money for our requirements as outlined has been somewhat onerous. For four or more months after the outbreak of war international money markets were closed to new issues. By December, after the successful flotation of the British war loan, an easier tone prevailed and it became possible to obtain short date money in limited amounts at fairly reasonable rates. Capital was still, however, averse to permanent investment, although evidence was not wanting of improvement in that regard. Any prospect of general resumption in this respect in Great Britain was, however, terminated by the announcement by the British Treasury authorities on January 18, that owing to the necessity of conserving the financial resources of the country during the war, fresh issues should thereafter be made only with their approval. Issues for undertakings outside the British Empire were prohibited. Issues for undertakings within the United Kingdom are to be allowed only if considered advisable in the national interest; those for undertakings in the British Empire overseas only where urgent necessity and special circumstances exist.

To meet our financial requirements since the August session the following steps have been taken:

We arranged with the Imperial Government for advances from September until March 31 of £12,000,000, or say $60,000,000, of which we have received to date £8,000,000, or $40,000,000.

We issued for Dominion purposes Dominion notes to an amount of ten million dollars in excess of the additional issue of $15,000,000 authorized by Parliament at its last session. For this I am introducing special legislation confirmatory of our action.

We borrowed five million dollars from the Bank of Montreal.

We issued after the successful flotation of the British war loan £3,000,000 of six months Treasury Bills negotiated at 4½ and 4¼ per cent and maturing in June next.

We sold at a net price of 94½ £1,300,000 ($6,500,000) of our 1940-60 stock to meet the private requirements of our investing clientele in London.

By these means we have arranged our finances until the end of March of the present fiscal year. At present we have substantial balances to our credit both here and in London.

So far as floating indebtedness is concerned, we shall therefore enter upon the new fiscal year with £3,000,000 of Treasury Bills maturing in June and a bank indebtedness of $5,000,000. Apart from these we have no maturing loans to meet until the year 1919, a most satisfactory situation which I am disposed to attribute to the policy hitherto followed by the Dominion of financing by selling its permanent stock at such prices as could from time to time be obtained rather than by issuing short date loans in the hope of more favourable conditions developing later.

As regards our borrowings from the Imperial Government, our arrangements are that we shall pay interest at the same rate as is paid by the Imperial Treasury upon its war loans, from the proceeds of which advances are to be made to us. At such time or times in the future as may be agreed upon between the British Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Canadian Minister of Finance, a Canadian war loan or loans will be issued and the borrowings from the Imperial Government repaid. It seems to me that no fairer terms could be named than those so generously accorded us by the Imperial authorities.

Revenue and Expenditure, 1915-16.

In approaching the question of our finances for the coming fiscal year beginning April 1st next it will be advisable to give preliminary consideration to prevailing

trade conditions, because upon such conditions will depend the amount of revenue which will be derived from all sources and particularly from customs, which is our principal mainstay in the matter of income. Since the outbreak of war there has of course been a most serious interruption of our international trade. Commercial dealings with enemy nations have been automatically shut off. The increased risk of ocean traffic and higher freights have had their influence. The demoralization of the rates of exchange, which are now happily becoming normal, was for several months a serious detriment to international transactions.

In addition, our import and export trade was for a considerable time and is still in some degree adversely affected by the interruption of our merchant marine service through the chartering of so many steamships for the transport of our troops and the engagement of a part of our shipping by the Imperial authorities. The falling-off of immigration, the departure from Canada of reservists and of our own contingent have also had their effect. But by far the most important factor has been the curtailment of our borrowings abroad. This has been the outstanding feature of the economic effect of the war upon Canada. Canada has been borrowing at the rate of from two to three hundred million dollars annually for some years past. For the six months preceding the war our loans abroad and principally in Great Britain aggregated two hundred million dollars, or over a million dollars a day. These borrowings represented the sale of securities by the Federal and provincial Governments, by municipalities and by railway, public utility, industrial and financial corporations. For the most part the purpose of loans so effected was to provide funds for the construction of public undertakings, works and services, railways and industrial and other plants and establishments. The war at once cut off this stream of borrowed money, and only recently have there been evidences of its resumption upon a greatly reduced scale. Until the war is over and for a considerable period afterwards it is not probable that monetary conditions will permit of the issue of securities even of the highest character other than for war purposes in any such volume as that to which we have been accustomed in the past. This interruption of the influx of capital has necessarily meant marked curtailment of expenditure upon undertakings, works and buildings in all parts of Canada with consequent reaction upon the industries, trades and businesses furnishing material and supplies therefor. The result has been a material slackening of general constructional activity, considerable unemployment and attendant diminished buying power on the part of the community. Commercial houses are exercising prudence in commitments and the public generally are practising economy, that is to say they are buying less both of domestic and imported produce. The result of all this has been a rapid change in the volume of our imports and exports. For the nine months ended December 31 of the present fiscal year our total exports (merchandise only) amounted to $353,000,000 as compared with $380,000,000 for the corresponding period of the previous year, a decrease of $27,000,000. For the same nine months of the present year our imports (merchandise only) have been $391,000,000, a decline of $112,000,000 over those for the corresponding period of the previous year. Thus the ratio of decrease in our exports has been much less than in the case of our imports. The total trade for the first nine months of the present and last fiscal years was $745,000,000 and $885,000,000 respectively. In 1912 the so-called adverse balance of trade against Canada was $225,000,000; in 1913, $300,000,000; in 1914, $180,000,000. From present indications it would appear that we shall to a large degree overtake this balance. In view of the decrease in our borrowings which have accounted in large measure for our excess of imports, this condition is what we should naturally expect. Our exports will, it is to be hoped, so increase as to enable us with such borrowings as may be obtained outside of Canada, to pay any trade balance against us together with our interest maturing abroad without resort to gold exports.

From what I have stated it is apparent that with the war still continuing we may expect for the year 1915-16 diminishing imports and consequently reduced revenue as compared with the present year in which there have been four ante-bellum months. Upon the present basis of duties of customs and excise we estimate that our revenue from all sources for the coming year would not exceed $120,000,000. So far as expenditures are concerned the policy we

enunciated in August we shall continue. Our estimates contain no new items and as to items which they include we shall proceed with works not already under contract only as we feel justified having regard to the financial situation. Dealing with what we may call uncontrollable expenditure, that is to say expenditure necessary for the conduct of civil government and required to meet interest and other obligations of the Dominion, we cannot look forward to any reduction over the past year. The Dominion has large undertakings under contract for construction. Chief among these may be mentioned terminal and harbour works and improvements in our larger port cities, the completion of the National Transcontinental railway and the Quebec bridge, the Hudson Bay railway, and the Welland canal.

We must calculate upon a Consolidated Fund expenditure of $140,000,000 and of capital and special expenditure of at least $40,000,000, making a total of $180,000,000. For investments authorized by statute we shall have to provide $4,000,000 additional. It will be necessary also to raise funds to meet the outstanding Treasury Bills to which I have referred. Our special war expenditure may reach $100,000,000 for which a special appropriation Bill will be passed at this session. Our interest charges will, of course, greatly increase from this forward. Our outlay for this year on this account will exceed sixteen millions. In next year's estimates they appear at twenty-one and one-half millions. We must also look forward to a large and increasing pension-list expenditure.

It is apparent in these conditions that we must obtain additional revenue to a very substantial amount. Assuming that our total cash requirements for all purposes whatsoever, including our war expenditure, will amount during the coming year to over $300,000,000 while our revenue on the present basis would yield only $120,000,000 we are faced with the problem of raising by additional taxation and borrowing, a sum in excess of $180,000,000. My proposals for meeting the situation are as follows.

So far as concerns our special war expenditures which may reach one hundred million dollars I should be disposed, if we had not such heavy and uncontrollable capital expenditure to meet, to recommend that we should pay at least a part of it from current revenue. But it is obvious upon a consideration of the figures which I have submitted that we shall not by any reasonable supplemental taxation measures be able to close the gap between revenue and expenditure much less to pay a portion of the principal of our special war outlay. In the circumstances I have no hesitation in proposing to the House that we shall borrow the full amount required under this heading. Canadian Governments have always justified public borrowing for capital account on the principle that expenditure upon enterprises, permanent in their nature, enures to the benefit and advantage of future generations who may therefore fairly be asked to pay interest upon the debt contracted in respect of them. If this theory is correct, and so far as I know it has never been seriously challenged, then we need have no reluctance in borrowing to meet the expense of this war, because such borrowing is for the purpose of accomplishing for future generations that which is infinitely more precious than material undertakings, namely, the preservation of our national and individual liberty and the constitutional freedom won by our forefathers during centuries of struggle, enjoyed by us to-day and destined, we believe, to be ours for all time. It is therefore the intention of the Government to negotiate for a continuance of the arrangement which I have mentioned with the Imperial Government for the purpose of procuring the funds necessary to meet our special war expenditure.

Assuming that this can be accomplished, and I have reason to believe it can, we have still to deal with the problem of so increasing our revenue as to meet our current expenditure and at least a part, and I should hope a substantial part, of our capital expenditure. I express this hope because we shall be obliged to borrow heavily for military purposes and our interest charges upon the vast amount which will be required on this and capital accounts will mount up rapidly in terms of millions by way of fixed charge to be provided yearly.

Many suggestions for supplementing our revenue have been put forward by members of the community and in the public press throughout the country; some quite impracticable, others worthy of consideration and adoption, but, speaking generally, wholly lacking in adequacy to meet the situation which the war has so suddenly brought upon us. It is not a question of raising a few millions by stamp taxes, by income tax or other minor means of supplementing revenue. We must endeavour to

raise additional revenue to an amount of at least thirty million dollars, and when we have accomplished this we shall still be obliged to borrow heavily over the next fourteen months, that is to say, between now and March 31, 1916, to meet expenditure for purposes other than for war. We feel that the situation with which we are confronted should be resolutely met, and the finances of the country placed upon a basis which will enable us to go forward prepared to face whatever may lie before us until this war is concluded, and concluded as we would wish. In making this statement I am convinced I am but expressing the sentiments of the whole Canadian people, who will, I know, be eager to make whatever of sacrifice may be required from them during this supreme crisis in the Empire's history.

The chief source and mainstay of our revenue is the tariff, and it is to this we must look principally for relief of our present financial conditions. Taxation imposed by increased customs duties bears upon all classes, because all are consumers, and in paying additional taxation each member of the community will feel that he is to that extent contributing to the cost of the war and the defence of his country. As an auxiliary means of raising revenue we shall resort to certain special taxes, the burden of which will fall more particularly upon those members of the community who are best able to sustain it.

To supplement our revenues to the minimum amount regarded by the Government as necessary, I shall later introduce to the House a Bill intituled 'The War Revenue Act, 1915.'

Its provisions will cover a levy of special and general taxation as follows:

Special Taxes.

Upon all banks to which the Bank Act applies, a yearly sum equal to one per cent upon the note circulation, to be computed and paid quarterly. From this taxation we shall realize approximately one million dollars.

Upon every trust and loan company incorporated under any legislative authority and carrying on business in Canada, a yearly sum equal to one per cent of its gross income derived in Canada, payable quarterly.

Upon every insurance corporation, society, association, firm or partnership carrying on the business of insurance, other than life, fraternal benefit and marine insurance, a sum of one per cent upon all net premiums received by it in Canada. Payments to be made quarterly.

The provisions of the Bill will apply to businesses of the respective banks, trust and loan and insurance companies transacted after January 1, 1915, and the first receipts therefrom will reach Consolidated Revenue Fund about May 1.

In addition the following special taxation will be provided for:

Upon every cable and telegraph company using telegraphic cables or wires within the jurisdiction of Canada, a sum equal to one cent upon each despatch or message originating in Canada for which a charge of fifteen cents or more is imposed. Returns to be made quarterly. The company is authorized to charge the additional toll and collect the same from the person sending the message.

Upon every purchaser of a railway or steamboat ticket in Canada for any point in Canada, Newfoundland, the West Indian Colonies or the United States, the sum of five cents in respect of a ticket costing over one dollar and not more than five dollars, and

The railway or steamboat company or fractional part of five dollars which the ticket costs.

Upon every purchaser of a berth in a sleeping car or seat in a parlor car, the sum of ten cents in respect of each berth bought, and five cents in respect of each seat bought in Canada.

The railway or steamboat company or person selling the railway, sleeping car and parlor car tickets referred to are required to collect the taxes imposed and transmit to the Government.

4 p.m.

Upon every person, firm or company carrying passengers by vessel to ports or places other than ports or places in Canada, Newfoundland, the British West Indian Colonies and the United States, in respect of each passenger the sum of one dollar if the amount chargeable for the passage exceeds ten dollars, the sum of three dollars if such amount exceeds thirty dollars, and the sum of five dollars if the amount exceeds sixty dollars. The company is authorized to collect the tax from the passenger and is required to account therefor to the Government.

In addition to the above, the following stamp taxes:

Upon all cheques, receipts to banks by depositors and upon bills of exchange pass-

ing through a bank, a stamp tax of the value of two cents.

Upon all express and post office money orders, a stamp tax of the value of two cents, and upon postal notes a stamp tax of one cent.

Upon every letter and postal card posted in Canada, a war stamp tax of one cent.

Upon every bill of lading, a stamp tax of two cents.

Upon proprietary or patent medicines and perfumery sold in Canada, the retail price for each bottle or package of which is ten cents or less, one cent, and in addition for each ten cents of retail price, one cent.

Upon wine non-sparkling, sold in Canada, for every bottle or package containing one quart or less, five cents, and for each additional quart, five cents.

Upon champagne and sparkling wine—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE: I knew that a proposal to tax its favourite beverage would appeal to the House. Upon champagne and sparkling wine sold in Canada, every bottle containing one pint or less, twenty-five cents, and for each additional pint twenty-five cents.

The special taxation to which I have referred other than that levied upon banks, trust and loan and insurance companies, will come into force at a date to be fixed in the Act. I am making an exception to this in the case of wines and champagnes, the stamp taxation upon which will become effectual at once.

From all these special taxes we expect to raise a sum approximating $8,000,000, although there is no means of accurate calculation; my own view is from $8,000,000 to $10,000,000—I should think more likely $8,000,000 than $10,000,000. It will be observed that I have in these special taxes omitted income tax upon individuals, about which there has been some discussion since the outbreak of the war. The matter has had the consideration of the Government and it appears clear to us that such a tax is not expedient, at all events for the present. Under the British North America Act, while the Dominion may impose direct or indirect taxation, the Provinces are restricted to the former. At present under legislation existing in certain of the provinces income is subject to taxation by municipalities, and in two instances by the provinces themselves. In other provinces no income tax exists, although in some of these a business tax in lieu thereof is levied upon incorporated companies. In order to bring into force an income tax the Government would be obliged to create machinery for assessment, revision and collection. This would involve a heavy expense as compared with the amount which would be realized. Taking the income tax of the United States as a basis it would appear that Canada could hardly expect to derive from a similar tax a sum in excess of two million dollars, from which would have to be deducted the heavy expense connected with its administration. My chief objection, however, to an income tax is the fact that the several provinces are also likely to be obliged to resort to measures for raising additional revenue, and I am of the view that the Dominion should not enter upon the domain to which they are confined to a greater degree than is necessary in the national interest. There is another feature of income tax which makes it unsatisfactory for the purpose of Dominion finance. I refer to the length of period which must elapse before it becomes productive. In Britain, where the tax is the chief source of revenue to the Imperial Government, there is no municipal taxation upon incomes. There is also the important difference that in Britain taxable incomes are derived largely from investments. They have therefore a settled and permanent character, are ascertainable with fair accuracy and are capable of being levied upon at their source. With us this is not the case.

Tariff Taxation.

As our main revenue measure we propose with certain exceptions (numerous exceptions, I may say a general horizontal increase in the customs duties upon all goods and commodities imported into or taken out of bonded warehouse in Canada. The list includes all articles hitherto dutiable or on the free list, and whether raw material or finished or partly-finished product. The increase we propose is seven and a half per cent ad valorem to the general and intermediate tariffs and five per cent ad valorem to the British preferential. In the case of iron ore, for reasons I shall give in Committee, the added duty is specific and not ad valorem. In determining the list of exceptions, regard has been had to our trade convention with France and the obligations of our agrement with certain of the British West India colonies. By reason

of the convention with France the increased customs duties will not apply to silk fabrics, velvets, ribbons, embroideries and certain other goods. The exceptions to the tariff increases I have mentioned include wheat, flour, tea, anthracite coal, fish from Newfoundland, salt for curing fish, lines, twines, nets and hooks for the fisheries, reapers, mowers, binders, harvesters, binder-twine, traction ditching machines, sugar, tobacco (dealt with in August), news-printing paper, newspaper printing presses, typesetting and typecasting machines and a number of other items of lesser consequence. The tariff upon the articles exempted from the increased duties will remain as at present. So far as concerns the duty upon raw materials it is to be pointed out that in accordance with regulations made under the provisions of the Customs Act manufacturers are entitled to a drawback of 99 per cent upon all duties paid upon imported materials used, wrought into or attached to articles manufactured in Canada and exported therefrom. In addition to making the increases mentioned for the purpose of increasing revenue, we propose to alter the existing tariff by adding squid and nicotine sulphate to the free list. Squid is used as bait by the fishermen while nicotine sulphate is a spraying material used by fruit-growers for destroying insect pests. These two items have for some time past been noted for change.

The revenue obtained from the proposed tariff changes will be separately shown in the Trade and Navigation returns of the Department of Customs. By this we shall know the precise amount collected through the customs under the provisions of the War Revenue Act.

Upon the basis of importations for the current year and having regard to conditions which I have described as likely to prevail during the coming year we expect to realize from our proposed customs tariff legislation from twenty to twenty-five million dollars.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the proposals of the Government, having as their object the raising of additional revenue rendered necessary by the war and our participation therein as a belligerent. We are not unmindful that they will entail a considerable financial burden upon the community. We believe however that to adopt measures less comprehensive in their scope would be but to temporize with a situation with which it is our duty to adequately cope. That the people will cheerfully respond to the demands made upon their patriotism goes without saying. At the outbreak of the war it would have been premature to have brought forward measures which to-day have been long foreseen by public opinion to be necessary and indeed inevitable. It would also have been most inopportune and inexpedient by reason of the profound dislocation and disorganization of business caused by the war and the shock to financial stability which the Dominion was so suddenly called upon to withstand.

We believe the tariff increases which we propose will be not only effectual in producing greater revenue but will be strongly efficacious in stimulating Canadian industry and agricuture and in relieving unemployment. In order to initiate the legislation necessary to give effect to the proposals I have laid before the House I beg to give notice that when the House goes into Committee I shall move the following resolutions:

Resolved that it is expedient to provide:

1. That each bank to which the Bank Act applies, exclusive of banks in the course of winding-up, shall pay for Consolidated Revenue Fund quarterly a tax equal to one-fourth of one per cent upon the average amount of the notes of the bank in circulation during the three months preceding, the greatest amount of notes in circulation at any time during each of the three months being the basis of the average, provided, however, that where the greatest amount of notes in circulation exceeds the amount of the paid-up capital, then an amount equal to the paid-up capital shall be the basis used in calculating the average;

2. That every loan and trust company incorporated under any legislative authority, including the banks subject to the Quebec Savings Banks Act, 1913, shall pay for Consolidated Revenue Fund a tax of one per cent upon the gross amount of

(a) interest, the property of the company, from loans and investments in Canada, and

(b) income, other than interest, on business transacted within Canada,

received by the company on and after the first day of January, 1915;

3. That every insurance company other than life and marine companies and fraternal benefit societies shall pay for Consolidated Revenue Fund a tax of one per cent upon the net premiums received by the company in Canada on and after the first day of January, 1915;

4. That every cable and telegraph company shall pay for Consolidated Revenue Fund a sum equal to one cent upon each despatch or message originating at the offices of the company in Canada and transmitted thence over the company's lines for which a charge of fifteen cents or more was imposed, the company having the right to charge the one cent to and collect the same from the person paying or liable to pay the regular charges for the transmission of the despatch or message;

5. That every purchaser of

(a) a railway passenger ticket or right to transportation over a railway to any place in or outside of Canada,

(b) a steamboat passenger ticket or right to transportation by steamboat between ports or places in Canada or from a port or place in Canada to a port or place in Newfoundland, the West Indian colonies or the United States,

(c) a ticket or right entitling the passenger transportation over a railway and by steamboat to a port or place in Canada, Newfoundland, the West Indian colonies or the United States, whether such transportation be by railway and steamboat or by steamboat and railway or by railway, steamboat and railway,

shall pay for Consolidated Revenue Fund, in addition to the regular charge for the ticket or right, in respect of a ticket or right costing—

(i) over one dollar and not more than five dollars.. .. .. 5 cents.

(ii) over five dollars—for each five dollars and in addition for any fractional part of five dollars.. 5 cents;

6. That every purchaser of a berth in a sleeping car or seat in a parlour car shall, in addition to the regular charge for the berth or seat, pay for Consolidated Revenue Fund—

(a) ten cents in respect of each berth bought,

(b) five cents in respect of each seat bought;

7. That every company carrying passengers by vessel from any port or place in Canada to any port or place outside of Canada, except Newfoundland, the West Indian colonies and the United States, shall pay for Consolidated Revenue Fund in respect of each passenger carried—

(a) the sum of one dollar if the amount chargeable for the passage exceeds ten dollars;

(b) the sum of three dollars if the amount chargeable for the passage exceeds thirty dollars;

(c) the sum of five dollars if the amount chargeable for the passage exceeds sixty dollars,

and that the company may charge to the passenger and may collect from him the sum so payable;

8. That no person shall issue a cheque payable at or by a bank and no person shall negotiate a bill of exchange through a bank or deliver a bill of exchange to a bank for collection unless he affixes thereto a stamp of the value of two cents; that a cheque or other bill of exchange made or drawn out of Canada in the possession of a bank in Canada shall before payment or presentment for payment have affixed thereto a stamp of the value of two cents, and the value of the stamp shall be chargeable to the person entitled to the proceeds of the cheque or bill;

9. That every customer of a bank shall affix to a receipt for money paid to him by the bank and chargeable against a deposit to his credit in the bank a stamp of the value of two cents;

10. That every express company carrying on business in Canada shall, before the issue of a money order or traveller's cheque, affix thereto a stamp of the value of two cents chargeable to the purchaser of the order or cheque or to the payee thereof;

11. That no money order or postal note shall be issued under the provisions of the Post Office Act until there is affixed thereto a postage stamp of the value of two cents and one cent respectively, to be paid for by the purchaser of the order or postal note, and upon such stamp there may be printed or impressed the words 'war tax';

12. That on every letter and post card for transmission by post a tax of one cent shall be levied and collected, such tax to be payable by affixing to the letter or card a postage stamp of that denomination, upon which there may be printed or impressed the words 'war tax';

13. That every person by whom goods are received—

(a) to be exported or carried coastwise, or

(b) to be transported by railway,

shall attach to the bill of lading or other evidence of receipt a stamp to be furnished by the shipper or consignor of the value of two cents;

14. That every bottle or package containing—

(a) a proprietary or patent medicine,

(b) perfumery,

(c) wine, non-sparkling,

(d) champagne and sparkling wine,

shall be subject to the payment of the stamp duties hereinafter set out :

Article.	Stamp of the Value of.
(a) A proprietary or patent medicine,	
(b) Perfumery, the retail price for each bottle or package thereof being—	
Ten cents or less..	One cent.
More than ten cents—	
For each ten cents and in addition for any fractional part of ten cents..	One cent.
(c) Wine, non-sparkling, each bottle or package containing—	
One quart or less..	Five cents.
A quantity greater than one quart—	
For each quart and in addition for any fractional part of a quart..	Five cents.
(d) Champagne and sparkling wine, each bottle or package containing—	
One pint or less..	25 cents.
A quantity greater than one pint—	
For each pint and in addition for any fractional part of a pint	25 cents;

15. That the provisions of any Act founded on these resolutions, in so far as such provisions relate to wine, non-sparkling, champagne and sparkling wine, shall be deemed to have come into force on the twelfth day of February, 1915, and to have applied to all such articles—

(a) imported or taken out of customs warehouse for consumption on and after that day and to have also applied to such articles previously imported for which no customs entry was made before that day,

(b) owned by or in the possession of the manufacturer or producer thereof,

(c) owned by or in the possession of the wholesale or retail dealer therein.

1. Resolved that it is expedient to amend

Schedule A of the Customs Tariff, 1907, and to strike thereout tariff item 329 and the enumeration of goods set opposite said item, and to provide that the following items, enumerations and rates of duties, if any, be inserted in said Schedule A:

	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
118a. Squid	Free.	Free.	Free.
209b. Nicotine sulphate	Free.	Free.	Free.
329. Ores of metals, n.o.p.	Free.	Free.	Free.
329a. Iron ore ..per ton.	6 cents.	8 cents.	8 cents.

2. Resolved that it is expedient to amend The Customs Tariff, 1907, by providing that:

(1) There shall, in addition to the duties of Customs otherwise established by Schedule A to The Customs Tariff, 1907, and Orders in Council amending Schedule A, be levied, collected and paid upon all goods enumerated, or referred to as not enumerated, in Schedule A, except as hereinafter provided, when imported into Canada or taken out of warehouse for consumption therein, the several rates of duties of Customs herein specified:

British Preferential Tariff, 5 p.c.
Intermediate Tariff, 7½ p.c.
General Tariff, 7½ p.c.

(2) There shall be levied, collected and paid upon all goods enumerated as being free of duty in Schedule A and in Orders in Council amending Schedule A, except as hereinafter provided, when imported into Canada or taken out of warehouse for consumption therein, the several rates of duties of Customs herein specified:

British Preferential Tariff, 5 p.c.
Intermediate Tariff, 7½ p.c.
General Tariff, 7½ p.c.

Provided, however, that the following goods shall be exempt from the foregoing provisions:

(a) goods admitted into Canada free of Customs duty under the provisions of Sections 8 and 9 of the Customs Tariff, 1907;

(b) goods enumerated in Schedule C of the French Convention Act, 1908;

(c) goods imported to be used in the manufeature of mowing machines, harvesters, self-binding or without binders, binding attachments, reapers, and complete parts thereof, under regulations by the Minister of Customs;

(d) goods imported to be used in the manufacture of binder twine for harvest binders, under regulations by the Minister of Customs;

(e) articles imported to be used in the manufacture of goods enumerated in Tariff Item 682 in Schedule A, under regulations by the Minister of Customs;

(f) anthracite coal and anthracite coal dust;

(g) bacteriological products or serum for subcutaneous injection;

(h) vaccine and ivory vaccine points;

(i) pressed felt, elastic webbing and hollow blocks of wood imported to be used in the manufacture of artificial limbs;

(j) steel imported to be used in manufacturing rough unfinished parts of rifles, when such parts are to be used in rifles to be made for the Government of Canada;

(k) fabrics of which silk is the component material of chief value imported to be used in the manufacture of neckties;

(l) goods enumerated in the following Tariff Items in Schedule A: 1, 2, 3, 19, 20, 20a, 21, 22, 23, 28a, 29a, 39b, 40, 55, 60, 61, 66, 77a, 101a, 118a, 129, 132, 134, 135, 142, 143, 144, 145, 153, 164, 169, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 178a, 180a, 184, 196, 201, 209b, 329, 329a, 348a, 352a, 359, 360, 369, 373, 441, 443, 445, 445a, 446a, 464, 466, 466a, 470, 483, 544, 544a, 576, 595, 596, 676, 682, 688, 689, 689a, 690, 690a, 691, 692, 692a, 693, 694, 695a, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708 and 709.

Provided, further, that the duties of Customs collected and paid under the provisions of this Section shall not be subject to drawback under Schedule B.

3. Resolved that any enactment founded on the foregoing resolutions shall be deemed to have come into force on the twelfth day of February, 1915, and to have applied to all goods mentioned in the foregoing resolutions, imported or taken out of warehouse for consumption on and after that day, and to have also applied to goods previously imported for which no entry for consumption was made before that day.

Mr. GERMAN: Are the materials for the manufacture of binder twine subject to an increased duty, or are they left as now?

Mr. WHITE: Binder twine is free and the material of which it is made is free.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Will the minister please state the effect of these changes upon sugar?

Mr. MACDONALD: And upon tea.

Mr. WHITE: Tea, sugar and tobacco are left precisely as they are to-day.

Mr. MACDONALD: What is the article 682 of schedule A, referred to in section (e) of resolution 2?

Mr. WHITE: Fish-hooks for deep-sea or lake fishing and a line of articles of cognate character.

Mr. MACDONALD: As to section (f), anthracite coal, that is free now, is it not?

Mr. WHITE: It is free now and remains free; the additional duty is imposed upon bituminous.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it may be fitting that I should say something as to

general economic conditions, actual and prospective. On the whole, having regard to the vast dislocation of finance and commerce occasioned by the war, the Dominion has withstood the shock exceedingly well. When we consider the immense distance we have traversed since August last in improved tone, confidence and commercial and financial outlook there is abundant cause for gratification and thankfulness. Readjustment has necessarily been a painful process for many of our industries, but it must be considered as having proceeded and as proceeding satisfactorily. The consequences of the interruption of our borrowings abroad for purposes to which I have alluded in the course of my remarks have been shown in a slackening of activity in many trades. On the other hand production in various lines has been greatly quickened and stimulated by orders on a very large scale for clothing, munitions and other equipment and material placed in Canada not only by the Canadian Government but by Britain and her Allies as well. Expenditure for supplies of this character must appreciably assist in counteracting the adverse factors of which I have spoken. It will also exert a most favourable influence upon the important problem of international exchange, with which is involved the question of gold export. It is apparent that throughout the Dominion strong efforts have been and will continue to be made to increase production. The enhanced prices of grains and other products will be a great inducement to exceptional exertion along this line. The returns as to fall ploughing and general condition of land are most favourable for a record crop production next year. The intervening period we shall bridge successfully in proportion to the courage and energy displayed by our citizens in their several callings. During war-time it is the duty as well as the interest of all to multiply effort, to increase to the utmost their production, in order that wastage may be repaired and the nation kept strong for the struggle. Our farmers, tradesmen and manufacturers will no doubt more keenly study their problems and expand wherever possible the scope of their enterprise.

While one hesitates to attempt a forecast in conditions so variable and subject to sudden and violent change, it would appear that accumulations of funds with accompanying easier interest rates and increasing confidence on the part of investors will result in a gradual resumption of the sale abroad and at home of securities for needed expenditures on the part of our Provinces, municipalities, railways and industries. Such expenditures, even on a greatly reduced scale, together with war outlays in Canada should go a long way towards the restoration of such of our trade and industry as have suffered from the effects of the war. Above all will our commercial improvement and, for that matter, commercial improvement throughout the world, follow upon the continuing success of the Allies. With such continuance legitimate business throughout the world must improve during the remaining period of the war. Should the progress of that success be interrupted, international trade and commerce must receive a further setback. To put it another way: If the exchanges of the world were in operation as before the war any notable success on the part of the Allies would cause securities everywhere to rise; with any notable success on the part of the enemy they would fall. Happily we have no cause to be apprehensive as to the continued favourable progress and the certain ultimate triumph of the arms of the Empire and her Allies. So far as any war can be said to go well, we have every reason to make the statement as to this the most terrible of all wars. As to its duration, it would be idle to hazard even a guess. But one thing is certain that be it long or be it short, the Empire and every part of it is determined that its conclusion must be upon such terms that the ensuing peace will be not a transient truce, not an armed and arming armistice, but a real and lasting settlement with securities amply guaranteeing the world against a recrudescence of the militarist ambition, the aggrandizing spirit, the greed of possession, the lust of conquest, which have brought about almost a subversion of our civilization.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In accordance with the arrangement made a few days ago, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate. I did propose suggesting the resumption of the debate on Tuesday next, but it has been suggested to me by some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House that Thursday would be preferable, owing to the fact that the previous day, Wednesday next, is a holiday. However, I suppose it would be satisfactory for the moment simply to move the adjournment of the debate, and the exact date of its resumption can be arranged later.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What my hon. friend suggests is quite satisfactory. I shall be glad to confer with him with regard to the date.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

EUROPEAN WAR CREDIT, $100,000,000.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved that the House go into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

1. That it is expedient to provide that a sum not exceeding one hundred million dollars ($100,000,000) be granted to His Majesty towards defraying any expenses that may be incurred by or under the authority of the Governor in Council during the year ending 31st day of March, 1916, for:

(a) The defence and security of Canada;

(b) The conduct of naval or military operations in or beyond Canada;

(c) Promoting the continuance of trade, industry and business communications, whether by means of insurance or indemnity against war risk or otherwise; and

(d) The carrying out of any measures deemed necessary or advisable by the Governor in Council in consequence of the existence of a state of war.

2. That the Governor in Council be empowered to raise by way of loan, temporary or otherwise, such sums of money as are required for the purpose of making any payment authorized by any Act founded on these resolutions.

3. That the principal raised by way of loan under this Act and under the War Appropriation Act, 1914, and the interest thereon shall be chargeable on the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister to the fact that some days ago I asked him if he would, without a motion, lay upon the table of the House the names of the gentlemen who have been acting, or who to the knowledge of the Government or any minister thereof have been professing to act, either for the Canadian Government or for the Government of Great Britain in the purchase of supplies and munitions of war.

My right hon. friend has not yet done that, and I would like to see that done before I for one would be in a position to discuss this vote and consider, as it is the duty of the members to consider, the expenditures which have been made of the $50,000,000 voted by Parliament in the war session in August. This information ought to be furnished. There appeared in the press supporting the Government, at the end of January last, this despatch from Ottawa:

Ottawa, Jan. 15, 1915.—As a consequence of the misrepresentations that have been made to business firms in the United States and Canada by persons who have fraudulently styled themselves agents of the British and French governments, it has been considered advisable by the Government to publish the following list of purchasing agents for military purposes of the allied governments.

British—Col. A. G. Barton and F. W. Stobart, Ritz Carlton Hotel, Montreal.

French—Hudson Bay Co., Montreal; Capt. Lafoulloux, Hotel Brévort, New York; Direction de l'Intendence, Bordeaux, France; M. de La Chaune, 28 Broadway, London.

Russian—Messrs. S. Ruperti and Alexsieff, care of the Russian Embassy, Washington, D.C.

When I inform you that I have information, which I think is of a most reliable character, that gentlemen went to New York not many months ago, took apartments at one of the leading hotels in that city, sent letters or circulars to leading manufacturers of ammunition informing them that they were appointed to represent the Canadian and British Governments and gave orders for vast quantities of ammunition on behalf ostensibly of the Canadian and the British Governments, you will see how important it is that those members of the House who wish to examine into and ascertain the facts with regard to purchases which have been made on behalf of the Canadian and the British Governments should be informed as to those gentlemen whom the Government had in mind when they issued this notice, if it was issued, as I presume it was. There is no immediate hurry, it seems to me, for entering upon the consideration of this motion. Parliament has already voted $50,000,000 which it has been stated by the Prime Minister will last to the close of the present fiscal year. This vote of $100,000,000 is not to take effect till after the 31st of March. It, therefore, does seem to me that we ought not to be rushed along unduly with the consideration of a vote of this magnitude until we have been furnished with information to which Parliament has a right about the expenditures which have been made for war purposes. I do not at present desire to charge, it is far from my wish to charge the Government or any member of the Government with any wrong-doing in connection with the letting of various contracts; but my information is that, whereas the price of a certain kind of ammunition (the fair price even one month after the breaking out of the war) was only some $25 per thousand rounds, these gentlemen representing or professing to represent the Government gave the order and made contracts under which this Government and the British Government paid the large sum of $33 per thousand rounds; that

these orders were not confined to millions of rounds but ran into hundreds of millions of rounds. That is the information I have. I may say that in the city of New York this is current talk among members of that splendid Canadian colony who, by their enterprise and interest in Canadian affairs, are a credit to the land of their birth. Many of them hang their heads in shame at the revelations which have been given to them. They say that the Canadian Government and the British Government have been called upon to pay vastly larger sums for ammunition and other war supplies than ought to have been paid. My object and my sole object in bringing the matter to the attention of the House to-day is that the Prime Minister may have this information before him and look into this matter. All that he has to do is to send proper representatives to the city of New York and he will have no difficulty whatever in ascertaining what has taken place there, if the information I have is correct. It may not be correct, it may be that these rumours are unfounded; but they have wide circulation amongst the members of the Canadian colony in New York; they are generally talked about, gentlemen there claim to have absolute knowledge of the truth of what I am stating. I wish to give one illustration which is to be found at pages 38 and 41 of the paper laid on the table of the House by the Minister of Militia. We find that whereas ammunition was supplied by the Dominion Cartridge Company, a Canadian concern, for the price of $31 a thousand rounds, which was a high price, for identically the same ammunition, to be delivered at the same place in the city of Quebec, there was paid in the United States $33 per thousand rounds. This may or may not be confirmatory of the truth of the statements which are made in New York. At all events it is a singular fact, and one worthy of the attention of the Government, that a larger price was paid for ammunition in New York, namely, $33 per thousand rounds, than was paid to a Canadian company, which furnished identically the same ammunition delivered to the same place at $31 per thousand. But my information is that a fair market price for this kind of ammunition in the United States, when these gentlemen, representing or pretending to represent the Governments of Canada and Great Britain, appeared upon the scene and succeeded in bringing about, as I am informed, a combination among the manufacturers, was $25 per thousand rounds; yet the Government of Canada has been charged, as appears here in the report submitted, $33 per thousand, and the British Government has been charged the same price, or $8 per thousand more than was a fair market price at the time when these gentlemen appeared upon the scene and brought about a combination.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What was the time to which the hon. gentleman alludes?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Some time in the fall of 1914. I do not wish to suggest for a single moment that there has been any wrongdoing on the part of the Government; but in view of what is professed to be almost common knowledge among Canadians in New York, I am sure that if, through these gentlemen who have been given credit by the Minister of Militia or some other member of the Government, the British Government or this Government, have paid much higher prices for war supplies than they ought to have paid, it is a subject which demands the immediate and most serious consideration of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister and his Government. It would be bad enough, it would be condemned by the Canadian people, it would be reprehensible, if gentlemen representing Canada had gone to the United States and succeeded in making only the Canadian Government and people pay more for ammunition in these times of stress than they ought to have paid; but it is worse when these gentlemen, by reason of having credit from the Canadian Government, have succeeded in making the British Government also pay a very much larger sum than ought to have been paid. The contracts of the British Government which have been secured in this way are not confined to one, two, five, or ten million rounds of amunition. One contract alone called for the enormous amount of 200,000,000 rounds, so I am informed; and if you take the extra charge of $8 per one thousand rounds, on that contract alone the British Government paid $1,600,000 beyond the fair market price for ammunition at the time these gentlemen acted as go-betweens between the manufacturers and the Government. My information is not at all of a confidential nature. The facts are professed to be generally known in the city of New York by those who keep in touch with Canadian affairs. I recognize that it would be impossible for the Opposition in this House to get the

necessary information without the co-operation of the Government. It would be impossible for even a committee of this House to get that information without the Government's co-operation, for the subpœnas of the committees of this House do not extend beyond the limits of Canada. The facts can only be got through the co-operation of the Government, and I have no doubt that if the Prime Minister institutes the proper inquiries he will be able to ascertain the truth of these allegations, which I make by reason of information given to me from a source which I am obliged to accept as reliable. If, as my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition suggested in his remarks upon the Address, a committee of this House were appointed consisting of members of both sides and of some member or members of the Government who could speak with the authority of the Canadian Government, and to a very considerable extent with the implied authority of the British Government, I am sure there would be no difficulty in ascertaining the facts in regard to the purchase of this ammunition and other war supplies.

I rise for the purpose of urging that before this resolution is considered in committee the Government should lay on the table of the House the names of those gentlemen who it has ascertained were improperly claiming to represent this Government and the British Government, as well as the names of the gentlemen who had authority from either this Government as a whole or from any member of this Government, whether the Minister of Militia or any other minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understood the hon. gentleman rose to ask a question. As I have not had an opportunity of presenting the resolution to the House, I may state that the question before us is the motion of Sir Robert Borden that I do now leave the Chair for the House to go into committee to consider the resolution.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I suggested to my right hon. friend that we might pass this resolution pro forma without any discussion, and I understood him to assent. I understand my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) objects to that, and I shall therefore withdraw the motion.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not object. My point was that the names of these gentlemen should be laid on the table of the House before the resolution is considered in committee.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Oh, I did not understand. As far as my hon. friend's observations are concerned, I am not prepared to speak to-day on the number of rumours concerning war supplies which he thinks ought to be brought to the attention of the Government, for I did not know that a discussion was coming up on this subject. But I venture to say this: that if the British Government bought with the assistance of this Government any ammunition in New York City or anywhere else, the price was first submitted to them and they were asked whether it was a fair price which they would be prepared to pay. As to what is a fair price for ammunition, I have no such personal knowledge as my hon. friend professes to have. I venture to say that he will find that a price higher than that which he has named has been paid by the British and Allied Governments since the outbreak of war. That is my recollection, and I know that a very considerable effort has been made by some of the Allied Governments to get ammunition. I told my hon. friend the other day that we would give any information in the possession of the Government with regard to persons authorized to purchase war supplies. I intended to give that and would have given it before the matter came up in committee, without the long discourse which my hon. friend has made upon the subject, and I repeat to him now that all available information will be given in due course before the matter comes up in Committee.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into committee on the proposed resolution. Mr. Sevigny in the Chair.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Has my right hon. friend (Sir Robert Borden) any information to give now?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No, I have no information. I did not purpose giving the information at this stage, in view of the arrangement which had been made.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I think the discussion might take place upon the second reading. Perhaps it would be well for the committee to rise and report progress. I would ask my right hon. friend to see that at the next sitting of the House, when we take this up again, we have all the information we asked for the other day.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY.

On the motion of hon. W. T. White for Committee of Supply:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We cannot discuss Supply to-day.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We cannot take it up except by consent. I thought we might take Civil Government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We are not prepared to discuss Supply to-day.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Do you wish to go through the motion paper?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have no objection.

WAR CONTRACTS—TENDERS FOR ARMY STORES.

On the motion of Mr. Sinclair for a copy of all tenders for army stores that have been received and dealt with by the Department of Militia and Defence since August 1, 1914:

Mr. SINCLAIR: I would ask this to stand. I explained to you yesterday, or the day before, Mr. Speaker, that I had been informed that it would be difficult for the Department of Militia and Defence under the pressure at present to furnish me with all the information I have asked for in this motion. I was also informed that information was to be brought down by the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Major General Hughes) within a day or two which would probably furnish me with a great deal of the information asked for and I asked to have this motion stand until the Minister of Militia brought down the information.

Motion allowed to stand.

FISHING BOUNTIES.

Mr. KYTE moved:

For a copy of all correspondence with, and instructions issued, to fishery officers in Nova Scotia during the year 1914, relative to fishing bounties payable to fishermen in respect of fish caught during the year 1914.

Mr. HAZEN: No instructions were issued to fishing bounty officers in Nova Scotia during 1914, with the exception of the standard instructions which are embodied in circular letters and sent out every year. The other correspondence is very little indeed, but what I rose to say to my hon. friend was that, if he desires me to bring down the letters from the fishing bounty officers enclosing the terms of the bounty claims, there are some 27,000 of these, and I do not suppose that is what my hon. friend wants. I would like my hon. friend to let us know just what he wants and if he does so I will be glad to bring down all the correspondence there is.

5 p.m.

Mr. KYTE: I had not that in mind. My object was to get any instructions which had been given to the inspectors previous to the taking up of the bounty claims.

M. HAZEN: There have been practically no instructions, but such papers as there are will be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

PURCHASE OF SUBMARINES.

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (St. John City) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence relating to the purchase of, and payment by the Government for two Submarines authorized by Order in Council dated the 7th August, 1914, and of any other Order or Orders in Council relating thereto; and also of all reports received by the Government or any Department thereof referring to said Submarines.

He said: I find that these two submarines were purchased pursuant to an Order in Council dated the 7th of August, 1914, which appears upon page 20 of the blue book entitled Documents relative to the European War. The Order in Council is as follows:

The Committee of the Privy Council have had before them a report, dated 6th August, 1914, from the Minister of the Naval Service, submitting that, in view of the existing emergency, it is necessary to provide some additional means of naval defence on the Pacific coast of Canada. The minister states that two submarine boats have been offered to the Dominion Government; that these boats were originally built for the Chilian Government which was unable to receive them, and that their dimensions are as follows—

Giving the displacement, length, beam and speed. The order proceeds:

The technical officers of the Department of the Naval Service report that these boats are very suitable and recommend their purchase. The minister concurs and recommends, therefore, that these boats be purchased for the sum of $1,050,000, and that, as the necessity is urgent, a Governor General's warrant be issued covering this expenditure, the Minister of Finance having reported that there is no parliamentary appropriation from which this expenditure can be defrayed. The Committee advise that a Governor General's warrant do issue as recommended accordingly.

(Signed) Rodolphe Boudreau,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

There are two singular facts connected with this Order in Council which I think my hon. friend the minister will feel desirous of explaining to the House. The first is that the price fixed by the Order in Council is $1,050,000.

Mr. HAZEN: The price was $1,150,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister will agree that the amount was actually $1,150,000. Therefore it would seem that when that Order was passed, the minister thought that $1,050,000 was the amount paid for the submarines. I do not find any other Order in Council correcting this, although this report was brought down, I think at the session which opened on the 18th of August; but my hon. friend will no doubt, if there is another Order in Council, call our attention to it. Another important statement which I think requires explanation is as follows:

> The minister states that two submarine boats have been offered to the Dominion Government and that these boats were originally built for the Chilian Government which was unable to receive them.

From that statement one would assume that for some reason or other—financial, I would suppose—the Chilian Government was not able to take delivery of these submarines.

That is a fair inference from the statement of the minister contained in that recommendation to Council. My opinion is, that so far from that being the case, the Chilian government had rejected these submarines, that they had a naval expert present at Seattle where the submarines were completed, and that expert, after the tests were made on the 26th of July, declined to accept the submarines, claiming that they were not in accordance with the specifications and were not properly built. I cannot think that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, had he knowledge of that fact, would have made such a statement to Council. My hon. friend and I do not always agree, and when we are in our own home town we differ markedly on some questions. Perhaps one of the most important questions on which we differ has reference to the building of ships. I did all that I could, when I was in the ministry, to secure the building of war vessels in Canada. The fact that they were going to be constructed in St. John did not prevent me from being enthusiastic over the project; I have not been afraid to do anything I could for my own constituency. My hon. friend, for reasons that seemed good to him, has taken the opposite view, and has done all he could to prevent the building of war vessels in Canada. I do not now criticise his course, nor do I argue which of us was right. I have no doubt he thought he was right, and I am sure I was right. But, as I have said, I do not think he knew, when he made that recommendation to Council that these submarines had been rejected by the expert of the Chilian government. It shows that somebody must have been pulling the leg of the minister and that gentleman lived in the province of British Columbia. I think that when I give all the evidence which I have bearing on the subject, evidence which comes from British Columbia, and which I think is to be relied upon, it will be seen that that gentleman—who may properly be called the sixteenth member of this Government, though he is not yet sworn in; I refer to Sir Richard McBride—I say I think the House will agree that he was not exactly fair or frank with my hon. friend the minister when he induced the Government to make the purchase of the submarines. Not but that it may have been advisable—as to that I do not know—to purchase these submarines at a fair price. But I think my hon. friend would not have asked Council to purchase submarines of a somewhat obsolete character, the construction of which had been entered upon some three years before, and which had taken an unconscionably long time to build—for they could ordinarily be constructed by a good shipbuilding plant in from eight to ten months. But, as I have said, when my hon. friend was induced to purchase these submarines at a price of $1,050,000, or $1,150,000 which is the sum to be paid though it is not what is stated in the Order in Council, he was induced to do something which, I think, he would hardly have done had he had full knowledge of all the facts.

There appeared in one of the leading Seattle newspapers, the Sunday Times, of 26th July last, an article with reference to these submarines, which I think will be of interest to the House. This newspaper, I am informed, has a wide circulation both in Victoria and in Vancouver, and we may well presume that statements published in it would be pretty well known to the people of these cities. The article is as follows:

> Chile rejects fighting craft launched here—Two submarines made in New Jersey and put together in local yard reported as unsuitable.
>
> Iquique and Antafogasta, submarine war

craft built in Seattle by the Electric Boat Company of New Jersey for the Government of Chile, at a cost of more than $1,000,000 will never be known in future history as great sea fighters defending the honour and welfare of the people of the South American republic. They have been officially pronounced undesirable by the Chilean naval commission, of which Captain Charles Plaza, of the Chilean navy, is chairman. They will not be accepted by the Government of Chile, says Captain Plaza.

The two underwater destroyers, built at the shipyards of the Seattle Construction and Drydock Company assembled, rather than built, to be speaking with technical accuracy were launched with great eclat and with impressive ceremonies. They have been about three years in building. All the material was made in the east by the Electric Boat Company of New Jersey and shipped to Seattle, and the two war crafts made fit for service in the local shipyards, under the personal and official direction of the representatives of the Electric Boat Company of New Jersey.

Captain Plaza determined, in the recent trials at Bellingham, that the trouble with the Iquique and the Antafogasta is that they are overweight and not of sufficient and quick acting buoyancy as to justify their acceptance and this makes it practically certain that his government will sustain his adverse recommendation.

In a carefully guarded statement, Captain Plaza completely absolves the Seattle Construction and Drydock Company from any responsibility whatever for the failure of the Iquique and Antafogasta to meet the requirements of the Naval Department of the Republic of Chile.

It is known that the local shipbuilding company merely assembled the two submarines. Every part of them, practically, was either made in the East and shipped out here or was fabricated in Seattle under the specifications and drawings prepared by the Electric Boat Company of New Jersey. Therefore, the responsibility of the local shipyards was not more than that of a man instructed to put a hat in a bandbox.

Captain Plaza, who, as chairman of the Chilean Naval Commission has been in Seattle for months past in connection with the building of the submarines and whose written report advising his government against the acceptance of the Iquique and the Antafogasta has been mailed, said last night:

'I can only confirm the report you have, that the two submarines built here for my government have not been accepted and that at this time they do not meet the full requirements of the contract between the government of Chile and the Electric Boat Company of New Jersey.

Inasmuch as my report has not yet reached my government, I cannot disclose its contents, nor can I give you the facts upon which the commission acted in advising against the acceptance of the submarines.

You are authorized to state, however, that the disagreement is a matter entirely between the commission of which I am the chairman and the Electric Boat Company of New Jersey and does not in any way involve the Seattle Construction and Drydock Company, which built the destroyers for the Electric Boat Company of New Jersey and according to the directions of the representatives of that company on duty here.'

Considering all the angles in the case it is evident that the incident of the rejection of the Iquique and Antafogasta will cause a mild sensation in Coast shipbuilding as well as in naval circles. It is apparent, however, that aside from the discovery that the two submarines lack the proper buoyancy to make certain their safety and efficiency, they are considerably out of date as to style and pattern. They were designed several years ago, and it is known they do not compare with the type of submarines now building here and elsewhere for the United States Government. In fact, it is understood, were the two submarines satisfactory in point of safety and efficiency, they would scarcely measure up in standards of destructive power, speed and other requirements to the submarines recently built or on the ways in various ship yards of the country.

Because of the absence from the city of President R. J. Patterson, of the Seattle Construction and Drydock Company, and of T. S. Bailey, local representative of the Electric Boat Company of New Jersey, no official statement could be obtained yesterday from the builders' and designers' point of view.

What recourse, if any, the Electric Boat Company of New Jersey has against the Chilean Government is not known, but it is shrewdly guessed that the company, which owns the so-called Holland patents, will charge the experience up to profit and loss.

In Bellingham Bay, several months ago, as The Times then exclusively told, the Iquique, during her preliminary trials, while partly submerged, ran afoul of a boom of logs towing in the harbour. Her plight was a serious matter for a period of two hours or more, because of the fact that the master of the tug was unaware of the fact that his tow had hooked the upper works of the diving destroyer, thereby imprisoning the craft, so to speak, and likewise confining the officers and crew within her steel body in such a manner as to menace their lives.

Before any real harm had been done the master of the tug ascertained that he was mixed up in a peculiar and embarrassing situation with the submarine, and measures were promptly taken to release her and to permit her crew to handle her in their own way.

This is the report of Captain Plaza, chairman of the commission appointed by the Chilean Government to make an examination of these submarines, to witness the test to which they were subjected and to determine whether or not they were acceptable. As this newspaper states, Captain Plaza in reporting to his Government refused to recommend the acceptance of the submarines. That was on July 26. I am informed from British Columbian sources that Mr. Patterson was the chairman or president of the company in Seattle which was putting together the parts of the submarines. I am informed that upon the rejection of the submarines by the naval expert of the Chilean Government this gentleman imme-

diately went to Victoria and interviewed Sir Richard McBride. Presumably Sir Richard McBride communicated with this Government on the subject—of course we shall have the correspondence if this motion is carried—and it appears that in the course of a few days Sir Richard McBride purchased the submarines on behalf of the British Columbia Government, the cheque of the British Columbia Government being given in payment of the purchase price. That is a matter which I think my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries ought at some time to explain to the House. If this Government found it desirable to purchase these submarines, I think it will be a matter of interest to know why the Government did not purchase them direct from the builders, and why it was left to Sir Richard McBride to take the extraordinary step of making a purchase in the name and on behalf of the Government of British Columbia. As one who has had some correspondence on the subject, it looks to me as if this Government was hesitating about purchasing the submarines and Sir Richard McBride took it upon himself to force the hand of the Government by purchasing them himself on behalf of the British Columbian Government, knowing right well that when he had gone that far his influence with this Government would prevent the ignoring of his recommendation and would obviate the danger of the Government of British Columbia being placed in the very awkward position in which they would have been placed if they had become the owners of these submarines.

It appears that a few days afterwards these submarines were brought over to Victoria, and subsequently, on August 7, an order in council was passed for their purchase. As I have said, in its terms the sum of $1,050,000 was mentioned as the purchase price. It was not stated that the submarines had been rejected by the naval expert of the Chilian government; my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries merely reported to His Royal Highness that the Chilian government had been unable to receive them. That order in council says that technical officers of the Department of Naval Service reported that these boats were very suitable and recommended their purchase. So far as is known in Victoria, no naval experts from the department at Ottawa had any opportunity of examining these boats before they were purchased, and my information is that no such examination was made. However, I have no doubt that the correspondence will show what these reports were. I take it that my hon. friend cannot treat that correspondence and those reports as private, and that he will bring them down as part of the return which will be submitted.

It is important that the Government should examine into all the facts in connection with this purchase. It is stated by many people and believed by many people on the Pacific coast that this company was not paid either $1,050,000 or $1,150,000 for these submarines. My information is that two cheques were passed, one of which, for the sum of $900,000, was issued to the company which built the boats. The other cheque may have been issued bona fide to a proper party, but the feeling in the public mind—among many people in British Columbia, at all events—is that somebody got a commission on the purchase of these submarines. I do not know whether or not that is so, and I make no charge in that respect, but I do say that having regard to the fact that these submarines were rejected by the naval expert of the Government for which they were built; that the builders had no market for them, except Sir Richard McBride on behalf of the British Columbia Government; that the boats were reported to be obsolete and not according to the specifications and that the naval expert of the Chilian government reported adversely upon them, it is an extraordinary thing that the price paid for them was equal to the price at which two of the most modern and up-to-date submarines could be purchased. I say that is an extraordinary fact, and it does seem to me that if those who were acting in the purchase of those two submarines had been anxious to do so, they could have purchased them at a very much lower price than that which was paid for them. My assumptions are based upon what is recognized out on the coast as public knowledge; based upon newspaper reports and statements of persons familiar with these submarines.

The fact that the purchase price was divided into two sums, one for $900,000 and one for $250,000, lends colour to the suspicion entertained on the coast that a considerable portion of this money did not go to the Electric Boat Company of New Jersey, which had the contract with the Chilian government for the building of these two submarines. As a further evidence that there can be no truth in the statement contained in the Order in Council—which I assume the

Minister of Marine and Fisheries placed in the recommendation to Council without full knowledge of all the facts with regard to the Chilian government being unable to receive the boats—the Chilian government, the moment this thing was closed up and they found that they were freed from any responsibility of litigation with this company, gave an order for two up-to-date submarines and those two are now, I am told, under construction, showing that their failure to take the submarines over was not due to inability on their part to receive them but to the report of their naval expert that the vessels were not up to specifications and entirely unsuitable and obsolete.

The motion also asks for any reports which have been made with reference to these vessels at the time of purchase and also since they have been in the ownership of this Government. In this connection I am told that one of these submarines has been in the drydock practically ever since they were purchased and that recently a great portion of the side of one of them has been stripped out and that new machinery was installed. I can understand that that might be done in order to put in lighter machinery to prevent the boats from being over-burdened. I am told that the difficulty is to keep them at the proper level. They are overweighted and will sink down very much below the depth at which, for ordinary purposes of navigation or service they ought to be kept. No doubt my hon. friend will bring down any reports he may have on these subjects. With regard to the general question of purchasing submarines to form part of the Canadian navy I would assume that the correspondence I am asking for will give full information. I myself am very much in favour of adding submarines to the Canadian navy. It is a matter of great rejoicing to me that we have upon the Statute book an Act known as the Naval Service Act of 1910 which would enable the Government to have submarines built and to add to the Canadian navy a class of vessels which this war has already demonstrated is of the very greatest possible value for the protection of our harbours and for attacking larger vessels which might attempt to invade our coast. My only regret is that there should be any question as to the suitability of these submarines for the purpose for which they were bought. It is a well known fact that for some fifteen months there have been in Canada shipyards well adapted for the building of submarines and larger vessels as well. Submarines could be built to-day, and for a considerable period could have been built, at the magnificent shipyards at Maisonneuve, near Montreal, where there is one of the finest ship-building plants to be found in the world. They could be built at Esquimalt where there is a dry-dock and a shipyard as well. They could be built at Levis, where Mr. Davie has a very fine ship-building plant, not suitable for the building of large vessels, but entirely suitable for the building of the submarines. They could be built at Halifax, where there is a dry-dock and a ship-repairing plant, but we know it is very easy, by a little enlargement, to convert a ship-repairing plant into a ship-building plant. I am sorry to say they could not be built at St. John, but my hon. friend knows the reason why, and we need not refer further to that. Up on the Great Lakes at Port Arthur there is a splendid dry dock and shipyard, built under a contract which the late Government made while I was minister. Submarines could be built there. It might be that under the Rush-Bagot treaty, unless by the consent of the United States, we could not turn out more than one at a time, but you know at least two vessels of a certain tonnage are allowed on the Great Lakes. Even if they could not be put together there, all the parts could be brought down to Montreal and Quebec and assembled. I think this correspondence, when we get it down, will show that a strong argument was made by Sir Richard McBride in order to induce this Government to act, and to act promptly and buy the two submarines, even although they had been rejected by the naval experts of Chili. I take it that the papers will show a very strong argument in favour of adding submarines to the Canadian navy.

I was pleased to observe the other day in Canada, a paper published in London, a despatch from Montreal, or from New York originating in Montreal. I am sorry the Minister of Militia is not in his place. The despatch is as follows:

A telegram received in New York from Montreal, according to Reuter says: To meet the exaggerated stories published in the United States, the Canadian Militia Department has authorized the statement that there is no reason why the facts concerning the construction of submarines in Canada should not be published. They are as follows: The keels of eight first-class craft have already been laid down by the Canadian

Vickers Company here and it is expected that several will be ready in August next. The plant is running at full capacity.

I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if that statement is correct?

Mr. HAZEN: As to whether the Militia Department authorized the statement I do not know.

Mr. PUGSLEY: As to the fact?

Mr. HAZEN: As a matter of fact, I think submarines are being built by the Canadian Vickers at Montreal.

Mr. PUGSLEY: For whom?

Mr. HAZEN: I presume for the British Government.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What hon. gentlemen on the other side do not know when they do not want to know is beyond comprehension. Is the censorship on my hon. friend? Has Mr. Cook or Mr. Hamilton got charge of him to see that no information can get out? The matter is very important indeed, and I would think that my hon. friend would be able to state with some definiteness whether it is correct or not, and also inform me how far he would feel I ought to go in discussing this matter. I should like my right hon. friend to intimate after recess whether the Government feel that I could, without injury to the public interest, discuss the building of these submarines at Montreal. Personally I do not think there would be any harm in it, for it is now a matter of common knowledge and has been discussed in all the newspapers of the United States and England, which profess to have published the news on the authority of the Minister of Militia.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Mr. Speaker, I will not detain the House very much longer. There is, however, one matter in connection with the purchase of submarines which I omitted to mention, and in regard to which I trust the report to be brought down will give the House the information, and that is as to the contract price of these submarines with the Electric Boat Company of New Jersey. I take it for granted, Sir that before paying this large sum of money for new submarines the Government would inform itself as to what was the contract price which the Chilian government were paying. I am informed on authority which I believe to be reliable that the original contract price was $387,000 for each submarine. That made the original contract for the two submarines $774,000. I am told that after the contract was entered into an extra torpedo tube and some other extras were provided which brought the contract price up to $900,000. My information is from the Pacific Coast. We can well understand that when the unusual circumstances occurred, of Sir Richard McBride, as Premier of British Columbia, purchasing these vessels, there would be a good deal of discussion and eventually a good deal of information would leak out to the public. The information which I have is that cheques were issued, one of which went to the Electric Boat Company of New Jersey for the sum of $900,000 which is said to have been the contract price for these vessels and the extras which was to be paid by the Chilian government, provided, of course, that they were up to the specifications. I would hope that my hon. friend would be able to give satisfactory evidence to the House as to the circumstances under which these two cheques were drawn, and also that the report will show what was the contract price with the Chilian government.

Now, I desire to repeat that I am particularly anxious to have the correspondence brought down and to see it and I am sure that my motion will commend itself to the House if for no other reason than to see what arguments are presented in favour of having a fleet of submarines for Canada. I am entirely in favour, as I have said, of increasing the Canadian navy by the addition of a number of submarines for the protection of our coasts. If my hon. friend the Minister of Finance and the members of the Government will pardon me for saying so, I would observe that I myself am unable to see any valid reason why submarines should not be built in Canada for the Canadian Government and to form a part of the Canadian navy. The Government has asked for a vote of $100,000,000 for war purposes, to be used for the defence of Canada in connection with the army or navy. Let me say to my hon. friend, who I presume will favour the House with a few remarks after I have got through with the observations which I shall make, that, speaking for myself—and, I know I can speak for my honoured leader because he has made a statement to that effect to the House, and I believe I can speak for the whole Liberal party of Canada as represented in this House—this

hundred million dollars will be cheerfully voted to the Government for the purpose of assisting in the defence of Canada and the defence of the Empire. Let me express the hope that a part of that money at all events will be used for the purpose of constructing submarines to be used by Canada and placed, of course during the war, if the war should be that long continued, at the disposal of the British Government. If it is necessary to add $10,000,000 or $20,000,000 to that amount I am sure that this House will cheerfully grant the additional sum.

There is no reason in the world, it seems to me why vessels should not be built in Canada for the Canadian navy. There is no obstacle in the way now that I can see. The late Mr. Monk was opposed, as I understood, to this policy. My hon. friends need not be afraid of their once beloved and powerfully ally, Mr. Bourassa, because he does not count for a great deal to-day with the Canadian people. My friends, Mr. Pelletier and Mr. Nantel, have been provided for and whatever obstacle their views might present as against a Canadian navy has been removed. My hon. friend the Secretary of State (Mr. Coderre) has gone into a pleasant office where he will not want to say anything contrary to the views of the Government. My hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Blondin) has also gone into a position where, I think, he will be very well satisfied to carry out the views of the majority, and the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Sevigny) has been put in leash so that he is not likely to present any serious objections to whatever course in the interests of the Empire may be decided on.

Let me say to my hon. friends: Come to us and let us join together to build up as well as we can a Canadian navy which will be able to defend our coasts in case of attack by an enemy. Although we trust that peril may not arise, still we ought to be prepared for whatever peril may come to us. Let us join together in building up a Canadian navy in defence of Canada and of the Empire. I am sure that in any course which hon. gentlemen in the Government may take, towards the better ensuring of our defences and ensuring the welfare of the empire either upon the land or upon the sea, they will be heartily supported by the members of His Majesty's loyal Opposition on the floor of this House, and I believe throughout this whole Dominion.

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): I regret very much indeed that an old and experienced parliamentarian like my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) should have thought it desirable to make a speech on a question of this importance before the papers for which he is moving, and which will give the facts of the case, have been laid before the House. Some of these papers possibly may be of a secret character and cannot be placed upon the table of the House, but I will bring down at an early date all the papers which I can, with the approval of His Royal Highness, and when they are laid on the table and carefully perused, they will show that my hon. friend is not justified in the criticisms which he has been making. I said that I regretted very much that my hon. friend should discuss a question of such a serious character at the present time, involving as it does the sufficiency of the defences of Canada upon the Pacific coast, but when I say I regret that fact, I may add that I am not at all surprised at the course which my hon. friend has taken, because had the papers been laid on the table of the House—and they would have been given to my hon. friend at any time he asked for them—my hon. friend, after perusing them, would not have been in a position to allow his imagination to run riot as he allowed it to do to-day and to give credit to idle rumours that have reached his ears from time to time, and to press clippings. My hon. friend attacks the Government and also Sir Richard McBride. His attacks may be divided into two heads. In the first place he says—and I think he will regret, as the country will deeply regret his statement, even if it were true, which it is not—that the submarines which were purchased were not suitable for the purpose for which they were acquired. Such a statement made at the present time—when there may still be some danger, if the vessels of the German fleet escape from the North sea, of an attack being made on the coast cities of British Columbia—will when reported in the American press to-morrow morning, no doubt carry delight to the hearts of all the members of the German societies in the United States, and to others who are in sympathy with Germany. Furthermore my hon. friend's criticism, although unwarranted, will have a depressing effect upon our friends in Victoria and Vancouver and throughout British Columbia who have been

relying, from the time the war broke out, on the defence and security afforded to them by the presence of these submarines in the waters of British Columbia.

My hon. friend also says that too much was paid for these submarines; and while he says he makes no charge, he insinuates that things were done of a scandalous character as regards the price paid. His remarks, if they mean anything at all, mean that Sir Richard McBride was a party to putting up a scheme on the Federal Government for the purpose of getting money through the purchase of these submarines which was not warranted, and that some of that money was diverted to other purposes. I think I am fairly stating the absolutely logical deduction from the remarks made by my hon. friend. It would have been a more manly course for my hon. friend to make the charges on his responsibility as a member of the House rather than to indulge in insinuations from which an inference of that sort can be taken. As my friend Sir Richard McBride is not here to-night to defend himself—although he is well able to do so on any and all occasions—I will take the opportunity of explaining more fully than I otherwise would Sir Richard McBride's connection with the purchase of these submarines, a connection which redounds to his credit and his patriotism and which will meet the approval, not only of his constituents in British Columbia, but of the people of Canada as a whole.

If the papers had been brought down, my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) would not have had the opportunity of making a speech which I charge was made for partisan purposes. In view of the remarks made by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in this House only last Monday, when he was speaking on the Address, my right hon. friend ought to take my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) in hand and tell him that caution must be observed, because if the hon. gentleman indulges in this sort of criticism which is of the most partisan character, there is no telling what the consequences may be.

The facts in regard to the purchase of the submarines are as follows: War broke out in this country on the 4th of August. For some days previous to that it was apparent that war was coming, and there was undoubtedly serious alarm felt on the Pacific coast. It was known that German cruisers, like the Dresden, the Leipzig, the Nürnburg and others were abroad in the waters of the Pacific or in the waters of the Atlantic, which could soon betake themselves to the waters of the Pacific. There was no panic among the people of British Columbia, but there was naturally alarm over this condition of affairs. On the 3rd of August, the day before war was declared, the Naval Department at Ottawa received this telegram from Esquimalt:

Esquimalt, B.C., Aug. 3, 1914.

Naval, Ottawa. Ont.

Two submarines actually completed for the Chilean government Seattle, estimated cost £115,000—

That is, £230,000 for the two, or a little less than $1,150,000.

—could probably purchase; ready for action, torpedoes on board. Chilian government cannot take possession. I consider it most important acquire immediately. Burrell—

Referring to the Minister of Agriculture, who was then on the Pacific coast—

—Burrell concurs. Provincial government will advance money pending remittance.

Esquimalt Yard.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Who sent that message?

Mr. HAZEN: That is from our Naval station at Esquimalt and it was sent either by Captain Hose, the captain of the Rainbow, if he at that time was senior officer there; or if he was not there, it was sent by Lieutenant Pilcher, who would have been the senior officer in command of this Naval station, unless there happened to be some ship there with an officer senior to him in command.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Who signed the message?

Mr. HAZEN: It is signed, as all these messages are signed, "Esquimalt Yard." That is the way in which such official messages are signed, just as a message coming from the Admiralty is signed "Admiralty." That message came from one of our officers, and I am sure any one will assume that a Naval officer of rank, qualification and experience, before telling us that he can purchase two submarines ready for action, with torpedoes on board; that the Chilian Government cannot take possession; that he considers it most important to acquire them immediately; will have made careful inquiries into the facts. As a matter of fact, as an officer of the Naval Department, he knew every detail in regard to these two submarines that were then at Seattle and

was able to speak with authority with respect to them.

That was on August 3. The naval department immediately took steps to gain further information. I consulted the expert advisors of the naval department of whom a number are men not only of ability but of experience in naval affairs, and their opinion was in favour of purchase. On the 4th of August, and before our decision had been reached, the Prime Minister received this telegram from Sir Richard McBride:

Sir Robert Borden,
Prime Minister, Ottawa.

Victoria, B.C., August 4, 1914.

After consultation with Burrell and naval officers, have advanced to-night $1,150,000 to Lieut. Pilcher, senior naval officer in command, for purchase of two modern submarines lying Seattle harbour built for Chile. All arrangements completed for their arrival Esquimalt to-morrow morning, unless untoward incident occurs. Congratulate Canada if this operation successful on acquisition of such usual—

I presume that this is a misprint for 'useful.'

—adjunct for defence of country.

R. McBride.

This telegram was in cipher, and I have this certificate signed by Mr. A. E. Blount, private secretary to the Prime Minister:

I hereby certify that the above is a true and accurate transcription of cipher Canadian Pacific telegraph message received by the Prime Minister from Sir Richard McBride.

We have therefore the recommendation of our own naval officers at Esquimalt, and the recommendation of the naval advisers of the Department of Naval Defence. and also the advice of Sir Richard McBride residing at Victoria, a comparatively short distance from Seattle, where the submarines were, and who might be presumed to be in possession of accurate information with regard to them. And this telegram of his is sent after consultation with the naval officials in Esquimalt. On these recommendations, I think, we should have been justified in buying the submarines, but we were not content with that. I caused a despatch to be sent to the British Admiralty. Hon. gentlemen know that the officers of the British Admiralty, are familiar, down to the smallest detail, with every ship of war that is being built in any part of the world. At least, that was true up to the time when war broke out. There may be ships building in Germany to-day, guarded from espionage, concerning which the British Admiralty have not such information, but I think I am right in saying that up to the breaking out of the war the officers of the British Admiralty would have accurate information about the details of every vessel building in any part of the world for any government. The reply I received from the Admiralty on the 5th of August was as follows:

London, August 5, 1914.

Your message Chilean submarines is recommended purchase by Canadian Government if they can be manned by Canada.

Admiralty.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Can the hon. minister give the telegram he sent to the Admiralty?

Mr. HAZEN: I cannot, I am sorry to say. I only had this file sent over this evening, and I cannot find the telegram here. However, it will be among the papers brought down.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is important.

Mr. HAZEN: Certainly. There is not the slightest desire to keep it back. It was a cable telling the Admiralty about these submarines and asking for advice. They advised the purchase, if we could man them. We found that we could man them. We were singularly fortunate in having in Esquimalt a gentleman who was in the British navy and experienced in submarines. There were also two or three retired officers of that class living in Victoria. With their assistance we manned these submarines, and had our crews practising day after day, as they are doing still, according to the information we have received.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the date of the telegram to the Admiralty?

Mr. HAZEN: It was the 4th of August.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What was the date of Sir Richard McBride's telegram stating that he had purchased the submarines?

Mr. HAZEN: The 4th of August.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the date of the telegrams sent by the Admiralty?

Mr. HAZEN: The 5th of August.

Mr. PUGSLEY: So, Sir Richard McBride purchased these submarines before their purchase was recommended by the Admiralty?

Mr. HAZEN: Not a doubt about it,—and before war was declared. And let me say to my hon. friend that it was a most fortunate thing that Sir Richard McBride did so. For, even as it was, an attempt was made to recall these submarines after they

had left Seattle. Fortunately, they had got outside the territorial waters of the United States and were able to get to Esquimalt. A delay of even a few hours in purchasing these submarines would have meant that we should not have had these vessels for the defence of our cities and coasts on the Pacific; and without that defence, there is no telling what might have occurred.

Now, let me say to my hon. friend that we have no information that the Chilian government had refused to take these submarines. Our information, as contained in the telegrams, is that they could not be delivered to the Chilian government. Our information was that there were financial difficulties which made it impossible for the Chilian government to take possession of these ships and so the builders were seeking for purchasers. But I desire to say to the House, that even if I had had that information, in view of the information I received from the British Admiralty, I would have gone on and purchased these ships; that is, I would have accepted the recommendation given by the British Admiralty in preference to any other recommendation, or statement or information, that might have been given in regard to them. It has been a most fortunate thing that we acquired these submarines. Ask any man on the Pacific Coast what he thinks has been the result of these submarines being there. Ask the naval officers of the department in Ottawa what the moral effect of the presence of these submarines has been. These officers tell me that the fact that there were submarines on our Pacific Coast ready to go out and do battle in front of Victoria, Vancouver or Esquimalt would be known to German cruisers on the Pacific Coast, like the Dresden, the Lipzic and others, and they would not venture in to make an attack, knowing that they might be met by a torpedo from a submarine. These German vessels on the Pacific Coast were of 3,400 tons, about the same size as the Rainbow. The Rainbow single-handed might have been able to engage any of them, except for the fact that she is slower that these German vessels, and if she had been the sole defence of the coast cities and left without the very valuable aid of these submarines, there would have been far greater danger of an attack. We have known that these cruisers were not very far from the coast of British Columbia. We have information, accurate information I believe, that one of them went as far north as Prince Rupert, no doubt watching the trade route to Canada across the sea. In the opinion of every naval man, the presence of these submarines in British Columbian waters not only had a splendid moral effect, but they would have rendered splendid defensive service had the occasion arisen. The information we have from day to day is that the men on these vessels are doing and can do good work. Our reports are to the effect that these submarines, while perhaps not the most modern or of the highest class, yet are able to give defensive service as efficient as submarines owned by any nation and were the best that could possibly be obtained.

My hon. friend has been listening to a lot of idle talk. Some one told him that one of these submarines had been kept in the drydock ever since it was purchased and that the other is so badly damaged that it is now laid up for repairs with its side torn out. That cannot be the case. I will simply read to the House the report which on the 9th of February, two days ago, was received from the Esquimalt dockyard with regard to these submarines, concerning which we have been receiving daily reports. It is as follows:

Naval, Ottawa, Ontario.

Night report. Both submarines of our own exercised and returned to harbour.

The circumstance that they had exercised and returned to harbour that night is hardly compatible with the fancy tale which my hon. friend has had poured into his ears and which he has narrated to this House to-day, to the effect that one of the submarines was so badly injured that its side had to be taken out and that one of them has been in drydock almost ever since it was purchased.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend has misquoted me. I did not say that the submarine had been so badly injured that it had to be put into drydock; I said my information was that she had been put into drydock ostensibly for the purpose of making changes in her machinery.

Mr. HAZEN: I do not wish to misquote my hon. friend or do him any injustice, but he certainly conveyed to my mind the meaning that one of these boats had been practically useless from the time of purchase and that one of them was very badly injured and is now laid up in drydock with its side torn out. But here we have the statement made on the 9th day of this month in the form of the ordinary report

sent to us from day to day, that these two submarines had been out exercising and had returned to harbour. A boat in the condition described by my hon. friend this afternoon would not be a very safe boat to exercise in the open sea. We have received similar requests from Esquimalt almost every day since the boats were acquired.

The hon. gentleman says that these vessels were in drydock; I may say that one of them was in drydock. In coming over from Seattle to Esquimalt it touched ground at a certain point and sustained slight damage—damage that was repaired in a very short time. But, my hon. friend may say: "the boats were in dry-dock on a number of occasions." So they were. The secret service people brought in information that an attempt would be made by night in the harbour of Esquimalt to destroy those vessels by bombs while they were at anchor. For greater safety, the vessels upon returning to Esquimalt harbour after exercising or after having been up north or down south, sailed into dry-dock. A guard was put about them; ample lights were set about the dry-dock so as to provide every safeguard and make it impossible for any marauder or any evil disposed person to destroy them. That is the truth about their being in dry-dock; so far as I know these are the facts as reported from day to day by the Esquimalt dock-yard.

My hon. friend says we paid too much for these boats. Let us see whether we paid too much or not. The first telegram that I received from our responsible naval officer in Esquimalt told us that the price for which these boats could be obtained was £115,000 each, or £230,000, something over $1,150,000. On August 4, the telegram Sir Richard McBride sent to the Prime Minister conveyed the information that he had paid for the vessels $1,150,000. We remitted $1,150,000 to repay Sir Richard McBride for the amount which he had paid for these submarines. The money was sent through the banks, and when the papers are laid before the House hon. gentlemen will have an opportunity of seeing in what way the amount was paid. What becomes, then, of the charge my hon. friend makes? He says that the $1,150,000 was divided into two cheques, and, although he does not definitely make the charge, he insinuates, if his speech means anything, that Sir Richard McBride was guilty of a corrupt transaction; that Sir Richard McBride did not pay $1,150,000 for these submarines. Here we have Sir Richard's own words, and the records of the banks in Victoria will show whether the charge made by my hon. friend against a reputable, public-minded man, who enjoys in a large measure the confidence of the people of his province, is correct or is not correct. This Government remitted the $1,150,000 to Sir Richard McBride, the amount which he had paid for the submarines, and from what I know of Sir Richard McBride I think he is too shrewd a man to pay an unnecessarily large price for them. It may be that the price is generous—I do not think it is too generous—but when the necessity of getting these submarines was so immediately imperative, was that a time to haggle about a matter of price? The responsible naval officials at Esquimalt thought the price was right; Sir Richard McBride, after consulting the naval officials, thought the price was right, and he paid the money. If, because he thought—and I do not think he did think so—that the price was too high, he had allowed these submarines to escape from our grasp and not to be made available to us for the defence of this country on the Pacific coast, he and everybody connected with the transaction would have been deserving of the condemnation of the people of this country.

My hon. friend has referred to the fact that the Order in Council passed in respect of the purchase of these submarines named the price as $1,050,000. He has read that Order in Council, which is dated August 7, 1914. That Order in Council does state, as my hon. friend has said, that the price was $1,050,000. Hon. gentlemen will observe that in the telegram from Sir Richard McBride to the Prime Minister, which I have read to the House, the price is stated as $1,150,000—and this was on the 4th of August. How the mistake occurred I have not been able to understand, but, so far as I can gather, the contents of that telegram sent by Sir Richard McBride to the Prime Minister were communicated to the officials of the Naval Department by telephone, and either the naval officer who drew the report to Council misunderstood the telegram as it was received from the office of the Prime Minister, or whoever transmitted it from the Prime Minister's office made an error in reading the telegram and gave the amount as $1,050,000 instead of $1,150,000.

When the Order in Council was submitted to me the mistake escaped my eye, as it did that of Deputy Minister Desbarats. The mistake was discovered very soon afterwards, and on the 29th of August this Order in Council was passed:

The Committe of the Privy Council have had before them a report, dated 27th August, 1914, from the Naval Service, stating that authority was recently given him by O. C., P. C., No. 2071, of the 7th August, 1914, to purchase two submarine boats.

The minister further states that owing to a clerical error the purchase price was shown as ten hundred and fifty thousand dollars ($1,050,000) whereas the actual price should have been one million one hundred and fifty thousand dollars ($1,150,000).

The minister therefore recommends that O. C. P. C., No. 2071, of the 7th of August, 1914, be cancelled and that he be given authority to purchase the submarines boats for the sum of one million one hundred and fifty thousand dollars ($1,150,000), to be charged to war appropriation.

The committee concur in the foregoing recommendation and submit the same for approval.

Mr. PUGSLEY: When was the $1,150,000 actually paid?

Mr. HAZEN: Before that, I think.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Before the amending order?

Mr. HAZEN: The date is not very material, but these facts will all appear from the correspondence.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It was of course paid out without authority, but that is merely technical.

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The amending order is not printed in the file brought down.

Mr. HAZEN: This perhaps was not printed. I am reading this because my hon. friend said he was not able to find any Order in Council correcting the mistake that was made, and I am showing him that the amending order was passed on the 29th of August. There is no objection, as I have said, to bringing down the papers. I am sorry my hon. friend sees fit to insinuate charges of such a serious character against Sir Richard McBride, when a perusal of the papers would have satisfied my hon. friend that such insinuations and charges were without foundation. The papers will be brought down at an early date and laid on the table of the House. I invite my hon. friend's careful scrutiny of every transaction in regard to the matter, and of everything the Naval Department has done in connection with the purchase of the submarines. I am sure he will come to the conclusion that his suspicions are ill-founded, that the transaction is beyond suspicion or reproach in every respect, and is to the very best interests of this country during the crisis in which we are engaged, and that Sir Richard McBride, instead of being the subject of criticism and condemnation, is deserving of the praise of the people of Canada for the prompt and excellent measure he took to further safeguard the interests of the people on the Pacific coast.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): I think my hon. friend the member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), upon reflection, will come to the conclusion that it would have been better for him to have obtained the papers first and made his speech afterwards. The reason for the course he has adopted perhaps may be his suspicion that if he saw the papers first he could not have made the speech and indulged in the insinuations which we heard from him this afternoon. As far as the Government are concerned, I entirely concur in what has been said by my hon. friend the Minister of Naval Defence (Mr. Hazen), that if the hon. member for St. John has any charge to make with regard to this matter, we shall welcome him to make it, and give him the investigation he desires. As far as we are concerned the facts are precisely as my hon. friend the Minister of Naval Service has said. A communication was received on the 3rd day of August when we had secret telegrams leading us to believe that war with the Empire of Germany in the immediate future was highly probable. The Minister of Naval Service came to me and spoke to me about the telegram which had been received from the Esquimalt Naval Yard. We conferred upon the matter and I said to him that as the sum of money involved was large it would be wise for us to consult the Admiralty first and see whether or not they would recommend the purchase. If Sir Richard McBride had not taken the action which he did the submarines could not have been purchased by Canada and the security they have afforded to the Pacific coast would not have been available. I would like to remind hon. gentlemen in this House, and my friends from British Columbia will remember it, that there was grave apprehension at one time on the Pacific coast as to an attack

from that very same squadron which afterwards sunk two British ships in the southern Pacific. We knew at the time, at least we had reason to believe at the time, from information gathered by the naval officers on the Pacific coast and also from information afforded to us by the Admiralty, that the German ships in the Pacific which afterwards constituted the fleet I have alluded to were endeavouring to come together. They were not together at the beginning of the war but their plans were so well laid and their means of communication so well arranged that they did succeed in coming together and defeating a British fleet much inferior in power, with a loss of two British ships. Four gallant young Canadians went down with Admiral Craddock and his crew in that disaster. There was reason to believe at the time that those German ships were intending to come north. I know it was the belief of the naval authorities on the coast, and I think also the belief of the Admiralty, that they intended to come north, and I have telegrams from personal friends of mine in Vancouver pointing out that considerable apprehension was felt as to an attack; in fact one very old personal friend of mine in British Columbia, not Sir Richard McBride, suggested to me that it would be better to not have any defences at all at Vancouver or Victoria and to rely on the observance by the German fleet of the Hague Convention which forbade an attack on an undefended place. I replied that I had not that same confidence in the observance by the Germans of the Convention and that we would, at Victoria, at Vancouver and everywhere else, perfect all the defences we could and fight it out to the end if they did attack us. I may tell the hon. member for St. John that two British ships, one of them the Rainbow, another a cruiser, I think the Newcastle, and a Japanese cruiser which happened to come to our Pacific coast at that time, together with those two submarines for which my hon. friend has such a contempt, were prepared and were ready and made their preparations to go out and fight that German fleet if they did come off the coast of British Columbia. You can imagine the unctuous air of moral indignation that would have been displayed by the hon. member for St. John if we had failed to get those submarines. No one would have been louder in his criticism upon the Government if we had neglected what I believe was our duty in that regard. I conferred with the Minister of Naval Defence. He sent a telegram to the Admiralty. The next morning we received from Sir Richard McBride this telegram:

[Sir Robert Borden.]

August 4.

After consultation with Burrell and naval officers have advanced to-night one million one hundred and fifty thousand dollars to Lieut. Pilcher, senior naval officer, in command for purchase two modern submarines lying Seattle harbour and built for Chile. All arrangements complete for their arrival Esquimalt to-morrow morning unless untoward incident occurs. Congratulate Canada if this operation successful on acquisition of such useful adjunct defence of country.

R. McBride.

We were so close to the great event of which we had notice a little before nine o'clock on the evening of August 4th that it was doubtful whether or not we could get the submarines, because, as hon. gentlemen in this House may know, there is a difference between the international law with regard to the sale of a war ship and that which prevails with regard to the supply of ammunition and munitions of war generally. So we had to get those boats out of American territorial waters before the declaration of war, and owing to the promptness, activity, and patriotism of Sir Richard McBride, we succeeded in securing them as a very great aid to the defence of the Empire. In reply to Sir Richard McBride I sent the following telegram on the 5th day of August, 1914:

Sir Richard McBride,
Victoria, B.C.

Yesterday morning we communicated with Admiralty as to advisability of securing two submarines mentioned and as to feasibility of manning them as without crew they would be useless. They advised purchase provided crews could be secured. As this has been accomplished we appreciate most warmly your action, which will greatly tend to increase security on Pacific Coast, and send hearty thanks. Please advise us of their arrival.

R. L. Borden.

As far as the Government is concerned, that is the whole story with regard to these submarines. I may, however, add that Sir Richard McBride afterwards sent me a copy of the official cheque which was issued by the Finance Minister of the province of British Columbia, as a souvenir as he expressed it, of what had been done with great promptness and great vigilance by the Government of that province.

The cheque is issued to the Premier of British Columbia, who endorsed it to the order of Henry Byng Pilcher, Lieutenant R. N., and bears the endorsement of Lieutenant Pilcher.

I regret that my hon. friend from St. John should have taken the course he has. It seems most undesirable that any hon. member of this House should seek to depreciate the value of any submarines, ships of war, or war munitions of any kind that have been acquired by the people of this country for their defence. I repeat, it is a most undesirable course for my hon. friend or any other member of this House to take. I do not know what we may expect from him next. Shall we have an attack upon the guns that have been sent forward with the Canadian contingent?

Mr. PUGSLEY: The boots.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend is quite willing to make an attack upon boots. I think he will find his efforts in that regard, as in other respects, absolutely bootless.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The boot will be on the other foot, I think.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Perhaps my hon. friend changes his policy as often as he changes his boots, for this afternoon he expressed great willingness to vote $100,000,000 when two years ago he stood up in his place and resolutely fought
9 p.m. against that aid which would have been of vital importance in the present struggle.

Mr. M. CLARK: Might I ask my right hon. friend a question? I am sorry he should have made a remark like that in the course of this debate. If he is going to make that class of remark I should like to ask him to substantiate the statement he has made, that my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) ever expressed a willingness to spend $100,000,000 now on naval aid. I should like to ask another question, whether he or we wanted the Pacific defended two years ago?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In any observations I make on these questions I shall be governed very largely by the attitude of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, and I want them to understand that if there is going to be a fight and recriminations on these questions it will not be a one-sided fight. As far as the Pacific is concerned, I suppose that if the British Navy were increased by a number of useful and serviceable ships there would be a better opportunity to have the Pacific coast or any other part of His Majesty's defences adequately defended by naval force. That is what I would say in reply to my hon. friend from Red Deer. As far as the whole matter is concerned, the debate has been brought on unnecessarily and with provocation by my hon. friend the member for St. John.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The tone which he adopted in the debate from the first was one which was intended to provoke and apparently intended to induce exactly the kind of debate that has ensued. We are perfectly prepared to conduct this session on the lines laid down by my hon. friend from Red Deer the other day, but if there is going to be attack upon us from the other side of the House, we are quite ready and prepared to carry the war into the enemy's camp.

Mr. G. H. BARNARD (Victoria, B.C.): I regret that I was not in the House before 6 o'clock when the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) opened the debate upon this question. I have, however, had an opportunity of perusing the " Hansard " notes of what he said with reference to the purchase of the submarines in question. As far as I recollect he made two objections to that purchase: the first as to quality, the second as to price. I should not have intervened in this debate had it not been for the fact that I may possibly give my hon. friend some information in regard to the purchase of these boats which will not be found in the papers—possibly information that he does not want to get. Before doing so I just wish to say to him that I do not think his friends on the Pacific coast will feel grateful to him for the motion he has made to-day and his remarks in support of it. The burden of his complaint is that the submarines are no good; that they were rejected by the Chilian Government because they were obsolete; that one of them—I am speaking from my recollection of the " Hansard " notes—has been in dry dock ever since it was purchased and has been absolutely useless.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I did not say that one had been in dry dock ever since it was purchased. I said, almost ever since.

Mr. BARNARD: I accept the correction. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that in

both particulars his information is absolutely wrong. From personal knowledge I know that those ships have, ever since the 4th of August, been constantly patrolling the straits of Juan de Fuca and protecting the entrance waters to Victoria and Vancouver—two cities which, I may say in passing, are, at least in my opinion, finer than any he has in his native province.

Now in regard to the quality of those ships. The hon. gentleman says they are obsolete. I want to tell my hon. friend the facts as they have been given to me. We were extremely fortunate on the Pacific coast in that we had residing amongst us a number of retired Royal Naval officers. One in particular who is to-day in command of the two submarines and of the parent ship, the Shearwater, is a lieutenant who happened to have had six years' experience in submarines on the North Sea. He had only retired from the Royal Navy twelve months ago; in fact so recent was his service in the Royal Navy that he was not even on the retired list. He was on what is called the active leave list. Directly war was impending and before it was declared, he was ordered to report to the nearest naval station which happened to be at Esquimalt. The senior naval officer in command there, Lieut. Pilcher, immediately told him that he wished him to stay for the present as he needed his services. That was before he had any knowledge that there was any possibility of obtaining the submarines at all. Lieut. Bertram Jones is the gentleman's name. When it was decided to purchase these ships Lieut. Jones went out and brought the ships in. Lieut. Jones overlooked these ships and he told me himself, personally, that they were better and more modern submarines that any he had ever served on, and he had left the Royal Navy only twelve months ago. The day before I left Victoria to come to Ottawa to attend the present session I had the pleasure of going on board the submarines. I may inform my hon. friend that neither of these submarines was in the dry dock. They were lying in Esquimalt harbour beside the parent ship. Lieut. Jones, the officer in command—and I want my hon. friend to realize that he is the man who goes out sailing these ships, who dives them and who risks his life in them—said to me when he took me over them: I want you, when you go to Ottawa, to tell the admiralty authorities at Ottawa in what fine condition these vessels are. He pointed to the torpedo tubes and said: These tubes are loaded with war heads ready to go to sea at any moment, we are prepared to do our best to account for anything that may come, and we can handle these vessels and handle them satisfactorily. That officer has not been allowed to leave these ships, or at least he had been allowed no shore leave for the past three or four weeks prior to when I left Victoria on account of some apprehension that occasion for the use of these vessels might arise.

In regard to the statement that these vessels have been placed in the dry-dock, I will venture to say without fear of contradiction, that with the exception of painting or cleaning, neither one of these vessels has been in the dry dock since they were purchased, and excepting also, as the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has told us, during a couple of weeks back in November or the beginning of December when information was received by the local authorities that there was the possibility of a filibustering expedition or a bomb-dropping attack of some kind. As to the efficiency, the working and quality of these ships, I say they are good and modern vessels, and vessels that will give a good account of themselves if they get the opportunity.

When these vessels came they were manned by men of the Royal Naval Volunteer Force, a force composed of citizen sailors of the town of Esquimalt and the city of Victoria, and I want to pay a well-deserved tribute to the valour and patriotism of the men who were prepared to go on board and undertake work of the most perilous kind in naval warfare—that is submarine work. They are entitled to the highest credit for the work they have done.

In regard to the facts concerning the purchase of these vessels, I know that my hon. friend from St. John is not nearly so much interested in the question of the efficiency of the ships as in the possibility of finding something wrong about the purchase. I can assure him that there was absolutely nothing that either he or anybody else could find any fault with in connection with the purchase of these vessels. On the 1st of August, which was a Saturday, the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burnell) happened to be in the city of Victoria. He was in my office about eleven o'clock in the morning when I received a telephone message from Sir Richard McBride. Sir Richard McBride told me that Captain Logan, who is the agent on the whole of the Pacific coast for Lloyds

underwriting agency, a very responsible citizen and a very upright man, was particularly anxious to see Mr. Burrell. Sir Richard McBride did not even say what he wanted to see him for, but he asked me if I would see that Captain Logan should get immediate access to Mr. Burrell if he came to my office. Of course I acceded to the request; Captain Logan came over, he saw Mr. Burrell and myself and he told us that there were these two submarines at Seattle that were available for purchase. Mr. Burrell and I, with Captain Logan, at once went to the naval yards at Esquimalt, where we found Lieutenant Pilcher in command. We told him about these submarines and asked him if they would be of advantage and if he thought it would be advisable to try and purchase them. He said that he thought it would. Thereupon the telegram which my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has read to the House was sent. Mr. Burrell happened to be staying in my house, and next morning at half past three he and I were called to the naval yards with Captain Logan for a further conference with Lieutenant Pilcher on the question of the purchase of these submarines. It was arranged that Captain Logan should go over to Seattle that day and see what could be done. At the very first interview between Captain Logan, Mr. Burrell, myself and Mr. Pilcher, Captain Logan told us verbally that he thought the price would be about $375,000. In our presence he telephoned to Seattle, got Mr. Patterson, the man who had the control of the sale of these vessels in Seattle, and at that time Mr. Patterson told him over the telephone that the price would be $575,000 apiece or $1,150,000 for the two.

The price was stated in the presence of Mr. Burrell, Lieutenant Pilcher and myself. There was never any question as to what the price was to be; it was absolutely settled at that time. A telegram was sent to Ottawa—

Mr. PUGSLEY: When he thought the price would be about $375,000 each, did he state on what he based that?

Mr. BARNARD: Not to my recollection. That was his first statement, before we went down to see Mr. Pilcher at all. What happened was this: He rang up long distance, —and got Seattle on the telephone. He said: "Your price is $575,000?" Then I heard "What? $575,000?" And the man said "Yes."

Mr. PUGSLEY: What date was that?

Mr. BARNARD: Saturday, the first of August. On Monday Mr. Burrell had to leave for the East. Monday was the third and war was declared on the night of the fourth. Ottawa was communicated with and did not reply very promptly. The naval yard had information that war would probably be declared at any moment. The consequence was that delay was dangerous. Had, of course, Sir Richard McBride or the Dominion Government followed the policy of our friends opposite, the policy which is so enthusiastically supported by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) when he delayed for eighteen months in letting his contract after he had all his tenders—

Mr. HAZEN: Six months.

Mr. BARNARD: Well, six months, it is all the same. It was just as bad, as it turned out for my hon. friends opposite. Had they followed the policy of my hon. friends opposite, the chances are that the vessels would never have been obtained No definite reply having come on August 4, in the afternoon Sir Richard McBride said: 'I am going to take these submarines and I think Ottawa will back me up.' Accordingly he authorized the purchase and issued a provincial Government cheque. Lieutenant Jones went out; looked over the submarines; passed them; handed over the cheque and brought the submarines in. On the morning of August 5, the United States cruiser Milwaukee came out from the harbour of Bemerton into the strait of Juan de Fuca looking for these submarines with the idea of taking them back, but the cruiser was about two hours too late.

My hon. friend seems to think there is something wrong in regard to the question of price. This Mr. Patterson to whom I refer is the general manager of Moran's shipyard at Seattle. I do not know that the question of responsibility particularly interests the hon. gentleman, because, of course, when he begins to cast insinuations, the responsibility of the person against whom he casts them does not seem to worry him very much. I would like, however, to state for the benefit of other hon. members that Mr. Patterson is a responsible man, a man of high honour and standing in the city of Seattle. In the corres-

pondence on the subject matter of this purchase, I find a letter from Sir Richard McBride in which he speaks as follows in regard to Captain Logan:

> His connection with the purchase of the submarines at Seattle is quite easily explained. Through his business relations with ship owners and builders on the coast he ascertained that there were two completed submarines in the shipyard of the Seattle Construction and Drydock Company, built for the Chilean Government but for which that Government could not pay. He reported to me and I took upon myself the responsibility of asking him to examine them to undertake the negotiations for their purchase. War was about to be declared and there was not a moment to lose and not another qualified man available. The moral effect of the quick action necessary was in itself sufficient to justify what I did. I turned over to the construction company a certified cheque of the Government for over a million dollars, confident that the federal authorities would recognize the wisdom of the transaction and reimburse the provincial treasury, which they very readily did.

If my hon. friend were to travel to either the city of Victoria or the city of Vancouver, where both Captain Logan and Sir Richard McBride are pretty well-known, and make the insinuations against them that has made in this House, he would find he would meet with more than a cold reception. For my own part, my connection with this transaction was very small; but small as it was, it has been and will be a matter of great gratification to me that I was able to be present when the transaction was entered into. When the hon. gentleman chooses to make such insinuations against Sir Richard McBride, I simply wish to hurl them back in his face and to tell him if he ever, during the whole course of his career, does such a patriotic action, he will stand a good deal higher in the estimation of the people of Canada than he does at the present time.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I suppose I ought to be very thankful to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister for letting us on this side of the House know that if we have the audacity to attack the Government, we must look out for ourselves. In other words, if we have reason to believe that some persons, not members of the Government, not members of this House, have made secret rake-offs in connection with the purchase of war vessels or of ammunition and we dare to breathe it in this House, our action will be resented by hon. gentlemen opposite. They will take it as showing that we are influenced by partisan spirit and they will endeavour to make the country believe that in some way or other we are obstructing them in doing their part in connection with this war. They will not terrify me and I do not think they will terrify any other hon. member on this side of the House. The Prime Minister, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barnard) have set the example of making partisan speeches. I have not done so. Has it come to this that, because Canada is engaged in war, we are not to bring to the notice of the House or of the Government any wrong-doings, as to which we have had notice, and which we believe ought to be investigated in the interest of the people of this country? If the people of Canada are prepared to spend their last dollar and to make every possible sacrifice in the interest of the Empire, we are not satisfied that there shall be any waste of public money. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries charged me with improper conduct this afternoon when I spoke of the purchase of ammunition in the United States. If the people of Canada will condemn the Government if they do not investigate any facts brought to their notice from which presumption of wrong-doing can be drawn, one hundred times stronger will be the condemnation of the people of Canada if through agents appointed by this Government—I care not whether with the knowledge of this Government or not the wrong-doing shall take place—there has been money filched from the treasury of the mother country. And Sir, would we be doing our duty, not merely as members of the Opposition but as members of this House, if we took any course but that which we are taking? I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite—I appeal to the hon. gentleman opposite who, a few days ago, at a meeting of the Horse-breeders' Association, declared that there was graft in the purchase of horses, who stated that those who purchased horses might be good at playing marbles but they were not good in the purchase of horses. The atmosphere of this country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, is reeking with stories of corruption by people who have been buying supplies for the Government. I can say that without making any charge or insinuation against a member of this Government or this House. We know very well that when these large expenditures are taking place it is difficult for the Government to watch every expenditure. They

have to appoint agents, not only for the purchase of horses, but for the purchase of ammunition, motor-trucks, blankets, shoes and all kinds of war material, both in this country and in the United States. They cannot be supposed to watch all the purchases. And when we bring to their notice the fact that we have evidence which leads us to believe that there is this wrong-doing and ask them to take action, is it to be charged against us that we thereby are guilty of partisanship? My hon. friend (Mr. Barnard), and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the Prime Minister also, have made the charge against me that I insinuated that Sir Richard McBride had been guilty of taking the difference between $900,000, paid to the Electric Boat Company, of New Jersey, for these submarines and the $1,150,000 which the Government paid. The minister has said that the Government of British Columbia actually paid out $1,150,000. Who denied it? I did not dispute that fact. With emphasis which was great even for him, my hon. friend said that the amount of $1,150,000 was actually paid to the British Columbia Government? Who denies it? But what became of the difference between $900,000 paid to the contractors for the construction of these submarines and the $1,150,000 which was paid first by the Government of British Columbia and afterwards paid to them by the Government of Canada?

Mr. BARNARD: Did the hon. gentleman hear the Prime Minister read the cheque by which Sir Richard McBride paid over $1,150,000 direct to the contractors?

Mr. PUGSLEY: No, it was paid by the British Columbia Government to Captain Pilcher. It is a matter of deep regret for me to know that Captain Pilcher is out of his mind.

Mr. BARNARD: He is not.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am told he is. What are the facts as to this gentleman's state of health?

Mr. HAZEN: Does the hon. gentleman say that $900,000 was paid to the company in New Jersey, and that that included all the costs, including the assembling of these vessels on the Pacific coast?

Mr. PUGSLEY: My information is that $900,000 was the entire contract.

Mr. HAZEN: The hon. gentleman might state the source of his information.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It comes from a very reliable gentleman in British Columbia, let me say with all due respect to my hon. friend from Victoria, not less respectable, not less truthful, not less honourable, than my hon. friend, and that is saying a great deal, for I would believe my hon. friend as to any fact of which he has knowledge. The difficulty about what my hon. friend has said is this, that he has no expert knowledge of these submarines, but nevertheless he has given us to-night very valuable information. That information is that when the expert, Lieutenant Jones, was asked to advise with regard to these submarines, he stated that in his opinion they could be bought for $375,000 each.

Mr. BARNARD: Lieutenant Jones had absolutely nothing to do with the price and knew nothing about it. He was the man who went out and examined—

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, I beg pardon; it was Captain Logan. I thank the hon. gentleman for the correction; it would have been unpardonable if I had not got the name right. It was Captain Logan, the agent for Lloyds than whom, as my hon. friend for Victoria said, there would be no better judge in these matters—

Mr. BARNARD: I did not say that. He does not know anything about submarines; he is a mercantile marine captain.

Mr. PUGSLEY: At all events he was asked what he thought the price should be, and he gave the figure I named. As hon. gentlemen know, Seattle is not far from Victoria, and there is a daily steamer running back and forth. The people of the two cities keep close in touch with one another and their business relations are very intimate. Captain Logan, who would have information on the subject, thought these submarines could be bought for $375,000 each. The correctness of that statement is confirmed by the statement which the hon. member for Victoria has kindly furnished us this evening. Remember, this was the 3rd of August. My information is that this was not the first occasion when Mr. Patterson came to Victoria to consult Sir Richard McBride with regard to the purchase of these vessels. He came over on the 27th of July, the day after the tests were made at Seattle and the inspector of the Chilian government had stated that he would not recommend their purchase by his Government. A telephone message was sent to Seattle somewhere between the 26th of July,

when the adverse report was made by the Chilian naval inspector, and the 3rd of August. Whether Mr. Patterson had it understood with anybody as to the price which he would name or not, I do not know, but certainly it is a singular fact that the price ascertained by telephone was about $400,000 greater than Captain Logan stated would be, in his judgment, a fair price for these submarines. If there was wanting any circumstance to cause the Government to investigate this matter, it is the statement of my hon. friend as to the valuation put upon the submarines by this expert, Captain Logan, who was called in for consultation with reference to the matter.

I should like to know when I made any insinuation that Sir Richard McBride had received this $250,000? I did not do so. I have great respect for the intelligence of Sir Richard McBride, and I would not for a single moment suggest that, having paid out $1,150,000 of the money of the people of British Columbia, he would be guilty of taking back this large amount of $250,000 and putting it in his own pocket or using it for an election fund. We all admit that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works knows how to run elections, but who for a single moment would suggest that the Minister of Public Works would besmirch himself with the handling of election funds? Who would imagine that Sir Richard McBride would do so? But Sir Richard McBride and this Government have their friends in British Columbia, and if any one were disposed to take advantage of it, here was a magnificent opportunity. Here were two submarines, valued by Mr. Logan at $375,000 each, the price of which according to the original contract to build was only $387,000 each. They had been rejected by the expert of the government of Chili. War was on, and public opinion in British Columbia demanded that these boats should be purchased at any price. Oh, Sir, what a temptation there was for those in the Conservative party who would like to wipe the Grits off the face of the earth, and who know so well how to use campaign funds in order to do so. What a temptation there was to take advantage of the situation. I do not, upon the information which has come to me, charge the minister with wrong-doing, nor did I do so from the beginning to the end of my address. I do not charge Sir Richard McBride with wrong-doing; I did not do so from the beginning to the end of my address.

Mr. HAZEN: Did the hon. gentleman not distinctly say that Sir Richard McBride had pulled the leg of the Minister of Naval Affairs? What other meaning can be attached to that, if the hon. gentleman is correct, than that Sir Richard McBride is party to a conspiracy to defraud the country?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am glad my hon. friend asked that question. Sir Richard was in favour of having some naval defence on the Pacific coast. He had urged that repeatedly; in that respect he has been at one with us on this side of the House. He was most anxious to secure these vessels, because of the advantage that would accrue to him in his own province if he could have two war vessels—not so good as the Rainbow, but two additional war vessels—nevertheless, upon the Pacific coast. The Government here was hesitating; apparently they had hesitated for six months. According to the statement made by the Prime Minister at the August session, he and this Government had had reason to believe that war would soon take place between Great Britain and Germany. Hon. gentlemen will remember that at the August session he said that as early as January last he began to organize the different departments so that they would be ready to take action when war broke out, yet for six whole months Sir Richard McBride was obliged to look on and see this Government apparently indifferent to naval protection upon the Pacific coast. Therefore he was most anxious that these vessels should be secured. He knew that if he wired the Prime Minister that the vessels had been rejected by the naval expert of the Chilian government, this Government would be guilty of additional delay before making the purchase. Therefore he did not convey that information and this Government was led to believe that for some reason or other the Chilian government could not pay for the vessels. I ask my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he honestly believes today that they were rejected because the Chilian government was not able to pay for them?

Mr. HAZEN: It certainly is my belief, and it is the belief of the officials of the Naval Department.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Then, my hon. friend and his department had better study the wealth and resources of Chili. It is one of the wealthiest countries upon the American continent; a country with great resources; a country with a large revenue; a country which is amply able to pay not merely for two submarines, but for twenty or for fifty if they want to do so.

I repeat that immediately after these submarines were got out of the way the Chilian government gave an order to a shipbuilding firm in the United States for the construction of two submarines of a modern, up-to-date type, which would be serviceable in case of war. Upon reflection, does my hon. friend not think that he ought to have been informed that these submarines were rejected by the Chilian government? Oh, he says, we telegraphed the British Admiralty, and, after Sir Richard McBride had committed us to this purchase by paying over the money, we got a favourable answer from the British Admiralty, who are constantly in touch with war vessels in all parts of the world, and would know about these particular vessels. Does my hon. friend think that he is acting fairly by this House when he seeks to make hon. gentlemen believe that? Would the British Government or the British Admiralty have any knowledge of the testing of these vessels at Seattle on July 26? Would they be likely to have any such knowledge? Not at all. See the position in which my hon. friend was placed by reason of the fact that the report of the expert of the Chilian government was withheld from him. He did not inform the British Government of that circumstance; he informed them—and I take it for granted that he believed it to be true—that for some reason or other the Chilian government were not able to pay for these submarines, and that here was a chance to get two splendid boats which had stood the test. Under these circumstances he asked the British Admiralty if they would recommend the purchase of the submarines.

My hon. friend says that I am very much to blame for making it known that these submarines had not stood the test required by the Chilian government. He says that my statement will give great comfort to Germans in the United States and that it will cause alarm on the Pacific coast; that cannot be so, because I merely stated what was published by a newspaper of very large circulation, printed in Seattle on July 26 last and what was telegraphed by the Associated Press all over the United States. If German-Americans are interested in the fact that these submarines failed to pass the test of the naval expert of the Chilian government, let my hon. friend not imagine for a single moment that that fact is not well known all over the United States. No words of mine in this Parliament could spread more broadly the news of that inspection which took place, as I said, at Seattle on the 26th of July. But if there were anything at all to be said about the subject of my bringing the matter before the House it would rather seem that if this statement is incorrect, if this test did not take place, if the naval representatives of the Chilian government did not reject these submarines, then let the truth be known and it will reassure the people of British Columbia, and let me say to my hon. friend that it is due to himself and due to this House that we should make inquiry of his friends in British Columbia as to whether this test did take place on the 26th of July and whether Captain Plaza, Chairman of the Naval Commission of the Chilian government, had reported recommending that they be not taken over as not being up to the specifications. Further than that it is due to my hon. friend that he should have himself put right because he assured His Royal Highness that it was for financial reasons apparently that the Chilian government did not take these submarines, and he withheld from the British Admiralty the fact that these submarines had been rejected by the naval experts of the Chilian government as early as the 26th of July. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries states that this money was paid to Captain Pilcher. True, it was, but he paid it over to Mr. Patterson, who on the 27th of July had the interview with Sir Richard McBride in Victoria and Mr. Patterson, my information is, as is well known in Victoria, divided the cheque and gave two, one for $900,000 for the amount of the contract price, and I have no knowledge of what he did with the other $250,000.

Mr. HAZEN: The contract price did not include the sending out and the assembling on the Pacific coast, did it?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, according to my information that was all to be done by the Electric Company, the Seattle

Construction and Dry Dock Company assembling for the Electric Boat Company of New Jersey. It may be that this $250,000 was properly expended. I am only stating the facts. But the remarkable thing about it, from the standpoint of my hon. friend, is that he thinks the statement of facts which I have made and which has not been controverted necessarily leads to an inference of suspicion against certain gentlemen in British Columbia. I cannot help that; I have simply stated the facts, and it is because my hon. friend and my hon. friend from Victoria feel that these facts lead any sensible and reasonable man, accustomed to weighing evidence and drawing inferences to believe that there has been something wrong, that both of these gentlemen have become so angry and have rushed to the defence of Sir Richard McBride as if I had made a violent attack on him as being a boodler and one unworthy of the confidence of his province, when I did nothing of the kind.

My hon. friend says that one of the submarines in being taken over to Victoria unfortunately struck the bottom. It is very curious that I have a statement made by a gentleman, an expert submarine operator, who states that this is not the first time she struck the bottom. You know one of the essential things for a successful submarine is that when she is scaled for sinking to a level of thirty feet she must not go down to sixty feet. They sometimes do. Possibly that is why they were rejected by the naval experts of the Chilian government. This expert submarine operator says:

> That the main trouble connected with the submarines was due to the fact that no definite plan was put through to formulate a system regulating the resistance brought about by the submergence of the vessel. At one time the Chilean crew were scared nearly to death when the mark for sinking was set at thirty feet and the boat sank sixty feet or more. On another occasion, due to lack of standard, the submarine came up under a big raft of logs, breaking the raft and causing considerable trouble, the periscope being damaged.

And the same gentleman puts the value of these submarines at $250,000 each, $100,000 less than Captain Logan's estimate.

Mr. HAZEN: Who is the gentleman?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Mr. John Martinson.

Mr. HAZEN: Where does he live?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Out on the Pacific.

Mr. HAZEN: What place?

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Mr. PUGSLEY: I presume at Victoria.

Mr. HAZEN: Is there no date on the letter?

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is in a statement which I have from him. When the papers come down, if the Government see fit to have it investigated, I have no doubt that Mr. Martinson can be brought here to give his expert knowledge before the committee.

Then there is a marine engineer who states that the engines in the two boats are all right and that the whole trouble is with the hull which being overweighted detracts from the buoyancy of the ship. He says:

> The only way we could overcome this was by having about one-half the specified amount of liquid in the tanks; then the ship behaved very well but of course was not up to the specifications.

With regard to the question of the purchase of the submarines, I am not condemning that at all, I am in favour of submarines for the Canadian Government; what I say is that we ought not to pay too high a price, we ought not to pay for a second-class submarine, one which is not of modern construction and thoroughly up to date, the same high price which first-class submarines can be obtained for; and we do know that first-class modern submarines can be obtained for about $550,000, which would be less than the amount paid for these. Neither should extravagant commissions be paid.

Now, with regard to the submarines being in the dry dock. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, with that ingenuity for which he is remarkable, states that the only time they were in the dry-dock was when the people out in Victoria became afraid of bombs being dropped on them and, instead of leaving them out in the ocean they were brought in and put in the dry-dock; and in order to thoroughly guard them against the dropping of bombs, lights were lighted all around them.

Mr. HAZEN: It is hardly worth while to correct the hon. gentleman.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I wonder very much that these gentlemen who advise the Minister of Marine do not go over to London and advise Premier Asquith with regard to proper protection of the city of London at night from bombs, that instead of keeping it in darkness he should light a circle of lamps around the city—and the better the

lights the greater the safety. That would be a sure preventive against the dropping of bombs.

Mr. HAZEN: Did the hon. gentleman suppose that the bombs would be dropped from Zeppelins?

Mr. PUGSLEY: How would they be dropped?

Mr. HAZEN: They would be dropped by persons who were there, like the German who went down to the bridge at Vanceboro the other day for the purpose of wrecking it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would think that a very imaginary fear. This is what I want my hon. friend to find out if he will, and he ought to have some report on the subject. My information is that one of these submarines was for a considerable time in dry dock. I do not say she is now. I have no doubt that my hon. friend's statement as to a telegram received yesterday is absolutely correct. But this boat was put in dry dock, not because she struck the bottom, but to make some change in the machinery; and the whole of one side of the ship was stripped for that purpose. That is the information I have, whether it be true or not.

Just a word as to my right hon. friend's regret that I should have brought this matter up. I must take the responsibility for that as a member of this House. If my hon. friend has made it clear to the people of this country that the purchase of these submarines was absolutely above suspicion, that they were first-class submarines, that only a reasonable and fair price was paid for them, that everybody concerned acted honestly, that there were no commissions,—all the better for my hon. friend, all the better for the Government, all the better for the people of this country. But I submit with every confidence, that a strong prima facie case has been made out.

Let me repeat very briefly the salient facts of the case. They are, first, that these vessels were built for the Chilian government under a contract price which I am informed, and which as a member of this House I state that I have from reliable authority, was originally $375,000 each; that Captain Plaza, the Chairman of the Naval Commission appointed by the Chilian government, was watching these vessels from day to day and from week to week; that when they were completed a test was made, as it was proper that it should be made; that he found they were not up to specifications and rejected them, and so reported to his Government; that then the Electric Boat Company of New Jersey had the boats on their hands and no customer for them; that the day after this test was made, the 27th of July, Mr. Patterson started for Victoria, thinking he would have a customer in Sir Richard McBride. He sees Sir Richard McBride, and on the 3rd day of August, the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barnard) is present with the Minister of Agriculture, and this expert, Captain Logan, is called in. He states that in his judgment the price will be about $375,000 each.

Mr. BARNARD: I have already told the hon. gentleman that he is in error when he describes Captain Logan as an expert.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Well, then, Captain Logan was called in. Why was he called in if he could not add to the knowledge—

Mr. BARNARD: He was not called in. It was his initiative, the whole thing.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Well, then, Captain Logan was there. He is one of the agents, possibly one of the middlemen who were arranging for the sale of these boats. He goes to the house of my hon. friend the member for Victoria—

Mr. BARNARD: The hon. gentleman should confine himself to the facts. Captain Logan has never been in my house.

Mr. PUGSLEY—Captain Logan goes to the office of my hon. friend.

Mr. BARNARD: I can appreciate the desire of my hon. friend to make a good case in his summing up, but he should confine himself to the facts.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I recognize that it is a matter of vital importance, whether it was at the office or the home of my hon. friend that Captain Logan appeared. Well, then, Captain Logan goes to the office of my hon. friend.

10 p.m. Mr. BARNARD: Wrong again; it was at the Department of Labour.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I cheerfully accept correction. At all events these are the facts. On the 3rd of August Patterson, after having seen Sir Richard McBride, goes back to Seattle and these gentlemen meet together. The gentlemen whom my hon. friend names are included among them. Captain Logan is asked his opinion of the price.

Mr. BARNARD: He was not asked the price. He volunteered his opinion.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Well, then, he volunteered his opinion. I cannot express sufficiently to my hon. friend the gratitude which I feel for the way in which he is assisting me. This gentleman expressed his view as to the price of these submarines; he said they should be bought for $375,000 each. Then they telephoned to Mr. Patterson who had previously seen Sir Richard McBride, and the price is fixed at $1,150,000, so my hon. friend says, and that amount is paid. And I state to this House that my information is that that amount of $1,150,000 was divided into two cheques. One cheque for $900,000 was paid to the contractors, but what became of the other $250,000 cheque I do not presume to say. These are the facts. Draw from them, if you like, the inference that there has been some wrong-doing. Get angry over it if you like. But in the interests of our country, in the interest of the people who pay this money and who cannot afford at any time, and more particularly in these times of stress, to pay out one dollar more than what a submarine or a gun or a round of ammunition is worth, I ask that this matter be looked into, and when the time comes that a proper and thorough investigation take place.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT.

Report of the Department of Customs for the year ended March 31, 1914.—Hon. J. D. Reid.

QUEBEC FISHING LICENSES.

On the motion of Sir ROBERT BORDEN for the adjournment of the House:

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL: Mr. Speaker, will you allow me, on this motion, to ask a question of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) of some urgency to my constituency? I intended doing so yesterday, but the sudden adjournment of the House prevented me. It is regarding the issuing of licenses for salmon fishing in the tidal waters of Quebec. There is some doubt existing as to whether these licenses are to be issued by the provincial Government or by the Ottawa Government. Notices have appeared in the Canada Gazette and in the Quebec Gazette and I have received a number of letters on the point. I would ask the minister if he would kindly tell us how the matter stands.

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): My hon. friend, with the courtesy which always distinguishes him, intimated to me yesterday that he would ask this question, and I had prepared a little statement so that the facts might be absolutely accurate. In 1898, in a reference known as the Fisheries Reference, to the Privy Council, a decision was given to the effect that whatever property interests in the fisheries were held by the different provinces prior to Confederation remained vested in them subsequent to it, but that the exclusive power to legislate or make regulations govering the conduct of the fisheries is vested in the Federal Government. As soon as that decision was given, or immediately afterwards, all the provinces that are sea-washed and have fisheries claimed the fisheries, not only in the tidal as well as the non-tidal portions of all the rivers, but in the bays and in the three-mile limit as well. The officers of the department in Ottawa, however, contended that, while there was no question about the non-tidal fisheries being owned by the provinces, in tidal waters, no matter where situated, there is a public right of fishery controllable only by the Federal Government and Parliament.

At the time it was hoped that the outstanding question of jurisdiction in tidal waters could be settled amicably, and all the provinces affected, except Quebec, agreed that pending a settlement of such question the Federal Government should continue to administer the fisheries in tidal waters as theretofore. It was finally arranged with Quebec that, pending such settlement, the jurisdiction of the fisheries on the south side of the river and gulf of St. Lawrence, and on the north side west of Point des Monts, would be handed over to the province, while the Federal Government would continue to administer the fisheries east of Point des Monts.

The negotiations with the provinces took much longer than was anticipated, and in 1908 British Columbia decided to act on the assumption that it possessed the property interests in the fisheries in tidal waters, and consequently started to require licenses from fishermen before they would be allowed to operate therein.

There were negotiations and finally a reference of certain questions to the court was agreed to with British Columbia, and these questions were so framed as to decide the matter in all the other sea-washed provinces. While the reference was with British Columbia, the other interested

provinces, including Quebec, became intervenants. The Supreme Court upheld the contention of the Federal Government on every point and on appeal to the Privy Council the decision of the Supreme Court was fully sustained.

The decision of the Privy Council, in brief, is that there is in tidal waters, no matter where situated, a public right of fishery which is controllable only by the Federal Government.

Following this decision, the Department of the Naval Service took steps to assert the rights which they believed the Dominion possessed in so far as the control of fisheries in tidal waters was concerned and in consequence of this judgment of the Supreme Court and Privy Council the province of Quebec was requested to hand over to the Federal Government the administration of the tidal fisheries which had been handed over to it following the 1898 decision and pending a settlement of the question of right. Quebec declined to do so on the ground that as the reference was with British Columbia alone the judgment did not apply to that province, that Magna Charta does not apply in Quebec, and that there is no public right of fishery in the waters of Quebec. There was a good deal of correspondence between the department and the government at Quebec and it was pointed out in reply that while the issue was confined to British Columbia the Privy Council laid down certain principles of public law which apply to New Brunswick, Nova Scotia or Quebec equally as well as to British Columbia. During the course of the correspondence it was intimated in a letter written by the deputy minister to either the Deputy Minister or the Minister of Mines and Colonization in Quebec that if the province desired to enter into negotiations on the question we would be prepared to do so as we were acting under what we believed to be our absolute right under the law and we were willing to concede to Quebec the credit of doing the same thing. As the question must clearly be settled some way or other, we were willing to have a case stated and a further reference made to the courts so that there might be no further question about the matter and that the question should be settled as it must be settled one way or the other. We said that we were prepared to discuss the matter, but as there was no suggestion of favourable consideration of this course, the Federal Government decided that the only course open to it was to carry out the law as laid down by the Privy Council. Consequently, the department issued a notice stating that during the next fishing season licenses would be granted by the Federal Government to those who were fishing in tidal waters and intimated that any one fishing without such a license would be prosecuted and prevented from doing so. The Government of Quebec has issued a similar notice to the effect, I understand, that any one fishing in these waters must first obtain a license from the Province of Quebec. Our department, acting on what we believe to be the decision of the Privy Council—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: In the 1898 or the subsequent case?

Mr. HAZEN: The British Columbia case—acting on what we believe to be the decision of the Privy Council, which decision is applicable quite as much to Quebec as to British Columbia, and having also the strong opinion of the Department of Justice to the effect that it is the proper position to take, felt that it was our duty to assert the rights of the Dominion in these tidal waters. I feel, however, that the matter is one in which the province of Quebec honestly maintains the position that it upholds at the present time and that the question will therefore have to be settled in the courts. If there is no agreement in the meantime, next year somebody will be fishing without a license from the Dominion Government, our officers will probably arrest him and have him fined and no doubt an appeal will go to the courts, or it may be taken up in another way through action by the Province of Quebec. It is not desirable that this matter should be left in a state of doubt and uncertainty and it is desirable that a stated case should be placed before the Privy Council as soon as possible. I am pleased to say that since this correspondence took place, within the last day or two, there has been some communication on the subject between the Attorney General of Quebec and the Department of Justice in Ottawa, and there is every reason for thinking that a conference will be held in a short time at which the matter will be discussed between the two Governments and some course taken which is reasonable and proper under the circumstances.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 10.15 p.m.

Friday, February 12, 1915.

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

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill No. 31, respecting The British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Taylor.

Bill No. 32, to incorporate The Brulé Grand Prairie and Peace River Railway Company.—Mr. R. B. Bennett.

Bill No. 33, to confirm certain agreements made between The Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company, The Georgian Bay and Seaboard Railway Company and The Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Blain.

Bill No. 34, respecting The Manitoba and North Western Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Cash.

Bill No. 35, respecting The Niagara-Welland Power Company.—Mr. Blain.

Bill No. 36, to incorporate Northern Pacific and British Columbia Railway Company.—Mr. Taylor.

Bill No. 37, respecting Pacific, Peace River and Athabasca Railway Company.—Mr. R. B. Bennett.

Bill No. 38, respecting The Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company.—Mr. Taylor.

POLLUTION OF NAVIGABLE WATERS.

Mr. GEORGE H. BRADBURY (Selkirk) moved the second reading of Bill No. 2 respecting the pollution of Navigable Waters. He said: This Bill is very similar to the one which I have had before the House during the last two sessions. We have taken a great deal of expert evidence, and the consensus of opinion of the experts of Canada is that a Bill of this kind is necessary to protect the streams and rivers of this country from pollution. That the House may understand thoroughly what I am asking for, I ask leave to read the Bill, which is a short one:

An Act respecting the Pollution of Navigable Waters.

His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:

1. No person shall put or cause or permit to be put, or to flow or to be carried, any sewage, offal or refuse or other matter that is poisonous, noxious, decomposing, or any injurious refuse or waste, into any navigable water or into any other water that flows into any navigable water unless such matter is disposed of or treated in accordance with regulations made under the authority of this Act.

2. Every municipal corporation convicted of an offence against this Act shall, upon summary conviction, be liable to a fine of not less than five hundred dollars and an additional sum of fifty dollars for each day during which the offence continues.

3. Every corporation, other than a municipal corporation, convicted of an offence against this Act shall, upon summary conviction, be liable to a fine of not less than two hundred dollars and an additional sum of twenty dollars for each day during which the offence continues.

4. Every person, other than a corporation, who is convicted of an offence against this Act shall, upon summary conviction, be liable to a fine of not less than fifty dollars and an additional sum of ten dollars for each day during which the offence continues, or to imprisonment not exceeding two months, or to both fine and imprisonment.

5. The Governor in Council shall have power to exempt any water or waters from the operation of this Act for such length of time as may be prescribed, and may from time to time extend, withdraw, or vary such exemption.

6. The Governor in Council may make such regulations and appoint such officers and employees as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act. All regulations and orders made under this Act shall be published in the Canada Gazette.

One of the great objections urged against this Bill by different interests and by some of the lower province members in this House last year was that the legislation would work a hardship by its control of sewage placed in tidal waters. They contended that there was no necessity of interfering with cities along the sea-coast. For the purpose of expediting the Bill and of trying to make some headway with it, I have changed the wording of the fifth clause in such a way as to give the Government absolute control of the matter, power being given to it to exempt any waters or water from the operation of the Act and to extend such exemptions or withdrawal from time to time.

During the time this Bill was before the committee we took a great deal of evidence and examined, I think, every expert in Canada. During the first session of 1913 we examined Mr. James White of the Commission of Conservation and Dr. Hodgetts. Both these gentlemen, whose evidence was very full and complete, took the position that legislation of this kind is absolutely necessary if we are to prevent our rivers and lakes from being polluted as they have been during the last fifty years. We examined also Mr. Joseph Race, F.I.C., municipal bacteriologist of the city of Ottawa; Dr. W. T. Connel, Professor of Bacteriology and Hygiene at Queen's

University, Kingston; Mr. R. S. Lea and Mr. John Kennedy, civil engineers, both of the city of Montreal; Professor C. H. McLeod, Vice-Dean of the Faculty of Applied Science in McGill University; Dr. Bryce, Medical Inspector of the Immigration Branch, Department of the Interior. These gentlemen were examined at some length, and were all agreed as to the necessity of legislation of this kind.

Although this Bill was very thoroughly discussed on a former occasion, I think it is due the House that I should refer for a few moments to some of the findings of the committee appointed to look into that matter. To that end I wish to read some of the evidence given by Mr. White of the Conservation Commission. The following is part of Mr. White's evidence:

Q. Have you any data or information as to how wide an expanse of water would be necessary to prevent pollution on this side, or can you rely at all upon the distance?—A. The Great Lakes undoubtedly act as great sedimentation basins. The public health authorities of Ontario have gone half way across Lake Ontario from Toronto collecting samples of water all the way. They found bacteria right out to the middle of the lake. Of course, we can concede that the chances of the sewage of a city like Rochester infecting the supply of a town like Port Hope or Cobourg are somewhat remote; but you cannot say that it will not. The most important point of all is that the population on the shores of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence is increasing, and, as the population increases, the danger of infection also increases.

Q. What is the distance between Rochester and Cobourg?—A. The distance across the lake is approximately 40 miles, I should say.

Q. Is that sufficient to purify the water?—A. We have traced the pollution half way across the lake. Of course we assume that the pollution they get in the middle of the lake is Toronto's pollution, because, of course, Toronto is the largest city on the shores of Lake Ontario, and the pollution was found practically opposite that city. They were trying to discover whether by extending their intake pipe out a reasonable distance they would get beyond the polluted area; and they came to the conclusion that they could not.

Q. Is the water from the Great Lakes used for domestic purposes by the city? A. Yes, that is what the city of Toronto depends upon. They have installed a very large filtration plant, but other cities along the lakes are using the unfiltered water.

Mr. Joseph Race of the city of Ottawa was also examined. He gave the following evidence:

The effects of the pollution of navigable waters have chiefly been reflected in the abnormal death rates from enteric diseases, and it is these rates that have attracted public attention to this serious problem. At the outset it should be remembered that it is the use of such water for drinking purposes without purification that is the cause of so many deaths, and that the sewage problem has become acute on account of the failure of communities to realize their responsibilities in that direction.

We come now to the other aspect of this problem. If the sewage pollution of navigable waters is allowed to continue and the population continues to increase, a stage must ultimately be reached when they become impossible as a source of domestic water supply.

Q. What is your opinion regarding the whole question of the prevention of the pollution of streams?—A. I think that all sewage pollution and trade wastes ought to be prevented from running into the rivers unless thoroughly purified.

Q. Do you agree with other scientists that typhoid is a water borne disease almost entirely?—A. Not almost entirely, but a large proportion of it is.

Q. You believe that it is a disease that is preventable?—A. Yes, certainly.

Q. What percestage is preventable by legislation?—A. I should say at least 75 per cent.

Q. Then according to your statement your opinion is that if we had proper sewage protection in the city of Ottawa we would have had at least 75 per cent fewer typhoid cases and deaths during these epidemics?—A. Undoubtedly.

The evidence of Mr. Race is, I think, particularly important, inasmuch as he gives it as his opinion—and this opinion is corroborated by the opinions of a great many other scientists—that typhoid fever is largely preventable, and that it is a water-borne disease.

When we think of the awful ravages that typhoid fever has caused throughout Canada, we must realize the importance of passing some legislation that will protect our great fresh-water supplies in this country. Dr. W. T. Connel, one of the scientists connected with Queen's University, Kingston, was the next witness examined by the committee, and in connection with the pollution at Kingston he gave the following evidence:

Q. If there were typhoid fever at Kingston, would that not increase the danger of infection at the towns below?—A. I think that we can say that either typhoid fever cases or typhoid carriers are constantly present in every town and city, hence that a certain number of typhoid bacilli are being daily discharged with untreated sewage into the rivers and lakes by practically every town and city in this country.

Q. If there were anything of an epidemic, of course that danger would be increased?—A. Provided the excreta were not disinfected, as they are supposed to be by law.

Q. Speaking generally would there be any suggestion you could make which would be applicable?—A. Every city should treat its own sewage in such a manner as to render it harm-

less to any other cities or towns which may take their supply from below.

Q. And harmless to itself also?—A. Of course, to itself, the selfish reason would apply first. As I have said, I think our own experience has been that the danger is very largely to one's own town first, and secondly to those below, and so for purely selfish reasons we should treat our sewage and thus not injure ourselves, and secondly, not to injure others.

There is a great deal more evidence which I need not inflict upon the House, but I may say that at one of the sittings of this Committee it was suggested owing to the great importance of this question and the fact that it had been widely discussed all over the Dominion, that a conference should be called of representatives of all the provinces to meet in Ottawa to discuss the question, and I received instruction from the committe to request the Government to invite such a conference. The conference was convened in the Tower room here on October 3, 1913, by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Among those present were the Hon. J. D. Hazen, Minister of Marine and Fisheries; Hon. Martin Burrell, Minister of Agriculture; myself, as Chairman of the House of Commons Committee on the subject; Mr. Warnock, M.P., and Mr. Baker, M.P. The province of Manitoba was represented by Hon. Mr. Howden, the Attorney General of the province; Prince Edward Island by Hon. Mr. Matheson, Premier of Prince Edward Island; British Columbia by Hon. William R. Ross, Minister of Lands; the province of Quebec by Dr. E. P. Lachapelle, president of the Provincial Board of Health; Mr. R. S. Lea, member of the Provincial Board of Health; and Dr. E. Elzear Pelletier, secretary of the Provincial Board of Health. The province of Saskatchewan was represented by Mr. P. Aird Murray, C.E., and Dr. Maurice M. Seymour, Commissioner of Public Health for the province of Saskatchewan; New Brunswick by Hon. Mr. Flemming, Premier of New Brunswick; the International Joint Commission by Mr. C. A. Magrath and Mr. H. A. Powell, K.C.; the Conservation Commission by James White, Secretary and deputy minister and Dr. C. A. Hodgetts.

The subject was thoroughly discussed at the conference, and the consensus of opinion was that some federal legislation should be passed to control the disposal of the sewage of the Dominion of Canada. Mr. White in his evidence made this statement:

I have all that information and I could have it here at a later date. I would like to say

[Mr. Bradbury.]

that the Conservation Commission is entirely in accord with Mr. Bradbury in his effort to prevent the pollution of streams.

That is apparently the opinion of all who are interested in this great question.

I do not wish to take up too much time of the House, but I should just like to say a word as to the death rate from typhoid fever in this country. When one remembers the great bodies of water we have in Canada, our great lakes and our great rivers, and then compares our condition with European countries, with their densely populated districts, and discovers that the death rate from typhoid is much higher in Canada than in those European countries, the condition is alarming and one that ought to command and demand the attention of this Parliament. According to a table submitted to the committee by Dr. Hodgetts the death rate from typhoid fever in Scotland was 6·2 per 1,000 population; in Germany 7·6; England and Wales 11·2; Belgium 16·8; Austria 19·9; Hungary 28·3; Italy 35·2; Canada 35·5; and the United States 46. These figures indicate the awful condition that prevails in Canada at the present time. It is positively alarming when we think of such great rivers as the one that flows by the base of this building. The Ottawa river is in an awful condition and has been so for many years. The condition of the Ottawa river ought to appeal to every man in this House; and it is but one of many of such rivers in Canada. In this city we have a great population of nearly 100,000, who are taxed for water, and the city of Ottawa supplies them with water that is utterly unfit for domestic purposes. It is unfit to drink, either for man or beast. It has been condemned, not only by the medical profession, but by the veterinary surgeons, who claim that the water of Ottawa is not fit for a horse or even a dog to drink. There have been a number of serious cases among the horses and dogs of this city on account of the dope that has been put in the water. Some scientists would have it that hypochloride is harmless, that it does not cause any serious trouble when put into water. But the medical profession of Ottawa will tell you that the continual doping of the Ottawa water supply has caused a great deal of sickness in the city, apart altogether from typhoid fever. No one doubts that hypochloride prevents typhoid epidemics for it kills the baccili; but while it kills the baccili, it ruins the constitutions of the people who drink the doped water. The con-

sequence is that the people of this city are forced to pay a high water rate, and an additional charge to get pure water. People all over the city are glad to go long distances to get pure water, just as they did five and thirty years ago before we had a water system. All this could have been prevented if Parliament had taken action years ago, as it should have done.

In view of the conditions that prevail I hope the House will not hesitate to adopt the Bill before it.

I trust that the Government will not feel inclined to send this Bill to a committee again. It has been in committee for two years. We have obtained all the information that can be obtained on it. The Bill is framed in such a manner as to leave it entirely in the hands of the Government to determine when it shall be called into operation; that is the Government can withdraw any of the waters from its operation whenever it sees fit. It empowers the Government to make regulations under which the Bill will be enforced so that the enforcement of the legislation will rest entirely in the hands of the Government. The point that it is an interprovincial question has been raised, but I do not think it is a serious difficulty in the way of the adoption of this proposed legislation. I am not a lawyer but I have discussed the question with able lawyers and I have been assured that there is no reason why the federal power should not pass legislation that would control the disposal of sewage throughout this Dominion. There is no question to my mind that the federal Government have absolute control of navigable streams. That question was settled by the case we had up here some years ago, when the millmen undertook to deposit their sawdust and slabs in the Ottawa river. It was demonstrated then that the Government could control our navigable waters and prevent the millmen from polluting these waters in any way. The same thing prevailed in connection with our fisheries. We can prevent the millmen or anybody from polluting lakes by depositing sawdust or any material that would militate against the fisheries. I claim that we can enact legislation in this House to control not only navigable waters but every stream that runs into a navigable water and say whether sewage may or may not be deposited in the streams. The Bill has been discussed from every standpoint by the best informed men in Canada. There has been no source of information left uncanvassed by the committee. Every man in Canada that the committee thought could throw any light upon this important question was summoned to attend that committee and to give his evidence and the summing up of the evidence —and we have two volumes of it—proves beyond a doubt that some legislation ought to be enacted by the federal authorities.

I noticed a few days ago that the International Waterways Commission, which has been doing some splendid work, has at last induced the nation to the south of us to join with that commission to prevent the pollution of the great rivers running between these two countries. This will also apply to the lakes. This is a move in the right direction. When this Bill was first introduced one objection raised against it was that it would be perfectly useless for this House to take any action until we could induce the American people to take similar action. I did not agree with that contention. My position was that this condition that prevailed in Canada demanded redress, it was the duty of Canada first to take care of the situation in this country; in other words, to clean up the condition which existed in our country and then we could reasonably appeal to the nation to the south of us to join with us and do its share. But the International Commission, has, I see, accomplished a good work in securing the consent of the United States Government to join with Canada in preventing the pollution of the St. Lawrence and, I presume, the great lakes contiguous to their own country. In view of this fact I submit the time has come for this House to act and I venture to say that the Bill, while not perfect by any means, will be a step in the right direction and it can be amended if necessary from year to year. Therefore, I beg to move the second reading of Bill No. 5 entitled an Act respecting the Pollution of Navigable Waters.

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): My hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury), who has introduced this Bill, and who, during the past two years, has introduced Bills very similar in character, has suggested that the matter should now be dealt with by the House. In the session of 1913 a Bill of this character was introduced which was referred to a committee of the House and a similar course was taken in the session of 1914. The committee, as pointed out by my hon. friend, met on a good many occasions and gave a great deal of consideration to the matter. They heard the opinions and the

evidence of members of the Conservation Commission who had made a special study in regard to this question, and of sanitary experts, bacteriologists and other men of scientific training who had made scientific researches regarding it. They also, in the summer of 1913, had a conference with representatives of the different provincial authorities, and the health authorities of the different provinces, and they gave a great deal of thought and consideration to the matter. At the last session of the House they made a report to Parliament which report is found in the Votes and Proceedings of the 11th of June, and in which they made the statement that it was evident that sufficient time was not available to the committee for the completion of the task which had been committed to them, and therefore they reported back without amendment the Bills to the House. They took this course because there had been certain practical objections raised to the Bills which they thought required serious consideration and further because they believed that it was well to ascertain, if they could do so, what action the International Joint Commission proposed to take in regard to the pollution of boundary waters. There is no doubt at all, I think, that this Parliament has the right to pass legislation preventing the pollution of waters that constitute the boundary line between Canada and the United States. But that was not the difficulty which they had to face. What the committee felt was that if Canada should pass legislation to prevent raw sewage from Canadian cities and towns being placed in the waters of boundary rivers, such as the St. Lawrence and the St. John, very little good would be accomplished thereby unless the United States passed similar legislation preventing sewage from the Republic going into these boundary waters, thus preventing the pollution not only of their own waters but of the waters that were on the Canadian side of the boundary as well.

As pointed out by the hon. member for Selkirk, the International Joint Commission representing the United States and Canada, regarding the pollution of boundary waters, have made an investigation of that subject. I hold in my hand the progress report which they have made thereon. Since then they have devoted a good deal of research and study to the question, and they considered it, I believe, at a meeting which was held by the members of the Joint Commission in the city of Toronto a week or ten days ago. I am told they have practically come to a conclusion as to the recommendation they will make. While legislation in this direction should not be too long delayed, I think we should know before proceeding, the findings of the International Joint Commission, which I am led to believe will be of a very drastic character, in order that we may not pass any legislation that will conflict with or be inconsistent with the conclusions arrived at by that commission which represents the Governments of both countries.

While the Committee of this House was unanimous in favour of legislation to prevent the pollution of navigable streams, yet it was felt that to pass a sweeping law saying that no sewage should be put into any river or stream in Canada would work hardship in many cases. In the past, cities, towns, and villages, with full authority of law, have established sewage systems depositing their sewage in these streams, and were they to be at once ordered to cease this practice it would entail great financial responsibilities upon them. I am told that the city of Montreal alone would be put to an expenditure of seven or eight million dollars to change its sewage system, and of course the city of Toronto and other cities and towns would have to bear proportionately large expense.

My hon. friend has introduced quite an important provision in this Bill which was not to be found in his Bill of last year, a provision giving the Governor in Council power to exempt any water or waters from the operation of this Act, for such length of time as may be prescribed, and may from time to time extend, withdraw, or vary such exemption. That places very wide powers as to the administration of the Act in the Governor in Council, and practically makes them the judges as to the waters in which sewage can be put, and as to what time may reasonably elapse before cities, towns and villages shall be compelled to introduce some system of purification of sewage approved of by sanitary engineers. This makes a very considerable change in the Bill, as compared with that which was introduced by my hon. friend last year.

I believe this measure to be in the public interest, and that the public desire legislation which will prevent the rivers and streams from being polluted. Yet, in view of this change, and as the committee which dealt with the measure last year reported that they had not time to complete their findings, it occurs to me that the Bill

should go back to the same committee. With the information which that committee has already obtained, with knowledge of the change made in the Bill, and with the information they would have as to the action of the International Joint Commission, I think the committee should, at an early date this session, report the Bill back to the House with their recommendations. I would suggest to my hon. friend, who has shown so much zeal in promoting this Bill before the House, that he should consider this suggestion. I think the Bill may properly be read a second time now, and in the meantime I will consult with my hon. friend as to the propriety of referring the Bill back to the same committee, with the understanding that the recommendation and report of the committee shall be made, so that the House can possibly deal with the Bill at the present session.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The suggestion of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine (Mr. Hazen) cannot be received with very much favour by my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury). That hon. gentleman has shown much zeal in promoting this legislation, which, in my humble judgment, is very much needed. I am sorry he has not received from his friends that encouragement which I think is due to the laudable object he has in view. I would have been disposed to support the contention of my hon. friend (Mr. Bradbury) that the Bill should be disposed of in the House and not referred to the committee, were it not that it is so framed as to present some objections. I am highly in favour of such legislation as this, which I believe to be most important, and which I think should have been placed on the statute books of this country before now.

My hon. friend in his Bill makes it a criminal offence to put refuse of any kind into any of the waters of Canada, and he gives the Government power to restrict the operations of the Bill in certain areas. As the Bill is now framed, a man in any remote district in the country, where there is no population or a very sparse population, could not erect a small sawmill on a stream and put the refuse into that stream. That cannot be the aim of my hon. friend. He is anxious that his Bill should apply to certain densely-peopled areas, such as the city of Ottawa, the city of Toronto, and others cities, towns and villages. Thus, while my hon. friend is anxious to apply this legislation to a city such as Ottawa, he at the same time would subject to penalty any person who puts refuse in waters where no ill effect could possibly arise from that act. The drastic provisions of this Bill would apply to new and remote parts of the country where there could be no possible danger to the public health from putting refuse in the water, whereas in my opinion, they should apply only to the large centres of population where the evils which my hon. friend wishes to prevent are prevalent. Were I a member of the committee I would move to amend the Bill so that the Governor in Council would have the power to proclaim the area to which the provisions of this Bill would apply and to exempt all the rest of the country. I am of the opinion that that would be a more workable provision than the one now contained in the Bill.

I cannot see any force in the objection raised by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that we should not proceed with this measure until we get the report of the International Commission. If we had this legislation on this side of the line, it would assist the American Commission in obtaining similar legislation on the other side. It is very important that we should have joint legislation in this matter, but I would not be deterred from going on with the Bill by the objection that we should wait for the report of the International Commission.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY: As one of the members of the committee which, during the last two sessions, considered the Bills to which my hon. friend the member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) has referred, I would like to ask my hon. friend a question. Before doing so, let me say to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that the objection which he voiced from the point of view of certain cities, some of which he enumerated, was, I think, speaking from memory, met by the other Bill which has been referred to as having been before the committee, namely, the Bill introduced by Senator Belcourt in another chamber. Therefore I would like to ask my hon. friend from Selkirk whether the Bill he has now introduced combines the features of his former Bill with those of the Bill introduced by Senator Belcourt.

Mr. BRADBURY: There is no change in the Bill now before the House from the Bill

which I introduced last year, except the last clause, which gives the Government power to exempt certain waters.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM: When these matters come closely home to us, perhaps we take a deeper interest in them than we do when we are discussing them generally. This question of disease originating from our water supply is perhaps as important a one as can be discussed by hon. members, and one in which all are interested; if not just now, they do not know when they will be. Possibly when in Ottawa they are all interested. The difficulty which confronts a good many towns on the banks of the St. Lawrence and towns on other rivers is that they have expended a lot of money in sewage plants and systems and sewage goes into the streams. Every town above on the same stream has done the same thing, so that some of these towns are liable not only to the troubles arising from their own sewage system, but to others originating from sewage systems farther up the stream.

Hon. J. D. REID: On the American side also.

Mr. GRAHAM: On both sides. In the town of Brockville at present there are more than one hundred cases of typhoid due simply to the water of the St. Lawrence. We have considered that water the purest in the world and have used it very freely.

4 p.m.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: At times.

Mr. GRAHAM: How long are we to wait for this matter to be remedied? While we are waiting people are dying of disease. At the present time examination is being made of the intake pipe of the town of Brockville, in which it is contended there is a break. The Board of Health tells us to adopt a filtration plant. Another expert says: No, you must treat the sewage as it goes into the river. We proceed to do one or both of these things under the Provincial Health Act, and a little later on we shall have a Dominion Act under which to take action. It is time that this House indicated in some way what it proposes to do. The measure need not be drastic; we may not insist on towns being bankrupted or put to great expense; but every day that this matter is postponed, a greater mileage of sewage systems is being constructed in these towns; greater quantities of sewage are being poured into the streams, and greater will be the expense of re-adjusting whole systems a few years later. Therefore I think we have waited long enough.

I do not intend to discuss the details of this Bill; but if the Government are anxious to handle this question in a practical manner, some measure can be passed which will be an indication to the people in the various towns that action is going to be taken, but that they will be given time to readjust themselves to the new condition of affairs. I am not in favour of sending this Bill to another committee if it is to be held over until another session. If it is to go to a committee, the committee ought to understand the gravity of the situation in many of our towns and investigate as far as possible all the conditions; there is plenty of material to afford them all the information necessary; and they can report a Bill which can be passed this session, letting the people throughout the Dominion know that we are going to stop the menace of pollution of our streams; because so long as something is not done to stop it, it will be continued, and no amount of talk will make the people change their systems. I have had considerable experience of injurious results from such pollution during the past few months. I hope the Bill will come before this House as a practical measure to be voted upon before this session closes.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.): I wish very briefly to endorse the sentiments of my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham). I have also, like him, had a practical experience in my family of what putrid water means; and when we go through such experiences, we have perhaps a different view of the conditions than we would otherwise have. However, one does not require personal experience to have an understanding of what impure water means to a community, to a town, or to the country at large. The hon. member from Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) deserves a great deal of credit for the persistence with which he has brought this measure before the House and for the large amount of information which he has been the means of disseminating amongst the people of Canada. Hon. gentlemen so far have been talking very largely about conditions in the city of Ottawa and other portions of the province of Ontario; but there is hardly a place in Canada at all fairly well settled but has to contend with the same problem. In my portion of the province of New Brunswick

exactly the same condition exists as in Ottawa. The problem is just as acute and just as urgent there as it is in the city of Ottawa. The whole thing resolves itself into two questions: one as to the cost, and the other as to the method to be adopted. The question of cost, of course, in a small community, is always important; but the difficulty it presents is not insurmountable. The great difficulty seems to be that there is no power to prevent the recurrence of the cause of the difficulty. Take our own case. We are taking water out of the St. John river. Now, this river runs through a number of small towns and villages above us, all of which are pouring their sewage into the river. It is not of much use for us to take means to improve conditions unless others are compelled, so to say, to behave themselves. But it may be done. There is a great deal in what my right hon. leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says, that the Bill might be changed so that the power to bring it into effect in any given district shall rest with the Government—not make it the general law with certain districts exempted. Otherwise certain districts might not be exempted that ought to be so treated, and some crank coming along could commence prosecution of an innocent user of the water. If the Government had the power to bring the Act into force by Order in Council, stating the portions of the country in which it should be effective, it would be much better. But that is a matter of detail; so far as the general principle is concerned, I think the Bill is entirely right. I am very much of opinion that some action ought to be taken to bring this matter to a head during the present session. Let us be men enough to stand up and vote upon it; let us take our responsibility. So far as I am concerned, I am ready to vote on the principle of the Bill; and I have confidence in the judgment and ability of this House to work out the details in such a way as to insure justice being done to all and injustice to none. It is pretty hard, from my standpoint, to conceive of injustice being done to any man by compelling him to keep pollution out of the river which is the water supply for all his neighbours as well as for people, it may be, hundreds of miles away from him. Personally I am ready to take responsibility in the matter. Therefore, I do not like the motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen). For, while I do not say it offensively, yet I do say, that this is a dilatory motion. We who have had some experience in parliamentary matters know that, in a session such as this which will necessarily be short, if a matter like this is handed over to a committee to take some further action, that means that it goes over until next session. The hon. minister knows that there have been hundreds of Bills sent to the political bone-yard since he entered Parliament, and thousands since Confederation. And for a public Bill like this, which can only be discussed in the early stages, except with the leave of the Government, once it is sent to the committee, it might as well be put out of existence and its promoters told to come back next year. I do not say this in any controversial spirit. I do hope that some arrangement can be arrived at between the hon. member for Selkirk and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries by which this Bill will not be sent to the political bone-yard but a vote taken upon it,—and I hope that vote will be to-day. I believe this Bill involves one of the most economic questions ever brought before this House or that could possibly be brought before it. So far as I am concerned, I should like an opportunity to vote for this Bill to-day.

Hon. T. CHASE CASGRAIN (Postmaster General): My excuse for taking part, even in a very brief way, in this discussion, is that until lately, I was a member of the International Joint Commission, and one of the most important questions submitted to that Commission was a reference, under the Waterways Treaty, of the question of pollution of boundary waters. Two questions were submitted: First, whether pollution existed in boundary waters, and, if so, second, what means should be taken to remedy that pollution. The International Joint Commission has had this question under consideration for almost a year, I believe, and has expended vast sums of money, in conjunction with the United States, in an effort to find out whether pollution existed. The second question is now before the commission: What are the best means to remedy the pollution which, beyond doubt, exists in the boundary waters between the United States and Canada?

I believe my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) has brought down to the House this preliminary or progress report of the experts who were charged by the commission to examine the boundary waters between the Lake of the Woods and the Atlantic. The Commission held a great many meetings in boundary towns from the Lake of the Woods almost as far as the Atlantic ocean, hearing witnesses, including

many experts. The conclusion to which we came was that this was one of the most momentous questions that could come before a commission of this kind. One most important point which struck us was the enormous expense which would be involved in the change of systems in the different cities consequent upon any decisions given by the International Joint commission. For instance, take such cities on the American side as Buffalo, Detroit, Niagara Falls and Port Huron; and, on the Canadian side, Port Sarnia, Windsor and Toronto, all of which contribute to the pollution of boundary waters. But when you seek a remedy, you are forced to the conclusion that it would cost millions and millions of dollars. In some instances it would almost bankrupt those cities if you imposed upon them stringent measures by which this pollution should be stopped. The commission examined some of the most renowned sanitary experts in the world to find the means by which this pollution could be remedied or altogether eradicated. I believe the commission is just finishing a very important meeting in Toronto, and if my information is correct its report will be brought down in a very short time.

This question was referred to the International Joint Commission by the common consent of the Canadian Government and the United States Government. So far as navigable waters are concerned, the question I put to my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) and these hon. gentlemen on the other side who are in a hurry to see legislation passed on the subject is this: Having referred this question to the commission by general consent under the treaty, how can this House proceed to pass in advance of the report, legislation which would affect that question? It seems to me it would be almost a breach of faith. The two governments having referred to the commission this question, which is a most intricate and complicated one, until that report is brought down, so far at any rate as boundary waters are concerned, I do not think this House could pass legislation in face of that report. Therefore, I think the best way would be to refer it to a committee. Nor is this reason I have given the only reason. If hon. gentlemen will study the report of the International Joint Commission they will see that it would be impossible—as it seems to me—for this House to pass legislation which would be of value in the premises. You have to hear all the interested parties and see what can be done in the different cities, to learn what would be the cost. Otherwise we should run the risk of passing legislation which, by reason of the great cost it would entail, could not be enforced and would be inoperative.

Mr. BRADBURY: In moving the second reading of this Bill, I was impressed with the importance of the question with which it deals. I have given a great deal of attention to the matter, and believe that it is one of the most important questions that this House can deal with. The fact that so many valuable lives have been sacrified because of the pollution of our streams, and that so many of our citizens are going through life with impaired health and weakened constitutions on account of the use at some time of polluted water should be sufficient reason for Parliament's taking some action in the matter. However, after listening to the remarks of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, I realize that there is good reason why this Bill should go back to committee. I had no intention of making the Bill so far-reaching as the right hon. gentleman pointed out it would be; nor had I any intention of making it a hardship on outlying districts. I felt that I had provided for that, however, when I inserted a clause under which the Government had power to withdraw certain districts from the operation of the Act. I am anxious that something should be done; consequently I am willing that the Bill should go back to the committee, with the understanding, I hope, that the Bill will be considered, and that the committee will make its report as soon as possible, and that the House will deal with the matter during the present session.

I realize that the hon. Postmaster General, as a member of the International Joint Commission ought to be well informed, but I am not prepared to agree with him that this House should not take any action until we know what the United States or the International Joint Commission are going to do. I think we ought to take care of our own country; we ought to make it impossible for our people to cause the pollution of our rivers and of the lakes which they are obliged to use for domestic purposes. I think we could appeal to our friends on the other side of the line with more force after taking action on our own part. However, as the hon. gentleman has

pointed out, a reference has been made to this commission with regard to the effect of the disposal of sewage in boundary waters, and I presume that to that extent the hands of this House are tied until we know exactly what the views of the commission are, as expressed in its report. I understand from the hon. gentleman that that commission has reported.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Two questions were referred to the commission: first, as to the existence of pollution; second, as to the remedy. There is a report on the first question; in a very short time there will be a report on the second question, namely, the means by which the pollution may be either eradicated or remedied.

Mr. BRADBURY: Even if the members of this commission should not be able to agree among themselves as to what should be done, I submit that for the protection of our own people we ought to take action. If we cannot protect the boundary waters, we can at least protect the other waters of Canada. However, as I have said, I trust that when the Bill goes back to the committee it will be with the understanding that the committee report this session and that the matter be finally dealt with.

Mr. MURPHY: May I ask the hon. Postmaster General how soon the report of the International Joint Commission is expected?

Mr. CASGRAIN: So far as my relations with the International Joint Commission are concerned, of course I cannot say, but I believe—and I think my information is correct—that the report will be soon submitted to both Governments.

Mr. HAZEN: I will move for the appointment of a committee to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

ABOLITION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

Mr. ROBERT BICKERDIKE (St. Lawrence, Montreal) moved the second reading of Bill No. 18, to amend the Criminal Code. He said: When I introduced this Bill a few days ago I made the assertion that capital punishment is murder. I repeat that capital punishment is murder; legalized, if you like; but the state that puts capital punishment into force becomes a murderer.

Capital punishment is a relic of the dark and pestilential days of Nero's misrule of the Roman empire. I think I am safe in saying that the time has arrived when it is the bounden duty of this Government and this Parliament to give consideration to this grave question, which is daily growing in importance all over the world, especially among Christian nations. The purpose of the Bill is to abolish capital punishment in the Dominion of Canada and to substitute life imprisonment for the different crimes for which capital punishment is provided in our present criminal code.

The opinion has gained ground very rapidly in recent years that the death penalty is nothing more or less than legalized brutal murder. I am aware that there are several members of this House who still cling to the idea that capital punishment is a deterrent, and to those I would say that if they really consider it to be a deterrent, our executions should be made as public as possible. If it is to be considered as an object lesson to the community, let us have a hanging bee in the public square. If it is to be an object lesson, it should be as thorough a one as possible; it will be better to hold it where every man, woman and child will be able to see the whole ghastly proceedings. If any hon. gentlemen in this House vote against the Bill, I hope they will feel a sense of personal guilt if Canada must continue to stand before the whole world as a barbarous country.

I submit that life is the immediate gift of God to man; man has no right to resign it, nor should it be taken from him, unless by the God who gave it to him. I believe that all the members of this House will agree with me on that point. Innocent individuals, as we know, are occasionally executed, and thus makes the state which orders his execution a murderer of the worst kind. Capital punishment prevents reparation in cases of subsequently proven innocence. I submit that two or more men organized under a form of government have no more right to break God's commandments or to take life than one man has. It is murder in either case. Is it not better that ninety-nine guilty persons should go free than that one innocent man should be hanged?

We all know that 1914 has been quite a hanging year; in fact, it will be known in history as the hanging year. It has been suggested that the authorities developed a mania for hanging in 1914 such as never has been known in Canada since the days of 1837 and 1838. In truth, it has been said by some that the authorities of 1914 went hanging mad. I am prepared to prove to this House by statistics—and my remarks

will consist largely of statistics—that a great many guilty men go free, while a number of innocent men are hanged, especially if they are poor men. I say also that in 1914 three men were hanged whom the public believed to be innocent. One of them, we know, was innocent, and I am prepared to prove it.

Capital punishment, I say, is a legalized crime, and is morally indefensible. All who take part in it are tainted with blood guiltiness, from the judge down to the hangman, the crown prosecutor and his running mate, the crown executioner, as well as the nation which passively allows such things to be. If crime does not increase in other countries in consequence of the abolition of capital punishment, why should it increase in Canada? It is universally admitted that two wrongs do not make a right; yet the operation of our law would seem to indicate that the contrary is the truth. A man sins by taking human life; the state sins by taking his life, and two lives are sacrificed. I submit that this is a grotesque travesty of justice. In King John's time the whole injunction of 'an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth' was literally obeyed, as well as 'a life for a life.' For many centuries we have ignored the two first injunctions, whilst holding with firm tenacity to the third; yet we Canadians call ourselves a Christian nation.

Capital punishment has been abolished in a great many countries, states and provinces, and in every case with good results. The following countries have abolished it: Italy, Portugal, Switzerland, Holland, Tuscany, San Marino, Roumania, New South Wales, State of Michigan, Rhode Island, Wisconsin, Maine, and Kansas.

In the early stages of society the man committing homicide was killed by the avenger of blood on behalf of the family of the man killed, and not as representing the authority of the state. This was the custom for centuries, till the mischief of this practice was mitigated by the establishment of cities of refuge, and in pagan and Christian times by the recognizing of the sanctuary of the temple and of the churches. In the laws of Khamurobi, king of Babylon, 2285-2241 B.C., the death penalty was imposed for many offences; the modes of execution specially mentioned are drowning, burning and impalement. Draco, the first compiler of the penal code of Greece, made death the penalty for all offences. When asked why he did so, he replied; 'The least offences deserve death, and I can impose no worse for the higher crimes.'

Under the Mosaic code the law of vengeance was personified in the then prevailing doctrine of 'an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth,' in many instances that rule being carried out literally. In the dark ages of the United Kingdom, under the rule of the Saxon and Danish kings, the modes of capital punishment most common were: hanging, beheading, drowning, burning, stoning, and precipitation from rocks. William the Conqueror would not permit the execution of the death sentence by hanging, but by mutilation. Death was the penalty for the most trivial offences; for example, the cutting down of a tree, poaching deer, or even stealing a loaf of bread. In 1800 there were over 200 capital crimes in Great Britain, and 180 in 1819. Men were hanged and quartered for offences which now would be regarded as misdemeanours, while the learned clergy and statesmen looked on with approval and applause. During the reign of Henry the Eighth 72,000 persons were executed. The author of Capital Punishment in the Encyclopoedia Britannica, vol. 5, page 279, says:

> At the end of the eighteenth century the criminal laws of all Europe were ferocious and indiscriminate in their administration of capital punishment for almost all grave crimes... yet such forms of crime were far more numerous than they are now.

The best blood of England drenched the execution block, and Kech, the legal executioner, became more infamous than Rob Roy, the bandit. Death was a panacea for all ills.

The United States adopted the common law of England replete with capital offences, but has finally limited the number of hanging offences, in practice at least, to two: murder and rape; but the statute names other offences, and hanging is the mode of execution.

In Belgium no execution has taken place since 1863; in Finland none since 1824; in Holland none since 1860, and capital punishment was totally abolished there in 1870. There have been no executions in Norway since 1876. Norway abolished capital punishment in 1905; Portugal in 1867; Roumania in 1864. Russia abolished capital punishment, except for military offences, in 1750, but later restored it for a short period, only to again abolish it in 1907. Only 7 out of 22 cantons in Switzerland have it. Italy revoked the law in 1888.

In the United States the number of capital crimes has been reduced in recent years to only four, and the following states have abolished the death penalty: Maine, where it was abolished in 1876, restored in 1883, and finally abolished in 1887, on the recommendation of the governor of the state; Rhode Island, in 1853; Wisconsin, in 1853; and Kansas, in 1901, but there have been no legal executions in Kansas since 1872; Michigan, in 1847.

I now propose to repeal the law of blood and vengeance in Canada, and to make life imprisonment the maximum punishment. The two main objects in enforcing our criminal laws are, first, to protect society; secondly, to reform the criminal. Some would add a third reason, namely, to punish the criminal himself, but in this day of brotherly love, when we are taught to love our enemies, and when charity and love have triumphed over vengeance and hatred, no one would seriously insist that this country has any more right to kill a man, in order to avenge the death of his victim, than has an individual.

Every man will agree with me on this one point, that, if social conditions will not be made worse by the abolition of the death penalty, then it should be abolished. The only way to determine this question is to compare the statistics of the states with and without the death penalty. The statistics are rather voluminous. I will just read a few of them, and, with the permission of the House, will hand the rest to the "Hansard" reporter.

Mr. SPEAKER: It cannot get on "Hansard" in that way. The rule is to report only what is read.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: Very well, Sir. According to the mortality statistics compiled by the United States Bureau of Statistics and published in 1912, the latest I could get, the number of murders in California was 19 per 100,000 population; in Colorado, 21; in Connecticut, 7; in Indiana, 10; in Maine, where capital punishment has been abolished, only 2.

Mr. LANCASTER: Do those statistics include cases of manslaughter, or relate only to murders committed with malice aforethought?

Mr. BICKERDIKE: Homicide.

Mr. LANCASTER: Homicide could be murder or manslaughter.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: I think they include both.

Mr. LANCASTER: Is the hon. gentleman making any distinction in his Bill between punishment for manslaughter and punishment for deliberate murder with malice aforethought? Manslaughter to-day is punishable by imprisonment for life if the judge chooses to inflict it.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: I make no distinction. I claim that the greatest penalty that a Christian country should inflict upon any criminal should be life imprisonment, even for murder, which I suppose is considered the greatest offence. I was saying that in the states where capital punishment has been abolished, crime has decreased. Furthermore, no state or district or country that has abolished capital punishment has it in practice to-day. I challenge any one to find a single country in the world that has abolished capital punishment and inflicts the death penalty to-day. The following figures show the number of murders per 100,000 population for ten years in several states:

State.	1900.	1901.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.	1906.	1907.	1908.	1909.
New Jersey—										
Cities	1.7	0.9	1.4	0.7	1.3	1.8	2.9	4.2	3.7	4.7
Rural	0.1	0.1	0.8	0.2	0.9	1.4	2.5	3.2	4.6	2.9
New York—										
Cities	2.00	1.8	2.0	1.4	2.2	3.5	5.0	6.1	5.3	4.4
Rural	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.6	1.8	3.3	3.6	3.3
Ohio—										
Cities	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	7.4
Rural	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2.8
Pennsylvania—										
Cities	...	...	...	...	...	...	5.8	6.5	5.0	4.7
Rural	...	...	...	...	...	...	4.5	4.8	4.9	4.1
Rhode Island—										
Cities	2.5	2.8	2.7	2.3	3.5	2.5	3.9	5.5	4.2	3.0
Rural	2.8	0.7	4.0	1.9	1.9	0.6	2.3	1.1	3.3	2.1
South Dakota—										
Cities	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	7.4	7.2
Rural	...	...	...	...	...	...	2.1	2.6	3.8	2.2

State.	1900.	1901.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.	1906.	1907.	1908.	1909.
Vermont—										
Cities	...	...	...	...	2.0	2.0	...	3.9	3.8	3.8
Rural	...	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	2.0	1.0	1.3	2.3	3.8
Washington —										
Cities	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	11.7	8.1
Rural	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	6.3	4.2
Wisconsin—										
Cities	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3.1	1.9
Rural	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1.6	1.7

It will thus be seen that for the ten-year period beginning with 1900 the average number of homicides in the States where capital punishment had been abolished per hundred thousand population was: Maine, 2·5; Michigan, 3·8; Rhode Island, 5; and for the two years, 1908 and 1909, for which Wisconsin reported her homicides, she averaged 4·1, there being a decrease in 1909 over the previous year. In some of the States where capital punishment prevailed we find that for a ten-year period, beginning with the year 1900, the average number of homicides per 100,000 population was: Indiana, 6·4; New Jersey, 4; New York, 4·8; and for the four years reported by Pennsylvania an average of 9·8. Ohio reports for the year 1909 only, giving 10·2; California for a four-year period shows twenty homicides per 100,000 population. While Massachusetts only shows an average of 2·57 for each 100,000 population, the increase in that State from 1905 to 1909 was 100 per cent. It will be further seen that California, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Indiana, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania and Vermont, where capital punishment obtains, and where it is enforced rigidly, show an increase in the number of homicides for the period reported in the above statistics, while of the five states that have abolished the death penalty, only Michigan shows an increase, which is slight, but her general average for a ten-year period is less than either of the states that have retained the death penalty, with the exception of Vermont and New Hampshire; and that they have increased their homicide rate per annum continually, while Michigan shows a decrease in 1909 over the previous year. Besides the record shows that the death penalty has been abolished in Vermont and New Hampshire by practice for twenty years.

The general average for the period reported in the above table of statistics for the five states where the death penalty has been revoked is 3 85 per 100,000 population, while for the states inflicting the death penalty for the period reported the general average is 8·25, or nearly 115 per cent greater. The average homicidal rate in Tennessee was five times greater than in either of the abolition states.

While I was unable to get the statistics on this question from Kansas, I am reliably informed that the number of homicides in that state per capita is comparatively small, and in a recent letter from the secretary of the present Governor of that state he informs me that the people there are universally pleased with the workings of the new law abolishing the death penalty, and that there is no disposition to restore capital punishment in that state. It will be remembered that there has never been a legal execution in that state since 1872, the governors in their discretion failing to sign the death warrants at the end of one year's imprisonment, as the law required.

The results obtained in foreign countries from the abolition of the death penalty are no less beneficial than in the United States. I take the following facts and statistics from Report No. 108 on capital crimes of the fifty-fourth United States Congress, first session, printed January 22, 1896, by order of the House of Representatives:

Belgium.—The penalty of death has not been abolished in Belgium, but since 1866 it has not been executed. In order to appreciate the results, the following statistics are given. For the period from 1831 to 1890, in the first thirty-five years, there were 321 capital condemnations, which was at the rate of 9.17 per year. In the twenty-five years following the cessation of executions there were 201, which was at the rate of 8.004, showing a decrease of 1.1696.

Costa Rica.—The results of the abolition of capital punishment for all offences in Costa Rica are considered very favourable, thus confirming public sentiment against capital punishment.

Hayti.—The constitution of 1879 abolished the death penalty for political offences. Since the period of said abolition political crimes have not been more frequent.

Holland.—There has been no increase or crime since the abolition of the death penalty.

Italy.—Since the abolition of the death penalty by the new common penal code, which went into force January 1, 1890, the results obtained

up to this present time have fully realized the expectations cherished by parliament, by public opinion, and by students of criminal matters, that is to say, social security has not been disturbed or diminished by it, and consequently the conditions of high criminality have not been rendered worse.

Norway.—Since 1874 it is made discretionary with the courts of death or hard labour for life, since which time a majority of the latter cases have been imposed, and no bad consequences, so far as public safety is concerned, have been observed.

Portugal.—The death penalty was abolished by the law on the first of July, 1867, and the number of homicides to which this penalty was applied has diminished during the succeeding years.

Switzerland.—Since 1874 capital punishment has been abolished in fifteen of the twenty-two cantons in Switzerland.

The only light we have to guide our advancing footsteps in enacting progressive legislation is the unerring light of experience. The record shows that the death penalty has been abolished in Michigan for sixty-six years; in Rhode Island for sixty-one years; in Wisconsin for sixty years; in Maine for thirty-seven years, and in Kansas by practice for about fifty years, and recently by statute. And yet those enlightened and progressive states have discovered no good reason for repealing these laws that have been in force for over a half century in most instances. That alone should be sufficient to convince us that the abolition statutes have vindicated their existence. Besides, is it a mere coincidence that the states that have so long foregone the death penalty have less than one-half the number of homicides of the states that foster executions? Is it only a coincidence that homicides in Connecticut, Massachusetts, Vermont, and New Hampshire have increased over previous years, while in their sister state of Maine, where life imprisonment is the highest penalty, the number of homicides have decreased in the same period? In 1909 the three states named above registered a total of homicides per 100,000 population as follows: Massachusetts, 4·8; Connecticut, 7·9; Vermont, 7·6, while in Maine, for the same period 2·2 for the same ratio is shown.

Making further comparisons for the year 1909 we find registered homicides per 100,000 as follows: Michigan, 4·4; Wisconsin, 3·6; and Rhode Island, 5·1; as against the death penalty states as follows: Indiana, 10·7; Ohio, 10·2; Pennsylvania, 8·8; New York, 7·7; New Jersey, 7·6; Colorado, 21·4; California, 20; Maryland, 7·2; New Hampshire, 2·9; South Dakota, 9·4; Washington, 12·3. Can all of the above facts, so favourable to the states that have abolished the death penalty, be attributed to mere chance?

In the same year the number of homicides per million people in the four abolition states was thirty-five; there were eighty-five in the death-penalty states per million population. In 1904, taking the whole United States, the ratio was 104·4 per million, while Maine, for the same year, registers 24 for each million inhabitants, Michigan 20, and Rhode Island 51, or nearly one-half the general average for all the states.

The record further shows that from 1885 to 1904 homicides increased from 32·2 per million people to 104·4 for the same ratio. There is no question that capital punishment increases the number of murders in any country. Crime begets crime just as thistledown begets thistles. In every case in which a man has been hanged, in Canada or any place else, immediately afterwards a large number of murders have been committed. This in the face of the fact that capital punishment was in full force in every state in the Union but four or five.

The foreign States that have abolished the death penalty not only refuse to reinstate it, but the reports above quoted show that criminal conditions are in all instances as good, and in some reported better than before the abolition of it. After centuries of observation and experience, the learned judges of England and America established a rule making a preponderance of evidence in civil cases the guide for themselves and juries in deciding questions of disputed facts. That is the only true rule. Then, have I not proven my case by an overwhelming preponderance of the proof? The evidence based on actual experience in foreign States is so near unanimous in favour of its abolition that it is a mere exception to a general rule that a fact militates against it.

But you may ask why do legal executions increase capital crimes? Because crime is largely a disease, and the demoralizing effect of a legal execution, and the example thus set by the state arouses the criminal nature and cheapens life in the estimation of the criminally inclined. Like begets like in this respect, as sure as night follows day. We cannot put it better than to quote from Mrs. Ella Wheeler Wilcox's beautiful poem on capital punishment:—

And last the people, frenzied or depressed
By sight or sound, or knowledge of the deed,
Are wronged and injured by the law's effect;
Crime follows execution; thought breeds thought,
And,as from thistledown new thistles spring,
So violent actions to disorders lead.
That vengeful God of Hebraic lore
Has blocked the progress of the world too long.
When Science seeks the cause, and Love the cure,
Then crime will vanish from the human race.

Did you ever for a moment contemplate the moral wrecks, the devastation and depravity, that have followed in the wake of war and of active armies? If anything, it is worse than the active warfare itself. Notwithstanding that the guerilla knew he would be shot by his captors, hundreds of formerly honourable men, or at least apparently so, became sutlers, ghouls, horse thieves, or common robbers, and even little value or respect was placed on the virtue of womanhood. Some of the women themselves were contaminated by the general moral stagnation, and many yielded to the degeneracy of the times. Human life especially became so cheap, in the estimation of the people, that murder became the rule instead of the exception. The Government itself was engaged in the vocation of killing; the citizen, or at least the criminally inclined, put no higher value on life than his Government, and that is always true. If we are to teach our citizenship that life is sacred, we must not take it by law, nor even by law sanction it. As an example, the Quakers even refuse to go to war or for any reason take life, and they do not commit murders.

But you say it deters others from committing crimes. If that is so, why have States that do not kill the smallest homicidal rate per capita? Why are such crimes increasing, while the death penalty is being enforced? If it deters to kill by hanging or electrocuting, it would certainly act as a much stronger deterrent if you would, as of old, torture and mutilate the murderer? You say that would be too cruel and barbarous and would demoralize the public and even brutalize men. Well, the majority of people think inflicting the death penalty is too cruel and barbarous, and that the majority of people think so is proven by the fact that great majority of people want the sentence on the condemned man commuted to life imprisonment in each instance. Our descendants a century hence will look back on our legal executions with the same aversion and horror, and denounce us as we do our ancestors who burnt at the stake and mutilated the body of the condemned, or caused it to hang, for weeks, as a warning.

Dr. A. B. Martin, Dean of the Lebanon Law School of Cumberland University, gives a demonstrative illustration from his own observations, that hanging does not deter others from committing crimes. A man was to be hanged on the public square in Lebanon, Tenn., and the gallows was erected. Two enterprising—I think infamously so—young men erected an arena around the scaffold, and on the day of the hanging were present and collected a great deal of money for their seats. Within one and a half years both of the men were hanged for the same offence for which the victim that they had exploited was executed.

Some of the most shocking crimes follow closely the most notorious executions. For example, the Allens murdered Judge Massey and four others in the Court House at Hillsville, Va., while the papers of said state were heralding the news of the execution of the noted wife murderer, H. C. Beattie. The assassination of Rosenthal in New York city followed closely on the heels of the execution of four men in New York State within one hour. Instances are reported in which the spectators at a hanging in England for picking pockets committed the same offence for which the victim was being executed.

Another reason why capital punishment should be abolished is that innocent men are sometimes executed. We know of one innocent man who was hanged in Canada, and we have grave doubts that there were not three innocent men hanged.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Who were they ?

Mr. BICKERDIKE: One innocent man that we know of was hanged in New Westminster, B.C. In one case two men—I do not say they were innocent, and we know they were thieves—went into a sawmill office, stole a cash-box and went to the park to divide the spoils. It was getting dark, and one of them struck a match, and a policeman came along and one of them fired. Some said that both fired, but one of them claimed he did not fire, and the other claimed he merely fired to frighten the policeman, but the bullet struck a tree and glanced off and killed the policeman As a result of the exami-

nation it was found that there was only one bullet which struck that policeman, but British Columbia was determined to make an example, and in that case, as in the old days in Ireland, they gave both of them the benefit of the doubt and hanged the two.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: They were both guilty.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: They were not both guilty, Sir. I am sorry to have to contradict my leader.

Mr. PROULX: The hon. gentleman should know that, being on an unlawful errand, if one of them committed murder they were both guilty of murder.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: That is because one of them was in bad company, and if every man in this House that was ever in bad company was hanged there would not be many of us here to-day. Of course, that remark does not apply to my respected leader. The fact is, that that man was innocent of the crime of murder for which he paid the death penalty; and, to the disgrace of that court, and to the disgrace of the judge and jury, they took the money for sending that innocent man into eternity; they took blood money and they knew it. Even the Tory papers that were entirely opposed to anything I said in the discussion on former occasions said they were surprised that the Minister of Justice did not see that there was a reprieve in that case.

The Government itself is engaged in the vocation of killing the criminally inclined, and the criminals put no higher value on life than the Government does itself.

Mr. BURNHAM: What happens to those who die in sin?

Mr. BICKERDIKE: I am not able to answer that question; but no man, unless he is an infidel, will vote to send a soul into eternity when he cannot say what the result will be. If a man believes truly that there is an eternity of the soul, either saved or damned, he cannot vote to send his fellow-man into eternity. He will not do it unless he is an infidel. It is true, there must be a lot of infidels.

The Government say that capital punishment deters others from committing crime. If that is so, I ask: Why have the States which do not have capital punishment the smallest number of crimes? Why do such crimes increase in number when the death penalty is put into force?

I would like to give a few opinions of great men on this question. I do not wish to detract from our good friend the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) at all. I have not his opinion here, but I will put it down next time. Thos. B. Reed says:

> Capital punishment is injurious to society because the example is bad.

The Government says, very nicely, to the poor criminal: We are going to punish you; we are going to prove to you that murder is wrong, and we are going to prove it by murdering you; we kill to prove that killing is wrong. Why, they are a great deal worse than the butchers in Montreal who say: 'We kill to keep alive.'

Whittier says: 'All revenge is crime.'

Lafayette says: 'I shall ask for the abolition of capital punishment until I have the infallibility of human judgment demonstrated to me.'

John F. Fitzpatrick, of the Chicago Federation of Labour, says:

> Organized labour everywhere stands for the abolishment of capital punishment, and if I am elected sheriff (he was then a candidate for sheriff), I will do my best to further this civilized reform.

William Lloyd Garrison says:

> The horror of inflicting the death penalty makes jurors violate their oaths.

General N. M. Curtis says:

> During my four years and eight months of military service, I had opportunity to observe the effects of many executions under martial law, I came to believe firmly that they were in every case demoralizing and destructive of discipline. These convictions against the efficiency of the death penalty have been strengthened as I have become better acquainted with the evil effects of executions under civil laws.

Henry Ward Beecher says:

> While the fear of hanging does not deter men from crime, the fear of inflicting death deters many a jury from finding a just verdict, and favours the escape of the criminal.

Rantoul says:

> The strongest safeguard of life is its sanctity; and this sentiment every execution diminishes.

5 p.m. Bulwer says:

> Society has erected the gallows at the end of the land instead of guide posts and directions boards at its beginning.

Seneca says:

> Many hold death in contempt, regarding it at rest from evil, while they are much afraid of imprisonment.

Dr. Cheevar says:

Had the state done its duty in his (the murderer's) education, he never would have been a murderer.

Blackstone says:

Life is the immediate gift of God to man, which neither can he resign nor can it be taken from him, unless by command of Him who gave it.

He also goes on to say that in Great Britain there is an average of three innocent men hanged every year. Channing says:

When I reflect how much of the responsibility for crime rests on the state, how many of the offences which are most severely punished are to be traced to neglected education, to early squalid want, to temptations and exposures which society might do much to relieve, I feel that the spirit of mercy should temper legislation, that we should not sever ourselves so widely from our fallen brethen; that we should recognize in them the countenance and claims of humanity; that we should strive to win them back to God.

I am sure my hon. friend will agree with what Benjamin Franklin says, namely:

Laws which inflict death for murder are, in my opinion, as un-Christian as those which justify revenge; for the obligations of Christianity upon individuals, to promote repentance, to forgive injuries, and to discharge the duties of universal benevolence are equally binding upon the state

John Quincy Adams says:

Gladly will I co-operate with any society whose object should be to promote the abolition of every form by which the life of man can be voluntarily taken by his fellow man. I do heartily wish and pray the success of your efforts to promote the abolition of capital punishment.

Father Matthew and Victor Hugo tell the same story. Robert Burns says:

Man's inhumanity to man makes countless thousands mourn.

William Shakespeare on one occasion out of curiosity visited one of these murder trials, and he says:

The jury, passing on the prisoner's life,
May, in the sworn twelve, have a thief or two,
Guiltier than him they try.

Cicero says:

Away with the executioner and execution, and the very name of its engine. Even the mere mention of them is unworthy of a Roman citizen and a freeman.

Some of my hon. friends who, when I first introduced my Bill a few years ago, thought I was in error, have since changed their minds. I would be pleased if all those who formerly opposed it would change their minds. One of them, I think my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) was very strong on the Old Testament rule of Moses that there should be a life for a life, an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth. I think we have passed that stage. It is true that Moses did shed the blood of his enemies; but we have in place of him One, the Lord, who shed His blood for His enemies. To me there is quite a difference. My hon. friend claimed that the Scriptures say 'a life for a life.' I claim—and I challenge successful contradiction—that there is not a word in the Scriptures from Genesis to Revelations that commands capital punishment or even commends it. Example is surely better than precept; and I would ask, what about Cain, Moses himself, David, and twenty or thirty others mentioned in the Old Testament who committed murder and not one of whom was hanged? The man who will send a soul into eternity, whether he be a murderer or the state's hangman, does not believe in eternity. If he believed in eternity, he would not, he could not, commit such an act. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition says that this man was guilty of being in bad company—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No, I said he was guilty of murder. But I did not say he should be hanged.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: Was it not a case for reprieve?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Possibly.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: The right hon. gentleman knows it was; he would never have thought of hanging such a man. There was nothing against this man but that he was in bad company. He was in bad company, and probably was a thief; I think there is no question that he stole the money. But was that a reason why he should be hanged? The man did not commit the murder, and yet he was hanged as a murderer. We call ourselves a Christian nation, and we bow our heads in prayer. Yet we hanged that man though he was innocent of the crime for which he was condemned.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), when I introduced this Bill last year, had something to say about it. I am sorry the hon. gentleman is not here. He said:

And the time may come when it will be unnecessary to have such extreme punishment, as capital punishment is, and administered as it has been for the deterrence of great criminals.

The hon. gentleman thought we were doing better. I claim that we are not doing better. The ink was hardly dry on the

"Hansard" from which I have quoted when one of the most brutal murders ever committed in any country was committed in the Canadian city of Calgary, a brutal, legalized murder. It took twenty minutes to hang the victim, or rather to kill him. This took place in the barracks of the Northwest Mounted Police. The man was hanged and afterwards cut down, but it was found that he was not dead. The suggestion was made that they should hang him again, but the representative there of the mounted police said that that must not be done, it would not be legal. They dragged the man over and laid him beside his coffin, and he lay there for twenty minutes groaning. Why, there is not a member of this House who, if he owned a yellow, mangy, mad dog, would have the animal tortured in the way that poor unfortunate criminal was tortured to his death. The Minister of Trade and Commerce stated also that he believed there were countries that had abolished capital punishment—he could not remember which countries—and had afterwards reinstated it. I can tell the hon. minister he was misinformed. Of the twenty-eight states, countries and places that have abolished capital punishment, not one of them has reinstated it. I challenge the hon. minister or anybody else to contradict me.

My hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) was also misinformed as to the proportion of murders as between the State of Maine on the one side and New Brunswick and Nova Scotia on the other. He said there were not half as many murders in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick as in Maine. My statistics show that there are twice as many. Of course, that was a mistake on the part of the hon. gentleman; he would not make a statement that he did not believe.

Mr. CARVELL: Have you the statistics of the State of Maine for the past year?

Mr. BICKERDIKE: No.

Mr. CARVELL: I think they would be against you.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: But if my hon. friend will look into the figures given by him and by me last year, I think he will find my figures much better based than his own.

In the discussion on this Bill last year I was well treated—very well treated; I have no fault to find. None of the hon. members called down fire from heaven to burn up my Bill, though I must admit that some of the remarks had an almost sulphurus odour. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) was misinformed as to the historical facts in relation to British Columbia which he gave. He said that in that province Judge Begbie warned evil-doers: I am here to administer justice, and if there is a murder there will be a hanging. The hon. gentleman said there was a murder and a hanging followed; and murders stopped. There is where the hon. gentleman is misinformed. There was murder, there were hangings; and murders increased. And murders will go on increasing while the hangman's rope dangles over the heads of the people. My hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Wilson), who, I am sorry to say is not here to-day, drew the colour line at that time. I am sorry for that. The coloured man to whom he referred was hanged—the first man to be hanged in Bordeau jail, I believe. And he was innocent of the crime for which he was condemned. Let any man who doubts that consult the Roman Catholic chaplain of that jail and he will be given to understand that that man was innocent. I do not say he was a good man; he was a bad man. He was a bad man, a poor man and a black man—and he was hanged.

Some hon. gentlemen tell us that the command was ' a life for a life.' There was no such thing as a command in it. And if it were a command, as I have said before, example is better than precept, and what about Cain, Moses, Lamech, Simeon, Levi, David and many others who committed murder, and not one of whom suffered capital punishment?

Now, if the Minister of Justice, the Prime Minister and the leader of the Opposition would place their ears to the ground, they would learn that there is a demand all over this country for a little more mercy and a little less law. If you cannot go any further, let us agree that there is no reason why a poor man should be punished for a crime more than a rich man. But, if a man is wealthy—especially if he is very wealthy—when charged with crime,, he can be adjudged insane. Or if he has a fair amount of ' pull ' he will get off. Eminent jurists, like my hon. friend, would go to work and find means to get him off. But the poor man has to go. I tell you the poor men of this country will not stand it very much longer. Which Minister of Justice in Canada shall have the immortal honour of abolishing capital punishment in this Dominion? I sincerely hope that it may be our present Minister of Justice (Mr.

Doherty). He is a good man; he has been on the Bench and he knows something about these things. If he does not, then one of his successors will. The time has come in Canada when legalized murder should be discontinued. As I have said, two alternatives are open to us: what Moses did, and what the Lord did. Which shall we choose?

I have asked the Government to give this legislation a trial. No harm can be done by making the experiment between the close of one session and the beginning of another. Let us make the experiment, and I venture to say that if we do so we shall never again go back to capital punishment. I will go further and say that if the Government will agree to give this legislation a trial and it is found that I am mistaken, I will resign my seat in this House. This shows how sure I am that if capital punishment is abolished in Canada it will never be re-established.

I do hope that the Prime Minister will see the necessity of giving this legislation a trial. Let me close by saying that Moses shed the blood of his enemies, while the Lord shed his blood for his enemies.

Mr. F. L. SCHAFFNER (Souris): Undoubtedly the hon. gentleman has given this question a great deal of thought and research. He made two very strong, if not bold, assertions. If I understood the hon. gentleman aright, he said that capital punishment is a stimulus to murder rather than a deterrent. I should like to know how the hon. gentleman came to that conclusion. One other question. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that if we are going to have capital punishment, the more public the form this punishment takes, the better.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: I did not say that. I said that if you contend that capital punishment is a deterrent, then the more public it is the better.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Looking upon 'deterrent' as applying personally to the individual concerned, I do not see how capital punishment would be a greater deterrent if the man who committed the murder were punished publicly than if the punishment were administered in private.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: If the hon. gentleman himself believes—and I know he does—that capital punishment is a deterrent, then it should be made as public as possible; hang the por man up where everyone can see him.

[Mr. Bickerdike.]

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): While I do not agree with the sentiments expressed by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, I do him the credit—and I think every member in this House will do so—for the earnestness and sincerity with which he advocates what he believes to be right.

The question of capital punishment may be considered from several different viewpoints; I am going to deal with it only from one. Considering it from the viewpoint of punishment for a crime committed, I think there are worse things than hanging. If the hon. gentleman argues that the worst thing you can do to a man is to put a rope round his neck and by that means send him into eternity, then I take issue with him. After all, what are the circumstances? Occasionally a man who has committed the crime of murder pays the penalty by being hanged. Why make a fuss about an occasional hanging? Why make a fuss about the occasional taking of life in that way? Men are being murdered by the dozen in a worse way than that in our penitentiaries—the result of the administration, or mal-administration, of justice at the present time. If hanging is a crime, then I submit that worse crimes than that are committed against men. To place a man in a prison and take away from him everything but the breath of life—and that is being done right along, and apparently is being approved right along—is, in my estimation, even worse than actually to take a man's life. The hon. gentleman mentioned the case of a murder committed in the Pacific coast province, in which two men were involved. He says that only one shot was fired, and that, therefore, at least one of these men was wrongfully hanged. While I am not a lawyer, I think that the hon. gentleman is wrong in that respect; these men were both committing an unlawful act, and, consequently, were both responsible. But supposing only one of them had been hanged, and that the other had been mercifully saved and sent, we will say, to Kingston penitentiary. Let us follow the career of the poor unfortunate who goes to Kingston penitentiary. He is confined in a cell, and is allowed to go out for exercise and fresh air. He is not permitted to utter a sound; to speak a word to a guard or to a fellow convict is a misdemeanour. He is probably put on the stone pile, cracking stone month after month and year after year. He is subjected to tauntings and goadings and tor-

turings, and if he rebels against them he is taken to a specially-constructed cell, a hose pressure of 70 pounds is turned on the poor unfortunate wretch, and he is thrown and knocked about in the cell, until, as they say, he gives in. If that treatment sends him to the hospital, on Sunday he gets three meals, the first at nine o'clock, the next at eleven and the third at one o'clock in the afternoon, and he receives nothing more until between eight and nine o'clock the next morning. Hon. gentlemen may smile at that, but I am stating what is the fact. If the man's health breaks down after that and his treatment in the institution drives him to insanity, as is frequently the case, he is taken to the insane ward, where the last final touches are administered. Forty or fifty persons are herded together in one room, the worst cases with the milder ones, the diseased persons with those whose only defect is mental derangement. They are herded together during the day and then sent into their cells, their food is handed to them and they tear it to pieces with their fingers and teeth like wild animals. If any one of them dares to utter a protest against one of the guards or keepers, the unfortunate wretch is stripped, specially constructed harness is fastened on him, his legs are bound together and his arms fastened to his side and he is dipped into a tub of ice-cold water, being left there until, as they say, he gives in. That is how the insane are treated, or some of them at least. I am stating facts. Under this treatment the men, not merely one or two but dozens, have the life and soul crushed out of them. They become indifferent, they have no hope in this world, and are made incapable of any thought of the next. That, in my judgment, is a worse penalty than hanging.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: If the hon. member makes it much worse, I shall have to ask leave to withdraw my Bill.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am stating what I know to be facts. I repeat that in my judgment such a condition is far worse than hanging. It is a condition of affairs sanctioned apparently by organized society, and is a disgrace and scandal to this country and to all the men who keep silent in this House while this sort of thing goes on. That is how I feel. I regret that the Minister of Justice has shown an apathy in regard to this matter which to my judgment is not at all to his credit. It was three years ago that I first directed his attention to the condition of affairs at Kingston penitentiary, and Kingston penitentiary is probably no worse than other penitentiaries in the country. It is high time that this state of affairs was remedied. It reflects little credit on the Department of Justice and on the members of this House to allow this state of affairs to continue. Later in the session I hope to call attention to it more in detail. I shall not support the Bill of my hon. friend because I believe that in hanging a man you are doing him a kindness by taking him out of Kingston penitentiary.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM: I shall not occupy the House very long, but I could not conscientiously let this discussion go by without expressing my opinion in favour of the measure. Since I became a man, I have always been opposed to capital punishment. I have always felt, and have no reason now to change my mind, that by legalizing the taking of the life of a fellow-being we are making ourselves familiar with the shedding of blood. I have no comment to make on the remarks of my hon. friend from Frontenac, except this: that a charge of that kind having been made publicly by a member from his seat in this House, it is the duty of the Government to look into the matter and, if conditions prevail such as have been described, to provide a remedy. Perhaps I may be considered too humane in my views concerning the duty of one man to another. I maintain that we are our brother's keeper, and no law that can be placed on the statute book of Canada or of any other country can relieve us of that obligation to our fellow-beings. Did it ever strike a member of the House who is in favour of capital punishment that he does not hob-nob with the machinery that carries out the death sentence? None of us are ever seen hob-nobbing with the hangman.

Mr BICKERDIKE: They take him to the club for lunch.

Mr. GRAHAM: Not knowingly. Another thing that strikes me as peculiar in the administration of justice is this, and it shows our inconsistency. A criminal awaiting the death sentence in one of our penitentiaries is perhaps stricken with some disease of which he might die if he were allowed to do so. But no, the greatest care is taken to keep him alive so that he may be executed a little later on. Now, if the object in the public mind was to rid society of this criminal, why not let him pass away peacefully of his disease? And the more I

study criminal law, the more convinced I am of this: the public is possessed of the idea of revenge upon the man who commits murder, and that is the only reason why his life is kept in him—in order that he may be reserved for the gallows. For if it were only a question of getting rid of the criminal he might just as well be allowed to die peacefully of his own accord. Two things govern us: first, society should be protected; second, the individual should be punished. I go a litle farther and say that the criminal should be given an opportunity to reform. No man has the right to say to what length of time that opportunity should be extended. Do we, by hanging a man, protect society? Most certainly we do. Would punishment of another kind protect society just as well? On this point there is a great difference of opinion. I have given some study to the question during the years I have been in public life, and before. I have seen how many countries, one by one, have abolished capital punishment. I am not at all surprised at the figures read by my hon. friend to-day, because I am firmly convinced that capital punishment is no greater deterrent than life imprisonment, and I think the experience of the countries that have done away with hanging fully bears me out in that.

Now, as to the punishment of the individual. I would not go so far as my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) and say that imprisonment is a greater punishment than hanging, but I do believe that imprisonment is as thorough a punishment as hanging. It is only a matter of degree anyway, and only those who have had the experience could give an absolute answer. For the purposes of society, a man is punished just as thoroughly by imprisonment as by hanging, and history shows that criminals consider it just as great a punishment. Some dread it even more than execution.

I shall possibly be called a sentimentalist for the remarks I shall make as to the reclamation of criminals. I know is is much more popular to say, "Away with him; he killed somebody, so he ought to be killed," than to intimate that the criminal might possibly be reclaimed and made a good citizen. I believe that no product of the Creator's handiwork but has some good in him. In most cases the surroundings of an individual in his youth have a great deal to do with his after-life. But, I repeat, I am a firm believer that there is in every man an element of good which can be developed and fructified if found and properly nurtured. If it be true that society is protected as thoroughly by imprisonment as by hanging, and that imprisonment is a sufficient punishment, you do not by imprisonment deprive the individual of the opportunity of being reclaimed and made what the Creator intended he should be made, in a measure at least—a respectable man, before he is called to pass from this life. By capital punishment we say: "You must die on a certain day, and, in the words of the judge, may the Lord have mercy on your soul." We undertake, as a human agency, to give a man so many days to get ready for heaven, and if he cannot then he takes the consequences. We have no right to take that position, and I do not think we protect society any more by doing it. I do not believe that we punish the individual any more, and we do take from him every opportunity that he would otherwise have, perhaps during the long years of imprisonment, of becoming a man again and of making himself right in so far as possible with his fellow men in this world and with his Creator in the eternity that is before him. I go as far as my hon. friend goes in saying that I do not believe that any human being under any guise of law, under any statute that he may invoke, has the right to step in and assume the prerogative of the Creator himself and take life, with the giving of which he has had nothing to do. This may be a sentiment, but it is a sentiment I strongly entertain. I entertain it conscientiously, and so long as I am in this House I shall vote for the abolition of capital punishment, because I believe it is wrong and affords no protection to society.

Mr. G. W. KYTE (Richmond, N.S.): I was not present when this Bill was discussed on a former occasion, but the grounds I take for opposing the Bill are as sincere as the sentiments that have prompted the hon. member for St. Lawrence, Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike), to propose this legislation. It speaks well for his humanity and his philanthropic disposition that he should present this legislation to the House. His description of execution by form of law as being legalized murder has its counterpart in another obligation which rests upon the Government in respect to the raising of revenue for carrying on the affairs of the country. I have heard in days past a certain form of taxation described as being legalized robbery, in the same way as the hon. member for St. Lawrence, Montreal,

describes executions under forms of law as being legalized murder. If we go to Great Britain for a precedent in this respect, what do we find? We find that fifty years ago they abolished that form of legalized robbery, but that up to the present time they have adhered to this form of legalized murder. I think we may fairly go to the mother country for our precedent and guidance in this particular. My hon. friend has quoted figures calculated to show that in certain states of the American Union where capital punishment has been abolished, the number of charges of homicide has very considerably decreased. But I have listened to temperance orators describing the advantages of total prohibition in certain of these states, and they have attributed the extraordinary decrease of crime within these states to the existence of total prohibition. Michigan and Wisconsin are two of the states which my hon. friend has referred to as being examples of those where crime has decreased by reason of capital punishment having been abolished. I think that Michigan and Wisconsin are also states that are enjoying the advantages of a prohibitory law, and the advocates of prohibition lose no opportunity of attributing the decrease in these forms of crime to temperance legislation. My hon. friend also refers to several countries in Europe where capital punishment has been abolished. I remember that on more than one occasion during the last three years the hon. gentleman having charge of the administration of justice in this Government has felt himself called upon to propose legislation in this House calculated to reduce the number of crimes committed particularly in the city of Montreal by reason of the privileges hitherto enjoyed by certain citizens there in respect to the carrying of concealed weapons. How is it that the crimes of murder, manslaughter and the various forms of homicide which this legislation was designed to suppress were committed largely by the subjects of those countries in Europe that have abolished capital punishment?

Mr. BICKERDIKE: They do not commit them where there is no capital punishment but they come here and commit them.

Mr. KYTE: It does not indicate that the abolition of capital punishment in these countries has had a very salutary effect upon the character of their subjects. I might say, in regard to the criminal statistics in Nova Scotia, that it is quite true that in the last ten years crimes have increased in the province. But who committed them? They are committed by subjects of those countries in Europe where capital punishment has been abolished. I respect the humane instincts of the people of the United States who have been led to adopt the reform which my hon. friend from St. Lawrence, Montreal, is endeavouring to bring about, but we do know that crime and sentimentality are inextricably interwoven in certain parts of that country. There is a certain degree of sentimentality in respect to these things that is not at all creditable to those indulging in it. We hear of cases where men who have committed the most degrading crimes are, while awaiting sentence of the court, the subjects of the most touching marks of favour and sentiment. We do know that criminals who have been convicted of the most revolting crimes, while awaiting in prison the period of execution, have been visited by respectable people who have bestowed upon these criminals presents and testimonials of a character which do not suggest that these people are actuated by purposes or motives altogether calculated to put an end to these grave offences. There are certain forms of sentimentality which have been manifested that it is not well that we should copy in this country. We know that in the United States they have a record for defences on behalf of those who are charged with these grave crimes. It has been given to the legal profession of the United States to create the brain-storm defence and the defence of the higher law when their clients are charged with offences which are most revolting and which ought to be punished in the severest manner.

If we desire to take our example from any country it should be taken from the mother country which has a record for humanity and philanthropy not excelled by that of any country in the world. There they exercise the right to enforce capital punishment, but capital punishment is limited to three offences only, and as a matter of fact it is only meted out in respect to one, that is murder. With respect to manslaughter and other forms of homicide capital punishment is not inflicted. I think the humanity of the British people ought not to be challenged or inhumanity attributed to them because throughout the ages for the highest good they have adhered to capital punishment in respect to that offence. It is quite

true that in days gone by capital punishment was inflicted in England in respect of many offences which to-day appear to us trivial, but the fact that they have eliminated capital punishment for all other crimes except murder goes to show that the criminal law has been developed in the direction of the widest sympathy for erring humanity, and the reasons that they adhere to capital punishment in the administration of the criminal law of England, as respects murder, ought to be sufficient for us to follow the examples which have guided us for so many years. We may, therefore, be pardoned if we fail to accept the reasoning or the sentiment applied to the question by my hon. friend.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I appreciate, in common with the other members who have listened to the hon. member (Mr. Bickerdike), the earnestness and sincerity with which he has presented his views, even if we do not concur in all the conclusions he has reached after his consideration of the subject. All the members of the House are impressed with the very great importance of this question. I do not purpose debating the matter this afternoon, because it is desirable that the Minister of Justice should speak on this motion before the debate is concluded. Before moving the adjournment of the debate, I would like to say to my hon. friend that we shall see that an opportunity shall be afforded him of having the debate continued.

With regard to the observations of my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), I may say that I remember that an investigation was held into the condition in the Kingston penitentiary, and that the report of that commission, after careful investigation disclosed that certain abuses prevailed. I would be surprised if the abuses to which my hon. friend has alluded have been allowed to continue in Kingston penitentiary since, and I would also be surprised to learn that they exist in all the penitentiaries in Canada. However, that is a matter as to which I have no personal knowledge. It is a subject peculiarly within the knowledge of the Minister of Justice, who unfortunately cannot be here to-day. For that reason also it is highly desirable that the debate should be adjourned, in order that the attention of the Minister of Justice may be directed to the observations of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards). As to the insane who have been confined in penitentiaries, I understand that negotiations have been going on for some time past, between the Minister of Justice and the various provincial authorities, with the view to an arrangement by which insane prisoners should be transferred to asylums under the control and jurisdiction of the provincial authorities. Although the information comes to my knowledge indirectly in the absence of the Minister of Justice, I understand that arrangements have been consummated with all the provinces of Canada except one, and from that province there are only two insane persons confined in the penitentiary, as to whom a suitable arrangement will be made. However, I am not in a position to give the House this afternoon a full explanation which will be afforded by the Minister of Justice later on. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions to be answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

WAR CONTRACTS—HAY.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. With what persons, firms or corporations has the Department of Agriculture, or any other department of the Government of Canada, contracted for hay for the British Government, since the first day of August last past?

2. How much hay has been delivered by each of the said persons, firms or corporations since that date, and the places of delivery thereof?

3. What price, or prices, was paid to each of the said persons, firms or corporations for the hay when delivered to the Government, and the several ports or points of delivery?

4. Into how many cubic feet per ton was the said hay to be compressed, and what was to be the size and weight of each of the said bales?

5. Has the Government, or any department thereof, paid any such persons, firms or corporations, for the compressing of the said hay, the actual article having been furnished by the Government, or a department thereof? If so, what persons, firms or corporations did the compressing, and what price per ton were they paid for so doing?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I would ask that this question stand as a notice of motion for a return. There is some question as to the extent to which it should be answered in view of the precedent which was laid down some years ago, and there are other considerations which I shall be glad to mention to the House when the motion comes up at a later date.

Question to stand as notice of motion for a return.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—RIVER DU LOUP SHOPS.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. How many persons were employed at the River du Loup car shops of the Intercolonial railway, in the locomotive sheds and in the repairs establishment, respectively, from September, 1911, to 1st January, 1915?

2. How many of such persons were discharged, dismissed or suspended during the said period of time?

3. How many of such persons willingly accepted superannuation, and how many demurred when superannuated?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Car or repair shop, 38; locomotive sheds, 114.

2. Car or repair shop, 3; locomotive shed, 11.

3. 8 willingly accepted. Two demurred, but were superannuated on account of their age and disability.

MR. F. P. GUTELIUS.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Has the Department of Railways and Canals, the minister, or the Government any information regarding the nationality of Mr. F. P. Gutelius, general manager of Government railways? If so, what is his nationality? If not, will such information be obtained?

2. Has the said F. P. Gutelius sent in his resignation, or has notice been sent him to this effect?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. British subject.

2. No.

BAGOT COUNTY POSTAL SERVICE.

Mr. MARCILE:

1. Has the post office at Royville, county of Bagot, been permanently closed? If so, for what reason?

2. Have the citizens of the said post office district protested against its closing and will said post office be re-opened?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Yes, the Royville Post Office has been closed, the establishment of rural mail delivery in the district having rendered its further maintenance unnecessary.

2. No protest has been received.

Mr. MARCILE:

1. Has the Moose River post office, county of Bagot, been permanently closed? If so, for what reason?

2. Who recommended the closing of said post office?

3. Does the Postmaster General know that the closing of said post office is said to be detrimental to the inhabitants of this district?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. The Moose River Post Office has been closed owing to the establishment of rural mail delivery in the district, which rendered the Post Office unnecessary.

2 and 3. The Post Office inspector reported that the closing of this office would not inconvenience any of the patrons, as all would come within the scope of rural delivery.

Mr. MARCILE:

1. Has a rural mail service been established in the parish of Ste. Christine, county of Bagot. If so, when?

2. Were tenders called for said service? If so, what are the names of the tenderers, and the amount of each tender?

3. Who obtained the contract and was he the lowest tenderer?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Yes, on the 20th January, 1915.

2 and 3. Tenders were invited. Only one tender was received, that of Barthelemi Bisaillon at $800 per annum. This tender was considered too high and Mr. Bisaillon agreed to reduce the amount to $775 which was accepted.

Mr. MARCILE:

1. Has the post office of the village of Emileville, county of Bagot, been permanently closed? If so, for what reason?

2. Was a petition received by the Postmaster General requesting that said post office be maintained? If so, is it the intention of the Postmaster General to authorize its re-opening?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. No, the Emileville Post Office has not been closed.

2. No petition has been received.

Mr. MARCILE:

1. Has the Britannia Mills post office, county of Bagot, been permanently closed? If so, for what reason?

2. Has a petition, signed by a large number of citizens requesting the maintenance of said post office been received by the Postmaster General? If so, is it the intention of the Postmaster General to accede to the said petitioner's request?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. No. Britannia Mills Post Office has not been closed.

2. A petition asking for the maintenance of this Post Office was received at the Department and steps have been taken to have further inquiry made before a decision is given.

PROPOSED WAR PENSIONS.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. In case of death of a member of the Canadian overseas contingent, what consideration is received by his dependents?

2. Is it the intention of the Government at this session to provide by legislation or otherwise, for pensions for disabled members of

Canadian overseas contingents or to the dependents of deceased members of such contingents?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. There are regulations in force at present governing the consideration that is to be received by way of pension. A revision of those regulations has been under consideration for some weeks past, and I anticipate that a final conclusion will be reached at a very early date.

2. I am advised by the Minister of Justice that it will not be necessary to pass any additional legislation.

SOUTHAMPTON RAILWAY INVESTIGATION.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. What is the total amount paid to date re Southampton railway investigation?
2. According to the claims filed, what amounts are still demanded?
3. How much has been paid respectively to each of the following persons, viz:—E. J. Walsh, A. J. Milden, James K. Pender, David W. Brown and Titus J. Carter?
4. What amounts claimed by each of the above persons still remain unpaid?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. $8,482.02.

2. None.

3. E. J. Walsh, C.E., $2,029.55; A. J. Milden, C.E., $840.70; Jas. K. Pender, paid nothing by the department; David W. Brown, paid nothing by the department; T. J. Carter, K.C., $941.85.

4. None.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. With reference to paragraph 14 of the findings of R. A. Pringle, a commissioner for investigating certain charges re the Southampton Railway Company, has the Government or any department thereof taken any steps to recover the sum of $34,607.50 which amount was found to have been overpaid to the said company?
2. Has the Government commenced criminal proceedings against James K. Pender or David W. Brown in connection therewith?
3. If not, is it their intention so to do?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. The Department of Justice has the case under consideration, with instructions to proceed for the recovery of any moneys which the Government is entitled to recover.

2. No.

3. This matter is also under consideration by the Department of Justice.

THE VALLEY RAILWAY.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. Under the present agreement for the operation of the Valley railway, so called, between Fredericton and Centreville, in the province of New Brunswick, what proportion of the gross receipts are retained by the Intercolonial railway?
2. To whom is the balance of the said gross receipts to be paid?
3. In case of a loss in the operation of the said railway, what portion thereof is borne by the Intercolonial railway?
4. In such case, who bears the balance of said loss?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. None.

2. See answer to No. 1.

3. Fifty per cent.

4. Province of New Brunswick.

RIVER JOHN CUSTOMS SUB-COLLECTORSHIP.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Has any appointment been made to the position of subcollector of customs at River John, Pictou county, vacant by the death of Mr. Henry?
2. Does the Government intend to maintain said office?
3. If so, when do they intend to make an appointment?

Mr. REID:

1. No permanent appointment has been made to this position.

2. Yes.

3. The position of sub-collector will be filled ere long. The duties of the position are now attended to temporarily by an officer from the customs house, Pictou.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—OXFORD JUNCTION-NEW GLASGOW BRANCH.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Why was one of the regular trains taken off the short line between Oxford Junction and New Glasgow on February 8?
2. Has the department received any representations to objections to same?
3. Does the department intend to put on said train again? If so, when?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. No schedule train was taken off the short line between Oxford Junction and New Glasgow. The way freight was taken off and its work is now being done by the regular mixed train.

2. No.

3. Way freight or extra freight trains will be run as business requires.

WRENTHAM, ALTA., POST OFFICE.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Was a post office established at Wrentham, Alberta?
2. Is it still in existence?
3. If not, for what reason was it closed?

Mr. CASGRAIN: A post office has not yet been opened at Wrentham, and therefore the office has not been closed. Complaints were made against the person nominated as postmaster; but on inquiry no evidence was adduced to sustain the charge, and shortly afterwards he left the locality. Another nomination has been made, and the office will be opened immediately.

LETHBRIDGE POSTMASTER.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Who is the postmaster at Lethbridge, Alberta?
2. On whose recommendation was he appointed?
3. What is his salary?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Mr. Alvin Ripley.
2. On recommendation of Mr. W. S. Ball, president of the Conservative Association, Lethbridge.
3. $2,200 per annum.

IMPORTATION OF OIL FOR FUEL.

Mr. WILLIAM CHISHOLM:

1. How many tons of oil for fuel has been imported into Canada from April 1 to December 31, 1914, and what was the value of the same?
2. Has any duty been paid on such importations?

Mr. REID:

1. Imports entered for consumption in Canada of petroleum, crude, fuel and gas oils, ·8235 specific gravity or heavier at 60 degrees temperature, amounted to 149,419,923 gallons, valued at $4,217,336; under provisions of tariff item 267.
2. No duty was collected on the above.

PICTOU ISLAND TO MAINLAND PROPOSED TELEPHONE LINE.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Has the Department of Public Works or Marine and Fisheries received any requests for the construction of a telephone line between Pictou Island and the mainland?
2. What action is proposed to be taken in regard to the same?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.
2. The matter is under consideration.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. What was the total receipts of the Intercolonial railway from April 1, 1914, to December 31, 1914?
2. What was the total expenditure on the Intercolonial railway in the same period?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. $8,913,100.11, exclusive of free shipments for Belgian relief, amounting to $44,600.
2. $8,859,950.80.

FORT ERIE SHOOTING CASE.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has the Government retained counsel to defend Corporal Archie Kaye and Privates Leslie Kinsman and Edmund MacIntosh, now awaiting trial for the shooting of the American duck-hunters, Smith and Dorsch, at or near Fort Erie on the 28th of December last?
2. Will the Government also provide counsel for the defence of Constable Thomas Delaney who was committed for trial with the three militiamen on the same charge? If not, why not?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The answer to the both questions is in the negative.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has the Government paid, or agreed to pay, any sum to the legal representatives of Walter Smith, who was killed, and to Charles Dorsch who was wounded by three militiamen, at or near Fort Erie, on the 28th of December last?
2. If so, what are the terms of the statement?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. Yes.
2. The Government have paid $10,000 to the mother of Walter Smith, and $5,000 to Charles Dorsch as an act of grace for the shooting which occurred at Fort Erie on the 28th December, 1914. The sum of $2,250 has been paid for legal and other expenses incurred by the parties.

CANADIAN PATRIOTIC FUND.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. What are the names and addresses of the persons employed to administer and distribute the Canadian Patriotic Fund?
2. What salary is paid to each?
3. What was the total amount paid for salaries and expenses up to February 1, 1915?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Government has no information on this subject; but it can easily be procured by application to the Association. The Association carries on its work under chapter 8 of the Statutes passed at the last session of Parliament, by which His Royal Highness the Governor General, the Lieutenant Governors of each of the provinces, the Prime Minister, and the leader of the Opposition of the Parliament of Canada, the Prime Ministers of the several provinces, and a number of other gentlemen were constituted into a body corporate under the name of

the Canadian Patriotic Fund. The objects of the corporation and the purposes for which it was formed have been fully set forth in the Act alluded to.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. Delisle: For a return showing how many persons of German nationality are employed in the several departments of the Federal Government, in what official capacity they are employed and the salaries they receive respectively.

Mr. McCraney: For a return showing how many applications for seed grain have been received from residents of the three Prairie provinces since June, 1914; how many bushels of grain were included in the applications; how many acres of land were to be seeded by the grain applied for; how many bushels of wheat, oats and barley, respectively, the Government has on hand with which to meet the applications; if arrangements have been made under which the several provincial governments will assist in meeting the needs of the settlers for seed grain.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, the House adjourned at 6 p.m.

Monday, February 15, 1915.

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

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Interim report of the Commissioners of the Transcontinental railway for the period of nine months ended December 31, 1914.—Mr. Cochrane.

Correspondence with regard to the retirement from the Government of Hon. L. P. Pelletier and Hon. W. B. Nantel.—Sir Robert Borden.

Report of the board of officers concerning the boots supplied to the expeditionary force.—Major-General Hughes.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

APPOINTMENT OF TRANSLATORS.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That the recommendation of His Honour the Speaker as to the appointments of Messrs Jules Tremblay, Paul Gédéon Ouimet, J. T. Keliher and L. J. Chagnon as translators of the blue book staff of the House, presented to the House on the 10th instant, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

WAR SUPPLIES—BOOTS.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: With regard to the report of the departmental committee which had under consideration the character, quality and suitability of the boots supplied to the first Canadian contingent, laid on the table of the House to-day, I think it desirable and in the public interest, and also due to the various manufacturers who supplied the boots, that the report of the committee and all matters which it concerns should be referred to a special committee of the House, in order that the subject may be further investigated, if desirable, and that the committee may report to the House in due course its findings with regard to the whole matter. Accordingly, I shall move to-morrow, when motions are called, that a committee of seven members be appointed for that purpose. If my right hon. friend will give me to-day the names of three hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, I shall be glad to have their names included in the list of members of the committee.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: On Wednesday, February 10, the following questions were asked by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair):

1. Has an investigation been made regarding the quality of the boots supplied to the Department of Militia and Defence for the use of the Canadian volunteers?
2. If so, who made this investigation and has the inquiry been closed?

The answers given by the Minister of Militia were as follows:

1. Yes.
2. Board appointed by the Minister of Militia. The inquiry has been closed.

There was in the press some time ago a report that the Minister of Militia had instituted inquiries in his own department, and it was also stated in the press that an inquiry had been instituted by a commission appointed by the Government for the purpose. Is it true that a commission has been appointed to conduct an investigation into this matter?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The inquiry was a departmental one, made, I understand, by a board appointed by the Minister of Militia.

REPORTED APPEARANCE OF AEROPLANES.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: A report appeared in the public press to-day to the effect that aeroplanes coming from the United States had been sighted. Can the right hon. Prime Minister give me any information on this point?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am afraid that I am unable to give the point of departure of the aeroplanes in question. The only information I have on the subject is that about nine o'clock last evening the mayor of Brockville telephoned to me that three aeroplanes had crossed over Brockville, going to the north, and that one of them had turned a searchlight upon the town, lighting up very considerably the principal street. On receiving the information I communicated it to the chief of the general staff, with the suggestion that it should also be made known to the Commissioner of Dominion Police.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. O. TURGEON: (Gloucester, N.B.): I rise to a question of privilege. My attention has been called to an article in the St. John Standard of the 11th instant, in which certain assertions of mine are misrepresented. I am reported as having used the following words at a recruiting meeting:

> I do not see how Britain can expect the men of Gloucester county to volunteer or enlist to fight her battles when they are obliged to leave their homes and go to the United States to earn their living and a living for their families.

I brand that report as an infamous distortion of fact and language. Others may call it what they wish, but that is what I think of it. I believe that no member of this House—especially you, Mr. Speaker, who have heard practically all my utterances in this Parliament during the last fifteen years—would say that I would use these remarks before the people of Gloucester county. I believe too that the diatribes contained in that report are not the views of the editor who wrote it. It has been published, no doubt for a purpose, one month after I made the declaration in Tracadie; but every man from New Brunswick knows that I was the first to organize and call recruiting meetings in Gloucester county and along the north shore of New Brunswick, as is shown by the correspondence with the Canadian Patriotic Committee of St. John, New Brunswick, of which His Honour the Lieutenant Governor of New Brunswick is president and Mr. Jas. Gilchrist is secretary. At my instance, eloquent speakers have attended these meetings. One of them in Bathurst was addressed by a gentleman whose name is familiar throughout New Brunswick, more particularly to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. F. M. Sproule, a member of the legal profession, an ex-member of the legislature, one of the most eloquent speakers it has ever been my pleasure to listen to, and the next morning fifteen or seventeen young men from Bathurst enlisted before dinner. If I had allowed this statement to go without contradiction some one, not in this House or in New Brunswick, might have believed it. I did not wait until war was declared to pronounce my allegiance or my loyalty to the Crown. My allegiance was my birthright and my loyalty has grown stronger with each year of my life. At the last meeting I addressed I did say, at the end of my remarks, after calling on the young men to enlist, that the young men of the county of Gloucester had not responded as generously as I had expected, although more generously than those of any of the surrounding counties. The number was not to my satisfaction. I said that, owing to the hard times prevailing in Gloucester since the year before, owing to the depression of business, such as the closing of the iron mine at Bathurst by which three or four hundred men were thrown out of employment, many of whom had gone to the United States and were therefore not here to enlist, a larger number should have gone to the front. I shall not take up your time by reading the diatribe against me that follows, as I have said I do not think that the editor of the Standard himself believes it. If any further explanation is required at any time I shall be glad to give it.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 4, respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company.—Mr. Michael Clark.

Bill No. 5, respecting the Athabasca and Grand Prairie Railway Company.—Mr. Green.

Bill No. 6, respecting the Brantford and Hamilton Electric Railway Company.—Mr. Barker.

Bill No. 7, respecting the British Columbia and White River Railway Company.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill No. 8, respecting the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company.—Mr. Green.

Bill No. 9, respecting the Essex Terminal Railway Company.—Mr. Wilcox.

Bill No. 10, respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. E. M. Macdonald.

Bill No. 11, respecting The Hudson Bay, Peace River and Pacific Railway Com-

pany, and to change its name to Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. W. H. Sharpe.

Bill No. 12, to amend the Independent Order of Foresters Consolidated Act.—Mr. Glass.

Bill No. 13, respecting the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill No. 14, to ratify and confirm a certain agreement between the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Oliver.

Bill No. 15, respecting certain patents of Duncan Donald McBean.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 16, respecting The Title and Trust Company, and to change its name to Chartered Trust and Executor Company.—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill No. 17, respecting The Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. W. H. Sharpe.

Bill No. 20, respecting The Canadian Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Bradbury.

Bill No. 21, respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Blain.

Bill No. 22, respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—Mr. Guilbault.

Bill No. 23, respecting the James Bay and Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Girard.

Bill No. 24, respecting the Ottawa and New York Railway Company.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 25, respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Smith.

Bill No. 26, respecting the Southern Central Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Green.

Bill No. 27, respecting the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 28, respecting the Toronto Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Smith.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

IMPERIAL GOVERNMENT LOANS TO CANADA.

Mr. KYTE:

1. Has the Government made arrangements with the Bank of England to borrow certain sums of money?

2. If so, how much has been borrowed up to date?

3. How much money is borrowed each month?

4. What is the total amount the Government has arranged to borrow up to the end of the fiscal year?

Mr. W. T. WHITE:

Arrangements were effected under which up to 31st March next His Majesty's Government lends to the Government of the Dominion of Canada the sum of £12,000,000. Of this sum £5,000,000 was advanced by the Bank of England for the Imperial Government up to the 24th December. To date the sum of £8,000,000 has in this manner been borrowed.

ISSUES OF DOMINION NOTES.

Mr. KYTE:

1. Has the Minister of Finance exceeded his authority and issued Dominion notes beyond what have been authorized by Statute?

2. On what authority were these notes issued?

3. What amount of Dominion notes have been issued over and above what is authorized by Statute?

4. When was this additional issue distributed?

5. Was any portion given to the Canadian Northern Railway Company? If so, how much?

6. On what authority did the Minister of Finance hand over to the Canadian Northern Railway Company this money?

7. If by Order in Council, what is the date or dates that authority was given?

8. How much money was given to the Canadian Northern Railway Company on this authority and what are the dates?

Mr. W. T. WHITE:

Issues of Dominion notes were made by the Minister of Finance under the authority of Orders in Council as follows:—

(a) $10,000,000 in order that certain obligations of Canada might be met as they matured. These issues were made at various dates after November 2, 1914.

(b) $10,000,000 advanced to the Canadian Northern Railway Company upon the security of $12,500,000 of that company's four per cent debenture stock guaranteed by the Dominion under the provisions of The Canadian Northern Railway Guarantee Act, 1914. These sums were placed to the credit of the Minister of Finance and paid out under the provisions of the deed of trust securing the issue of said debenture stock. This advance is repayable, May 1, 1915, with interest at five per cent per annum.

Particulars: $2,500,000—Order in Council, September 5, 1914; $2,500,000—Order in Council, September 26, 1914; $2,000,000—Order in Council, October 24, 1914; $2,000,000—Order in Council, November 20, 1914; $1,000,000—Order in Council, December 16, 1914.

(c) $6,000,000 advanced to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company upon the

security of $7,500,000 of that company's four per cent bonds guaranteed by the Dominion under the provisions of The Grand Trunk Pacific Guarantee Act, 1914. These sums were placed to the credit of the Minister of Finance and paid out under the provisions of the deed of trust securing the issue of said bonds. This advance is repayable May 1, 1915, with interest at five per cent per annum.

Particulars: $2,000,000—Order in Council, September 5, 1914; $2,000,000—Order in Council, September 26, 1914; $1,000,000—Order in Council, October 24, 1914; $1,000,000—Order in Council, November 20, 1914.

BORROWINGS BY CANADIAN BANKS FROM THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. KYTE:

1. Have any of the Canadian banks taken advantage of the special Act passed at the last session of Parliament and borrowed sums of money from the Government?
2. If so, what banks have availed themselves of this opportunity, and what amounts has each one borrowed?
3. Have any of the banks paid back any portion of this money? If so, what amount?

Mr. W. T. WHITE:

The sum of $14,439,767.55 was borrowed by Canadian banks from the Government under the provisions of The Finance Act, 1914. Of this sum $7,047,267.55 has been repaid.

Mr. KYTE: I wish to say to the Minister of Finance that his answer to this question is not complete. The first part of the question asks if any of the Canadian banks had taken advantage of the special Act passed at the last Session of Parliament and borrowed sums of money from the Treasury, and the second part of the question asks what banks have availed themselves of this opportunity and what amounts has each borrowed. The Minister in his answer has not given the names of the banks or the amounts borrowed by them.

Mr. WHITE: The Government does not regard it as expedient to give detailed information as to the advances made to individual banks. This policy follows the precedent established in 1907, when loans were made through the Bank of Montreal and details were not only not given as to loans to banks but are not even of record in the Department of Finance. I do not make this statement by way of criticism, because I think it was sound policy. There is another reason which I am sure will appeal to my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte) why detailed information should not be given. In the letter which I addressed to the several chartered banks on September 5, 1914, giving notice of the proclamation which was issued by the Government under the authority of the Finance Act passed at the special war session in August, I stated:

> All applications to the Treasury Board will be regarded as confidential, and it is my earnest hope that we shall have the hearty co-operation of the banks in bringing into effect the new legislation.

Under all the circumstances it would seem to me that my hon. friend might possibly be disposed to refrain from pressing his application for particulars.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: At this moment I express no opinion as to whether or not the information should be given to the House; I simply call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the precedent of 1907, when, if my memory serves me, the advances were made either to the Bank of Montreal itself or upon guarantee of the Bank of Montreal.

Mr. WHITE: My right hon. friend is correct in this, that the Bank of Montreal made and guaranteed the advances, but that does not at all alter the fact that advances were made to banks from Dominion funds. There was the additional security of the guarantee of the Bank of Montreal, but there is no distinction in principle. If it is advisable to make public details of loans made to the banks upon any security, it would appear to me that the same principle would apply, although the security is enhanced by a guarantee of a bank, even though that bank may be an institution such as the Bank of Montreal. The principle is the same: Advances were made in Dominion notes upon security.

There is the further consideration, not necessary for me to emphasize unduly, that last September it was very desirable in the public interest that the banks should be made to feel quite free to avail themselves of this legislation which had a two-fold object, namely, first, to conserve the gold supply of Canada, and, secondly, to enable the banks the better to supply the commercial needs of the community. In those circumstances, I wrote the banks pointing out that such was the object of the legislation; and in order that they might be more readily induced to avail themselves of its provisions, I stated, as I have already mentioned to the House, that their applications would be regarded as confidential. Under those circumstances, I think it would be a violation of the understanding between them

and the Government that we should bring down details. As a matter of fact, the total amount advanced the banks has been comparatively small, as shown by the answer to the question of the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte), and a substantial part has already been repaid.

BUILDINGS RENTED BY GOVERNMENT.

Mr. TURRIFF:

1. How many buildings have been rented by the Government in the city of Ottawa since October 1, 1911?
2. Who are the owners of the said buildings?
3. Where are said buildings situated?
4. What rent per annum is paid for each building or part of building?
5. For what term are said buildings rented?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Thirty-six buildings.

2, 3, 4 and 5. Wm. A. Allan and S. H. Fleming; 2 rooms in Victoria Chambers; $1,080; 1 year to 20th April, 1915.

Sir H. N. Bate Realty Corporation; Suite No. 6 Aylmer Annex; $648; 19th August, 1914, to 30th September, 1915.

Sir H. N. Bate Realty Corporation; Suite No. 7, Aylmer Annex; $360; 17 months to 1st October, 1915.

Russell Blackburn; 2 rooms, 1st floor, 209 Sparks st.; $350; 1st May, 1914, to 1st May, 1916.

R. L. & R. Blackburn; Room 414, Union Bank Building; $371; 1 year to 9th November, 1915.

R. L. & R. Blackburn; part of 2nd floor and part of 3rd floor, and whole of 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th and 9th floors of eastern portion of the Union Bank Building; $28,986; 5 years to 16th July, 1918.

R. L. & R. Blackburn; 6 floors, Union Bank Building; $13,000; 5 years to 6th January, 1917.

R. L. & R. Blackburn; Rooms 608, 609 and 607, Union Bank Building; $1,154; 1st August, 1914, to 15th July, 1918.

R. L. & R. Blackburn; front room in basement, Union Bank Building; $350; 1 year to 21st August, 1915.

C. Jackson Booth; 3 upper floors of Booth Building; $16,495; 5 years to 1st November, 1918.

Bryson Realty Co.; 4 floors above ground floor in Lessors' Building on Queen St.; $8,596; 5 years to 25th April, 1919.

Bytown & Suburb Land Co.; 105 Murray St. (storage Printing Bureau); $2,390; 5 years to 14th July, 1919.

Wm. D. Morris; top floor Capital Building; $1,500; 2 years to 17th April, 1915.

Capital Storage Co. Ltd.; basement 136 Emmett St.; $1,650; from 13th August, 1914, to end of war should it be longer than one year.

Eva C. Carling; 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th floors, Carling Building, east side Bank, between Sparks and Queen Sts.; $13,000; 5 years from date of occupation, in January, 1914.

W. D. Morris, D. M. Finnie; property 128 Wellington St.; $4,000; 3 years to 20th November, 1915.

John M. Garland; 2 top floors of Imperial Building, corner Queen and O'Connor Sts.; $2,500; 1st November, 1912, to 1st October, 1916.

James Hope & Sons; third floor of Hope Building corner Sparks and Elgin sts.; $2,500; 3 years to 29th January, 1916.

Frank Jarman; 1st 2 flats and basement—326 and 328 Queen st.; $1,560; 3 years to 1st April, 1916.

Journal Printing Co.; 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th floors Journal Building; $11,592; 5 years to 12th January, 1919.

Journal Printing Co.; 770 square feet on 6th floor; $539; year to year.

Journal Printing Co.; 621 sq. feet in basement; $434.70; year to year.

P. Labelle; Building of Lessor corner York and Dalhousie sts.; $11,500; 5 years to 2nd January, 1919.

J. P. Laurin; brick building 95 George st.; $1,200; 2 years to 1st May, 1915.

Lord Furniture Co.; premises 2 stories high—64 and 66 George st.; $1,800; 15th February, 1914 to 20th February, 1916.

Dr. Frederick McKinnon; house 72 Elgin st.; $780; one year to 9th October, 1915.

E. R. McNeill & R. G. Stewart; 3rd and 4th floors Lessor's Building 198 and 200 Queen st.; $1,850; 5 years to 5th Sept., 1916.

W. H. Martin; basement of 174, 176 and 178 Wellington St.; $900; 3 years to 14th Dec., 1916.

Ottawa Masonic Temple Co.; ground floor and 1st floor New Masonic Temple; $6,141; 5 years to 15th November, 1918.

Robert E. Powell; premises 221 and 223 Queen st.; $900; 1 year to 1st March, 1914 (vacated.)

Quebec Buildings Ltd.; 5 rooms on 2nd floor and 2 on 3rd floor, Quebec Bank Building; Wellington st.; $1,200; 1 year to 1st May, 1915.

A. E. Rea & Co., Ltd.; 3 upper stories of Rea Building corner Rideau and Sussex sts.; $44,034 90; 5 years to 9th September, 1919.

Rideau Club; premises in Rideau Club Building; $1,800; 5 years to 1st May, 1917.

Hiram Robinson; whole of Robinson

Block, S. side Queen st.; between Metcalfe and Elgin sts.; $15,200; 3 years to 1st Sept.; 1915.

J. L. Rochester et al.; premises 126 Queen st.; $900; to 1st May, 1916.

W. H. Stroud; 2 flats building 109 on Rideau st.; $1,677; 1st August, 1914; to 20th February, 1916.

ALLEGED DESTRUCTION OF MILITARY PROPERTY.

Mr. MARCILE:

Is the Minister of Militia aware that a quantity of blankets, saddles, boots and food was burned about the time the expeditionary force of volunteers departed from camp at Valcartier? If so, what are the reasons therefor?

Major-General HUGHES: No military property of any value was destroyed. Some property of civilian pattern brought into camp was destroyed, as was also some obsolete and worn out uniforms and some worthless articles not worth cost of removal. These latter are authorized under regulations to be destroyed on the certificate of the Senior Ordnance Officer, and under his supervision. Report of the Board herewith (filed with Clerk of the House.)

WAR SUPPLIES—BOOTS.

Mr. MARCILE:

1. How many pairs of boots were purchased for the first expeditionary force of volunteers?
2. From whom were such boots purchased, and what was the price paid per pair?
3. Were the boots supplied satisfactory?

Major-General HUGHES:

1. 65,000.

2. From Ames, Holden, McCready, Ltd., Montreal, $3·85 per pr.; Tetrault Mfg. Co., Montreal, $3·85 per pr.; The Slater Shoe Co., Montreal, $3·85 per pr.; Louis Gauthier Co., Quebec, $3·85 per pr.; John Macpherson Co., Hamilton, $3·85 per pr.; Hartt Boot and Shoe Co., Fredericton, $3·66 2-3 per pr.; Amherst Boot and Shoe Co., Nova Scotia, $3·80 per pr.

3. Yes, taking into consideration the short time allowed for manufacture.

WAR SUPPLIES—HORSES.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. How many horses were shipped to England with the first contingent?
2. What was their purchase price?

Major-General HUGHES:

1. Total horses shipped to England with first contingent, 8,393.

2. Average price paid, $173·32.

WAR SUPPLIES—MEDICAL.

Mr. KYTE:

1. From whom were medical supplies purchased in Ottawa for the equipment of the first Canadian contingent?
2. Did one Mr. J. E. Powell supply a quantity of medical supplies and bandages to the Government for the first Canadian contingent?
3. If so, what amount was paid to Mr. Powell for these supplies?
4. Is Mr. Powell's place of business in Ottawa?
5. Did Mr. Powell solicit these orders or did some one act for him?
6. If so, what is the name of the person who acted for him?
7. Were steps taken to see that the prices charged for these goods were fair and reasonable?

Major-General HUGHES:

1. Supplies for the medical services for the first expeditionary force were obtained from: Canadian Milk Products Co., Toronto; Ingram & Bell, Ltd., Toronto; Hartz Co., Ltd., J. F., Toronto; Wood, W. Lloyd, Toronto; Murray-Kay, Ltd., Toronto; Burroughs Wellcome Co., Montreal; Chapman, J. H., Montreal; Davidson Mfg. Co., Thos., Montreal; Frosst Co., Ltd., C. E., Montreal; Gilmour Bros. & Co. (agents, Johnston & Johnston), Montreal; Lymans, Ltd., Montreal; National Drug & Chemical Co., (agents, Seabury & Johnston), Montreal; Canadian Red Cross Society, Montreal; Mothersill Remedy Co., Detroit; Stott & Jury, Bowmanville; H. K. Mulford Co., Ltd., Philadelphia; S. S. White Dental Co., Philadelphia; Chandler & Fisher, Ltd., Winnipeg; Eimer & Amend, New York; Kny-Scheerer Co., New York; Whitall & Tatum Co., New York; I. Flack, London, England; Idris & Co., London, England; Baird & Tatlock, London, England; Birkett, T. & Son, Ottawa; Brownlee, T. A., Ottawa; Eddy, E. B. & Co., Ottawa; Graham, Weldon J., Ottawa; Harrison, R. I., Ottawa; Macdonald & Co., W. B., Ottawa; Oliver & Sons, Ltd., J., Ottawa; Ottawa Truss & Surgical Co., Ottawa; Plant, F. H. (successors to Watson Carriage Co.), Ottawa; Powell, E. (agent, Bauer & Black), Ottawa; Rea Co., Ltd., A. E., Ottawa; Stevenson, S. J., Ottawa; Watts, E. R. & Sons, Ottawa; Preston Car & Coach Co., Preston.

2. Yes.

3. $18,163.

4. Yes.

5. (a) No. (b) The goods bought were manufactured by Bauer & Black, Chicago, whose Toronto representative, Mr. Shaver, gave Mr. Powell's name to the department as their Ottawa agent.

6. Answered by 5.

7. Yes.

LETHBRIDGE IMMIGRATION OFFICER.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Why was A. E. Humphries removed as immigration officer at Lethbridge?
2. When was A. H. McKeown appointed to the immigration service at Lethbridge and for what reason?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Owing to the fact that there was at that time practically no work to do in connection with immigration at Lethbridge, Mr. A. E. Humphries, whose salary was $1,300 per annum, was, on October 15, 1914, indefinitely suspended from his position as travelling immigration inspector.

2. On November 1, 1914, Mr. A. H. McKeown was appointed as caretaker of Lethbridge immigration hall at a salary of $65 per month, it being found necessary to have some one in charge of the building there.

COUTTS, ALTA, QUARANTINE AREA.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Has any portion of the Government quarantine area at Coutts, Alberta, been leased or sold to private individuals?
2. If so, to whom and when?
3. What was the consideration in each case?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. No.
2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

DEATH OF HENRI NOTTAR.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has the Government paid, or agreed, to pay, any sum to the widow and family of Henri Nottar, the French reservist, who was shot and killed by Sergeant George Hooten at the Drill Hall in Montreal?
2. If not, is it the intention of the Government to compensate the widow and family of the deceased?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am informed that a suit is pending in the courts between the representatives of the man who was unfortunately killed and the sergeant named in the question. No representations have been made to the Government on the subject. We will take the matter into consideration.

C.N.R. PAYMENTS FOR SERVICES.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. What was the total amount paid the Canadian Northern Railway Company for transportation and all other services in connection with Valcartier Camp?
2. How much of the said amount was made up of express charges?
3. Were all the accounts so paid the Canadian Northern Railway Company audited on behalf of the Government? If so, by whom?

[Mr. Sam. Hughes.]

Major-General HUGHES:

1. $19,098.89 paid to date.
2. $7,965.24.
3. Yes, by an official of the Accounts Branch.

CHARLES P. LIVINGSTONE.

Mr. CARROLL:

1. Has Charles P. Livingstone, of Glace Bay, Nova Scotia, been appointed to a position on the telegraph staff of the Public Works Department, or in any other department of the Government?
2. If so, what are his duties, and what is his salary?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Mr. C. P. Livingstone, of Glace Bay, was by authorization of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, appointed 15th December, 1914, to the position of superintendent of Government telegraphs in Cape Breton, with headquarters at Sydney.

2. The duties of the position will embrace attention to the upkeep of the telegraph and telephone lines at present in operation; the establishment of new offices as required, and the conducting of whatever further construction work may be undertaken. The salary attached to Mr. Livingstone's position is at the rate of $100 per month.

ICL. RY.—ATLANTIC SUGAR REFINERY SITE.

Mr. KYTE:

1. What price did the Intercolonial Railway receive from the Atlantic Sugar Refining Company for the site occupied by the latter company in St. John, N.B.?
2. What was the date of sale or acquisition of the property by the Atlantic Sugar Refining Company?
3. Has the Department of Railways been paid the amount agreed upon?
4. Has the Department of Railways received or collected from the Atlantic Sugar Refining Company the amount due? If not, what is the reason for the delay?
5. What rate of interest is charged the Atlantic Sugar Refining Company for the postponed payments?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. $100,000, in addition to 5.51 acres of land in payment for 6.94 acres out of the 11.13 acres previously granted but surrendered.

2. Property was conveyed to the company by letters patent dater January 7, 1913.

3. Yes.

4 and 5. Answered by No. 3.

EXPORT OF HORSES TO UNITED STATES.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. Are horses prohibited from being exported to the United States from Canada? If so, since when, and under what authority?

2. Does such prohibited export of horses apply generally or are certain exceptions made?

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. Saddle, draught and pack animals suitable for use in war are prohibited export to any place other than the United Kingdom or British possessions, since August 9, 1914, under Order in Council based on Section 291 of Customs Act, Chapter 48, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906.

2. Exception is made to saddle, draught and pack animals which are not suitable for use in war; and to horses temporarily exported for racing or exhibition purposes.

MR. F. MORRIS.

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Was Mr. F. Morris in the employ of the Customs Department as special and investigating officer at Chicago, in 1911?
2. Is he now in the employ of that department?
3. If not, did he resign, or was he dismissed?
4. If the latter, what was the cause for such action on behalf of the Government, and what is the date of the Order in Council dismissing him?

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. Yes.
2. No.
3. Services dispensed with.
4. His services were not further required in the Customs Department. The date of the Order in Council is November 8, 1913.

SIR CLIVE PHILLIPS-WOLLEY.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Does Captain Sir Clive Phillips-Wolley hold an appointment in connection with the Department of Militia and Defence? If so, what appointment does he hold?
2. What is the date of his present appointment?
3. What is his remuneration?
4. What are his duties?

Major General HUGHES:

1. Yes. He is an Assistant Censor and Special Service Officer.
2. December 1, 1914.
3. Seven dollars per day.
4. Assistant Censor and Special Service Officer.

H.M.C.S. NIOBE.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Were any repairs or expenditures made during the year 1914, to or upon the H.M.C.S. Niobe?
2. If so, what was the nature of the same, the total cost of such expenditures or repairs and by whom performed?
3. At the outbreak of war, how many men were enlisted upon H.M.C.S. Niobe, and what is the total enlistment today?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.
2. Halifax Graving Dock Co., Ltd., docking.. .. ..$ 3,266 00
Halifax Dockyard, hull, fittings and equipment .. ..$ 4,335 17
Machinery and boilers.. 16,283 72
Armament 158 86 2,077 75

$24,043 75

3. July 15, 1914—9 officers, 34 men. January 15, 1915—41 officers, 644 men.

MILITIA MEN IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. How many militiamen have been on active service in the province of British Columbia since August 15, 1914, to February 1, 1915?
2. What was the cost of maintaining the militia in British Columbia since August 1, 1914, to February 1, 1915?

Major General HUGHES:

1. Numbers have varied. The average number of non-permanent militia which have been on active service in British Columbia since 5th August, 1914, to the 1st February, 1915, is as follows: August, 4,102; September, 3,728; October, 3,017; November, 3,348; December, 2,460; January, 2,065.
2. $1,434,996.74.

E. C. WOOD'S LAND PATENT.

Mr. NEELY:

1. Is the Minister of the Interior aware that Mr. E. C. Wood, now holding entry for the northwest ¼ of section 24, township 35, range 24, west of the 2nd meridian, is said to have obtained a patent in Manitoba in 1892 or 1893 for the northeast ¼ of section 36, township 4, range 3?
2. If so, why was Mr. Wood given this second entry?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes.

2. Mr. Wood secured free homestead patent for the N.E.¼ 36-4-3-W.P.M., in July, 1898. When he made homestead entry for the N.W.¼ 24-35-24 W. 2nd Mer., on the 7th August, 1906, he was not entitled to a second free homestead and not eligible to make entry. The entry was illegal and had to be cancelled. Mr. Wood claimed that his first homestead was a very poor quarter-section being totally unfit for agriculture, and that when he made his second entry he had no idea he was breaking the law. An official of the department reported that Mr. Wood had been in continuous residence upon the N.W. of section 24-35-24 West 2nd Meridian, since he made his entry and had placed valuable improvements on the quarter-section in addition to breaking

42 acres of land. It was considered it would be a great hardship to deprive Mr. Wood of the land and it was decided last October to permit him to purchase it at the rate of $3 per acre, being the value placed thereon by a homestead inspector—such sale to exhaust Mr. Wood's right to a purchased homestead.

NEW BRUNSWICK AND PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY.

Mr. COPP:

1. Has the Government purchased or agreed to purchase the railway running from Sackville to Cape Tormentine, county of Westmorland, known as the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island railway?

2. If so, what was the price paid or agreed to be paid for said hire of railway?

3. From whom was said railway so purchased?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. There is an agreement for purchase.

2. To be $270,000.

3. The New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railway Company.

IMPORTS OF CORN.

Mr. ROBB:

What was the total quantity of corn entered at each of the customs ports of Athelstan, Dundee, Hemmingford, and Valleyfield, during the year ending December 31, 1914?

Mr. REID: Athelstan, 11,018 bushels; Hemmingford, 2,019 bushels; Valleyfield, 17,989 bushels. Dundee is not a customs port, and separate returns are therefore not available.

WAR SUPPLIES—SEASICKNESS CURE.

Mr. COPP:

1. What quantity of Mothersill's Seasickness Cure was sent with the first contingent to England, and what amount was paid therefor?

2. From whom were the purchases made?

Major-General HUGHES:

1. 20,000 boxes; $3,983.34.

2. Mothersill Remedy Co., Ltd., Detroit.

REVENUE OF CANADA, 1912, 1913, 1914.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. What was the total revenue of the Dominion of Canada each month for the calendar year of 1912?

2. What was the total revenue of the Dominion of Canada each month for the calendar year 1913?

3. What was the total revenue of the Dominion of Canada each month for the calendar year 1914?

Mr. W. T. WHITE: The total revenue of the Dominion of Canada each month for calendar years 1912, 1913, and 1914 is as follows:

	1912.	1913.	1914.
January	$ 10,084,035.11	$ 13,442,378.80	$ 11,529,753.30
February	11,078,633.78	13,135,870.58	9,698,120.91
March	12,099,769.22	14,372,331.40	11,688 901.97
April	*2,622,003 33	*2,686,625.91	*2,0.2,229.89
	11,019,445.77	12,145,455 78	9,848 998.51
May	13,636,718.10	14,818,919.33	11,723,162.90
June	13,181,946 75	14 3?4 316.25	12,088,228.50
July	*740,827.96	*475,139 39	*653,(26.06
	14,619,201.22	15,811.914.26	12,521,624.27
August	14,445,849.42	14,547,853.20	14,196,104.31
September	14,475,483.52	15,249,258 36	9,953,093.07
October	14,758,946.72	14,225,590.16	10,641,254.82
November	14,297,778.28	13,536,981 32	9,495,526.30
December	14,142,180.59	12,931,466 77	9,167,440.62
	$161,202,825.77	$171,684,108.51	135,238,075.43

* Amount belonging to the fiscal year ended 31st March, but which did not come to account until after close of fiscal year.

The answers which I have given to this question also cover the answer to question No. 1 asked by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte). If the hon. member for Richmond is content with that, he will probably accept this answer as an answer to his question.

WAR SUPPLIES—GALVANIZED IRON PAILS.

Mr. TURRIFF:

1. How many galvanized iron pails have been purchased by the Government or the Militia Department from the Dominion Machine and Supply Company of Ottawa?

2. How much was paid the company for each pail?

3. How many of the said pails were manufactured by McFarlane, Douglas Co., Ltd., of Ottawa?

4. How much was the latter company paid for each pail manufactured by them?

5. By whom are the Government cheques issued to the Dominion Machine and Supply Company endorsed on behalf of the company?

6. Who are the members or directors of the Dominion Machine and Supply Company?

Major General HUGHES:

1. Two thousand one hundred and sixty.
2. $1.47½.
3. Not known.
4. Not known.
5. 'For deposit only to credit of Dominion Machinery and Supply Co.' Bank of Ottawa, Chaudière Branch, 29th December, 1914.
6. Not known.

SACKVILLE POST OFFICE SITE.

Mr. COPP:

1. Has the Government purchased a site for a new post office in the town of Sackville, county of Westmorland?
2. If so, when was such purchase made?
3. What was the price paid for said site?
4. Is it the intention of the Government to proceed with the erection of a new post office building at Sackville during the present war?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.
2. In July, 1913.
3. $8,000.
4. The matter is under consideration.

VICTORIA MEMORIAL MUSEUM TOWER.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has the Government undertaken to repair the tower of the Royal Victoria museum by day labour, or has it awarded a contract for the repair of the same?
2. If the latter, to whom was the contract given and what is the amount thereof?
3. Were tenders for the work invited by public advertisement? If not, why not?
4. What is the official estimate of the total cost of the repairs?

Mr. ROGERS: No; the department is having tests made at the present time with regard to the foundation, but no work of repair has yet been undertaken. I am adding to the answer the report of Mr. Monsarrat, who made a very full report with respect to the museum:

Montreal, January 27, 1915.

Sir,—In accordance with the Order in Council dated January 5, 1915, authorizing me to examine the foundations of the Victoria Memorial Museum at Ottawa and report thereon, I beg to make a preliminary report as follows:

In order to deal intelligently with this matter there are points that should be definitely established, viz:

(1) To what extent has settlement occurred in the foundations of the building.

(2) Has such settlement affected the stability of the building.

(3) Is this settlement still going on.

When these points have been determined, and if it is found that settlement is still going on, it would then be in order to point out what steps should be taken to prevent further settlement in the future.

After an examination of the building, I will consider this subject under two heads, namely:

(1) The foundations of the main building.

(2) Foundations of the tower and heavy cross walls.

Main Building.

With regard to the settlement of the foundations of the main building there can be no question. How much this has amounted to is, however, more difficult to determine. There seem to be no plans in existence which show the original elevations of the footings or piers, nor have any observations been made to determine the progress of the settlement. The amount of settlement, however, can be arrived at approximately by comparing the present elevations of footings which have been subjected to unit loads of varying amounts. On the outside walls of the building an estimate of the weights shows that there is approximately an average pressure on all the bearing areas of about three tons per square foot. On the interior sub-basement walls and footings of columns there are loads varying from one to two tons per square foot. The result is that the outside walls have gone down much faster than these interior walls or footings.

This movement is more plainly in evidence on the ground floor, which is supported at the centre, on two rows of columns resting on light interior walls in the sub-basement, and at the sides on the main walls.

Accompanying this report is a blue print dated January 27, 1915, showing elevations which I have had taken on this main floor. The cross sections and profiles shown thereon indicate at a glance what the settlement amounts to at all points on this floor.

The settlement around the four walls of the east and west wings is shown to be fairly uniform, although there seems to be about one inch more settlement towards the north face of these wings. From the cross sections of these wings it would seem that there has been between 5 and 6 inches settlement of these walls, assuming that there has been little or no settlement of the interior walls.

There is nothing to show that the interior walls in the two wings have settled to any appreciable extent. While the average elevation of the floor over these walls is about one inch higher in the west wing than in the east wing, yet it is quite possible that some of this difference may have occurred in the original laying of the floor.

The interior walls of the main building do not show such a regular line, the settlement being much more pronounced near the main tower and wings. This, however, can be accounted for from the fact that these walls, being incorporated in the heavier walls of the tower and cross walls, would be carried down simultaneously with the latter.

From the elevations taken it would appear that settlement of the walls of the main building amounts to from 5 to 9 inches. The slope of these walls is towards the main tower, where the greatest settlement has taken place.

This indication of the settlement of the main walls is practically confined to the ground floor and basement. On the first, second and third floors, where the supporting girders extend from wall, there is little or no evidence that any such settlement has taken place.

As regards the stability of the walls of the main building, I do not consider that this has been seriously affected. If the ground floor had

been supported on long girders extending from wall to wall, similar to the floors above, there would be little or no evidence to show that settlement had taken place, except of course at points where it is incorporated with the walls of the tower and the heavy cross walls. Cracks have opened up in the walls of the east and west entrance, which would naturally be expected, but this result could not in any case prove serious. A few of the stone lintels and mullions of the building have been cracked but not to any serious extent. The greatest evidence of this settlement is shown in the basement, which is sub-divided into offices with light brick partitions. These partitions rest on foundations having a very much smaller load to the square foot of area. The result is that when the outside wall settled its tendency was to shear past these lighter walls or to carry that portion of the wall nearest the main wall down with the latter, thus opening up cracks in the brickwork. These partition walls are only one story high, and, outside of the unsightly nature of the cracks, their displacement has no bearing on the stability of the building. From a thorough examination of the basement I find that the relative action between these walls is practically uniform.

The question as to whether settlement of the foundations of the main building is still going on is one that at present I am not prepared to answer. While it is an undoubted fact that considerable settlement has taken place, it may be possible that the soil has become compacted to such an extent that further settlement has stopped. On the outside of the building there is nothing that would point to the fact that settlement had taken place for a considerable length of time. At the rear of the building there is a concrete sidewalk which was laid hard up against the base course of the walls, which sidewalk, I have been informed, was constructed three years ago. If settlement had taken place in that time I would look for some evidence of cracking or distorting where this sidewalk joined the building. It is possible that the ground under this sidewalk may be more or less loose and that the walls, if settling, would carry the sidewalk with them. In this case, however, I would look for a tilting or cracking of this walk, which does not appear. While this point is not conclusive evidence, yet to my mind it is sufficient to raise serious doubts as to whether settlement is taking place at the present time.

In the basement, where the partition walls between the offices join the main walls, there seems to be a certain amount of evidence that a movement is still going on. Several occupants of these offices have informed me that cracks in the brick veneer of the main wall and in the partition wall have been opening up within the last eighteen months, and in one or two cases there seems to be evidence that the cracks have increased in length during the past few months. In other offices, cracks which had been puttied up two or three years ago, have opened very slightly. As the brick veneer on the main walls, has an air space of one inch or so behind it and is not cemented directly on the main wall, it may be that there is some local action taking place between the partition walls and this brick veneering which may be entirely independent of any present action of the main walls. It would appear, however, from the consensus of reports, that the movement during the last eighteen months has been very slight. In view of the evidence obtainable, it would seem that the only way to determine whether any action is really taking place on the main walls of the building would be to have a series of accurate readings made on the outside of these main walls, such readings to extend over a sufficient length of time to enable an intelligent and definite report to be made. I have taken steps to have such a series of level readings taken, and have given instructions that checks on these points be taken at regular intervals in order that this information may be obtained.

[Mr. Rogers.]

Main Tower and Cross Walls.

The settlement of the main tower and cross walls is considerably more pronounced than that of the main building. This is undoubtedly due to the fact that the load on the footings is very much higher. On the main tower the average pressure on all the foundations of the piers and walls amounts to about four tons per square foot. On the cross walls the load per square foot varies from three to four tons. As in the case of the main building, it is also difficult to determine exactly what the total amount of settlement has been. While the tower has gone down a certain amount as a whole, it has, however, gone down much faster at the front wall, the rear wall being undoubtedly supported to a certain extent by the other walls intersecting thereat. At the present time the tower has an inclination from the vertical of about twenty-four inches, measuring from the highest point of the tower to the foot of the foundation. This means that the extreme outer edge of the foundation is 10½ inches lower than where it joins the main walls of the building.

There is no doubt in my mind but that the displacement of this tower is sufficient to cause anxiety for its ultimate safety. In moving forward it is taking the main walls of the building with it. The result has been to open up serious cracks in a portion of this wall and cause serious doubts as to its stability. So great has been the movement of this tower that the steel beams of the 4th floor, which were resting on this tower, have, I am told, pulled entirely out and have had to be supported on special girders. The cracks in the walls between the cross walls of the main building and the tower have been opening up continually and have been filled up from time to time as they became apparent. It is, moreover, quite apparent that movement is still taking place. Last September, I believe, all openings at this point were plastered up, but at the present time this crack has opened up again about ½ inch, and at one point daylight can be seen through the wall.

An indication that the tower is still settling is shown by the sidewalk at the front entrance. Last September, I understand, a new sidewalk was laid at this point with a grade sloping away from the building. At the present time this sidewalk has an inclination in the opposite direction, or towards the building, and where it joins the building, is several inches lower than at points in the near vicinity. I would judge from the nature of the soil and the loads that have been distributed upon it that there is every possibility that settlement will continue to go on until the stability of the tower is seriously menaced. This menace is magnified

from the fact that as the tower continues to lean outward the centre of gravity also moves outward, increasing the pressure on the extreme toe of the foundation and thus tending to increase the rate of movement.

The cause of the trouble which has arisen in connection with this building is due entirely to the fact that the soil upon which the building was erected has had loads placed upon it entirely out of proportion to its supporting values. This soil is a type of blue clay which, under ordinary conditions, should be able to support from two to three tons per square foot. The bearing value of clay as a foundation, however, is uncertain and great difficulty is very often experienced in foundations on this class of material.

On the interior columns, which support a load of about one ton per square foot, there has probably been little or no settlement, although I cannot verify this fact. On the outside walls of the main building there is an average of three tons per square foot. This has proved too heavy a load for this material as the walls have gone down from 5 to 9 inches in the last seven years. The loads under the tower have averaged 4 tons per square foot, the settlement at this point being considerably greater than under the walls of the main building. It is quite evident, therefore, that the first point to be determined is the bearing value of the soil upon which the building rests. I have taken steps to this end, and a series of loading tests on the soil in the basement of the building is now going on.

Recommendation.

I would recommend that nothing be done with regard to the walls of the main building until a series of observations have been taken over a sufficient length of time to enable me to determine whether further settlement is actually taking place.

With regard to the main tower, I consider steps should be taken at the earliest possible moment to prevent further settlement. This can only be done by increasing the bearing area under this portion of the building. This is entirely an engineering problem, and in a later report I will advise what, in my opinion, is the best means by which this work can be successfully carried out.

I would say that I do not consider there is any immediate danger to the building, or that it will be necessary to close it to the Government employees or the general public so long as the present rate of settlement is not increased. I have made arrangements with the chief architect to have a series of readings taken at the point where danger might be expected, so that any increase in this movement would be immediately noted.

I think, however, in view of the foregoing that the necessary steps should be taken by your department to have repairs instituted in connection with the main tower and effected during the coming summer.

Respectfully submitted,

(sgd.) C. N. Monsarrat,

Hon. Robert Rogers,
Minister of Public Works,
Ottawa, Ont.

WAR SUPPLIES—FIELD GLASSES.

Mr. TURRIFF:

1. How many binoculars or field glasses has the Government purchased since August 1, 1914?
2. From whom were they bought?
3. What price was paid for them?
4. Was there competition by asking different dealers to quote prices?
5. If so, who were asked for prices?

Major General HUGHES:

1. 4,624.

2. From P. W. Ellis & Co., Ltd., Toronto, Consolidated Optical Co., Toronto, and the Topley Co., Ottawa.

3. About 100 different prices were paid, ranging from $9.45 to $75, according to the type and quality of binoculars bought in each case. Those procured for the first contingent were of many different patterns.

4. It was never a question of competition, but of getting the requisite number of binoculars of a satisfactory character in the time available. Generally speaking, the conditions did not admit of competition. Binoculars of a certain type and power were required; a sufficient quantity of these was not available. It was necessary to make the best arrangements for the provision of a more or less satisfactory substitute at reasonable prices.

5. Answered by No. 4.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. Sinclair: For a copy of all tenders for army stores that have been received and dealt with by the Department of Militia and Defence since August 1, 1914.

Mr. Macdonald: For a copy of all letters, telegrams, minutes of investigation and other documents relating to the dismissal of Isaac Arbuckle, foreman carpenter, Intercolonial railway, at Pictou, and of appointment of Alex Talbot to the vacancy.

Mr. Macdonald: For a copy of all letters, telegrams, minutes of investigation and other documents relating to the dismissal of James Brenan, fireman Intercolonial railway at Stellarton.

Mr. Buchanan: For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams and other documents in connection with the removal from the customs service at Lethbridge, Alberta, of Brown Pipes and A. R. Gibbons.

Mr. Buchanan: For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams and other documents in connection with the appointment of A. H. McKeown to the immigration service at Lethbridge, Alberta.

Mr. Buchanan: For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams and other documents in connection with the removal from office of A. E. Humphries, inspector of immigration at Lethbridge, Alberta.

Mr. Buchanan: For a copy of all tenders in connection with the supply of lumber to the Department of Militia for the training camps at Medicine Hat and Calgary, and of the invoices for the material supplied.

Mr. Law: For a return showing the names and addresses of all persons in Yarmouth county to whom the bounty under the Fenian Raid

Volunteer Bounty Act has been paid, the names and addresses of all persons from said county whose applications have been rejected and a list giving names and addresses of all applicants from said county whose applications have not yet been disposed of.

Mr. Murphy: For a return giving the names of all the transports hired since August 1, 1914, for the conveyance of troops, horses, stores and material to England, the name of each vessel owner, broker or other person through whom the vessel was chartered, the tonnage of each vessel, speed, rate paid per ton per week or month, minimum time for which engaged, date of agreement, date at which pay commenced, date at which pay ceased, and the total sum paid by the Government for hire and other charges.

Mr. Macdonald For a copy of all letters, telegrams, contracts, and other documents relative to the purchase of cars by the Intercolonial railway since July 1, 1914.

Mr. McCraney : For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, instructions, reports and other documents relating to an application by Udo F. Schrader for a grazing lease in townships 40 and 41, range 7, west of the 3rd meridian province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Robb: For a copy of all tenders, letters, and telegrams, including first and second call for tenders, for rural mail delivery in the township of Dundee, county of Huntingdon.

Mr. Nesbitt: For a return showing how many transport wagons were purchased for the second and third contingents, from whom they were purchased and the name of each person or firm, how many were purchased from each, the price paid per wagon, whether tenders were asked and whether any tenders were received that were not accepted, and if so what was the price tendered at.

Mr. Cockshutt: For a return showing whether there have been any exportations of foodstuffs since August 1 last to European countries, other than to the United Kingdom, France and Belgium, and if so, their nature and to what countries.

ICL. RY.—FREIGHT RATES AND TRAINS.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.), moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, by any and all persons whomsoever, had with the Department of Railways and Canals, or F. P. Gutelius, General Manager of the Intercolonial Railway, or any other official thereof, with reference to freight rates over that portion of the Transcontinental Railway, province of New Brunswick, and also with reference to the removal of the Y connection at Wabski, county of Victoria, between the said Transcontinental Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway at that point.

He said: I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) to a matter of very great importance to the business community of the western portion of New Brunswick. And in doing so, perhaps the better way, in order to make it plain, is to refer to a matter which is somewhat personal. But I hope the minister will understand that this personal reference is only to illustrate what is really a public matter; nor is it purely personal, as it refers to my connection with an estate and what affects me in that capacity affects many other business men in that portion of New Brunswick. The House is aware, of course, that the Transcontinental runs in a diagonal direction from the northwestern corner of New Brunswick to the southeastern corner. In its course it crosses the Canadian Pacific railway at a place called Wabski, near Plaster Rock. It crosses the Canadian Pacific railway at an elevation of from one hundred to one hundred and fifty feet. When the Transcontinental was under construction, a branch line of about a mile in length was made and a connection was in this way made with the Canadian Pacific railway. This branch line was constructed, paid for, owned and operated by the Transcontinental down to three or four months ago, when the connection was destroyed and the rails taken up, so that there is no possibility of getting communication between the two roads. About a year and a half or two years ago I had occasion to bring this matter of railway rates and connections to the attention of the minister, and I complained that the Government was not taking any means, or was not taking the proper means, to promote business and industry in that portion of the province of New Brunswick. I pointed out that the rates charged on the Transcontinental were so exorbitant as to be practically prohibitive. I dealt with this matter in this House on the 21st of March, 1913. The minister, I think very much to his credit, was greatly surprised at the statement I was making, so much so indeed that he challenged the truth of it and wanted me to give a case in which the Transcontinental practically refused to do business or undertook to do it only at rates so high as to be practically prohibitive. I at once called his attention to a statement of facts. He will find the debate in "Hansard" of that year, pages 6816 to 6818 inclusive. Of this I desire to read now only one paragraph:

I happen to be the executor of an estate and during the past three or four months I have hauled by team between three and four million feet of lumber a distance of fifteen miles over probably the most hilly road in New Brunswick, to the Canadian Pacific railway. I could have hauled that very same lumber to the Transcontinental railway, a distance of less than five miles, and practically all down grade, between the mill and the railway. The party whom I represented was alive at the time the negotiations started in November, he died in December and since then, as the executor of the estate, I have been carrying on the business.

I went on to explain that we had hauled over 3,000,000 feet of lumber by team fifteen miles over a hilly road, and shipped it by the Canadian Pacific railway, because we could make more money than by hauling it five miles and shipping it by the Transcontinental. I will give the minister the credit of saying that he took up the case energetically. He told me both publicly and privately that he would see justice done. The Transcontinental wanted 6 cents per cwt. to transport that lumber thirty-one or thirty-two miles, which means almost $1 a thousand feet on ordinary spruce lumber. That was prohibitive. He told me he would send Mr. Gutelius to me and have the matter arranged. While Mr. Gutelius did not come to me, yet, after considerable negotiation, an arrangement was made under which we were to get the lumber hauled at 4 cents per cwt., which would be practically $1.20 per thousand feet. That means that I was wrong in my first calculation—6 cents per cwt. would be not $1 but $1.50 on ordinary spruce lumber. But I should think that $1.20 ought to be enough to satisfy even Mr. Gutelius, who, I presume, is animated solely by a desire to make money for the Government railway system. But, while the rate was exorbitant, still, in order to carry on business, we accepted it. In 1913 we did about the same amount of business, and got some money out of it, I am glad to say. We carried on the same business in 1914, and again made money. We had hoped to continue carrying on this business and still make money, but, early in the summer—I have forgotten exactly what date; I would give the minister the precise facts but that I have not the papers before me—the manager of the company was informed by the officials of the road that they would not accept any more freight at Wabski, that they were going to take up the connections, and that we would have to send our freight north on the Transcontinental to Theriault, which is practically fifty miles north of the connection at Wabski. There we should hand it over to the Canadian Pacific railway, who would have to bring it back on a line practically parallel to the Transcontinental and carry it to Boston. Fortunately for us, the Canadian Pacific railway charged the same rate from Theriault as from Wabski. If they had hauled the freight for the extra fifty miles for the same money we should have had no complaint to make. But it made a wonderful difference to other people. The man who had freight originating on the Canadian Pacific railway and wanted it delivered on points on the Transcontinental, found the rate was prohibitive. But the Transcontinental, or Intercolonial railway authorities, not only wanted to haul the freight the fifty miles further, but wanted us to pay 7 cents per cwt. for hauling it, or 3 cents per cwt. in addition to what we were already paying. As the average of spruce lumber will weigh 3,000 lb. per thousand feet, this extra rate would amount to 90 cents per thousand. This meant practical prohibition. After negotiation, they offered to carry the lumber at 1½ cents per cwt. additional, which would mean about 45 cents or 50 cents per thousand, which, in many cases, is a large proportion of the profit a man makes on lumbering operations in New Brunswick. I was told at that time that the difficulty lay with the Canadian Pacific railway, who were unwilling to accept freight at the Wabski junction. I took the matter up with Mr. Bamford, divisional freight agent of the Canadian Pacific railway, at St. John, to whom I wrote on the 3rd of October, 1914. This correspondence is brief, and I should like to read it so that the minister may have the facts before him:

4 p.m.

I fear very much that the minister knows only one side of this case; otherwise he would never have been a consenting party to the business outrage committed upon the people of that portion of New Brunswick. I admit that the words "business outrage" are pretty strong, but I know of no other words in the English language which would correctly describe the transaction.

On October 3, I addressed the following letter to Mr. Bamford:

> Dear Sir,—As one of the executors of the estate of Michael Welch, of Bristol, who in his life-time carried on a milling operation at Foreston. Up to last year the lumber was hauled to your road at Bristol, but as the mill is within seven miles of the Transcontinental, we hauled it to Juniper and handed it over to your road at Wabski.
>
> We have now nearly three millions of lumber to send to the American market during the coming winter, and would commence loading this just as soon as the snow comes, provided conditions were satisfactory.
>
> Last year we obtained a 17 cent rate from Juniper to Boston. I do not know how it would divide up, but I always understood the Intercolonial railway got the lion's share.
>
> Not long ago we were informed that your company objected to taking this lumber at Wabski, and therefore, it could not be handed to you until it reached Theriault, some distance below Edmundston, and we were told the rate would be 20 cents. We absolutely refused to do any business at that rate and decided that we would be compelled to haul to Bristol, and close down the business. Gutelius then came down to 18½ cents, but still persists in saying

that your company objected to taking it over at Wabski, and therefore it must be taken to Theriault. This means about 50 cents a thousand, which eats up a large portion of our profits, and if this condition of affairs continues, I see nothing to do but to close up the business.

Will you kindly write me and let me know just why this course is being pursued? If you are willing to take it at Wabski at the old rate, I will endeavour to give the matter such publicity that Mr. Gutelius will hand it over at that point. If, on the other hand, it is a mutual arrangement, probably the force would be so great, that the only move would be to shut down.

On October 19 I received from Mr. Bamford the following letter, which, in my judgment, was very satisfactory:

F. B. Carvell, K.C.,
Woodstock, N.B.

Dear Sir,—With further reference to your letter of October 3 in regard to lumber shipments from Juniper to Boston.

At Wabski the interchange of traffic has been permitted between the National Transcontinental railway and Canadian Pacific railway. A connection was put in at the time of the construction of the National Transcontinental railway to permit the contractors to get in their construction material. The connecting track was of considerable length and down grade. It is claimed by the Intercolonial railway that the steep grade rendered its operation very hazardous and difficult, particularly during the winter months, and that their train operating between Moncton and Edmundston was being badly delayed on account of the time taken to do the switching.

You mention in your letter that you were informed that the Canadian Pacific railway objected to taking this lumber at Wabski. This is not correct. Our rates are still in effect from that point to Boston, and on July 30, Mr. Grout wrote the Intercolonial railway to know if he would not continue the practice as it seems to him to be a very fair arrangement. To this he received a reply dated August 10. An extract read as follows:

'It has been decided that we will not transfer any more traffic at Wabski of any kind after the 15th inst.'

In connection with this matter, I might mention that we have a published rate of 13 cents per 100 pounds at the present time from Theriault to Boston.

Trusting this explanation will be satisfactory.

Yours truly,

W. B. Bamford,
Division Freight Agent.

In this letter Mr. Bamford puts the matter up to the Minister of Railways direct. Without any doubt the blame comes back to the Minister of Railways—I am speaking now of the minister not in his personal but in his official capacity—for depriving the people of that portion of New Brunswick of that railway connection to which as a matter of business justice they are entitled. I have given an illustration showing that the taking up of that connection and the denying to the people of the right to do business means a matter of 50 cents on every thousand feet of lumber handled by one firm, with which I am connected purely in the capacity of an executor.

I do not know whether my reply to Mr. Bamford's letter is of any importance to the minister; if he wishes to see it I shall be only too glad to send the file over to him. I told Mr. Bamford that I was very glad indeed to learn that he was willing to carry out the arrangement; that I was then writing to the Minister of Railways and that I hoped to be able to succeed in having the old conditions re-established. I wish to read Mr. Bamford's reply, because it shows beyond the shadow of a doubt that the Canadian Pacific railway were not only willing but anxious to have this rate continued and to have this trade handed over to them at Wabski, and at no other point. Nevertheless, every business man in that part of the country was led to believe—I do not say by Mr. Gutelius personally, but certainly by the officials of the Intercolonial railway—that the Canadian Pacific railway were not willing to carry out this arrangement, and that it was in consequence of the protest of the Canadian Pacific railway that this connection was torn up and the people subjected to the extra cost. This is Mr. Bamford's letter, dated November 14, 1914:

Dear Sir,—I have your letter of the 4th inst., in reference to the transfer of freight at Wabski.

We are perfectly willing to continue the interchange at Wabski, if the National Transcontinental railway will give us the business at that point. In the mean time, until I hear from you again I will not do anything further.

For your private information, we would prefer to have this traffic handed to us at Wabski, and so would a large number of saw mill men doing business in that district. We are in a better position to supply empty cars to handle the traffic than our competitors, having direct connection with the Maine Central, and as you are aware, they hand over to us from fifty to one hundred empty cars daily, and we will be glad to hand over a good share of them at Wabski.

I will be very glad if you will advise me the result of your negotiations with the Minister of Railways, and oblige,

Yours truly.

I may explain that in reading over this letter a few days ago, I observed in it the word "private." I at once wired Mr. Bamford to inquire if I had his permission to use the letter, and received a reply giving me full permission to make any use of it that I wished to make.

After I had definitely ascertained beyond any doubt that the Canadian Pacific railway

were not only willing but anxious to accept trade at that point, I took the matter up with Mr. Gutelius, and here is a letter which I wrote him on November 4, 1914:

Dear Sir,—Some time ago I was informed by Mr. Welch, one of my co-executors of the Michael Welch estate, that you had refused to transfer any more freight at Wabski to the Canadian Pacific railway, and informed him that in future this freight must all go to Theriault, a point 50 miles further north, for which you wanted 3 cents additional. We promptly refused to have anything more to do with the road, when he was then notified that the rate would be reduced to 1½ cents additional, or 5½ cents in all, the net result of which means that we lose 50 cents a thousand on our lumber, and you haul it 50 miles and get the 50 cents. You possibly get out of it alive, we lose it absolutely. Mr. Welch was informed by your people that the Canadian Pacific railway refused to handle this freight at Wabski. I took the matter up with Mr. Bamford at St. John, and by his letter of October the 19th, he assures me that as early as July the 30th, Mr. Grout asked you to continue the practice as then established, to which you replied under date of August the 10th, as follows :

'It has been decided that we will not transfer any more tramc at Wabski of any kind after the 15th inst.'

This puts it up to your road without any question whatever.

I thought after appealing to the minister in the spring of 1913, that I had this matter settled once and for all.

Do you consider it a fair proposition that men along the line who would like to do business with you, shall be compelled to fight for the 50 cents which you get, which practically means their profits, when to the ordinary observer there is no necessity whatever for so doing? The Canadian Pacific are perfectly willing to accept this lumber at Wabski, and are also willing to give us a rate at Bristol with the view of transportation by team from the mill to that point. We have on hand now over two million and one-half of long lumber and over one million and one-half of laths, to be transported just as soon as the snow comes, and we would like to know whether you will still give us the rate in existence last year, or whether we will be compelled to haul this lumber 15 miles over the hills to Bristol, as will certainly be the case under present conditions. Such conduct may look like good railroading from your standpoint, but it is certainly death to the operator, along the line who is trying to do an honest business.

I am very anxious indeed to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

I have also been applied to by the Fraser Company, Limited, and others along the line who would like to continue doing business at Wabski, but will be prohibited should this unfair and unprecedented discrimination be continued. I would assume that you would like to continue doing business and until I hear from you to the contrary, am going to continue in that assumption.

Mr. HAZEN: Where is Theriault?

Mr. CARVELL: It is about half way between Grand Falls and Edmundston. It is the point where the Canadian Pacific railway and the Transcontinental cross.

Mr. HAZEN: In the parish of St. Leonard?

Mr. CARVELL: In Madawaska county. The distance from Juniper to Plaster Rock, now Wabski, is thirty-two miles, and from Plaster Rock to Theriault, fifty-one miles, so it is fifty-one miles from the crossing of the Tobique to Theriault. I have taken the mileage from the Intercolonial folder.

I have here a lot of letters with which I shall not encumber the record; there are letters from the Fraser Lumber Company and others protesting against this interruption of traffic, and asking me, as a member from New Brunswick, to do what I could in order to have this injustice remedied and I promised them, of course, that I would do what I could. As you will see, two or three months prior to these things I had been trying to do what I could, you may say from a personal business point, but at least doing all I could to have the injustice remedied. I waited some time but got no answer to my letter of the 4th of November to Mr. Gutelius. I waited two weeks and it was a surprise to me that I had to wait that time in a matter of such business importance without the courtesy of an answer. So I was compelled to write to the minister direct, which I did on the 16th of November, as follows:

My Dear Sir:

I am enclosing you herewith a copy of a letter, dated the 4th inst., which I addressed to Mr. Gutelius, General Manager, Intercolonial railway, Moncton, to which I received no answer, and as the letter is complete in itself, it is unnecessary to repeat the statements therein contained.

I cannot tell you how sorry I am that Mr. Gutelius has broken up the arrangement which was made over a year ago, after a persistent and somewhat public attempt on my part to have things straightened out.

You will remember after discussing this matter in Parliament, you promised me that Mr. Gutelius would come here and arrange matters satisfactorily. While he did not come, yet he put the rate at a point where we could do business, and live, but even than 4 cents a hundred for 30 miles in carload lots, is exorbittant. Now to add on another one and one-half cents means prohibition. I simply put the matter up to you, and ask you to see that justice is done.

It is now 12 days since this letter was written, and as it is so late in the season something must be done immediately if we are to continue doing business, and I trust I will be more successful in obtaining an answer from you, than I have been from Mr. Gutelius.

I wish to say, to the credit of the minister, that I was successful in getting a let-

ter back the day he received my letter in Ottawa and, more than that, I got an answer from Mr. Gutelius two days later, so that no blame can be attached to the minister for any discourtesy so far as replying to my letter was concerned—but I am sorry to say that was the end of it. I received a second reply from the minister dated 18th of November and also one from Mr. Gutelius dated the 20th of November. I shall read the letter from Mr. Gutelius in order that the railway side of the case may be placed upon " Hansard " as well as the business man's side:

Dear Sir:

Re your letter November 4th.

The transfer between the National Transcontinental and Canadian Pacific railway at Wabski was closed for the reasons as described by our Agent as follows:

'The distance from our main line to the Canadian Pacific railway track is about three quarters of a mile and two per cent grade practically all the way. We handle all cars both to and from their line and do all the switching.

'Should there ever be a failure of equipment such as the breaking of a coupling and taking a string of loads down the hill the damage would amount to more than the gross traffic for several months.'

This connecting track was constructed by the Transcontinental people to enable them to get material and contractors supplies up to the Transcontinental grade from the Canadian Pacific railway. It was not contemplated that it would be a point of transfer and as such it carries with it hazards to life and property that cannot be safely undertaken.

General Traffic Manager Hayes advises me that the rate from Juniper to Wabski which you desire to perpetuate was 4 cents per 100 lbs. He also advised that an offer has been made to your people to haul your lumber from Juniper to Fredericton for 4½ cents per 100 lbs. and explains that if the Canadian Pacific railway will give you the same rates from Fredericton to Boston points as they give from Wabski or Theriault that the aggregate increase which you would have to pay is a half a cent per 100 lbs. and further if the Canadian Pacific railway would give you the benefit of the reduced haul it would make the rate from Fredericton a half a cent lower than from Theriault which is about one hundred miles shorter and that your Boston rate would be the same as via Wabski and the effects of the entire operation would be to give you minimum rates and give the railways an opportunity to handle by minimum mileage at minimum risk.

From the above explanation you will understand I trust that the sole object in not making this temporary branch line a regular transfer point is based entirely upon safety of operation and that our offer to haul to Fredericton at the low rate relieves the proposition of any charge of discrimination on our part.

Yours truly,

F. P. Gutelius.

[Mr. Carvell.]

You will see that he puts the whole thing on the agent, just as if an agent at a small country station had anything to do with the tearing up of the connection between two railways, a matter so important that if it occurred on private railroads we would have an order from the Railway Commission within twenty-four hours.

I want to discuss this matter with the minister from two standpoints, first from the standpoint of the company which I represent, for it is a material matter to us, and then from the standpoint of the general public. First from our standpoint, look at the absolute inconsistency of the minister's general manager of the National Transcontinental railway. He refuses to haul freight thirty-two miles for four cents, but is willing to haul it seventy-one miles for four and a half cents. Just think of a business man putting up a business proposition like that. He is willing to haul seventy-one miles to Fredericton for four and a half cents and not willing to haul thirty-two miles to Juniper for four cents and the only objection to the Juniper line is that it has a down grade of two per cent. Millions of dollars of business is done all over Canada and the United States on short railways with, not two per cent, but three per cent and four per cent grades. My hon. friend knows that the Canadian Pacific railway crosses the Rockies in many places with more than two per cent grades, and then they talk of the danger of failure of equipment and the danger of a string of loads going down the hill and being dumped. There is danger of that occurring in any railway operation if it is not run properly, and we are not going to assume that the Transcontinental or the Intercolonial will handle business so negligently that they will allow loads to go down hill because there happens to be a two per cent grade on the hill. It seems to me it is the most childlike defence to any reasonable proposition I have ever seen advanced by a business man in my experience. Then he goes on to say: If the Canadian Pacific railway will do what they ought to do. Well, unfortunately, this Parliament has not very much control over the Canadian Pacific railway, not nearly as much as I would like, but this Parliament and this Government have absolute control over the other two roads, and no matter how unfair the Canadian Pacific railway may be, this Parliament is the body that has the power to say what the Intercolonial

shall do and what the National Transcontinental railway shall do.

He says that the Canadian Pacific railway should give us the same mileage rate from Fredericton as from Wabski and that they could be hauled as cheaply. But how are we going to get the Canadian Pacific railway to change their rates from Fredericton, or from Wabski to Boston? We have no power to make them do that. The rate to-day from Fredericton to Boston is 14 cents per 100 lbs. on this class of merchandise.

Mr. COCHRANE: What is it from Wabski?

Mr. CARVELL: Thirteen cents. Mr. Gutelius agrees to have that freight for Fredericton for 4½ cents but you add 14 cents and you get 18½ cents, exactly the rate Mr. Gutelius wants us to pay if he takes it round by Wabski. I do not care whether he takes it around by Quebec or any other place so long as he gets it to Boston and gets it to Boston at 17 cents a hundred. We would be satisfied but that does not satisfy the public. The Walsh estate is only one member of the public. He says that if the Canadian Pacific railway would reduce the rate and give us the benefit of the proportional mileage, although he does not suggest what it is, we would get a less rate, but unfortunately we have no power to compel the Canadian Pacific railway to reduce their rate from Fredericton to Boston and give us the proportional mileage. That is where the matter stands to-day. I do not care whether you haul by way of Theriault or by way of Fredericton—we pay fifty cents a thousand more than we paid last year. The Transcontinental railway haul this freight 32 miles and get 4 cents per 100 lb. for doing it. If they take it to Theriault they haul it 50 miles further and get 4½ cents a hundred pounds for it, or they haul it a distance of 71 miles and get 4½ cents for hauling it. It may be good railway business on the part of the Government to haul freight 50 miles for half a cent per 100 lb. but I cannot understand it. If they can make money by hauling that freight an extra fifty miles for half a cent they must be coining money when they get four cents for hauling it 32 miles. That may be quite plain to a railway man but I only try to size up things as they appear to an ordinary lawyer upon reading the rates, and I must confess that I do not understand it. Possibly my hon. friend, being a railway expert, will be willing to explain this most remarkable discrepancy as it appears to a lawyer.

Now, having discussed this matter from the point of view of the Walsh estate I desire to look at it from the standpoint of the public. If the Walsh estate were the only ones doing business over that line of railway it would only be a matter of their losing 50 cts. per thousand, closing up their mill and going out of business. But the Walsh estate is only a small proportion of the public which would like to use that road. I have protests from a very large number of mill owners. There is Donald Fraser & Co., who have the largest lumber mills in eastern Canada, a firm which are handling over a hundred million feet of lumber a year and a firm that handles probably—

Mr. COCHRANE: Not over this road?

Mr. CARVELL: No, I am not saying that. I was just going to say that this firm handled over 15,000,000 feet of lumber at Plaster Rock, right at the point where the Transcontinental railway and the Canadian Pacific railway come together. This is a firm that, under ordinary conditions, would be able to ship millions of feet of lumber over the Transcontinental railway if they gave them a rate at the present time to St. John. My hon. friend knows that during the last three or four months there has been a complete change in the lumber market in the maritime provinces. Prior to October and possibly November practically all the inland lumber of New Brunswick went to the American market. But on account of the war conditions existing in the old country British buyers are now taking it at a price away above the price that the Americans would pay for it and they are taking lumber which you could not give away in England in the past.

Mr. COCHRANE: But that would not affect the subject you have brought up.

Mr. CARVELL: Oh, yes.

Mr. COCHRANE: No, the lumber would not go over the National Transcontinental railway, because instead of the Canadian Pacific railway giving it to the Transcontinental they would take it themselves.

Mr. CARVELL: But I will show you how it affects the matter. The Fraser business is at the end of the Canadian Pacific railway at Plaster Rock. The Y connection between the Canadian Pacific railway and the Transcontinental railway is at that same point, the Frasers have 15,000,000 feet of lumber practically all going to the English market and they would have the opportunity of shipping it either over the Cana-

dian Pacific railway or the Transcontinental. With the Y connection gone not a foot can go over the Transcontinental railway.

Mr. COCHRANE: And would not either.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend says it would not. My hon. friend does not seem to want to do business. There are 15,000,000 feet of lumber being manufactured this year and every year right at the point where he has taken out the connection between the Canadian Pacific railway and the Transcontinental.

Mr. HAZEN: Is it my hon. friend's contention that, if there was a connection between the Canadian Pacific railway and Transcontinental railway at Wabski, the lumber of Fraser's going from Plaster Rock would go right over the Tobique Valley branch of the Canadian Pacific railway to Wabski and then over the Transcontinental railway to St. John?

Mr. CARVELL: No, not exactly, but my hon. friend (Mr. Hazen) does not understand Wabski and Plaster Rock are practically the same thing.

Mr. HAZEN: I know Wabski is a few miles below Plaster Rock.

Mr. CARVELL: This crossing is perhaps two miles below Plaster Rock, but the Y connection runs north, so that the Y connection is practically at Plaster Rock. There is only a shunting yard. It is practically all in the same yard. The Y connection between the Canadian Pacific railway and the Transcontinental is located there, and it is practically all in the same place.

Mr. COCHRANE: Is the hon. gentleman absolutely fair there? The Fraser mill is on the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes.

Mr. COCHRANE: Do you suppose the Canadian Pacific railway would be stiff enough to hold up a rate from there to St. John that would enable the Intercolonial railway to make this a transfer point to them when they would have just as far to carry the lumber as the Canadian Pacific railway and make this dangerous interchange between the two railways?

Mr. CARVELL: I do not admit it is a dangerous interchange between the railways. As to the business end of it, I am not in a position to say what the effect may be.

[Mr. Carvell.]

Mr. HAZEN: Taking it from Plaster Rock or Wabski to St. John, what is the difference in distance by the Canadian Pacific railway and the Transcontinental railway and Intercolonal?

Mr. CARVELL: My impression is that there would be very little.

Mr. COCHRANE: The Intercolonial would be longer.

Mr. HAZEN: The Canadian Pacific railway would be shorter.

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes.

Mr. CARVELL: The difference is so little that it never would be considered for a moment with respect to the question of the rate; the rate would be the same. I would be very much surprised if there would be 25 miles difference between the two railways. But that is not the point. No matter what has been done in the past, and no matter what my hon. friend may argue as to what should be done in the future, the fact remains that my hon. friend has put himself out of the race. He is not in a position to compete, because he has torn up the connection by which he could compete. When this track was torn up, the Frasers had half a million feet of hard-wood piled at that Y connection. They were using the Y connection for a piling ground. I know what I am talking about, because I was there and saw it. I am familiar with the location, and they had the lumber piled there. I do not know exactly what they have done about it, but I know that they had the lumber and that they had erected a large piling ground out on this Y connection about a mile away to the southward in order to get it away from the danger of fire and to get it where it could be piled.

In shipping to a distant point like Boston, it makes a great difference in the weight of lumber, and consequently a great difference in the rate, as to whether the lumber is dry or not. I have also a protest from Upham, who runs a business eight or ten miles below Plaster Rock, on the Canadian Pacific railway it is true, but who has done some business by shipping from the Canadian Pacific railway over to the Transcontinental, and I have also a protest from J. B. McLaughlin & Company. This means that every man engaged in the lumber and other business in that portion of New Brunswick has only one line of railway at his disposal, whereas he might have two com-

peting lines to carry his produce to the market. How the Minister of Railways sanctions a policy of this kind is something that I cannot understand. After this letter was written I wired to Mr. Gutelius, stating that we wanted to ship to Boston, and that if he would give us a seventeen-cent rate to Boston via Fredericton we would ship it that way, but I got no answer to that telegram. We have been perfectly fair from a business standpoint; we have done everything we possibly could, and we only appeal to the minister when we cannot get an answer from the general manager of the railway to a reasonable business proposition. All we have got from the minister up to the present time is courtesy, and I admit we have had that. The tracks have been taken up, the connection is gone, and we are sending our lumber to Boston at a loss of fifty cents a thousand. A large part of the lumber we intended should go to Boston is going to St. John over the Transcontinental, and therefore, so far as that is concerned, I do not think we are losing any money by it, but we know this is only a temporary condition of things. We are sending lumber to England to-day which we could hardly give away there a year ago, and that applies not so much to quality as to specifications. Until a year ago we could only sell deals 3 x 7, 3 x 9, and 3 x 11, whereas to-day they will take almost any specification and pay a good price. However, when the war is over, that condition of things will cease, and then we will have to pay this extra fifty cents per thousand or stop doing business. How the minister can be a party to carrying on that unfair transaction, I cannot understand. I could understand it if this road were being operated by the Grand Trunk Pacific, because the Grand Trunk Pacific could make connections with the Grand Trunk at Lévis or Richmond Junction, and they might get down to Portland and Boston in that way, but the Intercolonial Railway cannot do that. What the minister says is, that he will haul this lumber fifty miles further to Theriault and fifty miles further south to Fredericton, and hand it over to the Canadian Pacific railway and make the shippers pay for it. I hope the minister will be able to make plain what to me is particularly dense at the present moment. I wrote to Mr. Gutelius on the 25th of November and I protested as strongly as I could against the injustice, pointing out to him that we were losing fifty cents per thousand, and I have received no answer and no redress of the grievance. What is true of the Walsh estate is true of many other business firms who do business in that portion of New Brunswick and it applies to other business besides the lumber business. Probably for all time to come the great industry in the central portion of New Brunswick will be the lumber industry. While there are some parts of that region which might be made profitable as arable land, I believe that the greater portion of central New Brunswick will always continue to be more productive and more profitable as a forest area than as an agricultural area. The lumber operators in that portion of New Brunswick have to import hay, oats, fodder, and everything which goes to carrying on their business. The only way the man who lives on the Tobique or St. John river can possibly get in his supplies is by the Transcontinental railway, taking the freight up to Wabski on the Canadian Pacific railway, handing it to the Transcontinental at that point, and distributing it thence. Florenceville is possibly the great distributing centre for farm produce in New Brunswick and Florenceville is only fifty miles from Plaster Rock. The next fifty miles east of Plaster Rock is the great lumbering centre of New Brunswick, so that the farmer who has produce to sell in that portion of Carleton county and that portion of the province to the north, can best distribute his produce from that point. As it is to-day, the merchant of Florenceville who sells hay or grain must send it to Fredericton, eighty-five miles distant, thence to McGivney's, the junction of the Intercolonial railway and Transcontinental railway, another thirty odd miles, or in all twice the distance it should be sent, and that extra haul the farmer or the merchant has to pay.

Mr. HAZEN: How far is the haul by road from Florenceville across to the Miramichi waters?

Mr. CARVELL: Bristol is the nearest point. It is fifteen miles to Foreston and seven miles to Juniper, which would be twenty-two miles by team, and I think it is the hilliest part of the province.

Mr. HAZEN: I know the road.

Mr. CARVELL: If the minister has been over the road he knows what it is like and he knows that while it is possible to team there, it is utterly impracticable from a business standpoint.

I am pointing out to the minister the real facts in regard to the business of our country; I am giving nothing fanciful, nothing got up for political purposes, because there is no politics in this matter so far as I am concerned. This is business, something that affects not only the lumberman but the farmer, the merchant, the business man everywhere. It is an injustice which the minister would never have allowed had he been seized of all the facts. I have endeavoured to place the facts before the minister from an entirely unprejudiced standpoint. I have read all the correspondence between myself and Mr. Gutelius. I have given my side of the case and Mr. Gutelius' side as well, and I am willing to leave the matter to the sterlingly honest judgment of the minister. When he applies that judgment —and there is no other man in the House in a better position to apply a business judgment than he—I am sure he will come to the conclusion that the people of New Brunswick have been unjustly treated in the matter, and that we should have that track replaced and be given back the connection and the right to do business, which we had before this track was taken away from us.

Hon. FRANK COCHRANE (Minister of Railways and Canals): This siding was put in for the use of the contractors in the construction of the Transcontinental. To throw a different light on what my hon. friend has stated, I may say that the Canadian Pacific railway have a station and sidings at Plaster Rock, where this spur joins their line. On the Transcontinental railway it was never intended to have a station or a siding at this point. This was only a temporary affair built by the Transcontinental Commission long before I had anything to do with the matter. One can understand the difference between transferring cars from the Canadian-Pacific railway, where there is a station and a siding, for the construction of the Transcontinental, and transferring cars from the Transcontinental to the Canadian Pacific railway where you would have to leave part of the train on the main line of the Transcontinental and push the cars up a steep grade to the Canadian Pacific railway. It is not a proper place for a transfer; and I am satisfied that if the road was under the control of the Railway Commission, they would neither authorize nor permit a transfer there under existing conditions. I do not want to put the blame on my officials, because I was a party to the removal of the spur.

[Mr. Carvell.]

Mr. CARVELL: I am sorry to hear it.

Mr. COCHRANE: My hon. friend says it is a proper transfer. I do not pretend to be a railway man; but as long ago as May, 1913, an engineer who was on the Transcontinental road at the time wrote to the then superintendent, Mr. Brady, objecting, from the Transcontinental standpoint to this transfer. This is a question for an engineer, not for a layman like my hon. friend or myself. The letter is as follows:

May 31, 1913.

Dear Sir,—As no doubt you are aware, we now have two connections with the Canadian Pacific railway, Theriault at mileage 216, and Wabski at mileage 163.5. I would suggest that we abolish one of these points, and think that Wakski is the one that should be dropped, for the reason that we have to take our loads three quarters of a mile down a 2 per cent grade, with the risk of their getting away from us, and take the empties up the same grade. With the motive power we have had so far, our train has been frequently delayed from one to two hours. Last winter we had very often as many as twenty cars to lift at a time, and that meant four trains down the hill.

He is an engineer whose judgment I think my hon. friend will accept.

Mr. HAZEN: Who is he?

Mr. COCHRANE: Mr. H. B. Dibblee. I understand that my hon. friend some years ago recommended this engineer to the Commission, although I have no evidence as to that. From all I know, he is a good engineer; and I am quoting him rather than my own engineers employed at Moncton, who also take the position that this is a dangerous point for a transfer. For the justification of myself and of the management at Moncton, I may say that we would rather haul the freight the whole distance to Fredericton for the rate that we receive than have our employees down there run the risk of losing their lives. I am willing at any time to remove any dangerous point and to overcome the difficulty in some other way, even at a loss of money. To overcome the opposition of shippers to the proposed removal of this transfer on account of the difference in mileage to Fredericton or Theriault, which would replace Wabski, the rates accruing to the National Transcontinental railway were so adjusted as to minimize the increase in the through rates; and if for the shorter haul from Fredericton the Canadian Pacific railway would make the rates to New England correspond with those which they apply from Theriault, the aggregate through charges against the

shippers of forest products originating on the Transcontinental would be the same.

In view of the temporary operation of the Transcontinental, we have not been in a position to quote or arrange for through freights. We are greatly handicapped, because we have no outlets ourselves and unfortunately we connect largely with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, who have absolute control in many cases. We hope to overcome this as soon as the money markets will allow us, so that we may be able to give the people of New Brunswick two outlets to the markets to the south.

The rate from Juniper to Wabski was four cents, as rightly quoted by my hon. friend, but that four cents did not pay us, because we had no siding at Wabski. We had to leave part of our train on the line in order to shunt up to the station four or five cars at a trip. On the other hand, the Canadian Pacific railway could leave their train on the siding and take the cars down.

The distance from Juniper to Fredericton is seventy-two miles, and we have made the rate four and a half cents. Therefore the freight, instead of being fifty cents, is only seventeen and a half cents per thousand feet of spruce, or 3,300 lbs., according to my hon. friend. In order to meet the hon. gentleman's clients and the general public, rather than take the risk of this dangerous interchange between the two railways, we would haul the freight from Juniper to Fredericton; and, on the whole, I think we would make more money as well as protect our employees by not making this dangerous transfer. The trains running to Fredericton could drop the cars off at a siding much more quickly than the locomotives could shove the cars for three-quarters of a mile up the hill.

Mr. CARVELL: What does the minister now say is the rate from Fredericton to Boston points?

Mr. COCHRANE: I am not giving that. I do not know it.

Mr. CARVELL: I do; that is the trouble. Fredericton is one hundred miles nearer than Plaster Rock to Boston points.

Mr. COCHRANE: Then your complaint is not against the Intercolonial railway or the Transcontinental; it is against the Canadian Pacific railway. If we haul the freight one hundred miles nearer to the Canadian Pacific railway, they can surely give the same rates or a little less.

Mr. CARVELL: The minister is all in error.

Mr. COCHRANE: I am not; I think my hon. friend will find that I am correct. If that proposition will not do, we will take the freight from Juniper to Theriault for five cents, not for one and a half cents, as my hon. friend quoted. To prove that my statement is correct, I want to quote a letter written by the I. N. Chase Lumber Company, a New England customer of Mr. Welch, one of the shippers from Juniper. It is as follows:

> We are in receipt of yours December 17 regarding rates on lumber in carload lots from Juniper to New England points and we are greatly obliged to you for this information, the rate from Fredericton to New England to be used for furtherance. We had nothing like this before and this gives us an opportunity to route shipments to New Haven points at a comparatively flat rate with shipments off the Canadian Pacific railway.

I want to assume the blame to a large extent of having this taken out. The matter was discussed with me before it was done, and the danger to employees was laid before me, and I O.K.'d the proposal.

Mr. P. MICHAUD (Victoria, N.B.): I have been consulted by the Donald Fraser Lumber Company with reference to this siding at Wabski. I understand that they have a pretty difficult situation on account of this siding. The Minister says that there was danger at that siding on account of running the train down the grade. But I have known of the running of trains on that siding at Wabski. I understand that they never heard of an accident there. I understand that the Donald Fraser Lumber Company is under a serious handicap for lack of siding at that point. I wonder if the Railway Commission of Canada would not authorize a siding there from the Transcontinental to the Canadian Pacific railway, but I am told that the minister has made up his mind that there shall not be a siding at that place. I am sorry to hear that.

Mr. COCHRANE: But we will overcome that difficulty so far as these people are concerned. As soon as the bridge and railway are completed at St. Leonard's, we will have an outlet to our bow, and will take the stuff to St. Leonard's and exchange with either the Canadian Pacific railway, the Maine Central or whoever is building that road.

Mr. MICHAUD: I know that as a matter of fact the National Transcontinental is not getting business that it might get on the line from Edmundston to Plaster Rock. There are lumbermen along that line who claim that they cannot get Intercolonial railway cars in which to ship their lumber. I have that

personally from the shippers themselves, who tell me that they use Canadian Pacific railway cars to ship their lumber. The minister says I am wrong; I am sorry to say that the hon. gentleman himself is wrong. I have approached Mr. Fleming, the superintendent of that division of the Transcontinental. I am told that it was the station agent at Edmundston who went over the Wabski siding to gather the facts about it, and I am sorry to say that he was not the proper man to collect that information and send a report. The officials at Moncton took it for granted that this report was all right, and Mr. Fleming, superintendent of this railway in my constituency, said to me that the decision arrived at by the officials upon the report of this station agent was final. I am sorry that such a report should be made. It was even said that it would be of no use for me to go on with the matter, because everything was settled. I am glad that in the near future the international bridge will be built at St. Leonard's, and we shall have better communications. Meantime the Transcontinental railway is certainly not living up to its op-

5 p.m. portunities in the province of New Brunswick. A great traffic is possible in the district through which this railway runs, but there have arisen these difficulties in making the connections with the Intercolonial railway and Temiscouata railways. I hope that for the future we shall have better communications and better operation of the road. I do not wish to criticise the minister, but I must say that on some parts of the line the people are not satisfied with the officials of the railway, but little heed seems to be paid to the opinion of the people in this matter.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton): I trust the minister will pardon me if I take advantage of this discussion on the management of the Intercolonial railway to bring to his notice again two matters on which we have had some correspondence. He is aware that there is a change in the line of the railway in the eastern part of Cape Breton, between the towns of Sydney Mines and Florence and the city of Sydney. The road runs by a new route for a distance of ten or twelve miles, and for the first time the towns of Florence and Sydney Mines are on the main line of the Intercolonial railway. While the road was not placed exactly where, on business principles, it should be, we are satisfied for the present that the change is a great improvement on the old condition. What I wish particularly to bring to the minister's notice is the fact that though the town of Florence is a mining and commercial town of about fifteen or sixteen hundred people where considerable business is transacted, yet the regular train does not stop there. There is a very good passenger station and freight shed, all new. The minister will understand what a startling surprise it was to the people of the town to find that the express train did not stop there. It is unnecessary for me to point out how inconvenient it is for the people that, though they have a railway station in their own town, they must go to Sydney Mines or to the Bras d'Or station to get aboard a train. I brought this to the minister's attention a month or five weeks ago, and he replied very promptly that he had asked the officials to take the matter into consideration. I have been watching from day to day to see what was to be done, in fact, to see the trains stop at this important point. But nothing has been done. I hope the minister will see to it that the people of Florence are given the full benefit of the road. It was bad enough to be inconvenienced when the road was not running that way but now that the road passes the doors of the people, it does seem an unusual thing in the history of the Intercolonial railway that trains do not stop at a place of this size and importance.

Another matter I have to inquire about is the local connection between Sydney and the points in the northern part of the county. The minister is aware that in very cold weather the ice stops our ferry. We are then dependent for communication between the city of Sydney and the northern part of the county on the local trains of the Intercolonial railway. For years that connection has been satisfactory, but this year the old traditions have been set aside and there are no regular trains, but we have to depend upon freights passing through.

Mr. COCHRANE: That train is running now.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is only two days since I got a letter on the subject. There may have been improvements since, and if so there is no purpose in what I am saying. My information is that the regular train is not on, but if the minister says that the old service is restored, that is satisfactory.

Mr. COCHRANE: I am speaking only of the local train which runs there when the ferry stops. Do none of the trains stop at Florence?

Mr. McKENZIE: None but freight trains. I do hope this matter will be taken up at once and proper accommodation afforded the people of Florence. If the old conditions with regard to the local trains were re-established that would be quite satisfactory, but my information is that the old conditions did not prevail after the ferry stopped this year.

Mr. COCHRANE: I have not before me the information with regard to Florence, as I did not know that the matter would be brought up to-day. I was informed on Friday that the local train which operates when the ferry service is discontinued is now running. In any case I shall certainly be glad to obtain information with regard to Florence, and to see what can be done.

Mr. MACDONALD: With the minister's permission, I wish to call his attention to a matter about which I have spoken to him privately: that is, the cancelling of a train previously running on what is known as the short line railway. The regular accommodation train is due in Pictou at 9.30 a.m. and, under the new arrangement, leaves at 11.40 a.m. A local paper says that on the four days during which the train had been in operation, owing to the extra work imposed upon it by reason of the taking off of the special it did not arrive in Pictou until about the time it was scheduled to leave. If the minister would extend the time of departure say to 1.30 p.m., the trainmen would probably be later in reaching their destination at the other end, but the people would be enabled to get into the county town, transact their business and return the same day. May I have the assurance of the minister that he will look into this matter?

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes; I have made a note of it.

Mr. CARVELL: The minister has read a letter from the Chase Company of New York with regard to New York and New Haven points. I happen to know that the combined rates from Juniper to New York and New Haven points are not at all the same as the rate to Boston points, but I am not sufficiently acquainted with the details to discuss the matter intelligently. I wish the minister to remember, however, that it costs our company 18½ cents to get that material from Juniper to Boston, via Fredericton, and 18½ cents to get it to Boston by way of Theriault, while under the old arrangement we could get it to Boston for 17 cents. These are the things the minister cannot get away from.

Mr. COCHRANE: Your grievance is against the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. CARVELL: No; the Canadian Pacific railway have their rate, and they will maintain it, so far as I know. I have tried at various times to induce the Canadian Pacific railway to cut their rates, but I never succeeded in getting them to do so. As a matter of fact, I succeeded only once in my life in getting the Canadian Pacific railway to change their rates, and that was a case of getting them not to lower them but to raise them. I had no trouble in getting them to raise the rate, the only condition being that I should agree to defend them before the Railway Commission if any one tried to have the rate cut down to its original figure. A Boston party did attempt to have the rate cut and I defended the company—successfully, I may say. That is the only success I ever had with the Canadian Pacific railway in that respect. It would be useless for me to ask the Canadian Pacific railway to reduce the rate from Fredericton to Boston; the minister knows that they would not do it. There is no use in mincing the matter; the minister knows quite well that in suggesting that I have the Canadian Pacific railway cut their rate, he is asking me to do what is impossible.

Mr. COCHRANE: No, I do not.

Mr. CARVELL: Well, the minister has had something to do with freight rates, and he should know that I cannot have that rate reduced. The minister does know, however, that he can carry out the agreement he made with me a year and a half or two years ago, and that he can get that lumber to Boston for 17 cents per cwt. But that is only my own part of the matter; that does not touch the root of the question. If it were entirely my own affair, I am sure that I would not take up the time of the House in discussing it. The whole public is interested in this outrage. My hon. friend says that we have no siding at the junction point. That may be true, but it would not cost very much to put a siding at the junction point; besides, my hon. friend must take the bitter with the sweet. If he is going to run a transportation company he must supply the people of Canada with transportation. It cannot be all cream; there must be some skim milk in the transaction.

Mr. COCHRANE: Cream for the Canadian Pacific railway, but none for the people of the country.

Mr. CARVELL: It cannot be all cream for my hon. friend. In one respect I think the minister has hardly been fair in his discussion of this matter. I do not say that offensively, because the minister always tries to be courteous, with me at any rate. Perhaps it has not occurred to him that the distance from that junction point to his station at Plaster Rock is not more than a mile and a half. The minister has a station on the north side of the Tobique river, with enough yard room to hold a great many more cars than he will handle on the road for a good many years, especially if he allows the thing to run as it is running at the present time. When the minister puts forward as an excuse the absence of sidings or yard room, I think he is putting up a severe form of special pleading. It is like a drowning man grasping at a straw; I think my hon. friend will get very little protection from his suggestion in that regard.

The matter, then, reverts back to the main question: does the minister want to give the people of that portion of New Brunswick the rights to which they are entitled, or does he not? I am very sorry indeed to hear my hon. friend say that he does not propose to put back the connection. That is what I understood him to say; if I am wrong, he has an opportunity of correcting me. I repeat that I am sorry indeed to hear him say so, because, unfortunately, when my hon. friend puts his foot down, it usually stays down. Possibly, however, my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries may be able to bring sufficient persuasion—I shall not say influence—to bear on my hon. friend the Minister of Railways to induce him to have the matter straightened out.

Did I understand the minister to say that in so far as my company is concerned, he will haul this freight to Boston at the same rate that it cost us before? I thought I heard him say so.

Mr. COCHRANE: No, I did not. I said that our rate would give you a shorter mileage.

Mr. CARVELL: Then that grievance is not remedied; I thought my hon. friend would give me that assurance. My friend is in error as to the mileage. I am within a mile or two of being correct. It is not one hundred miles, but only about sixty-four from Plaster Rock to Boston than from Fredericton to Boston. McAdam Junction is a point common to both reads. As I figure it, it is one hundred and twenty-seven miles from Plaster Rock to McAdam and sixty-six miles from Fredericton to McAdam; that leaves a distance of about sixty-one miles against Plaster Rock. My hon. friend knows that the distance is not the only factor in the determination of freight rates; it is the competition that counts, the endeavour to get business at competitive points, and the fact that the Canadian Pacific railway are giving a lower rate from Plaster Rock and Theriault to Boston than from Fredericton to Boston is no fault of mine. It would not be that way if I could help it, but I am powerless.

Mr. COCHRANE: It is not our fault.

Mr. CARVELL: It is not mine and it is my friend who is making my company and every other man doing business along that road lose money. I can only say again that I am sorry my hon. friend has flatly refused to remedy this grievance. But I hope that, even at this late date, some influence or compulsion will be brought to bear on my hon. friend which will cause him to relent and give back to the people the right so ruthlessly taken from them.

Mr. COCHRANE: I wish to impress the hazardous nature of the operation of making that transfer; that is the reason for our taking out the connection.

Mr. CARVELL: That is surely not a reason.

Mr. COCHRANE: It is to me. When these men are under my charge we will not ask them to do a hazardous thing day after day if we can avoid it.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—FREDERICTON LAND EXPROPRIATION.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.,) moved:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and correspondence had by Margaret Lynch, or any person representing her, with reference to the expropriation of certain land belonging to the said Margaret Lynch in the city of Fredericton, province of New Brunswick, by the Intercolonial railway, and also of all letters, telegrams and correspondence had with F. P. Gutelius or any other official of the Intercolonial railway with reference thereto.

He said: This is very largely a private and professional transaction, but yet the matter has been so grossly handled that I feel I am justified in calling the Minister's

attention to it in this public manner. I have done so privately, that is, by letter, and the minister, I think, did all he could, but unfortunately that was not enough to produce results. That is my justification for this motion. The minister is aware that, some time in the summer of 1913, the Department of Railways and Canals saw fit to expropriate quite a large lot of land in Fredericton belonging to a Mrs. Lynch. While, of course, the Minister of Railways has the legal right to expropriate any land, yet some discretion and respect for the rights of owners should be exercised. Mrs. Lynch is the owner of perhaps the finest residential grounds in Fredericton. It is the old residence of ex-Governor Wilmot, one of the great men of New Brunswick, and it has been in the Lynch family a great many years. It consists of some ten or twelve acres. The old residence is a fine home surrounded by many beautiful shade trees. It is one of the most desirable properties in Fredericton, and that is saying a great deal because there is perhaps no town in Canada with more desirable places in it than Fredericton. The St. John and Quebec railway, commonly known as the St. John Valley Raliway Company, wanted a certain amount of this land for right of way sidings, warehouses, and generally in connection with their scheme. The railway company have never tried to purchase this land from Mrs. Lynch. An agent in Fredericton, who we understood was acting on behalf of the St. John and Quebec Railway Company, wanted to buy the property from her two or three years ago. It was a private transaction, but nothing came of it. The next thing we knew the Intercolonial railway had filed plans to expropriate it. I have been prying into the affairs of the St. John and Quebec Railway Company during the past six or eight months and have got quite a bit of information in reference to it. I found in some of my excursions along that line that the St. John and Quebec Railway Company would have had to pay Mrs. Lynch for the land before taking possession, because if they took the land under the ordinary expropriation proceedings, under the Railway Act, they would be compelled to either buy it from this lady and pay her price or apply to the Court and deposit in Court such sum as the judge under such conditions might think fair and equitable. It seems that by getting my hon. friend to take charge of the matter for them they got rid of this inconvenience. They were able to get this land without asking the owner for leave or license, they simply filed a plan in the office of the registrar of deeds and sent her a notice that they had taken three or four acres of her land. The next thing she knew a gang of navvies were on her land cutting down trees, tearing up the lawns and destroying the place; and when she protested they said: Well, what have you to say about it? We have the right, the Minister of Railways can do it. And when she said: I want my pay, they said: Go to the Minister of Railways and get your pay That was in 1913. I took the matter up for her, as her solicitor, and I attempted to get some sort of settlement with the Department of Railways and Canals, but I was put off and put off and put off. The ostensible reason given me at that time was that they might want more land and did not want to expropriate until they decided what land they wanted to take. They did take more land in the summer of 1914, a year afterwards; they filed another plan and made greater incursions upon her private property, cut down more shade trees, and reduced the value of the remainder of her property. They made her house almost uninhabitable.

Mr. HAZEN: How near do they go to the house?

Mr. CARVELL: They go, I would say, within 100 feet speaking generally. I will send the plan over to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, because he knows the property very well. He knows where those beautiful fir and elm trees were. They are practically all cut down. The line runs from a point on Regent street in a diagonal direction right back of the house. It would probably be more than 100 feet from the house to the line of the railway, but the land taken is really in the rear of the house. I wrote a number of letters to Mr. Gutelius and, I am sorry to say, there as in another matter, to which I referred this afternoon, and I did not get the courtesy of a reply, and could get no answer or satisfaction whatever. I realized that as a lawyer the Crown had a right to take this woman's property, but while I realized that the Crown had that right, there was also the moral right to try and settle with her or otherwise to start proceedings in the Exchequer Court to fix the compensation that should be allowed her. All I asked Mr. Gutelius to do was to either settle with this lady or to apply to the Exchequer Court and have compensation fixed. He would do neither. So again I resorted to a course

which I find generally produces results and I appealed to the minister. I have not the correspondence here but the minister, I have no doubt, has it. I have pointed out the condition of affairs to the minister. I know I used fairly strong language. I think I told him that they were acting as—I have just forgotten the exact word and I would not like to use one for fear it might be a little too harsh—but at all events the language I used was not very complimentary. I realized that they had a right to take that woman's property, but they ought to pay for it or go to court and have the compensation settled. I got back at once a very nice letter from the minister and I got action on the part of Mr. Gutelius so that the minister again did exactly what he should have done.

Some week or two after I wrote to the minister I received an offer from a very reputable firm of solicitors in Fredericton who were acting as agents of the Government, but as the offer was afterwards withdrawn I do not feel like making it public. It was a very respectable offer. Unfortunately, Mrs. Lynch was away in New York at the time and I was unable to give an answer immediately although I did not think she would have accepted the offer as it was not high enough but it was a reasonable offer coming from the Department of Railway and Canals. The amount was as large as we would expect the Department of Railways to offer when the Intercolonial railway is presided over by the gentleman who is the general manager of that institution at the present time because his heart is not known to have any great enlargement excepting when it comes to the question of his own salary. We have not seen any contraction whatever of the valve of that gentleman's heart when it comes to taking money out of the coffers of the Dominion of Canada, but we have seen every evidence of the most sudden contraction when that gentleman is paying money to other people of Canada whose property he is taking away from them. Under these circumstances, and coming from this gentleman, I thought it was a very reasonable offer.

Before my client returned to Fredericton, where I had been for three or four weeks attending court, the solicitors to whom I have referred came and asked me if I would be willing to give up the offer I had received in writing as they had received instructions from Moncton to withdraw it. As we have always got along in a very friendly way, I, as a matter of professional courtesy, gave back the offer, and, as far as the legal effect of the matter is concerned, it stands as though the offer had never been made. From that day to this nothing has been done. They have taken altogether five acres of this lady's home. They have taken land that is worth a great many thousands of dollars, and they have torn up her property with the most ruthless hand possible. I have begged them now for a year and a half to start proceedings in the Exchequer Court. Let us have a judge of the Exchequer Court settle the matter, let them pay this woman what he says she is entitled to and we will get satisfaction. But we can neither get the Department of Railways and Canals to pay us nor can we get them to put us into the Exchequer Court, and I do not know, from the manner in which this matter is being dealt with, that Mrs. Lynch may not be able to go to the Department of Justice and get a fiat in order to bring suit against the Crown. I cannot believe that the Minister of Railways and Canals is going to stand for any such conduct as that. I cannot believe that the minister wants to take people's property in the high-handed and barbarous manner I have detailed, giving them neither compensation for their property nor the chance to have the compensation settled by the proper authorities.

I know my legal rights, of course, as well as any lawyer in this House does. I know that my client can apply to the Minister of Justice and get a fiat to start suit against the Crown, but I also know that this involves an enormous expense. It is the duty of the Crown, when they take any person's land, to start proceedings in the Exchequer Court to ascertain the compensation to be allowed for the land taken. Why the Department of Railways and Canals are carrying on this affair as they are I cannot understand. I have tried to figure it out in my own mind, but I am at a loss every time I try to do so.

I can understand quite well why the St. John and Quebec Railway Company did not go on. They would have been compelled to have paid the money before they got possession of the land, or to have paid a certain amount into court before they took possession, and that meant paying out money. We know that the St. John and Quebec Railway Company have not been very flush of funds for some time. But not so with the Department of Railways and Canals. Why you have taken this high-handed method without giving us a chance to find out what should be paid to us as compensation is something I cannot understand. While this is to some extent a

private transaction, yet it is a matter of so much importance that I feel compelled to bring it before the minister in this public manner, and all I ask is that he settle with us or bring us into court and allow the proper tribunal to settle the matter and let us get our compensation and be done with it. That is a reasonable proposition, one that I do not think the minister will deny is reasonable, and now that I have brought it to his attention, I feel sure that he will be willing to see that the proper machinery is put in motion, that no more clogs are placed in the wheel, and that this woman shall be accorded the right to which she is entitled as a British subject and a person whose land has been taken by the Crown while no compensation has been made.

Hon. FRANK COCHRANE (Minister of Railways and Canals): When I took charge of the department I found that there was a system in reference to the acquisition of real estate which had been in vogue on the Intercolonial railway for a long time. About six months ago I became so disgusted with it that I issued a new order with reference to the matter, and it requires that we must get two or three men to value property which we wish to acquire. To give you a fair illustration of what I mean, let me say that at a certain place on the Intercolonial we wanted to put in a track scale. We saw the owner of the property which would best suit the purpose of the railway, and he offered to let us have what we required for $80. In conformity with this system we appointed three arbitrators, and instead of eighty dollars they assessed us six hundred dollars, and that puts us in the awkward position of having evidence piled up against us if we take it to the Exchequer Court. I would cite another instance: We wanted to acquire a certain property and the owner only asked $2.25 a foot for it, but we appointed three arbitrators and they charged us $800 for expenses, for a secretary and everything else, and they assessed it at three dollars a foot. In these circumstances, I concluded it would pay the department to get a valuator of our own who would have no axe to grind and who would give us a fair valuation, and if the owners were not satisfied with it, they could go to the Exchequer Court. My hon. friend (Mr. Carvell) has stated that this property was for the Quebec and St. John railway. The first expropriation was not for the Quebec and St. John railway, but for the Intercolonial railway, for a freight-shed and track which we needed, because of the changing of the station, and its area was 3.81 acres.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not think it makes very much difference as to that.

Mr. COCHRANE: It does, because it removes some of the ground on which my hon. friend based his remarks.

Mr. CARVELL: Suppose the Quebec and St. John railway had never been built, would the minister have expropriated that land?

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes, I would. The hon. member stated that this property was 100 feet from the residence, but I have a plan here which shows it was 200 feet from Mrs. Lynch's residence.

Mr. CARVELL: That is all wrong.

Mr. COCHRANE: I do not think so. It is quite a distance.

Mr. CARVELL: About fifty feet.

Mr. COCHRANE: It is more than that.

Mr. CARVELL: At any rate, it is near her residence and you tore down her trees and cut through her summer house.

Mr. COCHRANE: We had three men value this property, and the value that was placed on the 3·81 acres was $11,935, or $3,132 per acre, and in the case of the second expropriation the land had an area of 1·15 acres. The total valuation made by these gentlemen was $15,575.

Mr. CARVELL: You made no such offer as that to me.

Mr. COCHRANE: No, because we considered it was altogether too large, and we believe so to-day.

Mr. CARVELL: We are convinced to the contrary.

Mr. COCHRANE: The lawyer who is handling the case for the Intercolonial railway is a gentleman of some repute, Mr. R. B. Hanson, and he protested against it. He says in a letter:

August 27, 1914.

Replying to your favour of the 26th instant, I beg now to give you some of my reasons for considering that the property taken from Mrs. Lynch is not worth more than $8,000 or $9,000. The Intercolonial railway takes approximately five acres of this property but only a portion of the part taken is on a street, the balance is inaccessible at present and will be for the future unless the street is put through. There was no prospect of a street until after the Intercolonial had expropriated and built the freight

shed. The property immediately across Regent street, known as Scully's Grove, contains 14 acres. It is situated in as good a position, in fact better, as it had access not only to Regent street, but also St. John street, and it sold in 1911 or thereabouts for $10,000, for the whole block, and the executor of the estates thinks he made a splendid sale and so do I. A few years before (not more than three or four) the estate of Wm. H. Scully sold the same property to Charles Scully for $4,000. This was a bargain, of course, but it is also a fact to be taken into consideration.

The Randolph property, known as 'Frogmore,' situate on the same side of Regent street, but west of the Canadian Pacific railway, contains 22 acres. It has a fine residence, stables and outbuildings, with fine graded grounds and large gardens and fields, and could have been purchased at any time during the last four or five years for $18,000 at the outside.

The value of the land alone taken by the Intercolonial railway considered as a whole, having in view the uses to which it could be put before August, 1913, would not, in my opinion, exceed $1,000 per acre, which would aggregate, in the whole, about $5,000. The damages to the property adjacent are difficult to measure; the conditions have not changed. A railway ran along the edge of her property then. A railway runs along the edge of her property now. The only difference is that the railway which skirts her property now is some distance nearer her residence than it was in 1913. Without pretending to estimate all the consequential damages, I would think that $3,000 or $4,000 would be liberal.

I understood also that an offer of $13,500 was made to my hon. friend (Mr. Carvell), but he refused it. I am not in a position to prove that, but I give the statement for what it is worth.

Mr. CARVELL: Do you want me to answer that?

Mr. COCHRANE: I am not making any assertion about it.

Mr. CARVELL: I may say that Mr. Hanson who gave me the offer gave it to me in writing, and I wish to state here that Mr. Hanson and I are the very best of personal friends.

Mr. COCHRANE: I understand so.

Mr. CARVELL: At that time I was acting as counsel with Mr. Hanson in a very large expropriation. I never saw my client and had no opportunity to, as she was away in New York. Three days afterwards, Mr. Hanson asked me if I would give to him the offer that had been made, as he had received instructions from Moncton to that effect, and as a matter of professional courtesy I handed it back.

Mr. COCHRANE: You did not refuse it or accept it?

[Mr. Cochrane.]

Mr. CARVELL: I had not the opportunity; I had not seen my client.

Mr. COCHRANE: I accept your word.

Mr. CARVELL: Mr. Hanson will bear out what I say.

Mr. COCHRANE: I will see that there is no further delay in sending the case to the Exchequer Court. I do not want to say that those men who valued the property have not acted fairly, but the man whom we sent down there agreed with Mr. Hanson as to the value, and he thinks he can sustain his opinion in the Exchequer Court.

Mr. CARVELL: Would the minister give me the names of the gentlemen who valued this land? I understood there had been some gentlemen appointed but we never knew the result of their valuation until to-day, and it is interesting.

Mr. COCHRANE: I do not think I ought to give the names. We will try to prove that their opinion is right.

Mr. CARVELL: The minister does not want to give me the names?

Mr. COCHRANE: I would rather not.

Mr. CARVELL: They will be given in the court, and the minister might as well give them now. I do not think the minister has grasped the point I was trying to make. The fact is that great damage has been done to this lady's property. I will send to the minister a photograph showing what he has destroyed. You may talk about the Germans ravaging Belgium, but there has been nothing worse done in Belgium than the minister has done in this case.

Mr. COCHRANE: I know all about it. I was on the ground before the expropriation.

Mr. CARVELL: I am sending the minister a photograph of the ground he has cut up and run his railway through, and I wish I could get the photograph on "Hansard". It is not a question, however, how much damage has been done to my client's property. We will take our chances of convincing the Exchequer Court as to how much damage has been done. It is not a question of how much was paid for Scully's grove, because that is a matter for the courts to find out. Scully's grove is a baseball field on the opposite side of the street and a little farther towards the Canadian Pacific Railway tracks.

Mr. COCHRANE: It is good commercial property.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes. It has not a building on it; I do not think it ever had. It has been used as a baseball field and as a general resort for athletes. I think it was sold for $7,000, as Mr. Hanson states.

Mr. COCHRANE: The railway runs alongside of the property which we have taken and it would not be residential property.

Mr. CARVELL: I admit that Mrs. Lynch does not reside on every inch of this land, but it is all enclosed by her fences. It is land she did not want to sell to a railway company; she was holding it for other purposes; it is land which, as I said before, was probably the best residential property in Fredericton. It was formerly occupied by Governor Wilmot. Mrs. Lynch did not want a railway within 150 feet of her residence. When my hon. friend speaks about comparing the quantity of land taken with the Scully grove property, he is speaking as many railway people do when they take away people's land—they simply speak of acreage. Were I sitting as a judge of the Exchequer Court, the last thing I would consider in giving damages would be acreage. The acreage, the actual land taken, is the last thing which an arbitrator should consider. It is the damage done to the rest of the property that counts.

Frogmore, to which my hon. friend has referred, is nearly half a mile away from Mrs. Lynch's property.

Mr. COCHRANE: That is better residential property.

Mr. CARVELL: No, it is not. It is away out in the country. You have to cross the Canadian Pacific railway track and climb a hill in order to get to it. There is no comparison whatever. You could cut up the Lynch property into lots to-morrow, and you could sell every one of them in the course of two or three years. If you were to cut up the Frogmore property into lots, you could not sell them in twenty-five years, because the city of Fredericton is not growing rapidly enough. That, however, is a matter which we shall discuss when it comes to the court. The point is that my hon. friend has taken this woman's property, and he will not pay her nor put her into court.

Mr. COCHRANE: I will put her into court.

Mr. CARVELL: I hope my hon. friend will; that is all we ask. We shall be satisfied with what we get. If we cannot get more than $15,000 damages, or more than $7,000, the value that my hon. friend's solicitor puts on the property, I shall be much surprised. I think my hon. friend's solicitor has had his eyes opened. He is learning a lot of law on the right side of these arbitration cases; that is, the side of the owner, the person whose property has been damaged. If my hon. friend would write again to his agent, he would get a somewhat different valuation from what he got three months ago.

Mr. COCHRANE: I have not received any.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend should write to his agent again. I know the gentleman very well, and his mind has had a wonderful transformation during the last few months as regards the potential damage to property and the amount of damage that ought to be allowed for taking the land itself for severance and all those other matters that enter into the question of damages in an arbitration or Exchequer court suit. As I have my hon. friend's promise that he will put this matter into the court, that is all I want, and we will undertake to look after the law of it and try to see that the lady gets the amount of compensation to which she is entitled.

Motion agreed to.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

ST. JOHN VALLEY RAILWAY.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N. B.) moved:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence, contracts, and other documents relating to the operation of the St. John Valley railway, so called, by the Intercolonial railway, since the first day of July last past, and of all letters, correspondence, etc., had either with the Department of Railways and Canals, or with F. P. Gutelius, or any other official of the Intercolonial railway.

He said: Before this motion is passed, I desire to recall to the attention of the minister what we look upon in New Brunswick as the very unfair attitude assumed by the Department of Railways and Canals in the operation of the Valley railway, so called. While it may be possible that the minister is technically within his rights and is not compelled to do more than he is doing, yet, if he be right, it is the narrowest, most

technical construction of a statute and contract I have ever known since I entered Parliament. He agreed in the most solemn fashion imaginable, and this Parliament by statute provided, that if the province of New Brunswick built a certain road up to a certain standard—a standard set by the minister himself—and did certain other things, he would operate that road as part of the Intercolonial railway, and pay back to the province forty per cent of the gross earnings with which to pay interest on the bond guarantee, the balance, if any, to go to the company that built the road. Now, I am not here as the special champion of the Government of the province of New Brunswick, nor of the company that built the road. I have had occasion during the last three or four years to say many things which were perhaps not entirely complimentary both to the Government and to the company. But the people of the province of New Brunswick have certain rights and privileges; they have a future before them, and they have certain debts which they must pay. Therefore, I contend, the Minister of Railways and Canals should carry out this contract made in good faith with the province of New Brunswick, whether he has the most friendly feeling towards the Government of New Brunswick and the railway company or not. This is a question bigger, broader and much more important than whether the province of New Brunswick has carried out its contract or whether the company has acted in perfect good faith. This is a matter that has caused great discussion in New Brunswick during the last two or three years; in fact, it has been one of the greatest bones of political contention we have had there since 1909. The subject has been discussed in this House many times, and I am not going over it now except to say generally that the people wanted a railway built along the river St. John through a country portions of which had been settled for a hundred years and which was without railway communication. This section contained some of the finest and most productive land of Canada, yet some parts of it were thirty and forty miles away from railway communications. Portions of this area had water communication during seven months of the year, but others had not even that. The great need was the need of railway communication. For some reason which I can hardly explain—and it does not matter for my present purpose—when the railways in western New Brunswick were built, they did not follow the St. John river below Woodstock. A branch line ran into Fredericton, but in the whole distance of one hundred and forty miles this point, Fredericton, about equi-distant from Woodstock and St. John, was the only point that had railway communication with the outside world. After years of agitation and, I am bound to say, considerable cross-firing between the Government of New Brunswick and the Government of the Dominion, what we thought a fair working basis was arrived at which was embodied in legislation passed in the session of 1911. Among the provisions of that statute were the following.

> The Governor in Council is authorized to enter into a contract with any railway company already authorized, or which may hereafter be authorized by law, to construct a line of railway from a point on the line of the National Transcontinental at Grand Falls, in the county of Victoria, to the city of St. John, in the province of New Brunswick, a distance of about two hundred and twenty miles, the principal and interest of the bonds of which railway company, pursuant to the provisions of chapter 6, of the statutes of the province of New Brunswick, 1910, the Government of the province of New Brunswick has guaranteed, or may guarantee, to the extent of twenty-five thousand dollars per mile, and with the Government of the province of New Brunswick, for the leasing of the said line of railway when completed, with its appurtenances, and for its operation, equipment, maintenance, up-keep and repair by the Government of Canada, as part of the Government railway system of Canada, for a period of ninety-nine years and for the payment by the Government of Canada to the said province of New Brunswick, or to the said company, each year during the said term ninety-nine years, of forty per centum of the gross earnings of the said railway as or in the nature of rental thereof: Provided, however, that the said contract shall be entered into only upon the condition that the said railway shall be constructed upon plans and specifications to be approved of by the Governor in Council upon the recommendation of the Minister of Railways and Canals and shall be up to the general standard of the said National Transcontinental railway through the said province: Provided further that the Governor in Council shall be authorized to enter into a contract, as aforesaid, for the operation of the said railway in sections, when completed and equipped, as follows:
>
> (1) From Fredericton to Woodstock;
>
> (2) From Fredericton, south, a distance of fourty miles;
>
> (3) Each twenty-five miles, thereafter, until the line be completed from Grand Falls to St. John.

That is an important part of the statement, because it gives the minister the right to go on and operate the road. When the present minister (Mr. Cochrane) came into office in October, 1911, he found the contract drawn up between the Dominion

Government and the Provincial Government and the St. John and Quebec Railway Company which we thought was satisfactory to all parties concerned. I think it had been signed by the Dominion Government, though I am not really positive about that. However, it had not been signed by the Provincial Government. But it had been drawn up at the conference of the three parties concerned, who agreed that it would be sufficient. During the election of 1911 the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) and his colleague in the Government of New Brunswick had promised all over New Brunswick that within a few days they would sign the contract. But the elections came, the Dominion Government was defeated, and the contract had not actually been signed.

The next year, in the session of 1912, that legislation was repealed in so far as the practical working out of the scheme was concerned, and new legislation was passed which necessitated the making of a new contract. The difficulty occasioned by the new legislation was that it provided practically no specification upon which the road should be constructed.

If I may be permitted to anticipate the answer of the hon. minister, I think he will say: Oh, well, you have not given me as good a road as I wanted; you have not given me a road which I can operate economically and at the same time pay you back forty cents out of every dollar. I am not sure that the minister will not go further and take the extremely technical ground that the road is not completed, that these sections have not been constructed and completed according to the statute and that, therefore, he is not compelled to operate it under the statute. I want to discuss in a very cursory manner these two phases of my hon. friend's answer—because I know that will be his answer—in order to show him the fallacy of the principle under which he is acting. If my hon. friend has not as good a road as he ought to have, it is his own fault. If the road is full of twists and curves and crooks and hills and everything that is contrary to good railroading, then he has only himself to blame. When my hon. friend came into office he found upon the statute book legislation which provided for the construction of a railroad. One of his first official acts in so far as railways in New Brunswick were concerned was to pass an Act repealing the legislation which provided for the construction of a good railroad, and to give his political friends in the province of New Brunswick the right to build anything—so long as it consisted of a roadbed and two rails—and pass it over to him as a railway. I am not going to say that as a railway, aside from the question of curves and grades, it is not a pretty good railway; perhaps I shall not be charged either with egotism or with excessive modesty if I say the course I took last year had something to do with making the road as good as it is. We had a rather severe investigation into this matter in the province of New Brunswick during the last year. We had shown up a great many things which have not redounded to the credit of the party in power in New Brunswick; we have compelled them to spend a great many thousands of dollars which they never intended to spend. Taking it all round, we have a pretty good roadbed; the difficulty is that it is not a very good road upon which to do business, because of the curves and grades.

I want to point out to my hon. friend wherein he has to thank himself for the difficulties under which he is labouring this evening. Chapter 49 of the Statutes of 1912 recites in the first place that by Chapter 11 of the Statutes of 1911 this Parliament agrees to operate the road as part of the Intercolonial. It goes on to recite the general substance of the legislation of 1911, and then it provides for assistance towards the building of three big bridges. That I will refer to later. I do not believe my hon. friend the Minister of Railways realized for a moment the true significance of section 10 of this Act when it was being passed. I wish the Minister distinctly to understand that what I am saying to him to-night is not personal. I have no idea in the world that the Minister knew what he was doing —I do not say that offensively—but his friends, to use a slang phrase, put it all over him, and now he is compelled to pay the penalty. The first part of section 10 reads as follows:

> Notwithstanding anything in any other Act, the agreement set out in the schedule to this Act is hereby ratified and confirmed and declared to be binding upon the respective parties thereto, subject to the provisions of this Act, and the Dominion may do whatever is necessary to give full effect to the said agreement and specifications and to the provisions of this Act.

My hon. friend will see that with one stroke of the pen everything done in 1911 was set aside; an entirely new contract was opened up and the Minister was bound to it. The schedule referred to in section 10

was an agreement which had previously been entered into between this Government, the Government of the province of New Brunswick, and the St. John and Quebec Railway Company. The St. John and Quebec Railway Company was a provincial organization having at its head a very shrewd American gentleman, Mr. A. R. Gould—a man who knows how to put it over my hon. friend, or my hon. friend's friends, without any difficulty whatever. This contract was made on the 5th day of March, and the legislation was not passed until the 1st day of April, 1912. The legislation of 1912 simply ratified this contract and made it the law of the land in the place and stead of the legislation of 1911. The contract first provided as follows:

Whereas it has been agreed by the several parties hereto that the said Company shall construct the said railway under and pursuant to an agreement which has been entered into between the company and the province, dated December twelfth, one thousand nine hundred and eleven, whereby the said province agrees to guarantee first mortgage bonds of the said company to the extent of $25,000 per mile.

Then, the enacting part of the contract proceeds as follows:

Now this indenture witnesseth.

That the said company hereby undertakes and agrees that the said railway, including the line of railway and all bridges connecting the same or forming part thereof as in the first paragraph of the preamble of this agreement set out, or intended so to be, shall be constructed and equipped in all respects up to and according to the specifications hereto annexed.

My hon. friend agreed that all they had to do was to build the railway up to the specifications annexed to the contract, and his department would take it over, operate it for 99 years, and pay back to the province of New Brunswick 40 per cent of the gross earnings. But the trouble is that there are no specifications annexed to the contract.

Mr. COCHRANE: There is a specification.

Mr. CARVELL: It is not here.

Mr. COCHRANE: That may be.

Mr. CARVELL: I can go further than that, and say that we have never been able to get the specifications. If they are or have been in existence, I should like to see them and ascertain what kind of agreement my hon. friend made at that time. Then subsection 2 of the contract provides:

That the company shall complete the construction and the equipment of the said railway in all respects up to and according to the specifications hereto annexed and the requirements as in the preceding clause set out on or before the first day of November, in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and fifteen.

There again the specifications are kept secret so far as the public is concerned. To-day the people of New Brunswick and the people of Canada in general have no knowledge of what the specifications were or what kind of railway these people agreed to build for the minister. Subsection 9 of the contract is as follows:

It is hereby understood and agreed by and between all the parties hereto, that during the first fifteen years of the term of the said lease forty (40%) per cent of the gross earnings of the said railway (exclusive of the bridges) and the bridges shall be paid by the Government of Canada to the Province of New Brunswick to be applied so far as necessary towards payment of the interest upon the said bonds so to be guaranteed by the Province of New Brunswick, and the surplus, if any, after payment of said interest to be paid semi-annually to the railway company; and during the first fifteen years of the term of the said bridge bonds the interest thereupon shall be paid and borne by the Government of Canada as further aid towards the construction of the said bridges.

The substance of that legislation was this: The minister agreed that when they completed the construction of the railway according to the terms of the specification—which we do not know anything about—they would agree to take that road over and operate it in sections and when the road was completed he would take a leasehold of it and would pay back to the province of New Brunswick 40 per cent of the gross earnings with which to pay the interest on the bonds. That is the contract which the minister made. Acting on that, the railway company went to work in the spring of 1912 and have since built 120 miles of railway running from Centreville in Carleton to Gagetown in the county of Queens, passing through York and Sunbury. The first of the sections referred to in the statutes of 1911 to which I referred the minister before, was from Centreville to Woodstock. That road has been built from Fredericton to Woodstock and, according to my information, has been completed. I received an answer from the minister the other day as to whether the contract had been carried out; he said the road was not completed. I hope the minister will say in what respect the road has not been completed. I wish to say it has been completed, that we had an inspector this year, Mr. J. J. Taylor, who, I believe, tried to do his duty, a gentleman who, while not satisfied with the specifications, yet held the

company down to those specifications as well as he could, a gentleman who certainly made that company do everything which he could possibly conceive he was entitled to make them do under those specifications. He could not make them cut out one per cent grades by the hundreds and seven degree curves by the dozen because these were in the specifications. I think that the first protest that came to the minister over the character of the road came from Mr. Justice Crocket, then Conservative member for the county of York. He made very severe protests against the number of seven degree curves and one per cent grades they were inserting but all of no avail. Mr. Taylor made not only one protest but tens and dozens, and I think I may say hundreds of protests against the character of the road they were building, but all of no avail. In every case he was turned down. When it came to questions of the quality of the culverts and the width of embankments, the amount of ballast, the character of ties and all such things as that, he had his own way and in so far as he was allowed to be the judge of the question. My hon. friend has as good a railway as it is possible to give him; but whenever it got beyond the power of Mr. Taylor, the politicians interfered and my hon. friend has a railway about which he complains to-day and over which he will complain that he cannot do business at a profit. That is his fault and not the fault of his inspecting engineer. I have endeavoured to find out, if I can, wherein the road is not completed between Fredericton and Woodstock—and I might say it is also completed from Woodstock north, a distance of twenty-five miles, and they treat the two together. I have tried to find out wherein the two sections are incomplete. I am assured by gentlemen who ought to know, by the officials of the railway company itself, that the only thing which is not completed on that section of nearly eighty miles of road is a track scale at Woodstock which I believe has not been placed. It may be that my hon. friend can technically say that because a track scale has not been put in in a stretch of railway eighty miles long, the road is not completed and he is not compelled to operate it; but if he takes that ground it is the most literal interpretation of a contract I have ever heard and one which will not please his friends or any other person in New Brunswick.

The next thing is that portion of the road from Fredericton south to Gagetown. I tell my hon. friend the road is completed from Fredericton to Gagetown, a distance of thirty-six miles, going through the counties of York, Sunbury and Queens; and I have it from the contractor who built that portion of the road, I have it from the railway company itself, I have it from gentlemen who live along the line of the road, it is common knowledge in New Brunswick, that this part of the road also is absolutely completed excepting that there may be a little riprapping to be done along some of the track, but that is a matter which has been left in abeyance and which may or may not be required. The Minister must remember that, by the contract, if it becomes necessary to do anything else in the way of capital expenditure he has the power to do that work and charge it back to the company. So if it should turn out that there were any little matters not entirely completed the minister has the power to do the work and charge it back to the company and the Intercolonial suffers no loss from the transaction. What do you suppose will be my hon. friend's answer as to his reason for not operating that portion of the road. It is no more and no less than the fact that the contract says the road was to be forty miles in length and it is only thirty-six miles and they have a road entirely completed with no exceptionally bad grades except one, although the curves are not what they might be. The railway runs through a portion of the province which has been settled for over one hundred years. It is a country which has no communication whatever with the outside world in the winter. One of the finest producing countries of Canada and is to-day without railway accommodation; and yet it has a railway entirely completed, ready for operation and the Minister of Railways refuses to operate it because he said to the company; you agreed to build a stretch forty miles long and have only completed thirty-six miles. That is the only reason the Minister can urge for his non-operation of that section. When it comes to the other two sections of the road, that is from Fredericton north to Woodstock and from Woodstock north to Centreville, he cannot urge that the sections are not completed because the road is completed from Fredericton to Woodstock and is completed not twenty-five miles but twenty-six miles north of Woodstock. If my hon. friend tries to apply a somewhat hairsplitting interpre-

tation of the contract he might say: I will operate that road up to within one mile of Centreville and then stop because I have entered into a contract with relation to a line to a point twenty-five miles north and this is twenty-six miles. He is operating the twenty-six miles. He is running one train a way a day over the road from Centreville to Fredericton. I am not complaining so much of the character of the service he is giving. I realize that it is a new road and that it takes time to work up business; and while I would like to see a little better train service, I wish to be reasonable. I hope that in the future we will have a better service than at the present, but it is a great advantage over no train service at all. In the twenty-five miles from Woodstock to Centreville I believe the road will get more freight than can be obtained from any other twenty-five miles of purely agricultural country in Canada, and that is saying a good deal. It may be that for the last two months the minister has not been getting as much traffic as he might expect because, unfortunately, a great portion of the traffic originating in that section is potatoes, and there is no market to-day for potatoes in Canada or elsewhere, and I believe there are to-day half a million barrels awaiting shipment there. If the time comes, and it must come, when we can find a market for these potatoes, we will find that the capacity of the road will be taxed to the utmost and what is true this year will be true next year and every year. I repeat that I do not believe the minister will find twenty-five miles of agricultural area in Canada that will produce more traffic of a purely agricultural character than this twenty-five miles of road.

But when it goes beyond Fredericton, while possibly it is not as good a country, and while there would not be as much traffic, yet these people have no accommodation whatever, simply because the minister says: You agreed to build a road forty miles long, and you have only completed thirty-six miles. Yet the thirty-six miles takes in the large and thriving town of Gagetown, the shire town, and if the minister insisted on going the other four miles he would simply be going down four miles into the country. There is no reason why the company should have built the section beyond Gagetown, because that will come in connection with the next section. I have no doubt that the company never had any idea that forty miles would be required to be built, or that the minister would take any exception if there were not the exact forty miles built. Now the minister maintains that he is excused from operating that road because they have not complied strictly with the terms of the contract. I do not believe that his colleagues, that the Government, that his followers in the House, that anybody in the province of New Brunswick, will agree with him in the excuse which will be put up for the non-operation of that portion of the road. I not only condemn the minister here, to-night, for not operating that road, but I condemn him for not operating any portion of that road according to the contract. The minister—and when I use the word " Minister " I mean the Government, because I want to make it perfectly clear that I cast no personal reflection on the present incumbent of the office—has not carried out his bargain with the people of New Brunswick, with the Government of New Brunswick, or with the railway company. He agreed by chapter 49 of the Statutes of 1912, in the most solemn manner possible, that when that road was completed according to certain specifications, he would operate it and pay forty per cent of the gross earnings to the people of that province. He has not done that. He shakes his head as much as to say, I suppose, that he does not intend to.

Mr. COCHRANE: I did not agree to it.

Mr. CARVELL: Did not agree to it? I have read the Statute.

Mr. COCHRANE: Let me answer for myself; you need not answer.

Mr. CARVELL: I will try to let my hon. friend know what I want him to answer.

Mr. COCHRANE: You are trying to give my answer.

Mr. CARVELL: And when I have done I will be perfectly willing to listen to the answer which my hon. friend wishes to give. I said he made a contract, and he has broken his contract with everybody concerned. As far as the Government of New Brunswick are concerned, it does not bother me very much whether they are in trouble or not, and as far as the railway company are concerned, it is perfectly clear that they are not clients of mine, but if everybody had carried out his contract the same as this company have, perhaps we would not be in the mess which we are in to-day. As far as the people of New Brunswick are concerned, the people who have to pay the interest on this enormous debt which has been rolled up over their heads, they are concerned, and it is for that reason that I am calling upon the minister to

explain why he has not carried out the contract.

This road was completed practically ready for operation, and should have been in operation, last October. I do not say it was completed in the sense that every spike was driven, every shovelful of ballast had been placed upon the road, or that the last brush of paint had been put upon the station houses, but I do say that way back even in September this road was completed and fit for traffic. The roadbed was entirely completed long before that, and it was perfectly feasible to operate the road in October. The produce of that country, which is largely potatoes, was saleable in very large quantities in September and October, and hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of potatoes grown in that country might have been gotten out if the minister had in an honourable spirit carried out the contract and operated the road. He did not do so, and the result is that this stuff is locked up to-day, there is no market for it, and I am afraid there will be no market for it. To-day he is not operating the road according to his contract. I got an answer from him on Friday last, I think, and according to that answer no portion of the gross receipts of that road go to the province of New Brunswick. As I understand the contract says that no matter what the road earns, nothing goes to the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. COCHRANE: I did not say that.

Mr. CARVELL: That is what I understood the hon. gentleman's answer to be.

Mr. COCHRANE: No, I did not say that. You mean the present operation ?

Mr. CARVELL: The present operation.

Mr. COCHRANE: There will not be any.

Mr. CARVELL: I see; there will not be any other per cent. Am I right ? I think I have the faculty of understanding the English language when I read it.

Mr. COCHRANE: I misunderstood your statement.

Mr. CARVELL: Whereas by the contract which Parliament made, the people of New Brunswick were to have forty per cent on every dollar earned, under the present agreement they get nothing; and, worse than that, the Intercolonial takes all, but if there should be a loss in operation, we pay half of the loss. What is the contract which my hon. friend made, or which Parliament made for him in 1912 ? I would like to know it. That is what I am finding fault with and that is what I want the minister to explain. Why should the people of New Brunswick be compelled to pay the interest on the bonds to something like three or four million dollars ? We are liable to pay the interest on bonds to the amount of $4,000,000 and we are not getting one dollar out of the operation of the road with which to pay that interest, whereas, by the statute, by the contract made by Parliament, we are entitled to receive forty per cent of the gross earnings of the road with which to pay interest on the bonds. The minister may say: I do not think I am going to make money out of it. That is not the contract. He may say: You have not finished the road. That is not the contract. He may say: You have not built the kind of road you should have built. That is not the contract. He agreed, no matter what kind of a road we built, that he would operate it. He agreed that, so long as we built a section of 25 miles, he would take it over, and he agreed to take the whole of it. He agreed to pay forty per cent of the gross earnings for the purpose of assisting the people of New Brunswick to meet the interest on the bonds. These are things which the minister is called upon to answer. But he may say: Well, you agreed when the contract was made that you would finish that road to Grand Falls by the first of November, 1915. Let him quarrel with the people who made the contract, let him go to his friends the Government of New Brunswick, let him go to his friends of the St. John and Quebec Railway Company and ask them why they did not carry out their contract. But that is not the fault of the people of New Brunswick. It is not the fault of the men who have to pay the interest on those bonds. Just here perhaps my hon. friend may ask me whose fault it is. Why was that road not completed according to the contract ? It is all very simple. It has not been completed according to the contract because of the boodling, the worse than boodling, the almost pilfering of public money, by the men whose duty it was to safeguard the interests of the people of the province. He may say that if the road had been built through to Grand Falls he would have been able to get traffic from the Transcontinental railway and do a through business. It is not our fault that that has not been done. I have talked upon this question in the House a number of times. I have stated before, and I repeat to-night, that the road never was

justifiable. The whole scheme never was justifiable. The whole scheme was almost a business and political crime if it did not go through to Grand Falls and draw freight from the Transcontinental railway. The whole scheme was based on the idea that it was to be the outlet for transcontinental railway freight into the city of St. John, and without the transcontinental railway freight it was never feasible for a moment because there will not be sufficient traffic originating along that road, partly as a branch line of the Canadian Pacific railway, to give enough business to pay forty per cent on the bonds and yet leave sufficient margin to operate the road. It is not the fault of the people that the road has not been built to Grand Falls. The minister's friends in New Brunswick may say to him: we cannot sell our bonds on account of the war and therefore we cannot extend the road to Grand Falls, but there never was a more unjust, unfair, and dishonest statement than that, and the minister's friends are simply deceiving him in the most scandalous manner possible—were it parliamentary to use a stronger term I would use it, but the minister can supply the term mentally without my saying it orally. The fact is that in 1912, when the money market was in splendid condition the province of New Brunswick and that railway company sold on the London market bonds for 170 miles at $25,000 a mile, and not for the 120 miles they intended to build. The actual cash brought from England, away back in May, 1912, amounted to $1,200,000, and that money is on hand or ought to be on hand from that day to this, and if it is not on hand to-day it is because some person in the province of New Brunswick, pretty close to the minister—

Mr. COCHRANE: Do you mean to say I got any of it?

Mr. CARVELL: No.

Mr. COCHRANE: Or anybody in this House?

Mr. CARVELL: There is no question about who is responsible; it is the Government of New Brunswick. They brought that money to Canada, and instead of putting it in the Bank of Montreal, in the Bank of Nova Scotia, or in the Royal Bank, or in one of the big trust companies, as they ought to do, they put it in the hands of a trust company in Montreal—with which I do not want to have any quarrel, and against which I have not a word of condemnation—that is at least not to be compared with the big institutions to which I have referred. They put $4,000,000 in the hands of a company called the Prudential Trust Company, and the only qualification put upon the investment of that money was a letter written by the then Provincial Secretary of New Brunswick, the present member for York in this House (Mr. McLeod), addressed to the Prudential Trust Company, and telling them they were at liberty to invest that money as they thought fit, the only condition being that every three months they should send to the Government of New Brunswick a statement of the manner in which that money had been invested.

Now, if they have not got the cash to build that road, the fault lies with the Government of New Brunswick and the Prudential Trust Company. I do not want to go further; I do not think it would be fair to go further; I can only say that they cannot get the money, and they are putting it up to the people of the province as a reason why they cannot get the money, that the money market is in such a bad condition that they cannot sell their bonds. I think I am justified in the assertion I made a moment ago as to the word that ought to be used, when these people tell the minister that they cannot finish the road because they could not sell bonds to get the money.

Again, they may say to the minister: we have issued second mortgage bonds at ten thousand a mile and we cannot sell these second mortgage bonds. I tell the minister that it is not necessary to sell the second mortgage bonds. I tell him that if he can get the cash for the first mortgage bonds, or if the Government, or the Prudential Trust Company, or whoever has the money can dig up the money from the first mortgage bonds, I will find contractors who will take the second mortgage bonds upon their own responsibility and build the road. There is no trouble about that at all. The contractors who built the road from Woodstock to Centreville—I have no hesitation in giving their names, they are Kennedy & Macdonald of Antigonish, N.S., who were large contractors on the National Transcontinental—never received a dollar of the $10,000 a mile second mortgage bonds, but took the bonds themselves. The same is true of the Hibbard Company, which built the road from Fredericton to Woodstock, and the same is true of the Corbett Construction Company, which built the road from Fredericton to Gagetown. They took the second mortgage bonds of $10,000 a mile and financed them themselves.

I was solicitor for two of these companies, and I tell the minister they are perfectly willing to take these second mortgage bonds and to build the remainder of the road, providing they have the assurance that the money which ought to be in the hands of the Prudential Trust Company is forthcoming. They will take that money and they will take these second mortgage bonds and they will build the road, and if the road is not finished it is not the fault of the contractors or anybody else, except the Minister's political friends in New Brunswick.

You may ask me why the money was put in the hands of the Prudential Trust Company. I will throw a little sidelight on the transaction, and only a sidelight, because I am not here to discuss everything that has been made public in New Brunswick during the past year. The Minister may say: Why did these men put that money in the place in which they did instead of in one of the big financial institutions of Canada? I can tell the Minister that there was a very good reason for it, a reason which was brought out in the investigation held in New Brunswick last year. We proved in that investigation that before the bonds were sold an agreement was made with the Prudential Trust Company that in case the money was left to them on deposit they would loan to Mr. Gould and his associates on their notes alone the sum of $350,000 which of course would come out of that trust fund. The money was brought from England in May, and between that date and the running of the provincial elections, $200,000 was paid over to Mr. Gould and his associates, on their own private notes. The notes were signed by Mr. A. R. Gould, a bright, shrewd, active Yankee promoter, who lives in the State of Maine a few miles away from where we live, by Ross Thompson, chief engineer of the road, by Mr. Lisman, a lawyer of New York, and by Mr. Macdonell, an official of the Canadian Pacific railway in Montreal. They advanced $200,000 before the election, and they increased the advance to $350,000 the next two or three months thereafter. Out of $350,000, I state here to-night that $100,000 was paid to a member of the Government of New Brunswick for the election fund for the elections of 1912, and I state here further that $97,000 of that amount is still owing by these gentlemen to the Prudential Trust Company. You now get some idea as to why the money was handled as it was, and the Minister of Railways can go back now and see why the road has not been completed to Grand Falls and why he ought to be compelled to operate that road.

Mr. COCHRANE: Will the hon. gentleman let me know what this has to do with running the railway, and, even if it be all true, what has this Government to do with it?

Mr. CARVELL: I am trying to enlighten the Minister of Railways.

Mr. COCHRANE: I do not see where it comes in on the operation of the road.

Mr. CARVELL: I am trying to show the minister why this road has not been completed. The minister may say: You have not lived up to the contract, and therefore I am not bound to operate the road and if I do not operate it you are going to lose the money.

Mr. COCHRANE: I never said so.

Mr. CARVELL: I have said so and I have shown the minister. The best evidence is that what I have said hurts him.

Mr. COCHRANE: Oh, no.

Mr. CARVELL: It has all the evidence of it.

Mr. COCHRANE: Oh, no.

Mr. CARVELL: I am trying to show my friend why the money was squandered as it was, and that as a result of the squandering of that money the road has not been completed. I know that very strong representations have been made to the minister, to Mr. Gutelius, to the Intercolonial authorities generally, to operate this road according to the contract. I know that representations have been made by the Government of New Brunswick and by the railway company; and I know that they are all truly penitent to-day for their sins, and would like at least to have the road operated, because they realize now the crime that is being practised on the province. They realize that we are liable to pay interest on about $4,000,000 for the road already completed, and that we are paying or liable to pay interest on $1,200,000; which is in the hands of the Prudential Trust Company, and which should have gone into the building of the road. They are trying to make amends, and I know they have been importuning my hon. friend the minister to operate the road according to the contract; but so far as I know he has not done so. Instead of operating the road, instead of giving the people of New Brunswick that proportion to which they are entitled, he is giving them nothing; but

if there is a loss in the operation of the road, in addition to paying the interest on the bonds and bearing other burdens, they will have to put their hands into their pockets and pay one-half of any such loss. How long is this to continue? Is it to be forever? Will my hon. friend forever be able to find some quibble and say: Your road is not yet completed. No man can ever say that a road is completed if the minister or the other party to the agreement says it is not, because building a railroad is not like binding a book or building a house, but is something which any man can say is not completed. A man might go back a hundred times and do everything the minister wants him to do, and yet the minister might say there was some other thing that should be done. There would never be a finality. Is the minister to take that course, or will he get off his perch and be reasonable and say that this road is completed to all intents and purposes? I want to say on behalf of the railway company, for whom I hold no brief whatever, that they have honestly endeavoured to complete the road. I believe they have, during the last six months or a year, done everything which lay in their power to get that road completed, to see a finality of it, to get the Intercolonial to take it over and operate it according to the terms of the contract. But it seems there is nothing which they can do, nothing which the Government of New Brunswick can do, no atonement for their sins which will satisfy their lord and master the Minister of Railways. It seems to be impossible to get him to carry out his part of the agreement and to place both them and the province of New Brunswick in the position in which they ought to be placed. I do not blame my hon. friend if he chides his friends in the province of New Brunswick very severely. In fact in my judgment he cannot castigate them strongly enough to repay them in any degree for the sins which they have committed. He can castigate them just as severely as he chooses, but there is no reason why he should castigate innocent people while he is trying to pay back a little of the political debt he owes to his friends in the province. Every one in the province of New Brunswick says that he should complete the road; but it is not our fault if the road has not been completed. The sin rests at the door of his political friends in the province of New Brunswick. Let him wreak his vengeance upon them in any way he sees fit. Let him not wreak his vengeance upon the innocent man who really wants the road constructed, the man who has not the railway facilities and who has to pay interest on that debt, because the road is not constructed. I may have spoken a little plainly to-night, but that was my intention. I may have said some things to-night which the minister may think I should have left unsaid.

9 p.m.

Mr. COCHRANE: No.

Mr. CARVELL: I think, however, I have said enough to show the minister that he, unwittingly perhaps, is wreaking his vengeance upon the wrong party. He is making every one suffer when he is perfectly justified in making his political friends suffer in any way in which he possibly can. I believe I have given the minister sufficient information to-night to justify careful investigation into the matter so far as he is concerned; to justify probing into the whole transaction in order to find out whether or not the facts I have told him to-night are borne out by the record; to justify his going into the matter to see why his friends have not carried out their part of the agreement; to see whether the fault lies with the Government of New Brunswick or with the gentlemen who are their friends, namely, the railway company. I do not know that I can say they are his friends, because I know of no connection between this Government and the railway company, excepting that I know that until about six or eight months ago the railway company could get anything they wanted in Ottawa. When things did not go right in New Brunswick they came to Ottawa and got whatever they wanted. I believe there has been a change in the relations between the department and the railway company in the last six or eight months.

There is another point in which my friend is to blame that this railway has not been completed, and this is a very serious one. While my friend perhaps did not want me to speak about the sins of his friends in New Brunswick, I know he will be glad to hear me discuss the other point, because it is strictly germane to the issue. I have tried to point out to my hon. friend the practical impossibility of ever making that road a financial success or of ever carrying out what it was intended it should be by the promoters unless it connects with the Transcontinental somewhere at or near Grand Falls; but in order to connect with the Transcontinental at that point or at

any other place in the vicinity, that road must cross the river St. John. Unless my hon. friend wishes the road to parallel the Canadian Pacific railway running along the St. John river from Andover to Grand Falls, he must build a bridge across the river. Just where his friends intend to tap the Transcontinental, I do not know; it has been a political football for a number of years in our province about getting to Grand Falls with the Valley railway. Some of us were doubting Thomases to such an extent that we never believed that my friend intended the railway to go there at all; but of course my hon. friend's political friends always protested in the loudest and most pious manner possible that they had no other intention on earth except to go to Grand Falls. When I had the chief engineer of the railway company under cross-examination last summer, I found that they had never even surveyed a road from Andover to Grand Falls, and that they never intended to go to Grand Falls at all. They thought they might strike the Transcontinental some five or six miles south of Grand Falls. From the transportation standpoint, it does not make much difference where they strike the Transcontinental, so long as they get there; but from the standpoint of accommodation and business of the people, the railway should go to the town of Grand Falls, as was promised. In order to reach Grand Falls, my hon. friend must build a bridge across the St. John river. It will be a fairly important bridge, and will cost probably two or three hundred thousand dollars; including approaches, perhaps a little more.

This Act of 1912 provided, and the minister solemnly covenanted to carry it out, for the guarantee of the bonds to the extent of $1,000,000 with which to assist the building not only of that bridge but of two others, one across the St. John at Mistake, and the other across the Kennebecasis. But the railway company came back to him and said: We can not build these bridges with an assistance of $1,000,000, and must have more money. I know not whether that be true, but they convinced the minister that they could not—

Mr. COCHRANE: I was not here.

Mr. CARVELL: I know the hon. minister does not wish me to say who was the real culprit, if I may use that word, in this transaction. But let us speak of the department; they convinced the department that they could not build the bridges with that assistance, and I think they said that they ought to have $3,000,000. I confess I objected to that; I did object to having $3,000,000 handed over to these people for the purpose of building bridges or anything else. We had had experience with them. I say to the credit of the department, they conceded the point, and they agreed to build these bridges outright. The legislation providing for this was passed ten or eleven months ago. The minister and his department agreed to build the bridges no matter what they cost—a bridge across the St. John at Andover, a bridge across the St. John at or near Mistake, and a bridge across the Kennebecasis river. And the hon. gentleman agreed, in effect, to build these bridges at once. Oh, yes; don't deny that. There was a clause in this legislation as presented to the House providing that before the department could act they must have the consent of the Legislature of the province of New Brunswick. I pointed out to the minister at that time that the Legislature of the province of New Brunswick had then prorogued and that it would not be possible to get consent from them for a year, and so if they passed the legislation as it stood the effect would be to put the work off for a year. On account of my pointing this out the Bill was changed, that clause was cut out and the matter left open. So, while there was no distinct pledge either by the Government direct or through this legislation that they would build these bridges at once, still that was the real contract. For if they had put the legislation through as provided it would necessarily have caused delay of about a year and, as the result of my protest, they cut out that clause and so provided that they could go on as quickly as they liked. So, I must hold the Minister guilty of not carrying out another contract, solemnly made, with the people of New Brunswick.

The minister may say that this is a tremendous task. So it may be. But, no matter what may be said about the bridges on the lower part of the river, and whether the minister has an alternate scheme or not—and let him fight that out with his friends in New Brunswick—there is no reason why he should delay the building of the bridge at Andover. He ought not to have lost a day in the construction of that bridge. There are no engineering difficulties. If he will send down an engineer, that engineer ought to be able in two weeks to obtain the data necessary to draw the plans and specifications necessary for the building of that bridge. And not only is it easy of con-

struction, it is absolutely vital to the whole undertaking. For, without that bridge as I have said, he cannot get connection with the Transcontinental, without which the whole scheme is a failure and will never carry out the objects intended and will never pay the interest on the investment.

When he answers me, I hope the minister will take into consideration both branches of the case that I have presented. I hope he will not try to find excuses—that is no remedy for our trouble—but will forcefully take this matter in hand, as he above all other members of the Government has power to do. We know the minister to be a forceful man. When he takes a thing into his head he usually puts it through. And we know that if he went after this matter in that way he has the power and the ability to go on with it. He will not only be able to find out where the blame lies for the condition of affairs there, but will be able to satisfy himself—and I believe will come to the conclusion—that he cannot move a moment too soon. He will find his first duty, I believe, to be to build the bridge at Andover, and the second to find out without a moment's delay where is the money obtained for the sale of these bonds nearly three years ago,—whether that money is available, and if not, why not; and if it is available then why the Government of the province of New Brunswick does not build that road to Grand Falls, make the connection with the Transcontinental and put the scheme into a position where it will not be, as the minister will tell you it is, a money-losing venture, but where it may be a boon and benefit to thousands and tens of thousands of people living in the most fertile portions of New Brunswick, and I believe one of the most fertile portions of Canada.

Hon. FRANK COCHRANE (Minister of Railways and Canals): As to the statement of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell), I must take strong exception to his statement of facts, and indeed must give him a flat contradiction. In the first place, the difference between the two Acts is an engineering point. I make the statement on my responsibility as a minister, and after discussing this matter with people who understand the operation of railways fully as well as my hon. friend does, that the road that is being built now can be operated just as cheaply as the one proposed by the late government in the statute of 1911. That is the statement made to me by men who are ready to back up their opinion, men whose business is the operation of railways, while the hon. gentleman himself will admit that he is not an operating man. Now, as to the operation of the road, the statute is very clear on it. The railway company, the contractors who are building this road, notified us that the road would be ready for operation between certain points on the 15th October last. On the 3rd of November, the engineers of the Intercolonial railway went over that portion of the road accompanied by representatives of the railway and representatives of the New Brunswick Government, and they had to admit that the road was not completed. We gave them a list of the parts that were not completed.

Mr. CARVELL: Has the minister got that list handy?

Mr. COCHRANE: No.

Mr. CARVELL: I would like to see it.

Mr. COCHRANE: They have got it. My hon. friend knows that the road was not completed, the terminals were not completed at Woodstock, his own home town. Nor were the terminals completed at Fredericton. The province of New Brunswick and the railway company wanted to enter into some kind of agreement with us under which we should complete the work, and we have undertaken to do it, giving them a service that the traffic there demands, and with the direct understanding that if there is a loss the Government of New Brunswick pays half and we pay half. He is a good man who in these stringent times carries out an agreement as I have endeavoured to carry out the provisions of this legislation. I make no bones about it; I say the road was not completed; they had to admit that it was not completed. If we carry out the letter of the law, what right has my hon. friend or the province or any one else to ask us to spend money which we are not authorized to spend? There is not a railway in the Dominion of Canada today that operates on a 60 per cent basis and furnishes rolling stock as well; yet we have entered into an agreement with the province and with this railway company to do that, and when the road is completed we will carry out our contract to the letter. As to the part of the line running to Gagetown, this we have had examined by our traffic men with a view to seeing what business there would be for the road in that section. Last Friday we came to the conclusion that we would give the people of that district a service on that portion of the line.

It may not be as good as the other, but it will give them an outlet. We have tried to meet their desires in every possible way. No money was voted for this purpose, and we had to get a Governor General's warrant in order to enable us to operate this section. As to the construction of the road, the Act does no more than give us authority to see that the road is constructed according to the specifications agreed upon by the railway company and the department. We have endeavoured to carry that out to the letter, and have made no changes which the Act does not authorize us to make.

I am sorry that I am not quite as familiar with the matter of the bridges as I should be, owing to the fact that I was not here when the Act was passed last session. I think, however, that it would be a great mistake for the province, the railway company or the people of Canada to spend millions to run the line to St. John unless the traffic proves to be much heavier than we estimate it will be. It is the intention of the Government to try to make some connection between the Transcontinental and this road. I do not know whether it is best and cheapest to make it at Grand Falls, or whether it would be better to make it at some other point. We cannot possibly make a connection which will not get through traffic, and if we make connection with the Transcontinental at the cheapest possible point, we can get through traffic from Montreal and other points to St. John. This would not only be a shorter route of transportation than on the Intercolonial, but the resulting traffic would help to pay the cost of operation and keep the road up to a better standard.

I think there is one thing in the statutes of 1912—and which was not in the legislation of 1911—for which we can take credit. We have the right to issue bonds on betterments, which in the case of private roads would ordinarily be charged to capital, and if the road is ever worth it we will get our money back in that way. I have consulted practical railway men, men who have been in the business for years; men who have been financing betterments and that sort of thing on such railways as the Canadian Pacific Railway—and they tell me that his clause in the statute, which was new to them, is worth a good deal to any road which has to be run on such a basis as we are running this one.

In the matter of the construction of the road, what the provincial Government has not done is not a matter for me or for this Government or for this House. I have endeavoured to keep up to the limit our part of the agreement. I have endeavoured to see that we did not pay them a cent out of Dominion subsidies more than they were entitled to, and I propose to continue to do that, so far as I am able, and to see that we get a road that is constructed according to the specifications—of which, by the way, the hon. gentleman can get a copy if he wants to. The hon. gentleman started out by trying to lead the House to believe that there were no specifications, and he afterwards said that the engineer had tried to see that the specifications were lived up to. There were specifications, and there are specifications still.

I do not think that technically or in any other respect I have done anything but what is right and what is my duty. I have no right to overstep my powers and spend the people's money when I have no authority to do so, and I am not going to do it. The Act is quite plain; it says that when forty miles are completed we shall operate the line under the terms of the statute. This I intend to do and will do. The distance to Gagetown is not forty miles, yet we are going to put the line in operation. I am satisfied, from the report made by the traffic men, that operation will be at a loss, but I want to help as much as possible, and I am trying to do it by giving the people of that section one train a week. If the traffic warrants it, we will give them two trains a week. I am satisfied that we have carried out our part of the agreement to the letter of the law. We have nothing to do with the province; if they made a bad investment, the province is worth it, and we will not be put in the hole on that account. They have their share to bear, and must bear it.

Mr. CARVELL: I thank the hon. gentleman for the very frank statement which he has made, but I should have been pleased if he had been a little more explicit as to how he expects to connect with the Transcontinental.

Mr. COCHRANE: That is a matter of engineering which cannot be determined at the present time.

Mr. CARVELL: I should have been glad if he had been more explicit in the matter of whether he intends to build the bridge at Andover, because that is the essence of the whole thing.

Mr. COCHRANE: The railroad is not there yet.

Mr. CARVELL: It ought to be there. My hon. friend does not have to say more than he wants to; I have given him the opportunity of telling us all about it, and I am pointing out the matters in respect of which he has been hardly as explicit as he might have been. My hon. friend says that he has been advised by competent operating men that this road can be operated just as cheaply as the road we proposed. I can only say that we proposed a road which maintained a four-tenths grade, except in two places where it was necessary to exceed that to some extent. My hon. friend may have a fetish for velocity grades; I think he has. If he confined himself to velocity grades, I would not quarrel with him so very much, but I want to tell him that there are two places along the river St. John between Fredericton and Woodstock, a distance of 62 miles, where the railway leaves the river and climbs hills 175 feet high, and then comes back to the river again.

Mr. COCHRANE: And you had two pusher grades.

Mr. CARVELL: Not in that place. We had pusher grades, but they were necessary. I am telling my hon. friend now that pusher grades have been built in places where there was absolutely no necessity for them; they have made a one per cent grade four or five miles in length, both ways, north and south. They are not velocity grades; they are pusher grades of one per cent. Yet my hon. friend says he is advised by his traffic managers that he can operate that line just as cheaply as he could operate a road having a four-tenths grade. Well, that may be my friend's opinion and that may be the advice he is getting from his officials, but, if it is, it is something entirely new in the railway world.

My hon. friend also says it is a good man who carries out his agreement in these hard times. Heavens, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Railways says that the Government ought to have credit because they carry out their agreement in these hard times! That is a most remarkable statement coming from the Minister of Railways, a minister with all the resources of this Dominion at his back, a member of a Government that can go out and borrow fifty or a hundred million dollars and add to the cost of the poor man's living by adding $30,000,000 more in taxes, simply by turning his hand over, and then he says the Government are entitled to a great deal of credit because they carry out that which the law makes them carry out and they will not operate this road simply because, as a matter of law, you cannot make them do it. If the minister wants to take that position he is welcome to it. I do not think his friends and followers and supporters would entirely like to sanction a position like that in many measures affecting the government of this country. He says it is a bad bargain for the Dominion and they are going to lose money. Because they are going to lose money he will not touch it until he is compelled to, and he does not believe there is a road in Canada which is operated on sixty per cent of gross earnings with the road furnishing rolling stock and equipment. Why right in New Brunswick there is the road we were discussing this afternoon, from Perth in Victoria county to Plaster Rock, which is being operated by the Canadian Pacific railway on a sixty per cent basis, the Canadian Pacific railway getting sixty per cent only of the gross earnings, furnishing rolling stock and, more than that, betterments. They are adding betterments to the amount of thousands of dollars every year, and during the ten or twelve years they have had the road have spent vast amounts of money on it. We know it is doing good business, and I have no doubt it is paying. The very best evidence that the Canadian Pacific railway is making it pay is the fact which I gave this afternoon, that when the minister first tore up the railway connection with the road the Canadian Pacific railway came along and said: Leave the track down there and give us the business; we want the business and wish to carry it on as before. The Canadian Pacific railway does not ask for business if it does not pay. My hon. friend has a good many things to learn about railway operation. He may know something about railway finance and political railways but he has many things to learn about railway operation.

I am glad indeed to have had the perfectly frank statement we have had. I am glad the people of New Brunswick will know that the minister does not intend to operate this road excepting as the law demands and as he could almost be compelled to do by application to the court for a mandatory injunction. I only wish we had the power to go to the court and get a mandatory injunction; if so, it would be easy to find some one who would not hesitate to move, but unfortunately we

cannot get such an injunction against the Government of Canada. Only that protects him and I am glad that he takes the frank and full position he does to-night and says that he will not do it because we cannot, as a matter of law, compel him to do it.

Motion agreed to.

TOBIQUE INDIAN RESERVE TIMBER.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.) moved:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence, leases, and other documents relating to the cutting of lumber by Mr. B. F. Smith, and others from the so-called Tobique Indian reserve in the province of New Brunswick since the twelfth day of March, AD. 1914, and also of all agreements, offers and premises made either by the said B. F. Smith or the Department of Indian Affairs, with reference to the sale or disposal of any of the said Tobique Indian reserve since the said date, or any logs or lumber cut thereon.

2. Also a statement of all lumber cut by the said B. F. Smith from the said reserve, the rates of stumpage charged, and the amounts actually paid thereon from the first day of January, 1912, down to the date hereof.

He said: During the last general session of the House I asked a number of questions about some very curious transactions that were taking place in New Brunswick over timber being cut on Indian land. I got some information of it and finally moved for a return of all the papers and documents in connection with it. Some time in March I got a return down to the 12th day of March. The notice of motion which I have given and to which I am speaking now asks for a continuation of that return from the 12th day of March, 1914, down to the present time. I have not very much to say upon this particular question now except that I would like to get the remainder of the file in order that we may have the whole story. It is without any doubt something which should have been probed up at an earlier date and something which I am glad to say has been probed to some extent and will probbably be probed further. The minister has acted with reasonable discretion since the matter was brought to his attention by myself in asking a question and asking for the return. The Tobique Indian Reserve is a pretty important piece of property situate near the town of Andover in Victoria county. It is divided into two parts by the Tobique river. It fronts on the river St. John, one portion north of the Tobique river and the other south. On that portion north of the Tobique the band resides They are a very thrifty people, they have quite a large village, a church and school; and they have made pretty fair progress towards civilization. On that part south of the Tobique, by some arrangement, the department have the right to sell the land and give title; and some time in 1913 a gentleman by the name of B. F. Smith of Carleton cast longing eyes on the lumber on the reserve. He came to Ottawa and made a contract with the department by which he had the right to cut the dead and burnt timber on that portion of the reserve lying south of the Tobique river; but it was distinctly stated in the contract that no green or partly green trees were to be cut by him. My friend will find that on page 79 of the return. It is very explicit, so explicit indeed that I hardly understand how there could be any question about it. It is as follows:

Department of Indian Affairs,
Ottawa, May 8, 1913.

Sir,—Referring to your recent interview at the department concerning the offers for the burnt timber on the Tobique reserve, south side of the river, I have to inform you that your offer of $1.25 per thousand feet, B.M., free of dues, has been accepted on the conditions that no green or partly green trees shall be cut and that sworn returns of measurement shall be furnished each season during three years allowed for its removal, by an authorized scaler, culler or surveyor, and that payments shall be made before removal of the timber from the reserve.

That was in May 1913. As soon as the logging season opened up in 1913, I think in the latter part of November or the first of December, the department received a communication by wire, signed "Tobique Indian," a telegram dated November 25, 1913, a letter dated November 29, 1913, and another letter, dated 1st of December. In all of these the department was apprised of the fact that white men were cutting green timber on the north side of the reserve. It is no secret now, because the report shows that the gentleman who signed the name of the Tobique Indian was none other than the Rev. Father Ryan, missionary, who is in charge of the Indians, the parish priest, and a gentleman who gives every attention and vigilance to the discharge of his duties that he posibly can. In addition to that, he occupies the position of a sort of inspector for these Indians and receives a small gratuity from the Government for so doing. Acting in what he considered to be his right and his duty, he notified the department of what was going on. The department sent down an inspector, an officer by the name of Mr. Bury. This gentleman acted with the very greatest energy and zeal, and certainly the depart-

ment ought to be congratulated on having in its employ a gentleman who acted as fearlessly and honourably as this gentleman did in investigating this matter. He sent in two reports; I am not going to weary the House by reading them. He sent one under date of December 12, and another under date of December 23, and in these reports he told the story as it was, stating that he had found man after man, operator after operator, cutting green lumber open and above board in every manner, and that they had said they had been instructed by the Indian chief and that the Indian chief had said that there was a contract with Mr. Smith. This gentleman had got the right to cut dead and burnt timber on the south side of the reserve, and he started in to clean out every green tree on the north side of the reserve, which timber represented an enormous amount of money in proportion to the size of the reserve. The timber on the north side would be worth $16,000 or $20,000, and this gentleman started in to clean it up. On account of the action and reports of Mr. Bury this was partially stopped and then, in order to have a sacrifice of some kind, they started after the poor old Indian chief and the department gave instructions to prosecute him. The chief was prosecuted and fined $2,000, and because he could not pay the fine he was sent to jail and remained in jail for a month. Then the demand came that something should be done with the white man who had put the chief in this position and who was really responsible for the attempt to clean up the reserve. While the return simply states what the facts are, evidently this gentleman himself had to come to Ottawa and in one of his letters he states that Mr. Hazen was looking after the matter for him. We find that a proposition comes from the department suggesting that Mr. Smith be allowed to buy four lots on the south side of the reserve and pay a certain amount of stumpage for the lumber which has been cut on the north side. Quite a large amount of correspondence took place about the buying of these four lots. The lots, I think, were numbers 19, 21, 23 and 25. At any rate, they were four lots on the south side of the reserve. A very nice scheme was worked out and Mr. Smith was allowed to take these lots on settlement conditions, paying down the sum of $353 and agreeing to pay, in four or five equal annual instalments, a sum amounting to somewhere between $1,100 and $1,200. He had been cutting the lumber and up to this time he had possibly cut over half a million feet of green lumber on this reserve. It would never do to prosecute Mr. Smith and put him in jail, because Mr. Smith was an important gentleman. He could not be treated as the Indian was, so this scheme was worked out for him. My hon. friend knows that the settlement conditions require that a certain amount of land be cleared; that a house be built and that certain homestead duties be performed. Of course my hon. friend is thoroughly familiar with the conditions. He will find them in "Regulations for the disposal of Indian Lands," section 3, and also the penalty provided in section 4 for cutting lumber contrary to the regulations of the department. Section 3 provides that:

> Settlement on the lot or lots included in any sale, is one of the conditions thereof, and shall consist of actual occupation and improvement of the land, which must commence within six months from the date of sale and be continuous for a period of three years; within which time there shall be cleared and fenced at least five acres in every one hundred acres, or in that proportion, also a dwelling-house of not less than 18 x 24 feet must be erected on the land included in any sale.

An Hon. MEMBER: How many lots had he?

Mr. CARVELL: Four lots, which means that he was required within 6 months to build a house and fence and clear at least five acres in each lot. Of course, this gentleman had no idea of clearing land or building a house, or anything else except getting the lumber off the land. Section 4 provides that:

> No timber, saw-logs, staves, lathwood, shingle bolts, cordwood, or any other description of wood, may be cut for sale until the patent for the lot shall have issued, except that the same may be cut under license, issued under existing regulations governing the issue of such licenses, to the party residing thereon by the Indian Lands Agent, covering any trees cut on the location in actually clearing the land for cultivation, other than pine or spruce, which are reserved from the operation of the sale of the land, and may be otherwise disposed of by the department and may be cut and removed by the purchaser of said pine or spruce up to the date on which the patent covering the land shall issue.

There is no license in this case. Then it was pointed out to the department that there was another provision of the law to the effect that no logs or lumber may be cut except logs and lumber necessary to clearing the land, but even in that case the spruce and pine lumber which is cut is the property of the Crown and shall be

held for the benefit of the Indians. Smith was cutting practically all spruce lumber, and therefore he was violating the terms of the Act every time he turned around. The more my friends try to help him the deeper in the hole he gets. We find that on the 11th of March a letter was written to Mr. Smith pointing out to him the fact that this scheme could not be worked out at all. At page 59 of the return, this letter appears addressed to Mr. Smith and signed by Duncan C. Scott, Deputy Superintendent General:

> In regard to arrangement come to with you as to disposition of lots on the south side of the River Tobique Reserve, upon which timber has been cut, I beg to say that there would appear to be some difficulty in carrying out this arrangement under the regulations of the department, section 4 of the land regulations making provision for exemption of spruce in the cutting of timber on land sold under settlement conditions.
>
> As the timber on these lots was cut in trespass, prior to agreement for sale, you should pay treble dues on the quantity of spruce cut by you, viz: 179,850 feet, which amounts to $674.44 as pine and spruce are reserved from sale under settlement conditions. If, however, you are willing to pay in full for the four lots, the department would be prepared to accept such payment at once, in full settlement for the land and timber, and give permission for the removal of the timber.
>
> I am enclosing you a copy of the land and timber regulations of the department, and would refer you to section 4 of the land regulations and section 29 of the timber regulations.
>
> If any green spruce has been cut on these lots since seizure was made by Mr. Bury, payment of treble dues will be required to be made in addition to the above.

I think this return will be interesting to the minister if he will read the statement of the manner in which this affair was managed between Mr. Smith, the Indian Agent, and the department in order to get Mr. Smith and the department out of the hole in which they found themselves.

I have always looked upon the Indian agent down there as a perfectly honest and upright man and I am only sorry to find in this correspondence such evidences of that which amounts to almost a breach of duty on his part. I find that they were not willing that the gentleman who was doing the surveying for the department should be continued in the position, a gentleman named Clarke, a good Conservative, and one with whom no fault was to be found on that score. This gentleman to whom I have referred cut lumber and lots of lumber on the reserve, south of the river outside of the four lots, though the great majority of the lumber cut was on the four lots. Under this letter of the 11th of March he was liable to pay treble dues on the lumber cut outside the four lots, although he should have been treated the same as the Indian was. They were not even willing to allow this Mr. Clarke to do the surveying and they recommended a particular friend of Mr. Smith, a Mr. Craig, to assist him and then they suggested that Mr. Craig had a little more experience in surveying lumber than Mr. Clarke had and that he probably would not like to work under Mr. Clarke, and that Mr. Craig had better be given the whole job. Then the honest man Mr. Clarke was worked out and Mr. Smith's friend was worked in. I would like to know how much lumber really was cut outside of the reserve on the four lots. That can be ascertained. If the Minister wants to know he can send a man down there to count the stumps and he will be able to get a fair estimate. I believe that more lumber was cut off the four lots than on the four lots. The honest man, the man who investigated the matter, was turned out and the other man was thrust in, and Mr. Smith got out by paying a smaller amount of money than he should have paid. The Minister will find the whole thing in the return, and he will see how this was all manipulated.

In the answers to the questions which I asked on different occasions last session, I find that on the 16th of April, 1914, I was told what had been done on that portion of the reserve north of the Tobique river and that Mr. Smith had paid somewhere about $293, all for green lumber. Mr. Smith had simply gone in as an absolute trespasser and started to cut this lumber, and he probably would have succeeded in carrying out his scheme if the Rev. Father Ryan had not interfered and blocked it. On the 23rd of March, 1914, the Minister will find the answer given to me, that on the south side of the reserve Mr. Smith paid $354 to Mr. White, the Indian agent on the 10th of March; and that $1,400, the balance of the purchase price, was paid to Mr. Bury on the 13th of March, 1914. When I got that answer I took it for granted that Mr. Smith had paid all that had been required of him and while I felt he was getting a splendid bargain yet there it was and the department had seen a way out of the difficulty, and he had paid altogether $1,765. I supposed the matter was settled.

The minister will see what I am coming to, and why I ask for the remainder of the file. This Mr. Smith took at least from half a million to three-quarters of a million feet of lumber off the south side of this reserve. It is in evidence from the file that

this lumber was delivered to Mr. Smith by contract on the banks of the River St. John for somewhere about $7.68 a thousand, and it would cost him from thirty to thirty-five cents to get it to Mr. Smith's mill, making the timber stand him about $8 at his mill, while that lumber last summer on the river St. John was worth $13 just as much as one dollar is worth another. Mr. Smith has made a profit of several thousand dollars on the logs, and he had the land left.

I suppose the Minister will say that this land was of no value, but he may be surprised when I tell him that Mr. Smith sold the land, after he had taken off this enormous amount of lumber, for almost as much as he paid the Department. He offered to sell it to a client of mine who came to me to know whether the title was all right and I told him it ought to be because from the information I got in Parliament this land had been sold to Mr. Smith. I wired to the Department some time in the month of January, and I got the answer back that he could not give a title for the land as it had been sold to him under settlement conditions, which conditions had not been performed. As the Minister is dealing with the property of the wards of the Government and is trustee for them, the House is entitled to know from the Minister everything that happened in connection with this transaction. In the answer given me on the 23rd of March I was told that this gentleman had paid $1,765 and the other amounts mentioned, in that and other answers, but eight months later I was told that he could not give a title because he had obtained this land on settlement conditions. I cannot understand that. There may be some good explanation for this and I hope the Minister will give it to us. When the remainder of the file is brought down perhaps the matter will be made clearer than it is now. In my experience there never has been a bolder attempt made to take from the wards of the Government their right and their patrimony than was made in this case. I give the Minister of the Interior credit for acting with a good deal of alacrity when the matter was brought to his notice both by the reverend gentleman to whom I have referred and myself. After this thing was done the Minister did all he reasonably could to protect the interests of his wards with justice to all parties. I can, if the Minister wishes, give him the name of the gentleman who purchased the property from Mr. Smith and the amount he paid for it, and it is almost as much as Mr. Smith paid for it before he took off the valuable lumber. Mr. Smith has made a large profit on it after paying the amount of money which the Minister has demanded of him for the lumber, and still he is selling the land for nearly as much as he paid for the whole thing.

While I give the Minister of the Interior credit for attempting to stop the transaction after it was brought to his attention, I cannot give the Department the same credit for allowing the matter to proceed in its initial stages. I want to say also that the Minister was not present at the time this transaction was worked off in the beginning. I do not hold the Minister responsible but I do hold his Department responsible. I hope that my hon. friend will bring down these papers; that they will make clear what now seems to be very badly muddled; that it will be a warning, and that the remainder of that reserve, whatever it may be, will be kept for the purpose for which it was intended to be kept and that the wards of the Government will not have taken from them that which at least the law intends for their protection and support.

Hon. W. J. ROCHE (Minister of Interior): This matter was dealt with in the usual way departmentally, and I do not remember that it was ever brought to my attention until after the hon. gentleman had asked his respective questions which he had placed upon the order paper during the last session of Parliament. The hon. gentleman, while speaking on the previous motion, I understand spoke on behalf of his client. On this occasion, however, I understand that he is speaking in opposition to the gentleman whom he had the honour of opposing at the last general election, namely, Mr. Smith, and I do not know whether his animadversions are at all influenced by that fact. I am not saying that they are. Of course the hon. gentleman is quite within his rights in bringing this matter to the attention of the House.

The fact is that there was some dry timber, burned timber, on the reserve, on the north side and also more particularly on the south side, for the cutting of which timber tenders were asked by the department. Tenders were received from two parties, one amounting to fifty cents per thousand and the other, Mr. Smith's, amounting to $1.25.

Mr. CARVELL: Not his first tender.

Mr. ROCHE: No. The first tender was seventy-five cents, and Mr. Smith subsequently enlarged it to a dollar and a quarter.

Shortly after that—I think it was the latter part of the month of November, or the early part of December—it was drawn to the attention of the departmental officers that trespasses were being committed on the north side of the reserve and that Chief Lockwood, the Indian in charge, had been issuing permits, not only to Indians but to white men, to cut timber on the reserve. The chief exceeded his authority in that respect, as he had no right to issue any permits. In fact, he had cut on the reserve some three hundred logs. When this complaint was brought to the attention of departmental officers by Father Ryan, Mr. Bury was sent down by the department to investigate. He sent one report in on the 12th of December and another one on the 23rd of December to the effect that wholesale cutting—to use his own words—had been going on by white men as well as by Indians on the reserve. While the hon. gentleman states that a vast amount of timber has been cut on the north side of the reserve—

Mr. CARVELL: I did not say that a vast amount had been cut on the north side; I said on the south side.

Mr. ROCHE: Well, on the south side, outside of the four lots which Mr. Smith was permitted to purchase. I happen to know exactly what Mr. Bury has reported as the total cut on the south side, and it amounts to 83,700 feet outside of the four lots, and 179,850 feet inside the four lots, which is far below the amount which the hon. gentleman has stated.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend is in error in the figures he has given.

Mr. ROCHE: I am quoting from the report which Mr. Bury sent in. He gives the names of all the parties who did the cutting. The hon. gentleman is comparing the treatment accorded the chief with the treatment accorded Mr. Smith, and states that the same treatment should be accorded the latter. My hon. friend knows perfectly well that the Indian comes under the Indian Act, and that the white man does not. The chief issued permits, although unauthorised to do so; he cut some 300 logs, and, when the investigation was made by Mr. Bury, he went around and defaced the logs by cutting off the seizure marks, which was a very wrong thing for him to do, and he hindered Mr. Bury very much in connection with the investigation and report. As a matter of fact, the Indian could have been prosecuted under the criminal code, and the penalty, not only for the trespass but for his defacement of the logs, would have been three years' imprisonment without the option of a fine. The department did not wish to take such harsh measures against the chief, and therefore they laid an information against him for having cut a hundred logs illegally. Under the Indian Act the penalty is twenty dollars for each log, or a total fine of $2,000, or, failing that, imprisonment for from one to three months. Inasmuch as the amount exceeded $20, the penalty of three months' imprisonment could have been imposed, but the minimum penalty was imposed by way of imprisonment. The chief could not pay the fine, so he was put in jail for thirty days. That penalty was imposed under section 128 of the Indian Act, which was applied to the chief because he was the chief and was setting a bad example to the other Indians. The section reads as follows:

10 p.m.

Every Indian of the band, who, without the license in writing of the Superintendent General, or of some officer or person deputed by him for that purpose,—

(a) cuts, carries away or removes from land in a reserve held by another Indian under a location title or by an Indian otherwise recognized by the department as the occupant thereof any of the trees, cordwood, or part of a tree, saplings, shrubs, underwood, timber or hay thereon, or removes from such land any of the stone, soil, minerals, metals, or other valuables; or,

(b) cuts, carries away removes from any portion of the reserve of his band, for sale and not for the immediate use of himself and his family any trees, timber, cordwood or part of a tree, saplings, shrubs, underwood or hay thereon, or removes any of the stone, soil, minerals, metals, or other valuables therefrom for sale, as aforesaid; or,

(c) unless with the consent of the band and the approval of the Superintendent General, cuts or uses any pine or large timber for any purpose other than for building on his own location or farm; shall incur the penalties provided in the last preceding section in respect to Indians of other bands and other persons.

The penalty referred to in the next preceding section is:

For every tree he cuts, carries away or removes, a penalty of twenty dollars.

That was the penalty imposed on the chief. It was impossible to impose the Indian Act on the white man. If we were to utilize the Indian Act to every trespasser every person who has a license and who trespasses, whether wittingly or unwittingly, I think we would have the treasury replenished by many millions of dollars. It is a very common thing for a licensee to go beyond the land for which he holds a

license. The fine imposed upon Mr. Smith was the maximum fine imposed in the history of the department. Mr. Bury was a new agent, sent down there for the first time. Double dues are usually imposed; but Mr. Smith had imposed upon him treble dues, and the amount he paid in treble dues was for the amount he cut, namely, 15,500 feet on the northern side of the reserve, $97.40. He paid that in cash. He cut on the south side, outside of the four lots purchased, 83,700 feet of hemlock and spruce, for which he paid treble dues, $3 per thousand for hemlock and $3.75 for spruce, or a total of $294.47. He paid this amount also in cash. That cleans up the trespass on the north side of the river and on the south side of the river outside of the four lots which he was allowed to purchase. According to Mr. Bury's report he did cut 179,850 feet, which at treble dues, would amount to $674. Inasmuch as he expressed his willingness to settle immediately, he was given his option either to purchase the land entire with the timber, or pay treble dues. He purchased the land. But before the land was purchased, the following notice was sent out by the Deputy-Superintendent General:

Sale of Tobique Lands.

Notice is hereby given that the unsold lots on the Tobique reserve, south of the Tobique river, are for sale at upset prices, in the hands of the local Indian agent, Mr. S. P. Waite, of Andover, New Brunswick.

The terms of sale for lands fit for settlement are one-fifth cash and the balance in four equal, annual instalments with interest at five per cent, subject to the regulations of the department as to occupation and improvements. The lots unfit for settlement will be sold for cash without any conditions of settlement.

Full information in regard to the lands may be obtained upon application to the local agent, Mr. S. P. Waite, of Andover.

The unauthorized insertion of this advertisement will not be paid for.

Duncan C. Scott,
Deputy Superintendent General
of Indian Affairs.

Department of Indian Affairs,
Ottawa, November 19, 1913.

That notice appeared in the Perth paper for six weeks, and during that time not one single offer came in for these lots from any person except Mr. Smith. If this was the bonanza that the hon. gentleman says, surely some one would have seized upon it. This was at the upset price which had been placed upon the lands by a land surveyor of the province of New Brunswick and by Mr. Bury who coincided in the valuation. Nor was it an ordinary valuation, but was sworn to by Mr. Craig and acquiesced in by Mr. Bury, the inspector who was sent there. The valuation placed on these lots were as follows:

Lot 25	$ 250
Lot 27	290
Lot 29	280
Lot 31	945
Total	$1,765

But, as I have said, notwithstanding the notice given by the advertisement no person came forward with an offer except Mr. Smith.

The hon. gentleman speaks of the value of this land and of Mr. Smith having sold it for almost as much as he paid for it minus the timber. Will it surprise the hon. gentleman when I tell him that these lands of the Tobique reserve were sold for years by the Government of which he was a supporter for a bare $1 per acre? It was the rule to sell these lands at $1 an acre up to 1913, and it was only when the department sent Mr. Craig down to make a valuation that these lands were sold at $4 an acre. If they are so valuable as the hon. gentleman says, they must have become valuable since this Government came into power. We shall search the pages of "Hansard" in vain for any record of condemnation by him of this policy as carried out by his friends in selling similar properties at $1 an acre.

I do not think, therefore, that the Government or the department is to be blamed for this transaction. As to Mr. Smith selling these lots, Mr. Smith has not the title to them. He was correctly informed in that telegram sent by Mr. Scott. The lots were sold subject to settlement conditions, and we have no proof yet that these conditions have been complied with. And Mr. Smith, so far as I am concerned, will not get his title until his contract is lived up to and the settlement clause complied with. We have everything under our control. If Mr. Smith fails to live up to the conditions, we can, if we desire appropriate the money paid in and cancel the sale. Or we can retain sufficient to cover triple dues the option of which we had given him in lieu of the purchase of the property. He may have forgotten about these settlement conditions, but at any rate we have given him the option and—

Mr. MICHAUD: Had Mr. Smith the right to cut the lumber?

Mr. ROCHE: No, he was fined for cutting the timber outside his lease from the Crown to the amount of treble dues, and in

lieu of these treble dues, he was allowed to purchase these four lots at an average price of about $4 an acre, as against $1 an acre which had been charged for many years before.

Mr. MICHAUD: But has he the right to cut the lumber on these lots?

Mr. ROCHE: I have not before me the return the hon. gentleman has quoted. I will bring down the remainder of the papers he has moved for. There is no objection to bringing them down; there is nothing whatever to hide, and certainly nothing that I am conversant with that we need be ashamed of. As the hon. gentleman says, when the matter was brought to my attention, I made inquiries, and Mr. Smith was instructed that he must live up to his contract. I do not know whether he has applied for the patents or not, but most assuredly he has not received them, and settlement conditions must be complied with, and compliance with them proven, before patent will issue. I do not know that there is anything I can add. The hon. gentleman will see that we cannot treat the white man exactly as the Indian is treated under the Indian Act. As I have said, it is not uncommon for a lumberman to cut in trespass and, in some cases, where it has been done by inadvertence, only single dues are charged. It is common to charge double dues; but in the case of Mr. Smith he was charged treble dues. For what he had cut on the north side he paid in cash, and outside the lots he bought on the south side he paid treble fees, while the lots he was allowed to purchase at four times the price at which the former Government sold similar lands on the same reserve.

Mr. CARVELL: I thought I threw enough bouquets at the minister to cause him to answer in a little different spirit. I tried to tell him that in my judgment he at least had tried to act fairly in the matter, and I thought that the department also had tried to protect the interests of the Indians. He is in error, however, in some of the statements he has made—innocently in error, of course. When he says that the former Government sold these lands at $1 an acre, that, I presume, is true. I never had anything to do with purchasing such lands nor do I know of a case of a hundred acres being sold; but if he says that the price charged was $1 an acre, no doubt that is true. But there are lots of land and other lots of land; some are worth $100 and some are worth $500 or $1,000. I can tell him that any lands sold by the late Government on the old Tobique Indian Reserve were burned over and practically useless. But I know a man who tried to get these very lots, which were timbered and desirable.

My hon. friend will find that a company known as the Perth Lumber Company made a contract with the Government to cut this burnt lumber—a fire took place some four or five years ago—which Mr. Smith had contracted to cut. They assigned their contracts to a gentleman by the name of Wentworth, of Boston, who was losing a large amount of money through his contracts with the Perth Lumber Company. I went to the department to see if it was possible to make some arrangement by which first the Perth company and latterly Mr. Wentworth could cut enough green timber to finish the operation. That was absolutely refused, it being contended that these four or five lots of land were the only lots south of the Tobique river upon which there was any lumber. My hon. friend will find that in the days of the old Government and under the present regime the Department of the Interior never offered to sell these lots of land at $1 an acre. Had it been known that these special lots of land were available at $1 an acre, not one but a dozen or two dozen men would have been delighted to buy them. I do not know the conditions of that notice of sale, because, unfortunately, it is not in the return which I have received, but I have no doubt at all that there was some reservation; there was something which prevented the ordinary man from knowing that these four or five lots of land were on sale.

The minister is also in error in saying that 179,850 feet of spruce and 95,330 feet of hemlock was practically all the lumber cut inside the four lots.

Mr. ROCHE: By Mr. Smith.

Mr. CARVELL: By Mr. Smith. In that respect my hon. friend is in error, and I can prove it by referring to this file. My hon. friend will find, according to the satement made by Mr. Bury in his report of December 23, 1913, that at that time Mr. Smith was only in the initial stages of the process of cutting. Up to that time it is true that he had cut only 265,000 feet of lumber, but he went on and on; my hon. friend will find that telegram after telegram was sent in regard to the matter. The amount of lumber cut by Smith on this land and on the adjoining lot was nearer 750,000 feet than 265,000 feet. It is

true that down to December 23, 265,000 feet is an approximate estimate of the amount of lumber cut, but Smith did not stop; he went on and, I presume, finished the job. I say this not for the purpose of finding fault, but in order to point out the real facts of the matter. According to this Mr. Craig, the land was worth only the amount of money paid. I tell the minister that at the end of the year 1914 the amount of lumber cut was nearly three-quarters of a million feet, and that these four lots have been and could be sold to-day—part of the purchase money has already been paid, although I suppose it will now have to be repaid—for almost as much as Mr. Smith paid for them. My hon. friend will find in the report of Mr. Bury, dated December 23, 1913, this paragraph:

Practically the whole of the growing merchantable timber on the Indian lands on the south side of the Tobique river has been cut, there being left about 1,000 trees, or approximately 60,000 feet board measure left standing on lot 25.

According to the report sent to the department by Mr. Craig, the lumber was all cut on December 23, excepting 6,000 feet. Half a million feet has been cut since then, and Mr. Smith can still turn round and sell the property for nearly as much as he paid for it. That will give you some idea of the value of the reports my hon. friend is getting. That will give you some idea of the credence with which my hon. friend can receive the evidence given him by this Mr. Craig. At the time when Craig said there were not more than 60,000 feet of lumber there, worth, according to his estimate, not more than $200, there was on the land lumber upon which a profit was made of more than $2,000, and the lot was subsequently sold for $1,500. That will give you some idea of the absolute worthlessness of the evidence upon which my hon. friend has been basing his arguments to-night. I am finding no fault with my hon. friend; I am finding no fault with Mr. Bury. Mr. Bury, in the first report which he made to the department, criticised the whole transaction in the severest possible terms. He went so far as to recommend that the contract with Mr. Smith be cancelled. Here is the report which Mr. Bury made on December 12, 1913:

I beg to confirm my wire to you as follows:

'Wholesale cutting of green timber by white men and Indians has been going on, sanctioned by Chief Lockwood. Am making thorough seizure. Chief defies seizure by removing marks from logs. Suggest suspending him from office pending completion of investigation. Letter following.'

[Mr. Carvell.]

Mr. F. B. Smith, licensee for most of the timber on south side, has several men cutting green logs on the north side, all of whom claim that Lockwood himself gave them verbal permission to cut over 170 logs for Mr. Smith, and I have already seized a total of over 500 logs (green) cut on north side, in addition to several cords of green maple and birch cut by white men also.

I expect to seize the same number of green logs cut on the south side.

Mr. Smith has violated the terms of his license, and I would suggest you instruct me to order all cutting to cease pending presentation of report.

This refers to Mr. Smith's operations under his three-year lease.

Chief Lockwood has received moneys from time to time from various parties in return for allowing them to operate. None of said moneys have been surrendered to agent Waite.

The chief moreover has chopped off my seizure mark on his logs, and practically defies me in the execution of my duties.

I intend making a thorough clean-up of all the illegal lumber operations both on the north and south sides of the reserve, and am of opinion that this will have a very desirable effect in preventing a recurrence of trespass.

I am also scaling all logs and wood I seize so that action for collection of dues can be commenced immediately upon my return.

'In this connection I beg leave to suggest that all these green logs be confiscated outright and sold by public auction, thus providing more valuable returns, and also establishing beyond cavil that trespassing will no longer be tolerated.

And the minister says, after receiving a report like that from a responsible officer: Oh, well, we know that these lumbermen committed trespass; we know that they cut from other people's lands. As a rule, my hon. friend says, we charge them double stumpage and sometimes single stumpage, but in this case we were unusually severe, imposing upon them the full penalty of the law. We made Smith pay treble stumpage. Could Smith have paid treble on one-tenth of what he actually cut, in the face of Mr. Bury's report.

Mr. ROCHE: Does that official say that the amount quoted was only one-tenth of the amount cut?

Mr. CARVELL: No, I say so. My hon. friend made Smith pay stumpage only on the logs that were cut when Bury was there. That was back in December, and they did not commence until the 3rd or 4th of December. Smith went on cutting logs practically all winter and really paid no stumpage on the lumber cut in December. There is where the whole trouble comes in. I did not want to go into this part of the matter, but my hon. friend attempts to excuse the transaction, and I have thought it necessary to give him a few of the

facts. I think if he will go over the files carefully he will come to the conclusion that it is a pretty shady transaction.

Mr. ROCHE: How will the hon. gentleman explain this extract from the report of the gentleman whom he has examined, Mr. Bury:

It is also significant to note that when the seizure was made and the cutting of green timber stopped, the various operators shut down their camps, thereby tacitly agreeing that it would not pay them to cut the burnt timber.

They shut down their camps as soon as the seizure was made.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend should take this file and look it over carefully. I am afraid he has not read the return.

Mr. ROCHE: The extract I quoted is from the same report.

Mr. CARVELL: I know, but they did not stop cutting; that is the trouble—they went right on.

Mr. ROCHE: Mr. Bury says they stopped.

Mr. CARVELL: If my hon. friend will examine the file he will find that there is a very gratifying letter from the Rev. Father Ryan to the minister, dated December 2, in which he thanks him for what he has done and expresses the hope that on account of the energetic action of Mr. Bury there will be no more pilfering and no more trespassing upon the rights of the Indians.

Andover, N.B. January 7, 1914.

Duncan Scott,
Indian Department,
Ottawa.

Smith parties lumbering for past week cutting green logs.

(Sgd) Tobique Indian.

Then Mr. Smith started in again. Then you come next to a letter from Mr. McLean to the Indian agent at Andover:

Ottawa, January 7, 1914.

S. P. Waite,
Indian Agent,
Andover, N.B.

Department has received report that Smith parties have been cutting green trees on the reserve during last week. Make immediate personal inspection and report facts. Instructions as to action to be taken will then be sent you.

(Sgd) J. D. McLean.

Following is a letter from Rev. Father Ryan, dated January 7th, in which he says:

Dear Mr. Scott,

I have learned to-day that Mr. Smith has opened his camp stronger than ever and is cutting down green lumber, there being no burnt lumber here to cut. I fear if the Government does not order him and his contractors from the reservation that serious trouble will follow in the next few days. I would strongly advise the Department to act at once have all seized lumber sold at public auction. Such would greatly please the Indians and bring about a better feeling.

Yours,

(Sgd) F. C. Ryan, Pt.

P.S.—Dear Mr. Scott, as I intend that certain matters re the seizure of lumber be brought before the House in its next session I will number letters so if ever reference is made such can easily be found.

Here is where Mr. Waite comes in. Here is where Mr. Waite's fine Italian hand commences to show itself. This is directed to the Assistant Deputy and Secretary of the Indian Department, Ottawa:

Andover, N.B., January 8, 1914.

Sir,—Telegram regard to Smith's parties cutting to hand. In reply may say since receiving same I have met one of Smith's men and he said he had been cutting under instruction from Mr. Curtis, Mr. Smith's agent. I also have information that De Merchant and F. Hanson are also working under same instruction. With this information I do not think it necessary to make further inspection to establish the fact that Smith parties are now cutting green as well as dead timber.

As it will not pay Smith's parties to make road and haul only dead timber—and it means a serious loss to Mr. Smith to have parties stopped work in mid winter—why not allow them to cut green timber and collect trespass stumpage? It will be with the Superintendent General to say what that will be as I understand it, the Indians have no voice in reserve south of Tobique but it is for Department to give right to cut timber as well as to sell the lands.

Your Obedient Servant,

(Sgd) S. P. Waite.

The return reveals one eternal conspiracy on the part of Smith and the minister's agent to rob this reserve of every green tree on it, in so far as it was possible to do so, and the minister's Department knows it, and from that day down knew it. That is where I blame the department. Up to that time they acted honourably and with a good deal of credit to themselves, and it is true that the Smith parties stopped cutting logs when Mr. Bury made his report. But what further evidence does he require than this to show that the moment this gentleman got back to Ottawa the stealing went on worse than ever, not only with the knowledge, but with the connivance and consent of the agent and it was ratified by the Department? This was allowed to go on, and they continued their trespass until the snow went away and they could not cut any more logs. Yet, in the face of evidence like that, my hon. friend would try to tell me that they cut only 265,000 feet of logs out of this re-

serve when that only referred to the transaction down to the 23rd of December, 1913.

Mr. ROCHE: My hon. friend knows that the valuation sworn to was long before any of this timber was cut.

Mr. CARVELL: It was sworn to by Craig, the tool of Smith, through whose instrumentality he was seeking improperly to obtain the timber of the Indians and finally did succeed in obtaining valuable property which should have been reserved by the Government for their wards.

Motion agreed to.

PROTECTION OF COPYRIGHT.

Hon. R. LEMIEUX (Rouville) (Translation) moved the following resolution:

That, in the opinion of this House, stricter measures should be taken for the carrying out of the Berne convention relative to copyright.

He said: Mr. Speaker, considering that this question concerns specially the province of Quebec, since publications in the French language are those now dealt with, I wish to address the House in French, as briefly as possible, as regards what is going on in this connection in some of our large cities in the province of Quebec.

I much regret the absence just now of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture; but I may inform the Right Hon. Prime Minister that on meeting the Hon. Mr. Burrell before recess, it was arranged between us that I should move the resolution this evening, he promising to read the report of my speech in "Hansard" and to do his best to remedy the state of things complained of.

The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) informed the House a moment ago of the thefts and plunder of which the New Brunswick Indians are the victims. I wish to draw the attention of the House to the thefts and plunder which other whites are guilty of at the expense of writers in the French language, whose works are sold and republished, more particularly in the province of Quebec.

As you are aware, Sir, protection for copyrights is secured under the Berne convention. For some time there were doubts entertained as to the possibility of enforcement I think in Canada of the rules laid down by the aforesaid convention; but through the exertions of Sir John Thompson, at one time Prime Minister of the Dominion, all uncertainty in this respect has disappeared.

[Mr. Carvell.]

Following on a prolonged campaign carried on by the writers concerned, through the press in France and Canada, Mr. Jules Mary, under instructions from the "Société des Gens de Lettres," of Paris, entered action in the latter part of 1905, in the Superior Court of Montreal, in the form of a test case, against a counterfeiter of that city (B. Hubert). On March 23, 1906, the Hon. Mr. Justice Fortin, before whom the case had been heard, condemned the Montreal counterfeiter, holding that the Imperial statutes (49-50 Vict., cap. 33, sect. 9) did extend to Canada the effects of the rulings of the Berne convention which secure to writers in countries forming part of the Union protection for their rights within the territories covered by the international union, to which Great Britain has assented for herself and her colonies. On April 28 of the same year, the court of Appeal, sitting in Montreal, unanimously confirmed the aforesaid ruling of the Hon. Mr. Justice Fortin and set down the law in that respect. The pleadings will be found in the "Revue Canadienne," 1906, vol. 1, pp 252 and 535; the rulings of the courts, in the "Quebec Official Law Reports," Superior Court, vol. xxix 1906, p 334 and following; and, the same, Court of King's Bench, vol. xv., 1903, page 381 and following.

The judgment rendered in that test case of Jules Mary vs. B. Hubert had the effect of securing for some time in Canada the production of copyrights held by foreign writers. But counterfeiters were not to be deterred for any length of time, and French authors were once more constrained to apply to the courts to vindicate their rights protected in Canada under the Berne convention.

In matters of copyright claims having to do with theatricals, our civil courts lay down the following requirements which are to be observed by the French and Belgian plaintiff:

(1) He shall find out the name of the author of this or that production advertised and given under a false description or under a false signature, or under no signature whatever;

(2) He shall authenticate that production thus falsely represented and show that it is his property;

(3) He shall retain the services of a Canadian lawyer;

(4) He shall file with the Canadian courts the original text of his work and the certificate of its formal registration in its country of origin;

(5) He shall also file a solemn declaration duly certified in France or in Belgium, according to the case;

(6) He shall furnish a security bound 'judicatum solvi';

(7) (In the case of an editor, heir, assign or assignee) He shall, moreover, file all deeds of transfer, duly authenticated, showing that he is the rightful owner of the work.

Then the author's case is put on the list to be heard when its turn comes at some indefinite time.

Now it is a matter of experience that most counterfeiters form partnerships which are practically insolvent, which are likely to shift or dissolve at any moment; they are up to all the tricks which may be resorted to without technically breaking the law. So that, once posted, the French and Belgian author, whose works have been counterfeited in Canada, hesitates, and rightly so, to comply with all such requirements of our procedure, and to run the risks of a lawsuit with possibly no other satisfaction as regards himself than the paying of a heavy bill of costs. The practical result is that Canadian counterfeiters are allowed to go scot-free.

The Berlin conference of November 13, 1908, which revised the rules laid down by the Berne convention of September 9, 1886, provided more efficient means of protection available to authors in countries belonging to the Union. But Canada, not having as yet given its assent to the rulings of the Berlin conference, authors in unionist countries whose works are counterfeited in Canada are not entitled to claim more than the protection afforded by the Berne convention, which in the absence of proper means of enforcement, is not of much more avail than a mere " scrap of paper."

'The British organic law of December 16, 1911 (applied along the lines of the Berlin Act of 1908), is already in force in most of the colonies and possessions, save Canada and the South African Union.' (" Le Droit d'Auteur ", monthly organ of international Bureau of the Union for the protection of literary and artistic works. Berne, January 15, 1914, page 2, column 3).

I may state in passing that, on April 26, 1911, the Hon. S. Fisher, then Minister of Agriculture, introduced in the House of Commons a Bill (No. 184) amending and revising former legislation of the Dominion Parliament relating to copyright, and framing further Canadian legislation after the Imperial modernized statute (1 and 2 Geo. V., cap. 46, 1911), which, in April, 1911, had not yet been put through the British Parliament. That Bill, introduced by the Hon. Mr. Fisher, did not imply our assent to the Berlin Act, but prepared the way for such assent, with certain reservations deemed necessary for the holding in check of competition on the part of the United States. (See speeches of the Hon. S. Fisher, "Hansard," April 26 and May 12, 1911).

The Fisher Bill was not then passed. A general election was forthcoming in September, 1911, and the result was a change of Government in the Dominion. The Borden Administration has not in the meantime dealt with the question. Matters have remained in their former state, and foreign writers using the French language are still bound to apply to the courts for the enforcement of the imperial statute and the Berne convention.

" Unfortunately, difficulties and the cost of litigation are such as to render that protection more or less delusive. Copyrights are constantly infringed upon in Canada, in spite of the efforts of many prominent men who consider rights and equity as of greater account than prejudices or the egotistic interests of a few men."

That view, which reflects to some extent on Canada, is expressed by Mr. Léon Poinsard, deputy head of the international offices for the protection of trade marks and copyrights at Berne (" La propriété artistique et littéraire," par Léon Poinsard, p. 53; Paris, librairie générale de droit et jurisprudence, 1910).

In fact, any copyright claims in connection with theatrical productions due to other foreign writers, are enforced in Canada, under the provisions of the imperial statute 3 and 4, Wm. IV., cap. 15, sec. 2. That Act merely provides for a pecuniary fine recoverable from any one who, without the owner's authorization, produces a theatrical work. It enables the author at whose prejudice this is done, to claim either the profits secured through the illegal performance of his work, either an estimate of the loss incurred, or a statutory fine of not less than forty shillings for each unauthorized performance. It is almost impossible to get at the exact amount of profits secured; it is difficult as well to show what losses have been sustained. The simplest thing to do is to claim the statutory fine. That fine is recoverable after going through the regular process of law. The summary procedure, by brief of injunction, to forestall the representation of a work, is not as a rule of any use in practice, and for several reasons. In the first place, programmes of theatres are changed from week to week, and in some instances several times a week, and the various attractions are usually advertised only a few days ahead. Now, according as the case may be, the author, or his heir, or assign, or the editor who has

purchased his rights, will be expected to apply in his own name to the Canadian courts and establish his claim to the property of such or such a work. The "Société des auteurs et compositeurs dramatiques" of Paris, alone has more than 50,000 works on its list. French and Belgian authors are numbered by the thousand. Several of them live in the country while others are travelling. It is utterly impossible to reach them in time to secure from them the requisite information in regard to a specific case and to transmit that information to their representatives in Canada. Besides, in a great many cases of assignment, proof of that transfer will also be required. Then, those who are acting for the "Société des auteurs" must be posted as to the actual rights held by the owner of the work the performance of which it is the object to prevent, and must secure authority from the holder of such rights before advising the author or his assignee to fulfil the requirements laid down by Canadian courts and to furnish the required security (viz., as a rule $500 for costs and $500 for possible damages) and indeed, to run the risk of being called upon to pay heavy costs, should the counterfeiter disappear—for only insolvent impresarios or theatre managers dare infringe the law with whose provisions they are quite familiar.

The Canadian counterfeiter is therefore perfectly aware to-day that the foreign author must prove his case to the satisfaction of the Canadian law courts, and such an undertaking is not of a tempting nature. So that the first comer, however insolvent he may be, is free to lay hands on the work of a French or Belgian author, make changes to suit himself, and utilize it for performances entirely for his benefit. Our theatre season generally covers ten months or forty weeks. A company which has resolved not to pay any fees for copyright advertises every week a new French or Belgian production, makes the alterations it sees fit and gives no heed to threats of the law. To adequately protect themselves, the authors concerned would have to institute against that faithless company forty law-suits for as many plays illegally produced during those forty weeks in a single theatre, and to furnish security for as many times $500 or $1,000. The company which is thus making money out of foreign works is aware that previous to judgment being rendered, the season will be over, it will have had time to dissolve and to re-organize itself under a new business name, owing to the delays inherent to our civil court proceedings.

I may point out here a few instances of such delays the effect of which has been to cause the recourse granted by our laws to actually inflict losses on the authors concerned.

(1) The "Parisiana" theatre, of Montreal, after being formally prohibited from doing so, produced during the week beginning May 19, 1910, under the assumed title "Sherlock Holmes," and without any indication of authorship, a one-act comedy really entitled "En lisant Sherlock Holmes," and whose author, Mr. R. Berton, by the way, is at present with the French army in front of Rheims. The representatives at the "Société des auteurs" made inquiries, and they brought to light both the name of the author and the original title of the play, which was being reproduced under false colours. They applied to Paris for the necessary documents to enable them to enter action, and these, duly authenticated and certified, were duly transmitted to them through the British consulate at Paris. The requisite security was furnished and an action entered on June 27, 1910, in the Montreal Superior Court. Judgment in favour of the author was rendered on December 17, 1912. Now, at that date, the "Parisiana" had ceased to exist and its owners were out of sight. . . . . Apart from the expense incurred on account of researches and the forwarding of documents, the author had to meet costs to the amount of about $100.

(2) The Aborn Opera Company, of New York, produced at the "Princess" theatre in Montreal, during the week beginning on November 18, 1912, then at Toronto, during the week beginning on November 25, 1912, the play entitled "Cloches de Corneville" (Chimes of Normandy). The Aborn Company having refused to settle with the author's assignees found it impossible to secure a brief of injunction for the following reasons which recur in a great many cases:

Editor Choudens, of Paris, had acquired full property rights in connection with the Chimes of Normandy, and had in turn transferred to the firm of James Williams & Co., of London, the right to produce that musical work throughout Great Britain and the Colonies. To secure a brief of injunction, papers proving the successive transfers were required. These papers reached here after a rather lengthy exchange of correspondence between

London and Paris, and made possible the entering of an action against the Aborn company. Judgment by default was rendered against the Aborn company on October 11, 1913. But the latter had a long time previously crossed the boundary, and they have not in the meantime revisited Canada. All the costs connected with this lawsuit had to be met by the representatives of the author.

(3) The " Liberty " theatre, of Montreal, though notified several months ahead, produced without authority, under assumed titles and without indication of authorship, from December 16, 1912, to February 13, 1913 (that is during a period of eight weeks), fourteen one-act comedies of which editor Joubert, of Paris, had secured the ownership. That editor, owning a number of short plays especially well adapted to moving picture shows, is shamefully robbed in the province of Quebec. He resolved to put a stop to such plundering by suing one of the counterfeiters, the " Liberty " theatre.

As that small theatre did not go to the expense of printing a programme, the representatives in Canada of editor Joubert had to get photographs taken of the posters outside the entrance, and to send a stenographer to report extracts of the dialogue, so as to enable a comparison of it with the author's text, and thus show proof of the counterfeiting. They had also to secure in Paris authenticated copies of all transfers and other documents relative to these fourteen plays, etc. Suit against the Liberty theatre was entered on June 15, 1913, in the Superior Court in Montreal. Sixteen months later, on November 21, 1914, judgment was rendered against editor Joubert, though at the same time acknowledging that the Berne convention affords protection in Canada to French authors and editors. But the judge presiding ruled that it was the " Société des auteurs, compositeurs et éditeurs de musique," known as the " Petite société," which should have initiated the proceedings against the " Liberty " theatre, and not editor Joubert.

The above ruling upsets the whole procedure previously established as regards French authors who have rights to vindicate in the Canadian courts, and is in direct contradiction to the jurisprudence of the last eight years, that is, ever since the Berne convention has been assented to by the Canadian law-courts.

The case was at once taken to appeal. But the French editor concerned, besides having to settle the cost incurred for the making of the voluminous records required in the court below, may still have to disburse $1,500 of further costs and fees, even should the Court of Appeal decide in his favour, as he will not be in a position to recoup himself on an insolvent defendant.

On another occasion we find a troop of amateurs giving performances for the benefit of some one or other. Amateurs and beneficiary are at one in refusing to indemnify the author, and the representatives of the latter are sent from the one to the other. An action was entered in one instance against amateurs giving performances without previously making arrangements with the author. Judgment was rendered for $15 and costs in favour of the author and he had to wait a whole year for his money.

Apart from itinerant or occasional companies which shamefully delve into the works of French and Belgian authors, there exists to-day, in Montreal, as well as in other localities of the province of Quebec, over ten theatres which have recourse to counterfeiting and dispense paying any royalties to authors, with full knowledge of the law. And in spite of it all, nothing can be done.

Itinerant or occasional troops give no security; they disband or cross the frontier before any process of law can be taken against them. The author wronged in that way has no possible recourse against the owner of the hall or theatre where these itinerant companies have given their illegal performances, though the owner of the theatre often shares in the profits secured by means of these unlawful performances. The English jurisprudence exonerates the theatre owner. (Lyon vs. Knowles. See " Copinger's Law of Copyright," 4th Edition, by Easton, 1904, page 292).

As regards stock companies, which occupy permanently a theatre, the " Theatre des Nouveautes " affords us an instance of that. The " Nouveautes " theatre has been producing for the last ten months, in the heart of Montreal, French and Belgian plays. Its managers have never heeded the numerous summonses which have been served on them on behalf of injured authors; while the latter are unable to institute proceedings for this very reason that the managers of the said theatre have not registered in the Tutelles' office, that " they are doing business under the name of ' Theatre des Nouveautes,' " in other words they have not conformed to the law which requires owners

or managers of places of entertainment to register their legal designation. The managers of this popular resort remain, from the legal point of view unknown entities.

The merchant is free to deliver or refuse to deliver goods to an insolvent patron acting under his own name or under that of a company. But the writer, though technically allowed, under the law, to permit or interdict the production of his work, has no means of protecting himself. He can claim compensation only when all security for the payment of such compensation has been put out of his reach. And should he make up his mind to protest against the thefts of which he is the victim in Canada, he is met by the exacting requirements of our civil procedure and is bound to secure numerous legal documents in France and in Belgium, which, unless they are absolutely without a flaw, are liable to be rejected. Then he must furnish security, put up one hundred dollars in the hope of getting one dollar back. For, those who prey on the author's means of living are in every case insolvents or people who cannot be reached under the law. And that seems to warrant the harsh expressions which Mr. Léon Poinsard made use of referring to Canada's attitude on this question, in a work which deals authoritatively with the matter.

Writers in the French language who are of French, Belgian or Swiss nationality, are mainly the victims of that state of things which, moreover, stifles the growth of a French-Canadian literature. In fact, the future of French-Canadian writers is so well linked to that of their fellow-workers across the Atlantic, that within the last two years the Société des Auteurs, of Paris, admits Canadian authors to its membership and looks after their interests. During the theatre season of 1913-14, a total amount of about $2,000, as may be vouched for and certified to by the Bank of Hochelaga, was paid over to French-Canadian authors, through the intervention of representatives of the society.

By the way, I may inform the House that the aforesaid society has effected a kind of merger, whereby all French-speaking writers have assigned their rights to it, the latter in return undertaking to safeguard such rights.

Authors in France protested in various ways against the abnormal situation in which they were left in Canada. Their representatives on several occasions approached the Dominion authorities in order to secure some redress. The Royal Society of Canada, at its meeting of May, 1913, passed a resolution urging the Dominion Government to model Canadian legislation after more effective and up-to-date enactments adopted elsewhere. The society reiterated that resolution at its meeting of May, 1914. But matters are left in the same state, opposition to any improvement in our copyright legislation centering apparently in the great body of Ontario editors and publishers, who are not in the least anxious that copyrights held by foreigners be protected here to the same extent as they are elsewhere.

The hon. Minister of Justice, whom I am glad to see at his seat, will no doubt inquire what remedy or what means I would suggest to bring about an improvement. I am prepared to offer some suggestions.

In the first place, if possible, measures should be taken requiring that organizers of entertainments should register at once with the authorities and secure a license, which, if need be, should guarantee any loss resulting from any action of theirs. Of even greater importance would be the providing of foreign writers with a summary process of law in the form of a penalty or of imprisonment for infringement of author's rights. A sanction of that kind is to be found in the legislation of most civilized countries, especially England (1 and 2 Geo. V, chapter 46, section 11); of most self-governing colonies, especially New Zealand (Act of November 22, 1913, section 15); in that of France (Penal Code, section 428-429), without in any way depriving authors of their recourse under section 1362 of the Civil Code; even in that of the United States, though they stand aloof from international unions (United States statutes at large, chapter 320, "An Act to amend and consolidate the Acts respecting copyright," March 4, 1914, sections 28 and 39); etc., etc.

At the session of 1909, Sir Allan Aylesworth, then Minister of Justice, introduced in the House of Commons a Bill (No. 148) amending the Criminal Code. That Bill comprised among others a clause providing a penalty for counterfeiting of musical and dramatic productions. After discussion that clause was modified as follows:

> Whosoever, after a dramatic work has been registered, performs or produces in public, or in some way causes to be performed, or assists in the performance or production in public, in whole or in part, of such dramatic work, without the consent of the owner, is (unless he shows that he has done so innocently) guilty of a misdemeanour and liable, on summary conviction, to a fine of one hundred to five hun-

dred dollars, or to imprisonment for a period of thirty days, or to both cumulatively, at the discretion of the court, and on the second or any further conviction to imprisonment for a period of six months with or without hard labour.

The Aylesworth Bill, with that clause inserted, was passed by the House of Commons on May 15, 1909 (see "Hansard" for 1909, vol. III, page——; vol, IV, page——

The Senate, on May 18, 1909, also passed the Aylesworth Bill, but after striking out a few clauses, especially the proposed section 508b providing protection for dramatic works (see Senate Debates, 1909, page——).

I trust the hon. Minister of Justice will read once more the discussion which took place in this House in 1909, in regard to copyrights and to the penalty suggested by Sir Allan Aylesworth, for infringement of such rights. And I shall leave to him to say whether the time is not ripe for the passing of such a clause by this Parliament.

The facts alleged by me show that the Berne convention as it is, and with the slow procedure provided for its enforcement in Canada, or at any rate in the province of Quebec, is practically of no use in helping authors who have been wronged to secure redress from the courts of law. The hon. gentleman has been on the bench long enough to know to what extent people in Quebec are fond of litigation, and should one of the litigants be in bad faith, he may drag the matter on indefinitely, in spite of the earnestness of the other party and of the presiding judge.

I have pointed out instances in which French writers who had been wronged found it impossible to secure compensation for the enforcement of the penalty provided by the Berne convention. Would it not be possible, then, to amend our criminal code in the sense suggested by Sir Allan Aylesworth, and to have that amendment passed by the Senate?

Mr. DOHERTY (text): I believe we would need your help for that purpose.

Mr. LEMIEUX (translation): I may be of some help to my hon. friend.

In closing my remarks, I wish to express my regret for having addressed the House at such length. But this is a question with which the honour of the nation and its reputation for honesty in literary matters are deeply concerned. That is what induces me to appeal to the Minister of Justice, and to request that he find a remedy for the evils which afflict specially French authors in this country.

I do not intend saying anything in reference to writers in the English tongue; others who are better qualified than myself, no doubt, will take an interest in them. I repeat it, I am anxious to secure protection for the rights of those who in old France have produced masterpieces, which we are fond of reading and re-reading, or seeing performed on the stage. However, it is only fair that such a result should not be secured through an enfringement of the most elementary principles of equity and honour.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): The question of copyright is one that comes primarily to be dealt with rather by my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) as forming part of the matters that are allotted to that particular department of the Government.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not know that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Doherty) was present when I opened my remarks, but I stated that before six o'clock I had met the Minister of Agriculture and that he had begged me to go on, because, although he had to leave, he said " I will read your remarks in "Hansard" and deal with this matter as soon as I come back." But I am pleased to see my hon. friend (Mr Doherty) in his seat, because he can deal with this matter in the way I mentioned.

Mr. DOHERTY: In making the observation I did I had no intention of addressing any reproach to the hon. gentleman. I only made that observation to point out that I did not come here this evening myself anticipating that I would have the pleasure of listening to my hon. friend upon this subject and still less prepared to undertake any full discussion of the very important matter that he has dealt with. I did not have the advantage either of hearing all that the hon. gentleman has said, but if I correctly followed him, the gist of the complaint seems to be that the civil recourse of parties complaining of a violation of their rights as authors of dramatic productions is inadequate; and furthermore, that the inadequacies would seem to result from the fact that as a rule the persons guilty of such unlawful reproduction are persons financially irresponsible as against whom it would be impossible to execute any judgment. That seemed to be one of the causes which gave rise to the inefficiency, or ineffectiveness, of the law; and the other resulted from the undue delays which occurred in the enforcement of the civil right. If I followed the hon. gentleman correctly, he does not

complain of the insufficiency of our law as it stands as recognizing the existence of the right, but he complains simply that we have no effective sanction.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Hear, hear.

Mr. DOHERTY: So long as one keeps to the civil recourse, the recourse that seeks an indemnification for loss caused, there is not any method by which we can make insolvent violators of the law solvent. In so far as he points to the very regrettable consequences of the delays that occur in the procedure in connection with such civil actions, it seems to me that is something for which provincial legislation rather than any legislation of this Parliament should be responsible. I do not mean to say that perhaps it is not conceivable that we may have authority to enact some special disposition in regard to procedure in relation to the violation of copyright, but as I understand it, the procedure in cases of that kind, as in all civil cases, is at the present time governed by provincial laws, and delays in that procedure, if they be attributable to a defect in any law, would be attributable to the defects in the laws of the provinces concerned. It is undoubtedly a very regrettable thing that it should be found that, for the violation of a right which our law recognizes, that law does not at the same time provide an adequate remedy. The hon. gentleman referred to cases where Canadian authors had succeeded under the French law in obtaining compensation for such violation of their rights.

Mr. LEMIEUX: No, I said that we ought to at least reciprocate with the French, that the French-Canadian authors had the benefit in France of a fund which existed for the protection of their works. It operates automatically. If a man writes an article in a review he belongs to the Société des Auteurs. If the article is reproduced in another country, the society is represented by somebody, and the party reproducing that article will have to pay a certain amount. French-Canadian authors enjoy that protection in France, but what I said was that while they had benefited from the organization for the payment of authors in Europe, in our own country French authors are being pillaged. When the victims seek redress before the courts, by the articles of the Berne Convention, they are discouraged by delays.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not know that I quite follow the hon. gentleman. I did understand that the hon. gentleman referred to some successful proceeding which had resulted in indemnity being obtained by our authors for violations occurring in France, and to urge that we should provide some similar method. If I understand correctly now, it is not the benefit which he receives as the result of any law which confers any legal right, but the result of the operation of some association which provides a fund.

Mr. LEMIEUX: A benefit fund.

Mr. DOHERTY: That is something that I do not suppose we could provide for. It is no doubt, however, a most regrettable condition of affairs if, in this country, by violations of the law of this country, persons living outside of the country suffer and if for such violations they are without adequate remedy. My hon. friend has pointed out certain grievances which are grievances shared by all persons who have recourse to the courts to enforce their rights. He points out that a foreign author would have to give security for the costs that should be incurred. If he is bound to do so, he is so bound in the province of Quebec under a provision of the law of Quebec, which I think is usually looked upon as a wise provision, that where a stranger comes into the province seeking to invoke the law against a resident, the latter should be protected to the extent of some provision being made to secure him in the event of his successfully defending himself in the action instituted against him. I do not quite grasp that that is in any particular way a grievance on the part of those who seek to enforce the particular right that may belong to a dramatic author. As regards delays, of course, in that respect dramatic authors suffer in common with the public in general, and suffer in common with our own citizens. What means may be found to expedite the civil procedure is perhaps more properly for the consideration of those who are charged with legislation as regards the procedure and administration of justice in the different provinces. I do not desire to express any absolute opinion on this subject, but it seems to me that there is a remedy to which the hon. gentleman did not refer, but which, under the law of the provinces, would be available to the authors concerned, and that would be an effective remedy in so far as it might operate as a prevention rather than a cure of the wrong that may be done. I have some difficulty in seeing why the recourse by injunction is not open to the author who is in a position to establish that any person is about to produce a work which he claims is his own,

and in which he claims to be protected by the copyright law. It seems to me that that right ought to be available and ought to operate to obviate some of the things of which the hon. gentleman spoke in discussing the position of these foreign authors, and I think it is a remedy of which they might avail themselves. I am not disposed to quarrel with the proposition that it might be desirable that a means should be taken which would reach persons who might be, from the point of view of civil responsibility, not in a position to comply with any judgment that may be rendered against them. From that point of view there is a great deal to be said in support of the suggestion of the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux), that this might be a proper matter to be dealt with by the criminal law. The Bill to which the hon. gentleman refers, I think passed this House without being opposed, but was rejected by the Senate. Of course, the Senate must be assumed to have good reasons to refuse to pass measures that this House adopts. At all events since the time to which the hon. member refers the Senate seems to have persisted with a good deal of consistency in the assertion of its right to annul what the wisdom of this House has decreed. We on this side of the House perhaps do not feel the same absolute confidence in being able to control the operations of that august body as do gentlemen on the other side of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That shows the independence of the Senate; it was in 1909 that they refused to pass the Bill.

Mr. DOHERTY: I quite understand that, but I am only pointing out that they are obdurate in the determination to place themselves above what may be decreed by the wisdom of this House and that some people have thought that possibly the influence that existed at that time from this side of the House over the Senate was greater than it might be at present. If that be true, we would now have less hope of being able to convert them from their error, than had those who sat on these benches at that time. I quite recognize that the position of these authors is one which calls for careful consideration on our part, and the question as to whether or not an amendment to the criminal law such as is suggested might prove of aid to the protection of their rights is certainly one which deserves to be considered. I shall have pleasure in complying with the suggestion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) to read the debates of 1909, and I shall have pleasure also in endeavouring to ascertain what reason, if any, the hon. gentlemen in the upper House set forth as justifying their action.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I regret that the Minister of Agriculture is prevented through indisposition from attending the House this afternoon. In addition to what the Minister of Justice has said, I may say that I know that the Minister of Agriculture has had the whole question of copyright under consideration during the past two years, and that representations, not so much with regard to procedure as to the substance of the law itself, and in connection with the Berlin convention, have been made to him. If I am not mistaken, negotiations have gone on from time to time with a view to adhering, if possible, to the Berlin convention, but under such conditions as to safeguard Canadian interests, which might otherwise suffer materially, but which we would not desire to sacrifice if the convention were absolutely adhered to. I have not a clear recollection of what the Minister of Agriculture, upon the advice of his officers, thought necessary, but I do know the matter has engaged his attention. The proposal of my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) would require a great deal of consideration, because questions may arise with regard to patents as well as copyright—though the infringement would probably be more distinct in the case of literary works than with regard to patents—as to whether there had been wilful infringement. As far as the remedy is concerned, I do know that the one to which the Minister of Justice has alluded has been brought to bear in other provinces, because when I was practising at the Bar I had occasion to invoke with very good results that remedy which I understand to be available under the law of Quebec, and which if made use of by those authors might be found to afford a better remedy than that which they have succeeded in obtaining in the past. As my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) has brought this matter fully to the attention of the House. I shall now move to adjourn the debate, with the assurance to my hon. friend that his observations will receive the careful attention of the Minister of Agriculture.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, the House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

Tuesday, February 16, 1915.

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

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Regulations under the Destructive Insect Pest Act.—Hon. M. Burrell.

Report on the Agricultural Instruction Act, 1913-14.—Hon. M. Burrell.

Supplement to the 47th Annual Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, Fisheries Branch: Contributions to Canadian Biology, being studies from the biological stations of Canada, 1911-1914, Part I, Marine Biology.—Hon. J. D. Hazen.

CANADIAN TROOPS IN FRANCE.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): I have much pleasure in communicating to the House the following telegram just received by His Royal Highness the Governor General from the Secretary of State for the Colonies:

Mr. Harcourt to Governor General.
London, February 16, 1915.

Your ministers will be glad to learn that the whole of the Canadian contingent are doing well at the front, having safely crossed over to France.

(Sgd) Harcourt.

POLLUTION OF NAVIGABLE WATERS.

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE.

Mr. HAZEN moved:

That a Select Standing Committee consisting of Messrs. Boyer, Bradbury, Burrell, Casgrain, Graham, Gray, Hazen, Kyte, Lespérance, McCraney, Molloy, Murphy, Northrup, Descarries, Warnock, and Wilson (Wentworth), be appointed to inquire into the pollution of navigable waters and consider all matters relating thereto, with power to send for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses under oath, and to report from time to time.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Hazen, the Order for the House to go into committee on Bill No. 2, respecting the pollution of navigable waters, was discharged and the Bill was referred to the special committee above named.

WAR SUPPLIES—BOOTS.

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That the report of the Board of Inquiry consisting of Lieutenant Colonel W. H. Halleck, E. A. Stevens, Esq., and Theo. Galipeau, Esq., respecting boots supplied to the Department of Militia and Defence, a copy of which report was laid upon the table of the House on the 15th instant, and all matters pertaining to the boots so supplied to the said department, be referred to a special committee of seven members with instructions to investigate the matters aforesaid and to report thereon to this House.

That the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses on oath or affirmation and to report from time to time.

That the following members shall constitute the said committee, namely, Sir James Aikins, Mr. McCurdy, Mr. Middlebro, Mr. Rainville, Mr. Macdonald, Mr. Lemieux and Mr. Nesbitt.

Motion agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I notice that the report placed upon the table of the House the day before yesterday, to which reference is made in this motion, does not contain the reference upon which the board of inquiry has acted. The commission has been omitted. It would be interesting to the House and to the committee to have the commission.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not sure whether there is any formal commission or not. It was a board constituted, I believe, according to military usage to make inquiry into a particular matter. If it should be found that there was a more definite reference to that board I shall be very glad to have it brought down.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I notice that the report is made by one official of the department and two outsiders. Presumably they must have received some instructions.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Colonel Halleck, I understand, is an officer at the head of a particular branch that has control of such matters. The other two gentlemen are outsiders—Mr. E. A. Stephens of the city of Ottawa, who is a dealer in boots and shoes and is supposed to have expert knowledge in such matters, and Mr. Theo. Galipeau of Montreal, who, I understand, is a manufacturer of shoes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There was no commission, but were no instructions given as to what was expected of them?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We shall be glad to bring down whatever information there is.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN PATRIOTIC FUND ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 39, to amend the Canadian Patriotic Fund Act, 1914. He said:

This Bill is intended to amend the

Act for two purposes: first, to enable the Corporation created by the Act of 1914 to assist the wives, children and dependent relatives of residents of Newfoundland who may be on active service during the present war in the military or naval forces of Canada; secondly, to assist men of the Canadian expeditionary forces who may become incapacitated in the course of the war and return to Canada; and likewise to assist the widows and dependent relatives of members of the Canadian expeditionary forces who may be killed during the war. Under the present Act, the power to extend assistance to wives, children and dependent relatives is limited to relatives of residents of Canada actually serving in the expeditionary forces; so that under the law as it now stands, assistance could not be given to the dependent relatives of a resident of Newfoundland on active service in our naval or military forces. I understand that there are a number of these men, more particularly in the naval force, and we desire to treat their relatives in the same manner as those of Canadian residents on active service.

Under the present Act the Corporation has no power to give any assistance to members of the Canadian expeditionary forces who have become incapacitated during the war and returned to Canada. Its powers are limited to giving assistance to the wives, children and dependent relatives of men on actual service. Again, under the Act as it now stands, there is no power to give assistance to the wives, children and dependent relatives of men who have been killed on active service. The present amendment will give the Corporation these powers. With regard to the power to assist either men who have been incapacitated and returned to Canada, or widows, children and dependent relatives of men who have been killed, it is provided that this power can be exercised at any time during the war or within six months after the war, but that it shall not be exercisable for a period of more than six months, in favour of any one individual, person or persons, or the relative of any one person or persons; and, further, that it shall not be exercisable in favour of persons who are in receipt of a pension provided by Canada. It is, in effect, intended to cover a period which may elapse after a man has died or become incapacitated and before his dependent relatives, or himself if living, may have established their right to the benefit of a pension that may be provided either by Canada or by the government of the country in whose service the man may have been.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

SALE OF MILITARY STORES.

Mr. JOHN H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 40, to amend the Criminal Code. He said: The object of this Bill is to make it a crime to defraud the Government by the sale of military or naval stores. The word "stores" is used in the Interpretation Act to cover all articles sold to military or naval authorities. I was surprised on examining the criminal code to find that no punishment has been provided for defrauding the Government in this way, although ample provision is made for the punishment of any fraud perpetrated by a man on his fellow man. It is well that parties who attempt to defraud the Government, especially at a time like this, should know that there is a day of reckoning to come. I would give them to understand that, while they may deceive an innocent Minister of Militia or some simple general or colonel in his department, any attempt to defraud the Government may bring them behind the bars of a penitentiary. That is the object of the Bill. I do not suggest that there are many people practising this kind of fraud in Canada. I do not know, but if some of the public speeches of the Minister of Militia have any weight, there are some at least. I understand the minister proposed that he should be given leave to shoot these swindlers, but I do not propose anything so drastic as that; that looks to me very much like a German move. My proposal is to give them two years behind the bars of some Canadian penitentiary. I am quite well aware that I shall not secure the passage of this Bill without the consent of the Minister of Justice, and I should like to ask him to see that this important and necessary Bill goes through the necessary stages and finally becomes a part of the criminal law of Canada.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

SELECT COMMITTEE APPOINTED.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved:

That a Select Committee composed of Messrs. Northrup, Maclean (Halifax), Murphy, Carvell,

Robidoux, Bennett (Calgary), and the mover be appointed to inquire into the operation of the Act relating to the election of members of this House, and into the practice and procedure in connection with election petitions; and to consider what changes are desirable therein, with power to send for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses under oath, and to report from time to time.

He said: The House will remember that at the last session a committee was appointed for the purpose set forth in the present resolution. That committee held a number of sittings, gathered some very valuable information, took steps to prepare a draft of legislation that seemed to be desirable, and in its report to the House recommended that it should be reconstituted at the present session in order that it might proceed with its labours. It is to give effect to that suggestion of the report that I now make this motion. The composition of the committee is changed to this extent: the name of Mr. Bennett, of Calgary, is substituted for the name of Mr. McKay, who last session represented Prince Albert in this House, but has since been appointed to the bench.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I understood from the report presented by the committee last session, that a Bill was to be prepared by the parliamentary counsel for submission. Is there such a draft Bill now in existence?

Mr. DOHERTY: The Bill has been put in regular shape by the parliamentary counsel for re-submission to the Committee.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That when this House adjourns this day, it stand adjourned until Thursday next; that Government orders shall have precedence after questions and notices of motions for the production of papers on Thursdays until the end of the session; and that Government orders sha l also have the same precedence on Wednesdays as on Thursdays until the end of the session; the House to meet at three o'clock on Wednesdays, and the sittings on such Wednesdays to be in all respects under the same rules provided for other days.

He said: This motion to take Wednesdays and Thursdays for Government business is earlier this session than is usual. I may point out, however, that the session of the Imperial Parliament commenced on the 11th of November and continued to the 27th of that month, when after a session of sixteen days it adjourned until a few days ago. Practically all the time of that session was taken up with Government business, probably by consent or by some arrangement. Since the session of the Imperial Parliament has been resumed, the entire time has been devoted to Government business. We do not purpose proceeding that far here, as Monday is reserved for private members. There will be also the evenings of Tuesday and Friday for private Bills, and on Wednesdays and Thursdays Government orders are not to be taken up until after notices of motion for production of papers, and questions.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There are really three motions included in this. The first is that the House should not sit to-morrow, Ash Wednesday, and that goes as a matter of course. The other two motions are to take for Government business first the Thursdays, and then the Wednesdays. We on this side of the House have no disposition to interfere with the object which is to be served by this motion, which comes earlier this session than in any other previous session. We know the peculiar circumstances under which we are meeting, and we find no fault with the proposition generally speaking. Under the Rules of the House Thursday becomes a Government day automatically after the House has been in session for a month, and then, in about the sixth week of the session, the Government moves to take Wednesday, whereas that motion is now made in what is practically the second week of the session. Private members will under this motion be deprived of every day except Monday, and consequently there are several important matters on the Order Paper which will not come up this session, amongst others the Bill of Mr. Bradbury, which has been to-day referred to a special committee, the Bill of Mr. Armstrong to amend the Railway Act, the resuming of the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Bickerdike on his Bill relating to capital punishment, an important Bill to amend the Criminal Code, introduced by Mr. McCraney, a Bill by Mr. Maclean (York), to amend the Railway Act, and the resuming of the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of Mr. Lemieux with regard to copyright. My suggestion to my right hon. friend is that he should not take next Thursday, when these Bills can probably be discussed.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will accept that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Then will the right hon. gentleman give us next Friday for private members' day in the same manner as we had Friday of last week? If that

were done we would have no objection to offer to the motion. The proposition with regard to Wednesdays would come into force on Wednesday, the 24th instant.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will have the motion amended so as to meet the suggestions of my right hon. friend. We will take next Friday as private members' day, the order to be the same as it would have been on Wednesday had we been sitting to-morrow. I move the motion in the following amended form:

That when this House adjourns this day it stand adjourned until Thursday next; that Government orders shall have precedence after questions and notices of motions for production of papers on Thursdays on and after the 25th instant until the end of the session, and that Government orders shall also have the same precedence on Wednesdays as on Thursdays until the end of the session; the House to meet at three o'clock on Wednesdays, and the sittings on such Wednesdays to be in all respects under the same rules provided for other days.

Motion as amended agreed to.

SOUTH WELLINGTON MINE DISASTER.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. WILLIAM GRAY (London): I wish to ask if the Government has any knowledge of the serious accident which has recently taken place in the Pacific Coal Company's Mine at South Wellington, Vancouver Island, British Columbia. I notice by the press reports that some of the workmen have lost their lives. As I am a new member, it is with some diffidence that I ask the question. I have waited several days anticipating that some other honourable member would do so; but I feel it my duty in the interest of the workingmen of Canada to inquire into the facts. Miners have very arduous duties to perform, and there are many of them engaged in various parts of Canada. I know something of their duties and dangers, as I have been for some years in the mining business. They are exposed to underground work—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member is out of order in introducing a discussion at this stage. It would be in order for him simply to ask a question, and I hope the hon. member will confine himself to doing that.

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour): A few days ago a fair wage officer residing in Vancouver advised me that twenty miners had been drowned in one of the Pacific Coast Coal Company's mines at South Wellington, Vancouver Island. He was instructed to proceed at once to South Wellington and advise us as to conditions there. One of the expert officers of the Department of Mines was also instructed to go to South Wellington. Later I received another message from the fair wage officer saying that the accident had occurred in this way. There was an old mine, worked out many years ago and was full of water, near the mine that was being opened. The miners working at a lower level in the new mine had broken through into the old mine, and the water in the latter had rushed into the new mine, in which there were ninety-eight men working. Seventy-eight of them escaped, but the remaining twenty were drowned. The officer also advised me that nothing could be done by way of an investigation until the mine was pumped out; that was being done, but that it would require several weeks to empty the mine. It is the intention of the provincial government to make a thorough investigation, and it is our intention that an expert of the Department of Mines shall attend that investigation in an advisory capacity.

MINISTERIAL CHANGES.

On the motion of Sir Robert Borden for Committee of Supply:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has asked me to make a statement with regard to the changes in the Ministry which have taken place since the session of August last. Two changes have taken place, as my right hon. friend and hon. members generally are aware. Mr. Pelletier, who was Postmaster General from the time that we took office until some time in October last, felt that his physical strength was not equal to the further performance of the very arduous duties imposed upon him as the head of that important department. I know personally that he had been advised by his physician from time to time during the past eighteen months that his health would not bear the very severe strain imposed upon it. Those who were colleagues of Mr. Pelletier, and especially I, as head of the Government, have reason to know that he applied himself to the duties of his office with a vigour and an industry which perhaps have never been surpassed by a member of any administration since Confederation. I do not think it is too much to say that no minister at the head of the Post Office Department has ever proved himself more capable as an administrator than Mr. Pelletier. The correspondence

which has taken place between Mr. Pelletier and myself has been laid upon the table of the House.

The former Minister of Inland Revenue, Mr. Nantel, has also retired from the Government and has been appointed to a position on the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada. The position which he now fills had formerly been occupied by Mr. Bernier, at one time a member of the late Administration, whose health in recent years prevented him from giving to the discharge of his duties the attention which he would undoubtedly have desired to give. Mr. Nantel, as head of the Department of Inland Revenue, occupied himself very closely and assiduously with the duties of his department, and the correspondence which took place between him and myself upon the occasion of his retirement has been placed upon the table of the House.

Mr. Casgrain, who succeeds Mr. Pelletier as Postmaster General, has had a long service in public life, although in recent years it has been interrupted for a considerable period.

Both in the Legislature of Quebec and in the Parliament of Canada he had been a distinguished figure years before he made his re-entry into public life as Postmaster General. I have no doubt he will give to the duties of his department the same indefatigable attention, and that he will bring to them the same ability, as characterized the administration of his predecessor.

Mr. Nantel, as Minister of Inland Revenue, has been succeeded by Mr. Blondin, a man whose services in public life have not been nearly so long as that of Mr. Pelletier, as he came into Parliament only in 1908. During the past three years, having been selected to occupy the position of Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees, he has displayed, sometimes under very difficult conditions, an ability, discretion and good judgment which I am sure must have commended themselves to the members of the House without exception. I have no doubt that in his new position as a responsible minister of the Crown he will display the same qualities and will give to the public service of the country an administration which will commend itself to the judgment of all.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The explanations which have been given to the House by my right hon. friend (Sir Robert Borden) have been copious in words though absolutely lacking in substance. He has told us what everybody who reads the newspapers already knew that there have been two vacancies and that they have both been filled. I have no exception to take to what he said of Mr. Pelletier, as to his ability and vigour. Mr. Pelletier was well known to us who come from Quebec as a man of ability, and those who did not come from that province were soon convinced of his ability when they saw him in office. As to his vigour, especially in the line of dismissals, I do not think it was exceeded even by any of those who still remain on the Treasury Benches. I have known Mr. Pelletier for a great many years, and I think I can do him no injustice if I add to what has been said about his qualities that he is also possessed of qualities which find expression in the maxim, "What we have we'll hold." He never was known willingly to give up what he had obtained. It was a surprise to us who knew his good points and his weaker points that he had made up his mind to resign his office. Some there were who remembered that Mr. Pelletier had carried on his campaign in 1911 on the policy of no participation by Canada in the wars of Great Britain, and that the Canadian navy should be destroyed unless the scheme were approved by a plebiscite; who remembered also that, after having taken office he went to his constituents for re-election, he promised that he would obtain a plebiscite or something better. When something better did not come, some there were who proposed that he should do what Mr. Monk had done, and withdraw. Others remembered that when he went for re-election, and afterwards, he more than once told the people of Quebec that as he had agreed to have the shops of the Transcontinental removed from the line of the Transcontinenetal to the line of the Canadian Northern railway, some nine miles from the Transcontinental line, he would see to it that the line of railway, which runs in the valley of the St. Lawrence river, and the shops which are in the valley of the St. Charles river would be connected by a tunnel; but, finding that the Minister of Railways was obdurate and would not agree to the tunnel, finding, as I should say if the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) were present, that the minister had hardened the heart of Quebec, he thought that it was due to his honour not to remain in a Government in which he could not have his wishes and promises carried out. But all these suppositions were wrong. The true reason of the removal, or rather resignation, of Mr. Pelletier is to be found in his ill-health. All were certainly sorry

to hear that Mr. Pelletier's health was not equal to the duties he had undertaken to perform. But their feelings were relieved when they found that, though he was too ill to be a minister of the Crown, at least he could serve the people as a judge of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec. It is singular how bad health will affect individual cases when, unfortunately, it comes to gentlemen on the other side of the House. Here is Mr. Pelletier unable to serve the country as a minister of the Crown but still with health enough to be a judge of the Superior Court of Quebec; and here is my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) unable to serve the country as a judge and serving the country as a minister of the Crown. This is a fortunate condition of things which may not be quite plain to the common understanding, but it can be explained by the flexible and elastic logic of the Conservative party, which can always find a solution of every difficulty, and find it on the profitable side.

With regard to the successor of Mr. Pelletier, Mr. Casgrain, I have only a word to say. In my humble judgment he was the logical appointment under the circumstances. Mr. Casgrain has always been a Tory, an undiluted Tory. If he were here, I am sure he would not object to that compliment; or reverse of compliment. He is certainly entitled to the credit—or discredit—of having been under all circumstances a pure, undiluted Tory. He never served the new gods whose stars have risen on the horizon; he was always faithful to his old convictions. I give him full credit for that. He and I are old friends. It is a pleasure personally, though I must say the reverse of a pleasure politically, to see him where he is. And I am sure that the statement of my right hon. friend as to Mr. Casgrain's ability to fulfil the duties of his office will be realized. As to his political views or convictions I cannot say much; they are the misfortune of his circumstances.

There is another change. Mr. Nantel also has been called away from the floor of Parliament and removed to another sphere. It is not my intention to say anything of the removal of Mr. Nantel from office, but I may have something to say as to the choice of his successor, the present incumbent of the office, the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Blondin). It seemed an evidence of the irony of fate that the hon. member for Champlain, the arch-Nationalist, should have been introduced into this House by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), the arch-Imperialist. When, on the opening of the session, I saw the new minister walking into this House leaning upon the arm of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, I thought the Minister of Trade and Commerce showed by the way he seemed to be limping that he had a heavy load to carry. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce has always been an insistent advocate of imperialism. I cannot say as much of his new colleague; but perhaps, after all, there may be within the ranks of the Conservative party, as there is somewhere else, some joy over the conversion of one sinner. The Minister of Inland Revenue was introduced by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce. When he told you, Sir, that that hon. gentleman had taken the oath and had signed the roll, I thought he would add that the hon. gentleman had filled up the holes in the flag and that he would now breathe the atmosphere of liberty. But he did not, and really there was no necessity for his doing so. The hon. member for Champlain is now breathing the atmosphere of office; he has found an atmosphere which is suitable to him, and he can breathe freely, whether there are holes in the flag or not. I have only this to observe: when my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue, then the hon. member for Champlain, was making the speeches which he did make in the province of Quebec; when he was threatening to destroy the Canadian navy when he had an opportunity of doing so, I never believed that he meant one-half of what he said. I always supposed, and rightly supposed, that what he was after was simply to create advantage for himself and for his party. He has succeeded. He is now in office, but to attain office he has travelled a very dangerous road. He has sown the seed of discord—and these appeals to passion are always sure to bring forth a crop of prejudices. My hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue is a young member of this House; perhaps he will permit me to say, since he now has the responsibility of office, that he had better always stand by true principle.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): If there were wanting evidence of how absolutely at a loss the right hon. gentleman is to find unfavourable comment to make upon the resignation of my hon. friend Mr. Pelletier and his nomination to the Bench, it certainly would be found in the fact that he could not do so otherwise than by making a statement in this House

which is absolutely and unqualifiedly untrue.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. DOHERTY: If hon. gentlemen will allow me to say what I wish to say—

Mr. SPEAKER: I only wish to remind the hon. member that to make the assertion that another member said what was untrue knowing it to be untrue, is not parliamentary.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Take it back.

Mr. DOHERTY: I said that the statement was untrue; if I had been allowed to proceed I think it would have appeared that I was not stating that the right hon. gentleman knowingly stated what was untrue. If I may be permitted to complete my phrase, I think I shall be able to put before this House what are the actual facts and at the same time be within the limit of parliamentary rules. I was going on to say that the right hon. gentleman ought to have known the assertion to be untrue. I say that because, Mr. Speaker, every man who knows me, and who knows the circumstances under which I resigned my position on the bench—and I thought until to-day that I might count the right hon. gentleman among them—knows that in connection with my resignation there never was a question, in any manner, shape or form, of illness on my part, or of illness incapacitating me from my duties on the bench. The letter in which I tendered my resignation is on record in the Department of Justice, and I defy my right hon. friend to find in that resignation the slightest suggestion of illness on my part. I tendered my resignation without the slightest suggestion that I was ill, and I asked for nothing when I tendered that resignation; I simply pointed out that under the express law of this country—a law enacted long before I was born—my fifteen years upon the bench of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec entitled me to the annuity for which that statute provided. I tendered my resignation to take effect when
4 p.m. that right was recognized, and the Government of which the right hon. gentleman was the leader recognized that right by accepting my resignation; yet the right hon. gentleman ventures to-day to make the assertion that he has made. I recall a previous occasion when the right hon. gentleman made the same statement—or, let me correct myself, when it was reported that the right hon. gentleman made the statement. That was in 1908, when I ventured to comply with the request of what proved to be the larger number of the voters in the division which I have the honour to represent, and to present myself for election to this House. It was then reported in all the papers—among them the papers supporting the right hon. gentleman—that he made in that election campaign a statement similar to the one that he has made here to-day. At that time I took occasion to point out precisely what had occurred; to point out that my resignation, as I said a moment ago, had no connection with any illness or any pretension of illness on my part, and to point out publicly through the press that all the friends of the right hon. gentleman in the province of Quebec, if he did not, knew that perfectly. I can see before me gentlemen with whom I was, as I am glad to say I am to-day, upon terms of friendly intimacy, who sit upon the other side of the House, and who knew me then and knew that I was not ill, and had made no suggestion and no pretension that I was ill. I published that assertion, and the right hon. gentleman has not come back to it until this late date. I may say that afterwards the right hon. gentleman denied having found fault with me in connection with my resignation at that time. What light has come to him since, that he makes the assertion that he has made to-day?

It is certainly a pitiable sight; the leader of a great party compelled to resort to making statements of fact which certainly he cannot know to be true, and which, as I say, the public documents on record in the Department of Justice of this country, the documents forwarded to the Minister of Justice of the Government of which he was the chief, demonstrate to be false; and that for the petty purpose of making some jeering remarks both with regard to myself, who, thank God, enjoyed at the time I retired from the bench, as I am glad to say I enjoy to-day, the very best of health, and at the expense of my friend the late Postmaster General, with regard to whom I am satisfied that every one who knew him knew that his health during all the time he was with us left much to be desired. When he left us it was in that position that while his medical adviser would not take the responsibility of counselling him to continue to give constant and arduous and unremitting attention every moment to the numerous details which his duty in the position which he occupied imposed the obligation of looking after, we all know that it is not inconsistent with that, that the hon. gentleman should have been capable of doing the

work that would fall to his lot in the position which he is now filling, work of a totally different kind.

I do not know that there is anything I can add to what I have said. I have heard whisperings of what the right hon. gentleman has said to-day from other people before. I thought the right hon. gentleman was a bigger man than they are, but I find to-day that he has chosen to put himself upon a level with them. It is a matter, of course, for his own choice to determine. In making the statement which he has made, I am bound to assume that he did not know what he ought to have known; but the thing that outstands is that the statement is absolutely untrue, and that if I am entitled to receive what I am receiving to-day, it is purely and simply that, as recognized by the Government of the right hon. gentleman, as recognized in particular by the gentleman who in that Government held the office which I hold, as it must be recognized by any man who can read a statute, that the contract under which I was appointed to the Bench of the Superior Court gave me the same absolute right to receive the pension it provides for on condition that I gave fifteen years of my life to service in that court as it gave me to any dollar of salary which I drew while I sat upon that Bench. I say the truth of that statement does not rest on my word; it rests upon the public record of my resignation, and its acceptance by his Government, and it is justified by the express provision of the statute law of this country. I do not think there could be any more complete demonstration of the untruth of any statement susceptible of being made than that which I trust I have made of the untruth of the statement of the right hon. gentleman.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: In reply to the hon. gentleman's explanation, I just wish to say that I knew, as everybody knows, that the law of the land allows a judge, when he has served fifteen years, if he does not find himself equal to the task, to ask for his pension; but I should suppose that if he found himself equal to the task, rather than take the pension he would continue to discharge the duties of his office. The minister has told us that he accepted the pension being in perfect health. I accept his explanation; every one will accept it.

Mr. DOHERTY: I rise for the purpose of saying that the right hon. gentleman, to bolster up his statement, has had to misstate the provision of the statute.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: Just a word about the retirement of my good friend the ex-Postmaster General. I quite agree that the Hon. Mr. Pelletier left office because he was in poor health. But if he was in poor health, everybody knows that he is a rich man. I am surprised to find that now, after he has retired from the Government and is a judge of the land, receiving $7,000 a year and a pension after fifteen years at his sweet will, that the mail clerks, who earn something like two or three dollars a day, who have large families and get no pension, are called upon to raise a fund for the Hon. Mr. Justice Pelletier. I have received protests from some mail clerks who are indignant at the audacity of some sycophants around the Post Office Department in Ottawa who are trying to raise a fund for the Hon. Mr. Pelletier. I state the simple truth when I say that everybody knows that Mr. Pelletier is a very rich man. Here is a circular—and I call the attention of the right hon. gentleman to this—issued from Ottawa and dated January 14, 1914. It is as follows:

Appreciation for the Honourable Louis P. Pelletier, the friend of the man in the service.

Ottawa, January 14, 1914.

To Postmasters, Chief Clerks, Inspectors, Superintendents, Officers, Clerks and employees of the Post Office Department.

A few months ago some admirers of the Honourable L. P. Pelletier revived the idea of a testimonial to Mr. Pelletier in view of the great sympathy he had always shown towards the best interests of his department during his term as Postmaster General. Released from the cares of office Mr. Pelletier is now free to accept such a testimonial of our esteem, which was impossible while he was a minister of the Crown.

At the convention of the Civil Service Federation held in Ottawa, January 7, 8, and 9, the following committee was entrusted with the completion of the work: F. Grierson, G. Carpenter, J. C. O'Connor, C. A. Halladay, W. J. P. Cantwell, postal clerk, and Wm. Hoop, President Dominion Federation of Letter Carriers, Winnipeg. The committee found the work well advanced but wish to afford an opportunity to all the members of the department to subscribe.

Will you, therefore, constitute yourself the local treasurer of the fund, afford those in your branch or district an opportunity of subscribing, and forward the amount received without delay to the treasurer, C. A. Halladay, Railway Mail Service, at Ottawa, or to any of the above named committee. Small individual contributions only are requested, and all must be in the hands of the treasurer by April 15, 1915, on which day the fund will be closed.

Signed on behalf of the committee.

G. A. Carpenter,
Chairman,
Dead Letter Office, Montreal.

C. A. Halladay,
Secretary-Treasurer,
Railway Mail Service, Ottawa.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What is the date?

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is dated 1914, but I think from the context it should be 1915.

I have received protests from some of the unfortunate mail clerks who are being mulcted in this way, and in these hard times, for the benefit of a very wealthy citizen of this country, Hon. Mr. Pelletier. Here is a letter from Kingston in reply to Mr. Halliday, the man who is passing the hat.

I have a circular letter signed by you asking for contributions from the mail clerks for a fund for the benefit of Hon. Mr. Justice Pelletier. I did not know he was in need of this 'widow's mite' from his late employees. If such is not the case and a few of his personal friends or those receiving special favours choose to make a personal presentation, then it is their business; but if it is to be made in the name of the service, then I think you have your nerve with you to undertake to speak for them.

Mr. ROGERS: Who signed the letter?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I will show my hon. friend the letter. I do not want this man to be dismissed. The idea of raising such a fund for Hon. Mr. Pelletier from the letter carriers and mail clerks passes my comprehension. It is simply a hold-up and an evidence of sycophancy on the part of those who are getting up the fund, and I am quite sure that if the Hon. Mr. Pelletier knew about it he would stop it at once.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Do not be too sure.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes, I must give the devil his due. We are all being asked to contribute to one thing or another nowadays. There is the Patriotic Fund, the Belgian Relief Fund, subscriptions to hospitals and the Red Cross, and is the poor mail clerk and letter carrier to be asked to stretch the last stitch in his purse and to give his mite to the Hon. Mr. Pelletier, who is worth many hundreds of thousands of dollars? I am quite sure that if he knew about this fund he would give orders for the hold-up to be stopped at once. I hope that the right hon. gentleman will see that this circular does not circulate any more, and that orders are given to the young man whose name appears on this circular to stop soliciting subscriptions at once.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not understand that I have anything to do with it. I never heard of it before. The movement originated, as I gather from the remarks of my hon. friend, in the Civil Service Federation, which is not an official organization at all. Any person who receives a circular would be absolutely at liberty to disregard it, and his disregard of it would not have the smallest effect in the world upon his status in the Civil Service.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY.

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

Department of Trade and Commerce—Deputy Minister, $5,000.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There are two mistakes on this page which I wish to correct. In the 12th line it reads, "1 at $931 50"; that should be $937 50. In the Census and Statistics Branch, in line 10, it reads, "5 at $1,500"; that should be 5 at $1,050. These are just mistakes in printing.

Mr. NESBITT: The number of clerks appears to have been increased.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The work of the department has been very greatly increased and I had to add three clerks in the lower grade.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Where does the increased work come in?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It comes in from all branches. I should think I would be perfectly safe in saying that in the last six months or a year the work we have been doing in that department, counted by our communications in and out and general activities, has been pretty nearly twice as great as in the preceding year. That is a large statement to make but it is fairly well-borne out by the facts. Especially within the last six months the correspondence has been overwhelming.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Where does it come from?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: From all over.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is it on account of the expansion of trade or in consequence of the war?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is because of the larger number of inquiries resulting from conditions brought about by the war. Commercial questions, questions in reference to internal and external trade have multiplied exceedingly. The bulletin which had a very small circulation previously has now a very large circulation. My own particular part of the work is very much more onerous than it has ever been before

in my experience in that department or in any other department with which I have been connected.

Mr. MURPHY: Has work previously performed by other departments been transferred to the Department of Trade and Commerce?

Mr. PUGSLEY: That was done two years ago.

Mr. NESBITT: I quite believe that the work of the department has materially increased, but I think it is a bad year to increase expenses in any department, and that it would be better to keep the work of the department down in some way or make those on the staff work harder.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My officers are working for all they are worth and a great many of them are working overtime; I will tell my hon. friend what I would do if I had a free hand. I would add $100,000 to this department and I would put it this year and next year into the commerce side of the department, and I would do that because I believe that the activities to be developed in connection with the general work of the country, owing to the dislocation of trade, the openings for trade and the vast number of inquiries coming from every part, would justify it. If it were not that financial matters are in such a stringent condition I would ask my colleagues for a large increase in this vote and I would use it I think to the great good of the country.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Could not the minister make some arrangement by which part of the clerical work could be done by some other department where the business has fallen off, for example, the Customs Department, the revenue of which is some $30,000,000 less than formerly, and which cannot have anything like the necessity for the same clerical staff it had when there was an abounding and expanding revenue, as was the case under the previous Government? I speak of this because in this time of stress, when the Minister of Finance is obliged to impose what he, improperly I think—if I could use the emphatic language of the Minister of Justice, untruthfully I think—calls a war tax, which is striking everybody in this country, striking people who cannot afford to pay it, it does not seem to be a proper time to increase the expenses of administering the different departments. The Minister of Trade and Commerce is adding to the items on page 27 of the Estimates altogether pretty close to $12,000, which is a pretty heavy jump for one year, particularly a year like the present, when everybody in this country feels the necessity of curtailing. People who could very well make use of more employees in their business are cutting down the number of hands employed by them; they are doing more work themselves, they are spending longer hours at their business, in order to economize, and yet we find the Government instead of economizing going on increasing the expenditure of this department. Has the Minister of Trade and Commerce noticed the Ottawa Citizen of this morning, which refers to the addition of a number of employees and consequent very great increase in expenditures? The Citizen quotes from a statement made by Prof. Shortt, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, at a meeting a short time ago, as to which the Citizen says:

> Prof. Shortt referred to the return brought down in Parliament a few days ago, showing the names of 2,000 men who had been dismissed since the change of government. Who, asked the Speaker, took the places of the 2,000? The answer was 10,000.

It is a great pity that the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who has been usually recognized as being pretty economical—perhaps the economical member of the Government—has not had some supervision over these other departments in which such an enormous increase in the number of employees has taken place. If that statement of Prof. Shortt is true, what does it mean? It means that, since this Government has come into power, during a considerable part of which time business has been depressed and times have been hard, if the statement of Prof. Shortt is true, there has been added to the employees of the Government the enormous number of 8,000. Assuming that their average salary would be $1,000—I do not imagine that would be too large a figure—it would mean an addition of $8,000,000 to the expenditure of the country. Prof. Shortt, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, is regarded as being very careful and accurate in what he says; and, if his statement is correct, this is rather an alarming state of affairs. Surely that expenditure might be avoided. Surely it is better to put up with some inconvenience; surely it is better for the clerks already in the service to work a little harder and for the ministers and deputy ministers to give a little more attention to their departments, than to go on so rapidly increasing expenditure.

Mr. SINCLAIR: It is hardly fair to charge the Minister of Trade and Commerce with this large addition to the service, because he is not by any means the greatest offender. I find, on examining the return, that in the Department of Trade and Commerce there were thirteen dismissals and forty-nine appointments during the present Administration. Some of the other departments, however, have gone much further than that in the number of appointments. The Department of Customs has dismissed 271 persons and appointed 1,649. The Department of Indian Affairs has dismissed 135 and appointed 295. The Department of Inland Revenue has dismissed 73 and appointed 291. The Department of the Interior has dismissed 309 and appointed 1,651. The Department of Justice has dismissed 20 and appointed 257.

Mr. PUGSLEY: With immigration falling off.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The Department of Public Works is perhaps the greatest offender of all, with 511 dismissals and 2,002 appointments.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Shocking!

Mr. SINCLAIR: The Department of the Secretary of State has dismissed 20 and appointed 287. The Department of Railways has dismissed 363 and appointed 2,076. The total number of dismissals is 2,115 and the total number of appointments 10,576.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What about the Post Office Department?

Mr. SINCLAIR: I have not the figures.

Mr. J. D. REID: They did not dismiss any.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In observing the remarks of Prof. Shortt in regard to the subject to which the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) has drawn attention, I noticed that the return said nothing whatever of retirements; and I myself was rather surprised that a man in the position which Prof. Shortt occupies should, with a return in that form, give the impression which would evidently be gathered from his words as reported in the press. During the discussion which may ensue on the words of the hon. member for St. John, it should be kept in mind that, whatever explanation there may be, the fact appears very patently that no account is taken of the very great number which there must be of retirements.

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Mr. PUGSLEY: How many would there be?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would the hon. member expect me to answer that?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Fifty at the most.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think those who affect to speak publicly on the subject should know before they speak.

Mr. PUGSLEY: When my hon. friend the Solicitor General says there are a great many retirements, he ought to be able to give us an idea of the number, if it be around 25 or 50 or 100.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Will the minister indicate to the committee what his staff is doing in the matter of seeking new outlets for Canadian trade? He has informed us that his department is extremely busy at one thing or another in consequence of the unsettled trade conditions, but he has not given us any definite idea as to the nature of the work his department is doing.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Perhaps my hon. friend would rather take the items as they come under the regular heads. There is a vote which will come up shortly for trade commissioners, to which appertains chiefly the extension of trade. It would be better if the discussion would come up on that.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think this is the proper place, because we are asked to vote these increases in salaries upon the ground that extra work has been thrown upon the department by reason of trade conditions. The Minister of Trade and Commerce usually gets through his estimates very quickly, and we may never again have an opportunity to have this explanation. It need not be a lengthy one.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I was a little amused at my hon. friend the member for St. John, who professed to be greatly alarmed at the increase of expenditures shown in this modest estimate of mine.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This is only a sample.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Verily some great change must have taken place in my hon. friend during the last five or six years if he has learned now to be afraid of a small increase occasioned by the appointment of four or five clerks, mostly of low grade. My memory is fairly good; and I think I have been in the House when my hon. friend has come down, not only in connection with

his own estimates, but in company with his colleagues, and has asked for far larger increases, and he has never shown the least sign of alarm in his countenance.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Those were prosperous times.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: But my hon. friend is taking fright at so small a bogey as is before him at the present moment. I would like to know what will become of him when he approaches some of my colleagues, of whom he has been speaking to-day, and comes up against what my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) has stated to be very large increases. It is not very fair that the brunt of this should come against the least offending one, according to my hon. friend's own contention. I have, however, always been used to taking a heavy burden on my shoulders.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Sin no more.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have appointed to permanent positions three clerks, who have been in the service of the department for a number of years at $500 each. Then there is an appointment, in the Census and Statistics branch, one in the third division; but while there is an appointment of one extra in that division, a very large number have been dropped out from the non-permanent statistical work on account of the work which had been apportioned to them in the way of tabulations and such like having been performed. But there is always a certain amount of work which remains over for file clerks after these tabulations have been made.

The one appointment that was made here is to keep up with that extra work. If my hon. friend insists that I should go into a disquisition to-day on general trade matters, of course I shall have to oblige him but he would oblige me if he would leave it over until the time when the principal items of the Trade and Commerce Estimates come up. I shall show to better advantage at that time.

Canada's proportion of expenditure in connection with International Customs Tariffs Bureau, $662.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This is the International Customs Bureau which has been in operation for eight or ten years.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is that the one with its head office in Brussels?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes. Since the war commenced it has not been carrying on its work, but we hope there will be an end to the war, and when that comes this work will be taken up again, I suppose.

Gold and Silver Marking Act, $4,000.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This work is carried on by our inspector, Mr. W. J. Ryan, of Toronto. He has been in charge of the work since the Act came into force. His salary is $2,000 a year. He was formerly an official of the Department of Agriculture for this same work, which has been transferred to my department.

West India cable, $38,932.33.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This is the usual vote in accordance with the agreement that was made two years ago between the West India Islands, the British Government and Canada. About August last the reduction in cable rates which was the result of the arrangement took place. We had supposed that the reduction would come into force about the first of the year, but the arrangement had to be ratified by Act of the British Parliament, and owing to certain delays it was impossible to get that ratification through in time for the reduction to come into force before August. The reduced rates are just about half those which formerly were charged between points in Canada and the West Indies and between points in Great Britain and the West Indies. The West India Islands pay £10,000 towards the subsidy and Great Britain and Canada pay £8,000 each.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Has there been any addition to the length of cable provided for this service?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No.

Supervision of lake and ocean freight rates, $6,000.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This is a vote I took last year for the purpose of employing an officer with expert knowledge, and at the same time practical knowledge, of freight rates, particularly of ocean rates and also rates by lake and river, in connection chiefly with the trade from the Great Lakes to and across the Atlantic. I explained last year why I wanted the vote and it was given me by the House, but it has been impossible for me to find a really good man whose services I could get, and so I have not made the appointment. I do not intend to fill the position until I find the one whom I consider to be the proper man; and it is

sometimes difficult to engage such a man, because they are not usually idle but are taken up by the great transportation companies, and it is difficult to get them at a fair salary. However, communications are now in progress which I think will result in my being able to find a man for the position.

Mr. MURPHY: Does this vote cover salary alone ?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Salary and general expenses.

Mr. PUGSLEY: How is it intended to supervise ocean freight ?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: As the hon. gentleman is aware, the Minister of Trade and Commerce makes a great many of these steamship contracts and provides the lines with subsidies, and has to oversee the service itself. I was successful in getting a very good man to take in charge the supervision of the service in Canada on both coasts and also the inland services that were subsidized. But in these contracts there is a clause which gives the Minister of Trade and Commerce the power to fix rates. So I find myself obliged to make decisions of that kind yet without the technical and expert advice necessary to give what I think a reasonable judgment. What I wished was expert advice upon which I could rely in enforcing these clauses of the contracts. A layman who has to deal with these matters finds it difficult to follow the intricacies of transport rates by land or sea. It is one of the most difficult and complex subjects that I ever attempted to get some knowledge of. The object then, of the vote is to get an advisor or expert who can inform the department and the minister with reference to these matters.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Why not call in an expert each time you require one?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If my hon. friend had charge of the department I do not think he would be able to do that very well. Invariably the expert would be connected with a transportation company; one would need to enlist the services of an expert receiving salary or emolument not from these companies, but from the department.

Mr. MURPHY : Would it not be possible for my hon. friend to avail himself of the services of Mr. Hardwell or some of the other experts of the Board of Railway Commissioners to deal with these particular matters?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think their time is pretty well taken up. I talked that over with the Chairman of the Railway Board; there are many things in respect of which we could co-operate if we had an expert of that kind in connection with ocean services.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister stated that under the mail contract there is power on the part of the department to regulate and control freight rates. I should like to ask my hon. friend if he has taken any steps to regulate ocean freights in respect of subsidized mail steamers during the past six months. It appears that the rate on lumber shipped to the United Kingdom, which a year or two ago was 36 shillings per standard of lumber, to-day is 100 shillings. That, of course, very seriously interferes with the export of lumber to the United Kingdom. The freight charges made by the subsidized steamers naturally have a very considerable effect upon the charges made by steamers which do not belong to the regular lines and which are not subsidized.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think my hon. friend will recognize that the last six months have been a very difficult and stormy period in which to try to regulate ocean freight rates; the causes for this condition my hon. friend very well knows. Our subsidized steamship lines crossing the Atlantic were levied on by the British Government, owing to the necessity for securing transports, and were time after time much reduced in their bests vessels. All the great lines had their best vessels taken away from them, and they had to get such vessels as they could find. This disorganized and confused the service. These somewhat extraordinary causes and others, operating together, brought about a great scarcity of ocean tonnage, and freight rates have gone up in all parts of the world. It has been absolutely impossible for the Government to get, even for its own purposes, for the transport of war supplies, vessels at anything like the proper time or at anything like reasonable rates. If I had had all the experts available, I do not think I would have endeavoured very much during the past five months to regulate ocean freights. As to our main subsidized companies, we have been keeping in constant touch with them and, so far as possible, consulting with them in the matter of rates. So far as our subsidized ser-

vices from Montreal, Halifax and St. John are concerned, whilst the rates have increased, I do not think they will increase abnormally. Certainly they have not done so, compared with increases that have taken place in all parts of the world.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think that freights on lumber have been subjected to an increase of about 150 per cent.

Mr. SINCLAIR: There is another reason for the increase in freight rates upon lumber with which my hon. friend, perhaps, is not familiar. Under the system that prevails in the province of New Brunswick and in some of the Maritime provinces, lumber cargoes taken across to England invariably fall short in measurement. The man who undertakes to carry a cargo of lumber to Great Britain expects to incur a loss; that is, when he reaches the other side he expects to find that he is a number of standards short of the quantity he was supposed to carry, and the lumber people on the other side compel him to bear that loss, which usually amounts to a very considerable sum. The consequence is that the difficulties which are encountered come back on the lumber people. No ship-owner wants to carry lumber across the water, because he knows that he will have to meet the loss occasioned by shortage when he lands on the other side. An attempt was made to rectify this a few years ago. I had the honour of introducing a measure amending the law so as to make the ship-owner responsible only for the number of pieces delivered to him at the point of shipment, thus relieving him from any liability for loss after having reached the other side. It is impossible to
5 p.m. measure lumber when it is placed on board ship. It comes down the St. John or some other river in scows or schooners; the ship is always in a hurry to leave, and to put the scale on each board or plank would be an endless and practically impossible task. The consequence is that the ship-owner has to take the measurements given him by the merchant and is victimized when he reaches the other side with his cargo. When the measure to which I have referred was introduced in the House, the lumbermen, especially of new Brunswick, came here in great numbers and insisted upon the restoration of the old law, which obliged the ship-owner to sign for the number of feet stated by the owners to have been delivered to him. Consequently the law is the same as it was before; ships are scarce and rates high, and the lumber owners are themselves to blame for their present difficulties.

I would point out to the minister, too, that if he employs an expert, that expert should not only be engaged in ascertaining the proper rates, but should be able to report to the minister as to whether or not subsidies should be granted in particular instances. Many of the subsidies have been on the list for twenty or twenty-five years, and some of them should not be granted. I have no hesitation in saying that subsidies are granted by this House that should not be granted and would not be granted by the minister if he knew all the facts. I realize the importance of obtaining information as to freight rates, but the matter to which I now refer is also an important phase of the work of the department.

Department of Customs—salaries, $323,375; contingencies, $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why, with a declining revenue, is it necessary to increase the staff?

Mr. J. D. REID: We are not increasing the staff. Last year we had a staff of 245 and this year we have the same number.

Mr. PUGSLEY: There is an increase of nearly $8,000.

Mr. REID: That is the statutory increase only. We have the same number of employees, but one clerk in the third division, subdivision A, is replaced by one in the third division subdivision B.

Mr. NESBITT: I suppose that it seems rather harsh to dispense with some of these people, but the customs have fallen off enormously. Could not the minister shift some of his staff over to say the Militia Department? There must be many in his department who are practically idle.

Mr. REID: Of course, quite a number have gone to the war. Seventy-six employees of the Customs, inside and outside, have enlisted.

Mr. NESBITT: What is the rule adopted with regard to employees of the Government who have volunteered for foreign service? Do they get their full salary?

Mr. REID: So far as the customs officials are concerned, any who have asked to be allowed to go to the war and who have obtained permission from the department are paid their salaries in full.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The reason I ask is that I have heard lately that quite a number of the employees of the Intercolonial Railway volunteered for service, and they make

the statement in the press that they were assured by the Intercolonial authorities that they would receive their full pay while on serivce. The have latterly been informed that the Minister of Railways has refused to carry out the arrangement that was made with them by the general manager. They feel very much aggrieved at the treatment they are receiving, which they claim is harsh and, apparently from the statement of the Minister of Customs, is entirely different from the treatment meted out to the employees of the branch of the service over which he presides. I think the same rule should apply to all the employees of the Government service. If an employee of the Department of Customs is allowed full pay while on foreign service, I do not see why an employee of another department, such as the Intercolonial, should not be treated in exactly the same way, more especially as they volunteered under an assurance given to them by the general manager that they would receive full pay.

Mr. STANFIELD: Was any assurance given the first contingent?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Personally I do not know the details, but I saw a statement in the press that the Government had gone back on the promise made by the general manager.

Mr. REID: As I understand, in all the departments of the Government, which would include the Intercolonial, all who asked and obtained permission to go to the front would receive their pay in full, and the same applies to the Intercolonial. It was necessary to ask them to apply for permission for the reason that in some cases it was very difficult to allow men to go. There must be some misunderstanding, and I am sure that the Minister of Railways will be able to explain the matter satisfactorily to my hon. friend when the railway estimates come up.

Mr. PARDEE: What is the cause of the enormous increase in the number of clerks engaged in the customs during the past three years? The following questions and answers are supplied in a return brought down on the 10th of March, 1914:

Q. How many employees of the Federal Government of Canada, including all services and all departments, have been dismissed from October 10, 1911, to the present date?—A. 271 dismissals.

Q. How many customs employees have resigned?—A. 194 resignations.

Q. How many have deserted the service?—A. 11.

Q. How many deserters have been punished?—A. None.

Q. How many new employees have been engaged or appointed by the present Government during that period?—A. 1,649.

And it is signed by John McDougald, the Commissioner of Customs. To take on 1,649 new employees there must have been an enormous increase in the work to be done. The most likely explanation is that the Government or the Customs Department have created vacancies in order to find places for 1,649 men who are looking for Government jobs. According to that return, the Minister of Customs has a remarkable knack of making jobs for friends. But the knack is not peculiar to him. The Minister of Railways and the Minister of Public Works, as a matter of fact, even outstripped him in this respect, but by the pleased look on the minister's face I see he has made up his mind to catch up to them. Seriously, it is an extraordinary state of affairs and requires some explanation. The work must have increased enormously to justify engaging all these new employees.

Mr. STANFIELD: Does that return include deaths and superannuations? There must have been quite a number of them in that time?

Mr. PARDEE: It is up to the department to furnish that information.

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Stanfield) has partly explained the increase. Information was not asked for in the return as to the number of deaths. I can get the numbers, however. During the last two or three years there has been a great deal more to do in the customs on account of the increased revenue, but we never appoint a man at any place unless he is recommended by one of the inspectors. We increased the staff in the town of my hon. friend. Does he complain of that?

Mr. PARDEE: That is a very busy point.

Mr. REID: And so are other places. New offices have had to be opened and staffs increased all over the Dominion. We are continually being urged to open new offices along the frontier and throughout the West. With the growth of settlement it is absolutely necessary to have more men, but no more are appointed than are actually required; in fact, there are places now along the frontier where men are urgently required.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: How many did you appoint at the request of members?

Mr. REID: None, unless there were vacancies or some new port was opened.

Mr. KYTE: The minister has just stated that he made no appointments except on the report of the inspector. Two years ago I called to his attention the dismissal of a man in my constituency, and was told by the minister that he had been dismissed because there was nothing for him to do. The salary he enjoyed was $100. Another man was appointed for the same job of doing nothing at $250.

Mr. REID: Not at the same place?

Mr. KYTE: At the same place. The minister at that time stated that he made the appointment upon the recommendation of the inspector, and I asked him to bring down the inspector's recommendation. The minister was unable to find any recommendation on his file, and said that the man must have been appointed on the verbal report of the Commissioner of Customs. The Commissioner of Customs could not possibly have had any intimate knowledge of the circumstances existing in that remote community, but nothing that I could do could elicit any further information from the minister. As a matter of fact the dismissal was made upon the recommendation of the Conservative candidate, and the new appointment was made on the same recommendation, but with this difference: whereas the former occupant of the office got $100 for doing nothing, the present one does nothing and gets $250 for it. The minister cannot get away from that. There must be thousands of such cases in Canada to account for the extraordinary increase in salaries of Customs Department employees, and for the extraordinary number that have been appointed to take the place of those who have been dismissed.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is it customary to punish deserters from the Customs service?

Mr. REID: We never have deserters.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If they did desert, would you punish them?

Mr. REID: We shall wait for a case.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister has stated that a large number of additional employees have been put on by reason of the increased revenue. My hon. friend knows that the revenue has fallen off lately at least 25 per cent. Has there been any corresponding reduction in the number of employees? There must be less work for them to do.

Mr. REID: Those 1,600 positions are not all new appointments; deaths and resignations account for some of them.

Mr. PUGSLEY: How many?

Mr. REID: I will get that information. Although the revenue has fallen off, at some places it has increased very much and we have had to take on new employees. Then the war came. I do not feel like dismissing these men immediately. I hope the war will not last so very long, and I hardly think it is fair to turn out men with families, who have been for some time in their positions. While perhaps they have not as much to do as before the war, I believe we should keep them on until at least we see what the conditions will be later. I believe that when the war is over these men will all have as much to do as they had formerly. I have not dismissed any officials on account of the war, but in cases where the revenue of a port has decreased and where there have been resignations at other ports and vacancies caused by men going to the war, I have sent the men from the ports where business has decreased to take their places. I am continuing that practice.

Mr. COPP: I understand the minister to say that he has paid the salaries to his officials who have gone on active service.

Mr. REID: Instructions were given to pay every such official his salary and if my hon. friend knows of a case in which that has not been done I should be glad if he would let me know.

Mr. COPP: I have no information as to that with regard to the Customs Department. I would like to know why what applies to the Customs Department in that respect does not apply to other departments of the Government. I may state that the employees of the Intercolonial railway who have gone on active service have not been paid their salaries. Why are the men belonging to the Department of Customs who have gone to the front paid, while the employees of the Railway Department are not paid?

Mr. REID: I am not in a position to answer for the Railway Department. The salaries of all Custom officers who have gone on active service have been paid from the time they left the service up to the present.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Then, it is correct to say that in the Department of Customs ever

since the war broke out there has been no effort made to economize or reduce expenses?

Mr. REID: We have tried to economize in every way we could, but in some cases the war as a matter of fact made more work for the officials. We have had to take extra precautions along the frontier. I have done everything to economize other than to dismiss permanent officials. I do not think the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) would urge that I should dismiss wholesale the officials who have been employed for some time. I do not think the hon. gentleman would suggest that under present conditions I should dismiss officials at every port in the country.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would think that before the Finance Minister of this Government came to Parliament to impose a very unusual and very heavy tax burden upon the people of this country, there should have been an honest effort made on the part of the different members of the Government to reduce expenses in all the departments, not only in the matter of public works but in the matter of salaries. Apparently, so far as we know at present, there has been no effort to do that, although the Government has resorted to every expedient to impose additional taxes on the people. With a declining revenue it seems to me there ought not to be and would not be nearly as much work to do in the Department of Customs as there was when there was an abounding revenue and when of course there would be need for more help.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Does the minister intend to make any reduction in the cost of administering his department, outside of the salaries of the officials? The estimates of the department provide for $4,215,000, or an increase of $400,000 over last year, although the revenue this year will be very much reduced.

Mr. REID: The hon. gentleman is incorrect in saying that these estimates exceed the estimates of late year by $400,000. The estimates of last year were for $4,210,000, and this year the estimates amount to $4,215,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There is an increase anyway. I am sure there could be some means found to reduce the expenditure of the Customs Department by $100,000 or even $200,000.

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Mr. REID: The increase of $5,000 in these estimates is an amount to be paid to the Department of Justice to be disbursed by it, and on account of secret preventive service. Owing to the war the secret service has been increased, and we are asking for $5,000 more. Outside of that amount we are simply asking for the same estimates as last year. Of course it does not necessarily follow that we will expend the whole amount of these estimates. If the war keeps on and there are resignations or deaths, we will not replace with new men. I do not think it would be proper for me to decrease these estimates.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Why not?

Mr. REID: I may require them.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the minister tell me later on how many employees there were at the ports of Montreal, Winnipeg, Halifax, Quebec and Toronto when he took office, and how many there were on the 1st of January this year?

Mr. REID: I will get the information later.

Mr. MURPHY: I would point out to my hon. friends on this side of the House that bad as is this return which they are discussing, it is only a partial return. So far as the Customs Department is concerned, the return is about a year old, being dated March, 1914. The Minister of Customs should give us a supplementary return showing the state of affairs approximately to date before he proceeds with his estimates.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the increase in the number of employees in the Inside Service?

Mr. REID: No increase. We had 245 employees last year, and we are asking for the same number this year.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How many were there before my hon. friend took office?

Mr. REID: In the estimates for 1911-12, 198 were asked for. There has been an increase of 47 since then.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What was the revenue when my hon. friend took office and what is the revenue to-day?

Mr. REID: I have not the figures. The revenue last year was about $30,000,000 more than it was in 1911-12.

Mr. McKENZIE: Upon what principle does the minister make promotions in posi-

tion and increases in salary in the outside service ? I understand, of course, that the Civil Service Act furnishes machinery by which the minister makes promotions in the inside service. Does he receive a report from any official in his department, or is there any well-defined rule by which those promotions are made ?

Mr. REID: As has been the practice for many years, the officials of the department prepare a statement for the minister showing the increases they would recommend in the outside service from one end of the Dominion to the other. It has been not only my custom, but that of my predecessor, to follow that practice very closely.

Mr. McKENZIE: An official of the department making a list of that kind would have some regard for the number of years of service of each officer, for the position which he occupied, and for the salary which he was then receiving. I would imagine that the official who would report to the minister would be an officer of the inside service who would be largely governed by the records of the department. There appears to be some peculiar method by which that official deals with officers in the otutside service. In the town from which I come we have many officers of the Department of Customs.

Mr. REID: What town is that ?

Mr. McKENZIE: The town of North Sydney, a well-known town in the Maritime provinces. I am sorry that my hon. friend's geography has been so neglected. I find that by some beautiful instinct this inside official passes over the Grits and promotes the Tories in that town. I am rather suspicious that there must be some other influence than that of the inside official. I rather think that the inside official puts himself in touch with the Tory heelers in the town of North Sydney and finds out who are Grits and who are Tories, and that he promotes the Tory over the head of the poor Grit. Such has been glaringly the case in the town of North Sydney for the last few years. New men have been appointed at salaries four or five hundred dollars more than the old officials are receiving. That is unworthy of this country and unworthy of the department. The minister should inquire more closely into the knowledge which his inside officer has of these things and into the unfairness of this method of dealing with the officers of this Department.

Mr. REID: As regards increases, I find that the statement which the official submits to me is very fair so far as both Liberal and Conservative officers are concerned. We have shown no favour, and I can hardly believe there is an hon. member on the other side who can say that we have not been treating all the officers, irrespective of politics, fairly as far as increases are concerned. I know that increases have been given to Liberals as well as to Conservatives in all the ports, including Sydney. The hon. member knows that. If he does not, I have a list of the officials at Sydney and can show that they have received increases. Of course, there are officers whose salaries are at the maximum for the positions which they hold, and therefore we cannot give them further increases. I have, however, tried to give fair salaries where the salaries were small.

What happens in most of these Customs positions is, I suppose, what happened when my hon. friends opposite were in power; that is, if a vacancy occurs, and a person competent to fill it is appointed, that position is generally the one that he gets. That has been the policy of the Liberal party, and I do not see why it should not be the policy of this party. I am willing to make promotions as far as possible, but if a vacancy occurs in the Customs Department, that is the vacancy the appointee is after, and that is the vacancy he should get if he is qualified to fill the position.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not wish to mention any names of officers. If the minister will familiarize himself with the different names, he will find that some of the old officers are working at small salaries, and that others who have been appointed since the change of Government are getting large salaries and have been receiving their increases from year to year, while the older officers, appointed under the former Administration, are not receiving increases at all.

Mr. REID: I will make inquiries. I have a list before me of the officers at North Sydney. There are four or five men there, and they all got increases last year. If these are not all the names, I shall be able to give them to the hon. member later. We gave increases to T. L. Brennan, David Edwards, E. F. Jackson and Angus Young.

Mr. McKENZIE: Those are the Tory officials.

Mr. REID: Are there any Liberal officials there?

Mr. McKENZIE: Yes; but you will not find their names on the list of those who have received increases.

Mr. KYTE: I would like to ask the Minister in reference to a vacancy in the Customs office at Arichat. The preventive officer there, Captain Lawrence Gerrior, died nearly a year ago, The office has not been filled, and I would like to know if it is the intention of the minister to fill it.

Mr. REID: Not at the present time. I seem to be in a rather awkward position, the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) insisting that I shall reduce the staff and the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) insisting that I shall make appointments.

Mr. KYTE: I am not insisting at all, but I would like to know how long the minister will persist in his determination not to fill the office.

Mr. REID: I will not fill it until the work requires an officer at that port.

Mr. KYTE: And that will probably synchronize with the decision of the Tory patronage committee there as to an appointee. They suffer there from an embarrassment of riches—there are about twenty, I understand, applying for the office, backed by their several groups of the patronage committee. Is it because there is no work to do that the position is not filled?

Mr. REID: I have decided not to fill it at the present time. We can get along at present without the services of an officer there.

Mr. KYTE: And unless there is evidence that the services of an officer there are necessary, the minister will not fill the position?

Mr. REID: No.

Mr. KYTE: You know, we have had instances of men dismissed because there was nothing to do and others appointed at higher salaries to do that nothing.

Mr. MURPHY: The minister said some of the expert officers of his department had gone to the Finance Department?

Mr. REID: One man, Mr. Breadner. Mr. Breadner was brought here from Toronto and took a position in the Customs Department. But the Minister of Finance wanted his services in connection with that department, and so Mr. Breadner was taken over by the Finance Department, and has ceased to be an officer of the Customs.

Mr. MURPHY: Is he the only one?

Mr. REID: So far as I know.

Mr. MURPHY: His salary is not provided for in these estimates?

Mr. REID: No.

Mr. CARROLL: Are the officers on the revenue cutters on the coast under the jurisdiction of the Customs Department?

Mr. REID: The naval cutter Margaret was taken over by the Naval Service Department at the outbreak of the war and the Customs Department has nothing to do with her at the present time.

Mr. CARROLL: I refer particularly to the Alert, a vessel in the service on the coast of Cape Breton.

Mr. REID: That is a small vessel, and she is still with the Customs.

Mr. CARROLL: I would like to bring to the attention of the minister, for his investigation, certain occurrences on the coast of Cape Breton last year during the time the Alert was in that vicinity. In September, I think it was, a large amount of contraband or smuggled goods was landed at Lingan from a vessel called the Mary. For several days before that, the revenue cutter Alert was in Lingan bay or harbour. The arrival of the Mary containing the smuggled goods synchronized with the departure of the Alert. Now, I am not making any charge, but simply stating a fact when I say that the supposition in that part of the country is that the Alert was called off duty in Lingan bay after having knowledge of the fact that the Mary had left St. Pierre with a load of smuggled liquor. The public in the vicinity of Lingan and New Waterford believe that she was called off by certain political heelers in Cape Breton for the purpose of enabling their friends to land these smuggled goods. Many of the smugglers, it is true, have been convicted and have paid heavy fines. I say I am making no charge, and I am sure no charge has been made against Mr. Angus Young, who is not an officer of the Alert, but an officer of the Customs at North Sydney who was looking after the case in Sydney when these parties were tried. I would like the minister and his department to investigate and investi-

gate thoroughly, the rumours that have been going around in that vicinity as to the negligence and incapacity of the captain, and particularly the evidence of his negligence and incapacity in allowing these contraband goods to be landed at Lingan.

Mr. REID: This is the first intimation I have had of this matter. I have just made inquiry of the commissioner, and he tells me that the parties were prosecuted, and that this vessel, the Mary, which is not worth very much, is under seizure. Until the officers reach a final decision in a case of seizure, the matter does not usually come before the minister. I shall certainly have the matter brought before the commissioner for investigation, and if anything has happened such as the hon. gentleman says, of course we cannot allow that. I think there must be some misunderstanding. The commissioner and the officials of the department have dealt with the matter. However, before we get through with my estimates, and at some future sitting of the committee, I will be in a position to discuss the matter much better than I can now:

Mr. CARROLL: Did the minister say he would investigate it?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: There were rather extraordinary things in connection with the landing of liquors at Lingan. To begin with, let me tell the minister, that the chief leader of the Tory party at that place has been found guilty of being the leader of this gang of smugglers. It so happens that this landing was made on a beautiful Sunday morning. And the extraordinary thing is that it happened that these goods were landed right at the door of the customs officer at that place. But early on Sunday morning, before seven o'clock, this customs officer was called away, forsooth, by the leading Tory heeler of that town, for a meeting at Glace Bay.

Mr. REID: Can the hon. gentleman tell me the name of the officer?

Mr. McKENZIE: His name is John Burke. I am not saying he went away, but that he was called away by the chief Tory boss in that vicinity. The absence of the officer and of the Alert seems to synchronize strangely with the landing of the goods. I am surprised that the hon. minister has heard nothing of this matter. It took place on Sunday morning, at a time when the Alert had glided away and the customs officer had been carefully stowed away in Glace Bay. The chief performer of the Tory party has since been found guilty of being at the head of the gang.

Mr. REID: I shall be better able to discuss the matter when the item comes up for consideration.

At six o'clock, the House resumed and then took recess.

The House resumed at 8 o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 29, respecting the Van Buren Bridge Company.—Mr. Michaud.

Bill No. 31, respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Taylor.

Bill No. 32, to incorporate the Brulé, Grande Prairie and Peace River Railway Company.—Mr. R. B. Bennett.

Bill No. 33, to confirm certain agreements made between the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company, the Georgian Bay and Seaboard Railway Company and the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Blain.

Bill No. 34, respecting the Manitoba and North Western Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Cash.

Bill No. 35, respecting the Niagara-Welland Power Company.—Mr. Blain.

Bill No. 36, to incorporate Northern Pacific and British Columbia Railway Company.—Mr. Taylor.

Bill No. 37, respecting Pacific, Peace River and Athabasca Railway Company.—Mr. R. B. Bennett.

Bill No. 38, respecting the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company.—Mr. Taylor.

SUPPLY.

The House resumed in Committee of Supply, Mr. Sevigny in the Chair.

Customs—salaries and contingent expenses of the several ports in the Dominion, including pay for overtime of officers, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $3,590,000.

Mr. REID: We placed in the Estimates the same amount as for 1914-15, as we had the same number of employees.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What proportion of that is for salaries and what for contingent expenses?

Mr. J. D. REID: I have a list here of the amounts spent at every port in Canada.

Mr. MACLEAN: Will the vote be exhausted at the end of this year?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN: Approximately how much will be spent on contingencies?

Mr. REID: I have not separate figures showing that.

Mr. MACLEAN: The boat service would not come within that item?

Mr. REID: No. There is an item below for boats and cruisers.

Mr. MACLEAN: Can you give us some idea of what will come under this item besides salaries?

Mr. REID: Rent, overtime of officers, expenses in connection with stationery, and so on.

Mr. MACLEAN: Is there no way in which the minister could reduce this item by a million dollars or so? This item of $3,590,000 for salaries and contingent expenses is more than the total cost of Customs administration in 1913, in which year the total cost was $3,150,000.

Mr. REID: The increase in salaries brings the cost of administration up each year.

Mr. MACLEAN: But the total cost in 1912-13 was 3,150,000; for 1915-16 you are asking for an amount greater than that, which seems pretty hard to understand.

Mr. REID: The revenue was probably $25,000,000 or $30,000,000 more in 1914-15 than in 1911-12. Although the amount expended for the collection of the revenue was more, the percentage of the cost of collection was less. I have a statement showing the percentages for a number of years. In 1912-13 the cost was $274,000, and it was higher in 1913-14.

Mr. MACLEAN: Your revenue in 1912-13 was $135,000,000. It was less than that last year.

Mr. REID: The revenue in 1912-13 was $115,630,000, and in 1911-12 $87,596,426.40. The increase in the number of officers and in salaries of course makes our expenditures greater. Now that the war is on there is a great deal more work to do, although the revenue is less. For instance, we could not possibly reduce the staff at Halifax or Quebec, or Montreal, or Toronto, where many of the extra officers are employed. I do not think any member of this House would ask us to dismiss these men in the winter, especially as their services will probably be required when navigation opens.

Mr. MACLEAN: You should never have taken them on.

Mr. REID: I never took a man on unless he was recommended by the inspector or by the Commissioner or one of the officials of the Department. I was asked a question about Montreal. I never took on a man there unless he was recommended by the collector, Mr. White, or the surveyor, Mr. McLaughlin. I have always tried to keep the staff down.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Two good officers.

Mr. REID: No better in Canada. Before dinner I was asked for a statement showing the total number of officers and the total salary in force on October 10, 1911, and on December 31, 1914, and the duty collected in those years. The figures are as follows:

	October 10, 1911.		
	Officers.	Salary.	Duty.
Halifax.. ..	78	$ 63,880	$ 1,772,806 64
Quebec	72	72,940	1,352,345 94
Montreal. ..	306	261,605	18,233,550 77
Toronto.. ..	177	153,122	13,698,275 03
Vancouver ..	99	74,434	5,499,593 93

	December 31, 1914.		
	Officers.	Salary.	Duty.
Halifax.. ..	114	$111,900	$ 2,221,696 86
Quebec	83	82,440	1,853,595 20
Montreal. ..	386	400,340	24,460,813 30
Toronto.. ..	229	238,180	18,866,881 27
Vancouver ..	157	172,850	7,416,514 49

Mr. LEMIEUX: There has been quite a growth in Halifax.

Mr. REID: That is true, but I do not think the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) would say we have too many officials there.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not know about that; I think I could say that. Will the minister tell us how much more it would cost to collect a revenue of one and a half million dollars than it would to collect a revenue of one and a quarter million dollars?

Mr. REID: I have not got it down as fine as that. The total collections throughout the Dominion were taken and the ratio was 2.74 which was one of the lowest in the history of the department.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the minister implement that statement as soon as possible with the Winnipeg figures?

Mr. REID: I shall. The Winnipeg figures were overlooked. I will hand them to the hon. gentleman to-morrow.

Mr. LAW: I understood the minister to say that within the last two years the salaries of Customs officials all over the Dominion have been increased. Has there been any increase of salary granted to Custom officials in the port of Yarmouth within the last few years?

Mr. REID: I cannot answer that question now; I have not got it on the list.

Mr. LAW: I always thought Yarmouth was something of a place, but if the minister has not got it on his list he cannot think much about it.

Mr. REID: It is a good port all right.

Mr. CARROLL: Have there been any recommendations from Cape Breton county for the appointment of customs officers at New Waterford?

Mr. REID: There was a petition some time ago but no action was taken.

Mr. McKENZIE: Has the minister appointed any new customs officers in North Cape Breton, and if so, where?

Mr. REID: I do not remember of any at the present time. If the hon. gentleman will give me some more information on the point I may be able to answer him.

Mr. McKENZIE: The question is fairly explicit. Since last winter has the minister opened any new customs offices in the county of Victoria or North Cape Breton, and if so where? For example, has he opened a new customs office in Iona in Victoria county; what has been the revenue from this office since it was opened, and how far is it from the nearest previously existing customs office?

Mr. REID: There has been an office opened at Iona, but what the revenue has been I cannot say; I shall send a statement of it to the hon. member.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is it not a fact that this new office is within a mile of another office. It is a very nice country settlement, of course, but usually a country settlement like that is served by one customs house. I understand that about half a mile away from this new customs house is another. What was the urgent necessity for putting a new customs house there when there was one close by?

Mr. REID: Is it not a fact that the old customs house is on the other side of the lake? I am told there is quite a revenue at that office and it was opened for the convenience of the people.

Mr. McKENZIE: That remark of the minister would apply to two customs houses at every bridge in the country because one would be at one side of the river and the other would be at the other. This is a mere narrow arm of the sea where there is a very excellent bridge travelled all the time, and the old office was at one end of the bridge and I understand political necessity made it necessary to open another office at the other end of the bridge.

Mr. REID: It may possibly be true that the old customs house was within half a mile or a mile of the new one, but it is of great convenience to the steamers plying in that locality. Sometimes we have to put these offices close together for the convenience of steamers which run on lakes or rivers so that we may have a preventive officer to clear them in and out, or they could not call at a particular place. As I understood it, if we did not have an officer at this point it would be very inconvenient. At all events, representations were made to that effect and we opened an office for the convenience of the public and I suppose it is benefiting them.

Mr. McKENZIE: This bridge to which the minister refers is a drawbridge and the draw is at the end of the bridge where the old customs office is. For any vessel that wants to enter there, the Government wharf is at the draw end of the bridge. There the vessels had every convenience necessary to depart or enter, as they might deem advisable. On the end where the minister has put his new custom house, there is no draw at all and no vessels go there in the winter time. No vessels will ever go there, so that the building is absolutely away from the market. I do not grudge the people of Iona the convenience of a customs house if it is to be of any use; but I claim that it was put in that position for a political necessity, to meet a political emergency. Let the minister not try to defend it on any commercial principle whatever.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: I understand from the minister's remarks that throughout the

country there have been general increases in the salaries of the customs officials. On what basis have these increases been made? Have they been made on the basis of length of service? For instance, in any particular customs office there are the collector, the assistant collector and a number of clerks and appraisers. Do the collector and the assistant collector get stated increases by way of an added percentage each year, and does the same rule apply to the clerks and appraisers and under clerks in each office?

Mr. REID: I explained this matter just before recess. The hon. member will understand that in the inside service the statute provides for certain increases which go into effect at the end of each year. So far as the outside service is concerned, it has been the general rule for the Minister of Customs to ask for a certain amount to be distributed amongst the officers throughout the whole Dominion. Whatever that amount may be, the officials of the department divide it up as best they can amongst those whom they think are deserving of it. The inspector reports to the commissioner the efficiency of each officer, and the report is generally accepted by the minister. It has been not only my custom but that of my predecessor to follow that report closely. Of course, there are many cases where men are at their maximum for the positions which they hold, and they sometimes complain because they are not receiving increases when others are. For instance, if the hon. member will look over the list of salaries, he will find that landing waiters in Ontario and Quebec receive between $800 and $900 per annum; but that many of them have from $200 to $350 for overtime, so that they make very good salaries. These salaries are considered about the maximum in the eastern provinces. In the western provinces, the landing waiters are paid $100 or $150 more. When the landing waiters reach that salary, the increases do not come as fast as they do in the case of other officers. Therefore, when a landing waiter is receiving a salary of $900, he generally has it supplemented by $200 or $300 for overtime. The clerks are supposed to hold higher positions and they receive higher salaries than the landing waiters, but they do not receive overtime. I would like to see the outside service on the same basis as the inside so that no fault could be found. My officials and I have tried to divide up the salaries in such a way that very little fault can be found in any way and especially so far as politics is concerned.

Mr. NESBITT: On what basis does the minister allow the extra amount for overtime? A man might be able to do his work without overtime.

Mr. REID: The men are paid at the rate of thirty cents an hour for all their time over ten hours. They must get a certificate from the collector or the surveyor that the work has actually been performed. The surveyor in a large port like Montreal has charge of the outside work. In smaller ports, where there are only half a dozen officers, they may be working at a railway station or at a steamboat landing, and it is easy to have a check on work of that nature. An officer might have to be on duty all the time. In my own town, a ferry boat runs until twelve o'clock at night and an officer must be on duty until that time. The men divide up that time: One man will be on duty for a couple of hours and another for a couple of hours each night. At a railway station they have to attend certain trains, such as express trains, coming in, and it is very easy for the collector to keep a check on the men's time. I do not think there would be much loss.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What is the estimate of the cost of collection of customs for the province of New Brunswick for the year 1914-15?

Mr. REID: I have only the general figures. I have not Nova Scotia separately.

Mr. MACLEAN: Before preparing his Estimates for 1915-16, did the minister go into the matter with his officers and make any effort to reduce them by say two million dollars or by one dollar?

Mr. REID: My officials tell me that they have as much work with the war now on as they had prior to the war; in fact, a great deal more work has been thrown on the Customs Department on account of the war. The men are all busy and they will use the whole vote of last year. With that information before me, I do not see how I would be justified in asking for a smaller vote than that of last year.

Mr. MACLEAN: Then the minister has not endeavoured to reduce the Estimates?

Mr. REID: Yes, I took the matter up with the officials of my department and that is the information they gave me, and I must rely upon the officials who understand the situation thoroughly.

Mr. NESBITT: The minister has said that on account of the war the work has been so heavy. I am curious to know how the war has increased the work of the customs officers seeing that the revenues have declined.

Mr. REID: The war has made it necessary for us to have many more officers watching vessels coming in and going out. We have to watch the imports and exports much more closely because of the prohibitions made necessary by the war. Take it, for instance, at Bridgeburg, where many cars cross—we have to have officials there to watch very closely. The Commissioner of Customs tells me that the officials are busier than they have ever been though the revenue has decreased.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: How many officers have been appointed in the Customs Department since the day when war was declared, the 4th of August?

Mr. REID: As I said before dinner, we designed to make no new appointments at all. A number of our officers went to the war and their places have not been filled, the others being used as relieving officers until these men return. When vacancies occur, we do not fill them unless it is absolutely necessary. Therefore, the new appointments are practically nil.

Mr. STANFIELD: Before dinner I asked about a return showing how many deaths and superannuations had taken place since 1911. Can the minister give me that information now?

Mr. REID: Since that return we have had 39 deaths, 16 superannuations, 43 dismissals and 45 resignations.

Mr. STANFIELD: But can the minister give me the figures since 1911?

Mr. REID: I haven't it, but will get it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Were these voluntary resignations?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. LAW: Will the minister please state what are the duties of these special officers?

Mr. REID: These officers are for special preventive service. When we receive complaints of smuggling or learn that smuggling is suspected, these officers are detailed to look up the case. Also they are supposed to travel around and learn if smuggling is going on. Such officers are needed throughout the Dominion. We have two or three in Nova Scotia, two in New Brunswick, two or more in Quebec, and so with the other provinces.

Mr. LAW: In some cases, I think the duty of these officers consists mainly in collecting their pay at the end of the month.

Mr. CARROLL: Last session I called attention to the lack of a customs officer at New Waterford. Has the hon. gentleman changed his mind since then, and does he intend to appoint a collector of customs there?

Mr. REID: We have not decided. At present I am trying to keep down the expense as much as possible, and to avoid the appointment of more officers while the war is on.

Mr. CARROLL: I am sorry the hon. gentleman has not succeeded in keeping down the expense. We do not see much difference in the expenditure except that the estimate of expenditure for next year shows an increase. I do not think there is another town of the size of New Waterford in the whole Dominion of Canada without a customs officer. The minister may not know it, but this is a town of about 8,000 people. The custom house is at a point three miles away, where there are not more than thirty families. The minister promised to give this consideration last year, but as no consideration seems to have been given, I call it to his attention again. If he feels that he cannot make a new appointment in New Waterford, I would suggest to him that he move the custom house from where it is now into New Waterford, and thus serve the bulk of the people in that locality.

Mr. REID: I shall be glad to look into the matter again. But the hon. gentleman admits that we have a custom house within three miles of New Waterford. There are many places quite as large, yet with no custom house nearer than three miles.

Mr. CARROLL: But I suggest that the minister put the custom house where it will serve the people, and not compel the seven or eight thousand of New Waterford to go to a custom house located where there is a population of about one hundred.

Mr. REID: I did not understand the matter in that way before. I shall be glad to look into it and discuss it with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I see that the customs revenue of Arichat in 1914 was $438.31, while the expense of collection was

$2,588.27. In Shelburne the customs duties were $1,641.51, and the expenses of collection, $1,966.39. There should be some explanation of the great cost of collecting so small an amount of revenue.

Mr. REID: Arichat is a chief port with several outports under it—D'Escousse, Fourchu, Irish Cove, L'Ardoise, Petit de Grat, Lennox Ferry, River Bourgeoise, St. Peter's and West Arichat. The officers at these points all act as preventive officers. The hon. gentleman will see the need of having these officers when I tell him that 1,569 coasting vessels and 92 sea-going vessels arrived, and 1,556 coasting vessels and 99 sea-going vessels departed. It is necessary, therefore, to have these officers to look after the clearing of vessels at these several ports.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It was pointed out this afternoon by the member for Richmond that at the port of Red Islands a man in the customs service was dismissed because there was nothing for him to do, and a little later another person was appointed to the same office at a salary of $250.

Mr. REID: But Irish Cove is one place and Red Islands another.

Mr. KYTE: I have endeavoured to teach my hon. friend a little geography, but so far my efforts have been entirely unsuccessful. These places are in the same parish. Irish Cove is a couple of miles from Red Islands, but no business is done at Irish Cove that could not be properly attended to by the collector at Red Islands. Irish Cove is in the same district as Red Islands, but in another part of it.

Mr. REID: I do not think there is any dispute between the hon. member and myself in that respect. These places may be in the same parish, but Irish Cove is just as different from Red Islands as Ottawa is from a place in Carleton county ten miles distant.

Mr. KYTE: So is Sparks street different from Wellington street, but the hon. minister would not propose appointing collectors of customs on each of these streets. These places are in the same district; the same people are served in either case.

Mr. REID: I am sorry I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: In many parts of the Maritime Provinces there seem to be a number of customs offices in the same district, within two or three miles of each other. In western Canada it is quite unusual to see customs offices or ports of entry outside the large centres. I have intended to bring to the minister's attention the question of establishing another port of entry on the international boundary midway between Regina and Moosejaw. There are two ports of entry in that district, one called Big Muddy and the other Wood Mountain, where there has been a customs office and a station of the North West Mounted Police for many years. The distance between these ports is seventy or eighty miles, and in that district there are a large number of settlers. I do not know whether the minister or any one in his department has had any correspondence in regard to the matter, but I have had correspondence, both before I left Regina and since I came to the city of Ottawa, with regard to the question of establishing a port of entry at a little place called Overland.

Mr. REID: Does any railway pass through that place?

Mr. MARTIN: No railway passes through Overland, but the Maryfield extension of the Canadian Northern, running west from a place called Goodwater, south of Weyburn, runs north of this particular settlement. The people who live in that settlement are about thirty miles from Wood Mountain, the port of entry to the west, and about the same distance from Big Muddy, the port of entry to the east. There are no towns nearer these people than those on the Soo line, which is forty or fifty miles from where they reside. There is no town of any consequence there at all, and any proposed port of entry would be in the same class as that established at Wood Mountain many years ago and that which in recent years has been established at Big Muddy. It would be a matter of great convenience to the people of this district if they had a port of entry nearer their places of residence than those which they have at the present time.

Mr. REID: I do not know whether any application for a port of entry at Overland has been received, but I shall be glad to look the matter up. I agree with the hon. member that along the international boundary there should be more customs offices; I think it is necessary not only for the convenience of the public, but in the interests of the revenue as well. I will discuss the matter with my officers. I may point out that it

9 p.m.

is necessary to have at these ports of entry an official who can act in the capacity of veterinary surgeon and quarantine officer. I am advised that the Minister of Agriculture has found great difficulty in getting veterinary surgeons to act as quarantine officers at those places. I have been willing to open offices along the frontier if persons can be obtained to act in that capacity, and I shall be glad to do so now. The difficulty is that it is hard to get a man to take up his residence along the frontier in districts where there are practically no settlements. Only the other day I took up with the Minister of Agriculture the matter of locating at some place along the international boundary a veterinary surgeon who was mentioned as wanting a position. The hon. member can understand how awkward it would be if a settler should come across with his cattle and horses and find he could not get them through on account of their being no quarantine officer to inspect them. It is, perhaps, on account of that difficulty that I have not been able to open as many offices along the boundary line as I would like to have opened.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Shortly after the present Government came into power a man named Cavanagh of the customs service at New Glasgow, Pictou county, N.S., was removed from office. Will the minister tell me what salary he was getting, and the grounds for his removal?

Mr. REID: My deputy does not remember the circumstances in connection with the matter; I will get the information for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MACLEAN: Can the minister inform me whether there are two men named respectively Gillies and Cameron in the customs service at New Glasgow, and what are their salaries?

Mr. REID: Gillies, $1,000; D. A. Cameron, resigned.

Mr. MACLEAN: Was anybody appointed in his place?

Mr. REID: A man named Bailey, I think, was appointed in his place.

Mr. MACLEAN: How much does he get?

Mr. REID: $900, the same salary as that received by Mr. Cameron.

Mr. MACLEAN: Does the list state how much Mr. Cavanagh received?

Mr. REID: He was merely an acting officer. I have not the information, but I shall be glad to get the papers and send them to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. McKENZIE: Has the department any building rented at the port of North Sydney besides the regular customs house; if so, from whom is the building rented, and at what rental?

Mr. REID: We rent a warehouse at North Sydney. I cannot say at the moment what the rent is.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am informed that there is a middleman in this case. The department required additional room and instead of the Government renting direct from the owner of the building two good Tories rented the building and sublet to the Government so that the Government are paying twice as much for the building as if they rented it direct. The minister will find that the people from whom he is renting are not the owners, they are not in business and have nothing to do with the building. The Government is paying them a subsidy because they are Tories and because they are middlemen in the handling of this little graft.

Mr. REID: I shall be very glad to look into this matter and shall be very much surprised to find if it is the case. If I find any middleman I will—

Mr. McKENZIE: I shall be equally surprised if you find that it is the case.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What will the minister do if he finds the facts as stated?

Mr. REID: I shall wait until I see if these are the facts.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: I have had some correspondence with the Department of Customs extending over two years on the question of the importation of certain horses. The department wrote me some time ago that, as far as they are concerned, the question was closed. At the same time I do not think it will do any harm to state briefly the facts. A man named Underwood, a farmer not very far from where I live, imported nineteen horses from some portion of the United States. He purchased the horses and brought them into the country by means of certain certificates and seven of these certificates were discovered on investigation by the Customs Department to have been false certificates. The reason for holding an investigation was that some of the horses were quarantined by a Govern-

ment veterinary in the West for dourine which caused an investigation into where they came from and the discovery of the false certificates. I am not concerned with the vendor of the horses in the United States. Underwood brought the horses into Canada, he paid for them to the vendor in the United States and filed declarations with the department that, as far as he was concerned, he had acted in good faith. I believe that the purchaser of these horses did act in absolute good faith and why he should have been punished by the imposition of double duty on him I have never been able to make out. I have taken that up with the department for two years but ceased doing so when I was informed that the matter had been finally closed. I cannot help representing to the minister that this man suffered an injury which he did not deserve. He acted in good faith and should not have been charged $2,200 by way of double duty owing to the false certificates under which the horses were brought into Canada, he having no part in the fraud.

Mr. REID: The horses were fraudulently imported into this country.

Mr. MARTIN: Not by this man.

Mr. REID: The hon. member agrees that they came in fraudulently.

Mr. MARTIN: I do not so far as he was concerned.

Mr. REID: The man referred to claims that he had nothing to do with the fraud, but at the same time we follow the goods. We followed the horses in this case and held them as responsible for this duty. In cases of this kind these matters are always dealt with by the regular seizing officers of the staff, and in this case double duty was imposed. That is one of the smallest fines that is imposed on fraudulent importations, and we could not possibly let men off in such cases, because if we accepted such pleas as this man's, then in every case of fraudulent importation a similar claim would be made and we feel that in business of this kind if we find the importer is not really the guilty man we impose only double duty. In other cases we would take the whole goods, simply take the horses and dispose of them and fine him the penalty of the total value. In this case while he may think it is a hardship, I feel that he got off as reasonably as many others have in similar positions.

[Mr. W. M. Martin.]

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What does the minister estimate his customs and excise revenue will be at the end of March next?

Mr. REID: I will let the hon. member have that to-morrow morning.

Customs—to provide for expenses of maintenance of revenue cruisers and for preventive service, $100,000.

Mr. REID: That will only be used in case we get our other cruiser back again from the Naval Service. This is a new cruiser, the Margaret. Of course, this vote may be used if we have to get another boat to take the place of the Margaret during the continuance of the war.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What steamer does the minister use in the Halifax customs service?

Mr. REID: A little gasoline launch takes the officer out to the steamer.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is the boat satisfactory?

Mr. REID: We have had no complaints about it.

Mr. MACLEAN: I understand that no provision was made for the engineer to get down to the engine room.

Mr. McKENZIE: Does this cover the Alert? I have a protest to register against the voting of money for the Alert and her crew. The minister will remember that about this time last year we had a local election in the county of Victoria, in the province of Nova Scotia, and that I charged the minister with sending this Alert down the coast with political agents and agencies with them, such as booze and the other machinery that was brought to bear in the county of Victoria. The minister's friend the Tory candidate was elected on that occasion, but we have succeeded in unseating him since. That is what the minister does with the money we vote for him, and I am warning the people of Canada, particularly those in public life, that here we are voting money to be used by Tory candidates for Tory purposes throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion with the consent of the minister. The minister's chief agent on that boat was blacklisted by a judge of the Supreme Court, after having been found guilty of all the crimes in the calendar in connection with that trip. We are now voting money to pay for that trip, and I am registering my protest and saying that we should not spend money in that way. The minister should at least find out that the proper kind of booze is kept, for

one of the strong speakers for the Tory party on that occasion complained that the booze in some out-of-the-way place where he was landed was rotten. That is the message which he sent over the public wires, which were put at his disposal. Not only did the Government put the Alert at the disposal of this man, but the telegraph line as well. Everything that the Government had in the county of Victoria in the shape of Government appliances was put at the disposal of the head man of the Conservative party in Nova Scotia, who was blacklisted by Judge Russell of the Supreme Court along with twenty-three others of my hon. friend's friends.

Mr. REID: I think the hon. member is hardly fair. He will remember that I never heard about this trip until the matter came up in Parliament, and that I then immediately suspended the officer and the use of the boat. I had nothing to do with it, and I think the hon. member is unfair when he says that I sent this boat down. An investigation was held at the time, but there was no evidence to show that there was any booze on the boat on that trip. The hon. member also says the judge blacklisted twenty three friends of mine. Whether they are friends of mine or not I cannot say, but certainly they were not customs officers. I do not think any Government official was blacklisted.

Mr. McKENZIE: Let me tell my hon. friend that the customs officer appointed at Iona, fresh from his hands, was blacklisted.

Mr. REID: I am glad to get the information; I never heard of it before. Was he a customs officer at that time?

Mr. McKENZIE: Yes, with his honours fresh upon him.

Mr. REID: I will make inquiries about that.

Customs—Amounts to be paid to Department of Justice to be disbursed by and accounted for to it, for secret preventive service, $10,000.

Mr. NESBITT: That is an increase?

Mr. REID: Yes, on account of the war.

Mr. PARDEE: What is the money spent on?

Mr. REID: We have to give information to the United States and to other countries in regard to export stuff.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If this item passes the minister will allow us to discuss any customs matter on a subsequent item?

Mr. REID: Certainly.

Department of the Interior—salaries, $1,143,567.50.

Mr. ROCHE: That is just the same as last year, except for the statutory salary increases.

Dominions lands and parks—salaries of the outside service, $465,000.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: According to a return brought down, up to March 10, 1914, there was a very large increase shown in the number of employees in the Interior Department, both in the inside and the outside service. I have no doubt that since that date, owing to peculiar conditions existing in certain parts of the West, there has been a further increase, and as to a portion of that increase I have no criticism to offer. Up to March 10, 1914, the return showed 301 dismissals in the Department of the Interior and 1,649 new appointments. In certain parts of western Canada with which I am familiar, I believe that a large number of these new appointments were absolutely useless to the public service. I can give an instance of four homestead inspectors being employed by the present Government in the Dominion lands office in my own city, where there is not work for one. The late Government for twelve or thirteen years only employed two homestead inspectors there and now I believe there are four, whereas any one who knows the district knows that the homesteads are practically exhausted in that vicinity and one homestead inspector could easily do the work. I am sure the present Minister of the Interior does not want to waste the public money by keeping an unnecessary number of homestead inspectors sitting around doing nothing. A couple of years ago a man named Sipes was employed as homestead inspector in the country tributary to Regina, and according to an answer given me by the Minister of the Interior some two years ago, for the four or five months that he was so employed he did not make a single homestead inspection. I know that the present Minister of the Interior has too much respect for his own reputation to waste the public money in this way. The homestead office in Regina is just an instance of what is going on in other parts of Western Canada. The appointment of 1,649 new officials in the last three years is due to the fact that the present Government has largely increased the number of officials operating in the Department of the Interior in western Canada. Homestead work is decreasing, and immigration during the past eighteen months, even before the war,

as we all know, amounted to almost nothing, so that this enormous number of officials should not be needed. I do not wish to impute any motives to the present Minister of the Interior, but surely there must be some reason for keeping men in these various places in western Canada, doing practically nothing.

Mr. ROCHE: In addition to what the Solicitor-General explained before recess, as to appointments to fill vacancies by resignations and deaths, etc., there is something further to be said. I understand that Professor Shortt used an expression in an address in the People's Forum on Sunday night, which was calculated to leave an entirely erroneous impression on the public mind. In my own department the appointments probably numbered twice the number of dismissals, but that included not only the appointees referred to by the Solicitor-General, but a very large number of temporary employees. For example, the office of the Surveyor-General employs a large number of men for six months in the year when their services are dispensed with, and next year there will be forty or fifty new men engaged who, while only temporary employees, are reckoned as new appointees by the Government. The Interior Department has nearly 900 employees, and up to last year we have had as many as 140 temporary employees engaged for six months in the year, as the Civil Service Act will not allow us to retain the services of these temporary employees for a longer period. Professor Shortt not having explained this situation, his remarks have left an erroneous impression on the public mind. In reference to the homestead inspectors, I understand that some of these gentlemen have been transferred to other districts. An additional reason why there have been more homestead inspectors appointed is that we have been trying to afford greater convenience to the farmers of the country who enter for their lands, and who ordinarily would have to pay a good deal of money and spend a good deal of their time travelling long distances to the nearest subagency, for their patent, by instructing many of our homestead inspectors to visit those farmers on their farms. This is a great convenience to the farming community, and I have many requests from the settlers that it should be continued.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: That was done before.

[Mr. W. M. Martin.]

Mr. ROCHE: Not nearly to the same extent as it has been done for the last eighteen months. It may be that there are more employees now in some of these offices than the work of the offices would warrant, but the hon. gentleman knows that in these hard times it is not very nice to dismiss employees, unless you have ground for it, and we do not wish to impose any undue hardships upon these men. No person has ever complained to me before with regard to the land office at Regina. I understand there are four officials in that office at present. It is true that there are not many homesteads remaining in that district, but at the same time there is considerable work in the office. The present land agent there has gone to the front and somebody had to take his place. At all events, I can assure my hon. friend from Regina that I certainly have not appointed as many officials as I have had demands for appointments.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What does the minister estimate that the revenue for Dominion lands will be for this year?

Mr. ROCHE: It will not be as much as last year.

Mr. MACLEAN: Let me put a few facts before the minister in regard to the cost of administering this branch of his department. In 1910-11 there was a revenue of $3,108,000 from Dominion lands, and the cost of administration was $1,804,000. In 1913-14 the cost of administration had risen to $3,286,000, or nearly $1,500,000 of an increase in three or four years. The minister estimated the administration cost for 1915-16 as over $4,000,000, with a revenue less than in 1914-15. How does the minister explain this? We are receiving less money from Dominion lands than we did three or four years ago and the cost of the administration has increased between $2,000,000 and $3,000,000.

Mr. ROCHE: I understand that heretofore, in the years which the hon. gentleman first quoted, there was one special item of Dominion lands alone. Now we have several branches included under the one vote.

Mr. MACLEAN: I do not think that was true in 1910-11.

Mr. ROCHE: For instance, the Parks branch.

Mr. MACLEAN: That was in 1910-11.

Mr. ROCHE: No, it was under the item of miscellaneous.

Mr. MACLEAN: How much does that amount to ?

Mr. ROCHE: The estimate for the Parks branch for this year is considerably below what it was last year—$586,000.

Mr. MACLEAN: Would the minister give me the following information to-morrow or the next day by letter or otherwise, namely, the estimated revenue and expenditures for 1914-15 for Dominion lands, immigration and Indian Affairs ?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes.

Mr. BOULAY: I wish to refer to a matter which I drew to the attention of the minister last year, concerning the immigration inspectors working on the trains in the province of Quebec. I then informed the minister that of eighteen men appointed as immigration officers eleven could not speak a word of French, and I said it was not fair to French-Canadians passing the boundary line on their way back from the United States to be questioned in a language which most of them could not understand. The minister promised me then that he would look into the matter. I would like to know if anything has been done to improve that condition, because some of those inspectors go so far as to be very impolite to those who cannot understand them in English. I myself was a victim on one occasion. This situation was not created by the Conservative party, but I would like to know from the minister if anything has been done to give protection in some way to our fellow citizens when they cross the border on their way back from the United States.

Mr. ROCHE: That matter more properly comes in under the Immigration vote, and I will have what information my hon. friend desires when that vote comes up. I have not had any complaints that I am aware of in regard to having too many officials who do not understand the French language; but I must admit that I have had quite a few complaints from other quarters in regard to officials in the province of Quebec, notably at the port of Quebec, because they did not understand the English language sufficiently, and it was stated that this condition had prevailed for a good many years. It may be true there are some border inspectors, notably in the Eastern Townships, who are not very conversant with the French language, and I will make inquiries into the matter. I am, however, given to understand that there is a fair proportion who do understand it.

Mr. DOUGLAS: What is the policy of the department in regard to members of the Outside Service who enlist? Are there salaries kept on in full?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes, by Order in Council passed last fall.

Dominion lands and parks contingencies, advertising, etc., $300,000.

Mr. NESBITT: Anything can come under contingencies. In a manufacturing business an employer would sack a clerk who put in such an item. What does it mean?

Mr. ROCHE: That has been the custom from time immemorial.

Mr. NESBITT: The minister ought to change such a bad practice.

Mr. ROCHE: This refers to the expenses of officials, such as homestead inspectors, including the purchase of their repairing outfits, harness, etc. It also includes the expenses of timber inspectors and of inspectors of ranches; 26 Dominion lands and Crown timber agencies; offices of the inspectors of the Dominion lands and Crown timber agencies; payment of telegrams, telephones, commission, postage, subagents, clerical assistance of a temporary nature, janitor service, and so on; printing, stationery, advertising and miscellaneous, such as express charges, freight, and so on.

Protection of timber, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and the Northwest Territories, and the Railway Belt in British Columbia; tree culture in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and inspection and management of forest reserves, $750,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS: There is an increase here; what is the explanation?

Mr. ROCHE: Hon. members will recollect that last session we formed a number of new forest reserves in the northern portion of Alberta and Saskatchewan. A large part of the increase is made necessary by the work of organisation of those reserves. There is also an increase in connection with tree planting. This covers the work of distributing trees for planting on farms, which work is steadily increasing. This additional amount is asked for to develop the new nursery station at Saskatoon, established last year.

Mr. DOUGLAS: Are the trees got at the experimental farm at Lacombe?

Mr. ROCHE: No, I think mainly from the nursery station at Indian Head.

Mr. DOUGLAS: This is the same policy that has been carried out for years?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS: As to re-forestation, is anything being done along that line?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes.

Protection of reindeer herd, $3,000.

Mr. NESBITT: What about this?

Mr. ROCHE: I am sorry to say that the history of our reindeer work has not been very satisfactory. But probably we shall do better in the future, because of what has been learned. Thirty-three reindeer were taken from Labrador, of which seven died on the way. The first season they were there flies stampeded them, and some of them did not recover. The survivors have been removed to a better part of the country where they are not likely to be so troubled with flies, and our officers have expressed the opinion that they are more likely to live.

Mr. NESBITT: Why do you want to spend $3,000 on half a dozen reindeer?

Mr. ROCHE: There were thirty-three reindeer, though there are only nine left. They have a great many of them in Alaska and find them very useful.

Mr. NESBITT: They make money out of them there.

Mr. ROCHE: I hope that some day we shall develop the industry so as to make money out of it too.

Mr. DOUGLAS: What do you do for this money?

Mr. ROCHE: We have to supply a certain amount of attendance for the reindeer. We have herders whose salaries have to be paid.

Mr. NESBITT: How many?

Mr. ROCHE: We had originally one herder and two assistants, but there is only one assistant now.

Mr. NESBITT: Better tie the reindeer up than have two herders for nine deer.

To pay expenses connected with water-power investigations and reports in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and the Railway Belt in British Columbia, $194,000.

[Mr. Roche.]

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: What portion of this grant, if any, is being spent in connection with the Saskatchewan river and on what water-power?

Mr. ROCHE: I cannot give the facts in quite such detail as that. The whole expenditure is in the prairie provinces, particularly in Alberta and Saskatchewan—$25 000 in Saskatchewan. The vote includes a considerable expenditure in connection with the head office at Ottawa. The offices are carrying on a good deal of work in connection with small water-powers, getting information for those who wish to develop them. My information from the superintendent of the branch is that they have been doing a great deal of useful work during the past two years and hope to continue it. They are engaged in a work which they think it would be wrong policy for us now to drop. Therefore, the superintendent recommended to me the securing of a vote for this amount This is one of the only two items that are increased in the Department of the Interior.

Mr. MARTIN: I wish to find out how much of this money is being spent in connection with the supposed diversion of the Saskatchewan river or the taking of water from that river. Is any part of this money to be spent in connection with taking water from the Saskatchewan and diverting it through portions of the country south of that river?

Mr. ROCHE: There is an item of $17,000 in connection with the storage in the Saskatchewan basin.

Mr. MARTIN: What has been done in connection with that scheme? And is it the intention of the Government to actually take water from the Saskatchewan and distribute it in the surrounding country?

Mr. ROCHE: A delegation from Prince Albert made requests of the department on this subject about eighteen months ago. I remember that several gentlemen waited upon myself on my western tour in 1913. As a result of that delegation an investigation was authorized with a view to improving, if possible, the low water conditions in the river and placing the municipal plant of Prince Albert at Lacolle in a more satisfactory position for the production of power. The future of hydro-electric development along the Saskatchewan river is largely dependent on the storage facilities which may be available throughout the basin. The importance of this question to the industrial life of the prairie is such that it

must receive immediate and energetic attention. The great demand for cheap power throughout the West makes it necessary that every possible effort be put forth to secure the same, and the storage investigations now going on have in view the best methods of securing satisfactory results from hydro-electric development. This appropriation will enable us to carry on the investigation which we have been conducting during the past year.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: Do I understand from the minister that this item of $17,000 has only to do with the matter of the investigation of the power contained in the Saskatchewan river? For the last few years requests have been made by the city of Prince Albert to the Government to grant them some assistance in respect of obtaining some assistance for the development of Lacolle Falls up to the present time, I believe, without avail. I am scarcely able to gather from the minister, however, whether this $17,000, which includes all the money voted for the purpose of investigating water schemes along the Saskatchewan river, is to be devoted entirely to the development of Lacolle falls for the benefit of the city of Prince Albert, or whether it has anything to do with the distribution of water for domestic purposes to the people who reside south and east of the Saskatchewan river.

Mr. ROCHE: It is not at all confined to the particular item to which the hon. gentleman has referred. It is for surveys and investigations all along the Saskatchewan river, in what is known as the Saskatchewan basin.

Mr. MARTIN: I do not wish to be unduly persistent about this matter, but in the province in which I reside we have been led to believe that the Government had on foot a tremendous scheme having in view the supplying of pure water to the cities of Moosejaw and Regina and to the rural inhabitants of the adjoining country by diverting water from the Saskatchewan river and bringing it down through Buffalo lake to the southeastern part of the province. In a section of the country where water is scarcer than it is in the eastern provinces, it is important that steps be taken to secure an adequate supply of pure water. As I say, we have been led to believe that the Government has had this scheme in view, with the object of getting rid of the question of the scarcity of water in the province of Saskatchewan for all time to come.

Mr. ROCHE: I may say that there is no provision in these Estimates for an expenditure such as the hon. gentleman has mentioned. We think it is not a suitable time to launch out on such an extensive enterprise.

Mr. MARTIN: Does the minister consider that it would not be a proper expenditure?

Mr. ROCHE: No, I say this is not the proper time to incur it.

Mr. MARTIN: I suppose it is the view of the minister that it is all right to spend the money somewhere else, but that it is not the proper time to spend the money there.

Mr. OLIVER: This item is very largely increased this year. It is an item that provides for examination and exploration, which examination and exploration can not be turned to actual account without a vast future expenditure of money. It seems to me that if we are in a condition of financial stringency which precludes the probability of any of these large expenditures being carried forward within a short time, these processes of examination and exploration might very well be slackened off for the present or for a year or two, instead of being increased as they have been. I do not wish to make the criticism in any factious spirit, but, having regard to prevailing conditions, and especially to the financial situation, I take the ground that this is an item which might very well be reduced at this session without throwing any discredit upon the general purposes that the Government has in view, and without affecting the ultimate carrying out of these objects. But, inasmuch as the giving effect to the results of these examinations or explorations must involve a vast expenditure of money, which money is not likely to be available, the preliminary expenditures might be postponed for the time being, or reduced rather than increased.

Mr. ROCHE: A special staff of engineers is engaged on this work. The hon gentleman will realize the difficulties which would arise if we dismissed the staff and re-engaged later persons who possibly would not be so conversant with the work. Having set out to do this work, we thought it better to continue it, and we have kept the engineers together. This item covers not only the expenses of surveys, but several sub-items as well, such as: publishing reports in connection with investigations

and surveys; expenses of official administration at the head office; drainage and reclamation. There are several items under the one heading of water-powers. I realize that this is not a good year for launching out on new enterprises, and we have endeavoured not to do that, but in respect of this enterprise which we have already undertaken, we thought it would be more economical to continue it, especially in view of the fact that we have a special staff engaged for the purpose.

For surveys and works under the Irrigation Act, etc., including $400 for P. Marchand, as auditor of disbursements made by companies acquiring lands under the irrigation system, $268,350.

Mr. OLIVER: I merely repeat the criticism I made on the previous item. I do not wish to make any adverse criticism of the payment to a very capable auditor, Mr. Marchand, but I think it is only fair to say that this item is, in my judgment, in very much the same position as the previous one. It is an item for expenditure upon examinations and explorations which, if it were desired to study economy, might be decreased or deferred in some measure during the present year.

Canadian national parks, $349,670.

Mr. WARNOCK: May I ask the minister whether he has had any complaints or protests in respect to the extension of the boundaries of Waterloo Lakes Park?

Mr. ROCHE: I think I have had one or two complaints in regard to the extension. I cannot remember from whom, but I think the matter has been brought to my attention.

Mr. WARNOCK: Is it proposed to reduce the size of that park? I understand that there has been some friction, in the matter between the Forestry Department and the Parks Department. The matter is quite important, in a way; I am sure that some petitions have been sent in by stockmen and settlers.

10 p.m.

Mr. ROCHE: The matter is under consideration. I think I can tell the hon. gentleman that it is most likely that there will be a reduction in the size of the park.

Mr. OLIVER: In what particular feature is the very considerable reduction in this item?

Mr. ROCHE: In nearly all the parks we are having a reduction of expenditure. There was a large expenditure in connection with the Banff park last year in building the bath house. That is now completed and will effect quite a saving.

Mr. DOUGLAS: Is any money being made out of the Wainwright buffalo park? What are you doing with the surplus buffalo? They are breeding very rapidly.

Mr. ROCHE: I do not think there is much money being made out of the park, there may be some but not very much.

Mr. OLIVER: Is there any intention of increasing the area of the Jasper park? At present there is a stretch of, I think, ten miles on each side of the railway.

Mr. ROCHE: If my memory serves me correctly it was enlarged a year or two ago.

Mr. OLIVER: Before leaving Edmonton, I was spoken to in reference to a suggestion that the area should be increased very considerably. There was some objection to any very considerable increase, the idea was that it was fair and reasonable to have a stretch of say from ten to twenty miles on each side of the railway track under the special park regulations. I wish to put myself on record as in favour of not having an unreasonable extension of the park regulations.

Mr. DOUGLAS: Has the minister had any representations from the residents of Wainwright asking for the removal of the buffalo park?

Mr. ROCHE: Not that I am aware of.

Mr. DOUGLAS: I understand a petition was sent in asking the Government to remove that park, that they required the land for arable purposes. Wainwright is the centre of a good arable country and it is considered a detriment to have the whole southern section of the district occupied by a buffalo park.

Mr. ROCHE: I was under the impression that the people of Wainwright originally were all in favour of having it there.

Mr. DOUGLAS: At one time, yes.

Mr. ROCHE: It may be that they have changed their minds and sent in some petition, but I cannot recall it.

Mr. OLIVER: At Jasper park the Government have made very considerable expenditures in road-making and otherwise. They have added greatly to the advantages of the park as a point for tourists and pleasure seekers but they have been so very particular in their determination that

everything be kept up to the highest standard that, up to the present time, time, no accommodation has been provided for visitors at the park. The natural beauty is there, but of course unless a visitor is able to obtain food and shelter, the scenery is not of any serious advantage to him, and he passes on through. I understand it is the intention of the Government to require the erection of very first-class hotel accommodation in the park. I would suggest that in these hard times the minister lower the standard required by his officials and endeavour to secure moderate accommodation which will meet the immediate purposes of the tourist trade and enable the visitors of to-day to enjoy the scenery and advantages of the park. There are two important points. Jasper is what might be called the capital of the park, and Pocohontas the point at which people leave to go into the hot springs. There should be accomodation for travellers at both.

Engraving, lithographing, printing and preparation of maps, plans and kindred publications of the Dominion, including necessary materials for same, $81,500.

Mr. ROCHE: This increase is offset by the reduction which we have made in the surveys, so that there is no real increase in the vote, and it is caused by the establishment of a blue print plant in connection with the department for lithographing, etc.

Mr. OLIVER: Homestead maps of the West are issued showing the progress of settlement from year to year. They are unique, and most valuable to any one who desires to follow them. They are gotten up in four separate sheets, one Manitoba, one Saskatchewan, one of the southern part of Alberta and one of the northern part of Alberta. I suppose that owing to the great amount of labour involved, in making corrections from year to year, the staff is occupied nearly the whole year, so that the last of the four maps gets out only at the end of the year. That is to say, the map of Northern Alberta which gives the condition of settlement up to the beginning of 1914, does not reach the public until the end of 1914. As the area covered by the map of Northern Alberta includes the Peace River country, which to-day is attracting attention and settlement more than any other section of the West, I would suggest to the minister that this map be made the first care of his staff in getting out these four maps.

Mr. ROCHE: I recognize the force of my hon. friend's remarks. As homesteaders are flocking into the Peace River District at the present time I think we might be justified in giving that map the first claim, although my hon. friend no doubt remembers the argument that is sometimes made against the department for encouraging settlers to go up into the north country in advance of transportation facilities. The settlers there frequently become a charge on the department for grub-staking and so on. After they have raised their crops they say: We have no transportation facilities; you encouraged us by your immigration literature to locate here, and now you must look after us. That must be taken into consideration, although personally I do not think that a map would induce people to settle there; but undoubtedly it would be a great source of information.

Mr. OLIVER: What the minister said would have been to the point at any time up to the present. Although nobody is more interested in that section of the country than I am, I have refrained from encouraging settlers to go in there for the reason the minister has just stated; but to-day conditions have got beyond that point. Many thousands of people have gone in there under great transportation difficulties, and are in there now. As a matter of fact, railroad communication is following them up and overcoming the difficulties of getting in and out of the country. In these circumstances the point that my hon. friend has mentioned is really behind us. It may as well be accepted that the Peace River country is a field for active settlement, and everybody might just as well join in and help it along, for it has gone so far that if any setback occurs it would be detrimental to the whole country.

Department of Marine—salaries, $209,100; Department of Naval Service—salaries, $170,600.

Mr. HAZEN: I have practically to take the two departments together. Last year we had 178 officials in the Marine Department; this year we have 143, or 35 less. In the Naval Department last year we had 84 officials, and we have now 125, or 41 more. In explanation I may say that under the statute the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is also the Minister of Naval Service. The two departments are under the one minister, and for the purpose of equalizing the work of those departments we have found it desirable to transfer a considerable quantity of

work from the Marine and Fisheries Department to the Naval Service Department. This equalizes the work and promotes greater efficiency. For the Naval Service Department, which deals not merely with naval affairs, but with fisheries protection, the hydrographic and tidal surveys, and other branches of some importance, had a far less share of work than the Marine and Fisheries Department. By the changes we have made, 38 clerks are transferred from the Marine Department to the Naval Service Department, which accounts for the great diminution in the number of marine officials, and the great increase in the number of Naval Service officials. There are no salary increases in the Marine Department except the ordinary statutory increases. There are apparently three extra clerks, but when it comes to be looked into one of them is the naval architect, who has been employed by the department for many years. He has always been in the outside service, but it is now proposed to place him in the inside service on the same footing as other Civil Service officials. The other two extra clerks are stenographers at $500 a year. In the Naval Service Department too, there are apparently three extra clerks, but they are all outside service officials who are being transferred to the inside service. There are no promotions, and no increases except the statutory increases.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Can the minister explain why there has been no return from the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the Department of Naval Service as to the number of officials appointed or dismissed? A return was moved for more than a year ago asking for these figures in regard to all departments, and apparently the Post Office Department and the Marine and Fisheries Department are the only ones that have not complied with that order. Can the minister tell us how many officials have been dismissed and how many appointed since this Government took office?

Mr. HAZEN: I am not able to say offhand, but speaking from memory I do not think a single official in the insiae service of either the Marine and Fisheries Department or the Naval Service Department has been dismissed since the Government took office.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I understand that most of the changes have taken place in the outside service. Might I suggest to the minister that his department follow the good example of the other departments and furnish the House with that information.

Mr. HAZEN: I do not know why it has not been done. I shall certainly have the information brought down.

Mr. SINCLAIR: There is apparently an increase in the total.

Mr. HAZEN: For 1915-16 the total salaries for the two departments are $379,700, and last year $359,950. In the two there is an apparent increase of $20,000, but fully half of that is accounted for by the statutory increases, which in the case of most of the officials is $100 a year, although some of the lower ones get only $50. In addition to that, there is the salary of Mr. Duguid, the naval architect, who has been transferred from the outside to the inside service. That accounts for $4,000. Two stenographers at $500 a year brings that up to $5,000. In addition, there is an inspector in the radio-telegraph branch at $1,600, an engineer in connection with the fish hatchery work, $1,800, and a clerk in the accountant's branch of the Naval Department, $500. These three officers were in the outside service, and they were transferred to the inside service. These items amount to $9,000 or $10,000, and the balance of the other $10,000 is represented by the statutory increases in the salaries of the officers.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Would the minister furnish us with a complete list of the appointed and dismissed officials before he goes into the main estimates?

Mr. HAZEN: I will if it has not already been brought down.

Mr. SINCLAIR: A large number of officers were appointed in October as inspectors of pickled fish and fish canneries.

Mr. HAZEN: The administration of that Act was handed over to us by the Agriculture Department and we re-appointed the officers, but it entailed no extra salaries.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Would it not be better to appoint competent men and pay them?

Mr. HAZEN: Perhaps it would.

Civil Government—Department of Naval Service, $220,600.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Many persons were rather surprised when the Fisheries Department was transferred to the Naval Service Department. In August last when war was declared everybody was looking

with a good deal of interest to see what our Naval Department was doing to keep the flag flying and to protect the coasts of Canada, and to my astonishment on the 4th of August I received a very pretty little book, entitled "Fish and How to Cook It," issued by the Department of Naval Service. I have no criticism at all to make of this book; it is a beautiful little book with pictures of fish and containing little stories that are no doubt useful to the housewives of the country. For example, it tells us:

In buying fresh fish, see that the eyes are bright and prominent, and that the fish is firm and not flabby.

That is very good advice. On page 39 it refers to the way to cook a herring, saying:

Have a clean frying-pan quite hot and place herring in it with the skin next the pan and fry them for five minutes and then turn them and fry the other side.

I have no doubt that is all right; at all events it looks to me to be all right and I think it would work out all right in practice. Then at page 58 of this nice little book I find a dissertation on smelts. It says:

The only way to cook smelts is to fry them.

It must never be said again that the Naval Department has not made up its mind on some questions, for here is a question on which it makes the most positive statement that the only way to cook smelts is to fry them, although it does add that they are sometimes baked. Then it says, also dealing with smelts:

Open them at the gills and draw each smelt separately between your finger and thumb.

That seems to be very good advice also. There are quite number of interesting and useful details in this book, but what struck me was that at a time when the country was at war with one of the greatest naval powers in the world, the circulation of this book was the only thing I could find that was being done by our Naval Department. I wondered how the Naval Department had anything to do with cooking fish, a process which it would seem to me should appertain to the Fisheries Department. Can the minister explain why he transferred these matters from the Fisheries to the Naval Department?

Mr. HAZEN: It was done with the intention of equalizing the work of the departments. Ever since there has been a Naval Department it has had to do with the administration of a portion of the fisheries, such as the fishery protection service and other branches, and it was thought desirable to equalize the distribution of the work between the officials. The change was made in the public interest and it has worked well. The book referred to was published first of all in 1913 for distribution at the Toronto Exhibition where the Department for the first time made an exhibition of the fisheries wealth of Canada. There was an edition of 50,000 originally published and that soon ran out, and we are getting further demands from all parts of Canada. Our French citizens have been asking for copies of this book so that we have had a translation made for distribution amongst them. I am glad my hon. friend from Guysborough approves of the book, and coming as he does from a fishing county he no doubt recognizes the value of fish as a food.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Why not say that it is issued by the Department of Marine and Fisheries?

Mr. HAZEN: Because it is not issued by the Department of Marine and Fisheries; it is issued by the Department of Naval Affairs which has under its charge fishery matters. What difference does it make? I think it is better to speak the truth.

Mr. MACLEAN: It makes a great difference. It is throwing ridicule upon the Department of Naval Service to say that this cookery book is issued by that department.

Mr. HAZEN: No one has tried before to throw ridicule upon it.

Mr. MACLEAN: I think the minister should not bring out another edition of this book and credit it to the Department of Naval Service.

Mr. HAZEN: Then we would not be crediting it to the right department.

Mr. MACLEAN: The Government will forgive the minister if he is not quite frank in stating the name of the department issuing the book. I think he should state the fisheries branch.

Ocean and river service, $1,256,900.

Mr. HAZEN: I just want this item of the main estimates called. I am not calling it for the purpose of discussion.

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. minister will remember the claims that are filed in his department with regard to the Behring sea fisheries. I do not know exactly which item they come under, and I presume they are not to this discussion; but I have received

several inquiries from men who laid claims before Judge Audette when he was going throughout the country and they are naturally anxious to know what progress is being made in regard to the matter. Perhaps while the minister is dealing with the estimates, he will be able to tell us in what state those claims are at present.

Mr. HAZEN: There have been a great many of those claims, and Judge Audette has investigated nearly all of them. He is going to British Columbia in a very short time to dispose of the remaining ones in which he has not yet heard the evidence. That will wind up the hearing of the claims, and I understand he hopes to be able to make a report dealing with the whole question some time during the coming summer. The matter is getting to the point where it will be wound up very soon.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 10.40 p.m.

Thursday, February 18, 1915.

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

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill No. 41, respecting The Athabaska Northern Railway Company—Mr. R. B. Bennett.

Bill No. 42, respecting The Canada Preferred Insurance Company—Mr. Stevens.

Bill No. 43, respecting The Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Company, and to change its name to "The Huron and Erie Mortgage Corporation"—Mr. Marshall.

Bill No. 44, respecting certain patents of The Lohmann Company—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 45, respecting The Vancouver Life Insurance Company—Mr. Stevens.

Bill No. 46, respecting The Western Dominion Railway Company—Mr. R. B. Bennett.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Report of the Secretary of State for External Affairs for the year ended March 31, 1914.—Sir Robert Borden.

Detailed statement of all bonds or securities registered in the Department of the Secretary of State of Canada since last return (21st January, 1914)—Hon. L. Coderre.

Annual return under Chapter 125, R.S.C., 1906, intituled An Act respecting Trade Unions—Hon. L. Coderre.

[Mr. McKenzie,]

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

FAIR WAGE CLAUSE IN GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS.

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. Was there a fair wage clause attached to the contract for the erection of the Grenadier Guard armoury building at Montreal?
2. Was there any representation made to the Government in that respect? If so, by whom?
3. What action, if any, has the Government taken in that respect?
4. Was there a fair wage clause attached to any or all the contracts at Valcartier and Petawawa?
5. Has any representation been made to the Government? If so, what action was taken?
6. Has there been any fair wage clause attached to the contract for the supply of clothing, boots or other supplies given by the Government for the soldiers now gone or to go to Great Britain, or was there any representation made to that effect?
7. What is the intention of the Government in that respect?

Major-General HUGHES:

1. No.

2. (a) Yes. (b) To the Department of Labour by J. Poulin, Secretary of the Montreal Branch of the Journeymen Stone Cutters' Association of North America.

3. The plans and specification for this drill hall were prepared by local architects, employed by the officers of the regiment. Tenders were invited by the local architects, and contracts were prepared by them, on their form, and on plans and specifications approved by the officers of the regiment, and then returned to the department, duly signed, in order to ensure the payment of the Government grant after an Order in Council authorizing the tenders had been passed.

4 and 5. A fair wage clause was attached to the contract governing the work on the rifle range and camp construction works at Valcartier camp. A fair wage clause was also attached to the contract governing the work of construction of buildings at Petawawa camp.

6 and 7. The printed forms of tender and of contracts for military stores, clothing and necessaries, used by the department, contain a fair wage clause; and much of the material purchased for the expeditionary forces was supplied under contracts containing this clause. In some cases, however, owing to the great pressure of work, and in order to save time, the printed forms were dispensed with. In such cases, the contract was not subject to the fair wage clause. These exceptions were the result

of the unusual circumstances, and were not due to any change of policy.

WAR SUPPLIES—HAY.

*Mr. CARVELL:

1. With what persons, corporations or firms has the Government, or any member, official or department thereof, contracted for the compressing of hay for military purposes in the province of New Brunswick?
2. What amounts have been contracted for with each such person?
3. Where is the said hay to be delivered?
4. What prices are to be paid each such person, firm or corporation at such point or delivery?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am informed by the Department of Militia and Defence that the Government of Canada has not purchased any hay for military purposes in the province of New Brunswick. If the question refers to purchases by the British Government, the hon. gentleman might recall the question and put it in more distinct form.

LEASES OF OIL AND GAS RIGHTS.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Has the Government decided to extend the time within which the lessees of oil and gas rights would have to commence operations?
2. If so, for how long, and from what date does the extension apply?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes.
2. For one year from the 12th of November, 1914. An Order in Council was passed, and every publicity given to the extension through the press and otherwise.

OTTAWA AND HULL TOWN PLANNING COMMISSION.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. What are the names of the members of the Ottawa and Hull Town Planning Commission?
2. What are the names and addresses of the engineers and other persons employed by the commission, and what salary is paid to each?
3. What was the total amount expended by, or on account of, the said commission up to February 1, 1915?
4. Has the commission made a report to the Government?
5. If so, will the report be submitted to Parliament, and when?

Mr. W. T. WHITE:

1. Sir Herbert S. Holt, chairman; Sir Alexander Lacoste, Frank Darling, R. Home Smith, Mayor of Ottawa, Mayor of Hull.

2. E. H. Bennett, consultant on city plan, professional fee, $15,000 (for complete report), of which $10,000 has been paid, together with all office and travelling expenses; E. L. Cousins, consulting engineer, salary, $2,000 per annum, together with travelling expenses; A. E. K. Bunnell, assistant engineer, Ottawa, salary, $200 per month; N. W. Birkett, acting secretary, Ottawa, salary, $75 per month. Previous to the first of the year the staff in the Ottawa office was larger and averaged about ten men.

3. Total appropriation, $63,000; total expenditure from December, 1913, to February 1, 1915, $57,039.44. Balance, $5,960.56.

4 and 5. The report of the commission is almost completed, and will, it is expected, be ready for presentation to Parliament before the close of the present session.

HYMAN BENJAMIN.

Mr. CARROLL:

Is Hyman Benjamin, of Glace Bay, Nova Scotia, employed by the Militia Department or by any other department of the Government? If so, what are his duties, and what is his salary?

Mr. CODERRE: Not in the employ of the Government.

EDGAR KELLY.

Mr. CARROLL:

1. Is Edgar Kelly, of Glace Bay, Nova Scotia, employed by the Militia Department, or by any other department of the Government?
2. If so, what are his duties, and what is his salary?

Mr. CODERRE:

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

LEVIS QURANTINE STATION.

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. What was the cost of labour on the buildings of the Lévis quarantine station up to January 1, 1915?
2. How many buildings were erected at said station, and what is the cost and the purpose of each such buildings?
3. Were tenders called and received for the construction of such buildings? If so, what is the name of each tenderer, and what was the amount stated in each tender?
4. In connection with the contracts of such building operations were any extras allowed? If so, for what amounts and to whom were such amounts paid?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. $9,283.83.

2. Three dwelling houses, for certain employees to live in; one office.

The three dwelling houses and one office were contracted for at a lump sum of $21,255, plus extras amounting to $1,605.90. The architect's charges amounted to $917.40.

18 cattle sheds. These sheds were composed of buildings at the old quarantine station, which were taken down and rebuilt at the new station by a staff of labourers

working under the supervision of our superintendent at the Lévis Quarantine Station. They were built for the accommodation of import stock. The cost of taking down and rebuilding these cattle sheds amounted to $9,283.83.

3. Tenders were called for the construction of three dwelling houses and a small office at the new cattle quarantine at Lévis. Only one tender was received, and that from Messrs. Lagueux & Veilleux, of Lévis, P.Q., for the sum of $21,255.

4. The following amounts were allowed for extras: To Messrs. Lagueux & Veilleux, $1,480.90; to Beal Giguere (for wiring the office and one house with electricity) $125.

ALBERTA RELIEF DISTRIBUTION.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Who were the parties appointed by the Government to direct the distribution of relief in the drouth affected districts of Alberta?

2. What was the remuneration paid in each case?

Mr. ROCHE:

Lethbridge Land District.

Name.	Address.	Salary per month.
Boyd, Hugh,	Lethbridge	$150
Stuart, G.,	Lethbridge	75
Ingram, C. E.,	Sundial	25
Patton, W. F.,	Coutts	25
Salvage, Wm.,	Grassy Lake	25
Peterson, Louis,	New Dayton	25
Burr, C.,	Kippenville	25
Ringwood, R. H.,	Foremost	25
Mantle, Isaac,	Milk River	25
Benningfield, A. E.,	Barhill	25
McLellan, J. J.,	Purple Springs	25
Karren, C. H.,	Magrath	25
Maxwell, W. J.,	Burdett	25
Thomas, F. S.,	Retlaw	25
Hunt, W. J.,	Iron Springs	25
Wride, Geo. T.,	Raymond	25
Russell, Wm.,	Taber	25
Couper, Geo. V.	Brunetta	25
Hilliard, R. H.,	Macleod	25

Medicine Hat Land District.

Brown, H. H.,	Medicine Hat	$150
Power, Geo.,	Medicine Hat	75
Brown, Geo. T.,	Medicine Hat	60
Card, Jas. S.,	Medicine Hat	60
Bentley, W. D.,	Cyan	50
Jackson, Annie,	Medicine Hat	50
McPherson, P. G.,	Medicine Hat	50
Drummond, A. J.,	Carlstadt	50
Cotton, W. P.,	Bow Island	40
McKetrick, C. W.,	Brooks	25
Bond, W. A.,	Jenner	25
Posey, A. L.,	Seven Persons	25
Reid, J. S.,	Suffield	25
Carson, J. H.,	Whitla	25
Parker, G. W.,	Winnifred	$25
Crews, F. J.,	Irvine	25
Cruickshanks, W. A.,	Foremost	25
Edwards, E. H.,	Faith	25
Rogers, M. J.,	Minda	25
Cussack, Jno.,	Empress	25
Purves, Geo.,	McNally's P.O.	25
Jonah, Gordon,	Youngstown	25
Cooper, W. W.,	Youngstown	25
Johnson, H. S.,	Bassano	25
Stone, E. L.,	Redcliff	25
Campbell, David,	Ryremore	25

FENIAN RAID BOUNTY ACT.

Mr. MACDONALD:

Is it the intention of the Government to introduce legislation at this session to extend the provisions of the Fenian Raid Bounty Act so as to provide for the payment of the bounty to the widows or personal representatives of those veterans who died previous to April, 1912?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The necessary announcement in regard to this inquiry will be given to the House in due course.

FIRST CANADIAN CONTINGENT— SUPPLY OF CARTRIDGES.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Were the members of the first expeditionary force from Canada supplied with cartridges?

2. If so, in what quantity and from what source?

3. Were said cartridges accepted or discarded by the British military authorities? If so, for what cause?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am informed by the Department of Militia and Defence that the answer to the first question is in the affirmative and that the answer to the third question is that no cartridges were discarded by the British military authorities. It is not desirable in the public interest that any answer should be given to the second question.

EMIGRATION FROM WESTERN PROVINCES.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. How many settlers from the western provinces left Canada for the United States during the year 1914?

2. What is the number in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia respectively?

Mr. ROCHE: No statistics are collected by the Canadian Government of persons leaving Canada for the United States.

CHAPLAIN TO OVERSEAS FORCES.

Mr. LAW:

1. Was Rev. E. E. Graham, of Arcadia, N.S., recommended for appointment as chaplain in the first or second Canadian expeditionary forces?

2. If so, by whom was he recommended?
3. Has he received his appointment, and when?
4. If not appointed, why not?

Major-General HUGHES:

1. Yes.
2. By many estimable gentlemen.
3. He has not an appointment.
4. There are already upwards of five thousand applicants for positions of chaplains. There are twenty-two chaplains now in England, besides only eleven permitted to accompany the force to the continent. Permission has not yet been obtained for the sending of further chaplains.

TORONTO HOME GUARD.

Mr. LAW:

1. Were rifles supplied by the Government to the Home Guard of Toronto?
2. If so, under what terms and conditions?
3. Is it the intention to supply all home guards with rifles?

Major-General HUGHES:

1 and 2. No rifles were supplied.
3. No. Rifles firing service ammunition are reserved exclusively for militia.

SUSPENSION OF IMMIGRATION OFFICERS.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Were Chas. C. Genik, Robert Adamson, M. Mitchell, John Beckett, J. M. Boyd, and — Johnson dismissed from the staff of the Immigration Hall at Winnipeg in the fall of 1914?
2. How many years service had been performed by each of the men so dismissed?
3. What was the reason for the dismissal in each case and under whose direction was it made?
4. Was Baron Von Amorengen appointed to a position in the immigration offices at Winnipeg after the said dismissals?
5. What experience had he to qualify him for the position to which he was appointed?

Mr. ROCHE:

1, 2 and 3. On September 17, 1914, it appeared unnecessary, on account of decreased immigration, to have entire staff at Winnipeg under pay and consequently the following officers were suspended indefinitely:

Charles C. Genik, 17 years in service; Robert Adamson, 13 years in service, reinstated December, 1914; M. Mitchell, 5 years in service, given other work during December, 1914, reinstated January, 1915; John Beckett, 5 years in service, reinstated January, 1915; J. M. Boyd, 3 years in service.

With reference to — Johnson, if question refers to Arthur Johnson, this party is employed in Grain Exhibit Warehouse at Winnipeg under the direction of the Commissioner of Immigration whose accounts show that Johnston was not at work between September 13, 1914, and October 15, 1914.

4 and 5. The Commissioner of Immigration at Winnipeg reported the necessity of engaging some person of suitable experience and education to conduct foreign correspondence and mentioned Baron Amorengen as one who would no doubt fill the requirements of the position. Baron Amorengen was accordingly appointed and entered on his duties November 2, 1914.

FOREIGN TRAWLERS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Have the provisions of chapter 14 of the Act of 1913 been enforced as against foreign trawlers who make Canadian ports a base for their fishing operations?
2. If not, why not?

Mr. HAZEN:

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

VILLAGE OF RIBSTONE.

Mr. DOUGLAS:

1. Has patent been issued for that portion of the northwest ¼ of section 17, township 43, range 2, west of the 4th meridian on which the village of Ribstone is situated?
2. If not, what is the cause of delay?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes, and was sent to the Registrar at Edmonton by whom it was returned, as the land was described therein as shown upon a certain plan of survey attached thereto instead of by metes and bounds. Such patent has in consequence been cancelled and steps are now being taken to issue a new patent in lieu thereof, describing the land by metes and bounds.
2. Answered by No. 1.

OIL LEASE TO GEORGE McRAE.

Mr. DOUGLAS:

1. In whose name does oil lease comprising east half of sections 21, 28, 33, and west half of sections 22, 27, 34, township 73, range 24, west 4th stand?
2. What date was the claim filed on and by whom?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. In the name of George McRae.
2. Location was staked on the 22nd of November, 1913, by George McRae. Personal application for a lease was made to the Recorder at Edmonton on the 28th of November, 1913, by George McRae.

MAIL ROUTE FROM KILLAM, ALTA.

Mr. DOUGLAS:

1. Has rural mail route No. 1, starting from Killam, Alberta, and running south and east, been put in operation?
2. If so, when? If not, why not?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. No.
2. Inquiry into the matter has just been completed and tenders for proposed route will be invited at once.

PRINCE OF WALES FUND.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has a loan of five million dollars been made to the Dominion Government by the controllers of the Prince of Wales Fund in England?
2. If so, at what rate and on what terms?

Mr. W. T. WHITE: No direct loan has been made to the Government from the fund referred to. It is possible, although the Government has no information on the subject, that the fund may have purchased Dominion Treasury Bills of which £3,000,000 are outstanding maturing in June next or Dominion debenture stock.

WAR SUPPLIES—BOOTS.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. How many ankle boots were purchased from each firm which supplied the first contingent?
2. How many canvas shoes?
3. How many slippers?

Major-General HUGHES:

1. Ames, Holden, McCready, Ltd., 20,000; Tetrault Shoe Mfg. Co., 20,000; Louis Gauthier Co., Ltd., 10,000; Hartt Boot and Shoe Co., 6,000; John Macpherson Co., 6,000; Amherst Boot and Shoe Co., 2,000; Slater Shoe Co., 1,000.

2. Louis Gauthier Co., 17,000; Ames, Holden, McCready, Ltd., 16,500; Tetrault Shoe Co., 16,500.

3. Ames, Holden, McCready, Ltd., 600.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Have any purchases of boots been made from any of the following firms for the first expeditionary force, namely: Cook-Fitzgerald Company, London, Ont.; Western Shoe Company, Berlin, Ont.; Valentine & Martin Company, Waterloo, Ont., and Relindo Shoe Company, Toronto, Ont.?
2. What is the quantity of boots purchased from each of the above firms and the price per pair?

Major-General HUGHES:

1. No.
2. Answered by 1.

[Mr. Roche.]

IRON ORE IMPORTS.

Mr. CARROLL:

What was the number of tons of iron ore imported into Canada in the calendar years 1914 and 1913 from the colony of Newfoundland?

Mr. J. D. REID: 1913, 869,669 tons; 1914, 389,850 tons.

ANTHRACITE COAL IMPORTS.

Mr. CARROLL:

What was the total quantity of anthracite coal imported into Canada in the calendar years 1914 and 1913?

Mr. J. D. REID: 1913, 4,642,057 tons; 1914, 4,435,010 tons.

SQUID IMPORTS.

*Mr. KYTE:

1. What was the total value of squid imported into Canada during the calendar years ending December 31, 1912, 1913 and 1914, respectively?
2. What was the amount of duty collected on same in each of said years?
3. At what ports in Canada was said squid entered and what was the amount of duty collected at each of such ports?

Mr. J. D. REID: Squid is not separately enumerated in the customs classification of imports, and therefore no information as to value of imports, duty collected thereon or ports of entry is available from the statistical records.

PICTOU COUNTY POSTAL SERVICE.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. How many rural mail routes have been established in Pictou county, and what are the names of such routes?
2. How many post offices have been closed in said county, and what are the names of the same, since January 1, 1912?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. 19. Beaver Bank No. 1, Eureka No. 1, Glengarry Station No. 1, Glengarry Station No. 2, Hopewell No. 1, Hopewell No. 2, Meadowville Station No. 1, Merigonish No. 1, New Glasgow No. 1, New Glasgow No. 2, New Glasgow No. 3, Pictou No. 1, River John No. 1 (authorized but not yet in operation) River John No. 2, Salt Springs No. 1, Scotsburn Station No. 1, Stellarton No. 1, West Branch River John No. 1 (in part), West River Station No. 1.

2. Twenty-four post offices have been closed in Pictou county, N.S., from January 1, 1912, to February 15, 1915, viz: Abercrombie, Burnside, Churchville, Concord, Elgin, Granton, Heathbell, Iron Rock, Island East River, Lorne, Lorne Station, Lower Barneys River, Marshdale, Minto, Mount William, Murrayfield, Ponds, Rock-

lin, Royal Centre, St. Paul's, Scotsburn, Stillman, Union Centre, White Hill.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Who were the tenderers for the mail contract from Barneys River Station to Barneys River, Pictou county, for which tenders closed on January 8, and what was the amount of each tender?
2. Has the contract been awarded?
3. If so, to whom and at what price?

Mr. CASGRAIN: 1, 2 and 3. The contract has been awarded to the lowest tenderer. As the contract has not yet been executed, it is not considered advisable to furnish the names of the tenderers and amounts until this has been done. This information will be given later.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

Mr. MACDONALD:

Does the Government intend to introduce at this session any legislation to carry into effect the recommendation of Commission upon technical education?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The information in regard to this will be given in due course.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES INVESTIGATION ACT.

Mr. MACDONALD:

Does the Government intend to introduce this session the amendments to the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, asked for by the Deputation from the Trades and Labour Council in January last?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Any information necessary in regard to this matter will be given in due course.

THE VALE RAILWAY.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Has any agreement been arrived at between the Department of Railways and the Acadia Coal Company as to taking over the railway from New Glasgow to Thoburn, in the county of Pictou, known as the Vale Railway?
2. If so, what was the price agreed upon?

Mr. COCHRANE:

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

THE ROYAL SOCIETY.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

Has the Minister of Public Works been able to reserve space in the new public buildings in Ottawa to enable the Royal Society of Canada to hold its meetings therein, and for its library?

Mr. ROGERS: No space has been reserved as yet, but the society is now using a portion of the library at the Royal Victoria Museum building for their library.

Icl. Ry.—ENLISTMENT OF EMPLOYEES.

Mr. COPP:

1. Was the following notice posted in the General Offices and shops of the Intercolonial Railway at Moncton, county of Westmorland, on or about the day of the date of said notice:

"Canadian Government Railways.
Office of General Manager,
Moncton, N.B., Oct. 30, 1914,
Circular No. 16.

To Officers and Employees:

All officers and employees of these railways enrolled in the active militia, called out for active service, and all officers and employees who, with the consent of the management, enlist for Overseas service, shall receive their regular salary or wages while in the said service, subject to such regulations and conditions as to the payment of such salary or wages as may be prescribed by Order in Council or by the management, and all officers and all employees in active military service shall, upon their immediate return from such service, be reinstated in the same position as held by them at the time of their being called out for enlistment.

All officers and employees desiring to enlist for the Second Contingent should make application for leave and pay during such absence on forms to be obtained from the heads of departments and similar forms should be presented for all such officers and employees who are already in military service.

F. P. Gutelius,
General Manager.

2. At the time of the posting of said notice, were any officers or employees of the said Intercolonial Railway enrolled in the active militia called out for active service?
3. After the posting of said notice did any officers or employees of the said Intercolonial Railway enlist for Overseas service?
4. If so, have the said officers or employees who were so called out, or who so enlisted, been paid their regular salary or wages by the Railway Department?
5. If not, is it the intention of the Railway Department to pay such salaries and wages to such officers and employees who have been called out for active service or enlisted for Overseas service in defence of the Empire?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.
4. No.
5. Yes.

PICTOU FISHERIES GUARDIANS.

Mr. MACDONALD:

What are the names and Post Office addresses, with amount paid to each of the Fishery Guardians in the county of Pictou during the year 1914?

Mr. HAZEN:

Guardians 1914-15.

Name, Address	
Wm. Conley, Alma	$20.00
	$20.00

J. R. McDonald, Pictou	$25.00
Alex. Fraser, Watervale	25.00
Roderick Martin, Westville	50.00
Angus D. McDonald, Lourdes	50.00
Jas. Cameron, River John	16.00
James McKenzie, Alma	20.00
J. T. McGregor, Eureka	20.00
Philip V. Long, Springville	20.00
J. D. McKinnon, Bailey's Brook	15.00
Alex. D. McDonald, Ponds	20.00
D. W. McGregor, Avondale	20.00
John Roberston, Marneys R.	20.00
J. W. Foote, French River	20.00
David Simpson, French River	20.00
W. A. Campbell, Sutherlands R.	40.00
Joseph Mason, E. Br. St. Marys	10.00
Daniel McLaren, Eden Lake P.O.	10.00

PICTOU FREIGHT HANDLING.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. How much has been paid each week since the beginning of the season at Pictou, N.S., for labour at the winter boats in connection with handling of freight?

2. How much has been paid each week at same service for the loading of coal?

3. Who is the foreman in charge of labour at Pictou on said service, and what is being paid to him?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. For week ending—

December	26	$215 15
January	2	393 00
"	9	198 68
"	18	386 85
"	23	270 74
"	30	226 49
February	6	210 14
"	13	535 60

2. For week ending—

December	26	29 25
January	2	195 30
"	9	195 30
"	18	116 78
"	23	120 03
"	30	107 74
February	6	223 58
"	13	100 69

3. The work is done under contract with David A. Morrison, who paid 50 cents per ton for discharging and loading freight on Minto, and 60 cents per ton for loading coal on same steamer; and 50 cents per ton for discharging and loading freight on Stanley and 75 cents per ton for loading coal on same boat.

TRAWLERS AND FISHING BOUNTY.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM:

1. Are fishermen engaged in the prosecution of their industry in steam or beam trawlers entitled to the fishing bounty in Canada?

2. Are steam or beam trawlers paid a fishing bounty?

3. Did beam or steam trawlers, or fishermen engaged on such vessels, ever receive fishing bounty in Canada? If so, in what years?

4. If trawlers are no longer entitled to fishing bounty, when was the bounty withdrawn by this Government?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. No.

2. No.

3. Yes; in 1909.

4. No bounty has been paid to such trawlers by the present Government.

HORSES FOR FIRST CONTINGENT.

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. How many horses purchased for the first contingent were sold at Quebec before the departure of the first contingent?

2. What was the reason of the sale of the said horses?

3. What amount was realized upon the same?

Major-General HUGHES:

1. None.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

ARTICLES EXEMPT FROM INCREASED DUTIES.

Mr. McCRANEY:

What are the articles referred to in the Budget speech of the Minister of Finance as exempt from increased duties, as follows:

(1) Goods enumerated in the following tariff items in schedule A: 1, 2, 3, 19, 20, 20a,, 21, 22, 23, 28a, 29a, 29b, 40, 55, 60, 61, 68, 77a, 101a, 118a, 129, 132, 134, 135, 142, 143, 144, 145, 153, 164, 169, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 178a, 180a, 184, 196, 201, 209b, 329, 329a, 348a, 352a, 359, 360, 373, 441, 443, 445, 445a, 446a, 464, 466, 466a, 470, 483, 544, 544a, 576, 595, 596, 676, 682, 688, 689, 689a, 690, 690a, 691, 692, 692a, 693, 694, 695a, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, and 709.

Explanatory.

List of articles exempt from the added percentage duties (5 p.c. ad valorem, preferential, or 7½ p.c. ad valorem, intermediate and general) provided for in the Customs Tariff Resolution introduced in Parliament 11th February, 1915.

Reference.	Articles Exempt From Added Percentage.
Section 8.	Products of Newfoundland fisheries.
9.	Products of Canadian fisheries arriving from sea.
	(b) Goods specified in schedule C, French Convention Act, viz.:
Item.	
86 ex.	Vegetables, except tomatoes, including baked beans in cans or other air tight packages, n.o.p.
120 ex.	Anchovies, sardines, sprats, and other fish, packed in oil or otherwise, in tin boxes, weighing over eight ounces and not over twelve ounces each.
163 ex.	Wines of the fresh grape of all kinds, not sparkling, imported in barrels or in bottles.
165 ex.	Champagne and all other sparkling wines in bottles.

169 ex. Novels, etc., unbound or paper bound, or in sheets, in the French language, not including Christmas annuals or juvenile or toy books.

171 ex. Books, printed, periodicals or pamphlets, in the French language, n.o.p., not including blank account books, copy books, or books to be written or drawn upon.

220 ex. All medicinal, chemical and pharmaceutical preparations, compounded or more than one substance, including patent and proprietary preparations, tinctures, pills, powders, troches, lozenges, syrups, cordials, bitters, anodynes, tonics, plasters, liniments, salves, ointments, pastes, drops, waters, essences, and oils, n.o.p.

Ex. (b) All other than dry and not containing alcohol.

Provided that drugs, pill mass and preparations, not including pills or medicinal plasters, recognized by the British or United States Pharmacopœia, or the French Codex as officinal, shall not be held to be covered by this item.

262 Olive oil, n.o.p.

575 ex. Embroideries, n.o.p.; lace, n.o.p.; collars or collarettes in lace and all manufactures of lace; nettings of cotton, linen, silk, or other material, n.o.p.

581 ex. Velvets or pure silk and silk fabrics.

582 Ribbons of all kinds, and materials.

583 Manufactures of silk or of which silk is the component part of chief value, n.o.p.

445 Goods imported to be used in the manufacture of mowing machines, harvesters, self-binding or without binders, binding attachments, reapers, and complete parts thereof, under regulations by the Minister of Customs.

544 a. Goods imported to be used in the manufacture of binder twine for harvest binders, under regulations by the Minister of Customs.

682 Articles imported to be used in the manufacture of goods enumerated in tariff item 682 in Schedule A, under regulations by the Minister of Customs.

586 ex, Anthracite coal and anthracite coal dust.

206 ex. Bacteriological products or serum for subcutaneous injection.

206 ex. Vaccine and ivory vaccine points.

564, 620 and 506 ex. Pressed felt, elastic webbing and hollow blocks of wood imported to be used in the manufacture of artificial limbs.

725 Steel imported to be used in manufacturing rough unfinished parts of rifles, when such parts are to be used in rifles to be made for the Government of Canada.

765 Fabrics of which silk is the component material of chief value imported to be used in the manufacture of neckties.

1 Horses, cattle, sheep, goats, asses, swine, and dogs, for the improvement of stock.

2 Domestic fowls, pure bred, for the improvement of stock, homing or messenger pigeons, and pheasants and quails.

3 Bees.

19 Cocoa shells and nibs.

20 Cocoa paste or 'liquor' and chocolate paste or 'liquor,' not sweetened, in blocks or cakes.

20a. Butter produced from the cocoa bean.

21 Cocoa paste or 'liquor' and chocolate paste or 'liquor,' sweetened, in blocks or cakes not less than two pounds in weight.

22. Preparations of cocoa or chocolate in powder form.

23. Preparations of cocoa or chocolate, n.o.p., and confectionery coated with or containing chocolate.

28a. Tea imported direct from the country of growth and production, and tea purchased in bond in the United Kingdom.

29a. Tea, n.o.p.

39b. Arrowroot.

40. Salt for the use of the sea or gulf fisheries.

55. Indian corn, not for purposes of distillation.

60. Wheat.

61. Wheat flour.

66. Biscuits sweetened.

77a. Cocoa beans, not roasted, crushed or ground.

101a. Limes.

118a. Squid.

129. Oysters, seed and breeding, imported for the purpose of being planted in Canadian waters.

132. Live fish and fish eggs, for propagating purposes.

134. All sugar above No. 16 Dutch standard in colours, and all refined sugars of whatever kinds, grades or standards.

135. Sugar, n.o.p., not above No. 16 Dutch standard in colour, sugar drainings or pumpings, etc., and molasses testing over 56 degrees by the polariscope.

142. Tobacco, unmanufactured, for excise purposes.

143. Cigars and cigarettes.

144. Cut tobacco.

145. Manufactured tobacco, n.o.p., and snuff.

153. Lime juice, raw and concentrated, not refined.

164. Wine of all kinds, except sparkling wines, containing not more than 40 per cent of proof spirit, when the produce of any British colony or territory in the South African Customs Union Convention.

169. Novels, etc., unbound or paper bound, or in sheets, not including Christmas annuals, or juvenile or toy books.

171. Books, printed, periodicals and pamphlets, or parts thereof, n.o.p., not including blank account books, copy books, or books to be written or drawn upon.

172. Books on the application of science to industries of all kinds; books printed in any language other than the English and French languages, etc., and bibles, prayer books, psalm and hymn books, religious tracts, and Sunday school lesson pictures.

173. Books, embossed, and grooved cards for the blind; and books for the instruction of the deaf, dumb and blind; maps and charts for schools for the blind.

174. Books printed by any government or by any association for the promotion of science or letters, and official annual re-

ports of religious or benevolent associations, etc.

175. Text books, etc., which are on the curriculum of any university, etc., in Canada; and books specially imported for the use of incorporated mechanics' institutes, public libraries, etc.

176. Books, bound or unbound, printed and manufactured more than twelve years.

178a. Goods specified in item 178, imported by mail, and duty-paid by customs revenue stamps.

180a. Photographs sent to the press for use only as news pictures.

184. Newspapers, magazines and literary papers, unbound; fashion plates imported with magazines or periodical trade journals.

196. Printing paper, in sheets and rolls valued at not more than 2¼ cents per pound.

201. Matrix paper, not being tissue paper, adapted for use in printing.

209b. Nicotine sulphate.

329. Ores of metals, n.o.p.

329a. Iron ore.

348a. Works of art in bronze, cast from models made in Canada and designed by sculptors domiciled therein.

352a. Bells when imported for use of churches only.

359. Gold and silver, in ingots, etc., unmanufactured; gold and silver sweepings; and bullion fringe or gold fringe.

360. British and Canadian coin and foreign gold coin.

369. Chronometers and compasses for ships.

373. Scrap iron and scrap steel, old and fit only to be remanufactured, recovered from vessels wrecked in Canadian waters.

441. Typecasting and typesetting machines, etc.

443. Newspaper printing presses, etc.

445. Mowing machines, harvesters, binding attachments, reapers, etc.

445a. Malleable iron castings when imported by manufacturers of mowing machines, harvesters, etc.

446a. Traction ditching machines adapted for tile drainage on farms, etc.

464. Tools and machinery, and materials or parts in the rough, unfinished, etc., for the manufacture of rifles for the Government of Canada.

466 Surgical and dental instruments of metal, etc.

466a. Glassware and other scientific apparatus for laboratory work in public hospitals, etc.

470. Goods as specified for the manufacture or equipment of ships or vessels.

483. Sterotypes, electrotypes and celluloids of newspaper columns in any language other than French and English ,and of books, and bases and matrices, and copper shells for the same.

544. Binder twine and twine for harvest binders.

544a. Articles which enter into the cost of the manufacture of binder twine or twine for harvest binders.

576. Silk, raw or as reeled from the cocoon, not being doubled, twisted or advanced in manufacture in any way; silk cocoons and silk waste.

595. Locomotives and railway passenger, baggage and freight cars, property of railway companies in U. S. crossing the frontier, etc.

596. Materials to be used in Canada for construction of bridges and tunnels crossing the boundary between the United States and Canada, etc.

676. Metallic tubes, etc., for manufacture of vaccine points.

682. Fish hooks for deep sea or lake fishing, and all other articles enumerated in this item.

688. Artificial limbs and parts thereof, artificial teeth not mounted.

689. Life boats and life saving apparatus specially imported by societies to encourage the saving of human life.

689a. Miners rescue appliances, and automatic resuscitation apparatus.

690. Clothing and books, donations of, for charitable purposes, and photographs, not exceeding three sent by friends and not for sale.

690a. Casual donations from abroad sent by friends, and not being advertising matter, tobacco, articles containing spirits or merchandise for sale—when duty does not exceed fifty cents in any one case.

691. Communion sets of metal, glass or wood.

692. Coins, cabinets of; collections of medals and collections of postage stamps; medals of gold, silver or copper and other metallic articles bestowed as trophies or received as prizes, etc.

692a. Articles presented from abroad in recognition of saving of human life.

693. Collections of antiquities, for public museums, public libraries, etc.

694. Models of inventions and of other improvements in the arts.

695a. Paintings in oil or water colour and pastels, valued at not less than twenty dollars each; paintings and sculptures by artists domiciled in Canada, but residing temporarily abroad for purposes of study.

696. Philosophic and scientific apparatus, utensils, instruments, and preparations, including boxes and bottles containing the same: maps, photographic reproductions, casts as models, etchings, and lithographic prints or charts—when imported under conditions of tariff item 696.

697. Globes, geographical, topographical and astronomical.

698. Typewriters, type, tablets with movable figures, and musical instruments, for schools for the blind.

699. Botannical and entomological specimens and all other articles in this item.

700. Animals and articles brought into Canada, for exhibition or competition for prizes.

701. Menageries, horses, cattle, carriages, and harness of.

702. Carriages for travellers and carriages laden with merchandise.

703. Travellers' baggage.

704. Apparel, wearing and other personal and household effects, not merchandise, of British subjects dying abroad, but do-

miciled in Canada; books, pictures, family plate of furniture, personal effects and heirlooms left by request.
705. Settlers' effects as per item 705.
706. Articles for the personal of official use of Consuls General, etc.
707 Articles for the use of the Governor General.
708. Arms, etc., property of the Imperial Government as per item 708.
709. Articles growth, produce or manufacture of Canada, returned—under conditions in item 709.

PHILIPSBURG-ST. ARMAND MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. KAY:

1. Why was Willie Rivers dismissed as courier between Philipsburg and St. Armand Station, Quebec, and how long a notice given?
2. Who asked for his dismissal?
3. Who recommended the appointment of the present courier?

Mr. CASGRAIN: Willie Rivers has not been an employee of the Post Office Department in connection with the mail service between Philipsburg and St. Armand Station. In view of this fact, Nos. 2 and 3 cannot be answered.

HORSES FOR CANADIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE.

Mr. J. A. ROBB (Huntingdon): I desire to draw the attention of the Minister of Militia to a condition that may lead to a scandal almost equal to the boot incident that has caused so much injury to Canadian industries. In the Montreal Gazette of February 18, reference is made to the recruiting camp at Sherbrooke, and I wish to draw the attention of the minister to this statement in particular:

> A number of horses have also arrived at Sherbrooke for the regiment being sent on from Ontario by the Remount Commission, under Sir Adam Beck. The Ontario horses have not all shown themselves suitable for cavalry work and it is not improbable that some changes will be made.

In the Toronto Globe of February 17, this statement is made in regard to the Salisbury camp:

> They brought two or three hundred Clydesdales down from Scotland, as our general purpose horses were too light to haul the heavy transport wagons.

Our friends from Ontario may sit quiet under this charge, but we from the province of Quebec will not sit dumb while an incompetent purchasing commission is buying all the old hacks throughout the country and sending them out as Canadian-bred horses.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I beg to remind the hon. member that it is not in order at this stage to read an article from a newspaper and found an argument upon it. It would be in order to ask a question or to deny the correctness of a statement, but not to commence a discussion.

Mr. ROBB: I have made the statement I wish to make, and I want to know from the hon. minister if this remount commission is to be continued in office?

Major-General HUGHES: There is absolutely no foundation in fact in the statement, and the remount commission remains.

THIRTIETH OVERSEAS BATTALION.

MAJOR-GENERAL HUGHES: I wish to announce the fact that the Thirtieth Overseas Battalion from Victoria, B.C., will pass through this city to-morrow en route to Halifax, to join the other corps of the brigade in preliminary training for overseas work during next month. The regiment will be paraded for review in front of the parliamentary buildings to-morrow at 10.30 a.m. I am requested to invite all the members of Parliament, the press and friends generally of the service to come and witness the review. The regiment is a very fine one, and I am sure the soldiers will be delighted to see the members and the members will be delighted to see the soldiers.

MEDICAL EXAMINER J. C. MORRISON.

Mr. CARROLL: Has Dr. J. C. Morrison, of Waterford, been dismissed as medical examiner at that recruiting station?

MAJOR-GENERAL HUGHES: If my hon. friend will send in his question in proper form, I will attend to it. I endeavour to keep in my head everything that comes under my notice, but it is rather difficult to do so.

INLAND NAVIGATION RATES BILL.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton) moved the second reading of Bill No. 3, to amend the Railway Act. He said: This Bill will, I believe, be of great benefit to producers and shippers in western and eastern Canada. It calls for the placing of vessels on our inland waters under the control of the Railway Commission. The transportation problem is one of the most important with which Canada has to deal. We have a vast territory and a small population. Our lines of communication in many instances have been built in advance of the needs of the districts through which they run. With the most wonderful water transportation facilities in the world and with a

people who are ready and willing to develop these advantages, we have the duty imposed upon us of assisting this development.

In Europe artificial and natural waterways are developed to an enormous extent. The great bulk of the grain and grain products are never carried by rail. The port which has behind it a navigable stream or canal has a wonderful advantage over its competitor that depends entirely upon railway transportation. When the Welland canal is completed the Canadian Government will have expended since Confederation $350,000,000 in developing our waterways. This is an enormous sum of money, and it is the duty of Parliament to surround the people who have been so generous, with legislation that will mean every safeguard in the transportation of our products both east and west. This expenditure is increasing year by year, and the charges of maintenance and operation are being borne by the people. We have great fleets of dredges, ice breakers, and barges, that are constantly assisting navigation, and practically all these advantages are free to the vessel-owners, who are not compelled to make any sacrifices for them. Notwithstanding this enormous outlay freight rates keep steadily increasing.

A commission, appointed by the Saskatchewan Government two years ago for the purpose of investigating the freight rates from the producers in Saskatchewan to the Liverpool markets, made some startling statements. One statement was that the lake-carriers' charges have doubled since 1909. If hon. members will look at the report placed in their hands by the Joint Commission appointed by the Senate and the House of Commons for the purpose of investigating the consolidation of the Railway Act, they will find on the last page of it a statement made by the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals which practically supports the statement made by the Saskatchewan Commission. If this statement is correct, and I have no reason to doubt that it is correct, then, it is the duty of this Parliament to surround the producers in western Canada with such legislation that they may receive a reasonable service for a reasonable rate.

The Liverpool market, we know, regulates the price of grain products for the whole world. Every dollar that we add to the cost of transportation of our products to that market means that the producer in Canada receives one dollar less. Another statement made by the commission appointed by the Saskatchewan government was that our ocean freight rates have increased since 1909 to an enormous extent. They say that, while in 1909 the cost of transporting a thousand bushels of grain from the port of Montreal to Liverpool was only $40, the present charge for that service is no less than $75. They say that the grain of Canada costs more per ton delivered to the Liverpool market than does the grain of any other country in the world. If that be true, the sooner we adopt the Bill which I have presented to the House and allow the Railway Commission to deal with this question the better it will be for the producers of Canada. Is it possible that grain can be collected at the ports of the Argentine Republic with its territory very similar to our own, and transported a distance of about 5,000 miles across the ocean, practically double the distance that our grain has to be transported, and delivered in Liverpool at a less cost than we have to pay with all our splendid facilities? Is it possible that grain can be carried from Australia and New Zealand, 12,000 miles from Liverpool, at a less cost than from Canada?

The governments of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta have built hundreds of elevators in these western provinces. This Government, also, has built large elevators in Saskatoon and Moosejaw, and others are in course of construction. The Railway Commission has control of freight rates from the time the grain leaves the producer until it arrives at Port Arthur or Fort William. But there it is handed over to the vessel owner who is free to make any charge he pleases, to enter into any arrangement he wishes. We have appointed a Grain Commission to assist the producers in the West to secure a fair and adequate return for their efforts. But after we have expended the enormous sums I have already stated on the maintenance and improvements of our inland waterways, the vesselmen can take that grain, carry it where they please, and charge what they please without restriction.

The building of elevators at our ports has materially assisted in the handling of grain. Montreal has elevators with capacity of about nine million bushels. And just a word with regard to the port of Montreal, because men who are interested in the carrying of grain on our inland waters have placed some definite statements on that subject before the committee that had this Bill under consideration. They stated that last season vessels had to remain in the port of Mont-

real, ten, fifteen and even twenty days before they could be unloaded. They said that the elevators of the Montreal Harbour Commissioners at the port of Montreal in 1907 only handled a little over a million bushels of grain, while owing to their greatly increased elevator capacity they were able last year to handle sixty-two million bushels. That is an enormous increase. But the president of the Marine Association and others declare that the port of Montreal is not yet capable of taking care of the grain that comes to that port. If that be the case, it is up to this Parliament, it is up to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, to put forth every effort to remedy that state of affairs. Those of you who will read the book that has been placed in your hands by the Gazette Publishing Company of Montreal during the last few weeks, a book for which that concern deserves a great deal of credit, will learn that vessels containing 1,500,000 bushels of grain after reaching the port of Montreal could not be accommodated there, and were compelled to return to Buffalo to unload their grain rather than lose the twenty days or more of waiting in Montreal harbour during the two months when there was a blockade in that port. This is another reason why the Railway Commissioners should have control over our shipping rates. They should be able to force the speculators who hold up grain in the port of Montreal to send that grain forward; and should be able also to provide sufficient elevator capacity for the handling of our products from the West.

It is estimated that when the Welland canal is completed we shall save one cent a bushel in cost of transportation. But if this Parliament will not surround the producer with such legislative protection as I am proposing, the whole of that saving will go, not to the producers but to the transportation interests.

One great difficulty is that grain is held in Montreal by speculators, and the Harbour Commissioners seem to be powerless to force these men to export it.

The port of Buffalo handles about 150,000,000 bushels of wheat per annum. The bulk of that wheat is not exported, but is for consumption in the United States.

The carrying trade of this country, especially water transportation, is capable of wonderful development; Canada is only at the beginning of the development of her industries. It has been stated that only two per cent of the arable land in Alberta is under cultivation, and it has also been stated by members of this House that only ten per cent of the arable land in Saskatchewan is under cultivation. I remember listening to a speech made by a former minister of the province of Manitoba, during the course of which he said that the province of Manitoba—then without its increased area—was capable of producing at least 500,000,000 bushels of wheat in addition to other grains. I have no reason to doubt that assertion. In the face of these facts, is it not wise that we should enact such legislation as I am proposing, in order that we may assist the western producer as much as possible?

I know that the Government have received many urgent requests to defeat this legislation. I understand that this very day we have men here representing the shipping interests who assert that every member of the Joint Commission of the House of Commons and the Senate are opposed to this Bill. I wish to say to these visiting gentlemen that that assertion is untrue. I feel confident that not half a dozen members of the committee will oppose this legislation, and I feel sure that it is not too much for the producers to ask that their interests be protected, and that whatever is done by the vessel men be done in the interests of the public.

There are 8,500 vessels registered in Canada, and the Department of Marine and Fisheries report that 42,500 men and boys are working on those vessels. The Department of Railways and Canals reports that during 1913 the total tonnage passing through American and Canadian canals was 79,000,000 tons, and that 55 per cent of that was carried through Canadian canals. The people of Canada furnish every means to assist transportation on our inland waters, and they protect the marine interests against foreign shipping. Our coast regulations give Canadian vessels advantage over vessels of other countries; in other words, we retain for our vessel owners the exclusive right to enjoy the coasting privileges. All vessels owned, constructed or operated in connection with the railway system in Canada are compelled to file their tolls, rates and tariff arrangements with the Board of Railway Commissioners, and the Railway Commission have absolute control over those arrangements. Only a small proportion of the vessels on our inland waters come under the jurisdiction of the Railway Board. If the ships carrying freight on our inland waters and connected with our railways are compelled to come under the jurisdiction of the

Board of Railway Commissioners, what reason can be given why other vessels should not be willing to come under that same jurisdiction? The railway men have not complained because they have been placed under the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners, and there is no reason why the vessel men should not be fairly treated by the Board if they were placed under their control.

This Bill simply asks that all other vessels plying between any port or place in Canada to other ports in Canada and handling produce of any kind in Canada shall be considered common carriers and come under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission. The vessel men protest strongly against being placed under the jurisdiction of the board, and assert that it will result in increased freight rates and lack of competition. Increased freight rates? Is it possible that these men object to increased freight rates. Increased freight rates means increased profits for these men. I feel that I am justified in making the assertion that there is mighty little competition on our inland waters to-day. I want to make use of a statement made before the joint committee by Mr. Henderson, Chairman of the Marine Association, in which he said that 90 per cent of the vessels on our inland waters are under the control of the Marine Association. He also said that with regard to rates, charges tolls and agreements they had no combination. But it seems very strange that these men are ready and willing to organize and band themselves together, unless it be for their own mutual benefit.

Remember that we must take into consideration not only the large shippers of grain and products from western Canada, but the small manufacturer; the small producer from eastern Canada who is anxious to ship his goods to the West to compete with similar products coming in from the united States. These men are seriously handicapped because of the restrictions surrounding them and forced upon them by the vessel owners. I am informed that unless some definite action is taken by this Government during the present session, increased freight rates will be charged to the shippers both in the East and in the West. I hope that the Government will see to it, therefore, that this Bill becomes law and that a reasonable service and reasonable rates are granted to shippers, both east and west. It cannot with justice be said that the Railway Commission has not the right to control in this matter, and that the Marine and Fisheries Department of Canada is likely to interfere. I have made a thorough investigation into this phase of the matter, and I have the most definite assurance from the best legal advisers—men who are thoroughly posted in regard to the marine laws of Canada—that nothing can interfere with this legislation if it once becomes law. I, therefore, respectfully urge the Government to place this legislation on the statute book at the earliest possible moment giving to the Railway Commission control of all freight charges, and tariff agreements made by vessel men. By doing this they will enable manufacturers and producers to do business on a basis of reasonable service. They will make the boat owners liable for any failure in their duty. The Board will fix penalties, and provide for fair and equitable treatment of all interests using our navigable waters. Vessel men giving service need not fear this legislation; those who do not give such service should be compelled to do so.

Mr. HEPBURN: If an individual is operating small steamers, say in the bay of Quinte, and giving perhaps a tri-weekly service, and you endeavour to force him to give a weekly service and he says; rather than do that I shall withdraw my steamers; what would you do?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: It is not my intention to attempt to answer questions such as that because it is a matter which, if this Bill becomes law, would come before the Railway Commission and there is no reason to doubt that the Railway Commission would deal fairly and reasonably with any proposition placed before them. The Railway Commission have shown that they will be most reasonable and fair towards the transportation companies and also towards the people who are using transportation facilities. I am satisfied that the Railway Commission are a reasonable body of men who will do justice to any matter that comes under their jurisdiction.

Mr. CARROLL: This applies only to steamers carrying some passengers?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: To both freight and passenger boats.

Mr. CARROLL: Would a steamship or vessel carrying only freight come within the meaning of this amendment?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Most assuredly. There is another clause dealing with certain

privileges granted by railway companies to shippers and manufacturers in the eastern provinces especially. I have received petitions and letters from numerous shippers and manufacturers who feel that they are seriously handicapped by the privileges which are being granted to other shippers and manufacturers in the eastern provinces, and of which they cannot take advantage. For instance, before the joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons, it was shown that the Board of Trade of Toronto had formulated several objections to the privileges granted by railway companies to millers and speculators whereby large quantities of grain are stored in cars at Port Arthur or Fort William or in Winnipeg, the rolling stock which should be placed at the disposal of the producers in our western country being thereby tied up and the advantage which should accrue to the producers
4 p.m. through the handling of their grain seriously lessened. I might also refer to the privileges granted to real estate speculators, particularly in western towns, who are also interested in railway companies who have been able to induce the railways to pass by communities which are thickly settled and to establish townsites at points where there is no reason or justification for their establishment. The Board of Railway Commissioners have distinctly stated time and again that they have no control over the privileges granted by the railway corporations in this respect. This clause merely provides that all these privileges shall come under the jurisdiction of the Railway Board. Questions such as cartage should also come under their jurisdiction. I am satisfied that the matters which I have laid before the House call for a remedy, and I believe that the remedy is to be found in the Bill that I am now proposing. There is not a farmers' organization in western Canada that will not support this Bill nor is there a fruit or vegetable growers' association in eastern Canada that will not be enthusiastically for it. Boards of trade, shippers and manufacturers in different parts of our country have been calling for just such legislation as this, and I am confident that it is the duty of the Government to place it on the statute book at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia): I am glad the hon. gentleman has brought forward this Bill. Most members will agree that it is a very necessary one. The principle was discussed and received very general acceptance in this House a year ago. There is absolutely no reason why the steamship companies should not come under the Board of Railway Commissioners. No decision of the Railway Board has ever been challenged as unfair. The railway companies themselves are satisfied with the board. I was told by one of the biggest railway men in Canada about two years ago that if they had a choice they would not go back to the position in which they were before, for one of the very reasons that my hon. friend is trying to remedy this Bill of his, that is that they much prefer the decision of the Railway Commission that enables them to do away with the granting of any privilege to any particular class of shipper or class of people, While at this moment the rates on western grain may not appear so very burdensome simply because the grain is double the price it was a year ago, yet the grain was practically all out of the hands of the farmers before the rise in price came about.

Things had reached such a point a year ago that there was no profit or mighty little, for the farmer who produced the grain. The cost of taking a bushel of wheat from Winnipeg to Liverpool was from 6 to 8 cents higher than for two years previously. This was all brought about by mergers and amalgamations among the lake and ocean transportation companies, and the farmer had to pay every cent of the increase. The Bill my hon. friend has introduced will remedy this to a very large extent. The steamship companies cannot suffer; for no one can make me believe that the Railway Commission is not absolutely fair, or that it will deal unfairly with railroads, steamship companies or the public. We can safely leave the matter to them. I trust the Minister of Railways will accept this Bill and see that it becomes law this session.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN (Regina): I desire to make a few remarks in regard to this Bill, and to say at the outset that I approve of the principle of bringing navigation companies on the lakes, and their tolls, under the control of the Railway Commission just as railway rates are under its control. I have not been able to gather from my hon. friend's remarks the relative charges of the railroads, the lake and the steamship companies. Personally I do not know exactly how much the lake companies charge for carrying a bushel of wheat from Fort William to Montreal, for instance, or how much the ocean companies charge for carrying it

from Montreal to Liverpool. If we had that information we should be in a better position to know exactly where the high rates come in. In western Canada we have been inclined to blame the railroads more than the steamship companies, and we have had the idea that ocean rates are perhaps higher than they should be; but as a rule, I have not heard much criticism in western Canada of the companies operating on the Great Lakes. My hon. friend spoke about competition, and would have us believe that there is no competition on the Great Lakes; but I have always understood, although I may be wrong, that there was competition between American companies and American ports and Canadian companies and Canadian ports. It is a matter of great importance that our tolls on the Great Lakes should not be too high, and I am sure that if the navigation companies are put under the Railway Commission they will be fairly dealt with. If the companies are not charging too much I cannot see why they should not at once agree to come under the commission, but if they are charging too much I can see why they would be afraid to come under its jurisdiction. It would be a most fortunate thing for the people of Canada to know that they were being charged fair rates by the navigation companies. It has always seemed to me that any great corporation using the public utilities whether canals, lakes, or the right of way, should be under the control of the Parliament of Canada through a commission of some sort. That is only due to the people of this country, who are paying for these great public utilities. It is important that our rates on the lakes should be low, not only for the purpose of building up our Great Lake ports but, as my hon. friend from Lambton has said, for the benefit of all the producers in this country. For these reasons I think every member in this House might well give his support to this Bill.

Mr. EDMUND BRISTOL (Centre Toronto): I was present before the committee, and had the opportunity of hearing some of the vesselmen who would be affected, presenting their views to the committee. I have also listened with some attention to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, and to the hon. gentleman who has introduced this Bill. It seems only fair to the House, to the country, and to the enormous interests which would be affected, that I should give, in the briefest possible fashion, the reason why the vesselmen believe it is not in the interests of the Canadian people that this particular legislation should pass. And as I understand it manufacturers and shippers take practically this view. I have not the evidence before me, but I understand that is the case, and it is very easily explained.

Obviously the rates of the shipping companies on the Great Lakes have to be lower than railroad rates, because if they were not, the shipping companies would not get the business. They must beat the railroad rates, whether American or Canadian. Consequently, although the Railway Commission may fix reasonable railway rates in view of water and other competition, shipping companies have still to get under those rates. That is the first point. Secondly, the competition on the Great Lakes is not merely among Canadian shipping companies themselves but also with American shipping companies via Buffalo and New York. Consequently, to get grain from the head of the lakes to Montreal and thence to Liverpool, the rate on Canadian vessels has to be lower than on American vessels, or otherwise the grain would go via Duluth, Buffalo, and New York. Every one knows that the Buffalo and New York route, so far as the ocean end of it is concerned, has a great advantage over the Canadian route. New York is on what is called the Atlantic triangle. Vessels going from London to the Argentine come up the coast to New York, and then cross to London. The ocean rate is the one that very largely affects the situation, and over that rate, unfortunately, we have no control. From day to day and hour to hour during the grain season in this country, the competition is against New York and the New York route, and if by any chance the rates happen to be reasonably high, you can rest assured that the Atlantic combine will take over all there is from Canada via New York; and we cannot touch them.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: We do not permit that.

Mr. BRISTOL: This Bill does not touch them in any way. What the Canadian vessel owners say is: We want to get freight away from Buffalo and New York and into Canadian ships, Canadian channels, and Canadian ports. The only way to do that is from day to day and hour to hour to give a better rate, and we have done it this season. We have taken over ten millions of grain this season out of Chicago via Montreal, and it is the first time it has ever happened. If their view is correct,

how would it be possible for the vessel owners of this country to give a better rate practically from day to day and hour to hour on grain, which is the most important product shipped out of this country, and on which every one wants to see the best possible rate given to the Canadian farmer? We must make transportation as cheap as we can in this country. Farming is one of the most vital industries of Canada; more important than transportation, and unless we can give cheap rates the farming industry will not advance. The vessel people say: You will hinder us from doing the very thing you want to see brought about, because we have to be in a position to beat the Buffalo and New York route.

What has happened this year? Atlantic rates are higher to-day than they have ever been and the reasons for that are obvious. The rates on the Great Lakes have been lower than they have been for years. We have had the spectacle of grain being carried from Port Arthur to Montreal for three and a half cents a bushel as against five, six and seven cents a bushel in other years. If there have been any combinations on the Great Lakes that have affected the matter they have affected it very beneficially for the Canadian farmer because if the Canadian farmer had been getting anything like the same rates from the head of the lakes to the shipping point in the Canadian west or from Montreal to Liverpool he would have had a lower rate than that in force in any other country in the world.

Mr. WEICHEL: Is it not a fact that more Canadian tonnage was under the jurisdiction of one company this year than in any other previous year?

Mr. BRISTOL: Absolutely; there is no doubt about it, but the result is that the company has been able to save nearly $300,000 in cost of operation and the Canadian farmer is getting his share of the benefit in a lower rate than has ever been known in this country before.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I would ask whether the American ships on the Great Lakes are under the control of the Inter-State Commerce Commission?

Mr. BRISTOL: I understand that those operated by railways are and that the others are not. But the boats we have to compete against in the grain trade are not operated by railways but by private shipping companies. Anybody can get into the shipping business. You can incorporate a company; the Great Lakes are free to everybody and competition is absolutely keen. There is no opportunity to do anything different so long as Buffalo and New York are competing with Canadian shipping. We are deepening the Welland canal and I am sorry we are not also deepening the St. Lawrence. When you deepen the Welland canal what do the Americans do to meet that situation? They have paid many millions of dollars in building a canal from Oswego to the Erie canal so that when the Welland canal is deepened the big boats that now stop at Port Colborne or Buffalo will go to Oswego, Kingston or Prescott. The way the grain will go will depend precisely on what the rate is going to be between Oswego and New York. New York has a very great advantage over Montreal by reason of insurance rates, accessibility, and the tramp ships that come in there. One of the great troubles we have is the fact that on our northern route insurance on the vessels is greater and that the route itself is considered somewhat more dangerous than the New York route. The Canadian Government have been doing everything they possibly could do to make the St. Lawrence route as good as it can be made. I believe that we could canalize the St. Lawrence, and I believe that in doing it we would help the Canadian farmer, because the grain would go to Montreal and then be loaded into lighters or into ships going abroad. That is the ideal shipping situation for this country to be in, and that is what we should aim at. I am satisfied that my hon. friend is introducing this Bill in absolute good faith, and I am satisfied that every hon. gentleman who supports it is supporting it in good faith, but I believe that we should pay heed to what the shipping interests say when they tell us that so long as they have to fight this American competition they cannot be giving a rate of tolls from hour to hour and minute to minute to the Railway Commission, that they have to be in a position from hour to hour in order to fight that competition, to give a better rate by Canadian boats and through Canadian channels, and that if you do not leave them in that position you are going to seriously hamper them in the competition that they have to meet in the shipping world to-day.

Mr. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I had the honour last session to be a member of the joint committee, composed of members of

this House and of the Senate appointed to consider the consolidation of the Railway Act, and this was one of the changes which it was intended to make and which was introduced by the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong). I am sorry that I did not hear that hon. gentleman throughout his speech. He presented his case very ably in the latter part of his speech, and, like my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol), I believe that the hon. gentleman who has introduced the Bill has done so with the very best of intentions, and I also believe there are many people who think that the adoption of this Bill would be of very great benefit to the Canadian people. I do not think I can present the evidence that was taken before that committee last year in any better manner than it has been presented by the hon. member for Centre Toronto. The great question that was raised there by the shippers who opposed this amendment was, just as he has stated, that the task which the steamboat owners had to perform was to successfully meet competition from their American rivals and they represented, as I understood their story, that in the United States the steamboats and vessels which were directly connected with the railways were under the jurisdiction of the Inter-State Commerce Commission. This is a grave situation. If the situation on the Great Lakes is as grave as it was represented to be by those who opposed this amendment last year, I think we should come to a decision in regard to this Bill only after the most mature consideration. My hon. friend who introduced the Bill tells us that because steamships are connected with railway lines they are under the jurisdiction of the Railway Board and he argues that therefore all ships should be under the jurisdiction of the same board. I do not follow him in that contention. There are very good and very serious reasons why ships connected with railways should be under the jurisdiction of the Railway Board, which I suppose is responsible to Parliament. I do not know whether it is responsible to Parliament or not, but I suppose that if it does not do right the Government can dismiss it. There is not a railway in the Dominion but has received aid from the Government, and the Government must necessarily be interested in the proper conduct of these railways because the country's money has been invested in them. I suppose that is true of every railway built in Canada since Confederation. When these railways operate boats there is good reason why this Government should have some say in preventing these boats from putting on exorbitant rates. The Government exercises that control through the instrumentality of the Railway Board. But the question that we are now considering is an entirely different one. When it is proposed to place under the jurisdiction of the Railway Board vessels under private ownership which have never received anything from the Government by way of subvention or anything else, the proposal is one involving a very important departure from the policy which has hitherto been pursued. I do not pretend to be a very great constitutional lawyer but I have serious doubts as to whether or not the Railway Department, leaving the Railway Board out of the question, could take control of the shipping interests. The Railway Department has a man of good business capacity at its head at the present, but if he should propose to take control of the shipping interests a considerable howl would go up and I believe the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) would say: Hands off; you may be well able to look after the railway interests but I have been appointed to look after the marine interests.

What difference is there between the Minister of Railways taking control of the shipping interests of this country and a board or commission appointed by him doing so? That is a question that should be submitted to the Minister of Justice for his consideration. Doubtless my hon. friend who has introduced this Bill has some very good reason for introducing it in this form; but, while there may be some excuse for bringing common carriers under the jurisdiction of the Railway Board, ships owned and controlled by people who ship only their own products in their own ships should not come under this Bill, and ships chartered by the season by companies or individuals who ship in such ships only their own products, should not come under this Bill. I have in mind several companies in the lower provinces, namely, the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, the Dominion Coal Company and the Dominion Steel Company, all of which absolutely control their own ships. The Dominion Steel Company has a magnificent fleet of ships plying between Sydney and Montreal, and also with Newfoundland. The Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company have also a very large fleet of ships plying to and from Montreal, Sydney, New Glasgow, and in fact every place where they can sell a bar of

steel or a pound of coal. Their ships carry nothing but the products of the mines of their owners or the products of the steel works; they are in no sense common carriers, and I do not think it would be fair to place them in the same position as common carriers. Owing to the very strong evidence which I heard given before the committee last year by the shipping interests of this country, and owing to the fact that they would be unduly hampered in their competition with the United States, I object to the passage of this Bill. I have not heard their objection answered. If it is answered to my satisfaction, then, of course, my objection to that phase of the Bill will fall to the ground.

As I pointed out a moment ago, I think the Minister of Justice should take the matter into consideration and give his legal opinion as to whether or not the Department of Railways or the Railway Commission can take control. Is it not the function of the Minister of Marine to institute a board to look after this matter?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: The Minister of Railways is also the Minister of Canals, and as such has jurisdiction over the public canals. On that ground alone he can take control over the rates of the railways that use the public canals.

Mr. CARROLL: That is a very small part of my objection. Canadian ships coming to and from Canada pass through other waters than our canals.

Mr. MACLEAN: The St. Lawrence channels, for instance, made by the Government.

Mr. CARROLL: I do not think the Minister of Railways contends that his department has any exclusive jurisdiction over the river St. Lawrence or the gulf of St. Lawrence or the waters into which the river St. Lawrence flows. As a Nova Scotian, I am not so very much interested in the traffic on the Great Lakes, but as a Canadian I am deeply interested. My chief objection to the Bill is that if it passes it will embrace common carriers. I contend that it should not embrace a line of steamships exclusively engaged in carrying the produce of one company from the place of production to its destination.

Mr. B. R. HEPBURN (Prince Edward): I have listened with a good deal of interest to the remarks of my hon. friend the member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong), and I believe he is perfectly sincere in his desire to have this Bill pass. Having been, however, in the steamboat business for a number of years, but fortunately now being out of it, I can see that if this Bill is passed, it will cause all sorts of complications. If the hon. member for East Lambton was thoroughly familiar with the port of Montreal, for example, and the thousands of small ships owned by different individuals that trade between the port of Montreal and the ports of the lower St. Lawrence in the different parts of Quebec, he would see it would be almost impossible to put such boats under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission. If we attempted to do that, we would put the small boat owners absolutely out of business. A great many of the men owning boats that operate on the lower St. Lawrence are uneducated, not being able to read or write, and they have trouble enough now endeavouring to make a small living out of the operation of their boats, because of the slowness of time in the carrying of freight between ports and the giving to the people of a service probably once every week or once every two weeks as the case may be.

The manner in which freight rates are arrived at with regard to package freight for carriage on the Great Lakes is that the steamboat owners take the freight and work on a differential basis. The differential between Montreal and Port Arthur, for example, runs from two cents for fifth-class freight to either eight or ten cents for first-class freight. Let us suppose that I am operating a line of steamers from Montreal to Port Arthur to connect with the railroads there, and that I am running a boat a day and giving quicker service from Montreal to Winnipeg than do the railroads, is there any reason why I should not be allowed to charge the shippers as much money as the railroads do? I cannot see any reason why I should not, and I am satisfied that the Railway Commission could not see any either. The Canadian steamship owners are giving a daily service out of Montreal and are operating at a less cost than the railways, on a first-class rate of ten cents per 100 lb., and a fifth-class rate of two cents per hundred. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol) has given reasons why the control of the grain carriers between Port Arthur and Liverpool via Montreal should be in the hands of the steamboat owners in order to enable them to meet competition via New York. If you attempt to put grain rates under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission, you will practically ruin the Canadian shipping industry and drive all business via Buffalo and New York.

The same thing applies to the smaller boats in the province of Ontario. I live in a

county in which the carriage of freight is practically dependent on the steamboat men. We have only one railroad there and only one line through the county. I know a number of men operating small boats on the Bay of Quinte and endeavouring to make a living. If you put them under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission it will mean the introduction of men skilled in the formation of tariffs and so on, the elimination of the existing boat service, and bring about all kinds of trouble.

Mr. F. L. SCHAFFNER (Souris): I believe I should not fulfil my duty if I had not something to say on this Bill. It goes back to the old question of freight rates, which is an important question to any man from western Canada. Perhaps that question has been more important in the past than it will be in the future. For we all know that, thanks to the efforts of this Government, we shall soon have in operation the Hudson Bay railway, and a large percentage of our grain—though perhaps not so much as has been stated to-day—will be exported by that route. If I have any fault to find with this Bill it is that, as I understand it, it does not include ocean freight rates. Heretofore, when the question of freight rates has been before this House, we have always thought of railway rates—land rates—and have not paid much attention to ocean freight rates. An exception is to be made, I believe, by my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) who made careful research into that problem and made it a subject of a very able speech. What we want is the cheapest possible freight rates, whether by land or by water. I was a little surprised at my hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. Hepburn) saying he could not see any reason why ocean rates should be cheaper than railway rates. I am confident that any commission to which the matter is submitted would not hesitate to say that there was no comparison between the cost of transporting freight by sea and transporting it by land. As an illustration I may state that it costs about the same to bring a bushel of wheat from Argentina to Montreal by water as it costs to carry a bushel of wheat from Winnipeg to Port Arthur by rail. Any board to whom this matter of freight rates, whether by land or water was referred would be expected to consider it in a sensible, businesslike manner. This year, freight rates are not bothering us very much; the farmer is getting now perhaps more than a reasonable price for his wheat.

[Mr. Hepburn.]

Mr. BRADBURY: The middleman is getting it.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: If the farmer has the wheat, he is getting the price. I do not know that it is much of an argument as suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. Bradbury) to say that the wheat is out of the hands of the farmer. There is a good deal of wheat still in the farmers' hands, and most of what has been sold did not get out of their hands until a very good price was received. If we could have a guarantee that in the future the farmer should not find it necessary to let the wheat out of his hands for a lower price than that which he is receiving this year, I do not know that we should object to paying a good, round freight rate, whether by land or water. But we can only judge the future by the past, and, judging in that way, we must conclude that the conditions which have existed will return. During the last four or five years, and until war conditions prevailed, it did not pay the farmer to raise wheat. Now, from the time the farmer begins to prepare his land for the crop until the grain reaches the market, it is the duty of this Parliament, in the interests of the whole people, whether in the East or in the West, to give us the most favourable conditions. What shall we say about the Railway Commission? My opinion is that commissions may come and commissions may go, but the Railway Commission will go on for ever. Why? Because never in the history of this country has any commission given such general satisfaction. Some hon. member said that he did not know that the railways would be very anxious to have the Railway Commission discontinue. I do not agree with him. The railways of this country are not very fond of the present Railway Commission. This commission has been fair, and because of its great popularity the railways have not seen fit—and rightly too—to take the unpopular side and oppose the commission. I believe that we in western Canada have much to thank the Railway Commission for. Of course, the Railway Commission does not operate in exactly the same way as it did when it was inaugurated. How do we know but that from a small beginning—and I do not mean anything offensive to the promoter of the Bill in that—we may develop another body which will be as useful as the Railway Commission? Let us start somewhere. If we have been so successful in relieving the western farmer through the Railway Commission, we have a right to believe that we shall be just as successful with a commission controlling the rates by water.

The only objection I have to this Bill is that it does not go far enough. It controls rates, as I understand, only on inland waters. It is stated by some hon. gentleman on the other side that the Bill should not apply to private companies, but that we have a perfect right to apply it to companies that receive subsidies from this Parliament. But, even though we are not granting subsidies in actual money to these companies, we have spent, are spending, and will spend in the future, immense sums of money in aids to navigation, in docks, harbours and canals, for the development of this business. Hence, I cannot see why these companies should be exempt from control. The new commission, should one be appointed and charged with this duty of regulation, may be counted upon to be as fair to all companies as the Railway Commission has been to the railway companies. We must realize that wheat is not always going to be $1.50 a bushel—if it were I might not be supporting my hon. friend's Bill. But, in view of the change that may be expected to take place in the market conditions, the real business of this Parliament is to do its utmost to enable the farmers of Canada to send their products to the market at the lowest possible cost.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe): The riding which I have the honour to represent is very much interested in the growth and development of large grain ports, especially in view of the fact that the Canadian Pacific railway have elevators at Port McNicoll, and the Grand Trunk railway elevators at Midland. The fact that the business of transportation of grain through Canada has not increased as we hoped it would is my reason for rising to give my opinion of this proposed legislation.

While some gentlemen who have supported the Bill have made many statements, I regret that few of them have been statements of fact. One would almost imagine that the freight rates on the Great Lakes have been going up by leaps and bounds for the last ten years. Perhaps it will surprise hon. gentlemen when I tell them that there was a time when the freight rate from Fort William to Midland was seven cents a bushel, and that last year it was about one cent a bushel. I have in my hand the report of the Chamber of Commerce of Buffalo—the rates to Georgian bay ports are about on a parity with the rates to Buffalo—and for the benefit of hon. gentlemen and for future reference I will quote the rates in force previous to 1908.

In 1897, the range of rates on wheat from Duluth to Buffalo was 1-2½ cents; 1898, 1-3½ cents; 1899, 2½-6 cents; 1900, 1½-3¾ cents; 1901, 1⅛-3¾ cents; 1902, 1-2¼ cents; 1903, 1⅛-2¾ cents; 1904, 1-5 cents; 1905, 1¼-4 cents; 1906, 1¾-3 cents; 1907, 1-2½ cents; 1907, 1-2½ cents; 1908, 1-3½ cents.

There is no report later than that for the year 1908, but I can say that so low were the rates last year that a large number of vessels were tied up, on the American as well as on the Canadian side; the rates would not pay investors to go into the business. When the Algonquin first went on the lakes twenty or twenty-five years ago, the rate in the fall was seven cents a bushel, the reason being that there were very few vessels then in the grain business. I wonder if hon. gentlemen know how trade has grown particularly in respect of American vessels. I hold in my hand a book commonly known as the Great Lakes Red Book, issued in 1912. It gives the name of one vessel, the William P. Snider, with a tonnage of 13,000 tons, and scores of others with tonnages of 8,000, 10,000, and so on. As a rule the Canadian vessels are small, having a tonnage of about 3,500 tons. What is the real position of this grain trade? It is admitted that in the United States there are no restrictions in the shape of commissions hampering or interfering with the vessel owner or with the grain owner. It should be remembered, after all, that the grain owner is the man who dictates the route which the grain will take. If the grain owner has a million bushels of grain in the Port Arthur elevators, it is to him not a matter of sentiment, but a matter of business whether he ships it by Buffalo or by Montreal. My hon. friend the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol) made the statement, which everybody knows is correct, that the rates from New York are always lower than those from Montreal. Some hon. gentleman referred to the fact that there was an abnormal output from Montreal last year. I have sent for one of the reports, and I find that during the year 1913-1914 70,000,000 bushels of wheat were sent out of Montreal, and during the year before, 41,000,000. In 1897 the amount of wheat sent out was 11,000,000 bushels. Living at Midland, I know that prior to the war it was a matter of common knowledge that through that port there was passing a lot of wheat for Germany last year, and that the increase of 30,000,000 bushels at Montreal was due to to the fact that the German Government or German dealers in grain, in view of the impending war, were buying largely, and

were having the grain shipped via Montreal. I presume that was the reason for the vast increase of 30,000,000 bushels.

What are we going to do if we pass legislation like this? A man who owns grain in the Northwest will ship it by the Soo line to Duluth; it will then go on American vessels to Buffalo and be transhipped to England or other European country. It will not be interfered with by any commission in Canada, because no commission will deal with it in the United States. On the other hand, supposing a grain dealer should wish to send shipments by Fort William or via the Canadian Northern to Port Arthur; he is not bound to be under the ban of the Railway Commission, because it will be no contravention of the coasting laws to employ American vessels to take that grain from Port Arthur to Buffalo. It is in the fall of the year, when grain is passing out rapidly, that the Canadian vessel owner is looking for freights. In this little red book there is arranged a list of what are known as ore carriers, of which, I think, there are about 600. Some of these are of Canadian register and some American. Any vessel which is of such strength that you can shoot ore into its hold will easily carry grain, but any vessel that will carry grain will not necessarily be strong enough to carry a cargo of ore. Hon. gentlemen who have seen ore rushing into the bottom of a vessel realize that for that particular purpose a vessel of superior strength is needed. I take it, therefore, that there are not only upwards of 600 ore vessels in the trade, but two or three thousand large grain vessels in Canada and the United States. What are you going to do about it? Last year Canadian trade was in an apathetic state and competition with American carriers was so keen that Canadian vessels by the score were tied up. Vessels were tied up in Midland which in other years were probably getting two or three cents a bushel for carrying grain. The same conditions prevailed at the Soo, in the Detroit river and elsewhere. The ship lines of Canada made no money last year. The largest of them, the Canada Steamship line, passed its dividend; many others did the same, and some of them paid a very much decreased dividend. The passing of legislation of this kind means that the grain owner, who, I repeat, does not consider sentiment in the matter, may take his grain to Duluth by the Canadian Pacific railway and via American lines. The American system owned by the Hill people crosses into Manitoba and from the Northwest; and grain may by this line be brought down to Duluth, and the grain owner will not be hampered by the control of freight rates by a commission. In that respect you take the chance of hitting your Canadian railways. Of course, the Canadian Pacific railway can bring the grain to Duluth on their own line just as conveniently as they can bring it to Fort William, but it is the vesselman who will be hit, and hit the hardest—the vessel man who in Canada to-day is not getting within two or three cents a bushel of the rates that he got a few years ago. Despite the vast export from Montreal, last year such a state of things existed that the owners were compelled in many instances to tie up their vessels. These men will be in this position, that the ore trade being over in the United States, immense carriers like the Snider, with a capacity of 13,000 tons or 450,000 to 500,000 bushels of wheat, having made a good season in the ore business, will take on board cargoes from Port Arthur or Fort William for Buffalo at seven-eighths of a cent per bushel, as was the case last year; whereas the Canadian vessel, which cannot enter the ore trade owing to the American coasting laws, must wait for the Canadian wheat trade in the fall, and then cannot meet such a price as that charged by these immense carriers, the capacity of the Canadian vessels being usually about 100,000 bushels. This competition tends to divert the wheat from the Canadian Georgian bay ports or St. Lawrence ports to American ports. Not only are the two ports in my constituency deeply concerned in this, but also Goderich, Collingwood and the other ports on our lower lakes. The men who are endeavouring to build up a vessel trade in Canada are seriously handicapped in this way. It may be said, of course, that they are permitted to engage in the coal carrying trade from American ports to Fort William and Port Arthur in the summer, but there they have the competition of old American sailing vessels which are now used as tow barges and which, owing to their age and inferiority, carry the coal at rates which would be quite impossible for the Canadian steamships as the Canadian vessels, in order to comply with the insurance requirements for the carrying of grain, must be of a very much better class. It must be remembered that the proportion of American shipping to Canadian shipping is about seventy to one. The moment you place the Railway Commission over vessels this result will come about that the owner of the grain will be fearful that rates may

be imposed which are not now imposed by reason of the keen competition on the lakes to-day and the grain would be diverted to Buffalo and other American ports by these vessels. It would be an unfortunate thing for the Canadian vessel owner and for Canadian ports. The records show that the rates to Buffalo and to Georgian bay ports are the same. The freight rates on the Great Lakes are not high. They are decreasing and have decreased abnormally, and in view of the fact that while on the other side enterprise and capital have gone into the business of placing ships on the Great Lakes so that their merchant marine is firmly established, there are
5 p.m. comparatively few Canadian-owned vessels. These vessels should be given a fair chance and we should not pass legislation that can have but one effect, that of causing the shipper of grain to prefer the American ships and American avenues of trade rather than Canadian ships and Canadian avenues of trade.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (York South): Mr. Speaker, we have undertaken to deal in Parliament with the general transportation question. We have regulated the railways and we propose now to regulate the inland steamboats, and if I had my way we would regulate the ocean rates as well. I believe that ocean rates can easily be brought within the jurisdiction of this Parliament and it would be absurd for this country to continue spending the millions we are spending on the solution of the transportation problem unless we deal with the question as a whole, embracing railroads, inland navigation and ocean freight rates. One great principle that must be kept in mind is that water transportation and land transportation ought to be complementary one of the other. That has been worked out in Germany and in other countries and if a freight company can use both railroad and water transportation it should be compelled to do so. The question is not, as it was put by the hon. member for Centre Toronto, whether the steamships charge less than the railways, but do they charge a rate that gives a fair margin above the actual cost? So the man or the state that proposes to deal with transportation must deal with land transportation and with water transportation—and by water transportation I mean both on inland waters and on the high seas. So it is well within the jurisdiction of this House to deal with this question, and it is the duty of this House in dealing with transportation to regulate the rates on water as well as on land. It will be idle for us to spend any money in improving our inland navigation if we do not get the benefit of that improvement, because the more canals we build and the cheaper we make transportation, unless we regulate the steamboat lines, the more they will benefit by the reduction in cost of operation. If these things are true we ought to take control of the boats as well as of the railroads, and if we do take control we will not try to prevent the boat lines giving the claimed low service they have been giving to our people, but will prevent them doing any injustice. Inland transportation rates have often been the same as railway rates. They should not be as high as railway rates and we should have been able to prevent such a charge. We are told that we will be asked some day to allow a great railway company in this country to segregate its assets and take its boats and its steamship lines out of the control of the main company and put them under a company that would be purely a navigation or sea-going steamship company. If we had not control over the inland transportation of a railway, we might in this case lose control of it altogether. If we have control of a railway we ought also to have control of the boats, and it is only in that way that we can regulate transportation and get lower rates. Furthermore, if the proposal which the hon. gentleman has introduced to-day was in the Government measure of last session, why is not the Railway Act to be dealt with this session? We ought to have the Railway Bill before the House to-day, because the dislocation that has come to this country by reason of the war calls for regulation of the great corporations that seek to give public service to this country, whether banks, railway companies, inland transportation companies or ships upon the sea. We ought to be dealing with this transportation question in a broad way, and I hope the Minister of Railways will announce to-day that he is going on with this measure, so that it will not be necessary for private members to bring in Bills that seek to put in force some of the good principles that were incorporated in the Government Bill of last session. It would be to the great benefit of this country if we dealt with the transportation question this session, and put in force not only the clause which the hon. gentleman has introduced to-day but nearly all the clauses in the estimable Government Bill of last session. We should then be trying to get good

rates. As the hon. member (Mr. Schaffner) has just said, it is not of so much importance to the farmers this year because the price of grain is high; but we do not know how long that high price will continue. And I absolutely endorse what he has said and what the commission in the West found out that grain-growing is almost impossible in this country at the price obtained by farmers in the last few years. Furthermore, as grain went down in price, freight rates went up. In fact the whole tendency for the past few years has been to reduce the price that the farmer obtains for his wheat and to increase the cost of carriage. We shall not be able to populate the West and make it a successful farming country unless we control the rates charged on the produce of that country. We may subsidize railways, build competing lines, spend our money as freely as we like, but unless we adopt regulation of transportation as a principle, and in that direction, we shall be throwing our money away and not be helping to settle the West. The problem to-day is to settle the Canadian West and to restore prosperity to that country. Instead of only two per cent of the agricultural lands being occupied they should all be occupied. But to do that we must be able to say: We are going to give you a fair deal, you shall get a fair share of the product of your labour. Apparently there is no way of doing that and of holding out the lamp of hope to attract settlers to the West, except by regulation of transportation. When you adopt a great principle of that kind there is bound to be injustice in various directions. All practical legislation does more or less injustice; but it works. This principle could be applied and public relief attained, but only by making the principle broad and giving it a fair interpretation; and you can trust any public commission such as the Railway Board, to do justice, to secure fair treatment to the companies who give the service, and to injure nobody. I heard apologies made in this House to-day for a great transportation company that only a year ago was authorized to do what it liked in connection with its capitalization. That company has not been successful in making money on the enormous flotation it put out some months ago. But that is largely the fault of this Parliament. We should have kept control of the capitalization of that company, and if we had that control and control of its rates, we should be in a better position to-day to compel them to do what this Bill seeks to do: to treat the public fairly, to give a good service; and those who give the service should get a fair remuneration for it, based on its actual cost. I should like to see the House seized of this Bill, and the Bill of last session We should prepare now to take up the new duty that comes to Canada by reason of the dislocation the war has caused, and we should approach these new conditions with transportation under the control of Parliament by way of a commission, whether transportation by lake, rail, river or canal.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: Just a few words in answer to the objections made by different members. The hon. member for South York and the hon. member for Souris are supporting the measure. They merely ask that we shall have control of ocean freight rates as well.

Hon. F. COCHRANE (Minister of Railways and Canals): There is no doubt a good deal that is interesting to the people of Canada in the Bill that is now before the House, and from the discussion that has taken place this afternoon there is no doubt that there are two sides to the question. There was also considerable discussion in the committee last year, although I was not present, and I think the best thing for me to do is to move that the Bill be referred to the Railway Committee for discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question of the second reading is not disposed of yet, and consequently the hon. gentleman cannot make his motion now. The motion before the House is: Shall the Bill be read a second time? It is my duty to say that if there are any who desire to speak before the hon. member who moved the second reading of this Bill makes his final reply, as is his privilege, they have the opportunity to do so now. They cannot do so after he has spoken.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: I wish to thank the Minister of Railways for being good enough to let this Bill go to the committee. I am satisfied that when the evidence on both sides is heard the committee will unanimously decide in favour of the Bill. The hon. member for South York and the hon. member for Souris have called attention to ocean freight rates and urged that the Bill should give us control over those rates. That is quite impossible here. These gentlemen know that a commission has been appointed by this Government for the purpose of investigating freight rates on the ocean, and that commission is acting jointly with a similar commission appointed

by the British Government and have this matter under consideration. There is a provision in this Bill which requires that ocean vessels coming to our ports shall file their tolls and tariff arrangements and agreements at those ports. I am satisfied if that should become established the commission that is appointed to investigate ocean freight rates will be materially assisted. The hon. member for East Simcoe called attention to the fact that the United States has not any legislation similar to this applicable to shipping having coasting privileges along the shores of the United States. That is true; but at the present time Congress has under consideration a Bill which proposes to control such rates and to place them under a commission in the United States. They have had during the past two years a commission investigating this question and have decided to bring in a Bill, not similar to this, but one whereby they will be able to place vessels in their inland waters under the control of a commission.

The hon. member for East Simcoe quoted a number of rates in force to-day, but you will quite understand that these are the lowest rates that are given to the port of Midland. He also called attention to the fact that we are at the mercy of the vesselmen of the United States. The increased export through Montreal goes to show the enormous extension of the trade of that port and the need of such legislation as I am proposing. The volume of the transportation of grain through our ports is constantly increasing.

The hon. member for Central Toronto (Mr. Bristol) called attention to the fact that some of the manufacturers in eastern Canada are opposed to this legislation. I am quite aware of that. Large manufacturers, who to-day are receiving special privileges, or the lowest possible rates, from the vesselmen on inland waters—and I am not objecting to these reasonably low rates because they have tremendous quantities of goods to be carried by these vessels—are the only manufacturers who are coming forward to object to this measure. On the other hand, practically all the smaller manufacturers and shippers will welcome this measure in order that they may be able to have the rates applied in such a manner as the Board of Railway Commissioners will apply them. We have a statement from one hon. gentleman in opposition to this Bill to the effect that the freight rates on the inland waters should not exceed those on the railways, or that they should compare favourably with them. What an absurd statement to make, because when you take into consideration the fact that there are boats on the inland waters that are capable of carrying 250,000 or 300,000 bushels of grain, and that these boats can be operated at a cost of $250 per day, you can readily understand the small amount of actual cost involved in the transportation of these products from western ports to the port of Montreal.

I do not know that there were any other statements made seriously objecting to this measure. The hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll) gave his assurance that he would not oppose this Bill if people who own private steamboats or vessels are not interfered with, such as the Steel Company. I might call his attention to the fact that this Bill will have no effect on companies, such as the Steel Company, who own, control and operate their own boats. Therefore, I will in the future look for his sympathy in connection with this measure. I again wish to thank my hon. friend the Minister of Railways for agreeing to refer this measure to the Railway Committee, and I feel confident that we will be able to establish justification for taking the action we have.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. COCHRANE moved that the Bill be referred to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is that really the committee to which my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) wishes to refer this Bill? The Railway Act itself is referred to a committee which I think is not the standing committee on railways, but rather a special committee. The Senate has named a committee likewise. It was supposed that these two committees would possibly meet together and discuss the new Railway Act. It strikes me that it would possibly be well to refer this Bill to the special committee.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: This Bill is worded so that it applies to the old Act and it is perfectly right to refer it to the railway committee.

Mr. COCHRANE: We did not propose going on with the consolidation of the Railway Act this session and that is the reason I was proposing to refer the Bill to the Railway Committee of the House.

Motion agreed to.

ABOLITION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

On the order for resuming the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Bickerdike for the second reading of Bill No. 18, to amend the Criminal Code:

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): I had not the pleasure or the advantage of being present when the motion of my hon. friend from Montreal, (Mr. Bickerdike) for the second reading of the measure which he proposes, was moved. I have, however, taken occasion to read carefully the report of what was said by my hon. friend and by other hon. members who took part in the discussion on this very important question. It is unnecessary for me to say that my hon. friend who is my neighbour in the city of Montreal, put his motion before the House, in such a manner as to win our sympathy for the cause he is advocating. No one questions the absolute sincerity of the view that he puts forward on this very important question, nor would any one be disposed to question that he supported that view with arguments that are worthy of the most careful consideration. Neither do I think that there is any need of saying anything about the importance of the question itself. It is one that has for a long period of time engaged the attention of, I think I can without exaggeration say, the civilized peoples of the world. It is one too upon which there has been a very marked divergence of opinion. I am certainly free to concede that upon the side of this question which the hon. member (Mr. Bickerdike) has taken up there can be invoked the authority of names entitled to the very highest respect, as well as arguments of the very greatest weight.

In the United Kingdom in 1864, a committee was appointed to consider this matter and upon that committee were men of the very highest standing in the legal profession and in the public life of the country. The result of the deliberations of that committee was that its members were practically equally divided upon the question whether or not capital punishment should be abolished. That means that upon both sides of the question one could invoke the authority of the most eminent and most qualified men to judge, to be found in the United Kingdom at that time. That fact alone demonstrates that we are dealing with a question upon which no one can undertake to speak dogmatically, or which can be looked upon as one having anything even approaching but one side to it.

[Mr. Cochrane.]

I do not purpose going seriatim into the arguments advanced in support of this Bill. I may say at once that they have not carried to me the conviction that, at the present time at all events, this measure should pass into law. The basic argument—if I correctly grasp the effect of what the hon. member who introduced this Bill said—upon which he founds his contention, is that there is no right in the State to take any man's life. I understand him to take the most absolute view of the effect of the prohibition, "Thou shalt not kill". In the first place, before I touch the question whether there is any distinction to be made between the individual and the authority vested by society in the head of the State, when you come to the application of that prohibition, I think it may be well to point out what is obvious to us all, that even as regards that prohibition as addressed to the individual, it is not possible to accept it as being as absolute as the hon. member would seem to consider it. For instance, I do not think it would be suggested even by the hon. member himself that the individual is so absolutely bound by that prohibition that under no circumstances whatsoever would he be justified in killing a human being. Take for instance, a case that presents itself at the very first glance to every one—the case of self-defence. Surely no one would suggest that the prohibition is so absolute that when some man, armed to take my life, attacks me, I must, to conform with the reasonable requirement of the prohibition, stand quietly and allow him to kill me. It must be present to all our minds that there are other cases where the prohibition is not of absolute application. On the battlefields of Europe to-day our brothers, those of our own blood, those of our own immediate country, are engaged in the destruction of human life. We are making great sacrifices to fit them out and equip them so that they may be able to act with the greatest effect in that work in which they are engaged. I am satisfied that my patriotic friend from St. Lawrence will not suggest that those men are violating the command for which he, in common with us all, has such a very great respect. Therefore in so far as the contention is that the prohibition is so absolute that neither the State nor the individual can have any right under any circumstances to violate its letter, I need not spend more time in meeting it.

It seems to me also that there is a distinction to be made between the effect of that prohibition as addressed to the indi-

vidual and its effect when you seek to apply it to the governing power of the State, which is charged with the defence and the preservation of the State, just as the individual is charged with his own defence and his own preservation. And if it be true that the individual, when it is necessary for the preservation of his own life, is entitled to treat the prohibition as not applicable, I hardly think it can be claimed that, where the State, responsible for the protection of society and of all its members, finds it necessary in discharge of that paramount duty to take human life, it can be held to have violated that prohibition.

It seems to be contended that there is some more absolute right to life on the part of the individual than there is to any other possession of his, and more especially it is manifestly the contention of the supporters of this Bill that the individual has a more absolute right to his life than he has to his liberty, because what is proposed is not that we should let the guilty man, who to-day is condemned to lose his life, go free; what is proposed is that we should deprive him of his liberty. I think that on reflection it will appear clear that man's right to his life is no more absolute than his right to his liberty. It may be that in one case the object of the right is more precious or more valuable than in the other; but that does not alter the nature of the right, though it may affect the interest which a man has in asserting its inviolability. Whether life is more precious than liberty is a question on which there may very well be a difference of opinion. Certainly, the people who have at all times been most highly admired and commended are those who thought that liberty was more precious than life.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would remind the hon. minister of that great Irishman who said, " Give me liberty or give me death."

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: No, he was a Scotch-American. His name was Patrick Henry, but Patrick is an Aberdeen name.

Mr. DOHERTY: If he was not an Irishman, he had the best of names, and when a man has the best of names, I can excuse the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) for thinking that he must be an Irishman.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He deserved to be.

Mr. DOHERTY: Patrick Henry, whatever may have been his nationality, was among those who expressed the view that liberty is more precious than life. That is a view with which one may concur in without fear, at all events, of finding himself otherwise than in the very best of company. I am entirely unable to see what distinction can be made between the right to life and the right to liberty. If the proposition upon which this measure is based be that the right to life is so absolute that under no circumstances has the State the right to deprive a man of it, then it seems clear to me that it should apply equally to the right to liberty. Or, if it be alleged that the object of the right to life is more precious than the object of the right to liberty, I cannot see that reason has been given for making such a distinction. Looking at the matter from the point of view of abstract principle simply, I therefore find it impossible to follow the hon. member.

Now, if we could conceive of circumstances in which an individual, even when he becomes a member of society, retains rights so absolute that it is not to give way in the face of the superior right of the State to do the things essential for its preservation and for the effective carrying out of the duties incumbent upon those who are charged with the authority of the State, then I presume that a man's right to his life might be counted as among those absolute rights. But we must remember that, whatever may be the absolute right of the individual when he stands alone, yet, when he forms one unit in a great society his right must yield in order that the society of which he is a member may properly perform its functions and may secure to him, in common with all his fellow-members of that society, these very advantages, the assurance of which to the individual is the purpose for which society exists.

If I am right in this, all we have to ask ourselves is: Is the continuance of capital punishment necessary as a means for the repression of crime? For my part, I am willing to go further and to ask: Is it desirable for the enabling of society or the State to perform its duty of securing to those who are in its charge in the enjoyment of their lives and their liberty? No man's right is so absolute that it must not yield in the face of the equal right of his neighbour, and no man's right is so absolute that it must not yield in the face of that which is necessary, or even desirable, to maintain that condition in which organized society may ensure to the individual the full measure of protection which it is the duty of the State to give, and the giving of which to its members is the one thing that justifies the

existence of the State and its rightful authority.

I know, it may be said, that it is upon those who advocate the maintenance of this form of punishment to demonstrate its necessity and desirability. The best answer to that is that those who maintain the rightfulness of this form of punishment are, in this country at all events, the parties in possession. They are able to invoke, moreover, the fact that from the earliest times down to a comparatively recent period, there has been common consent as to the right of the State to enforce this penalty, and as to its necessity and desirability. Some countries in modern times have done away with this penalty; all countries have reduced its application so that it comes into play only in respect of the very gravest crimes. In that regard I think we may all agree that they have acted wisely—and in saying that I do not think that we imply at all that it would be wiser for them to go further and apply it to crimes of all classes.

A great deal has been said in support of this measure as to the sacredness of human life. I think the very sacredness of human life is the strongest justification for the maintenance of this penalty. Human life is sacred; there is no doubt about that. The life of the criminal is, within the limits of the disposition of properly ordained law, sacred. But the lives of the innocent are sacred, too; the lives of the whole community—men, women and children—are just as sacred. Their enjoyment of life, free from apprehension, is a very sacred thing. We are apt to lose sight of that when we get face to face with one man who is going to be hanged. Advocates of this measure at once forget the other one man, or the other several men, perhaps, who stood facing the revolver of this condemned individual. One life is not more sacred than another. But, it will be said, by taking the one you will not revive the other; and that is perfectly true. But, I think we need nothing more to justify the maintenance of this penalty than that it operates to deter the commission of the crime for which it is inflicted. I do not conceive that it is incumbent upon us to show that it is necessary for the purposes of a deterrent. All we are called upon to show is that it contributes to deterring, and adds an additional safeguard. Upon the question as to whether or not it operates as a deterrent, as upon all matters that touch this question, I am quite free to agree that there is anything but unanimity of opinion, and that people of the very highest authority have taken the view that the imposition of this penalty does not operate as a deterrent, or, at all events, not as a more effective deterrent than other means of punishment. When we are called upon to form an opinion about that, we are always asked to confine our attention to the individual man who has come to the stage of contemplating committing a murder and it is said: unless it can be established that the man at that moment stops and says to himself, well, if it were not for the hanging that might follow, I would kill my neighbour, you have not shown any deterrent effect. I do not so understand it. The great deterrent effect, to my mind, that the infliction of this penalty produces is the great deterrent effect upon the whole body of the community; upon the general mind; upon the manner in which the whole of the people look upon murder. It is in that respect that I think the argument fails, that because good effects have followed upon the abolition of this penalty with regard to minor crimes, we should go further. I can quite understand that the deterrent effect of capital punishment was very much minimized when it was made of general application, so that any offence whatever which a man might be tempted to commit, or, at all events, offences even of a minor character which a man might be tempted to commit, exposed him to this ultimate penalty. Inasmuch as we cannot hope for a community exempt from temptation to crime or offence of any kind, that condition of affairs very naturally created the feeling which is expressed in the saying that one might as well be hanged for a sheep as for a lamb; if hanging is to be applicable to offences great and small, the effect is that you put all offences upon the same level. But when you single out this crime of murder, this crime of taking human life, and set it apart in a category with treason, which involves taking or attacking the life of the state itself; when you set it aside to have applied to it this extreme penalty, then, it seems to me, you infallibly set that crime apart as an uncommittable crime for the great bulk of the population. That, to me, is the deterrent effect that I argue for. I am not prepared to argue, and I do not think it is necessary to argue, that when a man under the influence of passion, under the influence, perhaps, of intoxicating drink or under the pressure of cupidity, has come to the point where he is willing to consider murder as among the possible things, he will stop because he

may be hanged. But I do contend—and this seems to me to be clear—that the maintenance of this penalty is a great deterrent on the great mass of the people. You keep this crime before them as the thing that may be compared to the scriptural unpardonable sin and the thing that the State visits with the last and ultimate penalty of deprivation of life. Doing that, you bring home to every individual in the community just the extent to which the State appreciates the sacredness of human life. The state so appreciates that sacredness, it attaches such importance to enforcement of the prohibition: Thou shalt not kill, that before all its people it proclaims that towards the man who takes his neighbour's life, the state has no disposition to exercise mercy or leniency. So, for my part, it is not a question at all of what the individual would-be murderer thinks at the moment that he is going to commit his crime; the great important matter is how the whole community will look upon the crime of slaying a human being. I think that we can make no mistake when we take the most extreme means that are at our disposal to create and maintain in the common mind of the whole people that absolute conviction that the man who kills another steps beyond the pale of compassion.

So much for the deterrent effects of the maintenance of this form of punishment—and if you once admit the deterrent effects I do not think I need spend time in arguing for the position: that the authority responsible for the protection of society and all its individual members, the authority to whom the individual owes allegiance purely and simply because it exists to give and does give him that protection, is bound to use effective means to secure it to him. I know that minor arguments are advanced. We are told of the terrible danger, in view of the fallibility of all human judgment of some innocent man being convicted and being executed. I think under our system of administration of justice, that while, of course, no one can say that that is not a possibility, at the very least we can safely claim that it is a most remote possibility; and if it should have to be admitted that it might, after a long series of years, happen that one man, innocent of a crime, should unfortunately be convicted and executed, no doubt that would be a most lamentable thing. But for my part I would be quite prepared to set over against that the immense advantage which, in my judgment at least, results to society at large and to every individual member of it from the maintenance of this most extreme form of punishment.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bickerdike) spoke with a good deal of feeling of a case in which he said within the last year an innocent man had gone to the gallows. I happen to be familiar with that case. I am quite sure that the hon. member will not find fault if I suggest that I had greater opportunity of knowing just what happened in that case than he could possibly have had. I have on my shoulders the responsibility of that man's life, jointly, of course, with my colleagues, but the initiative of the advice and the responsibility for it was mine; and might I say to the hon. gentleman that that man went to the gallows after a trial before a properly constituted court, before a jury of his countrymen who convicted him; and he went to the gallows after the perfect regularity and legality of the trial had been submitted to the Court of Appeals in his own province and then to the Supreme Court of Canada, and he went there under the unanimous judgment of that Supreme Court and under a disposition of law which, for my part, I would with great regret see disappear from the Criminal code of this country.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. DOHERTY (resuming): When you left the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I was proceeding to speak of a case which the non. member who introduced this Bill had referred to in his remarks as being a case where an innocent man had gone to the scaffold. In themselves the circumstances of that case are perfectly simple. I have no desire, it is not a pleasant task, to insist upon the guilt of one who has now gone before a higher and an infallible Judge. But the fact remains that, so far as it is possible for us with our limited capacity for judgment to reach a sound conclusion, I myself have no doubt that that man went to a deserved death. The innocent man for whom the hon. member's heart bleeds started out with another innocent man, each of them armed with revolvers loaded and prepared for action, on the laudable purpose of holding up whomsoever they might meet and robbing them at the point of the revolver. They intended to go in company with two others. Somehow or other their arrangement did not turn out as they expected. They missed the two

others, and from the innocent employment of holding up the passer-by they diverted their attention to the equally innocent employment of burglarizing a couple of stores. They achieved this laudable purpose, and proceeded to divide the swag. But while engaged in that perfectly innocent occupation a policeman was imprudent enough and inconsiderate enough to intrude upon them and the policeman was shot. Nobody knows till this hour which of those two men shot the policeman.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: Good!

Mr. DOHERTY: But it is absolutely certain that one of those two men shot the policeman. The hon. gentleman's interjection of "good" conveys his idea of immaculate innocence. In the eyes of the hon. member, the man that did not fire the shot is an innocent man. All that he did was to start out armed and equipped and ready for murder. All that he did was to go out with murder in his heart. All that he did was to prepare himself so that if somebody interfered with his robbery of his neighbours he would be in a position to murder that somebody. That is all. Perfect innocence! If you have tears, prepare to shed them now. This perfectly innocent gentleman—and I do not know which of these two was the perfectly innocent gentleman, and nobody does—had only started out with that purpose. He had only started out with a companion inspired, to his knowledge, with the same purpose. The two of them had only gone out on an absolutely unlawful expedition in the course of which the two of them perfectly knew that murder was liable to be committed. They got ready for that. They went out, and what they perfectly knew might happen did happen. The barbarous representative of the law, the law that hangs men that murder their neighbours, ventured to interfere with them, and between the two of those men he was shot down and killed. There was not any possible doubt of all the facts that I have stated. These two men told us the story themselves. They agreed upon every incident until the moment of the firing of the shot; and then each said that the other man fired the shot. If we are to apply the doctrine that my hon. friend apparently thinks we should apply, then so far as we knew these were two absolutely innocent men who ought to have gone scot free.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: I did not say so.

Mr. DOHERTY: It is absolutely certain that one of them fired the shot. The Parliament of this country has enacted that where two or more men prepare for the committing of a crime, join together in the attainment of an unlawful purpose in the pursuit of which it is probable that any crime may be committed, each one of them is responsible for whatever crime the other commits and that certainly was the case here. For my part, I would be sorry should that cease to be the law. There was an innocent policeman who went out in the performance of his duty to protect the lives and the property of the citizens of Vancouver, for it was in that city this happened. He lost his life. My hon. friend does not seem to be impressed with the sacredness of his life; yet he was a perfectly innocent man. More than that, he was a brave man courageously doing his duty for the protection of the citizens of this country, doing his duty in seeing that other people who slept quietly at home in their beds that night were protected from the nefarious operations of the man who has gone to the gallows, and that policeman was shot down in cold blood without a moment's warning; was sent to his reckoning with his Creator without one instant of preparation. Human life is sacred, but my hon. friend has no sympathy to waste on the death of that man. His horror is that the two men were held responsible for that crime, the two men who co-operated to bring about the conditions in which that policeman lost his life, the two men whom the law declared to be equally guilty whichever of them fired the shot and the actions of each of whom led up to and culminated in that crime. For my part, I have said it twice already, and I say it now, I hope the law in that respect may long remain on the statute book. I think it is an absolutely just, an absolutely equitable, an absolutely necessary law. I said that I was responsible for the advice that sent that man to the gallows. I have no repentance for that advice. I certainly would have most absolutely failed in my duty, and my colleagues would have failed equally with me, had we given any other advice. Should we have sent it forth broadcast throughout this country that all that the burglar and the man willing to murder in the process of burglary has to do to save his neck, is to secure a companion so that you will not know which of the two did the shooting, when those who seek to interfere with him in the perpetration of his crimes have been murdered? I say it is an absolutely salutary law. If a guilty man ever went to the gallows, and I now have in mind the man who did not fire the

shot, I say it was that man. So much for that one particular instance which the hon. member has been able to point out in which he says an innocent man went to the gallows.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: I did not say an innocent man. I said he was innocent of the crime for which he was condemned and hanged. I will say he was a bad man.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not know that it makes any material difference. This is his statement as "Hansard" reported it, although of course I am quite willing to take the hon. gentleman's statement and believe the reporter was in error. I will read it just to show that certainly I did not intentionally misquote the hon. gentleman. He is reported as having said:

> Another reason why capital punishment should be abolished is that innocent men are sometimes executed. We know of one innocent man who was hanged in Canada, and we have grave doubts that there were not three innocent men hanged.
>
> Sir Wilfrid Laurier: Who were they?
>
> Mr. Bickerdike: One innocent man that we know of was hanged in New Westminster, B.C.

That is the innocent man I have been speaking of. Now, the hon. gentleman referred to another case not as an instance of where an innocent man had been hanged, but apparently for the purpose of showing how horrifying was the execution of the death penalty. He told us of an unfortunate man who was hanged at Calgary, and pictured the distressing circumstances of that man's death. It would appear that the man was cut down before he was actually dead and that it took some little period of time—I think that the hon. gentleman said twenty minutes—before life was entirely extinct. I believe that was the fact, and it certainly was a most distressing circumstance for those whose duty it was to be present and witness what happened. But, if I am not mistaken, the very best authorities say that a man, having undergone what he underwent, is unconscious absolutely from the moment that the drop falls. It is very distressing that that should have happened, but there are good and innocent men who die under greater suffering every day. Undoubtedly, it would be a horrible thing if the law provided that any unnecessary suffering should be imposed upon a man who had to be executed. For my part, I do not think that I am much more hard-hearted than the average man, but if it did happen that a condemned man suffered some of the agony that hundreds of thousands of innocent men suffer on their dying beds, I do not know that to avoid that we would be justified in wiping out that, which in my conviction is, to say the least of it, an invaluable aid to society in the discharge of its duty to protect human life.

We have had some statistics put before us for the purpose of supporting the proposition that the infliction of capital punishment does not deter people from committing crime. If I correctly seize the purpose for which these statistics are cited, it is to lead us to the conclusion that because in some of the countries where there is capital punishment there have been as many or more murders as in other countries where there is no capital punishment, the infliction of capital punishment does not deter people from committing crime. Other statistics are cited for the purpose of showing that in some countries, at a period when capital punishment prevailed, there were as many, or more, murders as there have been since capital punishment was abolished. As regards the first class of statistics, you have to consider a great many other things, when you are comparing two countries, than the mere matter of whether capital punishment prevails in one and not in another. There are a great many things that render probable the commission of crimes of a certain class that might exist in one country and not in another. If you have a wild, unsettled, or only partially settled country, where the methods for the detection of crime are weak, and where the opportunity for escape is ready to the hand of the criminal, you have circumstances that render it probable that you will have more crime in that country than in an adjacent, well-settled, quiet country, where the arm of the law is strong and reaches the offender easily. If in that latter country there was no capital punishment, and if in the former there was, if murders are more numerous in the former country, and if you are to be guided by statistics alone, you say: Why, it is the presence of capital punishment that apparently incites to murder. I want to show how absolutely unconclusive mere statistics are when dealing with a question of this kind. If you take them for the purpose of showing that in some country, at a period when capital punishment prevailed, murders were numerous, while at a later period when capital punishment had disappeared murders are few, you have to consider the advance of civilization within the country, and the possible change of conditions. It is a most dangerous thing to say

that purely and simply because after capital punishment was abolished murders did not increase or that they even decreased capital punishment does not deter. Post hoc, ergo propter hoc was always one of the most dangerous of arguments. They say, the devil can quote Scripture to support his own propositions.

You might quote statistics also to show that capital punishment should not be abolished if statistics are to settle the question. In 1905, comparative statistics of murder in the United Kingdom, where capital punishment prevails, and in Italy, where there is no capital punishment, were gathered. It was found that, whereas in the United Kingdom the murders were 25 or 26 for every million persons, in Italy where there was no capital punishment the murders were 105 for every million persons. If statistics are to settle this matter, there is a very startling argument indeed. I do not contend that they do. I quite admit that in that case, as in the other case to which I have referred, you have to look into a great many other conditions prevailing in the respective countries; but I mention it as showing that after all statistics may be appealed to on both sides of this question.

While we are on statistics I would like to call attention to some that come right home to ourselves, and that I think have a particular bearing upon this question. Within the last few years we have had a most alarming increase in the number of murders in this country. If you go back over a period of ten or twelve years, you will find that we had an average of twelve or thirteen convictions for murders per annum, whereas in the last three years the figures have been 26, 24, and I think 29 respectively, or in all 79 convictions for murder in Canada in the past three years. In that connection I would like to call attention to the fact that out of those 79 convictions for murder 38 were convictions of foreigners newly arrived in this country. Of those 38 foreigners 27 were people who came to us from countries where capital punishment either had been entirely abolished, or at all events was not applicable to the ordinary case of murder. That means that of our murders 49 per cent were committed by people newly arrived amongst us, and that of that 49 per cent, 68 per cent were committed by men who came from countries where capital punishment had been abolished or at all events did not apply to the ordinary crime of murder. Can we have any better lesson?

[Mr. Doherty.]

Mr. BICKERDIKE: I think that is a pretty good argument in my favour.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am glad if my hon friend is satisfied with the argument. I am satisfied with it. The hon. member does not bear in mind how relatively small a proportion of our population this foreign element is, and yet they contribute 49 per cent of our murders, and 68 per cent of that 49 per cent, or 35 per cent of our entire murders, are committed by people who come from those countries where capital punishment does not prevail or is not applicable to the particular crime of murder. It seems to me that it establishes beyond a doubt that among that class of people you see the absence of the constant pressure resulting upon the minds of the whole community from the fact that murder is put aside in that class by itself as the crime that calls for death. Certainly it is no unfair thing to say that it is evidence that those people look more lightly on human life, to the sacredness of which the hon. member attaches such importance, than do the great bulk of our population who have grown up under this awful shadow of the death sentence being imposable upon murderers. The same thing is true when you look at the comparison between the people who come from countries where capital punishment prevails and those who come from countries where it does not prevail. Those statistics seem to me to have a direct bearing upon this question.

Is it an opportune time to make the change proposed when murder is becoming additionally frequent amongst us, and when we find that it is additionally frequent because we are getting flooded with a population who are accustomed to think that you can kill your neighbour but that your life is so sacred that the state will never touch you? It seems to me that this is not the time to adopt the system that prevails in the countries from which these people come to us, who have such a light idea of the value of human life. Perhaps as the years go by, and when we all get better trained and more advanced (as I suppose the hon. gentleman would say), when the horror of murder shall have been more impressed upon the universal human mind, it may perhaps then be possible to withdraw the means or the method whereby it was so impressed; but until that time comes, and so long as we live in a country where we find that we are being flooded with people who have grown up so careless of human life under a state of law that was so careful of the lives of the guilty that it forgot to take care of the lives of the innocent, we may very well adhere to the safe old rule that

has come down to us from our fathers, to the rule that has behind it the sanction of human law for centuries, and that has behind it the sanction of the divine law.

The hon. member, if I am not mistaken, asserted absolutely that there was no country that had ever abolished capital punishment and that had gone back to it. I would like to point out to the hon. gentleman his mistake in that respect. I have been at some pains to get absolutely accurate information, and it shows that in quite a number of countries capital punishment has been abolished and people have come back to it, and that in some of those countries they have abolished it again, and in some of them they have adhered to it. That has happened in Austria-Hungary; that has happened in seven or eight of the states in Germany. Capital punishment was abolished in Brunswick, Coburg, Nassau, Oldenburg in 1849; Saxe-Meiningen, Saxe-Weimar in 1862; Baden in 1863, and Saxony in 1868. In 1872, it was restored by the Imperial Criminal Code, limited, it is true, to attempts on the life of the emperor or the sovereign of any State, deliberate homicide as opposed to unintentional homicide, and treasonable acts. Here we have a noteworthy case of repeal followed by re-establishment. In Russia capital punishment was abolished in 1750 and subsequently re-enacted, and freely inflicted. Since 1907, there his been no capital punishment in Russia, it is true, save for crimes endangering the life of the Emperor or Empress or the heir to the throne. In Switzerland no less than seven of the Cantons in which capital punishment was abolished have since returned to it. In the United States you have the cases of Rhode Island and Colorado which states returned to capital punishment after having abolished it. Maine is another instance of the same kind. It is true, some of these states have since abolished it again. But, so far as the hon. gentleman seems to find what he regards as an unanswerable argument in the fact that those states that have abolished capital punishment have never repented their action, I think these instances are enough to show that his assertion is, at all events too wide. I do not intend to detain the House at any greater length upon the merits of this question. I have tried to put forward the reasons which lead me to conclude that the House should reject the measure the hon. gentleman has proposed.

There is one matter, perhaps not directly pertinent to this discussion but which has been introduced into it by one of the hon. gentlemen who spoke on Monday evening during my absence, the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards). I once knew a distinguished alienist who said that all men and women were on their way either to the penitentiary or to the insane asylum. When he was remonstrated with, he said that he could not qualify that statement further than to say that some people died before they got there. Now, it rather seems to me that, from wherever I start or for wherever I start, I am gently led up to both the penitentiary and the insane asylum. That is the predicament in which I find myself now. However, I have no fault to find with the hon. member because he has led me up to the consideration of these two institutions. I have every sympathy with every one who is anxious about the condition of our penitentiaries, and more particularly about the manner of treatment of our unfortunate insane convicts. I have every sympathy with him, because I share his anxiety. It is a subject that is present to my mind during a very large part of the time, and which has given me matter for thought, and I may say for action, during a period of months. The argument of the hon. member with regard to this Bill—though I understood him not to support the measure—was that there were worse things than hanging, because a man might be sent to Kingston penitentiary. He went on to tell us the reason why he said that. Now, I want to deal with this thing frankly, fairly, and quite calmly—for it is altogether too big a question to afford room for anything in the nature of personal feeling, and I am quite sure that the hon. gentleman who made the observations to which I am going to refer will agree witih me in that. But he made these statements, and they are very grave. Certainly, whatever one may think of their value as an argument bearing on the infliction of capital punishment, they are altogether too grave to be allowed to go to the public unanswered. I desire purely and simply to answer these statements so far as they are statements of fact. When referring to the case to which the hon. member who proposed the Bill instanced, that of a man said to be innocent, at all events, of the offence of which he was convicted, but who was hanged, the hon. member for Frontenac said:

> But supposing only one of them had been hanged, and that the other had been mercifully

saved and sent, we will say, to Kingston penitentiary. Let us follow the career of the poor unfortunate who goes to Kingston penitentiary.

Now, we have a series of statements of fact:

He is confined in a cell, and is allowed to go out for exercise and fresh air. He is not permitted to utter a sound; to speak a word to a guard or to a fellow convict is a misdemeanour. He is probably put on the stone pile, cracking stone month after month and year after year. He is subjected to tauntings and goadings and torturings, and if he rebels against them he is taken to a specially-constructed cell, a hose pressure of 70 pounds is turned on the poor unfortunate wretch and he is thrown and knocked about in the cell, until, as they say, he gives in. If that treatment sends him to the hospital, on Sunday he gets three meals, the first at nine o'clock, the next at eleven and the third at one o'clock in the afternoon, and he receives nothing more until between eight and nine o'clock the next morning. Hon. gentlemen may smile at that, but I am stating what is the fact. If the man's health breaks down after that and his treatment in the institution drives him to insanity, as is frequently the case, he is taken to the insane ward, where the last final touches are administered. Forty or fifty persons are herded together in one room, the worst cases with the milder ones, the diseased persons with those whose only defect is mental derangement. They are herded together during the day and then sent into their cells, their food is handed to them and they tear it to pieces with their fingers and teeth like wild animals. If any one of them dares to utter a protest against one of the guards or keepers, the unfortunate, wretch is stripped, specially constructed harness is fastened on him, his legs are bound together and his arms fastened to his side and he is dipped into a tub of ice-cold water, being left there until, as they say, he gives in. That is how the insane are treated, or some of them at least. I am stating facts. Under this treatment the men, not merely one or two but dozens, have the life and soul crushed out of them. They become indifferent, they have no hope in this world, and are made incapable of any thought of the next. That, in my judgment, is a worse penalty than hanging.

I am stating what I know to be facts. I repeat that in my judgment such a condition is far worse than hanging. It is a condition of affairs sanctioned apparently by organized society, and is a disgrace and scandal to this country and to all the men who keep silent in this House while this sort of thing goes on. That is how I feel. I regret that the Minister of Justice has shown an apathy in regard to this matter which to my judgment is not at all to his credit. It was three years ago that I first directed his attention to the condition of affairs at Kingston penitentiary, and Kingston penitentiary is probably no better than other penitentiaries in the country. It is high time that this state of affairs was remedied. It reflects little credit on the Department of Justice and on the members of this House to allow this state of affairs to continue.

I wish to point out that in all this the hon. gentleman is speaking of a condition of affairs which he states to exist at the present time. The whole context which I have read shows that, and in the earlier part of his remarks, where he makes his general statement, he says it in so many words:

Men are being murdered by the dozen in a worse way than that in our penitentiaries—the result of the administration, or maladministration, of justice at the present time.

I want to point that out as showing that what I am called upon to deal with is purely and simply a condition of affairs at the present time; what may have occurred in the past is not in the question at the present moment.

I wish to deal as briefly as I can with these serious statements. Of course, the general assertion that men are being murdered by the dozen is supported only by the particular statements that follow. I am not going to enter into a discussion of the general statement that men are being murdered by the dozen; but what are the particular statements? We are told that when a man arrives at Kingston penitentiary he is confined in a cell—mind you, this is at the present time—and is allowed to go out for exercise and fresh air. I have followed conditions in the Kingston penitentiary as closely as possible before, and unquestionably since, the investigation into that institution which took place last year. I have impressed upon those responsible for its administration the necessity of remedying so far as possible everything which it was suggested by the investigation called for remedy in that institution. With regard to the first statement, that the man is confined in a cell and allowed to go out for exercise and fresh air; what are the facts in that connection? I may say that before the investigation took place a vacancy occurred in the wardenship of the penitentiary, and I appointed to that wardenship a man of long experience and one considered above reproach. It is true that he was advanced in years, but I did not expect that he would remain long in the position, and he did not. Since then I have had occasion to appoint a second warden, and I have not heard a suggestion that he is not an absolutely capable man. He was a man of long experience in work in connection with penitentiaries. There could not be a suggestion of any political influence in the matter. It is true that the position that he occupied was not directly concerned with the administration—he was accountant in the office here—but I had

tried him out; I had used him as acting warden in different institutions as temporary vacancies occurred. I tried him out, I appointed him, and he is now in charge. I refer to Mr. Creighton. As I have said, I have not only endeavoured myself to follow as closely as possible the conditions in the penitentiary, but I have asked that gentleman, warden of the penitentiary, for a statement with regard to these particular affirmations. What does he say as to the treatment of prisoners when they are received in the institution? I read from his report:

When prisoners are received at the penitentiary they are bathed, changed into prison uniform, examined by the surgeon, and their work allotted to them, except on the rare occasions when men are sent from other penitentiaries as incorrigible, when they are confined in the prison of isolation until their conduct warrants their being placed at work with the other prisoners.

That is what is done with them, according to the statement of the warden. I have been there myself on different occasions—and I have no reason to believe that the whole system was revolutionized prior to my arrival—and I found these men at work. I did not find that they had the choice between being locked in their cells and going out for a little exercise. They were at work, and I have the testimony of absolutely reliable people who have been there, as well as of the officers, that that is the regular routine. As to their being prohibited from uttering a word, unquestionably there is a regulation which prohibits talking except under certain conditions: for instance, except upon matters of work in which the men are engaged—I am not pretending to give the exact words of the regulation—or with the guards upon matters pertaining to their work. But what is it that is actually done under that rule? The warden says:

While silence is one of the rules laid down for the guidance of prisoners, it is not rigidly enforced except in the prison of isolation. We do, however, try to enforce the rule to a certain extent, otherwise bedlam would result.

What I am told by people in whom I have absolute confidence is that conversation that constitutes no interruption of work or no creation of noise that would disturb discipline, and that is not otherwise objectionable, is not interfered with, notwithstanding the letter of the rule. The next statement of the hon. gentleman to which I wish to call attention is this:

He is probably put on the stone pile, cracking stone month after month and year after year.

That is what probably happens to him. The warden states:

Unfortunately there is not sufficient work to employ all the inmates otherwise; consequently we have to keep a large gang breaking stone. The stone pile, however, is the last resort. Those working in the tailor and shoe shops and in other sedentary occupations are given exercise in the fresh air morning and afternoon. The prison of isolation is used solely for gross breaches of prison discipline. Except in rare cases the term of confinement is about three months.

Mr. EDWARDS: Does the warden inform the hon. minister what proportion of the total number of inmates work on the stone pile?

Mr. DOHERTY: No, he has not sent me that information. The stone pile is not a pleasant or desirable place, and I shall be glad when it becomes possible to find work for all these men without putting them on the stone pile, but I venture to say that work on the stone pile is better than enforced idleness. However, I do not want to argue; I want to put the facts, as I have every confidence they exist, before this House and before the public. The hon. gentleman further makes this assertion:

He is subjected to tauntings and goadings and torturings, and if he rebels against them he is taken to a specially-constructed cell, a hose pressure of 70 pounds is turned on the poor unfortunate wretch, and he is thrown and knocked about in the cell until, as they say, he gives in.

Bear in mind that it is stated that these things occur at the present time. The report of the warden goes on to deal with matters which do not bear upon the subject under discussion, but I will read them to show that I do not want to conceal anything:

There are two men who have been confined in this building for about three years, for the reason that it would be a menace to the safety of the prison to permit them to be at large with the other prisoners. These are two of the five men who succeeded in escaping from this building about three years ago, after almost killing Guard Davis and seriously injuring two other officers. The other three men implicated in the escape were less dangerous characters, and have been at work for some time. So far as I am aware there are no 'tauntings' or 'goadings' of prisoners by officers. Needless to say if such a thing came to my knowledge it would entail the suspension of the officers and a recommendation that he be dismissed. No prisoner has been hosed since I have been in charge or for some time before.

Mr. Creighton has been in charge, if my memory is correct, since some time last May. He was there as acting warden for a period of time prior to his actual appointment as warden, and I have information, of which I have not the slightest doubt, that for at least two years there has been no hosing, and under his predecessor in

office, Col. Irvine, my information is that there has been no hosing, and in any event we are dealing with conditions at the present time. As I said, I gave instructions that care was to be taken, pending whatever might be considered to be the final determination of what ought to be accepted or what ought not to be accepted in the report of the investigation, to avoid the outstanding things that they condemned, and this hosing has not taken place and does not take place at the present time. I do not wish to be carried back to any discussion of the past, but I think it fair to say that any generalization by which it would be understood that any man who came into the penitentiary would at any period probably be hosed, would not be borne out by the evidence before the investigation. But cases were found, and the larger number occurred while the penitentiary was under the administration of a gentleman who was not the permanent regular warden of the penitentiary. However, it will be wiser to adhere to conditions at the present time, because it is present conditions that are in question in the observations of the hon. gentleman, and because no good purpose would be served by going back over the past, save in so far as we may find in it a lesson to guide our conduct in the future.

The next statement of the hon. member for Frontenac is:

If that treatment sends him into the hospital, on Sunday he gets three meals, the first at nine o'clock, the next at eleven o'clock, and the third at one o'clock in the afternoon.

The statement of the warden is:

In the hospital the meals on Sunday are served at, approximately, the following hours: breakfast, 8.15; dinner, 1 p.m.; supper, 4 p.m. During the week the supper hour varies with the closing hour of the prison. This, however, we are trying to rearrange; it requires thought and consideration to bring about the change without endangering the safety of the prison. When patients are seriously ill they receive constant attention, and are given nourishment day and night, as ordered by the surgeon.

Mr. EDWARDS: Is the minister aware that only last July two convicts died in that institution, within twenty-four hours of one another, without any attendance?

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not aware.

Mr. EDWARDS: I can tell the hon. gentleman that was published in the papers at the time, so public was it.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have seen a large number of things published in the papers that were not borne out by the facts.

The warden further says:

When prisoners are seriously ill they receive constant attention, and are given nourishment day and night, as ordered by the surgeon. I may say that during the present fiscal year, which will expire on March 31, there have been but two deaths, not a high average with a population of over 500 inmates.

There were two deaths in that period of time; whether they are the two to which the hon. member referred it is impossible for me to say; but as the hon. member tells me that it has been stated that two men died there utterly unattended, I shall inquire into that situation. The warden continues:

9 p.m.

During the winter months the inmates of the asylum, with the exception of two or three, who have marked homicidal tendencies and are of necessity kept in their cells, spend the day in a large room provided for that purpose and there means of recreation, such as draughts and playing cards, are afforded.

During the summer, when the weather permits, they occupy a good-sized yard situated behind the asylum building.

They are given their morning and evening meals in their cells, and their dinner at common tables situated one at the end of each corridor. They are provided with spoons, but no forks.

That is in connection with the statement that:

They tear it to pieces with their fingers and teeth like wild animals.

The warden says:

They are provided with spoons, but no forks, the latter being used in the prison proper only. Tubbing, if it ever existed, has been a thing of the past for a long period.

That is in reference to the statement:

If any one of them dares to utter a protest against one of the guards or keepers, the unfortunate wretch is stripped, specially constructed harness is fastened on him, his legs are bound together and his arms fastened to his side and he is dipped into a tub of ice-cold water, being left there until, as they say, he gives in.

That is the statement of the present warden of the penitentiary with regard to the conditions. As I say, I believe the gentleman to be trustworthy and reliable, and, with regard to the statement he makes to me of the conditions, they indicate the carrying out of instructions that were given and insisted upon.

Mr. EDWARDS: Does the warden assign the prisoners to their respective work?

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. member the other afternoon did not refer to that, and therefore I did not inquire; but I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. EDWARDS: Your regulations tell you it is the work of the deputy warden.

Mr. DOHERTY: I believe that is true. The warden, however, has made the statement of the facts. There is a further observation I desire to make with regard to the treatment of the insane. The hon. member, of course, will hardly expect that I will agree with him in his observations as to the Minister of Justice. Of course, he is fully entitled to appreciate my conduct as it presents itself to his view, and I have no desire to quarrel with him on the subject. At the same time, he will not expect me to agree in his observations on that subject. He says:

> That it was three years ago when he first directed my attention to this condition of affairs at Kingston penitentiary and Kingston penitentiary is probably no better than other penitentiaries in the country.

My memory is not in accord with the memory of the hon. member, but I have no desire to quarrel about that. His position in the matter or mine is of relatively small importance as compared with the importance of the work at the penitentiary. As regards the treatment of the insane, I want to add something which may have a bearing on my alleged apathy in that regard.

The Commissioners found that conditions at the insane hospital were not suitable, and recommended—I am not pretending to quote their words—that these people should be in an institution provided for the insane, and suggested that this might be done under the provincial authorities. I took the matter up very shortly after last session and came to the conclusion that the proper course, when it would be possible to do it, would be for this Government to provide a special institution for the detention of insane convicts. I have no hesitation in saying that in my opinion it is not a desirable way to deal with persons who are insane, whether convicts or not, to keep them in an insane asylum carried on as an adjunct to a penitentiary.

But of course you cannot create an institution of that kind in a day, and I looked for a more prompt method of action, for something that might temporarily meet what is quite clear to me is a need. I took the matter up with the provincial governments. Under the existing condition of affairs in the provinces of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba, insane convicts are taken care of in insane asylums by the provincial authorities. This had been done under arrangement with the provincial governments. Under the Penitentiary Act we are authorized to deal with insane convicts in one of two ways; either by the establishment and maintenance of an insane ward; or by having them sent to provincial insane asylums under an arrangement made for that purpose with the lieutenant-governor. When this Government came in we found an insane ward in existence at Kingston which had been used for a considerable period of time, and to which insane convicts from the provinces of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and I believe from the Yukon, were sent. Such was the system we found in existence. As the result of our own examination, I might perhaps say to some extent of my own examination, as well as in consequence of the views expressed by the Commissioners, I have reached the conclusion that that is not the best way to deal with these unfortunate people. Having that in mind, I took this matter up with the provincial governments shortly after the end of last session. I did not find that it was simply a matter of saying, will you do this? and their being prepared at once to say, yes. The matter was a serious one from their point of view, and while at a very early period the Government of Quebec expressed their willingness to take over convicts from that province, they coupled with it what under their system they necessarily had to, a condition that we should make satisfactory arrangements with the proprietors of the insane asylums; for the system down there is a system of proprietary asylums subsidized by the Government, not a system of government institutions. In Ontario the Government was at first entirely indisposed to take over these patients because of the fact that they found themselves crowded in their present institutions. We had some correspondence on the subject, and I impressed upon these gentlemen the importance of this work and the consideration that it was a good work in the cause of humanity. After looking over the situation they consented to find means to provide for these men, and are at present classifying them at the institutions; for I understand they contemplate distributing these men in different institutions, as the case warrants. In the province of Quebec we have reached the point where the Government has expressed its consent subject to such conditions as I have mentioned, and there I hope arrangements will be completed in a few days. In New Brunswick, where we have only one man to deal with, the Provincial Government has consented to take him over and he

has been sent to them. So that we have kept at work preparing this great amelioration, and I hope soon to have it completed. I am free to admit that it might have gone quicker under different circumstances, but I fancy that everybody knows that the condition of this country since the war began, and the condition in which in consequence this Government has been placed, has necessitated delays with regard to many projects. But I am not here pleading any excuses, nor am I making any boasts whatever. The fact is that in common with my colleagues the state of war since August last has created a condition where the time of myself and largely of the people in my department has had to be given to things that were of the first importance and called pressingly for immediate attention. If that situation had not existed this negotiation with regard to insane asylums might have been pushed with more vigour. I do not know that we should sooner have reached a conclusion, because of course it was a matter of persuading other people. Although the work might have gone on quicker in different circumstances, the delay is not for want of a real interest in the subject and a real determination to do the best that was possible to ameliorate the condition of these unfortunate people.

I have made what I deemed to be the necessary explanation to meet the very serious statements which the hon. member (Mr. Edwards) made the other evening. My conviction is that he is misinformed upon these subjects. Further than that I have no comment to make upon his observations. I have no doubt that he acts believing in the truth of his statements and that he was doing his duty in making them. I equally have felt it my duty to meet them with the answer which I have given, and of the correctness of which I am absolutely convinced. In saying that, I am speaking of course of that portion of it which is not personal to myself. As to what has been done and is being done in regard to insane asylums, I speak of my own knowledge.

Mr. D. A. LAFORTUNE (Montcalm) (translation): Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of attention to the statements made this afternoon by the Hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), in respect to the Bill now before the House. I may say at the outset that I fully agree with what he said in regard to capital punishment.

In the course of the last session, the hon. member for St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike) introduced a Bill to the same effect, and after listening attentively to what he had to say, I found that I could not comply with his request that I should support his Bill; far from it, I felt bound to oppose it.

I was not at my seat when the hon. gentleman once more introduced the matter, but I have read the report of the speech he delivered on that occasion, and I must say that he did not bring in any new arguments, and was content with going over his statements of last year. The reasons alleged previously, and which had failed to win me over to his point of view, have not met with greater success this year.

As was stated by the hon. Minister of Justice, this is a very serious question and which should be discussed most carefully, without show of prejudice or ill-feeling. When it comes to a question of amending the law inflicting capital punishment, and of repealing its provisions, very weighty reasons should be given to justify such a course. I have the greatest respect for the motives which have induced the hon. member for St. Lawrence to take such a stand. Satisfied that he is fulfilling a duty and doing what is right by his constituents, believing that such a change should be effected, he insists that his Bill should go through. I hasten to say that I believe him to be sincere and acting in good faith, though all the while mistaken. The hon. gentleman submitted to the House a carefully prepared and painstaking presentment of his case; but he will allow me to say that, had he a more intimate acquaintance with what is going on in our criminal courts, and specially in the district of Montreal, possibly he would not be so anxious to secure the repeal of an Act which, in my humble opinion, should remain in our statute-books.

Having enjoyed for the last nine years the signal honour of representing the Attorney General in the district of Montreal, I made it a point, Mr. Speaker, to look into the question, and did my best to satisfy myself that there was something good and useful in the measure introduced by the hon. member. But the older I get, the wider my experience, and the more I am satisfied, on the contrary, that it would be a grievous mistake to abolish capital punishment.

The hon. gentleman referred to judicial errors. He spoke of the pity inspired by, of the mercy which should be shown to, those who murder their fellow creatures, and who are brought up for trial before the criminal courts. I also, Mr. Speaker, have feelings

of pity; I also have a heart, I also know that it is painful to condemn a fellow-being to death. But were the hon. gentleman to consider the question from the standpoint of the victims, possibly he would not be so anxious to secure the abolition of the death penalty in the case of those who, from their own impulse, inflicted it on a fellow-citizen.

It is objected: But why hang the man? Would it not be enough to send him to penitentiary for life? Would not society, through such means be sufficiently safeguarded? I have had occasion to see how matters are in the penitentiaries. In 1897, I was called upon to investigate at some length how things were being managed at the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary. Numerous cases were at the time looked into, until I had obtained a fairly accurate knowledge of the situation. I tried to find out whether errors had not been committed prejudicial to those who were interned, some of them under sentences for life. I also tried to satisfy myself, as the hon. member for St. Lawrence has done, that life sentences in the penitentiaries afford sufficient and adequate protection for the community. Well, I must acknowledge that, as a result, I reached the very opposite conclusion. I found that criminals, though shut up for life in penitentiaries and I make particular reference at St. Vincent de Paul—were still a danger to the community, inasmuch as they were turned into professors for the teaching of crime.

Criminals serving life sentences in our penitentiaries are actually expert teachers in the arts of the criminal, who spend night and day plotting to make their fellow-prisoners even worse than they are. Is that the kind of protection that the hon. member for St. Lawrence would secure for the community? Such people spend the greater part of their lives in the penitentiaries in an effort to corrupt their fellow prisoners. I may state for the benefit of the hon. gentleman that criminals interned in our penitentiaries are the most dangerous people with whom the community has to deal. Society has a right to protect itself against them, and such criminals should be punished in proportion to their guilt.

Oh, but, the hon. gentleman may interpose, you are the Crown prosecutor, and therefore not in a position to express an unbiased opinion, considering that you are paid for doing such work. My answer is that I am no more prejudiced than he is himself, and that moreover, I always feel very sorry when, in the fulfilment of my duties as Crown prosecutor, I must ask that the death penalty be inflicted on some of those poor fellows. I always feel sorry when I have to insist on the carrying out of the law against them. We, Crown prosecutors, are in duty bound to forward the ends of justice, not by any means to secure convictions under all circumstances, and we are always glad when lawyers for the defence can procure the release of their client and induce the jury to give a verdict of not guilty. The fees we are paid are not for the purpose of securing convictions, but solely with a view to forwarding the ends of justice. It is immaterial to us, as far as money is concerned, whether the charge is sustained or not. Should the verdict be one of not guilty, the Crown has no reason to be dissatisfied, since the accused has proved his innocence. A verdict of guilty is also a source of satisfaction to the Crown, since the majesty of the law is thereby upheld. Jurors are at all times warned to be careful before rendering a verdict of guilty to make sure that there is no possibility of error; should there subsist the least doubt, jurors are instructed that the accused should be given the benefit of it, for it is preferable that ninety-nine criminals should escape, rather than have one innocent person to suffer condamnation. Such is our duty and we are careful to fulfill it conscientiously.

Reference has been made to judicial errors; it is an easy matter to dilate on such a subject, but much more difficult to prove one's statements. Now, in the course of the last ten years I have had constantly to do with the administraion of justice in an important district; in the meantime, numerous trials have taken place, many verdicts have been rendered, and once more I assert that not a single judicial error has been pointed out. It has been insinuated that such an error had been committed, but no evidence whatevver has been adduced in support of this contention. A single case has been suggested. It was claimed that a judicial error had been committed in the case of a man in whose behalf the intervention of the Government was sought after he had undergone five or six years' detention in the penitentiary. His discharge was asked, but not on the ground of any judicial error. There was no reference to the subject in the solemn declaration. A petition was forwarded to the hon. Minister of Justice and the hon. gentleman deemed it proper to grant the discharge sought for. Is that any evidence

of the so called judicial error which has been referred to? No, there was no judicial error committed. What happened was only this, that the hon. minister considered that the prisoner had paid the penalty of his crime and took pity on him; nothing more. I am quite conversant with the case referred to, and I may say to the hon. minister that he was right in extending mercy under the circumstances, and in granting the petition forwarded to him, he did so of his own accord, and not on account of the discovery of any so-called judicial error. He then set at liberty a man who had been five or six years in the penitentiary.

Taking into account the safeguards provided by the requirements of the law in all criminal proceedings, it is not an easy matter that a judicial error should occur. To begin with, a complaint is filed with the magistrate who is not to finally dispose of the case but simply to decide whether there is a prima facie case against the accused, and should this be so, the latter is sent before the grand jury. Witnesses previously summoned before the magistrate will be called to testify a second time before the grand-jury, and the grand-jury in turn, inquires whether the prosecution should go on. Should the grand-jury bring in a true bill, the accused will then have to appear before the petty jury, consisting of twelve of his peers, and they will render final judgment. The evidence is taken and the accused either convicted or discharged. Should the accused be a poor man, unable to secure the services of a lawyer, the Crown immediately provides one for him. and if necessary summons witnesses in his behalf. Should he be found guilty, after being granted the full benefit of doubtful circumstances, the docket is completed and forwarded to the authorities who, in turn, will look into all the proceedings.

The record, then, is examined, so is the judge's charge, so is the evidence, and the judge is expected to forward a report to the Minister of Justice. Should all that prove insufficient, should there still be a doubt, the benefit of that doubt is given to the accused. Lastly, the prisoner may solicit the royal clemency. And, as an additional means, there are the writ of error and the writ of appeal. When new issues are raised by the accused, he has the right to demand that the full court of appeal should look into the records. And still, should he be not satisfied, he may take his case to the Supreme court and as far as the Privy Council in England.

All the aforesaid proceedings show how jealously the rights of the accused are safeguarded, so that full and entire justice be meted out to him. Why then show such compassion for those who are to suffer capital punishment? Why should they specially be the object of our pity?

Murderers do not kill for the mere pleasure of taking other people's life. They do so through a desire to plunder, rob, dispossess their victim of the treasures they covet. Murderers commit outrages, and then take the life of their victims. and dispossess their victim of the treasures They set fire to buildings, and then commit murder. Still there will be found people who take compassion on such ruffians and who are ready to blame others anxious that such crimes be punished by the infliction of the death penalty. They forget that these thugs have not taken compassion on their victims, that they have not even given them time to make their peace with God and clear their conscience before departing for the other life. Criminals, on the other hand, are granted all the time requisite to make their peace with God, a privilege they withheld from their victims. How strange that so much goodly feeling should be expended on these cut-throats, while so little heed is paid to the sufferings of their victims.

There was a poor man, a workingman, settled in my village; he used to work in the quarries at Joliette. One day he started out with some tools, some clothes and twenty dollars in his valise. On his way he was murdered by some one who wanted to have that money and other valuables. Now, the hon. member for St. Lawrence tells us: Hands off that murderer! I say that all the people in my village were loud in their clamourings not for revenge, but for justice, anxious as they were that any others who might be tempted to follow in the lead of that cut-throat should, through the knowledge of the punishment inflicted, be deterred from doing so.

I shall point out another instance. A middle-aged man having met a young girl just leaving school, took her against her will into a house, and after outraging her, shoved her through a third-story window. Notwithstanding that, the hon. gentleman considers that this miscreant is entitled to mercy. I wonder what would have happened, supposing the hon. gentleman had been the father of that child. I am pretty sure that that would have caused him to change

his mind, and possibly he would have killed the man on the spot.

I may cite still another case. By dint of hard work and strict economy, a man had succeeded in saving $300. His intention was to send that money to Italy, his country of origin. One of his fellow-citizens, born in the same village, tried to induce a fellow-worker to accompany them both on a trip to the Cedars. His plan was to rob the other fellow and murder him, if need be, with the help of his friend. However, the latter refused, saying that rather than commit such a crime, he would prefer losing his own life. If we are to believe the hon. gentleman the man who started out to commit that crime single-handed was worthy of the concern of his fellow-citizens and should not have undergone capital punishment.

While, as I stated a moment ago, I respect the view held by the hon. member for St. Lawrence, but he must be ignorant of what is going on before the courts.

We are told that once the criminal is interned, the community will no longer run any risks. The hon. gentleman would have quite a different story to tell if he had inquired into the facts which occurred at the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary in the year 1885-86, when the then warden, Dr. Laviolette, came near losing his life at the hands of some of the convicts serving life sentences and who had been for months engaged in a conspiracy to escape from the penitentiary. They would have attained their object, had it not been for the remarkable courage displayed by the warden who refused to give up the keys to these ruffians. They left him lying in the yard, and believing him to be dead, were content with killing two men and severely injuring a third. Such is the protection afforded by the penitentiary. Mainville,—I can speak freely of him to-day, since he is dead,—was at the time a recognized expert in the arts of the criminal.

During most every session of the Assize Court, convicts are brought from St. Vincent de Paul against whom very serious charges have been made for having wounded, sometimes deadly, the guards of the penitentiary.

Let me tell the honourable member that he is mistaken, and that those people do more harm than before, because their hatred toward authority is boundless.

The hon. member may re-introduce his Bill every session—it is his right to do so—but I do not think he will ever find a majority to sanction his request. As far as I am concerned, he must set forth some more convincing reasons in order to have me change my opinion.

I say to the hon. member: You are not doing justice to the community by asking, with no argument whatever in support of your proposal, that we should do away with capital punishment. A poor man is slaughtered, his wife and children are plunged into the greatest misery as a consequence of that crime, and then you talk of charity, of humanity, of what a cruel thing it is to take away the life of a fellow man. But did the murderer allow his victim to prepare for death, to set his temporal and spiritual concerns in order? No, he struck him treacherously, without giving him one moment for reflection, whereas he, the murderer, will have months and months to prepare his departure from this life, in view of the life to come.

The hon. Minister of Justice was quite right in saying, a moment ago, that the most dangerous culprits are those interned in the penitentiaries. Most of the strangers who become guilty of such heinous crimes are from countries where capital punishment has been abolished. I have examined the record of some of these prisoners, and I could not believe my eyes when I witnessed that a man had only been sentenced to six months' imprisonment for having once committed murder, and to nine months for the same offence in another instance. Is it strange that such individuals, when in our country, should kill so readily? No, because such is their frame of mind. They think that the same treatment is awaiting them here as in their own country, and that they will get no more than six months' imprisonment for one murder and nine months for another.

The session of March will soon be opened. Indeed, there is a great increase in the number of crimes, but that increase would be still greater were the hon. member for St. Lawrence to have his Bill approved by this House. We could no longer allow our wives and children to go out and walk on the streets of our great cities after six o'clock in the evening, nor even by full daylight, lest they should be attacked. Is it not true that things so happened in the case of Hayden, who slaughtered a child in order to rob him of eleven cents? Yes, he struck him with his knife and left him dead on the sidewalk. And the hon. member tells us that we should have pity on that man, on that murderer? Really, I cannot believe my ears.

I am only quoting those several cases from memory; but how many crimes are committed which will remain forever unknown and unpunished, notwithstanding the severity of the law? Who does not recollect the case of Gregoire? A man knocked a poor woman down on Jacques-Cartier street at three o'clock in the afternoon, to rob her of five dollars; he had pounded her with a bottle and had left her as dead on the street. And we should have pity on that man? Who does not recollect also the case of Demers which created such a sensation at the time, the murderer in that case, having never been detected? The poor woman was found weltering in her blood, at six o'clock in the morning. And the case of Quinn? Somebody had murdered a poor old woman who lived alone in her house, in order to take $100 away from her; the corpse was found, cut to pieces, at four o'clock in the afternoon.

Let us extend our protection to thieves and murderers, when no later than last winter, at St. Laurent, in my own village, Beauchamp, Bourret and Foucault, who had just stolen a few flitches of meat at a butcher's stall in the village, killed two policemen who were trying to arrest them, for we all know that robbers are always provided with the tools they want for the purpose of committing murder. Let us protect those assassins, let us have pity on them, let us ask that the law be repealed, let us apply to those poor murderers the law of Christ which forbids that they should be hanged, because this would be contrary to humanity. Well, as far as I am concerned, I say that the assassins and the murderers should behave honestly, and they would by no means be endangered. But so long as the law of Christ demands that justice should be done, so long as humanity remains what it is, let us apply this precept: Eye for eye, tooth for tooth. He who draws the sword shall perish by the sword. If you wish to be respected, you should first have respect for others.

The motives of these culprits are always the same: Robbery, plunder and rape.

When a prisoner comes before us and is found guilty of a mere manslaughter, never is he hanged. The Crown must prove that there was malice and premeditation, in order that an execution should take place. If the Crown failed to establish that the murder was committed deliberately, with malice, and premeditation, the verdict should always be to the effect that there was manslaughter only.

[Mr. Lafortune.]

It was said before to-night, and justly so, that the assassins should first refrain from committing murder, and hanging would then be done away with. But until the assassins have done so, I see no reason why our laws providing for capital punishment should be amended. It has been suggested that we should make an experiment; the hon. member urged us to repeal the law, and he suggested that, should this measure fail to give good results, we could at any rate, have capital punishment restored. But the same experience was made in other countries; in France, for instance, the system advocated by the hon. member was resorted to. The guillotine was abolished, and what was the result? Crimes increased in number to such an alarming extent that the guillotine had to be restored. Why should we put ourselves in such a danger, I pray? Why should we make such a trial? Why should such a sad experience repeat itself in our country? I shall go no further, I have said enough already to make myself understood and to give an account of the experience I have acquired before the criminal courts.

I respect the opinion of the hon. member, but I think he is mistaken in requesting us to adopt such a Bill, a Bill which would bring about an intolerable condition of things, especially at this time, exposed as we are to receive here a great number of strangers as a consequence of what is taking place in other countries. In fact, we may well fear that with the influx of immigration which will come to our country hereafter and settle within our walls, a great number of these culprits may be found whom capital punishment alone could deter from committing such heinous crimes.

Let me tell the mayor of Montreal, who is sitting by my side, that he would not remain in his chair, as mayor of that great city, for a very long time were we to adopt this Bill. Owing to the official position which he holds, he is not a single day without receiving all kinds of threats from miscellaneous vagabonds, and were not the scaffold there, ready to throttle these misbelievers, they would soon put their threats into effect and kill him. The sentiments of the hon. member call for our respect, but he also must respect the opinion of those who think otherwise than he does. We are interested in the sound administration of justice to the same extent as he is, and that is the reason why we take leave to

differ in opinion with him on such a serious question.

I think I would be neglecting my duty as member for Montcalm should I fail to follow the dictates of my conscience, enlightened as it is by the experience I have acquired before the assizes of Montreal, and were I not to vote against the Bill now before us.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: I presume that I am expected to make some reply to the very many criticisms—and some of them are rather unjust—which have been offered since I introduced this proposed amendment to the Criminal Code. I do not think my hon. friend from Montcalm (Mr. Lafortune) is a very fair witness in this case. He has had a great, big harvest out of sending souls into eternity, I suppose no bigger harvest than he has had in 1914, and he is expecting a very large one in 1915. He has grown fat, lusty and wealthy on sending souls into eternity without caring where they are going to. It is generally stated that the hon. gentleman has made $50,000 out of sending souls into eternity. I shall not reply to the hon. gentleman any further than that. I say that he is an interested party. He wants the law, he wants the murders, and he wants to send the murderers to the other world. I would like to say one or two words in regard to the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards). While he was opposed to this Bill, he gave reasons for his opposition and these are the very reasons I advance in support of it. He said that it would be more of a punishment to send a man to Kingston penitentiary than to hang him. That is what I have contended all along. My hon. friend, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) argued rather in that direction too. He said that the loss of liberty was a greater punishment to the individual than the taking of his life. That is also exactly what I have been contending for. That is the principle upon which I have founded this Bill. If you want to punish a man and to provide a deterrent, I say it is a greater deterrent to send him to penitentiary, with the consequent loss of liberty, than that he should lose his life, and if that is the case let us abolish capital punishment.

Mr. GRAHAM: The hon. gentleman made out a very strong case for you.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: He made out a fairly good case for me. I do not think the Minister of Justice really intended to put it just in that way. The Minister of Justice says that all of these men that commit murders in Canada come from a country where capital punishment has been abolished and is not now in existence. They come to this country, where murder is staring them in the face, and naturally they commence to murder. Would you expect anything else from men coming from a country where there is no legalized murder into a country where the Minister of Justice approves of and stands by it—would you, I say, expect anything else than that these poor, ignorant men should start killing each other, if not one of us? The state here sets the example to murder, and as long as the state sets the example to murder you will have murder.

It looks to me as though my Bill were going to be guillotined, but I do hope that my hon. friends, the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham), and others who supported me in this measure, will not become discouraged. The time will come when the people will realize that hanging a few poor, miserable men every year, strangling a half-dozen citizens or so, is not going to be the best law for this country. It may look all right now. The Minister of Justice surprised me very much, because in the old days, before he got into politics, he was a good, tender-hearted judge. Now with him it is more rope, and nothing but the rope. We may not live to see the day when the millennium is here, when swords will be beaten into plough-shares and spears into pruning-hooks, but we will see the day when the better elements in this country will rise in their might, and in that day they will make oakum of your halters, they will smash your gallows, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific make kindling-wood of your scaffolds. If the Government wishes to teach that human life is sacred, they must not set the example of deliberately destroying it. I am not disposed now to argue the question at any length at this late hour, of the impropriety of the punishment by death on entirely religious grounds, nor do I intend to quote largely from the Scriptures in support of my views. We should study this question with a just estimate of its importance and unbiased prejudices which form an almost impassable barrier. The hon. member for Montcalm would not understand the sentiment. I think I have surely furnished sufficient proof to convince any real enquirer after truth that any extreme of cruelty in punishment, beyond what could

be proved to be really necessary and indispensible, is contrary to the profession of Christianity. That is the ground I stand on here. The question again resolves itself into proof, and I think I have already shown that the punishment of death is useless and unnecessary.

The security of life in Canada does not depend upon the public strangling of a few poor wretches every year, and I should be glad indeed that it might be said of this Government and this Parliament at some future time that it had dared to act upon the true lessons and not upon the superstitions of the past, and that it might be declared to be the Parliament which destroyed the gallows in order that it might teach that human life is sacred, for upon that alone can the public safety be secured. Reference has been made to the hanging of a poor unfortunate negro, the first criminal to be hanged on the new gallows at Bordeaux, and I may say here that the general impression is that poor Campbell was hanged innocent, at least so far as the crime for which he suffered is concerned. I do not mean to say, that he was an innocent man; he was a bad man, a poor man, a black man, he had no friends, and therefore he was hanged. Just before leaving the cell, in company with the Catholic priest, he wrote this illiterate and mis-spelled letter:

> This is the word to let them know I died for nothing, before God and man I am not guilty of this crime, it was all made up on me by.....and the detectives. Really I am not guilty of what I am accused. I want all coloured men not to take up with white women for God's sake, goodby.
>
> (Signed) William Campbell,
> in death cell.

He was just leaving his cell with his father confessor, to step into eternity, and this is what he said. He was hanged on January 24, 1914—my hon. friend from Montcalm knows all about it—for the murder of George Muir, at Senecal station on the Park and Island railway.

I wonder if the judge and the jury and my hon. friend the Crown Prosecutor and his running mate the Crown Executioner realize that they will have to stand on that last great Judgment Day side by side with these poor criminals whom they have sent into eternity. It is well to think upon these things at times. I have no doubt that the Minister of Justice will realize that also in regard to that poor man in British Columbia whom he sent into eternity, for which act he takes all the responsibility. I submit that where the equities are equal the element of mercy should hold the balance of power in deciding this question; and with the statistics which I have given the House all the members ought to be convinced that the equities are equal, and that they will vote for mercy instead of blood for blood.

My hon. friend has given half a dozen pictures. Let me give just one—of the awful suffering and remorse of the family of the victim of the homicide. We agree that it is hard on the family of the deceased and our sympathy goes out to them whether death is the result of assassination or of justifiable homicide. It is just the same in either case. But for that reason would you have two widows, two sets of orphans and two sorrowing parents? Why, the family of the prisoner are just as innocent of an offence as the family of the deceased, and are just as much entitled to compassion and sympathy. For example, a man commits murder. He probably got drunk or was by environment made a criminal. He has a good wife and also children; a good mother and father and a large number of relatives, all innocent people and profoundly grieved that the offence was committed. The accused is tried and convicted and sentenced to be hanged. The very thought of taking the life of the husband, father, brother and son breaks a multitude of hearts. The time has healed the wounds that grief for the victim rent; but as the days roll by and the time approaches for the execution of the prisoner, the hearts of the mother and father all but break; the affectionate and tender cord of love that stretches from the altar to the scaffold is crushed but not broken, and the heart of the wife once gay is burned to its very socket. She goes to and from the awful death cell. Little innocent hearts of children are crushed like the tender blades of grass beneath the angry wheels of cannon on the German battlefield, yet they are all innocent. The brother and sister suffer for his sins, and see his ghost-like form in their dreams of repose. As the day draws near, the father and mother with tottering footsteps visit the death cell, and their minds wander back to the time when a little boy said his prayers at his mother's knee and whistled the tune that his father carrolled, and they ask God why they have this affliction to bear. The wife, children and relatives and friends all bid him goodby and leave with breaking hearts, bitterly thinking of to-morrow. With heart-breaking despair, the mother prays God to spare her child, and as the time flies by, the height of Heaven could not measure her

sorrow. The father's hair turns gray over night, and their very souls are all scarred and forever seared over by the thought of the vengeance visited on their unfortunate relative, son and husband and father. The parents are hurried to their graves of broken hearts; the wife tries to forget, but cannot forgive and the hearts of the children, relatives and friends are hardened by the harrowing example of killing by the country. Two families are in mourning and the prisoner's family crushed and heart-broken by a protracted suspense, and that amounts to cruelty to the innocents. Then why make two families instead of one desolate? Then suppose he was innocent? The country cannot retract what it has done. If life imprisonment would serve the same purpose, would you not prefer it to the death penalty? My hon. friend the Minister of Justice says it is a greater deterrent than the death penalty. Then why not abolish the death penalty?

One of the strongest arguments why capital punishment should be abolished is that innocent men are sometimes executed, and I will give a few instances. Some time ago Sir James McIntosh, a most calm and dispassionate observer, declared that, taking a long period of time, one innocent man was hanged in England every three years. I have no doubt my good friends the Minister of Justice and the hon. member for Montcalm will say: What is one man in three years; let him go; he will hardly be missed.

The late Chief Baron Kelly stated, as the result of his experience, that from 1802 to 1840, no fewer than twenty-two innocent men had been sentenced to death in England, of whom seven were actually executed. That is a point that apparently my opponents have forgotten. I wonder how my hon. friend will feel when he sends an innocent man into eternity?

Mr. LAFORTUNE: No proof of that—only your assertion.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: I am giving you authorities.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: No proof—it is only the opinion of that man.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: It is pretty nearly as good as yours. Here is an opinion that the Crown Prosecutor will approve. Mrs. Booth says:

> I know a man who has served nine years and is still in prison, where he has been visited by the boy whom he was supposed to have murdered. The fact that in our day justice may thus miscarry must give men constant pause before they seek remedial vengeance in the death penalty.

My opponents have handled the question altogether on the line of vengeance—a man has committed murder and we must kill him.

Mr. Scruggs, former secretary to ex-Governor Patterson, states on his honour that, while he was serving as said ex-Governor's secretary, an innocent negro was hanged, as it developed subsequent to the hanging.

Two negroes by the name of Duvall and Clapp were arrested for rape on a white woman by the name of Warden. She could not state whether her assailants were white or black. They tried, convicted and hanged the two negroes at Blandville, Ky. Their last words were that they were innocent of the crime. Some years later a white man by the name of Gossop moved to Arkansas from Milburn, and shortly afterwards took sick, and on his deathbed made confession to the crime. But two innocent lives had gone to meet their Maker. Let me give a few names that I know will be familiar to my friend. Socrates, Cicero, Sir Walter Raleigh, Algernon Sidney, John Huss, Michael Servetus, Louis XVI, the Duc d'Enghien, Marshall Ney, Riego, Sandor Nagi, Maximilian, are among the conspicuous instances of victims of the law of blood.

I will now cite a case that I think the Minister of Justice knows something about as well as the hon. member for Montcalm. The most powerful case cited by Mr. McConnico was the Durand case, from California. Durand, though ably defended, was convicted of the murder of his sweetheart in the tower of a church; and, on what appeared, so far as human eye could see, an absolutely perfect and unbreakable case of circumstantial evidence, he was convicted and hanged. About a year after the murder, the minister of the church in which the murder occurrred confessed that he was guilty of the crime for which the other man had been put to death.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: Have you the confession?

Mr. BICKERDIKE: No, I have not been there for some time. My hon. friend painted a very brilliant picture of a man robbing another of twenty dollars. I think that man deserved punishment, and I would not care how much you punished him, if you did not send his soul into eternity unprepared. And I want to say, that any man who really believes in the eternity of the soul will not vote for capital punishment—he cannot do it.

My hon. friend the Minister of Justice said, I think, that we had divine authority for capital punishment. He did not tell us where he found it. From Genesis to Revelation there is no commandment, no recommendation, of capital punishment. In fact, the Creator proved that he was in favour of the life penalty as against the death penalty. I was surprised when the Minister of Justice made that statement. Of course, he would not have made it had he not believed it; but I think it will be very difficult for him to establish it. Let me point out where you will find a very strong contradiction of the belief that we have divine authority for sending these poor souls into eternity. When Cain slew Abel—and that was the first murder we read about—God was the only arbiter between men. He was both the political and moral governor of men. Did God kill Cain? On the contrary, he gave him a life sentence, the very thing I am asking for:

> When thou tillest the ground it shall not henceforth yield unto thee her strength; a fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth.

And He added, in order to prevent another murder:

> Whosoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him seven fold.

Could anything be clearer than that? I repeat, I challenge the Minister of Justice or any other member of this House to find a single word in Scripture, in the word of God, from Genesis to Revelations, that approves of capital punishment. No such word can be found.

The Minister of Justice said that he knew of some places that had abolished capital punishment, and reinstated it. I do not like to contradict the hon. gentleman, but I am sure he is in error. I say it boldly, there is no place in the world to-day that has once abolished capital punishment and is practising it to-day. Some places have abolished capital punishment and then reinstated it. But only for a short time. I say I do not wish to directly contradict the minister, if he has proof of his statement. But I have written to all these different countries, and in every case I have an answer that they are not practising capital punishment now. That is true of twenty-nine places. We had twenty-eight places when this Bill was up last year, but since then New South Wales has adopted my very Bill. If these places find that abolition of capital punishment is best, and if the people there are satisfied, surely the Minister of Justice and the Crown Prosecutor will not attempt to show that those people should be dissatisfied. These people say, in effect, that the abolition of capital punishment has reduced crime; were it otherwise they would go back to capital punishment.

I wish to tell the Minister of Justice that the day will come when he will introduce this Bill; he will get credit for it, and that will be all right. I should be glad if he would adopt the Bill and take the credit for it now; I had hoped until recently that he would accept the Bill as a Government measure.

I had intended laying a lot of statistics before the House; but the hour is late, and I will finish by giving one more picture—it is a picture that many hon. members have seen. A French painter has depicted this scene: In the dreary hours of night, Napoleon's drummer boy is made to arise and sound the march. The ghost of Napoleon comes forward and stands at attention. And then the Grand Army and the Old Guard pass by in solemn review before the "Archangel of War." They come from Arcola, from Lodi, from Austerlitz, from Waterloo. And on Napoleon's face you see an expression which says as plainly as words: Is it possible that I am responsible for all these men being sent into eternity?

How many men have been burned at the stake for their religious convictions—and surely religious conviction is no crime, whether we agree with it or not. Hundreds and hundreds have been burnt, some because they would not turn Protestant, some because they would not turn Catholic. As you are considering the passing of this law, the blood of the many martyrs of the block, the guillotine and the gibbet appeal to you to abolish the law that is founded on vengeance and destruction instead of on mercy and reform.

Motion for second reading of Bill negatived on division.

TITLE OF REAL ESTATE BILL.

Mr. GEORGE E. McCRANEY (Saskatoon) moved the second reading of Bill No. 19, to amend the Criminal Code. He said:

This Bill is to amend Section 390 of the Criminal Code, which is as follows:

> Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to seven years' imprisonment who, being a trustee of any property for the use or benefit, either in whole or in part, of some other person, or for any public or charitable purpose, with intent to defraud, and in violation of his trust, converts anything of which he is trustee to any use not authorized by the trust. 55-56 V., c. 29, s. 363.

A period of speculation in real estate such as Canada has recently passed through is inseparable from conditions where persons contract to sell what they themselves have not title to, and for which they have not paid, and for which they may never pay. The losses which are being suffered by many buyers of land who have paid their money and are unable to obtain title or to secure return of the moneys paid show that our laws are defective in the obligations which they impose on those who sell under such circumstances. The purpose of a purchaser in paying money is to become the owner of the land which he buys. Until that purpose is accomplished, the purchaser should have an interest in the moneys which he has paid. At present the law gives him no interest, and when he cannot obtain title to lands purchased his only right is to a judgment for damages which will include the moneys paid. This course will always be expensive, but usually valueless. Our law at present treats these purchase moneys as belonging to the seller of lands, and imposes no corresponding duty to make use of them for the purpose for which they are paid, namely, to perfect title in the purchaser. Sometimes the moneys are squandered before the eyes of a purchaser who has no right to interfere, for he has no interest in the moneys, no matter what his misgivings may be. This Bill would impose a duty on such a seller of land to use the money in clearing up his own title, and to hold in trust any moneys not so used until that end is accomplished. Until the vendor has title in himself, the purchaser would have an interest in any moneys which may be in the vendor's hands. The principle is not new, for where the title is held by the vendor the interest of the purchaser in the property being paid for is recognized. The statement in Halsbury's "Laws of England," vol. 28, p. 64, is as follows:

> A person who has contracted to sell real property to the purchaser is in a sense a trustee of it for the purchaser, but until the completion of the purchase he has a lien upon it for the payment of the purchase money. He has also a substantial and paramount interest in the property, and a right to protect that interest, and an active right to assert that interest if anything is done in derogation of it.

This Bill would apply the same principle to the converse case, and would impose a trust interest on behalf of a purchaser in the moneys paid where the interest could not be imposed on the lands.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): I have read the Bill of the hon. member, and there is, no doubt, a good deal to be said in favour of the proposition. I should like to point out, however, that the Government is, with regard to this measure and to measures generally looking to the amendment of the Criminal Code, in this position: they did not contemplate passing legislation at the present session providing for amendment of the Criminal Code. Our desire has been, so far as that is possible consistently with the public interest, to limit any legislation that may be introduced to legislation connected in some way with the war conditions. Under these circumstances I—and other members of the Government, I think—in answering a number of applications for amendments to the Criminal Code, intimated that we did not propose to introduce legislation for that purpose at this session, and that, therefore, we were not prepared to take up the suggested amendments. Quite a number of those would have a great deal to be said in their favour if we should depart from that rule. Should we facilitate the passing of the Bill of the hon. member, I think it will be agreed that it would only be fair that those who have suggested other amendments should have an opportunity of submitting them, and, if amending legislation is to be passed, that there should be an opportunity of embodying in the Bill the amendments sought by these other parties, if they should be approved. My hon. friend the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) the other evening pressed upon us very strongly an amendment to the Criminal Code connected with the Copyright Act. I may say, therefore, that I would be disposed, with the understanding that by so doing we do not necessarily adopt the principle of the Bill, to allow this Bill to have its second reading, and after that I shall at a subsequent sitting move that it be referred to a committee together with such other suggested amendments to the Criminal Code as may come up.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York) moved the second reading of Bill No. 30, to amend the Railway Act. He said:

A year ago the Government brought in a Bill to amend the general Railway Act, and in it there was a clause placing the regulation of the capitalization of railway companies under the control of the Railway Commission. We have received no intima-

tion from the Government that they intend introducing legislation this session to amend the Railway Act, but I am convinced that the railway situation is such that if we do not re-introduce the whole of the proposed amending legislation, we ought to bring forward some of its more important clauses and have them put into law this session, particularly in view of the fact that the difficulties sought to be removed may be increased by neglect of Parliament to deal with the matter this session.

I have called the attention of this House time after time to the capitalization of one great company in Canada, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I have endeavoured to point out that that company has been financing in an expensive way at the expense of the country, and especially at the expense of those who use the railway. I did suggest that we should have a law similar to that which they have in many of the states of the Union, providing that a company's capitalization shall be subject to regulation by a commission, which would see that any money raised for the benefit of the company is raised only because it is absolutely necessary, and in such a manner as to place the lightest burden upon the people who use the railway. The Canadian Pacific railway and other railways in this country have, so far as I can make out, conducted their financial operations in a manner expensive to those who use the road, and therefore I think it is high time that we should adopt the system which now prevails in New York State, thus providing that if a railway wishes to increase its capitalization it must show good reason for doing so and must show that the method it proposes to employ is one that is in the public interest.

There is a rumour in the press that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company intend to increase their capitalization, to divide the company, and to do other things that are, I think, largely in the interests of the shareholders rather than in the interests of the country. In this time when transportation is, as was stated here this afternoon of greatest importance, it is essential that the intention of the Government to bring the capitalization of railways under public control should be speedily carried out. If we neglect it this session something will be done in the meantime by the railway that will be against the public interest. We have taken over control of the Canadian Northern railway, and its capitalization is now strictly within the control of this Parliament. Why should not that be the case with every other railway company that we have in Canada? As I said, there is a danger of the public interest being jeopardized by new legislation on the part of the Canadian Pacific railway and other roads. It is for the purpose of having these matters immediately placed under the Railway Commission and of preventing anything unfair to the public being done that I urge that this law should be adopted this session. There is no harm done to the railway if it be made to justify its new issues, and if it is shown that the plan which it proposes to follow is in the public interest there is no hardship in it.

The great trouble to-day throughout the world is improvident capitalization in connection with great corporations. The experience of the United States in connection with the Boston and Maine, the New York, New Haven and Hartford especially, the Rock Island and other railroads show that road after road has been ruined or injured by improvident capitalization; and, as a consequence, the people of the United States are now seeking to bring all of this capitalization under control. To show what improvident legislation will do in the way of capitalization one has only to look at the failures all over Canada, from ocean to ocean, in connection with over-capitalized companies. If you take the mergers that have taken place, if you look into the flotations that have been made, if you look into the way in which the great industries of this country have been over-capitalized and then put in a condition that they could not pay their interest or any dividends, and if you look at and realize the way they have been wrecked, you will find that over-capitalization is the cause of their trouble. A marvellous light has been thrown on this question of capitalization in the United States lately. A man named Henry Ford started a great automobile industry, beginning in a very small way. He succeeded in the operations of his company and he is to-day distributing $25,000,000 of the profits of his company among his employees. He is enabled to do it because there has been no water injected into that great company. You find company after company whose profits ought to be as large as Ford's; had they not to pay dividends on watered stock the owners would have been enabled to do as Ford has done and to pay out the profits of the company for the benefit of the workingman.

Anyone who professes to have the interests of labour at heart must admit that the only way to get fair treatment out of the great bulk of these corporations is to control their capitalization, put it down to the lowest possible amount and have it of a kind that bears least on those who are patrons of the proposition. If a company finance by issuing bonds say at 4 per cent instead of stock on which owners expect 10 per cent and if we stop this business of cutting melons we will overcome much of the trouble. It is not a legitimate proposition that a public company, holding a public franchise, should devote its time to cutting melons for the benefit of the shareholders; it should be devoting its main attention to the service of the public and there cannot be good and faithful service to the public where there is an enormous over-capitalization—and there are so many instances of it. Take all these outside flotations that are centered in Canada with franchises today in parts of the world. We have had scores and scores floated all over Canada, Mexicans, South Americans, and others. They have all been over capitaized, none of them have realized the promises of their promoters; the public served by the franchise have not had a good service and the people who have invested their capital have largely lost thereby. They have lost because we allowed this unfair capitalization to take place. It must be regulated. We have been promised in Parliament time after time that it would be regulated. We have had Ministers of Justice in this House who have said that it was not any concern of the public that they ought to be regulated, but all experience goes to show that you must regulate capitalization in such a way as to bear least on the public. That is all I ask. I ask that the railways of this country, who have undertaken to solve the transportation problem of Canada shall do it on sound financial lines, on lines that will be approved of by the public and be in the public interest. The Government of the day have recognized this principle. They put it in a Bill which they introduced last session. That Bill was delayed. I do not see why it should be delayed now. I see the seriousness of the situation in regard to the war, but I also see the disturbance the war is causing to the transportation and the settlement of our West, and in trying to build the West up again and have it populated, we should let the people of the West and of Canada know that when we are creating corporations for the public we shall take power to regulate their capitalization. I say that is a reasonable thing and if we neglect to do it now some of these companies will get away from our jurisdiction and do whatever they wish before they come under the law. If the Government will say that they did not quite see their way this session to go on with this legislation but they will give notice to the corporations that none of them will be allowed to deal with their capitalization until the general law can be passed, I might be satisfied to accept that and probably the country would be satisfied. I feel that I do not need to argue in favour of this proposition. The consensus of opinion is in favour of it. The effect of the clause that I have here tonight is a recognized Government measure of last session. Inasmuch as they are following on the lines of legislation in other countries I say that we ought to adopt it now and let every one know that hereafter undue inflation in connection with public franchises, and especially railways, will not be allowed.

A Bill was introduced in this House in connection with a steamship company a year or so ago. I opposed it and I gave as a reason then that there was a flotation proposition in it that was against the interests of the public. It was denied in a way, but what happened afterwards? They organized under the Companies Act and they did what they liked in connection with their flotations. It has been a great disappointment to the people who put their money into it. Our object today, if we are to assist in the recuperation of Canada, in trying to regain our position after this war, will be to encourage and allow only sound financing in this country in connection with these companies. If we put an end for all time to this high financing and get them back to honest and fair measures, we shall be doing a lot to put this country in better shape. It will take this country and the mother country and every nation in Europe years to recover from the setback occasioned by the war, and nothing will so much prevent a recovery as unfair financing. I could go fully into that and give argument after argument, but it does not require it. It seems to me absolutely in the public interest that the high financing which takes place in connection with railways in this and other countries should cease. All these matters should be under the control of a public body and, following the lines of the Government Bill

of last session, my suggestion is to put these matters under the regulation of the Railway Commission.

The other clause of this Bill deals with a matter that largely affects the cities of Toronto and Montreal, and in fact the whole country. The clause is taken from the Government Bill of last session, and is to give power to the Railway Commission to make an order, if it sees fit, whereby a municipality can associate itself with a railway company that proposes to build a bridge within the municipality, in order that a joint bridge may be built for vehicular and steam traffic. That is a sound commonsense principle. In my own constituency the Canadian Pacific railway has built within the last two or three years two great bridges. The township council of York, through its council, approached the railway company and asked to be allowed to join in the building of the bridge so that a roadway might be made for the public. The railway company said they were ready to discuss the matter; but it was not discussed. Other great bridges are to be built in my constituency over ravines that the public wish to cross, and they would be prepared to pay a fair share of the cost if they had an opportunity of doing so. This clause is to give them that right. One of the members of the city of Montreal, when this matter was up in the Railway Committee a year ago, pointed out that it was of the greatest importance to the people of Montreal as also to people of other towns and cities in the province of Quebec. I have seen members of the Railway Committee urge time after time that municipalities be given the right to join with the railways in building bridges. The Railway Commission would apportion the cost. Member after member from the West has brought up cases of this kind where people want a public roadway in connection with the bridges that are built across the rivers and ravines in their districts. In a number of cases the railways have of their own motion joined with the municipalities in giving such a public service bridge. The demand for this kind of bridge is greatly increasing. The question is up in my constituency, and in the city of Toronto where the railways propose to build additional bridges over the great ravines that surround the city, and there is no reason why the city of Toronto and the municipality should not have the right to join with the railway company in order to get a public roadway as well as a railway bridge. These two things are in the public interest and are needed now and every day, and I see no reason why Parliament should not put these two clauses on the statute-book this year. It is for that purpose, because I think it is in the public interest, that I have introduced the Bill this session. I should like to have it read a second time, but would prefer to have seen it discussed in Committee of the Whole House and dealt with there; but as the Minister of Railways has moved that the previous Bill go to the Railway Committee I suppose, if the House sees fit, the same course will be taken with this Bill, and that I shall have to bring forward my arguments there. The need for this legislation is apparent to everybody, and it is more needed now than ever it was. It will help to meet the general transportation question, and the financing of the railways. It will help the settlement of the country, and give farmers better rates and better bridges to the towns, and Parliament will have done something towards meeting conditions in this country. For that reason I move the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia): At this late hour I shall only occupy the House for a moment or two. I quite agree with the object of the Bill and the remarks made by the mover. I think the over-capitalization of our railways is one of the biggest difficulties that this Parliament will have to deal with in the future. If it were not for over-capitalization I do not think the different railways would be coming here before the Railway Commission on the 1st of March next to ask for an increase in railway rates. Nor would they need to increase the rates to pay handsome dividends on their capitalization, at least on all the money that went into their capitalization. There is no reason why we should not take this action. The country practically financed the Canadian Pacific railway, and certainly the Canadian Northern railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific, the three companies which own practically the whole mileage in Canada. As this Bill is exactly in accordance with what the Government undertook to do last year I trust the minister will see his way clear to accept and pass it this session. I see by the press that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company again proposes to ask for a large increase in their capitalization. As the hon. member for South York has pointed out, if not to-night, on some former occasion, if the money was borrowed on debentures at four per cent, it would not be necessary to

charge as high freight rates to pay that interest as the company has to do when it sells stock on what it now pays ten per cent, and on which I presume it expects to pay ten per cent in the future. There can be no harm in asking the railways to come before the board and make out their case. They can say how much money they want and how they propose to get it, and if they make out a reasonable case the Railway Commission would undoubtedly give them the authority they ask for. But if they can get money at four per cent instead of ten per cent, I think the Railway Commission would say to them that it was in the interests of the company, in the interest of its patrons, and of the farmers and producers and of everybody that used the road, that they should get the money on the cheapest basis and put it into the company instead of into the pockets of the shareholders. For these reasons I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the second reading.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (South Renfrew): I have a good deal of sympathy with the object of my hon. friend from South York. I think much of our difficulty at the present time arises from over-capitalization and the merging of different interests without any control over them whatever. My hon. friend has spoken of the protection of the public. That is true. Greater rates have to be charged in order to meet the overhead expenses, including interest on watered stock. But there is the other side to it and that is the side of the investor. I think it is time that we went a little farther than the Bill of my hon. friend proposes and, in conjunction with the provinces, took a little more interest in the amalgamation of different concerns, including industries, because while the public suffer, I am afraid our good name in the money markets of the world is also suffering from the fact that we are flying a good many kites and asking the capitalists of the world to invest in undertakings which, on account of very great capitalization, are not proving a financial success. When times are good and everything is running along swimmingly this is not noticed so much, but when the pinch comes and we find that some concerns formerly looked upon as quite solvent have to cease even paying their bond interest and have to postpone further dividends on preferred stock, we begin to wonder if these investments are sound. We in Canada may perhaps have more confidence in them, being on the ground, but we do not supply the money to float these great institutions. Everybody knows that during the next two years investors will be particularly careful where they place their money as there will be such a demand for it. Belgium will have to be resuscitated and money will be required by Great Britain, France, Russia, Servia, and all the countries involved in the present struggle. Untold millions will be necessary and it will not perhaps be so easy to get money and certainly not so easy unless we can present a good financial standing to the financiers of the world. I would prefer that this Bill should go on to a committee, although I am prepared to discuss it in Committee of the Whole, for the reason that the Government has rather given notice to the large companies that they will be allowed a hearing before the committee on all questions affecting the Railway Act. They will expect that, and we want to be absolutely fair to the men who have their money invested in these great undertakings, and I think it would be unwise not to give them that opportunity which they had been expecting to place their side of the case before Parliament, through the committee which has been appointed. As to the second clause, the railways will object to that, although I do not see much reason for their objection. While I was Minister of Railways and Canals this question came up on two or three occasions, but unfortunately bridges were started before they were brought to my notice. The railways declined to enter into any negotiations. I see no reason why, if a bridge is being constructed and if a municipality will pay the extra cost, such construction should not be made to admit of a roadway or footway being added at the time or at such future time as the municipality may decide. If something of this kind had been in force, and the Board of Railway Commissioners had had the power, we would not have had the spectacle that we have to-day of having to avail ourselves of a scow ferry when we wish to go from Montreal westward. There are two bridges at different places across the Ottawa river and yet people with an automobile or a vehicle of any kind have to take a very primitive ferry to get across the river. This is a move in the right direction. Possibly the railway companies may have some better reasons than I have yet heard for the position which they take, but I am prepared to support this part of the Bill at least and I think the other portion in principle. If the hon. gentleman takes the right view it

will be better to have it sent to the committee so that the companies that represent great investments in this country will have an opportunity of presenting their cases to Parliament, and we will be in a better position to judge of the merits of the Bill.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: When a Bill consolidating the Railway Act was introduced last year, which embodied several new features, and among others the one that is expressed in the first section of the Bill introduced by the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean), it was the intention of the Government at that time, and that intention was carried out, to give to all persons interested in the proposed amendment an opportunity of being heard. That was carried out last year by the constitution of a special committee of this House and a similar committee was appointed in the Senate in order that there might be economy of time in the discussion of the amendments. It was apprehended that a great many interests would desire to be heard before the committees, and it was more convenient that the hearing should take place once for all. It had also the additional advantage that if the two committees conferred together and worked practically as one committee, although technically they were two committees, there would be a better opportunity of coming to a definite conclusion which would carry the judgment of both Houses of Parliament. The committees were so constituted, and I believe that considerable hearings were had. The report of the evidence has been placed before both Houses of Parliament. My hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) comes this year with this proposition which embodies one of the amendments that he alluded to, and he has supported it by reference to capitalization. As far as the Canadian Pacific railway, to which he has particularly alluded, is concerned, I am not especially aware of the affairs of the company, but I have a very strong impression that the capitalization is represented by solid cash put into the enterprise. I do not think that in respect of that railway it can be said that there is any portion of its stock which is not represented by money actually expended. My hon. friend the member for York has advocated the view that if stock is issued it should be issued at or very nearly the figure which the stock from time to time commands on the market. It has been urged by different railway companies, particularly by the one to which he alludes, that it would be impracticable to raise money in that way and for the reason, among others which have been urged, that no one could foresee the contingencies which might arise between the time that the figure was fixed and the time that people were called upon to subscribe to the stock. The event of tremendous importance which occurred six months ago is an indication that circumstances might arise which would make it impossible for a railway company to fix, without the possibility of an amendment or change, the figure at which its stock should be offered for subscription unless one were to contemplate the possibility of the absolute failure of any subscription at all.

My hon. friend refers to the possibility of raising money in a way which will be more in the public interest than by the issuance of stock. All these matters are of course very proper for consideration by such a tribunal, if one should be established to supervise the issuing of stock or of debentures for the purpose of providing necessary capital in addition to that already provided. I think we should bear in mind what my hon. friend the member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) has said, if I gathered his meaning correctly, that is, that money for the building of railways in this country must be very largely provided from abroad; and in dealing with all these matters we must have regard to the consideration that capital will not come to us from abroad for that purpose or for any other purpose unless those who propose to invest it can do so under such conditions as will make the investment a safe and a reasonably remunerative one. I am aware that in several of the states a provision somewhat similar to this has been in force, although I am not sure that it goes precisely along the same lines. I understand —I do not know whether it is correct or not —that commissions in the United States have refused, even at the request of the company proposing to make the issue, to authorize that issue at a higher rate than par. That has been so represented to me, but I have not had an opportunity of investigating the question nor do I understand at the moment precisely the reason which would induce any commission to come to such a conclusion. What I have said, however, relates to matters that are very proper to be considered by the committee to which the Bill will be referred if the House should so decide, be-

cause it is the proposal of the Government, as my hon. friend has said, that the Bill should be referred to a committee for the purpose of giving an opportunity to those who may desire to be heard.

I have not had an opportunity of giving much consideration to the proposal which is embodied in the second section of the Bill, but I am bound to say that the impression which I gathered from the remarks of my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) and of my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) leads me to think that a proposal of that kind has a good deal to commend it. We have not any money in this country to waste in the building of two bridges where one would be sufficient. It is necessary for us to do a great deal of construction of that kind in the vast territory which it is our duty to develop; and if by adding at small expense to a railway bridge, a footway or a way for carriages under the conditions set forth in the Bill can be provided, it seems to me that the proposal is an eminently fair one and entirely reasonable. In fact if I remember correctly, the late Administration, on one occasion, when the Victoria bridge was being rebuilt, gave some assistance—I think it was the payment of a certain sum of money—so that in the reconstruction of the bridge a footway should be added.

Mr. CODERRE: There was a double drive on both sides.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Therefore we are content to have this Bill take its second reading with a view to having it referred to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

My hon. friend the member for South Renfrew referred to the fact that there was a special committee last year. We have not proposed to establish such a special committee this year. I am aware that the Committee on Railways and Canals is a very large committee, almost as large in numbers as this House itself—

Mr. GRAHAM: As large as the attendance in the House.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: But Bills of this character, which require very careful and special consideration, such as this Bill and the one already introduced by the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong), could I suppose be referred by the Committee on Railways to a smaller sub-committee, and in that way the same advantage could be obtained as if the Bill was referred to a small committee in the first instance. I have a distinct prejudice in favour of small committees in this House, and perhaps it would have been better to have referred both these Bills to a small committee, but I deferred to the proposal that it be referred to the large Committee on Railways, with a view that such a course might eventually be adopted if it commended itself to the members of the railway committee. I am speaking in the absence of the Minister of Railways and Canals, but I know it was his intention to move that the Bill should be referred to the committee after having passed its second reading.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, the Bill was referred to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, the House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

Friday, February 19, 1915.

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

AID TO FARMERS IN QUEBEC.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Hon. CHAS. MARCIL: Mr. Speaker, will you allow me to ask the right hon. the Prime Minister if he will give me a moment of his attention with respect to what I consider an urgent matter on account of the times of stress through which we are passing. The Department of Agriculture—I am sorry that the minister is absent today—has been following up the custom established by the department of sending agricultural lecturers to the province of Quebec, as well as to other provinces, for the purpose of furthering the interests of agriculture which is a very laudable purpose and should be continued. I hold in my hand one of the circulars which have been distributed by the department by authority of the Hon. Martin Burrell, in which the province of Quebec has been divided into five groups for the purpose of these lectures. This series of lectures is to be given in the district comprising the counties below the city of Quebec, or a majority of them, such as Bellechasse, Montmagny, L'Islet, Kamouraska, Temiscouata, Rimouski, and Bonaventure. These lectures, one hundred and one in all, extend throughout the whole province of Quebec. The object for which they are to be given is the promotion of patriotism and production which is certainly a very laud-

able object at the present time. These words convey the object of these conferences:

(Translation.) The lecturers who will address these meetings are agricultural experts for the campaign of "Patriotism and agricultural Production" inaugurated throughout Canada. "Let us serve the Empire by increasing the means of re-victualling." Such is to be the text of their speeches. Every farmer should attend those lectures. Ladies are specially invited.

Those lectures are organized by order of the Hon. Martin Burrell, Minister of Agriculture for Canada.

I approve entirely of this campaign, but I am sorry to say that in some of the more remote regions of Quebec, and in some of the new settlements, especially in my own constituency, with which I am more familiar—I am not speaking of the older parts of the province but of the remoter districts and newer settlements—the farmers have been through a very hard winter, and I am informed on reliable authority that many of them have not the means of raising the seed that is necessary to put in the ground for ordinary production. In the one or two districts in the county of Bonaventure that have been called to my attention the farmers have been entirely deprived of the means necessary to carry on work of this kind. I would ask my right hon. friend the Prime Minister to give this matter his attention, if he has not already done so, because it is probably the most important question that could come before him at the present time, and I would ask him if he cannot extend to at least some of the more deserving parts, not only of Quebec, but of the other older provinces, the benefits of the campaign which has been undertaken and of the aid which has been given in Saskatchewan and other parts of Canada. The farmers of the eastern provinces have borne the burden and heat of the day and they are willing to do their share to preserve the Empire and Canada. If you send an agricultural lecturer down to these poorer settlements and ask the people to go in for this new campaign of production without providing them with the means to do so this work will be useless and Canada will suffer from a declining production. I hope that the Prime Minister will give this more consideration and that he will, if possible, have an investigation and find out exactly to what extent this aid might be given.

Hon. W. J. ROCHE (Minister of the Interior): Inasmuch as the matter referred to comes more particularly under the department over which I have the honour to preside, I would call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that he apparently confuses the propaganda that is being carried on under the auspices of my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) for greater production with the matter of seed grain relief in the western province. The one is under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Agriculture and the other under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. They are entirely separate and distinct.

Mr. MARCIL: I thought both were under the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. ROCHE: No, we are granting assistance of the character referred to by reason of the exceedingly dry season in certain districts in Alberta and Saskatchewan, which has deprived settlers of their crop almost in their entirety. It has been the habit to a limited extent each year for some years past for the Department of the Interior to come to the relief of settlers deprived of their crops who were resident on their homesteads and not the owners of the land. The reason is that we have encouraged immigration and we look upon those people, until they become the owners of the land, as in a certain sense wards of the Government. In the past owners of their land who have been deprived of their crops through drouth or otherwise have been provided for by the provincial governments, but the provincial government felt themselves unable to cope with such a huge proposition as presented itself this year and we have arranged with the Provincial Governments of Alberta and Saskatchewan that we would look after the seed grain of those who were deprived of their crops last year, while, the governments have agreed to pass legislation at the next sessions of their legislatures giving priorty to our liens over those mortgages for our advance of seed grain. Wherever we have advanced provisions for people who are actually in need of food, either for themselves or for their stock, we have secured a promise from the provincial governments to give our lien against the crop priority in the same manner as they are giving priority to our liens in connection with mortgages against land for seed grain. Petitions along much the same lines have been presented to me from the northern provinces of Ontario, and I have referred back these petitions with the statement that the people should apply to the provincial government, which has handled

this matter in the past, and is in the best position to give aid to them. The difference between the western provinces, in which farmers are receiving aid, and the eastern provinces, in which a certain number of settlers appear to be in need, is that the provinces of Quebec and Ontario are the owners of their natural resources, whereas the Dominion Government is the owner of the natural resources of the western provinces. In consequence of that we feel under an obligation to supply those of our homesteaders who are in need.

COMFORTS FOR THE CANADIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. TURRIFF: I should like to bring an important matter to the attention of the Government, and I can best do so by reading a short article headed "Our sockless soldiers again," which is as follows:

Once more Canada is placed in the humiliating position of having to appeal to private benevolence for the common articles of clothing needed by our troops who have crossed the ocean to fight for the Empire. The extraordinary part of the present appeal is that it is made by a member of the Canadian Government, Sir George Perley, who is temporarily acting as High Commissioner for Canada in London. The despatch comes from Ottawa, and reads as follows:

Ottawa, Ont., February 16.—The first official announcement that the Canadian troops are in France was made this morning, and carries with it an appeal which will doubtless evoke a prompt and ready response from all parts of Canada.

Sir George Perley cables urgently for a large stock of comforts for the use of the Canadian contingent. All kinds of warm clothing is needed, and Sir George undertakes, through the Canadian War Contingent Association, that the requirements of the Canadian troops shall be met as far as possible. He is in constant communication with the commanding officers and is, therefore, in a position to know the exact nature of the supplies required. The association, however, cannot supply comforts unless it receives a constant stream of goods from Canada.

The National Service Committee of the Canadian Woman's organization, therefore, appeals to the people of Canada for a prompt response to Sir George Perley's request.

The articles asked for at present are all kinds of heavy woollen articles, especially socks, while later it would be better to confine attention to socks and mitts, woven belts, and coloured handkerchiefs, well knit socks being the most important.

Gifts of money to purchase woven body belts, sweaters, tobacco, and such comforts will also be most acceptable, especially if sent promptly.

All donations of money should be sent to the officer of the National Service Committee, 77 King street East, Toronto, and parcels, freight charges collect, to the Toronto office or to the warehouse. 1 Campbell Road, Halifax, N.S.

This appeal for the men in the trenches should take precedence of all local appeals for field comforts, and the cable received definitely requests that all supplies should be sent through the National Service Committee to the Canadian War Contingent Association in London, and not to Salisbury Plain.

Then the paper adds on its own account:

What can the Canadian people think of the situation when, not merely for tobacco or other 'comforts' of that class, but for the common necessary articles of clothing, especially socks,' an appeal of this kind has to be issued? If out of the millions of dollars that are being poured out like water for war expenses, the Canadian Government cannot supply the soldiers with such necessary articles as ordinary woollen clothing, what is the money being spent for? If the millions that are being voted so readily at Ottawa are not enough, then let the Government ask for more millions, which will be readily granted, and see that the Canadian soldiers are supplied from the Government stores with the clothing that is so urgently required.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What is that from?

Mr. TURRIFF: From The Journal of Commerce, Montreal, under date of February 18, 1915. This is a matter of such importance that I thought it advisable to bring it to the attention of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, because every one in Canada will agree that, while gifts are very acceptable to the soldiers, it surely should not be necessary, in view of all the socks and other articles of clothing that have been purchased for the soldiers, for Sir George Perley to make a request that the people of Canada should supply such articles as a necessity. It is all right to send socks as extras; but our soldiers should be properly equipped by the Government, and they should not have to go to the front wearing boots without socks, especially the class of boots that have been supplied to them.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If the hon. gentleman had made inquiries, as he might easily have done, he would have found that the troops going to the front are supplied with clothing and socks precisely on the same scale as the British armies in the fields; but perhaps it served his purpose better to endeavour to cast some discredit on the Government by the remarks which he has made.

Mr. TURRIFF: It is not my remarks that are against the Government.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Pardon me a moment. The hon. gentleman is, or ought to be, perfectly well aware that in Great Britain as well as in Canada efforts have been made by private individuals and associations of various kinds to supply to the troops who have gone to the front comforts

of the character mentioned, in addition to those supplied by the country; and I would not think that any hon. gentleman in this House, or any person in this country, would find fault with any Government because those efforts had been made by private individuals and associations. It is a highly commendable course that they have taken to endeavour to add to that which in the ordinary course is supplied by the country, because we know that this war is being waged under very difficult conditions, and it is desirable that our men and the men who go from the British Isles into the field should be furnished with any additional comforts of the character mentioned that patriotic benevolence, whether in this country or in the British Isles, may desire to supply. I am informed by the Minister of Militia—and I have no reason to doubt his word—that the scale upon which our men are supplied with clothing and socks is precisely the same as that upon which the British soldiers in the field are supplied; and whenever any requisition for that purpose is made, the Department of Militia uses its best endeavours to fill it, and I believe that up to the present time always has filled it. The hon. gentleman knows that not only in this country, but in every other dominion of the Empire, in the British Islands and in the United States as well, women, inspired by a patriotic desire to assist, have been furnishing socks, comforters, caps, belts, and articles of that description, and that these have been sent forward under private organizations so that they might be placed at the disposal of the troops for use whenever required. It is only for that purpose, so far as I understand, that this appeal has been made by my hon. friend Sir George Perley. I know nothing of it except what has appeared in the press.

Mr. TURRIFF: Mr. Speaker, will you allow me to say one word?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is presuming a little too far upon the courtesy of the House in bringing in a long article and reading it, on which to found an argument. It is not in order to do that, although it would be in order to ask a question. Therefore I would ask that the House do not encourarge this practice.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

[Sir Robert Borden.]

FUEL OIL IMPORTS.

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. What quantity of fuel oil was imported into British Columbia during the years 1911, 1912, 1913 and 1914, respectively?
2. What was the value of said oil in each of these years?
3. What quantity of coal was imported into British Columbia from the State of Washington, Australia and Japan, during each of said years?
4. What was the value of same?

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. Imports entered for consumption through customs ports in the province of British Columbia during the fiscal years ended March 31, 1911, 1912, 1913, and 1914, respectively, of "petroleum, crude, fuel and gas oils, .8235 specific gravity or heavier at 60 degrees temperature" under the provisions of tariff item 267, were as follows:

1911	7,299,727	gal.
1912	20,454,309	"
1913	79,233,053	"
1914	110,547,653	"

2.

1911	$ 151,028
1912	446,718
1913	1,443,519
1914	2,278,918

3. Customs returns do not show local origin of imports from United States.

	Australia.	Japan.
1911	Nil.	Nil.
1912	Nil.	Nil.
1913	Nil.	9 tons.
1914	13,430 tons.	Nil.

4.

	Australia.	Japan.
1911	Nil.	Nil.
1912	Nil.	Nil.
1913	Nil.	$34.
1914	$51,573	Nil.

CREAM EXPORTS TO UNITED STATES.

*Mr. KAY:

1. How much cream was exported to the United States from the counties of Brome and Missisiquoi during the year 1914?
2. How much was exported from each port in these counties and what was the value thereof in each case?

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. The Department of Customs has no returns showing the local origin of goods exported.

2. The exports of fresh cream to United States through customs ports of exit in the counties of Brome and Missisquoi during the year were as follows:

Abercorn	340,615	gals.	$440,746
Highwater	132,608	"	121,150
Mansonville.. ..	81,910	"	59,685
St. Armand	60,818	"	40,463

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. Lemieux: For a copy of all Orders in Council, letters and telegrams exchanged between the Dominion Government and the several provinces, concerning the proposed transfer of fisheries in tidal waters from the provincial to the federal control.

Mr. Marcil: For a copy of all correspondence and other documents relating to the awarding of the mail contract at Maria Capes, Bonaventure county, in 1914.

Mr. Macdonald: For a return showing the names and addresses of all persons in the county of Pictou who have been paid the Fenian raid bounty, and of all persons in said county who have made application for said bounty and who have not yet received it.

Mr. W. M. Martin : For a copy of all correspondence between the Dominion Government and the governments of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta relating in any way to the supplying of seed grain to settlers for the season of 1915.

2. A copy of all memoranda and instructions given by the Government, or any department thereof, to any of its officials regarding the purchase and distribution of seed grain to settlers in the provinces referred to.

3. A copy of all circular letters whether written, printed or typewritten, together with forms of application, forms of security and all such other forms or circulars as were issued by any department, or any official of the Government in dealing with the seed grain problem.

Mr. W. M. Martin: For a return showing the total quality of seed grain purchased to date, specifying in each case the number of bushels of wheat, oats, barley and flax; the average price per bushel paid for each class of seed grain secured to date; the names and addresses of all persons employed to purchase seed grain and the amount of salary and expenses paid to each; and the name and addresses of all persons empowered to take applications from settlers for seed grain, and a copy of all instructions sent to such persons in connection therewith, and the amount of the salary or remuneration paid to such persons.

Mr. W. M. Martin : For a copy of all Orders in Council, letters, memoranda and all documents issued by the Government, or any member or department thereof, which contain instructions or directions regarding the distribution of relief or assistance of any nature whatsoever to settlers in Alberta and Saskatchewan, owing to the partial crop failure of the past season.

2. With a return showing the total amount of such relief or assistance actually granted to such settlers in each of the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, exclusive of the cost of administration and exclusive of all expenditures made in connection with the purchase and storing of seed grain.

3. The total amount of such relief or assistance actually granted to settlers in each of the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, being within the area recently fixed by the Interior Department and referred to as the 'drouth stricken area,' such amounts to be exclusive of the cost of administration and exclusive of all expenditure made in connection with the purchase and storing of seed grain.

4. The names and addresses of the committee, board or other body appointed by the Government to take charge of the distribution of such relief, and a statement as to the provision made by the Government for their remuneration and expenses.

5. A list of any persons appointed by the Government, or any department thereof, since July 15, 1914, to assist in receiving and approving applications for such relief; such list to include the names of the persons so employed, their addresses, monthly, daily or other salary, date of employment, length of time employed, total salary paid each and total amount paid each for expenses.

6. The provision made by the Government for getting security for loans advanced by way of such relief, and

7. The steps, if any, taken by the Government to prevent duplication of relief to needy settlers by the federal and provincial authorities.

Mr. Sinclair: For a return showing the names and post office addresses of all persons in Guysborough county, N.S., to whom the bounty under the Fenian Raid Volunteer Bounty Act has been paid; the names and post office addresses of all persons whose applications have been rejected, and the reasons for such rejections; also the names and post office addresses of all person whose applications have been received but have not yet been paid, distinguishing between those who have been dealt with and allowed, and such applications as have been received but not yet considered, if any.

Mr. Carroll: For a return showing the names and addresses of all persons in South Cape Breton, Nova Scotia, who have been paid Fenian raid bounty; the names and addresses of all persons in South Cape Breton, N.S., who have made application for said bounty and who have not yet received it.

Mr. Michael Clark: For a statement in detail of: The number of prisoners of war in this country; the number under parole; the number held in detention camps; the number of detention camps, where situated, how accessible, and the number of prisoners in each. The amount of cost to Canada in each of these camps, respectively, for subsistence, pay, clothing, transportation and supervision; the nature of work done by prisoners, and the total value of same to date.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm: For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, petitions, letters and all other documents in any way referring to the dismissal of Mr. Mallet, captain of the life boat in the life-saving station at Cheticamp, and the appointment of his successor?

Mr. A. W. Chisholm: For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, letters, petitions and documents of all kinds in any way referring to a proposed change in the mail route from Inverness railway station to Margaree harbour.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm: For a copy of all letters, telegrams, memoranda, pay-lists, recommendations and any other documents whatsoever in anywise appertaining to the construction of a wharf at Lower Burlington, in the county of Hants.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT.

EXTENSION OF COASTING AREA.

Mr. JOHN H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to amend section 3 of chapter 65 of the Acts of 1908 by repealing the said section and substituting therefor the following:

(f) "Coasting voyage" means a voyage between any port or place on the eastern coast of Canada, and any other port or place on such coast, or in Newfoundland, Labrador, or St. Pierre or Miquelon, or any other port or place on the eastern coast of the United States of America or Mexico or Ceneral America or in the West Indies, or on the eastern coast of South America not further south than forty degrees south latitude; and also means a voyage between any port or place on the western coast of Canada, and any other port place on such coast, or on the western coast of the territory of Alaska, or of the United States of America or of the western coast of Mexico or Central America or South America, not further south than forty degrees south latitude."

He said: This resolution will be followed by a Bill, the object of which is to amend the Canada Shipping Act so as to enable certain captains holding coasting certificates to visit or clear for ports in South America. In our Canadian Shipping Act provision is made for two kinds of certificate. The first is what is publicly known as a deep-sea certificate, which enables those holding such certificates to clear for any port in the world. I do not propose to interfere with that certificate in any way. The other class of certificate is that which is known as a coasting certificate, which enables a captain holding it to sail his ship within a certain limited area. My complaint is that the limitations of this area are too much restricted. At present the master of a Canadian ship holding a coasting license can sail his ship only as far south as 5 north latitude, which is somewhere in the vicinity of the mouth of the Amazon river. This shuts our vessels out from a very profitable trade in South America. So far as I am aware, there is no reason why this restriction should be maintained. Before Confederation no such restriction was in force; a coasting captain in my province was allowed to take his ship to any port on the coast of South America. He was permitted to go through the Straits of Magellan, to sail up the coast of Chile, and thence to California, British Columbia, or Alaska. For one hundred years Nova Scotia ships were seen in all these parts, but when the seat of Government was changed from Halifax to Ottawa some meddlesome official for some reason which I have been unable to ascertain, decided that the coasting captain should be restricted in his movements. The rule was then laid down that coasting captains should not take their ships farther south than Cape Hatteras, thus shutting them out from a very profitable trade in the West Indies. It was the custom of persons owning large schooners in those days to engage them in fishing during the summer and in the winter season to send them with cargoes of fish to the West Indies and have them bring back molasses. In this way a very good trade was carried on, but by stopping these ships at Cape Hatteras this business was entirely wiped out, and a great deal of trouble ensued among shipping people on the coast of the maritime provinces. Protests were made here, but they were apparently of no avail. This has never been a political question. It is simply a matter of business, and I do not want the minister or any body to suppose that I am endeavouring to make it a political question now. I regret to say that Governments of both political parties have maintained this provision, when, I think, they should not have done so.

By reason of this condition of affairs, owners were compelled to seek a remedy in some other way. One plan to which they resorted was that of securing a retired captain holding a deep-sea license and putting him as a figurehead on board the ship. In this way they were enabled to clear their ship from a Canadian port and get out of the custom house. The next thing was to get rid of the figurehead. Sometimes he went ashore in the pilot boat; sometimes the ship was stopped at the headland, he was sent ashore, and the real captain boarded and took charge of the ship and was generally successful in his voyage. No trouble ensued; the only difficulty was that shipping people had to resort to this subterfuge in order to get away from the Canadian custom house. There was no escape from the regulation; these plans were unsatisfactory, people began to transfer the registry of their ships to other ports. The registers of many Canadian vessels were transferred from Canadian ports to Barbados, which was the favourite port for that purpose. Some were transferred to Newfoundland, and some to Bermuda—anywhere where they could enjoy the protection of the British flag and at the same time escape the restrictions imposed upon them by the Canadian Government.

I have here a partial list of ships owned in the maritime, provinces, which, were-

compelled to seek refuge in Barbados. These ships comprise some of the largest freight vessels that we have in the maritime provinces. In order that the minister may see how far this matter has gone, I will read a portion of the list:

Name of Vessel.	Owner.	Residence of Owner.	Port of Registry.
Annie M. Parker	R. C. Elkin	St. John	Barbados.
Adonis	Cushing & Co.	t. John	"
Annie L. Warren	F. K. Warren	Halifax	"
Alvina Thériault	P. A. Thériault	Belliveau Cove	"
Archie Crowell	C. W. Anderson	Sherbrooke, N.S.	"
Bessie Crooks	Arthur Crooks	Liverpool	"
Beryl Corkum	William Duff	Lunenburg	"
Coral Leaf	J. F. Whitney & Co.	New York	"
David C. Ritcey	Capt. D. C. Ritcey	La Have	"
E. M. Roberts	R. C. Elkin	St. John	"
Earl of Aberdeen	C. C. Langill	Parrsboro	"
Edde Thériault	F. K. Warren	Halifax	"
Edyth	J. Ernest & Son	Mahone Bay	"
Emily Anderson	F. K. Warren	Halifax	"
Fleetly	Zwicker & Co.	Lunenburg	"
Frances	F. K. Warren	Halifax	"
General Laurie	Wm. McMillan	Lockeport	"
H. R. Silver	W. C. Smith	Lunenburg	"
Inga	J. N. Rafuse	La Have	"
J. L. Nelson	F. K. Warren	Halifax	"
Laura C	Lemuel Creaser	Riverport	"
Lavengro	George A. Cox	Shelburne	"
Lavonia	J. Willard Smith	St. John	"
Lillian Baluvelt	H. Jones	Weymouth	"
Maple Leaf	Wm. Arenburg	Lunenburg	"
Melba	R. C. Elkin	St. John	"
Mineola	J. Willard Smith	"	"
Moama			"
Mary Hendry	Henry Ltd	Liverpool	"
Ponhook	"	"	"
Ronald	J. B. Waggoner	St. John	"

And so I could go on with a large number of vessels once registered in the Maritime provinces but now registered in the Barbados and in other ports. The question arises, why should the people of the maritime provinces transfer their ships from Canadian registration to the Barbados? The answer is very plain: it is because the British law is in force in Barbados, and by transferring to Barbados they get rid of Canadian regulations and are able to sail ships with captains having only coasting licenses. They are able in this way to take cargoes to South American ports, as they are bound to do if they are to carry on a successful business. Competitors in the United States are able to do this without restriction, and consequently, as our vessel owners have to compete with coasting vessels of the United States, they have to get rid of the customs regulations of Canada and, leaving the Canadian flag, go to some place else. I venture to say that by reason of the change no calamity has overtaken the ships that left the Canadian flag and registered in the Barbados. They have been carrying on a successful business. I do not think the minister has ever heard that they were unable to find their way to South American ports or back again. This regulation has been maintained from year to year, and the only result has been that we have driven the ships belonging to the people of Canada away under some other registry.

In 1908, with the assistance of some of my colleagues, I brought this matter to the attention of the Government then in power. At that date I had the same view as I have to-day, that captains holding coasting certificates should be allowed to sail anywhere on the coasts of North and South America. However, I was unable to induce the Parliament of that date to adopt my views. They did compromise: they agreed to fix the southern limit of coasting voyages instead of at Cape Hatteras, at the fifth degree of north latitude, which, of course, was a measure of relief, enabling the ships of the Maritime Provinces to carry on their business in the waters of the West Indies. This

was a very valuable concession, but it did not open to these vessels the trade of South America. The question has arisen recently in an urgent form owing to the fact that the coasting trade in Canada is not profitable at present and has not been for a number of years, whereas the trade with South America is profitable and our vessels are very anxious to get a share of it.

This is not a new question; I have brought it to the attention of the present Minister of Marine more than once. I attempted last year to have the law amended. My hon. friend expressed himself, I think, in favour of some relief; but he informed the House when I introduced my Bill that he intended to revise the Canada Shipping Act and that within two or three weeks from the date on which I made my motion the Bill for that purpose would be introduced, which would be the proper time for me to deal with this question. My hon. friend kept his promise and introduced his Bill, but I was disappointed to find that the old clause defining a coasting voyage was re-introduced. Some change was made in the size of vessel that required a certificated captain, but there was no change of the character that I am asking the House to make. If my hon. friend had adopted my view of last year and allowed my Bill to go through, it would have meant tens of thousands of dollars in the pockets of the shipping people of the maritime provinces since that time. That money has gone to the ship owners in the United States, because the people of the maritime provinces were unable to take advantage of the freights because their captains could not clear to a point south of the 5th degree of north latitude.

This restriction, I submit, cannot be justified. It cannot be said that our captains are incompetent, for they can sail anywhere and have always done so. It cannot be said that it is unsafe. I do not think there is any record in the department or anywhere else that will show that there has been anything risky or unsafe in allowing a coasting captain to take his vessel anywhere in North or South America. There is no such rule in force in Great Britain, the greatest shipping country in the world. There, a ship engaged in deep-sea foreign trade or in the home trade carrying passengers must have a certificated captain; but a vessel not carrying passengers in the home trade is not required to have a certificated captain. No matter what the size of the ship, the captain is allowed to go anywhere on the coast of Britain. In the United States any ship of less than 700 tons register is also allowed that privilege; the smaller ships are allowed to go to South America or wherever they please—to clear from any American port without restriction. If we had the same law as the United States there would be no trouble, because nearly all the sailing ships I have referred to, and nearly all the ships owned in the maritime provinces, are under 700 tons. As we compete with the United States in this business, it is very important that we should give our people some relief and put them in a position to take advantage of the profitable trade that offers in South America. I think we ought to feel that the rule that obtains in Great Britain, the greatest ship-owning country in the world, should be good enough for us.

There is another reason why prompt action should be taken, and that is that since July last the registry of the United States has been thrown open to foreign shipping. Prior to that date you could not register a ship in the United States, and an American citizen could not buy a ship; he had to build it in the United States. Protection had gone so mad in that country that they would not allow an American citizen to import a ship and put it under the American flag. The consequence was that the American flag was driven off the seas altogether. The United States found that they had made a mistake, and they are now endeavouring to build up a merchant marine. They have gone to the limit; they have thrown the door wide open, and if a Canadian citizen wishes to register his ship under the American flag, he can now do so in the name of some American Associate without any trouble and without paying any duty. That is what our shippers generally will do if my hon. friend does not give them some relief in this direction. A few days ago I asked his department for some information as to the number of ships transferred during the past year. The questions and answers were as follows:

Mr. Sinclair:

1. How many vessels of all kinds were withdrawn from the Canadian Shipping Registry since July 1, 1914?

2. What is the gross tonnage of such vessels?

3. What are the countries to the registry of which such vessels were transferred?

Mr. Hazen:

1. Twenty-two vessels of all kinds.

2. Gross tonnage, 28,791.

3. Three to Newfoundland; three to Barbados; one to France; fourteen to United States of America.

These figures do not cover the whole year,

but only a period of six or seven months. They show what is going to happen. Since July 1, just about the time when the American registry was thrown open, fourteen vessels formerly registered in Canada have transferred to the United States; and after the war is over and Canadians can sell or transfer their vessels, practically all the coasting vessels will go over to the United States flag if something is not done in regard to this matter. This resolution deals with the coast of British Columbia as well as with the coast of eastern Canada. I have no mandate to speak for the Pacific coast, but I am assuming that it is just as important for a coasting schooner owned in British Columbia or in the West to have this privilege as for a schooner owned in eastern Canada. I understand that the present limit is the harbour of Portland; but as the Panama canal is now being opened, and will probably result in a very profitable trade for our coasting vessels carrying lumber and other products from British Columbia through the canal to the eastern coast of Canada or the United States, I regard it as very important that the western limit should be moved as well as the eastern limit. I propose that instead of five north, the latitude should be fixed at forty south. That would allow our vessels to go to Rio de Janeiro and the River Plate on the eastern coast of South America, and the vessels on the western coast could go as far as Valparaiso, in Chile.

4 p.m.

A few days ago I wrote a letter to the secretary of the Maritime Shipowners' Association in Halifax, asking for his opinion of this resolution, and this is his reply:

Maritime Shipowners' Association,
Secretary's Office,
Halifax, N.S. February 12, 1915.

John H. Sinclair, Esq., M.P.
Ottawa, Canada.

Dear sir,—I thank you for your favour of the 9th inst., enclosing a copy of Orders of the Day, and in reply would beg to say that this association heartily endorses your resolution regarding coasting voyages, and I trust that you will be successful in getting it passed, as present regulations prohibit vessel owners from sending their vessels to Brazil if registered in a home port, unless both the master and the mate hold foreign-going certificates and it is needless for me to tell you that it is an impossibility to get masters, and far more so to get mates (because any mate holding the necessary certificate would have no difficulty in getting command of a vessel) and consequently in order to evade the restrictions of the Canadian Shipping Act, we are compelled to register our vessels in Barbados.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd) J. K. Warren,
Secretary.

That will show my hon. friend why so many of our vessels are leaving Canadian ports. The question is, what ought to be done? I submit that this resolution should pass and the Act follow at once. I have no objection to a committee except that a committee, as the minister knows, generally ends in delay, and in that case we might not get the Act passed this session. If a committee is granted I have not the slightest doubt that the shipping people will be able to show that there is a complete case for a change. The minister no doubt knows the facts already, and I would much prefer that he deal with this matter himself rather than refer it to a committee. It is a business proposal that ought to be patent to everybody without being threshed out before a committee. I therefore beg to move, seconded by the hon. member for Cape Breton, that this resolution be adopted.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why does the hon. gentleman limit his resolution to vessels doing a coasting trade on either the eastern or the western coast? If, for instance, a Canadian coasting vessel wanted to go south of the Panama canal, why should she not be allowed to go through that canal and along the west coast?

Mr. SINCLAIR: I did not intend to. Does not this resolution cover that?

Mr. PUGSLEY: No; it simply allows vessels on the eastern coast of Canada to trade up and down the eastern coast, and vessels on the western coast to trade up and down the western coast. I do not see why a vessel on the western coast should not be allowed to go through the Panama canal and up the eastern coast, and vice versa. That would greatly encourage trade between Eastern and Western Canada, and between Canada and the United States.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I hold the view that this resolution would enable coasting vessels to go through the Panama canal. It would certainly enable them to go to the mouth of it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But not through.

Mr. SINCLAIR: That is really one of the objects of the resolution, and if there is any defect in the wording, it must be amended to allow vessels to go through the Panama canal.

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) has introduced a

subject that is undoubtedly of very great interest to the owners of ships engaged in the coasting trade. The hon. gentleman has put before the House very clearly and very precisely his reasons in favour of having some lesser restrictions upon the coasting trade. I am disposed to agree very largely indeed with the argument which my hon. friend has made, though I do not agree entirely with him as to the means which should be taken for the purpose of carrying out what is undoubtedly the object of this resolution. If the resolution accomplishes what my hon. friend expects of it, it would prevent the owners of vessels on the Atlantic coast from transferring their ships to Barbados registry, as they now do to a very considerable extent, and in my opinion would also result in vessels that are now registered in the United States being transferred to Canadian registry. This subject is one, as my hon. friend says, which has been considered for a good many years. My hon. friend refers to the fact that in 1908 he introduced a resolution in practically similar terms to the one which he has now introduced and which apparently was not viewed with favour in its entirety by the Government of that day. That is no reason why this resolution should not be regarded with favour now and why the House might not take a different view of the situation in view of what has occurred since and especially perhaps in view of what is occurring in Canada at the present time in consequence of the action of the Government of the United States as pointed out by my hon. friend from Guysborough. The resolution proposed by my hon. friend is designed to extend the limit of a coasting voyage from five degrees north latitude to forty degrees south latitude. This question of determining what should constitute a coasting voyage is one that has at various times received the very earnest consideration and attention of the officials of my department and they gave special attention to it during the summer of 1913 when the revision and consolidation of The Canadian Shipping Act was undertaken by the department. The Bill for the revision and consolidation of The Canadian Shipping Act was introduced to Parliament last session. This is a very large and a very important measure and after conversation with a number of members of the House interested in shipping matters it was my opinion not that it would be desirable not to press the Bill through Parliament last session but rather to have the Bill distributed and have copies sent all over the country to those interested in shipping matters so that they might have the opportunity to give careful study and consideration to the measure and let us know what their criticism and views were in regard to it so that we might have these views before us when we came to deal with the question at another session of the House. That course was taken. We have not had very much criticism of the measure; we have had some carefully considered criticism, but as a rule the Bill has met with favour from shipping interests. The Bill has not been introduced at this session, and this being a session for a particular purpose, the particular purpose being the consideration of the war, it might not be possible that the Bill should be introduced and receive that consideration which the importance of the subject demands.

That Bill dealt with this question in a way which I will proceed to explain to the House. At the time that the officials of my department were considering this Bill masters and other interested persons were consulted, and, having regard to the facts as considered by us, it was decided to restrict our own coasting vessels to the limits of a coasting voyage and in another way to meet what I thought to be the objections put forward by my hon. friend for Guysborough concerning which I had during the past summer consulted and advised with gentlemen in my own constituency and other parts of Canada in respect to what remedy might be applied. In the Bill which was laid on the table last session providing for the revision and consolidation of The Canadian Shipping Act it is provided that a "coasting voyage" means—

> A voyage between any port or place on the eastern coast of Canada, and any port or place in Newfoundland Labrador or St. Pierre or Miquelon, or any port or place on the eastern coast of the United States of America, not further south than Charleston, in the state of South Carolina, and on the Pacific, means a voyage between any port or place on the western coast of Canada, and any port or place on the western coast of the United States of America not further south than the port of San Diego in the state of California, and not further north than Cape Spencer in the territory of Alaska, or any inlet or bay having its entrance on the eastern side of said cape.

This conclusion as to restricted coast voyages was reached very largely as the result of a provision of the International Convention for the Safety of Human Life at Sea. Perhaps the House will remember that following the Titanic disaster a convention was held in London at which representatives were present from all the maritime coun-

tries in the world for the purpose of considering the question of the safety of human life at sea. Canada was represented at that meeting, its representative being the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries. A convention was concluded, Canada was a party to it, and the terms, which I fully explained to the House last year, will become operative on the first of July next. Under the terms of the convention, vessels employed on voyages between Canada and ports out of Canada which take them two hundred miles off shore are to be regarded as " foreign-going " vessels, and they are to be subject to the terms of the convention in regard to life-saving equipment and matters of that sort. In the revised Act, laid on the table last session, wherein it is proposed to terminate " coasting " voyage at Galveston on the Atlantic and at San Diego on the Pacific, due regard was had to the provisions of the convention, and on examination of the chart it will be seen that at no point on such a voyage unless extraordinary conditions occur, would a ship be taken two hundred miles off land. But the convention has raised a different question, one which has to be carefully considered in any legislation that we may pass unless we are prepared to withdraw from the convention and not be parties to its terms which, I believe, are in the interest of the travelling public and of the people generally. If the limits as proposed by the resolution moved by the hon. member for Guysborough are adopted, it will be at once observed that on a voyage from Halifax to Brazil, for instance, by the shortest route, a vessel would at one point be 700 miles off land and for a distance of 3,000 miles of the journey the same vessel would be an average of 300 miles off land, which is in excess of the distance allowed by the London convention. It would scarcely seem consistent to designate a voyage of that nature as a coasting voyage.

Mr. SINCLAIR: At what point would it be 700 miles off land—in the Gulf of Mexico?

Mr. HAZEN: I presume in the Gulf of Mexico. In the revision of the Canada Shipping Act the department endeavoured to deal with the proposals contained in the resolution under consideration by creating another class of voyage to be known as " limited foreign-going voyage." I see that my colleague from St. John (Mr. Pugsley), who has taken a great interest in this question in the past, has just come in, and I shall repeat what I have to say. I was saying that if the limits as proposed by the resolution before the House are adopted, this would be observed that on a voyage from Halifax to Brazil, by the shortest route, a vessel would at one point be 700 miles off land and for a distance of 300 miles of the journey the same vessel would be an average of 300 miles off land, and it would scarcely be consistent to designate a voyage of that nature as a coasting one. In the revision of the Canada Shipping Act we endeavoured to deal with the proposal contained in the resolution placed before the House by the hon. member for Guysborough.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Suppose a coasting ship were to leave Halifax to cross by the shortest route to Charleston, how far off land would it be?

Mr. HAZEN: I am not prepared to answer.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It would be 500 or 600 miles, would it not?

Mr. HAZEN: Perhaps it would. Of course, the idea of a coasting vessel is a vessel that follows from one point on the coast to another point on the coast, and so on. The certificate for a coasting vessel is different from a deep-sea certificate, which is for a vessel that crosses the ocean. It may not in many cases be more dangerous to navigate a vessel across the ocean than to navigate a vessel along the coast.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Much easier.

Mr. HAZEN: In some cases perhaps not so dangerous, but by legislation in Great Britain and also in other countries a distinction has been drawn between the two classes of voyages. In the revision of the Canada Shipping Act, we endeavoured to deal with the proposal contained in the resolution under consideration by creating another class of voyage to be known as " limited foreign-going voyage." This voyage—and I would ask hon. gentlemen's attention to this is defined in the new Bill as follows:

> A voyage between any place or places in Canada and any place or places in the West Indies, or on the continent of America or the islands adjacent thereto not within the limits of a coasting voyage.

Under that " limited foreign voyage," a vessel could go to any port on the continent of America or the islands adjacent thereto. If that idea is adopted by the House, we shall have three classes of voyages, namely: the deep sea voyage, the coasting voyage, and this other voyage which I have referred

to as being described as the "limited foreign-going voyage;" and certificates will be granted for this limited foreign-going voyage, not of such a character as is required for the ocean going voyage, but to some extent requiring a little more skill than is required for masters and mates of coasting vessels.

Hon. gentlemen will see at once the difficulty, in view of the London Convention, of adopting the resolution moved by my hon. friend the member for Guysborough, unless we are prepared to say that we shall withdraw from that convention, which was entered into in good faith by all the maritime nations of the world. Masters wishing to trade only on coasting voyages can at present be given certificates for a coasting voyage, the qualifications for which need not necessarily be as high as those required for a limited foreign-going certificate. Similarly, it is proposed by the department, if the terms of the proposed Bill should be adopted, to provide that limited foreign-going certificates should issue to masters who desire to engage in trade to the larger areas. The qualifications for this certificate would not be so high as those required for foreign-going certificates.

With a limited foreign-going certificate, a master would be enabled to take charge of a vessel to trade between ports in Canada and ports in the West Indies, the United States of America, Mexico, Central South America, or the islands adjacent thereto. It seems to me, that this is the more desirable way to deal with the situation; and with that end in view, I would suggest to the hon. member for Guysborough that, instead of asking for the adoption of his resolution as it stands, he should agree to refer it to the Committee on Marine and Fisheries, where the merits of his proposal and the proposals to which I have referred, would be more fully and carefully considered. I have an amendment prepared to refer to the Committee on Marine and Fisheries, and I am not suggesting this course with any view of delaying action in the matter. While a great deal of time may be taken up in discussing the whole of the Canada Shipping Act, which is a very large measure, it seems to me that this one proposal might be dealt with. The committee would have before them the proposal embodied in the resolution introduced by my hon. friend, the proposal embodied in the Bill introduced by the department last year, and other matters which might be considered by the committee as well.

[Mr. Hazen.]

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will the minister tell the House if he intends to re-introduce at this session the Bill consolidating the Canada Shipping Act?

Mr. HAZEN: I do not think so. I thought I intimated that a little while ago.

I am disposed to agree with my hon. friend the member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) that the resolution placed on the order paper to-day, if passed in its present form, would not enable any one engaged on a coasting voyage to go through the Panama canal. Whether that should be allowed or not is a matter that should be taken up by the Committee on Marine and Fisheries; and whether the large certificate that we propose to give should permit, in addition to what I have stated, vessels to pass from the Pacific through the Panama canal to trade on the Atlantic and vice versa is a matter that the committee should consider as well. I understand that the committee has not very much before it this session, and it might be brought together at a very early date and consider all these matters. There is no difference between my hon. friend and myself as to the desirability of having some legislation; the question is as to the proper means by which the change that is desired in the interest of our coasting vessels should be obtained. Therefore, before the debate concludes, I would move this amendment:

That all the words after the word "that" in the first line of the proposed resolution down to and including the word "following" in the third line of the resolution be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

The Committee on Marine and Fisheries be instructed to inquire and report whether it is expedient to enact as follows:

And by adding to the proposed resolution at the end thereof the following words:

Or, whether it is expedient to make any other amendment and if so what amendment to the existing laws defining a coasting voyage.

That would raise the whole question and there would be ample opportunity for its full consideration by the committee.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I understand from my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that, while it is not intended to introduce a Bill providing for general amendments to the Canada Shipping Act, there will be no objection to making, at this session, amendments along these lines or along the lines of a limited ocean voyage.

Mr. HAZEN: I know of no reason at the present time why that should not be done.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am very much pleased that the minister has shown that he is really interested in this matter, and that he has told us that he intends to put through some kind of a measure dealing with it before this session is over. At least, I understand him in that way. I am not very clear as to the way in which this proposal interferes with the Hague convention, because I do not see how a question of this kind could be before the convention at all. Our Act is a peculiar one. There is no similar Act either in the United States or in Great Britain, or, so far as I know, in any other country. The same restrictions on coasting voyages are not imposed in any other country so far as I have been able to find out. The safety of human life at sea is, of course, very important; but has there been any evidence submitted to show that the proposal to allow coasting vessels to trade to South American ports will endanger human life at sea? I do not think so. I do not think that there is such evidence available anywhere. Ships meet with disaster out at sea, but the most dangerous place where a ship can be is close to the land. A good captain does not take a sleep until he is far enough away from the land to feel that he is out on the ocean. The simplest kind of navigation is that far from the land. Two years ago when we had an investigation of this matter before the Marine and Fisheries Committee, one official told us that his view was that coasting captains went along the shore till they found one lighthouse, then looked for the next, and in this way crept along by the points on the shore.

Mr. HAZEN: They have an expression that they "spell" their way along.

Mr. SINCLAIR: That is what this man understood, and he was an employee in the department of my hon. friend and might reasonably be supposed to know something about shipping. Perhaps he never saw salt water in his life; certainly he did not know much about it. The captain who leaves a harbour in Nova Scotia for the West Indies never sees land again until he arrives at the port of destination. He is a navigator and knows how to figure out his position at sea. So long as he sees the sun that is all that he cares about; he can figure out his course. I see no reason why the coasting captains should not be allowed to sail across the ocean; it is much simpler sailing by latitude than by longitude. As a matter of fact these men are crossing the ocean. Some of the registered vessels in Barbados not more than ten days ago were chartered to carry cargoes to ports in Europe. It is commonly done, and there is no record that it is dangerous to human life or to property to carry on this business. The hon. gentleman says that the London convention fixes the limit for coasting captains at 700 miles from land. If that be so it is a very curious condition for the convention to impose. I venture to say that all the convention ought to require is some special appliances on board the ship. It would not be necessary to interfere in any way with the license under which the captain runs his ship merely because he happens to be more than seven hundred miles from land. But it might be necessary to have an extra boat or some life preservers aboard. I think my hon. friend will find that is all that is required in order to comply with the order of the convention.

However, I am not opposing the proposal of the minister. On the contrary, I am glad he is taking this course, and hope will invite a number of the shipping people of the Maritime Provinces to come here before the committee. My main purpose is to arrive at a result, and to arrive at it during the present session.

Mr. SPEAKER: It appears to me that the proposed amendment is not in very good form. It goes on to say "that the Committee of Marine and Fisheries be instructed to inquire and report." Yet the matter is not referred to the committee.

Mr. HAZEN: I would suggest that that be made to read in this way, which is practically in the same form as an amendment made in the case of the Bill with regard to cigarettes proposed by the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder):

> That all the words after the word "that" in the first line of the proposed resolution down to and including the word "following" in the third line of the resolution be struck out and the following substituted therefor: "The Committee of Marine and Fisheries be instructed to inquire and report whether it is expedient to enact as follows", and by adding to the proposed resolution at the end thereof the following words: "or whether it is expedient to make any other amendment and if so what amendment to the existing laws defining a coasting voyage."

That gives the committee full power to inquire into the amendments proposed by my hon. friend, and also to consider whether any other amendment, and if so what amendment, should be introduced.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Would it enable the committee to send for and examine witnesses?

Mr. HAZEN: As this is one of the standing committees, I take it for granted that it has the power to send for persons and papers and to examine witnesses under oath; but I have not looked into the matter. In order to be on the safe side, perhaps we ought to add the ordinary words which give the committee this power.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the committee already possesses this power under the resolution of the 11th of February:

That the Select Standing Committees of this House shall severally be empowered to examine and inquire 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.

Mr. HAZEN: That does not give power to examine witnesses under oath.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not certain, but I think that under our rules that power is given to committees of the House.

Mr. HAZEN: If we find that we have not the power, we can ask for it later.

Amendment agreed to and motion as amended agreed to.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

SALE OF MILITARY STORES.

Mr. JOHN H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough) moved the second reading of Bill No. 40, to amend the Criminal Code. He said:

When introducing this Bill I took occasion to explain shortly its provisions. Perhaps the simplest way for me to proceed now would be to read the two clauses of the Bill. They are as follows:

Every person is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for two years, with or without hard labour, or to a fine not exceeding five thousand dollars, or to both imprisonment and fine, who knowingly with intent to defraud, sells or delivers, or causes to be sold or delivered, to His Majesty or to any officer or servant of His Majesty, any defective military, militia or naval stores of any kind or description, whether such stores are for His Majesty in the right of His Government of Canada or in the right of any other of His Majesty's dominions, or who in any way commits any act of dishonesty, fraud, or deception upon His Majesty or any of His Majesty's officers or servants in connection with the sale or lease or purchase or delivery or manufacture of such military, militia or naval stores.

If any offence referred to in this section is committed by a body corporate, every director and officer of such body corporate who has taken any part or share in such fraud, dishonesty or deception, or who knows or had reason to suspect that such fraud, dishonesty or deception would be committed, or knows or had reason to suspect that such fraud, dishonesty or deception has been committed, and does not at once inform His Majesty thereof, shall be liable to the penalties imposed by this section in all respects as if such offence was committed by said directors or officers themselves, and every such body corporate, director or officer convicted of such offence shall be thereafter incapable of contracting with His Majesty or with any of His Majesty's officers or servants, or of holding any contract or office with, from or under him or them, or of receiving any benefit under any contract so made.

The necessity for such a measure as this will, I think, be admitted by the Minister of Justice and by every member of the House. I was looking over the criminal law to ascertain whether we really had any provision for punishment of those who defraud the Government in the sale of military stores, and I was unable to find that Parliament had legislated on this question at any previous time.

There is a large number of provisions relating to military affairs; for example, we have imposed penalties for persuading soldiers to desert, for concealing a deserter, for attending a drill without lawful authority, for obliterating the marks on military stores, for being in possession of stores without lawful authority, for receiving clothing, etc., from a soldier or deserter. We have a large number of provisions in the code that relate to minor offences of that kind, but no provision that punishes a contractor who deliberately and with intention of fraud palms off shoddy goods on the Militia Department. We know that at a time like this, when there is great excitement and when everybody in the department is busy with matters of great importance, the dishonest man is also busy. It is his opportunity to get contracts, to supply articles that are not up to the standard, and in this way to deceive the Government, and so do far more damage to the public interest than could be done by men who might commit the minor offences to which I have referred; but at the same time no provision has been made for such cases. I do not know to what extent these things are carried on, but if we are to credit the press we must believe that they are carried on to some extent. The press of Great Britain has made reference to them. The London Times, even, has discussed the question of the character of some of the supplies that have been furnished to the Canadian soldiers. I have

seen frequent references in the press to this subject, and what startled me most was the reference of the Minister of Militia himself, who in Vancouver said that he would like to have authority to shoot the dishonest contractors who were imposing upon the Government in this way.

Mr. HAZEN: Does the hon. gentleman propose shooting as a penalty under the Bill?

Mr. SINCLAIR: I do not. I propose two years' imprisonment, which is a much milder form of punishment; but it will be for the Minister of Marine, if he thinks the penalty is not severe enough, to ask the House to add to it.

In the Ottawa Evening Journal of the 12th of January reference is made to a letter from a prominent Canadian officer at Salisbury, whose name for obvious reasons is withheld, in the course of which he says:

> Outside of certain discomforts, we get plenty, and all that money can buy, but I would ask you to appeal to the Government contractors with a view to touching their sense of honour. It seems to me that all they care about is to produce some kind of article that has appearance. They evidently do not stop to consider that these sons of Canada are roughing it for the specific purpose of fighting, and sacrificing their all in order to defend these same contractors' factories and personal liberty. The principal trouble has been in boots, and it is not fair to the soldier to allow these contractors to reap a harvest at his expense. An officer is in a position to purchase his own equipment, but the man behind the gun must take what he is served out with. Of course, there have been some good boots issued, which have been manufactured by a certain two firms, but the others are absolutely unserviceable after a few days' wear.

No later than yesterday morning I myself received a letter from a person who wished me to inform the inspector of military stores that shoddy blankets were being manufactured for the Government at Toronto. I do not know whether that is true or not, but the person who wrote me said it was true. I did not know who the inspector was or to whom I should go. It is well, I think, to have these contractors understand that while they may be able to deceive the department and sell them shoddy and useless stuff for the present, there is a day of reckoning ahead, that these things generally come out; and that when fraud is discovered they will be liable to criminal prosecution. I think that such a provision would deter many people from undertaking a crime of that kind. All the money that we spend should be well spent at a time like this. Money, as we all know, is the sinews of war. The Finance Minister has his own troubles in securing enough cash to carry on our share of this dreadful conflict, and every dollar should be used to the very best advantage. Everybody remembers the scandals in Europe at the time of the Crimean war. The soldiers suffered in the trenches before Sebastopol because defective clothing, blankets and boots were furnished to them by worthless contractors in Great Britain, who were reaping a rich harvest from contracts. The facts all came out later on. People ought to be punished for a crime of this character in connection with military affairs. The German spy who secures information for his government and is paid for it suffers death; but he is a gentleman compared with the Canadian contractor who, when his country is engaged in such a desperate struggle as the present, when the life and the future of the Empire and of civilization are at stake, plots and schemes to defraud the Government by selling shoddy blankets or boots, or a spavined horse, or something of that kind. I think that no penalty is too severe for men who do these things, and I hope the Minister of Justice will aid me in placing either this provision or a provision of this kind on the Canadian statute-book.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): I do not think many of us will hesitate in agreeing that persons guilty of offences such as those referred to by the hon. member should be condignly punished. I have great deference for the hon. gentleman's statement that he has not been able to find in the existing criminal law any provision that will cover the cases he suggested. Inasmuch as he has carefully gone into it, I have some hesitation in suggesting that there may be some provision to cover such a case as he speaks of. It seems to me surprising that there should not be some such provision. If there be any doubt upon that, under the method I propose to suggest we shall be able to make it quite clear. For the reasons I gave last evening with regard to the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney), I propose to move that this Bill be referred to the committee which, in accordance with what was said last evening, is to be constituted to take in to consideration suggested amendments to the Criminal Code. I suggested last evening the reasons that led us to the conclusion that it was desirable to proceed in that way. I am quite willing, therefore, having it

understood that by doing this we are not necessarily accepting the principle of the Bill, to have the Bill go to a further reading, and then I will move that it be referred to the committee I have just mentioned.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the second time.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I understand that we have gone through the entire order paper, and would move that the House adjourn.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 4.56 p.m.

Monday, February 22, 1915.

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

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the return of Gideon Rochon, Esquire, as member for the electoral district of Terrebonne.

WAR SUPPLIES—COMMITTEE ON BOOTS.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That the name of the Hon. Charles Murphy be substituted for that of the Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux on the committee appointed to inquire into all matters appertaining to boots supplied to the Department of Militia.

Motion agreed to.

EVIDENCE BEFORE COMMITTEES.

Mr. SPEAKER: In reply to a question put to me on Friday last, I stated that committees have power to swear witnesses without the House authorizing them. I quote from the Revised Statutes, 1906, cap. 10, sec. 25, "an Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons:"

Any committee of the Senate or of the House of Commons may administer the oath to any witness examined before said committee.

I have noticed that motions have been made in the House to confer power on committees to examine witnesses under oath, and I have already stated that I thought this unnecessary. I quote this section of the Act now in confirmation of that view.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It may be a question as to whether the statute has application only to a committee that was so authorized by the House, and that may be the reason why motions have been made in the House to confer that power.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is quite evident that committees of the House are fully authorized and empowered to administer the oath to a witness because under another clause, sec. 24, the Senate or House of Commons may at any time order a witness to be examined under oath before a committee, provided the committee had neglected to do so.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill No. 47, to amend the Civil Service Act, 1908—Mr. Broder—introduced and read the first time.

WAR SUPPLIES AT SALISBURY PLAINS.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM: I notice in a despatch which has been given prominence in the leading newspapers, including the Ottawa Journal of Saturday last, a statement that wagons, harness, Ross rifles, etc., have been discarded in great quantities and left behind at Salisbury Plains. Has the Government any information on that point?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not think we have any such information as that. I shall be able to give my hon. friend full information later. I believe the Princess Patricia regiment did take British rifles, because it was brigaded with a British division, but so far as the Canadian Overseas force is concerned, I have no information whatever that the Ross rifle has been discarded. The long Ross rifle, I understand from the Minister of Militia, is not regarded as very suitable for cavalry, not because of the rifle itself, but because of the difficulty of handling a long rifle on horseback. So far as the motor transport is concerned, my recollection is that it was subjected to very severe usage during the four or five months which have elapsed since the force has been in Salisbury Plains, and it would be desirable, I have no doubt, that new motor transports should be sent to the front as quickly as possible; but I do not know at the moment how much of the motor transport which was so used has been taken to the front and what proportion has been left behind to be usesd during training by any further expeditionary force that may go forward.

Mr. GRAHAM: The despatch also refers to wagons and harness having been left behind.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: So far as wagons and harness are concerned, I am not in a position to speak; but I will get the information later on.

GASPE-CAMPBELLTON STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL: With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) regarding the memorial that has been sent to him by the Campbellton Board of Trade, a copy of which has been sent to me by the secretary of the board, regarding the steamship service between Gaspé and Campbellton. As the House is aware from our last discussion on the matter, the minister was under some difficulty in establishing that service last year, and the best that he could do was to establish a long-distance service between Montreal, Quebec and Campbellton. But this does not meet the requirements between Campbellton and Gaspé and of the Bonaventure shore, and so they are asking that the local service between Gaspé and Campbellton be re-established. I have no objection to the long-distance service if it can be maintained, but the signers of the memorial are in favour of re-establishing the old semi-weekly service. Would it be possible for the minister, in view of the near opening of navigation, to call for tenders for such service? Has any action been taken in the matter?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is as the hon. member for Bonaventure has intimated, about the beginning of last year's service the proprietor of the line, a contractor in this case, died. His estate was not able to carry on the service. We were in the midst of the season before this was decided, and so the best that could be done at that time was to make an arrangement for weekly service instead of semi-weekly with a line which carried as far as Montreal. The document referred to by my hon. friend has been received, and is now being considered by the officers of the department. In a little while I shall be able to come to a conclusion as to what is best to be done, or what is possible under the circumstances.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 41, respecting The Athabasca Northern Railway Company.—Mr. R. B. Bennett.

Bill No. 42, respecting The Canada Preferred Insurance Company.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill No. 43, respecting The Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Company, and to change its name to The Huron and Erie Mortgage Corporation.—Mr. Marshall.

Bill No. 44, respecting certain patents of The Lohmann Company.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 45, respecting The Vancouver Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill No. 46, respecting The Western Dominion Railway Company.—Mr. R. B. Bennett.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

ST. GILBERT DE PORTNEUF POSTMASTER.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. Has the postmaster of the parish of St. Gilbert de Portneuf been dismissed from office?
2. If so, who requested his dismissal?
3. Who is his successor? and by whom was he recommended?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. The Postmaster General directed a change in the site of the post office.
2. Mr. Honoré Grenier.
3. Mr. Bertrand Giraud, who was recommended by Mr. H. Grenier and approved by the Postmaster General.

WAR SUPPLIES—CLINIC THERMOMETERS.

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM:

1. Did the Government purchase for the first Canadian contingent any clinic thermometers from any one in Ottawa?
2. If so, from whom were these clinic thermometers purchased, and what was the price paid?
3. Did the Government have any offers from private individuals for clinic thermometers? If so, what were the prices quoted?

Major-General HUGHES:

1. Yes.
2. T. A. Brownlee. $1 was paid at first, but subsequently Mr. Brownlee discovered an error in his charge, and refunded half of this, making the net price 50c.
3. Not before the order was given—August 11.

WAR SUPPLIES—RAZORS.

Mr. TURRIFF:

1. How many razors have been bought by or on behalf of the Government since the war began?
2. What price was paid per dozen, gross or thousand?

Mr. CODERRE:

Department of Militia and Defence.

1. 62,363.

2. Prices varied from $4.85 to $9 per dozen.

Department of Naval Service.

1. 500 razors were purchased November 14 for delivery at H.M.C. dockyard, Halifax, N.S.

2. $5.84 per dozen.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN CITIES.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has the Department of Labour ascertained how many unemployed there were on the 1st of January, 1915, in the cities of Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Vancouver, Halifax and St. John, N.B.?

2. If so, what is the number in each case?

Mr. CROTHERS:

1. No information has been received showing the precise number of unemployed on January 1, 1915, in the cities named. Information is gathered from time to time showing generally the extent of unemployment in various parts of Canada, including the cities named.

2. Answered by No. 1.

VALCARTIER CAMP—DISPOSAL OF STORES.

Mr. CARROLL:

1. Has the Government or any official of the Government recently received written or verbal information in regard to the disposal of the military stores at the close of the Valcartier camp?

2. If so, has the Government taken any steps to investigate the charge and recover the property?

Major-General HUGHES: No information on the matter.

WAR SUPPLIES—DRUGS, MEDICAL SUPPLIES, ETC.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. What wholesale firms doing business in pharmaceutical supplies have furnished the first expeditionary force with drugs, medical supplies, surgical instruments, etc.?

2. What are the names of such firms, and what is the amount in each case?

3. Were tenders called for in every case?

Major-General HUGHES:

1 and 2. Ingram & Bell, Ltd., Toronto, $3,054.99; Hartz Co., Ltd., J. F., Toronto, $704.52; Wood, W. Lloyd, Toronto, $3,125; Burroughs Wellcome & Co., Montreal, $614.62; Chapman, J. H., Montreal, $14,741; Gilmour Bros. & Co. (agents Johnston & Johnston), Montreal, $1,180.60; Lymans, Ltd., Montreal, $702.83; National Drug & Chemical Co., Montreal (agents Seabury & Johnston), $3,081.13; Stott & Jury, Bowmanville, $246; H. K. Mulford Co., Philadelphia, $4,950; Chandler & Fisher, Ltd., Winnipeg, $1,838.47; Eimer & Amend, New York, $953.48; Kny-Scheerer Co., New York, $3,618.73; Whitall Tatum Co., New York, $500.55; E. Powell, Ottawa, $18,163.

3. No. In many cases the supplies were of a special character and were obtained from the manufacturers, either direct or through their representatives.

BUILDINGS RENTED BY GOVERNMENT.

Mr. TURRIFF:

1. How many buildings or portions of buildings under lease by the Government in the City of Ottawa on the 1st of October, 1911, have been vacated or leases cancelled?

2. Who are the owners of said buildings?

3. Where are said buildings situated?

4. What rent per annum was paid for each?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Nine.

2, 3 and 4. W. J. Baskerville; tenement east side Sussex street, Nos. 537 and 539; $800. Victoria Dubé; offices corner Sussex and Clarence streets; $600. Great North Western Telegraph Company; 2 rooms corner Sparks and Metcalfe streets; $420. E. D. Kerr, Vancouver; portion of ground floor 136 Lyon street; $900. Molsons Bank; Basement and 1st and 2nd flats No. 14 westerly side Metcalfe street, Molsons Bank Chambers; $2,340. J. A. Seybold; Premises corner Sparks and O'Connor streets; $6,500. Slater and Sherwood, Rooms 9, 16, 14, 49 and 17 Sparks Chambers, 193 Sparks street; $1,020. Edith Taylor; 4th, 5th and 6th flats and part of basement, Corry building; $10,200. Thistle Estate; Ground floor, 2nd and 3rd flats, Thistle Building, 26 Wellington street; $1,100.

Leases had expired in all cases, excepting that of J. A. Seybold's property, where lease was cancelled by mutual agreement

Mr. LOUIS PEART.

Mr. MACNUTT:

Is Mr. Louis Peart, who was until lately a school teacher at the Indian Industrial school, Lebret, district of Saltcoats, Sask., now in the employment of the Government? If so, in what capacity, what are his duties and what is his salary?

Mr. CODERRE: Not now in the employ of the Government.

CARIBOO ISLAND BREAKWATER.

Mr. MACDONALD:

Why was the amount voted for breakwater at Cariboo Island, in the session of 1914, not expended during the past season?

Mr. ROGERS: Owing to the Engineer's branch being occupied with works of

greater importance, this work was not put under way.

ANTICOSTI LIGHTSHIP.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. What are the names of the officers and engineers of the Anticosti Lightship?
2. Are said officers and engineers in possession of certificates of competency as such? If not, what are the names of those who are not duly qualified?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Captain, Joseph Boulanger (on leave); Captain, Peter LeBlanc (acting); 1st mate, Arthur Marvin (acting); 2nd mate, C. J. Morin (acting); 2nd mate, N. Mathurin (on leave); Note:—On return of 2nd mate Mathurin to duty acting 2nd mate Morin will take position of 1st mate.) Chief Engineer, C. F. Duffy; 2nd Engineer, J. Murphy.
2. Yes.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—CEMENT POSTS.

Mr. BOULAY:

Has B. B. Stewart, contractor, Newcastle, N.B., obtained contracts from the Government of Canada for the construction of cement posts for the use of the Intercolonial railway? If so, for what amounts, and at what localities in the province of Quebec?

Mr. COCHRANE: No.

CANADIAN ORE REFINED IN UNITED STATES.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. What quantity of ore production from the mines of North Ontario has been shipped to the United States to be refined and finished off, during the years 1910, 1911, 1912 and 1913?
2. What is the value of such ore products when refined and finished off?

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. Export entries in Department of Customs do not indicate in what part of Ontario iron ore shipped from Canada to United States originates.
2. The value will depend on the extent of refining and finishing.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—CONTRACTS FOR TIES.

Mr. BELLEMARE:

1. How many railway ties were sold to the Government of Canada for the Intercolonial railway, by a Mr. Fraser of Quebec, during the year 1914?
2. What was the price paid, and the number of each kind?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. W. J. B. Fraser, of Quebec, supplied 35,547 ties.

2. 11,770 No. 1 cedar ties, 52c. each; 17,620 No. 2 cedar ties, 44c. each; 2,688 No. 3 cedar ties, 30c. each; 2,408 No. 1 black spruce, 50c. each; 1,061 No. 2 black spruce, 42c. each.

Mr. BELLEMARE:

1. Did a Mr. Flemming of Ottawa obtain a contract from the Government or the Intercolonial railway for the supply of railway ties in the year 1914?
2. If so, what was the number and the price paid, respectively for No. 1 and No. 2 of such railway ties?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes. C. E. Flemming, of the Harris Tie and Timber Co., was given such a contract.
2. 46,694 No. 1 cedar ties at 50 cents each; 31,926 No. 2 cedar ties at 44 cents each; 7,639 No. 3 cedar ties at 30 cents each. Total, 86,259.

Mr. F. P. GUTELIUS.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Since when has Mr. F. P. Gutelius of the Intercolonial become a British subject?
2. To whom, and in what locality was the application to become a British subject presented?
3. By whom was the naturalization certificate given the said F. P. Gutelius, and what date does such certificate bear?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. February 23, 1912.
2. Judge of Circuit Court, Montreal.
3. Said judge, February 23, 1912.

SEED LOBSTERS.

Mr. LAW:

1. How many seed lobsters have been placed in the lobster pond at Long Beach, St. Mary's, Digby county, N.S.?
2. What was the cost of said seed lobsters for each year?
3. What amount has the Department of Marine and Fisheries expended on said pond since its purchase?
4. How many lobsters have been liberated, and when?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. 436.
2. In 1913 the cost was $48.50; in 1914 the cost was $60.50.
3. $11,746.17, including construction, maintenance and cost of lobsters.
4. 169 in 1913; 119 in 1914.

The pond is also being used by the Biological Board in conducting experiments into the rearing of lobsters.

GOVERNMENT PURCHASES OF CATTLE.

Mr. LAW:

1. How many and what breeds of service horses and cattle have been purchased by the

Department of Agriculture in the county of Yarmouth for farm or breeding purposes during the year 1914?

2. What is the name and address of each seller?

3. What is the name and address of each agent or representative through whom the purchase was made?

4. Were any of the animals so purchased found not to be satisfactory? If so, were they returned to the seller, and what is the name of the party from whom purchased?

5. What was the cost of purchasing above animals and to whom was same paid?

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. Four Jersey bulls and one Devon bull were purchased by the Live Stock Branch of the Department of Agriculture in the county of Yarmouth for breeding purposes during the year 1914. No stallions were purchased in this county.

2. Messrs. H. and A. Cann, Chegoggin, N.S., "Fox's Gay Boy", 4195, Jersey.

John C. Corning, Chegoggin, N.S., "Prospect of Hebron", 4970, Jersey.

Robt. J. Melvin, Yarmouth, N.S., "Clairmont 3rd", 3198, Jersey.

John C. Corning, Chegoggin, N.S., "Victor of Hillcrest", Jersey.

W. A. Pintney, Melbourne, N.S., "King Philip 2nd", 8905, Devon.

3. Each of the above bulls was purchased by Mr. C. A. Archibald, Clifton, N.S., a duly authorized representative of the Live Stock Branch of the Department of Agriculture.

4. Three of the animals have not proved entirely satisfactory at service. They were not returned to the sellers, who were: Messrs. H. and A. Cann, Chegoggin, N.S.; Robt. J. Melvin, Yarmouth, N.S.; W. A. Pintney, Melbourne, N.S.

5. "Fox's Gay Boy," 4195; $125—Messrs. C. and H. Cann.

"Clairmont 3rd," 3198; $125. Robt. J. Melvin.

"King Philip 2nd," 8905; $100—W. A. Pintney.

"Prospect of Hebron," 4970; $125—John C. Corning.

"Victor of Hillcrest" (yearling), $50—John C. Corning.

STEFANSON ARCTIC EXPEDITION.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. What is the latest information in the hands of the Government as to the present whereabouts of the several members of the Stefanson Arctic Expedition who were on board the Karluk when she was crushed in the ice?

2. What steps were taken by the Government to rescue the members of the expedition, who are reported as not having been heard from since they left the neighbourhood of the vessel?

[Mr. Law.]

3. What information has the Government as to the present whereabouts of Mr. Stefanson?

4. What are the names of the men in company with Mr. Stefanson?

5. Does the Government intend to take any steps to find Mr. Stefanson and his party and to aid them if they need aid?

Mr. HAZEN:

1 and 2. After the steamer Karluk was crushed in January, 1914, the surviving members of the expedition landed on Wrangel Island, where they wintered. Captain Robert Bartlett made his way over the ice and across Siberia to Emmer harbour and then across Behring Strait to St. Michaels, where he advised the Canadian Government of the fate of the Karluk. Arrangements were made to attempt the relief of the expedition, and the following ships sailed for Wrangel Island during the summer of 1914, with this object in view: the Russian ice breakers Vaigach and Taimyr, United States patrol steamer Bear, whaling steamer King and Wing, and whaling steamer Corwin. The steamer King and Wing penetrated to Wrangel Island and took off the survivors. Three members that died on the island, and two parties who left the main camp shortly after the wreck of the Karluk have not been heard of. During the winter search parties had been organized to look for these men. Wrangel Island had been explored and search parties had travelled over the ice without finding any trace of the missing parties, and the opinion of the returning members is that these parties have perished.

3, 4 and 5. The second section of the Arctic expedition is at present engaged in scientific work on the Arctic shores of Canada. They have with them, three ships commanded by navigators experienced in northern waters.

4. Mr. Stefanson left the Alaskan coast in March, 1914, for an exploring trip north over the ice, with two men, Storker Storkerson and Ole Anderson. Before leaving he gave instructions as to measures to be taken in case he did not return the same winter. The vessel was to proceed in the summer of 1914 to the coast of Banksland and lay caches, and erect beacons for the men of the Stefanson party when they reached land in the winter of 1914-15. When the latest news of the expedition, dated August, 1914, reached the department, these instructions were being carried out. The expedition being supplied with three vessels does not seem, from latest advice, in need of any further aid at the present time.

ROYAL NORTHWEST MOUNTED POLICE—PREMISES AT REGINA.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN:

1. What rental is being paid for premises for the Royal Northwest Mounted Police in the city of Regina in connection with what is called the town station of the police?
2. To whom is such rent paid?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. $100 per month.
2. Hugh Armour & Co. Ltd.

ABERDEEN ASSOCIATION—FRANKING PRIVILEGE

Mr. W. M. MARTIN:

Has the Government decided to take away the franking privilege from the Aberdeen Association, a society which has for its object the sending of good literature to settlers in lonely parts of Canada? If so, why?

Mr. CASGRAIN: The matter is under the consideration of the department.

LAST MOUNTAIN LAKE DREDGING.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to continue dredging operations at the foot of Last Mountain Lake, province of Saskatchewan?
2. What amount of money has been spent by the Government in carrying on such dredging in each of the years 1912, 1913 and 1914?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. The requirements of navigation having been sufficiently attended to, the matter of further dredging will be considered when the need for such is shown to exist.

2. 1912, $6,973 52; 1913, $7,114 43; 1914, to Dec. 31, $6,272 00.

MOOSEJAW-REGINA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to make provision for supplying the cities of Moosejaw and Regina and the surrounding country with water diverted from the Saskatchewan river?
2. How much money has been spent in making preliminary surveys or in any way investigating the feasibility of such a scheme?
3. Has any federal assistance ever been granted in Canada in order to assist in providing a water supply for domestic purposes for any urban community? If so, what community?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. The Department of the Interior has made preliminary investigations covering the development of the power necessary to carry out the Moosejaw-Regina water supply scheme. Further action on this matter has been stayed in so far as this department is concerned, pending the consideration by the Saskatchewan Water Commission of the data collected.

2. About $19,720.

3. In 1903, the sum of $5,000 was granted to the City of Regina for the purpose of rebuilding the Wascana dam which formed the reservoir from which the city obtained its water supply. No other assistance was given through the Department of Public Works.

STEAM TRAWLING.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

Were any steps taken by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, or his department, during 1914, in the direction of prohibiting that mode of deep sea fishing known as steam trawling? If so, what were the steps taken?

Mr. HAZEN:

The Fisheries Protection Cruisers were as active as conditions would permit to prevent steam trawling in territorial waters. There has also been correspondence with the United States Bureau of Fisheries to ascertain when the report it was having prepared following its investigations into the effects of such trawling would be completed, as that country desired to complete such investigations before considering the question of an international arrangement with regard to such trawling.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY ICE SUPPLY.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What are the names of all parties who tendered for supplying ice to the Intercolonial railway at Mulgrave for the current year?
2. What are the dates of such tenders?
3. What is the amount of each tender?
4. If tenders were called for more than once, what are the names, amounts and dates on each occasion on which tenders were called for?
5. Who was the successful tenderer?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1, 2 and 3. S. W. Hagerty, Mulgrave, Nova Scotia, Jan. 4, 1915, 52 cents per net ton, delivered on cars at Pt. Tupper; 88 cents per net ton, delivered and packed in ice house.

G. H. McIntyre, McIntyre's Lake, Nova Scotia, Jan. 4, 1915, 46 cents per net ton, delivered on cars at McIntyre's Lake; 25 cents per net ton extra for storing in ice house.

E. L. Hadley, Mulgrave, Nova Scotia, Jan. 2, 1915, $1 per net ton, delivered and packed in ice house.

J. J. Duff, McIntyre's Lake, Nova Scotia, Jan. 4, 1915, $2.50 per net ton, delivered and packed in ice house.

James Dunlap, Leitches Creek, Nova Scotia, Jan. 4, 1915, 65 cents per net ton, delivered on cars Dunlap's Siding, at Leitches Creek.

4. Tenders were called for, only once; by poster dated Dec. 24, 1914.

5. S. W. Hagerty, at 88 cents per ton, delivered and packed in ice house, his tender being the lowest.

EXPORTS OF COPPER TO UNITED STATES.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What is the quantity and value of copper ore and copper of all kinds exported to the United States between August 4, 1913, and February 15, 1914?

2. What is the quantity and value of copper ore and copper of all kinds exported to the United States between August 4, 1914, and February 15, 1915?

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. During the six months ended January 31, 1914; copper, fine, contained in ore, matte, regulus, etc.: domestic, 37,636,785 lbs., $4,399,974. Copper, black or coarse, cement copper and copper in pigs: nil. Copper, old and scrap: domestic, 11,157 cwt., $148,212; foreign, 674 cwt., $8,833.

2. During the six months ended January, 1915: copper, fine, contained in ore, matte, regulus, etc.: domestic, 20,279,733 lbs., $2,059,447. Copper, black or coarse, cement copper and copper in pigs: domestic, 6,020,576 lbs., $811,877. Copper, old and scrap: 10,245 cwt., $108,315.

CIVIL SERVANTS IN HOME MILITIA.

Mr. PROULX:

1. Are there any Dominion Civil Service employees and Provincial Civil Service employees serving in the home militia as guards on canals and other public works or otherwise? If so, how many?

2. What are the names of such civil service employees serving as officers and non-commissioned officers, the salaries they receive from the different Governments, and the remuneration allowed them by the Department of Militia?

Major-General HUGHES: No means immediately available of ascertaining these names.

D.G.S. EARL GREY.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES:

1. Was the D.G.S. Earl Grey sold?
2. If so, to whom, and for what price?
3. What did she cost when completed and ready for sea?
4. If said steamer was not sold, what disposition was made of her?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.
2. Russian Government, $493,000.00.
3. $516,690.97.
4. Answered by No. 1.

FOREIGN STEAM TRAWLERS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

Have foreign steam trawlers been permitted to purchase coal and supplies at the Port of North Sydney, N.S., since the passing of Chapter 14 of the Acts of 1913?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes. The present collector at North Sydney says French steam trawlers have been permitted to purchase coal and supplies at the port of North Sydney, N.S., since he has been in office.

NATIONAL DRUG COMPANY.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has the Militia Department given any contract to the National Drug Company?
2. If so, for what amount, and what is the nature of the purchase made?

Major-General HUGHES: No.

THE PROPOSED STAMP TAX.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

Has the Minister of Finance received protests from the manufacturers of patent medicines against the proposed stamp tax? If so, from whom?

Mr. W. T. WHITE: A number of communications have been received from manufacturers and dealers in patent medicines respecting the stamp tax referred to. It is not the practice to make known the names of those from whom such communications are received.

VALCARTIER CAMP—PAYMENT OF ACCOUNTS.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Was an advance of money made by the Government, or by any department thereof, to enable paymasters or other officers or officials to pay in cash, bills and accounts incurred in connection with the transportation and training of troops at Valcartier camp?
2. If so, what amount was advanced, and to whom?
3. Out of the amount so advanced, how much was paid to the Canadian Northern Railway Company?
4. Are there any receipts or vouchers for such cash payments?

Major-General HUGHES:

1. Yes. Militia Department.
2. Aggregating $2,245,000 up to January 31, 1915; Major C. N. Shanly, Camp Paymaster, Valcartier, until departure of troops, and Capt. J. A. Gilbert, C.A.P.C., his successor.
3. Nothing.
4. Answered by No. 3.

LEONARDSVILLE DREDGING.

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. Who were the tenderers for the work of dredging at Leonardsville, N.B., for which tenders closed on the 10th August, 1914?
2. What were the amounts of the various tenders received?
3. Who was the lowest tenderer?
4. To whom was the contract awarded?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. The Maritime Dredging and Construction Co., Ltd., J. S. Gregory.

2. Tender "A," 36½ cents per cubic yard, class B; tender "B," 50 cents per cubic yard, class B.

3. The Maritime Dredging and Construction Co., Ltd.

4. No contract was awarded, as it was decided not to proceed with the work at present.

YARMOUTH COUNTY FISHERY GUARDIANS.

Mr. LAW:

What are the names and post office addresses, with amount paid to each, of the fishery guardians in the county of Yarmouth, during the year 1914?

Mr. HAZEN: Jacob Foote, Sanford, N.S., $22.50; C. J. B. Tooker, Yarmouth, N.S., $354; J. E. Golden, Chebogue Point, N.S., $37.50; C. E. Churchill, Short Beach, N.S., $15; David Stanwood, Yarmouth Bar, $30; Nathan Sweeney, Pleasant Lake, $30; Frank Frost, Carleton, N.S., $56.25; Samuel V. Miuse, Quinan, $22.50; C. Reeves, Kemptville, $56.25; Forman Harlbert, Canaan, N.S., $30; J. V. N. Hatfield, Gavelton, N.S., $150; Wade Reynard, Tusket Falls, N.S., $150; S. J. Hood, jr., Yarmouth, N.S., $37.50; Albert A. Pothier, Wedgeport, N.S., $37.50; David Le Ferve, Belleville, N.S., $18.75; Albert Elwell, Argyle, N.S., $18.75; Loran Smith, East Pubnico, N.S., $15; Dennis J. Amiro, West Pubnico, N.S., $37.50; Freeman De Viller, Comeau Hill, $121.50.

YARMOUTH COUNTY MAIL ROUTES.

Mr. LAW:

1. How many rural mail routes have been established in Yarmouth county, what are the names of such routes, and the dates established?

2. How many post offices have been closed in said county, and what are the names of the same, since January 1, 1912?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Six rural mail routes: Carleton No. 1 (in part), Sept. 1, 1913; South Ohio No. 1, Aug. 1, 1909; South Ohio No. 2, April 1, 1910; Tusket No. 1, June 17, 1914; Yarmouth No. 1, May 1, 1909; Yarmouth No. 2, Oct. 1, 1911.

2. Eight post offices: Brenton, Deerfield, Gavelton, Pleasant Valley Corner, Reynard's Bridge, South Deerfield, Tusket Falls.

WINNIPEG VOLUNTEERS.

Mr. MOLLOY:

1. How many volunteers for overseas service are now in barracks in Winnipeg?

2. What are the names or numbers of the several regiments, battalions, or squadrons?

3. At what price per man is food supplied?

4. Who are the contractors for supplying food to the volunteers?

Major-General HUGHES:

1 and 2. Inadvisable to answer, as question is one of military preparation.

3. Cost per ration, 27·74c.

4. John Enright, Winnipeg, meat; Speirs-Parnell Baking Co., Winnipeg, bread; Hardy & Buchanan, Winnipeg, groceries; Laing Bros., Winnipeg, flour.

GUYSBOROUGH COUNTY FISHERY GUARDIANS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

What are the names and post office addresses, with amount paid to each, of the fishery guardians in Guysborough county, during the year 1914?

Mr. HAZEN: Albert Pride, Sonora, N.S., $20; John Faulkner, Sherbrooke, N.S., $20; Earl Archibald, Stillwater, N.S., $35; David Kirk, Aspen, N.S., $20; Archibald Smith, Smithsfield, N.S., $20; George J. Wilson, Caledonia, N.S., $20; William Findla, Caledonia, N.S., $20; John D. Hattie, Camerons Settlement, N.S., $20; Geo. A. Hudson, Country Harbour Mines, N.S., $16; Wm. R. Mason, Country Harbour Cross Road, $20; Moses Mason, Country Harbour Cross Road, $20; Joseph Rudolph, Liscomb, N.S., $15; John Cross, Indian River, N.S., $20; Stephen Myers, Isaacs Harbour, N.S., $20; Ira Sangster, New Harbour, N.S., $10; Otto N. Munro, Cole Harbour, N.S., $30; Norman McDonald, Cooks Cove, N.S., $15; Jeremiah Jones, Cooks Cove, N.S., $15; Harvey Spanks, Rockdale, N.S., $20; Patrick McDonald, Erinville, N.S., $20; John Kenny, Erinville, N.S., $13; James M. Cunningham, Havendale, N.S., $5.20; Duncan Chisholm, St. Francis Harbour, N.S., $20; Jeremiah Borden, Upper Big Tracadie, $15; Walter Nicolle, Mulgrave, N.S., $20.

PHILLIPSBURG-ST. ARMAND MAIL CARRIER.

Mr. KAY:

1. Who was the mail carrier between Phillipsburg and St. Armand station during the summer of 1914?

2. Was he dismissed? If so, when and how much notice was he given to discontinue his services?

3. Who asked for his dismissal?

4. Why was he dismissed?

5. Who recommended the appointment of his successor?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. N. Larivière.

2, 3, 4 and 5. On the expiration of the last regular contract on the 30th September, 1913, and pending certain proposed rearrangements in connection with the estab-

lishment of rural routes, a temporary arrangement, terminable at the pleasure of the Postmaster-General, was entered into with Mr. Larivière. This temporary arrangement was continued until the 22nd November, 1914, when a new temporary arrangement was made and the service put up for public tenders.

BONDED LIQUORS AND TOBACCO.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES:

1. What quantity of spirituous liquors proof gallons, including ales, wines and beers, was taken out of bond between August 6, and August 21, 1914?

2. What quantity of cigars, cigarettes and tobacco was taken out of bond between the above mentioned dates?

Mr. BLONDIN:

1. Spirits, 617,461.85 p. gals.

2. Cigars, 13,008,570; cigarettes, 2,209,250; tobacco, 469,224 pounds.

WAR SUPPLIES, FIFTH MOUNTED RIFLES.

Mr. McCREA:

1. From whom is food for men and horses and all other supplies and equipment for the Fifth Mounted Rifles, now in camp at Sherbrooke, bought from and how?

2. If by tender, what date were tenders called for?

3. When were tenders opened and contracts awarded?

4. What are the names and Post Office addresses of all parties who submitted tenders?

5. Who are the successful tenderers, and the price of each?

Major-General HUGHES:

1. Harris Abattoir Co., Ltd., beef, 11 cents per pound; mutton, 11 cents per pound.

Walter Allatt, bread, 4 cents per pound.

Harris Abattoir Co., Ltd., groceries: Bacon, breakfast, 18c per pound; bacon, green, 15 cents per pound; potatoes, 9-10 cents per pound; beans, 6½ cents per pound; jam, 13 cents per pound; butter, creamery, 31 cents per pound; butter, dairy, 22 cents per pound; cheese, 17 cents per pound; split pease, 6 cents per pound; sugar, white, 7½ cents per pound; salt, 2 cents per pound; pepper, 25 cents per pound; fresh vegetables, 2¼ cents per pound; lard, 12 cents per pound. At these prices the grocery ration costs less than at those of any other tenderer, viz., 11·76 cents per man per day.

Hyndman Grain Co., straw, $11 per ton; oats, 70 cents per bushel; afterwards increased to 74 cents per bushel.

C. C. Lusk, hay, $20 per ton.

La Cie. Coderre and Fils, coal, hard, furnace, stove, and egg sizes, $7.50 per ton.

S. and W. Fortier, Ltd., wood, hard, 4-foot lengths, $6 per cord; wood, hard, 2-foot lengths, $3.25 per cord; wood, soft, 4-foot lengths, $5 per cord; 2-foot lengths, $2.75 per cord.

The above prices were obtained by public tender, contracts having been made with the lowest tenderer in each case.

2. January 27; time afterwards extended to February 5.

The advertisement calling for tenders did not specify the period for which contracts were to be made. Prospective tenderers complained that they were unable to fix the amount of security deposit and could not quote prices without knowing the time for which they were to hold good. On this account, therefore, after tenders had been opened on January 28, the time for receiving tenders was extended to February 5, the contract period was fixed to expire March 31, 1915, and notice to this effect was at once sent all previous tenderers who were allowed to withdraw their tenders and submit new ones, if this additional information had affected prices in their opinion. As a result of this extension of time, five tenders were received from firms not previously tendering; but in every case but one, the contracts were given to firms who had tendered in the first place and who were the bona fide lowest tenderers. The one exception was the contract for wood. Only one tender was received for this supply.

3. Tenders were opened on January 28 and February 5. Contracts awarded: Hay, January 30; contracts for balance of items were made on February 9.

4. Walter Allatt, Sherbrooke; Bouchard and Blais, Sherbrooke; Thos. J. Pavey, Sherbrooke; Henry Grant, Lennoxville; Eusebe Fontaine, Sherbrooke; Harris Abattoir Co., Quebec; Alex. Ames and Sons, Ltd., Sherbrooke; George F. Moore, Sherbrooke, M. McKechnie, Sherbrooke; Dean and Lacey, Sherbrooke; May and Houlahan, Sherbrooke; Hebert and Fortier, Sherbrooke; L. H. Oliver, Sherbrooke; C. C. Lusk, Cookshire; James Scott and Co., Montreal; Hyndman Grain Co., Sherbrooke; La Cie. C. O. Genest and Fils, Sherbrooke; Ewing Cross, Sherbrooke; La Cie. Coderre and Fils, Sherbrooke; S. and W. Fortier, Ltd., Sherbrooke.

5. Answered by No. 1.

WAR SUPPLIES—HORSES.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. How many horses were bought for the first contingent?

2. What was the average price paid per horse?

3. Were some of the horses so bought, afterwards sold at public auction? If so, how many?
4. Where was the auction held, and who authorized the sale?
5. What was the net amount realized by the auction sale?

Major-General HUGHES:

1. 8,150.

2. $172.45.

3. Yes: 481 horses which had received injuries, or which had deteriorated owing to exposure and other causes, were sold by public auction.

4. Auction sale was held at Quebec, P.Q., and authorized by the Department.

5. The net amount realized was $25,855.

Mr. MARCILE:

Were any horses, discovered to be unsuitable for service, sold by order of the Militia Department or of any other department of the Government, about the time of departure of the first expeditionary force? If so, how many were sold at the cities of Quebec and Montreal, respectively, and what was the average price obtained for such horses?

Major-General HUGHES: Quebec—481 horses which had received injuries, or which had deteriorated owing to exposure and other causes, were sold by auction. The average price obtained was $53.74. Montreal, none.

Mr. MARCILE:

How many horses were purchased for cavalry purposes, and for the ordinary camp service of Valcartier, respectively, in connection with the requirements of the first expeditionary force, and what was the average price paid for the same?

Major-General HUGHES: 1,436 horses purchased for cavalry. No horses were specially purchased for camp service. The average price paid was $172.45.

WAR SUPPLIES—OVERSHOES.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. How many overshoes were purchased by the Government for the Canadian contingents?
2. From whom were such purchases made, and at what price?
3. How many overshoes were supplied the first contingent, and at what date?
4. Were the overshoes sent the first contingent used by the troops or returned to Canada?
5. If returned without being used, what reason was given for such return?

Major-General HUGHES:

1. Since August 1, 1914, 120,000 pairs have been bought.

2. From Canadian Consolidated Rubber Company at $1.96 and $1.85 per pair; from Gutta Percha and Rubber, Ltd., at $1.70 and $1.85 per pair; from Kauffman Rubber Co., Columbus Rubber Co., and Independent Rubber Co., at $1.85 per pair.

3. 48,000 pairs were shipped to England during the month of October for the use of First Contingent and for upkeep.

4. Used by troops.

5. None have been returned to Canada.

WAR SUPPLIES—SHOES.

Mr. GERMAN:

Did Mr. Robert Wilson, boot and shoe merchant, of the city of Hamilton, have a contract with the Government for the sale of army shoes to be used by the first Canadian contingent? If so, for how many pairs, and at what price per pair?

Major-General HUGHES: No.

WAR SUPPLIES—DRUGS.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has any sale of drugs or pharmaceutical products of any kind been made to the Department of Militia by Mrs. George Plamondon, St. Joseph street, Quebec?

2. If so, what is the total amount of the purchase made from said Mrs. Plamondon, and what is the nature of the purchase?

Major-General HUGHES:

1. Yes.

2. (a) $23,495.54, from July 1, 1914, to January 31, 1915. (b) Drugs, etc., for Permanent Corps and troops mobilizing at Valcartier.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. Gauvreau: For a return showing the names and post office addresses of all persons in the county of Temiscouata, who have received the bounty which is granted to the Fenian raid veterans under the provisions of the Fenian Raid Volunteer Bounty Act. Also, the names and post office addresses of all persons in the county of Temiscouata, whose requests have been rejected, and the names and post office addresses of such persons whose claims have not yet been taken into consideration.

Mr. Gauvreau: For a copy of all papers, petitions, declarations, affidavits, sworn statements, requests, certificates and all other documents in connection with the naturalization of F. P. Gutelius, general manager of the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. Cruise: For a copy of the report of investigation held about June 1, 1914, by R. T. Ferguson, as special commissioner, into the allotment of homesteads on the area cut of the Riding Mountain Forest Reserve in the year 1908 or about that time.

Mr. Law: For a copy of all letters, telegrams, reports, recommendations, orders in council and all other documents and papers in connection with rewards to the officers and crews of steamers John L. Cann and Westport III, for their heroic efforts in saving the passengers and crews of S.S. Cobequid, wrecked on Trinity Ledge, January 13, 1914.

Mr. Sinclair: For a copy of all petitions, correspondence, complaints, reports and other

documents relating to the dismissal of Alfred H. Bonnyman, postmaster of Mattatall lake, in the county of Colchester, N.S.

Mr. Sinclair: For a copy of all correspondence, recommendations, petitions. contracts, tenders and other papers and documents in any way connected with the letting of the contract for carrying the mails between Guysborough and Erinville, N.S.

Mr. Sinclair: For a copy of all petitions, letters or other papers or documents in the possession of the Department of Public Works relating to the expenditure of money for the construction of new public works in Guysborough county since October 10, 1911.

Mr. Sinclair: For a copy of all petitions, correspondence, reports of engineers or other persons in the possession of the Department of Railways and Canals relating to the construction of a railway in the county of Guysborough, N.S.

Mr. Sinclair: For a copy of all correspondence, recommendations, tenders and other papers on file in the office of the Department of Railways and Canals relating to supplying ice for the Intercolonial railway at Mulgrave for the year 1915.

Mr. Sinclair: For a copy of all correspondence, petitions, recommendations, and other papers on file in the office of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, relating to the automatic gas buoy placed at the entrance of Country Harbour, in the county of Guysborough, known as The Isaac's harbour Buoy.

Mr. Sinclair: For a copy of all orders in council, memoranda, correspondence or other documents in the possession of the Government, or any department thereof, relating to the trade in dried fish and wines between Portugal and Canada.

Mr. Sinclair: For a return showing the names, tonnage, port of registry and destination of all foreign vessels engaged in fishing, both sail and steam, that entered and cleared from the port of North Sydney, N.S., from December 31, 1913, to date.

Mr. Boyer: For a copy of all letters, telegrams and papers generally concerning the proposed construction of a bridge between the island of Montreal and the mainland at Vaudreuil.

Mr. Boyer: For a copy of all letters, telegrams and papers generally concerning the proposed construction of a bridge to connect Isle Perrot with the mainland at Vaudreuil.

Mr. W. M. Martin: For a return showing what properties have been acquired by the Government in the city of Regina since September 21, 1911. The descriptions of such properties by metes and bounds. For what purposes such properties were acquired. From whom such properties were purchased. The total price and the price per foot paid for each property. If any such property was acquired by expropriation, what tribunal determined the price to be paid for any property so expropriated. The dates on which any such properties were acquired.

Mr. Lemieux: For a return showing the total number of employees, both permanent and temporary, at the following post offices: Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Halifax, Quebec, St. John, N.B., and Vancouver. The total number of salaries paid in each case. The total number of employees, and the amount of salaries paid in the above offices on the first of October, 1911.

[Mr. Sinclair.]

Mr. Achim: For a return showing the total amount of the travelling expenses of the members of the late Government in the last ten years of their administration. Trips to other countries, Europe included, they have made. The names of the ministers who have travelled at the expense of the public treasury. The total amount so expended by each of the ministers who have so travelled. The objects of these visits, and how long did they last.

Mr. Loggie: For a return showing the inward tonnage freight, and also the outward tonnage freight respectively, at Loggieville station on the Intercolonial railway for each month of 1914, and also for the month of January, 1915. The inward tonnage freight, and the outward tonnage freight at Chatham station, on the Intercolonial railway for each month of 1914, and also for the month of January, 1915. The inward tonnage freight, and the outward tonnage freight at Newcastle station on the Intercolonial railway for each month of 1914, and also for the month of January, 1915. The local and through passenger traffic to and through each of the above stations respectively, during each of the months above mentioned. It is requested that coal and other railway supplies be shown separately.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm: For a return showing the names and addresses of all Fenian raid veterans in the county of Inverness who have been paid the Fenian raid bounty, the names and addresses of those who have not yet been paid, and the names and addresses of those whose applications have been refused.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm: For a return showing the amounts expended by the Public Works Department in the county of Inverness each year from 1896 down to 1915.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm: For a copy of all letters, telgerams, petitions and documents of all kinds in possession of the Post Office Department, referring in any way to the conduct of the postmaster at Grand Etang since his appointment until the present date.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm: For a copy of all telegrams, letters, reports petitions and all other documents in any way referring to the proposed line of railway from Orangedale to Cheticamp.

PARLIAMENTARY REPRESENTATION OF PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.) moved:

That a humble address be presented to His Majesty praying that he may be graciously pleased to give his consent to submitting a measure to the Parliament of the United Kingdom to amend certain provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, in order that the province of Prince Edward Island will always be entitled to at least six members in the House of Commons of Canada, that being the number of members assigned to the said province when it entered confederation.

He said: During the last regular session of Parliament the question of the membership of this House, and of the other House as well, occupied a good deal of time and attention. The fact that there was a continued and steady reduction in the number of members of this House coming from the

group of provinces known as the Maritime Provinces claimed considerable attention, and the Committee on Redistribution suggested that a change be made in the British North America Act so that no province would have fewer representatives in this House than it had in the Senate. That suggestion appeared to have commended itself to the House, and some action was taken in regard to it. However, Parliament prorogued without anything definite having been done in that regard. Hence I am bringing this resolution to the notice of the House to-day. The members from the larger provinces may perhaps wonder why we from the smaller provinces, particularly from Prince Edward Island, attach so much importance to this question. My answer to that natural inquiry would be, that in all countries having representative institutions to which delegates are sent, the small communities are always very sensitive, perhaps even jealous, with regard to the number of their representatives. While the larger provinces and the strong places can take care of themselves, the smaller provinces or communities are not so satisfied that they can under all circumstances look after their own interests, and they have in consequence a sensitiveness on the question of representation. I should like the members from the larger provinces to look at this question for a few moments from our viewpoint. I think I can establish that there was in the minds of those who drew up the terms of Confederation the idea that whatever the number of members a province started with that number should not be reduced, particularly in regard to the smaller provinces. A provision was put in the Constitution to safeguard that principle. I think I can prove that when Prince Edward Island finally came into the Confederation after her stipulation for six members had been conceded, the delegates from that province were firmly convinced they were to have at least six members for all time; and I believe that the members of the sub-committee of the Privy Council with whom they negotiated the terms of the Union had the same opinion. In support of my argument, I shall quote from Sir Joseph Pope's Confederation documents, which I believe is as good a record of the negotiations as is extant. As of course the members of this House know, the first conference on Confederation was held at Charlottetown, in the province of Prince Edward Island, and was called to consider the question of a Maritime union. The public men of Canada—Quebec and Ontario at that time—had a larger idea, and suggested at the Charlottetown conference that the meeting be adjourned to meet later on at Quebec, and that representatives of the lower provinces be invited to attend to consider the question of the Confederation of the Dominion. That suggestion was carried out and the second conference met at Quebec in 1864. The province of Prince Edward Island sent certain representatives, and on looking up the records I find that those delegates were willing to discuss any question in connection with Confederation except the question of representation. The other questions were very important of course but on the question of representation the delegates from Prince Edward Island would make no concessions. They pointed out that unless they could get six representatives that, so far as they were concerned, Confederation could not be considered. The delegates from the other provinces did not see their way clear to grant this concession, and the consequence was that when Confederation was accomplished some three years later, Prince Edward Island did not come in. I have already stated that in the minds of those who were laying down the principles of Confederation there was the idea that whatever number of members a province started with, that number should not be reduced; and the conference unanimously passed a resolution to that effect, resolution No. 21, which reads as follows:

> No reduction shall be made in the number of members returned by any section, unless its population shall have decreased relatively to the population of the whole Union, to the extent of five per centum.

That provision was later on embodied in the British North America Act in subsection 4 of section 51. It was put in with the object of preserving the original representation. Under certain conditions that provision would have very far-reaching consequences. For instance, if the population of any province compared with the population of the whole Dominion was reduced in the first decade by only 4 per cent, or one twenty-fifth, no reduction in representation would take place. A basis of calculation would then be established, and if in the next decade the reduction of population in the province compared with the population of the whole Dominion was only one twenty-fifth, again no reduction in representation would take place although the population had been re-reduced by eight per cent. Supposing the same thing took place in the third decade,

that the population of the province as compared with the whole Dominion was again reduced by 4 per cent; no reduction would occur in the representation, although in those three decades a reduction of 12 per cent would have taken place in the population of the province. And so on. If, in say 50 years, a reduction of 20 per cent took place in the population of any one province no reduction would take place in the representation. But that provision did not safeguard the Maritime Provinces from reduction in their representation, although in my judgment it was thought at that time a sufficient safeguard, and if it had not been deemed a sufficient safeguard, a provision would have been inserted that would have adequately safeguarded the original representation.

The discussion of the Quebec Conference went on from day to day, and an effort was made to meet the views of the delegates from Prince Edward Island. Mr. Galt, who was very anxious to meet the views of the delegates and to have Prince Edward Island included in the Confederation, proposed that the representation of the other provinces be increased. Mr. Brown, one of the delegates from Ontario, was, of course, very strong on the principle of representation by population. Mr. Brown had moved a resolution which gave Quebec sixty-five and all the other provinces a number in proportion but which gave Prince Edward Island only five members. Mr. Galt made this statement in reference to Mr. Brown's motion, he proposing two hundred and twenty-five members instead of two hundred:

If we divide two hundred and twenty-five, according to population. I calculated it would give Upper Canada ninety-nine, Lower Canada seventy-four, Nova Scotia twenty-one, New Brunswick seventeen, Newfoundland eight, and Prince Edward Island six. We should commence with the census of 1861, and readjust after each subsequent census. We have supposed that the population of Lower Canada, being tolerably equable in its character, would afford the best basis. But, having respect to the rapid increase of Upper Canada, we think the Lower Provinces should not be reduced if they do not increase in the same ratio. Therefore, the Lower Provinces would have the same as they have now—

I presume that is at the time of coming into Confederation—

—unless in the very improbable case of any one falling off by five per cent or more—that is a decrease relatively to the whole federation.

That, I think, carries out the point I have been trying to substantiate, namely, that in the minds of the men laying the foundations of Confederation the idea was present that this saving clause would be sufficient to safeguard the provinces against any reduction in their representation, and that whatever representation it started off with must not be reduced in number. The suggestion of Mr. Galt, however did not carry. Mr. Brown moved that Upper Canada have eighty-two members, Lower Canada sixty-five, Nova Scotia nineteen, New Brunswick fifteen, Newfoundland seven, and Prince Edward Island five. That carried, Prince Edward Island voting nay. Mr. Brown, in speaking to that motion, said:

The practical result will be that while Lower Canada certainly will not be less and the Lower Provinces may increase in population, they cannot decrease in the number of representatives. It keeps the House within a reasonable limit.

I think I have already stated that Mr. Brown's motion carried, Prince Edward Island voting nay. Mr. Haviland, one of the delegates from Prince Edward Island who was strongly in favour of Confederation, said:

Prince Edward Island would rather be out of the confederation than consent to this motion. We should have no status. Only five members out of one hundred and ninety-four would give the Island no position.

If five members out of a representation of one hundred and ninety-five at that time would give the Island no status, if we are now down to three and if the representation of the other provinces is much larger, of course our position relatively becomes much worse. There were speeches by other delegates from Prince Edward Island but all in the same direction.

Mr. Galt was, as I have already said, very anxious to meet the views of the delegates from Prince Edward Island. And he made this statement:

It would be a matter for the greatest regret that any difficulty should arise over this matter. We request the Prince Edward Island delegates to reconsider their decision. It would be a matter of reproach to us if the smallest colony should leave us.

In accordance with this suggestion the delegates from Prince Edward Island left the conference chamber to reconsider the matter and to give their answer the next day, but before leaving Mr. Whelan, one of the delegates who was also very favourably impressed with the idea of Confederation, made this statement:

4 p.m.

I should feel it my duty to-night to vote against the resolution, but we had better reconsider the matter. Mr. Haviland and I came

here perfectly untrammeled and without any instructions from the Government of Prince Edward Island. We understand that all proceedings were to be 'de novo' and apart from anything which had taken place at Charlottetown. I thought that Prince Edward Island had not been fairly treated as to representation in the Legislative Council, but I gave way on that occasion. I do not think, however, I could say I was satisfied with the representation of five in the Federal House of Commons. We are in an isolated position. Our resources are large, and our people would not be content to give up their present benefits for the representation of five members. It may be said that the confederation will go on without Prince Edward Island, and that we shall eventually be forced in. Better, however, that, than that we should willingly go into the confederation with that representation. But if the Government who formed the delegation will take the responsibility on them, I may support them.

I have already stated that the delegation from Prince Edward Island withdrew from that meeting and returned next morning to give their answer to the conference. Col. Gray spoke for the others. He said:

I am instructed by my co-delegates to say that the provision of five members is unsatisfactory. Prince Edward Island is divided longitudinally into three counties, each returning ten members.

That is for the local legislature.

But they are always opposed to a change of representation. We cannot divide the three counties into the five members.

Mr. Brown answered:

Every province must revise its own electoral divisions to suit the number of its representatives.

Mr. Pope, one of the delegates who was afterwards Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the Government here, made this statement:

I agree in all that has been said by Colonel Gray and Mr. Coles. But the circumstances of Prince Edward Island are such that I hope the conference will agree to give us such a number as we can divide amongst our three constituencies. Nature, as well as the original settlement of the island, has made three counties, and it would give rise to much difficulty if we had to adjust five members to the three counties. I cannot ask it as a matter of right, but one of expediency, as one without which it is impossible for us to carry the measure in Prince Edward Island. I, therefore, ask for six members.

Mr. Haviland said:

I fully agree with Mr. Pope. It would be an insuperable difficulty to us if we had not six members.

I do not think it is necessary to read further from these documents to show that the delegation from Prince Edward Island at that time were fully convinced that Confederation could not be carried in that province unless they got six members to start with and six in perpetuity. I draw from these statements the conclusion that in the minds of the delegates from Prince Edward Island, and in the mind of every man at the conference, the idea was established that whatever number of members the province received that number would not be decreased. Otherwise, why lay stress upon the particular number to start with? If Prince Edward Island were to have six members for a few years only I presume the delegates from the other provinces would not have considered it such an important matter and would have yielded the point. Then, if it were only to be for a few years the delegates from Prince Edward Island would not have laid such stress upon it and would not have considered it a matter which would justify them in remaining outside of Confederation. Therefore, I come to the conclusion, and no other conclusion in my judgment is feasible, that at that period the delegates from Prince Edward Island and the delegates from the other provinces were fully impressed with the idea that the original number would not be reduced.

When the delegates returned to Prince Edward Island they were sustained by the legislature, the people, and the press. The people were willing to discuss any other feature of Confederation, but on the question of representation there was no compromise, and three years later, when Confederation took place, Prince Edward Island remained out. It appeared, however, to be the wish of the Home Government and the wish of the Government of Canada that Confederation should be rounded out by the inclusion of Prince Edward Island, and from time to time negotiations were carried on looking to that end. In 1869 Lord Granville, then Secretary of State for the Colonies, wrote to the Governor General of Canada, suggesting that the Federal Government should give liberal concessions to Prince Edward Island, and what is known as the better terms of 1869 were offered; but still we could not get the six members in the House of Commons, and Prince Edward Island would not come in. Negotiations continued, and in 1873 Earl Kimberley, then Colonial Secretary, wrote to the Governor General of Canada along the same lines as the correspondence that had taken place between the Governor General and Lord Granville, and the Governor General of Canada wrote to Lieutenant Governor Robinson of Prince Edward Island, stating that if his Government would send a delegation to Ottawa, a sub-com-

mittee of the Privy Council would meet them to negotiate on terms of Confederation. Accordingly the Government of Prince Edward Island sent a delegation here, consisting of Messrs. Laird and Haythorne, and the Government of Canada appointed a subcommittee of the Privy Council consisting of Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir Charles Tupper, Sir Leonard Tilley, Sir Hector Langevin, and Mr. Howe. Negotiations between these gentlemen continued for several days. The delegates knew well the feeling of the people of Prince Edward Island on the question of representation, and this was the one point which they appeared to be determined to obtain, and did obtain, although their population entitled them at that time to only five members. So important was this point considered that it was the subject of several communications between the delegates at Ottawa and the Lieutenant Governor of Prince Edward Island, while the other conditions appear to have been left to the delegates, to make the best terms they could, although of course the financial and other terms were very important. On the 26th of February, 1873, Mr. Haythorne, one of the delegates, sent this message to Lieutenant Governor Robinson:

> Probably yield six representatives.

On the 6th of March, this telegram was sent by Mr. Haythorne:

> Highly probable get six representatives.

The negotiations continued and apparently the delegates from Prince Edward Island had impressed their views upon the sub-committee of the Privy Council, and on the same day, the 6th of March, the Lieutenant-Governor of Prince Edward Island telegraphed to Mr. Haythorne:

> We hope six representatives will be conceded.

A conclusion seemed to have been reached on that date, because later in the day Mr. Haythorne wired to Mr. Edward Palmer, his colleague in the Government of Prince Edward Island:

> Six representatives conceded.

The point upon which I have laid so much stress, and the point as to which we remained out of Confederation for six years and upon which we finally entered Confederation, was the concession of six representatives in this House. I leave it to the judgment of hon. gentlemen if they think that in the circumstances this representation was to be for a few years only. On a point which the delegates from Prince Edward Island emphasized so much and to which they attached so much importance, is it to be thought that the sub-committee of the Privy Council with which they were negotiating the terms, would have hesitated to yield the point if that representation of six members were to continue for only a few years. I do not think so, and I do not think that any fair-minded man would come to that conclusion. There is no other intelligent conclusion to be arrived at than that the delegates from Prince Edward Island had at all events convinced themselves that they were obtaining a minimum representation which would be permanent. The men who sat around that council board must have known what was in the minds of the Prince Edward Island delegates, and it would be an injustice to the memory and character of these men to say that they deceived the delegates, or even that they allowed these delegates to deceive themselves on that point. I, therefore, am justified in coming to the conclusion that it was in the minds of all these men who were carrying on the negotiations that Prince Edward Island was getting a concession which was to be hers in perpetuity. Unfortunately, the terms of the union were not worded so that that provision was put beyond doubt, or otherwise we would not be here to-day looking for our rights. I can understand how easy it is for a mistake to occur even in important documents. It is known to us all that important measures have passed this Parliament, statutes drawn by the most expert lawyers, and that defects have afterwards been discovered in them which rendered remedial legislation necessary. Only a few days ago the Minister of Marine gave an illustration of how mistakes may occur in connection with the purchase of the submarines on the Pacific coast. A telegram from Sir Richard McBride stated that the price of these submarines was to be $1,150,000, but the Order-in-Council was passed for $1,050,000, and that was a mistake which one would think could be easily seen.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries told us that he did not know how the mistake occurred. It might have occurred in transmitting a message by telephone from the Prime Minister's office to the office of Naval Affairs; it might have occurred—probably it did occur—in the course of the work of the officer in the Naval Affairs Department who prepared the memorandum for Council. It escaped the notice of that officer, of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, of the

Deputy Minister of Naval Affairs, of the Privy Council—and was only discovered a number of days afterwards. So we see how easy it is for mistakes to occur; and in all human probability a mistake occurred in the terms of union, which mistake escaped the notice of the delegates from Prince Edward Island, of the Legislature of Prince Edward Island, and of the Government of Canada.

During the last regular session of this Parliament, as I have stated, a resolution was passed in this House to the effect that no province should have fewer members in this House than it had in the Senate. That was an effort to correct this error. Some hon. member of the House—I have forgotten who it was—told the Prime Minister that he was departing from the principle of representation by population. The Prime Minister's answer was that the departure was not very serious. And I say the same now. If this House should agree to give the original representation to Prince Edward Island, the departure from the principle of representation by population would not be very serious. I do not think it would endanger the Constitution. On the other hand, it would be a settlement of the question; it would lead the people of Prince Edward Island to believe that they had been fairly and generously used in this matter, a matter that to them at least is important. And any other settlement will not lead to that conclusion. We may obtain four members. That, of course, would be better than to be reduced to three or to two; but will not, so far as we are concerned, be regarded as a full or generous settlement of this question. And I say that the Parliament of Canada is big enough and broad-minded enough, and I think the men of the other provinces are broad-minded enough, to give to the smallest province of the Dominion this concession, which cannot possibly injure anybody, and which is regarded by the people of Prince Edward Island as being of great importance.

Years ago, I think it was in 1892, when the question of redistribution was under consideration, and British Columbia was obtaining a larger representation in this House than she would have been entitled to on the basis of population, Sir John Thompson spoke very strongly in favour of British Columbia's views. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, then leader of the Opposition, spoke in the same way, and said—I am not quoting his words, but I think I give with precision the effect of what he said—he would be sorry that any province of the Dominion should have fewer representatives in Parliament than that province thought itself entitled to. That is all I am asking for. And if the right hon. leader of the Government and the right hon. leader of the Opposition think these views correct, if they would regret that any province in the Dominion should have a smaller representation in this House than it has always thought it was entitled to, there would be no difficulty about the passing of this resolution.

I think this matter should be dealt with this session. We may, or may not, have an election before another session, and we may, or may not, be reduced to three members. And some time or other this question must be taken up; and it would be just as well, in my judgment, to take it up and dispose of it now.

As I have already said, we of Prince Edward Island feel proud that Charlottetown, the capital of our province, saw the first conference to take into consideration the idea of Confederation. We think that since Confederation we have contributed our share towards the prosperity of this Dominion. Large numbers from the province of Prince Edward Island, as from the other Maritime Provinces, have gone into the Northwest. As a rule, I believe, they have done well there. They have cooperated with the people of the other provinces towards the progress of the West. And it is hard for us that this very contribution we are making towards the advancement of the country should become the very means of reducing our representation in this House and weakening our voice at the council board.

This, you may tell us is a matter of sentiment. To a certain extent, so it is. But it is a not ignoble sentiment. It is the sentiment that prevailed in our province before we entered Confederation. It is a sentiment, I think, that this House would be justified in considering; yes, a sentiment that this House would be justified in meeting and satisfying for all time. I place this matter before hon. members with full confidence that they will do what they believe to be just and generous, that they will dispose of the matter in the way pointed out by my right hon. leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in 1892, when he said that he would regret that any province should have a smaller representation in this House than it always thought it was entitled to.

Mr.D.D.McKENZIE (North Cape Breton): The case for Prince Edward Island has been put before the House so clearly and ably by the hon. member for Kings, P.E.I. (Mr.

Hughes), that it will not be necessary for me to review the same history at any length. It would appear to me, from the case the hon. gentleman has made out, that it was the intention of the representatives of Prince Edward Island at the time that province entered Confederation, that it was to have six members. The question is possibly not so difficult to the mind of the hon. gentleman as it might be to myself. He is a layman, and, taking the layman's view, the difficulty would perhaps not be so striking as it is, or ought to be to me who have had, to some extent, the training of a lawyer. I know that the right hon. leader of the Government, and possibly the leader of the Opposition, will say: What is the use of talking this way?—the adjustment of the terms of Confederation in relation to the representation of the provinces is a settled question. There was a time when this question was regarded as an open one, but a judicial interpretation of the Act was made. The matter was argued before the Supreme Court of Canada by the ablest legal minds in this country. It was carried from the Supreme Court of Canada to the Privy Council, and there received the last and, I suppose, the best, interpretation that can be given to it. That interpretation is, in effect, that the way in which the Act has been interpreted and carried out in Canada is the right way; that the representation of the maritime provinces must be reduced as the population decreases; that the reduction which we have suffered is the proper and legitimate outcome of the Act of Confederation in which we concurred in 1867. But I wish to present to the legal mind of the right hon. leader of the Government the fact that because an Act of Parliament is interpreted by the courts in such a way as not to carry out its original intention, it does not follow that Parliament must sit back and do nothing at all. In hundreds of cases where courts have given certain interpretations of provincial or Dominion Acts, Parliament has come back and legislated in such a way as to carry out the original intention of the legislation, regardless of what the interpretation of the courts may have been. Let me bring to the attention of the Prime Minister a particular case in point: that of the Manitoba School question. In that case the Lords of the Privy Council said that there was no doubt as to what the intention of the Manitoba Act was, but that the language used by those who drafted the Act was not of such a character as to ensure that the intention of the legislation would be carried out. The Government of the day thereupon introduced in this House what was known as the Remedial Bill, the object of which was not to accept the decision of the Privy Council, but to legislate in such a way as to carry out the real intention of the Act. I submit that a proper interpretation of the intention of the British North America Act as drafted and enacted in 1867 is that the representation of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island should not be reduced. I submit that if Canada had continued to consist of the four provinces—five with Prince Edward Island—that originally entered Confederation, and if the representation of these provinces had been adjusted under the terms of the Act according to each decennial census, we should not have lost any representation in the maritime provinces.

Let me call the attention of the Prime Minister to certain conditions in the province of Nova Scotia which, I think, will appeal to him just as strongly as the representations of my hon. friend who has just moved this resolution should appeal to the Prince Edward Islanders. At the time of Confederation every county in the province of Nova Scotia was to have a member, and the county of Halifax was to have two. We had then in the province the same number of counties as we have now, all bearing the same names. If the county of Shelburne, for instance, which was one of the first counties to suffer from this interpretation of the Act, had been told at the time of Confederation that after some years they would have no representation at all; that possibly they would be joined to some other county and secure their interest in a representative in that way; would they for a moment have supported the proposal to enter into Confederation? If the counties of Queens, Cape Breton, Victoria, Pictou, Annapolis, Yarmouth, Digby, the representation of all of which has since suffered by reason of this interpretation of the Act by the Lords of the Privy Council, had been told that only for a few years would they have their original representation in the House and that after that it would be a matter of doubt whether they would have any representation at all, would the strong-minded and intelligent people of those counties have supported the proposal to enter into Confederation? I submit that they would not. I submit that the understanding from the beginning was that there should be no reduction of the representation originally

granted in 1867. It will be readily understood that we expected to grow; we expected that Nova Scotia and the other Maritime Provinces would keep pace with the growth and development of Quebec and Ontario, the only provinces with which they had to keep pace. The idea was that we should grow and that we should subsequently have not a smaller, but a larger representation.

Under section 8 of the Act under which British Columbia entered Confederation, it was provided that British Columbia should be entitled to be represented by three senators in the Senate and by six members in the House of Commons, the representation to be increased under the provisions of the British North America Act of 1867. The idea of the people of British Columbia when they entered Confederation was that their representation should increase, if the conditions were such as to come under the terms of the Act, but that in any case it should not decrease. The idea of what terms of Confederation should be applied to the different provinces was then fresh in the minds of the great men who took part in framing the constitution, and I believe that they did not intend to give British Columbia any better terms than those granted to the other provinces. If the terms under which British Columbia entered Confederation were fair and right and proper, there is no reason why similar conditions should not be extended to the other provinces.

As I said a little while ago, the interpretation of sections 3 and 5 of the British North America Act stands as texture so far as the courts are concerned, but it is open to this Parliament to amend or readjust these sections. What was in the minds of the Fathers of Confederation when they drafted section 2 of the Act is, I think, clear:

> It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, to declare by proclamation that on and after a Day therein appointed, not being more than six months after the passing of this Act, the provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick shall form and be One Dominion under the name of Canada; and on and after that Day those Three Provinces shall form and be One Dominion under that Name accordingly.

Section 5 of the Act says:

> Canada shall be divided into four provinces, named—Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

Were I at liberty to do so, I would dispute the decision of the Lords of the Privy Council on this point. It is too clear for argument that Canada must mean, and meant at that time, those provinces—Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick—and that in every adjustment of representation, and on all other occasions when it was necessary for the Legislature to bear in mind what Canada meant, it simply meant those four provinces. But the Lords of the Privy Council have held against that view, and there is no use arguing that phase of it now. Our duty now is to press forward and legislate in such a way as to give the smaller provinces the rights they were supposed to have obtained under the provisions of this Act.

With further reference to what was argued by the hon. member for Kings, P.E.I., I think the terms of the Act of Union of Prince Edward Island itself could very well be cited. One section reads:

> That, in accordance with the terms of the said address relating to the electoral district and laws and regulations under which the first election of members to serve in the House of Commons of Canada for such electoral district shall be held, it is hereby further ordered and declared.
>
> That Prince county shall constitute one district to be designated Prince county district and return two members.
>
> That Queens county shall constitute one district to be designated Queens county district and return two members.
>
> That Kings county shall constitute one district to be designated Kings county and return two members.

That seems to be straight and emphatic legislation, leaving no loophole or provision for repealing. That was what was meant to be the condition upon which Prince Edward Island came into Confederation, and I submit that it is in itself a strong argument in support of the contention taken by the hon. member for Kings that there should be some remedy by which the operation of the Act as now understood should not result in the reduction of the representation of Prince Edward Island below the six members given to it at Confederation.

Although it is not in the resolution, and although my purpose in rising was to support the resolution of my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island, I would say that while the trouble which they have in the Island is perhaps not quite as acute in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, the whole question of the representation of the maritime provinces should be settled. We had at one time twenty-one members from Nova Scotia. After the next general election we may have only sixteen, and it is only a question of time until we shall be wiped out altogether. We still have eighteen members; after the next election we shall have

only sixteen; and while we have a Nova Scotia Premier guiding the ship of State would be a fair time to put a stop to this downhill run and restore to us the representation we had when we entered Confederation. I have much pleasure in seconding the motion made by my hon. friend.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens, Prince Edward Island): I do not suppose that any of the facts connected with the Confederation conferences are so well known to the people of Prince Edward Island, and particularly to the members of this House as the speeches delivered at the two conferences at Charlottetown and Quebec referred to by the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Hughes). Our object in this contention, which has been made for many years, is to impress upon this House and upon the people of Canada the fact that when we negotiated to come into Confederation, part of the contract was that we should, for all time to come, have a representation in this House of six members. The speech which the hon. member for Kings read goes to show that that contention was made. That is a historical fact. But I contend that the contract, evidence of which is to be found on the minutes of the proceedings of this House and of the proceedings of the local House in Prince Edward Island, proves conclusively that a representation of six members was conceded to Prince Edward Island by the telegram which was sent to Mr. Haythorne, the leader of the Government of Prince Edward Island, by Mr. Palmer, on the 8th of March, 1872.

I have been in this House on several occasions when this question has come up. In 1907, and I think in 1908, last session, and I think the year before, this matter of the representation was brought before the House. We have never yet had a division on the question. When the Liberal party were in power, I do not think that the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who was then leader of the Government, was very sympathetic with us in our contention that the contract we made in 1873 entitled us to a representation of six members. At any rate, he did not concede us anything. No member of the Liberal party would back us up in that contention, although we claimed in Prince Edward Island that it was clear that we were entitled to six members and that the records of the negotiations showed that. Last ssesion we brought the matter before the committee which was authorized to look into the redistribution of the seats in Canada. We had the privilege of being heard before that committee. The leader and one of the members of the Provincial Government came here and argued that there was no doubt, under the contract of 1873, that we were entitled to a representation of six members in this House. Members from the province also spoke on the same lines. When the resolution was brought down, the right hon. leader of the Government (Sir Robert Borden) did not concede that we were entitled to a representation of six members, but he inserted a clause which provided:

> That notwithstanding anything in this Act, a province shall always be entitled to a number of members in the House of Commons not less than the number of Senators representing such province.

When this resolution came up in this House, I must say that, although the members to whom I spoke were very sympathetic, there was no member who rose in his seat to back the representations of Mr. Nicholson and myself, the only Island members present, in our contention that we were entitled to six members.

On the 11th June, 1914, I moved the following amendment to the resolution:

> (b) Prince Edward Island shall be entitled to be represented in the House of Commons by six members. The representation to be increased under the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867. Prince county shall constitute one district to be designated 'Prince county district' and return two members; Queens county shall constitute one district and be designated 'Queens county district' and return two members; and Kings county shall constitute one district, to be designated 'Kings county district' and return two members.

I stated at the time that, while I appreciated the right hon. gentleman's concession of four members, as contained in the resolution which I have just read, and which referred not only to our province but to other provinces similarly situated. I thought that under the original bargain we were entitled to six members. The Government deserved credit, I said, for conceding us even four members, because previous governments would not recognize our right at all whenever the matter had been brought up.

So far as the representation is concerned, as proposed in the Government's resolution of last year, I realize that the Government was doing something, that we were entitled to more than was conceded to us in the British North America Act resolutions passed by the Government of this country and accepted by the British Government. I was very grateful for the small concession the resolution granted. But when the resolution went up to the Senate it was

turned down. The hon. member for Kings (Mr. J. J. Hughes) was not in Ottawa at that time, although he must have known that this very important matter was coming up. He went home to Prince Edward Island and neglected the opportunity, which he should have taken advantage of, for he had many friends in the Senate, and perhaps he might have been able to persuade those gentlemen to see the matter as he sees it to-day and as we saw it then. But, instead of doing that, he went to his home, and left the matter to the other Liberal members of this House. The Senate returned the resolution with this amendment:

That this Act shall not take effect until the termination of the now existing Canadian Parliament.

What did that mean? It meant that at the next general election Prince Edward Island would have only three members: one for Kings County, one for Queens County, and one for Prince County. Why did these gentlemen in the upper house do this; what reason was there for it? I can see no reason why they should have turned down the resolution. Some of the members in their speeches made distinctions between the East and the West. Some said that the right of Prince Edward Island should be recognized, that, under the terms of Confederation, she was entitled to the representation these resolutions conceded. But, when it came to a vote, they turned the whole thing down by their amendment. The right hon. leader of the Government announced that this House could not accept the amendment made by the Senate. The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) has spoken very well indeed on this question, and mentioned the province of Nova Scotia. Although I was present in 1914 when this matter was before the House, I do not think he had much sympathy for Prince Edward Island on that occasion. How is it these gentlemen come here now with trumpets blowing and ask for six members, when in 1914, when we had a chance to get some increase, although not what we asked for, these very same men were dumb?

I do not know what the intention of the Government is with regard to this matter, but I would respectfully ask that the Government take it into their consideration; and if they find that the Senate will not pass the whole resolution as submitted to them last session, the Government might eliminate from the resolutions that part which is obnoxious to the members of the Upper House. Personally I do not know any reason why the whole resolution should not be passed. But if that is impossible, I repeat that it is of very great importance to the people of Prince Edward Island that their representation in this House should not be reduced; and that although they consider themselves entitled to more than this resolution concedes they are willing to accept this concession for the present and leave the matter open for future negotiation by this or some other Government. I would ask the right hon. leader of the Government to take the matter into consideration, and to introduce this session a resolution similar to the one introduced last session, providing that no province shall be represented in this House by a less number of members than that to which it is entitled to be represented in the Senate.

Mr. G. W. KYTE: While I recognize that any discussion of the question of representation in the maritime provinces, so far as relates to the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, must be in the nature of a post mortem, I am glad there is still life in the carcass so far as the province of Prince Edward Island is concerned. I have on more than one occasion expressed my views on this question of representation of the maritime provinces, and I can only register my regret that I was not more successful in impressing upon the powers that be the validity of the arguments and the views which I advanced to this House.

I rise more particularly for the purpose of correcting a statement which the hon. member for Queens (Mr. A. A. McLean) has quite inadvertently I believe put before the House with respect to the attitude of another chamber of this Parliament on the question of representation of the province of Prince Edward Island. It is well remembered by hon. members of this House that in the early hours of the morning when the Redistribution Bill was going through its final stage at the last regular session of Parliament, the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) rose in his place and proposed an amendment to the Redistribution Bill which provided that in the province of Prince Edward Island the number of representatives should in no case be diminished below the number of senators for that province. That amendment was accepted by both sides of this House, and it was understood at the time that it would be annexed to the Redistribution Bill to be considered by the other body of this Parliament with that Bill. For reasons which are not patent to myself at all events, the resolution of the hon. member for Pictou was not attached to the Redistribution Bill, but to another resolution having reference to an increase in

the number of senators to be appointed from the western provinces. That resolution was held up by the Senate, or at all events so amended that it would not take effect until after the next general election. It is most unfortunate for the contention of my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island that the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Pictou was not attached to the Redistribution Bill, where it properly belonged. If it had been so attached, the Redistribution Bill having passed, the amendment of the hon. member for Pictou would have passed with it and at this moment it would be the law that under no circumstances should the representation of the province of Prince Edward Island be diminished beyond the number of senators. However, that course was not adopted, and while I am not here to criticise or defend the other body in this legislature in regard to their action on the resolution respecting the increase in the number of senators in the West, I am bound to say that in my judgment the amendment of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) had no place.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: I think the hon. gentleman is astray. If he will look at page 5364 of "Hansard," he will find that the amendment which was suggested by the hon. member for Pictou was incorporated in the Act and that the amendment was moved here, or suggested to the right hon. leader of the Government (Sir Robert Borden) while the resolution was up in the Senate and before the resolution was passed. "Hansard" states clearly what the suggestion of the hon. member for Pictou was, and it was accepted by the leader of the Government.

Mr. KYTE: What was the suggestion of the hon. member for Pictou?

Mr. McLEAN: It reads as follows:

Provided, that if the British North America Act, 1867, should be amended by the Parliament of the United Kingdom, in accordance with the address of both Houses of Parliament of Canada in that behalf, passed at the present session, immediately upon the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom amending the said British North America Act, 1867, in accordance with such address coming into force, there shall be in the province of the Prince Edward Island three electoral districts defined as follows:

1. The county af Kings shall form and constitute the electoral district of Kings and shall return one member.

2. The county of Prince shall form and constitute the electoral district of Prince and shall return one member.

3. The county of Queens shall from and contitute the electoral district of Queens and shall return two members.

That is what was suggested to the leader of the Government by the hon. member for Pictou on the day before the 11th of June, and the leader of the Government told the hon. member for Pictou on that occasion that the matter had been suggested by myself to him, but that it had been overlooked and that he intended to place it before the Deputy Minister of Justice in order that he might draw up a clause. Although the hon. member for Pictou handed this form to the leader of the Government and asked him to incorporate it in the Act, the time had not arrived when it should be incorporated, and the leader of the Government told the hon. member for Pictou that the matter would receive his consideration.

Mr. KYTE: I do not desire to rob the hon. member for Queens (Mr. McLean) of any credit that he may be entitled to for his in camera suggestions to the Prime Minister in respect to what he thought should be done on this question of representation. His statement, however, does not alter my recollection of the fact as I have endeavoured to give it to the House. This amendment was proposed by the hon. member for Pictou at a very early hour in the morning, when the Redistribution Bill was receiving its final consideration. The amendment was accepted by the Prime Minister with the understanding that it would be attached to the Redistribution Bill. If it had been it would now be law. Why it was not attached I do not know.

5 p.m.

Mr. McLEAN: It is attached to the Redistribution Bill and if the hon. member will turn up the Act he will find that it is part of the Redistribution Bill.

Mr. KYTE: Then it is law?

Mr. McLEAN: No, it is not law because it has not come into effect. At the time it was passed in this House the other resolution was in the Senate and it was turned down by the Senate and never became law.

Mr. KYTE: That has reference to the representation in the Senate of the western provinces.

Mr. McLEAN: No.

Mr. KYTE: If it is not law it is not because it did not receive the support of this House, and it does not change the position that I took in the first instance that the

whole question was settled as far as this House was concerned by the resolution of the hon. member for Pictou.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): The subject which my hon. friend from Kings, P.E.I. (Mr. Hughes) has brought to the attention of the House is one which has been debated on many occasions in the House, and all that has been put forward to-day, I think, has been brought to the attention of the House on the occasions to which I have alluded. Last year I took the responsibility of leaving the number of members for the province of Prince Edward Island blank in the Bill which was introduced, and I did that for the purpose of giving to those representing Prince Edward Island an opportunity of making their case fully before the committee and probably at greater length and with greater cogency than it might be made in a debate in this Parliament. The reasons why I thought that a desirable course to pursue were set forth in the observations which I made to the House at that time. The Bill was accordingly referred to the committee in that way. It was not, however, referred without some objection from my right hon. friend who leads the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who said, as reported at page 847 of "Hansard":

> My right hon. friend, in this Bill, has refrained from making one provision, the absence of which seems to me a weakness in the Bill, and, I cannot but think, also a weakness on his part. He refused to determine whether or not the Island of Prince Edward is to lose a member. He left that blank and referred it to the committee for determination. I have to represent to my right hon. friend that that is a matter upon which the committee cannot have any jurisdiction; it is a matter on which this House has no jurisdiction. Parliament in this matter is not a free agent; the whole question is simply a question of arithmetic.

Then my right hon. friend went on to adduce reasons why in his opinion it was not only a weak but an improper course to take. He said, for example, this:

> But when my right hon. friend leaves it to the committee to determine whether or not Prince Edward Island shall lose one member, what will he say to my hon. friend from Pictou or any other hon. member from Nova Scotia should he suggest that it be left to the committee to determine whether or not Nova Scotia shall lose two members?

Then he illustrated in the same way in regard to New Brunswick and Ontario. Finally he said:

> Therefore I regret that my right hon. friend has introduced in his Bill a principle—no, I cannot call it a principle, but rather a vicious feature—which might land him in very serious difficulties were its necessary implications followed to their logical conclusion.

However, the Bill went to the committee, and the committee gave a very careful hearing, as I understand, to members of this House representing Prince Edward Island, and also to members of the Provincial Government of Prince Edward Island, all of whom put their case before the committee with the greatest cogency at their command, and the committee eventually made a report to this House. In that report the committee recommended that an address should be passed asking that the British North America Act should be so amended that no province in Canada should have a smaller representation in the House of Commons than in the Senate. If the British North America Act were so amended the amendment would take no present effect in any province excepting Prince Edward Island, the representation of which in the House of Commons it would increase from three to four members. As my hon. friend has observed, there was some discussion on the Address which I subsequently moved in this House for the purpose of carrying out that proposal and certain other proposals which are not germane to my hon. friend's motion at the moment. When that address was moved my hon. friend from Queens (Mr. McLean), who has just addressed the House, was not satisfied with it, and he moved, as reported at page 5209 of "Hansard," a resolution of entirely the same effect as that which my hon. friend has now proposed. He moved in amendment:

> Prince Edward Island shall be entitled to be represented in the House of Commons by six members, the representation to be increased under the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867.
>
> Prince county shall constitute one district to be designated Prince county district, and return two members.
>
> Queens county shall constitute one district to be designated Queens county district, and return two members.
>
> Kings county, shall constitute one district to be designated Kings county district, and return two members.

The hon. member for Queens (Mr. McLean) then used these words:

> While I appreciate the concession of four representatives for Prince Edward Island, as provided in the last clause of the resolution, I submit that the original terms should be recognized and carried into effect. The Government deserves great credit for this concession, which is of very great importance, but I do not think it too much for me to ask that the original representation of six members should be restored.

The amendment was lost on division and the resolution as originally proposed by me

passed the House. The proposal which was reported to the House by the committee was accepted by the House, as I felt that it would not be possible for us to disregard the carefully considered report of that committee composed of five members from this side and four from the other side of the House, who had devoted a great deal of attention to the subject.

While I appreciate the spirit in which my hon. friend (Mr. J. J. Hughes) has brought this subject to the attention of the House, and while I appreciate the arguments he has put forward, I would remind him that he has argued sometimes the other way. In 1903 he took strong grounds against a motion which was proposed by Mr. Hackett, then a member of the House. My hon. friend at that time was of the opinion—I think I have his words under my hand—that it was not a question of a mistake at the time Prince Edward Island entered Confederation, but that the particular form of expression that was used at the time was the result of oversight or neglect. I do not desire to misquote my hon. friend, and therefore I give his exact words:—

> I regret as much as any man can regret that the delegates at the time the province of Prince Edward Island joined the Union overlooked this important point, and did not provide against the contingency that has since arisen.

My hon. friend did not put it upon the ground of a mistake at that time; he put it on the ground of oversight, and he also took very strongly the ground (as will be found by reference to page 10909 of "Hansard" of 1903) that the long acquiescence on the part of Prince Edward Island would make it difficult to provide any remedy. Twelve years have, of course, elapsed since my hon. friend made that remark. The hon. gentleman also explained in that speech that the reason why the original representation was not reduced in 1882 was not because of reasons which had been advanced in this House, and which at one time impressed me, but was due to the fact that the census of 1881 was the first Dominion census taken after the Island had entered Confederation, and consequently that, so far as Prince Edward Island was concerned, there was no previous census with which to compare it. Therefore he argued that inasmuch as there was no previous census with which to compare the population of Prince Edward Island in 1881, the Government of the day found itself unable to determine whether or not the saving clause, to which he has alluded, could take effect, and so he said there was little to be deduced in favour of the claim of Prince Edward Island from the fact that its representation was not reduced in 1882.

Under all these circumstances, it does not seem to me that the House would be justified at the present time in coming to a perfectly opposite conclusion to that at which the House arrived less than a year ago, when the motion of my hon. friend from Queens (Mr. McLean) was put to the House, which was then considering in committee, the resolution which I had the honour to propose. Further, I believe that we should be guided, as has always been the practice in this House, by the report of the committee to whom was confided the particular duty of hearing the claims of Prince Edward Island, and of hearing everything that could be said in favour of the motion which my hon. friend from Queens (Mr. McLean) proposed a year ago, and which my hon. friend from Kings (Mr. Hughes) is proposing. That report should command the support of the House unless very grave and cogent reasons can be adduced for leading the House to an opposite conclusion.

The resolution proposed by me last year went to the Senate by the unanimous consent of the House, and the Senate sent it back with a certain amendment, which by the unanimous consent of this House we refused to accept. My hon. friend from Queens has proposed that one or other of the courses he suggested should be adopted this session, and I will give to his proposal in that regard my best consideration and inform him and the House later of the conclusion at which we have arrived.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The members of the House know that we heard of this question for the first time, I think, in 1883, after the census of 1881, by which Prince Edward Island, for the first time, lost some of its representation in this House. There is no doubt that the grievance as put forward to-day by my hon. friend from Kings (Mr. Hughes), and re-echoed by my hon. friend from Queens (Mr. McLean) was just as much felt at that time as it is now. But no one thought then that it would be possible to interfere with the terms of the Constitution, which provided that the regulation of representation should follow the movement of population; the representation of a province increasing or decreasing according to the result of the census.

Ten years later, in 1902, not simply Prince Edward Island but all three maritime prov-

inces, had to submit to a further reduction of representation. The grievance then became more acute, and we have heard of it from time to time ever since. All governments and all parties have had to deal with that question. All have dealt with it in the same way, concluding that, without an amendment of the Constitution, it would not be possible to grant the prayer of the people of Prince Edward Island. Last year, when the right hon. leader of the Government introduced the Redistribution Bill, he left in blank the representation of Prince Edward Island. I pointed out at the time that he had just said that it was a useless step, because this Parliament had no power in the matter, and the authority that could deal with it was the British Parliament. If there was any doubt on the subject at that time, we all agree that at present there is no doubt at all: this Parliament has no jurisdiction over the matter, and, even if it had, it could not grant the remedy sought by my hon. friends from Prince Edward Island, on both sides, but would have to seek legislation to that effect from the Imperial Parliament.

Last year it was determined to seek that legislation, and it was done in a way that commends itself to my judgment, and I think commends itself to the judgment of hon. members generally. The committee to which was submitted the question of redistribution came back with a report that this House had no power to give to Prince Edward Island the representation it wanted; on the contrary, the committee had agreed to reduce the representation of Prince Edward Island from four to three, because they could not do anything else. A member of the committee, the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), made a suggestion. There was at that moment a petition pending before this House to increase the representation of the western provinces in the Senate. The hon. member for Pictou suggested that if this petition were granted by the two Houses of this Parliament, and if, in consequence, the Imperial Parliament were to be asked to pass the necessary legislation, advantage might be taken of the occasion to have an amendment of the Constitution made, providing, not for granting all that was asked for by Prince Edward Island, but that the prayer should be granted to this extent, that the representation of any province in the House of Commons should not be less than its representation in the Senate.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I thought that was the report of the committee?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No, that was the suggestion of the hon. member for Pictou.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think it was in the report.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My memory may be at fault in the matter; but, if so, the fact gives greater emphasis to the view I hold. My hon. friend from Kings (Mr. Hughes) has referred to some words of mine to the effect that I should be sorry that any province should feel that it had a grievance on account of its representation. I should be sorry that in matters of representation or any other matters a province should feel that it was aggrieved in any way by anything done or left undone by this Parliament. It is of the very essence of our Constitution that we should endeavour to have all provinces fairly represented, and the views of all provinces accepted in this Parliament in so far as we can attain that end. It may be that the condition I have referred to was in the report as stated by the Prime Minister; but I am certain that the hon. member for Pictou suggested that the amendment to the British North America Act referred to should be sought; and this was include in the Bill as it went from this House to the Senate. The Bill as reported was in these words:

> There shall be in the province of Prince Edward Island three electoral districts, defined as follows :
>
> 1. The county of Kings shall form and constitute the electoral district of Kings, and shall return one member;
>
> 2. The county of Prince shall form and constitute the electoral district of Prince, and shall return one member;
>
> 3. The county of Queens shall form and constitute the electoral district of Queens, and shall return one member.

My impression still is that this was the provision of the Bill as reported by the committee, and that the following amendment was added on the suggestion of the hon. member for Pictou:

> Provided that if the British North America Act, 1867, should be amended by the Parliament of the United Kingdom, in accordance with the address of both Houses of the Parliament of Canada in that behalf, passed at the present session, immediately upon the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom amending the said British North America Act, 1867, in accordance with such address, coming into force, there shall be in the province of Prince Edward Island three electoral districts defined as follows:
>
> 1. The county of Kings shall form and constitute the electoral district of Kings and shall return one member;
>
> 2. The county of Prince shall form and constitute the electoral district of Prince and shall return one member;

3. The county of Queens shall form and constitute the electoral district of Queens and shall return two members.

By the Act as passed by the House of Commons and the Senate the province of Prince Edward Island was given four members if it was in the power of Parliament to do so, and provided that the British North America Act should be amended so as to cover this change. This was on June 10. On the following day, June 11, my right hon. friend the Prime Minister introduced a resolution to amend the Act relating to representation in the Senate and to give to the provinces of Manitoba, Alberta, Saskatchewan and British Columbia, six members each in the Upper Chamber; and to this he added this resolution:

The British North America Act of 1867 is amended by adding thereto the following section immediately after sections 51 of the said Act:

"51a. Notwithstanding anything in this Act a province shall always be entitled to a number of members in the House of Commons not less than the number of senators representing such province."

That was passed by this House and by the Senate, but the Senate added a rider to the effect that this clause should come into force not immediately, but at the dissolution of Parliament. If this amendment had been accepted, the Act would have come into force at the time of dissolution, and after the next election the province of Prince Edward Island would have been entitled to four members.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: Not at the next election.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: At dissolution. I have not the amendment of the Senate before me, but I am quite positive that it provided that this section should come into force not after the general election, but at dissolution. When Parliament dissolved, therefore, the Act would come into force, and the province of Prince Edward Island would be entitled to four members. The amendment was not accepted, however, and the Act remains on the Statute book without it.

It is not worth while arguing as to what was done or what was not done by the Senate; I have only to say this to the hon. member for Queens (Mr. McLean) and to the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Hughes). I am well aware that the province of Prince Edward Island has felt for many years that it has been unfairly dealt with, because its representation has decreased with each succeeding census. But if the representation of the province of Prince Edward Island has been moving down, that decrease has been in accordance with the Act of Confederation; the province has obtained the representation to which it is entitled under the terms of that Act. My hon. friend says that Prince Edward Island would not have come into Confederation unless it had been assured of at least six members. When it entered Confederation, Prince Edward Island, according to its population, was entitled to only five members. The province did not want to come into Confederation unless it had a representation of six members, and the men of that day, very properly I think, not being inclined to quarrel upon such a trifling point, granted them six. No provision was made at that time that the permanent representation of the province should be six members. This want of foresight applied not only to Prince Edward Island, but to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick as well; no one of the fathers of Confederation—neither Sir John Macdonald, Sir Charles Tupper, nor anybody else—anticipated the great development which has taken place in the West, and which has reduced the population of the eastern provinces. This grievance is not peculiar to Prince Edward Island; it applies to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick as well. With census after census the three maritime provinces have seen their populations decrease. But representation by population is a fair and just principle. If the population of a province increases, the province is entitled to additional representation, whereas if its population decreases, its representation decreases also. So absolutely fair is this principle that the men responsible for government, either on the one side or the other, have hesitated to deviate or depart from it. It was proposed last year, by the committee that reported upon the Bill then under consideration, that the matter should be settled in this way: henceforth no province shall have less representation in the House of Commons than it has in the Senate. That was a departure from the principle, but it was, after all, what seemed to me to be a fair compromise. The larger western provinces—Quebec, Ontario and the young giants in the West—are too strong to have reason to begrudge the slight increase in representation which this would give to the eastern provinces. We accepted that compromise—for my part I was glad to support the committee in that respect—and it seems to me that our friends in the maritime provinces ought to be satisfied that in so doing we endeavoured to dispose

of this irritating question in a fair and just manner.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: I was very careful, Mr. Speaker, in the few remarks which I made upon this subject, to avoid saying anything at all that would have a party colour, because I think this is a question which can be and ought to be settled without resorting to party politics. I regret, however, that the senior member for Queens, Prince Edward Island (Mr. McLean), did not feel disposed to pursue a similar course. I regret to a still greater extent that the right hon. Prime Minister did not pursue a similar course. If I understood the hon. member for Queen's correctly, in speaking on this subject a few moments ago, he made a statement that is not borne out by the facts. He sought to leave the impression that on account of the action of the Senate, the Government was prevented from passing legislation which would give the province of Prince Edward Island four members at the next election. That matter has been pretty well cleared up since the hon. member sat down, and I am sure that he now feels that he made a mistake. He must realize that no action taken by the Senate when this matter was before them, operates to prevent this Government from passing an Act or from completing legislation, which would come into force upon the dissolution of this Parliament, to give the province of Prince Edward Island four members at the next election. My hon. friend, therefore, was mistaken in that respect, as he generally is.

The hon. gentleman went out of his way a little, I think, to mention the fact that I was absent from the House when this matter was finally considered during the closing days of the regular session of 1914. It is true that I was absent, just for a few days. I was informed by a member of the Redistribution Committee a few days before Parliament closed that the chairman of the committee had told him that the question of redistribution would not come up for consideration at that session therefore I left for home a few days before Parliament prorogued. The Redistribution Committee or the Government changed its mind, however; the matter was brought up, and I could not possibly find time to get back. But I wish to say to the senior member for Queens that if he were as attentive to his duties as I have been, whether on the Government side or in Opposition, he would not be in the position that he is in to-day. He would be certain of nomination when he goes back to his constituents, and would not have to importune the Government to give him a position to save him from his friends. The hon. member knows that he will not be nominated.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: The hon. member makes a statement which he cannot prove and which has no foundation in fact.

Mr. HUGHES: If the hon. gentleman will tell me he is not importuning the Government daily for some position in the gift of the Government I shall be satisfied.

Mr. McLEAN: I have denied it and it is an absolute falsehood.

Mr. HUGHES: All right, I will accept the hon. gentleman's explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is going, I think, a little too far in saying that a statement of an hon. member is an absolute falsehood; he could properly say it is untrue.

Mr. HUGHES: We shall know in a few months. The truth of this matter will be all explained to the hon. gentleman's constituents in a few months from the present time.

Now, with regard to the right hon. the Prime Minister, I regret that a man of the ability of the right hon. gentleman should think it necessary to go somewhat out of his way to represent to the people of Prince Edward Island that I was not thoroughly orthodox on the question of representation. The right hon. gentleman brought up this matter in 1914 and referred to a speech which I made in 1903, in answer to Mr. Hackett, then a member of this House. This speech did not happen to be indexed, and the right hon. gentleman must have waded through "Hansard" for eleven years to find some statement of mine that he could twist or construe into an argument against the representation of Prince Edward Island, while at the same time pretending to be a friend of Prince Edward Island on this subject. I had spoken two or three times as strongly and as favourably as I could for the views of Prince Edward Island on this matter, and these speeches had been indexed; but the right hon. gentleman did not quote from any of these, all the time pretending to be a friend of Prince Edward Island and wading through "Hansard" year after year to find some statement made by me that could be twisted into an argument against Prince Edward Island on this point.

The right hon. gentleman went farther than that. He said I had made the statement that it was too late to raise the question. The right hon. gentleman is a

shrewd enough man to know that my statement was that it was too late in the day for Mr. Hackett to raise that question in order to make political capital of it. I think perhaps I had better read my remarks. This is the conclusion:

Therefore I think it is altogether too late for my honourable friend and his political associates from Prince Edward Island to try to make political capital out of it at this time.

I referred to the fact that when the first reduction took place the Conservatives were in power and the hon. gentleman then speaking had raised no objection. That was an innocent remark to make, and I do not think it would bear the interpretation the right hon. gentleman put upon it. The right hon. gentleman said in effect that he might have got over that unfortunate speech of mine if I had not used the word "overlooked" or "oversight," but he said that was a terrible word to use and was equivalent to negligence or incompetence. I find in the International Dictionary the definition of the word is "an error committed through inadvertence." That was just what I meant, an error committed by the delegates through inadvertence, and I am sure if my right hon. friend wished to do something for Prince Edward Island that word would not have prevented him. I am sorry if anything I said prevented the right hon. gentlemen from doing what he would wish to do for Prince Edward Island. He said that the delegates who came here to argue this question before the Redistribution Committee and before the Government—the Premier of the Island and Mr. Stewart—had presented clear, cogent and strong arguments. I find that they used the word "unforeseen." I do not think there is a great deal of difference in the meaning of the two words, and if in their statement, which was written, by the way, so that they would have time to choose their words, they said that unforeseen contingencies had arisen. If that was a suitable word, the word "oversight" would not be so unfortunate. The right hon. gentleman in his course in this matter, reminds me of the characters in the Old Curiosity Shop, where Codlin told Little Nell not to pay any attention to Short, that Codlin was her friend, not Short. Codlin wanted to be the friend of Prince Edward Island, not Short; if they would have nothing to do with Short and cultivate Codlin, he would see them through. My friend Codlin has the opportunity; I would be pleased if he would see the matter through and give to Prince Edward Island that which he has always contended he would be inclined to give, provided he had an opportunity and power to do so. I hope it will not be a case of Codlin and Short.

Motion negatived on division.

THE FORT ERIE SHOOTING CASE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

For a copy of all complaints to the Government of the killing of one American citizen and the shooting of another by militiamen, in the waters of Lake Erie, and of all correspondence with regard to the same with the British Embassy and American authorities.

He said: The community some weeks ago was shocked when it heard that two American citizens in the waters of Lake Erie had been shot by three Canadian Militiamen, one being killed and the other wounded. What I saw in the newspapers led me to believe that these men were trespassers—that they were in our waters and were poaching and were at that moment violating the laws of Canada. The boys who shot them, three young militiamen, are now in durance. They are to be subjected to trial, and I would say nothing to prejudice them. On the contrary, I believe that they acted according to what they thought was their duty, and, for my part, I give them credit for having no wrong intentions. Perhaps they were too hasty in using the rifle, but that is the only thing with which we might reproach them. I understand that the Government have since that time made what amends they could by agreeing to pay $10,000 to the relatives of the one who was killed and $5,000 to the one who was wounded. In this the Government have followed the right course, and I commend them. They have done what in their power lay to alleviate whatever bad feeling may have been caused. They have preserved the peace between ourselves and our neighbours, and that is an essential element in the case. For my part I would approve of anything done by the Government with a view to repairing as much as possible the injury done, even though the men who were shot were trespassing and breaking the law.

My object in making this motion is to call to the attention of my right hon. friend a very similar case, about which my right hon. friend was questioned some time ago in this House. I refer to the case of Nottar, a French reservist, who had gone to Montreal to book his passage to France, where he was going to take up arms with

the rest of his fellow-countrymen. Nottar was shot by a sentry under circumstances very similar to those to which I have just alluded. There was this difference only, that, while the victims in the Fort Erie shooting case were trespassers, Nottar was not a trespasser. He was endeavouring to discharge his duty to his mother country. He was challenged by the sentry. He did not answer as soon as he should have done, perhaps because of a difference in language, the sentry having challenged him in English and he understanding only French. He passed on, and the sentry shot him. It is to be regretted—and if the Minister of Militia were here I should have less hesitation in saying what I have to say now—that the Minister of Militia seems to have given the order that sentries were to shoot to kill. At all events, in the early days of the war our sentries were too prone to make use of their rifles. But there has been no such action since. I rise to say that the relatives of Nottar are just as much entitled to compensation as the relatives of those American citizens who lost, one his life, and the other his limb; but Nottar has an even stronger case, I think, and I commend it to my right hon. friend that his family are just as much entitled to compensation. My right hon. friend stated the other day that he had received no application from Nottar's family, but was informed that they were bringing an action against the sentry who committed the act. That is equivalent to an application to the Government; for, if the courts determine that the sentry went beyond his duty, the Government would very properly assume the condemnation and seek to indemnify Nottar's family. It is for these reasons that I have brought this matter to the attention of my right hon. friend.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: After some question had been asked in the House about Nottar's case, I asked my colleague the Secretary of State to ascertain as precisely as he could the circumstances of the case and the position of the litigation, which I understand is pending. He informs me that the solicitor representing Nottar's family has promised to send us full information on the subject within a week. When that information arrives we shall take the case into consideration. I admit that there is a good deal to be said in favour of what my right hon. friend has put forward to-day as to the propriety of granting compensation to this man's family.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend has alluded to sentries having been somewhat too prone to shoot in the early days of the war. We must always bear in mind that at that time we were facing very unusual conditions and that there was a great deal of excitement as to the possibliity of an attempt to destroy buildings in which munitions of war were kept, and other buildings in which preparations for war could be carried on on an extensive scale. I am not aware that my hon. friend the Minister of Militia has ever used the language that has been attributed to him in his instructions to sentries. On the contrary, I have found him disposed to have them fully cognizant of the responsibility placed upon them. But at the same time one can realize that a sentry placed in an important position and under the conditions to which I have alluded, might find himself in danger of reprimand if he did not enforce pretty strictly the instructions given to him by his superior officers.

So far as the Fort Erie shooting case is concerned, there is no objection to bringing down such papers as are not of a confidential character; nor should I have the slightest objection to my right hon. friend perusing the entire file, which is pretty voluminous. Immediately after the unfortunate incident had occurred, we took steps to ascertain the facts as far as we could. Having ascertained these facts to a certain extent, through the Attorney General of the province of Ontario and by inquiry of the military authorities, we sent an expression of regret to the Government of the United States at a very early date. Afterwards, when the proceedings at the inquest were available, further communication took place over the telephone with the Attorney General of Ontario, and we ascertained his view after perusal of that evidence, whereupon, on the sixth day of January, a despatch was sent to His Majesty's Ambassador at Washington, which perhaps I might read for the information of the House:

> Referring to my telegram January 4th. Shooting at Fort Erie. From information received from Attorney General of Ontario as to nature of evidence given at Coroner's inquest, it appears that object of shooting was deterrent, as deceased and his companions were unlawfully engaged in shooting out of season and that injury which resulted in death of deceased was entirely unintentional. Nevertheless Government of Canada are of opinion that person guilty of shooting ought to be placed on his trial and steps will be taken for that purpose. In view of circumstances which so unfortunately resulted in death of deceased, Government of Canada consider that as an act of grace, suitable compensation should be made to family of deceased and to person injured by shooting.

Communication was had afterwards through the ambassador at Washington, and by direct negotiation through the Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs, Sir Joseph Pope. Eventually an arrangement was arrived at by which, as my right hon. friend has stated, we agreed to pay, and have since paid, $10,000 to the family of the unfortunate man who was killed and $5,000 to the man who was wounded somewhat severely and was in hospital for some time. There was also an arrangement made by which certain expenses of solicitors and others who were engaged by the representatives of the deceased man, and by the person who was wounded, but survived, should also be defrayed by the Government.

The accident was unfortunate in many respects. It would be unfortunate, of course, that this shooting should have taken place under any circumstances. It was particularly unfortunate that the persons, one of whom was killed and the other severely wounded, should have been citizens of the great and friendly nation to the south. We thought that under the circumstances it was our duty to express, and we did express, immediate regret, and we also thought—and I am glad to know that my right hon. friend agrees in that view—that under the circumstances, and as an act of grace, it was proper for this country to make compensation. I am glad to be able to assure the House that the course which the Government have adopted in that regard is entirely satisfactory to the Government of the United States and also satisfactory to the persons who were acting for the family of the deceased and for the unfortunate man who was wounded.

I do not desire to lay before the House any of the circumstances which were detailed to us through the military inquiry which took place, nor do I think it a desirable thing to dwell upon the evidence which was given at the inquest. The whole circumstances will be under judicial consideration early in March, when these men will be placed on their trial, and it would neither be desirable nor proper that we should make, in advance of the trial, any observations. This, however, may be said, that the men, as I understand, were asked to go to the assistance of an officer of the province of Ontario who had observed the two men trespassing on the Canadian side, and he was of the opinion that they were violating the game laws of the province of Ontario in what they were doing. He has stated, I believe, and it has been stated by the men also, that there was no intention to wound or kill either of the persons so engaged, but merely to deter them from proceeding in that which they had undertaken and, if possible, perhaps to induce them to come to the Canadian side and submit to the jurisdiction of the country upon whose territory they were in fact at the time the shooting took place. I shall be glad to bring the papers down at the earliest date. If my right hon. friend should desire to peruse the confidential correspondence, I shall be glad to place it at his disposal for that purpose.

Motion agreed to.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

VOTES FOR ELECTORS ON ACTIVE SERVICE.

Mr. A. E. FRIPP (Ottawa) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, legislation should be passed at this session providing that all electors of Canada who have enlisted for Imperial service be enabled to exercise their franchise at any election that may occur during their absence on such service.

He said: My attention was specially called to the necessity for some action by Parliament of the kind foreshadowed in my motion, by the remarks of the Prime Minister in his speech on the Address. The right hon. gentleman stated that 32,000 Canadians were either in England or in France in the service of our King and country, and that at least 50,000 more were being mobilized or would be mobilized with the intention of sending them to the front as occasion might require. It has occurred to me that probably before this war is over there will be at least 100,000 Canadians in the field, and should an election for this House occur during the progress of the war, these men would be disfranchised. In view of the fact that these men are making the greatest sacrifice that can be made by the citizens of any country, we should, above everything else, take care that they should have opportunity to exercise the franchise, which is the highest right of citizenship. In addition to the opinions they may hold with the civilian electorate of Canada on general public questions, these men, if given the franchise, would be especially qualified to pronounce upon the treatment they have received while at the front, and the provisions that have been made for their comfort and that of their families and relatives who have been left behind.

It has seemed to me proper that this Parliament should at the very earliest possible moment assure our volunteers that if the war is prolonged until an election should take place, they would be permitted to vote. I am quite satisfied that the majority, if not all the members of the House, agree with the principle of my motion, although I am quite prepared to hear that some may question the practicability of carrying out such a scheme, so as to secure a proper representation of the vote of the men absent on service. I find, that the principle for which I contend has been recognized by legislation in Australia and in New Zealand. In Australia, the Commonwealth Electorate Act of 1902 provides for ordinary absentee voters registering their votes, and some of the provisions of that Act might be incorporated in a Bill to attain the object I have in view. Under the Commonwealth Electoral Act, absentee voters are entitled to vote by mail, and the procedure is briefly this: they apply to the returning officer for a ballot, and certain persons, including justices of the peace and postmasters are authorized to take the ballot of the absentee, and as authorized witnesses must certify that he knows the voter who has exercised his franchise and that he has voted upon the ballot supplied to him. That has general application to absentee voters, but an Act passed last year by the Legislature of New Zealand deals specifically with the Overseas force. It is called the Expeditionary Force Voting Act, 1914, and under its provisions every member of that force who was sent from New Zealand to serve in the war for His Majesty, is entitled to vote.

I take it from this that the right to vote is not confined to those whose names appear upon the voters' lists. Under the Canadian Enlistment Act, a young man of 18 years is eligible to become a volunteer, whereas he would not be eligible to vote, and it would be a matter for consideration whether we should give all our volunteers, regardless of age, the right to vote, or whether we should confine that right to those whose names appear upon the voters' lists in Canada, and who would have voted had they been in their constituencies when an election occurred. Another provision in the New Zealand law is worthy of attention, and that is the recognition that it would be almost impossible for an absentee voter to vote for any particular candidate, and the provision therefore is that he shall have an opportunity of voting either for the Government candidate or for the Opposition candidate, and of course the Labour party being a very strong party in that country, he also has an opportunity to vote for a supporter of it. The voter therefore votes for his party and the vote is assigned by the Prime Minister for the Government and by the leader of the Opposition for the Opposition, and by two members of the Labour party if he votes for that party. Technically speaking, there is no government when Parliament is dissolved and the Act has a special clause which says, that "Government" and "Opposition" means the government and opposition in office at the time of the passing of the Act.

Mr. CARROLL: Does the hon. gentleman know how that Act worked out in practice last election?

Mr. FRIPP: I cannot say what the result was in the last election. In view of the fact that the principle of such legislation has been recognized in Australia and New Zealand, it does seem to me that a law could be framed by this Parliament which would give effect to the object my motion has in view.

It is a question whether a ballot should be supplied, or whether the volunteer should not be allowed to write on any piece of paper his choice at an election, and that paper, safeguarded, let us say, by the commissioned officer of his company writing his name on the back and stating that this is the ballot of so-and-so of such-and-such a company and such-and-such a corps and forwarded to the returning officer. Then, provision might be made that every returning officer should notify some officer in charge of the force of the dissolution of Parliament, that officer to notify the commissioned officers of the opportunity which the volunteers would have of exercising their franchise in this way. Copies of the Act, when passed, could be distributed by the Canadian High Commissioner, for example, for those who are now at the front, and by the Militia Department sending to the volunters a copy of the Act when they proceed to the front. Certain penalties are provided in the New Zealand Act which could be provided in ours also. On the whole, it seems quite feasible for us to frame an Act which would give to our volunteers an opportunity to exercise their franchise should an occasion arise. I understand that there is at present a committee of this House dealing with the electoral law, and I think this matter might well be referred to that committee for action, should the House be of opinion that we should make such an amendment as I propose.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Has the hon. gentleman in mind any machinery by which it would be possible to have the absent elector seized of the issues presenting themselves at a general election?

Mr. FRIPP: I think the volunteers are at present seized, and perhaps more strongly than we are, of certain features of what may be in issue in the campaign. They are, and must be, in almost daily communication with their parents or relatives in this country. For example, I have in my possession a very interesting letter from one of the volunteers at the front—I presume he is at the front; this is dated from Salisbury—in which he deals with the question of boots for the soldiers which is agitating the country at the present time. He expresses a clear opinion on that subject, and if the House is interested I should like very much to read the letter. It would show hon. members that our soldiers are familiar with what is going on at home. It seems to me that no difficulty would arise under the head suggested by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark). The volunteers would be seized of one of the issues at all events, and that is, what this Government has done to take care of them.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is not a party issue.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (West Peterborough). As the seconder of this resolution, I would say with all due deference to the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) that there is nothing in the Election Act requiring a man, as qualification for voting, to know one thing of what is going on in the country. The hon. member's objection would be valid if the right to vote were conditional on such knowledge; but it is not. In order to vote, a man must be a British subject, not less than twenty-one years of age, a resident of the electoral division, and—

Mr. GAUVREAU: And go it blind.

Mr. BURNHAM: Others go it blind besides the men at the front. I cannot see, on general principles, what justification there can be for withholding from the men who are defending this country at the front with their bayonets, the right to do the same with their ballots.

Mr. PROULX: This might be feasible if clear-cut issues were presented to the people. But we must remember that the candidates are nominated only eight days before polling, and in some counties both candidates are on the same side of politics. It would be pretty hard, at such a distance, for the soldiers to decide between the candidates. Many candidates would not even be known to these electors. I think it would be hard to devise any machinery to enable the soldiers to cast their votes intelligently.

Hon. ROBERT ROGERS: The resolution of my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Fripp) is undoubtedly a very important one. It is a resolution that requires, in my humble judgment, very calm, reasonable and fair consideration at the hands of hon. members of this House. I am sure I express the earnest hope and wish of every hon. gentleman within the four walls of this Chamber, when I say that it is to be hoped that it may not be necessary to have a general election in the Dominion of Canada before the termination of this terrible war. But there is none the less great importance to be attached to the suggestion of the hon. member. We are living in a time of rapid change and have to be prepared to deal with new conditions. The hon. member for Ottawa has referred to the legislation of the Commonwealth of Australia under which a system has been devised for the exercise of the franchise on the part of their soldiers who have gone to the front in defence of their country and their flag. But I am a little afraid that the Bill of the Commonwealth of Australia would not apply in so far as the Dominion of Canada is concerned. Should necessity arise for a general election, I am sure there is no man in this House or out of it who would like to deny the right of the franchise to the good, loyal citizen who has gone to the front in defence of the flag, and to fight our battle for the greatest possession of the people of Canada, our British citizenship, and for the maintenance of our membership in the great British Empire. However, I have not had time to discuss this matter with my right hon. friend the leader of the Government, who has just taken his seat, and I have no doubt that he will suggest what is the best course to be adopted with regard to the subject matter of the resolution now before the House.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM: I am not sure that the attitude of my hon. friend the hon. Minister of Public Works in this instance will not go down as one of the famous retreats under proper cover. I, like the Minister of Public Works, hope that there will be no necessity for a general election in Canada until this war is over. In fact, I would go farther, perhaps, than some of my

associates in clearing the way so that there need not be any election, so far as constitutional law is concerned. I understand that the New Zealand Act has not yet been made operative; consequently we cannot tell how it would work if an election were brought on during the war. I agree with all that has been said as to the wisdom of allowing our volunteers to exercise their franchise. They are defending, in a more practical way, perhaps, than we in this Parliament are—that citizenship which gives us the right of free franchise. They are doing their utmost to protect our rights as citizens of the country which we think is the freest in the world, and I would not think of doing anything to deprive them of the privilege of exercising their rights if some practical scheme could be worked out under which they could do so in a proper way. For some years the introduction of a system has been advocated in Canada to enable commercial travellers to cast their ballots without being obliged to return to their constituency and lose perhaps a week or more of valuable time. Up to the present no practical result has been attained along this line, for reasons which presented themselves to those in power heretofore and which are, no doubt, apparent to those in power at the present time. If our volunteers were all in Canada, the difficulty of working out a scheme of this kind would not be so great, because Canadian laws and regulations would be applicable no matter in what part of Canada the volunteers were at the time of the election. But the large majority of them are in a foreign land, many thousands of miles away, and they cannot have full information with regard to the candidates or as to the various conditions which prevail, a knowledge of which is quite necessary. Besides, there is no way, so far as I can see, of enforcing a Canadian Election Act in a foreign country. Certainly the difficulties are very great. Secrecy would be another extremely difficult thing to enforce in an army, the men composing which are scattered about, some in the trenches and some in other sections of the fighting line, working under conditions which we can scarcely comprehend. Then, again, I can hardly imagine that the soldiers fighting shoulder to shoulder in the trenches for the rights of the British people and the continuance of the liberties which we all enjoy would have any time to differ with each other on matters which to them would seem at the moment comparatively trivial. I think it would not be prudent to do anything which might sow the seed of discord among our soldiers who are neither Grits nor Tories, French nor English, Irish nor Scotch, but British citizens fighting without any division for what they believe to be right. It strikes me that their time will be fully taken up with the great work in which they are engaged. In saying that, I do not combat the principle at all, but it strikes me that a Bill should have been placed before the House so that we might have been enabled to see if there is any practical way of working the thing out. But were we to commit ourselves immediately to this principle without being sure that it is practicable, we would not be treating the question as seriously as its importance deserves. The adoption of some scheme might prove beneficial, or, again, it might create discord among the men—and unquestionably there should be no discord among them. I do not wish to be too emphatic in the matter, but I see almost unsurmountable difficulties in the way of our trying to apply this principle to our volunteers, particularly to those outside our own country. As to those who are in Canada, I think the modus operandi might be worked out if it were thought desirable.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I was not aware that the motion of my hon. friend was coming up this evening, nor have I had an opportunity of giving much consideration to the subject, which is not without importance, that he has brought to the attention of the House. It would seem to me, in line with what my hon. friend the member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) has said, that a great many difficulties would be encountered in working out legislation based on this proposal. To carry on an election in this country under the present statutory provisions, which are the result of a great many years' thought and frequent careful revision, is not unattended with difficulty; so that the proposal that men who are fighting for the Dominion and for the Empire should participate in an election by casting their votes thereat while abroad, is a subject that certainly demands the most careful consideration. I am not aware of the provisions of the New Zealand Act. I have never seen it, nor do I know of the existence of such a legislative provision in New Zealand except by references which I have seen from time to time in the press. It has been stated in the press that that Act was invoked in respect of New Zealand's expeditionary force. I am not at all sure that the statement is correct, but I remem-

ber that it was reported that some elections depended upon the returns of the voting of the expeditionary force. It is possible that my hon. friend the hon. member for South Renfrew is correct in what he has said in that regard. It would be undesirable for us to refuse consideration to the proposal which the hon. member for Ottawa has brought to the attention of the House; on the other hand, it would be even more undesirable that we should embark upon any such proposal without giving it very careful consideration. So I would suggest to my hon. friend from Ottawa that the best course would be to refer his proposal to the committee which has already been appointed for the purpose of taking into consideration certain amendments to the Act respecting Controverted Elections, and I therefore move that all the words after the word "that" in the proposed motion be left out and the following substituted therefor:

The select committee composed of Messrs. Northrup, Maclean (Halifax), Murphy, Carvell, Robidoux, Bennett (Calgary) and Doherty, be authorized to inquire, consider and report to this House whether legislation should be passed at this session providing that electors of Canada who have enlisted for Imperial service or are engaged in active service be enabled to exercise their franchise at any election that may occur during their absence on such service, and whether any other legislative provision ought to be made with respect to the matter.

Amendment agreed to, and motion as amended agreed to.

FREE LETTERS FOR SOLDIERS.

Hon. CHAS. MARCIL—for Mr. Lemieux—moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, legislation should be enacted during the present session of Parliament providing that all mail matter addressed to Canadian soldiers on active service shall be sent free of postage.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that the hon. member is moving this resolution at the request of the hon. member in whose name it stands, but who, owing to indisposition, is unable to be present. I presume that would be satisfactory to the House. I am afraid that this resolution cannot very well be moved by a private member, because it affects postage and therefore really involves a contribution of public money.

Mr. MARCIL: The hon. member for Rouville is unfortunately indisposed, and I understand that, acting under the advice of his physician, it will be a couple of weeks at least before he can again take his seat in the House. This afternoon he asked me, through a fellow member, if I would move the resolution in his absence. The late Postmaster General I presume, at the time was familiar with the rules of the House. The adoption of such a resolution may or may not compel the Government. Decisions have been rendered pro and con. During the time I occupied the Chair the point was raised several times. Some Speakers have decided that such a resolution is binding on the Government, but others have decided in a contrary way. It is at the request of the hon. member for Rouville that I am moving the resolution. We have heard something about the volunteers to-day. This is not a party question, but merely a friendly move towards the boys, giving an opportunity to their friends in Canada to send letters or newspapers free of postage. It is a thing that will appeal to the House. Of course, I am prepared to leave the matter in the hands of the Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: If carried in the affirmative, the resolution will practically commit the House to an expenditure of money, and therefore it should be moved only by a member of the Government.

Mr. GRAHAM: It might be considered either advisory or compulsory; I believe there are opinions both ways. Under the circumstances, could we let the motion stand for the present as if it had not been moved?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes.

Motion stands.

SUPPLY.

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

Department of Marine and Fisheries—Maintenance and repairs to Dominion steamers and ice-breakers, $1,125,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: What is the explanation of this increase?

Mr. HAZEN: The reason for the increase in this appropriation is that the department intends to pay out of it the maintenance and repairs of the following steamers, in addition to those whose expenses have been formerly charged to it: Aranmore, construction, N.S., Quebec and Hudson Bay, Halifax; Bellechasse, river St. Lawrence ship channel, inspection and staff boat, Quebec; Grenville, lighthouse and buoy service, Upper St. Lawrence and lake Ontario, Prescott, Ont.; Lambton, construction, Great Lakes, Parry Sound, Ont.; Rouville, construction, Gulf of St. Lawrence, Quebec.

These expenses were formerly charged to the boats, but we thought it more correct to bulk them into this one item. That accounts for the increase.

Mr. CARROLL: Have any new ice-breakers been put in commission during the last six months?

Mr. HAZEN: No.

Mr. MARCIL: Requests have frequently been made to me that an ice-breaker be sent into Gaspé bay early in the spring. Was any action taken in that regard last year?

Mr. HAZEN: No. The difficulty is that we can not comply with all the requests we receive for the services of ice-breakers. We are worse off now than last year, because we have sold the Earl Grey to the Russian Government to keep the White Sea open during the winter. We regretted having to part with her, but, under the circumstances, felt we ought to comply with the Russian Government's request. We have an ice-breaker in course of construction by the Canadian Vickers at their shipyards at Montreal, but for reasons hon. gentlemen will understand the date of its delivery has had to be postponed considerably.

Mr. MARCIL: The condition of Gaspé bay has become almost famous since the departure from that place of the Canadian expeditionary force. In the inner bay there is a lot of floating ice, which takes two or three weeks and sometimes more to break up, and delays navigation accordingly. It is just the same between Dalhousie and Campbellton. The route is blocked at both extremities. If ever the minister has an opportunity of sending an ice-breaker down there, I am sure it would be appreciated.

Mr. KYTE: How much was received from the Russian Government for the Earl Grey?

Mr. HAZEN: One hundred thousand pounds in round figures. The exact figures were given to the House to-day in reply to a question. It was $493,000.00.

Mr. GRAHAM: I should like a little explanation of an item I have seen in the press. I think it was on Wednesday last that I saw in the Montreal Star an item to the effect that an official of the Marine Department had made an examination in connection with the collision between the Storstad and the Empress of Ireland; and that on being asked by the Canadian Pacific Railway solicitors for some information concerning the investigation he had made, he declined to give it, saying that he had been engaged by the Storstad Company, and considered that he should give the information to them only. I do not know anything about the circumstances, but it struck me as peculiar that a Government official should be engaged by the Norwegian Company to get technical information which could not be made available to our own Canadian Company.

Mr. HAZEN: That would concern the Department of Naval Service, not the Marine and Fisheries Department. I presume it would be some official connected with the Hydrographic Survey. I do not know what the facts are, nor does the deputy of the Marine and Fisheries Department who is with me to-night. I will get the information, however, and give it to my hon. friend at a later date.

Mr. GRAHAM: It was in the other department?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, the Department of the Naval Service.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is assumed that this official said he had been instructed by the deputy of the department to do this work for the Storstad people. If the item is not absolutely accurate it ought to be straightened out.

Mr. HAZEN: I will ascertain what the facts are and when the items for the Naval Department are under consideration I will give the information to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MARCIL: For many years ice-breaking work has been carried on in the St. Lawrence. Will the Minister tell us if any material advantage has been gained by the work of ice-breakers during the spring, particularly at Cap Rouge and in the vicinity of Quebec?

Mr. HAZEN: Several advantages have resulted from the work of the ice-breaker. In the first place it has prevented the flooding in the spring of the low lands below Montreal, and in the second place, it has caused the opening of navigation to Montreal at an early date. I think it was last year I submitted a report to the House showing that it was believed that the navigation up the St. Lawrence to Montreal, in consequence of the work of the ice-breakers, was being advanced perhaps ten days or two weeks and in some cases more, depending on the season.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the minister's programme for this season in connection with the St. Lawrence channel?

Mr. HAZEN: I will be very happy, when we get to the vote on the St. Lawrence ship channel, to give the hon. gentleman all the information about that.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: I did not note the name of the Minto in the list of ice-breakers to be repaired under this vote that the minister read.

Mr. HAZEN: I did not give the list of all the vessels that are to be repaired but the list of the vessels that previously were charged to the item for construction. In the list of those that are to be repaired the Minto and the Stanley are included.

Mr. HUGHES: They will need repairs during the coming summer?

Mr. HAZEN: These boats nearly all have to be repaired, especially the ice-breakers.

Examiners of masters and mates, $16,500.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is it advisable to permit teachers who have had charge of instructing men who are up for examination as masters and mates to conduct the examination of these men and pass upon their qualifications? It is regarded as convenient if it is permissible.

Mr. HAZEN: It has never been permissible.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not see why it would not be permissible. A man who has attended college, has his degree, and has become a professor or a teacher ought to be more than usually competent. He does not get anything for the work of conducting an examination of this kind and I fancy it would be a great convenience. It is hard to understand why, if he is a capable man to teach these candidates, he should not be equally capable to conduct their examinations and pass judgment upon their qualifications unless there was some special advantage to himself in passing them. We have a school in the town where I live presided over by a very capable man and when some of the pupils attending that school wanted to go up for examination I understand that a man was sent from Halifax to examine them, whereas, if a local man could examine them, it would be less expensive and more convenient. When a man was ready to go up for examination he could be examined without having to wait. As it is now, I understand that if they want to go up for examination, unless there are five or six of them ready to be examined, the examination cannot be conducted and the result is that men who are ready to pass their examination are kept back.

9 p.m.

Mr. HAZEN: The hon. gentleman is raising a question about which there is considerable difference of opinion in connection with ordinary educational work. There are some people who contend with a good deal of force too, that the instructor is better qualified to conduct the examination of his pupils than any one else. There are other people who hold that the instructor should not conduct examinations, but that a fairer and more intelligent examination can be obtained by having examiners who have not been connected with the instruction of the pupil. There are some universities in this country that I know of in which degrees are awarded on examinations conducted by educationalists who are not instructors in the institutions. They feel that a teacher might have some prejudice against, or leaning towards, a certain pupil and that if they get an outsider who simply takes the pupil, having no personal knowledge of him, they may get a fairer examination in that way. The practice which has always prevailed in the department in connection with the examination of masters and mates is that examiners are appointed by the department. There is a regular examiner at Halifax, Captain Malcolm, and if any one in my hon. friend's neighbourhood wants to try the examination Captain Malcolm will be sent there to conduct it. It is not necessary to wait until there are four, five or six, or any number of students to be examined although the attempt is made to get as many together at the same time as possible. If there is only one man who is prepared to undergo examination he does not have to wait until there are several candidates, but the examiner will be sent down for that purpose. Naturally, we try to have a number of applicants together in order to save expense. This system is open to discussion. There is a good deal, I frankly admit, to be said on both sides of the question of whether the examiner should conduct the examination or whether the instructor should do it. Perhaps it is as well to have an examiner who is appointed by the department for that purpose and in whose knowledge, skill and experience the department have confidence. Perhaps that would cause greater confidence to be reposed in the results of the examinations and certificates given by the department than might be the case under the system which my hon. friend has spoken of. This is the system which has always prevailed and I think it would hardly be wise to change it unless the arguments presented were very strong the other way.

Mr. PARDEE: Regarding examinations for masters and mates, I take it that the system applies to salt water or would the minister send an examiner to any part to examine candidates for masters or mates?

Mr. HAZEN: Quite right.

Mr. PARDEE: Why should that system not be extended to fresh water?

Mr. HAZEN: It is.

Mr. PARDEE: When there are two or three candidates to be examined for certificates as fresh-water masters and mates, do you compel them to attend any particular centre for examination?

Mr. HAZEN: For the past two years, wherever there are candidates to be examined, we send an examiner there.

Mr. PARDEE: Who are the examiners in Ontario?

Mr. HAZEN: Captain King at Toronto, Captain Coles at Collingwood, Captain Phillips at Kenora.

Mr. PARDEE: I am glad to hear that an examiner is sent to wherever the candidates reside, it is an improvement on the former system.

Mr. MARCIL: Who are the examiners in Quebec?

Mr. HAZEN: Captain Lachance for Montreal and Quebec.

Mr. MARCIL: Who are the examiners for New Brunswick?

Mr. HAZEN: The examiners for the eastern division are: Captain Malcolm, Halifax, Captain Lachance, Quebec, Captain Alexander Cameron, Charlottetown, Captain Murphy, Yarmouth, Captain Sutherland, North Sydney, Captain Bennett, St. John, N.B.

Mr. PARDEE: I understand that whenever there is a candidate for a certificate as master or mate an examiner is sent to that point?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. PARDEE: Formerly the centres were Windsor, St. Catherines, Toronto and Collingwood.

Mr. HAZEN: My desire is that the students shall have every opportunity to pass the examination. Of course, if there are three or four students to be examined, residing at different points not widely separated, we would ask them to meet at a central point in the vicinity, but we would not withhold the examination from any person who wants to be examined, simply because he is the only candidate presenting himself. We will send an examiner to him if necessary.

Mr. MARCIL: Some years ago there was difficulty in Quebec arising out of the language question, and I assume that now the examiners in Quebec are familiar with both languages. In northern New Brunswick, where there is a very large French population, what would be the procedure in the case of a candidate who was not familiar with the English language?

Mr. HAZEN: The very idea my hon. friend suggests has occurred to us, but as such a case has never arisen we do not think it necessary to duplicate the examiners. If in northern New Brunswick a candidate who wants to be examined in the French language presents himself, we would get Captain Lachance to go down from Quebec.

Mr. MARCIL: If there is any one on the Lower St. Lawrence who wishes to be examined in the French language, he will have an opportunity of being so examined?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. MARCIL: There are a large number of Acadian navigators who would desire, I presume, to be examined in the French language.

Mr. HAZEN: When that question arises we will provide for it.

Mr. LAW: Has the Minister a list of the masters and mates who passed in Nova Scotia last year?

Mr. HAZEN: I have not the names, but the following table shows the particulars of the examinations held during the ten months ended 31st January last:

Name of Examiner.	Port.	Seagoing Master-Mate.		Coasting Master-Mate.		Inland Master-Mate.	
Capt. Malcolm	Halifax		10	12	11		
Capt. Lachance	Montreal and Quebec	3	2		5	25	5
Capt. Murphy	Yarmouth	9	7	8	6		
Capt. Bennett	St. John	1		9	2	12	
Capt. Eddie	Vancouver	2	7	25	21		
Capt. Macpherson	Victoria		2	10	6	1	1
Capt. Cameron	Charlottetown			1	1		
Capt. King	Toronto and Ottawa					37	35
Capt. Coles	Collingwood				1	11	6
Capt. Thordarson	West Selkirk					2	8
Capt. Phillips	Kenora					8	
Capt. Sutherland	North Sydney		1	4	2		
Lieut. Hallett	Nelson					3	

Mr. PARDEE: How long has Captain King been an examiner? Is he not a very old employee?

Mr. HAZEN: He was appointed not quite two years ago.

Mr. MARCIL: The Quebec district comprises all the country below Quebec?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. MARCIL: Where does the examination take place for the Quebec district?

Mr. HAZEN: At the city of Quebec, I presume.

Mr. MARCIL: A man living in Gaspé would have to travel three or four hundred miles to Quebec?

Mr. HAZEN: He would send an examiner down there, but as a matter of fact a great many do come to the centre to be examined.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the candidate to pay his own expenses going and coming?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. MARCIL: If he fails in the examination that is lost?

Mr. HAZEN: There is no allowance made for travelling expenses.

Mr. MARCIL: Not even a reduced rate on the Government railway?

Mr. HAZEN: I do not think so.

Mr. MARCIL: Why should he not have a reduced rate on the Intercolonial railway?

Mr. HAZEN: I will discuss that with the Minister of Railways.

Mr. GRAHAM: And I doubt very much if the Minister of Railways will be willing to consent.

Mr. MARCIL: The civil servants get reduced rates on the Government railways.

Investigation into wrecks, $18,400.

Mr. GRAHAM: Who is the Wreck Commissioner?

Mr. HAZEN: Mr. L. A. Demers, who is a very old official. Mr. Demers retired from the position at one time and became Harbour Master at Montreal and Captain Lindsay was appointed Wreck Commissioner. About a year ago Captain Lindsay was appointed to the commission in connection with the pilotage service, and Captain Demers was appointed to his old position in the department. The Wreck Commission is a court consisting of the Wreck Commissioner, who is chairman and two nautical assessors. The practice is for the Wreck Commissioner, in holding an inquiry at Quebec, St. John, Halifax, or elsewhere, to select two seamen of experience to act with him as assessors. The authority for the assessors is signed by myself, or whoever may be minister. He makes inquiry and gets the two most experienced sea captains, old sailors, he can find, and they act with him as assessors. The finding of the court has to be signed by the Wreck Commissioner and at least one assessor. The item this year is $10,000 less than last year. That is accounted for by the fact that last year inquiry had to be made into the loss of the Empress of India. For that purpose a special court was appointed. We estimated the expenses of that court at $10,000. This year no such special court is provided for.

Mr. GRAHAM: The signing of the warrant in blank is almost like a cheque to buy militia horses. The report of the Wreck Commissioner on the Empress of Ireland

disaster, I suppose, cannot be taken as evidence in the civil suit now pending?

Mr. HAZEN: I do not know what the laws of evidence are in the province of Quebec—whether evidence taken before a properly constituted court be accepted in another court. By agreement it could.

Mr. GRAHAM: How many wrecks are investigated in a year? How many were investigated last year?

Mr. HAZEN: In the fiscal year the number of wrecks investigated was thirty-four, exclusive of the Empress of Ireland, which was invesigated by a special court.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is there any report of the court in the Empress of Ireland disaster?

Mr. HAZEN: A very full report has been published. I suppose it would be right that that should be laid on the table. That had not occurred to me, but I see no objection to bringing it down.

Mr. McKENZIE: It would hardly be useful unless it is printed.

Mr. HAZEN: It is printed. If the hon. gentleman is interested, I shall be glad to send him a copy.

Mr. McKENZIE: I shall be thankful for it. Perhaps other members also would like to have copies, unless it is too expensive.

Mr. HAZEN: If I find we have enough copies, I will act on the hon. member's suggestion and send one to each member of the House.

Mr. PARDEE: The hon. gentleman said that Captain Demers, with two sea-captains—

Mr. HAZEN: That is the word I used, but they need not be sea-captains in the literal sense. They ought to be marine men, but both not necessarily sailors. In certain cases one might be an engineer, for instance.

Mr. PARDEE: The point was as to appointing men to examine into wrecks on the Great Lakes. I had occasion to speak to the minister last year upon this matter. The conditions on the Great Lakes are entirely different from those on the ocean. Without going into details, I may say that, so far as Captain Lindsay is concerned, he was a wreck commissioner to investigate the wrecks that occurred in the storm of the 9th November, 1913, perhaps the greatest that ever visited the Great Lakes. Some findings were made in the case of the Arcadia by the wreck commissioner, Captain Lindsay, who is wholly a deep-sea man that, in my opinion and in the opinion of many masters—I believe, in the opinion of ninety-nine per cent of those masters—were wholly erroneous. Had Captain Lindsay understood the Great Lakes as well as he understood deep-sea sailing, he never would have made such findings. I am not going into a dissertation on the evidence, which I have before me, nor into the findings themselves. But, from my knowledge of the Great Lakes, having lived upon them all my life and having some knowledge of marine matters, I think that in justice to the masters and mariners upon those lakes, and in justice to the department itself, no wreck commissioner should be appointed to investigate wrecks upon the Great Lakes except one who has had experience in sailing on the Great Lakes and knows absolutely the conditions of that navigation. I think the minister must agree that sailing on the Great Lakes is vastly different from deep-sea sailing. On the lakes they have not the room that they have at sea and cannot go about their course in the same way. In many other ways also the navigation differs. I am not pretending to find fault with the department except in the case of the Arcadia, in which the finding was erroneous. I throw out these suggestions in order that in future wreck investigations men may be appointed upon these occasions who are familiar with the navigation conditions of the Great Lakes.

Mr. HAZEN: My hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) called my attention to this fact during last session. A delegation waited upon me composed of gentlemen interested in the navigation of the Great Lakes, introduced, I think, by my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro). I was very much impressed with their sincerity, and it was perfectly clear that they believed the course that had been pursued was not fair to the navigation of the lakes. They asked that a Wreck Commissioner should be appointed for the Great Lakes besides those for the Atlantic and Pacific. But in view of the small number of wrecks on the lakes within the last few years I thought it not wise to appoint a Wreck Commissioner; but I did give positive instructions that when there was investigation of a wreck on the Great Lakes or inland waters, the Wreck Com-

missioner should see to it that the two assessors he selected to advise him should be navigators familiar with the navigation of the lakes. I hope that will meet the case. Certainly, we have had no complaints since. The hon. member refers to the case of the Arcadia. He will remember that I told these gentlemen there is a provision in the Act for an appeal, that appeal being to the Minister. It has to be taken within a certain time. But my recollection is I told these gentlemen that I would waive the time limit, if they wished to appeal to me and would hear the appeal. I think the power of the Minister in such a case is to order another inquiry before the same commissioner or before some other. However, the matter did not proceed further. They said it would not be convenient to get it up then, but I said I would hear it later in the season. But I believe they thought it better to leave the matter as it was. It is still open to them, however, to bring in an appeal if they desire to do so, and if they take that course I shall give my best attention to the matter.

Mr. PARDEE: I think the decision of the minister along the lines mentioned will be quite satisfactory.

Mr. MARCIL: Following this inquiry into the disaster to the Empress of Ireland, have any changes been ordered by the department with regard to the dropping of pilots by steamers at Father Point?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, we are carrying out the recommendations made in that respect. It may be necessary for us to obtain permission to build another boat some time in the future in order to have it done thoroughly. My hon. friend will understand that I have endeavoured to cut out of my estimates this year as much capital expenditure as possible; consequently they have been very considerably reduced. We are acting entirely in accord with the recommendations made by the commission especially constituted by this Parliament, of which Lord Mersey was chairman, and this year arrangements will be made which will obviate any danger previously arising from the source referred to.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the minister state briefly what was the result of the inquiry into the stranding of the steamer Canada at Ste. Anne des Monts?

Mr. HAZEN: I have here two lists of investigations. The first list is one of investigations into wrecks during the fiscal years 1913 and 1914. In this list I find: "Canada, stranding; no one to blame." The other list is one of investigations into wrecks during the period from April 1, 1914, to February 4, 1915, in which I find, under the heading "Canada, stranding," the following: "Master reprimanded, and mate suspended for three months."

Mr. MARCIL: Are any particulars given as to how the accident happened?

Mr. HAZEN: No.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the Canada been in dry-dock this year?

Mr. HAZEN: The Canada is not a government boat; I do not know whether she has been in dry-dock or not.

Mr. MARCIL: The Canada in which I am interested is a boat subsidized by the Government, which is about to begin a new service. There has been a good deal of talk about this wreck, and I am anxious to know what position the matter is in at the present time.

Mr. HAZEN: This boat receives a subsidy from the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. MARCIL: Before a subsidized boat begins a season of navigation under contract with the Dominion Government, is it inspected by any officer of the department?

Mr. HAZEN: All boats are inspected by an inspector of hulls and an inspector of boilers and must obtain certificates from these inspectors before they are allowed to go on route.

Mr. MARCIL: Are the results of these examinations made public in any way? Are they accessible?

Mr. HAZEN: They are available in the department to any one who wishes to see them.

Mr. MARCIL: The Canada is a very old boat. She used to be known as the Copatriot, and belonged to a French company navigating between Baie des Chaleurs ports and St. Pierre Miquelon. Her name was changed and she engaged in service in Chaleurs Bay. She has met with several accidents, and the people want to know whether the boat is seaworthy or not. I was told that last year and the year before she should have gone into dry-dock.

Mr. HAZEN: The boat cannot go on route unless a certificate is obtained from the inspectors of hulls and boilers.

Mr. MARCIL: The certificate of the suspended mate is in force this year, then?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, after the lapse of the three months.

Mr. BOULAY: Who is holding wreck investigations at Quebec; Captain Lindsay?

Mr. HAZEN: Captain Lindsay does not hold any wreck investigations. These would be held by Captain Demers.

Mr. BOULAY: I understand that during the summer an investigation was held as a result of which a certain person was held to blame. Subsequently another investigation was held, and the same person was exonerated because of the fact that the gentleman who conducted the first investigation was unable to understand the parties who were called to testify. Would the minister give me some particulars in regard to this matter?

Mr. HAZEN: I think that was in respect of the inquiry into the case of the Montfort. Senator Choquette appeared as counsel for the officers of the ship, and after the inquiry was over he complained that neither the wreck commissioner, who at that time was Captain Lindsay, nor the assessors were able to understand the French language well enough to enable the man whose conduct was being examined to make a proper defence. As a result of this a re-hearing was granted, of which Captain Lindsay was chairman and Captain Demers was one of the assessors. In that way the difficulty was overcome.

Mr. JAMESON: I should like to draw the attention of the minister to a statement made to me by a person whom I believe to be entirely trustworthy, to the effect that some of the steamers which are navigating our maritime waters at the present time are unseaworthy. I would like the minister to give definite instructions to the inspector of hulls with a view to securing a proper test of the seaworthiness of these boats. In order to ensure that the boats are actually seaworthy they should be subjected to a practical test involving the placing in the boat of a weight equal to that ordinarily borne by it in the carrying of passengers and crew. I have every reason to believe that the statement made to me is correct, and I believe there should be no difficulty whatever in seeing that proper and sufficient tests in that respect are made in the future.

Mr. HAZEN: If the inspectors of hulls—so far as I know they are competent men—carry out their duties and the instructions given to them, no vessel will go to sea that is not in a seaworthy condition. The same applies to the inspector of boilers, whose duty it is to examine the machinery and to see that it is in proper condition before the vessel is allowed to go to sea. Before appointment these gentlemen have to pass an examination to the satisfaction of the officers of the Marine Department, and the instructions given to them are of a very explicit character. I shall, however, examine those instructions more thoroughly and see if they are sufficient.

Mr. MARCIL: We hear certain strange stories from pilots, engineers, captains, etc., about the unseaworthy condition of such and such a boat. Is the minister certain that the inspections are properly and thoroughly made? I heard many stories in connection with the Canada that I do not care to repeat. Is the department in a position to know that the work of inspection is very thorough and full?

Mr. HAZEN: They make reports to us of their personal inspections of every single boat and these reports are in the department. Their instructions are to make most careful examinations, but in view of what has been said I think we shall send out a special circular letter to the inspectors calling their attention to the instructions received and pointing out that there is some alarm in the public mind that the inspection is not sufficiently thorough and telling them to see that the examination is as thorough as possible.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not expect the hon. members who have spoken to inform the House who are the owners of these steamers that are said to be unseaworthy, but it is extremely dangerous that steamers should be plying along the coast of Nova Scotia or anywhere that are dangerous, and I think it would be well for the hon. members to convey privately to the minister the names of the steamers referred to in order that there may be a thorough investigation.

Mr. HAZEN: If my hon. friends have any particular steamers in mind, if they will come to the Marine Department we shall show them the reports on those steamers.

Mr. LAW: The only complaint I have heard in reference to the inspectors in our part of Nova Scotia is that they are too strict. I doubt very much whether there are any owners of steamboats who would dare

to send boats to sea in an unseaworthy condition and without the certificates of the inspectors of hulls and boilers. As I understand, there is a heavy penalty for operating boats which are not regularly inspected.

Mr. JAMESON: There seems to be some misunderstanding as to my meaning. I did not mean that the steamers themselves were in an unseaworthy condition, but that the boats they carried had been lying on the decks for a long time and had become dry, and my informant did not think that they would support the number of passengers they are supposed to carry in an emergency. His idea was that the inspector should put the life boats in the water when making an inspection, and put in them a weight equal to that of the number of passengers they are supposed to carry. I shall be glad to give to the minister a list of the boats that have been mentioned to me.

Mr. LAW: It is part of the duty of the inspector to inspect the life boats just as he does the life preservers, etc.

Expenses of schools of navigation, $8,000.

Mr. LAW: What is the explanation of this item?

Mr. HAZEN: This item is intended to cover the expenditure in connection with the department's free navigation schools already established and to provide any extension of the service that may be undertaken in the fiscal year 1915-16. Free navigation schools are now in operation during the whole year at Quebec, Halifax and St. John, and during the winter free navigation schools are operated at North Sydney, Collingwood, Vancouver and Carleton. The hon. member from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) brought the necessity of that part of the country to my attention last year, and we established a school at Carleton, in Bonaventure county.

Mr. MARCIL: Who is the instructor?

Mr. HAZEN: Captain Landry.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the result been encouraging?

Mr. HAZEN: According to the report, the new school opened at Carleton, Bonaventure, on the 1st of December last, under Captain Landry has had an average attendance of six pupils and these will be ready for examination for certificates about the middle of February. There has been an average attendance of six pupils, and it cannot be said that the school is a failure.

Mr. MARCIL: For the first year that is very encouraging. Will the school be continued at Carleton or moved along the coast to other parishes, say Bonaventure?

Mr. HAZEN: Does the hon. member think there is a site better adapted for the school than Carleton?

Mr. MARCIL: Bonaventure has some three thousand people. It is farther east than Carleton.

Mr. HAZEN: I shall consider the desirability of changing the location.

Mr. LAW: Does the minister say that there is a free school at Yarmouth?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. LAW: Conducted by whom?

Mr. HAZEN: Conducted by Captain John E. Murphy.

Mr. LAW: That is news to me. I knew that Mr. Murphy delivered lectures there during the winter, but I never heard that he was running a free navigation school.

Mr. HAZEN: It would perhaps be more correct to say that lectures on navigation are delivered during the winter at the places I have mentioned.

Mr. MARCIL: Is the course completed in one year?

Mr. HAZEN: Not necessarily. As a rule the pupils who go to the school are young men who have had experience on the sea, and have studied more or less. Then they attend these lectures for a certain time and a good deal depends on their aptitude and cleverness as to the length of time that the course will take.

Mr. MARCIL: The minister will understand that my only object is to give the various districts an opportunity of benefiting by the schools to as great an extent as possible.

Mr. McKENZIE: The school in the town of North Sydney is doing excellent work. The attendance is getting larger every year, but we should like to see it larger still. I notice from the newspapers that the technical college at Halifax has added navigation to the subjects taught there. I understand there is some co-operation between the college at Halifax and the department at Ottawa. Perhaps the minister could give us some explanation of that arrangement, if any, and what assistance the department is giving in paying teachers.

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, we entered into an arrangement with the technical college at Halifax. They provide the accommodation,

fuel and that sort of thing, and we provide the instructors and equipment. We pay the instructor, Capt. John Simmons, $80 a month. I will just quote from Mr. Burnett's report of the school:

The Halifax school is making good progress. It was opened 1st April, 1914, and has been in operation continuously since. Captain Simmons, the instructor, has been in constant attendance every day and evening except Sundays. The attendance since the summer months has been good. For November and December the average daily attendance was seven pupils. Several of those attending the school have already passed examination and received certificates as masters or mates. Others after attending the school for a while, go to sea to return at a later date and finish the course. Others will be ready for examination in the spring. Thirty-one candidates have already passed at Halifax for certificates since April last.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: Have any applications been made to the minister for a school of this kind in Charlottetown?

Mr. HAZEN: I do not know of any.

Mr. HUGHES: We are a sea-faring people down there, and have turned out a good many captains who have sailed all over the world.

Mr. HAZEN: Is there a private navigation school at Charlottetown?

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, but the pupils have to pay a fee. If men in other parts of the maritime provinces can get tuition free or partly free, the department is discriminating. I am sure the teacher in that college would be glad to work under the Government and relieve the pupils to that extent. It is desirable that our young men should be encouraged to qualify themselves as masters or mates, and as the Government are helping in other parts of the country, I now make application and press it as strongly as I can for similar assistance to be given to the school at Charlottetown.

Mr. HAZEN: In places where a well-conducted school seems to be meeting the needs of the case, the department has always been very careful not to interfere with the gentleman conducting such a school. There have been no applications from Charlottetown for assistance of that kind since I have been minister; so evidently the people there are pretty well satisfied with the present state of affairs. However, I will look into the facts of the case.

Mr. HUGHES: I am not suggesting that the minister establish a rival school, but I think he should take advantage of the school that already exists there. The Government might supplement the instruction, or make it less expensive to the many young men who wish to get an education, but find the fees of a private school too high. The very fact that a private school is being successfully conducted there, would indicate that a competent instructor could be easily got.

Removal of obstructions in navigable waters, $20,000

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: What comes under that?

Mr. HAZEN: Perhaps I can best explain by giving what we paid out in 1914-15 for removing these wrecks. The steamer Charles Crawford, Lake St. Clair, Ont., $1,450; steamer City of London, Lake Erie, Ont., $4,900; sunken moorings, Grand Manan, N.B., $75; steamer Electra, Margaree Harbour, N.S., $150; old hulk, Guysborough, N.S., $70.45; schooner Annie R. Lewis, Barrington, N.S., $454.50; steamer Elfin, Charlottetown, P.E.I., $500. Up to the present we have spent $7,599.95. This money is for removing obstructions in navigable waters. Where the owners of a sunken barge or ship cannot be got to remove it quickly enough, the department removes it in the interests of navigation and charges the cost up against the vessel owners, and collects if possible. Sometimes we succeed in collecting, and sometimes not.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: Are you collecting the cost of removing the wreck at Margaree Harbour?

Mr. HAZEN: Captain LeBlanc removed that at a cost of $150, which we are trying to collect.

Mr. CHISHOLM: How does the minister select these persons for removing obstructions?

Mr. HAZEN: We advertise for tenders.

Mr. CHISHOLM: How are these tenders advertised?

Mr. HAZEN: By public posters in the district.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I am afraid the minister is ill-informed in respect to that. My information is that instructions were sent down to the Patronage Committee and that they selected Captain LeBlanc. If the notices were sent down there, they were never posted up. Nobody knew about the work except the man who got the contract, and he got it through the Patronage Committee. I have no doubt the minister has acted in good faith, but to say that public

tenders were asked for the removal of that wreck is not correct. Notices were not posted up. That is my home, and I know all about the circumstances, what it cost to remove the wreck, who did the work, and how the choice was made. I wish to impress upon the minister that this man was selected by the Patronage Committee.

Mr. HAZEN: I never heard of the matter before. The deputy minister tells me that the usual practice was followed. These posters are printed, sent down and posted up in different parts of the district. Tenders are asked for the removal.

Mr. CHISHOLM: These posters were not put up; nobody knew anything about them until this man came along and removed the wreck.

Winter mail service, $11,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: From where to where?

Mr. HAZEN: This is from Cape Traverse to Cape Tormentine.

Mr. MARCIL: The service is in operation now?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: Is that for the small boats?

Mr. HAZEN: The amount spent during the last fiscal year was $7,566. The amount spent during the present fiscal year, up to 31st December, was $2,218. Something, of course, depends upon the severity of the winter. The vote is used for the ice-boat service.

Mr. HUGHES: How many boats are employed?

Mr. HAZEN: The number of men employed is 74 and there are twelve boats altogether.

Mr. HUGHES: This vote is for the winter of 1916?

Mr. HAZEN: It is for next year.

Mr. HUGHES: Is it not supposed that the car ferry will be in operation then?

Mr. HAZEN: Then we will not have to spend any of this vote. The car ferry would have been completed by now but for the war. When the war broke out the British Admiralty took charge of the shipyard in which the car ferry was being built and put this work to one side as other work for the navy had to be undertaken. This has caused delay. I do not know whether the car ferry will be ready next year or not, but if it is this vote will not be wanted.

[Mr. A. W. Chisholm.]

Mr. HUGHES: The war could not very well have caused the delay in completing the car ferry because the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) told me during the regular session that the car ferry would be in operation by the 1st of August and the war did not break out until the 4th of August. I do not see how the war could have prevented the construction of a ship that was to have been completed, on this side of the water and in operation by the 1st of August.

Mr. HAZEN: There was a great deal of work done for the navy before the war broke out.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, in anticipation of the war.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Minister of Railways will have to explain that.

Mr. HAZEN: You will have to wait until he comes.

Mr. HUGHES: This vote has proved that the Government are a little doubtful as to whether the car ferry will be a success. Of course, I am glad to see that they are making provision to have the mails carried in any event. The fact that the Earl Grey has been taken away and sold to the Russian Government is unfortunate for that service. Perhaps it could not have been helped, perhaps there was a reason for it and we hope she is doing good service where she is, but if this had not been a very mild winter there would have been a very poor service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. The Minto and Stanley were put into that service and notwithstanding the mildness of the winter they were caught in the ice and were unable to perform the service. If that condition continues and next winter should happen to be severe the people of Prince Edward Island will suffer a great deal because of the war. Their communication will be cut out and I sincerely trust that every effort will be made to try and have the car ferry in operation before next winter. We have been waiting for it for a long time, we have been promised it and something always happened to prevent it being put in operation. This vote gives an indication that in the mind of the Government we will have to wait a while yet.

10 p.m.

Inspection of live stock shipment, $5,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: What is that for?

Mr. HAZEN: It is our business to see that live stock shipped through Canadian

ports is shipped in such a manner that it does not suffer during the voyage, that the stalls and places where the animals are confined are suitable for the purpose. We spent $2,400 last year. There are two inspectors at Montreal and we used to have an inspector at St. John. I did not see any reason for the continuation for the office at St. John and the work is now discharged by the agent of the department there.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the minister the number of cattle shipped from Montreal, Halifax and St. John?

Mr. HAZEN: The inspectors of live stock shipments at Montreal report that 134 horses, 512 cattle, 97 mules and 296 sheep were shipped to Great Britain from the 1st May to the 20th November, 1913. This year's report has not been received.

Mr. MARCIL: That is a great falling off from the previous years?

Mr. HAZEN: There has been a great falling off in the shipment of live stock from Canada of late years.

To continue subsidy for wrecking plants—Quebec, Maritime Provinces and British Columbie, $45,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: What wrecking plants are there in Nova Scotia?

Mr. HAZEN: The wrecking plant in Nova Scotia is provided by the Dominion Coal Company. They maintain a wrecking plant which is divided between Halifax and Sydney and which will be placed at the disposal of shipowners and others requiring this service whenever required. Steamers and tugs are located at Sydney and Louisburg and also at Halifax.

Mr. McKENZIE: What steamers are located at Louisburg?

Mr. HAZEN: The tugs Duglas Thomas and C. M. Winch are located at Sydney in summer and Louisburg in winter. The steamers located at Louisburg in summer are the Cabot, the Cacouna, the Cape Breton and the Louisburg; of course they are not there all the time.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is there any report from the Dominion Coal Company on the services they rendered last year as a wrecking concern?

Mr. HAZEN: There is such a report.

Mr. McKENZIE: Complaints have been made that the Dominion Coal Company, as a wrecking concern, is not a success. Unfortunately, and what is a very unusual thing, three foreign vessels went ashore in a dense fog, on the island of Scatari, last summer. The consul of the nation to which one of these ships belonged complained that they could not obtain any assistance from the Dominion Coal Company.

Mr. HAZEN: Do you know the names of these ships?

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not; but one of them was a Norwegian vessel. I do not make any complaint, but I think it is only fair to say that these vessels are not what might be called stationed at Louisburg in the summer, nor would that be contended for by the company. These vessels are carrying coal between Sydney and Montreal in summer and it is quite possible they may be for a little while at Louisburg, but they do not load coal there unless they are going to Boston or some New England port. I bring this matter to the attention of the minister so that he may make inquiry into what service the country is getting for the money paid to the Coal Company as a wrecking concern.

Mr. HAZEN: I will make inquiry. I understand my hon. friend to say that a complaint has reached his ear from the Norwegian consul or from some other consul. I can understand that persons may not wish to make a public complaint but if my hon. friend will send me the facts privately, I shall be much obliged to him. We want a proper service for money we pay and if we are not getting it we should know the reason why. If my hon. friend can give me privately more information than he would like to give in the House, I will have the matter very thoroughly inquired into, without involving names.

Mr. McKENZIE: I shall be happy to get particulars from the person I have in mind, and I will hand the information to the minister. I can assure the minister that I have nothing at all but the most friendly relations personally with the Dominion Coal Company, but if they are getting money out of the treasury of this country they should certainly render a suitable service for it.

Mr. LAW: Did the minister say there is a wrecking plant at St. John?

Mr. HAZEN: I said that during the winter the tug Springhill of the Dominion Coal Company was located at St. John. In addition to that, this winter, in consequence of representations we received, and there being a large amount of shipping in St. John, we made arrangements with the company that supplies the wrecking plant at Quebec, and

they stationed the large tug Strathcona with pumps and wrecking appliance, at St. John for service in the Bay of Fundy. The arrangement I made with that wrecking company was that we would guarantee them five thousand dollars. If they earned five thousand dollars we would have to pay nothing, but we had to ensure that they would receive five thousand dollars in any event. I think the arrangement was a very good one. Of course, if there was a wreck of any importance, they would easily earn an amount larger than we guaranteed.

Mr. LAW: Did any of these boats come to the wreck of the Navarre, bound from St. John to the old country, which occurred near Yarmouth, about the beginning of this year?

Mr. HAZEN: I know that our own boats went down there, but I am not certain as to the Lord Strathcona. However, I have no doubt she was available if her services were wanted by the owners of the ship.

Mr. LAW: I am very sorry the minister did not carry out the recommendation which I made to him last year, and I shall now repeat it. A great many wrecks occur at the mouth of the Bay of Fundy south of Yarmouth.

Mr. HAZEN: Not so very many.

Mr. LAW: Quite a number; almost every winter there are one or two steamers wrecked on the Gaunet Rock ledges or some of the Tusket islands. Last year I recommended that the minister should enter into an arrangement with Messrs. Hugh Cann and Son, Limited, of Yarmouth, who have a large number of boats, to look after wrecks that occur in that vicinity. If the minister had taken my advice, he would have a more satisfactory arrangement than that which exists at present. If a wreck occurs in the vicinity of Yarmouth, a considerable time must elapse before a boat can reach the wreck from St. John, and if an arrangement were made with this Yarmouth firm I believe it would result in the saving of lives and property. I hope that before long the minister will see his way to make such an arrangement as I have suggested.

Mr. MARCIL: What are the arrangements with the wrecking company on the lower St. Lawrence

Mr. HAZEN: The Quebec Salvage and Wrecking Company maintains the Lord Strathcona and such other craft as may be required to the satisfaction of the department, from the 1st of May to the 1st of November each year, on payment of a subsidy subject to certain conditions.

Mr. MARCIL: That applies to below Quebec as well as to above Quebec?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. MARCIL: Outside of the wreck of the Empress of Ireland, were the wrecks more numerous this year than last year?

Mr. HAZEN: The Empress of Ireland was the only wreck this year that was of any importance; the others were minor wrecks and little damage occurred.

Mr. MARCIL: Some of these wrecks were owing to defects in aids to navigation.

Mr. HAZEN: I do not think there was any such finding by the commissioner.

Mr. MARCIL: Was there any increase in insurance rates up to the 1st of August last?

Mr. HAZEN: I do not think there was any appreciable increase up to the 1st of August.

Ocean and river service—Unforeseen expenses, $5,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: I desire to call the attention of the minister to a service rendered last year to the fishermen in the harbour of Ingonish. I do not know whether any claim has been put in for it with the department. In the early part of the year 1914, the fishing was very poor, but what they call the fall fishing was particularly good. It was made possible for the fishermen because a steam tug called the Nelson was fishing in the harbour and its owner broke the ice, making a track around the harbour which the gasoline and other boats could use and so get out to sea. In this way scores of boats were enabled to enjoy good fishing. The fishermen were talking of making a claim on the department for some slight recognition of the services rendered by the owner of this vessel. I should like to have the Government bear the matter in mind if an application is made. The expense would be small.

Mr. MARCIL: Is there no application for life-saving stations?

Mr. HAZEN: That has been transferred to the Department of the Naval Service.

Mr. MARCIL: The minister will remember that at the last regular session I called his attention to the fact that there was not a single life-saving station on the whole

Gulf of St. Lawrence. I do not know if anything has been done since then. The minister will recognize the importance of having several such stations in the gulf.

Mr. HAZEN: We have been considering the matter, and hope to meet the hon. gentleman's wish.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: I desire, when the life-saving appropriation is under discussion to get some information. The boathouse of the life-saving service at Souris was moved, but I think that the present location is not as good as the former one. Also the building was somewhat injured in the removal. I wish to know how much it cost to remove this building, who recommended the removal, whether the new site has been purchased, and, if so, what it cost.

Mr. HAZEN: We will get the information for my hon. friend.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. Robert Rogers the House adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

Tuesday, February 23, 1915.

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

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill No. 48, to incorporate Austral Insurance Company.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill No. 49, respecting The Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—Sir James Aikins.

Bill No. 50, respecting The Canadian Western Railway Company.—Sir James Aikins.

Bill No. 51, respecting The Kettle Valley Railway Company, and to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company.—Mr. Green.

Bill No. 52, respecting The Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company. —Mr. G. V. White.

Bill No. 53, to incorporate The Marcil Trust Company.—Hon. Chas. Marcil.

Bill No. 54, respecting The Toronto Terminals Railway Company.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill No. 55, to incorporate Vancouver Terminal Railway Company.—Mr. Stevens.

INSURANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

RENEWABLE TERM POLICIES.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 56, to amend the Insurance Act, 1910. He said: The Bill deals simply with that class of life insurance policies known as renewable term policies, under which a man takes out a policy for six months or a year and is called upon to pay an increased premium each time that he renews it. Such policies as at present issued give a schedule of the rates which each man will have to pay, the premiums increasing steadily until he reaches the age of sixty; but the insurance company gives him no assurance as to what will happen when he reaches that age or after he passes it. The man finds that when he is sixty years of age he is at the mercy of the insurance company, and has to pay enormous premiums or lose all the money that he has paid in premiums up to that time. This Bill gives him an option at any time to exchange that policy for what is known as an ordinary life level premium policy by paying to the company the difference in the premiums that he would have paid, with compound interest computed yearly, so as to make the policy equitable to every one. That is the purpose of the amendment. It is not the custom to debate a Bill on its first reading, so I will defer any further remarks until the second reading.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS ACT AMENDMENT.

MEMBERS ON ACTIVE SERVICE.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 57, to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act. He said: The purpose and effect of this Bill is to render eligible to and capable of sitting in this House and of sitting in the Senate all officers and men in active service in the military or naval forces, notwithstanding the fact that they receive the pay pertaining to their position as such; and furthermore to provide that in the computation of days of absence on the part of any member of either House, any days during which he may be absent on active service in the military or naval forces shall not be computed.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PROPOSED INCREASE IN FREIGHT RATES.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. TURRIFF: A few days ago I asked the Prime Minister if the Government had taken any steps to appoint counsel to

protect the rights of the people in connection with the coming meeting of the Railway Commission to consider a proposed general increase in freight rates. Is the right hon. gentleman now in a position to answer my question?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is the intention of the Government to appoint counsel.

FEDERAL LABOUR BUREAU.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: Is it the intention of the Government to introduce this session any legislation looking to the creation of a federal labour bureau?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Minister of Labour has had the subject under consideration. I cannot give my hon. friend a definite answer to-day, but if he will repeat his inquiry later, we will be prepared to make an announcement.

THE BUDGET.

PROPOSED WAR TAXATION.

Consideration of the proposed motion of Hon. W. T. White (Minister of Finance) for Committee of Ways and Means, resumed from February 11.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): In resuming the debate on the motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means, let me point out that a review of the Budget speech or financial statement of the Minister of Finance naturally involves three main considerations: the war supply; the ordinary or civil supply; and the ways and means proposed to supplement the existing sources of revenue.

A few words indeed will suffice to express my views regarding the war supply, which has been outlined in the Budget speech of the Finance Minister, and by resolution. In August last, the war supply Bill amounting to $50,000,000, was submitted to Parliament by the Government, and was speedily and unanimously voted. In the same prompt, generous and patriotic spirit will the representatives of the people vote the proposed war supply of $100,000,000. Engaged in one of the most momentous as well as one of the most tragic of wars known to human history, we are fortified by the strong belief that it is a war not for domination but for the preservation of our national and individual liberty; a war for the extermination of military autocracy and the perpetuation of democratic institutions and rule by the people; a war to enforce the submission of nations to their treaty obligations and to the well established principles of international law; a war to redress the wrongs committed against an outraged people and to restore to a kingdom its sovereignty and its soil. In these circumstances, enjoying an unshaken belief in the justice of our cause, let me say, Mr. Speaker, that His Majesty's loyal Opposition will with promptitude and unanimity facilitate the passage of the War Supply Bill of $100,000,000, and we shall ever stand ready to supplement the same in order to continue the struggle to a successful issue and until peace under proper terms may be safely assured.

In doing this, however, we impose one condition upon and exact one promise from the Government: a strict accountability for the destination of the moneys so voted and a faithful realization on its part of the great trust resting upon it. The people of Canada expect from the Government unceasing vigilance against departmental follies and laxities, and dishonest contractors and patronage brokers. Nothing should more instantly provoke the overwhelming indignation of Canada than the thought that money voted for war purposes was diverted from its true destination by the profane hands of dishonest contractors and vendors, patronage brokers and party camp followers, and more so if it occurs owing to the lack of vigilance or duty on the part of the national trustees, the Government. I realize it to be too true that in Canada the public sense respecting Government expenditures is not so delicately and correctly adjusted as it should be, and it frequently appears but like the voice of one crying in the wilderness to protest; yet I feel it to be our duty to fortify as much as we can by protest the weak places in public expenditure. Having said this, I shall no longer direct your attention to that feature of the Budget programme.

Upon the balance of the Budget programme I find myself in unqualified conflict with the Government. Our national expenditure, revenue and taxation is a domestic affair, always demanding the most careful and mature consideration, not less in war than in peace, but rather more. National and individual interests to-day call louder than ever in our history for a frank, critical consideration of what might be termed this year, the civil Budget. We are on the threshold of a new era in Canada. New economic issues of tremendous

importance are on the horizon. Old issues are likely to pass away, other problems are before us. We must abandon many of our national practices. National finance, as Gladstone once remarked, is more concerned with expenditure than with revenue. There never was a time in our history when a critical examination of our finance was so necessary as to-day, because we have had from the Minister of Finance the most disastrous financial statement ever delivered by a Finance Minister. Therefore, while intending to do no violence to a reasonable construction of the public sense of a party truce, I propose at some little length dealing with the matter of expenditure.

Therefore I approach consideration of the matter of our ordinary revenue and expenditure. It being some days since the Minister of Finance delivered his Budget, I wish to refresh the memories of honourable gentlemen by repeating the summary of the financial statement made by him in respect to the fiscal years 1915 and 1916. The financial operations for the year ending March 31 next are estimated about as follows:

Revenue, (estimated).		$130,000,000
Expenditure ordinary.	$140,000,000	
Capital and special.....	50,000,000	190,000,000
Deficit for 1914-15		$ 60,000,000

The result of our financial operations for the year ending March 31 next will therefore show an excess of ordinary and capital and special expenditure over revenue, to the extent of $60,000,000, which will accordingly increase our debt to that extent, being the greatest in any year since Confederation. To this, of course, must be added the war expenditure for 1914-15 which the minister estimates will reach the amount authorized, $50,000,000. Including this amount the addition to the public debt will exceed $110,000,000. I do not wish to emphasize the war expenditure at the moment—in fact I mean to exclude it altogether from my remarks and calculations—but rather the fact that our ordinary and capital expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1915, will exceed the revenue by about sixty million dollars, increasing the net public debt by that amount.

Let me summarily state the conclusions reached by the Minister of Finance respecting the next fiscal year. The estimated revenue and expenditures for 1915-16, calculating revenue on the basis of taxation in force prior to the presentation of the Budget speech a few days ago, is as follows:

Revenue (on previous tariff duties)		$120,000,000
Ordinary expenditure.	$140,000,000	
Capital and special expenditure..	40,000,000	
Investments, Treasury bills and bank indebtedness	24,000,000	
War expenditure... ..	100,000,000	
		304,000,000
Excess of expenditure..		$184,000,000

Eliminating again entirely the war expenditure, it will be seen that calculating revenue upon the basis of the old tariff taxation, we were face to face with an estimated deficit of eighty-four million dollars, for the next fiscal year. Taking, therefore, the present and the next fiscal years together, we find that our total expenditures, exclusive of war expenditure, will probably exceed revenue, calculated on the former customs and excise rates, by over $144,000,000.

The Minister of Finance proposes meeting this situation partially by special and tariff taxation, and to the extent he recovers revenue from such sources the deficits I have stated will be reduced.

These figures, which disregard altogether war expenditures, disclose a condition in our finances which is indeed serious and calls for our careful consideration. Might this situation have been avoided by a sound businesslike administration of the public services? Is the Government wholly or partially responsible for this condition in our finances? Were the supplemental taxation measures introduced by the Minister of Finance avoidable under careful administration of public affairs? Were the causes producing the condition avoidable? These are questions which are agitating the people of Canada to-day. These are questions which we, as the parliamentary representatives of the people, must seriously consider and examine. While not a popular subject for exposition, I must discuss with some particularity the matters involved in these questions. I think I shall be able to show that our present financial condition was almost entirely avoidable, that it is due to an utter disregard of public interests and the lack of sound administration of the public services. I think I shall be able to show that the Government deliberately and in the face of warning, brought about our present financial condition, that they never did and are not to-day making an effort to maintain the equilibrium between revenue and expenditure, and place public expenditure upon a sound basis. They are almost entirely responsible for our present financial position. It was once remarked of the financial record of one

of the governments of Great Britain in office a few years ago that, "they were the heirs of a highly solvent estate; they have reduced it to a declaration of partial insolvency." Might not the same observation be made to-day respecting this Government?

On this side of the House we long ago prophesied the present condition of our finances. From the first day hon. gentlemen opposite assumed the treasury benches they gave great promise of prodigality in expenditure and regarded it even as a virtue. Extravagance has characterized their expenditures ever since. The country was promised and expected something quite different. The present Government party, when in Opposition, promised, if elected to power, a reduction in public expenditure. The late Government's ordinary expenditure was characterized as extravagant and wasteful. When in 1910 ordinary expenditure was about eighty million dollars, the present Prime Minister was so seriously alarmed and impressed with its magnitude that he declared it to be prima facie evidence of corrupt expenditure. They promised time and again by their leaders that if honoured with the confidence of the electorate, they would carry on the public services for a much less sum. And they professed much regard for the sanctity of public pledges given by political leaders. In their election handbook of 1911, I find this:

> If there is one thing more clear than another in the government of a democratic country it is that political leaders should be held to a strict account for their pledges, and platforms. These form the basis of the contract between them and the electorate. These undertakings are solemnly given. They are not actionable in Courts of Law ,and therefore all the more should they be held cognizable in the great moot courts of the people, and their terms rigidly exacted.

Let us see if they have observed faithfully their pledges. Under this code of political ethics are they guilty or not guilty? What are the facts regarding their ordinary or consolidated fund expenditures? Here are a few figures showing ordinary expenditures since 1910:

1910	$ 79,411,749 12
1911	87,774,198 32
1912	98,161,440 77
1913	112,059,537 41
1914	127,384,472 99
1915	140,000,000 00
1916	140,000,000 00

Does this show a fulfilment of their public pledges? Do these figures indicate restraint or prodigality in expenditure? If an ordinary expenditure of $79,000,000 in 1910 was prima facie evidence of corrupt expenditure, are not honourable gentlemen constrained to admit that an expenditure of $140,000,000 in 1915 is a plea of actual guilt? The expenditure of $140,000,000 in 1915 is almost double that of 1910, and I have no doubt that were it not for the little restraint that actual conditions have enforced upon them, the ordinary expenditure of 1915 would be more than double that of 1910. Such, doubtless, was their intention, for the amount voted for ordinary expenditure in 1915 was over $156,000,000. When the late Government came into power in 1896, ordinary expenditure was $36,949,000, and in 1910, fourteen years after, it was but $79,411,000; a little more than double the amount, and that was in a period of prosperity and development and rising revenues. The present Government have almost managed to double in less than four years, the expenditure of 1910, which they charged was prima facie evidence of corruption. Let me put this question to honourable gentlemen. Has any substantial change occurred in Canada since 1910 in respect to our material condition, our needs and necessities, to drive ordinary expenditure from $79,000,000 in 1910 to $140,000,000 in 1915? Let hon. gentlemen answer.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: May I ask whether my hon. friend regards a considerable portion of the expenditure as unjustifiable?

Mr. MACLEAN: I do, and I propose to prove it later on.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Did my hon. friend move against any of it in the House?

Mr. MACLEAN: I fail to see how the absence of a formal motion relieves the Government of its responsibility.

There is another way of looking at the matter. Was the increased expenditure for 1913, 1914, 1915, and the proposed expenditure for 1916 accompanied by a corresponding increase in revenue? Has it that doubtful justification even? Let us appeal to the arbitrament of the actual figures, starting with the year 1912-13, the first full year in which honourable gentlemen were in power after the elections of 1911.

Revenue.	From all sources.	Ordinary expenditure.
1912-13	$133,212,743 67	$112,059,537 41
1913-14	126,143,275 31	127,384,472 99
1914-15	130,000,000 00	140,000,000 00
1915-16	120,000,000 00	140,000,000 00

In order to make a fair comparison, in these figures I have estimated the customs and excise revenue for 1915-16 on the basis of taxation prevailing before the recently

added taxation. What does this disclose? Falling revenue and rising expenditure. For 1916 they do not suggest a reduction in expenditure. They propose continuing it at $140,000,000, as in 1915, knowing full well that customs and excise revenues on the basis of the taxation in force a few weeks ago would very materially fall and produce a much smaller revenue. "Oh, no," says the Minister of Finance. "We must count upon ordinary expenditure for 1916 reaching the amount of $140,000,000 the same as for 1915, notwithstanding a falling revenue; but we will just impose more taxation to meet the deficit, that is all." No reduction in expenditure, but more taxation to increase the revenue. They decide first what they shall expend, and then consider how they are going to get the revenue. Would it not have been prudent first to determine what the country could reasonably pay in taxation in 1915-16, and afterwards determine the amount and character of expenditures? I ask honourable gentlemen if this criticism is not just? Is not the conduct of the Government in the circumstances open to the gravest censure? Was not this a fitting season for the Government to practise economy and implement its pre-election pledges?

Let us look at it from another point. Do trade conditions warrant it? Did not trade figures for the past three years stand as a storm signal to the Finance Minister? Let us look at the volume of our total export and import trade since 1913. It is as follows:

1912-13..	$1,085,264,449
1913-14..	1,129,744,725
1914, calendar year.. ..	860,615,163

More than a year ago the Government had evidence of declining trade. The official figures give the total trade for 1914 at only about $40,000 over 1913, and this was due to the abnormal fall exports of wheat in 1913 owing to an early harvest. The Government know that the total trade of the present fiscal year will be much below last year's, and that next year, 1915-16, the decline will probably be greater still; and yet in the face of such facts and in the light of such knowledge, we are calmly informed that ordinary expenditure for 1916 will be $140,000,000. What have honourable gentlemen to say to this?

I have been speaking in general terms, and it might well be asked of me to point out with some particularity the expenditure increases I object to, what departments of the public service I complain against in respect to expenditure, and where and how I would suggest reductions in expenditures for the coming year. I propose to do this, and I think I can present a case which the hon. gentlemen will find difficult to answer. If I fail it will not be for the want of facts. It will be due to my inability to marshall and present actual facts as they are. I feel sure that the record of the expenditures of the Government during the past few years carries its condemnation.

I have prepared a statement showing the expenditures of several of the important departments or branches of the public service, but not including the Militia Department which I purposely eliminate for the moment, for the years 1911-12, 1913-14, and the expenditures estimated and to be voted for 1915-16, and I invite the careful attention of the House to the several increases. The figures for 1914-15 are not available, and I take the estimated expenditures for 1915-16 as they would be practically the same, and for the further reason, that I am seeking to establish the view that our proposed expenditures for 1915-16 are, in view of all existing conditions, enormously excessive, and the failure to reduce them the real cause of the freshly imposed taxation. The statement is as follows:

	Expenditures by Departments.		
	1911-12.	1913-14.	1915-16 Estimated.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Civil Government	4,774,678 00	5,607,794 95	7,024,253 41
Fisheries	843,856 98	1,229,519 19	1,561,400 00
Mines, Geological Survey	261,718 83	470,506 66	547,275 00
Immigration	1,364,999 93	1,893,297 77	1,875,000 00
Quarantine	182,392 43	220,927 83	248,000 00
Indians	1,756,565 46	2,182,470 95	2,254,928 00
Public Works	10,344,487 21	19,007,512 63	22,351,830 46
Customs	2,443,846 23	3,849,983 86	4,215,000 00
Dominion Lands	2,277,099 87	3,286,480 25	3,475,079 50
Post Office	9,172,035 47	12,822,058 44	16,677,355 25

Now, let me examine these severally. Let us inquire in a spirit of fairness if they are open to criticism. Let us inquire if there exist the facts to prove that degree of reckless and improvident administration of some branches of the public service which merits criticism and the withdrawal of confidence by the people in the Government. First, let me take the expenditures for Civil Government which cover salaries and contingencies of all the departments, at Ottawa, the High Commissioner's office at London, and the salaries of the lieutenant governors of the provinces. What is the record of increases in this branch of the service?

Civil Government Expenditure.

1911-12..	$4,774,678 00
1913-14..	5,607,794 95
1915-16..	7,024,253 41

We find that the cost of Civil Government in 1911-12 was $4,744,678.00; for 1913-14, two years later it was $5,607,795.95, an increase of $663,116.95; for 1915, $6,850,257.91 was voted and it looks as if it would all be expended by March 31, 1915, an increase over 1911-12 of $2,000,000, an increase of $1,342,461.96 over 1914. For 1915-16, we are asked to vote $7,024,253.41, which in round figures is nearly $200,000 over 1915, $1,500,000 over 1914, $2,300,000 over 1912. These figures speak in condemnation of the Government more effectively than I can, and I leave them to hon. gentlemen for food and reflection. Has anything occurred in this country to justify this increase within the past thirty-four months? Does increased revenue, expenditure, trade, immigration, productions, or an improved public service account for it? This can only be accounted for by unnecessary additions of officials and increases of contingent expenses. Some increase was inevitable, but it is beyond human credibility that any justification exists for this enormous increase within such a short period. What have hon. gentlemen opposite to say about this? The ministers to-day say, we cannot reduce the service without inflicting hardships. My reply is that if the unnecessary increases had not been made there would be no decreases necessary to provoke hardships.

A return recently presented to Parliament is my authority for the statement that some 10,000 additions were made to the Civil Service list, in both the outside and inside service, I assume, in about the period of two years. This number of additions may be capable of some explanation, but quite inconsequential. In the time of the present Government the Civil Service has been prostituted for political exigencies at the expense of the country while deteriorating the character and value of the Civil Service.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL: Would the hon. gentleman be in favour at the present moment of reducing all civil servants' salaries say by ten per cent?

Mr. MACLEAN: What I want to point out to my hon. friend is that under a sound administration of the public service of this country the cost of civil government would be two millions of dollars less to-day than it is, and there would be no necessity for my hon. friend to ask such a question.

Take Indian expenditure, which for the same period is as follows:

1911-12..	$1,756,565.46
1913-14..	2,182,470.95
1915-16..	*2,244,928.00

*To be voted.

Here the increase in 1914 over 1912 was just a little short of $425,000. The Estimates to be voted for 1916 are again in excess of 1912 by $588,000. The administration of this department has increased in every province. In Nova Scotia I see it has increased seventy-five per cent in two or three years. The increase in salaries for Indian Affairs for next year in Nova Scotia alone makes an increase of 140 per cent over the present year, 1914-15. A recent return showing dismissals and appointments by departments credits the Indian Affairs branch with 135 dismissals and 295 engagements in about two years. This means that for every vacancy created there were two appointments made. In this branch unnecessary offices have been created, not for the good of the service or the Indians, but for friends of the Government. The increase since 1911 has been about $750,000, an amount no one will believe to have been necessary.

The increases in Fisheries expenditures are as follows:

1911-12..	$ 843,856.98
1913-14..	1,229,519.00
1915-16..	*1,561,400.00

*To be voted.

Here we find for 1914 an increase of $385,663 over 1912, and the Estimates for next year, 1915-16, exceed 1912 by $717,000, and this, notwithstanding the fact that a part of the staff in the Fisheries branch will next year be in the Naval branch of the department, which diminishes the Civil Service vote of the Fisheries branch by $100,000. An examination of the ser-

vices performed by this department will disclose nothing to justify this increase.

Next, take the Mines and Geological Survey expenditures:

1911-12..	$261,718.83
1913-14..	470,506.66
1915-16..	*547,275.00

*To be voted.

In the Mines and Geological Survey branch the increase for 1914 over 1912 is $208,787.83, while for 1915-16 over 1911-12 it is over $285,000. The amount to be voted for salaries alone for the Mines and Geological Survey for 1915-16 is $358,775, being $97,000 more than the total expenditure of all kinds in this department in 1912, and $114,500 more than the total expenditures of all kinds in 1910-11. This branch of the service has the record of 103 engagements of officials in two years, which pretty well tells the story, and I shall not say further about it other than to observe that the increase in a great measure would never have been incurred if the good of the service was the only motive. Examine it critically or otherwise and you are bound to reach the conclusion that the increase is almost indefensible.

4 p.m.

Let me next inquire into Immigration expenditure just a little carefully. The figures for this period are:

1911-12..	$1,364,999.93
1913-14..	1,893,297.77
1915-16..	*1,875,000.00

*To be voted.

In 1911-12 the cost of this branch of the service was $1,364,999.93. In 1913-14 it was about $500,000 greater, over $800,000 greater than in 1910-11. For the ten months ending January 31, 1913, the expenditure was about equal to the total of expenditures for 1911-12, or $1,301,399, and let me with emphasis call your attention to the fact we are asked to vote $1,875,000 for 1915-16. The business of this department is immigration. While its expenditures were increasing, let us see how its business was getting along. In 1911-12 we had an immigration of 354,257, whereas in the calendar year 1914 it was 168,859, just about one-half. In 1915 our immigration will probably be from 50,000 to 75,000, and the amount we are asked to vote for that year is $1,875,000, which is $500,000 in excess of expenditures of 1911-12, when we had an immigration of 354,000, and about the same as the expenditure of 1913-14 when we had an immigration of 384,878. The return respecting dismissals and appointments credits this department with 110 dismissals and 343 engagements in about two years, which gives the scent to a great deal of the extravagance. I think the few facts I have given about this branch of the service cannot fail to impress one. It is expensively operated. The amazing fact is this, that apparently they do not propose cutting down expenditures, notwithstanding our financial condition and the almost complete loss of immigration. Their policy is to keep up expenditures and increase taxation, notwithstanding that the business of the department is at a standstill.

Next, take Dominion Lands expenditures, closely related to the immigration service. Let me give you the revenue and the expenditure since 1912 in connection with this branch of the service:

	Revenue.	Expenditure.
1911-12...	$3,775,856 97	$2,277,098 87
1912-13..	3,402,026 63	2,462,623 92
1913-14..	3,036,030 32	3,286,480 25
1914-15..	*2,996,271 39	†4,063,120 36
1915-16..		‡3,457,000 00

* Estimated. † voted. ‡ To be voted.

You will have noticed how revenue since 1912 has been declining and expenditure increasing. In 1914 there was a deficit of $250,000 in this service, the first since 1885. In 1915 there will be a deficit of probably over $500,000. Unless the Minister of the Interior undertakes heroic measures, he will soon have a deficit of $1,000,000 and more in this department. There is no defence whatever for the financial record of this service for the past few years. For 1916 there should be a reduction in the Estimates of expenditure of from $1,000,000 to $2,000,000. With declining revenue and diminishing immigration and homesteading, we have increasing expenditure. The homestead entries for the past three years show the following decline:

	No. of entries.	Acreage.
Fiscal year ending March 31, 1913..	33,699	5,391,840
Fiscal year ending March 31, 1914..	31,829	5,092,640
Calendar year, 1914..	25,623	4,099,680

It cannot be asserted truthfully that this vast increase in the administration of Dominion lands has any business justification, or was necessary for the welfare of the service and the protection of public interest. The business of the department did not warrant such increasing costs of administration. Expenditures made for purely political and partisan purposes is the open sesame to the business record of this department.

Let us inquire briefly into Customs expenditures. A comparison of Customs revenue, with the cost of collection for say five years, might be of interest:

Year ending March.	Revenue.
1911	$ 71,838,088 46
1912	85,051,872 18
1913	111,764,698 73
1914	104,691,238 43
1915	*77,000,000 00
	Expenditure.
1911	$2,187,174 76
1912	2,443,846 23
1913	3,150,776 75
1914	3,849,083 86
1915	*4,000,000 00

*Estimated.

In 1911-12 it cost $2,187,174.76 to collect customs revenue amounting to nearly $72,000,000. For the year ending March 31 next, it will cost $4,000,000 or more to collect about $77,000,000 of revenue. No person, I may safely say, will be so presumptuous as to contend that the increased cost of this branch of the public service can be sustained by any fair consideration of the facts and circumstances. It is obvious that the service has been overmanned, that unnecessary outports have been established and unnecessary salaries paid, until a few short years of such practices have brought about the condition which the Minister of Customs admits is unsatisfactory. Besides, a great injustice is being done to those legitimately engaged in the service. In about two years, a return shows that in the Customs service there were 271 dismissals and 1,649 engagements. This tells the tale. The minister now says he cannot reduce the number of employees at the present time. A difficult task I grant you. I am pointing out the causes, not the effects, of the improper administration of the Customs service. The Minister of Customs is responsible for the causes bringing about the effects which he says can only be rectified by causing hardship. If it is difficult to repair the wrong by reduction in the service and expenditures he is to blame for that condition, and in that respect his administrative record is gravely censurable.

Just a few words as to Public Works expenditure on revenue account. In this case the figures are:

1911-12	$10,344,487 21
1913-14	19,007,512 63
1914-15	*20,000,000 00

*Estimated.

Here we find the expenditure for 1914-15 one hundred per cent greater than the year ending March 1912, when revenue and trade conditions were much more favourable. The Minister of Public Works asks for a vote for 1915-16 of over $22,350,000 which, roughly speaking, is about what he expended in 1914-15. I recognize the necessity of public works expenditure. I admit that works commenced cannot well be abandoned, but why should the expenditures of the present fiscal year and of the next fiscal year respectively exceed the expenditures of 1912 by $10,000,000? Does the Minister of Public Works pretend to say that the conditions of trade and revenue justify his expending $10,000,000 more this year in public works than was expended in 1912? The estimated expenditure for public buildings and harbours and rivers alone total $18,379,580 for next year; this might well have been reduced for the present by 50 per cent. I do not believe that the people of any province of Canada would have objected to the most drastic measures on the part of the Minister of Public Works during the present year and during the next fiscal year in connection with public works expenditure. Many of these projected works were without justification, the necessity for others have at least temporarily passed away by reason of the declining business of the country. Expenditures for these purposes should have been reduced to the minimum this year and next year. And bear in mind that the expenditures to which I have referred do not include votes for dredging and dredging plants nor for other public works of an important or national character, whether proposed to be made under ordinary or capital expenditure. In respect to public works expenditure is it not time to adopt some rational policy? Is not this the time to commence? Circumstances will compel us in the near future, and I believe public opinion is condemnatory of the present method of spending money on public works. In this respect the present Government have been great sinners.

The Post Office Department deserves much attention, but I can devote to it just a moment. That this branch of the public service would sooner or later come into disrepute under the administration of the late minister was inevitable. Cancelling unnecessarily existing contracts, awarding contracts without tender, awarding contracts to tenderers other than the lowest, was bound in the end to tell. I do not know what is the record of this department in respect to additional employment. It would rank high. Perhaps a few figures showing the revenue and expenditure for a few years would be profitable:

	Receipts.	Expenditure.
1910-11.	$ 9,146,952 47	$ 7,954,222 79
1911-12.	10,492,349 18	9,172,035 47
1912-13.	12,051,728 86	10,822,804 57
1913-14.	12,954,529 92	12,822,058 44

Here we find the usual surplus of one million dollars and over in recent years reduced to zero practically in 1913-14. In 1914-15 there will be a probable deficit of from $500,000 to $1,000,000, the first deficit since 1900, and probably a still greater deficit will be found in 1915-16. And why? Extravagant and inefficient administration affords the answer. There is no sound business reason for it. There may have been reasons for a small portion of this increase, but in the main it cannot be defended. For the past few years this department has been operated almost as much for political purposes as for the public service. One could easily present a strong and unanswerable indictment against the administration of this department during the past few years, time, however, will not permit it. Investigation of this department would disclose many of the causes necessitating the new taxation proposals of the Government.

Now, Sir, I have gone into these matters with some particularity, to lay the foundation for the contention that our proposed ordinary expenditures for the next year are excessive in the extreme, as the expenditures were last year. I have shown that the several branches of the public services have been carried on during the past three years with what appears indefensible extravagance. The same is true of most other departments. The gradually increasing annual cost of operating these branches of the public service has not been for the good of the service or for the necessities of the service, or rendered necessary by the business or trade of the country. If this condition is difficult to remedy this year it is chargeable to the Government itself which deliberately and improperly created such conditions. The estimated expenditure of $140,000,000 on revenue account for next year cannot be defended. Had the public services been administered during the past two or three years with solely an eye for the public good and the public service, the ordinary expenditure would for the present year be at least thirty or forty million dollars below the amount which will be expended, and the additions to the public debt for the present fiscal year would have been that much less, and the estimates for ordinary and capital expenditure for next year, 1915-16, might easily be $40,000,000 below what they are. No effort has been made towards reduction. Every effort is directed towards increase.

Will any man seriously argue that ordinary expenditure for the years 1915 and 1916 could not have been well kept within the amount of expenditures for the years 1912 and 1914 when they were in round figures respectively ninety-eight millions and one hundred and twelve millions of dollars. Why should not our ordinary expenditures this year have been within the 100-million dollar mark, and why should not the proposed expenditures of next fiscal year be within the same amount? The fiscal year 1910-11 was a fairly prosperous one. It is a year memorable in the history of both political parties. It was in that year that hon. gentlemen opposite were contending that we were so prosperous and our future so well assured, that we should engage in no tariff alliances with our neighbours. In that year, our ordinary expenditures were eighty-seven million dollars. Mr. Speaker, do you know, or does any hon. gentleman know a strong, substantial, incontrovertible reason why our expenditures for 1915-16 should be in excess of that amount, namely, eighty-seven million dollars? Under a careful administration of the public services, during the present fiscal year, and next, there need not have been any substantial deficit, if any, in respect to capital and ordinary expenditures over revenue. Consider our declining revenue, trade and immigration, the cessation of railway construction, that our borrowings from abroad have ceased, that the public debt interest account rose during the present year by nearly nine million dollars, that we face a probable annual pension charge of ten million dollars, that the world's capital is being dissipated by the great war now in progress—in view of all these and other circumstances prevailing during the past year and likely to continue during the next, can it be seriously contended that our current expenditure for 1914-15, and the proposed current expenditure for 1915-16 are justified? A reduction of fifty million dollars and more in ordinary and capital expenditure for 1915-16 would easily be possible if hon. gentlemen opposite were attempting to govern this country solely for the country's good. The Minister of Finance apparently has no control over his colleagues in respect to expenditures. He seems to be without influence among them. I venture to say that no impartial man can do otherwise than condemn the expenditure policy of the Government ever since they came into power, but

particularly of the present fiscal year and as proposed for the next; and it is for this reason that they are directly and conclusively responsible for the new taxation recently imposed upon the country. They could easily have avoided this fresh taxation, but they made not a single effort to do so. Do not the facts I have presented to the House conclusively sustain that contention?

In respect to its ordinary expenditures this year and next, the Government is apparently proceeding upon the theory that trade and revenue will suddenly resume its former proportions immediately after the end of the war. There is nothing to indicate that this will happen; in fact, the trend of opinion is to the contrary. Compare the course now being pursued by the present Minister of Finance with that of his predecessor in 1908 and 1909, when there was a slight recession in trade. In 1909 Mr. Fielding reduced his ordinary expenditures by over five million dollars, just the amount of the decline in customs revenue that year. A small amount, it is true, but based upon sound business principles. In that year there was an excess of revenue over ordinary expenditure of over twenty million dollars, but still in the circumstances Mr. Fielding felt justified, on account of the recession in trade and the decline in revenue, in reducing his ordinary expenditure below that of the previous year.

Let us now consider the methods that are proposed for meeting the Government expenditures—methods which I consider objectionable. In order to meet the estimated deficit of about $60,000,000 of capital and ordinary expenditure for 1915-16, over revenue calculated on the basis of the former rates of taxation, it is proposed to raise more revenue by special taxes, stamp taxes and increased customs taxes. We are informed that the war expenditures are for the time being to be met by borrowings from the British Government. Therefore it is quite clear that the additional taxation is made necessary by our excess of capital and ordinary expenditures over revenue. I understand hon. gentlemen opposite to contend that the fall in revenue and the fresh taxation imposed is due to the war. If I am not correct in this, let the correction come now. At any rate this point is worthy of investigation. I personally do not believe our loss in revenue is in any substantial degree attributable to the war.

I would here like to remind Government supporters that they have always contended that an excess of imports over exports was to be deplored, and that an equality was the condition to be desired. During the past year imports have diminshed considerably while our exports have pretty well maintained the normal. We therefore find that close relation between imports and exports which Government supporters claim should prevail. I ask the Minister of Finance if that condition of affairs to-day appears to be productive of good results. And they are making things worse by encouraging this "buy in Canada" propaganda, which I am sorry to see members of this Parliament are supporting. I can understand local patriotism encouraging the purchase of local productions, when it is a reasonably fair thing to do so; but I cannot understand any sane man in this country encouraging the preposterous policy of discouraging purchases from abroad. That is but adding to the sorrows and difficulties of the Government. I would think that every man in this country who has reached the years of discretion would have learned in the first few weeks of the war the economic truism that to have exports you must have imports as well. The first few days of the present war must surely have impressed that lesson upon all men now living.

It is difficult to estimate to a nicety what will be the fall in revenue for the year ending March 31, 1915, due to the war or as a result of the war. Imports were declining, war or no war, with the consequent fall in revenues. I am of the opinion that our customs revenue will be found to have fallen but little this year as the result of the war. Our customs revenue for the year ending March, 1914, was $104,691,000; for the year ending March, 1915, it is estimated at the Customs Department at $77,000,000, a decline of $27,000,000. I have here a table showing our dutiable imports, and the duty collected each month during the calendar years 1913 and 1914:

Month.	Imports on Dutiable Goods.		Duties Collected.	
	1913.	1914.	1913.	1914.
	$	$	$	$
January	34,358,564	26,234,666	8,862,982	7,029,888
February	35,111,113	25,511,846	9,152,220	6,822,925
March	45,630,678	34,944,885	11,912,314	9,337,771
April	32,431,932	23,945,085	8,463,576	6,458,271
May	40,120,651	28,346,934	10,306,244	7,619,746
June	37,836,560	27,794,320	9,684,724	7,414,597
July	39,394,223	26,424,70	10,077,223	6,988,917
August	39,277,690	29,497,076	10,125,376	8,358,948
September	37,997,562	22,575,997	9,906,183	6,016,606
October	35,238,192	21,061,440	9,198,657	5,657,871
November	32,338,858	18,697,737	8,346,778	5,113,062
December	28,798,409	17,482,008	7,845,300	4,953,048
Total, 12 months	438,534,432	302,516,964	113,881,577	81,771,650

From this you will see that the imports of dutiable goods from January to August, 1913, inclusive, eight months, was $304,-161,411; while for the corresponding eight months in 1914 it was $222,699,782, a decline of $81,461,629. The duties collected in the same period were respectively $65,224,434 and $46,931,171, a total decline of $18,293,263 in the first eight months of the calendar year 1914 as compared with the same period in 1913, or at the rate of about $2,285,000 a month, or $27,420 for the year. The total decline in customs revenue for the calendar year 1914 as compared with the calendar year 1913 was $32,109,927; so on this basis it might possibly be argued that the loss of revenue in 1914 attributable to war conditions was less than $5,000,000. That, I submit, is a fair method of computation. It would be necessary to have the customs returns for January, February and March of this year to ascertain accurately the loss of customs revenue in the fiscal year of 1915 as compared with 1914, but I venture to say no decline greater than $5,000,000 can by any fair system of computation be assigned to the war. The Government must have anticipated the present trade and revenue conditions. Many banking and commercial men in this country have stated during the past few weeks or months that the financial conditions were not due to the war, but were for other causes inevitable. The Government itself was alarmed over the conditions prevailing during the present fiscal year. I remember seeing in the press last June or July that an Order in Council had been passed to actually deport people from this country back to Europe.

Mr. ROGERS: That is not correct.

Mr. MACLEAN: I say I read it in the papers.

Mr. ROGERS: You must have been reading the Globe.

Mr. MACLEAN: I do not know whether it is correct or not, but the matter was very much discussed in the public press, and I should like to have some further explanation than a flat denial from the Minister of Public Works about it.

Mr. ROGERS: I will be glad to supply it.

Mr. MACLEAN: Tell me what the trouble was?

Mr. ROGERS: An hon. gentleman, last night, just before the House closed, asked that such an order, if it existed, be brought down. I asked the Secretary of the Privy Council, and he gave me this reply: "There is no Order in Council ordering the deportation of unemployed in Canada." It has not been passed.

Mr. MACLEAN: I am glad to hear it, but that is only evidence of the fact that no Order in Council was passed. I assume, in view of all that appeared in the public press, that the Government must have been considering the matter. I am bound to accept the word of the Minister of Public Works that no Order in Council was passed.

I have only occupied the time of the House upon this point to emphasize the fact that while hon. gentlemen opposite have

said, and will doubtless say in the future, that the falling revenue for the present fiscal year was due to the war, the contention is not entirely founded upon the facts. Some decrease in trade, some small decline in revenue, may be attributable to the consequences of the war, but hon. gentlemen opposite must remember that a great deal of our export and import trade during the past few months has been directly attributable to the war. Let the war bear its own consequences, its own sins. Let the Government take care of its own obligations and its own shortcomings. The Government were more alarmed over conditions last July than now with the war on our hands. I do not mean you could infer this from their expenditures. That would only prove that they have not and never had any concern about the condition of our finances. I should say in conclusion on this point that the excise revenues for 1915-16 will be about the same as for 1914-15.

Now, if the decline in revenue is not in the main attributable to the war, then the Minister of Finance should have boldly faced the situation to-day and he should have commenced a year ago or more by reducing expenditure to come within the revenues, and not by increasing taxation to produce revenue to meet expenditure. It was almost as easy to reduce expenditure to the amount of revenue as not to do so. This was not the time for increasing taxation in any form except strictly for war expenditures.

But there is to be a war expenditure of $100,000,000, and we will be told that for this reason alone fresh taxation was necessary. I would not deny the validity of that position if such were the fact. It has been the practice of belligerent nations to meet war expenditures by taxation and borrowings. If such were all the facts and only considerations in our case a good defence might be made for taxation for war purposes. However, the minister has arranged for war loans from the British Government during the continuance of the war. There is much to be said in favour of this. Canada was a borrowing country. Her loans amounted to from $250,000,000 to $300,000,000 a year. That has been cut off, and in this and other circumstances to borrow upon favourable terms during the war, funding the same after the war, is perhaps amply justified. If the Minister of Finance saw fit to declare to Parliament as his policy, the meeting of war expenditures partially by taxation and partially by borrowings, I think he could have found justification for so doing, and the Canadian taxpayer would have met his proposals in the proper spirit. But such is not the case, and I say his proposed special taxes and customs taxation are caused solely by the fact that his expenditures are and have been absurdly excessive, and he should have kept within his revenue and on the former basis of taxation. He can give no reason for not having done so. The Government and not the war is clearly responsible for the proposed taxation. Even if the proposed taxes were specially ear-marked and to be directly applied in reduction of war loans I do not see that the position of the Government would be improved or that they would thus be relieved of blame for our present position. In that case the deficit of consolidated fund account would have been all the greater and the additions to the net debts would have been just the same. In either event they are censurable.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman stated that annual borrowings of $250,000,000 to $300,000,000 had been suddenly cut off. Will the hon. gentleman give the cause? Do I understand him to say that it is caused by the war?

Mr. MACLEAN: I suppose that was due largely to the war, or to some extent at least, but even our borrowings were declining. I referred to the decline in the borrowings of the country as a justification for the minister in borrowing entirely the war expenditure.

At this time I am not going to discuss the taxation resolutions in so far as they relate to stamp and special taxation. If they were necessary, or were to be applied to war expenditures, I do not think they are open to serious objection as to principle, though they work some injustice and might be improved in detail. I think the tax upon proprietary medicines is so excessive as to be unjust and should yet be modified. That is all I propose to say about the stamp and special taxes until the resolutions are before the Committee of Ways and Means, except to repeat that their imposition was not necessary at this time under proper economies and administration.

Now, I wish to discuss several aspects of the freshly imposed tariff taxation, but in rather a general way. The desire of the average man in Canada regardless of politics is to search for a justification of tax-

ation imposed by a government during a war period. Ordinary patriotism prompts a generous consideration of such measures. Now the Government have decided that 25 or 30 million dollars of taxation shall be levied by increasing the general tariff 7½ per cent, the preferential tariff 5 per cent, and the making of all articles now on the free list, with some exceptions, subject to a 7½ per cent ad valorem duty, and a 5 per cent preferential rate. I have given this matter some little consideration since the announcement. I have honestly endeavoured to discover supporting facts for the tariff increases on any grounds and have failed. I have sought for a justification for the method employed and the principle invoked, for obtaining supplemental revenue, and I must say that the more thought I have given to it the more convinced am I that there exists no justification for the tariff resolutions. If we had to raise additional revenue surely this was not the proper method. The Minister of Finance sought the line of least resistance but apparently invoked no principle and gave no consideration to the interest of trade or tax payer.

Mr. PUGSLEY: He took the easiest way out.

Mr. MACLEAN: He took the easiest way to make a tariff. Having created these deficits and incurred these expenditures in an easy way, it was only natural
5 p.m. that he would resort to an easy method of obtaining additional revenue.

As hon. gentlemen know we have in Canada a tariff based on the protective system. To raise the general tariff 7½ per cent, to increase the preferential tariff rates 5 per cent and to say that it was done for purposes of revenue is a proposition to which I cannot subscribe. It is trifling with truth and the facts. That additions to the general and preferential tariff restrict trade and reduce revenue is axiomatic, and the proposal to increase protective tariffs in a war period is without parallel, I think. It does look as if under the banner of war the Government have brought into the citadel a tariff for protection and not one for revenue, and we are not even told how long the misnamed stranger is to be within our gates. The country was entitled to a declaration from the minister, that this increased tariff taxation was to remain operative only during the continuance of the war as a war tax, or that it was likely to continue indefinitely. It is, I predict, likely to continue in force in the main, so long as hon. gentlemen opposite are to remain in power.

Some hon. MEMBERS: That will not be long.

Mr. MACLEAN: Let us hope we will be relieved of the war and of the Government about the same time. On the day he delivered his Budget, and after announcing his tariff resolutions, the Finance Minister, concluded by a statement of the belief that his new tariff would produce revenue and stimulate Canadian industry and agriculture. Well if the new tariff is going to stimulate Canadian industry and agriculture then that tariff is here, just as long as the present Government is here, because if it is a stimulant to industry and agriculture, then we may always expect to hear it said that dread consequences will follow a withdrawal of the stimulant. I predict it will prove more of a depressent than a stimulant. Further, it seems to me that more political consideration entered into the making of the tariff than the consideration of producing revenue. Was it politics or principal that induced the minister to leave tea on the free list?

Mr. WILCOX: Does my hon. friend think there ought to be a duty on tea?

Mr. MACLEAN: I do not think there ought to be any special duties or stamp taxes upon anything. Was it political consideration advanced by political supporters in some provinces or his own business judgment that prompted this course in respect to tea? He could not have been expected to restore the tariff on the agricultural implements that he slightly reduced last year, amidst the plaudits of hon. gentlemen opposite. However, Government supporters cheered the other day when the tariff was increased on other agricultural implements for the stimulation of Canadian agriculture. How very strange this all seems. Here and there we find a sop to this interest or that interest, to this prejudice or that prejudice. Everything indicates that the new tariff was inspired by protection and politics and not revenue or patriotism. It is utterly bereft of principle or reason.

Now, what should be the main features of a war revenue tax? It should be made as much as possible on articles relatively cheap and of universal consumption; it should not be so high as to discourage consumption; it should be of such a nature that it could be remitted on the termination of the purposes for which it was imposed; it should be of such a nature that the

revenue would go directly and wholly, less collection charges, to the Treasury; it should not create new vested interests; it should not unduly contract trade; judged by these tests, and they are the tests usually applied in such circumstances, the tariff resolutions fail, and should not meet with favour from any person or class. To add 7½ per cent ad valorem to our present general tariff could not promote revenue or trade. It is a heavy increase. It must restrict consumption, because it means increased cost to producers and to consumers, particularly in a period when the purchasing power of the country is diminishing. A revenue might possibly be obtained by an increase of 7½ per cent in the tariff rates upon selected imports. Here and there items of imports might be found where this could be done with success from the revenue standpoint. Investigation would lead the way in selecting the articles. However, to increase horizontally the general tariff 7½ per cent, the preferential tariff 5 per cent, and the placing of the free list articles under the general tariff, without exception practically, without discrimination, without consideration of the different facts that might apply to one article and not another, without regard to the existing tariff rates, without cognizance of disrupted world trade conditions, without reference to the fact that many commodities principally produced by the belligerent nations are to-day unavailable, without thought of the business conditions to-day prevailing in Canada, is beyond comprehension, and can only be understood upon the theory that the tariff was intended for protective and not for revenue purposes; or that, maddened by the situation and the conflicting views of his friends and colleagues, the Minister of Finance concluded to revise the tariff with his eyes shut and his ears closed.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: Will the hon. gentleman give us his method of raising this taxation, which will measure up to the test which he has just suggested?

Mr. GAUVREAU: It is your duty to give it to us.

Mr. MACLEAN: My contention is that there is no necessity for any tariff increases. Surely the hon. gentleman must admit that if the Government which he supports had administered properly the financial affairs of this country, we would not have had a $60,000,000 deficit this year, and there would not have been an estimated deficit of $84,000,000 for next year.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: The same would apply to every country in Europe.

Mr. MACLEAN: In the first place the tariff increases were unnecessary, and secondly, in themselves they are most objectionable and supported by no principle.

Again, take the increase in the British preferential tariff. This tariff was established to promote trade with the mother country. In that respect it has been successful. It has encouraged a preference in the British market for Canadian productions and has given an impetus to the investment of Canadian securities in Great Britain. But the general tariff to-day as amended, is such as to diminish the value and destroy the purpose of the preferential tariff to Great Britain. The withdrawal of so much British shipping from the seas for war purposes, the excessive ocean freight rates and insurance rates, alone, at the present time have more than offset the advantages of the preferential tariff to British exporters. As matters stood there was protection amounting to almost prohibition, and still the Government add to it.

Further, when Britain is financing our war obligations, when her artisans are enduring fresh burdens, when sufficient and efficient labour is scarce for manufacturing purposes owing to the vast army of former artisans that are upon the battlefield, when ocean traffic and insurance rates alone minimize if not destroy the effect of the preferential tariff, what motive prompted a decrease of the preference to British importations? Surely in such circumstances British connection should have counted for something? It cannot be shown that it was done for the purposes of revenue. I think the preference to British imports might well have been increased, at least in many cases, and not decreased. For patriotic and for business reasons such action would in the circumstances have been justifiable. I venture to say, Sir, that the decrease in the tariff preference to the United Kingdom will not meet with a favourable response in Canada, and it must arouse some curiosity in Great Britain.

Again, is there any justification of any kind for the indiscriminate application of a 7½ per cent general tariff and 5 per cent preferential tariff on articles formerly on the free list? Does a tax on raw cotton, raw wool, rubber, hides, tin plate and a host of other articles tend to extend commerce? Will it expand or contract imports, trade or consumption? Will it increase or decrease labour? True, taxing

raw material which we do not produce and which enters into manufactured articles will give a revenue, but at what price, and at what cost to the public? Does not that principle violate every canon in the creed of protectionist and free trader alike, and do violence to common sense as well?

It is to be pointed out further that a tariff on raw material of 7½ per cent is more than compensated by a similar rate on the finished article. The manufacturer is being given additional protection on his labour and capital, and labour will get none of the advantage, for wages are being reduced. In manufactured articles the cost of raw material constitutes from one-third to one-half the cost of production per unit of the manufactured product, the rest being chargeable to labour and fixed charges. If you tax raw material the manufacturer is entitled, generally speaking, to a compensatory tariff on his finished article. But a tariff of 7½ per cent on raw material is more than compensated by a 7½ per cent increase on the finished article, and adds to the protection afforded to labour and capital invested, anywhere from 2½ to 5 per cent. The new tariff on iron ore is to be 6 cents per ton. It takes two tons of ore to produce a ton of iron, which is worth say $12. The added tax on the raw material to the iron-producer is 12 cents while he has an added compensatory tariff or protection, on the finished product of say 90 cents. If the iron ore is converted immediately into steel, say rails at $27 per ton, then the producer has an added protective tariff of $2.12 per ton. He is getting an increase in the general tariff which not only covers the tax upon his raw material, but gives him an additional tariff upon his labour and capital which, in the case of iron ore and pig iron, is the far greater part of the total cost of production. And we are informed that this has been done for purposes of revenue. In view of the conditions confronting the iron and steel trade, one would imagine it wise to encourage cheaper production in order to meet competition but the Government evidently is of the opinion that this increased tax will encourage trade.

Again, take the wool tariff. We imported under the free list in 1914, 7,252,109 lb. of raw wool, of which 4,000,000 lb., valued at $1,872,089, came from Great Britain. This to be taxed 7½ per cent under the general tariff and 5 per cent under the preferential tariff, and on the finished product the same rates are to be added to the present general and preferential tariffs. Just as in the case of iron, I say that the 7½ per cent upon the finished article is more than a compensatory tariff; it is protective to the extent of anywhere from 2½ to 3½ per cent. Will it give a revenue? Perhaps it will, but at what cost? It will increase the production cost of woollen goods, which the consumer will pay; accordingly it will curtail consumption, and the revenue will be disappointing. It gives the manufacturer a protection greater than he ever had before, and forsooth, it is called a revenue tariff. Our own consumption of woollen goods has decreased and will continue to be below the normal. We may import more wool than usual, if it can be purchased, but it will be largely for the manufacture of clothing for the Canadian and British troops. What does this mean? It means that the Canadian manufacturer of woollen goods who sells to the Department of Militia pays the duty on the raw wool to the Canadian Treasury, but the Militia Department pays it back to him again plus the added protection on labour and capital employed in producing goods. In other words, you make the manufacturer pay a sum into the Treasury and you provide the means by which he can get it back, with interest and profit, from the same Treasury. Let me point out two conditions to-day existing in connection with the wool trade. London, as you know, is the great wool market of the world. So great is Great Britain's desire to protect her wool reserves for war and domestic purposes, and to control prices, that it is to-day a customs regulation that we may import wool from the United Kingdom and Australia only upon the undertaking of the importer that it is to be used for the manufacture of goods in Canada, and that the said goods so manufactured can only be disposed of for use in Canada or for export to the United Kingdom. Perhaps I had better read the regulation:

> Having regard to the circumstances of their exportation to Canada, it is ordered that the undermentioned goods, when imported into Canada from the United Kingdom or from Australia, on arrival at the port of destination in Canada shall be entered "for warehouse," and shall be ex-warehoused only upon an undertaking by the importer in writing, on the face of the entry, to the satisfaction of the collector, that the materials herein describd shall be used only for the manufacture of goods in Canada, and that the goods so manufactured shall be sold or disposed of for use in Canada, or for export to the United Kingdom and not otherwise, viz.:
>
> Goods herein referred to: wool, raw (sheep and lambs), wool tops, wool noils, woollen and

worsted yarns, woollen and worsted cloth suitable for uniform clothing (not including women's dress stuffs or cloth with pattern), uniform clothing, cardigan jackets, woollen jerseys, woollen gloves, woollen socks, and men's woollen underwear of all kinds.

Now, what does this indicate? It shows that the world's supply of wool is below normal, and that the cost of raw wool is unusually high. That is a fact known to all. It also shows that an effort is being made to conserve our wool supplies in order to ensure supplies for British and Canadian troops and the citizens of Canada and the United Kingdom. Now, Sir, do you think that in the circumstances this was the time to tax raw wool, to add to the cost of clothing for domestic purposes and for our troops, or to enhance the amount the British Government is paying to carry on the war? I would flatter the Government if I said this was a penny wise and pound foolish policy. It is worse. From the patriotic, business and revenue viewpoints it is reprehensible. The action of the Government in this respect is inexplicable.

There is another reason why it was unwise to increase the wool tariffs at the present moment. The cost of raw wool is now inordinately high. The increase, I suppose, has been on the average 70 per cent since August last and high prices will be maintained for a long time. Why should the cost be added to now? Why should this article be selected for taxation, assuming additional revenue was necessary? Then it is to be pointed out that it is the coarse or cross-bred wools used in the cheaper grades of woollen goods and army supplies which have increased the most. The price of the finer wools used in the more expensive goods has increased but little. Therefore, the recent tariff amendments will be borne by the class of goods and class of consumers which can least afford it. The same is true of a great many other articles of consumption, such as rubber, hides, and other commodities too numerous to mention.

In respect to the cotton tariff it is to be particularly pointed out that the spread between the tariff rate on raw cotton and the finished product is more than compensatory to the manufacturer, it is protective by three or four per cent ad valorem, because of the low price of the raw material, and the small proportion of the finished product the raw material constitutes. Possibly the Government may obtain some revenue, but I doubt if it will be as great as they expect. The price of raw cotton was extremely low when the season opened in the United States last September, owing to want of shipping and the demoralization of the foreign exchanges, and doubtless Canadian manufacturers availed themselves of low prices and imported heavily. From September 1, 1914, to January 31, 1915, 37,038,294 pounds of cotton was imported into Canada of the value of $3,091,544. Considering the curtailment of domestic consumption and needs for the next year, this importation will meet the demand for raw cotton for a long time, and if so, not much revenue will come from cotton for the next ten months.

The Government are promoting a "greater production" campaign among agriculturists. Is it to be seriously argued that this was the opportune occasion to tax wire fencing and increase txation upon agricultural implements of many kinds, in fact almost everything which is a factor in agricultural production? Will this tariff stimulate agriculture? Will the placing of a tariff on many articles formerly free but produced only or largely in belligerent countries, such as drugs, certain woods and other articles, either stimulate trade, promote the welfare of our people, or afford additional revenue?

Is the imposition of 10 cents per ton upon bituminous coal in addition to its present specific duty of 53 cents per ton, a desirable thing to such portions of Canada as must import American coal, particularly at a time when our railway earnings are declining and they are applying for permission to increase traffic rates upon coal to the extent of 10 cents par ton? We imported into Canada in 1914, 10,817,536 tons of bituminous coal of the value of $21,838,319, upon which duties were paid to the amount of $5,733,294.08. This was largely imported by the railways and by manufacturers for steam purposes, largely in Western Quebec and throughout the province of Ontario. If the railways secure an increase of 10 cents per ton for freight between the international line and Canadian points, this, with the additional tariff of 10 cents per ton, will constitute an addition of 20 cents per ton to the cost. That is a tremendous increase. I do not know anything more calculated at the present moment to reduce wages of railway operators and factory employees, and that I am told is likely to happen, than the addition of 10 cents per ton to the cost of coal for locomotive and power purposes.

The tariff changes afford a fertile field for just criticism and discussion, but I must conclude.

This was not a time for increased taxation which will be burdensome to the people. Economy and reduction in unproductive expenditure should have been the watchword of the Government. All classes of people are practising economy, and in our cities many are standing in the bread line. This was a time for the Government to practise economy in expenditure and redeem their pre-election pledges. The country is looking to the Federal Government for leadership in economies. The Government might have pursued that policy quite easily, and had they done so there would have been no special taxation measure this year. Additional taxation was not immediately necessary for war purposes. But the Government having determined otherwise I submit that the taxation should have been for revenue purposes purely, and not for protective purposes, as the war itself works for the prohibition of international trade. It should not have added to the cost of the actual necessities of life, now extremely high, and in many instances with the supply already below the normal. It should not have been so designed as to tend to the contraction of trade. In taxing raw products and goods formerly free there should have been displayed some discrimination and discretion. The tariff taxation should have been of such a nature as to be easily remitted at the close of the war, and I do not believe that the major portion of it can or will be remitted at the end of the war. The British Preference should not have been decreased, though its increase might be justified. The proposals are altogether unnecessary and unjust. They will not accomplish to any great extent the purposes of the Government, while they will inflict unnecessary burdens upon the people, and put unnecessary obstacles in the way of the trade and commerce of the country. This is the view hon. gentlemen on this side of the House entertain in respect to the taxation measures of the Government, and I believe it is in harmony with the view of the great majority of the people of Canada.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto): Mr. Speaker, permit me to say on rising how pleased I was with the early remarks of my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean). His words and mental attitude were pleasing, and his party supported him in his remarks with regard to the war, and I am glad that the party opposite are in accord with this Government in the matter of expenditures necessary on account of war conditions. But from his remarks on the domestic part of the Budget the members of this House and the country might very well expect an eight or ten-months session over the $100,000,000 war vote to be brought down later, provided he fought it as he now proposes to fight this Budget. However, I will meet the hon. gentleman half way, and congratulate him upon the British feeling which actuates him, and indeed the whole country, in regard to the war. I take his remarks as an assurance that questions pertaining to the war will be dealt with in this House in an absolutely non-partisan spirit. That part of his speech devoted to what is called the domestic matters of the Budget was very controversial.

My hon. friend has abandoned to-day the course of conduct he usually adopts in a debate in this House, and particularly in a Budget debate. For he has been in the habit of following the line of least resistance with regard to debate, the easy and apparently simple course which would give to him and his party the least difficulty. But to-day he showed heroic courage almost equal to that of Baron Munchausen, when he attacked the policy of the Government. The most reasonable inference to be drawn from the words of the hon. gentleman is that no state of war exists. My hon. friend must have been sleeping for the last six months, for he has certainly shown no knowledge whatever of war conditions. My hon. friend has had a very substantial advantage. It is now ten or twelve days since the Budget was introduced, so I think he has had ample time to familiarize himself with what it contained and the form of his reply.

I was rather disappointed at the way my hon. friend attacked the civil servants of this country. He is an able man in debate, as those who have watched his career in this House well know, and I was rather disappointed to-day when he dropped down to small piffling things such as the salaries of the civil servants.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I wish to protect the civil servants.

Mr. MACDONELL: These matters could be more properly dealt with in Committee of Supply.

I do not think I am doing my hon. friend very great injustice when I say that he appeared to be rather pleased with the shrinkage in the returns of the immigration and other departments of the Government. These shrinkages did not seem to weigh very heavily on him, or to impress him in any way with the seriousness of our pres-

ent condition, or to make him realize that we are to-day labouring in the throes of a great war. The hon. gentleman rather fell into a groove in that respect, which he could not get out of. Proceeding to criticise department after department, he reminded me of the old saying that the only difference between a "groove and a grave" is that of width and length. I hope my hon. friend will not take matters so seriously as to get into a groove of that kind; but politically he may if he continues in the course he followed this afternoon.

I was also surprised at his attitude with regard to the prosecution of public works, for he must know that the present war conditions make it imperative that the Government should do whatever they can in the way of providing employment under proper conditions for the people of this country. I do not think the Government have undertaken any new works recently. The works now going on were contracted for either by the old Government or by this Government before war begun. I would ask my hon. friend if he would approve of the public works at Halifax, for instance, being abandoned. In the Estimates I find provision made for the following works at Halifax: Dry-dock, $250,000 (p. 57); Citadel, $13,000 (p. 58); Customs examining warehouse, $100,000 (p. 58); Dominion buildings, $5,000 (p. 58); Drill hall, $45,000 (p. 58); Postal station, $25,000 (p. 58); Docks and wharves, $30,000 (p. 52); New terminal facilities, $3,000,000 (p. 52); to increase accommodation and provide machinery, $3,500 (p. 52); Willow Park sewer, $14,500 (p. 52). That is a total of $3,486,000. I ask the pardon of the House for referring to details of this kind, which should properly come up in committee, but as my hon. friend has shown me the way I think I am justified in referring to these matters. His attitude is that all public works should be stopped.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I did not say that.

Mr. J. D. REID: That is what you said.

Mr. MACDONELL: I took the hon. gentleman's words down. I did not find any argument in what the hon. gentleman said; all we got was words, words, words. We got no reasons. Some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House may have seen some grain of reason in the attacks which he made upon these public expenditures.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What about the $5,000,000 at Port Nelson?

[Mr. Macdonell.]

Mr. J. D. REID: That was started by you people.

Mr. MACDONELL: My hon. friend from Halifax attacks those who are advocating the "Made in Canada" propaganda. He thinks that is wrong; he condemns it. Surely the people of this country can do their own thinking in regard to buying where they want to, and if certain patriotic people want to buy goods made in Canada they should be allowed to do so, and, for my part, I commend them very highly.

My hon. friend says that the deficit is not due to the war. I shall follow that up a little later; but I would like to say a word in answer to another statement which my hon. friend made. He said in all seriousness that the sum of $5,000,000, no more and no less, represented the loss in the trade of Canada during the current year attributable to the war.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The revenue.

Mr. MACDONELL: Yes, that the revenue of the country had fallen by $5,000,000 on account of the war. I would like to know by what process of magic, reasoning, guessing, or otherwise my hon. friend arrives at the conclusion that the revenue of the country has suffered to the extent of $5,000,000 exactly. It is just a guess, as an hon. gentleman behind me says. In the next breath the hon. member for Halifax admitted that the general borrowing power of the country, which he said in the last year amounted to $250,000,000 or $300,000,000, had been cut off; that is, the general borrowing by industries, municipalities, provinces, cities, and so on. I think that is what the hon. gentleman meant?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. MACDONELL: Finance is a very sensitive thing, money is very elusive, and if money does not come in, how does my hon. friend expect trade is going to be carried on? Money is timid enough, trade is timid, too, but if our borrowing power is cut off, even suppose we had no war, what is going to be the result? Suppose our borrowing power had been shut off during the six months immediately preceding the war, when this country was borrowing $1,000,000 a day or more, would not trade have come to a standstill? My hon. friend's own admission is sufficient to prove that the war, having stopped the inflow of capital to Canada, had at least something to do with the tariff conditions, and it had a great deal

more to do with them than the hon. gentleman will admit.

I desire to say a word about the Budget. I believe that this Budget has been received with greater satisfaction than any Budget which has ever preceded it in the history of this country. There has been little criticism of the budget as far as I am aware, and we know that carping critics spring to the surface at the slightest opportunity, and if there is a chance of getting anything remedied that they believe to be wrong an outcry immediately commences. Whatever grievances the people think they have they will seek to have remedied. Beyond a few retail druggists who are complaining about the stamp on proprietary medicines, etc., we hear no criticism in the country of this Budget—at least I have heard none—except that which we have listened to in this House to-day. Why does the hon. gentleman not bring before the House some evidence of the public discontent with this Budget? It taxes those who are best able to pay the tax. I submit that this is a Budget for which the Finance Minister should have the greatest possible credit, and that the Government is entitled to whatever credit is due to a Government that acts wisely and prudently under the conditions and circumstances which confront us at the present time. The conditions are not normal and an abnormal remedy must be applied. Under ordinary conditions taxes of this kind would not be imposed. They have been imposed because of the necessity of imposing taxes to raise revenue. The country cannot get on without revenue. What does my hon. friend suggest in substitution of the Budget that has been brought down?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Economy. The minister estimates a revenue of $120,000,000 for the next fiscal year without any additional tariff taxation. I say, get that $120,000,000, spend $30,000,000 or $40,000,000 less and you will have enough for your capital and special expenditures and will not require any further taxation.

Mr. MACDONELL: The minister has shown very plainly the need of these taxes. He has shown that there is a deficit between probable income and expenditure that has to be met. It cannot be met by magic, it has to be met by dollars and cents, and you cannot get dollars and cents without raising revenue by tariff or taxation of some kind.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MACDONELL (resuming): Were the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) now in his seat, I would ask him again what public works now in progress in Halifax he would drop and cease to expend money on, so that the Government and the country might have the benefit of his opinion in detail, as to the cutting down of expenditures, that is, if he is sincere in his professions. The hon. gentleman laboured at great length in dealing with the expenditure of the Government on public works, and I trust he will permit me to say that he succeeded in arguing on both sides of the question. In his opening remarks he said he was in favour of continuing the public works which had been commenced; but later on he got to the other side of the fence, and apparently wanted to have most public works indiscriminately cut down or cut out. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) took the same view; he considered that expenditure should cease on the Hudson Bay railway and the terminals in connection therewith. I would remind the hon. gentleman that it was he and his Government who let the contracts for the Hudson Bay railway, and I presume in the ordinary course they are responsible for that undertaking.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. gentleman only heard an interjection of mine. The view I intended to express was that I would do exactly as was done in 1908 at the time of the financial depression, when the Estimates for our public works were cut in two. I was Minister of Public Works at the time. I would do that with all public works to-day, and I would go slowly during this year of depression.

Mr. W. T. WHITE: All these were your own Estimates.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Estimates were cut in two.

Mr. WHITE: But they were your Estimates.

Mr. MACDONELL: I would like to know what percentage of the Estimates were eliminated in the year the hon. member (Mr. Pugsley) refers to.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Pretty nearly 50 per cent of the Public Works Estimates. I had made up my Estimates and submitted them to the Minister of Finance, and the Government considered the declining revenue, and it

was agreed to cut them in two, and they were reduced by about 50 per cent.

Mr. ROGERS: Do you recommend that reduction in connection with the public works at St. John for the present year?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would recommend a reduction all round; and let me say to the Minister of Public Works that the people of St. John are patriotic enough to stand it just as well as any other part of the country.

Mr. MACDONELL: Perhaps the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) would tell us whether his Estimates in the year he refers to were reduced 50 per cent as compared with the Estimates of the then previous year?

Mr. PUGSLEY: What I recollect is that the Estimates were made up with great care.

Mr. MACDONELL: I did not ask that question.

Mr. PUGSLEY: There were no amounts included but what I thought to be necessary in the public interest; yet, in view of the declining revenue they were cut in two.

Mr. MACDONELL: Will the hon. gentleman state to the House whether or not the 50 per cent to which he refers was written off the face of the Estimates of the then previous year? Were the Estimates of the previous year reduced 50 per cent—Will the hon. gentleman say that?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I cannot say that.

Mr. MACDONELL: I do not think my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) was candid in speaking of cutting down all expenditure on public works. He will recollect that the Estimates for 1914-15 were passed months before war was declared and before there were even rumours of war, and therefore the Government had no opportunity to reduce these Estimates. The first opportunity the Government has had to reduce Estimates comes now for the year 1915-16, and I will draw the attention of my hon. friend to some of the reductions made in these Estimates as compared with the Estimates for 1914-15. The hon. gentleman will see that there were reductions in all the departments he criticised for incurring excessive expenditure. The following statement shows the reductions:

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Reductions in the Estimates for 1915-16 as compared with the Estimates for 1914-15.

Legislation	$ 155,906
Immigration	263,800
Railways and Canals (income)	255,361
Railways and Canals (collection of revenue)	1,253,000
Public Works	11,038,825
Naval Service	104,600
Lighthouses	170,360
Dominion Lands	588,040
Miscellaneous expenditure	274,170
Trade and Commerce	1,903,600
Railways and Canals (capital account)	3,833,890
Public Works (capital account)	3,321,300
Public Works (capital, Marine Department)	474,500
Total	$17,780,320

If my hon. friend is fair he will admit that these reductions have been made in controllable expenditure; for of course as he knows there are certain expenditures that are not controllable.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Public Works expenditure on current account is reduced, it is true, eleven millions below the Estimates of last year, but there are still thirty-two million dollars—

Mr. MACDONELL: I am not stating what they were last year; what I am pointing out is that on the first opportunity to reduce expenditure this Government has had since the war, it has reduced expenditure to the large amount of over $17,000,000 on controllable items in connection with the departments which my hon. friend attacked.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: You have reduced the whole lot $10,000,000, whereas the reduction should have been thirty or forty million dollars.

Mr. MACDONELL: The total reduction is $17,780,320, which is a pretty respectable cutting down at one stroke. I believe, Sir, that public opinion has endorsed this Budget to the full extent. The proposed taxation falls upon financial institutions and those who are able to bear the taxes. The revenue had to be raised, and the question confronting the Government was how it could be raised in the most desirable manner. The proposed taxation does not fall on the farmer or on the workingman, and both these classes are throughly satisfied with the Budget as it stands at present. They ought to be satisfied. Hon. members who came from rural communities can speak as to the farmers; but I can speak as to the men in

the cities, and they are thoroughly satisfied, because they realize that these taxes which are very necessary have been imposed very generally, principally upon the moneyed interests, and that they have not affected the artisan or workman except in a very minor respect.

My hon. friend cavils at protection. Protection seems to be the red rag that angers Liberals in this House and out of it. I have no apology to make for protection; I am a stalwart protectionist. Protection has built up Canada. When this country is in straitened circumstances, as it will be more or less, and as all other countries will be owing to the war, and after it is over, it will be protection and the protectionist interests and the National Policy over again that will rebuild this country and put it back where it was before the outbreak of the war, and make it even more prosperous than ever before. My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) is perhaps amused at that statement, but history will prove that it is the truth.

This afternoon I asked my hon. friend from Halifax a question which he did not answer. He was deprecating the immense amount of money spent on the Civil Service. I asked him if he would be in favour of a reduction of ten per cent in the salaries of all employees.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If the service had not been improperly increased, the amount spent on it would have been more than ten per cent below what it is.

Mr. MACDONELL: I will answer that in this way. My hon. friend made a point of attacking the Customs Department. If he will take the revenue collected and the expense of collecting that revenue he will find that the percentage of expense for collection is not any greater to-day than it was five or ten years ago.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What will it be in 1914-15?

Mr. MACDONELL: I hope it will be high, because that will mean a big revenue.

Mr. MACLEAN: But the percentage of revenue?

Mr. MACDONELL: I am not guessing; I am just trying to give facts.

Mr. MACLEAN: It will be over five per cent.

Mr. MACDONELL: The Government are to be congratulated also on the arrangements they have made for their war borrowings. They have made arrangements to borrow all the money necessary for war purposes. Let me be reminiscent with regard to our borrowings. On the first of October, 1913, we paid off the last of the old Imperial guaranteed loan amounting to $8,273,333. This was the last loan which Canada had bearing the underwriting of the British Government guaranteeing it in the markets of the world. In 1869 there was $7,300,000 of an Imperial guaranteed loan outstanding. In 1874 it stood at $16,000,000. In 1885 it stood at $31,600,000, part of which was used to purchase Rupert's Land which made a Canadian nation possible, part for the defence of the country, part for public works, and so on. The last of that loan, as I said, was paid off a short time ago. To-day we find history repeating itself, but in a better way. Canada is borrowing to-day not by British guarantees, because the loan for which the Government have arranged is one made jointly with Great Britain. Canada is participating in that loan and in its advantages equally with Great Britain. Canada is getting the same terms as Great Britain, though no longer in the position of having Great Britain's guarantee. Great Britain is borrowing with Canada, and Canada is borrowing with Great Britain. It is to all intents and purposes a partnership; and on both sides of the House it is a matter of congratulation that Canada has lived through the early stages of her history with Great Britain standing behind her, and that now Canada is standing by Great Britain and Great Britain is standing by Canada, and Canada will stand by Great Britain to the end of this war and I trust to the end of time.

Notwithstanding our borrowings, the Budget makes out a strong case for a large amount of increased taxation. The situation must be faced. To temporize would be weak from a financial standpoint. The situation has to be grasped with a strong hand. The Government have presented a determined front to every phase of the war situation which has appeared. They have mastered the mobilization of the troops and have co-operated with Great Britain as regards our loans and other matters of importance connected with financing the war. Our trade has been protected by Government action as far as possible; our banking has been safeguarded and made permanent and strong, and quite recently the Government have provided seed grain and other assistance

for the farmers in the West who are in need, so that they in turn may be able to reap a large harvest and bear their share of the war taxation when the proper time comes. Although the fact is not pleasing to my hon. friend from Halifax, the Government are proceeding with the construction of public works. My hon. friend comes from a city. Does he think it would be wise or proper to discontinue in an hour all the public works in the cities in Canada? Surely not. Private individuals look to the Government for an example. They want to see a strong Government going on with its work, undertaking and facing its obligations; and the business men and capitalists throughout Canada are doing their share to prevent unemployment. They are giving employment to men whenever it can be secured; and wherever it cannot be secured, they are putting the men on short time and are treating them as humanely as existing conditions will permit. In that the Government is taking its share and it is right that it should do so. The Government is strong and Canada is strong, notwithstanding what we see in the Toronto Globe—because we all read the Globe; even gentlemen on this side of the House read the Globe. I see by that paper that we are in for a "smash." In an editorial it tells us that the smash has actually arrived—Canada smashed, industry and enterprise smashed. It is a nice object lesson to Germany and the other continental nations whom we are fighting to be told by a paper of the prominence and eminence of the Globe that Canada is smashed.

Mr. PUGSLEY: A bad moral.

Mr. MACDONELL: That is not a desirable thing to say, and the statement is absolutely without foundation and is also very silly.

My hon. friend from Halifax spoke rather emphatically about there being no necessity for a revenue Budget. I presume he is aware of the fact that for the first ten months of the present fiscal year the revenue from Customs has fallen off $28,000,000, and that the estimated falling off for the whole year is $33,000,000. I am reminded by an hon. gentleman that the hon. junior member for Halifax rejoices in that fact.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Not at all.

Mr. MACDONELL: My hon. friend says that there has apparently been no loss to Canada or to the Government by the interruption of trade and ocean traffic. My hon. friend surely knows better than that. The falling off is due in a great measure to the use by the British Government of a great number of ships for the transport of soldiers and so on. Practically all ocean freight traffic has been tied up or ruined because there are not sufficient ships for the Canadian trade. My hon. friend comes from a maritime district, and knows that fact very well. It is no news to any one. The hon. gentleman has admitted that because of the war this country has not received a large addition to its finances. I am glad he makes that assertion; it simply corroborates what the Minister of Finance said as to the condition in which the country finds itself as a result of the war. My hon. friend is probably aware of the fact that borrowing in England is now prohibited by Royal proclamation; English investors of money cannot lend in the British Dominions without the consent of the Treasury Board. This circumstance operates greatly to decrease the flow of money into Canada, thus affecting not only the industries of the country, but the Government as well.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is that not a good reason why the Government should cut down expenditures?

Mr. MACDONELL: It is a good reason why trade has been almost ruined through the commercial congestion and depression which has been the result of lack of money.

Mr. MACLEAN: I would remind the hon. member that the Minister of Finance estimated that for 1915-16, with the taxation now in force, he could get a revenue of $120,000,000, only $10,000,000 below the amount he will receive for the present fiscal year.

Mr. MACDONELL: What does that establish?

Mr. MACLEAN: If you have a revenue of $120,000,000, why do you not cut down your expenditures?

Mr. MACDONELL: I have given the reasons why certain expenditures have been cut down, and I am endeavouring to give reasons why it is not possible to cut down everything. You cannot cut all expenditures down; my hon. friend knows that.

My hon. friend denies that this is a war tax, but I submit that this a war tax, if there ever was one. They are made necessary by the war, whether the proceeds are used to buy guns and war material or to make good revenue deficits caused by dislocation of trade and consequent loss of revenue. The war has closed off borrowing

by Canadian corporations, thereby diminishing imports.

The new taxes will pay interest on war loans, pensions, and part of capital expenditure. The interest on the $50,000,000 to be borrowed this year and the $100,000,000 to be borrowed next year will amount to nearly $7,500,000 annually. This the new taxes will have to provide for, together with interest on additional borrowings during the war. It must also provide for a pension list amounting to about $4,000,000 or $5,000,000 a year. If there were no war the Government could borrow money in the London market under the usual conditions, but, as I have attempted to show, the war makes that impossible.

Hon. gentlemen opposite take issue with the Government with regard to these taxes being war taxes. Hon. gentlemen opposite, especially the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), have been wont in times gone by to cast eyes across the border when looking for precedents and encouragement. What has happened in the United States, a neutral country, which is not embroiled in this war? Although they have no hand in the quarrel; although they are simply bystanders, they have been affected to such an extent by the war conditions that they have experienced a very great decrease in revenue. On September 4, last, in making an address to Congress asking them to pass a war tax bill, President Wilson said:

> During the month of August there was as compared with the corresponding month of last year, a falling off of $10,629,538 in the revenues collected from customs. A continuation of this decrease in the same proportion throughout the current fiscal year would probably mean a loss of customs revenues from sixty to one hundred millions. I need not tell you to what this falling off is due. It is due, in chief part, not to the reductions recently made in the customs duties, but to the great decrease in importations; and that is due to the extraordinary extent of the industrial area affected by the present war in Europe. Conditions have arisen which no man foresaw; they affect the whole world of commerce and economic production; and they must be faced and dealt with.

How did Congress face and deal with that message? They passed Bill No. 217 of the 63rd Congress, entitled an Act to increase the internal revenue and for other purposes. I wish to read one or two extracts from the report of the committee to which that Bill, together with the address of the President, was referred for report.

> The Committee of Ways and Means, to whom was referred House Bill H. R. 18891, to increase the internal revenue, and for other purposes, having had the same under consideration, report it back to the House with certain minor amendments.

Then follows, under the heading, "Necessity of this Legislation":

> The necessity for this legislation grows out of the reduction of revenue derived from customs receipts caused by the disturbed conditions resulting from the war in Europe.
>
> The following table shows the value of the dutiable imports into the United States from the European countries at war during the fiscal year ending June, 1914, together with the estimated falling off in customs revenue during the next 12 months, computed on the basis of Tariff Act of October 3, 1913.

Then follows a table showing the estimated falling off in revenue during the next twelve months, which is totalled at $125,811,000. On the next page I find the following:

> The necessity for this legislation cannot be traced to the Tariff Act of 1913. If it had not been for the war in Europe the Tariff Act of October 3, 1913 and the other sources of revenue would have yielded sufficient revenue to meet the demands of the Government.

Under the heading "Effects of the European War" is the following:

> The countries now at war comprise Austria-Hungary, Belgium, France, Germany, Japan, Russia, Servia, Montenegro and the United Kingdom of Great Britain. If it were not for remained the same as those of last year, had remain the same as those of last year, the customs taxes levied by the present tariff Act from said countries would have yielded $133,079,000. This does not include the importation from other countries that will naturally bring the customs devenue that is directly affected by war conditions to an amount over $150,000,000. The fact that the ships of these belligerent countries carried over 80 per cent of the foreign commerce entering our ports and the further fact that war conditions have disturbed the lines of transportation belonging to these countries and forced many of their tramp steamers to remain in port, will seriously affect the importation of merchandise coming from neutral countries, and thereby cause a diminution of customs revenues from neutral as well as belligerent countries.
>
> It, therefore, seems to be the part of wisdom for the Congress to levy a tax at this time to take care of the deficit in our customs revenues brought about by conditions over which our Government and our people have no control.

Is that not an exact parallel of the conditions existing here to-day? A non-belligerent neutral country, situated as we are and subject to the same commercial conditions, saw fit to pass an act of this kind long before we introduced our legislation, and for the same reasons.

The proposed tariff changes do not, I submit, mean more protection. My hon. friend, as are all gentlemen opposite, is subject to the protection bogey. The increased tariff, as my hon. friend knows, applies to raw materials, so that when raw materials come into this country to be used in the manu-

facture of various commodities, duties will be paid upon them. My hon. friend spoke particularly to-day about wool and cotton. If they come in, as I hope they will, in abundant quantities, to be manufactured by the workmen of Canada and sold to our own people or shipped abroad, a duty will be paid on the raw material and there will be a compensation in that respect. That will be an offset to any additional duty placed upon manufactured goods that may come from other countries.

My hon. friend is fearful for the British preference. The British preference is greater than it was before; the British manufacturer is better off; he gains 2½ per cent as compared with his foreign competitor. Take an article which under the old general tariff paid 30 per cent and under the preferential 20 per cent. Add 7½ per cent to the general duty and you have 37½ per cent; add 5 per cent to the British preferential duty and you have 25 per cent; therefore you have a preference of 12½ per cent whereas before the preference it was 10 per cent. So the British shipper is better off than he was by 2½ per cent. Why this wail about the British manufacturer? Why this grief and fear on account of the British exporter to our country? He is better off than he was before, especially—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MACDONELL: My hon. friends laugh—as compared with the foreign competitor of course.

Mr. TURRIFF: You increase the duty and make him better off.

Mr. MACDONELL: Certainly, as compared with his foreign competitor. There is no doubt about that. If the general tariff had been increased and there had been no increase in the duty under the Imperial preference Canadian industries would have been ruined. Let us bear that in mind. If you increased the general tariff by 7½ per cent or 10½ per cent or 20½ per cent and made no increase in the duty under the British preferential tariff, you would ruin the Canadian manufacturer; and for my part I adopt with the greatest possible enthusiasm the statement made by the hon. leader of the Government (Sir Robert Borden) on more than one occasion, in this House and out of it, both before and after the change of Government, that an industry in any Canadian city is as good for the Empire as an industry in Birmingham or any other British city—and much better for Canada. Surely the very essence of our relationship with the Old Country is the freedom and liberty which Great Britain allows always. We can compete with her if we want to, but we want to build up the Empire as a whole, and an industry in Toronto or Winnipeg is as great a factor in building up the Empire as one in Liverpool or Manchester. England builds up her trade and commerce; she is building up her greatness on the islands of Great Britain, and we are building up her greatness overseas in our own time and in our own way and in our own name. Our friends are still fearful of the bogey of protection. They did nothing to reduce the tariff when they had the power to do so. They allow themselves that delightful liberty and freedom, that splendid isolation in this case, of being able to blow hot and cold, of standing first on one foot and then on the other. One gentleman advocates one policy and another gentleman another, and the whole party advocate one policy in one province and another policy in another province. There is no consistency about the party on any subject; and so it is with protection. They could have reduced protection if they had desired to do so, if they thought it too high when they came into power. When they assumed office in 1896, the average rate of duty was 29·79 per cent; in 1911, when the change of Government took place, the percentage was 26·71 per cent; so there was a reduction of about 3 per cent, notwithstanding the fact that the average price of merchandise had increased between those two dates by from 30 per cent to 40 per cent. So I do not see any merit now in the hon. gentlemen beating their breasts and tearing out their hair and shrieking against protection.

Then, as to spending money, our friend of the Globe got funny the other morning. I do not know where the reverend editor was the night before, but he said that the Government was spending money like a drunken sailor. Let me give the foundation for Mr. Globeman's talk about spending money like a drunken sailor. He makes the statement that during the three years the Conservative party have been in power they have been spending money in a reckless manner, like a drunken sailor. I do not wish to go back to ancient history; some of us are still young men, and we do not need to take figures one hundred years old. Let us take the three years before and immediately after the great victory of the people of September 21, 1911, and what do we find as a result in regard to the expenditure of money? The years 1909, 1910 and 1911 show a net increase in the public debt of $62,000,000, while the three years

1912, 1913 and 1914 show a decrease in the public debt of $6,750,000, and this notwithstanding the fact that in these three latter years the Government expended large sums of money, aggregating about $130,000,000, on capital account, which moneys were taken from consolidated revenue fund account.

What is the record of surpluses for the same three years? That is a test which my hon. friend from Halifax tried to apply this afternoon. The surplus in consolidated account for the year 1912 amounted to $37,946,000; for 1913 it amounted to $56,960,000, and for 1914, $35,000,000, a total surplus of $129,576,000 for the three years.

My hon. friends say that the Government may have saved money in one pocket but paid it out of the other. The country has only one pocket as a matter of fact, only one chest of money; but I will answer even the argument they make, if it be an argument. The large expenditure during the last three years was due to the fact that the Government inherited obligations and debts from the old Government which they had to pay, with respect to public works and undertakings and contracts entered into, such as the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Quebec bridge, the purchase of Grand Trunk Pacific bonds to the extent of $23,000,000, the loan to the Grand Trunk Pacific of $8,000,000, besides railway subsidies authorized by the late Government. Let me give an instance.

Halifax was referred to this afternoon. Coming west, let us take the great harbour of Quebec. I am making a statement of facts and not an argument. I want it to be understood that this Government had been committed to make expenditures that they could not disregard. I am not quoting these figures for the purpose of getting hot justice from the electors of Quebec at the next election. The expenditures on Quebec harbour since the present Government came into power in 1911 up to date, that is, for three years, as compared with the expenditures made by the Liberal party during the whole fourteen years of their term of office, were as follows: By the present Government, during their three years, $8,841,379; by the late Government, for the same period of time, $3,338,307. The present Government spent $8,000,000 and the late Government $3,000,000. Why did the present Government spend the $8,000,000? On account of the National Transcontinental railway, on account of the Quebec Harbour Commission, and on account of the Public Works Department. The late Government built a railway to Quebec and left it. How could the railway operate without terminals and facilities of that kind? It had to have these or the whole road would have been wasted and all expenditure lost. That is why they have had to spend money, and they have done it.

That brings me to the question of railway subsidies. My hon. friend talked about subsidies, and they have been spoken of in the press. It has been said that these subsidies were a bugaboo, a very dreadful thing. I want to face that condition and tell the House the facts. There has been a substantial increase in the last three years in railway subsidies, which accounts for an annual expenditure of over $10,000,000 in that period. Over $2,000,000 a year was authorized by Acts of the late Government, and over $6,000,000 a year has gone to the Canadian Northern railway and its constituents on account of the old Government's guarantee of its bonds for upwards of $56,000,000. The Canadian Northern railway also got guarantees from the provinces to the extent of $76,000,000. This $76,000,000 and the $56,000,000 guaranteed by the Dominion were contingent liabilities. The time came when this road had to have more money and the cash subsidy which this Government is paying at the rate of over $6,000,000 a year was granted to prevent the guarantees which had already been given from becoming actual liabilities. Those are the facts. If this Government had not given the road that cash subsidy, the contingent liabilities of $76,000,000 by the provinces and $56,000,000 by this Government would have become actual liabilities, and the country and the provinces would have been called upon to pay them. That seems to me a very substantial reason why the Government should have given the subsidy. So that when you take the $6,000,000 and the $2,000,000, that means that this Government have only granted a $2,000,000 guarantee a year or thereabouts, since they have been in office for railway subsidies.

My hon. friend this afternoon dwelt ad nauseam I was going to say, but I will say very extensively, on the net debt. We had not been three years in office when war broke out and dislocated all trade. Our predecessors had fifteen years of office, and let us now compare the net debt of Canada as left by our predecessors with what it is now. In 1896 the net debt was $258,497,000, and in 1911 $340,042,000. That is, in those fifteen years the net debt was increased by $81,500,000, or at the comfortable rate of $5,000,000 a year. I am not objecting to a Government's spending money

properly, nor do I suggest that the money was wrongly spent, but the facts are obvious and what is the use of shutting our eyes to facts and doing the ostrich act like my hon. friend from Halifax did this afternoon. I am not criticising hon. gentlemen opposite for increasing the debt by that amount, but I say it is idle for them to turn around now and criticise the present Government for not having greatly reduced the net debt. Now look at the figures of the present Government. On the 31st March, 1914, the net debt was $333,300,000, and on the 31st March, 1911, $340,050,000. Whereas the previous Government had increased the debt by $81,500,000 in fifteen years, the present Government reduced the debt by $6,750,000 in three years. These are facts, and we know that the old adage says that facts are stubborn things. They cannot be got out of the way by such arguments as my hon. friend from Halifax used this afternoon.

In addition to that, this Government since it has been in power has spent nearly $130,000,000 of money taken from the current revenues and applied and used it for capital expenditure. The estimated taxation for 1910-11 was $89,350,000 as against $27,700,000 in 1896, when hon. gentlemen opposite took office; or $11.50 per head of population in 1910 as compared with $5.40 in 1896. In other words the late Government increased the debt on the people of this country from $5.40 per head to $11.50 per head between 1896 and 1911. I am not quoting these figures in the tu quoque manner, but it is not fair to criticise this Government for increasing the debt of Canada when, if any odium should be attached on account of that increase, it does and should rest on hon. gentlemen opposite.

I have already referred to the large expenditures this Government has made on account of contracts which had already been entered into. Large sums had been invested in public works throughout the country, and unless money had been supplied to continue those works they would simply have remained in a dormant state or rotted away. Would hon. gentlemen opposite prefer to see these public works which had cost tens of millions of dollars, rotting away rather than to spend the amount necessary to complete them. The necessity of giving employment to people of this country had also to be considered. The Government must set an example in this respect, and if I have any criticism to offer it is that the Government have been too stingy in carrying on the public works of this country under the present conditions. But certainly they should not be blamed for having increased the expenditure.

Our borrowing for war purposes will be enormous, but our credit is first-class as the public accounts will show. We must keep up the credit of Canada. We have built up Canadian credit, and that is why Canada can bear the strain to-day.

I have already referred to the large increase in the volume of trade which this country is annually transacting. This has made necessary a large increase in the public service and an increase in the expenditure of that service. I have here the figures showing the total trade of Canada with all countries for a few years past. In 1908 the aggregate trade was $650,793,000; in 1909, $571,268,000; in 1910, $693,211,000; in 1911, $769,443,000; in 1912, $874,637,000; in 1913, $1,085,264,000; in 1914, $1,129,744,000. The trade in merchandise only for the nine months ending 31st December, 1914, is estimated at $744,000,000. Increase in trade and revenue means an increase in the cost of collection, customs expenses and so on. If the Customs Department is collecting twice the revenue it did some years ago, it needs a larger staff. Surely that does not need to be laboured. I maintain that the increase in the gross expenditure by this Government was under the conditions proper and unavoidable, and as I have said, great expense has been incurred in carrying to completion the undertakings entered into by the old Government. Take the Department of Railways and Canals.. Comparing the three years previous to March 31, 1912, with the succeeding three years, we have an average annual expenditure during the first period of $37,426,000 as compared with $41,489,000 in the latter period, and having regard to the very great increase done by the Department of Railways and Canals I do not think the increase a large one. The average yearly earnings of Government railways should also be considered. The average yearly earnings of the Government railways during the respective three-year periods were $10,208,000 and $12,698,000; that is the average yearly earnings during the last three years under the old Government amounted to $10,208,000 and under the present Government they had reached $12,698,000. That, together with the increases in wages of employees, accounted for the increase in the revenue expenditures. Income expenditure shows an increase of $71,000 a year in the different departments, and the capital expenditure

shows an increase of $663,000 per year, which increase is accounted for by the expenditures upon the National Transcontinental railway, the Quebec bridge, the Hudson Bay railway, the Government railway, Canadian Government railways, the Welland ship canal and the Trent canal. All of these works were authorized by the old Government, with the sole exception of the Welland ship canal, the Halifax terminals and the Prince Edward Island car ferry. The Welland canal was endorsed by hon. gentlemen opposite, and we have yet to hear any complaints from them in regard to the Halifax terminals. That being our position, it seems to me that it is the duty of the Government to make the best of the present situation, to stand by the country, and to exercise every possible influence and energy that the country possesses, individually and collectively, for the purpose of tiding us over the trying time and permitting Canada when the war is over to take its stand again as the senior member of the great overseas dominions of the British Empire.

What is to be done by the Government, by public men, and by the industrial and business men of this country? I have just taken a glance at the exports from Germany, and I find that they have been very large. The trade of Germany, Austria-Hungary and the other enemy nations has been destroyed as far as the British Empire is concerned. Last year Germany exported to different countries throughout the world goods to the amount of $2,402,967,000, and that trade is at large to-day. Any one can get it who can take it. A great part of that trade belongs to the enterprising people who can compete in the markets of the world which have hitherto been supplied by Germany, and I believe there is no part of the world that can compete for that trade in a more effective and able manner than the people of Canada. Let us go after the chance. Great Britain was the largest consumer of German goods in the world; in fact, she was a greater consumer of German goods than any other two countries put together. Last year Germany exported to Canada and other overseas British dominions no less than $50,000,000 worth of goods. There is no part of the Empire that is better equipped in point of natural resources, raw material and energy of men to secure that trade than Canada. Twenty million dollars worth of that trade is our own. The total volume of the trade that Germany has hitherto done with Canada amounts to about $20,000,000 a year. But there is $50,000,000 at large for the British Empire to secure. We have a preference in all overseas British dominions with the exception of Australia, and therefore we should be able to capture two-thirds of that trade. As I say, we have a preference in all the markets of the overseas dominions except that of Australia, and as we are the premier manufacturing overseas dominion of the Empire, outside of Great Britain herself, we have a splendid opportunity of capturing that $50,000,000 worth of trade. Let us make the best of it.

I am going to refer for a moment to a matter and this time with the approval of my friend the Globe. I see that the Globe has been advocating that the country engage in a propaganda of industrial research. That is not a new idea; in fact, it is an old idea in Canada, and it is older still in other countries. The idea is to invoke the aid and assistance of our universities and great seats of learning and knowledge and to send out to the world practical scientific men equipped with expert knowledge, to secure information in regard to manufacturing processes and to ascertain the location of markets, etc., with reference particularly to those products the supply of which hitherto has been in the hands of Germany and which is now available to any one who may be able to capture it. Let me point out that in the University of Toronto they are now making anti-toxine for the relief of persons afflicted by diphtheria. It is a purely philanthropic work that is being done by university graduates and is the beginning of what I trust will be a very large public enterprise in the near future. They are also manufacturing tetanus, an anti-toxine for the use of the Red Cross Society for the treatment of lock-jaw and illnesses of that kind. The university, on the first small order saved the Red Cross Society no less than $3,000. We have many opportunities of securing the business that has been thrown open by the dislocation of the trade which Germany formerly did with Canada and the rest of the world.

9 p.m.

All of which means that Canada will have either to supply herself from abroad with what she has heretofore purchased from enemy countries, or make it herself, which is the preferable course to adopt.

We must ascertain the entire quality and quantity of the products that we will require under the new conditions, so that we may supply ourselves with all these goods from this time forward, which means aggressive industrial research, so as to submit to capital

and moneyed men the means of manufacturing what we need.

Our universities turn out each year a large number of engineers, chemical engineers, doctors, doctors of philosophy, chemists, and highly trained men in the various arts and sciences. These are "pure science men," and should be devoted to "applied science." They should be turned to practical problems and their solution, for the benefit of the people. These men have been taught to believe that their objective in life was to be teachers, professors, etc. This should apply to some of them, but many of the abler men should go out into the world to investigate and direct for the betterment of human kind and thereby increase the amount of useful knowledge. This method of research is practical.

There should be an established relationship between learning and industry. Laboratories of industrial research should be established at all great seats of learning, and at our universities.

We have precedents for this splendid work in many of the large institutions and foundations in the United States. I might refer to the Carnegie Institute at Washington, the General Education board, the Carnegie Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, et cetera, all of which are performing a great public service by educating men scientifically and equipping them to take part in the industrial enterprises of the country. These institutions are endowed with hundreds of millions of dollars. I commend to the Government some such action as that which has been taken in many other countries in regard to the encouragement of scientific men to aid and assist in the technical application of the scientific knowledge which they have acquired at the universities in order to help to build up the manufacturing enterprises of the country.

In conclusion, in my opinion, the Budget makes out the case for an increase of taxation. The situation must be faced. To temporize with it would be financial folly. These taxes are purely war taxes and must be treated as such. I do not care how you may argue or evade the question, these are war taxes and the revenue is raised, as similar revenues were raised in the United States, for war purposes.

My hon. friend from Halifax had nothing to suggest to this House as to how to raise the necessary money. He criticised, he objected to everything that had been done, but he argued himself in a circle, and he came out of the same hole that he entered by, without contributing any information as to how taxes should be levied. I understand that a single tax association had suggested a tax on land, but how could this Government levy a tax on land? It would take an army of men to collect such a tax, and anyway the taxation of land is a function of the provincial governments, and the provinces will need more revenue in the near future. At Confederation, the total revenue of the Dominion, as compared with the total revenues of all the provinces, was as two dollars to one; but now the total revenue of the Dominion, as compared with the total revenue of all the provinces, is about as three or four dollars are to one. We cannot invade the domain of the provinces; we are approached by them from year to year for additional and increased subsidies, and if we do not aid them in increased subsidies we do aid them by grants to agricultural and other matters. It would not be fair for us to trespass upon the domain of the provinces and invade the methods of taxation which the constitution has provided for them. Hon. gentlemen opposite have spoken about the cost of living, but the fact is that the cost of living has not increased in Canada. Farm products, except wheat, have not increased in price, and the ordinary man can to-day buy his groceries and his dry-goods as cheaply, if not more cheaply, than he could a year ago. The British preference is only affected to the extent of 2½ per cent when considered with the general tariff and if you argue from this until doomsday you cannot make it more or less. I believe, Sir, that this Budget from beginning to end meets the wishes and desires of the Canadian people. I believe that the taxation imposed by it is eminently fair and proper, that it bears upon nobody unduly, and that it justly apportions the burden which must be borne. It is my belief that the people of Canada will bear this taxation patiently until the time comes when war ceases, and this country will again be in a position to conduct its affairs under normal conditions.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): The Finance Minister, who presented the Budget, as well as my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Macdonell), who criticised it on behalf of the Opposition, have both spoken of it as an extraordinary Budget, and as being excusable on the ground of extraordinary circumstances. I will agree that the circumstances are extraordinary and that the Budget is extraordinary. I will admit that

extraordinary circumstances would justify an extraordinary Budget, but I do not admit that the Budget presented by the Minister of Finance is a Budget that is adapted or adequate to the extraordinary circumstances which now have to be faced. My criticism would be, that notwithstanding the fact that the Finance Minister has introduced a new principle into the taxation of the country, there is still evidence both in the items of the Budget and in the arguments which have been made in support of it, that the Government itself does not realize the gravity of the present situation, either in regard to the financial condition of the Dominion or in regard to the duty of Canada as a part of the Empire in this present time of stress and trial. There has been criticism of the Budget on the ground that it does not recognize the changed financial conditions of the country by a reduction in the proposed expenditure, a point which has already been dealt with. But it is surely elementary, if our revenues are declining, and if there is no other prospect than that they will continue to decline for an indefinite period, that it is the part of wisdom to introduce measures of economy of a substantial nature. That is a point that does not seem to have been considered by the Government as being of importance. My hon. friend (Mr. A. C. Macdonell), and I believe the Prime Minister as well, when this point was being dealt with, satisfied themselves and their friends by asking the member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in what particular he would reduce the expenditure, and especially if he would be willing to reduce the expenditure at the port of Halifax. I can only say that however satisfactory that form of answer may have been to the Prime Minister and to the hon. member, I do not think it will be satisfactory to the people of Canada. It is the gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches and their friends behind them who are responsible for the disposition of the public moneys. They are answerable to the people for what use is made of these moneys, and it is for them to say when and where and how moneys shall be spent, and to submit to criticism if money is spent for which provision has not been made, or for which no provision is intended to be made, so far as the Budget discloses.

I do not intend to weary the House with figures; but there is a point which has struck me in regard to the question of revenue and expenditure, of debt and deficit, that I will try to place before the House at this time. I gather from the speech of the Minister of Finance that in the current fiscal year there will be added to the public debt the sum of $60,000,000, not including moneys borrowed on account of the war. That increase of debt occurs, notwithstanding the special taxes imposed for revenue purposes at the last session of Parliament, which the Minister of Finance, when he announced them in his Budget of last September, expected would realize $7,000,000 during the six months of the current fiscal year then ensuing. That is to say, our shortage as between actual expenditure and actual revenue, based upon the tariff taxation as it was a year ago, was not $60,000,000 but $67,000,000. We have taken $7,000,000 more out of the pockets of the people of this country during the current six months than would have been taken out under the system of taxation that prevailed before the short summer session.

Again, I find that, notwithstanding this increase of taxation, expecting a further increase of the debt during the coming year to the amount of another $60,000,000, exclusive of war expenditure, the Minister of Finance brings in additional taxation which he hopes will yield $30,000,000. But besides that special taxation, which he proposes by his Budget just brought down, is the $14,000,000 of extra taxation which will accrue because of his Budget proposals of September last. We are carrying, then, a load of extra taxation, as the result of the Budget of last September and the present Budget, of not $30,000,000, but $44,000,000. The load of taxation has been increased for the year which we are about to enter upon to the amount of $44,000,000, and we shall still have a difference between revenue and expenditure, on the estimates of my hon. friend, of $30,000,000. Therefore we are $74,000,000 behind in our business transactions as expected for the coming year, aside altogether from war expenditure, according to the statements made by the Minister of Finance. That is a sufficiently startling condition to warrant the statement I have already made, namely, that the Government scarcely seem to have appreciated the gravity of the situation. Although our revenues have fallen so tremendously even in the face of such enormous increased taxation, we still are unable to meet the requirements of the public service, according to the estimates of my hon. friend.

The Government of to-day may have some means of creating something out of nothing, of creating money otherwise

than by getting it from the people by way of taxes. But, unless they have some other means of securing money, they are taking the position that they are not called upon under present circumstances to do what every other person, corporation, government, or other organization throughout the world has to do, that is, to bring its expenditures into some comparison with its revenues, present or prospective. As I read the Estimates, as I have followed the Budget statement, the Government have absolutely ignored that as being a necessity. If I have read correctly the Budget statement of the hon. Minister of Finance, he proposes to make the same expenditure on current account and on capital account during the coming year, and to face the shortage of which he speaks, as he did during the present year, when he had no such reason to expect a shortage, and had not found it necessary to impose an enormous additional burden of taxation upon the Canadian people in order to bring his revenue even approximately up to his expenditure. I do not wish to labour the point unduly, but surely it is the business of those charged with the administration of the affairs of our country to keep some reasonable balance between revenue and expenditure without adding repeatedly and seriously to the burdens borne by the people. If the Government are going to take the view that expenditures may be made freely, liberally, and carelessly, and that the result is simply an increase in some measure of the burden of taxation, and that this burden is something that really makes no serious difference to the people, I can only say that I do not think they appreciate the seriousness of the situation or the means that should be taken to remedy it.

I do not wish to deal with the question of the war or the war expenditures at any great length; but it appears to me that, if the Government has failed in its appreciation of the gravity of the financial situation of the country as it stands at present, it has failed even more seriously in regard to the gravity of the situation so far as the great world-war now in progress is concerned. The Government has a duty besides that of collecting taxes and spending money. It has a duty to give inspiration and direction to the minds of the people of the country in regard to all great questions that may come up for consideration, and ten times more so in a case such as that which confronts Canada. the Empire and the world at the present time. I do not wish to be misunderstood as to my conception of the position of the Government of Canada. The Government of Canada is not responsible for the occurrence of this war, or for its direction. The responsibility of the Government of Canada is that Canada shall take her proper part, with her men and with her means, in supporting the cause with which the interests of Canada are absolutely bound up: the maintenance of the prestige of the British Empire and the preservation of human liberty throughout the world.

The existence of the war has been used, it appears to me, as an excuse for a great many actions on the part of the Government and for a great many omissions on the part of the Government for which there is no excuse. As I have said, this Government neither directs the war nor is responsible for it, but this Government is responsible for the part that the Canadian people take in the war; and it is there, it seems to me, where they have failed in discharging their responsibilities; failed at any rate in appreciating the measure of their responsibility in the Budget proposals that they have laid before the House.

In the Budget proposals of last summer, the Finance Minister announced the necessity of a war loan of $50,000,000. We have been informed since this session opened that $50,000,000 will keep practically 50,000 men in the field for six months. We are proposing another war loan of $100,000,000 to last, I presume, for a year, and, if I understood the Prime Minister correctly, his statement was that we were to have 90,000 or possibly 100,000 men in the field. If 50,000 men require $50,000,000 to maintain them for six months, certainly $100,000,000 will not maintain 100,000 men for a year at the same rate. I do not wish to press this point; it is a question that is eminently for the responsibility of the Government, but the facts and figures are as I have stated. Do they believe that they can keep 100,000 men in the field for twelve months on an appropriation of $100,000,000, and is 100,000 men the limit of their intention in regard to the aid that they are to give the Empire during this war? We do not know how long this war may last; we do not know what turn it may take; we only know what our duty is and what results we desire to see achieved. At such a time, if ever, our resources should be conserved so that the money can be found and the men can be put in the field and kept there as long as the necessity remains. This is not

a time to dismiss lightly with a wave of the hand the question of expenditures, of deficits, of revenue or lack of revenue. This is the time above all others when every care should be taken, when every dollar should be conserved, when every portion of the credit of the country should be maintained to the highest degree as long as it can be so maintained. What is the use of our saying that we are in this war to a finish with our last man and our last dollar when we are throwing money right and left on this, that or the other expenditure, connected with the well-being of this country, it may be, but still not necessary in any degree for the maintenance of Canada's position in connection with the war? We are liberal with our money; the money that we spend in military support we borrow in England, and we go to England also to borrow the money that we spend over and above our revenues for the very ordinary current expenses of the country.

In following the remarks of the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. A. C. Macdonell), I noted that he made a strong point of the commitments of the late Government with regard to large public expenditures of various kinds, and especially with regard to railway expenditure, and gave these commitments of the late Government as a reason for the large expenditures at the present time of the present Government. I will not go into that matter at any great length, except to say in regard to one of the great commitments of the late Government, namely, the Transcontinental railway, that, if my memory is correct, when the late Government went out of power that railway was within fifteen per cent of being completed. That was three and a half years ago. I do not know how long it is taking this Government to complete that fifteen per cent, or how much money they are spending on it, but if they are using the same energy and the same economy that their predecessors used, certainly that expenditure should have been off the slate before now. In regard to the Canadian Northern, my hon. friend told of the guarantees by the Federal Government and of guarantees by the Provincial governments, and said that the enormous cash bonus paid by this Government was necessary in order to protect the guarantees already given by the Federal and Provincial governments. The cash subsidy paid by this Government to the Canadian Northern railway had practically no bearing on the security for the guarantees given by either the Federal Government or the provinces. The Canadian Northern railway was a sufficiently completed system, upon the guarantees given by the Federal Government and the provinces; and the grant of money by this Government was of their own motion, of their own desire to, as I presume, gratify the ambitions of the projectors of the Canadian Northern railway, but with absolutely no justification from a financial point of view, as the conditions are at the present time. They must take the whole responsibility for the vast expenditure of cash that they have made in regard to the Canadian Northern railway for that part of its line which runs through the province of British Columbia. The late Government was not responsible in any particular, in any degree, for a dollar of that expenditure either directly or indirectly, by reason of commitments, obligations or for any other reason.

I desire to draw the attention of the House more particularly to the means that is proposed by the Finance Minister to raise increased revenue. We will admit that if he keeps up his expenditure he must have revenue, he must have money, and he must get it either by increased taxes or by increased borrowings. As to what proportion should be increased taxes and what proportion should be borrowings I shall not argue, that is not the point I wish to bring forward. I wish to say that, assuming the necessity for increasing the taxes, I for one am glad to see this Government adopt the principle of direct taxation. I do not say that the details are in all particulars as I would like to see them, but it is certainly an important point that a Government whose policy is tariff for protection should, at this time of stress and serious conditions, adopt the principle of direct taxation as a means of raising revenue and of meeting a deficit. It is, in the first place, a square, straight admission that their tariff is a tariff for protection and not for revenue. If an increase of tariff would give increase of revenue now was the time to make that increase of tariff if it was revenue the Government wanted. We maintain that it is a fact that undue increase of tariff will not give revenue, and the direct taxation features of the Budget are an absolute admission of that contention.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has the hon. gentleman not just argued that the increase in duties which we made last year had produced some $7,000,000 more revenue than

would have been obtained if we had not increased them?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Now he is arguing that an increase does not give more revenue at all.

Mr. OLIVER: No, my hon. friend is mistaken. I say that if the Government wanted to raise $30,000,000 at this session, being a Government whose policy is a policy of protection by tariff, if they believed that any increase of tariff would raise that $30,000,000, now was the time to show their faith by their works. But they knew that no possible increase that they could make in the tariff would give them that amount of revenue and therefore they did not take that means of raising the additional revenue, they adopted the system of direct taxation as a means of raising revenue while they did increase the measure of protection already in force. I do not know how far this will be acceptable to the people of the country. I am inclined to think that there are many people who would have accepted a higher tariff for purposes of revenue, but that there are very few of the general body of consumers who will accept the higher tariff for purposes of protection and at the same time direct taxes in order to raise revenue.

How much revenue is expected to be raised by these two means of taxation? I understood the Finance Minister to say that he expected $30,000,000, of which he expected to get from $8,000,000 to $10,000,000 by direct taxation and the balance of $20,000,000 or $22,000,000 by indirect or protective duties. The Toronto Star has gone into the matter somewhat and figures that, on the business of last year, the direct taxes proposed by the Budget, exclusive of the Patent Medicines tax would produce $14,000,000, and I cannot imagine that the Finance Minister had not those figures at hand when he framed the Budget and he had in mind receiving a larger proportion of revenue from the direct tax side of his Budget than he gave the House to understand. His hopes of revenue centered rather on the direct taxes than on the indirect taxes. With regard to the direct taxes let me point this out. We all agree that there must be taxation, there must be revenue, and the whole question as between one party and the other, and between any two individuals in arguing upon taxation, is in regard to the fairness of the taxation. If the taxation is equally levied according to the ability of the different people to carry it, then it is carried easily and without detriment to the country. But if it is levied unequally, if the man of small means and great responsibility is compelled to carry more than his share and the man of greater means and less responsibilities carries less than his share, then there is an undue burden resting upon one section of the community, and, as a consequence, the whole community is hampered in its progress. In the scheme of direct taxation that the minister proposes I find that of $14,000,000 the banks will contribute $1,000,000, and the trust companies $1,000,000.

Mr. J. D. REID: Are you against that?

Mr. OLIVER: Not at all. Then $300,000 is expected on insurance premiums, $7,000,000 from increased postal rates, and $3,000,000 from railway passengers. It appears to me that the ordinary man who uses the postal facilities is bearing an unduly heavy share of this burden of taxation, while the great financial interests are bearing an unduly light proportion. Furthermore, I do not agree with the Finance Minister that it was not advisable to levy an income tax. I do not know where he would go for money except where money is. The burden should be levied according to the ability of the people to bear it. The burden should be laid equally, but the minister is not doing that when the banks with their great resources and profits pay only $1,000,000, and the trust companies with their profits only $1,000,000, while the ordinary people who write letters pay $7,000,000, and the people who ride in railway trains pay $3,000,000. The principle of direct taxation is sound, but the principle must be carried out in a sound way. The advantage of direct taxation is that the tax can be levied according to the ability of the person to bear it. When the tax is not so levied, when it is levied lightly on the wealthy and heavily on those who are not wealthy, it has many of the disadvantageous features of the ordinary protective tariff.

Mr. WILCOX: Do not the banks and the trust companies post letters?

Mr. OLIVER: They will help to pay that tax, of course. But does not my hon. friend think that the banks, with their hundreds of millions of free circulation and the advantages they have at the hands of the Government of Canada, might fairly be asked to pay a larger share than they are being asked to do?

Mr. WILCOX: My hon. friend said that the stamp tax would fall entirely on the poor people.

Mr. OLIVER: Oh, no, I said the poor people would pay the greater part of it.

Mr. J. D. REID: Oh, no.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Give us the figures.

Mr. OLIVER: I have not got them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If my hon. friend had taken the trouble to get them, he would have found that he was far from the facts.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not think my hon. friend could get those figures.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We will try.

Mr. OLIVER: The side of the Budget proposals that calls for the most attention, and will probably receive the greatest attention at the hands of the people, is the proposals relating to tariff increases. It was quite in order that my hon. friend from South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) should be the member on the Government side of the House to follow my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean), and defend this high tariff Budget. As I read it, the tariff was made for Toronto, by Toronto and in Toronto.

Mr. W. T. WHITE: It was made in Canada for Canadians.

Mr. OLIVER: But only for some of the Canadians, very few in fact. We are anxious to see a tariff framed for all Canadians, just as we should be glad to see a system of taxation that would lay the burden equally on the shoulders of all of us. The proposal to increase by 5 per cent the duty on goods coming from Great Britain, and by 7½ per cent on goods coming from other countries, is, in fact, an increase in the tariff of 25 per cent. By a stroke of the pen the Finance Minister or the Government of this country have raised the tariff by one-fourth. They have made the tariff of Canada to-day higher in many particulars than the so-called National Policy of 1878, which was reduced in many particulars by those who framed it after they had had experience of it for 16 years. By the introduction of this Budget, the Finance Minister has taken away in important instances the advantages that were given to this country by the tariff reductions of 1904.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There were no reductions then.

Mr. OLIVER: In 1894.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: That is a great point. They need points badly.

Mr. OLIVER: The Finance Minister said that this was a tariff for Canadians. I notice that some Canadians will do very well out of it. I see our old friend the lumber combine figures quite successfully in this tariff. Lumber dressed on one side only was made free under the tariff of 1894 as a concession to the special conditions existing at that time in the prairie regions of Canada. It has been recognized as being an important benefit to the people of that western country. There have repeatedly been demands made upon the late Government and this Government to have that condition of free lumber removed. My hon. friend has removed it, and to-day that lumber stands under a duty of seven and one-half per cent.

Mr. J. D. REID: That is a war tax.

Mr. OLIVER: We will deal with that later. Lumber that costs $15 a thousand and was free, now pays $1.12½ a thousand duty. Lumber that costs $20 a thousand which formerly paid $5, now pays $6.50, and lumber that costs $25 a thousand formerly paid $6.25, now pays $8.25. If there is one institution or organization in the Dominion of Canada that did not merit consideration at the hands of this Government it was the lumber combine. My hon. friend has seen fit to place a taxation that is unjustified, unwarranted from any point of view upon the people of western Canada who depend largely upon imported lumber. While my hon. friend is preaching a campaign of patriotism and production, while the Minister of Agriculture is lecturing, and sending lecturers, throughout the West enjoining the farmers on the prairies to raise stock, to go into cattle and hogs, which must have shelter in buildings made of lumber or they cannot live, the Minister of Finance puts a bar of from $1 to $1.50 a thousand upon the use of that lumber for the benefit of an industry and an organization that, I say, has no claim upon the consideration of this Government or of the people of this country from any point of view. Just how far the lumber combine will benefit by this duty I cannot say, but I find that during last year we imported lumber to the value of $4,428,000 and that on that amount the revenue to the country will be $221,000.

Mr. WRIGHT: How much of that lumber came in free?

Mr. OLIVER: It all came in free.

Mr. WRIGHT: It would affect the calculation if some of this were free and some dutiable.

Mr. OLIVER: The Trade and Commerce returns show that in the year ended March 31, 1914, we imported free of duty $4,428,341 worth of lumber, upon which, with the duty now imposed, the consumer would pay, or the treasury would receive $221,000. But while we imported four and a half millions worth we exported nearly twenty million dollars worth showing that we are not dependent on imports for our supply of lumber. As a matter of fact, I fancy, for every thousand feet of lumber we import, we consume twice as much as we import, and if we do, then, as a result of the imposition of this 7½ per cent duty, while we will pay the treasury $221,000, we will pay the gentlemen who constitute the British Columbia lumber combine $442,000. The duty of 7½ per cent will cost the settler in the Northwest, on this calculation, not $221,000 but

10 p.m. $663,000 in addition to what he has been paying in the past. That is one of my hon. friend's contributions to the campaign of patriotism and production.

Now, take cement. We imported 709,000 cwt. in the year I have mentioned of a value of $332,564 and the duty collected amounted to $69,684. On that amount of cement there will be $24,279 of additional duty under the increased tariff. In other words, the cement combine, these good Canadians, these true patriots, these gentlemen who are out for patriotism and production, get the benefit of a 30 per cent additional protection at the hands of my hon. friend. And the consumer of cement pays $24,000 in addition? No, he pays on whatever amount of cement is used in Canada that is purchased in Canada as well as on the amount that is imported. I do not imagine that we import one-quarter of the cement that we use.

Mr. TURRIFF: One-tenth.

Mr. OLIVER: If we import only one-tenth of what we use, then this little increase in the tariff, instead of costing $24,000 additional, will cost $240,000 to the consumer of cement. Again a boost for the campaign of patriotism and production!

Mr. WRIGHT: We know that cement was reduced a few years ago—I think it was two years ago—and that in practical operation the foreign manufacturers of cement put half of the reduction in their own pockets and the consumers did not benefit to the extent the hon. gentleman is setting forth.

[Mr. Wright.]

Mr. OLIVER: I do not know anything about that, but I think I can demonstrate that the producers of cement will benefit to the amount I say by the change which has been made in the tariff and I do not think that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance will question that.

Mr. W. T. WHITE: Oh, yes, I will.

Mr. J. D. REID: No one will agree with you on that.

Mr. OLIVER: However, that is a matter the facts will demonstrate, and there is no doubt about it the consumer will have to pay. I notice that this Budget provides that mowers and reapers and binder twine are not subject to this increase of 7½ per cent. That is an important omission. It is of great advantage to the people of Western Canada particularly, and to the farmers of all Canada, that mowers and reapers are not subject to this increased duty, but mowers and reapers are not the only implements that are necessary to carry on this campaign of production and patriotism.

Mr. GRAHAM: Ask them why they were left off the list of articles subject to increased taxation.

Mr. OLIVER: I wonder why they happen to be left out of the list of articles subject to the increased taxation, unless the increase was liable to raise their price. Some of the gentlemen on the other side can answer that question at their leisure, I will not press for an answer at the moment. While mowers and reapers are exempt from this increase of duty, there is a long list of other agricultural implements that are not exempt, and which might be, such as engines, threshers, ploughs, harrows, drills, seeders, rollers, packers, hayrakes, potato-diggers. The plough, as everybody knows, is the symbol of agriculture; it is the fundamental implement of agriculture, and the plough pays an increased duty of seven and a half per cent. We imported in the year ending 1914, one million dollars' worth of ploughs and the duty on them was two hundred thousand dollars. If we import one million dollars' worth of ploughs next year they will pay $275,000 duty, which means that the campaign of patriotism and production will be aided by levying an additional tax of $75,000 upon the men who buy the ploughs.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is the way the farmers are made prosperous.

Mr. OLIVER: Yes. In this country I do not think that we import the larger pro-

portion of our ploughs. We have men in Canada who make ploughs; they are very excellent ploughs, and they are made in such numbers and of such quality that they are even exported to the United States to compete in the United States markets with the product of that country. So that, if we import one million dollars' worth of ploughs, we may reasonably believe that we produce three million dollars' worth in this country. And so our bill in respect to ploughs, under the seven and a half per cent increase, will be not $75,000 but $225,000, $75,000 of which will go to the Treasury, and the balance to the patriotic manufacturers of ploughs to aid in the campaign of patriotism and production.

I hope the House will pardon me for taking so much time on this feature of the case, but my hon. friend from Toronto was so insistent on the point that everybody was satisfied with this tariff, that I am sure hon. gentlemen will permit me to show to what extent we have reason to be satisfied with it. But there are people besides farmers who are interested in this tariff, because many of the people of Canada use cottons and woollens. In the year ending 31st March, 1914, under eight particular items, we imported woollens to the value of over twenty million dollars, blankets, worsteds, tweeds, etc., and upon that importation we paid a duty of five and a half million dollars. If we buy that same quantity of woollens next year, then under the five per cent and seven and a half per cent increase we will pay in the neighbourhood of $1,225,000 additional to what we paid before. Remember we do not get all these goods from Great Britain and they do not all come under the preference, although the larger portion does. In cottons, taking four items, we imported seven million dollars' worth last year, and we paid on that $1,225,000 duty. Averaging the five per cent and the seven and a half per cent increase, we will pay in addition $409,000 on the same importation next year. I do not imagine that we import one-half the cottons we use in Canada. We have immense cotton factories, we must be producing a great deal of cotton goods, and I think we produce at least twice as much as we import, so that while the Minister of Finance takes less than half a million dollars out of the people for the Treasury, his friends, these good Canadians, these patriotic manufacturers of cotton, will draw down anywhere from one million to one and a half million dollars. There is no doubt they are highly satisfied with the increase in the tariff. There is another class of patriots in this country who ought to have attention at this particular time, I speak of the manufacturers of boots. In the year ending 1914 we purchased $4,225,000 worth of boots and we paid $1,225,000 duty upon these boots. Taking the increase at seven per cent, because the larger portion of these boots comes from the United States, we will be paying $300,000 more duty upon the same quantity of boots imported next year. But everybody knows that we only import a comparatively small part of the boots we use in this country. I fancy that we make at any rate three pairs of boots in Canada for home use for every pair that we import. If that fact is a fact—and it is unquestionably a fact in this time of strife and hardship, when the cost of living has gone up and the means of living have gone down—my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, by his Budget, is handing to the manufacturers of boots in Canada approximately $1,000,000 a year.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What does the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) think of that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps the hon. gentleman, while he is on the subject, will say why this Government raised the duty on boots by five per cent?

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend will have all he can handle in explaining what his Government has done. The point is what his Government has done, not what the late Government did.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is you I am asking for an explanation. I hope you will make it.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend is asking for an explanation of something that is not pertinent to the subject. We are discussing war taxes that are being imposed at the present time.

Mr. GRAHAM: So-called war taxes.

Mr. OLIVER: Yes. My conclusion is that, if the estimate of the amount of home production is correct, to those sterling patriots who are producing boots in Canada so greatly to the credit of Canada, and who are so strongly upholding Canada in its share of this war that is in progress, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has handed out a little matter of $1,000,000 at this time, when every man is wondering where his revenue is to come from and how

he can make his expenditure and his revenue meet.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: That is the way the bootmakers die for the flag.

Mr. OLIVER: In the exposure that we have had lately, if there is any class of manufacturers in this country who are not entitled to special consideration at the hands of this Government, it is our friends who make boots.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Who make boots for the army. There are some very good makers of boots at St. John.

Mr. OLIVER: Who make boots for the army. My hon. friends have spoken of this Budget as a war Budget. It is a war Budget inasmuch as it is a Budget that is placed before the country while a war is in progress, but it is not a Budget which provides for meeting the expenses of that war. That we have on the authority of the Minister of Finance, and the facts are evident on the face of the record. The war is responsible for many things; but it is not responsible for the mismanagement of the finances of Canada which has occurred since our friends have taken office, and which has resulted in a deficit as between current revenue and current expenditure for the current year, amounting, on the authority of the Minister of Finance, to, I think, $20,000,000.

Mr. W. T. WHITE: $10,000,000.

Mr. OLIVER: $10,000,000 this year, and that is with an additional and special tax, which is expected to produce $7,000,000 during the last six months of the year, so that it really amounts to a deficit of $17,000,000 on current account.

I would like to see the Government appreciate their responsibility in regard to the part that Canada has to take in this war. They have not done so up to date; and it is not right or fair—I will not go further and say what ought to be said—that the Government should make the pretence, should hold out the false signal, and declare that the existence of this war is a reason why they increase the burdens on the people of Canada for the benefit of their particular friends. We hear a great deal in war time about vessels sailing under false flags. When this Government put forward, as their excuse for increasing the tax burden upon the people of this country, the existence of the war in Europe, they are sailing under a false flag; they are attempting to trade upon the patriotism of the people for the benefit of their particular friends and supporters, the manufacturing interests. This is neither a time nor an occasion when any government of any British country should come before Parliament and the people with such a proposal. This is a time when we ought to have fair play, fair dealing, and square talking. The Government should not attempt to mislead public opinion by mis-stating the facts of the case, putting upon their stamp, "war tax," when not a particle nor a fraction of the cost of the stamp is intended to pay any part of the war cost.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What about the interest?

Mr. OLIVER: We are not even paying the interest.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, yes.

Mr. OLIVER: According to the statement of the Minister of Finance, we are not even providing enough money to pay the expenditures that we have undertaken, aside altogether from the war, let alone interest. We have to borrow money to pay the interest, as my hon. friend knows.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Nonsense.

Mr. OLIVER: Patriotism and production! The words sound well, and there is no doubt that there is great need in Canada at the present time both of patriotism and of production. Why is it that our friends are holding meetings here and there throughout the country and urging upon the farmers in the West to increase their acreage, to increase their production, for the sake of patriotism? Do they know why the farmers in the West have not increased their acreage during the past few years? Do they know that the acreage of production in the West in 1914 was no greater than it was in 1911, and do they know why?

Mr. BURNHAM: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: Does my hon. friend know why?

Mr. BURNHAM: Economically the world can consume only a certain quantity of food, and if you increase production, as some hon. gentlemen furiously profess they intend to do in the West, you will only heap waste on the market. While you may interchange manufactures and have five pianos or five motor cars or five anything else you like instead of one, you cannot eat any more than you did before, no matter what you may do.

Mr. OLIVER: In 1914 the area of production in the West was no greater than it was in 1911, and to-day the Government and the people who claim to have leadership in Canada are urging upon the people of the West to increase their production. Do our friends recall the conditions that existed throughout the prairie provinces immediately after they took office in 1911? Do they remember the tremendous crop that was on the ground, the unfavourable weather conditions that existed, the grain blockade that took place, the rotting of the grain in the stooks and in the granaries? Do they remember what was done when pressure was exerted in this House to secure an outlet for this grain by means of reduced railway rates and by means of tariff concessions in respect of trade with the United States? When it was too late, railway rates were reduced, but no tariff concessions were made. Railway rates were reduced for grain that was routed through, but not for grain that was sold in the States subject to the tariff; it had to pay the higher rates. Well, I can assure my hon. friend that when a farmer has seen his crop rot on the ground or in the granary, and when he has not the wherewithal to seed that ground the next year, he is just in the same position as any business man would be. In the first place, he is discouraged; in the second place, he cannot go on. And when the next year prices were abnormally low; when oats were selling in the province of Alberta at 15, 16, and 18 cents a bushel, what was done by this Government to relieve the situation? Anything? Nothing, absolutely. Since that time the changes in the United States tariff have given an advantage to Canadian producers. There has been a reduction in the duty on oats, and last year the reduction of the United States duty to 6 cents a bushel enabled the people of the western country to dispose of their oats, I shall not say at a living price, but they were able to get rid of them, and they would not have been able to do so otherwise. Yet my hon. friends wonder why production stands still. They think that by issuing pamphlets and by holding meetings in board rooms of banks they can instruct the farmer how to increase production. If they would give the farmer the benefit of a market, then he would increase production. At the present time, owing to the war, he has a market. Give him reasonable accommodation at the bank and you shall not need to issue pamphlets or hold lectures; he will increase the production all right enough. But he has to have the money. Unless you are prepared to let him have the money, he cannot make the production. If these kings of finance, who are so wise on every subject after everything is over, would make their arrangements so that they could and would finance the farmers of the western country during this year of high prices, I will guarantee that they will increase production. But talk will not do it, and the levying of extra taxes will not do it. The 25-cent increase that is proposed to be placed in the tariff by this present Budget is a campaign against patriotism and against production, and it will take years and great effort—on the part, I am sure, of some other government than this—to overcome the loss that the country will sustain by reason of its imposition.

On motion of Mr. J. H. Burnham (West Peterborough), the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Hon. W. T. White, the House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

Wednesday, February 24, 1915.

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

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill No. 58, respecting the Casualty Company of Canada.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill No. 59, respecting the Empire Life Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill No. 60, to incorporate Entwhistle and Alberta Southern Railway Company.—Mr. R. B. Bennett.

Bill No. 61, respecting the Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Railway Company.—Mr. Middlebro.

DIVISION OF BILL—RULING BY MR. SPEAKER.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE moved:

That it be an instruction to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, if it thinks fit, to divide Bill No. 17, an Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, into two Bills.

Mr. SPEAKER: With reference to this motion I have the honour to submit the following:

The motion referred to asks the House to give power—by instruction—to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, to divide Bill No. 17 into two Bills.

This Bill was referred to that committee on February the 15th instant, and is con-

sequently in the possession of the committee and is not on the Orders of the House.

On the subject of instruction to committees, May (11th edition, page 48), states that an instruction is necessary to enable a committee to divide a Bill into two Bills; but (see page 481) he further states that:

> A motion for an instruction which seeks to confer upon a committee of the Whole House power to make amendments in a Bill that is already possessed by the committee is out of order and this rule applies to instructions to standing or joint committees.

Bourinot inferentially sustains this position on page 651, 3rd edition, where it is observed that an instruction to a committee should be moved as soon as the Order for the committee has been read by the Clerk, showing that the Bill must then be in possession of the House when instruction is given.

In the case of Bill 17, now that it is in the possession of the committee and not of the House, it is not in order to entertain this motion. This Bill being in the possession of the committee, it would be in order for the committee to report the Bill back to the House with such recommendations as are thought desirable, including that of receiving power to divide the Bill into two Bills. The House could then take such action in the premises as it considers advisable.

A resolution of a similar character to the present appears, however, to have passed the House in 1888, the Bill in question being then in the possession of the committee and no notice of motion having been previously given. There was no ruling given by the Speaker on the propriety of the action taken: indeed, the question was not raised.

I do not think that case constitutes a precedent and consequently I have ruled as above.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Do I understand, Mr. Speaker, that your ruling is that the Railway Committee, which is possessed of the Bill, should send it back to the House for instructions?

Mr. SPEAKER: My ruling is that a Bill must be in possession of the House at the time it gives instructions. Therefore, in this case, it would be in order for the Railway Committee to report the Bill to the House, with such recommendations as they see fit. The House would then have the advantage of the committee's judgment and recommendation and could act upon it.

[Mr. Speaker.]

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

WAR SUPPLIES—HORSES.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Who was in charge of the purchase of horses for military purposes in the province of Nova Scotia in 1914?
2. How many horses were purchased?
3. In what counties and how many in each county?
4. How much was paid for these horses?
5. How many of them were sent to Valcartier?

Major-General HUGHES:

1. The Principal Veterinary Officer for Canada and his assistants.
2. 428 horses were so purchased.
3. Kings County, 224; Hants, 29; Halifax, 70; Colchester, 27; Pictou, 40; Annapolis, 38.
4. $72,994.
5. 428 horses.

*Mr. BOYER:

1. Did Sir Adam Beck act as purchaser of remounts for the first contingent?
2. If so, how many remounts were purchased by him and what was the average price paid per horse?
3. What was the average per horse to cover all expenses in purchasing the said horses?
4. Were the owners from whom the said horses were purchased paid by Government cheque, or were they paid for by Sir Adam Beck, by his own personal cheque and he afterwards reimbursed?
5. Were the said horses branded at time of purchase or only after arrival at Valcartier?
6. If the latter, why were the regulations laid down in mobilization orders 1913 not complied with?

Major-General HUGHES:

1. Yes.
2. 334; $166.08.
3. $7.50 per horse.
4. Paid by order on Bank of Montreal, signed by Sir Adam Beck and the Veterinary Inspecting Officer, and endorsed by the seller of the horse.
5. Horses were branded at the time of purchase.
6. Answered by No. 5.

Mr. NEELY:

1. Did Mr. A. DeWitt Foster, M.P., for King's county, N.S., purchase horses for the Canadian Government for the first contingent?
2. If so, how many horses did he purchase?
3. What was the total amount of money given to Mr. Foster by the Government for purchasing horses?
4. Did Mr. Foster draw this money from the deposit which the Government made in one of the Canadian banks?
5. Did Mr. Foster submit a receipt from each person from whom he purchased a horse?

Major-General HUGHES:

1. Mr. Foster was requested by the Principal Veterinary Officer for Canada to assist the Inspecting Veterinary Officers in the Maritime Provinces in the purchase of horses. Mr. Foster consented to assist, but on the understanding it was to be without remuneration.

2. 428 horses were so purchased.

3. None.

4. Answered by No. 3.

5. Yes. Each order on the Bank of Montreal was jointly signed by Mr. Foster and the Veterinary Inspecting Officer, and endorsed by the seller of the horse.

WAR SUPPLIES—CANVAS SHOES.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. From how many firms have the Government ordered canvas shoes for the various contingents now being equipped for service??

2. What are the names of these firms?

3. How many canvas shoes have been ordered from each firm?

4. How many canvas shoes have each firm delivered up to date?

5. How many canvas shoes have each firm yet to deliver?

6. What is the price that each firm is receiving for these canvas shoes?

Major-General HUGHES:

1. Seven.

2, 3, 4, 5 and 6:—

Names of Contractors.	No. ordered.	No. delivered to date.	No. still to be delivered.	Price per pair.
	Prs.	Prs.	Prs.	$ cts.
Cook & Fitzgerald	5,000	5,000	Nil.	2 00
Dufresne & Galipeau	5,000	4,639	361	2 00
Dufresne & Locke	10,000	9,748	252	2 00
Jas. Muir Co	10,000	9,961	39	2 00
Brandon Shoe Co	5,000	4,910	90	2 00
Regal Shoe Co	5,000	4,797	203	2 00
E. T. Wright Co	5,000	4,639	361	2 00

WAR SUPPLIES—SLIPPERS.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. From how many firms has the Government ordered slippers for the various contingents now being equipped for service?

2. What are the names of these firms?

3. How many slippers have been ordered from each firm?

4. How many slippers have each firm delivered up to date?

5. How many slippers have each firm yet to deliver?

6. What is the price that each firm are receiving for these slippers?

Major-General HUGHES:

1. One.

2. Ames, Holden, McCready, Ltd.

3. 2,350 pairs.

4. 2,348 pairs.

5. 2 pairs.

6. $1.50 per pair.

AMHERST ARMOURY.

Mr. LAW:

1. What was the amount of the tender by Rhodes, Curry and Company, Ltd., for building the armoury at Amherst, N.S.?

2. Has any extra amount been allowed the contractors for the completion of the building? If so, how much?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. $81,100.

2. $14,639, of which $125 was for a bevelled strip on floor, and $14,514 for strengthening foundation and increasing thickness of external brick walls and walls of tower; the substitution of brick walls for wooden partitions at end of main hall; substituting brick partitions for lath and plaster in basement, and changing the hot-air heating system to steam heating.

SHELBURNE HARBOUR FOG ALARM.

Mr. LAW:

1. Were tenders called for the repairs to or the construction of the fog whistle at Cape Roseway, Shelburne harbour?

2. If so, who are the tenderers, and what was the amount of each tender?

3. Was the work done by tender and contract? If so, by whom? If not, why not?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes, tenders were publicly invited in July, 1913, for the construction of a wooden fog-alarm building at Cape Roseway, N.S., and one offer was received, namely, from L. Mury & Son, of West Arichat, for the sum of $2,368. This was accepted, but the contractor declined to proceed with the work unless the department allowed an increase of $800 over his tender price. New tenders were invited in the spring of 1914.

2. In 1914 the following tenders were re-

ceived, namely, Maynard C. Denton & Maurice A. Condon, of Digby, N.S., $3,490; Oliphant J. O'Brien, of Digby, N.S., $3,930; Howard de Champ, of Shelburne, N.S., $4,100.

3. Owing to the fact that the lowest tender was considerably higher than the estimate of the departmental officials, the department decided to have the work performed by day labour, under the supervision of the resident engineer in Nova Scotia.

JORDAN EAST BREAKWATER.

Mr. LAW:

1. Did the Government receive any complaint from any person or persons in respect to any irregularities alleged or otherwise, in the pay-rolls or endorsements on cheques in connection with the repairs to Jordan East breakwater, either in 1913 or 1914?

2. If so, did the Government investigate the matter and give the person or persons making charges or irregularities an opportunity of proving the charges?

3. If so, what was the result of said investigation?

4. Will the Government lay on the table of the House a copy of all correspondence in relation to the matter?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.

2. Yes, investigated by an officer of the Department of Public Works.

3. That there was no foundation for the charges made.

4. Yes.

SOLDIERS' INSURANCE.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN:

1. Is the Government aware that life insurance companies generally are charging additional premiums on men who have enlisted, amounting to $50 on the first $1,000 of insurance, and $200 on the second $1,000 of insurance?

2. Has the Government taken any steps to regulate the additional premiums which may be charged in case of enlistment?

Mr. W. T. WHITE:

1. The Government is aware that on policies issued since the outbreak of the war life insurance companies generally are charging additional premiums on men who have enlisted, of $50 per $1,000 of insurance. In the case of a few companies, larger additional premiums are charged in respect of insurance in excess of $2,000, the additional premium on such excess amount being in some cases as high as $200 per $1,000.

2. The Government has taken steps to see that the provisions of the Insurance Act with respect to military service are complied with. The Act, however, does not provide for the regulation of the amount of additional premium which may be charged in case of enlistment.

[Mr. Hazen.]

CARLETON RETAINING WALL.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Has any application been received by the Government or any of its members, from the mayor or municipal council of Carleton, Quebec, or from the citizens thereof, for a grant for the retaining wall, consequent upon the damage caused by the high tides of last fall?

2. If so, has any action been taken, and what was that action?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes, application was received under date of December 18, 1914, from Mr. H. J. Martin.

2. No action was taken, as there was no provision made by Parliament to do this work.

STONEY MOUNTAIN PENITENTIARY.

Mr. EDWARDS:

(a) Is the wardenship of Stoney Mountain Penitentiary vacant? (b) If so, how long has it been vacant, and (c) who has been performing the duties of the said office?

Mr. DOHERTY: (a) Yes. (b) Since March 25, 1914. (c) The deputy warden.

EMPLOYMENT OF CHAS. GAUVREAU.

Mr. LANCTOT:

1. Is Mr. Chas. Gauvreau, of Rimouski, employed by the federal Government? If so, since when?

2. What salary does the said Chas. Gauvreau receive, and what is his occupation?

3. By whom was he recommended for appointment?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. Yes, since July 14, 1914.

2. He is paid at the rate of $2 a day as a mail transfer agent.

3. He was recommended for appointment by Mr. H. Boulay, M.P.

RIVER RIGAUD DREDGING.

Mr. BOYER:

(a) Is it the intention of the Government to dredge river Rigaud, this year? (b) If so, by whom was such dredging recommended, and (c) what is the aim sought thereby?

Mr. ROGERS: (a) The matter is under consideration. (b) Mr. De Lery Macdonald. (c) To obtain a uniform depth of 8 feet by a width of 75 feet.

ST. ZOTIQUE WHARF.

Mr. BOYER:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to repair during the coming season the wharf at St. Zotique, county of Soulanges?

2. Does the report of the engineer in charge of wharfs show that said wharf is totally unserviceable, in its present condition, to navigation?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. The question will be taken into consideration.

2. No.

WALLACE SPUR LINE.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What amount was voted for the construction of a spur line of railway in Wallace, N.S.?

2. When was this amount first voted?

3. Has any part of the amount been spent in construction? If so, how much?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. $60,000.

2. Fiscal year 1912-13.

3. No.

PUGWASH SPUR LINE.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What has been the cost of the railway spur line or siding to the brickyard at Pugwash, N.S.?

2. What have been the receipts?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. $74,568.84 to date.

2. Spur is not yet completed.

TRANSPORT OF PRINCESS PATRICIA REGIMENT.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. Was the SS. Megantic chartered to convey the Princess Patricia Regiment to England? If so, at what date, and upon what terms?

2. Did the regiment embark at Montreal, disembark at Quebec, and remain at or near the latter city until the date of sailing of all the troops comprising the first Canadian expeditionary force?

3. Was the detention of the said regiment due to the fact that a convoy could not be provided to escort the SS. Megantic on a special trip distant from the voyage of the other vessels hired to transport the rest of the troops?

4. If so, why was the Megantic hired, and the said regiment embarked before arrangements for a convoy had been made?

5. Were the owners of the Megantic paid for the interrupted trip across the Atlantic? If so, what amount was paid, and when?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. No, she was not chartered. On the 25th August, 1914, the Oceanic Steamship Navigation Company agreed to convey the Princess Patricias Light Infantry from Montreal to Liverpool on the steamship Megantic, sailing August 29. The rates to be charged were the usual passenger rates.

2. The regiment did embark at Montreal and disembarked at Quebec. They were placed under canvas at Levis until the first contingent sailed for England.

3 and 4. These questions relate to matters which are the subject of secret communications, and with regard thereto we have the distinct request of the War Office and of the Admiralty, expressed in a very earnest manner, that such communications should not be brought down to Parliament at the present time.

5. The owners were paid $54,754.25 on 28th November, 1914.

THE FARMERS BANK.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

Is it the intention of the Government to introduce legislation during the present session with a view to reimburse the depositors of the defunct Farmers Bank?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is not the intention to introduce legislation during the present session for the purpose mentioned.

CANADIAN HIGH COMMISSIONERSHIP.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

Is it the intention of the Government to appoint a successor to Lord Strathcona as High Commissioner? If so, when?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Some months previous to the outbreak of war Sir George Perley, who is a member of the Government without portfolio, had proceeded to London under authority of an Order in Council for the purpose of discharging the duties of High Commissioner. He remained in the discharge of these functions up to the time of the outbreak of war, and since then he has so continued. His service during that time has been of very great advantage to the whole country, as it has afforded a means of co-operation between the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of Canada which otherwise would not have been possible. At the time when Mr. Perley proceeded to London it was in order to consider the status of the High Commissioner's office with a view of possibly making certain modifications or changes therein. Until his colleagues, and especially myself, have had an opportunity of discussing that subject with him, the arrangements which have continued since last April or May will still continue.

WAGES AT VALCARTIER.

*Mr. VERVILLE:

1. Has the Department of Labour made an investigation in respect of work done in Valcartier respecting the fair wage clause?

2. If so, of what nature was the report?

Mr. CROTHERS:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

RECRUITING AT NEW WATERFORD.

Mr. CARROLL:

1. When was Dr. J. C. Morrison appointed examining physician for recruits at New Waterford, Cape Breton South, Nova Scotia?
2. When was he dismissed?
3. Why was he dismissed?

Major-General HUGHES:

1. February 8, 1915.

2. He was relieved from duty on the 15th February, 1915.

3. Dr. Morrison was not a member of the Army Medical Corps, and another medical officer, Dr. Macleod, had been nominated before Dr. Morrison.

WINNIPEG IMMIGRATION OFFICE DISMISSALS.

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. How many officials have been dismissed from the immigration service at Winnipeg, since August 1, 1914?
2. What are the names of those dismissed, their nationality and their length of service?
3. What others have been appointed in place of those dismissed, and what is the nationality of each?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Two dismissed and six indefinitely suspended, of whom four since have been reinstated.

2. Mary Ann Walsh, British, in service since September 1, 1906. Ivan Petrushevich, Ruthenian, in service since June 15, 1914.

3. None.

TEMISCOUATA RURAL MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. How many tenders for the rural mail service at St. Jean-de-Dieu, Temiscouata, did the Post Office Department receive?
2. What was the amount stipulated in each tender?
3. To whom was the contract awarded?
4. Was it the lowest tender?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Nine tenders were received.

2. Joseph Ouellet, $400, reduced to $345; Joseph Jean, $350; Jean Rosseau, $350; Cyrille Rioux, $448; Joseph D'Auteuil, $450; Timothe Rioux, $450; Theophile Sirois, $500; Pierre Deschenes, $500; Joseph Dumas, $525.

3. Joseph Ouellet, at the rate of his reduced tender.

4. It was the lowest offer received.

FRASERVILLE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

For what reason was the sum of $50,000, contained in the estimates of 1913-14 in connection with proposed improvements of the Fraserville harbour, River du Loup, not expended last year??

[Mr. Crothers.]

Mr. ROGERS:

The cost of the work was so much greater than was anticipated that it was deemed advisable to again inquire into the matter before calling for tenders.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. Law: For a copy of all correspondence, petitions and documents since the 31st of October, 1912, relating in any way whatever to the proposed public wharf at Lower Woods Harbour?

Mr. Law: For a copy of pay-rolls and all correspondence and vouchers in connection with the repairs of Jordan breakwater, Shelburne county, for which Leander McKenzie was contractor of works or foreman.

Mr. Law: For a copy of all correspondence, petitions, documents, etc., in connection with a petition of Donald Williams and others in respect to the regulation of fish traps in Green harbour and vicinity.

Mr. Law: For a copy of all pay-rolls, vouchers in detail, correspondence and all other documents in connection with the following public works in Shelburne: Breakwater or wharf at East Green harbour; shed on public wharf at Shelburne, and repairs to Gunning Cove wharf.

Mr. Law: For a copy of all letters, papers and documents relating to the dismissal of the following officers in Shelburne county, N.S.: Wm. L. Smith, lightkeeper, Baccaro, N.S.; J. A. Arechia, harbour master, Lowerwoods harbour, and J. C. Morrison, harbour master, Shelburne, N.S.

Mr. Law: For a copy of all tenders, contracts, pay-rolls, vouchers, letters, correspondence papers and documents, relating to the following public works in Shelburne county: breakwater and wharf at Frudes pont; breakwater and wharf at Jordan east; wharf at Shelburne; wharf at Port Clyde; breakwater at Blanche Point; wharf at Centreville; wharf at West Head; cribwork at Mathews lake, and clearing channel at Round bay.

Mr. Law: For a return showing the amounts in detail paid to Ward Fisher, of Shelburne, N.S., fishery inspector, for the years 1912 and 1913, for salary, office expenses, travelling expenses, and all other expenses.

Mr. Kyte: For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and petitions relating to the appointment of Alfred Bishop as farm foreman, or in any other capacity at the experimental station at Kemptville, Nova Scotia.

Mr. Law: For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence and pay-rolls in connection with the repairs and other work on the breakwater at Sandford, Yarmouth county, N.S., during the year 1914.

Mr. Law: For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence and pay-rolls in connection with repars and extension of breakwater at Bluff Head, Yarmouth county, N.S., during year 1914.

Mr. German: For a copy of all correspondence between the Government, or any member or department thereof, and P. W. Ellis and Company of Toronto, for the purchase of supplies for the Militia Department since the 1st of August, 1914, the amount of commission paid or agreed to be paid to the said P. W. Ellis and Company on the purchase of supplies for the Militia Department of Canada since the 1st of August, 1914, and the nature of all supplies furnished the Department of Militia by said

P. W. Ellis and Company either by themselves or through them on commission, and from whom purchased.

Mr. Lemieux: For a return showing:

1. Who the remount commissioners are for Western and Eastern Canada respectively.

2. When and by whom they were appointed, and what their general instructions were.

3. Why were the mobilization orders 1913, which provide for the purchase of remounts, ignored and civilians put in charge of the purchase of remounts.

4. The names of the purchasers and inspecting veterinary officers appointed by the remount commissioner for Eastern Canada, in the various remount divisions.

5. If any of the purchasers and inspecting veterinary officers have been stopped buying. If so, what their names are, and the reasons given by the remount commissioner for his action.

6. How many horses have been purchased between December 1 and January 21, in each remount division in Eastern Canada, and the average price paid per horse.

7. What the average cost per horse is in each remount division to cover the expenses, including pay or allowances and all travelling and other expenses, between the said dates.

Mr. Law: For a return showing:

1. If the Government ever leased any land at or near Shelburne, Nova Scotia, known as the Barracks property, to the town of Shelburne.

2. If so, when, at what rental, and for how long.

3. If said lease is now in force?

4. If the Government has sold any of the standing timber on this property.

5. If so, when, to whom, and at what price.

6. How long the purchaser has to remove it.

7. What is the minimum size at the stump, sold.

8. If the Government has ever had the property cruised by competent timber cruiser.

9. If so, by whom, and when.

10. If the timber on said property was advertised for sale, and tenders were asked for, or any opportunity afforded to other prospective buyers to bid for this timber.

11. If any other offers were received.

12. If the town of Shelburne was notified before the sale took place. If so, on what date?

13. How much timber the Government estimates to be on this property.

14, What steps the Government intends to take to compute the quantity of timber cut from this property.

15. If the Government is aware that timber is now being cut from this property by a person or firm who are cutting timber from private property adjoining said Barracks property.

16. What steps are being taken by the Government to be sure that in the case the logs are kept separate from those coming from the adjoining lot, for the purpose of having accurate count and scale.

17. If the Government will bring down a copy if all correspondence, cruisers' reports and contracts in relation to the sale of this timber.

Mr. Lemieux: For a return showing:

1. From how many firms the Government have ordered ankle boots for the various contingents now being equipped for service.

2. The names of these firms.

3. How many ankle boots have been ordered from each firm.

4. How many ankle boots each firm have delivered up to date.

5. How many ankle boots each firm have yet to deliver.

6. The price that each firm is receiving for these ankle boots.

CANADIAN PATRIOTIC FUND AMENDMENT BILL.

Bill No. 39, to amend the Canadian Patriotic Fund Act, 1914.—Hon. C. J. Doherty (Minister of Justice)—read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Sevigny in the Chair.

Mr. DOHERTY: I might just repeat the formal explanation I gave in introducing this Bill. The provisions of this amendment empower the corporation to assist incapacitated soldiers who may return from the war, and widows, children and dependent relatives of men who may be killed on active service. It also empowers the corporation to give assistance to the wives, children and dependent relatives of residents of Newfoundland who are engaged on active service in the military or naval forces of Canada. As the Act now stands, the powers of the corporation are limited to assisting the wives, children and dependent relatives of men on active service, so that an incapacitated man is not provided for, nor are the widows and children of the men who may be killed. Furthermore, under the present Act the powers of the corporation are limited to assisting the wives, children and dependent relatives of residents of Canada only.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the relatives of men on active service at the front, who are partially dependent upon the wages of these men, get anything from the patriotic fund?

Mr. DOHERTY: The Act says that dependent relatives may be assisted. I do nor think that the Act makes any express provision for those who are partially dependent.

Mr. CARROLL: I understand that applications have been made to certain local committees in different parts of the country for relief from this fund and that the best the applicants could do was to give evidence that they were partially dependent on the wages of their sons and they were refused any assistance.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not very familiar with the actual operation of the Act, but perhaps my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), will explain how the work is carried on.

Mr. GRAHAM: Perhaps it might be well if the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, would take this opportunity of making a statement of what has been done with the patriotic fund up to date.

Mr. AMES: If the House desires to have a statement of that character, in my capacity as honorary secretary of the fund, I shall be very glad to give it. The House will remember that towards the end of the last session held in August authority for the creation of this fund was given. At the present time probably ninety per cent of the Dominion of Canada is covered either by branches of the patriotic fund or by auxiliary organizations run on the same lines. We have an office in Ottawa which acts as a clearing house, and all cases that are referred to us are sent on to the proper organization which is a branch of our own organization or an affiliated association. We adopt, generally speaking, a uniform system in dealing with all these cases and we are constantly sending out from the head office memoranda for the guidance of the various branches. I shall be very glad to deal with any question which any hon. gentleman desires to raise. The story in detail would be a very long one but any questions that any hon. gentleman may wish to bring up I shall be most happy to deal with. The hon. member for Cape Breton, South (Mr. Carroll), raised a point a moment ago. In reply to his question I would say that generally speaking, the local committee of each branch is, within certain limits, a law unto itself dealing with applications for relief. We issue suggestions from the head office to them and we tell them how other branches are operating their relief funds. The principles upon which relief is given are these: The first question that is always asked is "Is the family in need, or would the family be in need if there was no patriotic fund?" If it is found that the family are getting along very well there would be no claim upon the fund. But if it is the case that in consequence of the departure of soldiers for the war a family is falling below the scale of decent subsistence then that family would have a claim upon the fund. The next question which would be asked is: Was the family dependent on the soldier? If a wife and children have been wholly dependent upon a man who has gone to the front there would be no question. If it is a widowed mother who is entirely dependent upon the soldier son who has enlisted there would be no question; she would rank both with the Government and with us the same as the wife and children. But we have a certain number of complicated cases of what you might call partial dependency that are dealt with usually by the local branch committee upon suggestions from the head office. In a case of partial dependency where a son has gone to the war, the question usually asked is: How much does the family fall below the scale of decent subsistence in consequence of this boy having gone to the war? If he has turned in $5 a week and his own board was worth $3 the fund would make up the other $2 and put the family in the same position as they would have been in if the boy had not gone to the front. These cases of partial dependency are rather difficult to deal with, and they are usually taken up by the local committees along some such lines as I have indicated.

Mr. GRAHAM: How much has been collected and expended?

Mr. AMES: As nearly as we can judge at present, in round figures, there is at the disposition of our honorary treasurer about $2,700,000, and there has been expended to date about $800,000, leaving a net cash balance on hand of about $1,900,000. We have resources which we expect will produce about as much more. Consequently, the fund will probably be self-sustaining to the end of the present year, and it is now mainly a question of securing the co-operation of a few communities that have not as yet contributed, on the basis that all take part in the burden before any are asked for the second time to contribute.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the proportion received by dependents of soldiers from the Government in the way of separation allowance, or assigned pay, and that received from the patriotic fund?

Mr. AMES: In order to answer that question adequately it would be necessary to classify the soldiers' families in this way: first, families of British reservists; second, French reservists; third, Belgian reservists; then Canadian Overseas contingents, and, finally, Canadians who are called out for home service whether they volunteer to go or not. Besides these there are men in the naval service. The Government, in the case of overseas service, gives a separation allowance of $20 a month to every wife or widowed mother. We take a family and consider the question with a view to the cost of living in a particular neighbourhood. We

would consider that in Montreal a woman with three children, one twelve years of age, one eight, and one four, was entitled to $45 a month from all sources in order to maintain a decent scale of living. The Government gives $20 and the patriotic fund would give her $25. When we get to the western provinces we authorized a scale which is about 25 per cent higher because we found by accurate comparison that the cost of living in Saskatchewan and British Columbia—not so much in Alberta—was about twenty or twenty-five per cent higher than in the large cities in the east.

An hon. MEMBER: Where do you draw the line?

Mr. AMES: At Lake Superior. As a general thing, the rule we have with the local committees is this: Our committees are composed of some of the best men in each province, and we say to the committee: determine what you consider to be the amount necessary for a typical family to decently live upon in your province; you can do it better than we can; decide this; fix the amount at $50 or $40 or whatever you may decide upon. The Government gives Canadians $20, the Imperial Government gives Reservists about $15, the French Government about $12, and the Belgian Government gives nothing at all. We make up the difference in each of these cases in order that a family may be enabled to maintain a decent scale of living.

Mr. OLIVER: As it appears to me the responsibility of caring for the dependents of men who are serving the country in a military way at the present time rests primarily upon the State and private efforts should not be called upon to more than supplement the provision made by the State. Does the State at the present time undertake the major provision for the dependents of soldiers, or has the major provision to be made up by subscriptions of citizens? I think it is entirely desirable from every point of view that it should be distinctly understood on all hands that the obligation of maintenance of soldiers' dependents is an obligation of the state, and that private generosity should not be drawn upon except to a supplementary extent and for supplementary purposes.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The separation allowance established in this country was fixed by reference to that of the United Kingdom, but it was made somewhat larger here than in the United Kingdom by reason of the fact that the conditions here as compared with those in the old country would justify it. In addition to that, the soldiers in some cases assign a portion of their pay. If I remember correctly, an Order in Council was subsequently passed to deal with cases in which pay was not assigned, providing that a certain proportion of the pay should be appropriated for the support of the soldier's dependents in cases of the character to which my hon. friend has referred. I shall be glad later on to lay a copy of the Order in Council on the table. It was passed purely for the reason that in a proportion of cases, I think not a large proportion, no portion of the pay was being assigned, and therefore the depend nts were left to be taken care of by the separation allowances, supplemented by the Canadian patriotic fund. It was felt that as the great majority of the soldiers did assign a portion of their pay, and as that seemed the proper course to pursue, an order should be made in regard to it, and an order was so made.

Mr. OLIVER: Was the order made to divert a portion of the soldier's pay to his family?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It was made so that a portion of the soldier's pay could be appropriated for the support of his family during his absence.

Mr. OLIVER: I have no desire to delay the committee, nor have I any desire to press unduly for information that I am quite aware it would be difficult to get; but this is a far-reaching matter, and I think that here and now is as good a place as any to get a fairly good general understanding as to what are to be considered the obligations of the state and the obligations of private citizens. I do not wish to criticise the Government or the gentlemen who are interested in the patriotic fund to any degree, but I take this opportunity of stating that within the range of my knowledge, and according to my judgment, the conditions of life from which our soldiers have enlisted differ materially from the conditions of life from which were enlisted the soldiers of the United Kingdom, to whose case the separation allowance which was used as the basis of calculation in fixing our separation allowance applied. I do not think that the fact that the present separation allowance was considered a proper allowance in the United Kingdom, under the circumstances existing before this war occurred, was a sufficient ground for believing that a certain percentage of advance

upon that allowance was a proper allowance in Canada when and where the extraordinary circumstances surrounding this war were taking place. The proof that the view I express is correct, is, that the British Government has found it necessary to recognize the new conditions surrounding enlistment in the army for the present war, and have seen fit—and no doubt not without the greatest necessity for it—to revise their provisions in regard to separation allowance. We could not tell beforehand—I do not expect even this Government to know everything in advance—but the war has been in progress for six months; we have had the separation allowance in operation, we have had the assignment of men's pay, we have had the patriotic fund raised generously throughout the country and administered I am sure with the very best of intentions, and I have no doubt capably administered, so that to-day we must know a great deal more about this matter of taking care of the dependents of those who are fighting our battles than we did in August last. While I quite readily accept the amendments to the Bill which we are now considering, I still think that there is necessary a very considerable revision of the provisions which have been made for the maintenance of the dependents of soldiers who are now serving their country, or who may be hereafter expected to serve their country. While I am quite aware that this legislation is not legislation providing for separation allowances from the treasury, I think this is a proper time to put on record the views I hold, and hold very strongly, that time having elapsed, and conditions having become known, it is in order that there should be a readjustment of the statutory arrangements for the maintenance of dependents of soldiers in the service of their country, that would render the efforts of the patriotic fund and those who are interested in it a supplementary source and not, as they appear to me at the present time to be, the principal source of support of the dependents of the soldiers who are at the front. I wish to say, as strongly as I can, that the support of these dependents is the duty of the state, and that the interests of the state require that that duty shall be discharged freely and generously, with, of course, good judgment and care. I hope that there will be legislation both in regard to separation allowances and maintenance of dependents, and that it will be based on conditions as they exist in this country, and as they have been found to exist in the operation of our laws in this matter up to the present time, rather than upon the legislation and regulations prevailing in the United Kingdom which were based on a totally different condition of affairs.

Mr. AMES: It appears to me that the Government has acted very generously in the matter of separation allowances. As I understand the Government is to-day paying 20,000 separation allowances, while the Canadian patriotic fund is carrying between 10,000 and 11,000 families, so that about half of the dependent families of the soldiers are not coming to the patriotic fund at all. That would go to prove that the Government, in making the basic appropriation of $20 applicable everywhere, was covering pretty nearly half of the cases. To overpay that half would be as bad as to underpay the other half. The Government, moreover, has no flexibility. It would have to pay $20 to a soldier's wife just the same, whether she lived in a rich rural community in the East where the cost of living was low, or in the Yukon or in a mining district in British Columbia where the cost of living was very high. The Government can not discriminate and say that for this area the separation allowance shall be $20, for that area $25, for that $30, and so on. The patriotic fund comes on afterwards and acts with a great deal of flexibility, on the best local advice that can be secured. It takes each family by itself and asks the simple question: Considering that the family gets $20 from the Government, how much more is needed to bring your family up to a decent scale of existence? One wife may have no family, and $10 added to the $20 separation allowance may be all that she requires. Another wife may have ten children, and the patriotic fund takes into consideration the fact that this woman needs a great deal more to support her than the first, although the Government gives both the same separation allowance. The Government has acted very wisely in giving a basic $20 to each dependent family whether it needs it or not, and the patriotic fund follows only in cases where further assistance is required.

You have only to read the casualty lists to see how many of our soldiers have their next of kin in the old country. For those families probably $20 is enough, and we do not send any money to England from the patriotic fund, because it is apparently not necessary to do so. The few cases of hardship that we hear of in England are pro-

vided for by reciprocal arrangement with the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Association. We care for the wives and dependents of old country reservists here, and that Association cares for our soldiers' wives and dependents in the old country in cases where $20 is not quite sufficient.

This combination of Government effort and local philanthropy works extremely well. It has been a great blessing to many people in Canada to have an opportunity to contribute to the patriotic fund. It has done many people a world of good, because many a one who could not fight wanted to have an opportunity of helping in some way. Many a man, who is saving from month to month and making a monthly contribution, has the satisfaction of knowing that, while he does not go to the front himself, he is providing for the wife and family of some other fellow who has joined.

Mr. W.H. BENNETT: This discussion will perhaps clear the air a little in the province of Ontario. The Toronto evening papers, which as a rule are very widely
4 p.m. read by the working classes, have been filled with letters in regard to what is being paid in the way of separation allowances. I regret that a great many of these letters have been anonymous, but I am sure a full statement has not yet been placed before the people of this country as to how the different funds stand.

According to my information, the amounts payable to-day to officers and privates are as follows. A major is paid $150 a month as pay, and receives in addition a separation allowance of $60, making a total of $210 a month. A captain is paid $105 a month, plus a separation allowance of $20 a month. A lieutenant is paid $75 a month with a separation allowance of $40 a month. A private draws about $35 a month, with a separation allowance of $20 a month. If these men hand over all their wages to their families, it means that the family of a major receives $210 a month, the family of a captain $155 a month, the family of a lieutenant $150, and the family of the man behind the gun $55. In my town, and in many other towns, the admirers of the man behind the gun consider it unfair that the wife of a major should be drawing $210 a month for pay and separation allowance, while the family of the poor private gets only a total of $55. I would ask the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) what proportion of this fund so far has gone to the families of officers, and what amount approximately to the families of privates, and also, if the statement is correct—because I have seen it so stated in the newspapers—that in any town where no contribution has been made to the patriotic fund, any person being the relative either of a private or of an officer who makes application to the patriotic fund is told: As your town has not contributed to this patriotic fund, you are stopped from participation in it. If such is the case, it is unfair, in view of the fact that the Government has paid a considerable amount towards this fund.

Mr. AMES: It has paid nothing.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: I understood there was a vote last session, but I am in error as to that. The wife and family of the private should get more money from the separation allowance, because his pay is so small as compared with the pay of an officer.

Mr. NESBITT: Was the hon. gentleman right in stating that the Government had paid something towards the patriotic fund?

Mr. BENNETT: I was in error as to that. I thought that it had contributed $1,000,000 last session.

Mr. AMES: The Government has contributed nothing whatever to the patriotic fund. Many municipalities and towns have been extremely generous, and so have individuals.

I do not think we have on our list a single case of a major or any one of higher rank than a major receiving assistance from the patriotic fund. A case might arise of some sudden call being made on the wife of a major, in his absence, for an insurance premium or something of that sort. In such a case the patriotic fund might make a special grant. Generally speaking, we have assisted very few officers. Some captains' and lieutenants' families have been assisted; but every case in which an officer's family has been assisted has been made the subject of inquiry by a special committee at Ottawa. It has been said that, if persons write from a community that has given no subscription to the patriotic fund, they are likely to get a reply to the effect that the fund refuses to assist them. That is putting the matter rather baldly, but there is a germ of truth in it. Where a community, like the county of Simcoe, for example, has through its county council set apart a vote of $25,000 for the patriotic fund, $4,000 of which has been distributed and $21,000 of which is not being distributed as yet in any way, if that community writes asking us to

take care of some of its cases, we are very liable to reply: "Take care of your own." Wherever it has been impossible to create a local organization—and there are two towns in Canada, so far, that have absolutely refused to do anything for their people—we have selected a leading patriotic citizen in the town and asked him to administer our fund, and we send him each week all that is needed for the soldiers' wives there, even though these towns have never given a dollar and never will.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: I forgot, while on my feet, to make a statement regarding my own town. Before this patriotic fund was launched and circulars sent out, an appeal was made—as I recollect it—for the Hospital Ship Fund. In my own town that was responded to very liberally—I think nearly $1,000 was subscribed. Then came the Belgian fund, and I think that upwards of $700 was subscribed for that; so the town was not doing badly. When the further appeal was made for the patriotic fund, in view of the fact which was well-known, that the officers and soldiers were going along the line of the figures I have given and they, the soldiers, had, in the main, given their pay to their families, it was thought it would be difficult to launch a third contribution for the patriotic fund. For that reason the town of Midland did not make any grant to the patriotic fund. As to the grant of the County Council of Simcoe, I have not the details of that grant before me, but I understand that it was apportioned so much to the patriotic fund, so much to the Belgian relief fund and so much for these other funds, all of which have in view the laudable purpose of assisting those engaged and who have suffered in the war.

Mr. MARCIL: Could the hon. member for St. Antoine give us the figures by provinces?

Mr. AMES: I could not give that exactly up to date. But up to the 1st of February, the cash actually received here amounted to about $1,035,000 for Quebec, $1,010,000 for Ontario, and contributions from the other provinces the amounts of which I do not recollect, making a total of about $2,500,000. Since then we have been in receipt of very large subscriptions from many places in Ontario, and to-day Ontario has probably subscribed $1,250,000 and Quebec about the same.

[Mr. Ames.]

Mr. MARCIL: There is a very laudable emulation between the two provinces in this matter.

Mr. AMES: There is.

Mr. MARCIL: Could the hon. gentleman also give us the amounts subscribed to the other funds by Quebec and the other provinces?

Mr. MACDONALD: I see in the press at various times statements as to aid being refused from the patriotic fund to wives of men who have gone to the front if the marriage took place after enlistment and after a certain date. I would like to know if there has been any such refusal, and what the position of the fund is in regard to a soldier who has married, no matter what date.

Mr. AMES: The fund has followed exactly the path blazed by the Government in that respect. The Government gave notice, about the middle of January, that after the 28th of January, it would not recognize marriages which took place after enlistment, except in special cases certified to as having taken place with the consent of the colonel commanding. We recognize the family as the Government recognizes it for separation allowance.

Mr. MACDONALD: Looking at the statute passed in August last, I do not find in section 3 any power to discriminate in the matter:

> The object of the fund is to assist in case of need the wives, children and dependent relatives of officers and men who may be in active service.

I very much doubt the wisdom of the patriotic fund declining to assist a woman who may become the wife of a soldier at any time previous to his leaving this country and going abroad. I can see that, from a military standpoint, it may be necessary to make regulations with regard to the marriage of soldiers, as to the consent of the colonel or officers of the regiment. But the idea of the patriotic fund is to assist cases of actual need, and one can readily imagine conditions under which any soldier's wife would be justified in coming forward for assistance and in expecting that assistance from the patriotic fund.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: So far as the general rule is concerned, my hon. friend doubtless knows that in the British army a certain number of men in each regiment are allowed to marry, and those who marry with the consent of the commanding officer—

Mr. MACDONALD: Marry "on the strength of the regiment."

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: For those that marry on the strength of the regiment provision is made for the support of their family. But a man who marries without leave is said to marry not on the strength of the regiment, and no provision is made for the support of his wife and family. I know that in garrison towns distressing conditions often arise because women have married soldiers and no provision is made for them under the regulations. I should be glad to lay on the table the Order in Council to which my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) has alluded. I appreciate the force of what my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has said, and I hope he will also appreciate the consideration that there has been some apprehension that marriages might be rather hurriedly contracted, especially abroad, and a soldier might occasionally be made a victim in an undesirable way. Some intimation of that was given to the Government, and the Order in Council was passed, I think, by reason of the desire to protect and assist the soldier by some such regulation.

Mr. MACDONALD: I apprehend that what my right hon. friend says is that the Order in Council provides for aid being given to the wife where the marriage took place with the consent of the commanding officer.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I cannot remember the exact terms. It was brought to us on the recommendation of the officers of the department, by whom it had been considered very carefully. We also gave it very careful consideration. If I remember it well, it amounted to this, that up to the time the Order in Council was passed all marriages that had been contracted were to be recognized and the families provided for. But after that date there were certain restrictions which we thought reasonable and in the interest of the soldier himself. However, I will bring down the Order in Council, that its exact terms may be brought to the attention of every hon. member of the House.

Mr. KYTE: Will the hon. member for St. Antoine be good enough to explain what course an application for separation allowance has to take? The municipalities of Nova Scotia were asked to forward their contributions to the treasurer of the fund at Halifax, who is the general manager of one of the banks. Applications have been made to the local committee in the town in which I live. After such an application has been passed upon, is it proper to send it to Halifax, or should it be sent to the central committee of the fund at Ottawa?

Mr. AMES: So far as Nova Scotia is concerned, we have a provincial organization which has a branch in every one of the eighteen counties. Moneys raised in Nova Scotia are all placed in the bank at Halifax, where they are under the control of the Hon. W. T. White, our treasurer. Halifax once a month makes an estimate of the amount required by the eighteen branches. That is released for distribution, and is sent in bulk sums to the eighteen counties. It is then distributed by the local relief committee, and at the end of the month each local relief committee is expected to give a detailed statement on forms furnished by us. These returns are checked by our accountant and if they are correct then an advance is made for the next month and we again receive a detailed statement.

Mr. KYTE: Have the contributions to the fund made in Nova Scotia been forwarded to Ottawa?

Mr. AMES: No, $50,000 is now at Halifax under the control of Mr. White, and it may be either left there or brought here, whichever he wishes to do. We usually leave them a working balance and send each month what they need for any one province. The underlying principle of the patriotic fund is for every community to make a general subscription and to put it all in the common fund. After that every community has a right to draw on the fund so long as there is a dollar there in proportion to their needs. We do not feel that the ability of communities to give in money or in men is always the same. One community may be able to send a large number of men but may not be able to contribute largely to the fund. We do not feel that a community which contributes $5,000 to the fund and draws $10,000 from it is in the slightest degree inferior to a community that gives $10,000 to the fund and draws $5,000.

Mr. WILCOX: What arrangement is made as to assistance to wives and families of soldiers when they live in the United States? I think about nine hundred have enlisted from Windsor of whom some two or three hundred come from the United States and their families reside in the United States. They are British subjects and I would like to know if the families of those who reside in the United States are receiving that assistance, and if so, by what means the assistance is contributed.

Mr. AMES: There are funds similar to ours in Great Britain, in Newfoundland and in the United States and we have a reciprocity of exchange between them. For example, we look after all the wives of British reservists here in Canada and the British Association looks after the wives of Canadian volunteers who have been left in their country. We have a similar arrangement in the United States. The Canadian Society of New York has collected a considerable sum of money in the United States and so likewise has the British Imperial Relief Fund of New England in Boston, where I understand our Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) speaks to-morrow night for the benefit of that fund. These organizations take care of all families left in the United States of men who enlist in our Canadian forces and besides that they have, in some cases sent us of their surplus funds as well. So the people referred to in Detroit can be all cared for through the American corresponding agency with which we deal.

Mr. TURRIFF: Has the separation allowance been paid to the families of men who did not go with the first contingent? I have heard it repeated on several occasions that a number of men who joined the service when the first contingent was raised, expecting to go to the front, did not pass the final medical examination and were therefore not sent; but in the meantime the names of their wives or families had been handed in for the separation allowance and in a number of cases the separation allowance has been paid. The report I heard was that after the first contingent left, for a considerable time, there was no complete list of those who had gone. Matters are being cleared up here in connection with the patriotic fund and I think it well, if that has not taken place, that a statement to that effect should be made.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I could not tell my hon. friend at the moment whether any cases of that kind have occurred. Of course if the money was paid under such circumstances it would be through inadvertence and in the belief that the men had gone to the front. I heard some rumour of it myself but was not able to verify it. I shall be very glad to make inquiry and let my hon. friend know later whether any such instance had actually occurred.

Mr. OLIVER: I wish to make a further remark in reply to my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames). I hold that the responsibility for the maintenance of dependents of soldiers on service is a responsibility of the State and should be discharged by the State. My hon. friend says that the Government cannot grade its aid according to conditions and circumstances as can the committee of the patriotic fund. I think my hon. friend is placing a limitation upon the Government which I would not like to place on it. I do not know why a committee of the Government cannot use at least as good judgment with such a fund as this as a committee organized under the terms of this statute. The main point that I want to bring to the attention of the House is that the very fact that these allowances from the patriotic fund are raised or lowered, are given or withheld, according to the judgment of private individuals, puts the fact of the receipt of aid from the patriotic fund on a different basis from an allowance from the State. I do not intend to suggest that it is the intention of the Government to continue to deal with the matter in that way, but if the Government should take such a stand; which is virtually equivalent to saying that the dependents of those who have sacrificed themselves and their prospects for the benefit of the country shall be left as dependents on charity, they are certainly not doing credit to either themselves or the country. The conditions of enlistment for this war are different from the conditions of enlistment under ordinary occasions in military service. We have need to-day of every man who can give his services, whatever rank of life he may be in, We are looking for the best and are not content with anything but the best.

Mr. WILCOX: The county council of the county of Essex appropriated $20,000 for this fund. In what way would that constitute charity more than if it had been given by the Government of Canada, to be applied absolutely to the same use?

Mr. OLIVER: That is not the point in question. If the County Council of Essex raises $40,000 by taxation, to be applied to the support of soldiers' dependents in that or any other county, it is exactly the same as if the money had been raised by this Government or by a provincial government. But the intent of the patriotic fund is that it shall represent private contributions. I agree with everything my hon. friend has said as to the desirability of there being such a fund, which confers not only a benefit on soldiers' dependents, but affords to

those who are neither soldiers nor dependents the privilege of contributing to the fund for the good of their own souls. But the point is that when that fund comes to be the larger part of the support of the dependents, they are then in the position of being receivers of charity rather than in the position of receiving payment of a debt which the country owes to them. I want to see the dependents of the soldiers who have gone to the front receive on the responsibility of the state to whom they are giving their services whatever consideration they are entitled to, according to the circumstances of the country and their own circumstances. If over and above that, private individuals or organizations see fit to come forward and supplement what has been done, well and good; it is entirely to their credit to do so. But I still say that the obligation of taking care of dependents of soldiers at the front rests primarily on the state, and that that duty should be discharged by the state as a sacred obligation and, with reasonable limitations, discharged to the full. I have seen it stated in the papers that in some parts of Canada recruiting for our contingents is not as rapid as is desirable. No one need go far to believe that one of the reasons for that is the fact that the dependents of men who have enlisted are not being provided for by the state as an obligation, but are dependent upon the good will and good offices of Mr. Smith or Mr. Jones or Mr. Robertson who holds the position of distributor of the patriotic fund. They do not like that, and we cannot expect them to. We are not enlisting ordinary soldiers for ordinary military service. We are facing a most extraordinary condition, and we must face it accordingly. It is not a time to quibble or to count cents. It is a time when we who ask our fellow citizens to take the risks or make the sacrifices of military service should take upon ourselves the responsibility of saying: The state is behind you, for you are doing the service of the state.

Mr. W. F. NICKLE (Kingston): Coming as I do from a riding that has been liberal in its contribution of men for this cause, and not illiberal in its contribution of money towards the patriotic fund, I regret exceedingly that the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has let it go to the country through this House that those who are receiving advantage from the patriotic fund are the recipients of charity. If it is charity that the dependents of the men at the front are receiving from the Canadian patriotic fund, it follows inevitably that it is given not as a bounty, but as a dole to those who are poor and needy. If I catch the meaning of the patriotic fund at all, it is this: the movers behind the scheme recognized that the state owed to the dependents at home an adequate remuneration in the ordinary conditions of life, but that upon those who were able to give and were not able to go there devolved the duty of supplementing this amount in the extraordinary and unusual case. I therefore say that the money that is going to the dependents of our soldiers is not going as a charity. It is going as philanthropy; it may be going as a benevolence; but it is going as the grateful gift of the people of the community, who feel that those who have gone to the front have given much in the cause of the community and of the Empire, and that those who have means and stay at home should contribute to this national fund. In the riding I have the honour to represent, the patriotic fund has never been regarded as a charity. When we made solicitation of the people of Kingston, it was clearly put before them that it was their duty to give, and that we wanted the fund to be the spontaneous gift of a grateful people. And in that city of some twenty thousand people, $50,000, or $2.50 a head, was raised for this fund. As the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) has said, through its elasticity the fund has relieved very much distress. It has a tremendous advantage in that what is being done is not done as the hon. member for Edmonton says, through the good offices of the local organizations, but through a body which acts judicially and in such a way that the needs and requirements of those who receive are not known to the general public. Through the elasticity of the compassionate allowance much has been done to relieve the distress of delicate women and delicate children. Speaking for my own community—if I may be permitted to speak for them, and possibly I should speak for them alone, as my experience in connection with the fund is practically confined to Kingston—I may say that the patriotic fund has been a God-send to numbers of people who have been relieved in a most trying time and in such a way that only a few knew their need, and those of us who gave to the fund had the tremendous satisfaction of feeling that we were doing something in the cause of the community and of the Empire.

Mr. JAMES ARTHURS (Parry Sound): I feel that there is a good deal of common sense and sound reasoning in the argument of my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). There is undoubtedly a good deal of dissatisfaction in the country over the distribution of the Canadian patriotic fund. There is a feeling that it is being done by favour, and that those counties which have contributed most generously towards it are securing the best treatment. Some other hon. member has mentioned that help from the fund for the dependents of any man on foreign service, depends entirely on whether his county has sufficiently responded. I might also give a case in point. Some time ago I wrote the secretary of the patriotic fund regarding the case of three English reservists who had enlisted from my riding. They had lived in the county only a short time and were practically unknown there, although they had been in Canada for a considerable period. They left an aged father and mother entirely dependent upon the community. The community did its best for them, and I think has supported them up to the present. I felt that if this fund was to be of any use to the people entitled to be relieved by it, this aged couple had a perfectly good claim against it. I wrote to the secretary of the patriotic fund, and the answer I received was that the district of Parry Sound as a whole had not contributed to the fund, and that it was up to me to get busy. The district which I have the honour to represent has contributed, not necessarily to this fund, but to almost every movement along this line and very generously. It has also a fund of its own raised in the district for those members of the regiment who have gone from there, numbering from 150 to 200 men. This fund has been raised locally, and it is kept in case of need for the dependants of those who have gone to the front. It has not, as far as I know, been transferred to the patriotic fund; but be that as it may, the point I raise is that people such as I have instanced, especially English reservists, have gone, leaving families totally without means, and these people ought to receive that money from the patriotic fund, which is due to them regardless entirely of the question whether this or that municipality or district has contributed anything towards this fund.

Mr. AMES: I want to record my protest against the use of the word "charity." There is absolutely no charity in the patriotic fund from start to finish. When we hear of a branch that is trying to run it as a charitable organization, we ask them not to do so. Every man throughout this country has two choices—either to fight or to pay. If a man fights, we say to him: "Go, God bless you, and may you return safely." If he does not fight, we say: "Pay; make it possible for some one else to go and fight in your place." The man who goes to the front leaving a wife and child behind him, goes because he has confidence that the people of Canada will care for his wife and child while he is gone. He does not bring home the pay envelope on Saturday night, but it comes all the same, because it is filled with the money that other people are ready and willing to put into that envelope, seeing that that man is fighting the battle for the other man who ought to fight. Every man will not be able to go to the front, but he should be quite satisfied to contribute to the burden of those who do. In the American Civil War it was customary for men to buy other men to take their places in the fighting line. I know a man who bought two other men to go to the front for him, and paid each man $500 for that purpose. We call for recruits, and when a recruit presents himself, we say: "Do not be anxious about your wife and children; they will be well cared for while you are gone." The Government makes a flat rate allowance, so to speak, for every family and dependent such as I have mentioned. The Government, as a rule, gives the larger part of the amount that the family receive. The average supplementary assistance from the patriotic fund generally runs about $18 per family, taking it for the older parts of the country, and a little more in the northwest provinces. A great many families get only $10 or $15, and some get $20 per month.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: You are speaking of the patriotic fund?

Mr. AMES: I am speaking of the patriotic fund. What brings up the average is the fact that we have to give larger assistance to the French and Belgium reservists, who get very little from their own Governments. Wherever we can bring any influence to bear upon those in charge of private patriotic funds, we tell them to eliminate everything that may give this work an appearance of charity in dealing with the people. We say: "Tell them that they are getting their 'dividend cheques,' if you like; send the cheques out from the head office; do not make it necessary for the woman ever to come to the head office, except the first time; see that she gets her cheque every month, or oftener because it is just as

much due to her as is the separation allowance cheque which the Government sends." Contented soldiers' wives distributed throughout Canada, living comfortably on what the Government gives and what the patriotic fund adds thereto constitute the best recruiting agencies we can have in Canada to-day. When it becomes necessary to appeal to the people for the third, the fourth and the fifth contingents, the fact that these women have been comfortable all winter and have learned to feel that they can trust the people of Canada to look after them, is going to help to get the remaining men that we so much need.

I want to say one more word and it is for the benefit of my hon. friend from Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs). It has always been our endeavour to organize committees either in towns or counties, and there are very few counties throughout Canada to-day which have not been thoroughly organized. Parry Sound is one of the few backward counties. The great province of Saskatchewan has 310 branches and so well organized is it that I understand there are but six municipal corporations in the whole province which are not connected with the fund in some way. If they can organize Saskatchewan they can organize Parry Sound. If the people of Parry Sound would create a local organization or would apply to become a branch of the Canadian patriotic fund, even if they only contributed $10 and drew $10,000, we would give them that $10,000 if we felt that $10 was all they could raise, provided we had a medium of distribution that could be recognized and controlled. We could not deal with any organization whose accounts we could not check, because we could not become responsible for them. If Parry Sound will become a branch of the Canadian patriotic fund, the matter of how much money they may send in is of minor importance. Let them send us what they can. The moment they become a branch of the Canadian patriotic fund, we will try to see that they get all the money they need, but until they do so, and while they take the position that they are going to look after their own people, I do not think we can interfere. The office here does not send out cheques to individual families. It is a clearing house, an organizing force that deals with the branches, and through these branches with the local situation. It stands behind them all, makes up the deficiency whatever it may be, and it is glad and willing to make up that deficiency and to endeavour to carry the gospel of giving into places that have not yet been covered. We are the central organizing clearing house here at Ottawa. We do not pay families, we do not determine how much families should get, we do not send out cheques to Smith, Brown and Robinson in Parry Sound, but we expect the people of Parry Sound to form a local organization there, and if they want $100 or $500 or $5,000 to care for cases in that county, they will get it.

Mr. OLIVER: We have heard enough to date to substantiate the view I hold that this is a question that is not only of national but of Imperial significance; and yet my hon. friend stands up in his place and dictates as to the terms and conditions upon which dependents of men who are serving the country and the Empire shall receive assistance from this legislatively authorized fund. We have a Government in Canada whose business it is to look after these things, to stand in the place of the people of Canada in dealing with the interests of Canada, and it certainly grates on my ear to hear any private individual, or any member of Parliament, even the hon. member for St. Antoine, say whether or not dependents of people who have gladly given their services to the country shall or shall not receive aid from this fund. We have been told that in Parry Sound they must look after their own people because they have not formed some organization. In Midland they must do the same because they have not made some subscription. This is not a question of whether they have formed some organization or given a subscription; it is a question of whether the men are serving the country and the Empire. But that is not the question with my hon. friend. It is whether they have gone through some sort of procedure that will be satisfactory to him, and if they satisfy him as to that they may come under the rule.

Mr. AMES: If a case should be reported in an outlying district of Parry Sound away from Ottawa, how could you tell whether that case was genuine and entitled to receive consideration unless we got assistance from the local authorities?

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend can answer his own question. My point is that a man who is rendering service to the State is entitled to the consideration and compensation of the State for that service and that neither he nor his dependents should be dependent upon my hon. friend or upon any other private individual.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): Perhaps the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) is scarcely just to the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames). I think he overlooks the fact that the patriotic fund was established by an Act in the War session and that practically speaking the patriotic fund and the work done under the patriotic fund, being an Act of this Parliament, is an Act of the State. I venture to say that to my hon. friend in all good nature. I have a feeling that the House is indebted to my hon. friend from St. Antoine for his explanation of what has been done, and I think the country is indebted to him for what we know to be the very painstaking effort he is bringing to bear upon making the patriotic fund a success, in so far as he can do it in his position as secretary, which I presume has been given to him under the Act of Parliament passed at the War session. I say this in a spirit of fairness and as expressing what I really feel is due to my hon. friend in this matter. Unfortunately, imperfection is a mark of humanity, and it would be difficult to invent any machinery which would work with absolute precision. So far from detecting anything dictatorial in what my hon. friend has said, I feel personally indebted to him, and I am very pleased to express my opinion.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

THE BUDGET.

PROPOSED WAR TAXATION.

Consideration of the proposed motion of Hon. W. T. White, (Minister of Finance) for Committee of Ways and Means, resumed from February 23.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (West Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to follow the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) in this debate. Before beginning my remarks in reply to him, I should like to pay the Minister of Finance the best compliment I can, in view of his magnificent handling of his great historic Budget in a masterly, comprehensive, and entirely satisfactory manner. It is true, it is possible to find fault; it is indeed only too easy to find fault anywhere. I have been rather surprised therefore by the remarks, although I enjoyed the speech as a whole, of the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), because he has expressed the policy largely of dissatisfaction at large, and in crystallizing his views he has laid down what may be called two main principles of dissatisfaction, to one of which I shall proceed to refer. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) said:

> But it is surely elementary, if our revenues are declining and if there is no other prospect than that they will continue to decline for an indefinite period, that it is the part of wisdom to introduce measures of economy of a substantial nature.

That means, if it means anything, that instead of spending money during this trying time to enable the people of this country to earn their daily bread on public works, when they cannot earn it on private works, he would prefer to see them tramping the streets in unemployment. I know perfectly well that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) does not mean that, but that is what he has said, and it shows how dangerous it is—if I may be permitted to judge so eminent a man as the hon. member for Edmonton—simply to oppose because you are in opposition. It would be far better for him, and better also for the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) to have taken the Minister of Finance and the rest of the Government party into their confidence, and told them how to construct this Budget, and wherein they are in error, and then supply details of reconstruction. They have done nothing of the sort; they have simply found fault. As I have said, it is easy to find fault—look at the weather; if they want scope for their feelings, let them turn their invective on the weather. Look also, if you will, at the universe—we find a lot of serious things happening, such as the earthquakes in Italy, for which we are in no way responsible. If these gentlemen want simply to find fault why not find fault there. It is very possible to find fault in such case, because it would seem according to the natural forces which work themselves out under Divine guidance, but these are things that pass our understanding, and if we cannot do better the least we should do is to keep quiet.

I would like also to pay a little attention to the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean). He made a tremendous deliverance in its way, but it was fired almost altogether in the wrong direction; but he was not firing at the enemy, he was shooting up in the air. The question was asked by Mr. Wilcox:

> Does my hon. friend think there ought to be a duty on tea?
>
> Mr. Maclean: I do not think there ought to be any special duty or stamp tax on anything.

Immediately afterwards Mr. Maclean goes on to say:

> Now, what should be the main features of a war revenue tax? It should be made as much

as possible on articles relatively cheap and of universal consumption.

Do I understand that tea is not of universal consumption? Perhaps the hon. gentleman refers to water. In any event, he has not made himself clear, nor has he taken us into his confidence and provided us with the details of a better Budget. Mr. Middlebro asked, very pertinently, I thought:

> Will the hon. gentleman give us his method of raising the taxation, which will measure up to the test which he has just suggested?

Mr. Gauvreau sprang into the breach and said:

> It is your duty to give it to us.

That is his idea of fulfilling his duty as a member of Parliament. If you cannot make any capital for your party, try to throw the other side into confusion; but do not remember that you were sent here by a grateful country to do the best you can for it. Raise a row; make a disturbance; split the whole affair up, and then when asked for an opinion say: Oh, you go on and give it; I do not know anything about it at all. That is the purpose which the hon. member served in making that statement. Mr. Maclean, however, said:

> My contention is that there is no necessity for any tariff increases. Surely the hon. gentleman must admit that, if the Government which he supports had administered properly the financial affairs of this country, we would not have had a $60,000,000 deficit this year, and there would not have been an estimated deficit of $80,000,000 for next year.
>
> Mr. Middlebro: The same would apply to every country in Europe.
>
> Mr. Maclean: Some time, when I have nothing else to do, and the hon. gentleman wants to know how I would arrange a tariff that would yield additional revenue under the circumstances prevailing to-day, I might do so, but I am not inclined to do so at the present moment.

Nor did he at any other time. Surely that is a fair question. We are living under conditions which the hon. member helped to create; and yet when he is fairly asked how he would construct a Budget or a war tariff under these circumstances, at the very moment of his criticism he absolutely declines to give us any consolation whatever, and takes his seat amidst the general confusion which he has created.

To my mind the most important reference in the Budget was to unemployment. Wars may come and wars may go, but the great war against unemployment continues with us at all times; it is perennial. I am not referring, of course, to shiftlessness or incapacity, to insanity or any other weakness of that nature. I am referring to economic unemployment; and I maintain that it is the great break-down of modern civilization, to which it is our duty, as indicated by the Minister of Finance in his Budget, to turn our immediate attention and to let it be no longer a reproach to our twentieth century civilization.

In the thirteenth century the people were in the midst of no such economic difficulties. Every man was his own manufacturer, his own farmer and his own consumer. He lived upon the land; he worked it; he was beholden to no man. He contributed, even though he were a serf, a slave, to the general fund of the little settlement or to the lord of the manor, but he had his indefeasible rights. He paid no rent and he owed no tax further than that to any man. There was never any unemployment.

5 p.m.

When he wanted wood, he went out and gathered it. When he wanted food, he went out and raised it. If he, by good fortune, had cattle, he had plenty of meat, milk and cheese. During his spare hours he did a little work perhaps as a smith. He was occasionally a carpenter or a stonemason or something of that sort. Every one was free to do as he liked. The consequence was that, except for those people who were perhaps shiftless—and they were very few—there was no economic unemployment. But later on there arose a different condition. People became divorced from the land by reason largely of the great plague of 1347, when nearly half of the people of Great Britain died. The consequence was that labourers were few. The harvest was naturally still great and the labourers chose to assess the value of their services at a higher rate, and the famous statute of labourers preventing them from doing any such thing was brought in by an alleged parliament of landlords and monopolists. This scattered the labouring class throughout the country in confusion. They were no longer upon the land or off the land. They had no standing, and to this day the great class of labourers has no particular standing in the country except what it is forcing from time to time upon the Government. There was no recognition of an economic standing. Why is it that there has been so much trouble? Why is it that in the midst of plenty, in the midst of a great and rich country where there ought to be such profusion, there is so much need? The taking of profit and the desire to take profit are, in my opinion, the sole

cause of economic unemployment. What is profit? Profit is the taking of that for which we give no true equivalent. If we gave a true equivalent there would be no profit. Take the case of 'making money.' A man makes money when he takes out money that he has not put in. If he takes out only what he puts in, counting his own labour, he will be extremely dissatisfied. The more he takes out the better pleased he is. If by putting in $5,000, a man can take out $50,000, he is considered a genius; whereas what he has done is he has robbed some one else of that money, because it is a mathematical impossibility that he can put in $5,000 and take out $50,000 without taking the difference from some one else. The alleged stimulus to modern industry has been the taking of profit. This is what the whole system of modern industry has been built upon; and the consequence of its being so large a factor in modern industry and a direct cause of economic unemployment, is that the whole modern system in regard to labour and economic unemployment is mere anarchy—and so it is.

What is the source of value? There is but one source of value—labour cost. Sometimes it is hinted that there is another—monopoly. But, of course, monopoly is not an economic source of value. If the people choose to allow monopolists to take possession of that which they did not earn, if they choose to allow these monopolists to place themselves in the position of lording it over the whole community and so exact tribute, they may. But it is unscientific, it is uneconomic, it is not sensible. Monopoly is in no sense a cause of value. Labour-cost and labour-cost alone, is the cause of value. Labour produces all wealth. Wealth includes capital, which, of course, is wealth in the form of money and money only. Labour, the working world, as we know, can produce in two days a week of eight hours each, enough and to spare for everybody in the world. These calculations have been made by statisticians; they are no guesswork and no dream. But the people who desire to take profit know that if they are to have profit they must create profit, and to create profit it is necessary to make things dear; and they proceed to do this in the only way in which it can be done—by limiting the supply. And by limiting supply you cause economic unemployment. Is not that clear? I think it is. So, we have the taking of profits linked up with economic unemployment and shown to be its sole cause. There should be no anxiety in the minds of the human race for food or raiment. There is enough and to spare; there is profusion, even luxury. But we are like a man stooping down to drink at a little stream flowing from a great lake. He thinks there is plenty and to spare; but some one comes along and says: I will take possession of the lake and charge you so much a cup for the water. The moment it is sought, by monopoly, and by means of taking profit, to make others pay, the troubles begin and one man becomes practically the slave of the other.

You see, the disposition always is for profit to limit supply. If it be urged that sometimes mills shut down in order to avoid loss and not to limit supply, it may well be replied that this is true under present conditions. But if we were to begin production all over again, no capital would be employed except where it is needed, none would be employed where it would be imperilled in any way, but it would be used entirely for the purpose of production. So, shutting down to avoid loss, like shutting down to make a profit, would be eliminated.

That part of price which is unearned means a profit that is wrongly taken. I admit that it is taken; I admit that there is practically no hope of anybody giving it up. But I do say, and I say it here because this is the proper place to say it, with reference to unemployment, there is no use of discussing free trade, protection or any other abstract question unless you come to the fundamental principle and see to it that people give a fair equivalent for what they get.

The theory of Ricardo, the founder of modern political economy, was altogether an assumption that political economy depended upon the theory of rent. Adam Smith, in his Wealth of Nations, argued that the wealth of nations would depend altogether upon freedom of trade and upon its twin monster, freedom of labour competition, which is absolutely essential to free trade and which must accompany it as its shadow must accompany any substance. Free labour competition is the basis, the source, the vital cause of distress. It has followed necessarily in the wake of free trade; and if free trade were deliberately, truly and correctly carried out, it would absolutely put the world in the power of money and make slaves of the labour market.

Thorold Rogers and men of that description gathered a priceless treasure of records from the vestries and other storehouses of records of life in England, records of the accounts and work of the people of England

for six centuries. And it was upon such records that Herbert Spencer was enabled to base his tremendous generalizations. Herbert Spencer, however, makes human progress depend upon natural evolution, which is a reversal; it takes it out of our hands altogether except as a normal outcome of our everyday proceedings. Karl Marx, the author of Capital—and I would commend the reading of that work to anybody who has not read it; it will take him three months night and day to read it; it is almost like a work on algebra; but it is worth all the trouble; Karl Marx has analysed, dissected and described every known economic phrase. But, strange to say, he has left them at that. Then, we have the French school—Fourier, Saint Simon and others—who insisted that the remedy for all this trouble is in the socialistic state and who declared that until we have the socialistic state as the owner of the machinery of production, exchange and transportation, there is no way out of the difficulty in which we find ourselves. Then come the Germans. The Germans believe in matter and force—gross modern materialism. They are the apostles of the strictly modern propaganda. Believing in matter and force, they have given an exhibition of it at the present time such as ought to satisfy anybody who likes that sort of thing.

Modern unemployment dates from the time when England invented, monopolized, and patented practically all the modern means of economic invention. Great Britain had a monopoly of this sort of thing. The consequence was that she wanted the rest of the world to give her the means of gratifying her desire to extend her trade in these particular goods. The rest of the world was then just awakening to the necessity of modern industrialism, but had no means of gratifying it. Great Britain had the whip hand with her system of patent rights, with her knowledge of the inventions which she herself had made. It was this monopoly that gave her that place of pre-eminence which she has so long enjoyed. She had the Corn laws. In 1846 it was decided to give up the Corn laws, and very rightly so, because the Corn laws were making labour in England expensive, and yet the landlords were getting all the benefit, while doing no good to themselves or to anybody else. So when the Corn laws were done away with food poured in from outside, food became cheap. The agricultural industry necessarily went down and out, but food became cheap, and great industrial organizations were soon in a position, as I say, to dominate the world. Then began that era of industrial slavery when men and women worked up to seventeen hours a day, and it has taken all the time from that early date to the present to get the day's labour down to nine and ten hours. This shows what a tremendous struggle there has to be in the world on behalf of life and labour against machinery and the desire to make profit. It is a very singular thing, but it shows a philosophic antagonism on the part of many people, it shows a callousness that is to be greatly deplored. It will work itself out, it is working itself out in the United States by means of a financial revolution; it worked itself out in France by means of a revolution that tore the country to pieces. These things were foretold, but nobody paid any attention. Why? Because they would rather take profit than listen to the truth. No doubt they will continue so to do, but, as I have said in reply to the hon. member for Edmonton, it is useless to lament the fact that the incidence of taxation under free trade or under protection goes here, there and everywhere, frequently not to the places which it should go. It is useless to lament that fact because what I have referred to are the underlying causes of the whole trouble. Manufacturing and money replaced the agricultural landlord and became the new landlord of the modern era. Labour looked back to the land, and the only solution that is proposed of the whole situation at the present time is: "Back to the land! Back to where we were in the thirteenth century." It is made a joke of, people laugh about it because they are insincere about it and frequently do not understand it, but it is a far atavistic cry to something six centuries back, which tells the people instinctively what is the matter; put them back on the land and they will be free, they will be liberated once more.

You take the grandest of all professions, the medical profession, that has conferred more great benefits on mankind by far than all others put together; would there not be a mighty howl of lament and anger if the medical men patented their remedies? Medical men are supposed to make these great sacrifices, to make these great discoveries and inventions which require the profoundest knowledge of science and of the fundamental laws of chemical motion and construction, even the sacrifice of life, yet no one expects the medical profession to patent their rights, because if they did place themselves in the position of the patentee of mechanical rights, the world's last hope would be gone. Surely, if that be

so with regard to the medical profession, it should be none the less so with regard to the feeding and clothing of mankind. If it be so with regard to the curing of mankind, it should be none the less so with regard to the feeding of mankind. Therefore, I say there should be no method of exacting tribute on the cost of food production or the production of clothes that goes on from day to day; it should be absolutely clear of that. People think that unless they are making profit there is nothing in the world, that nobody will do anything. Well, if that is the impelling spirit of any man, all I can say is, God help the man. If he has no more patience, no more unselfishness and no more nobility of character than to throw up his hands when he cannot make profit out of any transaction, then he is fit for Golgotha or some other place of that description, for certainly he is not fit for heaven. Protection is merely control. No one supposes for one moment that protection, which is restriction, is valuable in any other particular, except as a means of control. What is the history of free trade and protection? It is simply this: In the early days, twenty odd centuries ago, when the merchants of Tyre and Sidon, of ancient Greece, of Sicily and Alexandria and Bagdad and Damascus and the East, went about over the then known world with their Tyrian purple or their finished products, whatever they might be, there was no necessity of discussing free trade or protection, because the people in the countries from which they came fed and clothed themselves. These men were but adventurers, excursionists who went out on what might be called a side issue. Later on came modern inventions, came the means of making food in profusion, of making clothes in profusion, of wholesale transportation. The danger immediately arose, not that there would be a partial making of goods in one country for another, but that whole mountains of food would be transferred from one country to another, as, for example, from America to France, whole mountains of wools, whole mountains of everything of consequence, so that France would be put out of business by cheapness. The French could go to America and live and buy their food there; but French life and French civilization would disappear; the French people realized this and would not have it, and went back to protection. After 1846 it was felt that the influence of England upon France would result in France adopting free trade. France did so, but she found out, just as I have said, that the result was that her people were being stripped. Take China silk. The people of Cevennes used to make silk; they had the silk worms, the mulberry and everything else, and had established a great and prosperous industry. China silk began to come in under free trade, and the people had to stop making silk and fled to the towns. That is what happeed in France; and of necessity they had to stop it by protection, and they put on protection. To-day we must give our people employment. We must keep them at home and make Canada a well-balanced country; otherwise she will be ruined. You say Canadians could get things more cheaply where things are made by cheaper labour or grown more cheaply? So can anybody. But if we are to depend upon cheap labour and cheap production rather than upon the balance of life and production within the country in which we live, we shall become an effete instead of a progressive civilization, and shall soon disappear. From that it follows that this new theory of profit-sharing also is impossible. It might do for a while, but under it men put more money into their pockets than they earn, as I have pointed out. But the idea will remain I suppose, until the people are inspired with some new idea. It is not as in the old Athenian days. Did Socrates teach for gain, did Plato, did Aristotle, did even the Sophists? Not one. It is true that when the jeunesse dorée wished to take advantage of their generosity it was necessary for them to adopt means of protection, and they did make a charge.

We have then, if I am right, an exchange of work for goods, for wealth, for food and clothing. Now let us see how this works out. Everything will remain as it is to-day except what? The hours. If you have two days a week with short hours you still have everybody working in the same grade, in the same class, under the same conditions as to-day. Money is still utilized in the same way, and there is no change in exchange or creation or production. There is simply a limiting of the hours of labour in order that all may work. Then all will be able to get work, and there will be still plenty of time left. This is not a Utopian scheme; it is entirely mathematical; you can work it out with a pencil and paper. It is based on economic science, and can be proved or disproved in five minutes, and I therefore ask the Finance Minister's attention to it in the further consideration of his Budget.

I will now touch upon the most extraordinary measure that was ever placed before any country: the British preference.

The British preference is a trade advantage which Canada gives to Great Britain in the Canadian market by means of the the operation of a protective tariff, and without that tariff it could not exist. That means that the Opposition in advocating a preference, British or any other, are guilty of the wildest stretch of heresy that they could possibly indulge in, because Britain could not get a preference in our market for one minute without a protective tariff. The British preference or any other sort of preference has all the evils of protection, but none of its good points. Why? Because it sends the work out of this country; it sends money out of this country when we import goods; and it leaves the tax-paying to us. That is all. It is a confession that a preference can be given to people by means of a protective tariff, and that is the whole end and aim of protection, which in Conservative hands aims to give that preference to the people at home in Canada. The adoption of the principle of protection is a confession—notwithstanding any arguments to the contrary—that by means of protection you can confer a favour upon a friend; and they propose to confer it upon the British friend. We propose to confer it upon the Canadian friend. That is the only difference. What is the British preference? It is the most un-British thing that ever was concocted—the most absolutely un-British.

There is not a man in England who is not ashamed of the British preference. It is absolutely contrary to the principles of free trade, because absolute freedom of exchange without any preference is the basis of modern British economics. If that is so, you are injuring instead of helping the cause of free trade by giving a preference. You are saying to the British people that in order to establish trade relations with them it is necessary that they should have some little by-way or alley, and this you christen the British preference. I do not think there is any excuse for such a thing as a preference. I would sooner see honest square free trade, for a British preference is absolutely un-British; it is certainly un-Canadian; it is inconsistent and unreasonable. Great Britain gives Canada no preference. Why? Because it is absurd. It is against her idea of economic freedom. She would say that it would be injurious to Canada. And yet for some strange reason we plume ourselves on giving this mighty country of England a preference. We send our work and our money away, and retain the privilege of paying the taxes. If a member of the Liberal party had said that they had to adopt the preference and not free trade because protection had placed them in an awkward box, they would have had some excuse. But for years they had nothing but a long record of surpluses, and the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) particularly refers to this. He has now turned the tables on us. He says, why do you have these great surpluses taking money out of the pockets of the people? I ask the hon. member for St. John why when he had such big surpluses, he did not adopt free trade instead of giving a British preference? But these gentlemen dared not adopt free trade. The British preference is a two-faced affiair. It is a pretended exhibition of loyalty, and it is a sop to free-traders. It is an apology for having adopted a system of protection instead of free trade. I say that in all kindness and not abusively, but it is nevertheless true and cannot be contradicted. We cannot hope to keep our people employed if on any pretence we send our work out of the country.

The next point I wish to take up is even more practical in its application. I refer to the Eastern peril. Missionaries returning from India and China say that the awakening of those countries to industrial life has been marvelous. China which for 6,000, or at least 3,000 years, has been embedded in a matrix of granite, has changed her whole system of government in practically a day, and she is now a modern republic and ready for the most advanced ideas. Capital is now pouring in there. They lacked capital, and capital is now pouring in. It is now taking advantage of cheap oriental labour. The capitalist now is asking us to lower the tariff. He asks the Americans to lower their tariff so that he can go to China, erect enormous steel mills and other works and produce cheap goods for the markets of the United States and Canada. Do you imagine that we would be silly enough to allow him to do that? Eight hundred million people are now awaiting to be exploited. They were agriculturists, they dug away with a wooden stick or something of that kind for many years and earned a precarious livelihood. They have learned by means of the missionaries and in other ways the advantage it would be to them to take their place in the van of progress. Railways have disseminated information and established means of interchange and communication. The consequence is that with all these facilities and great natural resources the centre of gravity of modern industrial civilization will be in the Orient as sure as can be unless we keep it in

the West. That is something we cannot impress too strongly upon our people. In this connection I wish to read an article from that intellectual journal, The Globe, which has always seemed to me to be the brains of the Liberal party, with a few exceptions, of course. It says, in an editorial in its issue of January 22:

> Terror of good things is one of the peculiar results of distorted economic. A Consul has 'warned' the American Republic that an underwear mill in Hong Kong sells one-half ts entire product in New Work city, that steel rails are being produced in a Chinese modern steel mill with labour that commands only thirty cents a day for ten and a half hours, that Shantung province, with a population of more than 30,000,000, is building modern railways, that in the city of Tsingchau Chinese capital is building a modern steel mill with $10,000,000 invested, and employing labour at twenty cents a day. Instead of rejoicing at the resultant prospect of getting underwear, steel rails, and other products with much less effort than formerly, the reporting Consul regards these things as portentous and even terrible.
>
> This capacity of China to shower blessings on the world is regarded with terror because the reporting Consul has forgotten that the object of industry and commerce is to get underclothing, steel rails, and other products. He thinks the object is to throw obstacles in the way of getting these things and to make it more difficult to supply ordinary wants. The heathen Chinese may be peculiar, but he will not send one single suit or half-suit of underclothing from his gigantic factory or so much as a single knife-blade from his vast rolling mills to the United States unless the people of that republic make something more satisfactory to give him in payment.

Pray, what will they make?

> He will do no Zeppelin act to ruin American industry. He will distrbute only as American industry continues able to reciprocate. The more freely he is able to distribute and the more he gives in return for what he receives the more he will lessen the difficulties that make it so hard to produce a living by work in the Republic. The Consul's theory that it is a good thing to make good things hard to get has received a rude jolt by the present belligerent obstruction of trade.

The Globe of January 27 gives further consideration to this question. It says:

> The primary purpose of all economic effort, all industry, and all commerce is to obtain things to use and enjoy, not to create difficulties which prevent the accomplishing of that purpose. We must pay for goods from China with our own goods.

What would the Americans pay with, I ask again?

> The Chinamen's object in manufacturing is not to give, but to get. They want to get our goods. This shows how delusive is the notion that imports or purchases deprive us of work. It is only as we work that we can purchase.

That is true, and if the Chinese do the work, how are we going to purchase?

[Mr. Burnham.]

> The delusion about money leaving the country comes in here, but that is another story. Every industral expansion in China or elsewhere is a blessing to the world at large, and especially to the industrial workers. When this is understood and acted upon we will no longer have the paradox of want through an excess of producing capacity and efficiency.

There is the whole question of free trade and the problem of Oriental competition. I thought it wise to submit this to a labour body and I picked out the Peterborough labour body for the reason that the president is the president of the Liberal Association of West Peterborough, the secretary is a Liberal and several members of the executive are also Liberals. It is a large and influential body, it keeps in touch with Toronto, fairly represents the district, and is a very intelligent body as you will presently see. I submitted my course in the House of Commons on the Oriental question to them because, although some hon. members may not remember, I have spoken upon this subject on several occasions. I asked them what they thought of this whole question, and here is what they say:

> Peterborough, Feb. 5, 1915.
>
> Mr. J. H. Burnham,
> M.P. for West Peterborough.
>
> Dear sir,—We, the undersigned, a committee appointed by the Trades and Labour Council of Peterborough to express to you on their behalf the stand taken by them on receipt of your letters of the 22nd and 27th January, do hereby convey to you their wholehearted support of the proposals regarding Oriental labour you are seeking to place before the House.
>
> With the resources of the country developed by intelligent and representative administrations, there is no need for any working man in Canada to be cheap—we have no sympathy with 'Celestial' ideals of labour.
>
> Yours sincerely,
>
> G. A. Hamon,
> Thos. Palmer,
> Hugh Robertson,
> J. Arthur Sharp.

This, I think, is fairly clear and reasonable. Some little time ago when the British preference first came in, the potters of St. Johns, Que., suffered a serious reverse because they were placed at the mercy of the competition of the potters in the south of Scotland and the north of England. It was from these places in England and Scotland that most of the potters had come to St. Johns, Que. They would go back to the old country but for two things: one is that they have not money enough to go back; the other is that if they did get back they say the prospects are gloomy and they do not want to live as the potters live in Great Britain. I said to these men: "What were you in England—Tories or Liberals?" They said: "Most of us were Liberals." Not hav-

ing an a priori theory, and not being like the man in the fable of ancient Greece who, if he did not fit the bed, had to be made to fit it, they betook themselves to their common sense. They said to us: "If you will raise the protective tariff on sanitary ware in St. Johns, you will give us relief and enable us to go on with our work and live our life and have our being in this country. Here is where we want to live; we like the country, we like the people, we like the climate and we like the prospects." According to his promise not to discuss the tariff, the Minister of Finance could last year give no consideration. He is not at all presenting, as I understood him to say, the war tariff as a protective measure, although it might have that effect. And when the war tariff came forward what do they say? George Smith, as the spokesman of the sanitary ware men in St. Johns, said:

> The 5 per cent we have gained should make a difference although the manufacturers are trying to belittle it. I can assure you the operatives recognize that it will help materially, and I myself think it will do so; also the 7½ per cent against the States, even if there is not so much from these of our own class of works.

There is a concrete case. Here are men not brought up with any protectionist ideas, men brought up with free trade ideas, men confessing that formerly they had been greatly prejudiced in favour of free trade and who now say they do not want free trade; they want to stay in Canada and they want to stay here under a protective tariff, because clearly a protective tariff is good if evenly balanced—I do not for one moment say that a protective tariff which makes a country tight for the manufacturer and the farmer and leaves it wide open for labour is a beneficial protective tariff all around by any means; it is a humbug. You cannot leave it tight for certain things and open for other things and call it an even distribution; that is not an honest distribution. To invite labour from the old country or from anywhere else in here and yet keep the people locked in protection is an iniquity which no one will for a moment stand for. That would not be protection; it would be robbery.

I wish to consider for a moment another very threatening thing known as the menace. I would not have referred to it were it not for the fact that a good deal has been said about it, and I trust I am within the rules of the House in speaking of it now. I wish to confute the statement of the Opposition that there was no menace, or that we on this side of the House did not know anything about it, and I wish to confute it by the words of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark). The hon. member for Red Deer is a practical thinker, a philosopher, the very Cobden of the Opposition, and in Hansard, 1912-13, page 1200, volume 1, he says:

> I personally am rather in a position to plume myself on this naval question.

So that he offers no apology for the opinion he gives.

> The fact of the matter is that this German scare has become so attenuated a thing—

—if you please.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: What date was that?

Mr. BURNHAM: December 16, 1912.

Mr. CLARK: That is some years ago.

Mr. BURNHAM: The hon. gentleman said:

> The fact of the matter is that this German scare has become so attenuated a thing that it only finds a resting-place in such comparatively disordered minds as we have had an example of this afternoon.

And then the hon. gentleman spoke after recess, and during recess he does not seem to have considered the matter at all in the way of correcting it, for he says.

> Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock I had pointed out that just as in the middle of the last century the French scare passed away without there having been the smell of gunpowder between the two great nations of France and Great Britain from that time, and as the Russian scare in the seventies passed away likewise without there having been a trigger pulled then or since; so happily for humanity and civilization the German scare of yesterday is vanishing. I think I shall be able to offer proof from the best possible sources that a generation from now we shall be looking back upon this scare as another of the human follies and upon the historical fact that following it there was not the firing of a shot by the one or the other of these two great Christian nations.

A little further on in the same speech he says:

> There is no emergency. But the extraordinary political situation we are in in Canada is this: that although there is no emergency we have a government which comes cooly forward for its only naval policy with an emergency contribution.

Thus he confessed that the Government must have thought there was an emergency, must have thought that there was a reason for action, but he could tell them there was none. How disturbing it must be to mem-

bers of the Opposition these days, responsible and irresponsible, to think that they told us there was no menace and that we did not know anything about it, and that we did not know what we were doing, and that we were just as much in the dark as they.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: May I ask a question?

Mr. BURNHAM: Yes.

Mr. CLARK: May I say that I ask the question with very great reluctance. I do not see the connection between what my hon. friend is saying and the tariff, but he has given me permission to ask a question, and it is this: If he and the Government he supports knew there was a menace, why did they for fourteen months sit on their oars and do nothing, after the Senate rejected the Dreadnought proposal?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BURNHAM: When the applause has died away, Mr. Speaker, I answer the question thus: It was because of the tremendous opposition which was offered by the Liberal party in this House and in the Senate; it was because of their lack of sympathy with the efforts being made by the Government; it was because we had been kept here the entire winter by the Liberals, who did not believe in doing anything in the circumstances. It is true that the menace has nothing to do with the tariff, but having spent forty-five minutes on the tariff I thought it was long enough, and that I would give you a treat by turning to something else. I find unfortunately that some don't appreciate my efforts in that direction. Let us refer for a moment to Imperialism, and I entirely agree with the Globe's stand in this particular. Here is what the Globe said in its issue of February 20th inst.:

> Our imperialistic friends are now talking about rebuilding the Empire after the war. Has not the Empire just as it is proved reasonably efficient; why rebuild it?

That is what I say, but I want to say more. The Naval Service Act of 1910, section 22, says:

> The Governor in Council may place the naval forces, or any part thereof, on active service at any time that it appears advisable to do so, by reason of an emergency.

First of all, the Governor in Council may place the naval forces on active service, and I emphasize the word "may," and in the second place the Governor in Council can only do so if there is an emergency. So, if you prove there is no emergency, as in the present case of a war going on, you are in the soup, Mr. Speaker. We want it understood all the time that we belong to the Empire; that these forces are at the service of the Empire until such time as we say they are not; not as this Act, which says that they are not until we say they are. After that, if we want to meet and say that we cannot do this and that we cannot do that for various reasons, it is within our power to do so. That is consistent with the entire freedom and personal and practical independence of Canada. It is consistent with every ideal that we should like to have that we are managing our own affairs, but the proposition contained in the Naval Service Act is a practical declaration of independence.

Mr. PROULX: Does the hon. member know that it is identical with the provisions of the Militia Act?

Mr. BURNHAM: I have heard that certainly, but that does not defend it at all. If you think that is a confutation of my argument, you will have to think again.

Mr. PROULX: The Militia Act was passed when a Conservative Government was in power.

Mr. BURNHAM: The Conservatives may have made lots of mistakes, but they are trying to repair them. Section 23 says:

> In case of an emergency the Governor in Council may place at the disposal of His Majesty—

That means that he has not done so as yet.

> —for general service in the Royal Navy, the Naval Service or any part thereof, any ships or vessels of the Naval Service, and the officers and seamen serving in such ships or vessels, or any officers or seamen belonging to the Naval Service.

Section 24 says:

> Whenever the Governor in Council places the Naval Service or any part thereof on active service, as provided in the two preceding sections, if Parliament is then separated by such adjournment or prorogation as will not expire with ten days, a proclamation shall issue for a meeting of Parliament within fifteen days, and Parliament shall accordingly meet and sit upon the day appointed by such proclamation, and shall continue to sit in like manner as if it had stood adjourned or prorogued to the same day.

There is the gist of the Liberal opposition to an Empire. You stand out until such times as you say you are in; and if it suits your interest and your prejudices and your meanness, you will say you belong to

the Empire and that you are under the old mother's wing; but if it does not suit you, you can stay out, and you provide for that contingency by being out, so that, if it is going to be expensive and not going to serve your immediate purpose, if it is not going to be a good vote catching measure, why then you are out and you will not instruct the Governor in Council at all. He must be instructed by his advisors and he will not be instructed; or at least it will be long before he is and then Parliament will have to be called, and when Parliament has been called together, the Liberals will begin with their "ifs" and their "ands". This is the Liberal idea of loyalty to the Empire. I am not in favour of Imperial federation. Imperial federation with a central council would mean the dismemberment of the Empire in a week. I do not believe in that at all. I believe in Canada remaining as she is at the present time without the Naval Service Act. Repeal the Naval Service Act.

Mr. TURRIFF: That is what the Government promised to do and they did not do it. They did not dare to do it.

Mr. BURNHAM: They should have done it. I will concede that at any rate in my opinion.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Suppose the Naval Service Act had been repealed, what would my hon. friend have done with the Rainbow and Niobe?

Mr. BURNHAM: I would have taken the Rainbow and the Niobe and put them on the end of a toothpick and have presented them to the first passer-by.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BURNHAM (resuming): I will not detain the House further at any length, but I wish to make a few further remarks to emphasize my observations on the subject of trade. There has been a serious misapprehension, I think, as to the doctrine laid down by Cobden. In the preface to an edition of his speeches, compiled by Thorold Rogers and John Bright, this observation is made, and it is one, I think, that should be borne in mind by those who severely criticise protection, especially with regard to the incidence of taxation:

> He saw, for example, that no ultimate benefit would ensue to the mass of the people by the abolition of all taxes on food, unless what he called, by a pardonable metaphor, "free trade in land," were also established.

That, I think, is important, and has a very direct bearing, especially in the face of the somewhat violent attacks made upon the protective tariff with reference to food. Then, again, in this preface I find something of a still more profound nature, something that the protectionist particularly lays claim to have adopted as against the free trader who has absolutely defied it, and yet which is the foundation of Cobdenism:

> A cautious student of political economy, he knew that this science, the difficulty of which he fully recognized, was, or ought to be, eminently inductive.

Now, free trade is founded wholly and solely upon a narrow a priori principle or statement, from which are deduced certain rules for the guidance of mankind. Free traders would make political economy the deductive science par excellence. As they expound it, political economy is not an inductive science; it pays no attention whatever to results, nor does it cite facts; but, beginning with a principle of free exchange, free labour—free everything—proceeds upon the belief that all else will follow. It is a good deal like the physicist with the Newtonian principle of gravitation, who, having solved that, looks for the explanation of everything else in the terms of this one great fact, except that it errs to begin with. But the protectionist looks to see what nature has afforded and what man has done, and seeks to apply the remedy from time to time applicable to the cases before him. It is useless to say that a certain principle must be assumed and that from that everything must proceed and that all mankind must conform, because it is this sort of thing that has landed free traders in such a pit of distress, and it is that which has left them without a single companion in the world except in Great Britain.

I find in one of Cobden's speeches, something that shows exactly what he meant when he advocated the abolition of the Corn Laws. He shows that the whole bearing of that agitation which resulted in the mighty revolution inaugurated by Sir Robert Peel and brought about by him was altogether relative to the prosperity of the manufacturers:

> If I know anything, it means—

That is, the abolition of the Corn Laws means

> —increased trade, and the claim of a right besides to exchange our manufactures with the corn of all other countries, by which we should very much increase the extent of our trade.

That, I submit, is the real basis of Cobdenism—an attempt to develop manufactur-

ing in Britain. On the abolition of the Corn Laws, with more cheaply fed labour, and, as I said before, with patent rights and a monopoly of inventions, Great Britain sprang into that pre-eminence which she enjoys to-day and which is represented by the capitalist manufacturer. Britain, to-day is represented in her immense wealth and power by the British manufacturer, and he owes his success to the prescience of Cobden who saw that England was too small to give free scope to her own powers of food production, and saw likewise that landlords were living in idleness upon a monopoly, and who said: Do away with these things and you will raise manufacture to tremendous prominence—and he succeeded in doing it.

I wish to refer for a moment also to a well-known newspaper published in Ottawa —the Citizen—because of its attack upon the Budget. It says that our system of taxation showed last year that we were willing to pay $25,000,000 in taxes rather than let the work go to Great Britain. This newspaper, I frankly admit, is a journal of great influence and superior tone; although it indulges in the luxury of contradicting itself from time to time as the different writers present their views to the public. Its idea of prosperity, however, seems to be to send the work that we ought to do in Canada somewhere else. It says that we have penalized ourselves. Well, if we had the work, and kept the money in the country, and paid the taxes into our own treasury, it is difficult to see where we have penalized ourselves. We may have penalized some people, some class in the country, but we cannot have penalized Canada as a whole. Therefore, I deprecate these reckless statements in these influential newspapers. They convey a wrong impression and mislead the unthinking public. The Citizen seems to be betrayed by catchwords—many good men are betrayed by catch-words. The catch-words to which I refer in this case are these: "Buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest." It seems to be the impression that the typical free trader all his life dwells in a free trade terrestrial paradise and goes round chuckling over the fact that he bought in the cheapest market and sold in the dearest. That is the whole and soul of liberalism, to buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest, a principle which in itself is a manifest absurdity because economically if you continue to buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market how is the cheapest market going to pay for the goods in the long run? It cannot be done, it is an impossibility, but as a catch word it is all right to those influenced by unnatural cupidity and to stay public criticism, while the moneyed man bags the market. It also appeals to a certain class of labour men who have not in the past had time to investigate, but who are now getting shorter hours under protection and are looking into the matter and seeing the falsity of this system. Free trade therefore is pre-eminently a doctrine of selfishness. It says: "Laissez faire, laissez passer, laissez aller, pay attention to nothing." Once a capitalist has got his money, then you have put the whole world in his power. You have made the only legal tender that which he possesses in abundance, and you ask him or he asks you to let everything else go—just step to the one side and you will see the greatest fight you ever saw in your life. That is exactly what happens. He has the world at his finger tips, he is the master of the world, and therefore it is, I submit, pre-eminently a doctrine of selfishness. It reminds one a good deal of the case of "Lo, the poor Indian." The Indian brings in four beaver skins and trades them for a plug of tobacco. That is free trade. The capitalist is the man who furnishes the tobacco and his unsuspecting victim is the man who pays the four beaver skins. He has commanded, by reason of his superior acumen and capital, the immense labour of the poor Indian, who has probably journeyed hundreds of miles and sat up many nights to gain these beaver skins to buy his little plug of tobacco. The idea of letting the strong alone, the idea of inviting the strong to take care of the weak, the idea of putting the weaker part of the world in the custody of the strong on an economic non-sentimental basis and expecting them to be taken care of, is in itself an absurdity; you might just as well ask vice to take care of virtue. The truth of the matter is that the principle of control should govern and, in so far as protection means control, protection is good, but in so far as it means handing a monopoly to anybody, or an inequitable system of exchange, production or employment, it is of course absolutely bad.

I wish to refer briefly to the new cry of "Made in Canada," a most admirable motto for any people, the substitution of a request for a law. We ask the people of the country, although they may have established trade with other countries, to remember Canada, the land where they have been prosperous and happy, the land of noble

prospects, of health, prosperity and above all, the land of home. We ask them to remember that and not to sell their souls and their love of Canada for a little money; we ask them to remember, and rather than go outside of Canada, to be prepared to pay a greater labour cost for an article. It will come back to them, even on that low ground, but apart from that, let us remember that we cannot make of this country anything except by co-operation and consideration. We must remember that to keep the work in the country must be our supreme aim and object, and if we do not do that, how can we expect to make this country great? Let us be an independent, industrial Canada, let us feel and know that if the whole world was excluded, if there was a wall fifty feet high around Canada, that we ourselves, with our resources, our capabilities, our population, could go on and thrive, interchanging our products one with the other, and so securing a prosperity that would be tantamount to perfection and absolute balance. So much so indeed that it calls to mind a fact laid down and descanted upon by many economists, that foreign trade is a trap which beguiles people into the idea that they are extending their prosperity, whereas in the last analysis foreign trade should not exist because every country should manufacture and grow and produce for itself; every individual should have inherent in him the same quality. The minute the process is reversed and the individual extends out of himself, he makes himself depend on somebody else, he loses his free condition and becomes another man; the nation becomes another nation and becomes unsettled; labour becomes unsettled, and the whole involved system of exchange and interchange exposes the people of the country to the machinations of the unprincipled.

A great deal of the trouble arises, of course, from the altogether false position of gold. Gold, of course, is nothing more than wool or timber or fish or beef. It so happens that, being a handy thing to carry about and being universally appreciated, it is chosen as the one thing which will satisfy all parties and is used as a medium of exchange; but because of that there is attached to it a natural monopoly, and though we may have any quantity of timber, any quantity of wool, any quantity of mutton or of cattle, we can do nothing with them if people do not come along with the cash to enable us to transfer the products that we have to some other place. If they do not they will remain where they are forever, or so long as they do not rot, showing that the placing of one commodity, namely gold, in such a pre-eminent and monopolistic position is wrong, it is dangerous, it is serious and it is the cause unquestionably of a great deal of our unhappiness.

Strange to say, it has been customary, for what reason I do not understand, to laugh and sneer at the balance of trade. You would think the balance of trade was some bogey or absurdity that was in the imagination of the ignorant and unlettered. We are told time and again that the balance of trade is against England or against France or against so and so, and that is followed by a peal of loud, reverberating laughter, and the fears of a place like Canada are supposed to be at once stilled. Of course that is an absolutely unfair, improper and incorrect statement of the balance of trade. The balance of trade, because of the use of the word trade, is made to refer to the exports and imports of commodities, whereas it properly refers to all the transactions that a country has—cash, goods, means of transportation and everything else; and we find that the balance of trade so far from being against England and France is, on account of the foreign interest that they receive, and on account of transportation and other things, immeasureably in their favour. This laughing at the balance of trade has a bad effect, for the people are lulled into a false sense of security. The balance of trade in its narrower and more restricted meaning, referring to commodities, shows one thing; and that is, that unless the balance of trade in commodities is in your favour you are on the high road to immediate ruin. The capital which has given strength and pre-eminence to the nations to which I have referred was amassed by reason of the balance of trade in commodities being so long in their favour. If the United States continues to have a balance of trade of hundreds of millions in its favour against Canada, it is easily within our imaginations to grasp that the United States must be laying up a great store of prosperity and profit at our expense; and we must pay them for these things by borrowing money from England, and exhaust our resources in paying foreign interest. Is it any wonder then that the cry is raised from day to day, that our taxes are tremendous and that our borrowing powers seem to be without limit? That is one of the peculiarities of the preference. We were told by an hon. gentleman yesterday that the preference

enabled us to borrow more money from England, and yet the very same gentleman told us that this country was going to perdition because of its extravagance in borrowing—another nail in the coffin of preference. Therefore, it seems to me that Finance Ministers in making up their annual budgets might very well give for the information of the people a complete analysis of all the receipts and liabilities of the nation so that we should know exactly how we stand. Then we should see that although the balance of trade was in our favour with respect to commodities and production, actually it would be vastly against us when we took into account the foreign interest that we pay and the other liabilities; and we should see that our resources would be ultimately exhausted if we did not do our own work in Canada. If we send the money and the profit out of this country we are bound to pay for it in the long run.

I wish to make one more reference before closing, and that is to what I may call the ethical standard of the present day. In that connection I wish to say that trades unions exist for the purpose of curbing internationalism, and controlling the labour market. Except by force, there can be no trades union, logically speaking, in a country that has free trade and free labour competition. Agriculture is of course in the same predicament. It is customary to say that agriculture is not of a manufacturing character; but as a matter of fact the farmer is a manufacturer. He puts his labour into the soil and gets it out again, and is just as much a manufacturer as the man who makes lumber out of timber or digs minerals and makes them into something else. I have often thought how profoundly true was the remark made by the right hon. leader of the Opposition in an address to a large assembly of farmers near Toronto some three years ago. In discussing the conditions best suited to the farmer and their prospects for better trade and a superior development, the right hon. gentleman said: "Your best market is the home market." That is how he was reported in the Globe. I cut it out and have treasured it ever since. He laid particular emphasis on that fact , and I admired the candour of the right hon. gentleman as much as the fact itself. He laid it down to the farmers that the home market was pre-eminently the best, and I am sure the Ontario farmer knows, now that he has the competition of the West, that without the home market he would be a ruined man.

In the old days people got along very well without money. When they had anything to trade, they lugged it around to their neighbours until they got what they wanted in exchange. It occurred to a princess in the kingdom of Lydia that it would be a good idea to earmark the gifts to the goddesses in the temples, especially gold which was particularly an Asiatic product. The idea was good, because the ear mark not only indicated where the gifts came from, but was a guarantee of genuineness and from that sprang the idea of earmarking money. First of all, it had only a few earmarks such as a seal or mark of some peculiar weapon carried by an Asiatic prince. By-and-by the designs became more elaborate until finally the head of the Sovereign was used. As soon as that occurred and money became money, the financiers proceeded to invent the science of money, and capitalists ever since have been dealing in it, not always I am sure to the advantage of those who in all other walks of life are absolutely dependent upon it. Cash money is at the outside only one-fiftieth of the wealth of the whole world. It would be impossible to transport cash in payment for all the goods bought, because in a very short time the country that did so would be left without any cash, and would be on its beam ends. So the system of bills of exchange was adopted, which is a good deal like our system of a clearing house for banks. This was necessary because no nation in the world would allow its gold reserve to sink below a certain level; and in times of war when distress is greatest nations take particular care that the gold reserve in the treasury is as big as possible; for it is admitted that the country that has most gold will win the fight.

In Greece, the ideal was superiority. She gave to the world great sculptors, great painters, tragedians, great writers of tragedies and comedies, great orators such as Demosthenes, and so on. All the countries together in the world have never produced their equal since for quality or quantity. Why? Because the Greeks were a highly imaginative and intellectual people. Their ideal was typified in the reward they gave to their great athletes at the Olympian games. The winners were crowned with a simple chaplet of wild olive, the olive tree being typical of Greece. Money they never dreamt of, gold they despised, and a rich man they suspected.

Nowhere, even in Homeric history, is there any reference to the riches of anybody. It is their fighting ability, or their eloquence,

or beauty or strength that is spoken of, but never their riches. It has remained for this age to glorify the idea of materialism as typified by the rich man.

I wish, therefore, in conclusion, to say that every one of us must realize that we have sold ourselves very largely to materialism, whereas in this age we should keep constantly before ourselves the Christian or ethical ideal as opposed to the materialistic ideal. But Christianity is practically at a discount, or, if not at a discount, it occupies an altogether secondary position in its influence. It is not prominent, it is not predominant, its ideals are laughed at, and theology occupies about as much of a place in the public mind as political economy. What the people want is money, and it is very easy to glide from the wish for or want of capital into desiring to get it at any price and at the sacrifice of any principle. We see every day the mergers in this country, we see the banks that have gone up, we see the investigations, the disclosures, the horrible catastrophies from time to time that are taking place. We see them increasing, and we see people vainly endeavouring to stem this tide of corruption by laws. It can not be done, Mr. Speaker. There are laws enough on the statute books to send all the people in the country to jail. Unless the people become good enough to do more without law, to rise superior to laws, the ideal of a nobler human being will never succeed in placing itself spiritually and ethically on that high plane which it ought to occupy in our minds, and where it would be worthy of those great Greek idealists who have so long preceded us.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia): I think it will be conceded by everybody in this House, and also out of the House, that the propositions submitted by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. White) in his Budget speech are amongst the most important that have ever been submitted to this House. He comes to Parliament, as is usual, for the supply of money for the coming year, and the money he asks for is for the ordinary expenses of the country and for the continuance of the war. The money that he asks for naturally divides itself into two parts—that part that he asks for in connection with the war, and that part that he asks for in connection with the ordinary expenses of the country. I will, for a moment or two, deal with that portion of his Budget that asks for money in connection with the war. I want to say to my hon. friend that with reference to everything that he asks this House to vote in connection with the carrying on of the war, he will have every man on this side of the House right behind him; we will support him to the limit, and vote anything that he says is necessary for the carrying on of this war. This war has been forced on Great Britain, and the other portions of the Empire. It is not of their own seeking. Great Britain has gone to war for self-preservation in one sense, and for the purpose of seeing that smaller nations are allowed to live and that treaties are kept.

When the war broke out the Government that happened to be in power at the time took, in my judgment, the proper and necessary steps. They called a special session of Parliament and asked for $50,000,000, which was voted without a word of criticism on this side. Now, they are asking for $100,000,000, and we propose to vote that without a word of criticism from this side. We think that the Government took the proper course and that they are doing all right in carrying on the war and we say that Canada is with Great Britain in this war to the extent of her men and her money. If my hon. friend the Minister of Finance should find out at the end of the next fiscal year, March 31, 1916, that the $100,000,000 that he is asking for to-day is not sufficient for the war, the vote shall be supplemented, all he has to do is to come before Parliament and ask for what is necessary and he will find that every Liberal, and I am satisfied every Conservative, in fact every man, will be right behind any proposition he makes and will not criticise the amount he asks for.

We naturally reserve to ourselves the right to expect that it shall be properly expended and to ask, if it is not properly expended, that the matter shall be looked into. I do not imagine for a moment that any Minister of Militia or any Government can look after every dollar of expenditure and see that everything is done rightly. We expect there will be mistakes, that there will be a certain amount of wrong-doing that the Government cannot stop, but whenever there is any very persistent course of wrong-doing, where contractors are charging two prices or contractors are putting in an inferior class of goods for our soldiers, we reserve the right to ask for an investigation of these matters. I think it is our duty to ourselves and to the country and I am satisfied that it is our duty to the Government and that the Government will be a great deal better in the end if matters are looked into and stopped in the beginning

instead of being allowed to run on for a year or two or to the extent of the duration of the war. I do not think I need refer any further to that phase of the question.

We come now to consider that portion of my hon. friend's Budget which deals with the money required for the ordinary expenditure of the country and for the capital account expenditure. While we do not criticise the other portion of the Budget I feel that we are absolutely justified in thoroughly criticising that portion of the Budget where my hon. friend the Minister of Finance is asking for money to carry on the ordinary work of the country. It is just as much our duty and right to criticise and look into this matter at this session as at any other session that has ever been held. I think it is more necessary because we are in a very peculiar position at this time. We find that the country is in a most depressed condition, not on account of the war altogether. It may have had something to do with it, but the depression was on the country, conditions were bad, imports were falling, everything was largely at a standstill, the business of the country was going back day by day, month by month, year by year, and in face of all this the Minister of Finance comes down to this House and asks for a greater Budget than ever has been asked for in the history of Canada. My hon. friend tells us that his expenditures are going up so much and therefore he must have more revenue. There are two ways to equalize revenue and expenditure. One way is to do as my friend the Minister of Finance has attempted to do, increase the revenue; another way is to decrease the expenditure. What is the better way, what is the sensible way, in what way would any common-sense man go about equalizing revenue and expenditure? Would it be in hard times to try to collect more taxes or would it be to take the common-sense view and reduce expenditure?

The Minister of Finance is a business man, and I venture to say if he had been allowed a free hand he would never have submitted such a Budget. No business man in Canada, no business man in the civilized world, under the conditions that obtain at present in the Dominion, would have come down with a proposal asking for an expenditure of $190,000,000, apart from the cost of the war, when he admits that the revenue will be about $120,000,000. And yet, that is what he has done. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) suggested that the expenditure should have been cut down, and I say without the slightest fear of successful contradiction that the expenditure could have been cut down, with the full consent of the people of Canada, to meet the revenue of 1915-16, which will be $120,000,000, and that is some $30,000,000 greater than the expenditure was in Canada when the present Government came into power three and a half years ago. There is absolutely no reason on earth for this great increase of expenditure, from $87,000,000 in 1911 to $140,000,000 at the present time. Suppose the Minister of Finance had submitted a ballot to every voter in Canada, asking: Are you in favour of reducing the public expenditure by $30,000,000 or are you in favour of raising that $30,000,000 partly by a direct tax and partly by the raising of the customs duties by which for every dollar you put into the treasury you put three dollars into the pockets of the manufacturers, how many of the voters of Canada do you think would have marked that ballot against reducing expenditures? It is the people of Canada, who have the right to say whether expenditures shall be reduced or taxes increased.

Mr. BRADBURY: Let us go to the people and find out.

Mr. TURRIFF: You cannot go to the people too quick for me. Gentlemen on the other side of the House and their friends outside have been threatening us that if we do not behave ourselves and be good boys and keep quiet, they will dissolve the House and go to the country. I would tell these gentlemen that in view of this Budget they can dissolve the House if they dare and appeal to the people. My hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) and the gentleman who sits beside him (Mr. Meighen) will have a good deal to explain when they go out to the western farmers.

Mr. BRADBURY: It will not be hard.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend will have a good deal to explain, and he will have to use greater efforts than he did before to secure a majority.

Mr. BRADBURY: There will be others.

Mr. KYTE: On that side of the House.

Mr. TURRIFF: I think I am looking at a good many hon. gentlemen opposite to whom the remarks of my hon. friend will apply. The Minister of Public Works said yesterday that he hoped there would be no election. I venture to think that there is not

a man on the other side of the House who does not know what to take out of that assertion. I notice that while the Minister of Public Works says he hopes there is not going to be an election until after the war, that he is mighty busy, and hon. gentlemen opposite are mighty busy, sending out party literature at the present moment.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is the way they keep the truce.

Mr. TURRIFF: I can assure my hon. friends opposite, that we, as well as they, know how to interpret the smooth words of the Minister of Public Works. We know the Minister of Public Works and we are not blinded one iota by anything he says about deferring the election. My hon. friend stated that when the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) was referring to cutting down expenditures, he did not show how this extra revenue that is needed could be raised if taxes were not levied. That is true, but the hon. member pointed out that it was not necessary to raise this extra revenue at all if the expenditure were cut down. My hon. friend asked if we would stop the public works in view of the fact that there is a great deal of unemployment in the country, but I ask him, who supplies the money for carrying on public works? It is the taxes paid by the people of Canada that provides that money. If the Minister of Finance spends $30,000,000 more this year than he needs to, it is the people of Canada who will have to supply that money, and I tell the Government that when they say they are benefiting the people of Canada by carrying on public works, they are simply taking the money out of one pocket of the ratepayers of Canada and putting it into another. I say that the expenditure on public works could be cut in two and the good of the country would not suffer to the extent of one dollar.

The hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) took great credit to himself and to the Government of which he is a supporter that in the Estimates for public works this coming year there is a reduction of about $11,000,000 over the estimate of last year. But let me tell the hon. member that last year the Minister of Public Works put in an estimate of $33,000,000, not that he had the slightest intention of spending $33,000,000, but to hang it out as a bribe to the different constituencies of Canada, and for no other purpose. The Minister of Public Works did not spend that money and he had no idea of spending it when he put it in the Estimates. But, neverthless, when the Minister of Public Works comes forward now and asks for $11,000,000 less than he did in the inflated estimates of last year, the hon. gentleman from Toronto points to what an economical government we have. What my hon. friend is asking for now is double what was expected on public works when his party came into power three years ago.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Is my hon. friend finding fault with the Minister of Public Works for not expending the whole of last year's vote?

Mr. TURRIFF: Certainly not. The sums were put in the Estimates of last year, not for the purpose of expending all of them, but as a bribe to the different constituencies in case of an election and as nothing else. That is what I said, and that is what I stand by.

Mr. WILCOX: There was no election.

Mr. TURRIFF: There was always the prospect of an election last fall, and it would have looked very well to go through the different constituencies and say: See what this Government has done; it has voted tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars for public works. But the money was not expended, and this year my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works is asking for more than his expenditure of last year. Is it a time to go in for lavish expenditures when the revenue is falling away tremendously, and when my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has to borrow every dollar required for the war, every dollar for expenditure for public works on capital account, and, if he had not put on extra taxation, a considerable part of the ordinary expenditure on consolidated account?

What does the common-sense business man do when his revenue is partly cut off? Let us take the case of a workingman who for the last ten years until a year ago has been earning $2.50 a day. He is an industrious man and has an economical wife. He buys a lot on the outskirts of the city and builds a little house. As the years go by his house becomes worth say $4,000 to $5,000. Suddenly there comes depressed times throughout the Dominion, and he finds that instead of his wages being $2.50 a day they are cut down to $1.50 a day. What does he do if he is sensible and has succeeded, as the man I speak of has? Does he go to a loan company and borrow enough money to enable him to continue living at the rate of $2.50 a day, or does he cut his

living expenses from $2.50 to $1.50 a day? The latter is what the common-sense artisan does on every occasion.

Let me give my hon. friend the Minister of Finance another instance that will appeal more to him. As I said a moment ago, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance is a business man first and foremost, and moreover, he is a good business man when he is left alone—a first-class business man. Formerly, he was always able to conduct his business in a good and prosperous way, never making his expenditures greater than his revenue. It is only when he is Minister of Finance in the company in which he finds himself that he is reduced to borrowing.

Mr. GRAHAM: Inefficient.

Mr. TURRIFF: Supposing my hon. friend the Minister of Finance was the president of a company that for years past had been earning 8 per cent on its capital and had been paying an annual dividend of 6 per cent. As the years went on it gathered a nice rest account to give stability to the company to tide over any difficult time. When hard times come along, such as we are now experiencing, and the earnings of that company are reduced from 8 per cent to 5 per cent per annum, what would my hon. friend do? Would he continue to pay a dividend of 6 per cent if he saw hard times looming ahead with no prospect of better times for years to come, drawing out of the reserve account for it, and then, when the reserve account was eaten up, going to the banks and mortgaging the securities of his company to get money to continue paying that 6 per cent? Would he keep up the expenditure? Not for one moment. Would my hon. friend the Minister of Finance countenance such a procedure; and if his board of directors insisted upon keeping up the expenditure he would resign the presidency of that company, just as any sensible man would do. If that is good business for an individual, industrial or financial company, why should it not be good business for the Dominion of Canada? The ministers of this Government are simply directors and the people of Canada shareholders, and the ministers should be actuated by the same principles and standards of honour and honesty in expenditure and revenue as the president and directors of any financial or industrial company. But have they been actuated by such priciples? No. We find the country brought to a state of depression by the extravagance of this Government to a large extent; and instead of curtailing expenditure, my hon. friend says: No, clap on full sail; spend all the money you like on public works; spend all the money you like on all the other departments; and, although we have to mortgage the resources of this country, we will expend all the money that is wanted. Is that a common-sense business view to take? Is that a common-sense way in which to handle the finances of this country? It is the very worst kind of financing that has ever been attempted in this country from Confederation down to the present time. If this proposition of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance is made law in its present state, it will be the heaviest blow that has been given to the development and prosperity of Canada since Confederation, and it will take Canada many a long year to recover from the effects of it.

9 p.m.

Mr. WILCOX: Cheer up.

Mr. TURRIFF: I am usually of a somewhat optimistic nature. I generally look at the bright side of things, and I would particularly like to be able to look at the bright side of this question to-night; but I certainly see that we are to be in for a long period of depression. It cannot be helped. Our main customers on the continent of Europe will not be in a good position to buy from us when this war is over. We shall not be able to produce so as to sell to those countries as cheaply as in the past. Why? Because of the act of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance in heaping burdens upon the backs of the farmers.

Mr. WILCOX: Terrible!

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend is right. He does not strike the nail on the head very often, but he has hit it right this time.

Mr. WILCOX: I want to correct my hon. friend. I did not say "tariff"; I said "terrible."

Mr. TURRIFF: All right. The Minister of Finance tells the House and the country that a part of this taxation that he proposes to put on is a war tax—that it is a tax to help out the war. I say this Government is deliberately making an attempt to get money from the people under false pretenses. Not a dollar of what the minister proposes to raise by direct taxation or by the increased tariff duties is for the purposes of the war. I give the Minister of Finance and the members of the Government generally credit for this—that they have made the people of Canada to a certain extent believe

that this money is for the war. But I can tell them that, when the people of Canada realize that there is not a word of truth in the representations that they have made on this subject, when they realize that the Minister of Finance is borrowing all the money for the war and that all he has collected by taxation is to enable the Government to continue its course of reckless extravagance, the Government will not last five minutes after that question has been fairly submitted to a vote of the people. It takes a good deal of work, a good deal of explanation by the newspapers and public men to get the facts home to the people. But they will learn it. They will learn that the increased taxation is raising the cost of living, and God knows it was high enough. But it is going to be higher because this Government taxes practically everything the poor man eats or wears. The people will understand that before long, because each man will feel it in his pocket. Every time a postcard is mailed there is a special tax of one cent—the cost is doubled. Every time a letter is mailed, a stamp printed "war tax" must be put on at the cost of an additional cent. I wonder at the Government having the nerve to call this a war tax when they know it is nothing of the kind. If the Minister of Finance wanted to be exactly fair with the people of Canada, if he wanted the people to understand the reason for putting on the stamp marked "war tax" on each letter posted, he would proceed in a different way; in each post office there should be a little box, and when any person wished to mail a letter, instead of putting on the additional stamp, he would drop one cent in the box and on that box would be the inscription: "For two poor men: subscription for Mackenzie and Mann." How long would the people of Canada stand for a tax of that kind? And the same should be done in the case of every railway ticket or steamship ticket bought, every cheque going through a bank, every bill of exchange drawn—"For two poor men: Bill and Dan."

The Minister of Finance made the statement that he expected to get $8,000,000 or $10,000,000 out of the war taxes. What does he want it for? He wants it for the general revenue purposes of the country to pay back the money that the Government has given, during the past year, illegally to Mackenzie and Mann. Because we, a year ago in this Parliament, guaranteed $45,000,000 in bonds in the interest of these people, did that give the Government the right to hand over twelve and a half millions to Mackenzie and Mann? Why, the Minister of Finance had no more right to hand over that money to Mackenzie and Mann than he had to give it to me or to give it to the first man he may meet on leaving this House. If the directors of a financial corporation had done such a thing, it would not be long before they would be cross-eyed looking out through iron bars. My information is that every minister in the Government is liable to impeachment for that very thing. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance will have to come down to this House and get remedial legislation to legalize that illegal transaction of handing over the money of the people of Canada to Mackenzie and Mann and the Grand Trunk Pacific. That is the exact state of the case—I am not overstating it by a hair's breadth; and no one knows that better than the Minister of Finance.

So that this, instead of being a direct tax for the war as the Government is trying dishonestly to make out, is a tax that Mackenzie and Mann have more interest in than anybody else, because they will get the greatest share of it—in fact, they have it already. The Government have the glad hand and the warm heart for the big railway corporations and the big manufacturers, because there are fat election subscriptions to be secured. But for the workingman and the farmer there is the cold hand: "What do you want? We will give you a seven and a half per cent increased duty. That is good enough for you. Go back to your work, and produce more. Patriotism and production."

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman kindly let us know what he thinks of the argument of his friend the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) that we should not have taxed bituminous coal because that tax is too hard on the railways?

Mr. TURRIFF: I will say to my hon. and hair-splitting friend that if he will wait for a few minutes and, when I get through the few remarks I have to make, will ask me that question or any other, I will endeavour, to the best of my poor ability, to give him an answer—and I have no doubt that I shall be able to give him an answer that will not be satisfactory to him.

There is the position that we are in. The Minister of Finance comes to the people of Canada, and says: We want you to give us some twenty-two to twenty-five millions of extra taxes, and so we propose to raise the duties. It was well pointed out by my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) last

night—and the idea had not occurred to me, I am free to confess, and had not occurred to a good many members on either side of the House—that last August, in the extra session, the Minister of Finance put on extra taxes. I do not remember at what he estimated them, but I think it was about $15,000,000 a year. I would ask the Finance Minister whether that estimate has been borne out. I imagine it would be much better borne out than his expectations of revenue from the tariff he is now putting on, simply because so much of it came from sugar, whisky and tobacco.

Mr. W. T. WHITE: I stated in the Budget speech that the effect of the increase of August last had been to counteract the decrease which would otherwise have taken place in excise, but that until the end of the year it is impossible to state with any degree of accuracy what the precise effect of the changes of last August will be. The amount received will, in my judgment, owing to the very great interruption of general business last fall on account of the war, be less than I estimated.

Mr. TURRIFF: I thank the minister for the information; it is about as I would expect. Trade has not been good and it was to be expected that the revenue received would be somewhat less than any man would have been justified in estimating at that time. If that has occurred in connection with the taxes that were imposed last August then I am afraid that the Minister of Finance will fall very much short in his estimate of extra revenue from the taxes he is about to impose. There is a certain limit to which you can go in the raising of revenue from taxes by tariff. That limit, I think, has been reached and more than reached by the extra taxes now being imposed. If any judgment had been used in selecting certain articles which might bear the taxes, probably some extra revenue would have been received; but when you put on a horizontal tax, raising the tariff on everything without rhyme or reason, you are bound in many cases to put the tariff so high that instead of increasing the revenue you are bound to decrease it. I remember very well the discussion that took place a year or two ago, when the Minister of Finance cut the duty on cement. It was pointed out that the duty on cement was approximately 60 per cent ad valorem. Afterwards my hon. friend put the duty on cement back where it was and it has remained there ever since. Now my hon. friend comes forward and puts an extra duty of 7½ per cent on cement. Does any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House think for one moment that we are going to continue importing cement under these circumstances? This extra duty practically cuts out the importation of cement into Canada. How much revenue will it put into the treasury? The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) last night pointed out how much revenue had been received for duty on cement. The minister in putting extra duties on cement is not going to receive even the amount of revenue that is now being derived from that source. He is cutting off the revenue from cement altogether, and to whom has he given it? Is he saving it to the farmer or to the town or villages that are using cement for paving, or to the business man who uses cement in putting up buildings? Is he saving it to any user of cement? No, Mr. Speaker, he is not, he is handing over a bonus of thousands and hundreds of of thousands of dollars to the greatest combine and merger that we have in Canada to-day. Not a dollar of increased revenue, but thousands of dollars of increased cost for the user of cement and increased profits for the cement merger. Will my hon. friend or the hon. member from South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell), who said last night that those who are able to pay are being taxed, that the big interests are being taxed, tell me how much the cement merger is paying of this tax? I do not think anybody will attempt to answer that question.

Mr. MACDONELL: You had better guess it, you have been guessing a lot.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend was guessing all last night. He sat down guessing. My hon. friend was speaking for the manufacturers. He said he was a—

Mr. MACDONELL: No my hon. friend is quite mistaken, and I do not think it is fair that he should say that. I did not say that or anything to that effect. I said I was a staunch protectionist.

Mr. TURRIFF: A strong protectionist, yes. If that does not mean the same thing I do not know what it means. However, I take back the expression I used as I certainly would not wish to put wrong words in the mouth of my hon. friend; but I would ask my hon. friend the minister or my hon. friend from South Toronto how much the cement merger is being taxed in this direct tax. Every poor man who sends $5 home to

his wife in the Old Country has to put a stamp on his cheque and another on the envelope which carries it. The poor man has to pay. But does the cement merger pay? The man who sends a $5 cheque home to his mother in the Old Country pays exactly the same to carry that cheque and the same amount on that cheque as the cement merger or any other merger pays on a cheque for $250,000 for raw material or for anything else they purchase. That is treating everybody alike in a sense, but it is not making the man who has the money pay in proportion, it is putting the burden on the poor man and letting the rich man go free. As I said a moment ago, let the thing once come home to the people of Canada, let them once realize the position, and they will take care of my hon. friends across the floor of the House.

Mr. MACDONELL: Hear, hear; they will.

Mr. TURRIFF: I have spoken of decreasing the public expenditure. I said that public works could be cut down. What about the officials in Canada? My hon. friend from South Toronto last night asked my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) if he would be willing to cut down the civil service. Well, speaking for myself, I am prepared to answer that question, and I would say by all means cut down the Civil Service.

Mr. MACDONELL: What percentage?

Mr. TURRIFF: I was a civil servant myself a good many years here in Ottawa—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. TURRIFF:—and I know something about the Civil Service. I know that when this Government came into power and when the old Government went out of power, the Civil Service was not undermanned to any extent. The Civil Service has never been undermanned in Canada, no matter which party was in power. Since my hon. friends opposite came into power they have dismissed some 2,000 odd, and they have taken on 10,500 up to a year ago, practically a difference of 8,000; and if the figures were brought up to date, the difference would probably be about 10,000. Are we doing any more work than we were three and a half years ago? The extra civil servants are not the only matter of expense. The other day I moved for a return as to the number of buildings rented by this Government since it came into power. The figures for Ottawa alone show that some $202,000 has been spent in rent for offices to house these extra civil servants who were not required and are not required to-day. You cannot put on civil servants for less than $1,000 apiece per annum; and 10,000 civil servants at that rate mean $10,000,000 per annum. I say that the Civil Service could be cut down to what it was three and a half years ago, or even a great deal less than that, and the public service of Canada would not suffer to the extent of a five cent piece. So that if my hon. friend had wanted to cut down expenses, there was one way in which it could have been done. Take the public buildings being erected all over the country. I have looked through the Estimates, and I see that building after building costing $10,000, $20,000, $30,000 or $35,000 is being erected in places with less than 300 inhabitants.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Where?

Mr. TURRIFF: All through Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, Ontario, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Whereabouts in Prince Edward Island?

Mr. TURRIFF: Let my hon. friend look at the Estimates; no doubt he has them in his desk. He will find the figures there. I say that a saving of $10,000,000 could be made in this direction without the public suffering in the slightest degree. I do not say that the present Government is much more to blame than the old one. Time after time, when our own party was in power, I endeavoured to shut off these expenditures on public buildings in different places.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not in Parliament.

Mr. TURRIFF: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Have you your "Hansard" with you?

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend can find it in "Hansard" I advocated it both in the House and out of it. Take the Post Office Department for example. A small town wants a public building, and the Government puts one up at a cost for lot and building of say $25,000. When the building is up, you have to pay interest on that money for all time to come; you have to heat the building and put in a caretaker, and you have a continual stream of repairs, as any one can see by looking at the Estimates. The building has to be kept in repair even from the time it is built, and will cost altogether about $3,000 a year. I have in my own constituency two post offices which are not in public buildings, but the accommodation given to the public is equal to that

provided in the city of Ottawa, or in Montreal or Toronto or in any other place in the Dominion. The buildings are of solid brick, of first-class workmanship, perfectly heated, and have tables and chairs and pens and ink for the use of the public. A farmer can come in five miles and get his letter, sit down in the post office and answer it, and I will venture to say that the rent does not amount to $600 a year—not $2,000 or $3,000. Does any one suggest that either of those towns are suffering because they have not a public building for a post office? Not for a moment. The time has come when this Dominion—I do not mean this as a reflection on hon. gentlemen opposite more than on ourselves—but I say the time has come when we have got to get down to brass tacks in the matter of expenditure. We cannot go on as we have been doing for the last twenty-five years. It simply cannot be done. The Finance Minister stated the other day that the fixed charges for interest next year would be $21,500,000, if I remember correctly. When my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition came into power in 1896, the fixed charges for interest were some $10,000,000. When he went out of power in 1911 the fixed interest charges were in round figures $12,000,000, representing an increase of $2,000,000 in about sixteen years. When my hon. friends came into power three and a half years ago the fixed interest charges were $12,000,000, and next year the Finance Minister tells us that they will be $20,500,000, or an increase of $8,500,000. The Finance Minister of course is not responsible for the increase caused by our borrowings on account of the war. He is not to blame for that any more than we are. But the interest on our borrowings on account of the war will not make up that $8,500,000, and to that extent the Finance Minister is responsible.

I say we have come to a time when there must be retrenchment. When is it going to begin? Should it not begin now? Does my hon. friend the Minister of Finance think he is going to make prosperity by taxing the people of Canada? It is absurd to think that he can bring about prosperity by simply putting his hands in the pockets of the people and taking out the money, and the sooner the Government realize the position that Canada is in, the better it will be for the people of this country. We must make a change. We must live more economically. We must spend less money. How can we spend less money and do the least injury to the public service? We could reduce the number of officials, reduce them largely, and not interfere with the public service. We could cut the cost of public works in two and not interfere with the public service. My hon. friend from South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) was very anxious last night to know whether my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) was willing to see the expenditure on Halifax cut down. I understand that they are spending some $15,000,000 or $20,000,000 in Halifax. I venture the assertion that if the money was properly expended you could do all that is necessary for the development of trade in the city of Halifax for $5,000,000 instead of $20,000,000, and I venture the further assertion that the city of Halifax under the present circumstances would be perfectly willing to accept their share of reduction until conditions are better and the people of this country have more money and until there is not so great a discrepancy as exists at present between the expenditure and the revenue of Canada. I do not suppose it is necessary for me to emphasize that this so-called war tax is not a war tax, or that not one dollar of it is going to be spent in conducting the war. I have the "Hansard" report of the Minister's Budget speech here, in which he says half a dozen times that every dollar that is to be spent on the war will be borrowed. I have no fault to find with that.

Mr. W. T. WHITE: How will the interest be met upon the $150,000,000 that will have been borrowed since the outbreak of war until the end of the fiscal year 1915-16? It amounts to about $7,000,000, and is in consolidated revenue expenditure. I should like to point out that according to my estimate the special taxes will raise an amount slightly in excess of that which will be required to pay the interest upon the amount that will be borrowed for our war expenditure.

Mr. TURRIFF: That is exactly what I have been trying to make clear to my hon. friend all along. I am saying that this money that my hon. friend is proposing to raise by taxes and by the increased tariff is for the ordinary consolidated expenditure, and that interest on the public debt is part of the consolidated expenditure.

Mr. W. T. WHITE: And for war.

Mr. TURRIFF: Interest on our public debt will be paid out of consolidated revenue. But granted that my hon. friend is correct in the suggestion he makes that it would take about $7,000,000, let me point out that he is asking for from between

$8,000,000 and $10,000,000 direct taxes and between $22,000,000 and $25,000,000 indirect taxes. That is not all for interest, even taking my hon. friend's own statement.

Mr. W. T. WHITE: How is the pension list to be taken care of?

Mr. TURRIFF: Has my hon. friend paid any pension list?

Mr. WHITE: No, but I am afraid we will have to.

Mr. TURRIFF: What I object to is that my hon. friend tries to make the people believe that these taxes are for the war, whereas they are not for the war at all.

Mr. WHITE: They are.

Mr. TURRIFF: I did not want to take the time of the House to read my hon. friend's remarks, but I am afraid that I shall be obliged to. He is reported to have said—

Mr. MACDONELL: What about the war tax legislation of the United States? There is no war at all.

Mr. TURRIFF: I am delighted that the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) has asked me that question, because it is a matter I had in my mind and I perhaps would have forgotten it if he had not mentioned it. My hon. friend brought that matter up last night. Did the United States put on an extra duty to raise that tax?

Mr. MACDONELL: They did.

Mr. TURRIFF: What on?

Mr. MACDONELL: They put it on a very great number of articles. The list is quite as comprehensive as the list in the resolution before this House, and it contains additional matters, but the items that are taxed in our resolution are almost all included in the American Bill.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Not tariff taxation at all.

Mr. MACDONELL: Yes.

Mr. TURRIFF: No, my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonell) is mistaken in that. The United States, on account of the falling revenue, put direct taxes largely on the line of the direct taxes suggested by the Minister of Finance.

Mr. MACDONELL: And a stamp tax, too.

Mr. TURRIFF: A stamp tax, certainly, but they did not raise the tariff.

Mr. MACDONELL: I did not say that they did raise the tariff.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes.

Mr. MACDONELL: No, I never said so and do not intend to say so to-night.

Mr. TURRIFF: That is just exactly what I wanted to tell my hon. friend—that the United States put on direct taxes, a stamp tax, a tax on railway and steamship tickets, just along the line followed by the Minister of Finance, but every dollar that the United States levies goes direct into the treasury, whereas, as a result of what my hon. friend is doing in making a horizontal increase in the tariff, $1 goes into the treasury and from $4 to $5 into the pockets of the manufacturers. That suits the hon. member for South Toronto. He represents a constituency where they are all manufacturers and where there are no farmers. I do not object to him being pleased; I think he has got his way. The manufacturers have made this tariff or they might have made it. They could not have made it any better for themselves. I doubt if they made it, because if they had made it they never would have raised it as high.

An hon. MEMBER: They would not have had the nerve.

Mr. TURRIFF: The manufacturers have considerable nerve, but I do not think that they would have had that much nerve. If my hon. friend had followed the example of the United States he would not have proposed to have increased the tariff at this time.

Mr. W. T. WHITE: But they are not at war.

Mr. TURRIFF: No, but there was a depression just the same as there is here, and it was before the war just as it was here before the war. My hon. friends opposite at least do not need to take the word of any hon. gentleman on this side of the House. Let them read the statement of Sir Edmund Osler, president of the Dominion Bank, and the statement of the general manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia, and see what they say. They say that the war might in some degree have aggravated it, but that the depression was here, that it had been coming, that they had foreseen it, that they had warned the people about it, and that it was not caused by the war. As far as we are concerned, speaking for the province I come from, and I know it applies to Manitoba and Alberta in the same way, from the money point of

view, the war is a godsend. Nothing finer from a financial point of view ever happened the West.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is what Sir Edmund Osler says, too.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is that the member for Toronto?

Mr. TURRIFF: Yes, that is the same Sir Edmund Osler. Nothing better ever happened us. We had thousands and thousands of unemployed men in our cities there that we did not know what to do with. They have gone to the war, and they are earning good wages. If we want to sell wheat, oats, barley, horses, cattle, sheep or hogs we can sell them at good prices. Except in that portion of the country where they had no crop at all, where they suffered from drouth, the farmers were better off last year than the year before. This Government cannot put the blame of the hard times on the war. The war has been a godsend to them in many ways. This raising of the tariff that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance is proposing is just simply carrying out the promise made by gentlemen on that side of the House to the manufacturers prior to the election of 1911 for the support and subscriptions that they then received. They are carrying out and fulfilling a promise that up to the present time they did not dare to carry out, they did not dare to fulfil, and if it had not been for the war they would not have dared to fulfil it now. If there were no war, and if the Finance Minister came down with such a precious proposition as that which he has before the House today, why, they would be wiped out of existence. The Minister, notwithstanding the unfortunate position of Canada, has brought forward this measure to add burdens to the backs of the people in order to fulfil a promise made to the manufacturers in 1911.

I have been dealing with this question in a general way; now, I want to deal in a more concrete manner with one or two items. The hon. member for South Toronto said last night in his speech:

> The proposed taxation does not fall on the farmer or on the working man, and both these classes are thoroughly satisfied with the Budget as it stands at present. They ought to be satisfied.

Mr. MACDONELL: Just read the next paragraph.

Mr. TURRIFF (reading):

> Hon. members who came from rural committees can speak as to the farmers; but I can speak as to the men in the cities and they are thoroughly satisfied.

I give my hon. friend credit for being able to speak for his constituency, which is a city constituency. On the other hand, my hon. friend undertook to speak for my constituency. I propose in this House on this occasion, and on all occasions, to speak for my own constituency. I believe I can represent my people reasonably well. I certainly know the views of my people and I can tell the House that the views of the farmers of the West are absolutely opposed to the views expressed by the hon. member from South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell). I shall give to the House a list of articles on which the duty has been raised, to show the effect the increase will have on the people of the West. Rough lumber was formerly free, and it is now 7½ per cent. I do not think that even the British Columbia mill men are going to make money out of that. If I remember aright, and in this I am subject to correction because I have not looked into the matter recently, the United States reduced lumber to $1.15 per thousand feet on the 6th of October, 1913, and made lumber free to those countries that allowed American lumber in free. A year ago last October I was on the Pacific coast when the American tariff came into force, some of the mill men stated that the opening of the American market to them saved them from going into bankruptcy. If the mill men of British Columbia now lose the American market through this tariff, then the Canadian farmer will be taxed extra and the British Columbia mill men will be punished in the United States, so that both sides will suffer, and the country will not get any increased revenue. Oranges and lemons were formerly free, but now there is a duty of 7½ per cent on them; canned meats, formerly 27½ per cent, now 35 per cent; automobiles formerly 35 per cent, now 42½ per cent; blankets 35 per cent, now 42½ per cent; woollen goods 35 per cent, now 42½ per cent; boots and shoes 30 per cent now 37½ per cent; clothing 35 per cent, now 42½ per cent; bituminous coal 53 cents per ton now 53 cents specific and 7½ per cent ad valorem; cotton goods 25 per cent, now 32½ per cent; linen goods, formerly 32½ per cent, now 40 per cent; furniture, 30 per cent, now 37½ per cent; garden seeds, 25 per cent, now 32½ per cent; harness, 15 per cent, now 22½ per cent; ploughs, 20 per cent, now 27½ per cent; pumps, 30 per cent, now 37½ per cent; shovels, 32½ per cent, now 40 per cent; stoves, 35 per cent, now 42½ per

cent; threshing machines, 20 per cent, now 27½ per cent; wagons 25 per cent, now 32½ per cent; windmills 20 per cent, now 27½ per cent; drills, harrows, cultivators, rakes, 20 per cent, now 27½ per cent; grain-cutters and straw-cutters, 27½ per cent, now 35 per cent.

I wonder if hon. gentlemen opposite realize what all this means to the farmer. I see by statements in the western newspapers that this extra duty of 7½ per cent on threshing machines means $175 extra duty on a threshing machine outfit over and above what it was when the duty on threshing machines was only 20 per cent. Imagine what it means to the farmer to have to pay an increase of $175 on a threshing machine outfit. Let us see where the manufacturer comes in there and whether he has to pay any of this so-called war tax. I say, Sir, that the manufacturer does not pay to the extent of one dollar but on the other hand he gets a great big bonus. Nowadays, a threshing machine is made practically altogether of iron and steel. I do not suppose there are more than four tons of material that go into a threshing machine and engine. But supposing there were five tons, that material would not cost raw, in steel ingots and iron bars, more than $30 per ton on an average and 7½ per cent on five tons would be about ten or eleven dollars. The finished machine, when it leaves the shops, retails for from $3,000 to $4,000 and at the factory it should be worth $2,000, so that the manufacturer gets 7½ per cent on $2,000, and he only pays 7½ per cent on the raw material which is value for $150. That is the difference and that is where the manufacturer comes in. And yet, the hon. member for South Toronto says that everybody pays the tax. I say the manufacturer does not pay the tax and not only does he not pay anything but he gets a great big bonus. I repeat, that for every dollar the Minister of Finance will get from the farmer in the way of increased duties, the manufacturer will get three, or four, or five dollars more in his own pocket. But the farmer pays it all. The hon. member from South Toronto argued that this increase of the duty was favourable to Great Britain, in that it made the preference to Great Britain comparatively greater than it was before. I have taken the trouble to look through the tariff to see just how this increase of 5 per cent against Great Britain, and 7½ per cent against the rest of the world affects a lot of articles. I hold in my hand a list covering two sheets of foolscap, which shows the percentage of increase against Great Britain is a good deal greater than the percentage of increase against the United States. I shall put this statement before the House.

On axle grease, for example, the percentage increase against Great Britain is 40 per cent. A man buying a case of axle grease under the new duty, which is increased 5 per cent under the British preference, will pay 40 per cent more than he paid under the former duty. The duty from the United States was 20 per cent and the increase of 7½ per cent is only a percentage increase of 37½ per cent.

Mr. BLAIN: Cannot all axle grease be made in Canada?

Mr. TURRIFF: It is possible that in my hon. friend's part of the country they may make their butter poor enough so that it can be put into axle grease, and therefore it can be made in Canada.

Mr. BLAIN: What about the real question: cannot the axle grease be made in Canada? Axle grease is largely used in nearly every part of the country, and is it not nearly all made in Canada now?

Mr. TURRIFF: If my hon. friend is correct in that, why does the Minister of Finance put an extra 5 per cent duty on for the benefit of the manufacturer. If all the axle grease is made in Canada now, is the increased duty going to give him any more revenue? But the farmer pays it all the same.

The following table which I have prepared will show the former British preference duty on articles largely used; the percentage of increase in the British preference under the proposal now made by the Finance Minister, as well as the former general tariff duty on these articles and the percentage of increase now proposed, and in every item it will be seen that the British preference gets the worst of it.

——	British Preference Duty.	Per Cent Increase.	General Tariff Duty.	Per Cent Increase.
Axle Grease	12½	40	20	37½
Brick	12½	40	22½	33
Blankets (pure wool)	22½	22½	35	21⅓
Dictionaries	5	100	10	75
Fertilizers, n.o.p.	5	100	10	75
Furnaces (hot air)	15	33⅓	25	30
Gloves and Mitts	22½	22	35	21⅓
Garden or Field Seeds in 1-lb. packages or less	15	33½	25	30
Garden or Field Seeds, over 1-lb. packages	5	100	10	75
Grain Crushers	15	33⅓	25	30
Harrows	12½	40	20	37½
Horse Rakes	12½	40	20	37½
Leather for Glove Mfg	5	100	10	75
Manure Spreaders	12½	40	20	37½
Fanning Mills	15	33⅓	25	30
Nursery Stock	12½	40	20	37½
Paris Green (Dry)	5	100	10	75
Pipe, Iron and Steel and Wooden, wire bound, not less than 30 in., for use in Gold Mining	5	100	10	75
Ploughs	12½	40	20	37½
Printing and Lithographic Presses	5	100	10	75
Pumps (Power)	15	33	27½	27½
Rubber Boots and Shoes	15	33⅓	25	30
Rubber Clothing	22½	22½	35	21⅓
Paper Bags	15	33⅓	27½	27½
Sago and Tapioca	17½	28½	27½	27½
Sails for Boats	15	33⅓	25	30
Saws, Band, Gang and Circular	15	33⅓	27½	27½
School Slates	15	33⅓	25	30
Clover Seed	5	100	10	75
Seed Drills	12½	40	20	37½
Flaxseed	7½	66⅔	10	75
Timothy Seed	5	100	7½	75
Seeds, Field and Garden, valued at not less than $5.00 per lb. in packages, and weighing not less than 1 oz. each	5	100	10	75
Shade Blanks	5	100	10	75
Silk in gum, for manufacturing Shoe Laces	5	100	10	75
Steel Wool	5	100	10	75
Stoves	15	33⅓	25	30
Electric Stoves	15	33⅓	27½	27½
Urns of metals, etc., for manufacturing of Stoves	5	100	10	75
Table Cloths, linen, cotton, uncoloured	20	25	30	25
Electric Batteries, etc., etc	15	33⅓	27½	27½
Tinsel Thread and Wire for manufacturing Braids, etc	5	100	7½	75
Wall Paper	22½	22½	35	21⅓
Bees Wax	5	100	10	75
Wax, Mineral and Veg., n.o.p.	5	100	10	75
Weeders	12½	40	20	37½
Wood Veneers not over 3|32 of an inch thick	5	100	7½	75
Wool Shoddy	7½	66⅔	12½	62
Yarns, linen or cotton, for manufacturing of Tape Lines	5	100	10	75
Yellow Metal for use in making tanks for stoves	5	100	10	75

This table proves that the percentage increase against British goods is larger than the percentage increase against United States goods. Can these be the same people who three and a half years ago said: "No truck or traffic with the United States"?

Mr PUGSLEY: They do not look the same; they look more depressed.

Mr. WILCOX: Not as depressed as my hon. friend.

Mr. GRAHAM: Their salaries are better.

Mr. TURRIFF: This table shows what my hon. friend the Minister of Finance is doing to encourage trade with Great Britain. We had an example this afternoon from my hon. friend the member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham). He told us what hon. gentlemen on the other side think of the preference to Great Britain. He had no use for it. My hon. friend the member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) made the same statement a few years ago. "Give us," he said, "a majority in the House, and we will show you what we will do with the British prefer-

ence." My hon. friends opposite now have a majority and they have shown us what they propose to do with the British preference. This Government could have got along perfectly well without increasing the tariff; but not satisfied with increasing the general tariff, they have undertaken to increase the tariff on the goods that we are bringing in from Great Britain. My hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) stated yesterday that there was a great deal of difficulty in bringing in goods from Great Britain, owing to the extra freight and shortage of boats.

10 p.m.

My hon. friends opposite now propose an extra tax on British goods for the purpose of shutting off trade with Great Britain. The tax is put on for no other reason. If my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has to have more money, if the Government will not shut off expenditure, if it is bound to have an extra $30,000,000, impose the taxes on the outside world; and if you cannot do it in that way, impose a direct tax and take your $10,000,000; tax the banks and the trust companies and the insurance companies; tax every one, make them pay what money you want; but for Heaven's sake keep your unholy and disloyal hands off the British preference.

Three or four years ago we were told throughout the West that because we advocated a free market in the United States in which to sell our goods, we were hardly loyal.

Mr. OLIVER: Disloyal.

Mr. TURRIFF: That we were absolutely disloyal, as my hon. friend has remarked. Let us see what the position is now. I do not want to draw invidious comparisons between one part of the country and the other; but many people down East called us disloyal because we wanted to sell our crops in the best market. I think I am justified in pointing out what has taken place in the last six months. Have our friends in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, the three provinces that were picked out as holding many disloyal people because they wanted to sell their crops in the best markets—have they shown themselves less loyal than others? Have they been less ready to volunteer for service on the firing line than people in any other part of Canada?

Mr. AMES: Many of those who voted against reciprocity have gone to the front.

Mr. TURRIFF: I do not doubt that. I have said, time and again, in this House that I have never met a disloyal Conservative nor a disloyal Liberal, so far as I know, in my life. I should be sorry to think that there were many disloyal people in Canada. There are many kinds of loyalty. One kind consists in supplying good goods for the use of the army.

Let me point out another thing that has taken place in the West. The Grain Growers' Association of Manitoba, the Grain Growers' Association of Saskatchewan, the United Farmers of Alberta have all, at their conventions, held during the past few months, carried unanimously resolutions calling on this Government to do away with the duties against Great Britain and to make up any lack of revenue that may follow by a direct tax on the land—on the farmers' land. And, remember, there is no politics in these organizations; they are composed of Liberals and Conservatives alike. And these are the people who a few years ago were accused of disloyalty by the very men who, now that Great Britain is in trouble, now that she is fighting the fight of her life, fighting for her national existence and ours, and when her success depends upon her commerce, come forward and say: We will help you by sending some men, but with the other hand we will try to cut your throat by preventing your goods from coming into Canada. And I say again, once let the people of Canada realize the position—

An hon. MEMBER: Louder.

Mr. TURRIFF: Oh, I will speak loud enough for the people in the West to hear; don't you fear. I say, let the people of Canada realize the position, and my hon. friend the Solicitor General will be piping lower instead of louder than he is now.

I have another list here, a long one also, in which the increases against Great Britain and against the United States are exactly the same. I have another list in which the percentage of increase is somewhat larger against the United States and the rest of the world than it is against Great Britain. I have selected these items from the tariff because they particularly affect the settlers of the West.

There has been a good deal of talk in the last month or two about greater production. Our friends the manufacturers sent a delegation to Winnipeg to meet with the grain growers. They proposed that an extra million acres of wheat should be sown next spring—that new lands should be broken to the extent of a million acres and wheat sown. No farmer would ever have suggested

that. Any one who knows anything about farming in the West knows that you might just as well throw your seed away as sow it on the sod. You would not get a crop worth harvesting. The farmers showed that this was not practicable. Then it was proposed that $50,000,000 should be borrowed by this Government to place people on the land. The cry was "Back to the land." Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary to borrow $50,000,000 to get people to go on the land. Nor is it necessary to tell the farmers to put in a million acres extra of wheat. The farmer is not a fool altogether. He will put in an extra crop if that crop is going to pay him. All you have to do to get the farmer to put in all the land possible, all you have to do in order to get the people back to the land, is to make the conditions such that they can make a good living out of the land. But what is the Government doing? It is putting a load on the back of the farmer. The Grain Growers' Guide put it very well a month or so ago when it said: Just let the manufacturers get off the farmer's back and there will be no trouble about oack to the land and no trouble about production.

Just one word further about the effect of these extra taxes on the farmers. As soon as this war is over and the price of wheat goes down to normal again, and while this added burden remains, hundreds and thousands on the western plains will leave the land. Why? Because they cannot make a living on the land under the circumstances. The Minister of Finance is putting on these extra duties. But will he take off these duties and put the tariff back where it was as soon as the war is over? He will do nothing of the kind. Those taxes are there to stay, as long as the hon. gentlemen opposite can keep them there. When the war is over the argument will be: We have created vested interests; you cannot now take off this protection, for it would mean failure among the manufacturers. So these burdens are added to the burdens of the farmers and artisans; living is made more expensive; conditions will be worse for workingman and farmer. And what are the compensating advantages? Practically there are none.

My hon. friend from West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham)—and I do not intend to follow him back for five thousand years and all over the face of the earth—said that unemployment was an issue at the present time. Yes, and it was an issue prior to 1896. But it was not an issue from 1896 to 1911. But hon. gentlemen opposite are back in power, and unemployment is once more an issue. The hon. gentleman stated also that two days' work a week, at eight hours a day, should be sufficient, if everybody worked, to produce all that is being produced at this time. I do not blame my hon. friend for trying to bring the labouring classes to that point of view, because under this Government and under the tariff they have enacted, two days' work a week is about all that the working people are going to be able to get in the near future. So my hon. friend, I think, is quite right in bringing that forward. My hon. friend also stated that Great Britain had not been able to get one follower in the line of free trade; but he forgot to mention that to-day free trade Great Britain is financing the world. Where are all the protective nations getting their money to carry on the war? From Great Britain. Were it not for being able to get money in Great Britain we could not take part in the war, because the minister has to borrow every dollar to send our forces there—and $30,000,000 more. My hon. friend said that when British preference was introduced it came very near putting the pottery works at St. Johns right out of business. The preferential duty against Great Britain on pottery ware was 20 per cent. Now it is going to be 25 per cent. I say if the potteries in St. Johns, with a protection of 20 per cent and with high rates of transportation on that class of goods, cannot live, in the name of common sense let them shut up business and go into something that can get on with 20 per cent protection and allow some revenue to come into the treasury of Canada. The business that cannot live under these circumstances is not worth preserving in Canada. It is out of place in Canada, where there are many factories that we are bolstering up with new protection, the money invested in which would be far better invested in something that would pay a reasonable return—and there are in Canada many opportunities for the investing of money.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend has not answered the question as to his opinion of the argument of my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) that the tax on bituminous coal should not go on because it will be too hard on the railways that consume the coal.

Mr. TURRIFF: I agree that the tax on bituminous coal should not go on. I do not believe that one of the taxes imposed should go on. An additional objection is that it will put an argument into the hands of the

railway companies for an increase in freight rates when they have to pay 10 cents a ton more for coal. Is my hon. friend satisfied to put on an extra 10 cents on coal for the railroads and have every one of the farmers he represents pay extra freight rates to make up the additional cost of coal to the railway companies?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not said so. We are taxing the consumers of coal, but the hon. member for Halifax objects to that because the railways have to pay and argues that they cannot stand it. I am asking the opinion of my hon. friend who now has the Floor upon this point.

Mr. TURRIFF: If you are asking for the opinion of the hon. member for Halifax, he is able to express his own opinions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Your opinion.

Mr. TURRIFF: I am against the extra taxes on coal and on everything else the minister is taxing. I would say not to put on any of the taxes, and then you would suit me and my hon. friend to the right (Mr. A. K. Maclean).

My hon. friend from South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) yesterday said that it was necessary for the Government to pay those cash subsidies to Mackenzie and Mann in order that the bonds guaranteed by this Government and by many of the provincial governments might not become a charge on the respective Governments that guaranteed them. If the Government are running away with the idea that by giving the cash subsidy they have given to the Canadian Northern railway they are going to relieve this Government or any other Provincial Government from the guarantees of bonds that they have made, they are making a great mistake. They are only putting off the evil day for a few years, and the day will come before very long when this Government, after having done what they did a year ago, will have to take over the Canadian Northern railway and will have to expend another $50,000,000 in making it fit to compete, and they will add another $300,000,000 to the debt of Canada. They are not obviating any of those results, they are simply putting off the evil day for a very few years.

I only trust that the Minister of Finance may think better of some of these proposals that he has made and that he will give a little consideration to the view of the farmer and of the poor man; that he will, if he has to raise money, so arrange his taxes that they will fall not evenly per capita of the population, but evenly according to the ability of the men to pay. My hon. friend does not care to take up the matter of taxing incomes, or land; but I see by the press that the local government in his own province of Ontario to-day has come forward with a proposition to put a direct tax on all lands in the different municipalities, to raise $1,800,000. Could not the Minister of Finance adopt something on that line? Such a tax would have this advantage, that the man who has property worth $1,000 would only pay one-tenth as much as the man with $10,000 worth, whereas all I can say in favour of the proposition of the Minister of Finance is that he is following out one of the biblical rules that to him that hath shall be given and from him that hath not shall be taken even that which he hath.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT (Muskoka): There are many matters that come before this House which receive a measure of consideration, are dealt with by Parliament, are recorded in the statute-book, or pass into oblivion, and we hear no more of them in this House. But that hardy annual, the Budget speech, buds and blossoms and sheds its fragrance over this House once a year, and gentlemen on the Government side seem to be quite satisfied with the perfume; but gentlemen on the opposite side, for some reason, seem to become irritated. It is very peculiar how we differ with regard to these matters.

The Budget brings before us many matters for our consideration, among others the trade policy. How shall we raise the revenue? The people have come to be divided into three schools. We have those who believe that free trade should be the dominant consideration in any tariff. Then there are those who believe that protection should be kept to the front, and there are those who believe that we should attach more importance to a tariff for revenue. The Budget now before us is known as the war Budget, and as far as I have been able to put my finger upon the pulse of public opinion I have found that the general opinion of this country favours the proposals of the Finance Minister. So far as I have been able to learn very little objection has been raised in the country. It is generally conceded that the tax has been laid upon the public in such a manner as to fall upon those best able to bear it. It is true the non. gentleman who has just taken his seat, and who usually sheds a lot of briny tears over the farmers of the West, objects strenuously, as he always has done

since I have had the pleasure of hearing his voice in this House. I hope the farmers of the West have better friends in this House than the hon. gentleman, for it is well within my recollection that when a move was made by some of us on this side of the House, then in Opposition, to lower the duties on farm implements, a boon we will suppose to the farmers of the West, we met with objections from the hon. gentleman and others associated with him, who were quite satisfied with the tariff as it was; and as long as his friends were in power, he did not care how high the tariff was against the farmers of the West. I am just reminded by an hon. member that he even spoke against the proposal to lower the duties.

It must be conceded that there is room for honest difference of opinion with regard to the exigencies of tariff. Under the proposals before the House the duties generally are being raised 7½ per cent, and the duties against Great Britain only 5 per cent. It is true that the hon. gentleman who preceded me, by figuring out on percentages, tried to show that the people of Great Britain were not favoured under the present proposals to the same extent as the manufacturers of the United States. I want to unqualifiedly deny that. The people of Great Britain have the advantage of a 5 per cent increase against a 7½ per cent increase against the United States and other countries. An effort is being made, and no doubt will be made, if we are to judge by what has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite and the press who support them, to fasten a charge of disloyalty upon the Conservative party for having slightly increased the duty on goods coming from Great Britain. I do not believe that any charge of disloyalty can be laid against the Conservative party on that score. The people of Great Britain have a tariff that we will suppose suits themselves; they adjust it with a view to the needs of Great Britain, and the colonies have no preference whatever, not a particle, in the tariff arrangements of Great Britain. In fact when we look into the figures we find exactly the opposite. While a great country like Germany is able to send practically all she produces into Great Britain duty free, some of the colonies are taxed and taxed very heavily on their goods going into Great Britain. One would naturally think from listening to the discussion on free trade that Great Britain allows all goods to enter free of customs duty, but such is far indeed from being the case. Let me read some of the duties that are collected at the ports of Great Britain annually on various articles:

Tobacco	$86,270,625
Tea	30,759,395
Rum	11,940,605
Brandy	5,551,460
Other spirits	3,341,910
Wine	5,549,785
Currants	609,080
Raisins	1,190,795
Coffee	852,050
Cocoa and chocolate	1,658,455
Sugar and glucose	15,258,930
Motor spirit	3,609,755
Other articles	994,630
Total	$167,587,475

These figures do not include what is collected by the Isle of Man, the figures for which were $466,690. I would point out that that sum is vastly in excess of the whole customs duties of the Dominion of Canada. By way of illustration, I will just refer to the item of tea. As I pointed out a moment ago, Germany has free access to Britain on practically every thing she produces, while a country that lives under the British flag and whose people recognize the King of England as their King is taxed $25,000,000 out of the $30,000,000 collected by Great Britain on tea. I am only pointing that out to show that the colonies get no favours from Great Britain with regard to tariff. In fact, it is just the opposite, but I am not charging Great Britain with disloyalty on that account. She makes her tariff to suit herself, and while the peculiar brand of free trade that prevails there may suit the British people, I do not believe that it would as well suit the people of Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have listened with much interest to the list which my hon. friend has just read. Let me ask him whether a single product of Canada pays a dollar of duty when it enters Great Britain?

Mr. WRIGHT: I should not like to say, because I am not familiar with everything that is produced in Canada. I should imagine we produce some sugar and other articles in this country, but I do not know whether they are exported to Great Britain. What I was saying was that some of the articles in this list are produced in British colonies.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am speaking of Canada.

Mr. WRIGHT: Let me point out that while this may suit the people of Great Britain—it is absolutely unsuited to the

people of Canada. Taking up for a moment that item of tea, I want to show how the duty is levied and the unfairness of it. Let us take some poor person in Great Britain, some washerwoman, or some people in poor circumstances, who wish to go and have their tea. They buy tea worth 20 cents a pound, but they pay five pence, or ten cents, a pound duty; so that the washerwoman pays a 100 per cent duty on her tea. The rich chocolate manufacturer, who is protected up to the hilt, the iron manufacturer, the lord of the manor, or the wealthy gentleman who uses tea that costs $4 or $5 a pound pays ten cents a pound duty; in other words, he pays ten per cent duty while the very poor pay a 100 per cent duty. That may be good enough for the people of Great Britain, but it is not good enough for the people of this country. I have no objection to this tariff so long as it is confined within the borders of Great Britain.

Are we in a position to follow the example of Great Britain in regard to trade matters? When Great Britain adopted the present policy she was then the greatest manufacturing nation on earth; she had become so under a very strong protective tariff which had been kept upon the statute books for centuries. After they had become the greatest manufacturing nation upon earth, after they had found that they could not raise enough food to feed themselves, and after they found that they had to import immense quantities of raw material, they said: We are the greatest trading nation on earth; we have to buy and sell abroad and we believe that free trade would work out to our advantage. Are we in that position to-day? Have we ever been in that position? Have we ever been in such a position that we can call ourselves the greatest manufacturing nation on earth? Have we ever been in a position where we had to import nearly all of the food we consumed, or have we ever been in a position where we had to import all our raw materials from across the sea? We have never been in that position and I look over the pages of history and look in vain to see the name of a single country that ever started and became the biggest and foremost manufacturing nation and did it under free trade. It is true that Great Britain has a very great trade to-day, much greater than it had when she took up the policy of free trade. It is true that the trade of Canada is much greater than when we first adopted the policy of protection, it is true that the United States have a much greater trade than they had when they first adopted protection, and it is true that Germany and France are greater to-day than ever they were before. The thing is true of all the prominent nations of the earth; so that the fact that Great Britain's trade is greater than it was proves absolutely nothing in favour of free trade.

I think it is manifest to every man that the nation beginning at the bottom which wishes to build up its industries must from the very nature of things give a certain measure of protection to its industries for a time at least, and that is just what we are doing in Canada. That has been the policy followed by the Conservative party and that has been the policy followed by the Reform party. The only difference between us is that we practise what we preach and hon. gentlemen opposite preach one thing and when they get on the treasury benches they practise the very opposite. I fancy the people of this country have come to look upon the gentlemen who now occupy the benches opposite as being absolutely unreliable in regard to any trade policy. They cannot fail to remember the claims that were made during the years they were in opposition, they cannot fail to remember how the manufacturers were described as robbers and thieves, they lacked adjectives to adequately describe the people who happened to be engaged in manufacturing. We can remember that old knight of blue ruin who used to go up and down the concessions and side roads and picture to the farmers the awful conditions under which they lived. These hon. gentlemen said: Just let us into power and we will do away with every vestige of protection. The right hon. gentleman who now leads the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), on the platform in Winnipeg, when looking out on those vast prairies of the West, said: Put us in power and we will give you free trade as they have it in Britain. At that very time, Mr. Speaker, they had a hard-and-fast bargain with the big manufacturers that they should keep the protection that they had if they only helped them to get into power. On the strength of that bargain these big manufacturers stood behind them and helped them into power, and they got the advantage when these hon. gentlemen got into office. They put the duties into such shape as to help the large manufacturers. When it was pointed out that in raising these duties they were hurting the farmers of the country, they said: So much the worse for the farmers; the manufacturers are something tangible, we

can keep hold of them and we propose to keep them. Then they made an effort to hoodoo the farmers into the belief that they were doing something for them. The present Government has done more to reduce the duties in two or three years than was done by these hon. gentlemen during the fifteen years that they were in power.

A great deal has been said as to the assistance that was given to Great Britain by what is termed the British preference. I am willing to concede everything to hon. gentlemen opposite that they are entitled to, and to admit that they did put a British preference upon the statute books, which before the introduction of the present Budget amounted to 33⅓ per cent. Let us give hon. gentlemen opposite credit for whatever they did in that regard. But, before they adopted the preference, they raised the duties on a large number of articles we import from Britain, and they lowered the duties upon, or made free, a large number of articles coming from the United States, so that when the preference went into effect people in Great Britain who wanted to get into our markets were in as bad a position as before the preference went on. Looking it over and figuring it out, Mr. Speaker, you will find that for every $100 worth of goods that came in from Great Britain, $25 worth came in free under the Tariff Act. You will find that under that beautiful arrangement 45 per cent of goods from the United States were brought into this country free. This is what these hon. gentlemen were doing for England. In the two or three years since the present Government came into power, the percentage has remained about the same, namely, about 25 per cent coming in free from Great Britain; but there are only 37 per cent of goods coming in free from the United States. Britain has received an advantage equivalent to 8 per cent in her favour since the present Government came into power in respect to the free list. That is something we have done for the people of Great Britain or for the people of this country, because I have always been at a loss to follow the reasoning of our free trade friends. They tell us that the consumer always pays the duty, and yet they said they were doing a great deal for Great Britain, they lowered the duty to some extent on goods coming from there. How the preference could be of any particular advantage to Great Britain, if the people of Canada got the whole benefit of it, is one of these things that it is very difficult to understand, but hon. gentlemen opposite are always arguing on both sides of the question.

I will follow the hon. member (Mr. Turriff) for a few minutes in some of the claims he has put forward. He told us that he would lower the expenditure so that it would equal the revenue, but what he means by that I do not quite understand. The present Government takes the ground that it would not be in the interests of the people of Canada to cut down the expenditure to a very large extent suddenly. They have cut down all the controllable expenditure that they could, and they have taken what I consider fair and just means to increase the revenue. I think we can safely leave it to the people of Canada as to whether the proposition advanced by the hon. member or the policy of the Government is the wiser. The hon. gentleman told us that the Government had been paying huge sums to Mackenzie and Mann and to the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, but I would remind him that the present Government is not responsible for either of these great enterprises, both of which were carried forward to such an advanced stage by the late Government that it would have been against the interests of the country to stop them now. The hon. gentlemen opposite are responsible for the initiation of these two transcontinental enterprises which were designed to be completed about the same time. When they are completed there will be two transcontinental roads in competition with the Canadian Pacific railway, or three transcontinental roads competing for the business that had up to the present time been done by one road. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal Government ought not to have given the assistance they gave to either one of these roads, or that they should have forced the two to amalgamate, and thus give us one great trunk transcontinental line in competition with the Canadian Pacific railway, which, I think, would be sufficient. I believe an arrangement could have been entered into, between the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern railway, by which one of these lines would have answered every purpose. At all events the present Government is not responsible for the undertaking of these two railroads. The hon. gentleman told us that a large number of buildings had been erected during the last year in little villages and town all over Canada, but my information is that there were only two or three public buildings erected during the whole course of last summer in comparatively small places, and none of these were erected in places of 300

population as the hon. gentleman said. If there is such a case it certainly has never come to my knowledge and it does not exist, as the hon. gentleman said it did, in the province of Ontario. As the hour is late, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Hon. W. T. White, the House adjourned at 10.53 p.m.

Thursday, February 25, 1915.

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

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

EXPENDITURE, 1912, 1913 and 1914.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. What was the total expenditure of Canada, for ordinary expenditure, capital expenditure, and statutory expenditure, respectively, for each month of the calendar year 1912?

2. What was the total expenditure of Canada, for ordinary expenditure, capital expenditure and statutory expenditure, respectively, for each month of the calendar year 1913?

3. What was the total expenditure of Canada, for ordinary expenditure, capital expenditure, and statutory expenditure, respectively, for each month of the calendar year 1914?

Mr. W. T. WHITE:

Calendar Years.	Consolidated Fund Expenditure,	Capital Expenditure.	Special Expenditure.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Jan., 1912	16,351,716 98	5,612,271 28	38,954 83
" 1913	15,649,749 69	2,763,348 43	143,246 03
" 1914	17,100,445 67	3,179,841 42	2,536,702 50
Feb., 1912	6,490,236 28	2,075,413 39	315,552 00
" 1913	6,293,008 12	1,796,373 09	279,117 00
" 1914	9,132,762 11	2,498,201 71	853,088 51
Mar., 1912	6,414,768 27	1,864,770 49	30,176 00
" 1913	6,680,680 84	1,125,880 36	25,286 40
" 1914	6,545,860 75	2,245,782 61	746,745 47
April, 1912	7,544,638 32	1,746,125 30	.....
" 1913	9,053,560 73	2,373,050 50	.....
" 1914	9,491,662 19	1,698,686 89	686,934 87
May, 1912	12,269,789 35	1,251,681 69	64,037 33
" 1913	9,177,932 81	958,297 12	10,921 01
" 1914	8,593,786 70	2,563,968 82	783,805 68
June, 1912	7,300,804 15	1,330,225 35	928,049 28
" 1913	8,983,776 23	3,537,640 33	4,234,152 40
" 1914	13,579,672 75	3,089,681 00	243,214 33
July, 1912	15,883,687 42	2,360,384 45	145,781 74
" 1913	17,619,630 04	3,011,676 47	2,271,632 00
" 1914	19,656,727 76	4,844,472 76	482,421 92
Aug, 1912	6,953,065 63	2,862,068 27	1,941,742 82
" 1913	11,028,196 84	3,900,926 34	3,299,947 52
" 1914	9,848,444 12	4,907,859 92	61,503 64
Sept, 1912	8,580,402 45	2,628,479 09	342,337 00
" 1913	9,268,518 33	3,892,564 02	30,145 02
" 1914	12,962,824 66	4,581,282 73	687,201 81
Oct., 1912	7,343,853 21	3,080,210 16	312,785 06
" 1913	8,749,737 11	3,343,026 36	3,673,060 02
" 1914	9,696,064 71	4,479,119 80	84,857 76
Nov., 1912	8,177,843 08	2,807,607 75	1,337,560 88
" 1913	9,232,141 30	4,231,379 18	2,068,074 11
" 1914	10,496,923 83	4,250,385 75	350,245 68
Dec., 1912	7,548,338 97	2,865,972 01	593,984 38
" 1913	9,308,955 66	3,407,611 33	797,683 49
" 1914	9,942,985 96	2,910,167 25	1,532,807 78

The above represents the payments which passed through the books of the Finance Department up to the last day of the month.

MAJOR W. S. HUGHES.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. When was Major W. S. Hughes appointed inspector of penitentiaries?

2. What salary does he receive as such?

3. Does Inspector Hughes hold any other office or position from which he receives pay from the Federal Government? If so, when was he appointed to such office or position, and what is the amount of his remuneration?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. March 4, 1913.

2. $3,700 per annum.

3. Major Hughes is the officer commanding the 21st Battalion, Canadian Expeditionary Force. He was appointed October 20, 1914, and receives the pay of a lieutenant colonel commanding a regiment, viz.: $5 per diem with $1.25 field allowance per diem and $1 command pay per diem; in all $7.25 per diem.

AMHERST POST OFFICE SITE.

Mr. LAW:

1. What amount did the Government pay for the site of the proposed new post office at Amherst, N.S., and when?
2. What is the size of the site?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. On 21st October, 1914, the Exchequer Court awarded the sum of $30,000. A cheque for $20,000 was paid at Amherst on or about the 12th November, 1913, and another cheque for $10,000, balance due, was paid on 23rd December, 1914.

2. 95 by 93 feet, with the use of a right of way 12 feet wide.

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY.

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. How many miles of the Hudson Bay railway are completed?
2. How many miles of steel have been laid?
3. When will the railway be completed?
4. When is it anticipated that the harbours and terminals will be completed, including the elevator??

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. The road bed is completed and fully ballasted to mile 56, and partially ballasted to mile 175.

2. 214 miles of main line.

3. Autumn of 1917.

4. It is anticipated that works will be in position to ship grain before close of 1917; but a couple of years further work will be required before terminals can be regarded as completed.

Mr. LANCTOT:

What has been the expenditure on the Hudson Bay Railway construction since 1912?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Expenditure on Hudson Bay Railway construction since 1912:

1912-13	$1,009,063.15
1913-14	4,498,717.25
1914-15 to January 31, 1915 ..	4,261,088.83
Total	$9,768,869.23

[Mr. Edwards.]

THE MARRIAGE LAWS.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has the Government, or any member thereof, communicated with any provincial government with regard to revising or amending the Marriage Laws?
2. If not, is it the intention of the Government to do so?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. No.
2. No.

DISMISSALS.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE:

1. Is Mr. L. O Vallée, of Rimouski employed by the Federal Government at the present time? If not, has he resigned or been dismissed, and for what reason?
2 Who is his successor, and what is his salary.
3. What salary did Mr. L. O. Vallée receive?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. No. Services dispensed with on account of absenting himself from duty without leave.

2. J. A. Tremblay. $400.

3. $400.

Mr. THOMSON:

1. Has W. M. Thomson been dismissed from the postmastership at Fort Qu'Appelle?
2 If so, what was the reason for his dismissal?
3. Who has been appointed in his stead, and on whose recommendation has such appointment been made?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Yes.

2. For distributing his private correspondence and accounts through the post office without prepayment of postage, thus defrauding the public revenue.

3. Mr. John R. Hamilton, on recommendation of Mr. A. B. Gillis.

Mr. THOMSON:

What are the names of the postmasters dismissed from office since 10th October, 1911, in the constituency of Qu'Appelle and what are the names of the respective post offices in which they acted?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

The names of the postmasters removed from office since the 10th October, 1911, in the electoral district of Qu'Appelle, and the names of the post offices, are as follows:

Broadview, A. L. Brown; Fleming, R. C. Chappell; Fort Qu'Appelle, W. M. Thomson; Golden Plain, Thomas Kivell; Grenfell, Harvey Coy; Kipling Station, P. M. Dermody; Montmartre, J. A. Gouin; Qu'Appelle, Chas. L. Bailey; Red Jacket, Charles Wilkins.

MONTREAL DISTRICT PUBLIC WORKS ENGINEER.

Mr. LANCTOT:

1. Has Mr. L. Michaud, Public Works engineer for the Montreal district, been dismissed? If so, has a successor been appointed, and what is his name?

2. If dismissed, does the said L. Michaud receive a pension allowance?

Mr. ROGERS:

1 and 2. No; on the 16th ultimo Mr. Michaud was appointed consulting engineer for the Montreal district at the same salary he received as district engineer; on the same date Mr. J. L. Dansereau was appointed as acting district engineer.

WAR SUPPLIES—SHOVEL-SHIELDS.

Mr. BOIVIN:

1. Were any combination shovels and shields ordered by the Government at the time of the mobilization of the first Canadian contingent? If so, how many?

2. What was the price paid for each shovel?

3. By whom were these shovels manufactured, and where?

4. To whom did the manufacturer ship them, and to what point?

5. How were they brought into Canada?

6. Who is the patentee of this combination shovel?

7. Does the patentee hold any position in the Department of Militia and Defence? If so, what position?

8. Did the patentee receive any royalty as the inventor of this combination shovel?

9. Were samples or specifications of this combination shovel submitted to the British war office for report as to its suitability for war purposes?

10. If so, did the war office make a report, and was it favourable or unfavourable?

Major-General HUGHES:

1. Yes, 25,000.

2. $1.35 each.

3. Midvale Steel Company, Philadelphia, Pa.

4. William Price, Quebec.

5. Via Grand Trunk railway system.

6. Miss Ena MacAdam.

7. Yes; private secretary to minister.

8. No.

9. No; such submission is not necessary, but all the other nations engaged in the war are now adopting similar devices.

10. Answered by No. 9.

Mr. BOIVIN:

1. Was there a Canadian patent issued on or about the 25th of August, 1914, for a combination shovel and shield?

2. If so, who is the patentee?

3. On what date was the application for this patent filed?

4. Were any special instructions given the examiner in charge in regard to expediting the issuance of this patent?

5. If so, at whose request was this special rush order given?

6. Did the Minister of Militia write the Minister of Agriculture in regard to this patent for a combination shovel, requesting that it be given special consideration?

7. Is there a provision in the Patent Act giving the Government permission to use, without paying compensation, any patent or invention?

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. Yes.

2. Ena MacAdam.

3. 17th August, 1914.

4. Yes, as the invention was required for use in connection with the war.

5. The examiner in charge of the application was instructed to expedite its examination by the Deputy Minister of Agriculture.

6. No.

7. No.

THE QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Mr. LANCTOT:

What has been the expenditure for the Quebec bridge since 1912?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Expenditure on Quebec bridge since March 31, 1912:

1912-13	$1,512,825.96
1913-14	2,604,105.61
1914-15 to January 31, 1915	2,964,911.40
Total	$7,081,842.97

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC EXPENDITURE.

Mr. LANCTOT:

What has been the amount of expenditure charged to the Grand Trunk Pacific railway for each of the year 1911-12, 1912-13, 1913-14 and 1914-15?

Mr. COCHRANE: The following information has been received from the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, Montreal:

Prairie section—

Year 1911-12	$1,051,330.78
" 1912-13	1,966,847.18
" 1913-14	1,587,393.98
" 1914-15	2,244,593.96
Total	$6,850,165.90

Mountain division—

Year 1911-12	$12,275,403.44
" 1912-13	15,896,287.80
" 1913-14	23,990,160.64
" 1914-15	16,726,213.36
Total	$68,888,065.24

LAPRAIRIE RETAINING WALL.

Mr. LANCTOT:

1. How much money has been paid to Messrs. Duranceau and Poupart, to this date, for the construction of the retaining wall at Laprairie?

2. What amount is required to complete the said construction?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. $49,300.

2. About $27,379, exclusive of cost of inspection.

DEPUTY MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE.

*Mr. TURRIFF:

1. At the time of his appointment in the Inland Revenue Department was Mr. J. U. Vincent, now Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue, a shareholder in the Ottawa Wine Vault Company?

2. Does Deputy Minister Vincent still hold shares in his own name in the said company?

3. If not, are any shares of the said company held for him in the name of some other person or persons, in trust?

4. Has the Ottawa Wine Vault Company a bonded warehouse?

5. Are there any official or business relations between the Ottawa Wine Vault Company and the Department of Inland Revenue? If so, what are they?

Mr. BLONDIN:

1. No, and was never a shareholder, directly or indirectly.

2. No.

3. No.

4. Yes.

5. Yes. Hold license as bonding warehousemen and purchase of Tally-Ho spring water.

DREDGING AT LONGUEUIL.

*Mr. TURRIFF:

1. Has the attention of the Government been drawn to the reports published in the Montreal Gazette and the Montreal Star of December 14, 1914, of the proceedings at the opening of the new plant at Longueuil of the Armstrong-Whitworth Company of Canada, in which the following paragraph appears:

"The function was also notable for an announcement from J. H. Rainville, M.P., for Chambly-Verchères, that before a month borings would be commenced for extensive dredging on the south shore to provide better transportation facilites for the huge new industry. This dredging work would be started in the spring and would involve an expenditure of $1,250,000."

2. What authority had Mr. J. H. Rainville for making the announcement mentioned?

3. Has the Government any interest, direct or indirect, in the Armstrong-Whitworth Company of Canada?

4. If not, is it the policy of the Government to do dredging at the public expense for the private benefit of such a company as the Armstrong-Whitworth Company?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. This matter has not been brought to the attention of the Government.

2, 3 and 4. Answered by No. 1.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. Turriff: For a return showing the cost of furnishing the Government offices in each of the said buildings referred to in the answer to question No. 6 of February 9, and answered February 15, as per page 161 of unrevised "Hansard."

Mr. German: For a return showing:

1. Whether the Government purchased from the Canada Cycle and Motor Company tires for motor trucks for the first Canadian contingent; if so, at what price per set such tires were purchased, and how many.

2. Whether prices have been obtained by the Government for tires for motor trucks for the second contingent, and if so, what price per set has been so obtained.

Mr. Michaud: For a return showing:

1. How much money was collected by subcollectors of customs at Edmundston, N.B., at Clair, N.B., at St. Leonards, N.B., and at Green River, N.B., each and every year for the last five fiscal years.

2. What salaries are paid in connection with each of said ports each year.

PROGRESS OF RECRUITING.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM: Reports are printed in the newspapers as to the recruiting not being satisfactory. I have been assured privately that the recruiting is satisfactory to the Government. Does the Government care to make a statement to the House and to the country as to whether the recruiting at present is satisfactory to them?

Major-General HUGHES (Minister of Militia): So far as my department is concerned, and that is the one chiefly interested, I shall reply to the hon. gentleman's question by giving a number of instances. A few weeks ago, in six hours, 650 men were raised for a cavalry regiment. In some towns in Eastern Ontario, within 24 hours after the call of the third contingent, we had far more men than the quota desired. In places where the men have not responded it has been due to the fact that the corps have not been encouraged, or that we have not had accommodation wherein to place the men just at the time. We have now every regiment in Canada up to full strength. Edmonton recruited in twelve days up to full strength. The Nova Scotia cavalry regiment is over strength to-day. I could raise a regiment in Cape Breton in four hours if I wanted to. I am now speaking from returns that I have received. In short, at the present moment, according to the returns we have got, I could raise three more contingents inside of three weeks, if necessary.

WAR SUPPLIES AT SALISBURY PLAINS.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Major-General HUGHES: In answer to some questions asked by the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) a day or so ago regarding the "discarding in great quantities at Salisbury Plains of wagons, harness, Ross rifles, etc.," inquiry reveals that the wagons and harness have been subjected to four months of extremely hard usage, very bad weather, hauling very heavy loads over very rough roads and through deep mud. Naturally, the wear and tear was great. New wagons from Canada were not available, therefore it was deemed wise and proper to outfit the Canadians on going into the field in this great struggle with the best wagons on hand. Accordingly, they were supplied with the new wagons from the British stores. Regarding the harness the same holds good. The harness had been in use all winter and it was not deemed advisable to send the boys to the front with the old harness so they were equipped when leaving for France with the best harness available at the time. In so far as the rumour concerning the discarding of the Ross rifle is concerned, immediately after the hon. gentleman brought up the matter, the following cablegram was sent:

Ottawa, Ont., February 22, 1915.

Earl Kitchener,
War Office,
London.

Rumour that Canadian cavalry are to discard Long Ross and use short rifle. We are preparing a new rifle carrier which is most perfect and removes any inconvenience to rider in carrying a long rifle. I respectfully request that Long Ross rifle should not be discarded.

Sam. Hughes.

In reply to this I received the following cablegram:

London, February 23, 1915.

Major General Hughes,
Ottawa.

Your telegram about Canadian cavalry rifles. There is no such intention.

Kitchener.

Further comment is unnecessary.

THE MINISTER OF MILITIA.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY: I would ask the Minister of Militia if there is anything in the rumour that he intends to accompany one of the contingents to the other side.

Major-General HUGHES: I hope the hon. gentleman will not hold me down to answer all the rumours that are in circulation. Much as I might have in my own heart the desire to go, there are other duties to which I have to attend, and possibly other men can attend to going with the contingent just as well as I could.

STATUS OF OVERSEAS DOMINIONS.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY: In the absence of the Prime Minister, I wish to bring to the attention of the minister who is leading the House a paragraph in a cabled report of a speech delivered by Sir George Perley before the Victorian League in London, two days ago, in which he is reported to have said:

> Canada and the other dominions were fighting, he pointed out, because they were part and parcel of the empire. The time had now arrived when something more than autonomy must be given the dominions. They must be given a voice not only in the foreign policy but in issues of war and peace and all matters vitally affecting the Empire as a whole.

In view of the information given to the House on this subject a few weeks ago by the Prime Minister, I desire to know whether in making the statement I have just quoted Sir George Perley was voicing merely his own opinions or was acting under instructions from or with the authority of the Government.

Hon. ROBERT ROGERS: The Government do not take any notice of newspaper reports such as the one just read by my hon. friend. The statement made by the Prime Minister a short time ago in this House still stands.

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS ACT AMENDMENT.

MEMBERS ON ACTIVE SERVICE.

On motion of Hon. C. J. Doherty (Minister of Justice), Bill No. 57, to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act, was read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Sevigny in the Chair.

On section 1—Persons on active service in military forces during war not inelligible for members:

Mr. GRAHAM: I desire to ask a question relating to the representation in this House, which may or may not come within the scope of the amendment now proposed. Of course we are all anxious that the war should be over before there is an election,

or rather that there should be no election until the war is over. But in case the Government changes its mind would the present law enable a man at the front to be a candidate in his absence from this country?

Mr. DOHERTY: There may be doubt whether the receipt of his pay as an officer in the expeditionary force would disqualify him from being elected, but when this Bill is passed there can be no question based on the fact that he receives such pay, and I do not know of any other ground on which he could be disqualified. In the Election Act as it now stands, I think there are provisions whereby a man absent from the country may be nominated without his express consent being obtained. I do not remember the exact provisions, but I am satisfied that that is covered by the present Act. It might be that under the Act sought to be amended by this Bill, a man with the expeditionary forces would be ineligible for election by the fact of his receiving pay, but this Bill will remedy that. In the law as it now stands there is a provision to exempt militia officers, but the men with the expeditionary forces are not serving with the capacity of officers of the militia of Canada.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: I have not the statute here, but I think it is necessary for the candidate to sign on the day of his nomination.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is what I wanted made clear.

Mr. OLIVER: Does it apply only to officers on service overseas, or to any officers who have enlisted for service whether they are on this side of the water or not?

Mr. DOHERTY: The proposal would cover both. The first section of the Act makes that quite clear:

> Nothing shall render ineligible, as aforesaid, any person serving in the naval or military forces of Canada, or in any other of the naval or military forces of the Crown, while such forces are on active service in consequence of any war, and receiving salary, pay or allowance as a member of such forces while on such active service.

I think that would cover anybody on active service in the war. Section 19 of the present Act covers the case of militia officers on active service. It says that the Act shall not disqualify:

> (d) An officer of the militia, or militiaman, not receiving any salary or emolument out of the public money of Canada, except his daily pay when called out for drill or active service, or annual or other allowances of any kind prescribed by the Militia Act—

So that any man receiving pay or an allowance under the Militia Act is protected by the present law. But the purpose of this Act is to protect those who would not otherwise be protected; those for instance, who might be rendering military or naval service to the State in a capacity other than as officers or men of the Canadian militia.

Mr. GRAHAM: But this point might arise. As I understand the present statute, any person out of the country can be eligible as a candidate without having to formally accept nomination. But supposing a man serving in the militia had not yet gone out of the country, but could not possibly get to his constituency to accept nomination as prescribed by the Act, a man who might be at Halifax, for instance, en route to Europe, would it not be possible to provide that any soldier on active service could be eligible as a candidate, and be excused from coming to accept nomination.

Mr. DOHERTY: If it should be found that the difficulty which the hon. member apprehends might arise, I think it would be more proper to amend the Elections Act in that regard. The present Bill amends the Senate and House of Commons Act. I will look into the matter, and if such a case might arise, I think we ought to provide for it.

Mr. MURPHY: The amendment my hon. friend suggests to the Elections Act would certainly be necessary, because by the present Act the candidate is required to do a number of things which he could not possibly do if he was out of the country.

Mr. PROULX: Would the case of the hon. member of Beauce (Mr. Beland) be covered by this Bill? He is serving in the cause of the Allies, but not with the British forces; so it could not be said that he is serving under the Crown.

Mr. DOHERTY: The Act apparently applies to persons serving in the naval or military forces of Canada. But I might point out that the purpose of the Act is only to relieve a person who is receiving pay for serving in the naval or military forces of Canada, from any disability that might arise from the fact of his receiving such pay. The absence of the hon. member for Beauce under the present circumstances does not affect his eligibity in any way. If he is serving in the forces of any of the Allied nations, and even receiving remuneration therefor, which as I

understand he is not, there can be no possible suggestion that that would affect his right to be elected and to sit in this House.

Mr. PROULX: I was thinking of his right to draw his indemnity.

Mr. DOHERTY: We shall be glad to consider any amendment the hon. member may suggest to enable the hon. member for Beauce to draw his indemnity.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: We are making provision to maintain the rights of members of Parliament who may be abroad. Is any provision to be made to maintain the rights of a voter of this country who is serving abroad?

Mr. DOHERTY: A committee of this House has been constituted to consider possible amendments to the Elections Act or to the Controverted Elections Act, and of that committee I have the honour to be chairman. The point the hon. member raises has already been brought to my attention; in fact we had a discussion on it the other evening on the motion of the hon. member for the city of Ottawa (Mr. Fripp). We have been considering possible methods for enabling a man who is out of the country on active service to register his vote, but a satisfactory method is not an absolutely easy thing to find. I have asked the Parliamentary counsel to draft a tentative measure for submission to the committee, and we shall deal with that when it comes before us and report the result of our deliberations to the House.

Mr. MACDONALD: I see by the Act that a person can be nominated in his absence from the province. Section 96 of the Dominion Elections Act says:

> No nomination paper shall be valid or acted upon by the returning officer unless it is accompanied by,—
> (a) the consent in writing of the person therein nominated, except where such person is absent from the province in which the election is to be held, when such absence shall be stated in the nomination paper;

Mr. GRAHAM: He might be absent on active service.

Mr. MACDONALD: That would make no difference so long as, under the law, it was absence from the province. That has always been the practice. You may recall numerous cases where men have been elected in their absence, and the law provides for simply stating that fact in the document and dispenses with the necessity of legal consent.

On section 3—no deduction from indemnity for absence on active service during war:

Mr. DOHERTY: I would be glad to move an amendment to meet the suggestion of the hon. member for Prescott (Mr. Proulx). I beg to move that the section be amended by adding, after the word "Crown" in the second last line, the words "or in any forces of any allied nation."

Mr. MARCIL: That would not apply to the case of the hon. member for Beauce. He was not actually serving in the Belgian forces and he is now a prisoner of war.

Mr. DOHERTY: These are exceptional circumstances. Perhaps I might suggest that the House could proceed to deal with the case of the hon. member for Beauce as it has dealt with other cases where there have been satisfactory reasons to explain absence. It is a little difficult to find proper words to apply to all cases.

Mr. MACDONALD: At no time was the hon. member for Beauce serving in any of the allied forces. He attached himself, by consent of the Red Cross Society to the Red Cross service in Antwerp, and his assistance in the war was rendered by virtue of his being a part of the Red Cross organization. He had been appointed by the hon. the Minister of Militia of Canada to be a major in the Army Service Corps of Canada, but he was never able to leave Belgium in order to take up that position. His services therefore were of that character, but I think the proposition of the Minister of Justice to deal with the case by special resolution at the conclusion of the session is an ample and sufficient way of dealing with the matter.

Sesction as amended agreed to.

Mr. DOHERTY: I desire to move to amend the Bill by adding a section. It occurred to me after the Bill was drafted that there are officers actually in the service at present who have been there for a number of months and that the Bill as now drafted coming into force would not cover their cases. I beg to move:

> That the Bill be amended by adding thereto the following section: "This Act shall be construed as having come into force the 4th day of August, 1914."

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

THE BUDGET.

PROPOSED WAR TAXATION.

Consideration of the proposed motion of Hon. W. T. White (Minister of Finance), for Committee of Ways and Means, resumed from February 24.

Mr. WILLIAM WRIGHT (Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned last night, I was dealing with some criticisms of the Government made by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). A few minutes before the adjournment I was dealing with the charge that he had made that the Government had advanced large sums of money, many millions of dollars, to Mackenzie and Mann. I think the hon. gentleman could not help but know that this Government have advanced no money to Mackenzie and Mann, nor have they advanced money to either Mackenzie or Mann. It is true they made a loan to the Canadian Northern railway system, a loan amply secured by mortgages intended to pay off certain liabilities and complete the work of that transcontinental railway. But the charge is made that the company will be unable to complete their work and that the whole railway system will be thrown on the hands of the Government. If it is, if the worst comes to the worst, and that should unfortunately happen, the Gove n-ment has amply secured the people of this country by seeing that the amount of money they have loaned shall go into the paying off of the liabilities of the railway as a system and for the completion of the road so that if they ever have to take it over as an entity it will represent not only the value of the road when they made the loan but the added value after the expenditure of that money upon it. Mackenzie and Mann did not benefit personally or as a corporation by the amount of money advanced by this Government. Under the peculiar circumstances that have arisen it was absolutely impossible for the Government to allow this work to go by default. It was near completion, it served a large stretch of country; to have allowed it to go by default would have damaged our interests in the monetary markets of the world, and there was no other course open to the Government than to see that the work was completed. I want to say again, that the Canadian Northern matter and the Grand Trunk Pacific matter were twins that were left destitute upon the Conservative doorstep and the Conservative party had to take charge of them, although they deny parentage.

I want now to deal with a few of the points raised by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). He seems to have a vast fund of sympathy for the western farmer. I am a farmer myself, but not one of those farmers who derive their information in regard to farming conditions in some lawyer's office or in some doctor's studio or in the sanctum of some printing office. I derive my knowledge of farming conditions out on the farm itself, where I go and throw off my coat and get to work just the same as the other men upon the farm.

Let me look at the representation from the West. I look at the representative for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), and I see the ex-Minister of the Interior, who derives his information with regard to farming conditions in the sanctum of his printing office. Then I go down to Medicine Hat and I find that the representative for that constituency (Mr. Buchanan) also gets his knowledge of farming operations in his printing office. I now come to Moosejaw and I see that horny-handed son of the soil, the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles), whose knowledge of farming conditions enables him to conduct his business successfully as a lawyer. He issues writs against the farmers, occasionally charging them $5 per case for making out the papers. Then we have the genial member for Regina (Mr. Martin), another farmer from the West, who also derives his information with regard to farming matters and his sympathy for the farmers in his lawyer's office. I go south a little to Assiniboia, and I see the hon. member for that constituency (Mr. Turriff), another robust farmer—ex-civil servant and retired wealthy gentleman. I come next to Qu'Appelle and there we have a gentleman (Mr. Thomson) who also occupies a lawyer's office; but I believe he has a farm and he has probably a little knowledge of actual farming conditions. I now go across to Humboldt, the hon. member for which (Mr. Neely) derives his knowledge and inspirations in regard to farming conditions in the West by feeling the pulses of his patients and looking at their tongues occasionally, and charging them so much in each case. I next go to Saskatoon where we have another farmer (Mr. McCraney) entering suits and collecting bills in the interest of the farmers of that section—another lawyer. It is quite right to have a proper criticism of the Government, to have many farmers sitting in Opposition and keeping the Government straight and bringing the case of the farmer to its attention from time to

time; but seriously, some time I would like to see some seat on the Opposition side occupied by a real farmer, one of those men who are actually suffering from the conditions that prevail in the West at the present time.

It will be conceded by those familiar with farming conditions in the West that the farmer has not everything that he would wish; that he has difficulties in his way. He has not those large centres of population that have been created in the East by large manufactories and institutions of that nature, and practically all the product of his toil must find a market a long distance away from the source of production. That is a handicap which ought to be taken into consideration by any Government. It is the duty of the Government to do everything possible to help out the western farmer. There are matters of transportation, assistance to railways, the making free or the cheapening as far as possible of these articles that must be purchased by the western as well as by the eastern farmer, but especially by the western farmer. There is also the providing of elevator facilities where they are lacking and for a proper inspection of the grain, and the ensuring that the farmer gets a just return for his produce and proper grading. These are matters that have engaged the attention of the present Government since it came into power, and it has done a great deal towards assisting the western farmer.

The principal product of the western soil, as we all know, is wheat; and from time to time hon gentlemen opposite, since they have occupied the seats of the Opposition, have bewailed the position of the farmers in the West with regard to their great standard cereal. They say that we ought to have opened the markets of the United States; that we ought to have accepted the offer they made, by the acceptance of which they say we would have provided a wonderful market for the western farmer. I have given this matter a great deal of attention. For two years I have watched the markets of the United States and the markets of Canada as far as they have been reported in the press and during those two years there have not been more than two or three days on which the market price of wheat at Winnipeg has not been greater than the market price for the same grade of wheat at Minneapolis. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) and other hon. gentlemen who usually follow his lead with regard to this matter, have from time to time stated in this House that the price received by the western farmer for his wheat has been reduced by the amount of duty charged on it when it goes into the United States, and they have figured out tables to show the tremendous loss sustained by the western farmers in that way. Therefore, when the proposition was made in the fall of 1913 by the American Government to reduce the duty upon wheat, a proposition which finally carried reducing the duty by fifteen cents per bushel, naturally the western farmer, if he believed the teaching of the hon. member for Edmonton, would expect that the price of his wheat would be increased by fifteen cents per bushel. As a farmer in the West and at that time having wheat in my granary and being busily engaged in teaming it to the elevator in town, and believing that this reduction would not make a cent of difference in the price of the wheat that the farmers of the West had to sell, I went right on disposing of my wheat, knowing that in one or two or three weeks the Bill before the United States Congress would pass and become law.

I expected no advantage from the reduction in the duty. In course of time the Bill providing for that reduction was put on the statute book of the United States. I still had wheat to sell, and I went on selling it. And I am here to say that the farmers of the West do not benefit by the fraction of a cent by that reduction of fifteen cents in the duty on wheat.

As I have said, the price of wheat in Minneapolis has been almost steadily lower than the price in Winnipeg. I speak especially of No. 1 Northern which is the grade that is quoted in the press daily. Let me read the report as given in the Citizen of this morning, showing the market conditions in Minneapolis and Winnipeg. In Winnipeg, No. 1 Northern is quoted at $1.53\frac{1}{4}$; in Minneapolis, No. 1 Northern is quoted at from $1.47\frac{1}{2}$ to $1.51\frac{1}{8}$, an average of $1.49, or a fraction over four cents higher in Winnipeg than in Minneapolis.

But my hon. friend may meet me with the statement that the grading under the State Grading Act in Minnesota is lower than on our side. True, the standard is not so high. But let me point out that the cash price of wheat as quoted in Minneapolis has very little to do with the State grade. In only four of the States of the American Union have they a State Grain Inspection Act, and even in those States

the inspection is not compulsory. Let us suppose that a farmer in the West, finding all obstacles removed to his shipping grain to Minneapolis, sends down a car and follows it to put it on the market. It is graded No. 1 Northern under the State Grain Inspection Act. He goes to a dealer, tells him what he has to sell and asks for an offer. The dealer says he cannot make a bid as he has not seen the wheat. "But," says the owner, "you do not need to see it; it is No. 1 Northern." But the dealer insists that he must see it; and the owner finds that he cannot get a bid until the would-be purchaser has seen the wheat. A great deal of the wheat sent to Minneapolis is sold to the millers, for they have there the largest milling concerns perhaps in the world, and certainly the largest on the American continent. So, our friend the western farmer, goes down to the miller who is buying many carloads of wheat daily. The miller says, "I never buy wheat on state grades; I will send my man up and look over your wheat and will make you an offer for it." The man goes up and looks over our friend's car and over the cars offered by his neighbours. He may buy them all; and there may be a difference of as much as five cents a bushel in the price offered for the several cars, though all are graded No. 1 Northern. So, there is very little reliance to be

4 p.m.

placed on the figures given as to the cash prices of wheat in Minneapolis. But in any event, grade for grade, quality for quality, the price in Winnipeg for the last two years during which I have been looking into the matter has been better than the price in Minneapolis. To my personal knowledge wheat has been taken across the line and sold to Canadian elevators within that time. I have no doubt that under certain conditions and at certain times wheat may be teamed across from Canada to the other side and sold. A great deal of the wheat as disposed of in Minneapolis is sold on its quality and not on its grade under the State Grain Inspection Act. Over the rest of the United States they have all kinds of inspection—complete lack of uniformity. There has been an effort in the United States Congress for the last twenty-five years to get the Government of the United States to adopt a law enforceable throughout the Union. Those who favour that measure point out that there has been a great deal of complaint in England, Germany, France, the Netherlands and other wheat-buying countries in Europe about the lack of uniform grading in the United States. In the case of grain from the United States, the grade is not enforceable, and if the wheat does not come up to grade the buyer has no redress. On at least two occasions, as pointed out by Senator McCumber on the introduction of his Bill last year, the grain-importing countries of Europe have met and, after a thorough discussion of this matter, have passed resolutions appealing to the Government of the United States to have a law enacted that shall apply to that whole country. And Senator McCumber in his various addresses touching this matter when it was up for discussion last year, dealt exhaustively with the subject, and pointed out numberless resolutions passed by farmers' institutes and associations and by boards of trade in many localities, urging the United States to follow the example of Canada and have a uniform grade that would apply to the whole country. And it has been declared in many of the petitions sent in that the condition of the farmer in the Canadian west is vastly superior to that of the farmer of the western states in regard to the disposal of his wheat. Whether they are right in that or not I am not in a position to say. But I should think, taking the country over, there would be little difference in the condition of the western farmers on either side of the line. Both have the same disabilities arising out of the long haul to the seaboard. This great vexed question of transportation affects them as it affects us. The charges by the elevator men, by the insurance companies, by the transportation companies for ocean freights—all these things stand in their way as they stand in the way of the farmer of our West.

So that the adoption of any policy that would allow the free exchange of wheat between the two countries would fail to provide any remedy for the farmers of Western Canada. I am quite satisfied in regard to that matter. And the farmer in the Canadian west would lose the advantage he has to-day in the guarantees that go with his wheat by reason of the official inspection at Winnipeg as it passes through on its way to the ocean.

If American wheat could come across to Winnipeg, become merged with our wheat and find its way further east, our wheat would lose its individuality; it would practically become American wheat, and we would lose all the advantages that we now derive from our present system of grain inspection.

Permit me to call attention to another consideration that would militate against

the farmer of the West. When a good farmer happens to need money, he hurries his grain into the cars when the new crop comes in, in order that he may be among the first shippers, for if he succeeds in getting his wheat out early, he will get a better price than he would receive later. I am not now referring to present conditions, which have been so seriously affected by the war during the last few months; I am speaking of conditions as they have prevailed in the West, and as they will again prevail when the war is over. If we remove all obstacles to free interchange of wheat, and the people of the Western States put their grain upon the market a week, two weeks or three weeks earlier than our farmers do, they will at once swamp the Winnipeg market with their wheat and our farmers will lose the advantage which they have enjoyed in past years in that respect. But we are told that there will be a large demand for our wheat; that we grow better wheat than they grow in the United States; that our friends to the south want Canadian wheat to grind with their softer wheat and are willing to pay a large price for it. In that way, our friends say, the farmers of the West will benefit to a large extent. I want to point out that our American friends have a much larger surplus of wheat than we have in Canada and, just as we have to find a market for our surplus wheat, they have to find a market for theirs. Any wheat, therefore, going into American channels from Canada would increase that surplus, and that surplus must find its way to some foreign country. I have not the shadow of a doubt, viewing the whole situation generally, that under a system of free exchange we would purchase just as much American wheat as the people of the United States would purchase from us.

But, our friends say, freight conditions would be better. Let us look at that phase of the question for a moment. They say that there would be additional competition, and that the American railways, bidding for the carrying trade of the West, would reduce the price the farmers now have to pay in order to get their wheat to the head of the lakes or to the seaboard. I have given a little attention to the subject of freight rates in the Western States and to the seaboard, and I find, according to the commission which governs freight rates in the United States, that the rates are much the same as those prevailing in Canada. I would remind hon. gentlemen also that if any farmer in the West wishes to send his wheat through American channels to the seaboard and across the ocean, there is absolutely nothing to prevent his doing so, and he has been doing so for years. Nothing hinders his using any railway in the United States for the shipment of his wheat. There is practically no duty on grain going through the United States to other countries. As I have said, the United States has a much larger surplus of wheat than we have; that surplus must find its way across the ocean—and they might just as well export Canadian wheat as any other kind of wheat. Another reason why they wish to handle Canadian wheat is in order to keep their vessels busy. If the Canadian shipper can get a reduction in rates of one-sixteenth of a cent by sending his wheat through the United States, naturally he will take advantage of the reduction by routing his wheat southwards. There is nothing in the statute books either of this country or of the United States to prevent our wheat going through United States channels.

The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) said that during the last two years there has been no increase in the acreage sown in the great western country. I have an intimate knowledge of conditions prevailing in the West, as I have travelled over it a good deal, and I take issue with the hon. member in that regard. Any one who is conversant with conditions prevailing in the West knows that when a farmer breaks the prairie he has to keep it under cultivation; otherwise it will lapse back into a condition worse than its original state, and he will be the loser to the extent of a very large amount of money. The farmer is forced, therefore, to keep under cultivation such areas as have been broken and cultivated. I know by personal investigation that large areas have been brought under cultivation in the last few years. I believe that the acreage in 1914 was considerably larger than that of 1913, and that the acreage in 1913 was greater than that of 1912; the same is true, I think, of every year since the great western country was first opened up. It is true that the amount of wheat grown in the West last year was less than that grown in previous years, but a great drouth had prevailed, with the result that the farmers suffered severely. In many sections of the western country the farmers had only a short crop, and in some portions of it they had no crop at all. This accounts for the fact that on the last

day of December, 1914, the amount of wheat shipped through Winnipeg was not half as large as it was on the same day of the previous year. The conditions for getting wheat out were infinitely better in 1914 than they were in 1913, inasmuch as threshing commenced much earlier, and the weather was favourable for cutting and threshing and for getting the grain to market.

Some people in the East, in discussing the subject of farming conditions in the West, are disposed to belittle the difficulties of the western farmer. They say that he does not deserve any special consideration; that he gets his land for nothing; that it is all ready to be worked, and that he is doing better than the farmer of any other section of the country. My experience in the West, however, is that the western farmer has a pretty hard row to hoe. As a rule he goes out there as a poor man, without any money. He takes up his homestead, and in order to provide an equipment to work that 160 acres he is at the expense of approximately $2,000. Having no money he has to work for his neighbours. He finally succeeds in getting a little breakng done, he gets up a little shanty and works along as best he can under exceedingly great difficulties, because before he can plough a furrow or buy an outfit of his own, he must have at least four horses which would cost approximately $1,000. He has to have the harness and other attachments, he must have a plough, a spread harrow, a disc harrow, a seeder, and if he takes off his crop he must have a binder. He may succeed in purchasing some of these things on credit and finally, at the end of three years, he may be enabled to take out his patent. Usually he then rushes off to some mortgage company and borrows a large sum of money to pay off some of his debts and perhaps secure a few more implements; and this mortgage is for many years a heavy burden on him. That is a condition of affairs which no legislation that can be passed by either party in this House can remedy. That is a natural condition with men going into a country like that without capital, and our first duty should be to make it as easy as possible for them to secure some capital with which to go on. I think the Government of the country might well direct their energies in that direction. If they could find a solution of that difficulty they would do a great deal more for the farmer of the West than by finding markets for him that are already full, because finding a market for him across the border would be like finding a market with his next neighbour who has 20,000 bushels of wheat himself and says: I do not need your wheat, I have wheat of my own and I will only buy your wheat in order that I may sell it again at an advance. That will be exactly the condition if our farmers try to find a market in the United States. I believe the Government have done something towards providing elevators in the West. I think they might well work along in that direction in order that the farmer may be able to get his grain graded and raise money on it without having to dispose of it in a great hurry immediately after harvest, because it must be evident that every farmer there who has had to run nearly twelve months without money, finds that he must dispose of his grain as quickly as he can; his creditors are crowding him, he has to pay off his bills for machinery, he has to give something to the blacksmith, the grocer, the harness-maker and many others, and he simply must have the cash. As time goes on and men get into better circumstances in the West, they are able to hold their grain. That would adequately describe the position of a number of people in the West to-day, perhaps more particularly in Manitoba and the older settled sections of Saskatchewan; but there are large areas in Saskatchewan and Alberta where there are still many poor homesteaders struggling very hard to get a foothold in the country. There are many other ways in which we might be able to assist the settler in the West. My sympathies naturally go out to him because I have been there and I know something of his difficulties. When I am there, actually living out on the farm side by side with these men, going into their shanties, talking with them, working with them, exchanging work with them, attending their threshings and having them attend mine, knowing all about what they are doing, I feel that they deserve the very greatest consideration that can possibly be given them by the Government of this country. I do not know whether anything could be done in the way of rearranging our banking system so as to assist these people to get money when they need it, but I say this matter should be considered and I have no doubt it will receive consideration at the hands of the Government.

Referring to the charge that has been made that the Government has been letting the trade of this country go to the bow wows, I believe the Toronto Globe, or some neighbour of the Globe politically, has made the charge that the whole trade policy of the

Government has gone to smash. That is the irresponsible utterance of the irresponsible editor of an irresponsible newspaper. Hon. gentlemen opposite have always been disposed in the past to measure up the prosperity of the country by the total of its exports and imports, and I want, just for a moment, to make a little comparison with regard to that matter. In 1910 we had imports coming into this country of $241,961,556, of dutiable goods; and of free goods, $143,873,547 or a total, dutiable and free, of $385,835,103. In 1914 we had an importation of dutiable goods of $425,324,576 and of free goods of $210,186,916, a total dutiable and free, of $635,511,492 or an increase of $249,676,389. The same would be measurably true with regard to our exports. I find that they also have increased by a very large amount. The total exports in 1910 were $279,247,551. In 1914 they were $431,588,439, or a balance in favour of the present Government of $152,340,888. I do not believe that the total amount of our exports and the total amount of our imports is an infallible barometer giving an unfailing index of the prosperity of a country, but that is the favourite argument of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and if there is anything in it the comparison is certainly largely in favour of the Government now occupying the Treasury Benches. Personally I think we might very largely decrease both our imports and exports, and yet be just as well off as we are to-day.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: A great deal better off.

Mr. WRIGHT: Perhaps a great deal better off. My idea would be to bring the consumer and producer as closely together as possible, and looking at it from that standpoint I think we made a mistake in pushing as fast as we did some years ago the settlement of that great western country. But it was a case of " Cox could not wait." Those gentlemen in the West were making money out of land values and they said, Oh, you must not stop for a moment; rush the settlers in and let them produce wheat, and you will thereby be producing prosperity. But the only prosperity that has been produced is that we are getting money from abroad from the people going in there —prosperity of a temporary nature and of a kind that could not last for any great length of time.

I believe the Government should direct its energies towards developing industry in that great western country, industries suitable to the conditions that prevail there. I know of no reason why Winnipeg should not be a second Birmingham; Saskatoon, a second Manchester; Brandon, a second Leeds. I know of no reason why other cities and towns, such as Regina, Moosejaw, Medicine Hat, Calgary, Edmonton, and many other centres should not be great hives of industry They would be consuming the products of the farmers of the West, and consuming it at home, which avoids a tremendous loss in transportation charges, in railway and steamship hauls, in ocean-freight and insurance rates, in loss and shrinkage, and in the many other ways through which money is lost and will continue to be lost so long as we look to the other side of the world for a market for our surplus products. I know that a large number of people in this country think that Canada should be a purely agricultural country, that we ought to confine ourselves to growing wheat, potatoes, etc. But when I consider the fact that a beneficent Providence has stored immense bodies of coal in the great coal areas of this country, and immense quantities of iron, lead, copper, zinc, gold, silver, nickel, and other minerals, I do not believe that it was His purpose that these should lie for all time hidden in the bowels of the earth, or that they should be dug out by the hardest kind of labour by people in Canada to be sent abroad to be manufactured into something by the skilled artisans of some other country. I believe it was the intention that these great resources and the great water-powers of this country should be developed, and that we should be not only a great agricultural country, but one of the greatest manufacturing centres on the face of the globe, and that from the prairies of the West and other fertile portions of this Dominion we should provide food for a vast number of people engaged in other enterprises. I believe it was the intention that the needs of the farmers of the West and of the East should be supplied with products of the factories of this Dominion, dotted all over this country as they are in Great Britain. Looking at it from that standpoint, I have never been able to give my adherence to the free trade principle. I believe that it would be impossible for us to develop this country under that principle, and when I look out over those prairies of the West and consider the condition of its farmers, I ask myself how much has free trade done for the farmer of Great Britain. Has it made him prosperous? No. He has left his farm. There is not more than half as many on the farms of Great Britain to-day as fifty years ago. Agricul-

ture has declined, and declined enormously in Great Britain. They find that they cannot exist under the free trade conditions of that country. The farmer in Great Britain has all the advantages of great manufacturing centres right at his door. He can hitch up his team on the farm and find a market for everything he produces in the nearest market town, which will not be more than two or three miles away. If he wishes to buy, he can buy at his very door, where the goods are manufactured. He can buy and sell at first hand. There are no transportation charges in either case. If farming can be benefited by free trade, surely under those conditions the farmers of Great Britain would be the wealthiest people in the face of the earth. But we find the agricultural industry there has declined and declined enormously. Would not free trade have an immeasurably worse effect in this country? I think it would.

Let us suppose we adopted the principle laid down by some hon. gentlemen opposite and did away with our customs duties in large measure, or altogether. That would have the effect of shutting up our factories and of throwing a large number of men out of work. These men would naturally have to crowd out to the farms, or go to some other country. If they crowded out into the rural sections and became farmers, the production of the farms would largely increase; but there would be a much less number of people to consume those products, and a vastly larger percentage of those products would have to find its way across the ocean to a foreign market, under all the disabilities I outlined a moment ago. The result would inevitably be that they would have to take less money for their products, and what advantage would that be? Then for manufactured articles, as there would be no competition in Canada, they would have to pay to foreign countries whatever they asked. They would certainly pay a larger sum than they pay to-day. I ask myself would the agriculturist be better off under such conditions? I say no, most emphatically no. For these reasons I feel that a reasonable measure of protection is absolutely indispensable to this country in its present condition. I believe we should have a protective tariff, not a tariff as high as Haman's gallows, but one giving a reasonable measure of protection. We in Canada to-day under our tariff policy recognize to some extent, the principle of free trade; we recognize the principle of tariff for revenue, and the principle of protection. That is as true of the parties who occupied the treasury benches in years gone by as it is of the parties that occupies them to-day. Perhaps the only difference between us is as to the importance we attach to each of these various phases of policy. I think that tariff matters ought to be taken out of the political arena.

I believe there should be no party feeling in regard to it. We ought to have a tariff board which would deal with this matter independently of those who may be occupying the treasury benches. When such a proposition was laid before this House, discussed and carried in this House, the popular chamber which voices public opinion in this Dominion, the Bill was thrown out by the irresponsible body on the other side of this building.

An hon. MEMBER: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would remind the hon. gentleman that such a remark is not permissible when referring to the other branch of this Parliament.

Mr. WRIGHT: It has been said by way of criticism by hon. gentlemen opposite that such a tariff board might under certain circumstances show favouritism. The tariff board should be outside of political control or at least should be devoid of party politics. The Government of the country, or Parliament, should be allowed to name one member of that board and the Opposition might be allowed to name a member to see that no injustice was done to any manufacturer who might have his affairs investigated by the board. A representative of the great agricultural interests should be placed upon that board; the great manufacturing and mercantile interests might very well claim a representative upon that board, and the mining, lumbering and fishing industries might also very properly be represented upon it. The very best men in Canada, such as we have on the railway board, should find a place upon the board which should have authority to look into all complaints that might be laid before it, such as overcharging the public, or in one way or another taking advantage of the people. Such a board as that would be essential to the proper investigation of all such charges, and I do not know any good reason why the leaders on the Government side and the leaders on the Opposition side could not get together and agree upon such a board. I do not believe that the power should be placed in the hands of any board

to go right into a man's office, take his books and make known all his private affairs to his competitors and to the world generally. All investigations of that nature should be private, and a man's business should not be disclosed, but I would have the board of such a nature that there would be absolute confidence that fair play would be done. It would be a deterrent upon individuals here and there who might take advantage of certain conditions to overcharge the public.

Yet, when we come to deal, as we must, with trade treaties with other lands we should put up a united front. We should not in this House be fighting proposals pro and con and assisting those who are our competitors for the trade of the world by giving them information in that way that they would not otherwise get. We should put up an undivided front to them, and I believe that in the near future we shall have such a board as that which I have suggested to deal with matters that affect us as far as our foreign trade is concerned. In our domestic affairs this does not matter so much. We can meet together here and discuss, I hope in a friendly spirit, all these questions of domestic concern, we can present our views to the public in general elections as they come around and whatever policy seems to suit the public best will prevail because representatives will be returned to support that policy. But I say again, in regard to our dealing with foreign matters, that we ought to stand shoulder to shoulder on both sides of the House and we ought not to be engaged in unseemly squabbles in regard to matters of very great concern to the people of this country.

I have taken up the time of the House at much greater length than I had intended, and I have always laid down the doctrine that no individual member should occupy the time of the House at any very great length. I have criticised speeches of four, five, six, seven and eight hours' length that have been delivered in this House, and I hope that I will never be a sinner in that regard.

Mr. G. W. KYTE (Richmond, N.S.): Mr. Speaker, while I am succeeding the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Wright) in this debate, I trust he will pardon me if I do not follow him in all the subjects he has discussed during the course of his speech. I merely desire to refer to one criticism which he has directed against the representatives of the West on this side of the House. What he said would seem to indicate that he regarded it as a complaint that the farmers of the West have sent to the House lawyers or other professional men to represent them. I remember very well the record of the late Conservative Government from 1878 to 1896, and during all that time the portfolio of Agriculture was held by a brewer, a lawyer, or a doctor. If our friends in the Conservative party think there is no person qualified to represent the farmers in Canada but farmers—and I recognize that farmers are well able to represent themselves and other interests in the country—and if our Conservative friends think it is a reflection upon the farmers of Canada that they should be represented by professional men, I want to know how it was that a Conservative Government during all these years did not find any farmers in Canada to take the portfolio of Agriculture, but, as I stated a moment ago, placed at the head of the Agricultural Department a brewer, a doctor and a lawyer. These men were all very good in their way, but if the argument of my hon. friend from Muskoka should prevail, then I think he would be able to express the same opinion of his own party in the House. It remained for the Liberal Government from 1896 to 1911 to place the first farmer in Canada in charge of the portfolio of Agriculture. As I said, I do not propose to follow my hon. friend any further.

For the second time in a period covering a little over six months we are called together for the purpose of discussing matters pertaining to the greatest war known in history and to provide for Canada's participation in support of British arms. At the extraordinary meeting of Parliament in August last, which continued for the short period of five days, by unanimous vote, we supplied this Government with a war credit of $50,000,000 besides passing other legislation incidental thereto. Since that date we have witnessed the splendid response made by Canadians to the call of Lord Kitchener for "men and more men." From every city, town and hamlet, from the far North to the American boundary, from Cape Breton to Prince Rupert, there have been gathered companies, brigades, battalions and contingents of which it was our pleasure the other day to view the very climax and culmination in the magnificent body of men contributed by British Columbia to the overseas forces.

At this time we are asked for a further sum of $100,000,000 to pay the cost of Canada's undertaking in regard to this war. The unanimity that was displayed in respect of the vote of $50,000,000 will be repeated here. I believe that there is no division of opinion amongst Canadians, whether in this House or out of it, whether they be Conservatives or Liberals, as to what Canada ought to do for Great Britain in this crisis, and there is only one opinion as to our supreme confidence in the ultimate triumph of Great Britain and her Allies over the powerful foes that are arrayed against them. Should any further demands be made upon the resources of Canada for the purpose of achieving the end which we all have in view, I am sure they will be met with the same liberality and promptitude.

I desire now to pass on to other questions in which we are concerned. While we are discussing measures pertaining to the war, there are other matters of domestic concern with which we have to deal at the present session of Parliament. We are called upon to vote a Budget which the hon. Minister of Finance has brought down and for which he has asked the support of this House. At the opening of Parliament in the month of January, 1914, the following words were placed in the mouth of His Royal Highness the Governor General:

> Canada has been favoured by a long series of prosperous years, and, although at the present moment business is slightly restricted by the financial stringency which prevails throughout the world, I feel convinced that this condition will be merely temporary, and that the boundless resources of this Dominion, which are so fully and universally known and recognized, give us the fullest assurance of continued material prosperity and progress.

Therefore, as early as the month of January, 1914, there were signs that the prosperous conditions which had existed in Canada for so many years were about to be disturbed. In that month the Minister of Finance addressed a meeting of commercial travellers in the city of Montreal, and in the course of his remarks he made the following statement:

> Our country has experienced its time of stress and will come through it well. I believe the crisis has been reached, and passed in Canada, as in other countries of the world.

Every person in Canada shared the hope that the crisis had been passed, and that the prosperous condition which had existed formerly would be continued in the future. Our experience since then has justified us in coming to the conclusion that the Minister of Finance and his colleagues in the Government did not properly estimate the exact conditions that prevailed at that time, and that were about to come upon us to a greater degree.

The Government has now been in office for a period of some three years. If we may judge the administration of public affairs by the supreme test of results, I am sure that the hon. gentlemen occupying the Treasury benches will themselves be among the first to admit that they possess no superiority over their predecessors either in talent or virtue. We are told that the tariff changes which have been brought down by the Minister of Finance have been occasioned by the war which is in progress in Europe. It has been pointed out by hon. gentlemen who have preceded me in this debate, and it has been admitted by the Minister of Finance himself, that the war is not responsible for the conditions that prevail at the present time. I have here a statement of the revenues in Canada for the past three years, which discloses the fact that long before war was declared, the condition of affairs that prevailed in Canada reduced enormously the revenues of the Government. The statement is as follows:

Year.	Revenue for the first seven months.
1912	$ 89,682,581 24
1913	101,192,451 70
1914	81,784,646 31

Therefore for the seven months preceding the war, the revenue in 1914 declined by $7,297,937.93 as compared with the year 1912, and declined by $19,407,805.39 as compared with the year 1913. If you take these figures and carry out the calculations for the last six months of the present fiscal year, you will find that the decline in the revenue since war was declared last August has not been any greater than the decline in the revenue for the seven months preceding the outbreak of the war.

We have, moreover, other evidences to show that before war broke out there were unmistakable signs of the catastrophe which is now upon us. In an article in a newspaper published at Ottawa under date of June 20, I find the following:

> The Labour Department reports that as a result of the industrial quiet and the ample supply of labour for all work that is in progress, the general level of wages in the less skilled branches is somewhat lower than this time last year. In manufacturing there has been a downward tendency with reductions at 5 to 10 per cent in wages paid by some of the large business establishments. In the first quarter of 1913 there were 56 increases in the wage scales, this year there were only 17.

This year to date 11,000 employees belonging to unions have benefited by wage increases, while last year these benefiting numbered 16,000.

In an interview given by Mr. J. C. Watters, President of the Trades Congress of Canada, I find the following statement:

The industrial conditions all over Canada are in a deplorable condition, many are starving because they cannot get a chance to earn even the bare necessities to sustain life, and never in the history of Canada did things look so bad for the workers.

I have had many letters from different organizations throughout the country urging that an order in council should be issued to prevent all classes of workers from landing in Canada until conditions assume a normal aspect. The Congress strenuously opposed any bonus being paid on immigrants as it leaves the door open to unscrupulous agents to send all classes of labour into Canada as agriculturists.

"How is the situation to be met and conditions improved," asked the reporter, and Mr. Watters replied that conditions have reached such a stage that the Provincial and Dominion Governments must do something to provide work. They must co-operate in this respect and find work that requires to be done or create employment that will relieve the situation.

That discloses the condition of affairs prior to the outbreak of war on the 4th of August, 1914. There are other indications which suggest that the threatening condition of affairs should have been anticipated by the Government, and steps should have been taken to prevent the unfortunate shortage in our revenue as compared with our expenditure at the end of the present fiscal year. In the month of January, Mr. H. A. Richardson, General Manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia, made this statement at the annual meeting of the shareholders:

Canada with respect to her finances has for the present to depend more largely on herself, and I entirely agree with the views expressed by bankers whose annual meetings have preceded ours, that we should apply ourselves more diligently at home, to produce the money we have hitherto obtained so easily abroad. To be quite frank, those who blame the present depression on the war are hugging a delusion, for the reaction from speculation, extravagance and over-expansion was inevitable, however much it may be aggravated by war conditions.

We know that in the month of July 500 of the wage-earners of Ottawa, under the very shadow of the House of Commons, within sight of the Government offices, marched to the city hall asking to be fed. That is a condition of affairs that has not prevailed in Canada for many years. It was reported by newspapers in the month of July, 1914, that 44,000 people had returned from the Canadian Northwest to the United States. Hon. gentlemen opposite shelter themselves behind the allegation that the conditions existing in Canada arose under circumstances over which they had no control.

I shall endeavour to point out one or two respects in which, I think, the policy of the Government, if not absolutely the cause of the existing condition of affiairs, has tended to very greatly aggravate that condition. It will be remembered that in January, 1914, a delegation of western grain-growers came to Ottawa to ask this Government to place American wheat on the free list so as to enable them to take advantage of the reciprocal tariff with respect to Canadian wheat, which a few months before, had been put in force by the Wilson administration. Before this delegation came to Ottawa a delegation of grain-growers visited Winnipeg and were able to get a resolution through the Legislature of Manitoba in favour of their demands, and this notwithstanding the fact that the vast majority in that legislature at that time were Conservatives, men who had vigorously opposed any attempt on the part of the Liberal party to bring about a reciprocal treaty which would have opened the American market to the grain of Western Canada. With that resolution the delegates came to Ottawa. But hard upon the heels of the grain-growers came a delegation of the Millers' Association, and as a consequence the prayer of the petition of the grain-growers of the West was not granted; the Government held out no hope that they would facilitate or encourage the sending of Canadian wheat into the United States, and so the grain-growers went home disappointed. A few months afterwards the statement appeared in a western newspaper that no less than forty-four thousand settlers in the West had pulled up stakes and trekked back into the United States, whence they came. Evidently these people felt that, as they were not going to get the advantage of American prices while they remained in Canada, the best thing for them to do was to cross the line and settle in places where that market would be open to them. A question was asked the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Roche) a few days ago as to the number of farmers who had left Canada and returned to the United States last year, and the hon. gentleman answered that there were no records in his department showing the number of immigrants from the United States who had returned to that country. Therefore I am bound to assume that the

statement that forty-four thousand settlers in Canada had returned to the United States is correct.

One other instance I desire to refer to, and that is the conduct of the Government in relation to the reduction of the cement duties in 1912. During the session of 1913, the right hon. leader of the Opposition called the attention of the Government to the correspondence which had appeared in the newspapers some months before in which a gentleman in the city of Toronto, a supporter of the Government, had bitterly complained, that, notwithstanding that the Government had given him, or the interest in which he was concerned,

5 p.m. a distinct and specific promise that the cement duty would not be interfered with, that duty had actually been reduced fifty per cent, leaving the manufacturers of cement for the moment in an embarrassed position. An election took place in Saskatchewan about the time of this reduction and the question of cheaper cement, as well as cheaper goods of all kinds necessary for the settlers of the West, was a question which specially occupied the minds of the electors at that time. It was thought that by cutting the duty on cement some advantage might be gained by the Conservative party in that election, and notwithstanding that the Prime Minister a few weeks before, had given his solemn assurance to this cement manufacturer that the cement duty would not be interfered with, this cut of fifty per cent was made. This friend and supporter of the Government wrote a letter in which he protested against that conduct. He said: When I received your letter on the subject of the cement duty, I got the authority of my directors to spend a considerable sum in enlarging our plant and increasing our output, but we have been so embarrassed by the situation arising that we have lost our money and our shareholders will not hereafter have the confidence in the Government with respect to trade matters that they would otherwise have had.

During all the years when the Liberal party was in power, I believe, there never was an interference with the tariff by Order in Council except in one instance. When the late Minister of Finance intended to change the tariff, he made his announcements first in the House of Commons, and they were accepted only after full and thorough debate, and in this way the public was kept informed of what was likely to take place in respect of tariff changes. But in this instance there was no discussion in Parliament, no notice of the action to be taken by the Government; the stroke came like a bolt from the blue; with the result that the confidence of business men in this Government received a shock from which it has not recovered.

So, if we have bad times in Canada, if there has not been in some respects as great an output of production or as much employment as we might have expected, the condition may be attributable to the fact that the business community in Canada have not the confidence in this Government that they had in its predecessor.

I would like to discuss another matter which relates to the Civil Service situation. A statement was brought down in the House a few days ago in which it was disclosed that between the time the present Government came into power and March, 1914, something like two thousand civil servants had been dismissed and their places taken by something over ten thousand. The Prime Minister in the course of a speech delivered in Halifax before the election of 1911, made this statement:

> A government holds the power of patronage for the benefit of the public, and it is entitled to fill public offices solely in the public interest. The duties of those officials are for the public benefit and are fixed by the laws of the country; their salaries are paid out of the people's money. To use the power of filling such positions as a reward for party service and without regard to the character and capacity of the individual selected is a gross breach of a solemn public trust. A private trustee so dishonouring his office would be subject to punishment by the criminal law, but the one punishment which can be meted out for such abuse of a public trust is dismissal by the electorate.

We have had a revelation made within the last few days which is very startling in view of the source from which it comes; I have before me a statement by Professor Shortt, the chairman of the Civil Service Commission, dealing with this matter. In an address which he recently delivered in the city of Ottawa he said:

> "Patronage is entirely and absolutely in control of the lower grade appointments in the Civil Service," declared Professor Adam Shortt, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, addressing the People's Forum last night. "Seven out of every nine appointments have patronage behind them."
>
> "There have been many promotions in salary even where there were no vacancies in the upper ranks," he said. "The Civil Service is therefore in the same condition of an army with too many officers. The British expert, Sir George Murray, was shocked when he noticed this condition, and I am sick and tired of asking the Government to remedy this state of affairs.
>
> "It is no use arguing that the high cost of living makes these salary promotions necessary; everybody has to pay for the necessaries of life, but not all get promotions... I have

met men in the Canadian Civil Service," he said, "who, though they held positions under the Government, were quite ready to admit that the Civil Service system was rotten."

Now, when this Government came into power they made loud professions as to the manner in which they would deal with the Civil Service. We have heard a great deal during the last few months on the subject of "Patriotism and Production." I believe that a distinguished philosopher once said that the greatest patriot was he who caused two blades of grass to grow where only one flourished before.

That principle is applied by the present Government in a somewhat different manner. Their patriotism consists in patriotism for their party alone, their production consists in producing five government officials where only one flourished before. We have many instances of this kind of patriotism and production. We have the instance, brought up in the House of Commons a few days ago, where a customs official in my county was dismissed by the Minister of Customs because it was alleged that there was nothing for him to do; thereupon the minister appointed another official to do that nothing, at a salary of $250, being $150 more than his predecessor had received.

Mr. J. D. REID: The man we appointed has been doing something since his appointment; the other man did not do anything.

Mr. KYTE: I would like to get the record from the department of what the man is doing at the present time, and I take this opportunity of requesting the hon. minister to lay a report to that effect on the table of the House.

In the province of Nova Scotia a man was appointed in the Department of the Interior to discharge certain duties, his jurisdiction extending over the maritime provinces. For five or six years he discharged his duties to the satisfaction of the department and its officials. But there was in the city of Halifax a young man, secretary of the Conservative Association of that city, who desired to obtain employment in the public service. For some time he was not given a position, and he became very insistent. It was necessary to provide a position for him, and in the month of October last the officials of the Department of the Interior appointed him at a salary of $1,800 a year—with expenses and office allowance, amounting to $2,500—to assist the other officer to discharge the duties which he himself was quite capable of performing. Whatever extenuation there may have been in the past, when times were good, revenues bounteous and surpluses large, for the Government is indulging in extravagances of that kind, there is surely no excuse at a time when it is necessary, owing to financial conditions, for a Minister of Finance to issue phoney money from the printing machines in the form of Dominion notes issued without authority and without the necessary gold reserve.

Permit me to cite another instance which occurred in the county of Richmond, and which was dealt with in this House a few years ago. It was necessary for the Department of Railways and Canals to expropriate lands for the improvement of the St. Peter's canal. The owner of the land, a friend of this Government, was a defeated candidate on several occasions in that county. The Department of Railways and Canals paid him about $1,000 an acre for the land that was required from him. It appeared in evidence in this House that the land had been purchased by him a few years before for $10.50 an acre, and that subsequent to that his property had been assessed at $75 an acre. He moved in the Supreme Court to have the assessment quashed on the ground that the valuation was excessive. In evidence read before the court he proved that the property was not worth $75 an acre, and in this evidence he was supported by certain leading citizens of the town in which I live. That was about three years before he sold the land to the Government. When the property was expropriated by the Department of Railways and Canals, they appointed three commissioners, resident in the town, to value that property. Two of these commissioners were two of the gentlemen who swore three years before that the property was not worth $75 an acre, and the third was the campaign manager of the defeated candidate in the previous election. These three men awarded the owner of the property a valuation of $1,000 an acre, notwithstanding the fact that that valuation was far above and beyond any value which attached to the property. This was an instance where over $3,000 was given to a party friend for the purpose of discharging a party obligation. It does appear to me that the whole resources of this Government are being exploited for party advantage, and for party advantage only.

I could give other reasons why we have a deficit of some $60,000,000 at the present time. When the Minister of Finance delivered his speech before the Commercial Travellers' Association in the city of Montreal, perhaps

he might be excused if he did not fully appreciate the indications of the far-reaching depression which was about to become prevalent throughout the Dominion of Canada. The Finance Minister's mature years were co-incident with that happy period in Canada from 1896 to 1911 when the Liberal party was in power and when there were no such things as hard times, scarcity of money, deficits, or trade depression. But his colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce well knew what these signs portended. During all the years that he was Finance Minister in the Conservative Government which was defeated in 1896, hard times and unemployment supped, dined and lodged with him. He was never free from the glowering shadows of those unwelcome spectres; they were unbidden guests at every cabinet council and at every party caucus. The Minister of Trade and Commerce well knew what these things forebode, and if the hon. Minister of Finance was not in a position properly to appreciate the conditions which were upon us, it is unfortunate that he did not consult his colleague, the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

At the session of Parliament of 1913 the minister brought down certain proposals with regard to the supplies for that year. No attempt was made during that session to meet the stringency which was about to bear upon our commercial conditions. There was a period between 1896 and 1911 when there were evidences that the great expansion and prosperity which Canada had theretofore enjoyed were about to be checked for a period. In the Budget speech delivered on March 17, 1908, by the Hon. W. S. Fielding, then Finance Minister, he said:

> Business has received a check, but do not look for a continued period of depression. On the part of the Government it is a time for caution. Large new enterprises which would call for great outlay will be laid aside for a little while.

That was the position Mr. Fielding took in 1908, and in 1909, when he was bringing down the Estimates for that fiscal year, he gave further proof of his preparation for the expected depression. Referring to his Budget speech delivered in that year, he said:

> With this condition of revenue and with the very many demands made upon us, it would almost seem unavoidable that we should meet the difficulties by an increase in taxation. In some other countries that seems to be the remedy for the financial conditions that have there arisen. In our judgment, however, there is no need here of increased taxation. We think the truer and sounder method is to meet the situation by a substantial reduction in our expenditure, and that is the method we have adopted. Unquestionably if we were to continue the same rate of expenditure as that which has prevailed in recent years, we should be obliged to add to the burdens of taxation; but we have come to the conclusion that the part of wisdom is to ask all concerned to be patient with us for the time while we put the brakes severely on expenditure.

That is the attitude taken by Hon. Mr. Fielding at a time when no person in a position to judge of the financial conditions then existing thought that anything like such a severe depression was upon us as was upon the present Finance Minister during the session of 1914. Further on Mr. Fielding said:

> We know that in many parts of the country great works are projected, railways, canals, and other enterprises, which might in themselves be worthy enough, some of which will have to be undertaken at a later date and will figure largely in the development of Canada; but it is much more important that we should, in the present condition of affairs, await an improved financial condition. Therefore we say to the promoters of all these enterprises, no matter how worthy they may be, that they must be content to let them stand aside for the present.

What was the condition of affairs in 1914? In 1914 there was every appearance of distress at the time that Parliament was opened for the session of that year. Words were placed in the mouth of His Royal Highness the Governor General, which I read a few moments ago, and which indicated that the Government was not unaware that a serious condition of affairs threatened this whole country. But the present Finance Minister did not take the steps followed by his predecessor in the year of which I spoke. In 1909-10 Mr. Fielding reduced the expenditure upon consolidated fund account by $9,334,243. He reduced it upon capital account by $13,247,215, making a total reduction of his Estimates from the preceding year of $22,581,458. It is quite true that at the end of the fiscal year it was found that he had not maintained that decrease; but why? Because the equilibrium of the revenue had been established in the meantime, and there was every indication that a revenue almost equal to that of the preceding year, would be enjoyed by the treasury during the years 1909 and 1910, but, notwithstanding the expenditure, that year was in fact $5,000,000 less than that of the preceding year, but Mr. Fielding still had a surplus that year of $22,091,963. The hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) endeavoured to take some credit for the Government because in the Estimates for the present year it is proposed to reduce

them by a considerable sum of money. In giving a list of reductions in the expenditures for 1915-16, as compared with those for 1914-15, he read items to the House which aggregated the sum of $17,780,320. This, you will remember, is for the year 1915-16, but these reductions did not apply to the last year. In answer to my hon. friend from South Toronto, all I can say is that if the foresight of the Government was only equal to its hindsight, the Finance Minister would not have a deficit of $60,000,000 by a blooming sight. But it is not in 1915-16 that they should have reduced their expenditure, it was in 1914-15. If the Finance Minister had done so, then we would not now be met with the condition of affairs which was disclosed by his Budget statement.

I have here a statement which has been brought down to the House to-day showing the expenditures from month to month during the years 1912, 1913 and 1914. I shall take the expenditure for the last three months of 1913 and the last three months of 1914 and see to what extent the Finance Minister was preparing to meet the financial obligations which were maturing and which have been disclosed in the Budget speech. In September 1913, the expenditure on consolidated revenue account amounted to $9,268,518.33. For the corresponding month in 1914, when the war was on and with every sign of the financial depression and the scarcity of money apparent on all sides, he increased that expenditure to $12,962,824.66. The capital expenditure for September, 1913, amounted to $3,892,564.02 and in September 1914 to $4,581,282.73. Special expenditure in September 1913 amounted to $80,145.02. In September 1914 it amounted to $687,201.81.

In October 1913, the expenditure on consolidated fund account amounted to $8,749,737.11. In October 1914 it amounted to $9,696,064.71. The capital expenditure in October 1913 was $3,343,026.36 and in October 1914 it was $4,479,119.80. Special expenditure for October 1913, amounted to $3,673,060.02 and for October 1914 $84,057.76.

In November, 1913, the consolidated fund expenditure was $9,232,141.30 and in November, 1914, it was $10,496,923.83. The capital expenditure in November, 1913, was $4,231,379.18 and in November, 1914, it was $4,250,385.75. Special expenditure for November, 1913, was $2,068,074.11 and for November, 1914, $350,245.68.

In December, 1913, the consolidated fund expenditure was $9,308,955.66 and in December 1914, it was $9,942,985.96. The capital expenditure in December, 1913, was $3,407,611.33 and in December, 1914, it was $2,910,167.25. The special expenditure in December, 1913, was $797,683.49 and in December, 1914, it was $1,532,807.78.

We have here a record which certainly does not indicate care and forethought on the part of the Finance Minister. The total increase during the four months, September, October, November and December, 1914, as compared with the same months of 1913 amounted to $3,686,188. We have certainly no indication in these figures that the Finance Minister, even as late as December 1914, realized that there was reason for economy. But how is it proposed that the deficit shall be met? It is proposed that this deficit on ordinary expenditure and on capital account, apart from the war, shall be met by certain special taxes as well as by increases in the tariff rates. For the extravagance that I have pointed out—and I have only pointed out a few isolated cases—the people of Canada will be compelled, while the present Government is in power, to pay an extra cost on nearly every necessity of life as well as special taxes on other things which will add materially to the burden of the cost of living. We have increased duty on bananas, against which a very loud protest has been raised throughout this country, wearing apparel, boots and shoes, many kinds of foodstuffs, drugs and many other products which enter into the daily consumption and the ordinary business of almost every consumer in the Dominion of Canada. Some few years ago, and after the present Government came into office, the fishermen of the maritime provinces demanded a change in the interpretation of the tariff with respect to the duty on cotton twine used in the manufacture of lobster traps. The interpretation which had been placed upon it previous to the change of Government was regarded as too liberal for the fishermen, inasmuch as the actual commodity used in the construction of lobster traps was not described in the tariff. The result of the new interpretation put upon that item by the present Minister of Customs was to place upon the tax list an item which for many years under the old Government had been free, with the result that the fishermen of the maritime provinces have had to pay a higher price for that commodity ever since. In the session of 1912, I called the attention of the Minister of Finance to this unfairness, and he was good enough to say

that at the next revision of the tariff he would look into the matter. The next amendment to the tariff was made in the session of 1913, and while several articles heretofore taxed were placed on the free list by the tariff amendment of that year, notably coarse thread which is used by manufacturers of thread in certain cities in the province of Ontario, the Finance Minister did not see his way clear to reduce the duty upon this twine used by the fishermen, and as a consequence they have had to pay the duty ever since. So that in addition to the duty of 25 per cent heretofore collected by the present Government upon this kind of twine, there is to be an additional duty of 7½ per cent, and the fishermen of the maritime provinces will be obliged to pay that additional tax to make up for the deficit of the Minister of Finance —a deficit which is due to the wanton and unjustifiable extravagance of the several departments of this Government.

There is another item in which the fishermen of the maritime provinces are interested, and that is corkwood. Ever since 1897, corkwood has been on the free list. By the revision of the tariff made in 1897 by the Minister of Customs of that day and his associates, corkwood and many other things necessary in the prosecution of the fisheries were put on the free list. I notice that in the list made by the Minister of Finance of articles which will not be affected by the proposed increase of 7½ per cent, there is no mention of corkwood; so that necessarily this important item, hitherto free, will be taxed. If it is not too late, I most earnestly request the Minister of Finance to look into this matter, and inasmuch as nearly all the other articles used by fishermen in the prosecution of their industry are upon the free list perhaps the Minister of Finance might see his way to put corkwood on the free list, as it was before.

What is to be the consequence of the increase in the tariff? Is it to be a temporary or a permanent increase? For my part I think there are signs and indications that the present increases are to be regarded as a permanent institution. The interests that have been able to get this advantage over the consumers of Canada are not likely to yield it up very readily. We know the history of the United States with respect to tariff. We know that the American Civil War was the excuse for imposing high protective duties in that country. Large obligations were incurred by the United States Government during the Civil War, and as a consequence the duties had to be very largely increased. We know how the consumers of that country have struggled ever since to get the tariff reduced. We know that from 1865 up to the year 1913 they did not succeed in securing any decrease whatever. The interests that had grown up under the new tariff came forward year after year urging that the tariff be retained, and the consequence was that in a few years the United States had the highest tariff that has ever been imposed in any country. A writer of that day said of this tariff:

> A system of taxation more comprehensive, more burdensome and more confused than it has ever been the lot of any other civilized community to bear.

Further on he says:

> The tariff of 1864 is the real war tariff, and the basis of the present tariff. While the main reasons of its passage were without doubt the need of increased revenue for the Government and the desire to compensate the various interests for the burdens imposed on them by the internal revenue, it is undeniable that its final shape was largely owing to the endeavours of the protected manufacturers to gain each for himself the greatest possible advantage irrespective of the other's interests. Above all, the habits engendered during this period of comprehensive protection to every thing led to a crystallization of the sentiment in favour of national exclusion and isolation. The commercial policy of the United States for many decades was moulded by the dealings and habits generated during the period of the civil war. Henceforth the movement in favour of high protection, which still in great part dominates the American people, was to become the leading feature in the commercial and political life of the country. What was in its origin a mere temporary expedient called forth by the exigencies of a great military struggle was to become a permanent institution.

We have had our first war tariff in Canada. We had the first instalment of it in August, 1914, and we are now getting the second instalment. There would be some excuse for asking the people of Canada to bear the burden of an increased tariff if these were actually war taxes, but in view of the facts that are well known throughout of the country at the present time and of the facts that have been made known in this House since this debate began, it is inconceivable and incomprehensible how the Minister of Finance can bring down a tariff for the purpose of raising ordinary revenue and call it a war tariff, and blame the war for the necessity of bringing it on. The Minister of Finance is largely interested in important financial corporations

in Canada, and he is certainly not without familiarity with corporation law. Let me ask him what would happen if the president or general manager or board of directors of a corporation in Canada were to put shares upon the market and ask for subscriptions to funds to be applied on capital account or for the purpose of increasing the capital outlay of that corporation, and who then, notwithstanding the statement in the prospectus, applied those funds for the purpose of paying salaries. I am quite sure that a board of directors that would do such a thing would very soon be brought into intimate relationship with the crown attorney and with the judge presiding over the criminal court. In any other walk of life that would not be tolerated. I am bound to say it is absolutely improper and indefensible to couple a demand for war revenue with increased taxes which are required only for the purpose of paying the ordinary expenditure of the country.

There is another tax imposed upon the people by this tariff which will be extremely irksome and annoying. I refer to the postage tax. Now, if it is necessary for the Government to resort to this mode of taxation, why do they not as a matter of principle raise the postage on letters to three cents and on postal cards to two cents? That would have been very much better, and much less annoying than the present scheme. I am familiar with conditions existing in the country. We know that the owner of a farm, for instance, does not waste his time running to and from the post office. Neither do the grown-up members of his family, for they are employed in more important and serious work. The duty of carrying letters to and from the post office devolves upon the younger members of the family. Heretofore, when a farmer wanted to post a letter, he gave his child two cents, and he went to the post office, bought the stamp, placed it on the envelope and posted the letter, which then went on to its destination. What is the reason for the complicated system the Finance Minister proposes? There are going to be difficulties and irritations without end.

The child going to the post office after the new tariff is in force will have to ask not only for a two cent stamp, but in addition the one cent tax stamp which will also have to be attached to the letter, and if, through the ignorance or illiteracy of the postmaster, an ordinary one cent stamp is placed upon the letter instead of the tax stamp, the letter will find its way into the dead letter office, or the receiver of the letter will be penalized to the extent of double the deficiency in postage. I intimated that there was such a thing as illiterate and incompetent postmasters in this country. Perhaps it will come as a surprise to you, Mr. Speaker, to know that the term "illiteracy" could be properly applied to functionaries occupying the responsible office of postmaster, but it is a fact that under the present Government there have been appointed postmasters who are absolutely illiterate, and are unable to read the directions upon the letters coming into their charge, or to know the denominations of the ordinary postage stamps. There is a case in my own county where a postmaster was dismissed. He was competent, and he had discharged his duties as such for a good many years. There was no fault to be found with him. After the change of Government a complaint was made that he was a Liberal, and his office was removed to a neighbouring house. He received his notice of dismissal, and he was directed to hand over the property of the Postoffice Department to his successor. His successor came to the postoffice, a list was made out of the articles belonging to the Postoffice Department, and the retiring postmaster passed his successor over a receipt for those articles and asked him to sign it. The successor said: I can not sign it. The retiring postmaster said: Why can you not sign it? And his successor replied: Because I am not able to read or write. The postmaster stated: You will not get the property until you sign for it. The new postmaster had to go to the nearest village and get into communication with the postmaster there. The postmaster there telegraphed the postoffice inspector at Halifax, and the inspector at Halifax instructed the postmaster at the neighbouring village to go to the postmaster who had been dismissed and sign the receipt for the new postmaster. That is not a fanciful tale, but it is in line with many of the appointments which are being made by this Government. We have food inspectors appointed who can not tell the difference between a porterhouse steak and a gad of smelts, and we have fruit inspectors appointed who do not know the difference between a Gravenstein apple and a Brussels sprout. These are conditions which have grown up under the present Government, notwithstanding the fact that these hon. gentlemen, while in opposition, decried long and loud the system of patronage as it had developed during that period.

But we have other things which we are interested in and which we will continue to think about from time to time as a result of this new tariff. Upon the delivery by the Finance Minister of his Budget we had a deputation of two hundred tobacco growers from Ontario and Quebec asking to have more protection upon their tobacco. If every industry in Canada is to be protected I would like to know why the tobacco growers are not to be able to enter the swim as well as others. If they do not get what they ask for it must be because they are not organized and are not an adjunct of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. The Budget of the Finance Minister is an announcement that this is a protectionist Government and that protection not only for revenue but protection to prohibit the importation of foreign goods of any description is to be their policy. The amount of revenue that we will derive from the new Budget proposals of the Finance Minister remains to be seen when the tariff proposals are taken up in Committee of the Whole House. It would, I am sure, be interesting to inquire what amount of revenue can be derived under the proposals of the Government in respect to many of these tariff increases; but apart from the additional burdens which are to be placed upon the people by this increase of the tariff, there are annoyances and disagreeable features that ought to be remedied and which, if not remedied, will lead to the utmost confusion.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a good deal of interest to several addresses which have been delivered on this Budget, although I did not have the opportunity of being present when the main Opposition critic (Mr. A. K. Maclean) delivered his speech. I have read his speech quite carefully, and notwithstanding the criticisms made by the hon. gentleman and those who have followed him on that side of the House, I can sincerely offer my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) my hearty congratulations on the presentation of his Budget. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Kyte) found some fault with the present Administration for not having appointed, as he said, a farmer as Minister of Argriculture; and he took some credit to the previous Administration for having appointed the Hon. Sydney Fisher, a farmer, as Minister of Agriculture. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Sydney Fisher may have been a farmer, but I venture to say that no man ever occupied the position of Minister of Agriculture who had a smaller regard for the farmers of Canada than had the Hon. Sydney Fisher. The Hon. Sydney Fisher, from his place in this House, stated as a reason why the farmers preferred to raise hogs rather than sheep was that the obstinacy of the hog induced the farmer to engage in the production of pork rather than in the production of mutton. He also stated from his place in this House that the farmers were a slip-shod, lazy and indifferent class of people. He is on "Hansard" as having made such a statement, and yet the hon. member for Richmond gives credit to the Liberal Administration for having appointed as Minister of Agriculture a person of that kind.

I was very much amused by some of the arguments advanced by the hon. gentleman, particularly his argument in regard to the extra stamp to be placed on post cards and letters. The hon. gentleman was hard up for an argument when he said that the placing of an extra war stamp on a post card or letter would make the system a very embarrassing one. He said that children who now were sent to the post office by their parents with two cents to buy a postage stamp to put on a letter down in his constituency would hardly be able to handle the extra financing of one cent entailed by putting another stamp on the letter. If we take that as an illustration of the people generally in the county of Richmond we can readily understand how it is that they have their present representative in the House of Commons at Ottawa, but I think the hon. gentleman in making that statement has cast an unwarranted reflection on the intelligence of the people of Richmond.

Mr. KYTE: The intelligence of the Tory postmasters.

Mr. EDWARDS: I think that, notwithstanding what he says, the people in Richmond will be able to handle this large financial problem and work it out successfully so that letters will not go to the dead letter office. The hon. gentleman has said that during the year 1914 there had been considerable depression and that there were men out of work. That is undoubtedly true. Let us ask why that is the case. The Canadian Pacific Railway Lake Shore line, the Canadian Northern Railway, Ontario division, the Canadian Northern Railway Ottawa-Toronto branch and several other lines of railway have been completed lately,

throwing out of work men engaged in their construction. I take issue with the hon. member when he argues that at such a time we should put on the brakes at once and stop our public works. It is no time to do that when men are out of employment.

Is it a fact that we on this side of the House are entirely responsible for conditions in Canada at the present time, or is it not the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite should bear the blame? The hon. member said that this new tariff was imposed simply to meet the extravagance of the present Administration. Will the hon. gentleman declare that his party has no responsibility for any of the public works which were started when the Liberals were in power and which had to be completed by the present Government since it came into power? It is a fact that during the last four years ending March, 1915, the Minister of Finance has had to finance some $56,000,000 for the National Transcontinental railway, some $10,000,000 for the Quebec bridge, some $38,000,000 in connection with the extravagant implementing clause of the Grand Trunk Pacific bond issue, for which this Government is not responsible, and some $15,000,000 loaned to the Grand Trunk Pacific. That makes a total of about $120,000,000, for which the Minister of Finance has had to finance. If hon. gentlemen opposite want to be fair, they will not and cannot claim that the present Government is responsible in the main for these necessary expenditures.

Allow me to refer for a moment to some statements made by previous speakers in regard to Government dismissals. They allege that in the various departments officials of the Government have been dismissed and others have been put in their places. If I have any fault to find with the present Government along that line, it will be because it has not dismissed enough of them. There are a great many more who still retain their positions who should have been dismissed. What is the record of the Liberal party when it came into power in 1896? The axe fell, and it fell frequently. In the first nine months of the Laurier Administration, 466 Government officials were dismissed without the shadow of an investigation. I am not going to follow all the arguments advanced by the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) with regard to this, but I will refer to one or two departments to which he has alluded. Take for instance the Customs Department. The revenue from customs for 1911 was about two and a half times as much as it was in 1896. The cost of collection advanced by 162 per cent in that time. In 1913, the revenue had increased from $73,000,000 to $115,000,000, or an increase of 57 per cent, while the cost of collection had increased by about 47 per cent. The inward entries in the Customs Department in 1896 amounted to only 528,489, and the outward entries to 104,660. The business had grown enormously during the Laurier regime and continued to grow after the Borden Government took office until in 1913 the inward entries amounted to 1,902,155, and the outward entries to 466,122. It is unreasonable for hon. gentlemen to expect that a department, in which the work was growing at the rate which these figures indicate, could go ahead with its work without any increase in the cost or in the number of officials. It is true the number of officials was increased. In 1911, there were 198 officials in the inside service, and in 1915 there were 232—not a very large increase. In the outside service the increase from Otcober, 1911, to January, 1915, was from 2,273 to 3,144. The salaries paid to these officials indicate just the opposite of what has been charged against the Minister of Customs. They indicate that the utmost care has been used by the minister in that regard. It is true that the cost of living has increased and the salaries of these officials had to increase; but the increase is not so very great, and the average increase throughout has been more than warranted by the increased cost of living.

Let us take the cost of collection for the ten years from October 1, 1904 to October 1, 1914, because taking the figures year by year will best prove my argument. The figures are as follows:

Year.	Cost to collect. Per cent.
1904-05	3.49
1905-06	3.31
1906-07	3.04
1907-08	3.30
1908-09	4.15
1909-10	3.32
1910-11	2.98

or an average for those years of Liberal Government of 3.37.

1911-12	2.79
1912-13	2.74

These figures answer the statement made by the hon. junior member for Halifax and prove that he was not right in his statement charging extravagance to this department. In 1913-14, the cost of collection was 3.59 per cent.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What are the figures for 1914-15?

Mr. EDWARDS: I have not the figures. Since October, 1911, a number of new offices have been opened. Three chief ports have been opened, three outports have been made chief ports, and 54 new outports and five preventive and collecting stations have been opened. It is all right to refer to the number of officials in a department, but there are places throughout the country where men are doing preventive officer's work and getting possibly $100 or $150 a year, and they are included in the number of customs officials. Therefore the number bulks very large, and it is most unfair to place the figures before the House and the country as the hon. member has done.

The Post Office Department also came in for some censure from the hon. junior member from Halifax (Mr. Maclean), and it has not escaped the attention of the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte). The figures presented to the House by the hon. junior member for Halifax show that the revenue from the Post Office Department has each year exceeded the expenditure. But the hon. gentleman looks forward very dolefully to the future and predicts a deficit in that department. Suppose there were a deficit in the Post Office Department. I have maintained before in this House, and have no hesitation in stating now that if there is any department of Government that would be justified in having a deficit it is the post office. The money which makes up the revenue of that department is obtained from the people as payment for postage and should be given back to the people in the form of increased postal facilities. In my county, since this administration took office, the people have obtained postal facilities the like of which they never had before. I have in my county over seven hundred miles of rural mail routes, and many other counties have more than that. I estimate that about one-quarter of the population of the county I have the honour to represent are able to get their mails at their very doors. What was the situation before this Government came into power? The situation was this: The Administration of that day seized upon a suggestion made by the right hon. gentleman who leads the present Government in favour of rural free mail delivery, and just before the election of 1908 they established one or two rural routes in the province of Ontario. But from 1908 down to 1911, where were rural routes established? I cannot speak for the other provinces, but I know that in my own province of Ontario the rural routes were established only where there was sufficient political pull to get them. That is the fact and no hon. gentleman on the other side can deny it. A member who supported the Government of that day could get a few rural routes established in his county, but a county that was not represented by a Government supporter got no consideration whatever. Under the present Administration rural routes have been extended, and are being extended, regardless of the political complexion of the representative of the constituencies. That is an indication of fairness on the part of this Government which the Liberal Government never displayed.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. EDWARDS (resuming): Before six o'clock I was calling attention to the expenditures in connection with the Post Office Department, which have been criticised by the hon. member for Halifax. I was pointing out that if in the Post Office Department the expenditure for the last fiscal year was greater than that of 1911, there was ample justification for that expenditure in the improved postal facilities which this Government has given the people of the country districts in various parts of the Dominion.

I had also called attention to the cost of collecting the custom revenue. The hon. member for Halifax asked as to the cost of collection for the present fiscal year. I do not see how the hon. gentleman can reasonably expect to make any point in that regard. I gave the cost of collection for ten years, and showed that in 1911-12 and 1912-13 the cost of collecting the customs revenue under the present Administration was considerably less than the average cost of collecting during the previous seven or eight years under the Liberal Administration. Undoubtedly during the present year, and possibly during the coming year, there will be an increase in the cost of collecting, because of a loss of revenue, which is inevitable. But I scarcely think that hon. gentlemen opposite would argue that the moment your revenue begins to fall you should immediately dismiss your officials right and left, in order to keep the cost of collecting down to the average cost of previous years. That would be imposing an unnecessary and very unjust hardship upon many officials.

The hon. member for Halifax, in the course of his remarks, made use of this expression:

> I realize it to be too true that in Canada the public sense respecting Government expenditures is not so delicately and correctly adjusted as it should be, and it frequently appears like the voice of one crying in the wilderness to protest.

When did the hon. gentleman's political conscience become troubled in that respect? Can the hon. gentleman point to any places in "Hansard" wherein he is reported as objecting to any of these expenditures in the past? If the expenditures of the various departments have been open to censure the hon. gentleman stands condemned out of his own mouth for sitting here in silence when he should have called attention to unnecessary and extravagant expenditure. But he said not a single word. Nor does he get up in his place in the House to-day and tell the Government that they should cut out any expenditures that they intend to make in the city of Halifax. It is all right to say in general terms that the expenditure is too great. But the way to show a true desire to have it reduced is to point to specific instances in which reductions can reasonably be made. When I read that sentence of the hon. member for Halifax with regard to the public sense being not very delicately adjusted, I wondered what the Liberal party had done in the past in the way of adjusting that public sense. I wondered if it would be out of place to call to their attention some of the things which they did to put the machinery out of adjustment and to dull the public sense of appreciation of expenditure. Let me read to the House the words of a former Liberal member of this House in regard to one matter of expenditure for which the country holds the Liberal party responsible. I quote from the Winnipeg Tribune, the editor of which is Mr. R. L. Richardson, a former Liberal member of this Parliament. The article, which is headed "Graft and Loot," deals with the Transcontinental Railway scandal, and this is what that gentleman says:

> The entire report is such a record of incompetence, and dishonesty, and graft and loot that it ought to be sufficient to sink the country. Just what men like Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Mr. Fielding, Mr. Sifton, Mr. Graham, the then Minister of Railways, must think of the situation, would be interesting to know. Some of these men are still in public life, and others have retired, but they have certainly bequeathed a legacy to their country which should stand as a monument to their disgrace for the next century or two, until their names shall have rotted in oblivion. The appalling corruption and mismanagement in connection with this undertaking practically destroys it for all time as an asset to the Dominion. So enormously has the cost been enhanced, and so frightful will be the interest charges that it will be impossible to pay operating expenses, interest on capital, and wear and tear, afford to the settlers passenger and freight rates that are not prohibitory, and that could afford any relief to the burdened taxpayer. The whole enterprise has been so bungled that it would probably have been better if the Government had taken $100,000,000 of the country's money and thrown it into the furnace for utter destruction.

That is the opinion of a former Liberal member of the Government which went out of power when this Government took office—and a Liberal candidate for election since that time—in regard to graft, loot and extravagance. I respectfully commend his words to hon. gentlemen opposite when they feel disposed to talk about the graft and extravagance of this Administration.

It has been stated by the Finance Minister and by the junior member for Halifax—and not denied—that there will inevitably be an increase in the public debt of Canada. Let us look at the question of the national debt just for a moment. In 1896, the year the Liberal party came into power, the net debt of Canada was $258,497,432. In 1911, when they left office, the net debt was $340,042,052. So that they had succeeded in increasing the debt of Canada by over $81,500,000. The Borden Government took office in October, 1911, and at the end of the last fiscal year, March 31, 1914, they had decreased the net debt by something over $6,000,000. The present fiscal year will see an addition to the debt of Canada, due to Canada's participation in the defence of the Empire we love and of liberties that we hold sacred.

A decline in revenue and an increase in expenditure means, of course, an addition to the national debt; and no matter what party had been in power at the present time, I maintain that an increase in our national debt for this year was inevitable under the circumstances. In that, of course, I am assuming that if the Liberal party had been in power they would have gone on and participated in the present war as we have done. The Finance Minister puts the loss of revenue for the present year at $33,000,000. I would like hon. gentlemen opposite, in criticising the Budget, as they have a perfect right to do, to state how they would have altered or changed the policy of the Dominion of Canada so as to have avoided a declining revenue at the present time. Surely no hon. member in this House will to-day stand up and express the opinion that the adoption of the reciprocity

pact would have prevented the loss in revenue which has taken place. Surely no political party in this or any other country ever had its folly fully brought home as the folly of the Liberal party has been brought home to it in the last twelve months. For the years 1911-12, 1912-13, 1913-14 the surplusses are the largest in the financial history of the Dominion of Canada. We have had heavy expenditures on public works that had to be completed—the National Transcontinental railway, the Quebec bridge, the Hudson Bay railway, the Welland canal—and which of these would the hon. gentlemen opposite have stopped? If I mistake not, the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition not only favoured the construction of the Welland canal, but also favoured entering on the construction of the Georgian Bay canal, and that within the last twelve months. Special taxes are required at the present time to meet special conditions. Will anybody question the correctness of that statement? To meet the necessities of our war expenditures and our pension list, special taxation is necessary. If no war existed these special taxes would not be necessary, and the situation would have been met without difficulty. In regard to expenditure, what has been the record of the Liberal party? I remember that previous to 1896, before they came to power, the Liberal party pledged itself to reduce the expenditure which at the time was $38,000,000 or $40,000,000 a year. This amount they declared to be outrageous; in fact, from one end of the country to the other they declared that the then Conservative party was grinding the people between the upper and the nether millstone of taxation; and that if they were returned to power they would reduce that expenditure by at least several millions. That statement, of course, at that time was just as bad as the statements they are making from their seats on the other side of the House to-day. What was their record when in power? Instead of reducing the expenditure, in the first five years the average ran, not from $38,000,000 to $40,000,000, but over $50,000,000; in the next five years it averaged over $72,000,000, and in the next five years it averaged over $113,500,000, reaching more than $133,000,000 in 1909. They declared they would lessen the taxes of the people. Did they fulfil that pledge? The taxes represented by customs and excise in 1896 amounted to $5.46 per head of the population. In 1906 they amounted to $10 per head of population, and in 1911, still under Liberal rule, to $12 per head of population. That is how they kept their pledge to reduce taxation. But Canada's national debt is not to be measured merely in dollars, and while I submit that the Liberal party in this country is responsible for a very large part of Canada's national debt as represented in dollars, the Liberal party in this country is responsible, I believe I might say entirely responsible, for that part of Canada's national debt which is not measured in dollars, because there is a debt that this country owes, and which under Liberal administration was allowed to accumulate and increase from year to year, a debt of gratitude to the Mother Country, which they never seemed disposed to pay, and which was allowed to accumulate under their administration.

Allow me to call attention for a few moments to our trade. Canada's imports for the year ending March 31, 1914, amounted to $635,511,492, which was $31,000,000 less than our imports for the previous year, but notwithstanding that falling off, was $173,500,000 more than our imports in 1911. In 1914 our exports of Canadian produce amounted to $431,500,000, which was $75,800,000 more than in 1913 and $157,272,000 more than in 1911. Canada's total trade in 1914 showed an increase over 1913 of $34,500,000, and an increase over 1911, the last year of Liberal rule, of $460,300,000. Our trade with France shows a decrease in our imports of a little over $1,000,000 and an increase in our exports to that country of about a like amount. Our trade with Germany for 1914 shows a slight increase in our imports from that country, less than one-quarter of a million, and an increase of over $1,000,000 in our exports to that country. Our imports from the United Kingdom were $6,800,000 less than in 1913, but our exports to the United Kingdom in 1914 were $44,340,000 more than in 1913. To the United States our exports in 1914 were $25,900,000 more than in 1913, and our imports from that country were $39,300,000 less than in the preceding year. Of Canada's exports of animals and their products, 69 per cent go to the British Empire and 31 per cent to other countries. Of Canada's exports of agricultural products, 56 per cent go to the British Empire and 34 per cent to all other countries. Seventy-two per cent of our surplus farm products for which we have to find a market go to the United Kingdom, 12½ per cent to the United States, and 15½ per cent to other countries. In other words 87½ per

cent of those surplus products goes across the ocean, and is absolutely dependent upon Britain's supremacy on the seas for its safe conduct to the markets of the world. Let me give an example to illustrate the importance of this. In the first week after the war, salesmen representing various cheese factories in Eastern Ontario and Western Quebec attended their regular cheese board meetings, but were informed by the buyers of big exporting firms in Montreal, that they had had instructions not to buy any cheese that week. The reason given was that the exporting firms of Montreal did not feel that the trade routes were absolutely safe on account of the war. This was a serious matter for many of the farmers of Eastern Ontario, where dairying is carried on very extensively. The incident directed the attention of farmers from one end of the country to the other to the possibility of serious loss on account of the war. If we could not export our cheese, neither could we export our apples or our wheat. The next week, however, it was cabled to Canada from England that the trade routes were perfectly safe, and that the people of this country could export their produce as usual. What was it that made the trade routes safe? The British fleet. For years, every other overseas dominion had been contributing to the upkeep of that fleet. But the supremacy of Britain on the seas meant more to Canada, and particularly to the farmers of Canada, than it did to the people of any, or perhaps all, of the other overseas dominions; and yet this country, because of the action of the hon. gentlemen opposite, was in the position of being the only one of the overseas dominions that had never contributed a cent towards maintaining the supremacy of the British navy.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have often said in the past that the United States is Canada's natural market for wheat, and pretty nearly everything else. I feel that it is incumbent on me to give a few figures to demonstrate, as I think they will, that that argument is absolutely fallacious. Our wheat production in 1913 was something over 231,000,000 bushels. In 1914, it dropped to 158,223,000 bushels. To what was that falling off due? It was due to these three causes: unfavourable weather, less acreage under crop, and a smaller yield per acre. The United States in 1913 produced 763,000,000 bushels, and in 1914, 891,950,000 bushels. Their production last year was very great, and was due to the opposites of the three causes I have just mentioned. Their increase was due to favourable weather, greater acreage under crop, and a larger yield per acre. Let us look at the exports of wheat. The United States exported in 1912, 61,654,000 bushels; in 1913, 99,500,000 bushels, and in 1914, 173,861,000 bushels. Their exports of wheat flour were 10,621,000 barrels in 1912; 12,278,000 barrels in 1913, and 12,708,000 barrels in 1914. In the face of figures like that, can hon. gentlemen opposite still contend that Canada's natural market for wheat is the United States? It is just as reasonable to say that the natural market for Nova Scotia coal is Newcastle-on-Tyne, and hon. gentlemen opposite must surely admit that. We have a good market for wheat in England, but the market for our western wheat in our eastern provinces of Canada is almost as good. While we send to England 38,000,000 to 40,000,000 bushels of wheat a year, we send to Ontario, Quebec, the maritime provinces and British Columbia, over 32,000,000 bushels; so that these provinces alone furnish us with no small market.

Is the United States a market for our barley? The United States export figures do not indicate it. Last year they exported over 17,000,000 bushels; and as regards oats, while they import a lot, their exports of oats amounted to 25,500,000 bushels more than their imports. Is the United States a market for our horses? Last year Canada sold to the United States 4,618 horses, for which we received $583,000. The same year, the United States sold to Canada 33,718 horses, for which we paid $4,877,000. These figures do not convince me that the United States is a natural market for our horses, as hon. gentlemen opposite have frequently said. Take other products. The United States exports over 21,000,000 dozen of eggs and we import over 15,000,000 dozen; yet hon. gentlemen opposite argue that the United States is the natural market for Canada's eggs. Our exports of butter have dropped down to the vanishing point; we import over 8,000,000 pounds a year, and a large portion of that comes from the United States In this connection, let me say that one of the greatest butter-exporting countries in the world is Denmark, which annually exports over 200,000,000 pounds. When considering the tariff I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite to bear in mind this fact: that butter brought from Denmark or Liverpool can be laid down in the Montreal market for less than one cent a pound for carriage. It has been claimed that the United States is also the market

for Canadian meats. The United States' exports of beef run to over 36,000,000 pounds a year, and of hog products, to over one billion pounds a year. The United States invaded our home markets last year by sending to us 1,339,000 pounds of beef, nearly 9,000,000 pounds of bacon, 1,500,000 pounds of hams and shoulders, over 9,000,000 pounds of lard, and nearly ten million pounds of pickled pork; or a total of over 31,000,000 pounds of meats, to the value of four million dollars and upwards.

Last session I quoted from the United States official bulletin, to show that the prices of foodstuffs in the United States had not been materially affected by the Wilson-Underwood tariff. Why were the prices not materially affected? Because the importations were not sufficient to potentially affect the large supply in that country. But we must remember that a comparatively small quantity of foodstuffs imported into Canada would materially affect the supply here, and have a very strong effect upon prices. What would be a negligible quantity to the United States in comparison with the vast amount of foodstuffs in that country, would not be a negligible quantity if it were brought into Canada, and as I say, would seriously affect prices. That suggests to me another justification besides those already given by the Minister of Finance for the present increase in our tariff, and it is this. Since war broke out, large quantities of foodstuffs produced in the United States have been shut out of the markets to which they formerly went. For instance, the United States had an export trade of farm products to Germany of over $200,000,000 a year; but the war has stopped that, and, on account of the blockade, unsafe trade routes, and for other reasons, these products have also been shut out from other markets they formerly enjoyed. With these products on their hands, the United States would naturally look to selling them to their nearest neighbours, or wherever they could be most easily disposed of. In other words, they would try to dispose of them in this country. And I maintain that, if there were no other justification for this tariff, there is justification for it in order to prevent the dumping into Canada of the surplus productions of countries which through the war have lost the markets they formerly enjoyed. I am speaking as a protectionist when I make that statement. I make no apology for being a protectionist; I am a protectionist because I believe in the policy of protection. I talk in favour of protection, and in that respect I am unlike some hon. gentlemen opposite, who, believing in protection just as strongly as I do, for political reasons talk the other way; it all depending on which side of the House they are sitting.

Let us look for a moment at the British preference, about which hon. gentlemen opposite seem to be terribly worked up. They frequently talk as if the idea of the British preference originated in the minds of the Liberal party, and as if it were their child. But they can not demonstrate that, for it is not true. It is a borrowed idea, just as thousands of the ideas that they claim as their own are borrowed or stolen from somebody else. The Toronto Globe of June 13, 1896, in its report of a speech delivered by Sir Wilfrid Laurier in that city, quotes him as saying:

> I agree with him (Sir Charles Tupper) in regard to preferential trade. This is a new idea and one which in itself is fraught with greatness, not only for the Canadian people but for the British Empire at large. And now the principle is proclaimed that there shall be preferential trade within the Empire at large.

That idea of Sir Charles Tupper's was, then, a new one to the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier. The Globe goes on:

> That is to say that England and her colonies should trade upon a footing of preference over other nations. Imagine what would be the consequences if the products of Canada, the wheat, the barley, the oats, the butter, the cheese, which we are sending to England were to be accepted in the British markets on terms of preference over the products of the United States, of Russia, and all other countries which are competing with us in the market. The advantages are obvious, so obvious that the moment I saw the idea I jumped at it, and immediately declared myself in favour of it.

These are the words of the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier: that when the idea which originated in the mind of Sir Charles Tupper first appeared to the vision of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, he jumped at it. But hon. gentlemen opposite have forgotten the jump, and now claim the idea as their own. Shortly after this, Sir Wilfrid Laurier publicly announced, when he was in England, that he did not want any preference for Canadian farm products in the English market, but that he had given the preference to England without asking for any return. Hon. gentlemen opposite harp a good deal on that, but let us follow this British preference a little further. The intention of the Liberal party was to apply the preference, not merely to Great Britain—they did not intend to follow Sir Charles Tupper's idea along that line— but they intended to offer a preference to other countries besides England and the British Empire. In 1897 they

passed what they now call the British Preference Act. I will read the section of the Act that bears upon this:

An Act to consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the duties of customs; assented to 29th June, 1897.

Section 17 is in these words:

When the custom tariff of any country admits the products of Canada on terms which, on the whole, are as favourable to Canada as the terms of the reciprocal tariff herein referred to are to the countries to which it may apply, articles which are the growth, produce or manufacture of such country, when imported direct therefrom, may then be entered for duty, or taken out of warehouse for consumption in Canada, at the reduced rates of duty provided in the reciprocal tariff set forth in schedule D to this Act.

Let us see what the Finance Minister of that time said. The Finance Minister took pride in the fact that the preference was open to all countries and that we were not doing anything in particular for Great Britain. Here is what he said about the custom tariff of 1897, as quoted in Hansard of that year:

We do not by our resolution offer anything to Great Britain alone. We make our offer, not to Great Britain, but to every nation that is prepared to accept it. We make it to every country which is willing to establish fair and reasonable trade relations with Canada.

These are the words of Finance Minister Fielding on that tariff. The idea put forth by Sir Charles Tupper had undergone some modification. They introduced their tariff changes along the lines of section 17, but no sooner was the Act passed and put in operation than they found themselves in difficulties with other countries on account of existing treaties. They amended the Act in these words:

On and after the 1st day of August, 1898, section 17 of the said Act shall be repealed and the following shall be substituted therefor:

Articles which are the growth, produce or manufacture of any of the following countries may, when imported directly into Canada from any such country, be entered for duty or taken out of warehouse for consumption in Canada at the reduced rate of duty provided in the British preferential tariff set forth in schedule D to this Act.

I want to give hon. gentlemen opposite a few more figures in regard to this British preference which I thought perhaps would be interesting to them and certainly to the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). I do not see him present but I hope he will be here in a few minutes. Of Canada's total imports in 1896, 31 per cent were from Great Britain; in 1908, under Liberal Government, only 27 per cent of our total imports were from Great Britain. In 1896, of the imports coming into Canada free of duty 22 per cent came from Great Britain. In 1908, under Liberal Government, notwithstanding all their talk about the preference, only 17 per cent of the goods coming into Canada free came from England. From the United States the proportion rose from 64 per cent free of duty in 1896 to 70 per cent in 1908.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have been endeavouring to make capital out of the fact that under the Finance Minister's arrangement of the tariff he is not only increasing the general tariff 7½ per cent but he is also increasing the British preferential tariff 5 per cent. Hon. gentlemen do not seem to realize that it is possible to increase the rate of duty and yet at the same time increase the degree of preference and that is precisely what is being done here. The Budget of the Finance Minister increases the British preference by 2½ per cent relatively to other countries. Let us take a case to illustrate that statement. An article worth $100 comes into Canada from England. A similar article worth $100 comes into Canada from the United States. The duty on the article coming from the United States is 30 per cent, we will say. This 30 per cent on $100 is $30 that has to be paid on that article. The duty on the article coming from England is 20 per cent and 20 per cent on $100 is $20. The British merchant in that case gets his article worth $100 into Canada for $10 less than it costs the United States merchant. Take the tariff as changed by the Finance Minister. The duty on the article coming from the United States is 37½ per cent while the British tax is 25 per cent. The tariff of 37½ per cent on the article worth $100 amounts to $37.50 and 25 per cent on the $100 article coming from England is $25. If you subtract one from the other you will find that the preference to the British merchant is $12.50, whereas it was formerly $10.

I want to refer to a statement made by the hon. member for Assiniboia and I am sorry he is not here. In discussing the British preference last night the hon. member for Assiniboia got very tragic. He said: My hon. friend opposite now proposes to put an extra tax on British goods for the purpose of shutting off trade with Great Britain; the tax is put on for no other reason; the Finance Minister has to have more money; if the Government will not shut off expenditures, if it is bound to have an extra $30,000,000, impose the taxes on the outside world, and if you cannot do it in any other way, impose a direct tax and take your $10,000,000 out of the banks, the trust companies

and the insurance companies, tax every one of them, make them pay what money you want, but for heaven's sake keep your unholy and disloyal hands off the British preference. So spoke the hon. member for Assiniboia. Keep your unholy hands—

An hon. MEMBER: Disloyal.

Mr. EDWARDS: Yes, he said: keep your unholy and disloyal hands off the British preference. Let us see what his own party did in regard to the British preference and to what extent they kept their hands off the British preference in times past. In 1897, the Liberal party in this House made a cut of ⅛ or 12½ per cent from the general tariff in favour of Great Britain. Then in 1898, that was increased to 25 per cent, and in 1900 a further increase to 33⅓ per cent was made. Here is a list of a few articles to show how well the Liberals kept their hands off the preference between 1900 and 1907:

Comparison of British Preferential Tariffs.

Article.	Year 1900. Per cent.	Year 1907. Per cent.
*Dry white lead	3⅓	20
*White lead in oil	16⅔	30
Drain tiles, not glazed	13⅓	15
Sewer pipe, earthenware	23⅓	25
Monuments of marble or granite, and manufactures of marble or granite	23⅓	30
Cotton fabrics, white	16⅔	17½
" " coloured	23⅓	25
" sewing thread	16⅔	17½
" clothing	23⅓	25
Twine and cordage	16⅔	20
Bags, jute and cotton seamless	13⅓	15
*Wool cloth	23⅓	30
*Wool clothing	23⅓	30
Socks and stockings	23⅓	25
Door mats	23⅓	25
Carpets, n.o.p.	23⅓	25
Oil cloth, floor, table	20	25
Caps and hats	20	22½
Collars and cuffs	23⅓	25
Silk clothing	23⅓	30
Paints	16⅔	20

Varnishes, 13⅓ cts. per gallon and 13⅓ per cent, 20 cts. per gallon and 15 per cent.

* In 1904, the preferential rate on wool cloth and wool clothing was increased from 23⅓ per cent to 30 per cent.

* In 1905, the preferential rate on dry white lead was increased from 3⅓ per cent to 20 per cent, and on white lead , in oil, from 16⅔ per cent to 23⅓ per cent, and again in 1907 to 30 per cent.

This table shows that in the year 1907 the Liberal party imposed a heavier duty on all these goods coming into Canada than had formerly obtained. They took away from Great Britain the preference which they had formerly given and taxed British goods in some cases a good deal more than double the former tax. Was the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) a member of the House in 1907?

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS: Is it possible that he is the same gentleman who the other night, with tears coursing down his cheeks, begged that our unholy and profane hands would be kept off the British preference? Is it possible that that gentleman sat in this House supporting his party when they laid their unholy hands—surely no person will object to my using that language, because my hon. friends applied it wholesale to hon. gentlemen on this side—on the British preference, as I have shown that they did in 1907.

There is another remark which the hon. member for Assiniboia made and which I, as a member of this House, do not feel like letting pass. He begged us to keep our unholy and profane hands off the British preference; but the hon. gentleman in the course of his remarks saw fit to throw the taunt of disloyalty at members on this side of the House, mainly in regard to the change in the preferential tariff. Under those circumstances I am justified in inquiring as to who this hon. gentleman is and as to the record of his party so far as loyalty is concerned. If the Liberal party want a discussion or a comparison of records along that line, we will give it to them. If they get it, they will have themselves to blame for having invited it.

9 p.m.

What was their loyalty in 1891, and how did they manifest it? They manifested their loyalty by showing a willingness to barter Canada and Canada's honour for Yankee dollars. The hon. member for Assiniboia supported his party in that course at that time.

What was their record during the Boer war in 1899? The Conservative party and public sentiment actually forced the Liberal Government to send what troops they did send to South Africa. Let me tell the hon. member for Assiniboia and those sitting near him who applauded his taunt of disloyalty that, when they sent that party of less than 3,000 men—yes, less than 2,500 men, if we leave out the Strathcona contribution—they sent them C.O.D. When that contingent went to South Africa every dollar of the cost was paid by Great Britain during the whole time they were there; yet five times as much money came from Great Britain into the hands of the Lib-

eral Government to purchase supplies for the war as the Liberal party expended in sending that contingent of men to South Africa. That is their record so far as their loyalty in that regard is concerned.

What about their loyalty in 1911? What was their position as manifested then by their trade policy? They were perfectly willing at that time to make Canada an adjunct of the United States. I do not impugn their party loyalty not for a moment. They have manifested their party loyalty time and again in the past by a willing obedience to the crack of the party whip, to back up sawdust wharf transactions, which I commend especially to the attention of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley); McAvity steals, the Aylesworth ditch, the Saskatchewan land deal, which probably the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) could tell us a good deal about; and if there is anything that he would miss, the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) who has had some knowledge as to transactions regarding timber, will probably be able to tell us something. In all of these matters they have manifested a party loyalty which no one will impugn.

Mr. PROULX: The hon. gentleman should not forget the Prince Albert deal.

Mr. EDWARDS: I did not know you had a deal in Prince Albert, too. I know there are mighty few places you missed, and it would be rather surprising if you had overlooked Prince Albert. I am very certain that if my hon. friend had been there it would not have been overlooked.

Now, hon. gentlemen opposite argue as if it were possible to raise the general tariff without raising or changing the British preferential tariff. That is absolutely ridiculous. The hon. member for Assiniboia spoke as if it would be possible to add 7½ per cent and still leave the British preferential tariff alone. Surely, if hon. members will consider that matter for a little while they will see the fallacy of that. What would be the effect of such a course? You would simply invite disaster to every concern in Canada. Why? Because you would be forcing your Canadian manufacturer to pay an increase of 7½ per cent on his raw material while the raw material would still go into Britain free and their goods would be shipped in here at the old rate. That would give to the British manufacturer an advantage which would simply mean the destruction of every industry in the Dominion of Canada. Hon. gentlemen may talk about this 5 per cent addition to the British preference being disloyal or unfair to England, but they would not get any English statesman or politician to say that, because—and I do not wish to be discourteous—they would have more sense.

Let us consider another matter connected with the record of the party of hon. gentlemen opposite. They have shed tears—or have got ready to do so; they have gone through all the motions of weeping—about agricultural implements. Let us follow their course on agricultural implements and one or two other things, for it is an interesting course and one worth following. The tariff of 1894 reduced the duty on agricultural implements from 35 per cent to 20 per cent. We all remember, of course, how the Liberal party and their organs up and down the country declared that if only they had the chance to get their hands on the throats of the manufacturers they would utterly destroy them. Occasionally they talk along that line to-day, at least one or two of them do, forgetting that their own leader has said that the manufacturer was the farmer's best and warmest friend. In 1907, the Liberal party did pluck up courage to take off 2½ per cent from the duty on agricultural implements, cutting it down from 20 per cent to 17½ per cent. When the matter came up in the House in that year, the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) proposed this resolution:

> That the committee reconsider item 445, and that it be amended by striking out the figures 17½ per cent in the general tariff and inserting in lieu therof the figures 10 per cent.

That was voted down by 56 to 22. Every Liberal member in the House at that time forgot the farmer entirely and voted against the resolution. There was a discussion in regard to this resolution. The hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) is reported at page 5597 of Hansard of that year as follows:

> I shall give the Government hearty support for I believe the policy of the Government is in the interests of the country.

You have heard him speak rather differently since then. In the same discussion, the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) took part. At page 5624 of Hansard the hon. gentleman who now rages and raves about no duty on agricultural implements, said:

> The Tariff Commission got information all over the country. I do not think the farmers of the West at all events, asked for a great reduction such as is proposed by this resolution

on agricultural implements. They asked that the duties be left alone. I shall give the Government hearty support on this question.

Do you notice any difference in the attitude of the hon. gentleman now from what it was in 1907? Hon. William Paterson, who previous to 1896 had declared for free trade in everything except biscuits, said as reported at page 5582:

I do not disguise the fact that we propose to give these people—

That is, the manufacturers.

—nearly the amount of reduction in duty that has been made. For it must be remembered that 17½ per cent is no more than a revenue tariff.

I have looked in Hansard and have not seen that the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) expressed a different opinion, so I suppose I am right in concluding that he was of the same mind. But we have a still greater authority than any of these I have quoted—and I suppose some hon. members think he would not have to be very great to come up to that. Hon. Mr. Fielding, the Minister of Finance of the late Administration, said, as reported at page 5621 of Hansard:

By a careful calculation we are advised that the drawbacks we allow are somewhat less than the disadvantage under which the manufacturer is placed by the reduction of the tariff. Even suppose for a moment that he got everything free and had a duty of 17½ per cent on the implements, would that be an extravagant duty as things go in this country? I believe this proposal of the hon. member for Souris, if adopted, would do an injustice to an established industry.

My belief is that if this motion were passed we would strike a severe blow at one of the great industries of the country. I believe the International Harvester Company would find it to its interests to close up its business in Hamilton, at least so much of it as is devoted to mowers and binders and have them made at the American branch and bring them from the United States. The factory in Hamilton is an American concern. With a moderate duty we have induced American capital to come into Canada and to establish that great industry and after we have brought it in and established it in Canada I believe that if we were to pass this resolution the company operating that industry would find it profitable to close the Hamilton factory and bring in the goods which they make in the United States.

That was Hon. Mr. Fielding, then Finance Minister. You do not want any sounder protectionist than this speech shows him to be, do you? Now, follow the history a little further. Under the reciprocity pact the Liberals proposed a reduction from 17½ per cent to 15 per cent. At that time the hon. member for Dundas asked the then Finance Minister, Mr. Fielding, if there was to be any change in the valuation for duty. This was Mr. Fielding's answer:

Our negotiations have not touched the question of valuation; that must be left to the operation of the customs authorities of the two countries.

Why was that question asked by the hon. member for Dundas? The Liberal party had gone up and down this country preaching against the manufacturers and declaring their intention of taking the duty off agricultural implements. They did make a reduction in 1907 from 20 per cent to 17½ per cent; then they turned to the manufacturers and said: Do not be alarmed, we will fix this up so that it will not hurt you a bit. We will show the farmers that we have made a reduction from 20 per cent to 17½ per cent; we will make them believe that we are going to take further steps along that line, but we will simply change the value of a binder for duty purposes from $80 to $100. That is exactly what they did. When the rate of duty under the Conservative Government was 20 per cent the duty on a binder was $16; after the Liberal party got through tinkering with it, the duty on the same binder was $17.50.

Last year the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) moved this resolution:

That in the opinion of this House the time has arrived when in the interests of the farmers, and consequently in the interests of the whole of Canada, the duties on agricultural implements should be forthwith removed.

Why was it that the "time had arrived?" Just the difference between here and there; just the difference between the right of Mr. Speaker and the left. So far as the arrival of the time is concerned, that makes all the difference in the world. When hon. gentlemen are on this side of the House the time does not arrive, and they proceed to manipulate the tariff in the way that I have indicated. But when they get on the other side of the House the "time arrives" for them to endeavour to hoodwink the people. If hon. gentlemen opposite were sincere in their contention that to take the duty off agricultural implements would benefit the farmer, why did they not accept the standing offer from the United States to make farming implements free? It was on the statute books of the United States for years; why did they not accept the proposal? They knew perfectly well that not one per cent of the people of Canada knew of the existence of that provision; consequently they took the course they did.

During the period from 1909 to 1913 Canada imported from the United States over 21,000 mowers, binders and reapers, valued at nearly $1,500,000. I do not hesitate to say that I would rather see those mowers, binders and reapers manufactured in Canada, giving employment to our Canadian artisans.

Hon. gentlemen on the other side have called attention to the matter of cement. I do not think there is a quality of cement made that would hold together the conflicting ideas of hon. gentlemen opposite. In 1910 the price of cement in Canada jumped up 40 or 50 cents a barrel. The Liberal party was in power at that time. What did they do? Absolutely nothing; they did not attempt to relieve the situation so far as the farmers were concerned, nor did they shed any tears over the farmer because he had to pay 40 or 50 cents a barrel more for his cement. I suppose the time "had not arrived" for a change of ideas. Then they brought up the reciprocity pact, under which they proposed a reduction of 1½ cents a hundred pounds on cement, or 4½ cents a barrel. If the reciprocity pact had been carried into effect, the duty on cement coming into Canada from the United States, even after the reduction, would still have been three cents a hundred pounds, or nine cents a barrel higher than the United States duty on cement going into that country from Canada. If they had the interests of the farmers at heart, they might at least have proposed to bring the Canadian duty on cement down as low as the corresponding duty on the other side of the line—but they made no such proposal. They were on the Government benches at the time, and they did not look at the matter of cement as they look at it now. When it became apparent to this Government after they came into power that there was an apparent combine or merger in the matter of cement, they brought the members of that merger to time by a reduction of the duty on cement, thus showing a practical interests in the farmers of Canada. The hon. member for Assiniboia, in referring to this cement merger, implied, it seemed to me, that the men composing that merger were friends of the Conservative party. If I am not mistaken, the head of that company was and is Senator Edwards, a member of the Liberal party. If that combine is in existence at the present time, I have no doubt that the free trade ideas which are floating about on the other side of the House may reach the Senate and have such an effect upon hon. gentlemen of the Senate that the price of cement may be reduced.

But that is not the only evidence of the inconsistency of hon. gentlemen opposite. They made a reduction in the duty on coal oil, and in less than three years they handed back to the coal oil men subsidies to the extent of nearly a million dollars. So that while on the one hand they were apparently giving the people some benefit, on the other they were turning round and soaking them, so to speak, by the payment of these bounties.

We are face to face with a crisis not only in the history of the Empire but of this country as forming a part of the Empire. It has been found necessary to increase the rate of duty in order to produce a revenue to meet the conditions caused by the war. Hon. gentlemen opposite may argue until doomsday, but I am convinced that they cannot get the people to see with them in this matter. I am convinced that they cannot impose upon the people of this country their idea that this is not a war tax. This is a war tax due to our falling revenues, which revenues have fallen away because of interference with trade, caused by the war. Across the line the United States, which is not engaged in war, has been seriously affected by the war and has been obliged to take unusual steps to make good its loss in revenue, admittedly due to the war. Our revenue has gone down undoubtedly because of this war, prices have gone up, the consumption of products has decreased and so on. This has all had its effect in bringing about abnormal conditions. These conditions must be met, and are being met by the Government by means of these taxes. I want to be fair to hon. gentlemen opposite and at the same time to say what I honestly think. Hon. gentlemen opposite in one breadth say that they wholeheartedly support the Government in voting $50,000,000 or $100,000,000 to carry on the war; but in the very next sentence they do their utmost to oppose the only means at the disposal of the Government to raise money for prosecuting the war. It is in my judgment a roundabout way of showing opposition to the Government in their conduct of this war, a roundabout way and therefore not a very creditable way to hon. gentlemen opposite. They cannot make the people of this country believe that this tax is not made necessary by this war. Not only do the people of Canada believe that,

but they will turn with disgust from men who think to make party capital out of this increased taxation, because the people of Canada are patriotic and loyal and will pay these increased taxes and pay them without murmur. Hon. gentlemen may think they are taking a right course; but from Confederation down to the present time hon. gentlemen have never been known to take the right course on tariff matters, never once. That is the undeniable history of this country, that whenever a tariff issue has come up in Canada the Liberal party has always been on the wrong side, at least the people of this country said they were on the wrong side, they have never seemed to be able to grasp tariff matters. Let me beg of them to consider this past record of theirs and to see if that record should not teach them the lesson to beware of themselves when it comes to the consideration of tariff matters.

I heartily concur in the Budget which the Finance Minister has presented to this House. I believe it will benefit this country in more ways than one. Already evidences of that are apparent. To-day the Montreal Gazette contains this little item:

> New Plant at Hamilton—$150,000 to be expended by Horse Shoe Concern.
>
> Hamilton, Ont., February 24.—The United States Horse Shoe Company, of Erie, Pa., it was announced to-day, has selected Hamilton for its Canadian headquarters. The company is said to be the largest manufacturer of horse and mule shoes in the world. It will spend $150,000 on a plant here to start with and employ 100 men. Construction work starts at once.

I shall place that beside the quotation I gave a short time ago from the speech of the Hon. Mr. Fielding when discussing the duty on agricultural implements. The two taken together seem to me to indicate that this Government, like other Conservative Governments in the past, is following the proper course in this matter.

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (St. John): Mr. Speaker, I trust my hon. friend and my respected friend from Kingston, because I do respect him with all his faults and idiosyncracies—

Mr. EDWARDS: May I correct my hon. friend, not Kingston but Frontenac.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Frontenac? I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. My hon. friend has been finding so much fault and making so much criticism with reference to affairs at Kingston that naturally I associated his name with the constituency which contains the institution which is so much in the public eye whenever my hon. friend deals with penitentiary matters. I trust my hon. friend will pardon me if I do not follow him very closely along the lines which he has trodden this afternoon and evening. I trust, too, that my hon. friend will not be offended if I say that a gentleman must have a very lobsided brain who can, in the discussion of an important question like this, take up the time of the House even for a moment in referring to a matter involving the expenditure of some $5,000 when I was Minister of Public Works, and at the same time not deplore the action of this Government which gave away for $10 a piece of land within the town limits of Prince Albert worth some $200,000. My hon. friend has referred, I think somewhat improperly, to the attitude of the Liberal party in reference to the Budget, and to the taxation which is proposed to be placed on the people of Canada. He says that while with one voice we declare that we shall willingly grant the $100,000,000 of money which the Government requires to borrow in order to carry on the war, and any further amount which may be required, yet at the same time, by discussing the Budget, by discussing the mode in which it is proposed to raise the money, we are pursuing an improper course. Let it be remembered that this money is to be raised, not for war purposes, for the Minister of Finance has made it abundantly clear that he intends to borrow, and he has arranged to borrow, the whole $100,000,000 which will be necessary to prosecute the war during the fiscal year. Yet in spite of that my hon. friend says that because we here, as the representatives of the people, venture to criticise the Budget, venture to criticise the mode in which it is proposed to make good the deficiency between the revenue and the expenditure, we are in some way obstructing the Government in the prosecution of the war in which the people of Canada are engaged for the defence of the Empire and the defence of Canada as one of the most important parts of the Empire. In that my hon. friend, to say nothing more, discloses that peculiar method of discussion which so often distinguishes him when he ventures to address this House.

When these hon. gentlemen can get no other defence for the iniquitous taxation that is proposed, it is said: Oh, well, it is a war tax, and when the Empire is at war, in this day of trial and stress you should not embarrass the Government, you should not criticise it, but you should vote it

through no matter what your judgment may be upon it, and justify your conscience with the reflection that this is a war tax and nothing else. Now, Mr. Speaker, is it a war tax? What is it for? The Minister of Finance says we are proposing to spend out of consolidated revenue the large sum of $140,000,000, not one dollar of which is for the prosecution of the war. It is true that he says some $6,000,000 or $7,000,000 will be required to pay interest on the money which the Government propose to borrow for the prosecution of the war, but outside of that there is nothing in any way connected with the war. It is all for the Civil Service, it is all for carrying on civil government, it is all for the departments of Railways and Canals, Fisheries, Agriculture, and for all the different departments of Government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What about pensions?

Mr. PUGSLEY: We have no Bill before the House providing for pensions. If any Bill is brought before the House I presume it will take effect next year when ample provision can be made for any pensions. The Government has no idea of what will be required for pensions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has the hon. gentleman never seen on the statute books an Act providing for pensions?

Mr. PUGSLEY: There is no Bill yet at all events.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is.

Mr. PUGSLEY: No, not during this session. There is no amount estimated for pensions. Parliament has not been asked to make any provision for pensions and I sincerely trust it will not be called upon to make any large provision for pensions. I trust that better luck than that will attend our young men who have gone to the front. If the time should come when any large amount must be voted for pensions hon. gentlemen will find members on this side of the House standing side by side with them in voting whatever amount may be necessary. I think it has been demonstrated beyond the possibilities of contradiction that if this Government, since it came into power, had exercised even ordinary prudence with reference to the appointment of officials there would have been saved enough money to pay the interest upon this $100,000,000 which it is proposed to borrow for at least a year and a half.

I have not that familiarity with the Civil Service that Professor Shortt, chairman of the Civil Service Commission, necessarily has. He is a gentleman who is in the employ of the Government; he occupies, I presume, a quasi independent position as chairman of that commission; he has made the statement, made it publicly, made it with deliberation that under this Government the appointments to the Civil Service in the lower grades are entirely a matter of patronage and he says that, whereas there have been something like 2,000 dismissals from the Civil Service, there have been some 10,000 appointments, making a difference of some 8,000.

Mr. ROGERS: I would like to say that this is a statement that has been repeated so often in this House that hon. gentlemen opposite will possibly be beginning to believe it. No more dishonourable, no more dishonest, no more unfair—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROGERS—statement was ever made by any man than that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will the hon. gentleman repeat that?

Mr. ROGERS: I want to say that no more dishonourable, no more dishonest, no more—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

An hon. MEMBER: Untrue.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROGERS:—statement was ever made by any man—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will the minister repeat it? I could not hear him.

Mr. ROGERS: I have repeated it twice, but I shall be glad to stay here and go on repeating it if it will be any benefit to my hon. friend. I was referring not to my hon. friend but to Professor Shortt and in that connection I want to say here and now that no more dishonourable, no more dishonest, no more unfair statement was ever made by any man than that made by Professor Shortt, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. It is an absolutely untrue statement.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am sure my hon. friend could hardly hear his own voice when he got to the last sentence and it is delightful to see the way in which hon. gentlemen applaud the minister without hearing him. There is a sort of telepathic communication between the supporters of the Government

and my hon. friend and they take it for granted that whatever he says will be right. That is a very delightful position for the minister to occupy with reference to his party. It is more creditable to the hon. gentleman than it is to the party. Ordinarily one would suppose that a party of intelligent gentlemen, and very excellent gentlemen, would like to hear what the minister has to say and then decide whether it was something that should be applauded. The matter becomes a question at issue between the Minister of Public Works and Professor Shortt. Of course, we have to leave that to be settled between them, but unfortunately for my hon. friend's statement, when he makes this terrible imputation against a man of the high standing and independent position of Professor Shortt, the returns which have been brought down to this House by the Government would seem to justify the statement which Professor Shortt makes.

Mr. ROGERS: I am sure my hon. friend does not wish to make an unfair statement. He has surely not read the return himself or he would not venture to make that statement. The return shows nothing of the kind. Take the return of my own department for instance; in it 507 dismissals are credited and there are 700 odd resignations which Professor Shortt never takes into account. The same is true of every department of the Government which makes the fact absolutely clear as against Professor Shortt's statement.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We will find out more about that another day.

Mr. ROGERS: I shall be very glad to make my statement good.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am glad to accept the statement of my hon. friend so far as that matter comes within his own knowledge, but I would suppose that a gentleman of Professor Shortt's standing would not make such a statement without very good foundation.

Mr. MURPHY: It is only a partial return.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I base the statement which I have made, namely, that this is not a war tax, upon the Estimates presented to the House, and I find that one of the necessities for imposing that tax is the very large amount required for the Department of Public Works and for the Department of Railways. I make this assertion, which the Estimates confirm, namely, that some $18,000,000, which was voted last year for these two purposes, was not required and was not expended; and that notwithstanding the war, notwithstanding the necessity which ought to influence every prudent man in dealing with expenditures, in these two departments alone the Government is asking Parliament to vote $1,000,000 more than was expended during the year 1914-15. That could be justified only upon the ground that they are public works of such an urgent character that there can be neither a postponement nor a reduction in regard to them. That would be an extraordinary condition so far as Government works are concerned, when we know that all the cities and towns in Canada have found it necessary to reduce public works, works on street improvements, work of installation or enlargement of water systems, work in connection with the improvement of the fire department and of the various civic services. Those who govern those cities all feel that in view of the depression, in view of the fact that every man, woman, boy, and girl in this country is doing what he or she can, and is giving his or her mite, little though it may be, towards the various charities which have been organized in connection with the war, some for the Red Cross, some for the Belgian fund, some for the patriotic fund, some for the hospitals, all doing their part, this is not the time to impose further burdens upon the tax-payers, and that these services ought to be carried over for another year at all events to see whether or not the war is over and whether times may not become better. Notwithstanding that this is the example which has been set by all the municipalities throughout this vast Dominion, we find this Government asking Parliament for an appropriation for these two services, public works and railways, of $1,000,000 more than it found it possible to expend during the year about to close. I prove that by taking the Estimates which have been laid before Parliament. The re-votes are given in every case so far as the railways and public works are concerned. In the columns giving the votes for 1914-15, the items include not only the main estimates but the supplementary estimates as well, that is, the whole expenses for the current year which will expire on March 31. If we go over these Estimates, item by item, we shall find that a very large number of them are re-votes for harbours and railways; and taking out the re-votes, we shall find that the Government are asking Parliament to vote $1,000,000 more than it

was able to expend during the current year. There are scores of Estimates in these items, some for public works, some for harbour works, in regard to which no contracts have been let and for which it is not intended by the minister to let the contracts during the coming year. They are put in here—I shall not say to pad the Estimates, but in order to keep these amounts before Parliament and the people of the country, so that when the appropriate time arrives, the minister may engage upon the work and ask for tenders and let the contracts.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Did you ever do that?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes. I have often done that, and every minister who has ever been in a government in Canada has done it, and there is no harm in it when conditions are normal. I always kept such items in, because, Parliament being committed to the work, even though it were postponed for two or three years, there was less difficulty in getting the amount voted when it was really necessary to carry on the work. That has been done over and over again. But if my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works will take us into his confidence and go through these large items, he will agree with me that it will be impossible for him to expend within $10,000,000 or $20,000,000 of the amount which the Government has put into the Estimates and for which it has asked the approval of Parliament. To meet that ostensible deficiency of $18,000,000 to $20,000,000, the Government is imposing this war tax upon the people of this country. That is absolutely unreasonable and unfair, and it is a course which will not commend itself to the good judgment of the people of Canada.

My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works says: Well, what will you do with regard to the public works at St. John? Would you be willing to permit a reduction in the amount to be expended there? I would not be worthy of my position as a member of this House if I did not answer "Yes" to that question. I would not be worthy of the confidence of the people of my constituency if I were so cowardly that I would not dare to stand up in my place and give an answer to that question in the affirmative. Therefore I say that in these times of stress and trouble the amount proposed for St. John harbour of $1,500,000 might very well be cut down during this year to $750,000. The work could go on, and a great deal of work could be done for that money.

With regard to Halifax there is an appropriation of $3,000,000. If that were reduced to $1,500,000, a magnificent amount of work could be done there. When we come to the Hudson Bay railway and the terminals at Port Nelson, while I have always been in favour of the construction of that railway, yet we ought to pause, and instead of proposing to expend, as the Government is doing, $5,000,000 during this year on that railway and terminals, the Government ought, in fairness to the people of Canada cut that amount down to the sum of not more than $1,000,000.

There is $4,000,000 which they propose raising by putting a tax upon all people so far as they can reach them and which they propose to spend on this railway away to the north, going through a country where there are no people, going to a harbour where there are no people, and intended to develop a trade which under the conditions now existing is not likely to come for a number of years; and proposing to do it at a time when two of the great transcontinental railways which have been built for the purpose of carrying the traffic between the East and the West, between the interior and the seaboard are almost—and I am speaking now only of what is well known—are almost on the eve of bankruptcy. They propose to construct that railway and those terminals immediately, though there is no traffic in sight for the railway and no work for the terminals. Would it not be the part of wisdom to suspend work on the terminals and go ahead at reasonable speed with the building of the railway; and would it not be reasonable, instead of taking the material by steamer to Port Nelson, to construct the line first, and so bring in material for the harbour works by rail, and in the meantime operating the line by giving a reasonable service sufficient to carry the traffic that can be developed? Instead of that, in order to build this road and these terminals, you propose to tax every one who mails a letter. The poor woman who mails a letter, it may be to her son fighting in the trenches, is asked to contribute this extra alleged war stamp. And why? To build the Hudson Bay railway and create the terminals there. I contend that no work should be carried on during the present year unless it is of an urgent character, one the failure to prosecute which would cause the interests of the country inevitably to suffer.

Then, take the Quebec harbour. We are asked for $1,200,000 for a dry-dock there.

Well, they have a very fair dry-dock at Quebec. I recognize the importance of building a dry-dock there, but is it necessary to spend the whole $1,200,000? If $600,000 were expended there during the coming year it would do a great deal of work and would give employment to a large number of people. Then there is $450,000 for the French river waterway improvement for which last year $500,000 was voted and only $50,000 of which was expended. That being so, could not you reasonably postpone the expenditure of at least a part of this $450,000 until the war is over and the condition of the people improved?

Mr. BRADBURY: The time to spend money is when times are hard, so as to provide work for the people.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is right, if you have the money in the treasury. But is this the time to tax the people of this country, when, as I have said every dollar, every cent they can spare is being given to charity? The same remarks would apply to other harbours—Toronto, where you propose to spend $1,000,000; Vancouver, $1,000,000; Victoria, $1,400,000. Take these items on page 57 of the Estimates, to some of which I have referred, and you will find that where the minister last year asked for $12,780,000, he did not expend within $3,159,200 of it. Yet the amount is being carried forward as a re-vote and forms part of what is to be voted this year.

Mr. J. D. REID: The total vote is $9,000,000 less.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The total vote for railways, canals and public works, including the harbours and public buildings, is $1,000,000 more than the amount expended last year.

Mr. REID: I was referring to the amounts on page 57.

Mr. PUGSLEY: On those items the minister asks the same amount as he expended last year.

Mr. REID: Last year the minister asked, for these items on page 57 which are chargeable to capital, $12,780,500, and this year he is asking for $9,459,200, or more than $3,000,000 less—

Mr. PUGSLEY: Less than what?

Mr. REID: Less than he asked for last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But what did he expend?

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Mr. REID: He spent $9,000,000. But that does not say that he will spend that amount this year.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is exactly the argument.

Mr. REID: And the amount asked for this year is $3,000,000 less than it was last year. So, the amount for both departments is many millions less than last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Exactly what I said; I thank the hon. minister for corroborating my statement. I said these departments spent last year $18,000,000 less than they asked for under the Main Estimates and Supplementary Estimates combined. Today the two ministers are asking for $1,000,000 more than they actually expended last year. My argument is that with prudence, with the exercise of a little judgment, they could get along with $18,000,000 or $20,000,000 less than they are asking for in the Estimates. Now, take Harbours and Rivers, chargeable to income. I cannot speak of other places, but I will speak of my own constituency. The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) knows that he has an amount—$100,000, I think—to extend the breakwater to Partridge Island. But he has announced publicly that he is not going to commence that work this year. Why, then, is it in the Estimates, except for the reason I suggested—that the minister thinks it proper to keep it there because it will be easier to get it voted when he wishes to go ahead. But why raise a war tax—

Mr. ROGERS: I do not remember having made the public statement that I do not intend to go on with the breakwater to Partridge Island.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Let me ask, then, if the hon. minister intends to go on with it?

Mr. ROGERS: We have called for tenders, and I am hopeful that we shall be able to go on, because that is one of the most important works in the Dominion I believe.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The statement has been made publicly that the new works will not be gone on with during the present year.

Mr. ROGERS: That is not a new work.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Entirely new. The present breakwater has been completed for thirty years.

Mr. ROGERS: It is part of the harbour.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, but still it is a new work. Then again the Department of Railways asks for $112,000 to build the spur line to Courtenay Bay.

Parliament granted that money at least three years ago, and not a blow has been struck, although we voted and revoted the money, and it is put in again this year. I venture to say that there is no intention of going ahead with that work this year. I am sorry that by reason of the bungling and humbugging and the mistakes that have been made in connection with the Valley railway and the carrying of the Transcontinental to the port of St. John, it is not very likely that anything will be done on that spur line during the present year. The Provincial Government and the Minister of Railways do not know how they are going to bring the Valley railway into the harbour of St. John. They have reached Gagetown, they commenced at Centreville in Carleton county—the road begins nowhere and ends nowhere. The only thing which they have is an agreement—which, fortunately, I was able to negotiate with my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals—that the Dominion Government should undertake operation as each 40 miles were completed. But our scheme was to build from the city of St. John to Grand Falls, there to connect with the Transcontinental railway so that the Valley line might be utilized as part of the Transcontinental system. I say the matter has been humbugged and trifled with, mistakes have been made, grades have been altered between Fredericton and the country to the north, and there does not seem to be any reasonable probability that the line can be used with success as a part of the Transcontinental system. While the Provincial Government and this Government do not say publicly that the road is not to go to St. John, I am told that the Minister of Railways is pretty sure that it is not going to St. John, and that he is going to carry it over to Westfield to connect with the Canadian Pacific railway. It may be that that is the reason why this spur line to Courtenay bay has not been built. At all events, if it is not to be built this year, I decidedly object to the people being taxed to build it—the tax being called a war tax—when it is not proposed to go ahead with it at all during the coming year. The same applies to hundreds of other items in these Estimates.

With regard to public buildings. In the item for Ontario there are 106 or more public buildings, and in respect of nearly every one there is a revote. The total vote for Ontario is $3,905,100. The amount voted last year in both main and supplementary Estimates was $4,771,200.56; yet there is a revote of the enormous sum of $2,282.100. In other words, practically 50 per cent of the amount which my hon. friend had placed in the Estimates for public buildings in Ontario last year has not been expended, and is being carried forward as a re-vote. Did my hon. friend seriously intend to go ahead with those public buildings at that time, or did he, upon the persistent request of his friends from Ontario, put them there in order to obviate the danger of any question arising as to whether public buildings were or were not to be erected? The blue book is always authoritative; it counts for so much more than the mere statement of the member. While $3,354,750 was voted last year for public buildings in Quebec, in respect of nearly every one of them a very large amount is carried over as a re-vote, showing that no contracts have been entered into, that no work has been done; and that in respect of many of these buildings there is no urgency except political urgency.

Mr. ROGERS: There is no political urgency at all. There may have been urgency in my hon. friend's day, but there is none in mine.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am sure that my hon. friend is not altogether unaware of the fact that constituencies are to a certain extent influenced by the consideration as to whether or not they are to get public buildings.

Mr. ROGERS: Not those represented on this side of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Of course, it may be that my hon. friend would prefer to exercise other influences than the mere production of the blue book to the electors. I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 10.07 p.m.

Friday, February 26, 1915.

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

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Gédéon Rochon, Esq., for the electoral district of Terrebonne, introduced by Hon. C. J. Doherty and Hon. Louis Coderre.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENTS.

SELECT COMMITTEE APPOINTED.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved:

That a Select Committee, composed of Messrs. Meighen, Fowler, McCraney, Gauthier, Sinclair, Guthrie, Fripp, Morphy and the mover, be appointed to consider and report upon amendments to the Criminal Code which have been or may be suggested at the present session of Parliament, with power to send for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses under oath, and to report from time to time.

Mr. SPEAKER: I might point out that it is not necessary to ask for power to examine witnesses, for Select Committees already have that power.

Mr. DOHERTY: Two Bills have been introduced, one by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) and the other by the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney), seeking to amend the Criminal Code. When these Bills came up for their second reading it was agreed that they should be referred to a Select Committee such as is now proposed, and which would consider these and any other amendments to the Criminal Code that might be suggested. The reason why we take this course is that the Government did not contemplate introducing this session any legislation looking to the amendment of the Criminal Code, it being thought that under the present circumstances legislation should be limited to such as was necessitated by the war, or in some way connected with the present state of war. Having reached this conclusion, I myself, and I think some of my colleagues, pointed out this intention to the persons suggesting amendments to the Criminal Code, who then naturally did not press for legislation. It seemed to us fair that if these suggestions were to be dealt with, an opportunity should be given to others having different suggestions to put forward. The purpose of this committee would be to consider the two Bills I have mentioned, and such other amendments as might be suggested—there was a suggested amendment by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) with regard to copyright—and to embody all the suggestions that are approved in one Bill, which could then be introduced and passed through this House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There can be no objection to the granting of this motion and the organization of this committee; but the hon. gentleman will be opening the door very widely if he goes outside the two or three Bills which have been introduced this session. Not that I have any objection myself; but there are merits in the Bills which have been introduced, and if the hon. gentleman goes beyond these I am afraid we shall not get a Bill through this session.

Mr. DOHERTY: I would expect the committee to take action only on such suggestions as might be shown to be really imperative, and I hope we shall be able to keep within that limit.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. DOHERTY: With the consent of the House I beg to move that Public Bills and Orders be taken up so that we may refer the two Bills I have mentioned to the Select Committee, and so avoid delay. I therefore beg to move:

That the order for the House to go into committee on Bill No. 19 (Mr. McCraney) be discharged, and that the said Bill be referred to the Select Committee appointed this day.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MURPHY: My hon. friend also mentioned the motion standing in the name of my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux). Is it intended to refer that to the committee as well?

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. member for Rouville did not give notice of a Bill, but he made a motion in the course of which he suggested an amendment to the Criminal Code. I shall see that the suggestion is put before the committee. I beg also to move:

That the order for the House to go into committee on Bill No. 40 (Mr. Sinclair) be discharged, and that the said Bill be referred to the Select Committee appointed this day.

Motion agreed to.

FINANCE ACT, 1914.

PROCLAMATION CONTINUED.

Hon. W. T. WHITE (Minister of Finance) moved:

That it is expedient, in pursuance of the provisions of section 4 of the Act assented to on the twenty-second day of August, 1914, intituled: "An Act to conserve the Commercial and Financial Interests of Canada," to continue in force the proclamation in the form following published on the fifth day of September, 1914, in the Canada Gazette:

Arthur.

Canada.

George the Fifth, by the Grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, King, Defender of the Faith, Emperor of India.

To all to whom these presents shall come, or whom the same may in any wise concern, —Greeting:

A Proclamation.

E. L. Newcombe,
Deputy Minister of Justice, Canada.

Whereas in and by section 4 of an Act of the Parliament of Canada passed in the fifth year of Our Reign and intituled: "An Act to conserve the Commercial and Financial Interests of Canada," it was provided amongst other things that in case of war, invasion, riot or insurrection, real or apprehended, and in case of any real or apprehended financial crisis, our Governor in Council might by proclamation published in the Canada Gazette:

(a) authorize the making of advances to the chartered banks and to the savings banks to which the Quebec Savings Banks Act, 1913, applies, by the issue of Dominion notes upon the pledge of securities, deposited with our said minister, of such kind and amount as may be approved by the Treasury Board; such advances to be repayable at such tmes as the Board may determine with interest at a rate likewise determined by the Board of not less than five per cent per annum;

(b) authorize the chartered banks to make payments in the bank notes issued by such banks instead of in gold or Dominion notes, but the total amount of the notes of any chartered bank in circulation nootes, but the total amount of the amount of its notes issuable under the provisions of the Bank Act and of the next clause (c);

(c) authorize the several chartered banks to issue excess circulation, from and including the first day of March in any year, to and including the last day of August next ensuing, or during any part of such period, to amounts not exceeding fifteen per cent of the combined unimpaired capital and rest or reserve fund of the respective banks, as stated in their respective statutory monthly returns to our said minister for the month immediately preceding that in which the additional amount is issued;

(d) suspend the redemption in gold of Dominion notes,—

Now know ye that by and with the advice of our Privy Council for Canada we do by these presents proclaim and direct that by and on the date of the publication of this our proclamation in the Canada Gazette, the said orders in council shall be revoked; and we do further by these presents declare and proclaim as follows, that:

(a) the making of advances to the chartered banks, and to the savings banks to which the Quebec Savings Banks Act, 1913, applies, by the issue of Dominion notes upon the pledge of securities as provided in the said Act, be authorized;

(b) the chartered banks be authorized, subject to the provisions and limitations set forth in the said Act to make payments in the bank notes issued by such banks instead of in gold or Dominion notes;

(c) the several chartered banks be authorized to issue excess circulation as in the said Act defined from and including the first day of March, 1915, to and including the last day of August, 1915; and

(d) the redemption in gold of Dominion notes by the Receiver General of Canada be suspended subject to the provisions of the said Act from the date of the publication of this our proclamation in the Canada Gazette.

Of all which our loving subjects and all others whom these presents may concern, are hereby required to take notice and to govern themselves accordingly.

In testimony whereof, we have caused these Our Letters to be made Patent, and the Great Seal of Canada to be hereunto affixed. Witness, Our Most Dear and Entirely Beloved Uncle and Most Faithful Counsellor Field Marshal His Royal Highness Prince Arthur William Patrick Albert, Duke of Connaught and of Strathearn, Earl of Sussex (in the Peerage of the United Kingdom), Prince of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Duke of Saxony, Prince of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha; Knight of Our Most Noble Order of the Garter; Knight of Our Most Ancient and Most Noble Order of the Thistle; Knight of Our Most Illustrious Order of Saint Patrick; one of Our Most Honourable Privy Council; Great Master of Our Most Honourable Order of the Bath; Knight Grand Commander of Our Most Exalted Order of the Star of India; Knight Grand Cross of Our Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George; Knight Grand Commander of Our Most Eminent Order of the Indian Empire; Knight Grand Cross of Our Royal Victorian Order; Our Personal Aide-de-Camp; Governor General and Commander-in-Chief of Our Dominion of Canada.

At Our Government House, in Our City of Ottawa, this third day of September, in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and fourteen, and in the fifth year of Our Reign.

By command,

P. Pelletier,
Acting Under-Secretary of State.

He said: Mr. Speaker, under the Finance Act, 1914, which was passed at the August session, authority was given to the Governor in Council, in case of war or any financial crisis, by proclamation published in the Canada Gazette, to authorize the making of advances in Dominion notes to banks upon securities approved by the Treasury Board; to authorize the chartered banks to make payments in bank notes instead of in Dominion notes or gold; to authorize the chartered banks to issue excess circulation during that period of the year in which previously to the passing of this legislation they had not had that power and to suspend the redemption in gold of Dominion notes. The object of the Act was to give additional volume and flexibility to the currency and to conserve the gold supply of the Dominion. I draw the attention of the House to subsection 5

of section 4 of this Act, which reads as follows:

> No proclamation issued under the provisions of this section shall continue in force for more than thirty days after the beginning of the first session of Parlament held after the issue thereof, unless it is approved by resolution passed by both Houses of Parliament.

In September last the Government, in pursuance of the authority conferred upon it by the Act, issued a proclamation authorizing the doing of the several things which I have just mentioned, and it becomes necessary now, if this proclamation is to continue in effect, as the Government thinks it should, that a resolution should be passed by the House of Commons and by the Senate continuing it in force. While no such financial conditions exist as prevailed at the time this legislation was passed in August last, it is deemed prudent by the Government and by the financial and business community that the proclamation should be continued. It is quite impossible to forecast what effect the vicissitudes of the war may have upon international finance or monetary conditions in the great credit centres of the world, such as London and New York. Parliament having met on February 4, it is desirable that this legislation should be passed without further delay. The Budget debate is proceeding next week and, we should hope, without interruption. I would therefore ask the House to facilitate the adoption of this resolution. I have already brought down, in answer to a question, information as to the amount of advances which have been made to the chartered banks in Dominion notes under he authority of this legislation. To refresh the memory of the House, I may say that the total amount issued to January 31, 1915, was $14,400,000, and the total amount outstanding of indebtedness by the banks to the Dominion Government was $7,900,000, which indicates that there has been repaid to the Government $6,500,000.

I might say to the House that the amount of the advances made to the banks is by no means the measure of the advantage which has been conferred by this legislation. It has enabled the banks, among other things, to meet treasury bills of governments, municipalities and corporations maturing in London, it has enabled them to make advances to governments, municipalities, corporations and other customers, and it has assisted them, better than they otherwise would have been in a position to do, to finance the crop movement of last fall. The banks were required to make payments on behalf of their clients of treasury bills maturing due, to make advances to provinces, municipalities and other customers, and they did so the more readily by reason of the fact that they knew—and in many cases they had arranged in advance for it—that if it should become necessary, they could obtain advances of Dominion notes from the Government upon the pledge of the securities which they had taken, and which would be approved by the treasury board. The principle of the Bill was fully discussed and unanimously concurred in last August. I do not think, therefore, that it is necessary that I should discuss the substance of the legislation at this time. It may be a satisfaction to the House, which, as I have stated, unanimously approved the legislation, to know that it was instantaneously efficacious for the purpose of meeting the object we had in view when it was enacted, namely, to add to the volume of our currency and enable the financial institutions of the country, in the public interest, better to withstand the strain, stress and exigency of the trying conditions which prevailed as a result of the sudden outbreak of war. If at any subsequent stage of the session the House should desire to discuss more fully either the principle of the Act or our action under it, it is unnecessary for me to say that we shall be glad to afford an opportunity for such discussion, but in the meantime, unless this resolution is adopted, the proclamation will lapse, and I, therefore, hope that the House will facilitate its adoption.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The principle involved in this resolution was approved by Parliament at its August session. In order to make that legislation effective, the Minister of Finance states that after this House has been in session for thirty days, it is necessary to authorize, by resolution, a similar proclamation by order in council, and I do not think there is any objection to Parliament granting this power to the Government. It is quite possible that this power might be of great value to the country in certain circumstances. While it is quite true the financial condition of the banks of Canada to-day is such that they can, I think, reasonably meet all demands upon them, still, as the minister has suggested, the situation might change very quickly. I would also point out that there is not any very great danger of the abuse of this privilege by prospective borrowers, which in this

case must be chartered banks, owing to the fact that they must pay 5 per cent interest upon any loans, and if their own position is strong they are not likely to make application for loans from the Government. I think, however, we should have from the Minister of Finance a statement showing the financial result of these operations to the Treasury Department, whether it has been financially profitable or whether it has covered its cost. I presume that in all loans we have received the statutory interest rate of 5 per cent, and that the transaction has netted some little profit to the treasury. The Minister of Finance objects to giving detailed information as to the amounts advanced to the respective banks, and I will not press for that to-day, knowing that on a future occasion we shall have opportunity to make further inquiry and to discuss the matter fully, if we so desire.

Mr. W. T. WHITE: I place upon the table the form of application under the Finance Act, which is signed by the banks, and the pledge agreement executed by the banks in connection with advances made. Loans were made to some seven banks, to the total amount of $14,400,000, and of that $6,500,000 has been repaid. I am quite satisfied that any amount outstanding would be repaid tomorrow morning if we desired it. It is unnecessary to say to the House that in addition to the pledge of particular securities approved by the Treasury Board, under the Bank Act, the Dominion Government has a lien next after the note circulation, upon all assets of banks for any claims it may have against them, so that no question as to security could possibly arise. I have already explained why I consider it undesirable that I should bring down information showing what individual banks had availed themselves of the privilege of the Act. With the object of inducing the banks more readily to make applications for loans, in order to put them in a better position to meet the requirements of their customers throughout the country, I stated in a letter to them that their applications would be regarded as confidential. It did not occur to me then that the information would be asked for in Parliament, because in the fall of 1907, when advances were made in Dominion notes to banks, through the Bank of Montreal, no particulars were obtained, so far as I am aware, even by the department; the Bank of Montreal making the loans as the agent of the Government. I do not know that the matter is of very great importance, but certainly I would be the last to deny any information to Parliament that it might desire to have. Having promised the banks that I would not make public their applications, I feel reluctant to do so, and I trust this will be satisfactory to the House. I should be pleased to give to my right hon. friend, as leader of the Opposition, details as to the loans to the banks, but I hesitate for the reason I have given, to make the information public.

Mr. MACDONALD: Were these advances to the banks made out of the Dominion notes which the Minister of Finance had the power to issue under the special right Parliament gave him last August?

Mr. WHITE: Yes, all these advances were made in Dominion notes, under the authority of the Finance Act, 1914, passed at the August session.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I understood the Minister of Finance to say that he was introducing a measure to ratify the overdrawing of these notes, and when that measure is introduced we shall have full opportunity to discuss the whole question.

Mr. WHITE: It is my intention to introduce a Bill validating and confirming the action of the Governor in Council, in making issues of Dominion notes to the amount of $26,000,000, outside of and in addition to the $15,000,000 additional Dominion note circulation which was authorized by the Dominion Notes Act passed at the August session of Parliament. The Bill will be introduced within a few days and of course it will be subject to discussion.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What was the amount?

Mr. WHITE: The Dominion issued, in November last, ten million dollars for its own general purposes. There were advances in Dominion notes to the Canadian Northern Railway Company, during September, October, November, and December aggregating $10,000,000 upon the security of $12,500,000 of the debentures of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, guaranteed as to principal and interest by the Dominion of Canada, that is to say, we made advances at the rate of 80. We made an advance of $6,000,000 to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company over the same period of time and for the same purposes, namely to enable it to continue construction and effectuate the intention of Parliament in giving a guarantee of its securities. This sum of $6,000,000 was

advanced upon the security of $7,500,000 of Grand Trunk Pacific debentures guaranteed as to principal and interest by the Dominion Government; that is, at the rate of 80. It is my intention to introduce a Bill, as I have said, to confirm the action of the Governor in Council in issuing these Dominion notes.

Mr. MACDONALD: The minister says that $26,000,000 more of Dominion notes were issued than he was authorized last August to issue?

Mr. WHITE: Dominion notes were issued to the amount of $26,000,000 in excess of the amount which the Government would have been authorized to issue under the Dominion Notes Act of last session and under the Finance Act. But—though I do not propose to argue the matter now or to depend upon the Act—I am quite satisfied that the Governor in Council had under the War Measures Act, if we desired to rest upon it, the necessary authority for this action.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is not so sure as the hon. gentleman seems to think.

Mr. WHITE: I am expressing my own opinion; no doubt the right hon. gentleman has his. But I am satisfied I should have the sanction of very high legal authority, authority which my right hon. friend would respect, for such an argument.

Mr. MACDONALD: Z. A. Lash?

Mr. WHITE: No, not Mr. Lash. By reason of the fact that we introduced at the August session the Dominion Notes Act and the Finance Act dealing specially with this matter of note issue, I think it only proper that the Government should introduce legislation confirmatory of its action.

Mr. SPEAKER: It seems to me the discussion is rather irregular, as it does not refer to this resolution, but to another matter entirely. It would be better to deal with the resolution before the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker. But referring to one observation of my hon. friend, I never knew a case so desperate but that you could find legal authority of high character to support it. I am not expressing an unwarranted opinion when I say to my hon. friend that he has beside him and behind him, I doubt not, very respectable opinion that will justify what he has done. Bowing to your ruling, we will not take up the question. Confining myself to the resolution before the House, we have certainly no objection to the renewal of the provisions which would enable my hon. friend to continue in force the proclamation he has issued. For my part I am gratified to know that the power given to the Government to make advances to the banks was so limited in its application as events have shown. It is almost evident that there might have been no necessity for such legislation. The amount of $14,000,000 which was advanced to the banks under the Act is so insignificant as to show that the financial position of the banks was so strong that they did not want the legislation. In that case, the Act was granted from an abundance of caution, and it is renewed for the same reason, I suppose. I have only one point to take issue with my hon. friend upon, and that is his reluctance or diffidence, in giving information as to the banks that applied to him for advances. He tells us that only a little more than $7,000,000 is due now to the Government. That is so small an amount as not to be worth making an issue of in this House. I respect the precaution taken by my hon. friend, though I think it was not needed. I think he would do well to take the power to bring down to Parliament in future the information which, under the circumstances, we will not press for.

Resolution agreed to.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. In yesterday's issue of the Evening Telegram of Toronto there is a report of the Budget debate of the previous day as follows:

> J. G. Turriff came next with a speech wherewith he probably intends to spread his riding of Assiniboia—although the month is but February. He castigated the Government for extravagance and said that if the people had a chance to mark their ballots few would vote for the high expenditures now in vogue.
>
> "Let us go to the country and find out," was Mr. Bradbury's bold retort to that.
>
> "You can't go too quickly for us," returned Mr. Turriff, and the Liberals slapped their desks as lustily as the Tories had a moment before. The westerner loudly proclaimed that the Government dare not go to the country yet, though the members were busy sending out campaign literature.
>
> "So are you," interrupted Mr. Bradbury.
>
> "Well, I'm not saying anything about that," confessed the western liberal.

What I object to in that report is this: Mr. Bradbury may have made the remark attributed to him, but if so, I did not hear it; and certainly I never made any such

remark as, "Well, I am not saying anything about that." I had not any such thing in mind and could not possibly have said it, because as a matter of fact there has been no campaign or party literature sent out by the Liberal party since last August. But this reply attributed to me would give the impression that such literature had been sent out and that I knew about it but did not care to discuss it. Had Mr. Bradbury made the remark and had I heard it, I would have contradicted it there and then. The remark does not appear in Hansard, and I do not know whether the hon. gentleman made it or not. But I am taking this opportunity to state that I did not make the remark attributed to me and also that no campaign or party literature has been sent out by the Liberal party since last August.

17th BATTALION NOVA SCOTIAN HIGHLANDERS.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. KYTE: I desire to call the attention of the Government to the following press despatch that is going the rounds of the Canadian newspapers:

London, Feb. 12.—The 17th Battalion, Nova Scotian Highlanders is no more. This battalion, one of the best trained and disciplined of the Canadian overseas contingent, has been broken up, the men requisitioned and sent to make up deficiencies caused by sickness, death and desertion in the ranks of the Canadian Highland Brigade. Colonel Struan Robertson was relieved of his command on the 28th of January, and the only satisfaction which he has been able to obtain from the General Officer Commanding is "that the authorities were down on him."

The despatch contains many other matters affecting the standing of the Nova Scotia contingent at the front. I desire to ask the Government if they have information to verify or contradict this despatch.

Hon. W. T. WHITE: The despatch, so far as I know, has not been drawn to the attention of the Government, and we have no information with respect to the matter referred to.

SUPPLY.

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

Civil Government—Department of Labour—Salaries. $33,112.50.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Any resignations in the Department of Labour?

Hon. W. T. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour): Yes, we have had twenty-four resignations. But the newspapers did not mention these at all.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The newspapers cannot mention what they do not know. We have never heard of this until this moment.

Mr. CROTHERS: It was all in the return that was brought down, but the newspapers left out the resignations. Nearly all these resignations were of correspondents of the Labour Gazette. As hon. members know, we have about sixty-six correspondents in the principal localities in Canada.

Mr. NESBITT: They are not paid anything.

Mr. CROTHERS: They are paid from $125 to $300 a year. A resignation among them may be due to the fact that a person removes from one city to another.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: These are not members of the Civil Service?

Mr. CROTHERS: But they are included in the return of dismissals, resignations and appointments.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It has been stated in the debate that in one department alone seven hundred members of the Civil Service had resigned. I was for some years connected with the Government and I never knew there was such a virtue of resignation in human nature as I have found out since hon. gentlemen opposite came into office. But the people to whom the Minister of Labour refers were not members of the Civil Service, but temporary employees to gather information for the minister.

Mr. CROTHERS: Perhaps the right hon. gentleman has not noticed the exact wording of this order for a return: "How many employees of the Federal Government of Canada"—it is not confined to the Civil Service—"including all services and all departments." So it includes all employees.

Mr. MACDONALD: Has the Minister of Labour pursued the policy of the former Postmaster General, who has now gone to what we may call a higher sphere? When that gentleman wished to get rid of anybody in his department, he sent him a letter telling him he had better resign, and enclosing a form of resignation. Did the Minister of Labour follow that interesting and original method?

Mr. CROTHERS: In what we call the inside service, not a single man or woman

who was in the service of the department when I took charge of it has been dismissed. There was one whom I appointed, and with whom I took the course my hon. friend has spoken of—I intimated to him that unless he resigned we would dismiss him.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Dismissed by invitation?

Mr. CROTHERS: Yes, appointed by me by mistake.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What was the mistake? Was he a Grit?

Mr. CROTHERS: No, I would not have appointed him if he had been a Grit.

Mr. CARROLL: How many correspondents of the Labour Gazette have resigned since the minister took charge of the department?

Mr. CROTHERS: Twenty out of the twenty-four resignations were of correspondents.

Mr. CARROLL: And does the number of new employees appointed set forth in the return include appointments to replace these people?

Mr. CROTHERS: Yes. The return showed 60 appointed, 21 dismissed, and 24 resigned—a total of 45 dismissed and resigned, 15 less than the number appointed. Of these 15 we appointed three additional fair wage officers, one at Vancouver, one at Winnipeg and one in Ontario. I have been urged to appoint another, and am considering the advisability of doing so. There is not so much work now, however, for the fair wage officers, and it is likely that no additional appointment will be made until the public works are somewhat revived. I have accounted for three of the fifteen; four of them were female correspondents of the Labour Gazette. There was a demand for female correspondents, whose duty would be especially to look after the interests of women and children, and as an experiment I appointed four in the four larger cities of Canada. They have proved a great success, and as soon as conditions are normal I intend to appoint female correspondents in other places as well. When we came into power there were five vacancies among the correspondents of the Labour Gazette. This accounts for twelve out of the fifteen, and we have appointed three additional officers in the statistical branch, which has expanded a great deal during the last three years. That accounts for the additional fifteen officers, the total of 60 being made up of 21 dismissals, 24 resignations and 15 new appointments.

[Mr. Crothers.]

Mr. CARROLL: At what dates did the 20 correspondents resign, and were their resignations voluntary?

Mr. CROTHERS: I could not give my hon. friend the dates, which would be spread over a period of three years, but I can get the information for him.

Mr. CARROLL: In a return brought down March 4, 1914, this question was asked:

> How many employees of the Federal Government of Canada, including all services and all departments, have been dismissed from October 10, 1911, to the present date?

That would cover a period of three years and some months. The next question was:

> How many have resigned, including employees of the Federal Government of Canada in all services and in all departments?

The answer was:

> One resigned and one transferred to another department.

Mr. CROTHERS: I think that is a mistake on my hon. friend's part. I have before me the answers to the questions so far as the Labour Department is concerned. The answer to the first question is 21, and to the second, 24.

Mr. CARROLL: The question which I have read applies to all departments.

Mr. CROTHERS: I am not responsible for that; I never saw the return except so far as it was connected with the Labour Department. I have given the answers which were made to the questions so far as they apply to the Labour Department; if in the hon. gentleman's return the answer is given as one, there must be an error somewhere.

Mr. CARROLL: How many officers are there in the Department of Labour at the present time, including correspondents and outside employees?

Mr. CROTHERS: I think the exact number including correspondents, is 109.

Mr. MARCIL: Were any correspondents of the Labour Gazette dismissed for political reasons, or is the paper a non-political publication?

Mr. CROTHERS: When I was placed in charge of the department I asked an officer to report on the efficiency of the labour correspondents throughout Canada. The officer, who was a Liberal, reported that in

many cases the work was not efficient or satisfactory, and we dispensed with the services of those to whom this applied. Three were relieved of their duties because of political partisanship.

Mr. MARCIL: With respect to the large number of unemployed in Montreal and in other Canadian cities, has the minister information as to whether matters are improving, remaining stationary or getting worse, or whether there is any probability of an improvement within the next few months? So far as Montreal is concerned, the matter is getting to be very serious.

Mr. CROTHERS: Part of the duties of the Labour Gazette correspondents is to report monthly as to the conditions of employment in their various localities. Before the war broke out in July last I circularized these correspondents and requested them to answer certain questions with regard to unemployment, prices, wages, etc., and since that time they have been sending in weekly reports. In addition to that, the fair wage officers, of whom we have five, have covered their respective territories three times and have sent in three special reports checking up the reports made by the correspondents of the Labour Gazette. As the number of unemployed varies from day to day and from week to week, we have not been able to take anything like a census, but we have had an estimate made, based on information received from relief officers, heads of labour organizations and others specially interested in these subjects in the various localities. A great deal has been done to relieve unemployment. The Immigration Department has 163 special officers engaged all over Canada, who strive to have men placed upon the farms. They have also 30 regular agents whose offices 4 p.m. since the war broke out have virtually been turned into labour exchange bureaux; these officers have located a great many men on the farms. Private labour exchanges have also located a great many. Then the war has given employment to many. About 100,000 have enlisted with our troops and many thousands are engaged at the present time in making bodies for shells for the British Government. There are about a hundred factories engaged in that work in Canada at the present time. Since the 1st August last many thousands have been employed in manufacturing supplies for the Militia Department. Our reports, which are right up to date, show that conditions are not nearly so bad as they were a few months ago. Now let us see what the provinces are doing. The Government of British Columbia early undertook to look after the unemployed in that province by providing road work and making loans to municipalities to enable them to carry on public works. The Government of Alberta is also advancing large sums of money to several municipalities to enable them to find work for the unemployed and to provide relief work. For instance, it is giving some seven thousand dollars a month to Calgary, and about the same amount to Edmonton, fifteen hundred dollars a month to Medicine Hat and Lethbridge, and a small amount to Taber, a small place south of Lethbridge. In Manitoba there is very little unemployment. The Immigration Department has distributed amongst the farmers of Manitoba some four or five thousand men from the city of Winnipeg. As regards the East, there is very little complaint from the maritime provinces. Montreal and Toronto have more grounds for complaint as regards unemployment than any other cities in the Dominion. There have been a large number out of work in Montreal and Toronto, and I believe a considerable number still are out of work in those two cities. But outside of these two places there is not much to complain about at the present time. The Agricultural Department has relieved the situation in Toronto by sending many men out to the farms. Altogether things are getting better. Several thousand men have also been interned by the Justice Department. Shortly after the war began I wrote to all the provincial premiers making suggestions on these lines, and I got satisfactory replies from all except from the Premier of Quebec. The others said they would look after their own unemployed. The only reply I got to my letter to the Premier of the province of Quebec was an assurance that he would place my communication before his colleagues; that was all. I think the province of Quebec is the only one where nothing has been done by the Provincial Government towards relieving the unemployed.

Mr. MARCIL: It is mostly mechanics or labourers who make up the unemployed in the city of Montreal?

Mr. CROTHERS: Mostly unskilled labourers. I have a detailed statement here from one of my fair wage officers, and it shows that a good many engaged in the building trades in Montreal are out of

work. I understand that the Montreal Builders' Exchange proposed last fall to continue building operations as far as possible, provided the mechanics would accept a certain rate of wages. The mechanics, however, would not agree and the members of the Builders' Exchange said they could not afford to go on erecting buildings at any other rate, and so work was stopped.

Mr. MARCIL: Can the minister tell us whether the Dominion proposes to do anything in the near future towards relieving the unemployed in Montreal and Toronto?

Mr. CROTHERS: Last week I sent to Montreal Mr. DuBreuil, who has charge of that sort of work in the province of Quebec, to make a thorough investigation in a good many directions. He is to give me a detailed report, but I have not got it yet. I will be pleased to show it to my hon. friend when it comes.

Mr. MARCIL: I know the minister is cognizant of the condition of affairs in Montreal, for he reads our papers. Only last week the Archbishop called on the Board of Control to ask that money should be distributed amongst the needy. The oldest residents say that things have never been so bad, and I am glad to know that the minister is following the situation, and will do all he can to relieve the very serious conditions existing in Montreal at the present time.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The minister has not told us how he proposes to relieve conditions in Montreal and Toronto. Investigations are all right, but conditions have been bad for a long time now, and while the investigation is being carried on people are going about hungry. I saw in a Toronto paper the other day that a large procession of labour men paraded the streets of that city with this device on their flags: 'British subjects we were born, and British subjects we will soon be dead.' The minister no doubt has been thinking over the matter, and I think the House is entitled to hear what solution he proposes for this serious state of affairs.

Mr. CROTHERS: My hon. friend knows as well as I do that unemployment can be relieved to a greater or less extent in many ways. The Dominion Government for instance, can go on with public works if it has plenty of money, and in that way give work to the unemployed. The provincial Governments and municipalities, if they have money, can also do the same thing. My hon. friend, perhaps could set half a dozen men to work. I wonder if he has done it. If he has not, perhaps he has not fully done his duty. In a time of depression such as this, the Federal Government, Provincial Governments, municipalities and individuals should all join together and help the unemployed. Each one should do his part; that is the only remedy I know of.

Mr. SINCLAIR: That is a very indefinite remedy.

Mr. CARROLL: When the minister came back from his famous trip to England last year to learn how labour matters were conducted there, he made the statement, which appeared in the Ottawa Journal I believe, that he was going to revolutionize the existing labour legislation of Canada, and take steps to have introduced throughout this country a chain of labour bureaux. He stated that legislation for that purpose would be introduced at this session of Parliament. The minister has had the matter brought to his attention at various times, and by various labour organizations in this country. During the minister's unavoidable absence on account of sickness last year, this matter was taken up with the then acting Minister of Labour, the present Minister of Justice; and I understand that the Government gave some undertaking to at least introduce legislation at the present session of Parliament with a view to the formation of a central labour bureau with branch offices throughout Canada. This session, I understand, is going to be short, and yet nothing has been done so far as we know by the Minister of Labour with the view of introducing these labour bureaux into Canada. Any one who is more or less conversant with the labour situation knows that labour bureaux in Europe have been a wonderful success. They have actually surpassed the expectations of the labour people of the countries where they have been introduced. The Minister of Labour is not overburdened in his department, yet, after having given this interview to the Journal last year and intimating that this matter would be taken up in a forcible way at this session of Parliament, he has until this time shown no inclination to bring down a Bill for the establishment of labour bureaux. He has agreed with the representatives of labour organizations throughout the country that labour bureaux are excellent things and that they have worked out admirably in other countries where they have been established. He did say at the time that perhaps the Government would not under-

take to pay the travelling expenses that would be incurred in connection with the labour bureaux but that they would undertake to establish them. I have had letters from various labour organizations throughout the country asking me to bring this matter to the attention of Parliament and of the Government, and particularly to the attention of the minister, and I wish to ask him the reasons why he has not fulfilled the promise he made last year that he would introduce legislation at this session to establish labour bureaux, whether it is his intention to bring this legislation down and if not, why?

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not think I ever made any statement to the effect that it was my definite intention to establish labour bureaux in Canada. I have often said that I had considered it, and I have considered it. My hon. friend (Mr. Carroll) refers to a trip to England. I did go to England. I am not the first minister who has gone to England. I went to England especially to look into this question of labour bureaux and I put in four weeks at this sort of work. When the labour bureaux were first introduced in England about five years ago, and for some time afterwards, they were not looked upon with favour either by the employer or the employee. After they had been in operation for two or three years they seemed to be more in favour with both classes. At the present time I am told that they are very much in disfavour especially by the working people of England. It is very often contended that these bureaux should be established now especially by reason of the depression that exists. Every economist who has written on this subject has pointed out that labour bureaux should never be established in times of depression, that the proper time to establish them, if you expect them to work out successfully, is when conditions are prosperous. They are sure to turn out a failure if you attempt to establish them in times of depression. Another mistake is that a great many people think that the object of labour bureaux is to create employment. They never were intended for anything of the kind and they are not used for that purpose in England, Germany or anywhere else. They have had labour bureaux in Germany for many years and still they have hundreds of thousands of unemployed people to feed every winter. It is a mistake to suppose that labour bureaux create employment; they do not. They are not for the purpose of relief or for the purpose of giving work. The only thing they claim for them is that they will assist in distributing labour. One can understand that in a time such as this where there is a surplus of labour everywhere they would not be of very much use. Suppose there is a surplus of carpenters in every town and city in Canada, a surplus of a hundred or more, and you have a surplus of 200 or 500 in the city of Montreal; what would the labour bureau do towards relieving their positions? Send them to Vancouver where they already have a surplus of carpenters? That would not be of any use in a time of depression. The principal party who is interested in the establishing of these labour bureaux is one who has been harassing not only this Government but previous Governments during the last five or six years and that person seems to be more especially interested than anybody else. That person has gone so far as to prepare a Bill, send it all around the country and say that it is a Bill that I prepared and proposed to introduce this session. I have never prepared a Bill and I have never authorized anybody else to do so. What are the facts in regard to the labour organizations? The Trades and Labour Congress, at their meeting at St. John, New Brunswick, last September, passed a resolution substantially opposed to the establishing of exchanges in Canada. At a meeting of the Trades and Labour Council in Winnipeg last week they were unanimously opposed to the suggestion, and they arrived at that conclusion after quite a long discussion. I have received from some local Trades and Labour Councils a resolution passed at the request of this party who is so much interested, a person who wants to be appointed to inaugurate this system at a big salary—

Mr. CARROLL: Who is the gentleman?

Mr. CROTHERS: It does not happen to be a gentleman; it is a lady. I have received from some local Trades and Labour Councils copies of a resolution passed in favour of the establishment of labour bureaux on the assumption that they would do something to provide labour for people who are out of work. That is not the object of them at all; they never pretend to do anything of the kind. The Trades and Labour Congress, composed of representatives from all over Canada, at their annual meeting at St. John, N.B., passed a resolution in substance opposed to it; and a very strong resolution in opposition to such a system

was passed at a meeting in Winnipeg one night last week. Many of their leading men present at that meeting opposed it, and they gave particulars why they did not want it. A great many individual men, mechanics and others, are opposed to it, because, for instance if there is a scarcity of carpenters in Ottawa, they say that tends to increase their wages, and they do not want us to send in a number of men from Toronto to compete with them and reduce their wages. That is one of the lines they take in opposition to these bureaux. It is a matter that requires a great deal of consideration. In addition to what I have said, it would be a very expensive thing to undertake. Gentlemen who have had anything to do with Governments—this or any other Government—know that you cannot rent a building in a place like Montreal, Winnipeg or Vancouver, put a staff of people in that building, and do likewise in every town and city of Canada, without an immense expenditure. We have made a calculation upon that, and that is a matter that has to be considered in the present circumstances. The general feeling, I believe, amongst the workingmen is unfavourable to the establishment of national labour exchanges in Canada.

Mr. CARROLL: I have asked the Minister of Labour some questions which he has not deigned to answer. There is no person in this country who will for one moment contend that the establishment of a national labour bureau, with local offices throughout the country would create employment, whether it is established in times of depression or of prosperity. The minister says that there being so much depression at present in the country, it is not the time for the inauguration of a labour bureau, but I hold a contrary opinion. A year ago to-day there was as much if not more unemployment in Canada as there is now, and then the Minister of Labour was loud in his praise of the idea of establishing labour bureaux throughout Canada. The fact, as stated by the minister, that two organizations in this country have passed resolutions against the inauguration of such a bureau, is not complete evidence that the great bulk of the labouring people in this country are against the establishment of such a bureau, nor does it gainsay the fact that labour bureaux have been a great success wherever they have been established, and that they would be a success were they established in Canada. I asked the minister whether last year on his return from England he promised delegations, which waited on him, that he would introduce at this session of Parliament legislation to create labour bureaux in Canada, and whether or not it is his intention to introduce that Bill in accordance with the promise so given.

Mr. CROTHERS: My hon. friend has been before the public long enough to know that he should not place entire reliance upon everything he sees in the public press. I do not think I ever made a definite statement that I would introduce a Bill of that kind this session, and even if I did conditions have changed during the past year. The Poor Law Commission was appointed by the Imperial Government in 1905, and in their report they say, with regard to these labour exchanges:

> They were nearly all started in times of depression, exactly the wrong time to start a labour exchange. The time to start it is when trade is going up, because then the people whom you casualize have the best chance of finding other places for themselves.

I may add that the conditions in Canada are very different from the conditions in England. In England, if a carpenter in Liverpool goes to a labour exchange and asks if there is any employment for a carpenter, the United Kingdom being a small place territorially as compared with Canada, they are able to telephone around and in a few minutes they discover that carpenters are wanted in Manchester. The man says, I can not get to Manchester because I have no money, and the Government in that case supplies him with a warrant upon the railway to get to Manchester, and the employer is notified to deduct the amount from the first wages the man earns, and to send it back. I was told a year ago, when I was in England, that they had received in return 96 per cent of the money so advanced, which speaks very highly for the high sense of honour which actuates the mechanics and labouring people of old England. In Canada we could not, for instance, undertake to supply a dozen men, idle in Halifax, for work in Vancouver. I do not think from that point of view it would be practicable for the Government of Canada to undertake to do for people seeking employment here what is done for them in England. When I was in England I was satisfied that the system was working fairly well, but I am told that within the last year the working people have become very much dissatisfied with it. Something, however, has been done in this country already towards establishing these labour exchanges. The legislatures of Ontario and Quebec have established provincial

exchanges, and I think those in Quebec are working more satisfactorily than those in Ontario. Manitoba is also adopting the system; there are many municipalities throughout the country that have established labour bureaux, and of course there are many private exchanges. The experience is that men prefer to deal with these private exchanges rather than with exchanges established by the provinces or by the municipalities. The necessity for labour exchanges in large centres like Montreal resulted from the large number of immigrants that were coming into the country—there are very few coming at the present time—and it is complained that some of these private agencies swindled these men. I sent an officer to Montreal to investigate, and he found out that one firm had swindled immigrants out of ten thousand dollars in a few years.

Mr. MARCIL: They exacted as high as fifteen dollars from a labourer.

Mr. CROTHERS: That was our information.

Mr. NESBITT: I thought you were prosecuting them.

Mr. CROTHERS: We had no power to prosecute them that being the duty of the province. But the Interior Department, under section 66 of the Immigration Act, did pass rules and regulations for the governance of any one who had any dealings with immigrants, limiting the sum that they could charge any individual to one dollar, requiring them to take out a license from the department, and providing heavy penalties for infringement. A great number of prosecutions have been had under these rules and regulations for the protection of immigrants, but of course they only apply to immigrants. In some cases, however, it has not worked out very well, because the immigrant desiring work will go in and tell one of these agents, when he gets to know the ropes, that he has been in the country over three years, and therefore he is not an immigrant any longer, and they proceed to fleece him, outside of the rules and regulations which we have made. It is for the province to look after these things; we have no jurisdiction. The provinces are trying to do something in the direction of getting good results out of labour bureaux and so also are many of the municipalities. There are also a number of private agencies.

Mr. MARCIL: The Minister of Labour unintentionally said that the province of Quebec had done nothing for the unemployed in Montreal, but now he says that an important bureau of labour, established in that city by the provincial Government, has done good work.

Mr. CROTHERS: It was established some years ago.

Mr. CARROLL: The Minister of Labour has not yet answered my question as to whether or not this Government intends to bring down legislation at this session of Parliament for the organization, creation and maintenance, to some extent at least, of a national labour bureau for Canada. I base my arguments on the fact that the Minister of Labour, in an interview which he gave to the Ottawa Evening Journal, under date of May 20, 1914, said that he was going to introduce legislation at this session of Parliament. The article reads as follows:

Drastic Legislation to be Introduced dealing with Employment Matter.

Drastic Legislation to deal with the employment question will be introduced by the Government next session of Parliament. Action will be taken by the Canadian Government along the lines by which the Imperial Government has solved the difficulty in Great Britain. It was for the purpose of studying the methods pursued in England that Hon. T. W. Crothers, Minister of Labour, visited the old country last year. Since his return he has been in consultation with representative men in the various portions of Canada, and he is convinced, he said in conversation to-day, that he has evolved a scheme adapted to the needs of this country, and which will be a great boon to employers and workmen alike.

Incidentally, Mr. Crothers stated that there would be no labour legislation this year. He has just recovered from a serious illness, and the session is now so near a close that it is impossible to get time for adequate consideration of the legislation he has in view.

In Great Britain the Government has established a number of labour bureaux, with a central office in London. All expenses are borne by the Government, and Mr. Crothers found that they were most excellently managed and had been a godsend. These bureaux supply workers for employers and work for those out of employment. There is a perfect system of information kept regarding the needs in the various parts of the country, and the unemployed are, therefore, not subjected to the more or less misrepresentation of employment agents.

Travelling expenses are advanced to those who have to travel a distance to obtain work, and the experience is that 96 per cent of these have kept faith in refunding the expenses.

Mr. Crothers states that the distances in Canada render it impossible for the Government to advance travelling expenses, but he believes that he has arrived at a solution of the difficulty by getting employers to advance the money.

The Minister of Labour has found that to allow persons out of work, especially immigrants, to get into the hands of employment

agents, has not been in the best interests of workmen. He found, after going carefully into the matter, that one employment agent in Montreal had made $10,000 in three months out of immigrants alone, charging them as high as $15 and $16 to get them a job. He has stopped this extortion by compelling agents to take out a Government license, and there is now a regular system of inspection.

Mr. Crothers intends to go still further, and will establish Government bureaux at a number of centres of population. Accurate information regarding labour conditions in the various parts of the country will be available at each office, and to these offices those who desire employment will go. Employers also will be able to secure information as to the ability and record of those whom the bureau will recommend to them.

I agree with the Minister of Labour in everything that the Evening Journal reports him as saying. I agree with him also that it would be a great hardship for any Government to pay the travelling expenses of persons going long distances in Canada to secure work. He has told us also, however, that he has solved this problem in this way, namely, that he will get the employers to advance the travelling expenses of workmen, and they will deduct those expenses from the workmen's wages. That is all very excellent; but the trouble is that the Minister of Labour apparently is not doing anything to bring into effect this fine scheme which he evolved, and has no notion of bringing it into effect. I should not like to say that he is getting cold feet, because that is not a nice thing to say; but he has backed down from the position which he took last year when he was fresh from a country where labour bureaux had been an eminent success. I have here a long list of organizations throughout the country which have endorsed this idea of the establishment of a national labour bureau, and I will read some of the names to show that the people and the organizations of Canada everywhere have endorsed it.

Mr. CROTHERS: Has my hon. friend got his information from the individual to whom I referred, who was seeking an interview?

Mr. CARROLL: The hon. minister has not deigned to tell me who the person is.

Mr. CROTHERS: We both understand who it is.

Mr. CARROLL: This petition is signed by N. J. Garland, Ottawa Board of Trade; C. G. Pepper, Canadian Federation of Labour, of Ottawa; J. S. Adamson, Ottawa Builders' Exchange; Auguste Lemieux, C. W. Bullock, and E. St. John Wileman.

Mr. CROTHERS: The last is the most important of the lot.

Mr. CARROLL: Perhaps the hon. gentleman can gather from those names the one he has in view.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Are they all ladies?

Mr. CROTHERS: Did you get it from the last-named one?

Mr. CARROLL: No, I did not. I have not been so fortunate as to have had the acquaintance of the lady. The minister has told us that at the Labour Congress at St. John and at a local meeting at Winnipeg, the establishment of a national labour bureau was not endorsed.

Mr. CROTHERS: That Labour Congress was for the whole of Canada.

Mr. CARROLL: I understand that. There are some of the people and institutions throughout Canada who have endorsed and still endorse the establishment of such a bureau: Provincial Premiers; Alberta Legislature in Committee; Ontario Cabinet; Associated Boards of Trade for Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba; Affiliated Boards of Trade for British Columbia; Union of Alberta Municipalities; Union of Saskatchewan Municipalities; Canadian Lumbermen's Association; Mountain Lumbermerchants' Association; Social Service Congress; Retail Clerks' Association; Canadian Federation of Labour; Dominion Trades and Labour Congress President; Guelph Civic Authorities; Guelph Trades and Labour Council; Montreal Builders' Exchange; President Montreal Civic Improvement League; Associated Boards of Trade for Ontario—2 endorsements; Ontario Provincial Builders' Exchange; Prince Rupert Board of Trade; Victoria Builders' Exchange; Vancouver Builders' Exchange; Revelstoke Trades and Labour Council and other labour bodies; Medicine Hat Builders' Exchange; Lethbridge Civic Authorities; Saskatoon Civic Authorities; Minnedosa Civic Authorities; Brandon Board of Trade; Winnipeg Builders' Exchange; Haileybury Board of Trade; Hamilton Trades and Labour Council; Moncton Board of Trade; Halifax Constructive Mechanical Trades Exchange; Calgary Board of Trade; Calgary Builders' Exchange; Toronto Board of Trade; Toronto Builders' Exchange; Ottawa Civic Authorities; Ottawa Board of Trade; Ottawa Builders' Exchange; The Sons of England; Orangemen; St. Jean Baptiste Society; St. George's Society; Y.M.C.A.; Devonian Society; Old Countrymen's Club; Overseas Club; The presidents of McGill

and Toronto Universities. Although the hon. minister's name is not on this list, he endorsed this idea on the 20th of May, 1914.

Mr. CROTHERS: I never did.

Mr. CARROLL: Will the minister say that he did not give this interview which is credited to him in the Evening Journal of Wednesday, May 20, 1914?

Mr. CROTHERS: I am very glad to find that my hon. friend occasionally reads such a reliable paper as the Ottawa Evening Journal. I hope he reads it every day.

Mr. CARROLL: Always.

Mr. CROTHERS: If he does, his information will be better than it sometimes is. I am not responsible, however, for what appears in the Evening Journal, and it is not at all likely that I have ever made such a definite promise. Ministers do not do such things, as those who have had some experience know very well. We say that we will consider the matter, and if we arrive at a conclusion that in our opinion is in the best interest of the country, we do something. We do not say we will introduce a Bill next year. I do not remember the occasion at all, but I do not think I made any definite promise that this would be done. Even if I did so, conditions have changed since then. We are at present in a period of exceedingly severe depression and money is scarce. The Government has determined to introduce during this session no measures that can be avoided, that have no relation to the war. There may be some exception. Such a measure would arouse a great deal of controversy; the Government would have delegates of both shades of politics coming from various parts of Canada, and it is not considered desirable that such legislation should be introduced at this session. It would also be very expensive to inaugurate such a system. My hon. friend referred to a delegation. The particular individual to whom I have already referred was here during the Liberal régime and interviewed the then Minister of Labour on innumerable occasions. The same person has brought before me five delegations in regard to the matter, and she wants another interview next week. She wants special legislation to be brought down.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: The minister might as well be in the trenches.

Mr. CROTHERS: Yes. I received from several boards of trade and other organizations—I do not remember any of those to which my hon. friend has referred—letters formally endorsing the whole scheme. In several cases I wrote back asking where they had got the idea that I intended to introduce legislation, and they referred me to this one source. I believe every one of those signatures which my hon. friend has read has been secured in that way. We all understand that if a lady, especially if she is young and charming, comes and asks us, we would sign a petition of that kind at once. I believe that the majority of those signatures are attributable to the charming influence she exerts, and I have no doubt that she has exerted it on my hon. friend.

Mr. CARROLL: I have not been so fortunate.

Mr. CROTHERS: I have no doubt that the material which he has read to-day has been supplied by that individual.

Mr. NESBITT: You miss your guess.

Mr. CARROLL: I dare say that if I had had the pleasure of the acquaintance of this estimable young lady whom the minister knows so well, and who calls on him so often, I would have made a much better presentation of the case which I am trying to lay before the committee than I have done. I am not, however, as fortunate as the Minister of Labour in knowing the young lady. I am sorry to learn that the minister is not going to introduce this legislation this year. He says that he has no recollection of having given this interview to the Evening Journal, and he also says that the Evening Journal is a very reliable paper. As it is a very reliable paper and as this article contains almost every word regarding this bureau that the Minister of Labour has uttered here to-day, I would infer, since the minister says that he does not remember, that he must certainly have given this interview to the Evening Journal. Be that as it may, there is not much use in my discussing the question much further in view of the fact that it is not the intention of the Minister of Labour to introduce legislation at the present session for the establishment of a national labour bureau in Canada. This information will be received with deep regret by the people of this country. I hope the time will come when we shall have in this country a Minister of Labour who will take this question up with a more lively interest than has been shown by my hon. friend

who now holds the position. I do not care whether he be a Conservative or a Liberal; I hope he will fill the need that we have had in this country for a long time.

Mr. CROTHERS: Some of the representatives of the Trades and Labour Congress which met at St. John in September last were from my hon. friend's own town, and they voted in favour of the resolution to which I have referred.

Mr. CARROLL: I am willing to wager the hon. minister that there is not a member of the Dominion Trades and Labour Congress in the city of Sydney or in the town of Glace Bay who would not vote for the establishment of a national labour bureau in Canada.

Mr. CROTHERS: The resolution was carried unanimously, and representatives from my hon. friend's town were there and I understood voted for the resolution, although I do not undertake to say definitely that such is the case.

Mr. NESBITT: I just want to suggest to the minister that either his department or the Immigration Department could do some good if they had a means of placing with the farmers men who have worked on farms. The spring is coming on and a great many men could be placed in the riding from which I come, and, I believe, in the riding from which the minister comes. There are a great many mechanics who are accustomed to farm labour.

Mr. CROTHERS: Have you not in your town an agent appointed by the Immigration Department? There is one at St. Thomas.

Mr. NESBITT: There may be one, but I have not heard of him.

Mr. CROTHERS: My hon. friend had better look him up and ask him for farm help.

Mr. NESBITT: Personally I have never had any difficulty in getting help. I have a number of applications for help at the present time, but there are a number of men in my section of the country who I know are willing to hire men now.

Mr. CROTHERS: I am told by my deputy that these agents last year distributed amongst the farmers 20,000 men. That is the report from the Immigration office.

Mr. MACDONALD: In the debate on the Address I asked whether or not the fair-wage clause had been put into force in connection with the contracts let in Canada for the supply of various articles for war purposes, and I pointed out that, as there is an English fair-wage clause similar to the one we have in Canada, it was the duty of the Department of Labour, in letting these contracts, to see that this provision was carried out. I understand that representations were made to the department from my section, where some of the shells are being made. Has a fair-wage officer gone to New Glasgow or that vicinity, or has anything been done in the way of looking into and adjusting this matter in regard to not merely to wages, but to the working hours of the men employed in some of these industries?

Mr. CROTHERS: The same company is running a plant at Amherst, is it not?

Mr. MACDONALD: No, a different company. You might tell us also about the company at Amherst.

Mr. CROTHERS: There are about a hundred factories in Canada making bodies for shells for the British Government. Our fair-wage clause does not apply to any of these contracts.

I think the right hon. Prime Minister, in answering a question put by my hon. friend a few days ago, told him that these contracts are being let by a board appointed by the Minister of Militia, the chairman of which is Colonel Bertram, of Montreal. We received complaints from three different places to the effect that fair wages were not being paid and that the men were obliged to work long hours. We replied at once saying that we had not the power to enforce any fair-wage clause, but that we would take the matter up with the chairman of that board, Colonel Bertram. That gentleman has taken a great interest in this matter, and has a very strong sympathy for the working people, mechanics in particular. He went to Toronto to go into the factories the men working in which were strongest in their complaints; he also went into those in the Montreal district. He said that he entirely sympathized with the complaints made by these men; that the manufacturers of these bodies were receiving fair profit and there was no reason why they should not pay the men fair wages. He said he would see to it that fair-wage clauses were put in future contracts, and that no contract would be awarded unless this grievance was at once remedied. The superintendent of one of the Toronto companies came here; I saw him, and he understood before he left that he would have to deal fairly with the men;

otherwise he would make no more shells. I understand that he has proceeded to put things in proper shape so far as the men are concerned. I find Colonel Bertram exceedingly anxious to do everything he can to adjust matters in this respect. The complaint that came from the firm to which my hon. friend refers was handed over to Colonel Bertram. He is a very busy man, but I have no doubt he will see to it that the men in my hon. friend's constituency will get a fair deal.

Mr. MACDONALD: I agree with what the hon. minister says respecting Colonel Bertram; I know him personally and regard him as a very high-class man. While the situation may be remedied temporarily in some quarters, I think the minister ought in some way to assert control over his fair-wage officers in regard to these matters. I do not think that the minister, simply because Colonel Bertram says he will look into the matter, should refrain from any further attempt to have his fair-wage officers take action.

Mr. CROTHERS: I neglected to tell my hon. friend that I sent officers to London, Toronto and Hamilton. They went into the factories, and I have full reports from them. I should be glad, however, if my hon. friend would suggest anything that I can do, apart from Col. Bertram, to remedy these grievances.

Mr. MACDONALD: In England they have a fair-wage provision for Government contracts, just as we have in Canada. These contracts for supplies are important contracts, let through a committee appointed by the Government of Canada, so that although the money is not paid directly by the Government of Canada, it is paid through a body created for the purpose of carrying out the wishes of the Imperial Government. While it is well that Col. Bertram should undertake to look into these matters, I think the minister ought to send his fair-wage officers into localities from which complaints may come, in order to ascertain the nature of the grievances existing with respect to wages and labour. I am referring particularly to a communication which I understand was sent to the Minister of Labour from New Glasgow on behalf of a large number of men who are employed there, asking that a fair-wage officer be sent to that district. The minister has intimated that he sent men to London and elsewhere, and if he has not already sent one to Nova Scotia, I would ask him to do so in order that the necessary inquiries may be made.

5 p.m.

Mr. CROTHERS: I may say further that we had communication on this subject with the British War Office, through Sir George Perley, and the British War Office said in substance that they did not want the men in Canada to work under anything but fair conditions. My deputy informs me that a copy of the correspondence touching that matter was sent to Col. Bertram. It is not always practicable to send a fair-wage officer unless definite complaints are received.

Mr. MACDONALD: I understood that my hon. friend had received a letter from the labour people of that district.

Mr. CROTHERS: Yes, and the letter was referred to Colonel Bertram. In many cases we sent men to districts thousands of miles distant to investigate complaints of a general character, with the result that no real grievance was found to exist. Consequently we insist upon receiving definite particulars with regard to wages, hours of labour, etc. I think we have done everything we can do in the matter. Colonel Bertram and his colleagues act, in a sense, under our authority through the Minister of Militia. I am satisfied with what he is doing, and I am glad my hon. friend knows him and corroborates what I have said in regard to his activities. I believe that he is very much in earnest about this matter, and that he will remedy conditions so far as it is possible to do so, even going to the extent of withholding further contracts if necessary.

Mr. MACDONALD: Who is the fair-wage officer supervising these matters in the maritime provinces.

Mr. CROTHERS: Mr. Dubreuil. My deputy informs me that the communication received from New Glasgow referred to some condition that might be brought about, not to anything at present existing.

Mr. GERMAN: Has the minister's attention been called to a letter sent to his department in November last from the International Brotherhood of Steam Shovel and Dredge Men at Thorold, in the county of Welland? I have a copy of a letter, which is addressed to the Department of Labour, Ottawa, from this body, pointing out the minimum and maximum scale of wages paid to that class of men. The suggestion is made that something be done in the direction of fixing a definite scale of wages for these men, not only on regular days but on holidays and for overtime as well. Has anything been done?

Mr. CROTHERS: As my hon. friend is aware, five different contractors are working on the Welland canal. I think that during the last eight or ten months, one of our fair wage officers has been there practically half the time. I do not remember having seen the complaint my hon. friend refers to.

Mr. GERMAN: This is not really in the nature of a complaint; it is suggesting what should be done by the department.

Mr. CROTHERS: Do you think that letter indicates that there is no schedule of wages?

Mr. GERMAN: I understand that there is not a schedule, and they want one fixed.

Mr. CROTHERS: The matter has not been brought to my attention before, but I will look into it. I understand that there is a fixed schedule for all classes of labour employed on the canal.

Mr. GERMAN: If my hon. friend has not seen this letter, I will hand it to him so that he can look over it.

Mr. CROTHERS: All right. We insist on the contractors adhering strictly to the schedules, and we have succeeded in getting large sums of money for men who have worked on the canal in different capacities. But it is a herculean task to keep track of it. I shall be very glad to look into this matter.

Mr. W. A. BUCHANAN (Medicine Hat): The minister has referred to what the Government of Alberta is doing in the way of assisting the unemployed in some of the cities of that province. We can understand the cause of a good deal of the unemployment that exists; but there is a peculiar class of unemployment in a certain section of my constituency. I have taken this matter up with the minister by correspondence and in interviews, and I wish to deal with it on the floor of the House merely to bring about if possible an effort on the part of the Government to look into this particular condition. The coal mines on the prairies of Alberta have been practically without work all this winter. I should, however, except the Galt mine in the city of Lethbridge. The Galt mine is the oldest domestic coal mine in Southern Alberta. It has an established market as far east as the city of Winnipeg, and on that account has been able to keep up a good business. But the other mines adjacent to Lethbridge have been working less than half time. East of there is the mining camp of Taber a very extensive camp. I would say that there are eight to ten coal mines, large and small. I have satisfied myself that the mines of Taber from the beginning of 1914 up to the present time have not furnished work to the miners in that camp to the extent of a day and a half a week. That information was given to me, and I have investigated it and found it to be corroborated by the statements of others. There must be some reason for this condition. We may have a period of depression in the country during which we may do without certain things; but there is one thing the people of western Canada cannot do without, and that is fuel. The winter in Southern Alberta this year commenced the latter part of November and has continued up to the present time, and it was not the open winter we usually have in that part of the country, but a real winter which made fuel absolutely necessary. No doubt economy has been practised; people may have used less coal than they did in other years. There has also been a development of the natural gas area and in a great many communities in Alberta natural gas has supplanted coal as a fuel. But I cannot believe that it is for these reasons that the time of the workingmen at Taber camp has been reduced on an average to a day and a half a week during the year. I have mentioned to the minister the establishment of a new and extensive camp at Drumheller, northwest of Calgary, and there is no question that it has been cutting into the business of the Southern Alberta mines in Central Saskatchewan and Central Alberta. But the condition at Taber is an economic matter to a large extent, and I think requires an investigation. Charges have been made that some of the transportation companies are not assisting the mines at Taber, that they are operating against them, that in bringing back their empties this year the railways have filled them with a good deal of coal from the East which has come into competition with Western Canada coal. I do not know whether that is correct. But I know that in the camp at Taber the miners have been practically without work for a year, that there has been a great deal of distress and poverty, that there is no hope of employment ahead or that the situation will brighten. I think this matter is worthy of the attention of the Department of Labour, and that an investigation should be made by some person who is acquainted with mining, and who will be impartial in his investigation. I have had in mind that it

might be possible for even the Railway Commission to look into this matter of alleged discrimination, and ascertain whether there is any truth in the charges. The prevailing opinion among the miners in that district is that the railways are discriminating against them.

I will anticipate a question that might be asked. It might be stated that the duty on coal should be increased; that American coal is supplanting our Alberta coal. I take no stock in that argument, because the duty has not been changed, except at the present session, and American coal has always had the same opportunity to come into western Canada as at present, and in past years this condition did not exist in the Taber and other western camps. Again there has been no labour trouble in the mining camps of Alberta during the past year. Things have been running smoothly between the union and the operators, due largely to the fact that there was not very much work for the men to do and it was not to their advantage to have any difficulty with the operators.

Mr. CROTHERS: They have been quiet for three years.

Mr. BUCHANAN: The situation, nevertheless, is very severe, and I am bringing it to the attention of the House with the hope that an effort will be made by the Government to bring about a solution of the situation particularly at Taber. My opinion is that there is something economically wrong; for they had a market before, but now for two winters conditions have been extremely bad, and there is no improvement in site. I think it is worth while for the country to investigate this charge of discrimination on the part of the railways, and if discrimination is found to exist to remove it if possible. I know that officials of the Labour Department have looked into conditions at Taber camp. I believe that if the minister paid a visit to Taber and saw the conditions there he would appreciate the need of some immediate action.

Mr. CROTHERS: I regret very much that there has been so little work at Taber for so many months. Early in the fall I sent a fair wage officer from Vancouver to inquire into conditions there and later I wrote to my hon. friend (Mr. Buchanan) about it. He was kind enough to answer my letter and to give me all the information he had at his disposal. I have talked the matter over with him since the beginning of the session. Neither he nor I so far have been able to devise any means for relieving the situation there. He mentioned that perhaps the principal cause of the difficulty at Taber was the opening of another mine at Drumheller where they can get coal and supply the wants of many people in the province with a shorter haul than if they were to take it from Taber. I do not know that any one is to blame for that. I suppose that if a man buying coal finds he can get it at Drumheller cheaper than he can at Taber he will get it at Drumheller and that will lessen the work for the miners at Taber. I am told that the coal produced at Taber is not of as good quality as that produced in some other parts of the province and that is given as a reason why coal is imported and brought from other places. I understand that the Canadian Pacific railway is interested in the mines at Lethbridge, which my hon. friend has referred to, and that the miners are very busy there. The miners at Taber wrote me asking me to make a personal visit to Taber and my hon. friend desired me to do that too. Taber is in his constituency and if he will give me the assurance from his experience of the people there that if I go everything will be all right, I will make an extra effort to go.

Mr. MACDONALD: Do you think you can do that?

Mr. CROTHERS: My hon. friend (Mr. Buchanan) succeeds with the people at Taber and suggests that I should go. I do not claim to know anything about mining, but I will speak to the Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners and also to my colleagues and see if it would be possible to have the matter investigated by the Board. I cannot understand what good I could do these people by going out there personally, although they insist on my going.

Mr. BUCHANAN: They would like to see you.

Mr. CROTHERS: If that would please them and settle the difficulty I would be delighted to go, but I do not see wherein I could do very much more for them personally. It may be that an investigation will be held.

Mr. BUCHANAN: This is what is called domestic coal. With regard to the steam coal mines in the Crowsnest pass, there might be some reason for the slackness of work on account of the fact that the railways are not operating as they formerly were and some other industries are closed down and

therefore are not using as much coal. Domestic coal ought to be in general use from year to year.

Mr. WRIGHT: I know that in certain sections of the West they much prefer Galt coal, and that they do not buy Taber coal if they can get the other. They are willing to pay as much as fifty cents extra for the Galt coal in preference to the Taber coal. I presume it is fairly good coal, but the Galt coal is preferred.

Mr. MACDONALD: With regard to the question of coal in the west, coming as I do from a coal section in the East, the information I have about the situation there —and the figures verify it—is that during the last two or three years there has been a tremendous displacement of coal in the western field, more in British Columbia than in Alberta, by reason of the fact that the use of fuel oil on locomotives on the different railways there has greatly increased. This would have its resultant effect upon domestic coal. I fancy the characteristics of the two kinds of coal are not defined in such a marked way that parties who produce coal, which they sold to the railways, would not, when they were driven from the railway supply; naturally seek a market in a great many places where the people who had been purchasing domestic coal, such as Taber coal, which people would be looked upon as affording a natural market for this domestic coal. There have been complaints coming from those who have gone from the East to the West as to the conditions which exist in a business way there, which conditions, of course, affect labour and these conditions are no doubt largely due to the tremendous importation of fuel oil displacing coal in the business of the country. I mention this as being one of the causes which the minister will have to consider in regard to the request made by my hon. friend from Medicine Hat (Mr. Buchanan), because I have no doubt that he has had the same problem submitted to him from the coal people on the other side of the mountain.

Mr. CARROLL: How many labour disputes have been settled through the intervention of the minister's department during the past year?

Mr. CROTHERS: At the time of the outbreak of the war I publicly requested all employers and employees to avoid as far as possible any labour disturbances pointing out that we required our united strength to fight the enemy and that it would be unwise to dissipate that in any way by disputes between employers and employees. There were two or three disputes at that time approaching the appointment of a board of conciliation, but I was very much pleased to find that employers and employees got together and settled their trouble as I had suggested. We have not had a board of conciliation since although I think there are three at Edmonton in process of formation now. They are not large questions and I am in hopes that they will be able to settle them so that they may not require a board at all. Apart from that there have been about eighteen boards of conciliation during the past year. We have not had any serious trouble with any matter that has been dealt with under the Industrial Disputes Act.

Mr. CARROLL: Were the 17 or 18 boards that were appointed successful in bringing disputes to a satisfactory termination?

Mr. CROTHERS: I think they succeeded. I think both parties, with one or two slight exceptions, accepted the awards made by the board.

Mr. CARROLL: The Act appears to be working pretty well for both parties concerned. Is it the intention of the minister to bring in any amendment, or has he been asked by any parties or organizations, to prepare a Bill in amendment of the existing Act?

Mr. CROTHERS: Yes, I have been asked, and I have prepared a Bill, but it would be unwise to bring it up at this time. Some suggestions I have to make would not meet the wishes of all classes of working people, and as there would be a controversy no doubt I have determined not to bring that legislation in this year. Speaking generally, I want to testify to the fairly satisfactory working of the Industrial Disputes Act, so far as my experience goes. As no doubt my hon. friend (Mr. Carroll) knows, his native province is entitled to the credit for the main features of the Industrial Disputes Act. Credit is sometimes given to other places, but it was the legislature of Nova Scotia that, in the year 1890, adopted the chief features of that legislation. I think the Industrial Disputes Act operates fairly well. I desire to make some improvements to it and then I believe it will be as satisfactory as any similar legislation in any part of the world.

Mr. CARROLL: Has the commission on the high cost of living made a report?

Mr. CROTHERS: They promised me a couple of weeks ago that their report would be ready before the end of the month. I think it is about ready now, and I think my hon. friend and other hon. gentlemen will find it a very able report and a very satisfactory one, especially the work in connection with it which was done in my department, and of which I am very proud.

Mr. MACDONALD: The question of technical education is, of course, a very large one, and in our province, in which we have a very large industrial population developing our various resources, there is a very satisfactory technical school, which has been started by the Provincial Government. The results so far produced by that school have been of such beneficial character that we all have become greatly interested in the subject and we look forward to the extension of technical schools with a good deal of hope. There are four or five constituencies in Nova Scotia which seem to have led the way, so far as the country east of Quebec is concerned, in industrial development. Nova Scotia was the scene of the inception of the iron and steel industries of the Dominion, the initiation and progress of which have been due entirely to latent Nova Scotian talent. The Nova Scotia Government has established a technical school under the direction of Professor Sexton.

Mr. CROTHERS: One of the best in Canada.

Mr. MACDONALD: One of the best in Canada, and the beneficial results obtained from that school have attracted the attention of our people. One does not need to elaborate upon the desirability of extending the operation of the technical schools system among the working people of Canada. The report of the Commission on Technical Education has been before the minister for some time, and I would like to have him make a frank statement as to what his views in regard to that question are, and what his idea is at to what can be done in the future.

Mr. CROTHERS: When the Commission on Technical Education was appointed, the question of jurisdiction as between the Dominion and the provinces was raised, and so that there might be no misunderstanding the Prime Ministers of the various provinces were told that the object of this commission would be only to collect information and report that information to the various provincial governments. They were asked whether they in any way objected to the appointment of such commission. The Prime Ministers of all the provinces replied, saying that they had no objection, but Prime Ministers of Quebec and Ontario drew special attention to the fact that under the British North America Act education was within the purview of the provinces. The report was completed in February last, and on the 12th of March it was sent to the Prime Minister of each province with the accompanying letter:

Ottawa, March 12, 1914.

My Dear Sir,—You will, perhaps, recall communications exchanged in December, 1909, between my predecessor as Minister of Labour and yourself, with reference to the advisability of the appointment by the Dominion Government of a Royal Commission "to inquire into the needs and present equipment of the Dominion as respects industrial training and technical education," etc., my predecessor going on to remark, "It is intended that the commission shall be solely for the purpose of gathering information, the information, when obtained, to be published in a suitable report to be at the disposal of the provinces and available for general distribution." Letters were similarly exchanged on this subject with the Prime Ministers of the other provinces of Canada. None of the replies received objected to the appointment of the commission, and several contained expressions of cordial approval of the proposed course of action.

The Dominion Government appointed a Royal Commission in June, 1910, and the commission in due course reported. I deemed it well, before bringing the report formally to your attention, to await receipt of the concluding section (Part IV), in view particularly of the fact that this part contains a report of the inquiry of the commission in Canada itself. Copies of this part having been received, the four volumes comprising the report are now sent you, and I should be pleased to receive, as soon as may be possible, an expression of your views as to the general nature of the report, and especially concerning the recommendations contained therein. Any suggestion you may be pleased to make will be submitted to my colleagues, and will receive, you may rest assured, careful consideration.

The earlier volumes of the report have been already forwarded to each member of your Government and to many of your leading officers.

Yours faithfully,
T. W. Crothers.

I received a reply from all of the prime ministers, acknowledging the receipt of this report, but there was no indication that the Provincial Governments would take the matter up seriously, nor did they make any suggestions as to whether they were in favour of the report of the commission or not. The communication from Premier Murray, of Nova Scotia, was an exception, in that as he takes a special interest in the subject, he did go more fully into the question than did the others. The question

of technical education, as hon. members who have considered the matter will know, is a difficult one to deal with. As I have said, there was an intimation from the late Sir James Whitney, and from Sir Lomer Gouin, as to what they thought about the Federal Government taking any action in such a matter, beyond, of course, advancing money, and they are all quite ready to receive any sum of money we might give. But it is not thought that the Federal treasury could pay out money unless the Federal Government had something to say as to how it should be appropriated. The matter has remained there since. Even if we had a conference with the provinces, and had come to a conclusion as to what should be done, I do not think we could very well now undertake to spend the money, some $3,350,000 a year, which would be involved in carrying out that report. While I quite agree with my hon. friend the member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) that technical education in any line of work is of advantage to any one, and while I am willing to render any assistance in my power, yet at the present time the demands in other directions upon the treasury of this country are more immediately pressing, and we must see to it that our strength is used in the direction of bringing this great struggle to a victorious conclusion.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend has not indicated what his aspirations are in regard to this matter, but has confined himself to the simple statement that on account of the financial condition of the country he is unable to propose anything at all.

Mr. CROTHERS: My hon. friend will remember that I did not confine myself to that one point.

Mr. MACDONALD: Beyond showing a pious sympathy, my hon. friend intimated that, as there was no money at hand to spend, he would not say what should be done. My hon. friend ought to take the initiative. I have no doubt the Premier of Nova Scotia has suggested to him that he should follow the line adopted by the hon. Minister of Agriculture in connection with the special vote made for the purpose of assisting agriculture in this country. When I say that I do not know what the Hon. Mr. Murray has said, I am only supposing that he may have suggested this course to the Minister of Labour. Where in any province of the Dominion there is a well-established technical school, it would be desirable to supplement and extend its operations by assistance from the federal treasury along the same lines as assistance was granted to agriculture. The minister should not wait for the provincial ministers to tell him what he should do on this question. That is where I find fault with him. We admit that the financial condition of the country to-day is such that the Minister of Finance has to be very cautious when his brother ministers come to him with proposals involving inroads upon the treasury. We all know that he is bound to exercise the strictest economy in every quarter in order to maintain the financial status of Canada. He would be liable to criticism if he failed to take that position. I am sure that we on this side of the House will support him in that wise and cautious policy, if he follows it, endeavouring to keep things on an even keel. But assuming that he does so and that our business is to continue this war until it is brought to a successful conclusion, that ought not to prevent the Minister of Labour from having upon this question some policy, some views, which he may desire to carry into effect when the smoke of battle has cleared away and the Empire is sailing upon a level sea and Canada is following her usual course. My hon. friend the Minister of Labour apparently has no views on this question at all. Because the premiers of the different provinces have not suggested to him what he should do, he does not do anything and does not even propose to think about the matter. I entreat my hon. friend to get into a different frame of mind upon this question. Not only do we want to see this country great agriculturally, but where we have the facilities and the natural resources we want to see it great industrially. We cannot see it great industrially, unless we lay the foundation for that condition by a system of technical education. One of the things that has made Germany such a wonderful nation as she is in the way of providing modern devices relating to war, has been her system of technical education, which she has pursued with the greatest care for the last 20 or 25 years. In this new country of ours, where we are but laying the foundations, we should, at the earliest possible date, not merely provincially but federally, deal with this problem, so that we may lay a permanent basis of conditions upon which Canada may build an industrial structure which will give her a foremost place among the new nations of

the world. I beseech my hon. friend to adopt some policy upon this question; for apparently he has not any policy. I would like to know what he would do if he had the money. If he will frame a policy I am sure the people of Canada will supply the necessary money when the skies are clear.

Mr. CARROLL: This matter of technical education is very important in the province of Nova Scotia. Has there been under the advisement of the Department of Labour or of the Government any scheme whereby the provinces might be assisted in the matter of technical education along the lines of the report of the commission appointed for that purpose?

Mr. CROTHERS: The matter has been under consideration along the lines suggested by the members of the commission as well as along some other lines. Some of the provinces do not agree at all with the suggestions made by the commissioners. The report comprises four large volumes, which were sent out only last March. It would take a man a long time to read them, and a longer time to consider them. It is the intention of the Government, when the skies are clear, as my hon. friend the member for Pictou says, if we can make saisfactory arrangements with the provinces, to render material assistance in respect to technical education.

Conciliation and Labour Act, including publication, printing, binding and distribution of the Labour Gazette, and allowance to correspondents and for clerical assistance in preparing tables on statistics, $35,000.

Mr. NESBITT: What is the situation in regard to the British Columbia labour question?

Mr. CROTHERS: A short time ago I asked my fair wage officer at Vancouver to go over to Vancouver Island and give me a detailed report as to conditions of mines there, and he did so, giving the number of white people and the number of Orientals working in each mine. What my hon. friend no doubt refers to particularly is the labour trouble which has existed on Vancouver Island for a long time. The strike was called off some months ago and a great many of the men have returned to work, and some of them have moved out, but everything is quiet there now.

Mr. CARROLL: A recent issue of the Labour Gazette reported that the United Mine Workers paid out a million and a half dollars of their funds in conducting that strike. Is that correct?

Mr. CROTHERS: I understand that that is about the amount they paid out.

Mr. CARROLL: An article in a recent issue of the Labour Gazette, dealing with coal mining and, I think, not contributed by the regular correspondent, contained a statement which would lead people to believe that Sydney is a coal mining city. There is not a coal mining town within ten miles of the city of Sydney. The town of Glace Bay is the centre of the coal mining operations, and Sydney is the centre of the steel industry. The matter was brought to my attention by a gentleman who thinks that the article is unfair to the city of Sydney; I merely call the minister's attention to it.

Mr. CROTHERS: The correspondent of the Labour Gazette in that district, Mr. John Moffat, is one of the best men we have in Canada.

Mr. CARROLL: This article was not contributed by the correspondent.

Mr. CROTHERS: It was not contributed by Mr. Moffatt, but I fancy the editor based his article on information obtained from him. However, I shall look into the matter and see that it is remedied.

Mr. MACDONALD: The correspondent in my county, Mr. Mackenzie, has gone to the war. Who is performing his duties during his absence?

Mr. CROTHERS: We have had several cases of that kind. During the absence of the correspondent we pay him his salary, and pay a man to take his place, on the understanding that when the regular correspondent returns, he will resume his position.

Mr. MACDONALD: Who is substituting in this case?

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not remember the name; I will let my hon. friend know.

Mr. MACDONALD: As my hon. friend is aware, the coal situation in Eastern Canada is in a very bad way. Has the hon. member had any representations from that section of the country with reference to slackness of work or other difficulties of a like nature?

Mr. CROTHERS: I think we have had no complaints of that kind from the eastern provinces.

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, $20,000.

Mr. CROTHERS: We reduced that vote by $5,000, as we did not expect as many

boards of conciliation this year as we had last year.

Mr. COPP: Has the minister received a resolution passed by the Moncton Trades and Labour Council with regard to the payment of wages bi-monthly instead of monthly?

Mr. CROTHERS: I think I did receive a communication of that kind.

Mr. COPP: Has the minister received a action in the matter?

Mr. CROTHERS: This matter would more properly come within the scope of the Department of Railways. It has been proposed that there should be an amendment to the Railways Act requiring all railway companies to pay wages twice instead of once a month. I myself suggested an amendment of that kind last year; when the Railway Act is revised I have no doubt that that matter will be discussed.

Mr. COPP: It seems to me that this is a matter which concerns more particularly the Trades and Labour Council of the city of Moncton than the different Railway unions. By these resolutions they have sought the good offices of the Minister of Labour; they believe that he is a friend of labour, I suppose, and hope that he will work out these matters in their interest. I should like to know from the minister whether he has taken any action in the matter, so that I may be in a position to advise those who have communicated with me in that regard.

Mr. CROTHERS: I acknowledged receipt of the communication and promised, I think, to give the matter my favourable consideration and to consult the Minister of Railways about it. I have spoken to the Minister of Railways; I do not know what will be done.

Mr. COPP: With regard to boards of arbitration and conciliation under the Industrial Disputes Act, I have received a long resolution, passed by System Federation No. 11 of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways, complaining that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway officials will not recognize the decision of the arbitration board in regard to difficulties between the railway and the employees. I will read the resolution; it is as follows:

Whereas the workers are from time to time urged and are expected to live up to the spirit of conciliation and arbitration and award of the board appointed under the Industrial Disputes Act;

[Mr. Crothers.]

And whereas we expect as workers that in accepting that spirit of the law, the employers should accept it in the same spirit, and when agreeing to the creation of such a board, they should accept such a decision;

And whereas the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, in view of certain considerations guaranteed by the Dominion Government, agreed to accept and be bound by an award of a board appointed to consider the condition of workers on that road;

And whereas up to the present time the management of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway have refused to put into operation the award of the said board, and such refusal being a serious violation of the spirit and intent of the Industrial Disputes Act:

And whereas many millions of the public money have been spent by the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, and as said company has frequently received valuable concessions from the Dominion Government, and therefore they should be compelled to respect the Industrial Disputes Act:

Therefore, be it resolved that this System Federation of the Canadian Government railways co-operate with the workers on other railroads in Canada and the Trades and Labour Congress in entering our protest against the Dominion Government granting any more assistance to the said railroad until such a time as they live up to the award of the late Board of Arbitration dealing with the conditions of the employees on said road.

Has the minister taken any action in this matter?

Mr. CROTHERS: I fancy this refers to the Board of Conciliation which dealt with a dispute between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and their machinists at Winnipeg. A board was appointed in connection with this matter before I took charge of the Department of Labour, and an award was made. The Industrial Disputes Act provides that there shall be a board of investigation before there is a strike or lockout, and once the board has sat, heard evidence and made an award, any party to the dispute is at liberty to strike or to lockout, as they may see fit; there is no law against it. In the case to which, no doubt, they have reference, the machinists went on strike before the board sat; that was prior to October, 1911. An award was afterwards made and the company refused to carry that award out. An arrangement was made about a year and a half afterwards between the men and the company whereby the men were to go back and receive certain wages. Most of them went back to work at Transcona, near Winnipeg. The men contended that the company had not, as agreed, asked for a board, so they themselves asked for one. That was in the fall of 1913. Another board was appointed and another award made in favour of the men, which the company refused to recognize, contending that

the men had agreed that when they returned to work they would not ask for a board unless a majority of the employees in certain crafts were dissatisfied. The question at once arose whether there was a majority dissatisfied or a majority satisfied. The company said the majority of the men were satisfied; the men said that the majority were dissatisfied. The award of the board, however, was in favour of the men, and the company steadfastly refused to carry it out. The men have since continued to work.

At six o'clock the House resumed, and then took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

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

Bill No. 9, respecting the Essex Terminal Railway Company—Mr. Wilcox—in committee.

On section 1—annual meeting:

Mr. NESBITT: Why has this section been changed?

Mr. LANCASTER: By the original charter of this company the annual meeting of the shareholders was to be held on the first Monday of September which is Labour Day, a holiday. This simply alters the date to the third Tuesday in September.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—extension of time for completion:

Mr. NESBITT: Have they started the road yet?

Mr. LANCASTER: It is partly under construction, I believe. The road runs from Walkerville through Sandwich East and Sandwich West to Windsor, through the town and townships of Sandwich and Anderdon. We are adding what are called the three standard sections for the safeguarding of water-powers and for the protection of municipalities. The first clause is to prevent water-powers being acquired by expropriation, and the other two are for the protection of municipalities as to poles on highways or building on highways without the consent of the municipality.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

Bill No. 13, respecting the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company—Mr. Bickerdike—in committee.

On section 1—extension of time for completion:

Mr. LANCASTER: This company has water-powers, and we have incorporated a section in this Bill to subject those water-powers to what is known as our standard policy in that regard. The other two sections prevent the construction of poles on highways and the building on highways without the consent of the municipality.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

Bill No. 21, respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company—Mr. Blain—in committee.

On section 2—extension of time for the construction of certain authorized lines:

Mr. MACDONALD: Are these the lines that were referred to in the legislation of last year which provided for security being taken or are they entirely other lines on which no work has been done?

Mr. LANCASTER: I understand that no work has been done on these lines yet. The amendments are to strike out the words "or near" in various places, so as to make it definite where the railways are to go.

Mr. MACDONALD: Nothing here would affect the legislation of last year?

Mr. LANCASTER: I should think not.

Bill reported read the third time, and passed.

Bill No. 24, respecting the Ottawa and New York Railway Company—Mr. Fripp—in committee.

On section 1—lease of railway authorized:

Mr. LANCASTER: The committee probably would like to know why we amended this Bill. The Railway Committee thought it was not well to pass that section without limiting the power to lease to a certain length of time and they therefore required the company to make the lease for not more than ten years at a time. They also thought it was not well to enact that they

could renew the lease from time to time; therefore, the Committee has amended the Bill so as to compel them to come forward every time they desire to renew the lease and ask for a special sanction as a safeguard to the public interest.

Mr. MACDONALD: The effect of the legislation is to divest a Canadian company of control over the railway and to put the railway under the control of an American company.

Mr. LANCASTER: To a certain extent. It is like the Michigan Central and Canada Southern.

Mr. MACDONALD: To what extent has the committee reserved control over the New York Central operating this railway in Canada under our statutes. Does the chairman think that our laws are fully operative as against a foreign corporation?

Mr. LANCASTER: Yes, under the Railway Act the operating company is under the control of the railway commission. The New York Central becomes the operating company. We were careful to see that they could only operate for ten years at a time without getting a new arrangement and we refused to give them the latter part of their section which provided that they could renew from time to time.

Mr. MACDONALD: Were the terms of the lease submitted to the committee?

Mr. LANCASTER: No, I have not seen the lease; I do not know whether the department have. The gentleman who appeared in support of the Bill before the committee, Mr. Scott of this city, said that the lease had not actually been executed yet and that they could not get it executed until they got this sanction.

Mr. MACDONALD: Did the wisdom of providing that the terms of the lease shall be subect to the approval of the Railway Commission occur to the chairman?

Mr. LANCASTER: Yes, we say that this is to be subject to the provisions of sections 361, 362 and 363 of the Railway Act, which are very wide and all-embracing in regard to the protection that the hon. gentleman has in mind. They must take it before the Railway Commission.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

The following Bills were also considered in committee, reported, read the third time, and passed, without discussion:

[Mr. Lancaster.]

Bill No. 4, respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company.—Mr. Michael Clark.

Bill No. 5, respecting the Athabasca and Grande Prairie Railway Company.—Mr. Green.

Bill No. 6, respecting the Brantford and Hamilton Electric Railway Company.—Mr. Barker.

Bill No. 7, respecting the British Columbia and White River Railway Company.—Mr. Clements.

Bill No. 23, respecting the James Bay and Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Girard.

Bill No. 25, respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Wm. Smith.

Bill No. 26, respecting the Southern Central Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Green.

Bill No. 22, respecting the Canadian Northern Railway, Ontario.—Mr. Guilbault.

Bill No. 10, respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Macdonald.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 48, to incorporate Austral Insurance Company.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill No. 49, respecting the Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—Sir James Aikins.

Bill No. 50, respecting the Canadian Western Railway Company.—Sir James Aikins.

Bill No. 51, respecting the Kettle Valley Railway Company, and to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company.—Mr. Green.

Bill No. 52, respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—Mr. G. V. White.

Bill No. 53, to incorporate the Marcil Trust Company.—Mr. Marcil.

Bill No. 54, respecting the Toronto Terminals Railway Company.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill No. 55, to incorporate Vancouver Terminal Railway Company.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill No. 58, respecting the Casualty Company of Canada.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill No. 59, respecting the Empire Life Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill No. 60, to incorporate Entwhistle and Alberta Southern Railway Company.—Mr. R. B. Bennett.

Bill No. 61, respecting the Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Railway Company.—Mr. Middlebro.

SUPPLY.

The House resumed in Committee of Supply, Mr. Sevigny in the Chair.

Labour—Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, $20,000.

Mr. M. MARTIN (Montreal, St. Mary's) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to take up much of the time of the Committee but it seems to me that in my capacity of mayor of Montreal, it is incumbent on me to criticise the Government and specially the honourable Minister of Labour for neglecting to provide in the estimates an item of a few million dollars towards assisting the unemployed in the great industrial centres.

Of course, we were called upon to vote $150,000,000 to be spent in Great Britain for war purposes; but no provision whatever was made towards helping the workingman in the manufacturing centres of the Dominion. We have reached such a stage of misery that unless the Government realize what is going on and try to remedy matters, large numbers of our fellow-people are bound to starve.

In Montreal there are 45,000 of our people unemployed. The same state of things exists in all large cities of Ontario, and particularly Toronto. I deeply regret that this Government, and specially the Minister of Labour, should have overlooked the desirability of taking a vote towards helping out the destitute during this period of stress.

This morning, more than 800 unemployed called at my office at the City Hall; they included men in all class of society, accountants and clerks as well as laborers; for all our factories have closed down.

Therefore, I say that this Government should have been content with asking for a somewhat smaller amount to be forwarded to Great Britain. We are bound to borrow $150,000,000, that will be handed over to England; that money will not even cross the Atlantic, though we will have to pay interest on the loan and make good for it later on. We are willing to send men over there, but we should not send money, and I regret that no provision has been made for the destitute in this country, while millions are being sent to England.

Unless the Government make haste to assist our destitute, we shall presently be threatened with a revolution. I say then that we should at once provide in the Estimates, either of the Public Works or of the Labour Department, an amount sufficient to give work to our unemployed. Why not start forthwith the building of the Georgian Bay Canal? Why not carry out immediately the great work of improvement of the Montreal Harbour?

Times are hard, but the worst is yet to come.

The Minister of Labour need not laugh. It is a time to cry, not to laugh. It is very funny to see the Minister of Labour laughing when we are discussing questions of importance.

Mr. CROTHERS: You did not see him laughing at all. You are making that up.

Mr. MARTIN: You were laughing. It is not a time to laugh.

Mr. CROTHERS: I was not laughing.

Mr. MARTIN: I know you always laugh when you see citizens without bread in their house; but you will see, when the next election comes, that the shame will be on you.

(Translation) Mr. Chairman, I say that the Minister of Labour has been remiss in his duty in neglecting to provide in his Estimates an amount sufficient to assist urban municipalities. Rural municipalities, whose inhabitants undergo no hardship and are in a position to sell their produce at a large profit, need no help on our part. In cities, however, conditions are vastly different from those existing in the country, workingmen cannot find employment and charitable associations, among them St. Vincent de Paul find themselves unable to cope with the numerous demands made upon resources.

The city of Montreal has provided $75,000 to supply bread and soup to these unfortunate people. In my view, municipalities are not alone responsible for the maintenance of these dependents. I think the Minister of Labour should pay a visit to the poorer sections of our city, that might induce him to alter his views.

Mr. PAQUET (Translation): They should change the mayor.

Mr. MARTIN (Translation): I think rather we should change the government. At all events, I challenge the honourable member for l'Islet (Mr. Paquet) to try and have the people of Montreal change their mayor.

Labour—Combines Investigation Act, $5,000.

Mr. MACDONALD: Has there been an expenditure under this head during the past year?

Mr. CROTHERS: No.

Mr. MACDONALD: The minister is asking for $500 less than last year?

Mr. CROTHERS: Yes.

Labour—Industrial Training and Technical Education, $2,500.

Mr. NESBITT: What part does the department take in industrial training and technical education? What is this money for?

Mr. CROTHERS: My hon. friend will recollect that the Commission of Technical Education was launched from the Labour Department. Its report was completed only last February. Had my hon. friend been in his place before six o'clock he would have heard a letter read that I sent to the Prime Ministers of the various provinces with this report requesting that they should give expression to their views as to its contents and recommendations. We may have inquiries made, or may have inquiries to make, and we put in this small sum to meet any expenses that may arise in connection with this matter.

Mr. NESBITT: You have not taken any action on the Commission's report?

Mr. CROTHERS: The commission was appointed only to collect information and submit it to the various provinces, and this we have done. It does not follow that we are not to do any more. As my hon. friend knows, the subject of education is, according to the British North America Act, entirely within the jurisdiction of the provinces. Unless some arrangement can be made with the provinces such as was made by the Minister of Agriculture in the matter of assisting agriculture, there will be nothing done. The commission recommended, as my hon. friend knows, that we should supply the provinces with $3,500,000 a year. But we thought that other matters were more immediately pressing and made a first demand upon the treasury and that we were not justified in making such an expenditure now.

Labour—Inspection of railway construction, etc., $10,000.

Mr. CARROLL: How is this money to be expended?

Mr. CROTHERS: Up to a few years ago the Labour Department did not undertake to do any work of this kind; but complaints came to us from the construction camps on the Grand Trunk Pacific and other railways that sanitary and hospital provisions were not being carefully looked after. We undertook an inspection. One of the fair-wage officers of my department made two trips from Edmonton to Prince Rupert. On the first trip, he found things in a horrible condition. By reason of his inspection and the action he took on it the principal complaints were remedied within two or three weeks after his report was made. He has been over that whole line a second time. We have inspected the construction camps on the other railways of Canada, and we expect to expend this sum, or a portion of it in the same way. We cannot know in advance how much we shall be required to spend. That will depend on the complaints that come in.

Mr. MACDONALD: Who are the people employed in this work?

Mr. CROTHERS: The fair-wage officers. That is one of the reasons why we found it expedient to appoint more of them. There were only two when we came into office, and there are five now.

Mr. NESBITT: I understand that the fair-wage officers are employed to go round the various public works to see that fair wages are being paid.

Mr. CROTHERS: That is part of their work. The principal work they did originally was to fix fair wages, according to the current rates being paid in the district, on any public work that might be going on. If a public building, for instance, is to be put up by the Public Works Department, they send a request for us to make a schedule giving minimum rates of wages that should be paid to the various trades, such as stone-cutters, bricklayers, carpenters and plumbers, that are to be engaged in the construction. One of the fair-wage officers goes to the district where the work is to be carried on and ascertains what the current rate of wages is and what are the hours of labour for similar work in that district. He then makes a report. Those who are to tender on the job see exactly what they will have to pay the different craftsmen in the execution of their work. These officers do not go about inspecting these works unless complaint is made. But if complaint is made, for instance, against a contractor on the Welland canal or the contractors for public buildings, that they are not paying the wages, the fair-wage officer is sent to inquire into the circumstances and report, and we here try to see to it that the contractor pays what he should pay under the schedules contained

in the contract. These officers are sent out when a labour dispute arises even between two individuals. They are looking into the wages paid in the manufacture of shells now being supplied to the British Government. Anything of the nature of a dispute between employer and employed of either a private or a public character is investigated by one of these fair-wage officers.

Mr. MACDONALD: What is the total amount of the minister's estimates as compared with last year's?

Mr. CROTHERS: There are total reductions of about $12,800. The amount of money spent in the Labour Department last year was nearly $9,000 less than was expended in 1910-11, the last year of our predecessors.

9 p.m.

Mr. MACDONALD: And the hon. minister proposes still further to economize?

Mr. CROTHERS: I propose to cut it down quite a bit within the present year.

Mr. MACDONALD: It is good to find one minister economizing.

Civil Government—Department of Inland Revenue—salaries, $142,812.50.

Mr. MACDONALD: There is an increase of $13,175. Why the increase?

Mr. BLONDIN: It is due mostly to statutory increases. But there are some new appointments. If hon. members will turn to the details of this estimate at page 18, they will be able to follow my explanation. There is one more officer in the first division, subdivision A. This is due to the appointment of a translator. There is provision for a translator in the Department, but such an officer was not appointed before. Then, there is a new appointment in the second division, subdivision A. This is for the appointment of an analyst required for new laboratories opened in Winnipeg, Vancouver and Halifax. In the Electrical Branch there are to be two employees instead of one. This is to provide for the appointment of an assistant to the Chief Electrical Engineer in Ottawa. In the Weights and Measures Branch, in the lower grade, there are to be two instead of one. This is to provide for an assistant to the chief in Ottawa.

Mr. MACDONALD: There is another increase—second division, subdivision A.

Mr. BLONDIN: I was mistaken. This change in the second division, subdivision A, is to provide for an assistant to the chief. There is a small increase in contingencies also. That is due to an increase in business.

Mr. MACDONALD: Why is an assistant to be appointed to the chief of the Weights and Measures Branch?

Mr. BLONDIN: Both these appointments as assistants to the chiefs of these branches are made that there may be some one to take the place of the chief of the branch when he is absent.

Mr. MACDONALD: Has that need been recognized under the hon. minister's predecessors?

Mr. BLONDIN: I could not say. I rely only on the necessity for the appointment. I understand that this is a long-felt want in the department, and I feel we badly need these appointments.

Mr. NESBITT: We have just learned from the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) that he is doing without many things, even to technical training, on account of the stringency of the times. Does not the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue think that by a little effort he could have done without these new appointees? He ought to employ men who do not get sick. No doubt there are a lot of men who could run the branch even if the chief is away for a day or two.

Mr. BLONDIN: I understand this man is sick, and we have to get some one else.

Mr. NESBITT: Who is he?

Mr. BLONDIN: Mr. Way. Hon. gentlemen must not forget that this is a department of collection, and I believe it is good economy to have a proper organization to collect the money and manage the department.

Mr. NESBITT: Does the Weights and Measures branch collect as much money as it pays out?

Mr. BLONDIN: No. That is a branch more for the protection of the public.

Mr. MACDONALD: Is it for the same reason you are putting in an assistant in the Electrical branch?

Mr. BLONDIN: Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD: Have both these men taken ill at the same time?

Mr. BLONDIN: The chief electrical engineer is not ill, but his duties often call him away from the office here, and we need somebody to take his place when he is away.

Mr. MACDONALD: The Minister of Labour, whose estimates we have just finished, congratulated himself on the fact that he was going to administer his department at a saving of something like $12,800. My hon. friend (Mr. Blondin) has just assumed control of his department, and he proposes to start out with an increased expenditure. I do not know where he will land in a year or two, if the fates permit him to retain his office.

For what the Minister of Finance thinks will be a bad year my hon. friend is certainly starting off at a pretty fast clip, and I think he should explain why he is running into this unnecessary expenditure. These officials who have occupied their positions for a number of years under different ministers have never asked for assistants before, and I think my hon. friend is starting at the wrong end in appointing new assistants now. The Minister of Finance has intimated to the Minister of Labour that, although technical education and the interests of labour throughout the country are very important, he must practise economy in his department owing to the present condition; and yet the Minister of Finance permits my hon friend to appoint half a dozen extra assistants to sit in the office when the head man is a little unwell or wants to go out for a while. I am afraid the Minister of Finance is disposed to be too generous with his new colleague from Quebec. If these new assistants are really needed, I do not see why the gentleman who is now gracefully occupying the position of Railway Commissioner was allowed by the Minister of Finance to struggle along without this extra help. What a state of mind that gentleman must have been in when on going to his office in the morning he found that the chief of the electrical branch, we will say, was not feeling very well, but could not get away because there was no one to relieve him. In these times, when one looks at his purse twice before spending money, I think the Minister of Finance should admonish his new colleague to practise economy, and warn him against increasing his expenditures in this spendthrift fashion.

Mr. BLONDIN: We are making only two new appointments.

Mr. MACDONALD: Six.

Mr. BLONDIN: Not as assistants to the chief. My officers inform me these men have been badly needed for a long time.

[Mr. Blondin.]

Mr. MACDONALD: Mr. Nantel got along without them.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the translator mentioned here been appointed?

Mr. BLONDIN: Not yet.

Mr. MARCIL: I was amazed when a messenger brought into my office this morning copies of the Auditor General's Report. There were three volumes in English for 1914, but only one volume in French, and that was for 1913. As the minister is asking for a translator, I think he might explain why only one volume for 1913 is out.

Mr. BLONDIN: That would concern the general staff of blue-book translators. I regret I have not with me Mr. Desaulniers' report, but if I remember rightly the translating staff lost four of its members by death last year, and their places were not filled for months and months. When these new men have had a little experience, things will get in better shape, and no doubt they will catch up with the work. When Mr. Desaulniers took charge of the translating staff, there was a great deal of work on hand to be done, and that accounts for the delay in getting out the French reports.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the minister have the translation done in his own department?

Mr. BLONDIN: In the past the translation has been done outside, but it is our intention to have a translator in the department to translate purely departmental affairs. The blue-books of course are translated by the blue-book translation staff.

Mr. MARCIL: The practice of the departments varies. I understand that there is a translator in the Department of Agriculture, in the Post Office Department, and in the Department of Trade and Commerce. Only last week we appointed four translators for what is called the House branch. Personally, I think the proper way is to have the translation done in the department. From what I have said about the Auditor General's Report the House will see under what a serious disadvantage the French population labours. Only one volume of the Auditor General's Report for 1913 has yet appeared in French, and yet we have translators for Hansard, translators for the Law Branch, translators for the House, and translators in the various departments. At present we have on the pay-list about 50 translators, whose salaries range from $1,500 to $2,000. We probably spend about $100,000 on translation alone. My hon. friend will

see how useless it would be to send out one volume of the Auditor General's Report for 1913 in French, when he could send the whole report for 1914 in English. I think the minister is taking the proper step in appointing a translator to his own department. I must congratulate the Postmaster General upon the fact that the French report of his department was out ten days after the English report was published. There is some sense in that. The Marine Department, although short in one section, if I remember correctly, was only a few months behind with its French report. I do not know who is to blame for the delay in translating the Auditor General's Report. The correspondence at the beginning is the only thing that would have to be translated, for the rest is made up of names and figures. But certainly there has been omission somewhere. Can the minister tell us whether each department is to have a translator hereafter? That system has this advantage: Translators in the department could go ahead with the manuscript, whereas when the translators are clubbed together they have to wait for the whole bound volume before they can start work, and they are bound to be behind time.

Mr. BLONDIN: I do not think it was the intention of the Government when they appointed translators to have one in each department translating blue-books. I understand that that is the work of the blue-book translation staff. This question of translators is a most interesting one, and I hope we shall have an opportunity of discussing it more fully later on, when I shall have on hand a report of the work done in the last two years.

Mr. NESBITT: My hon. friend said just now that he was increasing his clerical staff because the duties were heavier, but if my memory serves me right the Minister of Finance told us that on the eight or nine months previous to the Budget speech the Inland Revenue Department was $200,000 behind the previous year. If that is so, where does the extra work come in?

Mr. W. T. WHITE: I think my hon. friend will find that the Inland Revenue returns will increase, and are increasing.

Mr. MACDONALD: From weights and measures or whisky? It is not in the weights and measures that he wants the extra men; it is at the whisky end of the department.

Mr. BLONDIN: The Department of Weights and Measures has to be completely reorganized.

Mr. MACDONALD: Why?

Mr. BLONDIN: Because it is not giving the satisfaction that the public has a right to expect.

Mr. MACDONALD: We have heard nothing of this.

Mr. BLONDIN: I am a new minister in the department and I have to rely upon the reports of my officers.

Mr. MACDONALD: I have been looking through the book to find one or two things. Take the Minister of Militia and Defence; he is very much in the limelight, has been for some months and probably will be for some time longer unless something happens. One cannot tell what may happen. That hon. gentleman, with all the responsibilities that have been put upon him and his department, actually comes before Parliament and says that he is prepared to run his department for $5,000 less than last year. The Minister of Railways and Canals has a very important department with vast interests to preside over. The Finance Minister is optimistic in regard to the amount of whisky that is going to be consumed. I would be rather inclined to take the other view. With Russia dispensing with vodka and the temperance movement spreading probably owing to the war, I think there is going to be less whisky consumed since the duty has gone up.

Mr. W. T. WHITE: I think my hon. friend's opinion on that subject is very much better than my own. I bow to his superior judgment.

Mr. MACDONALD: I am very glad to find the Minister of Finance is willing to give some one else the right to express an opinion that is perhaps better than his own.

Mr. WHITE: I defer to an expert.

Mr. MACDONALD: That does not affect the point of my argument. I was coming to the Department of Railways and Canals. The Intercolonial, I understand, is showing a surplus. In addition to his running the Intercolonial railway, my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals has very great and important interests from one end of the Dominion to the other under his charge. Yet he says that he is willing to struggle along this year with only $812.50 more than he had last year. We find that our versatile and interesting friend the Min-

ister of Public Works, who is supposed to be a gentleman who spends very freely in his department, only wants $8,000 more this year to run his department than he had last year. Our distinguished friend, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who is not here, has been planning great things for the trade of Canada. Not only are we having a propaganda throughout the country on behalf of the slogan "Made in Canada" but we are told on all sides that the Minister of Trade and Commerce has said that now is the time, foreign nations being engaged in war, for Canada to increase her export trade. With all these added duties and undertakings of the Department of Trade and Commerce, all that the minister asks Parliament to give him more than he had last year is $5,900. Perhaps there may be an explanation on account of the increased vote for the naval service, but the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says that he is willing to try and run his department for $51,000 less than he had last year. When you go through all these departments you find that my hon. friend (Mr. Blondin), who occupied the office of deputy speaker for a year or two until his predecessor in the department was translated to a happier sphere, comes in and says that everything is out of joint in the department, that his department has not been run right and that he has to reorganize the Weights and Measures Department. In this year of grace when everybody else is economizing, when everybody else must economize, my hon. friend comes before Parliament and says: I want $15,000 more to run my department. He has put in six additional officials and the average cost of each is $2,196. The minister should give some very much better explanation than he has given as to why he should have that unusual increase when administering the affairs of his department in the first year of his incumbency. He is hardly in his seat squarely yet and he is rushing in with this extraordinary expenditure in this unique and difficult year. The minister should take up each one of these items of increase and tell us what the duties of the positions are, how they are fulfilled, the necessity of putting these men on and who they are.

Mr. BLONDIN: My hon. friend is right when he says that there is an increase of $13,175 in my department, but he is wrong when he says that that increase is due to new appointments. Most of this sum is due to statutory increases.

[Mr. Macdonald.]

Mr. McCRANEY: How much is due to statutory increases?

Mr. BLONDIN: There are five or six new appointments.

Mr. MACDONALD: That is new appointments?

Mr. BLONDIN: That is new appointments—the balance is all due to statutory increases.

Mr. MACDONALD: Take the first one in the Department of Inland Revenue.

Mr. BLONDIN: There is one at $2,800.

Mr. MACDONALD: You are putting a man into the department at $2,800. Why do you need him?

Mr. BLONDIN: This is a promotion, I am informed, from the second division.

Mr. MACDONALD: You put somebody else in the second division? Why do you promote him? What is he going to do?

Mr. BLONDIN: This is a promotion by order in council, but let us proceed. My hon. friend will not make any reproach to me for the appointment of a translator?

Mr. MACDONALD: I am speaking of this additional officer to whom you give $2,800. I want to know what his duties are and what his name is.

Mr. BLONDIN: That man was in the $2,800 class. This is simply a promotion. I understand there is no change in his salary.

Mr. MACDONALD: You put somebody else in his place?

Mr. BLONDIN: I lack the information with respect to this man, but if my hon. friend will permit me to proceed I will supply the information later on.

Mr. MACDONALD: This man has a pretty big salary and we want to know what he is going to do for it.

Mr. BLONDIN: This man is getting $2,800 now.

Mr. MACDONALD: What do you give the man that takes his place?

Mr. BLONDIN: The other man starts at $2,100. He was in the department before, so that the increase is simply a promotion.

Mr. MACDONALD: What is the name of this $2,800 man?

Mr. BLONDIN: Mr. Doyon.

Mr. MACDONALD: What is he going to do?

Mr. BLONDIN: He is in the statistical branch.

Mr. MACDONALD: We will pass that one; we have not got much information about him; who is the next one?

Mr. BLONDIN: The next one is the translator.

Mr. MARCIL: Has he been appointed?

Mr. BLONDIN: No.

Mr. MARCIL: Will he be appointed by the minister or by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. BLONDIN: I hope he will be appointed by the minister.

Mr. MARCIL: Will there be an age limit fixed in the case of this new translator?

Mr. BLONDIN: It is technical work, and I have always contended that there should not be an age limit.

Mr. MARCIL: But an age limit was fixed when the translators were appointed in the House of Commons.

Mr. BLONDIN: That is another question.

Mr. PROULX: Why should there be any difference made; it is the same class of work?

Mr. BLONDIN: It is not in my department and I cannot discuss matters pertaining to the House of Commons staff.

Mr. PROULX: Last year there was a translator appointed by the House and the Civil Service Commission fixed an age limit; why should not the same thing be done in this case?

Mr. BLONDIN: I would be the last man in the House of Commons to take up the defence of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. WILLIAM CHISHOLM: There is an increased expenditure in this department and we should not allow the vote to pass without recording our protest. Notwithstanding the falling off in business there seems to be no attempt made at economy in this department, although some of the other departments have made a pretence at it. At a time when the poor people of the country have to pay extra for every drop of patent medicine they buy, when a poor country-woman cannot post a postcard without having to pay extra postage, when there are increased duties on boots and shoes and everything else, and when business is going to the dogs generally, one would think that the Minister of Inland Revenue would show some evidence of a desire to economize. The minister told us that some of this was represented by statutory increases of salaries to the officials, and when a man gets a statutory increase it is evidence of his ability to do his work satisfactorily, and there ought not to be any necessity for increasing the number of employees. It is true that the deputy minister of this department was a well-known lawyer in the city, without any qualification for a position in a department of this kind, and being appointed, and enjoying a high salary, I suppose all the others in the department felt that they having some knowledge of the business of the department should get more pay. Another explanation may be that the ministers wanted to be kind to their new colleague in the Department of Inland Revenue, and there may have been reasons why they did not venture to suggest any interference with him, he being a man to be reckoned with. Perhaps the Minister of Finance and others of the ministers were afraid to discipline the new Minister of Inland Revenue, as he should have been disciplined, and hence they allowed him to increase the expenditure of his department. It might be all right if the country could afford it and if the Government were not piling on the taxes and bleeding the poor people white. If ever there was a time for economy surely it is now. Has the Minister of Inland Revenue increased his outside staff such as the preventive officers? If the minister has found that he has a preventive officer looking after the manufacture of illicit whisky in a district where illicit whisky has not been made for the last quarter of a century, is he still keeping that officer employed so as to give him some little reward for political services? There was a preventive officer in my country who had not instituted a prosecution for eight or nine years, and when the Conservatives came to power, there being nothing for him to do, they decided to dispense with his services. It was discovered that for the first few years he held office he had reported on two prosecutions and for the next nine years there was nothing to be done, and so the office was an honorary one, but the officer being an old man they didn't discharge him. But he was finally discharged, and immediately after the change of government the then Minister of Inland Revenue employed another man, not-

withstanding that there was a report to the department that the services of such an officer were not required. In order to help him they made this new appointee food inspector and gave him $350 a year, but there was no food for him to inspect. I refer to an officer, in my own county, and I ask the minister now if there have been any prosecutions in that county since this officer was appointed. I do not believe that officer ever wrote a report because I know he has no duty to discharge. As a matter of fact, did this officer ever make a report to the minister?

Mr. BLONDIN: What is his name?

Mr. CHISHOLM: Moses Delorey. He is preventive officer and food inspector and he lives in a part of the county where there is no food exposed for sale. If he lived in a town or visited a town, there might be some reason for his going to the grocery stores and inspecting the food, but as a matter of fact he never did anything and never had anything to do. I am not saying anything against him personally because he is all right as a citizen of the community, and he is a loyal Conservative and he ought to have got a reward, but the Government ought to have rewarded him without doing anything so brazen as they have done and outraging public opinion and public morality. The people in that district, when they go to town have to pay an extra fare on the train; and they have to pay extra for everything they buy when they get to town, and probably they receive nothing more for the produce they have to sell, and in view of these conditions these supernumerary and unnecessary offices ought to be abolished.

I wish to refer to a matter that has not direct reference to this department. Some eight or nine immigration officers who were appointed for the province of Nova Scotia were given a three months' trip to the Old Country. Their salaries were $700 or $800 or $900. Separately the amounts are small, but collectively they are large. These agents have nothing to do. The one appointed for my county was a discharged railway sectionman. For some reason or another it was not convenient to replace him, and so he was made an immigration agent. There is on file in the department a report costing the country $800 or $900, and all the information contained in it is that up in the highlands of Scotland, whence this man's forefathers came, he met people who spoke Gaelic. We could get that information without paying $800 or $900 and without sending a man all the way to the Old Country. The other officers who were appointed were men of the same class. With some two exceptions, they were illiterate and did not possess sufficient education to deliver public lectures describing the country whence they had come. I have nothing to say against them personally, but they were not fit for a position of that nature. They were appointed to these positions simply and solely as a reward for political service. My hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue has a number of the same class of men in his department. When he is trying to justify the increases in the inside service, he will see the necessity of lopping off these officials to whom I refer, who are neither ornamental nor useful.

Mr. BLONDIN: I will give my best attention to the remarks of my hon. friend concerning Mr. Moses Delorey. The department has to have officers even in places where there is not much work to do, in order to prevent infractions of the law. The case of my hon. friend, of course, may be quite different.

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM: There is a report on file showing that this man's predecessor had nothing at all to do, and that the office could be abolished. In the face of that report my hon. friend is appointing another man and making him food inspector as well.

Mr. BLONDIN: My hon. friend will admit that I am not responsible for his appointment as food inspector. I will inquire into the matter. The salaries in cases such as the one my hon. friend has mentioned are not much over $100 or at most $200. The reason that my hon. friend is giving, namely, the extra tax on the people, to induce me to be more economical in the management of my department, is the same reason which imposes more work upon my officers than they had in the past, as I am sure my hon. friend will realize.

Mr. NESBITT: The Tilbury Gas Company supplies gas to many places in my section, and I am sure the minister has received a number of communications complaining that the gas is not purified. The town of Brantford, I understand, is taking the matter up with my hon. friend. Last year Mr. Nantel, my hon. friend's predecessor, sent a man to that district to inspect the gas and to report. He reported that the gas contained sulphur, and that it was not fit to be supplied to the people without being purified. The company made arrangements

with the various corporations to purify the gas; but when it came to operating and it had got the gas into the people's houses for cooking, in some cases for lighting and in other cases for heating, the company immediately turned on the unpurified gas. I wrote to my hon. friend since he came into the department, pointing out that in the case of Woodstock, as soon as the cold weather started and an additional amount of gas was required, the company turned on the unpurified gas, which was dangerous to the health of the people. We were placed in a peculiar position. We had an agreement with the company that they were to supply purified gas; but if we enforced the agreement and made them cut off the gas, the consequence would be that the people would have nothing with which to cook and some of them nothing with which to heat their houses. We were between the devil and the deep sea, and we had therefore to take the unpurified gas. I know a great deal about the matter, as I had to suffer from the effects of this unpurified gas. The department should be able to cancel the company's right to operate if it does not carry out its agreement, as I understand the law gives the department the right to force the company to supply purified gas. Hon. members could not stand the unpurified gas in this chamber for half an hour. Their heads would ache so much that they could not see, and unpurified gas is certainly not fit for use in houses. Has the minister taken any steps to force this company to supply purified gas to the various municipalities?

Mr. BLONDIN: I have received several letters in regard to the matter and some delegations have come to Ottawa. I have taken a great deal of interest in the question. My attention, however, was drawn to the fact that the particular section of the British North America Act mentioned as defining the scope of the powers of the Federal Government referred only to weights and measures, apparently leaving the quality of the gas to be dealt with by the provinces. My officers informed me that section 31 of the Gas Inspection Act, relating to the quality and purity of gas, was contested by some eminent lawyers as being beyond the powers of the federal authority. Therefore, I thought it best to refer the matter to the Department of Justice for its opinion as to the powers of my department, and I am expecting to receive their report at an early date.

Mr. NESBITT: Will you let me see the report when you receive it?

Mr. BLONDIN: Yes.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: Are there any preventive officers in the county of Inverness at present?

Mr. BLONDIN: I do not see that there is any.

Mr. CHISHOLM: The hon. minister in replying to the hon. member for Antigonish justified the appointment of Mr. Delorey on the ground that his duty was to prevent the manufacture of whisky. And that is a good reason. There was a similar officer in Inverness, Mr. McDonald, who was dismissed, because evidently, the minister did not see very much for him to do. But if he will look up the history of his department he will find that, having regard to the past history of Antigonish and of Inverness, there will be more need for an officer in Inverness.

Mr. CROTHERS: Because they made whisky there?

Mr. CHISHOLM: They used to charge them with making some liquor there. I do not think they do it now. But if an officer were appointed it would make sure that they did not fall into the sins of former days. The hon. minister's predecessor dismissed Mr. McDonald because there was nothing for him to do, and appointed the man in Antigonish; and there is nothing for him to do. The same reason that would justify the appointment in Antigonish would justify an appointment in Inverness. The man who was dismissed was a supporter of mine. But, as I am a believer in a measure that "To the victors belong the spoils" there may have been some justification for their action. But I understand that the difficulty about the appointment is that there are too many men who think that they ought to be appointed. I will try to influence my opponents to agree upon one man, and then I will suggest that he be appointed. Of course, he will be recommended by my defeated opponent, and then I hope he will be appointed.

Mr. MACDONALD: With nothing to do.

Mr. CHISHOLM: No, nothing to do, but that does not make any difference.

Mr. BOULAY: The dismissal may have been with a view to saving money, as in my own county. When we came into power in 1911, there was one preventive officer in Rimouski who had been appointed by the Liberals about ten years before, to do no-

thing. And when we came into power we found by the books that this man had actually been dismissed by the Liberal Government before they left office. They found that this man was doing so much nothing that they dismissed him themselves. We did not replace him because there was nothing for such an officer to do. My hon. friend from Antigonish should not be too much scandalized over the case he has referred to. If it is bad to appoint a man to do nothing, it must have been bad for his friends to appoint this man to do nothing and keep him in office for ten years.

Mr. MACDONALD: If the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Boulay) did not get a man appointed in the Inland Revenue, he has been getting them appointed in the Railways and Canals Department all along the line from Moncton to Rivière du Loup. He is regarded with envy and admiration by other public men of that region, and with suspicion by his colleagues here because he is known as the greatest patronage hunter in the province of Quebec. We find the work of his hand as far down as Westmorland, and in western New Brunswick along the borders of the United States. His speech this evening is a real case of Satan rebuking sin. The minister stopped in his explanation at the translator. I wish he would go on with his explanation with regard to these other officers.

Mr. BLONDIN: In the Second Division, Subdivision A, there is an additional officer. This is a new analyst required for the new laboratories opened in Winnipeg, Vancouver, and Halifax.

Mr. MACDONALD: You are giving him $1,600. Has he been appointed?

Mr BLONDIN: This is to provide for his appointment.

Mr. MACDONALD: You have no additions to the staff in the Methylated Spirits branch. You get along there without additional men?

Mr. BLONDIN: Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD: In the Electrical branch, you need some assistance. Why?

Mr. BLONDIN: Because the chief must often be away on official duties.

Mr. MACDONALD: You have two chiefs, one man in the First Division of Subdivision A, to whom you pay $3,400, and another in the same division and subdivision to whom you pay $2,700.

[Mr. Boulay.]

Mr. BLONDIN: My deputy tells me that there must be an error in the account there. It ought to be $2,100. I will ask that this item stand for further explanation.

Mr. MACDONALD: I do not think the minister has given us a very lucid explanation as to why he is going to spend this extra $15,000.

Mr. WILLIAM CHISHOLM: I would ask the minister to lay on the table of the House a report showing what Moses Delorey has done since he was appointed. I should like him to say also whether he is able to give any reasons for believing that there will not be anything for this gentleman to do in the future. If he cannot, I presume he will agree that any officials who are under similar circumstances should be dispensed with, in the interests of the country.

Mr. BLONDIN: I will have much pleasure in laying a report on the table of the House.

Mr. MACDONALD: We are willing to let this item pass if the minister, when he comes to deal with the outside branch, will give us an explanation with regard to the $2,700 to which I have referred.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the scope of the duties of the inspectors of weights and measures?

Mr. BLONDIN: It is their duty to inspect and certify all scales in their district upon the request of any interested party and according to the regulations of the department. As scales are sold they are certified and stamped by officers of the department.

Mr. MARCIL: Measures as well as scales?

Mr. BLONDIN: Yes.

Mr. LAW: How often are inspections of scales made?

Mr. BLONDIN: The inspectors must make an inspection in the same place every two years.

Mr. MARCIL: Is there any double system of measures in use at the present time: for instance, the imperial gallon and the old-style gallon? When buying maple syrup in Montreal recently, I found that there was a difference of 40 cents between the prices of the different measures; one is a larger gallon than the other.

Mr. BLONDIN: The imperial gallon is the only gallon measure recognized in this country.

Mr. MARCIL: Is it an infraction of the law to use the old measure?

Mr. BLONDIN: Yes.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: Inspectors of weights charge a fee for inspection. What is the system of checking the money received for inspections; how is it known that the money is properly accounted for?

Mr. BLONDIN: When the officer makes an inspection of a scale he has to place a stamp on the machine; this stamp comes from the department at Ottawa.

Mr. OLIVER: At one time I was under the impression that the inspectors of weights and measures were on duty for the protection of the public, but that appears to be a misapprehension. As I understand their duty—what the minister has said confirms this, and I think the public should know it—it is the protection of the dealer who owns the weight and measure, and not the protection of the public. The inspection is to guarantee that the dealer is not using a weight that is too heavy or a measure that is too large; it is no guarantee to the public that they are getting a full measure or a full weight. The point I want to make is that the inspector does not make his inspection in such ways or at such times as to give the public any assurance of protection. A dealer has a scale which is inspected and stamped by the inspector. That scale is in evidence when the inspector is there, and some other scale is in use when he is not there. I am not criticising the administration of my hon. friend; I am merely making the general criticism that so far as I am aware, the Department of Inland Revenue does not take steps, through the operations of their weights and measures officials, to protect the public interests and to see that honest weights are given and honest measures used.

Mr. BLONDIN: I am afraid I did not make myself clear in answering the question of the hon. gentleman. Every merchant is compelled by law to have his
10 p.m. scale inspected at least every two years, but the inspectors are on duty all the time, looking over the scales that have been inspected, seeing that no other scales are used, and that no method is adopted whereby the merchant or anybody else may rob the public.

Mr. M. MARTIN (Montreal, St. Mary's): (Translation): Mr. Chairman, in Montreal complaints are made not only as regards the inspection of scales, but as regards the inspection of measures, such as pints, quarts, etc. The public believe that they are not sufficiently protected in that respect, and I would like the honourable gentleman to inform the House as to the measures taken towards meeting such complaints.

Mr. BLONDIN: The officers of the Department are at all times available to the public free of charge. They play as it were the part of detectives and make every inquiry in that connection. It is their duty to give their services for the protection of the public.

Mr. MARTIN: In that case, the minister might give still stricter orders.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: What is the standing of D. Campbell, an official of the weights and measures branch at Strathlorne? Is he an assistant, or the chief officer?

Mr. BLONDIN: I have not the information here.

Mr. CHISHOLM: To begin with, let me tell the minister that I have a good deal of confidence in his sense of honesty and fairness. I am going to make one request of him. I am going to ask him to muzzle this man Daniel Campbell. He is the most active and I would say the most unscrupulous politician in the county of Inverness—and we have some of them there. It is seldom I have been heard to find fault in this House with any of my opponents in Inverness county, and I would not do so in this case if this man were not a paid officer of the Government. His business makes it necessary for him to go and see men of all shades of politics. There is not a convention, or a meeting or assemblage of Conservatives in the county of Inverness but he must be there and be head and tail of everything. He would have a perfect right to do that if he were not a paid officer of this Government, but if he is, I do not think it is fair or right. I will go further and say that I would not be very confident that a man would properly discharge his duties who is so influenced as this man is. He is a good officer, I believe, and does his duty all right when his political leanings do not carry him away. It is nothing to him to go to a meeting of the municipal council and stay there for a week at a time, when I am sure he has something else to do. At all events, he is paid for doing something else, and he attends the council for nothing else than to further the political interests of his party. I ask the minister

to take these few remarks to heart and correct this man, who is the only man in the county of Inverness that I have a word to say against.

Mr. BLONDIN: I will certainly see that this man keeps quiet.

Mr. M. MARTIN (Montreal, St. Mary's): (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I wish to draw the attention of the Honourable Minister of Inland Revenue to what is going on in the country in regard to cut tobacco. I may state that the Department is losing heavily as a result of frauds committed, I am satisfied, at its expense. Many farmers cut their tobacco by passing it through a straw-cutter, without holding any license from the department. That is being done constantly, and more especially during snowstorms or bad weather, when such farmers shut themselves up in their barns and proceed to cut their tobacco. That is unfair competition on their part, and the Government is made to lose heavily thereby. I think that the department should have watchful inspectors, so as to put an end to such frauds.

Mr. BLONDIN: (Translation): In answer to the honourable gentleman, I may say that our officers, though numerous, are kept busy going around and enforcing the law in that respect. The department is aware that frauds are being committed, detrimental to the revenue. Rigid measures have been taken to prevent and put a stop to such abuses. I thank the honourable member and shall be glad if he will suggest to the department any means that he may deem advisable for the better enforcement of the Act.

Mr. M. MARTIN (Translation): I would like to point out to the honourable gentleman that, in the same way that there are dishonest farmers, there are unscrupulous grocers who sell cut tobacco in bags labelled thus: "Black Tea," "Green Tea," "Japan Tea," etc.

Mr. BLONDIN: I shall be glad if the honourable gentleman will forward to the officers of the Inland Revenue Department, in Montreal, any information in his possession. They have strict orders for the enforcement of the Act.

Mr. OLIVER: Referring once more to the inspection of weights and measures, I am to understand that it is a part of the duty of the officer, and the responsibility of the department, to protect the public. But I have not been given to understand that by inspectors of weights and measures whom I have met. They have told me that they were purely officials; that is to say, that they were simply to test the accuracy of the weight or the measure and that beyond that they did not have any responsibility for what I have called the protection of the public. That might be considered to be in the interest of the dealer rather than of the buyer. Now if it is the duty of the inspector to protect the public, I suggest to the minister that he pass the word to his inspectors all along the line to use greater diligence on that side of their duties than they have hitherto done; and that they recognize that they have a responsibility in the protection of the public in the actual use of those weights and measures, and that they take due means to discover—and in some cases it would not require very much effort—whether short measures or light weight was being given to the public.

Mr. EDWARDS: Have not the inspectors power to confiscate inaccurate scales and measures?

Mr. OLIVER: Oh, yes.

Mr. EDWARDS: It seems to me then, they have the power which the hon. gentleman thinks they lack. While it may be true that inspectors of weights and measures are supposed to protect the man who owns the scale, it is undoubtedly true that they make their inspections at unexpected times. They are liable to drop in at any moment to inspect the scales, and I would take that as an indication that inspectors are intended to protect the general public from improper weights and measures. I wish to call the minister's attention to one thing which I think worthy of his consideration. At the time the investigation was held at Montreal, in regard to the weighing of cheese, I visited that city and went over one of the factories where scales are manufactured. They told me that they manufactured a scale which was in general demand in the cheese factories throughout eastern Ontario and western Quebec, and they demonstrated to me that that particular kind of scale could not be relied on for any length of time. It might be tested to-day and prove correct, but after being in use for only a short time the scale would become defective.

I may say that there was a scale generally called for by the trade because it sold at a smaller price than a better scale. On account of that defective scale being in pretty general use in cheese factories throughout eastern Ontario and western

Quebec, there were discrepancies in the weights as given by the factories and the weights as recorded in Montreal, this leading to disputes and possibly a good deal of sore feeling because each party thought that his weight was right. The factory no doubt thought that they were weighing their stuff properly and the people in Montreal claimed differently. Is not the advisability of getting out a standard scale in cheese factories, a scale which will stand the test of time and use, worthy of the consideration of the Minister? I would, in addition to that, express the view that the scales in cheese factories in particular should be inspected more frequently than they are. They should be inspected not merely once but twice or three times in a season. That would make for a better understanding between the producer of the cheese and the big exporter in Montreal and not only that but it would have a tendency to give us a better name in the English markets if our cheese went over there without any reflection being cast upon the people as to their giving full weight. I would like the minister to give his atttention to these suggestions.

Mr. BLONDIN: I shall certainly take note of the remarks of my hon. friend and give them consideration.

Mr. BOYER (Translation): Mr. Chairman, as regards the inspection of scales in cheese factories, I may point out to the hon. gentleman that we have, in the province of Quebec, inspectors appointed specially by the provincial Department of Agriculture and under the control of the Dairymen's Association, whose duty it is to inspect at frequent intervals cheese factories and creameries. If only we were in a position to enable such inspectors to inspect scales, a work which is now under the control of the hon. gentleman, that department would find such inspectors to be very capable officers whose services would be precious to the public. The Minister of Agriculture was favourable to such a proposal, and the dairy industry in our province would be largely benefited by the granting of such powers to the aforesaid inspectors. Such inspection of the scales would entail no extra expense on the Government and would prove entirely satisfactory to the public.

Mr. BLONDIN (Translation): My attention has already been drawn to the matter, and it is being considered. I am confident that we shall be able to devise a means of inspecting scales in cheese factories and creameries that will be entirely satisfactory to the public.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What does the department do when a man is discovered using a defective scale and defrauding the public? Is there any action taken by the department to punish him or prosecute him?

Mr. BLONDIN: The scale is confiscated and the party is subjected to a fine and the payment of the costs of the prosecutions.

Mr. BOYER (Translation): Before passing on to another matter, the hon. gentleman will allow me to say that last year—I mean during the session preceding that held in August—we amended the Act so as to protect maple syrup and sugar makers against adulteration of the products they sell. That enactment affords ample protection to producers, but if there be no inspection made, such protection is quite inadequate. For instance, the Act prohibits the use of labels which falsely state that such products are either maple sugar or maple syrup. However, it has been ascertained in the meantime that in many instances adulterated goods are sold labelled as maple syrup or maple sugar. The Co-operative Association of Maple Sugar Producers sent to the department a resolution stating the facts and protesting against what was going on. I have been requested to meet the officers of that association in the near future, and I should be glad if the hon. gentleman would kindly take me into his confidence and enable me to enlighten these people as to his intentions in that regard. Has he made up his mind to appoint inspectors for the purpose of ascertaining how the Act works? The enactment in itself is a good one, and his predecessor's intentions were excellent; but its enforcement should be looked after by inspectors. While there is no inspection, abuses persist, and the farmer is left without any protection whatever. I would like to know whether the hon. gentleman's intention is to fully apply the law?

Mr. BLONDIN (Translation): The matter is now under consideration; the department will likely introduce an amendment to the Act so as to increase its efficiency, and I trust the hon. gentleman will be ready to assist me when it comes to increasing the number of inspectors.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: I understand that in cases where defective scales are discovered they are confiscated and the users are fined. Does the minister know if any fines are remitted or not imposed?

Mr. BLONDIN: No, I do not.

Mr. HUGHES: In no case is that done?

Mr. BLONDIN: I am informed that it might happen that a man has received a scale which was not correct and used it in good faith. Then the scale is confiscated, but no fine is imposed, or if imposed, is remitted.

Mr. HUGHES: If the minister will look at the records he will find that excuses which were not valid were put in certain cases and the fines remitted, and that influence had something to do with the remission of the fine.

Civil Government—Post Office Department, $932,710.

Mr. MARCIL: Is there any increase?

Mr. CASGRAIN: There is an increase of $14,000. The statutory increases amount to $27,050. There is a difference in the salaries of clerks who died, left the service, or were promoted, and the salaries of clerks who filled the vacancies, amounting to $25,250, which if you deduct from the $27,050 leaves an increase of $1,800 in the salaries.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. W. T. White, the House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

Monday, March 1, 1915.

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

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill No. 62, respecting the Bank of Alberta.—Mr. Douglas.

Bill No. 63, to incorporate the Catholic Truth Society of Canada.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill No. 64, respecting a certain patent of the Mills Equipment Company, Limited. —Mr. Northrup.

Bill No. 65, respecting the Toronto Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—Mr. T. J. Stewart.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

COMPENSATION TO WORKMEN.

Mr. H. B. MORPHY (North Perth) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 66, to amend the Railway Act. He said:

The purpose of the Bill is to amend paragraph (e) of clause 34 of section 2 of the Railway Act, Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 37. The Act as it stands includes, under the head of "working expenditure" of railways "(e) all rates, taxes, insurance and compensation for accident or losses." The Bill which I ask leave to introduce extends the language of paragraph (e) to make it read in this way:

[Mr. J. J. Hughes.]

(e) all rates, taxes, insurance and compensation for accident or losses, including any such compensation payable under the provisions of any Act of the Parliament of Canada or of any provincial legislature providing for the payment of compensation to workingmen for injuries or in respect of industrial diseases.

The object of the Bill is to extend to the workingman who is injured the privilege of having his claim come under section 141 of the Railway Act in the same way as rates, taxes, insurance and compensation for accident or losses. It will give the claim of a workman who may suffer accident and loss priority as against a mortgage or bonding deed covering the railway's assets in the same way as rates, taxes and insurance now have a prior claim. This will bring the Railway Act into line with the new legislation of the province of Ontario dealing with compensation to workmen for injuries sustained. It is merely to extend the law as it stands, and it seems to be an amendment that is necessary in the case of a railway company which may be insolvent and unable to pay claims for losses. In such a case the workman's claim will have priority over a mortgage deed the same as the other elements now in the law have priority.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

YUKON PLACER MINING ACT AMENDMENT.

SOLDIERS' MINING RIGHTS.

Hon. W. J. ROCHE (Minister of Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 67, to amend the Yukon Placer Mining Act. He said: An Order in Council was passed on the 28th October by which all those who had enlisted for service in the war had their mining rights protected until six months after the proclamation of peace. Inasmuch as this did not apply to those acquiring rights under the Placer Mining Act in the Yukon, the Commissioner of the Yukon was instructed by the department shortly after the passing of the Order in Council that it was the intention of the department to have the same privileges extended to those who had acquired rights of a similar character in the Yukon under the Placer Mining Act. As the Placer Mining Act could not be amended to this effect by Order in Council, this amendment is introduced.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

PORTSMOUTH PENITENTIARY.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. What quantity of potatoes was produced on the Portsmouth penitentiary farm in each of the years 1912, 1913 and 1914?

2. Were any of such potatoes sold? If so, to whom and at what price?

3. From what persons or firms were potatoes bought for use in said penitentiary in the years 1912, 1913 and 1914, and to date, 1915, with the quantities in each case and the price paid?

4. What quantity of pork has been produced at said penitentiary farm during the years 1912, 1913 and 1914?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. In 1911-12, 517 bushels; 1912-13, 500 bushels; 1913-14, 366 bushels.

2. No potatoes were sold in 1912 or 1914. In 1913 the following sales were made, which (with the exception of 1½ bushels) were culls—too small for table use and purchased for seed: W. Holland, 9 bushels; F. Montgomery, 7½ bushels; J. Berrigan, 2 bushels; H. Powell, 4½ bushels; R. McGeein, 3 bushels; W. Tatton, 1 bushel; F. Doyle, 1½ bushels; J. M. Platt, 1½ bushels; Total, 30 bushels at 85c. per bushel.

3. Potatoes were purchased in 1912, 1913, 1914 and 1915, as follows:

Date.	Name.	Quantity.	Price.
1911.			
April 12.	Alfred Garrett	73 bags.	$0 80
" 28.	Jas. Redden & Co.	170 "	0 90
May 19.	"	4 "	1 10
" 23.	C. Craig	87 "	0 90
June 7.	Jas. Redden & Co.	56 "	0 90
" 11.	J. M. Stafford	14 "	0 80
" 16.	H. E. Peters	39 "	0 80
" 23.	J. Munroe	40 "	0 80
July 6.	J. Redden & Co.	48 "	1 00
" 7.	J. Crawford	20 bu.	1 25
" 29.	Isaac Fraser	13 "	1 25
Aug. 5.	John Henderson	15 "	1 50
" 12.	D. Boyce	10 "	1 40
Nov. 1.	F. C. Palmer & Co.	1,034 "	0 60
1912.			
Feb. 17.	Alfred Reid	15 bags.	1 75
Mar. 7.	W. P. Peters	24 "	1 80
" 19.	J. Y. Parkhill	17 "	1 85
" 22.	"	125 "	1 70
" 22.	W. P. Peters	190 "	1 75
May 6.	M. J. Hill	30 "	1 65
" 14.	Jas. Redden & Co.	2 "	1 90
" 21.	F. S. Ferguson	33 "	1 75
" 23.	J. Y. Parkhill	279 "	1 77½
July 18.	W. P. Peters	10 "	1 60
" 19.	St. V. de Paul Penity	50 "	1 35
" 30.	J. Y. Parkhill	30 brl.	4 25
Aug. 12.	J. R. Henderson	20 "	3 75
" 24.	W. A. Height	10 bu.	1 00
" 24.	Grant Pyke	50 "	1 00
" 31.	Geo. Curl	12 bags.	1 00
Sept. 5.	Allan German	20 "	1 00
" 19.	J. Y. Parkhill	26 "	1 00
Nov. 16.	H. Wallace	9 "	0 95
" 16.	Alva Emberly	8 "	1 00
" 20.	C. H. Spooner	102 "	0 95
" 26.	Harris Abattoir Co.	598 "	0 95
1913.			
Mar. 7.	A. Maclean	24 "	1 10
" 12.	J. Y. Parkhill	30 "	1 00
" 18.	W. P. Peters	30 "	1 00
" 22.	"	30 "	1 00
" 28.	A. Maclean	100 "	0 90
April 14.	W. J. Crothers & Co.	100 "	0 90
" 24.	W. P. Peters	600 "	0 88
July 26.	T. D. Creighton	10⅔ bu.	1 25
" 29.	J. Y. Parkhill	10 brl.	3 60
" 30.	J. D. Creighton	19¼ bu.	1 00
" 31.	J. R. Henderson	20 "	1 10
Aug. 5.	J. Y. Parkhill	10 brl.	3 00
" 9.	Sydney Parks	24 bu.	1 00
" 9.	C. O. Keeler	10 "	1 00
" 9.	H. Ball	12½ "	1 00
" 16.	C. O. Keeler	10 "	1 00
" 16.	Bruce Henderson	25½ "	0 95
Oct. 18.	Elmer Clyde	40 bags.	0 85
" 25.	"	17 "	0 85
" 17.	W. A. Potter	29 "	0 85
Nov. 1.	W. McNeely	31 "	0 90
Oct. 15.	Elmer Clyde	14 "	1 00
Nov. 15.	"	17 "	1 00
" 15.	David Fink	20 "	0 90
" 15.	Frank Joyner	15 "	0 90
" 20.	"	31 "	0 90
" 22.	"	38 "	0 90
Dec. 6.	Damon Amey	12 "	0 95
" 6.	J. C. Rogers	9 "	0 95
" 12.	J. F. Nolton	30 "	1 00
" 18.	T. A. Kerr	71 "	1 00
" 30.	"	120 "	1 00
1914.			
Jan. 23.	T. A. Kerr	107 "	1 00
" 23.	Wm. Gashman	43 "	1 00
" 23.	"	44 "	1 00
Mar. 18.	T. A. Kerr	300 "	1 00
April 14.	J. Y. Parkhill (seed)	50 "	1 25
" 15.	Geo. Irvine	15 "	1 00
" —	"	14 "	1 00
May 4.	A. Mac an	30 "	1 00
" 20.	J. Y. Parkhill & Co.	75 "	1 45
" 27.	Hatfield & Scott	455 "	1 25
Aug. 8.	H. W. Stover	10 bu.	1 00
" 8.	Cortland Snider	10 "	1 10
" 8.	Chas. Connors	16¾ "	1 00
" 15.	Alva Emberly	29 "	1 10
" 20.	H. Robinson	10 "	1 00
" 20.	Roy Rose	4 "	1 00
" 21.	Jas. Redden & Co.	32 "	1 00
Dec. 29.	Benson Coulter	112 bags.	0 75
" —	M. Mangon	103 "	0 75
Aug. 20.	R. Clark	11 bu.	1 00
1915.			
Jan. —	P. Yeomans	12 bags.	0 75
Feb. 10.	T. H. Watson	79 "	0 75
" —	T. A. Kerr	168 "	0 75
" —	Alva Emberly	46 "	0 75
" —	"	14 "	0 75
" 17.	Thos. W. Kerr	77 "	0 75
" 12.	M. Truesdale	69 "	0 75

4. Fiscal year 1911-12, 43,777 lb; fiscal year 1912-13, 38,233 lb; fiscal year 1913-14, 30,115 lb.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. When was Mr. Creighton appointed as warden of Portsmouth penitentiary?

2. In what institutions had Mr. Creighton performed the duties of warden previous to his present appointment, and what are the dates of his service in each case?

3. Who is the warden of Prince Albert penitentiary and when was he appointed?

4. What previous experience had he to fit him for the position?

5. On whose recommendation was he appointed?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. August 1, 1914.

2. Kingston penitentiary, June 26, 1913, to August 8, 1913; Alberta penitentiary, December 10, 1913, to April 6, 1914; Kingston penitentiary, July 11, 1914, to August 1, 1914.

3. W. J. Macleod, appointed March 25, 1914.

4. Continuous employment in the penitentiary service since January 1, 1896, in various capacities, clerical, administrative and disciplinary.

5. The Minister of Justice.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. By whose order or direction would the act of tubbing insane convicts be carried out?

2. Are there any guards or other officials at Portsmouth penitentiary who have assisted in or ordered the tubbing of insane convicts?

3. Was a specially constructed cell prepared for the hosing of convicts at Portsmouth penitentiary?

4. By whose order was said cell specially prepared for that purpose?

5. Have convicts at Portsmouth penitentiary been hosed by Inspector Stewart, Inspector Hughes and Deputy Warden O'Leary?

6. Has hosing and tubbing of convicts been discontinued? If so, when and for what reason?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Bathing (by use of ordinary bath tubs) is imperative as a sanitary regulation of the prison and is carried out weekly by the officer in charge of the ward as a matter of routine, without special orders from anyone. If the officer neglected the duty, he would be reported by his superior officer to the warden. Except in very rare cases, the convicts comply willingly and appreciate the opportunity. Occasionally, however, a refractory lunatic refuses to comply, in which case the bath is enforced by the officers—due care and precautions being taken to prevent the convict from injuring himself or the officers in charge.

2. The warden is unable to find any one on the staff of the penitentiary who has any knowledge of tubbing having been used except as before described. The following are the statutory declarations of officers who are still on the staff of the prison and who have been, from time to time, in charge of the insane ward:

Dominion of Canada, province of Ontario, county of Frontenac, to wit:

In the matter of the inquiry regarding the alleged "tubbing" of the insane at the insane ward of Kingston penitentiary.

I, Patrick J. Madden, of the city of Kingston, in the county of Frontenac, guard, do solemnly declare that I was in charge of the insane ward from September 3, 1907, to August 31, 1911, and from September 13, 1911, to September 26, 1911.

During that time there were filthy prisoners who refused to bathe. There was a strap placed round the body of the prisoner and two for the hands and one for the feet. This strap was used for the protection of the convict and the officers. These straps were only used for refractory convicts while bathing and for no other purpose. The water used was ordinary bath water.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of "The Canada Evidence Act, 1893."

(Sgd.) P. J. Madden.

Declared before me at the Kingston penitentiary in the county of Frontenac this 23rd day of February, A.D. 1915.

(Sgd.) J. Russell Foster.
A Commissioner in H.C.J.

Dominion of Canada, province of Ontario, county of Frontenac, to wit:

In the matter of the inquiry regarding the alleged "tubbing" of the insane at the insane ward of Kingston Penitentiary.

I, Arthur McConville, of the city of Kingston, in the county of Frontenac, guard, do solemnly declare that I was in charge of the insane ward from July 3, 1911, till September 12, 1911, and from September 27, 1911, till March 30, 1912.

During my time the bath was never used as a punishment. The straps were used on a prisoner who was filthy and refused to bathe voluntarily. There was no violence used toward any prisoner. The straps being used for his protection and ours. The water was luke warm, as used for bathing.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of "The Canada Evidence Act, 1893."

(Sgd.) A. McConville,

Declared before me at the Kingston penitentiary in the county of Frontenac this 23rd day of February, A.D. 1915.

(Sgd.) Chas. F. Smith.
A Commissioner in H.C.J.

Dominion of Canada, province of Ontario, county of Frontenac, to wit:

In the matter of the inquiry regarding the alleged "tubbing" of the insane at the insane ward of Kingston Penitentiary.

I, William Ryan, of the city of Kingston, in the county of Frontenac, guard, do solemnly declare that I was in charge of the asylum from July 1, 1912, to September 8, 1913. That during that time one or two prisoners had to be strapped for the bath. The bath was never used as a punishment—the straps being used for their protection and that of the officers. The water was not too cold for bathing.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of "The Canada Evidence Act, 1893."

(Sgd.) W. Ryan.

Declared before me at the Kingston penitentiary in the county of Frontenac this 23rd day of February, A.D. 1915.

(Sgd.) Chas. F. Smith.

Dominion of Canada, province of Ontario, county of Frontenac, to wit:

In the matter of the inquiry regarding the alleged "tubbing" of the insane at the insane ward, Kingston penitentiary.

I, Charles H. Gray, of the city of Kingston, in the county of Frontenac, guard, do solemnly declare that I was on duty in the insane ward from April 1, 1912, to May 25, 1912.

During that time there was a convict of filthy habits who had to be given a forced bath. Straps consisting of a waistband and two side straps for the hands and one for the feet were used. No unnecessary force was used. The water was tepid, such as used in a bath. This restraint was simply used for his and our protection.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of "The Canada Evidence Act, 1893."

(Sgd.) C. H. Gray.

Declared before me at the Kingston penitentiary in the county of Frontenac this 23rd day of February, A.D. 1915.

(Sgd.) Chas. F. Smith.

Dominion of Canada, province of Ontario, county of Frontenac, to wit:

In the matter of the inquiry regarding the alleged "tubbing" of the insane at the insane ward of Kingston Penitentiary.

I, Robert E. Aiken, of the city of Kingston, in the county of Frontenac, guard, do solemnly declare that I have been in charge of the insane ward since November 11, 1913.

Weekly bathing is compulsory in the ward, and sometimes—three times to my knowledge—one or two have resisted. The straps are placed round the waist and on the hands and feet. The prisoner is then placed in the bath and washed clean. No undue force is used. The water is never cold. Strapping is never used as punishment. The same straps are used when a prisoner refuses to have his hair clipped.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of "The Canada Evidence Act, 1893."

(Sgd.) Robert Aiken.

Declared before me at the Kingston penitentiary in the county of Frontenac this 23rd day of February, A.D. 1915.

(Sgd.) Chas. F. Smith.
A Commissioner in H.C.J. Ontario.

3. A cell in the isolated ward was set apart for the purpose and provided with an exit for water, etc.

4. By Inspector Stewart after an outbreak of several incorrigible criminals, in which several officers were rendered unconscious and dangerously injured.

5. Twelve convicts in Kingston penitentiary have been hosed—seven by Inspector Stewart and five by Deputy Warden O'Leary, when in charge of the prison. This was done under authority of No. 179 of the Penitentiary Regulations, drafted with the concurrence and approval of Sir Oliver Mowat when Minister of Justice and adopted on the recommendation of Hon. David Mills, his successor as Minister of Justice, by the Governor General in Council, on November 26, 1898. This form of punishment for defiant and incorrigible convicts was substituted for the "triangle and the lash" previously authorized.

As regards Inspector Hughes. No. He was never in charge of the penitentiary.

6. The hose has not been used since May 11, 1913.—Since the report of the Investigating Commissioners (April 15, 1914) the regulation authorizing its use has not been acted on, pending final decision as to modification of regulations now under consideration.

COLE HARBOUR WHARF.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Why has the Government not built a public wharf at Cole Harbour, Guysborough county, N.S.?

2. When was the money for the construction of this wharf first voted by Parliament?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Difficulty in obtaining a title to the site on which to construct the wharf.

2. In the fiscal year 1911-12.

NEW GLASGOW MAIL ROUTE.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Who is the mail contractor for rural mail route No. 3, New Glasgow, Pictou county?

2. What is the amount paid him per annum?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Danford McDougall.

2. $600 per annum.

CAPTAIN E. FISHER.

* Mr. TURRIFF:

1. Is E. Fisher, registrar of the Supreme and County Courts at Kamloops, B.C., drawing pay from the Militia Department as an officer in the R.M.R?

2. What is his rank?

3. What is the rate of pay per day?

4. How long has he been drawing pay?

5. Is he still under pay by the Militia Department?

6. Is it the intention of the Militia Department to continue Mr. Fisher under pay?

Major General HUGHES:

1. There is a Captain E. Fisher, 102nd Regiment, doing mobilization duties at Kamloops, and drawing pay from the Militia Department. The department has no information regarding his civil employment.

2. Captain Adjutant of the 102nd Regiment.

3. $4.25 per diem.

4. Since August 10, 1914.

5. Yes.

6. Yes, while he is on active service.

MIDDLESEX COUNTY INDIANS.

Mr. ROSS:

1. What salary does Dr. Woods receive as physician for the Indians on Middlesex county reserve?
2. Is he entitled to any fees beyond his regular salary?
3. If so, on what basis?
4. What has he been paid since March 31, 1914?
5. How many Indians were in the reserve in 1910, and how many in 1914?
6. What was the Indian Agent's salary and allowances in 1910?
7. What are the Indian Agent's salary and allowances now?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. $650 per annum.
2. Yes.
3. He is allowed remuneration for special calls at the Mount Elgin Institute to attend pupils other than those belonging to the agency, and for medicines supplied them.
4. $829.50.
5. In 1910, 1,366; in 1914, 1,371.
6. Salary, $600; allowance, $450.
7. Salary, $1,200; no allowances. The Order in Council appointing the agent states that he has to give his whole time to the agency.

BAIE DES CHALEURS RAILWAY.

Mr. MARCIL:

Has any action been taken by the Government on the report of Mr. Plante, Commissioner appointed to report on claims against the Baie des Chaleurs railway, the Atlantic and Lake Superior railway, and the Quebec Oriental railway and what was such action?

Mr. COCHRANE: Report still under consideration.

QUEBEC ORIENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. MARCIL:

Have any steps been taken since the last session of Parliament for the acquiring of the Quebec Oriental railway and the Atlantic, Quebec and Western railway by lease or purchase, by the Department of Railways and Canals, and what are they?

Mr. COCHRANE: No.

ATLANTIC AND LAKE SUPERIOR RAILWAY.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Has the Government paid the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy for the last twenty miles of the Atlantic and Lake Superior railway, from Caplin to Paspebiac?
2. If so, to whom has the amount been paid, what was the amount, when was the payment made, and on whose recommendation?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. $18,449.17 of a balance of $20,765.98 has been paid.

[Mr. Sam. Hughes.]

2. C. R. Scoles; $18,449.17; 6th July, 1914; on the recommendation of the Financial Comptroller.

ST. ROMUALD POST OFFICE.

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. Why was the post office of St. Romuald, county of Lévis, not erected out of the sum of $13,000 for which provision was made in last year's vote in the Estimates?
2. To what other purpose was the said sum of $13,000 used, what portion of it was expended, and to whom was it paid?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Instead of constructing a new building immediately, the department is considering the advisability of repairing the building located on the site lately purchased.
2. For no other purpose than the purchase of site and building thereon: H. Lagueux, $6,000; Adjutor Roy, legal services, $30.40; survey and examination of site, Gustave Gagnon, $6; Xavier Carrier, $6; Donat Carrier, $1.50; I. Lacasse, 70c.; total, $6,044.60.

NATIONIAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—QUEBEC TERMINALS.

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. Have any errors been discovered in the plans or specifications of the Champlain Market Railway Station at Quebec?
2. For what reason was it necessary to pull down some of the basement work of the said station?
3. What was the cost of such pulling down of the work and reconstruction, and what was the total loss as a result of the error discovered?
4. Who was accountable for such error?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. No.
2. None pulled down.
3. Answered by No. 2.
4. Answered by No. 2.

Mr. LACHANCE:

1. Has the Government purchased a railway from the Canadian Northern Railway Company or from any other company, for the use of the National Transcontinental, in the river St. Charles valley, Quebec? If so, when, and for what amount?
2. What is the length of the railway so purchased?
3. Did such railway, at the time of its purchase, connect at both ends of said line with the National Transcontinental railway? If not, how many miles had to be constructed in order to effect such connection, and in what localities or parishes was such connection effected?
4. Did the company from which such railway was purchased reserve any rights on such railway, and if so, what are such rights or privileges?
5. What are the gradients of such railway, including its curves and slopes?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes, on June 5, 1914; for $175,000.
2. Five and one-half miles.
3. It connected only at the east and near Cape Rouge, and, in order to facilitate operation, an additional "Y" connection is being constructed at the Cap Rouge end. This "Y" connection is 2,481 feet long. At the west end a connection 2·3 miles long has been constructed, in order to effect connection with the Leonard Shops. The east end is in the parish of Cap Rouge. The west end is in the parish of St. Malo.
4. The company did not reserve any rights.
5. The grade is 0·5 per cent. The curves are 4 degrees and less.

GUYSBOROUGH AND CANSO MAILS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has the contract for carrying the mails between Guysborough and Canso expired? If so, when?
2. Have tenders been asked for? If not, is it the intention of the Government to open this contract for public tender?
3. Has the contract been awarded? If so, to whom and at what rate?
4. Has the Department been requested by letters to have this service put up for public tender?
5. What was the rate payable in the case of the former contract?
6. If a new contract has not been entered into, what rate is being paid for the service at present, and to whom?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. No.
2. (a) No. (b) The department has authorized a renewal of the present contract which was entered into on the 1st of April, 1911, after public tenders had been invited, for a further period of four years from the 1st of April next.
3. Answered by No. 2.
4. Yes, but they were not received until after the renewal had been authorized.
5. $2,270 per annum.
6. $2,270 to William McDougall, present contractor.

DOMINION TRUST COMPANY.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has the Government appointed any person to investigate the affairs and management of The Dominion Trust Company, as provided for under section 70 of the Trust Company Act, 4-5 Geo. V, Chap. 55?
2. If so, what is the date of the appointment, the name of the person appointed and the scope of the proposed investigation?

Mr. W. T. WHITE:

1. No. The Dominion Trust Company is in liquidation, and its affairs are under the jurisdiction and control of the Courts.
2. Answered by answer to No. 1.

COLLINGWOOD SHIP BUILDING COMPANY.

*Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Has the Government awarded the contract for building a barge to the Collingwood Ship Building Company?
2. If so, is the schedule of wages to be paid the workmen attached to said contract according to what is known as Fair-wage clause in the statutes?
3. What rates are prescribed by this schedule?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.
2. The contract and specification both contain a clause providing that the wages paid in the execution of the contract shall be those generally accepted as current in each trade for competent workmen in the district where the work is carried on.
3. No special schedule included in contract.

EAST ERINVILLE POST OFFICE.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has an application been made for a money order office at East Erinville, Guysborough county, N.S.?
2. If so, has the application been granted?
3. If it has not been granted, why not?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Yes.
2. No.
3. The revenue of the office, which only amounted to $71.75 during the fiscal year ended 31st March, 1914, did not indicate that sufficient business would be done at East Erinville Post Office to warrant the establishment of money order business, but the postmaster was furnished with a credit supply of $100 in postal notes in May last, which serves the same purpose.

GUYSBOROUGH BRANCH RAILWAY.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

Does the Government intend at the present session to make provision for the construction of a branch railway in Guysborough county, N.S.?

Mr. COCHRANE: It is under consideration.

LEVIS SHELL FACTORY.

Mr. BOYER:

1. Who are the shareholders of the new shell manufacturing establishment at Levis, Quebec?
2. Has any contract been awarded by the Imperial authorities to the company in charge of such establishment?

Major General HUGHES: The Government has no information at its disposal on this subject.

SASKATCHEWAN AND ALBERTA COAL ROYALTIES.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN:

1. What amount of royalty has the Government collected on coal in the province of Saskatchewan in each of the years from 1906 to 1914, inclusive?

2. What amount of royalty has the Government collected on coal in the province of Alberta in each of the years from 1906 to 1914, inclusive?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. 1906, $249.90; 1907, $428.90; 1908, $358.11; 1909, $1,273.13; 1910, $2,172.65; 1911, $2,858.81; 1912, $3,128.22; 1913, $2,341.91; 1914, $1,639.72; total, $14,451.35.

2. 1906, $4,206.90; 1907, $8,740.45; 1908, $5,322.39; 1909, $115,151.24; 1910, $202,473.68; 1911, $133,367.55; 1912, $133,461.74; 1913, $146,195.46; 1914, $122,608.43; total, $871,527.84.

WAR SUPPLIES—HORSES.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. Have any horses been bought by or for the Government during the last eight months in the United States?

2. If so, how many were bought and what was the price per head?

3. From whom were they bought?

4. For what purpose were they used after they were purchased?

5. What are the names and addresses of the parties who made the purchases?

Major General HUGHES: No, none.

Mr. COPP:

1. Have any horses been purchased in the county of Westmorland, N.B., by the Militia Department since the outbreak of war?

2. If so, from whom were such horses purchased, and what prices were paid for same?

3. Who was the purchasing agent for said horses?

Major General HUGHES:

1. Yes.

2. R. W. Wood, 4 horses, $890; P. Heineisey, 1, $185; F. Milton, 1, $220; T. Ryan, 1, $200; H. Ross, 1, $185; D. Boyce, 9, $2,250; H. H. Warman, 2, $485; W. D. Allanche, 1, $225; C. F. Gross, 6, $1,500; T. B. Reade, 6, $1,350; J. Black, 1, $200; Geo. McKinnon, 1, $190; A. Humphrey, 1, $200; W. A. Humphrey, 2, $500; A. McConnell, 1, $198; C. F. Gross, 2, $460; W. H. Anderson, 18, $3,945; J. Coffee, 1, $220; W. H. Copp, 3, $565; W. McWilliams, 1, $200; N. Sleeve, 2, $460; W. B. McNeil, 54, $12,154; W. D. Hopper, 1, $150; E. Hogan, 21, $4,705; C. Bezanson, 2, $420; B. F. Myles, 1, $205; B. Chapman, 1, $215; B. E. Smith, 1, $225; J. McAnn, 4, $975; C. F. Gross, 2, $325; W. B. McNeil, 11, $2,475; J. F. Egett, 1, $225; J. McD. Cook, 1, $175.

3. Major S. B. Anderson, Moncton, N.B.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Who were the parties from whom horses were purchased for military purposes in Pictou county in the year 1914, and the amount paid for each?

2. Who were the parties from whom horses were purchased for military purposes in Pictou county in the year 1915, and the amount paid for each?

Major General HUGHES:

1. T. C. Woodworth, 40 horses, $6,766.

2. George Bailey, 1 horse, $160; S. W. Stevenson, 1, $185; H. H. Fillers, 1, $150; F. McGinnis, 1, $200; J. F. Harris, 1, $190; T. Carroll, 1, $180; A. McDonald, 1, $155; W. A. McLean, 1, $170; H. I. McKenzie, 1, $150; J. D. B. Fraser, 1, $165; A. McKay, 1, $160; J. Roff, 1, $165; K. McKenzie, 1, $175; D. Ferguson, 1, $175.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. Is the Minister of Militia or the Department of Militia aware that it is reported a certain number of horses, bought for the overseas contingent at Valcartier, had to be drowned in River Jacques Cartier, having been found entirely unsuitable for service?

2. How many horses died at Valcartier during the mobilization period of the overseas contingent?

3. What was done with such dead horses?

Major General HUGHES: I have no objection to answering this question, but I think courtesy requires that it be put in a different form. I shall have the answer ready for next question day, and I hope the hon. member will change the form of the question.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What change is required?

Major General HUGHES: The question brings in newspaper gossip. The first part reads: "Is the Minister of Militia or the Department of Militia aware that it is reported."

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not see what is to be eliminated in that question. If my hon. friend will tell me, I will inform the hon. member (Mr. Delisle), who is absent at present.

Major General HUGHES: The answer to the first question is "no."

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is all right. That is answered without elimination.

Major General HUGHES:

2. 12 to 15. I am not sure as to the exact number until I get the complete returns.

3. Some were taken to the glue factory; the others were buried.

Mr. SPEAKER: The latter part of the first part of the question is entirely out of order. It is an allegation of fact.

WAR SUPPLIES—SADDLES.

Mr. BOYER:

1. Has Mr. J. N. Ducharme of Montreal been awarded a contract to supply saddles to the Department of Militia? If so, for what amount, and what is the date of such contract?

Major General HUGHES: No.

WAR SUPPLIES—CLINIC THERMOMETERS.

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM:

1. How many clinic thermometers were purchased from Mr. T. A. Brownlee, druggist of Ottawa?
2. On what date did Mr. Brownlee deliver these clinic thermometers to the Government?
3. On what date did the Government pay Mr. Brownlee for them?
4. On what date did Mr. Brownlee refund to the Government half of the purchase price?
5. What are the names of the private individuals from whom the Government received offers for clinic thermometers?
6. On what date did the Government receive these offers from private individuals for clinic thermometers?
7. What was the price quoted by these private individuals?

Major General HUGHES:

1. 1,062.

2. 108, August 11, 1914; 594, August 17, 1914; 360, October 1, 1914.

3. August 31, 1914, for 702; October 29, 1914, for 360.

4. February 11, 1915.

5, 6 and 7. Chandler & Fisher, Ltd., Winnipeg, October 9, 1914, at $10 per doz.; W. B. MacDonald Co., Ottawa, November 5, 1914, at $8.50 per doz.

LETHBRIDGE CUSTOMS STAFF.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. When were W. A. Gibbons and A. B. Pipes appointed to the customs service at Lethbridge?
2. When were they removed, and for what reason?
3. What members of the staff still holding their positions, were appointed after Messrs. Gibbons and Pipes had entered the service?
4. Why were Messrs. Gibbons and Pipes removed from the service and more recently appointed officials retained?

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. W. A. Gibbons and A. S. Pipes were not appointed permanently by Order in Council. They were employed as temporary officers on November 7, 1910, and November 29, 1909, respectively, their services being subject to be dispensed with at the discretion of the Minister of Customs.

2. September 15, 1914, as it was deemed necessary to reduce the customs staff in view of the decrease in revenue.

3. H. Bentley, W. B. Burnett, jr., W. V. Hessey, T. D. Kevin, Wm. Scott.

4. In the interests of the service.

COAL IMPORTS FROM THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

How much bituminous and anthracite coal was received from the United States through the ports of Fort William and Port Arthur during the years 1912, 1913 and 1914 respectively?

Mr. J. D. REID: Entered for consumption during the fiscal years ending in 1912, 1913, and 1914, respectively:

Fort William—	Tons.	Valued at
Bituminous.		
1912	1,831,349	$3,920,519
1913	1,847,447	3,832,080
1914	376,835	1,954,441
Anthracite.		
1912	311,323	1,528,675
1913	294,162	1,356,106
1914	37 ,835	1,954,441
Port Arthur—		
Bituminous.		
1912	1,283,370	2,941,395
1913	1,048,850	2,308,101
1914	1,307,939	3,065,769
Anthracite.		
1912	152,588	763,675
1913	167,705	893,120
1914	205,380	1,078,450

EMPLOYMENT OF CHAS. NAPOLEON DORION.

Mr. DELISLE:

Is the Government aware that Mr. Chas. Napoléon Dorion, a practising lawyer of the city of Quebec, is said to receive a Government salary as an employee of the post office of said city?

Mr. CASGRAIN: Charles Napoleon Dorion, third class clerk, grade "A"; salary, $900 a year, since the 1st July, 1914.

Mr. Dorion has tendered his resignation to take effect as from the 1st of May, and the department has consented to his services being retained until that time, provided he works the regular hours.

EMPLOYMENT OF L. H. FOURNIER.

Mr. MOLLOY:

1. Is L. H. Fournier, of Winnipeg, in the employ of the Government?
2. If so, when was he appointed, what is his salary, and what are his duties?
3. By whom was he recommended?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If the hon. gentleman will tell us what particular depart-

ment is alluded to, it will assist us in answering the question at an earlier date.

Question stands.

PHILADELPHIA IMMIGRATION AGENT.

Mr. PARDEE:

Is James P. Jaffray now employed as a Government Immigration Agent at Philadelphia, U.S.? If so, at what salary and what are his duties?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes. Salary $2,000 per annum. His duties are to encourage emigration to Canada of desirable settlers and to examine Canadian bound passengers arriving by vessels at Philadelphia.

THE HOME MILITIA.

Mr. EDMOND PROULX moved:

For a return showing the names of all the Dominion Civil Service employees and Provincial Service Employees serving in the Home Militia as guards on bridges, canals or otherwise, and holding the rank of officers and non-commissioned officers; the salaries they receive from their respective governments as Civil Service employees and the remuneration allowed to them by the Department of Militia.

Major General HUGHES: I shall be glad to bring down the return in so far as the Dominion Civil Service is concerned. As regards the Provincial Civil Service, I shall be glad to bring down the return so far as the information is available.

Motion agreed to.

LOANS FROM IMPERIAL TREASURY.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN moved:

For a copy of all correspondence of the Imperial authorities on the subject of loans from the Imperial Treasury to the Canadian Government.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am informed by the Minister of Finance that the larger portion of this correspondence is of a confidential character. There may, however, be something to be brought down, and there is no objection to the motion passing.

Motion agreed to.

VALCARTIER LAND CLAIMS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

1. For a full statement and description of all lands taken possession of by the Government for the camp at Valcartier.

2. For copies of all titles of the Government to the same, whether by expropriation, purchase or otherwise.

3. For a specified statement of all amounts claimed and still unpaid whether for land or damages.

4. For a specified account of all amounts paid up to date either for land or damages.

He said: My object in presenting this motion is not to ask for information as to why there was a camp at Valcartier for the first contingent. The necessity for having a camp there has not been made clear to me nor, I believe, to the general public. If a camp was needed, Petawawa was available for the purpose, but the contingent which is now in course of preparation is being assembled neither at Valcartier nor at Petawawa; more properly, perhaps, the men are being assembled at the different stations throughout the Dominion where recruiting is going on. I believe it would have been better if the same policy had been adopted in respect of the first contingent. But what I wish particularly to bring to the attention of the Minister of Militia to-day is that many of the owners of land who were dispossessed for the establishment of Valcartier camp have not yet been paid. I understand that the camp comprises nearly ten thousand acres, and that between forty and fifty men were dispossessed. These men, practically all farmers, were not in circumstances of affluence, and each one needed the crop which he was then expecting to raise, and, of course, the price of his land upon expropriation. On August 28, the following notice was served upon one of the men so dispossessed —I understand that a similar notice was served on all.

From Lt.-Col. Wm. McBain,
Quebec, Que.,
To Mr. Michael Holton.
Dear Sir:

I have been instructed by the Department of Militia and Defence to notify you herewith that it is their intention to expropriate the land held by you in Valcartier and described as parts of Cad. Nos 54, 66, 67, 68 and list Cad. No. 71, on the official plan for the parish of St. Gabriel de Valcartier containing in all 240 acres.

I have been further instructed to notify you that it is the intention of the department to take immediate possession of the above described land and to offer you in full and complete settlement therefor the sum of $4,800. If this offer is not accepted by you within thirty days of the date of this notice, proceedings in expropriation will be commenced.

Kindly take notice of the above and govern yourself accordingly.

Yours truly,
(Sgd) Wm. McBain,
Authorized agent of the Department of Militia and Defence.

Who was Mr. McBain? For my part I do not know, nor did any of those to whom these letters were addressed. He was not connected with the Department of Militia. He styled himself colonel; I understand that he suddenly rose from a rank of obscurity to be a full-fledged colonel of the first rank. The management of the camp at Valcartier had been placed at first in the

hands of Sir William Price, a well-known business man of the city of Quebec and a former member of this House, a man holding the highest reputation for business ability and integrity of his character. Why Sir William Price was not continued in the agency of the Department of Militia is not known to me, but I believe that the change does not conduce to the public interest. I think there would have been less complaint than there has been if Sir William Price had been continued as agent of the department instead of Colonel McBain. I do not wish to reflect on Mr. McBain; I do not know him; but I do know Sir William Price very well, and, not knowing Mr. McBain and knowing Sir William Price as I do, and as everybody in this House does, I believe the change was not calculated to promote the public service. Be this as it may, the one fact I make complaint of is this: I have been informed—I have no special information except that which I received by correspondence—that though these men were dispossessed of their lands in the month of August last, yet, with the exception of one or two, these owners, some forty or fifty in number, have not yet received the money to which they were entitled. There may have been some dispute as to price. This was not unnatural. But I desire to represent to my hon. friend that in view of the circumstances an extra effort should have been made to give these people ample satisfaction. These men had their property invaded just at the time when their crop was ready. Some of them could not gather anything of their crop, and some of them are reduced, I will not say to penury, but certainly to stringent circumstances, in consequence of the delay. And, so far as I know, no effort has been made to have these men paid. I understand that the matter has been referred to the Department of Justice. That is to say, all these men have to go to law in order to get their money. If their claim has been put into the hands of the Department of Justice, that department cannot proceed except by due course of law; these forty or fifty owners, suddenly despoiled of their property, will have to go to the court to get the value of their land and also of their crop. I make this motion simply to have the information from the minister. Charges have been made as to the management of the camp. I make no charge; I simply ask for information.

Major General HUGHES: The leader of the Opposition has dwelt upon the necessity of Valcartier camp; but he says he will discuss that at some other time. I am willing to oblige him and will reply to his criticism of the camp at Valcartier at some other time. But, inasmuch as he went out of his way to discuss it a little, I may point out that the camp at Valcartier stands unique in the history of the world as having produced the best shooting regiment that ever wore a uniform. The object in getting the force assembled at Valcartier—war being a game of shooting—was to give the boys an opportunity to learn practically how to hit the bull's eye. They succeeded; and let me say, without disrespect to the second contingent, which is made up of a lot of as fine boys as ever gathered in any part of the world, that it will take them six or eight weeks' actual practice at the targets before they will be in the same class —I refer to rifle shooting alone—with the boys who sailed on the 1st of October.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition asks, who is Colonel McBain? May I tell him?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Certainly.

Major General HUGHES : Col. McBain is a descendant, a great-grandson, of an officer who stood beside Wolfe on the Plains of Abraham. Colonel McBain's ancestors ever since 1759—nearly as long as the ancestors of the leader of the Opposition—have lived at Valcartier, on the very spot where this camp was erected. Col. McBain is a gentleman of whom the city of Quebec and his home district are very proud. Col. McBain is a gentleman who struck out into western Canada years ago and who by honest business industry has amassed a fortune. Col. McBain is a gentleman who, when the call to arms came, volunteered for any position to go to the front. Col. McBain is a gentleman who has given his time and his services freely to the Canadian Government, I believe without any remuneration—I am not aware that he has accepted any; and in some ways I know he has refused it—in order to perfect the boys for service at the front.

The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) wants to know why Sir William Price was not given the position. Sir William Price is another distinguished gentleman of whom the people of Quebec and the people of Canada are proud. He also volunteered his services and refused to accept

a cent of remuneration. But he had nothing to do with the work which Col. McBain had in hand. Of five places that we selected as best suited for this purpose, this site at Valcartier was the one most convenient to railway facilities. To reach the others we should have had to build roads for eight or ten miles. It was Col. McBain who, with the committee, first selected the site, and it was he who was put in charge of it. He carried on negotiations with the people, a splendid lot of people, who lived on these ranges, and, as the records will show he carried on these negotiations most fairly. He had the matter settled to the entire satisfaction of all, with the exception of two or three men, until—no, do not shake the head—some designing gentlemen came along and told these people: "Hold higher; don't settle." Sir William Price had charge of the laying of water mains and getting in the water at Valcartier and other work of that kind. And, let me say, Sir William Price was in no sense discontinued in his work. He continued in his work until it was completed. Mr. McCarthy continued in his work until it was completed. Col. McBain continued in his work until it was completed. And so did Col. Low. Each of these stood to his guns like a man.

Now we come down to the settlement. I personally, feeling that these people were put to considerable inconvenience, went over every item. Valuations were made of each property, a fair valuation was taken, and to this was added a percentage as compensation for damages and for being forced to move out. Our instructions were that compensation for damages was not to depend upon the value of a man's property, because it may cost a poor man as much to move as a rich man. The matter was fairly and equitably arranged so far as we could do it. When it seemed that some people were not content with that, after consultation, Col. McBain was told to give the highest valuation made by any of the valuators. All except four owners, I think, were agreeable to accepting this settlement, until these emissaries got amongst them; I do not know whence they came, nor why, nor who sent them. Perhaps we can get that information. (Reading):

1. An Order in Council was passed on June 20, 1914, authorizing the acquisition of 4,391 acres in the parishes of St. Gabriel de Valcartier and St. Ambroise, in the county of Quebec, valued at $82,775, as a site for a central training area for the province of Quebec. On August 27, 1914, an Order in Council was passed authorizing the acquisition of an additional area of 10,116 acres in the parishes of St. Gabriel de Valcartier and St. Ambroise, county of Quebec, and St. Catherine, county of Portneuf, valued at $140,000. These two areas comprise: Lots 1-43; 54-115; 116-126; 128 and 129; 132; 134-154, St. Gabriel de Valcartier; 329-342 and 885-888, St. Ambroise, and 276-287 and 413-420, St. Catherine.

2. In September, 1913, and January and August, 1914, plans were filed under the Expropriation Act, thereby vesting title in the Crown, of the area authorized to be acquired by the Orders in Council above referred to.

3. The following properties, within the area of the camp site, which had been purchased by Lt.-Colonel Wm. McBain, representing the Department of Militia and Defence, have been conveyed to the Crown by that officer, at the price for which he paid for them:

Parish.	Lot No.	Area.	Vendor.	Price paid.
		Acres.		$ cts.
St. Gabriel de Valcartier	3, 4 & 94	275	R. Penney	3,525 00
" "	11 & 12			
St. Ambroise	329	198	M. McCoubrey	2,700 00
St. Gabriel de Valcartier	15 pt. 16 & 90	216	F. Thompson	3,000 00
	82 pt. 85 & pt. 80	135	John Billing	2,400 00
	84	210	Wm. Crawford	3,150 00
	Pt. 89	86	H. Brown	950 00
	92	89	Jno. McCoubrey	1,100 00
	103 & 104	170	Geo. Wolff	1,800 00
		1,379		18,625 00

Lieutenant-Colonel McBain having reported that he had come to terms with the undermentioned owners for the purchase of their respective properties for the prices named, cheques have accordingly been issued and forwarded to the Department of Justice for payment to the vendors and we are awaiting the receipt of the deeds of conveyance:

[Mr. Sam. Hughes.]

Parish.	Lot No.	Area.	Vendor.	Amount of cheque issued'
		Acres.		$ cts.
St. Gabriel de Valcartier	5 & 6	180	J. Adams	3,500 00
" "	9	90	Est. T. Penney	2,400 00
" "	13 & pt. 14	190	Curtis Billings	3,800 00
St. Catherine de Portneuf	Pt. 286			
St. Gabriel de Valcartier	56 & 57	180	W. M. Pinkney	2,000 00
	74	179	F. Lepire	3,000 00
	75, 76 & 77	273	Thos. Knox	5,800 00
	87	3	Mrs. H. Ireland	600 00
	89	87	Hopper Brown	2,500 00
	125 & 126 (pt.)	75	Thos. Adams	1,500 00
	Pt. 140 & pt. 141	135	Alex. Aiken	2,500 00
	138 & 139, pt. 140 & pt. 141	311	Jas. Hamilton	5,500 00
	151 & 152	251	R. Davidson	3,100 00
St. Ambroise	331	22	Jos. Darveau	440 00
" "	Pt. 337	41½	M. Dion	850 00
" "	338	45	F. & S. Pageau	810 00
" "	Pt. 340	15	E. Boivin	150 00
" "	" 340	15	D. Godin	225 00
" "	" 340	15	J. Martel	225 00
" "	" 342	30	J. Savard	450 00
" "	" 342	30	J. Savard	500 00
" "	" 342	30	P. Auclair.	300 00
St. Catherine	" 277	135	J. Fogerty	3,500 00
		2,332½		43,650 00

Four of the above vendors have refused to accept the amounts tendered to them, viz.: Messrs. J. Fogerty, Thomas Knox, Curtis Billings, Hopper Brown, claiming that the cheques were not in accordance with their agreement with Lieut.-Colonel McBain. The case of these people will be taken up with Lieut.-Colonel McBain upon his return to this country, which is expected shortly.

4. As regards the balance of the properties within the camp site:

(a) Lieutenant-Colonel McBain has reported that he has come to terms with the following, and the Department of Justice has 4 p.m. been asked to examine title. No cheques, however, have, as yet, been issued, pending a report from the Department of Justice that the titles are clear:

Parish'	Lot No.	Area.	Vendor.	Price to be paid.
		Acres.		$ cts.
St. Gabriel de Valcartier	Pt. 54, 66, 67 & 68	157	Thos. Holton	3,600 00
" "	64, 65 & pt. 67	180	Adam Aitken	3,250 00
" "	91	92	John McCoubrey	2,400 00
" "	149, 150, 148b & pt. 148a	315	Wm. Mabee	3,050 00
St. Ambroise	339	15	C. Linteau	150 00
St. Catherine	Pt. 277	1	Hagan	850 00
"	" 286	45	F. Racine	2,500 00
"	278-284	459	N. Elkins	9,000 00
		1,264		24,800 00

(b) With the owners of the remaining properties—some 75—we are still endeavouring to come to terms, and, if possible, obviate expropriation proceedings. The properties in question comprise an area of approximately 9,400 acres.

5. Twenty-seven of the owners within the area of the camp site have received compensation totalling $13,625 for damage to crops, as follows:

Owner.	Lot No.	Parish.	Compensation paid.
			$ cts'
Patrick King	20	St. Gabriel de Valcartier	425 00
George Thompson	14 (pt.)	" "	400 00
W. Lyons	19	" "	245 00
Est. Thos. Penney	9	" "	850 00
Walter Brown	86	" "	861 65
Frank Thompson	15 & pt. 16 & 90	" "	356 00
Robt. Penney	3, 4 & 94	" "	517 00
John McCoubrey	91 & 92	" "	423 00
John Adams	5 & 6	" "	630 00
Pat. Gough	7 & 8	" "	478 25
Jno. A. McCoubrey	93	" "	704 50
Thos. Knox	75, 76 & 77	" "	700 00
J. Fogerty	277	St. Catherine de Portneuf	1,000 00
Hopper Brown	89	St. Gabriel de Valcartier	750 00
Mrs. Ireland	87	" "	100 00
Thos. Holton	Pts. 54, 66, 67 & 68	" "	625 00
Alex. Aikens	140 & 141	" "	650 00
Mrs. O. McKinley	124 & pt. 83	" "	88 00
Curtis Billing	13 & pt. 14	" "	700 00
M. Pinkney	56 & 57	" "	250 00
Adam Aikins	64 & 65 & pt. 35 & 67	" "	450 00
Thos. Neil	70	" "	640 00
Patrick King	22 (pt.)	" "	120 00
Wm. Crawford	41 & 84	" "	809 75
H. McLaughlin	21, 22, 62 & 63	" "	550 00
F. Lepire	74	" "	150 00
Geo. Wolff	99, 103 & 104	" "	152 00
			13,625 15

6. To sum up:

(a) Deeds of conveyance to the Crown have been executed and received at the Department in the case of eight (8) properties—area 1,379 acres; price paid $18,625.

(b) Cheques aggregating $28,050 have been issued to close the purchase of eighteen (18) properties (comprising an area of approximately 1,645 acres). This does not include the cheques, amounting to $15,600 issued to Messrs. Fogerty, Knox, Billings and Brown, who have refused to accept same.

Note.—It is understood that in case of the majority of the properties the money has been paid over to the vendor and the deeds executed. The deeds, however, have not yet been received at the department.

(c) The purchase of eight (8) properties will be consummated as soon as the owners prove their title—area approximately 1,260 acres, price to be paid $24,800.

(d) Some seventy-nine owners have still to be settled with either by expropriation or negotiation, the area of whose properties comprises, approximately, 10,000 acres. (This total includes the properties of Fogerty, Knox, Billings, and Brown).

(e) Twenty-seven (27) owners have received compensation for damage to crops, totalling $13,625.

Note.—It is not clear from the correspondence whether the area should be quoted in "arpents" or in "acres," as at one time the word "arpents" is used and at another time the word "acres." For the purposes of this memorandum it is assumed that the area is in acres.

Lieut.-Colonel McBain returned to Canada to-day. This memorandum is signed by Mr. E. F. Jarvis, Assistant Deputy Minister.

[Mr. Sam. Hughes.]

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is the date of the memorandum?

Major General HUGHES: It was given to me to-day; I do not know when it was prepared. Every effort has been made to bring about a settlement, and, more than that, we instructed each of the valuators to give a fair valuation. My right hon. friend may not know this locality well, but the McBain family is one of the oldest in Quebec. Every effort was made to induce these people to accept the fairest possible valuation, and instructions were given to give compensation because the people were being turned out. When some of the people demurred at taking what was considered a good, fair valuation, we used every effort to bring about a settlement, and I understood that in every instance the offer had been accepted until, through some manoeuvring, the spirit got abroad among them to hold for higher prices.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF FOOD EXPORTS.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the circumstances arising out of the present war are such as to justify the Government of Canada in exercising supreme control over the quantity

and destiny of our food exports, thereby regulating the prices at which bread, meat and other food products shall be sold for home consumption, while at the same time directing that our surplus food exports should only reach British or friendly countries.

He said: The resolution standing in my name is one which I deem of great importance at the present time. It has no political significance, so far as I am concerned. It has appeared to me that for some months past it was the duty of those in charge of the Government of the country to keep a very good eye upon the food supply of the Dominion of Canada, and also to assist in every way possible the Mother Country in the tremendous struggle in which she is now engaged. I am aware that the principle contained in the resolution upsets to a certain extent what has been deemed proper economic law, that is, that the law of supply and demand regulates the prices of all commodities.

At the same time this war has upset a great many business axioms, has upset the calculations of many political economists and has brought to our attention the fact that a world-wide war is not dealt with by ordinary means nor controlled by ordinary circumstances. Supply and demand as a rule is a safe criterion for the fixing of prices of commodities. As far as I have been able to judge, Canada is the only country at present at war that has not given more or less consideration to this very important question. Very early in the war the Government of the sister dominion of Australia, that great Commonwealth, which is also a large producer of food, took possession of all supplies of wheat and arbitrarily fixed the price at $1.25 per bushel. That was done in one of the leanest years that Australia has seen in a long time. Their wheat crop was comparatively a failure. The supplies for home consumption were away below the requirements of that great country. New Zealand is in very much the same position and has been obliged to appeal to Canada for its supplies.

Wheat, of course, is not the only item to be considered in a resolution such as this. I have purposely drawn the resolution as broadly as possible. You will notice that the wording used only asks that the House concur in the opinion that the Government is justified in controlling both the quantity and destination of food exports. There may be those, and no doubt there are a number, who disagree with the first proposition but I believe that in this House it will be found that no one will disagree with the second proposition in regard to the destination of our food supplies. Surely the people of Canada who are the holders of greater or lesser quantities of food products can have no doubt in their minds that the exportation of these food supplies should be directed towards the Mother Country, friendly peoples and allies who are fighting with her to-day for the great principles that we believe are involved in the present war. Therefore, I assume that there will be no exception taken by any hon. member of the House to the proposition that the export of food supplies from Canada should be entirely to British and friendly countries. I have put in the word "friendly" out of deference to the opinions of some who may not agree with me, but for my part I would have preferred to have confined the resolution to British countries entirely because I believe that in the present crisis all our available food supplies are required by the Mother Country and the sister dominions.

Moreover, those who have studied the condition of this question and have followed it fairly closely, as I have for the past few months, must be forced to the conclusion that we are in rather a critical position at the present time, and in asking the House to give some attention to this very important question I am only asking it to do what has been done in the government circles of the various countries that are engaged in the war at the present time. Only this morning you will notice by the press that Mr. Lloyd George has been dealing with the matter and I shall have occasion to refer to that a little later on and also that there was held in Trafalgar Square yesterday a large gathering of the labouring element protesting against the high prices of food and pointing out that it was necessary in the interests of the workingman that the food supply should be immediately regulated and that prices, if necessary, should be set by the Government. That is a proposition that it may be difficult to carry out in such a country as the motherland. On the 11th of February the British House of Commons passed an entire day in discussing this very important question and further, at the close of the debate, after an amendment had been moved by one of the labour leaders, another day was set for the continuation of the debate. Mr. Asquith, it is true, stated that food prices could not be regulated in the United Kingdom with beneficial results. Let me point out that the conditions in Great Britain are exactly the opposite of the conditions that we have in Canada. Great Britain is a food-importing country; even in normal times the food

supply has to be almost entirely brought from outside sources. Britain's problem is to get enough food to come into the country. Canada's problem is to prevent too much food going out of the country. One perhaps is uncontrollable, but there is no one who can say that the other is uncontrollable, and it appears to me that the crisis at which we have about arrived, and I think more than arrived, is such as to demand that the subject should receive the very best thought and attention of the Government. The wheat supply, particularly of Canada, is in very narrow compass. Probably not 10 per cent of the wheat grown is at present in the hands of the farmers. Far be it from me to propound any proposition that is going to rob the farmer of his legitimate profits. The farmer has had to take too low prices for many years past for his wheat—there is not a bit of doubt about that. Personally if the farmer can get $1.50 or $2 for his wheat in so far as the matter of trade is concerned I am perfectly satisfied, but coming from an industrial constituency where there are 7,000 employed in the ordinary way, and where, owing to an industrial stagnation the like of which we have never found before in my time, 2,000 or more have been out of work almost the entire winter, with wheat, bread, oatmeal, meats and various products of the farm bringing prices that have rarely been experienced in the years gone by—

Mr. SCHAFFNER: When you speak of 10 per cent being in the hands of farmers, do you include seed wheat or only the quantity for sale?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I estimate that there is not more than 10 per cent in the hands of farmers for sale. I shall deal with the seed question a little later on, because that is an important factor to be considered at this particular time.

Sir JAMES AIKINS: Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he would reduce the price of wheat to the farmer for the purpose of benefiting his own constituency?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I have not made any such statement, and if my hon. friend will wait until my argument is finished I think he will not arrive at that conclusion. I am quite aware that some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House may not agree with my proposition, but at the same time I have the courage of my convictions, and I believe that not only in Canada but in every one of the countries at war this is a real live question that has to be dealt with on its merits. And, while my hon. friend from Brandon (Sir James Aikins) may think that the farmer is justified in getting $2 or $2.50 per bushel for his wheat, under war conditions, I am not going to say whether or not that should be the price fixed; I have not in my resolution named any price, nor do I propose naming any price to which wheat, and meat, and the food products consumed by the working men should be limited. I point out that while the price of securities of every kind, industrial transportation, insurance, railways, has been going down, and down, and down, in the last six months, on the other hand we have seen the necessaries of life of the workingman rising steadily and rapidly. I have a mass of statistics here, a part of which I can only place before the House, which show that the present condition of the wheat supply of Canada wants very careful watching. I believe that in the next six weeks we shall see a squeeze greater than anything we have yet seen. The visible supply of wheat in Canada is shrinking rapidly day by day, until it is estimated that the visible supply, as I am informed by responsible authority, is down to about 18,000,000 bushels, and that is disappearing at a very rapid rate. That has come about in Canada on top of a world shortage. The United States is the only country in the world which had a good crop last year, the world supply being about four hundred million bushels short of the crop of the previous year. We all heard the discussion that took place about two weeks ago, in reference to the seed grain proposition, in the interests of the West, and on that occasion we were told by some hon. gentlemen that thousands of farmers in the West have not even the seed with which to plant their land this spring, so that, if this statement be correct, the bulk of the farmers are now buyers rather than sellers, of wheat. I am glad to know that this Government has had the foresight to place aside a large sum of money for this purpose, and that they have already made purchases of a considerable quantity of wheat to supply this seed shortage. The great squeeze, as I see it, will come in seeding time this year. Canadians are now the greatest wheat-consuming people in the world, bar none, for while the people of the United States consume annually about five bushels per head of the population, Canada consumes between six and seven bushels. Taking our population at from 7,000,000 to

7,500,000, in round figures, our requirements for the bread of the people of this country are between 45,000,000 and 50,000,000 bushels of wheat per annum, and in addition to that we will have, in the very near future, to supply seed wheat for a very large area. It may be said that should a shortage take place we can import from outside, but from what countries can we hope to get the supply we need? The United States is to-day practically the only country that has a large visible supply that is available. The world's supply has been cornered and speculators, in Chicago largely, have been setting the price of wheat for the world during the last few months. The United States surplus, and it was a very large surplus, has been disappearing at the rate of eight million bushels per week. Great Britain, France and Italy have been compelled to purchase immense supplies from the United States. Italy is not even yet at war, but the Italian Government has taken the precaution to buy 40,000,000 bushels of wheat from the United States, as the following despatch shows:

Rome, February 28,—Provisions made by the Government to supply Italy with wheat pending the next harvest were defended by the Minister of Agriculture, Signor Cavasola, in a speech yesterday before the Chamber of Deputies. He declared special missions representing the military commissariat had made enormous purchases in the United States and Argentina, although the largest quantities had been made in New York and Chicago. The total contracted for abroad, Signor Cavasola said, was 13,500,000 quintals, (40,500,000 bushels), which will be divided between several of the largest cities as distributing stations.

About one-third of the amount contracted for already has arrived in Italy. The Minister of Agriculture declared that in view of the precautions taken by the Government a wheat famine would be impossible, because the supply provided for would be ample to last until after the Italian harvest.

After the speech of Signor Cavasola, the Socialists provoked a political test vote and were defeated, 314 to 44.

This proves that even these countries which are outside of the war zone are compelled to take extraordinary measures for the preservation of their food supply. I think you will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that nothing could be more deplorable, than to see the success which has attended the efforts of the Allies thus far set at naught by a food shortage which may cause very serious trouble in the Motherland. I quote from a speech delivered by Lloyd George in Bangor, Wales, on the 28th instant:

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, David Lloyd George, made a pointed reference to the United States in a speech here today.

"If Germany is triumphant over this country," he said, "she would be practically dictator of the world, and where," he asked, "could we then look to a chivalrous country to protect us—to America?"

If countries like France and Russia, with huge armies, and we, with the most powerful navy in the world, could not face this terrible machine, how could America step in? It would be more than America could do to defend herself in her own continent. America is unready more than we were."

The chancellor then took up the liquor industrial questions.

"The Government has wide powers to deal with the drink question, and it means to use them," he declared. He said a small minority of the workmen employed in the armament factories had refused to work a full week because of the lure of drink.

"The government would use its powers discreetly and in a spirit of moderation, Mr. Lloyd George asserted, but "fearlessly." He was sure the public would support whatever action was taken and allow no indulgence of this kind to interfere with the country's prospects in the war.

"The war," he said, "is to be won or lost by the engineers. We need men but we need arms more than men and every day of delay is full of peril to the country. For one reason or another we do not get the assistance we have a right to expect from our workshops. Industrial differences are inevitable, but we cannot afford them now.

"It is intolerable that the lives of Britons should be imperilled for the sake of a farthing an hour. During war, governments should have the power of settling differences so that work shall go on. If men are entitled to more money the government should give it. I do not believe the parties involved will refuse to comply with the urgent command of the government that there should be no delay."

Expressing confidence in the outcome of the war, the chancellor said the people of the country hardly realized yet the importance of the struggle in which they were engaged and warned them that victory could not be won without a long struggle. He declared that while England had enrolled the largest volunteer army ever gathered in any country or in any century it ought to be larger still.

There is also in this paper an article headed: "'Protest the food prices." In it the socialists draw attention to the fact that the Government has not done everything possible to safeguard the food supply of the workingman. There is danger to-day in the Motherland in regard to the food supply. I appeal to the House and to the people of Canada: Is it right or wise for any set of men to endanger the success of the allied forces for the sake of some monetary advantage to the individual citizen? The question simmers down practically to that. We are to-day facing a crisis such as has never before been experienced by the British Empire or by the world. If by a restrictive policy on the prices of our food products we cause any delay in turning out munitions of war and other army supplies, which are just as important in their way as are the men at the front, would it not be to the detriment of our cause, which I am sure

every hon. gentleman, whether he fully agrees with me or not, has just as much at heart as I have? This crisis has to be met by extraordinary precaution. I do not presume to suggest to the Government the course that should be taken. I want only to point out the condition of our supplies at present.

If you turn to the Weekly Trade Report issued by Sir George Foster, Minister of Trade and Commerce, you will find on page 375 that for the months of September, October, November and December we received at the various terminals 54,478,949 bushels of wheat, as against 104,451,593 bushels during the same period of 1913, or only about one-half for the four best shipping months of the year. It was a short crop, and the farmer deserved a high price for his grain. Unfortunately for him, he had parted with a very large portion of it before the high price came, and as a result the speculator largely made what we would like to see go into the farmer's pocket.

In the same report, on page 325, you will find a report of the Dutch Vice-Consul, sent out from Winnipeg on December 10, 1914, in which he gives the totals of the crops for the two years as follows:

1913.	
186,000,000 bu. of wheat at $0.70. ..	$ 1,302,000
210,000,000 bu. of oats at $0.28.. ..	58,800,000
25,000,000 bu. of barley at $0.30 ..	10,500,000
15,000,000 bu. of linseed at $1.10..	16,500,000
Total..	$216,000,000
1914.	
150,000,000 bu. of wheat at $0.95..	$142,500,000
175,000,000 bu. of oats at $0.42..	73,500,000
25,000,000 bu. of barley at $0.52..	13,000,000
6,000,000 bu. of linseed at $1.25..	7,500,000
Total..	$236,500,000

Therefore, for the short crop of 1914, even at the comparatively low prices at which that crop left the farmers' hands, $20,000,000 more were obtained than for the crop of 1913. That is fairly satisfactory; but every one will notice that the price of 95 cents for wheat and the price of 42 cents for oats are far below the prices at present current, which are in the neighbourhood of $1.50 for wheat and 60 cents or 70 cents for oats. All the arguments that I have applied to wheat apply with equal force to oats, and even more so to peas. Canada does not, of course, produce a large quantity of peas, although it is interesting to note that the price of peas to-day is considerably higher than the price of wheat, being in the neighbourhood of $1.90 for a 60 lb. bushel, a price never before reached in this country. I emphasize this only to show that the present prices of these food products are high.

I instance also the fact that there is in the elevators at the present time a very limited quantity, even for this season of the year, of the vast crops that Canada has produced, that is available for the millers, for the farmers for seed, and for the food supply of the people. In the same report, on page 377, you will get an idea of what we have in the various elevators. Without wearying the House by naming the various elevators, I might condense the report as follows: At Fort William and Port Arthur in the week ending January 29, there were 5,186,293 bushels; at Saskatoon and Moosejaw, 1,728,267 bushels; and in the various eastern ports, such as Midland, Collingwood, Goderich, Quebec, Kingston, Port Colborne, Prescott, Montreal, and so on, there were 5,733,651 bushels; or a total at the end of January of 12,648,211 bushels. The supply of oats was considerably less than this. There were only 1,860,000 bushels at Fort William and Port Arthur, 959,483 at Saskatoon and Moosejaw, and 3,729,777 bushels in all the elevators of the East, making a total of 6,549,524 bushels. Therefore the supply of wheat and oats in the Dominion of Canada was in very narrow compass. There is also the present large demand for home consumption, which, as I have already pointed out, requires about 45,000,000 bushels per annum; or, for the half year between now and the time that our next crop is available, there will be wanted, for the food of the people alone, in round figures 23,000,000 bushels of wheat. In addition to that, the people will require 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 or even 15,000,000 bushels, according to the increased acreage that the West may sow this spring, for the seed supply of the farmers of the West. I cannot conceive of any greater disaster happening to them than to be short of seed wheat in the coming season. If we are allowed to export with a free hand and so pull down our reserves to the very last notch, is there not a possibility that when the final squeeze comes in the middle of April next we may find lands in the West actually unseeded because the farmers could not find sufficient seed wheat to plant these acres? This will be a disaster not only for Canada but for the Empire. I appeal to this House to look into this question, which, I believe, the more it is looked into the more those who look into it will be convinced that it is wise for the Govern-

ment to have in their hands power that will prevent that which would be a disaster to Canada, to Britain and the overseas dominions. Some may say, that is all rot.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: My hon. friend from Brandon (Sir James Aikins,) who is an expert lawyer, though I do not know that he knows much more about wheat than I do, says, so it is, or something to that effect. But I have sufficient confidence in my own opinions to tell the hon. member that though he objects I still hold my opinions as strongly as he holds his, and I think I have just as much right to hold them. I believe, even though the hon. member may not agree with me, that the people of this country have a very keen eye on the situation as it now exists, and it is a situation that, I think, cannot be given too much consideration at the present moment. It would be a thousand pities if Canada, the granary of the British Empire, as we have called it, should fail at this critical moment. There is danger of its failing to do what is expected of it in the food supply. The resolution I have placed on the Order Paper is drawn broadly and lays down in very general terms the possibilities that may arise, and asks this House if it does not justify the Government in taking into its hands this position that may require dealing with. I do not ask my hon. friend to subscribe to any particular price for wheat. I do not set any price; I do not think it is in my province to do that. If it is thought that $1.50 a bushel is a proper price for wheat, all right; if $2 a bushel even is thought better, all right. I can remember as a boy when wheat was as high as $2.50 a bushel, and it may go to that again. But what I would point out is that there are many workingmen in this country who cannot afford to pay this price for their bread unless they have a corresponding increase in their wages. Now, the workman has been up against two propositions—first that his wages are dropping at the present time and that he has been very short of work in all the industrial centres; and second he has been asked higher prices for bread and for the products of the farm that go upon his table than at any time for years past. It may be said that I represent a few manufacturers. I repudiate that before it is said. While I may get ten or fifteen manufacturers to vote for me, I am here by the votes of the workingmen of the city of Brantford. I am here to represent the interests of these men and not the miller or the speculator, or the man who endeavours to corner the food of the people.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: With permission, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he has made any calculation of the amount of wheat which has gone out of the hands of the farmer into the hands of the miller?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I have some figures here dealing with that subject, but not of very recent date. The quantity in the farmers' hands, according to my figures, is about 8,000,000 bushels at present.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: How much in the hands of the millers?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I have shown that the millers and speculators have bought about ninety per cent of the crop, which was put at 158,000,000 bushels. That would leave about 15,000,000 bushels in the hands of the farmers according to that calculation.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but the point I wish to make is this: Undoubtedly the millers bought a great deal of this wheat during the months of December and January for somewhere about a dollar a bushel. Now, the way in which this question affects the workingman is through the price of flour. What I want to find out, if possible, is what proportion of the wheat of the three Prairie Provinces was bought from the farmer at a price of $1 a bushel or less, and whether there is good reason for flour going to the price to which it has gone.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I am afraid I could not give authentic figures on that point. I have stated that I believe that ninety per cent of the wheat of the country has passed from the hands of the farmer into the hands of the miller, who is more or less of a speculator. I do not think the price the millers have paid for wheat justifies the present prices of flour. I think the miller has made a very large amount. Judging by the figure at which milling stocks are selling and the profits the millers are said to be making, it looks to me as if the millers have the big end of the stick. I do not think it would be wise to endeavour to curtail the operations of the millers in the interests of the people, but I think it reasonable to point out that the millers, being a very small percentage of the people of Canada, should not expect to make out of a world-wide disaster a large personal profit, amounting in some cases almost to a fortune. I have here a

clipping from the Ottawa Free Press, a journal which I do not often quote with approval. I may be excused for quoting it now inasmuch as this article comes from a Conservative paper, the Montreal Star, something which deals with the question my hon. friend has asked:

> With the conditions indicating that the larger milling companies in Canada are likely to have one of the biggest years they have ever known, many local interests are already figuring on the bonuses the companies will be able to pay over and above regular dividends.
>
> The principal companies have only gone five months of their regular fiscal year, but it is admitted that whether peace comes eo-morrow or in a year from now, conditions are going to favour the Canadian companies for a couple of years at least, and on this account the companies are bound to make a very good showing, even though profits are not anything as large as some people have been figuring.
>
> In the case of one of the local companies, it is stated that earnings this year may run not far from 50 per cent on the common stock, while in the case of some of the still larger concerns, it would not be surprising to see earnings of from 20 to 25 per cent, even when the statements have been worked out on a conservative basis.

From this it will be seen that the millers have struck a very prosperous time, though most of the country is suffering in a financial way. As I have said, we have seen all our securities sinking. Every industrial company, every transportation company, every joint stock company of any kind has seen its stock go down, and down, and perhaps has found that stock unsaleable even at a fraction of the original price. Exchanges all over the world were closed on account of the war for several months, and those that did business did it on a limited scale and at prices almost unheard of in the history of the companies affected. Even Canadian Pacific railway stocks fell from 280 to 155. Almost all industrial companies, except, perhaps, the milling companies, have felt the pressure of the disastrous conditions which are the result of the war.

In the face of all these circumstances, the prices of food supplies have risen. Wheat at $1.50 a bushel in ordinary times would not hit anybody so very hard. I have said more than once in this House and throughout the country that wheat should never sell at less than $1 a bushel. I believe that the farmer either of the West or of the East can not afford to raise it at less than that price, and if the Government should think it wise to establish the price of wheat at $1.50 or $1.75 a bushel, I would make no protest. But what I want the House to decide is this: has the time come when the export of the staff of life produced in Canada should be controlled? Is the amount of the visible supply a justification for the Government's saying that when a certain price is reached they will step in? I propound this question in all seriousness. I have shown that the visible supply is lower than it has been for a long time, and, in the face of the most extraordinary demands from all parts of the world, is rapidly passing away. On the other hand, sources of wheat supply that were formerly available are now entirely shut off. Great Britain has always looked to Russia for a large supply of the staff of life, and the conditions to-day are such that not a boat has been able to get away from Russia, either to the north or to the south, for many months. Hon. gentlemen may say that the Dardanelles are very soon to be open, but Mr. Asquith himself anticipates that liberal supplies will not come from that source before June—and before June a great squeeze will come in this country. It is true that the allied fleets of Britain and France are operating upon the forts of the Dardanelles, and we are told by the press that they have succeeded in silencing three or four of the outer fortifications. But it is yet a long way to Constantinople, and it is a still longer way to Odessa. For my part I think that those who are anticipating a food supply from Odessa will be pretty hungry if they have not substantial reserves nearer at hand and more easily available. These fortifications may fall, but other difficulties will then present themselves. If the hostile shores are held by the enemy, there will be difficulties of mines in narrow channels, and of torpedo boats; under these conditions is it reasonable to expect that merchant ships will be passing from Odessa to Great Britain in the very near future? I may be pessimistic, but I think not. Then where is Great Britain to obtain her food supply in the future, and particularly during the next few months? Argentina, so far as I know, is the only source of supply outside of the United States, and I have told you that the United States is shipping at the rate of 8,000,000 or 9,000,000 bushels a week. Practically the world supply of this important cereal, the staff of life for nearly all peoples, must come from the United States and Canada. We hoped that in time of stress we in Canada would be able to turn out from 150,000,000 to 200,000,000 bushels of wheat; unfortunately this year we did not do anything like as well as we did in 1913. This we all deplore. While I do not wish to be unduly pessimistic, I say in all seriousness that

the present crisis may soon require action by some department of government, probably the Department of Trade and Commerce. I am glad to know that we have at the head of that department a shrewd man of business, a man upon whom we may depend to do the right thing at the right time. I think it would be reassuring for him to know that this House has provided legislation which he may put into force when it is necessary to take definite steps to conserve our food supply before it is too late. I cannot conceive of any greater calamity to the people of Canada than that of over-exportation of food products at this serious time. The Allies need those exportations.

I have before me a report with regard to the American wheat supply which I think I should place upon Hansard. For this report I am indebted to Mr. John Bunnell of the Chicago Board of Trade, an ex-Canadian. He is an expert in such matters, and is a recognized authority in that great centre of wheat production and distribution. This is the report:

The 1914 wheat crop of the United States was estimated to be 891,000,000 bushels. The estimated surplus carried over from the 1913 crop was about 76,000,000 bushels. There was, therefore, a total available supply of 967,000,000 bushels, and as the normal per capita consumption of wheat in the United States is about 5.3 bushels, 520,000,000 bushels should meet our normal domestic requirements for food. In addition, 90,000,000 bushels are required annually for seeding; 610,000,000 bushels, therefore, should supply the normal domestic demand.

It will be noted that 90,000,000 bushels are required for seeding purposes only in the United States; therefore the figures which I gave some time ago are quite in accord with the assumption that we would require in this country 20 or 25 per cent of that amount. The report goes on:

This would leave a surplus of 357,000,000 bushels. Of this surplus about 210,000,000 bushels were exported by January 30.

About two-thirds of the amount they had to spare.

This left 147,000,000 bushels, or 40,000,000 bushels more than our average annual export for the past five years, for export between February 1 and the appearance of the new crop, or for carrying over into the next crop year. The amount is sufficient to permit the exportation of nearly 1,000,000 bushels a day until July 1, before which time the new crop will begin to be available. This is about the average recent exportation.

I have already said that they are exceeding the export of 1,000,000 bushels a day; if they continue to export at that rate they will entirely consume their surplus before July, which is a time entirely unfavourable to the securing of wheat in large quantities.

The large demand for our wheat arises from the fact that there was an estimated world's shortage of over 400,000,000 bushels, outside of the United States;

A shortage of 400,000,000 bushels in the world's supply, coming on top of a world war!

—from the fact that the Russian exportable surplus of 100,000,000 bushels is not available generally and from the fact that the belligerent nations are eager to secure food supplies. If it were not for these things we would be discussing ways and means of disposing of our surplus food products. As has been stated, the new American crop will begin to appear before July. The Argentine crop is now coming on the market. It is estimated that from that source there will be available 100,000,000 bushels. A surplus of 75,000,000 bushels or more from India will be available in May and June. The increase in the fall sown wheat acreage of the United States in 1914 was 11.1 per cent, or over 4,000,000 acres; in the northern hemisphere generally the increase in the wheat zone shows an increase of from three to thirty-three per cent, as follows:

	Per cent.
Denmark	3
Italy	5
Switzerland	10
United Kingdom	10
United States	11
India	22
Canada	33

Canada tops the list with an increase in winter wheat of 33 per cent. That is one of the very interesting items with regard to the outlook for the Canadian crop.

But suppose a shortage in wheat should develop in the next three months, what would be the situation? There is a great surplus in other food crops in the United States, a number of which can be used as substitutes. Wheat does not constitute more than 12 per cent of the normal diet, about the same as poultry and eggs.

This corroborates what I have said, that there is a very large shortage in the world's supply, and the demands are of such an unusual character that all calculations of the past may be upset by the facts of the present that the warring nations are more or less nervous, day by day, as to the requirements of their people and as to the food supply. It is not necessary for me to recount to you the horrors which at present exist in some of these countries in order that you may realize what a shortage of food would mean to vast numbers of people. In Belgium we have to-day practically 7,000,000 people who are dependent on the outside world for their entire food supply. We are told that it requires 80,000 tons per week of food to keep 7,000,000 people of Belgium from starvation. They

know what war is. We in Canada fortunately, up to the present time, have scarcely realized what war is and we have not realized that we are personally called upon to make the sacrifices necessary for our cause to triumph. I think that every one of us should be prepared to make all necessary sacrifices for the success of the cause. It may be that some of us will be called upon to sacrifice flesh and blood. That is the highest sacrifice that man can make for man, and I am glad to say that there has been a spontaneity of response throughout the Dominion of Canada where the call has gone forth: "Your King and country need you." But that is only part of the battle. We have to send the men to the front, we have to send them equipped, and then we have to supply them with the munitions of war and with the food required to carry on the war satisfactorily. To-day the greatest problem in Britain is to maintain the supply of armaments, shot and shell and rifles and cannons and all those engines of destruction that are required to meet an enemy whose every man is equipped from head to heel, in a way that no army in the world has ever before been equipped, ready, the moment the war bugle sounded, to march forward in the ranks of war to meet any enemy in the gate.

Lloyd George has said, in the speech from which I have quoted, that they are fighting in such a way as no war machine has ever fought in the history of the world, and we are called upon to make all necessary sacrifices in order that our cause may triumph. I want to put it to the members of this House, I want to appeal to their patriotism if not to their pockets, is it not the part of Canadians, is it not the part of any Britishers to be ready to sacrifice not only their flesh and blood if necessary, but also what is far less of a pang, some of the profits which might go into our pockets as the result of a squeeze which would mean tremendous pressure on others. My hon. friend only laughs. I am afraid that all my shafts are lost on him, but I feel that, whether he agrees with me or not, he as a patriotic man must say that we are called upon to make some personal sacrifice. Is that not right? He will not agree with me to that extent. I know that my friend from Brandon (Sir James Aikins) is a highly philanthropic citizen and that he has sometimes, if not converted souls, made a good attempt to appear on religious platforms as a man who was attempting to save souls, and I appeal to him now,

5 p.m.

I appeal to his Christian charity, I appeal to him as a man who draws out his soul to the hungry and is ready to satisfy the afflicted soul. These are not my words, and I think he will know where they come from. I ask him if he will not draw out the bowels of his compassion and say that $1.50 or $1.75 or even $2 is enough for wheat to sell at. He is still dumb. However, without asking my hon. friend to subscribe to the proposition I am making, I think I can fairly ask the members of this House to let their bowels of compassion be moved for souls who are in want, that those who need the food of which we have, to limited extent, a surplus, may get the benefit of our surplus. But we cannot afford to feed even those who are worse off than ourselves if it is done to the detriment of our own people. While charity begins at home, we want to exercise just as much of it as we can to those of our kith and kin over the seas; and while I say that the resolution which I have moved may not appeal to all in one respect, that is, in the desire to limit our exports, I believe I can appeal to all that the exporting of those food supplies should be limited to British and friendly countries. I would prefer that it should go only to British countries, because I think it is the duty of a man to look after his own household first, to see that his own wife and children are fed; in other words to care for the people of his own nation, his own kith and kin, to whom he is bound by all that is Christian and all that is charitable, to provide for the wants of those who are suffering within the borders of his own country. I believe I shall carry the House with me in that respect, that our food supplies which do go abroad should go only to British and not foreign countries.

A return is in my hand, sessional paper No. 120, showing the countries to which food supplies have been exported since the month of August last; and while I shall not weary you with the fish and the cheese and apples and minor articles that go to replenishing the table of the workingman, I am going to draw your attention to the fact that in regard to wheat and flour and some other cereals we are in the humiliating position, to a certain extent, of having fed the enemy while many of our own people were not receiving food in a quantity or at a price that is desirable. That, I think, is something that should be rectified. I find in a return I asked for that we exported wheat to several non-British

countries. The order was for a return showing whether any exportations of foodstuffs have been made since August last to European countries other than the United Kingdom, France and Belgium. In response to that order I have a statement showing that 167,626 bushels went to Gibraltar, and 40,000 bushels to Denmark. It may be said that as far as Gibraltar is concerned, we were feeding the British garrison, and very likely we were; but as far as Denmark is concerned that cannot be said. But it is to the matter of flour more particularly that I want to draw the attention of the House. Since August last we exported flour to the following countries:

	Barrels.
Gilbraltar	4,171
Malta	2,030
Denmark	34,327
Germany	356
Greece	12,382
Holland	58,338
Norway	120,954
Sweden	3,089

We should not have sold one barrel to Germany while our own people needed it. I do not know what Greece wanted with all that flour. I am afraid that she did not use it herself. What did Norway do with 120,954 barrels of flour? I fear that some of this flour has been sent to furnish the sinews of war to our enemies. We have made mistakes up to date with regard to the exports of flour, but oats is just as important a commodity as flour, as far as the success of our arms is concerned, because there is a tremendous demand for the oats of this country to feed the war horses that are at present fighting our battles in northern France and Belgium. The position of the oat market is just as important as that of the wheat market in that respect, and we must be just as careful in regard to it. We want to see to it that no further mistakes be made in sending food supplies to the enemy or in sending them to those countries that may be friendly with the enemy and which allow these supplies to be sent from their borders into the country that is fighting against the armies of the Allies. I think that has been done; I am afraid it has been done.

I know that there is a disposition to blame the bakers of Canada for the inordinate rise in the price of bread. I am not familiar with the baking industry, but I have had a document sent to me by the bakers who repudiate the assertion entirely and who make the statement that they have gone on furnishing bread at a price that the present price of flour does not at all justify, that now they are practically at the end of their resources so far as flour that was laid in early in the war is concerned, and that very material advances must be made in all kinds of bread, cake and other things which the bakers furnish from day to day to the houses of workingmen. If that is the case it is a very serious matter, and it is certainly deserving of the consideration of this House because, after all is said and done, fully half of the population of the Dominion is resident in cities. We have close upon 700,000 men at the present time working in the industries of Canada. All of these are dependent for the staff of life pretty much on the bakers' product and I therefore appeal to this House to see that no injustice is done to any of those concerned in debating this question. I am making no imputation against the good faith of all our citizens. Far be it from me. I have the very highest respect for all classes of our citizens. I believe we have a splendid citizenship in Canada. I am endeavouring to direct the attention of the House to what I conceive to be one of the most important resolutions that will come before it at this session of Parliament. I am asking hon. gentlemen to say that in the judgment of this House the Government would be justified in controlling the amount of foodstuffs to be exported and the destination to which they should go. I am asking you to place no particular price on any product but I believe that when the resources are held in this country that of itself will be a regulator of the prices and that it will result in maintaining a constant supply of our breadstuffs and all those items that go upon the table of the workingman.

What I have said in regard to breadstuffs applies in a smaller measure to all kinds of products, to cereals and all those items of daily use that go upon the table of the workingman. They all require consideration at the present time and I ask you, as a fair proposition, to see to it that we in Canada, largely a food-producing country, shall not allow ourselves to be impoverished by over-exportation until we have taken care of the food requirements of our own people and of the supply of seed grain to those who are presently to go upon the land to sow the crops for the coming year. I am in entire accord with the Government in furnishing seed grain to the farmers. I think it was a wise move, but that of itself may affect the the situation at present existing somewhat acutely. I therefore have much pleasure

in moving the resolution which stands in my name. I thought it was the intention of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Sharpe) not the hon. member for Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Barnard) to second the resolution, although I do not think it makes very much difference. I offer the resolution believing that in doing so I am bringing to the attention of the House and the country a question that demands their very best consideration, and whether hon. gentlemen agree with me or not, I ask them to discuss the question free from any political bias or anything of that kind because I have no thought of that in my own mind at the present time and it has no bearing whatever upon the introduction of this resolution. I ask simply that this question be viewed upon its merits and I can only say again that I make this proposition believing that it is a wise and just one and that its adoption is in the best interests of the people of Canada and of the British Empire whose cause we have so very much at heart.

Mr. J. J. MERNER (South Huron): Being a farmer and representing a farming community, I desire to say a few words upon this very important question. I would like to have a little more information on the resolution that has been laid on the table. I would like to know if the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) is trying to get after the farmer or who it is he trying to hit. I believe that if the adoption of this proposition should affect the farmer it would inflict a great injustice upon him. I admit that at the present time the farmer is receiving a fair price for his product, but at the same time I do not believe that the price that he is receiving represents more than a good living profit. I wonder if the hon. member for Brantford lost much sleep when the farmer was receiving a starvation price for his butter, eggs and other products. I am a farmer and I know that the farmer at the present time is selling his cattle and his hogs at a price that does not pay him, considering the high cost of everything he is using. I believe that the consumer is paying too high a price for his foodstuffs, over and above the price the farmer gets. I know that in August and September last buyers paid $9.75 per cwt. for hogs, and $9.00 per cwt. for cattle, while to-day they are only paying $7.25 for hogs on the Toronto market and a correspondingly less price for cattle than they paid in August, and yet they are asking exactly the same price for their beef and pork as they did last fall, when they were paying two cents per pound more for live stock. There is something wrong there, and if the Government wants to obtain power to get after those fellows. I for one shall approve of their doing so. If the farmer alone is to be detrimentally affected by such action as is now proposed by my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt) I believe it would be most unjust. For the last few months there have been people going around the country advocating patriotism and increased production, but if you are going to adopt any legislation in this Parliament which will be injurious to the farmer, how are you going to get increased production. For my part I believe that the farmer requires protection just as well as the manufacturer. I wonder how the hon. member for Brantford would like it if the Government brought in a Bill to stop the shipping of ploughs to the other side. I think he would object to that most strongly. I believe we should not be selfish; I believe we should co-operate, one with the other; I believe we should allow the farmer to live. The farmer is the backbone of this country, and we must have protection for him. A great deal is said nowadays about the high cost of living, and I might perhaps give my experience in that respect. I am a farmer, but I am also a merchant, and I think I am able to deny the statement that the cost of living has greatly increased of recent years. I worked behind the counter in my store for thirty-seven years, and I know from personal experience that thirty-five years ago, with a few exceptions, the cost of the necessaries of life was higher then than it is to-day. Thirty-five years ago I sold tea at seventy-five cents a pound, and I am selling as good tea to-day at forty cents a pound; thirty-five years ago I sold coffee at thirty cents a pound, and I am selling as good coffee to-day at twenty-five cents a pound. I believe that as a whole the price of drygoods is lower now than it was say thirty years ago. That, of course, depends on whether the people are willing to use the same class of drygoods to-day that they did then. If people were willing to use the same drygoods to-day as they did thirty years ago, they could buy them just as cheaply; but nowadays they want style, and they have to pay for it. Thirty years ago the mothers on the farm would spin the yarn and the home weaver would weave the cloth; I wore these goods myself and I was content with them; but to-day the boys and girls are not satisfied with that. It is the way the people live to-day

that makes the cost mount up. About thirty-five years ago I remember selling six pounds of granulated sugar for a dollar, while to-day I am selling twelve and fourteen pounds for a dollar. Of course, the cost of living, especially in large cities, is high, and that is brought about largely by the high rents, which are the result of the good times we have been having. In the good times in the past, speculation ran high and rents ran up. Where twenty-five years ago an ordinary man could rent a house for ten or fifteen or twenty dollars a month, to-day he is paying thirty or forty or fifty dollars. We must place the responsibility for that on speculation. I did not expect this resolution to be brought up to-day, and I was not prepared to speak upon it; but it having come before the House, I felt that it was my duty to say a few words on behalf of the farmers. Those who live in the cities imagine that the farmer has an easy time of it, but I am in a position to know about that, and I feel satisfied that the farmer, even in view of the high price he is rceiving to-day, has the short end of it, and that he is not making the money he ought to make to recompense him for his hard work.

Sir JAMES AIKINS (Brandon): It was not my intention to have spoken on this resolution, nor did I think I would until after I suggested a question which perhaps to my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) was somewhat unfortunate. He drew particular attention to the hon. member for Brandon, when that member felt carried away by that inspired patriotic peroration of the hon. gentleman, pointing out how the people of this country should sacrifice themselves for their homes and for the Empire. He apparently misunderstood my disposition and turned his particular laudations to myself. While he was thus considering the member for Brandon, my thought was turned to see how his enthusiastic patriotism was given effect to by the resolution he placed before the House and now being considered, limiting the market and price of agricultural products. By this resolution he asked that some portion of this community should make sacrifices, and that portion of the community which he selects to make the sacrifice is the farmer. I can tell my hon. friend that the farmers of this country, and particularly the West, are willing to make and have made splendid sacrifices for Canada and the Empire. Thousands of the best men, sons of farmers, and farmers themselves, young, vigorous, intelligent and industrious, having ample opportunity for the development of their life at home, have sacrificed their peaceful pursuits and comforts and are now manning the trenches in a foreign land fighting our Empire's enemy.

But that is not the sacrifice which the hon. member for Brantford desires the farmers of this country for the love of it to make. When we consider this resolution we find that the sacrifice he demands of them is a sacrifice for the benefit of other people in this land, and particularly for the benefit of the manufacturers and the benefit of the employees of those manufacturers. In my view, Mr. Speaker, if sacrifices are to be made, they surely should be made by those who hitherto have had the benefit of the services of their workmen, and who have received advantages from them. If any one is called upon to make sacrifices, it should not be those who have constantly paid tribute to the manufacturers of my hon. friend's constituency and the eastern part of Canada. As I understand this resolution its purpose is that the price may be reduced to the agricultural producer so that the consumer may receive the benefit of that reduction. Therefore the sacrifice that the farmers are being asked to make is for the benefit of other classes in Canada.

There are two great producing classes in our country—the agriculturists and the manufacturers. Who should receive particular attention? Certainly those whose production is the natural and not the artificial production of a country. If we look at the returns for the year 1913, we shall find that the value of the agricultural exports was either three or four times greater than the value of the manufacturers' exports. As Canada is primarily an agricultural country, the agriculturists, if any protection of the people is given, should first receive that protection. I presume that any economic policy that is wise and sane for one class of producers should be wise and sane for the other class of producers. We have very frequently seen pamphlets sent out by the Department of Trade and Commerce—the minister for which deserves all the commendation which the hon. member for Brantford has given him—setting forth the wider market that the Government is attempting to create. For whom in particular? For the manufacturers. Seldom do we see any such pamphlet for wider markets for the farmer. When that subject was before the House, instead of giving wider markets for wheat,

which were in a limited way available and for considerations required, the House did not support that idea, which might occasion disadvantage to the miller and manufacturer. If, then, an economic policy is found good in the one case of the manufacturer, it should be found good in the other of the farmer. Does the hon. member for Brantford consider his economic policy as propounded in this resolution a sane and wise one in respect of the farmer? He, in fact, says: Do not give the farmer wider markets; do not give him even the natural market; do not obey the law of supply and demand, but control and limit his market for the benefit of the consumer, for the benefit of the other class of producers. Let us now reverse that resolution and make it apply, say, to agricultural implements. The resolution would then be that the Government of Canada would be justified in exercising supreme control over the quantity of agricultural implements produced for export purposes. In other words, the export of agricultural implements should be limited, so that the farmer who is obliged to use them might get the benefit of a lower price for them. Is that my hon. friend's policy? The farmers of the country require those agricultural implements just as much as the other people require food. If those implements are made cheaper to the farmer, his production will cost less. My hon. friend's policy is in the one case that because people require food, therefore, the export of wheat should be limited. Why not also because a farmer requires agricultural implements, therefore the export of agricultural implements should be reduced in order to reduce the price to the farmers. Moreover the reduction in the price of grain paid to the farmer in Canada would put him at a disadvantage in competing with the producers of the same class of material in other parts of the world. If we cannot get the same price for our agricultural products as the Americans do, our eyes will naturally turn to the policy of the United States. There we shall see that they have free agricultural implements in addition to a higher price for grain. Why should we not have a similar policy in Canada? asks the Canadian farmer. Why should not the hon. member for Brantford carry out his policy and give us free agricultural implements also, or give them at lower price?

I do not intend to speak further only to say that the intention of the hon. gentleman has not been for the benefit of our men who are fighting in the trenches or for the benefit of the Allies, but it has been for the benefit of a limited class in Canada and my hon. friend's sole thought is not how we can benefit the fighting cohorts of the Empire, but how we can benefit a few at home at the expense of others. I have no objections to those at home receiving kindly treatment, but there should be no sacrifice on the part of any portion of the community to the advantage of any other particular class. I do not think the food supply of the Allies is short. I read in a despatch from Liverpool in the Ottawa Evening Journal of this date the following:

> Never in the history of this port has the congestion of shipping been so great; nor have the Liverpool warehouses ever been so crammed with foodstuffs as at present. It is the consensus of opinion of importers here that even should the German submarine blockade prove effective, there is enough food now stored here to feed the country for a year.

There should be no limitation of the market for agricultural products, and the Government of our country should do everything in its power to increase the markets and the price of his produce to the farmer; for by the exports of agricultural production mainly may we be expected to receive that return which will meet the large amounts borrowed from abroad, and pay for our imports. I am very sorry to have taken up so much of the time of the House, because I believe this resolution in itself is so lacking in vitality, so anæmic that it must soon die quietly without any opinion by the House concerning its weakness.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN (Regina): I must first of all congratulate the hon. member for Brandon (Sir James Aikins) on at length having arrived at a very sane idea of the doctrine of protection in so far as the agriculturists of this country are concerned. If my hon. friend had been of the same view with respect to markets for the farmers of this country last session, and the session before, and, in fact, for the past three or four years, we might have had free wheat to-day for the farmers of western Canada. I do not wish to impugn the motives of the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) in bringing this resolution to the attention of the House. I have heard the hon. member on previous occasions get very close to the same doctrine as he has promulgated here to-day, namely, the fixing of the price of foodstuffs. It is quite true that he would not venture to suggest what the value of a bushel of wheat would be. I believe on one occasion, some two or three years ago, he said that wheat should never sell for more than $1 a bushel.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I never made that statement.

Mr. MARTIN: You got very close to it to-day.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Your imagination is carrying you away.

Mr. MARTIN: The sole purpose of his resolution is to control the price of wheat, which the hon. member himself has said, produces the staff of life which feeds all the people of this country. This is a most peculiar time in the history of Canada for a man to advocate in this House the control of the price of the main product of our farmers. During the past few years I have heard gentlemen of the type of my hon. friend advocating that the farmers of this country should go into mixed farming. When the farmer had about come to the conclusion that mixed farming was a good thing, the war came in August last, and immediately my hon. friend and his friends advocate that people should produce more. And now, I suppose, we have the climax of this campaign of " Patriotism and Production " in the speech of my hon. friend, advocating that the farmer should not be paid more than a certain price per bushel for his wheat. I submit that the hon. gentleman has started at the wrong end of this question. I am informed and believe—and perhaps my hon. friend has the information—that the millers of Canada are manufacturing flour out of wheat bought three or four months ago at prices not exceeding a dollar a bushel at Fort William. I know, and hon. members of this House know, that during October and even September—because our harvest was early last year—and during November, there was no dollar wheat in western Canada. It was the exception if the man got 98 cents or 99 cents a bushel, and from that were deducted transportation charges to Fort William. The farmer got for his wheat on an average from 80 cents to 90 cents a bushel. And I am informed that the millers fortified themselves with a large supply of wheat which did not cost them $1.25 a bushel or anything like it. And yet flour is selling at $8.75 a barrel.

There is another reason why the hon. gentleman has started at the wrong end of the question. He knows, as does every other member of this House, that for many years past the Canadian miller has been selling his flour in the markets of the world at a less price than that at which he sold it to the consumer in Canada. What is going to be the result of raising a question of this kind? I agree with the hon. member for Brandon (Sir James Aikins) that the agricultural business is the main industry in Canada. To increase the prosperity of this country, to get men on the land in the East and in the West, and to get larger acreage in crops and to get more agriculturists on the land, a campaign of " Patriotism and Production " is undertaken. I saw some figures the other day with respect to the population centering in the cities. While the rural population increased from 1900 to 1910 by half a million people, the population of the cities increased by almost a million and a quarter—or almost two and a half times the increase of the rural population. Of course, the cities are always attractive to a large number of people, but the main attraction has been the comparatively high wages that were paid there, especially by the manufacturers. The manufacturers did not raise wages for philanthropic reasons. They have acted in this matter the same as they have in relation to the doctrine of protection; it was an absolutely selfish proposition. They were forced to raise the wages of their employees because the cost of living has so greatly increased within the last fifteen years. The effect, of course, was to increase the wages of all city employees. The farmer could not compete with these prices, and so the farmer's hired men and the farmer's son went to the city. And now my hon. friend proposes that the price of the farmer's principal product should be curtailed. I would suggest to him, as the hon. member for Brandon said, that he might consider advantageously some reduction in the cost of agricultural implements in western Canada. Let me give an instance that came under my own notice a short time ago, one the facts of which I am ready to substantiate at any time the hon. gentleman wishes. A certain man bought an engine gang plough. I ascertained these facts at Carnduff. I learned that the machine was quoted there at a certain figure. But this man crossed the line into Sherwood, in North Dakota, and bought the plough there at such a price that though he paid about $100 duty on bringing it across the line, he saved $80 or $90 on the transaction. Does the hon. gentleman dispute that? That was a Canadian-made plough, one that had paid duty on going into the United States. Yet, though it had paid that duty and though it had to pay another duty on being brought back into Canada, the purchaser saved the amount that I have named. It was one of the agricultural implements manufactured by those philanthropic gentlemen of On-

tario, manufactured and sold abroad at 20 per cent less than they charge for it in Canada.

The hon. gentleman wishes to control the price of the product of the farmer, but at the same time he is arranging that his friends the Government of the day should increase the duty on the implements that the farmer uses, and on everything that the farmer consumes. That is the policy of my hon. friend. I would like to know what the Government think of that policy. Is it in favour of the policy of curtailing the price of all the foodstuff that the farmer produces and to enhance the price of all that the farmer uses?

As I have said, what we most of all require in western Canada, and I believe in the whole of Canada, is to get men on the land. Canada is primarily an agricultural country. We have prided ourselves on that for many years past. But immigration has practically ceased during the last six months, and it has been declining, like our revenue, for eighteen months past. If we are to get the farmers on the land to carry out the "patriotism and production" policy that we have heard so much about, how can any reasonable man defend the position that the price of the main product of the farmer's labour shall be fixed? I say, I believe that the majority of the House will agree that the farmer should be allowed the price for his products fixed by the open competition of the world.

Mr. ALPHONSE VERVILLE (Maisonneuve): My hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) has said a good deal in former years on questions similar to this, but formerly he argued on the other side. To-day he is very anxious to protect the workingman, not only of his own constituency, but of the whole of Canada. From what the hon. gentleman says, one would suppose that the workingmen of Canada ate bread and nothing else. I am prepared to favour the proposition of the hon. gentleman if he will ask the Government to regulate also the prices of everything that comes on the workingman's table. But I suppose he will not accept that, for otherwise he might be blackballed by the association of which he is a member. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman has changed from the position which he occupied in former years in this argument. For my part, I have always said that the farmers did not get enough for the goods they grow, yet the consumers always had to pay too much. The hon. gentleman can hardly deny that. There is a middleman somewhere—there are many of them, and my hon. friend is one. I would ask him in two words also to make some sacrifice, and would ask the trust of which, I assume, he is a member, to make some sacrifices. And I would say to the trust of the millers, which is really one of the biggest in Canada, and which has paid dividends on watered stocks of so many million dollars, that surely they also could do something for the country at the present time. My hon. friend may say that they are not paying any dividends this year. They are very sorry that they cannot pay any dividends, but I may remind hon. gentlemen that when I brought this question up in the House on a previous occasion it was plainly stated that these people were paying no dividends except on common stock. I may tell my hon. friend that I will second his proposition on the condition that the regulation or restriction of prices shall apply to every article of foodstuffs that goes on the workman's table. I may say, too, that I shall be willing to make some sacrifice if the interests with which my hon. friend is connected are willing to make one also.

Mr. W. A. BUCHANAN (Medicine Hat): The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) spoke of Canada as being the granary of the Empire; I think it will be admitted that western Canada is really the granary of the British Empire. The hon. gentleman proposes to make provision for the regulation of prices of foodstuffs, which would include the larger number of the products of western Canada. Farming in western Canada has not been profitable; that was established only last year by the report of the commission appointed by the government of the province of Saskatchewan to inquire into farming conditions. That was due largely to the prices received for the grain which the farmers produced. This year, when exceptional conditions prevail and there is a prospect of the farmer obtaining a good price for his wheat, the hon. member for Brantford comes along with a proposition to restrict the prices within certain limits and practically to wipe out the first opportunity for making a profit that the western farmer has had for a great many years.

What will be the effect of the proposed changes in the tariff upon the farmers of western Canada? The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) argues that the price of the protected article goes up just to the extent to which the tariff is increased.

I have before me substantial proof that since the Government increased the protection afforded to certain agricultural implements, the price of agricultural implements has been raised, and the new prices are now in effect. I will quote the statement, not of a politician, but of a gentleman who is engaged in the implement business in the city of Winnipeg. I have here a clipping from the Winnipeg Free Press of Tuesday, February 23, containing the report of an interview with Mr. H. W. Hutchinson, vice-president and managing director of the John Deere Plough Company. Mr. Hutchinson argues that the entire tariff, in so far as it affects tillage implements used upon the farms, imposes a burden upon the farmer of western Canada. We have been advocating, as Mr. Hutchinson points out, increased production, but production can only be brought about by utilizing tillage implements, and upon these the Government, under its proposed tariff arrangements, is putting an extra tax. Let me read what Mr. Hutchinson says in that regard:

> The prairie farmers will, of course, be called on to pay the duty. We have been already notified by Canadian manufacturers that prices will be increased to us and we have already begun to prepare a new price list for the sale of our commodities. On every walking plough there will be an increase in the price paid of from $1 to $2; on every sulky plough an increase of $4; on every drill an increase of $5.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Do these increases apply to ploughs made in the United States or to ploughs made in Canada?

Mr. BUCHANAN: Mr. Hutchinson says, "We have already been notified by Canadian manufacturers."

Mr. COCKSHUTT: So far as our firm is concerned, there is no truth in that report of an increase. It has been decided by the firm that prices shall remain just as they have been.

Mr. BUCHANAN: I presume that the hon. gentleman, who has dissociated himself from the agricultural implement business within the last couple of years, is probably more familiar with these conditions than I am, but I shall wait until I receive word from some of the farmers in western Canada who are buying the implements before assuming that Mr. Hutchinson's statement is incorrect. Mr. Hutchinson proceeds to enumerate the increases:

> On every gang plough an increase of $6; on every wagon an increase of $7, and on every disc plough a nincrease of $8, with similar advances in the prices to the farmer of all kindred tools.

Then there follows a lengthy interview with Mr. Hutchinson, in which he says that the tariff increases are discouraging to the farmers of western Canada. In view of the fact that the prices of these articles are to be increased, I submit that even if the prices of grain in eastern Canada to-day rise higher than they ever have been in the past, the additional prices which the farmer will have to pay for the articles which are given additional protection under the tariff changes introduced at this session of Parliament, will reduce his profit and take away from the benefit of the increased price he receives for his products.

The hon. member for Brantford takes a patriotic view of the situation. I wish to tell my hon. friend—not as a boast, but as a statement of fact—that there is no more patriotic part of Canada than the West; that there is no more patriotic citizenship in this country than that which is found in the farmers of western Canada. I have had the pleasure of attending a great many patriotic meetings in my own constituency, a constituency largely populated by men and women who come from the republic to the south. Those men and women have been interesting themselves in the promotion of every patriotic object, and are prepared to make sacrifices on behalf of Canada until the war is over and victory is proclaimed on behalf of the Allies. They are prepared to make sacrifices on behalf of patriotic enterprises, and they are prepared, if need be, to sacrifice their sons to the Empire. In my constituency a squadron of mounted rifles has just been raised to go to the front with the third contingent, and in that squadron there are six officers, each one of them a native born American citizen who has only recently become a naturalized citizen of Canada. Any one who is under the impression that our new citizens are not true Canadians has been entertaining mistaken ideas.

I believe that this war itself has developed a stronger Canadian citizenship than we have ever had in the past. It has proven the metal, it has proven and established the loyalty, of the people who have gone into western Canada; and they are prepared to make their contributions, but they are not prepared to be limited in the price which may be offered to them for the products of the soil, and then have to pay increased prices for the articles which they use. My hon. friend in his resolution says:

> While at the same time directing that our surplus food exports should only reach British or friendly countries.

My hon. friend surely has kept in touch with Britain's attitude during this war. He knows that to-day it has been declared that no food of any kind will be allowed to go into Germany or any other country opposed to the Allies on account of the attitude of Germany and the countries allied with her. Why is that? We can get food products to the Allies and the friendly countries because of the existence of a great power within the British Empire, and this resolution, I maintain, is not necessary in that regard, because all our surplus products are more than likely to go to the countries to which we want them to go—to Great Britain and to the allied nations.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia): My hon. friend the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), has brought forward a resolution that I do not think he can expect this House to approve of. At the present time my hon. friend is engaged in supporting a measure before this House which is to add very heavy burdens, not only to the farmers in the West, but to the farmers all over Canada. It is bad enough when you hit any class of the people one blow, but in this resolution that my hon. friend presents to the House he proposes to give the farmer the double-cross and hit him at both ends. He adds to the price of his machinery, adds to the price of everything that goes to produce wheat and if, on one particular occasion or in one particular year out of a great many years, the products of the farm are high in price my hon. friend wants the Government to step in and fix the price. I acknowledge that farmers are getting good, high prices for their products at the present time.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Some of them.

Mr. TURRIFF: Well, most of them.

Mr. CLARK: Pork is very low.

Mr. TURRIFF: Some of the farmers have got good prices and because they happened to have got good prices my hon. friend comes forward and wants to have the prices fixed by the Government. I think the hon. member for Brantford is beginning to learn something, and that is that high protection does not always protect or benefit the interests that he is so anxious to have benefited. Surely the proposition of the Government to increase the price of manufactured goods should be sufficient for my hon. friend who represents a manufacturing constituency—a constituency composed nearly altogether of manufacturers and artisans. If that proposition worked out as they would lead us to believe, the artisans of that constituency should be benefited, but according to the hon. member for Brantford they are not being benefited, he finds the prices of products too high and he comes to this Government and wants to have them regulated.

We have heard a great deal of late years about getting the people back to the land. What I am particularly concerned about is endeavouring to keep the people on the land that we have on the land at the present time. People have been leaving the land steadily and now, when you are placing heavier burdens than ever before on the backs of the men who are trying to make a living on the land, how does any one expect, how does the hon. member for Brantford expect, that we will be able to get more people back to the land or even that we will be able to keep the men on the land who are there now? My hon. friend, with a show of patriotic fervour, declared that we should make sacrifices. What sacrifices are his constituents making? What sacrifices are the manufacturers making under the legislation that is before Parliament to-day? I heard one manufacturer from Montreal make the statement—and he made it knowing what he was talking about—that the added duties that are proposed at the present session would mean 5 per cent additional profit to the manufacturers. These are not my words, these are the words of a practical manufacturer. If these added duties, of which the farmer will have to bear the biggest part, will enable the manufacturer to made an additional 5 per cent profit, I would like to ask my hon. friend where the sacrifice comes in. I have never been able to see any sacrifice that the manufacturer has ever made. The vice-president of the Manufacturers' Association said that they would have to grin and bear the extra taxes, but I notice that the Ottawa Citizen said chiefly grin, and it is a case of grin on the part of the manufacturer if he can make five per cent extra money.

I hope the hon. member for Brantford will not succeed in having his resolution carried into effect, because it would mean that the farmer, in addition to the extra burden that he is going to be called upon to bear, would be precluded from taking advantage of good

prices for his wheat, or his cattle, or anything else in the way of food that he produces, at any time that it happened that the prices were extra heavy. I would like to ask my hon. friend if Great Britain has asked for any such action on the part of the Government of this country. I do not believe she has. The hon. member for Brandon (Sir James Aikins) has pointed out the statement, in a despatch to the press to-night, that Great Britain had food enough on hand for the next twelve months. I do not think there is much suffering from the lack of food, and I think it would be a step in the wrong direction absolutely if the Government were to place any restrictions whatever in the way of the farmer getting the very best prices he can. My hon. friend from Brantford, only a year or two ago, supported very heartily a proposition in this House to prevent the farmer from selling his wheat on the other part of the line if he could get a better price for it. He could not see that there would be any advantage in that whatever, but if my hon. friend from Brantford refused to allow the farmer to sell his wheat in the best market that happened to be available, and that best market was across the line, and if he is supporting the policy of added burdens to the farmer in producing that wheat, surely he does not want to give him a third welt and to say: We must prevent the farmer from getting the market value of his wheat because that is going to make the cost of living too high for my constituents. That is exactly what he says—the cost of living is going to be too high. My hon. friend will find out that when he undertakes to legislate upon all these matters he just gets them going from bad to worse, and that it would be far more in the interests of his constituents, as well as in the interests of the whole Dominion, if they would leave matters as they are and not add any greater burdens to the farmer and not give any greater concessions to the manufacturers. He would then find that the cost of living for his constituents would not go up nearly as fast, and that they would be in a much better position than if the Government were to accede to their request and put a limit on the prices that the farmer could get for his product. If anything were going to be done in that line, now is not the time to do it. I can hardly think that the Government would entertain this idea for a moment; but if it were going to be done at all, the time would be before the grain has largely passed out of the farmers' hands—it is not altogether out of their hands, but a very considerable portion of it is—and into the hands of the great milling concerns. However, I am not at all alarmed that the Prime Minister will do anything of the kind asked for by this resolution. It does not seem to me it is a motion in the right direction and I do not think the members on his own side of the House will accord the hon. member very much support.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Queens, P.E.I.): One of the ideas of the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) in proposing his motion appears to be that most of the wheat in Canada has been secured by the millers and other speculators at a low price, and that these men are taking advantage of the war conditions to charge consumers an inordinate profit, and he seems to think that in some way or other this resolution if carried would regulate the price to the consumer. I do not think it would have that effect. The motion says:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the circumstances arising out of the present war are such as to justify the Government of Canada in exercising supreme control over the quantity and destiny of our food exports, thereby regulating the prices at which bread, meat and other food products shall be sold for home consumption, while at the same time directing that our surplus food exports should only reach British or friendly countries.

According to the proclamation issued by Great Britain and the Allies, the surplus products that Canada has to ship will only reach Great Britain and other friendly countries, and, therefore, that part of the resolution is not necessary. And if, by reason of that fact, you control the price of the home grain then there is no part of the resolution that is necessary. There is no doubt that the millers and other speculators are charging a very high price for flour at the present time, and if they have bought this wheat at a low figure before the price advanced, there is no doubt whatever but they are taking advantage of present conditions, and whether they should be allowed to do that is a point worthy of consideration. This is a combine-ridden country—

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Say that again.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: My hon. friend wishes me to repeat that, but everybody knows it who wishes to know it, and therefore it is not necessary for me to repeat. We have combines to raise the price of food and other products, and if they can be smashed, it would be a good thing for Can-

ada. There are men in this country—we all know it—who are taking advantage of the war conditions to make fortunes of thousands and tens of thousands of dollars out of the food and other products they are selling to the people of this country, and to the Government of this country, which is another name for the people. If the hon. member for Brantford had moved a resolution asking for a parliamentary committee to find out who the guilty parties are, and to try to prevent these practices, I for one would support him. The resolution of the hon. member in its present form would be innocuous and useless were it adopted. Something should be done to prevent the people from being fleeced, and to prevent the designs of the cormorants who are trying to fatten upon the people at this particular time, by taking advantage of the patriotism and loyalty and devotion of the people. These men think that perhaps their raids upon the treasury and upon the people of Canada may pass unnoticed, but we know them and they should be brought to book. Action in this direction taken as speedily as possible and before Parliament prorogues would be in the best interests of the country and of the Empire. If my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt) had proceeded along that line, I am sure he would have got support in this House, from independent members at all events, and perhaps some one may yet move in that direction. That is the view I take of this resolution.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (York, South): I am only going to detain the House for a moment to look on this question from the point of view of increasing production throughout Canada, especially farm production, both in the East and in the West. Having regard to the present situation, if I were asked to suggest something to improve the condition of the farmer of the West in the matter of increased production of foodstuffs, I would suggest the adoption of a policy by the Government to valorize or stabilize the price of the forthcoming wheat crop. I would be quite willing to see the Government make a price for the first and second grades of the coming year's wheat crop, somewhere in the neighbourhood of $1.40 or $1.50 per bushel. That would enable the farmer to hold the wheat until they got at least that price for it. If a better price were obtainable they would get the benefit. By the Government valorizing and stabilizing the price of wheat, the farmer would get what he does not get to-day, namely, the large amount which the miller takes away from him. The bulk of the wheat that has been raised by the farmers of our western country has gone into flour, and that flour has been sold, as nearly as I can make out, at a price which should have netted the farmer from $1.30 to $1.50 a bushel. There are always new ideas in economics, and the suggestion has been made, and I think it is worthy of consideration having regard to the present conditions, that the Government of Canada could well afford to stabilize the price of the coming crop at least at $1.30 a bushel. If we cannot do that, there are other things we can do to help the farmer. There are two things that could be done in that direction and the Government is doing one of them now in increasing the storage capacity in the West so that the farmer can keep his wheat until such time as the miller wants it, and thus secure a better price. A widespread system of storage throughout the West will no doubt help in that direction. Then we should have a banking system in this country that would enable the farmer to carry his wheat, so that he would not be compelled to sell it as soon as the crop is reaped. If the farmer could store his wheat and if he could have a banking accommodation that would help him to carry his wheat, we would accomplish what ought to be accomplished, namely, not a reduction in the price of wheat in this country, but the increasing of the price in every possible way, or at least the enabling of the farmer to get the price which he is entitled to get for his wheat. The Government should enter upon a policy of valorizing the price of wheat, especially of the higher grades; but we certainly can at least provide storage for the wheat and furnish a banking system that will enable the farmer to carry his crop until such time as he can sell it at a fair price. If we had those facilities to offer to the western farmers, farmers would flock to the West and settle there, and we would see the West thrive as it has never thrived before.

Freight rates also have a bearing upon this question, and there may be relief in that direction. Parliament should find a way to improve the condition of the western farmer and to enable him to get the best possible price for his wheat. If we do that, we shall increase our production in a most surprising way; we shall bring prosperity again to the West, and we shall see a new and greater West in the near future.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton): I have followed with a great deal of interest the speech of the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt). I am sure, whatever any one else may have said about the speech of my hon. friend, that he has at least brought a good deal of live information and reliable statistics to the notice of the House. The subject to which he has drawn our attention is certainly one of the greatest possible importance. During this discussion the hon. member for Brantford has been criticised for propounding a policy. It certainly cannot be said that the hon. gentleman has been propounding any policy. As I understood him, he was propounding a way in which to deal with an urgent condition of things brought about by the extraordinary state of the country at the present time. The resolution is perhaps not as well drafted as it might have been. As I read it, there is only one categorical assertion in it, namely:

That, in the opinion of this House, the circumstances arising out of the present war are such as to justify the Government of Canada in exercising supreme control over the quantity and destiny of our food exports.

There cannot be any objection to the resolution laid down to that point. It may be said that it calls for a great deal of work and that it imposes an unnecessary burden upon the Government; but it is a wise and sane statement to make, that the Government of the country, or any other country situated as we are, should have the greatest possible knowledge of the food supply of the country and that then it should know where it is going. The other phases which follow in the resolution are not necessarily the consequences of the first positive assertion, although they seem to be taken by the mover of the resolution as necessary consequences of it. I do not think that because the Government knows what quantity of foodstuffs there is in the country and their destination, the prices of foodstuffs will be regulated. I do not know much about the movement of wheat; but as far as I understand commercial conditions in this country, I know of nothing that would prevent a combine of speculators from buying up all the wheat that we have for sale in Canada, taking it to the United States and sending it to our enemies in the old land. This may be an absurd statement to make; but I know of nothing to prevent German money from coming into the United States, with which an American company may be formed for the purpose of buying our wheat and shipping it to Germany, if it can be got in there.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Germany has no money.

Mr. McKENZIE: My hon. friend is an authority on most things, but I would not care to change my mind with regard to voting for this resolution, because, as he says, there is no money in Germany. I would not care to take the risk of leaving our wheat within easy reach of Germany, even supposing that country has no money.

It is a fair and reasonable proposition that any country that is at war—and we are at war—should have absolute knowledge of the sinews of war within its bounds, and that it should have absolute control of where they shall go and how they shall go.

During the session of 1914, when we were only talking about war, which we then deemed to be far distant, legislation was passed giving control over the export of petroleum oil, because if war broke out, we should have absolute control of the oil so that it should not go out of the country except where thought advisable. If it were right to do that—and the legislation was passed without any controversy—surely it cannot be said that it would be wrong for the Government to have enabling legislation passed at this session to give it power to deal with this wheat question, if it were necessary to do so.

I do not quite understand that it is using very extraordinary powers for the Government of any country to take control of the food supply in time of war. It would be a species of expropriation of property. Wheat is property and land is property, and I do not think it would be any more drastic to expropiate wheat than to expropriate land.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman not recognize the fact that in so far as the House can give that power, the legislation is already on the statute book?

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not saying whether it is on the statute book or not. In reference to wheat, I am not aware that it is. Perhaps the hon. Solicitor-General will tell me where we have such legislation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In section 6 of the War Measures Act of the session of last August.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is quite possible. In that case, it is not necessary to legislate; it is a question as to whether it is a wise policy for the Government to act upon the legislation already on the statute book. It does not change the position that I have

taken, which is simply this, that if we exercise the power contained in the 6th section of the statute passed as our War Act of last session, it is a certain species of expropriation: it would be expropriating wheat instead of, as in other cases, expropriating land. I suppose that it was under that War Act that we expropriated the land at Valcartier. We not only expropriated the land there, but also the grain, the potatoes, and I suppose the cattle in the field. We took everything there was. Surely, if we were justified in doing that, if that was a wise and proper policy, I cannot see that it can be over drastic or unwise to give the Government control of the wheat supply of this country, provided that the owner gets a fair and proper price for it. In view of the suggestion that has been made, what strikes me as possible to happen is that the wheat might go out of the country, and go beyond the border and we not have anything to say about it. If that happened, I think we should be sorry that we had not adopted laws and regulations to prevent it. I do not think it at all an unreasonable thing to regulate prices of food if a few people are in command of the food of the country and by reason of that food we find that the prices are going up by leaps and bounds.

Speaking for the part of the country from which I come, the province of Nova Scotia, which is an agricultural country to some extent, also a lumbering, a fishing and perhaps more than anything else, an iron, steel and coal producing country, there are thousands of men there who are dependent for the support of themselves and their families on their day's work. It is a well known fact that for the last eighteen months or more times have been very poor and workmen have not been able to earn the usual amount of money. It is a regrettable fact that it is difficult for these men to feed themselves and their families. It is a startling and discouraging thing for a man who is not earning at all or who is earning but a small wage, and who has seven or eight children to feed, to find that he must pay $9.15 for a barrel of flour. If there is anything the Prime Minister can do to enable that man to pay what is fair and reasonable for flour, and I mention that solely as an example of other things, to see to it that this barrel is sold at a fair profit, so that the farmer will be well paid and everybody handling the business well paid, and yet the poor man who buys it will not be robbed, I do not think that, as guardian of the interests of the people he would be doing anything but what was fair and right. I had the pleasure of hearing the Minister of Finance address a delegation with regard to the price of tobacco. He described the Government on that occasion as the physician of the body politic. I do not find fault with the figure, although I say that the present gang of doctors should never have passed the board and been licensed, still, having been licensed and passed as physicians, they are now in charge of the body politic. And if they now find the body politic suffering with a disease such as hunger, is it not right, from the minister's own definition of his position, that the Government should cause him to take such necessary steps to deal with the disease and reduce such ills as his extraordinary skill in such matters may well bring about? If without injury to the farmer we can keep the somebody who is increasing the prices from doing so, if we can regulate prices so that they should be fair to the poor man, I think that is what this resolution aims at. I do not think that the hon. gentleman is trying to make political capital out of it.

Perhaps I may be pardoned if I go back to somewhat ancient days. My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) is fond of quoting history, and he quotes it well, and his comparisons are not always to the advantage of the present day. If we go far back in history we find an instance of a wise man taking control of the wheat of the country. We find him storing it up and selling it out as it suited him. He sold it at proper prices. On another historic occasion there were in the wilderness a tremendous body of men, women and children—twelve thousand. And there was nothing for them to eat except certain small fishes and few loaves of bread. Here was a grand occasion when one man had a corner in the food supply We do not find that the Master told him: This is your chance, my boy; put up your food for sale and you can make your fortune. No, the Regulator and Governor took charge of the whole business. He disposed of the loaves and fishes, and disposed of them properly. If there is only a little bread and fish to be divided, then those who are responsible for the management of the country should take charge of that food and see to it that it is properly divided so that the country from one end to the other shall be supplied with food so far as that food will go. In my own country, I am sorry to say, the rapid increase in

the price of flour is very embarrassing. When the mines are working, when people can readily sell timber, when the farmers are producing, no particular regulation is necessary. The miner, when he is at work, is a fine customer. In fact he is a little too free with his money, and when the hard times come he is up against it in a very short time.

If this resolution will put power into the hands of the Government that will enable them to say to those who grow wheat that they must not go too high in price, or say to the miller that he must not ask too much for flour, I shall be glad to support it. I have not examined the Bill we passed last August, nor am I suggesting the kind of legislation we should pass. I am glad to hear the statement of the Solicitor General that no legislation is necessary because the Government already have the power. That being so, there is no excuse on the part of the Government for not taking action if action is necessary. If this resolution goes to a vote, I shall have no hesitation in voting for it, so far as it goes to carry out the idea that the Government shall know how much food is in the country and where it goes.

Mr. G. W. KYTE (Richmond, N.S.): It was expected that during the past six months the Government would take some steps to prevent the undue enhancement of the price of foodstuffs; it was confidently asserted in the Government press that such action would be taken by the Government. I did think that the legislation which was passed at the August session of Parliament empowered the Government to take such action, and I quite agree that no further legislation is necessary. It is well known that the price of foodstuffs has been enhanced very far beyond the cost of the ingredients that enter into their production. I saw in the press a few weeks ago a statement that the Bakers' Association of Toronto had made representations to the Minister of Trade and Commerce protesting against the undue increase in the price of the materials entering into the manufacture of their products. It was alleged that the price of these articles had increased by 100 per cent within the last twelve months, and that of this increase the farmers had received only one-tenth.

I think that the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) does not necessarily imply that the farmers should not receive the very best price that they can obtain for their products; it is aimed, I think, more particularly, against the middleman, who is taking advantage of existing conditions for the purpose of exacting undue profits. Immediately after war was declared the price of flour in the province of Nova Scotia jumped up $2 a barrel. There was no reason for that increase; the merchants had laid in a stock of flour before war conditions could possibly have affected the price of wheat. Nevertheless, without any justification, they added $2, and in some cases more, to the price of each barrel of flour. I think that is a condition of affairs that ought to be promptly dealt with by the Government. I do not say that the farmers themselves derive too great a profit from their labour and the products of their labour, but I do say that before these products of the farm reach the consumer, the middlemen, through greed and a want of proper appreciation of the unfortunate conditions that confront the labouring men in Canada to-day, unduly increase their profits in respect of these articles. This is applicable to other food products as well as to flour and wheat. I do think that under the circumstances the Government ought not to hesitate to take such steps as would prevent the undue increase in the price of foodstuffs by the middlemen.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE (Lisgar): The matter of handling wheat in Canada has always been a vexed question, but in my opinion the most important consideration with which we are now confronted is that of seeing that the farmers in western Canada particularly those in the drouth-stricken districts, are supplied with seed grain. I understand that the Interior Department, under the arrangements which they have made, can supply only 400 bushels to each farmer, while many farmers in western Canada need 1,000 or 2,000 bushels of wheat for seed purposes. Some arrangement should be made whereby these farmers can be supplied with the necessary amount of seed grain. I think the Government would be justified in amending the banking laws of Canada so that banks would be empowered to take seed grain mortgages—which they can not do under the present law—thus enabling them to help the western farmers to obtain the extra seed grain that they need.

The great difficulty in connection with the wheat question is not the prices the farmers have been getting, but the extent to which the middlemen, or the millers, boost prices after 90 per cent of the wheat leaves the farmers' hands. Ever since I

have been in western Canada the dealers and the millers have manipulated the prices and the market so that the producer of the grain receives the very lowest price and the consumer pays the very highest. Every year a special train leaves Winnipeg with millers, grain dealers and reporters; they travel over the prairie, and when they get back they spread abroad reports of the great crop we are going to have in western Canada. In this manner they pound the price down to the very lowest possible point; then the moment the wheat is sold by the farmer they start a cry about the great shortage of crop—that it will not be nearly as large as expected. Up, then, goes the price to the consumer, and the toll is paid to the middlemen.

Some persons say: why do the farmers not hold the wheat? Because the farmers owe money to the loan companies, machinery companies and general stores; these accounts must be paid, and they are compelled to sell their grain to obtain the necessary funds. The crop of 1913 was sold by the farmers at an average price of 65 cents a bushel. It costs over 60 cents to grow a bushel of grain, so hon. gentlemen can see that the farmers of western Canada made no money out of that crop. In the past year 90 per cent of the wheat went out of the farmers' hands at an average price of from 80 cents to $1 a bushel, and to-day it is boosted up to $1.65. I submit that this Government should control the gambling in the food products of Canada. To-day a man can go on the option market and buy wheat on a three cent margin. I think we should pass some law whereby speculators would be obliged to pay a margin of 25 cents on each bushel of wheat they buy. This would do away with a great deal of speculation in wheat. I have no hesitation in saying that in my opinion the middlemen—in this case the millers and the grain-dealers—are the persons who are robbing the people of this country. They rob the farmer, the man who grows the wheat, and they rob the consumer as well. The farmers of western Canada have 13,000,000 acres ready for wheat for next spring. If we have an average crop of 20 bushels to the acre, that will mean 260,000,000 bushels of wheat grown in the prairie provinces for next year. Some 60,000,000 bushels of wheat will be sufficient for bread and seed for the three provinces, which will leave 200,000,000 bushels for export. So that even before we started this great cry of patriotism and production the farmers of western Canada were getting ready to supply the old country markets. I think that it would be a mistake for this Government to try to control the price of wheat, but I do think they should control the gambling in the food products of this country.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (South Oxford): I wish to offer a few remarks on this motion. I would not have done so, but apparently there are at least three hon. members in this House who are in sympathy with the resolution. When you allow your imagination to picture the vast extent of this country and our great community of interest, I do not think that you can come to any other conclusion than that this resolution is narrow and provincial in its character. It is an attempt to interfere with legitimate business, and would, as Premier Asquith stated with regard to similar legislation in the old land, cause no end of trouble.

Most of the discussion here to-day has reference to the effect that the resolution would have on the farmers of western Canada. The mover of it, however, comes from the province of Ontario. We do a little farming in the province of Ontario. Of course, the farmers there are not just as up to date as they are in other parts of the country, but this resolution would affect them to some extent at least; and I am sure that when the farmers of Canada read in the papers to-morrow the discussion that took place here on a resolution of this kind, they will be very much amused to think that this House has devoted as much time as it has to a discussion of this nature. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) thinks that the Government should not limit the amount of seed to be advanced to the western farmer to 400 bushels, that some farmers will require 1,000 or 2,000 bushels. I think that any farmer who has sufficient land to require 2,000 bushels to seed it, that is, 1,000 acres, should be in a position to acquire seed for himself without any assistance from the Government. I do not think it is a good thing for any class in a community to expect the Government to take up every little scheme and to solve all difficulties for them. I do not believe that that is in accordance with the genius of our people, nor do I think it would result in any benefit to them. I quite agree that the homesteader who may have invested every dollar he had in securing funds to work his homestead and who may have land ready for seed, if he is not in a position to procure seed, should have it advanced to him, as the Government in such case has ample security for the money advanced.

9 p.m.

I wish to tell the House something about the western farmers. I have heard so much in the House and outside of it about the farmers in Eastern Canada advising the farmers in the West what to do, that I shall not advise them at all, as I do not feel competent to do so; nor am I going to advise the farmers in Ontario; but I want to tell some of the western farmers what some farmers in western Ontario are doing. They are buying stock in the West, shipping it down here to Ontario and buying feed from other parts of the country and from the United States; they are feeding that stock and putting it on the market, and they are doing that year after year. They are not doing that just for the fun of the thing, but they are doing it from a business standpoint. Two feed merchants in the constituency I represent have sold during the present winter nineteen carloads of cotton seed meal to be fed to stock in that county. This is a feature of Ontario farming. In the West farming is supposed to be wheat growing, but this resolution covers a great deal more than the growing of wheat. It has been read a number of times, but I shall read part of it again:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the circumstances arising out of the present war are such as to justify the Government of Canada in exercising supreme control over the quantity and destiny of our food exports, thereby regulating the prices at which bread, meat and other food products shall be sold for home consumption.

I am satisfied that agriculture cannot be carried on in this country, or in any other country, without stock raising being an adjunct of it, or rather, the basis on which it is founded. We found lately a change in the price of cattle in the cattle markets. I quote from the Toronto Globe of February 18:

> The bottom fell yesterday out of the beef cattle market in Toronto, and it may take a little while to restore it. Various causes are given for the almost unprecedented drop in prices, but only one of them seems to have in it any element of permanency: scarcity and consequent dearness of fodder. The combination of this with other causes has produced a situation which is by no means pleasant to pass through, but which is not likely to last very long. It would be a mistake for cattle-owners to hasten to get rid of their stock for fear of a worse thing happening to them; better far hold the animals over even at an undue cost, and take chances of a better market with improved cattle.

We have a solution offered here for the high cost of living in this country. A commission was appointed a year ago to investigate the high cost of living in Canada. The Globe undertakes to solve the beef question, and I shall read its solution:

> If it be said there are no lands fit for cattle-ranching purposes the answer must be that there are such lands in abundance in Northern Ontario. The obstacle to be overcome is not the lack of suitable land, but the unreasoning though apparently invincible skepticism of the beef cattle producers. Wherever the deer can live and thrive in a state of nature cattle can live and thrive with a little factitious assistance, and on a woodland ranch they will cost less and thrive better, even in winter, than if housed up and tended with great labour in the most new-fashioned subterranean stables.

We have not yet had a resolution before the House with regard to the land now occupied by the deer. Possibly something of that nature will develop before very long.

The farmers of Ontario to-day are feeding their livestock at a great loss, yet you never hear a word offered in this House or outside of it in sympathy with them. People are very ready to advise the farmer what to do. We have at the present time a movement on foot throughout Canada called the "patriotism and production campaign." I shall not say very much about that, but personally I believe that if these gentlemen would devote their energies to prayer, they might accomplish just as much as they will accomplish by what they are doing. The farmers of Canada are just as alive to their own interests as any other class in the community, and possibly not any more so. I cannot see any reason why they should be singled out at a time like this, as distinguished from any other time, to be made victims for the benefit of others. We have a community of interests in this country, and if we are going to make of Canada a country such as we hope to make it, there must be times when some sections or communities must suffer while others will be in a position to reap greater benefits. I am sorry that the matter has been taken so seriously by the House. I did not think there was any occasion for it and I am satisfied that the mover of the resolution did not fully consider the matter before bringing it to the attention of the House. As far as the farmers of Ontario are concerned—and they have just as great interests at stake as any other section of Canada—they are not asking for special favours, yet they do not want to be hampered in their legitimate business.

I believe that the greatest difficulty that the farmers have to contend with is the transportation problem and the lack of

labour on the farm. These two things have brought about conditions that are detrimental to the whole country. We hear about thousands being out of employment in the towns and cities. No doubt many of them cannot get away from those places; all they have is invested there, they own their houses probably, they are mechanics and they are not accustomed to any other work. In the cities of Ontario there never was a time when it was more difficult to get men to go out and work upon the farm. That has been the case during the whole winter and I repeat that it was never more difficult to get men to work on the farms in Ontario than at the preseent time. That is the position. I went into the immigration office in the city of Toronto on Saturday last and the man in charge there said: Nothing doing here; I just placed one man last week. What do you think of that? Yet the cities are feeding thousands of men who say they cannot get employment in this country. Mind you, this is during the winter months. Some people say: Why does not the farmer build a house on the farm and keep his men the year round? These men will not stay with the farmer more than eight or nine months and then they flock to the cities. If many of the large cities would only exercise proper control over the unemployed they would not find so many people asking for assistance.

The condition that has come about in this country has developed during the last few years. When the farmers got to the stage when protection was of some value to them we found then, and not until then, that the Government of the day were prepared to allow imports of food products into this country free of duty. It was not until then that the conditions of which I am speaking manifested themselves. The farmers turned down that proposition and if you look over the imports into this country during the past few years you will find that we have in Canada a market that is second to none in the world. If we just leave things as they are and do not meddle with them we will find that a greater number will be induced to go back to the land and a greater development will take place in Canada than has been the case for many years past. I do not think that we need worry about this proposition. Let us see if we can improve the transportation facilities of this country, and I must say that I do not look very hopefully on the prospect. I see great obstacles in the way of doing that. We have altogether too many duplications of transportation facilities for what we have to transport and the result is that it will be impossible to give us the rate that we would have had if we did not have so many transcontinental lines.

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (South Cape Breton): If I correctly understand the resolution as proposed by the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), I am in perfect accord with it. My understanding of it is that the Government should take some steps to prohibit the enormous profit that middlemen are making upon the food products of the country. It is proposed, as I understand it, that the Government should take some steps to control the foodstuffs of the country, especially flour, wheat and the items mentioned in the resolution. I could well understand the sentiment of the last speaker (Mr. Sutherland) if the farmers were making some of the enormous profits which are being made, and have been made, on foodstuffs since June, July and August of last year. My hon. friend says that the resolution is too narrow and provincial. I take a somewhat different view. I believe that this resolution is calculated to bring to the attention of the Government a serious grievance which the consumers have at the present time. He says that the proposal of the resolution is to make the farmers the victims. The farmers are the victims already. That was pointed out by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. W. H. Sharpe). I would not have any hesitation about expressing the wish that the farmers should get the very best prices they could for the products of their farms. I would like to see the fishermen and miners getting the very best prices they could for the products of their labour. When these products are cornered by middlemen and speculators, or when products of the farm are cornered by perhaps half a dozen speculators, who hoard them in their granaries, the products of the western farms, as well as the products of the eastern farms and the farms of Ontario, when they take advantage of the misfortune of Canada, in common with the rest of the Empire, in connection with the struggle which we are waging, to force consumers to pay exorbitant and, I might say, awful prices for their food, it is the duty of the Government, in the interests of the people, to do something that shall prevent these middlemen, these speculators, from making fortunes themselves at the expense of the common people and of the Empire at large.

What is the fact? When we are buying flour in western Canada for $6 a barrel the

farmer on the prairie was making as much money as he is to-day. The farmer, three, four and five years ago, when we in the East were paying $6 and sometimes $5.75 a barrel for the very best flour, was making as much money as he is to-day. What are we paying in eastern Canada for flour? We are paying $9.25 for Five Roses flour, a brand which, I understand, is made from hard wheat. I do not think that the farmers in the West are making any more money on account of the excessive rise in the price of flour which has taken place during the past three or four months than they were making before. I have been given to understand by many people from western Canada that the wheat of the farmers of the West was sold to the millers and middlemen at not very much over the ordinary rate and that the middlemen and millers took advantage of the misfortunes of the country. We pride ourselves on being loyal to the Empire, and I think it is a proud boast that we are trying to do everything we can to further the interests of our common Empire in this struggle for existence. To-day the wheat market in Canada and the price of the wheat that we are exporting to the old land are controlled by the Chicago market, a market which is foreign to the British Empire. I can point to several milling industries in this country whose stocks have increased eight points since last Christmas, and of course the farmers who raised the wheat derive no profit from that. We have in the world to-day plenty of wheat and plenty of flour for consumption until the next crop is harvested, but it is not supply and demand which controls the price, but speculators who have hoarded the produce of the world and who are waxing fat at the expense of the Canadian and British taxpayer and consumer. The Government would be doing only its duty if it enforced the legislation passed at the special session of Parliament in August. The hon. gentleman suggested that it is possible that some of our wheat has reached the markets of our enemies, and indeed the public press of this country has made the statement that Canadian wheat has been shipped to the United States and thence to enemies' ports. I have no evidence to corroborate that, but if it be so it is all the more reason why the Government should take control of the flour and wheat remaining in this country.

I would not be so pronounced in favour of the idea set out in the resolution, if the workers in the industrial centres of Canada were living under the same conditions as they were a year ago. In eastern Canada, and that is the only portion of Canada as to which I am thoroughly familiar with the conditions, our operators in the mines and steel plants are working now about half time, and it is an enormous hardship on those who are only earning half the ordinary wages that they should have to pay almost double for the flour, the meat and the bread, which are necessaries of their subsistence. It is not very often I am able to agree with the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), but in this case I endorse most heartily his suggestion that the Government should exercise control over the price and the export of Canadian foodstuffs. This is not the only parliament in which this question is now being discussed. I have no doubt that in a day or two we shall get a very pronounced idea from the Government and Parliament of Great Britain as to what they intend to do with regard to this question. The last reports I have seen in our newspapers, and also in a newspaper published in Sydney, Australia, was that the Australasian Government intended to take over control of practically all the foodstuffs in that country. If it were that the farmers or producers were being made the victoms in not getting a reasonable price for their products, I would not raise my voice in favour of this resolution, but we know that such is not the fact. The wheat has gone from the farmers and they have only reciived a reasonable price for it, so that the people who are getting these exorbitant profits are the speculators and the middlemen who never ploughed a furrow or garnered an ear of wheat. I believe that the Government will be well advised, should they exercise the power they have and control the prices of foodstuffs, as well as the export of wheat and flour from this country, so that it cannot reach channels where it may become the staff of life of the enemies of the Empire.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: One hon. member on the other side of the House suggested that the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), in proposing this resolution, desired to cast some reflection upon the patriotism of the farmers of Canada. I am bound to say that I gathered no such idea or meaning from anything said by the hon. member for Brantford. I know that he realizes, as all members of the House realize, the spirit of patriotism which has inspired the farmers of Canada, whether in the East or in the West, and all the people of Canada, in the great crisis which the Empire now faces. I desire to join in

the appreciation which has been expressed by an hon. gentleman on the other side, of the spirit of those citizens who have come to us from the south of the line, and who, at the present time, as indeed before the war broke out, are discharging in the most commendable manner all the duties of Canadian citizenship.

An hon. gentleman on the other side of the House suggested that my hon. friend from Brantford and those in his community, should be prepared to make some sacrifice themselves. I would like that hon. gentleman to bear in mind that the hon. member for Brantford is making the greatest of all sacrifices that a man can make, in sending those of his own family and his own flesh and blood to fight for the Empire.

I deeply regret, as every hon. member regrets, that there are workingmen in Brantford, and doubtless in other industrial centres, who at the present time are not able to find employment to the full extent they would desire, but there is the consideration that conditions in Canada are certainly not worse in that respect, and perhaps not so bad, as they are in the neighbouring republic. We know from statements appearing in the press of the United States that this war has brought about conditions there perhaps more depressing than anything to which we can point in this country at the present time; but, as far as those men in Canada who lack work at the moment are concerned, it would be more in the general interest, more in the interest of the men themselves, that we should endeavour to turn our energies, so far as the Government may exercise any power at its command, to find some means of providing work for them rather than to undertake the control of the price of food supplies, except under certain conditions to which I will allude a little later on.

I am very glad indeed to hear my hon. friend the member for Brantford say that a certain manufacturing company with which he is understood to be associated has not increased, and does not intend to increase, the price of its products to the farmers or other persons in this country who may desire to purchase them. The allusion made by one hon. gentleman on the other side of the House as to some increase in price in that regard can not have any relation to that company, or to other companies in a similar line of business who are manufacturing in Canada at the present time.

So far as the general question is concerned, the policy which the Government has endeavoured to follow since the outbreak of war is not to interfere with the business activities of the country, except in so far as this is absolutely and imperatively demanded of it by reason of the war or by reason of conditions arising out of the war. In other words, the less interference by a Government under conditions such as prevail at the present time, the less interference with the business activities of the country, with the sale or the free interchange of products, the better for the country, except in so far as the war itself demands otherwise. If my hon. friend from Brantford had found it convenient to come to myself or to some other member of the Government for information on some points on which he has addressed the House this afternoon, he might have saved himself the trouble of making some points of his speech. He has spoken in the first place of the desirability of regulating the export of food products, particularly wheat. He has spoken in the second place of the desirability of regulating the destination of such food products, particularly wheat, so that they shall not reach an enemy country. In the third place, he has spoken of the desirability of regulating the price at which such food products should be sold in this country.

Let us take, in the first place, the question of export. That presents itself to us in two aspects: firstly, the desirability of preventing any such export as would leave the people of this country destitute, between now and the next harvest, of a sufficient food supply. I would like to point out to my hon. friend that the question of food supply, so far as wheat and wheat products are concerned, is not solely a question of the wheat in this country, but a question of the wheat available for milling and of the flour in the country. I would like to assure him and all other hon. members that this subject has more or less engaged the attention of the Government; that we know something of the supply in that regard, and that we do not think conditions in this country at the present time are such as to make any action by the Government necessary so far as that particular feature of the question is concerned.

In the next place, my hon. friend speaks of wheat leaving this country and reaching an enemy country. In that is involved the question of destination, to which I alluded a moment ago. He has spoken of a return which has been brought down, and he has attached importance to the fact that 368 barrels of flour seem to have reached Germany since the first day of August last.

Every hon. member knows that since the proclamation, which has been validated by Parliament, it is absolutely impossible for any man in this country to have intercourse by way of trade with any citizen of an enemy country, unless he desires to place himself under very severe penalties of the law. Therefore, I would assume that the 368 barrels—which seems a very minor matter to be alarmed about—must have gone between the first and the fourth of August; because my hon. friend asked for a return from the first of August, and there was no declaration of war until the evening of the fourth of August. So far as the exports to Holland and Norway are concerned, they do not seem to be very much greater than those which took place in ordinary years. If my hon. friend had directed his attention to the Canada Gazette, he would have found an important enactment by the Government in that regard, to which I will, in a moment, draw the attention of the House.

With regard to the question of prohibiting export from this country of any article of supply which might be useful to the enemy, we have acted thoroughly in accordance with a committee constituted for that purpose in Great Britain, whose activities commenced almost immediately after the war had begun—a committee which deals almost entirely with the question of prohibiting or not prohibiting the export from Great Britain, or, by co-operation with the Government of any Dominion, from any British possession, of articles which may be of use to the enemy. On occasions when recommendations or suggestions have come to us, we have felt called upon, in the interests of this Dominion, to make certain representations to the committee through the British Government which have always been met in the most friendly spirit, and there has always been friendly co-operation in all such matters between the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of Canada from the very first. So far as this particular question is concerned, there has never been the slightest difference between the two Governments, and the suggestions of the Government of the United Kingdom have never been called in question by us, nor has our action ever been called in question by it. In accordance with the suggestions of that committee communicated to us, we passed an Order in Council on the 29th day of October last by which we prohibited the exportation from Canada of certain articles to all foreign ports in Europe and on the Mediterranean and Black seas, with the exception of those of France, Russia (except the Baltic ports), Spain and Portugal. Among the articles enumerated, in a long list with which I need not trouble the House, I find feeding stuffs for animals and all foodstuffs and raw materials for the same. Therefore I desire to assure my hon. friend and all hon. members that this subject has been taken into consideration in the first place by the British Government, and especially by the committee to which I have just now alluded, and, in the second place, upon representations and suggestions from the committee through the British Government, by the Government of Canada, with the result which I have just now pointed out.

In the next place, my hon. friend suggests that there should be a regulation of the price of foodstuffs, more particularly of wheat. So far as wheat is concerned, I would be very sorry to attempt anything of the kind, and for the following reasons. In the first place, the price of wheat, as has been recognized in this House and in the country ever since I have been a member of the House, is regulated by the markets of the world, regulated very largely by the prices established in the great markets of the Mother Country. Now, if we undertook to regulate the price, what would be a fair basis for doing so? A fair basis would be to regulate it from time to time in accordance with what would be determined by the markets of the world. For, inasmuch as the farmer, when the price of wheat is low, must be limited in the price which he receives by the markets of the world from time to time, in common justice we can only adopt the same principle when the price has been increased by exceptional conditions, and that would leave the matter where it was in the first place. For us to say to the farmer, when the price of wheat is at the highest by reason of war or other conditions, that we must limit the price which he receives, and that in other years and under other conditions he must accept a price which barely covers what it costs him to grow the wheat, that would seem to me a position which could not be maintained. At all events, it is a position which I would not care to take, nor is it one to which I could give my sanction. Therefore I do not think it would be desirable for the country to attempt any such course as my hon. friend has suggested. We desire in this country that there shall be more production from the land. It would

be, I think, a very unfortunate initiative on the part of this Government to undertake at the present time and under present conditions the limitation of the price which the farmer shall receive for his wheat.

That leads to quite another aspect of the situation, and that is, the efforts of people in this country to combine for the purpose of raising the price of foodstuffs after they have left the hands of the first producers. We have not been unmindful of our duty in that regard, and have endeavoured to watch the situation very carefully. A great many representation of a general character have been made to me from time to time, and if any good ground can be established to show that people are combining for the purpose of enhancing unduly the prices of foodstuffs in a general way throughout Canada, I am bound to say that the Government would feel it its duty to give consideration to these representations, and to determine whether or not some action should be taken in the early future.

So far as foodstuffs are concerned, the hon. gentleman has only spoken of wheat, flour and meat. I am not disposed, from the information before me at the present moment, to agree that the prices of meat products have advanced. My information is that not only has there been a reduction in the prices of some of these products there are many food products in Canada as to which there is a difficulty in finding a market. During the past two or three months we have been endeavouring to find markets in the United Kingdom for food products, which may spoil for lack of people to consume them. For example, there is an enormous quantity of canned goods for which there is the greatest difficulty in securing materials even at cost prices. I understand from my colleague from the province of New Brunswick, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), that in that province there is a surplus of potatoes of about a million and a half bushels for which they would be glad to find a market. We know there has been a great abundance of apples. And we know that at one time—though not so much lately—there was considerable difficulty apprehended in finding a market for the surplus fish product of the country. I understand the situation in that regard has been improved in the last few weeks. So that I cannot see that there is any special reason for us to pass the resolution my hon. friend from Brantford has proposed.

I have listened to what my hon. friend from Brantford has said as to the danger to the Mother Country of a lack of food supplies. I can only say that if there is any such danger apprehended in the Mother Country at the present time, I have given ample notice within the last six or eight weeks of very great stores of food supplies which the producers of this country would be very glad to send to the United Kingdom at not more than they have cost them, without any profit. So I do not think we need have much apprehension so far as the Mother Country is concerned. The authorities of the United Kingdom, if there were any danger or difficulty in that regard, would have found occasion to communicate with us in reply to our frequent communications as to available stores in Canada. On the contrary, when we have communicated with them on the subject, they have in almost every case assured us that there were large stores of the particular articles in question available in the United Kingdom. Naturally, they would be glad indeed to assist us, if they could do so, in finding a market in the United Kingdom for the surplus food products of Canada, but they were not needed there at that moment.

Under the circumstances, while I appreciate the motive of my hon. friend from Brantford in bringing the matter to the attention of the Government, I regret that we cannot find it desirable to accept the motion at the moment. If conditions should at a later day so develop as to make anything of the kind necessary, my hon. friend may feel quite sure that we shall endeavour to keep in very close touch with the situation and take such measures as, according to our understanding of the conditions, may be necessary for the purpose he has in mind.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (South Renfrew): I had intended making a few remarks before the Prime Minister spoke. I had not the pleasure of hearing all my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) said on this question. I think the importance of the question entitles it to considerable attention on the part of the House, because people throughout Canada are talking about this matter a good deal. The trouble is that nobody seems to have a real cure for it. I am inclined to agree with the Prime Minister that the great strength of

the British Empire at the present time is that she with her Dominions has plenty of foodstuffs. However long this war may last there will be foodstuffs enough to see the Empire through. So far as the products of our Canadian people are concerned, I do not foresee any danger. As to prices and the high cost of living, I had hoped that the report of the commission appointed by the Government would have been down before this, so that we could have seen what was the cause and what should be the cure. The difficulty seems to be with us in Canada, as elsewhere, that cheap prices to the producer do not always mean cheap prices to the consumer. Between the price received by the man behind the plough and the price paid by the man who consumes the product there is too wide a spread to be accounted for by an ordinary profit, it is argued. I would not say we should not have middlemen. "Middleman" is merely another name for a dealer in articles of commerce. Properly conducted, this is as honourable a business as a man can follow. The business of the world could not be systematically conducted if it were not for the operation of specialists who go between, as it were, other individuals or bodies who are not specialists. It may be that in Canada there are too many people who handle the goods between the time they are produced and the time they are consumed; I had hoped that the commission of investigation would look into that phase of the question, and, perhaps, have thrown some light upon it. Again, there may be many middlemen who are anxious to make two or three profits; that is human nature, and you will almost have to remodel man before you altogether eradicate that from his system. The man, however, who will take advantage of the patriotism of the people and their loyal devotion to king and country in order to fill his own pockets is the worst kind of traitor that can be found; he is trading on the best that is in people for his own selfish purposes. As to whether that could be controlled, I am not prepared to say; in any case I am inclined to think that it could not be controlled in the manner suggested by the hon. member for Brantford. It is a big question, and could not be grappled with in a few moments.

The question of unemployment is one that comes very close to those who live in industrial centres, large or small. Although many persons are out of employment at present, I think I am safe in saying that in many of our manufacturing centres men have employment to-day that they would not have had if there had been no war. A great many of our factories—I speak from personal knowledge—are working half-time, some three-quarter time, some full time and some double time, on orders which they have obtained as a result of the war.

I touch now upon a very delicate point: I was severely criticised for referring to this at several patriotic meetings which I addressed throughout Canada. Without going into what I consider to be the duty of the banks at the present time, I submit that it is as important to the British Empire that the whistles should be kept blowing everywhere as it is that men should be kept in the trenches. Anything that does not tend to accomplish this does not tend to the best interests of Canada and the Empire as a whole. I think it is fair to the manufacturing interests to say that they have manufactured goods in many instances to the full capacity of their warehouses. They have no sale for the goods; many of them have stock on hand sufficiently large to last a year or more, and unless they have new capital they are not in a position to engage in further manufactures. I think the banks ought to do all they can to enable the manufacturers to go on manufacturing and putting their goods in the warehouse until such time as they can be sold. That would give employment to the men—if not permanently, at least for a time—and thus remove from the people of Canada and from the Empire as well, one of the greatest difficulties which we now have to face. It has been charged that the banks are not as generous as they should be. I am not sufficiently expert in financial matters to critcise them in that respect, but it does strike me that now is the time, if ever there was a time, when the financial institutions ought to take full advantage of the privileges given them by the Government and to do their utmost to see that the manufacturing establishments of Canada are kept going as near full time as possible. That would reduce the seriousness of the unemployment question to a minimum, at least.

I am fearful lest some of our mineral productions may possibly get into the hands of the enemy; I speak now more particularly of our nickel and copper. It has been said that the British Government is perfectly satisfied that none of it is getting into the hands of the enemy, and I am glad of that assertion. The Dominion of Canada, a part of the Britisn Empire, and France, one of her Allies, control practi-

cally the whole nickel output of the world. With the supply from these sources shut off, it is only a matter of mathematical calculation as to how long Germany can find an adequate supply of this material to carry on her warfare. I think it is absolutely important and in the interests of the Allies that we should be perfectly sure that not an ounce of our copper or nickel gets to Germany. She can get her wheat elsewhere, but she cannot get her copper and nickel elsewhere than from the Allies. I hope everything has been done that can be done to this end; if anything can be done by the Government to make it absolutely impossible for our nickel to get into the hands of the enemy, I am prepared to support any steps that they may take to that end. I would not go so far as some hon. gentlemen propose and forbid the export of nickel for all time to come, but I would urge on the Government that all possible precautions be taken to prevent its getting into the hands of the enemy. I am far more concerned about that than I am about the food supply, because I think that under the circumstances, if there are not too many go-betweens operating between the producer and the consumer, supply and demand will usually regulate the prices.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I am disappointed with the spirit in which members of the House have treated this resolution, and feel that they have given the discussion a turn that was not within the scope of the resolution. I endeavoured in a fair and businesslike way to show to the House the statistics of the wheat and food markets of Canada, and I expected that the gentlemen who opposed the proposition I was making would endeavour at least to show that the figures which I had quoted were wrong, and that, therefore, they had led me to erroneous conclusions. But man after man has spoken on the question, and scarcely one han. gentleman has referred to the statistical position of wheat in Canada, in the United States and in the markets of the world. No hon. gentleman has shown that I was wrong in the quotations that I made from Government and other returns. The hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) tells us that we are wasting a good deal of time upon a discussion that the country will be laughing at to-morrow, but I am afraid he will be laughed at himself. This is a question serious enough to engage the attention of all the parliaments of the world, not for a few hours but in some cases for days and which one has led to very drastic action by most governments. I think my hon. friend will see from this that he is not quite right when he says that we are wasting time on a matter of no importance.

My hon. friend comes from the same county as the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), who told us only a session ago, if I remember aright, that in the county of Oxford they grew wheat for the straw only. So if my hon. friend has regard for the straw, he can keep that at home for the benefit of the land to make it more fertile; but, so far as the wheat is concerned, I think I have established the fact that we are facing a crisis. I agree with the Prime Minister that I did not pay the same attention to flour being on hand, but probably the supply of flour is no more than it was a year ago and I have shown that the supply of wheat is a great deal less, I have shown that the statistical position with regard to wheat is that we have less than one-half of what we usually have at this season of the year, that we are facing most enormous demands on the part of the countries at war and in addition to that we have an unprecedented demand for seeding in the West. All these things are going to come within the next two months, and let me point out that my resolution does not attempt to deal with future but with present conditions, not with the crop of 1915 but with what remains of the crop of 1914. There is a big difference there. I said only in my opening remarks that I believed the crisis had not yet been fully reached but probably would be reached within the next sixty or ninety days; but that the wheat supply of Canada and the United States was growing rapidly less, that the position was such as to demand the critical attention of those in authority to see that excessive exportation does not take place. I think that is a proposition that has not been gainsaid by any of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken.

I have received some support from unexpected quarters and a larger amount of opposition from quarters that I thought might have supported the resolution. I have been taunted with being a protectionist when talking about manufactures and a free trader when it comes to farming commodities; but no one who knows me and knows the speeches that I have made both in the campaigns and in the House can reasonably challenge me for having ever gone back on the farmer getting all the protection and all the advantage that can be got out of the tariff, just as the producer in the city. I

can say that, without fear of contradiction, I have nothing to hide in that respect, I believe the farmer is entitled to protection of all his products the same as the manufacturer. I say that the farmer is entitled in ordinary times to get all the money he can possibly obtain for his commodities. I made the statement in opening that in my opinion the farmer in this country should never be asked to sell wheat at less than one dollar. I regret that the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin) is not in his place. He said he could recall a remark of mine that the farmer should never get above a dollar for his wheat. I challenge the hon. gentleman to produce any statement of that kind; I have never made such a statement to my knowledge. The hon. gentleman made other random statements with equally little foundation. I ask him to produce a case. He charged against the firm which bears my name, and with the management with which I have no connection, that a plough manufactured by them can be bought in the United States at $100 less than the ordinary price in the Dominion of Canada. I want the hon. gentleman to give me the facts, and I shall have them investigated. So far as I know, the statement is without foundation. So far as I know the firm which bears my name, and with which I have only a slight connection as a shareholder, has not exported a plough to the United States for three years. I explained that they tried once to open up a trade with our neighbours, and were met with the most drastic measures that any firm ever met in endeavouring to carry on trade with the United States. Their goods were seized at the border, held up for a long time, and they were fined heavily. Talk about the advantage in the great market of 90,000,000 people! These gentlemen may take all the advantages and profits if they will only take the losses on these transactions. If the hon. member for Regina has evidence of such a case as he speaks of, let him bring it forward and I shall endeavour to show him that the charge he makes is without foundation. I believe I am speaking by the book when I say that no exportation of agricultural implements has taken place from Brantford to the United States during the last three years. Some hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think that every question I have ever raised can be answered by the one parrot cry: What about the price of ploughs and the robbery of the farmer? That seems to be the one retort that some hon. members from the West can make.

10 p.m.

I introduced this question, trusting it would be discussed in a statesmanlike way, and not like a peanut politician; but a good many members from the other side have discussed it in the latter spirit. It is a large question, and should be discussed on its merits. It is a question that has some merits, and I am pleased to know that the Prime Minister has said the Government will keep their eyes upon the question, and, if circumstances become more acute and the crisis more extreme, will be ready to interfere at least with the profits of the middleman. I think the Prime Minister went so far as that. I pointed out that the middleman is getting nearly all the advantage of the rise in price now, that only ten per cent of the wheat of the 1914 crop is in the farmers' hands, and that ninety per cent of it is in the hands of the millers or speculators or has left the country. Under those conditions the farmers to-day are buyers of wheat rather than sellers of wheat. I venture to say there are more farmers in the West who will have to buy wheat for their spring planting than have wheat in their barns to sell at the present moment.

With regard to the wheat exportation, what I desired to point out was the danger of over exportation of wheat during the coming sixty or ninety days. I think that that is a possibility and even a probability unless other export markets of the world open up in the meantime. Russia, as I believe, is hoping to furnish 100,000,000 bushels providing the Allies can clear out the Dardanelles and make a passage for wheat carriers from Odessa to Liverpool and London. One hon. gentleman read a quotation from to-night's paper showing that the Liverpool stock of food is greater than was ever known before; but I saw an article in the paper to-night saying that although in Chicago wheat plunged down, they took no notice of the Liverpool market which made an advance. They paid no attention to the fact that the Liverpool market showed an advance instead of a decline. I think that in Liverpool and London they know as much about the chances of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles being opened as in Chicago; and if Liverpool advances and Chicago goes down it looks as if they thought in England that the food situation demanded attention. Statesmen in Great Britain have discussed this situation seriously. Mr. Asquith did not make fun of the question of the conservation of the nation's wheat supply or of the people's supply of food or of the prices the workingman was being

charged for his food. Mr. Lloyd George, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, did not belittle the sufferings of the British people who were crying out for cheaper food. So I might go on and quote the remarks of many statesmen who have given attention to this subject and have thought it well worthy to discuss and give consideration to. Further, I pointed out that Australia, a country quite as democratic as ours, a country ruled by the labour party at the present time, did not wait very long for the action of Parliament. They did not take into consideration all that might happen in the first six months of the war, but in about one month after the war began the Government of Australia took possession of the wheat supply of Australia and arbitrarily fixed the price at $1.25 per bushel. In my judgment they took a wise action. New Zealand is in the same position. Every country in Europe, bar Russia, is short of food. Some are in that position to-day; they have no food at present and no prospects for the future. Belgium, the best tilled country in the world, has been devastated from end to end and no crop is likely to be put in there during the coming season. Seven million people are dependent upon the outside world for their food supply. Eighty thousand tons of food are required weekly to feed the people of Belgium. What is true of Belgium is also true of Poland, what is true of Poland is true of Serbia, and what is true of Serbia is partially true of Austria, Germany and France. Try as we may, we in Canada do not realize what the people of Europe are contending with. They know what the scarcity of food means, they know what it means to go to the cupboard and find no loaf or anything else, with a wife and perishing children in the house. They know the effect of want. They know what it means to lack food and clothing. All these things are denied to many of the people of the nations of Europe who are probably just as much deserving at the hands of Providence as we are in this splendid and comparatively prosperous country.

What I have pointed out in this House I have done in all sincerity, believing that I was justified by the statistics that I have quoted. I believe that the food supply of Canada should be conserved, firstly, for the British people themselves, and then for the Allies, and the countries friendly with the Mother Country in the cause that we have espoused. I have not heard that part of the subject challenged very seriously. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister has said that probably this amount of flour that went to Germany was sent there before war was declared. Possibly that is the explanation, but I think the explanation in regard to Norway and Holland that are closely in touch with Germany and I have no doubt have been feeding the Germans to a greater or less extent, may be open to grave doubt.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not know whether I made myself clear to my hon. friend. On the 29th October last we passed an Order in Council which covered Norway and Holland.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I did not understand my right hon. friend to make that statement. I know there is an Order in Council, but I am not so sure even here to-night that that Order in Council has been quite as effective as it might have been; at least, there is in the mind of some people,, and evidently in that of many newspapers, the idea may be a mistaken one—that some food from Canada has been reaching enemy countries. There is little doubt of that. Only recently seven carloads of flour shipped to Salonika were held up at the border. I give all credit to the head of the department who did it. I do not know who did it but I understand that seven carloads that were just being sent out of Canada three or four weeks ago bound for Salonika, which is part of the enemy's country, were held up. Flour should be consigned to our own Allies if we have any to spare, or should be kept to furnish the sinews of war to our own cause and for our own people and not be diverted into enemy countries.

I have only issued this as a kind of warning. I have been freely criticised. I am ready for criticism in a fair and reasonable way but when I am criticised I would like my hon. friends to show wherein the statistics and figures I have given were contrary to the fact. If they did not vary from the fact then I have made out a case that is worthy of the best consideration of the Government. I have no desire to make what is hard any harder for any of the hon. gentlemen who are on the treasury benches who are controlling the destinies of this country. Nothing was further from my mind than that any further difficulty should be put upon them, any single ounce of burden that they are not at present bearing because they have plenty upon their shoulders to deal with in these war problems. I have every confidence that my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) has this matter

under very close survellance and that he is prepared to see that everything I have suggested is done. I am sure that the country will feel that the air has been somewhat cleared at least by the reassuring statement of the Prime Minister and others that we in Canada have no cause to worry, that the British Empire has no cause to worry, that food supplies are in abundance and are likely to be and that we are not likely to suffer from any adversity of that kind. I trust that is true, but I feel that I have done nothing short of my duty, and anything beyond my duty, in endeavouring to point out to the House that in my judgment the amount of our exportation and the destination of it should be under the strict supervision of the Government and that there should at all times be available in this country a supply necessary for our own domestic requirements and that if we have anything over it should be kept for Great Britain and the other overseas dominions.

Under the circumstances, I do not desire to press my motion. I have received considerable support and also a good deal of criticism. I presume that the temper of the House is that it would not be wise at the present time to pass this resolution and in view of the promise of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, who has stated that they will keep an eye upon the situation and if it becomes necessary will act in so far as speculation at any rate is concerned, I do not think it would be wise for me to challenge a division of the House. Taking what the Prime Minister has said as being likely to happen, and accepting his promise that they will watch this question in such a manner as to see that no injustice is done to anybody in Canada, I leave the matter and will be quite willing for you, Mr. Speaker, to call the resolution "lost upon division."

Motion negatived on division.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS,

Mr. Marcil: For a copy of the report of the officer in charge of the lobster hatchery at Port Daniel west, and of the report of the inspection thereof for the season 1914.

Mr. Marcil: For a copy of the tariff on flour shipments now in force on the Quebec Oriental railway and the Atlantic, Quebec and Western railway.

Mr. J. J. Hughes: For a return giving the names and post office addresses of all persons appointed to positions on the Prince Edward railway from the 1st of October, 1911, to the present time; with a description of the position to which each person was so appointed.

Mr. Sinclair: For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, recommendations, petitions and other papers received at the Post Office Department since January 1, 1914, relating to the contract for carrying the mails between Guysborough and Canso, N.S.

Mr. Warnock: For a copy of all telegrams, letters, papers, documents, evidence and reports, in connection with the dismissal of Charles H. Marshall as postmaster at Nanton, Alberta.

Mr. Copp: For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence and reports relating to the purchase of the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island railway, extending from Sackville to Cape Tormentine, county of Westmorland.

Mr. A. K. Maclean: For a copy of all correspondence, documents charges, evidence, findings and Orders in Council in reference to the dismissal of John Thomas, postmaster at Hammond's Plains, Halifax county, N.S.

Mr. A. K. Maclean: For a copy of all resolutions received by the Department of Labour, or by any of the departments of the Government from labour organizations, manufacturers' associations or other organized bodies, in reference to the Department of Labour since October, 1911.

Mr. A. K. Maclean: For a copy of all advertisements, tenders, accounts, vouchers, letters, documents and correspondence relating to the construction of an extension to the breakwater at Prospect, Halifax county, N.S.

Mr. A. K. Maclean: For a return showing the names and addresses of all persons to whom the Fenian raid bounty was paid in the county of Halifax, N.S., to date.

Mr. A. K. Maclean: For a copy of all advertisements, tenders, accounts, vouchers, letters, documents, etc., relating to the establishment of the ferry service between the city of Halifax and Dartmouth, N.S., for the employees of the Marine and Fisheries Department at Halifax, N.S.

Mr. Copp: For a copy of all petitions, memorials, letters, telegrams, communications and reports regarding the construction of a roadway to the new public wharf at Sackville, N.B., and also in regard to the building of a spur line or siding from the Intercolonial railway at Sackville to said wharf.

Mr. William Chisholm: For a return showing all letters, telegrams, reports and other documents communicating complaints against the manner in which the immigration officials conducted the work of relief to needy settlers in Saskatchewan, and a copy of the instructions issued by the department to the respective employees connected with the work.

Mr. William Chisholm: For a return showing all letters, telegrams, reports and other documents in connection with the appointment, duties, salary, expenses and work performed by W. W. Davidson, lately employed by the Immigration Branch of the Department of the Interior in Saskatchewan.

Mr. William Chisholm: For a copy of all petitions, reports, recommendations, letters, telegrams and correspondence relating to the dredging of Antigonish harbour and the opening or improving of the entrance thereto, received by the Government, or any department thereof, since the 1st January, 1912, and not already included in the return presented the 30th of April, 1914, in obedience to the order of the House passed the 1*th March, previously.

Mr. Macdonald: For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other papers relating to the dismissal of Bruce Wiswell, as sectionman on the Intercolonial railway at Stellarton, Nova Scotia.

Mr. Macdonald: For a copy of all letters,

telegrams, reports, recommendations, Orders in Council, and all other documents and papers whatsoever relating to or in any wise connected with the establishment of rural mail routes and deliveries from Bridgetown to Granville ferry, county of Annapolis, and especially of all letters, telegrams, reports, recommendations and documents relating to the closing of the post offices at Belleisle, Upper Granville and the establishment of the post office at Granville Centre, all in the county of Annapolis.

Mr. Macdonald: For a copy of all letters, telegrams, reports, recommendations, Orders in Council, pay-rolls, list of expenditures, names of foremen and superintendents, and all other documents whatsoever relating to or in any wise appertaining to the erection and maintaining of breakwaters at Phinney's Cove and Young's Cove, county of Annapolis.

Mr. Macdonald: For a copy of all letters, papers, telegrams and other documents relating to the purchase or lease of the railway from New Glasgow to Thorburn, in the county of Pictou, known as the Vale Railway, from the Acadia Coal Company, since January, 1911, to date.

Mr. Macdonald: For a copy of all papers, letters, petitions and other documents relating to the establishment of a rural mail route from River John to Hedgeville, county of Pictou.

Mr. William Chisholm: For a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams, correspondence, contracts, etc., in connection with the sale of the hay growing or the lease of certain tracts of land belonging to the Intercolonial railway, upon which hay is grown ,and which are contiguous to the properties of Charles Lavoie, Cléophas Leclerc and Joseph Parent, of the parish of Bic, county of Rimouski.

Mr. Pardee: For a copy of all papers, letters, petitions and other documents relating to a mail contract with David D. Heard & Sons, between Whitby and Grand Trunk Railway station, or with one John Gimblet, Whitby.

Mr. Marcil: For a copy of charges made against J. Herbert Sweetman, customs officer at Port Daniel Centre, Quebec, which brought about his dismissal; and also of charges against Belson Horie, lighthouse keeper at Port Daniel West, Quebec, which brought about his dismissal.

Mr. Copp: For a copy of all petitions, letters, communications and other documents relating to or bearing upon the dismissal of Leonard Hutchinson, chief keeper at Dorchester penitentiary.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm: For a copy of all letters, telegrams, petitions, reports and pay-rolls in any way referring to the expenditure of public money on the repairs to the wharf at Margaree harbour breakwater; repairs to the Grand Etang piers; repairs to the Port Hood wharf; repairs to St. Joseph's piers; repairs to Pleasant Bay wharf, and repairs to Inverness harbour since October 1, 1911, to date, with date of each expenditure.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm: For a return showing the number of miles of telegraph lines, and the locations erected in the county of Inverness, each year since 1896, to the present day, with the cost of each line.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm: For a return showing the amount of dredging done in the county of Inverness since 1896, up to the present; where such dredging was done, the quantity of dredging done in each place, and dates on which such dredging was done, also the cost in each case of such dredging.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm: For a return showing the amount of railway subsidies paid in the county of Inverness since 1896, to date, and the dates on which such subsidies were paid.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm: For a copy of all telegrams, letters, petitions, reports, recommendations and documents of all kinds in any way referring to the purchase of a site for a public building at Port Hawkesbury, and also referring in any way to the erection of a public building thereon.

On the motion of Sir Robert Borden, the House adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

Tuesday, March 2, 1915.

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

DIVISION OF BILL.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln) moved:

That Bill No. 17, respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, be recommitted to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, with an instruction to divide the same into two Bills and to eliminate from the present Bill and place in the second Bill all that portion of the present Bill, including the schedule thereto, that relates to a certain agreement between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company, respecting terminals at North Toronto, in accordance with the third report of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN NORTHERN ONTARIO RAILWAY—BILL WITHDRAWN.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln) moved:

That Bill No. 33, to confirm certain agreements made between the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company, the Georgian Bay and Seaboard Railway Company, and the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company, be withdrawn, in accordance with the recommendations contained in the third report of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Mr. SPEAKER: What about a motion to remit the fees?

Mr. LANCASTER: The fees paid have not been in excess of the cost of printing and translation, and therefore there is nothing to remit.

Mr. GRAHAM: What reasons did the company give for wishing to withdraw the Bill?

Mr. LANCASTER: I do not know that any particular reason was given. When the Bill was called in the committee, the

gentleman in charge of the Bill moved that it be withdrawn, and the motion was carried. I believe there was opposition to the Bill, coming from the city of Belleville, but that was not stated in the committee.

Mr. BLAIN: The Bill stood in my name. The companies mentioned in the Bill were unable to come to any satisfactory agreement, and they thought it was better to have further time, and so they requested that the Bill be withdrawn.

Motion agreed to.

17th BATTALION NOVA SCOTIA HIGHLANDERS.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. KYTE: On Friday I called the attention of the Government to a despatch that is going the rounds of the Canadian newspapers concerning the conditions in which the 17th Battalion of Nova Scotia Highlanders find themselves in the old country. It is reported that the commanding officer, Col. Struan Robertson, was relieved of his command on the 28th of January, and that the only satisfaction which he had been able to obtain from the General Officer Commanding was "that the authorities were down on him." The despatch contains many other matters which affect the standing of the Nova Scotia contingent and put it in a rather unenviable condition as compared with the other portions of the overseas contingent. Has the Prime Minister any information on the subject?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The arrangements for the troops on the other side have been entirely in the hands of the War Office, and we have no information from the War Office nor from any other source which would lead us to believe that the statements alluded to are well founded. I understand that the 600 or 700 men who went from Nova Scotia, together with four other battalions, have been set apart as reinforcements for the troops going to the front. I did see in the press, although I have no official information on the subject, that some men from the Nova Scotian regiment were to be sent forward as reinforcements for the Princess Patricia regiment. The Minister of Militia informs me that they were also to provide reinforcements for one of the Highland brigades. So far as Col. Struan Robertson is concerned, we have no information as to his having been relieved of his command. Nothing of that kind has originated or could originate here, and we are not aware that anything of the kind has transpired.

ILLNESS OF COL. LABATT.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. GRAHAM: I note by the press that Col. Labatt has retired on account of illness. Who succeeds him?

Major-General HUGHES: I have no information on this subject, other than what is to be found in the newspapers. Col. Labatt has undergone a very serious operation, and, until he recovers from the effects of it, I presume some one else will be placed in command of his regiment. The information regarding his illness came by wire, and we have not as yet received any official information on the subject.

SERVICE OF MR. CARRICK, M.P.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. GRAHAM: I notice in the papers a despatch stating that one of our colleagues in the House has been appointed as eye-witness with Sir Max Aitkin for the purpose of getting information with regard to the movement of Canadian troops, the furnishing of casualty lists, and so on. I have reference to Mr. Carrick. Has he been appointed by this Government or by the British Government; what rank does he hold, and is information being furnished to this Government by him?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: So far as I am aware, there has been no person appointed as eye-witness by this Government, notwithstanding all statements in the press to the contrary. Sir Max Aitkin was appointed to discharge certain duties in connection with the Recording Office in London. Mr. Carrick, who received the rank of honorary lieutenant colonel of his own regiment, desired to be of service in any capacity for which he might be available, and he was sent forward at his own request to have his services utilized in such manner as the War Office might deem expedient. Neither he nor Sir Max Aitkin has been appointed an eye-witness.

COL. McLEOD'S BATTALION.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. PUGSLEY: Has the Minister of Militia received any complaints with regard to certain dispositions made or proposed to be made in the various units which go to make up the battalion from officers in the battalion commanded by Col. McLeod, a member of this House? If so, what is the nature of those complaints, and

has the minister given personal attention to them in consultation with the general staff, and have the complaints been remedied?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I dare say that from time to time communications have come forward to persons in this country with regard to matters such as those to which the hon. member alludes. My own understanding is that any such communications are of a private and confidential character; and, further than that, I would like to remind my hon. friend that these troops, after they leave the country, having enlisted as Imperial troops, are necessarily subject to military dispositions under the control of the War Office, and that we do not make demands nor initiate anything at all in connection with such matters. It would be obviously impossible that there should be a dual control under such circumstances. We might, of course, in any case where the circumstances seemed to make it desirable, do something by way of suggestion. I am sure my hon. friend will be the first to realize that any attempt to establish a dual control over a portion of the troops at the front would probably, and indeed necessarily, have a most unfortunate result.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My idea is exactly the same as that of my right hon. friend, namely, that dual control would be very objectionable; but a copy of the communication to which I have referred was sent to me and was not marked confidential. It was not in the nature of a complaint against the commanding officer; but it referred to certain dispositions in regard to which the Minister of Militia was asked to intervene, and I am sure that my hon. friend the Minister of Militia will not forget that, since the troops went to the Old Country, he has attempted to have certain things done to add to their comfort and to meet the wishes of officers and men generally in the Canadian contingent. That would not be exercising dual control, but would merely be bringing to bear that knowledge of affairs which the Minister of Militia has, and which he might utilize to very great advantage in the interest and for the comfort of the Canadian soldiers. As the House is aware, the Minister of Militia went to England—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not forget that it is not permissible to enter into a discussion when asking a question.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Prime Minister rather provoked me to do that when he stated his views as to the course he thought I ought to take as a member of this House in regard to matters of this kind. I see the Minister of Militia is anxious to reply, and so I shall sit down.

Major General HUGHES: The general question of details—the name given to those who are not sent to the front, but who are kept behind to fill up vacancies arising from various causes in the brigades at the front—is left entirely in the hands of the British War Office, as has been explained by the Prime Minister.

I have not the slightest doubt that the officers, non-commissioned officers and men who were left on the details felt it very keenly. Each man is anxious to get to the front, and naturally each man would wish to get to the front with his own corps. But there must be some details. They all knew that. We have nothing to do with the selection of these details, and, whether the men are satisfied or not, these are matters over which we have not attempted to exercise any control, whatever else we may have done.

Mr. MURPHY: In recent press despatches it was stated that a complete list of the officers and men at Salisbury had been prepared and forwarded to the Government. Has that list been received?

Major General HUGHES: That is being prepared, and I hope it will be printed in a very short time.

THE BUDGET.

PROPOSED WAR TAXATION.

Consideration of the proposed motion of Hon. W. T. White (Minister of Finance) for Committee of Ways and Means resumed from February 25.

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (St. John City): Mr. Speaker, in resuming this debate, let me first express appreciation of the courtesy shown by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) on Thursday evening last in consenting to the adjournment of this debate until to-day. It has been a matter of very considerable convenience to me. I suppose the only way in which I can show my gratitude in a practical way is by shortening my remarks as much as possible, and this I shall endeavour to do.

Before continuing the remarks I was making in reference to the proposed, and I think wholly unnecessary, expenditure provided for in the Estimates, I should like to call attention to an article appearing in the

Montreal Gazette, a prominent Conservative paper, under yesterday's date, criticising my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) and other hon. gentlemen who have spoken from this side of the House for the attitude we have taken with regard to the proposed increased taxation and rather expressing the view that we are not discharging our duty to the country when we venture to criticise the Government with respect to these matters. I would like to read this, so that the nature of the criticism may go upon "Hansard." For this criticism is not peculiar to the Gazette; we find the same line taken in many prominent newspapers in many sections of the country. I have not observed that any prominent Liberal or Independent newspaper has criticised our course in this respect. The article to which I refer is not an editorial, but is contained in a parliamentary despatch or letter from Ottawa:

> In one of the most uncompromisingly partisan speeches which the usually moderate junior member for Halifax has ever been heard to deliver, Mr. A. K. Maclean on Tuesday attacked the Government for that decline in revenue, disturbance in trade and unsettling of financial conditions which has been experienced in Canada, as it has in a generally greater degree been experienced universally since the war began. In the course of his utterances he blamed the Government not only for the method of taxation which it proposed to adopt, but for the necessity of that taxation. It was, in many ways, an amazing deliverance, in that it arraigned the Government for a condition of affairs in Canada which has been general throughout the whole world since the first outbreak of hostilities, which in the United States alone has caused a revenue loss of over a hundred million dollars, and which has led even that neutral country to the necessity of imposing extraordinary taxation. In the face of such a fact, Mr. Maclean allowed himself to go on record as declaring that to the war alone could be laid no greater loss of revenue than five millions. It was, too, a singularly provocative utterance in view of the so-called political truce to which the Opposition has lost no opportunity of declaring its intention to adhere while Canada was in the throes of world war. As far as the method of taxation proposed by the Government was concerned, it was purely destructive criticism.

With that remark I entirely agree. It was destructive criticism—criticism of the most destructive character it would be possible for any critic to make of this Government.

> There were appeals not to increase the tariff, not to touch the British preference, not to impose stamp taxes; but in all this no suggestion of any other method of securing the ends at which all these measures aim. And as regards the general question of financing, the only remedy Mr. Maclean had to propose for war conditions was the cessation of all public works and the consequent dismissal of hundreds of civil servants. It was a fighting speech and an indication that, truce or no truce, war or no war, the Pugsley-Clark spirit—

My genial and unwarlike friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) must be astonished to find such a statement as this in a newspaper:

> —in the Liberal party has predominated and the Opposition, with no adequate measures of its own to propose, will fight those introduced by the Government.

Ye Gods! Think of an Opposition that would venture to fight the measures introduced by a Government. That is conduct which this newspaper and other newspapers cannot for a moment tolerate, especially at the present time. Mr. Speaker, I think the fact that a statement of that kind appears in such a prominent Conservative paper as the Montreal Gazette, such a thoroughly respectable and influential paper, calls for some remark from me. With regard to my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax, I think he made a fair and just criticism of the proposed measure of taxation. He argued that it was not necessary at the present time to impose this additional taxation on the people of Canada. He contended that it was very impolitic, very unfair to the people to unduly burden them as proposed by the Minister of Finance. At the same time he showed that this Government, in the three years it has been in power, had increased the ordinary expenditure from $89,000,000 to $140,000,000—or, if you like to put it more accurately, looking at the Estimates of the present year, $147,000,000, the added $7,000,000 or thereabouts being necessary to pay interest on the money which it is proposed to borrow from the Imperial Government for war purposes. The hon. gentleman contended that that increase of expenditure was unjustifiable. He showed that whereas the expenditure on public works chargeable to ordinary revenue when this Government came into power, ranged about eleven or twelve millions, it was proposed this year to expend the enormous sum of twenty-two millions. And he charged, and I think properly charged, that there was nothing in connection with the public works, the immigration or the progress of the country to justify that enormous increase within three short years. He contended that if even now the Government would exercise that ordinary prudence which the average businessman in this country is exercising, and which every city, town and municipality in Canada is exercising; if they would apply the pruning hook and proceed to carry on only those public works the necessity of

which is recognized by all; it would not be long before the ordinary revenue would overtake the expenditure of the country, and it would not be necessary to resort to these extraordinary taxes and to impose these extraordinary heavy burdens upon the people of Canada.

It has been asserted that the hon. member for Halifax said that all public works should cease. My hon. friend said nothing of the kind. What he said was that in respect of harbour improvements, the deepening of rivers, the dredging of waterways and the erection of public buildings it would be possible to reduce the expenditure during this year, perhaps by one-half. In that way the public works would go on with reasonable rapidity and the people would be far better satisfied than if these works were carried out at full speed by means of this proposed extra taxation. That was the argument of the hon. junior member for Halifax; that was a part of the criticism which he made of the policy of the Government, and I for one say that the junior member for Halifax was entirely justified in the remarks he made in that respect.

I have had an opportunity of being among my own constituents for a couple of days since I addressed the House last week. When I first arrived I met a number of people who said: You are charged with desiring to stop the public works in St. John; surely that is not a proper thing to do. But I explained that while it was proposed to spend a considerable sum of money at St. John, and while we desired that there should be retrenchment and economy, yet we proposed not that these works should be stopped, but that they should be carried on with all reasonable rapidity, subject to the due exercise of proper economy. When I pointed out that these taxes are going to impose upon the 350,000 people of New Brunswick the payment of the enormous sum of $1,500,000 a year, they realized that I as a representative from that province was justified in standing up with my Liberal friends in the House and appealing to the Government not to resort to these extraordinary measures of taxation, but to proceed to exercise that economy which they might fairly exercise without any detriment to the public interest. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House talk about the necessity for going on with public works. They know—but they conceal it from the people—that public works in any locality benefit but a small portion of the community. During the year which will close March 31, there will have been expended some $3,000,000 upon the harbour of St. John, but out of that total amount there has not been paid for labour more than $300,000. Many thousands of dollars have gone to the southern states to buy southern pine for the construction of wharves; vast sums of money have gone outside of St. John to purchase cement to be used in the making of concrete; vast sums of money have gone to pay contractors' profits and interest on the plant. I would say too, if it would not offend my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that a large amount possibly went towards the nourishment and support of those newspapers in New Brunswick which so violently attack members of the Opposition for venturing to criticise the Government.

At the adjournment last Thursday evening I was endeavouring to show that there are in the Estimates for the coming year items providing for works of various kinds —harbour and river improvements, erection of public buildings—in respect of which I believe the Government does not seriously intend to make any progress during the coming year. In a great majority of cases the amounts voted for next year are simply re-votes; if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will take the trouble to look at the estimates for New Brunswick, he will find that the items in respect of a large number of public buildings are exactly the same as the amounts voted for the same purposes at the last regular session of Parliament. This shows positively that no work has been done, and I presume that in a large number of cases no contracts have been let and no plans prepared.

As evidence of the fact that unnecessary items of expenditure are placed in the Estimates—I shall not say proposed to be made —in connection with the Department of Public Works, the Department of Railways and Canals and the Department of Marine and Fisheries, let me call attention to the fact that $5,000,000 has been struck out of the Estimates of the Department of Militia and Defence. In other words, the Estimates for the coming year are $5,000,000 and upwards less than they were last year. But that does not mean that the money is not to be spent; it means that the money is to be spent, but it is to be borrowed from the British Government to form part of the war expenditure. My hon. friend (Mr. Hazen) shakes his head, but—

Mr. HAZEN: If my hon. friend will look at the Militia Estimates he will observe that those items which were voted last year and which do not appear in the Estimates this year were expenses of camps of instruction, training of cadets, annual drill, and items of that nature which, in view of the war, were not considered necessary during the present year. Not one dollar for these purposes would be used out of the vote for war expenditure.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I was not calling attention to that at all; what I had in mind was annual drill. Last year $2,000,000 were voted for annual drill; there will be no annual drill this year because the soldiers are being drilled preparatory to their going to the war. Therefore the item is cut out, but it is charged to war expenditure.

Mr. HAZEN: No, annual drill is not charged to war expenditure.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But what takes the place of annual drill is paid for with money borrowed from the British Government. The item for ordnance and arms, amounting to $1,900,000, is also struck out. Ordnance and arms will be required for the militia for the coming year, or would be required if it were not for the war and if the militia men of Canada were not preparing to take part in the defence of the Empire. I do not know just how long my hon. friend was acting Minister of Militia and Defence; one of his organs in New Brunswick said that he was acting Minister of Militia during the absence of the minister, but when the minister returned he referred to the Prime Minister as having been the acting Minister of Militia during his absence. But if my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was acting Minister of Militia and Defence, he ought to know that this Government has ordered vast quantities of ammunition for the militia of Canada. Of course, it is for the purposes of war.

Mr. WILCOX: Did my hon. friend expect us to shoot blank cartridges?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Therefore that whole amount for ordnance, arms and ammunition has been struck out from the Estimates of the Department of Militia; $1,900,000 has been struck out. As I have said, it does not mean that the money is not to be expended, but that it is to be excluded from the Militia Estimates, while an equivalent or a greater amount, perhaps a far greater amount, is to be included in the sums which are to be borrowed from the Imperial Government for the purposes of the war. And there are stores. It will be necessary to have stores just the same, but I presume these stores which are to be purchased now and next year will all be charged to the expenses of the war. All this money taken out of current Militia expenditure, and which is to be included in the money borrowed from England for the purpose of the war should be available for the necessary expenditure of the other Departments of the Government.

Mr. HAZEN: Might I interrupt my hon. friend? He said that the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) did not suggest giving up public works altogether this year. I would ask the hon. gentleman what meaning he attaches to these words of the hon. member for Halifax at page 387:

> I do submit, and in fairness, I think, having in view the circumstances prevailing throughout Canada this year, and throughout the world for that matter, that instead of the Government's asking for an expenditure of $20,000,000 for public works, they might have asked for $10,000,000 or less, and, if need be, they might have wiped out altogether expenditures for public works for the next fiscal year.

The hon. gentleman adds:

> I do not believe that the people of any province of Canada would have objected to the most drastic measures on the part of the Minister of Public Works during the present year and during the next fiscal year in connection with public works expenditure.

I would ask my hon. friend if that does not convey the suggestion that there should be no expenditure for public works during the present fiscal year.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not so read it. Let me read the whole passage:

> I do submit, and in fairness, I think, having in view the circumstances prevailing throughout Canada this year, and throughout the world for that matter, that instead of the Government's asking for an expenditure of $20,000,000 for public works, they might have asked for $10,000,000 less.

It is important to consider this suggestion by itself. I think that my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax was speaking of the ordinary expenditure, not the expenditure upon capital account.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I was.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Not the expenditure on national harbors and so on. The hon. member went on:

And if need be, they might have wiped out altogether expenditures for public works for the next fiscal year.

That is, if need be. Where is the objection to that? Suppose the Government had exercised reasonable, fair economy and had found that in order to carry on the public services they would have to curtail the public works which are chargeable to ordinary revenue—the building of the hundred odd buildings throughout Ontario, most of them in small towns where they have very good postal accommodation at the present time; if they had decided that it was absolutely necessary to postpone the construction of these buildings for one year, where would be the harm, more particularly as although this Parliament gave the money to the Government upwards of a year ago they have in many cases not started the work; they have not, I venture to say, in the majority of cases, even had the plans prepared. Where would the public interest have suffered if the construction of these buildings had been posponed for one year? The hon. junior member for Halifax said:

I do not believe that the people of any province of Canada would have objected to the most drastic measures on the part of the Minister of Public Works during the present year and during the next fiscal year in connection with public works expenditure. Many of these projected works were without justification, the necessity for others have at least temporarily passed away by reason of the declining business of the country. Expenditures for these purposes should have been reduced to the minimum this year and next year. And bear in mind that the expenditures to which I have referred do not include votes for dredging and dredging plants nor for other public works of an important or national character, whether proposed to be made under ordinary or capital expenditure. In respect to public works expenditure is it not time to adopt some rational policy?

Who will object to that? Who will say it is not the time to adopt some rational policy in respect to national works? Who will say it is not the time to endeavour to economize to a reasonable and fair extent?

The junior member for Halifax goes on:

Is not this the time to commence? Circumstances will compel us in the near future, and I believe public opinion is condemnatory of the present method of spending money on public works. In this respect the present Government have been great sinners.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries should not pick out just one part of the hon. member's speech, but should read the whole of it. Having read the hon. gentleman's complete remarks, I ask how any fair-minded man could question the reasonableness of the views set forth by the hon. junior member for Halifax.

In connection with public expenditure. just let me show you for a moment with what ideas this Government came into power. When they came into power in 1911 they found themselves with a buoyant and expanding revenue, with millions of dollars beyond what was necessary to meet the ordinary expenses of the country. In the city of St. John a demonstration was held, which was attended by the Minister of Finance (Mr. White), the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid), and, I think, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen.) Under plans prepared by the late Government it had been proposed to expend there in the development of the great harbour of Courtenay bay about $11,500,000. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs had been taken around, and he had been amazed at the wonderful possibilities of the port of St. John; and at the banquet that night he said to the representative citizens who were there in numbers: "The only fear I have is that you are going ahead on too small a scale." And he said: "In your presence and that of the Minister of Finance, I want to say to the Minister of Public Works that if he wants more money to carry on and enlarge these improvements, let him come to the Department of Customs." These, Sir, were the ideas of extravagance which were being disseminated among the people of Canada. They were taught to believe that in the opinion of this Government the rainy day would never come and that all they had to do was to go ahead, to spend all the money they could possibly spend; that the time would never come when the revenues would decline, but that they might count upon them being enlarged year by year for all time to come.

Mr. HAZEN: The hon. member is mistaken in saying that I was present at the banquet to which he refers. I was in England at the time. I recollect, however, reading the reports in the newspapers, and it seems to me I read a statement by my hon. friend fully approving of what the Minister of Customs had said.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This is only one of the very erroneous ideas my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries received when he was in England. He can well understand that I would not approve of what the Minister of Customs said, because

it was a reflection on myself. I wanted the people of St. John to believe that I had been liberal in expenditure, that I had provided plans for these works which would be ample for many years to come, and when the Minister of Customs thought it necessary or desirable to belittle what I had done, to convey the impression that I had been too small in my ideas and that all they had to do was to come to the Government and get many millions more, my hon. friend will well understand that I would not be ardent in expressing my approval of what the Minister of Customs had said.

There is another thing in regard to which I should like to ask a question. I should like to know how it is that of the item of $4,700,000 which was voted last year for the construction, acquisition, leasing or expropriation of terminal elevators, no part has been expended during this year.

Mr. W. T. WHITE: Some has been expended.

Mr. PUGSLEY: No, it is marked a revote. It may be a clerical error, of course.

Mr. WHITE: If my hon. friend is referring to the elevators in the West, I may point out that a great deal has been expended in that direction.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Then, it is misleading to put that in as a revote.

Mr. WHITE: My hon. friend would call it that anyway.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Did I ever miscall anything that my hon. friend has done? I have enough to do to quote correctly what he has done, and enough to find fault with when I state correctly all his acts and statements, as perhaps he will discover before we get through with this discussion.

Mr. HAZEN: The amount voted last year was $4,700,000, and this year we are asking for $3,000,000. I think it would be natural to infer from those figures that $1,700,000 has been spent during the year.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, if it were not for the fact that it was put in as a revote. Mr. Speaker, I was saying that of the $3,905,100 which Parliament is asked to vote for public buildings in Ontario, the enormous sum of $2,282,100 is made up of revotes. In a great many cases not a single dollar has been expended on the buildings for which amounts were provided during the last session of Parliament. Take, for instance, the public building at Berlin, for which a revote of $50,000 is asked. What does that mean, Sir? It means that at the last session of Parliament—not, I am bound to say, in view of the statement of the Minister of Public Works, with any idea of influencing the electors—$50,000 was put in the Estimates in the session of 1913-14 but none of that amount has been spent. Why has none of it been spent? Why was not a contract let? Why was not even the foundation of a building prepared? We have conclusive evidence that not a blow was struck on that building. Yet last year, when no war was on, at all events until August, the building was not considered as urgently required, although provision was made for it in the Estimates. How can they justify the clapping on of this extra tax by saying that this and other buildings are necessary when, although they were so urgently required last year that provision was made for them in the Estimates, not one dollar has been spent on them since. Take the public building at Burk's Falls, for which $20,000 was voted in the session of 1913-14. Not a single dollar of it has been spent, and yet the amount is again put in to swell up the Estimates in the hope of inducing the people of this country to believe that it is absolutely necessary to impose these special taxes upon an already overburdened people. Take the public building at Cobourg. Not one dollar of the $25,000 that was voted for it last session has been spent and the whole amount appears as a revote. And so I might go on down the list. There are scores of buildings in regard to which provision was made in the session of 1913-14, but on which not a single dollar has been spent since the money was voted. The same remark applies to the province of Quebec, to which I have already referred; and to Manitoba, where the amount of $1,008,500 includes a revote of $752,500; that is to say, $750,000 of the amount voted in the session of 1913-14 remains unexpended. Take the Winnipeg barracks, for instance, for which $150,000 was voted in 1913-14; the amount to be voted this session is $150,000. The amount of the revote is $150,000. That shows that, although the Minister of Public Works sought to make Parliament believe that this money was required upwards of a year ago, not one dollar of it has been expended; which proves, I think, that there is no great urgency for these buildings, and that they might very well stand for another year at all events, and that no public interest would suffer thereby. Take Winnipeg postal station "C," for which $75,000

was voted at the previous session, and $73,000 is asked for now. It is true that in that case $2,000 has been spent—not a very large amount. Take Winnipeg postal station "D," for which $75,000 was voted at the previous session; $75,000 is the vote for this year, and the revote is $75,000, showing that not a single dollar of that money has been expended, and refuting in the most positive way the statement that these works are urgently required, and which has been given as one of the reasons for this alleged, and falsely alleged, war tax. In the province of Saskatchewan the cases are even more marked. The vote for 1914-15 was $983,500. The amount asked for this year is $806,500, and the revote is $711,500, showing that of the large amount of $983,500 voted at the previous session, almost all of it is a revote. And there are several other public buildings in regard to which no work has been done, and presumably no contract let. The same remark applies to Alberta, British Columbia, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and indeed to the whole of Canada. In view of that, Mr. Speaker, do you not think that the burden is upon this Government of giving to this Parliament a detailed statement of the public works in regard to which they think there is such urgency that the work on them cannot be delayed, and so justifying the imposition of this special tax? They attempt to justify it on the ground that these public works must go on. Presumably they said the same thing in the session of 1913-14, but I have shown to you and to this House that they asked for millions of dollars which they have not expended even in a time of peace. So it cannot lie in their mouths to say that these works are so urgently required in this time of war as to necessitate the imposition of these special and onerous taxes.

Mr. HAZEN: I might point out to my hon. friend that none of these votes are available for expenditure until the Supply Bill has been passed and assented to, and the House prorogued. The House prorogued last year on the 8th day of June, I think. War was declared on the 4th of August, but it was known a few days before that there would be war. Do I understand my hon. friend to complain because the Government, when war broke out, adopted the policy of proceeding only with those works actually under operation at the time, and does he say that the money that was voted could have been spent between the 8th day of June and the declaration of war?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not complain that the Government did not spend the money,

[Mr. Pugsley.]

I never did complain. I stated it as evidence that there is no emergency with regard to these public buildings. I quite agree with my hon. friend that after the war broke out the Government should have proceeded slowly. But the war is still on, and I greatly fear that the war will be on next year after these amounts have been voted, and if as my hon. friend suggests it was not reasonable to go ahead during these past six months, from the month of June to the month of December, when the building season was on, why does he say it is reasonable to ask Parliament to impose these special taxes in order that these works may now be rushed, the war still being on, and the financial condition of Canada in an alarming condition, due to the reckless administration of affairs by this Government since it came to power? There are in these Estimates items to the extent of millions of dollars in regard to which the action of the Government proves without the shadow of a doubt that there is no emergency, and that the public interest would not suffer if they should stand over for another year. If the Government could go slowly in respect to all these public works, surely that casts upon the Minister of Finance the burden of laying before this House a clear and detailed statement of the public works, the urgency of which is great, the necessity of going on with which is great, and which they purpose going on with, even though the war should continue. The Minister of Finance is asking the people of Canada to take upon themselves a heavy burden, and he should show absolute necessity for his course before he adopts the unusual expedient of raising money, not for war purposes —let that not be too strongly emphasized— but simply in order to restore the equilibrium between the ordinary revenue and the ordinary expenditure. Before he does that, he ought to be able to show to this House and to the people of this country that these public works which the Government say they intend to carry on, are of an urgent character, and that the public interest would suffer if the Government allowed some of them to be postponed until another year.

When you bear in mind that in this $140,000,000, which the Minister of Finance says will be expended and chargeable to consolidated revenue as ordinary expenditure during the coming year, is included seven or eight million dollars of interest upon the money borrowed and to be borrowed from the Imperial Government for war purposes,

surely it is not unreasonable to ask this Government to now curtail expenditure, and to bring the total expenditure chargeable against consolidated revenue down to at least one hundred million dollars. When we show that even in times of the greatest prosperity, even with an abounding revenue, even with a surplus of thirty or forty million dollars, the late Government only three years ago was able to get its ordinary expenditure down to less than ninety million dollars, surely in this time of war and trouble and stress, when the people of Canada need every dollar they can spare for contribution to various charitable objects to which they are cheerfully contributing, this Government ought to be able to cut down the expenditure within ten million dollars of what the expenditure on current account by the Liberal Government was only three years ago. It is not fair for hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to simply say: Oh, if you charge us with extravagance now, you are showing partisan feeling, and, after all, suppose we have been guilty of extravagance, what are you going to do about it? Well, Mr. Speaker, when we show, as we have shown conclusively from the public accounts, that only three years ago, when the whole country was prosperous, and when its revenues were increasing with wonderful rapidity, and when liberal provision was made for the various public works, the total expenditure on current account was only $90,000,000, surely we have the right to ask this Government to curtail the expenditure to at least $100,000,000. If the Government did so now, within a very short time the finances of Canada would be again in a sound position. The Minister of Finance is estimating a revenue upon current account this year of $120,000,000, and if we should cut the ordinary expenditure down to $100,000,000, we would have a surplus of $20,000,000. But, this Government is like the inexperienced mariner who, navigating his ship, hears the roar of the breakers off his bow and gives the order to steam ahead. All we want to do is to stop the ship as soon as possible, turn her so as to get her in a position of safety, guide her with skill and prudence, and in a few years we would be in a financial position which would give satisfaction and joy to the people of Canada. That is all we are asking the Government to do. We are asking them to be prudent; we are asking them to adopt the same prudent course which any business man or any municipality would adopt under the existing circumstances. In answer to that these gentlemen on the other side of the House say to us: Oh, the war is on, many people are out of employment, and now is the time for us to rush ahead and spend all the money we can get, not only from the ordinary revenues, but which we may be able to squeeze out of the people by these exactions in the way of stamp duties and increased customs taxes.

I have criticised in my own humble way the reasons presented by the Government for putting on these taxes, and I assert that in my opinion these taxes cannot be defended from any standpoint. They are so wanting in reason, so inharmonious, so unfair, so unequal in the burdens they impose upon the people that they cannot be defended. Take the question of putting stamps on receipts and cheques, and the poor man who is involved in a transaction of ten dollars pays as much as the wealthy man who is involved in a transaction of twenty or fifty or sixty thousand dollars. The burden upon the poor man in respect to small transactions is exactly the same as it is upon the rich man in respect to large transactions.

Let us consider the burden imposed upon people who travel in sleeping cars. The man who occupies a berth from St. John to Montreal, or from Montreal to Toronto, or from Ottawa to Toronto, pays as much as the man who gets aboard a sleeping car in Montreal and journeys all the way through to the Pacific ocean. The man going the journey of 3,000 miles in a sleeping car pays no more into the Dominion treasury than the man who goes the short journey.

Why is it that the man who, instead of buying his ticket, is furnished with a pass upon the railways, does not also pay a tax? Why is it that the 300 odd members of this Parliament who, by law, are entitled to travel free upon the railways, are not obliged to pay a tax whenever they enter upon a railway journey the same as the man who does not enjoy that privilege and who is obliged to pay for his railway ticket? What reason is there why the gentleman who enjoys the luxury of a private car and who is constantly travelling over the railways of this country, having passes not only for himself and his family, but for his car, is exempt under this extraordinary measure? Why is it that the rich men who enjoy these luxuries are exempt from taxation? An hon. member who preceded me, truly said that this tariff exemplifies the Scriptural

statement: "To him that hath, shall be given, and from him that hath not shall be taken away, even that which he hath."

Why is a tax placed upon bituminous coal, which is used by hundreds of thousands of poor people? Surely it is not because my right hon. friend the Prime Minister represents a coal-producing county. I would not suggest that; but what is the reason? Will the hon. Minister of Finance tell us why bituminous coal, $15,000,000 worth of which came into Canada from the United States last year, has the tax upon it increased, while anthracite coal, $22,000,000 worth of which came into Canada from the United States last year, is left absolutely free of taxation? Anthracite coal is used by the wealthy classes, perhaps I should say by the middle classes also but bituminous coal is the coal of the poor man.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. financial critic of the Opposition is on record in Hansard as saying—

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am not discussing the financial critic of the Opposition; I am speaking for myself.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman permit me—

Mr. PUGSLEY: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John has the floor.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I object to my hon. friend interrupting me in order to refer to what other hon. members on this side have said on this question. If my hon. friend wants to ask me anything in regard to what I have said on this question I shall be glad to give him an opportunity to do so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There will be another chance, and I will give my hon. friend all the opportunity he wants.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, that will be a first-rate opportunity.

Mr. BLAIN: Will my hon. friend permit me to ask a question?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Wait a moment. I wish to make a remark to my hon. friend the Solicitor General. I am glad to know that my hon. friend is not always unreasonable. Now what does my hon. friend wish to say?

Mr. BLAIN: As my hon. friend is so conversant with the coal question, will he tell us in what part of the province of Ontario the poor man uses bituminous coal?

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Mr. MACDONALD: What about Quebec and the maritime provinces?

Mr. PUGSLEY: In the form of gas. The poor man uses very little electricity as compared with gas. He is taxed by reason of this tax upon bituminous coal. Every company manufacturing gas in all the little towns throughout the province of Ontario is taxed a certain amount under this new tariff. The poor man also uses bituminous coal in his grate. Bituminous coal is used in that way by the poor man in my province, and I dare say also in the province of Ontario. Anthracite coal is largely used for furnaces, to heat the great office buildings in the various cities of Canada. It is used to heat the scores of buildings which the Government have been renting in vastly increased numbers from its wealthy friends in the city of Ottawa. It would be a shame to impose burdens upon these gentlemen and to make them pay a little more for their coal. But that is one of the inequalities of this tariff.

On behalf of the farmers of this country, I ask the Minister of Finance why he allows anthracite coal to the value of $22,000,000 to come in from the United States, and why he puts this tax upon practically everything the farmers of this country use? Why does he tax the farmers' ploughs, harrows, pitchforks, shovels, spades, hoes, potato-diggers and wagons? It has been pointed out in the very able speech delivered by my hon. friend the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) that amongst the many other things in regard to which there is imposed by this new tariff an increase of duty to the extent of 100 per cent, are fertilizers, the plant food, the life of the farmers' products. Why is that done? Can the Minister of Finance explain it? Can it be explained upon any other ground than to avoid the necessity for care, the necessity of going over the old tariff, taking up the different articles in regard to which in some cases the tariff was low and in some cases high and in some cases at a medium rate and adjusting the rates? Is it because it was easy simply to make an absolutely arbitrary horizontal rise of 5 per cent against Great Britain, 7½ per cent against countries enjoying the intermediate tariff and 7½ per cent against countries enjoying the general tariff? Under this new tariff the fertilizer of the farmer has been taxed by an increase in duty to the extent of 100 per cent against Great Britain, 75 per cent against countries enjoying the intermediate tariff, and 75 per

cent against countries enjoying the general tariff.

This was bad enough. But in case of another most important fertilizer, nitrate of soda, which is absolutely essential to the people of eastern Canada, particularly at this time when, by reason of the war, the importation of potash from Germany is shut off—whereas nitrates formerly came into Canada free of duty, this Government has imposed upon that very important fertilizer the high tariff of 7½ per cent against the only country in which nitrates can be obtained. I speak now of a country in regard to which the members of the Government seem ignorant, and more especially my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen)—I refer to the Republic of Chile. Chile has the only natural nitrate beds in the world. Last year there was brought into Canada from Chile some 45,000,000 pounds of nitrates. This was not all used for agricultural purposes; but a good deal, I presume, was used for making powder. Chile is a country with which Canada might have a good deal of trade; it is a country of enormous wealth and of vast possibilities. I hope the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will give attention to that country, because it especially interests his own province, which needs this fertilizer. Last year the export duties upon nitrates collected by the Chilean Government amounted to about $84,000,000 in Chilean money, or $42,000,000 in Canadian money. Under the former tariff nitrates came in absolutely free of duty, but now the Minister of Finance has put upon it a duty of 7½ per cent.

In view of what I have said, what irony it seems for the Minister of Finance to declare that by this tariff a stimulus will be given to agricultural productions and to manufactures. As to manufactures, I do not think there is any doubt, because the very object of the tariff was to give increased protection to the manufacturers. But why the Minister of Finance should venture to say that the new tariff would encourage the farmers of this country I cannot understand, unless the Minister of Finance is becoming impressed with the view which was once put forward by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), that increased taxation is the gateway to prosperity. Certainly, the farmers are getting the increased taxation, and on the reasoning of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, they ought to find themselves at the gateway of prosperity. But I very much doubt it.

There was no excuse for this increased duty. For a considerable time the watchword of this Government has been increased production. The Minister of Finance has said to the farmers: My word to you is Production, Production, Production. Therefore, when he was considering this question of taxation, he ought to have considered how he could make the farmer's burden less onerous rather than more onerous. Where was the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell)? Has he been spending his whole time circulating about San Francisco while the tariff was being prepared? Why is he not on hand to look after the interests of the farmers? Or, if he is not here, where, when this tariff was framed, was my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), who knows how anxious the farmers of his own province, New Brunswick, are to obtain these fertilizers at as low a rate as possible? Surely, he cannot be oblivious to the fact that at the annual convention of the Farmers' and Dairymen's Association of New Brunswick, held in Fredericton in February, 1913, the following resolution was unanimously passed:

> Whereas our farmers, in order to extend their operations, believe that it is necessary to use a considerable amount of commercial fertilizer; and,
>
> Whereas the cost of such fertilizers is so high that it is about impossible to use them with profit:
>
> Therefore, resolved, that in the opinion of this convention of agriculturists from every county of New Brunswick, it is desirable that our Government take such steps as are necessary to furnish the farmers with the chemicals for that purpose at first cost.

Sir, that was an important meeting, held in the capital of the province which my hon. friend represents in the Government. It was reported in all the newspapers. Its adoption of this resolution is only an evidence of the fact of which all of us in New Brunswick are aware, that for a number of years past the farmers have been of the opinion that, in order to carry on agriculture successfully they must have resort to chemical fertilizers. Now, when the farmers require these fertilizers, when they are being urged from all quarters to engage in greater production, surely this is not the time to impose these burdens upon them, to put a tax upon every kind of fertilizer, both upon the manufactured chemical fertilizer which comes largely from the United States, and from the natural fertilizer which comes from the great republic of Chile.

What has been the result of imposing these burdens? Since the resolution was passed which I have read, and since the farmers of New Brunswick through their various agricultural societies were induced to take hold of the matter, these societies have given orders for fertilizers. And I am told by my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Copp), whom I am delighted to see in his seat, and whom the House generally is delighted to see, tells me that at least one agricultural society in the county of Westmorland has cancelled its order for a large quantity of fertilizer that it had intended to bring in, in an effort to stimulate agricultural production in that county.

An hon. member on the other side has said that there has been no complaint in regard to this tariff and in regard to the way our farmers are being treated. My information is entirely different. I will read a letter which emphasizes what I have read as taking place in other countries. Germany for a considerable period nas been favouring in the highest degree the introduction of chemical fertilizers into that country. In the Commonwealth of Australia, so anxious is the Government to encourage the use of chemical fertilizers, that not only is no duty imposed upon tnem, but on tne Government railways fertilizers are carried absolutely free—absolutely no freight charges on fertilizers for the use of tne farmers. How different is tneir course, so far as the treatment of the farmers is concerned, from the course pursued by this Government. I have here a copy of a letter which was sent to the Minister of Agriculture and which I will read as it brings out strongly some of the points in favour of keeping fertilizers upon the free list:

February 19, 1915.

Honourable Martin Burrell,
Minister of Agriculture,
Ottawa, Canada.

Dear Sir,—A number of important newspapers published in Canada have recently solicited advertising from fertilizer manufacturers in the United States on the ground that the Dominion Government had entered upon an extensive campaign to encourage a greater production of the staple food crops.

We are also advised that the Canadian Government has increased the duty on fertilizers by 7½ per cent ad valorem, making a total duty of 17½ per cent, or almost double the previous rate.

In view of the increase in the tariff which carries the selling price of fertilizers to a point which will preclude their sale in Canada, we have been obliged to decline to advertise in Canadian newspapers, and in so doing have pointed out that the position of the Dominion Government in increasing the duty on fertilizer seemed almost incomprehensible.

No Governement in the world except Canada places a duty on fertilizers.

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Did the Minister of Agriculture bring that to the notice of the Minister of Finance before he framed this tariff? If he did so, surely the Minister of Finance would not place Canada in the invidious position of being the only country in the world which by a high tariff seeks to exclude fertilizers from the country and to deny to the people of Canada an opportunity of obtaining the cheapest possible food plant which can be procured. The letter continues:

Even the United States has always admitted fertilizers duty free and in the last revision of her tariff included sulphate of ammonia, even though it is extensively produced in this country.

According to recent reports in Australian papers, that Government, in order to encourage the use of fertilizers, in growing wheat this year, has offered to finance farmers in the purchase of fertilizers at a rate of interest not exceeding 5½ per cent.

The German government has agents in the United States authorized to buy large quantities of phosphates to be used in making fertilizers. Owing to war conditions she has recently classified fertilizers as preferred freight and offers to furnish free tarpaulins to cover shipments in open cars owing to the scarcity of closed cars. Yet Canada, although wishing to encourage the growth of food crops has placed an additional duty on fertilizers. By a strange coincidence she excepts insecticides and farm implements.

The hon. Minister of Finance has strained a point. He says when you talk about ploughs, wagons and fertilizers being subject to the new tariff which we have imposed, do not forget nicotine sulphate, which we have put on the free list. The writer of this letter is mistaken in saying that "by a strange coincidence the tariff excepts insecticides and farm implements." The only farm implements which are free are steam ploughs, gasoline engines, and those larger implements which are used only by wealthy farmers. The letter proceeds:

Now why should she except these, when fertility is fundamental?

It seems to us that if Canada wants to increase her food crops she would remove the duty entirely on fertilizers,—and why not? How much revenue does she derive from the importation of fertilizers, and to how large an extent are they produced in Canada? Not a pound of raw material except tankage and a little fish waste is produced in Canada, and only a few small concerns, employing probably less than a thousand labourers are protected by her tariff.

We believe that if the matters were properly presented to the farmers they would not only rise up in opposition, to any further tax on fertility in the shape of raw or manufactured fertilizers, but would insist that the duty be entirely removed. If, in times of war, the Cabinet has the right to increase duties, has it not also the right to remove duties on necessities? And certainly fertilizers come within the class.

Free fertility in the hands of your farmers

will be the most effective tool they can use to increase the staple crops of the Dominion.

Yours very truly,
W. H. Bowker,
President, Bowker Fertilizer Company.

I have a similar letter from a gentleman in St. John who is engaged in the transportation business. He tells me that on a cargo upon which under the old tariff the duty was $650, the duty under the new tariff will be $500 more, almost double the duty imposed under the previous tariff. I suppose it is too late to appeal to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance and to the Government, but I do on behalf of the farmers of this country make one last appeal before this tariff finally goes into operation. I ask the Minister of Finance not only to restore fertilizer to the tariff which previously existed, but to make it absolutely free, and to take off the duty which has been imposed upon nitrate of soda, which was previously free, thus making the burden of the farmers in respect of the food of the plant—that which gives life to the plant—just as light as possible, encouraging rather than discouraging them in the use of fertilizers.

It is said that the people of Canada generally are accepting these duties without any remonstrance. I do not believe that that is the case. I have here a letter from a gentleman in St. John who is in the wholesale grocery business. It is dated February 17, 1915, and is as follows:

Hon. Wm. Pugsley,
Ottawa, Ont.

My dear Mr. Pugsley:

On behalf of the wholesale grocers of this city, the writer begs to protest against the proposed increased tariff of 7½ per cent on American clear backs pork, and American plate beef, which lines our jobbers in the maritime provinces are forced to import from the United States to supply our lumbermen.

As you may notice, both pork and beef were formerly listed under the specific rate of duty at 2 cents per pound, which at 200 pounds per barrel would amount to $4 duty on each barrel, but if the increased rate is also enforced of 7½ per cent ad valorem on the present value of American clear fat backs, say at $20 per barrel, this would amount to $1.50 extra duty in addition to the $4 specific duty, or equal to a total specic duty of 2¾ cents per pound.

Hoping that you may be able to use your personal influence in this matter on behalf of your loyal constituents in the wholesale grocery trade of this city.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) H. S. Daly.

The people had no notice of the proposed imposition of this tariff and of the stamp duties. If they had had some notice I am satisfied that communications would have been received from every portion of Canada protesting in the strongest terms against these impositions. I have among others, a telegram from those engaged in the drug business in the city of St. John, protesting against the imposition of stamp duties. It is as follows:

We, the undersigned retail druggists of St. John, understand that the Government are about to impose stamp tax on proprietary medicines. While being prepared to share the financial burdens imposed by this war, we know this means of raising revenue to be class legislation of the worst kind, as we know positively from past experience that the retail druggists shoulder the entire load. Is this a fair deal? It is impossible for us to add one or two cents to a twenty-five-cent, or fifty-cent, or one-dollar bottle of medicine. Why tax the sick anyway?

Representatives of the Dominion Druggists Association now at Ottawa have our entire endorsement. We look to you to protect our interests.

This telegram is signed by the following gentlemen, many of whom my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows very well:

F. W. Munroe, S. M. Wetmore, E. C. Brown, H. J. Dick, G. Bell, S. H. Hawker, G. A. Reicker, Wm H. Hawker, Moore's Drug Store, H. Mowatt, E. R. W. Ingram, E. J. Mahoney, A. Chipman smith & Co., R. Rolston, Ross Drugs Company; R. B. Travis, M. V. Paddock, G. Coups, T. J. Durick.

I have no doubt that other hon. gentlemen have received protests, but, as I have said, time was short, the minister announced that the tariff and the stamp tax on wines went into operation on the very day he made his Budget speech. The ordinary stamp tax was not to go into effect until a day named in a Bill to be introduced. But if the Minister of Finance says that he will listen to protests I venture to say that the moment that announcement is made in the papers there will be 100,000 protests from the Atlantic to the Pacific against various phases of these stamp duties and this tariff. Will he say that he will listen to those protests? No, he will shut his eyes to any letters or telegrams and petitions and close his ears to any protests uttered on the floor of this House or elsewhere. Let me ask my hon. friend, if he was going to raise the tariff at all, how he can justify exempting from the provisions of this tariff all those articles contained in schedule C of the French Convention, so far as other countries are concerned. I know perfectly well that the French Convention, in so far as that schedule is concerned is binding on my hon. friend; and indeed the French Convention binds Canada generally to give

intermediate tariff on certain products of France and a specific tariff on other products of France; but why goods from other countries in no way affected by the French Convention should come from those countries, even although those goods are named in the French Convention, at a low rate of tariff, I cannot see. Why does the minister, so far as other countries are concerned, more especially the great country to the south of us, place a higher duty upon cottons and woollens and impose no extra duty upon silks and velvets and embroideries? Why does he do that? Is it because my young and handsome friend the Minister of Finance, the gallant and debonair Minister of Finance, thinks that no lady is well dressed unless she is dressed in silk and velvet? Why then does he tax the girl or the woman who wears cotton, or woollen, or muslin, or linen, and so far as this increase of the tariff is concerned, allow the girl or the woman who wears velvet or silk or embroideries, to go free? How can he justify that?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: He cannot.

Mr. PUGSLEY: There is no reason for it, there is no manner in which it can be justified. I can understand that, so far as goods from France are concerned, particularly those named in schedule C, you cannot make a change because it would be in violation of the French Convention. And while I am upon the French Convention, let me ask my hon. friend if he thinks that he is entirely within his powers in imposing an additional stamp tax upon wine which comes from France and upon which, under the French Convention, a specific duty has been imposed. Take wine of the fresh grape, not a strong wine; a specific duty is payable upon that under the French Convention, under schedule C. It does not come under schedule B but under C, and a specific duty is imposed upon it. He has raised the duty upon that by reason of this stamp tax 100 per cent. Has he the right to do it? He will say he has, because he will say that this is an Inland Revenue tax that he is putting on. Well, now, is it within the spirit of the French Convention? Parliament will be asked to say by the statute that these wines, these goods of France, cannot be taken out of the customs warehouse until this extra money is paid and this stamp is placed on them. What difference would it make if you had said that, before an importer could take these goods out of the customs warehouse, in addition to the duty imposed under the French Convention, the importer must give the collector of customs a cheque for 25 cents or 50 cents as the case might be, upon every bottle of wine which he would take out of the customs warehouse? Is it not adding to the duty when this tax is placed upon the wine as a pre-requisite to its passing through the hands of the collector of customs? As to wines from France, containing under 20 per cent proof spirits, provided for in schedule C, the minister has raised the duty by 1,000 per cent. Under the French Convention it is only 15 per cent, and he has raised it to $1.50, increasing the duty which has to be paid upon it before it can be taken out of the customs warehouse to the extent of 1,000 per cent. By stretching the terms of the convention, and by calling it a stamp duty instead of money which is to be paid by cheque to the collector of customs, you may get around the provisions of the French Convention.

The Minister of Finance may, by a lawyer's technicality, perhaps, under the advice of the Solicitor General, who looks so serious that I imagine he feels it is necessary to follow me in order to get the Government out of the difficulties they are in by reason of this iniquitous tax, be able to wriggle out of the spirit of this convention; but let me ask my hon. friend, in dealing with this great country, which is our ally as it is the ally of the Empire, not to give cause to the French Government to feel that Canada is treating this convention as a mere scrap of paper; let them feel that we treat it as a real agreement, a real convention between the Empire and our ally, made through the Canadian Government and the French Government, and one which Canada will live up to in truth and spirit, not live up to according to its mere words. It does seem to me that if the Government had provided that, as to these goods which come in under the French Convention, named by schedule C, in addition to the rates of duty therein provided for, before taking those goods out of the customs warehouse they must pay to the collector of customs an additional amount of duty, it would not have been any more a violation of the provisions of the French Convention than is the tariff which has been imposed and which is exacted by means of these stamps. In both cases they have to go through the customs warehouse before they can actually be considered entered in Canada for the purpose of consumption. A duty imposed in that way does not cor-

respond to an Inland Revenue tax, it does not correspond to the octroi imposed in certain localities in France after goods get into the country, and which are peculiar to certain specified places within the country; but this is an extra duty which you exact as a condition to the goods being passed through the customs house.

I intended before leaving the subject of agriculture and the burdens which are being placed upon the farmers, to refer to one respect in which I think a real benefit might have been conferred upon farmers. They are asked to engage in greater production. You might have encouraged them to go in for greater production with a whole heart if you had shown to the farmers, particularly the farmers of the West, that there would be a market for them after this war is over, when the demand for wheat in Canada and England will decline, as it necessarily will when there will be an opportunity to get wheat through the Baltic from Russia, and from other European countries. But in this tariff the Minister of Finance has gone through the farce of leaving wheat and wheat flour just as it was before, and how grateful the farmer ought to be to this Government because the duties on wheat and flour have not been actually increased. What a boon to such a great wheat-growing country as Canada is, a country which could easily become the granary of the world! Why does the Government not go further? Why do they not place wheat and flour upon the free list? If they had done so, what would have been the result? The farmers of the West would have felt that, while during this war there would be a good market for their wheat but still not good enough probably to pay for the investment of capital which would be necessary to prepare the land for greater production and to get additional horses and implements to cultivate the land, after the war there would have been a great market to the south, that they would then have had a steady and ever-growing market at good prices for their products in the great consuming cities of St. Paul, Minneapolis, Chicago, Spokane, Milwaukee and all the other great cities in the United States with their millions and millions of a consuming population. By refusing to put wheat and flour upon the free list the Government have struck a deadly blow at the development of our great western country. They have discouraged thousands of farmers. Their refusal to take a fair and broad view of the necessities and demands of our western people has been the means, I believe, of sending many American citizens back to the United States, and depriving Canada of the great benefits which they were conferring upon our western country, and indeed upon the whole of Canada.

I read with much interest the other day a statement by the Master of the Dominion Grange. I have not the pleasure of knowing the gentleman who occupies that position, but his statement is certainly one which must commend itself to the judgment of any fair-minded man; and it shows that even in the short time the farmers have had to consider these matters, there is a growing protest against the impositions which are being made against them. Dealing with these tariff increases he says:

> "There is not even the reasonable expectation of materially adding to our revenue," the Master continued, "since many of the recent changes in the customs schedule are practically prohibitive, their net result being to enable domestic producers to tax domestic consumers.
>
> "I will venture the opinion that for every dollar which the recent change in the tariff will put into the Federal treasury, ten dollars of taxation will be levied upon Canadian industry.
>
> "The Government might at least have considered the suggestion of the western farmers to adopt a direct tax upon land values in order to meet our requirements. This would have provided with no uncertainty for all our needs, and at the same time have cheapened land and thus have given the much needed stimulus to agriculture and to all production.
>
> "But, instead of this we find industry subjected to still further exactions; and, most astounding of all, our motherland placed under an additional disability of five per cent, in her trade with us. To knife Great Britain in this way when she is fighting for her existence and our liberties is a sight to make the gods weep."

He goes on:

> "Wild and stupid are mild terms to apply to the recent tariff policy of our Federal Government, doubly wild and stupid at present, when the need for stimulating agriculture is paramount. It is the answer of Rehoboam, and will have its reward."

Every hon. gentleman in this House knows to what distinguished Biblical character the Master of the Grange refers, but as there are a good many Rehoboams in this Government I might offer just a few remarks with respect to this gentleman who has long since passed away. You, Sir, with your Biblical knowledge, unsurpassed I take it by any gentleman in this House, know that Rehoboam succeeded Solomon as the King of Israel. Solomon had imposed many exactions upon his subjects, and when Rehoboam came to the throne the congregation of Israel requested an interview with him. Deputations waited upon him, as deputa-

5 p.m.

tions have waited upon this Government—the farmers' delegation, for instance, which asked for freedom from taxation and for a wider market for their products. Rehoboam promised the delegation an answer in a few days. But instead of consulting with the older men—like my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce for instance, or the hon. member for Halton—he consulted with the younger men, just as this Government consults with pro-Protectionists like my hon. friend from South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell). Rehoboam was advised by these younger men to tell the deputation that he would not let up upon the exactions imposed by his father, that whereas the yoke imposed by Solomon had been heavy, he would make it heavier still. And so when the delegation came back in a few days Rehoboam acted upon the advice of the younger men and said that he would not yield to their requests, that whereas the yoke upon them had been heavy he would make it heavier. He said: "My little finger shall be heavier than my father's loins. . . . My father hath chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with scorpions." And so it is with this Government. Angered, I suppose, because the farmers of our great western country had the temerity to come before them and demand that wheat and flour should be made free, and that the British preference should be increased so that our trade with the Motherland might grow greater year by year, the Government in effect says to these people: Whereas you have been chastised with whips before, we are now going to chastise you with scorpions.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Don't forget the squid.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Never mind about the squid. The Government says to the farmers of the West: Whereas you have complained that upon your implements, you have been obliged to pay too much into the Government treasury, we are going to put a further duty of seven and a half per cent against you; you folk have had the temerity to come to us and ask us to put wheat and flour on the free list, so that you could sell your wheat to the people of foreign countries so that you could take your wheat away from the millers of this country and send it to the United States; we will show you what we think of your conduct, we not only have refused to do that for you, but we will impose a further tax upon the implements with the exception of comparatively few, which you use in the production of wheat and other farm products.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, you will agree with me, and a good many members besides you in this House will agree with me, that we have a good many Rehoboams in this Government, who are acting towards the farmers of this country in the same spirit which Rehoboam displayed towards the Israelites when they went to him to obtain redress of their grievances.

In conclusion, let me say a word or two with regard to the British preference. To me it has been a matter of the greatest possible surprise that gentlemen on the other side of the House should, at this late date, get up in their places and say, in effect, that they did not value the British preference and that it was of no benefit to Canada. After the experience that Canada has had of the British preference since 1897, it is astonishing that any man should make such a statement on the floor of this Parliament. It seems to me it is un-English, it is un-British, it is un-Imperial. As a result of the British preference, the trade of Canada has progressed until it has reached enormous proportions. We all know that you cannot have in connection with these great transportation systems one-way traffic only; you want traffic both ways to cheapen the cost of transportation to the lowest possible figure. The ships which bring from Great Britain her manufactured goods to be delivered to the people of Canada take back the products of the Canadian people, and they take back these products at a cheaper rate than they could possibly afford to if they did not have traffic from England to Canada. Instead of doing anything to interfere with the British preference, the Government should have increased the preference and given greater encouragement to the trade between Canada and the Mother Country. If there is one thing in this tariff more than another for which this Government ought to be condemned, it is because of the blow they have struck at our trade with the Mother Country. At a time when the Empire has not only given of her money and the life-blood of her children for the defence of the Empire and of Canada as one of her most important parts, Great Britain is also lending to Canada, at a low rate of interest, the money which Canada needs to enable her to take part in the war, and surely that is not a time for Canada to strike this blow against the Motherland and to raise this barrier against her trade with us. I am satisfied that the Government might

save the people of this country from these stamp duties and this high tariff. I think that with prudence, there would be no necessity for increased taxes. The Government have got the Dominion into this deplorable state by reason of their want of foresight and prudence. They have told us, that for at least three years they knew there has been danger that war might come on between Great Britain and Germany. If they believed that, then surely three years ago they should have begun husbanding the resources of this country, they should have been saving money and keeping it in the public treasury, to meet the day of trial when it came. The Government told us in August that so long ago as last January they had reason to believe that war was imminent, and that they began to organize the different departments under Sir Joseph Pope, Under Secretary of State, in order to be ready for the war. Notwithstanding that, they acted as if they thought the war would make no difference to the revenues of the country; they acted as if they thought it would not bring hard times; they went on expending money just as before, and as a result of their mismanagement they have got the country into a position of very great difficulty, but out of which, even at this late date, it can be rescued by prudent management of its affairs. Evidently, while the Government have sown the wind the people of this country are reaping the whirlwind, and it is the people of Canada, not the Government, who will suffer for the wild and reckless administration of the affairs of this country by the present Administration.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton): I have listened with a great deal of interest to the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) and I was surprised to hear him use such language. In his opening remarks the other evening, he dealt largely in personalities. He referred to the hon. member for Frontenac as a man with a lop-sided brain. I was sorry to hear an ex-Minister of the Crown resort to such tactics against the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), who delivered one of the most able speeches in this whole debate.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will my hon. friend pardon me? I spoke of a man who could criticise an expenditure of $5,000 when I was Minister of Public Works, and sustain the action of the present Government in giving away for ten dollars some land which was worth $200,000, and I said a man who would do that must be a man with a lop-sided brain.

Mr. ROGERS: I wish to correct my hon. friend, because when he makes the statement that this Government gave away land for ten dollars which was worth $100,000, he makes a statement that he must himself know to be untrue.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I wish to say a word to my hon. friend—

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I believe I have the floor.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have a right to answer the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Not at this time.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for East Lambton has the floor.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Very well, I will answer again.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Not only did the ex-minister (Mr. Pugsley) refer to the hon. member for Frontenac in this way, but he seemed for some reason or other to have a particular spite against the present Minister of Public Works. I merely wish to say that neither in the speech which he has just delivered, nor in any other of his speeches, has he been able to point to one dollar misspent by the Public Works Department under this Government.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman does me a great injustice when he says that I have shown a particular spite against the Minister of Public Works. I have not done so. I have made no personal reference to the Minister of Public Works; and, moreover, I have a kindly feeling towards him. My hon. friend is entirely mistaken. That is my point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point of order of the hon. member is not very well taken. Throughout this debate hon. members have very largely indulged in a violation of the rule of debate by the way in which they have referred to other hon. members. The use of the personal pronouns, "he," "you" and "they" is not permissible according to the rule of debate. The proper form of address is "the hon. member for" the constituency which he represents, or "the hon. minister of" the portfolio that he holds, or something of that nature.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is not the point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: There was no proper point of order made.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The point of order raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) was that the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) had stated that my hon. friend beside me had exhibited spite against the Minister of Public Works; that he had imputed motives.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member, if I understood him correctly, denied the statement, and did not raise a point of order.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If you take into consideration the word "spite," a point of order was raised.

Mr. SPEAKER: While I was on my feet to make my statement in regard to the point of order, I thought it well, because of the frequency with which the rule of debate has been violated during this debate, to call attention to that violation.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Speaker, I shall endeavour to carry out your wishes in regard to following the rules of debate.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Mr. Speaker, would you give us the rule regarding the use of the personal pronoun? I have always understood that we must in every case address the Chair. That would, of course, preclude the use of the personal pronoun.

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members must address the Chair; but in referring to other hon. members they are not permitted to use the personal pronoun.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I was calling attention to the fact that the ex-Minister of Public Works had criticised unfairly the present Minister of Public Works in the administration of his department. I am justified in making that statement, because time and again the ex-Minister of Public Works has called attention to matters pertaining to the Public Works Department, which he said were most extravagantly managed and were unreasonably and unfairly dealt with. He took up at least half an hour of the time of this House in referring to different revotes that the present Minister of Public Works had put in the Estimates. Let me call the attention of the hon. member for St. John to the fact that in the year 1908, a copy of the Estimates for which I have under my hand, instead of a revote of $3,150,000, the amount of the revote put in the Estimates by the present Minister of Public Works, my hon. friend had a revote of $3,544,000. It was quite right for the ex-Minister of Public Works to have a revote amounting to $3,544,000, but it was a terrible thing for the present Minister of Public Works to have a revote of $3,150,000. Let me call the attention of the hon. member to some of the revotes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What was the expenditure for that year?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I do not care to take up the time of the House in looking up the expenditure. I do not see what bearing that has upon the question.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is the year in which we curtailed our expenditure, and very properly curtailed it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Yes, but the revotes appeared in the Estimates just the same, and this Government is also curtailing its Estimates. Let me give a few of the amounts. The revote for public buildings in Nova Scotia amounted to $143,000; in Prince Edward Island, to $5,000; in New Brunswick, to $11,000; in Quebec, to $314,700; in Ontario, to $386,500; in Manitoba, to $219,000; in Saskatchewan and Alberta, to $117,000, and in British Columbia, $93,000. If we consider public works and harbours, we find that in Nova Scotia the revotes amounted to $225,000; in Prince Edward Island, to $34,000; in New Brunswick, to $124,000; in Quebec, to $418,000; in Ontario, to $748,000; in Manitoba, to $17,000; in Saskatchewan and Alberta, to $31,000; in British Columbia, to $14,500. The revote in the Public Works Department for dredging amounted to $720,000; for roads and bridges to $20,000, and for miscellaneous, to $75,000. This makes a total of $3,544,950. It was all right for the ex-Minister of Public Works in 1908 to have a revote appearing in the Estimates for the department under his administration for that large amount of money; but it was a most serious state of affairs for the present Minister of Public Works, under the trying circumstances which we have to face at the present time, to have a revote of only $3,150,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I rise to correct my hon. friend.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I feel that the hon. gentleman has been interrupting me quite enough and interfering with my remarks. I allowed the hon. gentleman to proceed with his discussion without interruption, and I do not feel—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. If the hon. member rises to make an absolute correction or denial of a statement, he has a right to do so.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not think my hon. friend would intentionally put a misinterpretation upon what I said. I was not complaining of the revotes. What I was doing was this: I was showing that the large amount of revotes showed that there was no urgency for the works in respect of which the revotes appeared. The same was true in 1908.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: There surely is as much urgency to-day as there was in 1908. The hon. gentleman took up at least half an hour in dealing with this question. It seems to me that hon. gentlemen opposite are quibbling over little things. If they have any definite proposition to offer, let them present it to the House. They want to realize the fact that this Government is facing a tremendous crisis in the affairs of Canada. Our boys are marching to the front; some of them are on the firing line to-day, in the trenches and on the hillsides of France, assisting in the defence of their King and country. This Parliament should do everything possible to assist this Government in the position they occupy.

The ex-Minister of Public Works called attention to the Militia Estimates and complained because they were $7,000,000 less than they were last year. He realizes the fact that our boys are, as I have said, in the firing line; that therefore no camp or annual drill will be necessary, and that $1,900,000 for ordnance and stores and arms should not appear in the Estimates for the present year. He also appreciates the fact that, as far as public works are concerned, the Minister of Finance and a number of other hon. members have already stated that this Government do not intend to carry on public works that were about to be started or were under consideration.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why, then, put the amount in the Estimates?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: They do not intend to carry them on at the present time. But should the war cease before the end of the year and normal conditions obtain, this Government would be quite justified in carrying on these public works. The ex-Minister of Public Works, apparently would like to see half the men in his own district put out of work by a serious cut in the Public Works Estimates for his district. But I venture to say there is not a man behind him, in whose district large public works are carried on who would support the hon. gentleman in that position. What folly it would be for the Government, under the present circumstances, to cut down on these public works and dismiss men, making hard times harder. Hon. gentlemen opposite cry out about hard times and about the country going to smash; and yet they are trying to embarrass the Government and make it much harder for them to conduct public affairs. This country is at war, and hon. gentlemen opposite should be asking what they can do to help at this time of crisis. In England you will see the posters on the walls and billboards bearing the words, "Your King and Country need you." That call has come to the people of Canada, and nearly a hundred thousand of our brave young men have offered their services in defence of their country. These young men are marching to the front, and we ought to be willing to assist them in every way, and, instead of taking up the time of this House in trying to embarrass the Government, we should be doing our utmost to lend assistance to provide these men with every means whereby they can accomplish the glorious object for which they have gone to the front. Hon gentlemen opposite do not seem to appreciate what these men are doing. They do not seem to understand the position of the British Empire under present circumstances. When we realize that the Mother Country is facing the greatest crisis in her history and that every effort is being put forward by her people to bring this great war to a successful issue, surely it must be clear to us that our duty in Parliament is to stop criticising and embarrassing the Government, and to uphold them in the position they have taken.

I understand that some hon. members on the other side, even the hon. member for St. John City, are anxious for a fight. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) gave us to understand that he was anxious to drive the Government to the country on this Budget. If that is the desire of hon. gentlemen on the other side, then I can only say to the Government: The best thing we can do is to pitch our tents right here, and if we can not show these hon. gentlemen that they are wrong and we are right, let us go to the country. I am sure that the people of Canada will see to it that the majority of hon. gentlemen opposite are left at home,

and that the Government is returned by an increased majority.

These hon. gentlemen find fault with the manner in which the Minister of Public Works has conducted his department; but they can not point to a dollar wasted. The day has gone by for sawdust wharves and dredging contracts let at double the amount they should have cost. Newmarket canals and other extravagant expenses are things of the past. The Government is trying to economize in every way, and to husband the resources of the country. But these hon. gentlemen tell us to dismiss half the men on our public works, and one gentleman even suggests dismissing half the civil servants, making hard times harder, and placing the workingman in a position where he will have to ask for charity. But we say that the Government is doing right in spending money upon necessary public works and in conducting the public business on reasonable and businesslike lines. What would be the result if the manufacturers of Canada were to dismiss half the men in their employ? Many of these manufacturers within the last seven months have felt this great depression that has come over Canada owing entirely to war conditions. But, instead of dismissing their employees, these men have been keeping those employees on, doing their utmost to carry on their work, to develop their industries, knowing as they do that this war cannot last many months longer and that when it is over their industries will grow as they have grown in the past, and even more than in the past. They know that agricultural production in Canada will increase more rapidly than ever before. They know that there will flock to our shores men from all parts of the world to help in developing our mines, our woodlands and all our other resources. They know that they can look forward to better times. I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite during this crisis not to resort to such tactics as we have seen displayed within the last few days—quibbling and fault-finding, endeavouring to cripple the Government—when they know that every energy should be used to bring about a satisfactory conclusion of this great war.

Now, just a word about the position we were in in 1907. At that time Canada faced a financial crisis. Did the Conservative party get up in this House and criticise, brow-beat and ridicule the Ministers of the Crown as has been done to-day? The very opposite was the case. I well remember when a number of men went to the leader of the Opposition of that day, now the hon. Prime Minister of Canada, a man whom we all admire and honestly and faithfully try to serve, and told him that this was the time to cry hard times, to make much of the financial crisis and to warn the people that the country was going to smash. And what did he say? He said: In a few years, this financial stringency will pass and our manufacturers and agriculturists will increase their production—which they have done in these latter years.

Hon. gentlemen opposite say that the national debt of this country is increasing by leaps and bounds. Show me a country to-day in which the national debt is not increasing. The Prime Minister of Great Britain said the other day that the Imperial Government would require a sum exceeding $1,800,000,000 from the people of the Motherland to assist in carrying on this great war. Did the Opposition in the Imperial Parliament criticise this addition to the public debt? No. Did they quibble and find fault with little things as hon. gentlemen have done here to-day? No. They are ready and willing to give every possible support to the carrying on of the war to a successful conclusion, and they are doing everything they can to assist the Imperial Government in the present crisis. In all foreign countries enormous debts are being rolled up to the extent of hundreds and thousands of millions of dollars. In the country to the south, not only is the national debt increasing, but the people are being subjected to a direct tax in order that the sum of $125,000,000 may be raised to accomplish objects similar to some of those which we are endeavouring to accomplish. The Finance Minister has told hon. gentlemen that a portion of the money which will be obtained by means of these taxes will go towards the payment of pensions to wives and members of the families of those who are serving their country at the front. In addition to that it will be necessary to use $7,000,000 to pay interest on the $150,000,000 which this country will use for war purposes.

Hon. gentlemen say that the national debt under the Conservative Administration has been greatly increased. Is that assertion based on facts? Let us go back to 1911. For three years previous to that year the debt of this country under the Liberal party was increased over $60,000,000, while during the three years after this Government came into office the debt was decreased

$6,750,000. I commend these facts to the consideration of hon. gentlemen opposite. All honour is due to the Finance Minister who the first year after he came into office was able to reduce the public debt of Canada $25,000,000. We must expect that as long as this war lasts the debt of Canada will increase.

The hon. member for the city of St. John said that the farmers of Canada will find fault with these taxes. I believe the farmers will willingly and gladly pay these taxes; appreciating the position in which the Government is now placed, they will be willing to pay a reasonable amount of the expenditure which is to be made by this country in connection with its participation in the defence of the Empire.

Hon. gentlemen have referred to the cutting down of the Estimates. They know full well that the Estimates have been reduced over $17,000,000 this year, and that the Minister of Public Works has reduced the Estimates in his department over $11,000,000. It is surely not necessary for me to tell hon. gentlemen that before the war money was pouring into this country by hundreds of millions of dollars every year. From $250,000,000 to $300,000,000 per annum came into Canada and was used for the general development of the country. Owing to the war this money has ceased to come in, and so far as public works or the general development of the country is concerned, we have to rely entirely upon funds produced within our own borders.

The hon. member for the city of St. John, in criticising the actions of this Government, said that the Grand Trunk Pacific railway was, to use his own words, going to smash and financial ruin. Whose fault is it that the Grand Trunk Pacific railway is going to smash and financial ruin? In 1904 the present Prime Minister and those who sit behind him urgently pleaded with the Liberal Government to consider the advisability of extending the Intercolonial to the western coast, thus providing a road owned, operated and controlled by the people of Canada. Hon. gentlemen then in Opposition pointed out that the adoption of this plan would secure Government control of freight and passenger rates. But hon. gentlemen opposite when they were in power were determined to carry on that great undertaking, and what is the result? $35,000,000 has been expended on the eastern section; the rails are rusting and the ties rotting, and there is little or nothing for the road to do. Part of the western section terminating at Winnipeg, cost this country nearly $100,000 a mile, showing that it has been built up to a standard in advance of the needs of the district through which it runs. These considerations were time and again brought to the attention of the then Prime Minister and his colleagues in office. Opposite sit the men on whose shoulders rests the responsibility, Mr. Speaker, if this railroad is going to smash these are the men who are responsible for the reckless undertakings of the previous Government.

The hon. member for the city of St. John to-day attempted to hold up to ridicule the legislation which this Government have put on the statute books since they came into office. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that during the last four years more progressive legislation has been placed on the statute books than was enacted by the Liberal Government in all the fifteen years they were in office. Does the hon. gentleman want me to call attention to the extension of the boundaries of the provinces of Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec, a matter that was held in abeyance by the ex-Prime Minister of this country for years? Apparently hon. gentlemen opposite were unable to deal with this question, but when this Government came into office they dealt promptly and efficiently with it, and hardly a complaint can be offered in connection with the adjustment which was made. Does the hon. gentleman want me to call attention to the good roads proposition which was made by the present Government? If the ex-Minister of Public Works were in his seat I would call his attention to this proposed legislation, which hon. gentlemen opposite did their best to vote down and to dispose of in an unsatisfactory manner. Had that proposition been passed by the Senate, as it ought to have been passed, $7,000,000 would have been expended on good roads in Canada, in addition to what has actually been expended. Do hon. gentlemen want me to call attention to the banking laws that have been revised under this Government and to the splendid management of the affairs of the Department of Finance? There has been an increase of $10,000,000 in the expenditure on agriculture—and I was surprised to hear the ex-Minister of Public Works call attention to the fact that the Minister of Agriculture is absent from this House. He ought to know that the Minister of Agriculture is absent through illness. We have to-day the most progressive Minister of

Agriculture that Canada has ever had. He has placed on the statute books of Canada more pregressive legislation in favour of the farming interests of this country than has any other Minister of Agriculture. In addition to that what do we find? We find the department of the ex-Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) being criticised by hon. members opposite. Mr. Pelletier has given the most progressive and advanced legislation in connection with the Post Office Department of any man who has occupied that position in Canada. He has established a system of rural free mail delivery whereby the people living in the rural districts have the benefits of a post office at their very doors. The late Government for eight long years were urged to establish that system; but when they finally did undertake it they gave free rural delivery only on existing mail and stage routes instead of in the extensive way that the late Postmaster General has established that system. Mr. Pelletier also gave to the people of Canada a parcel post system which will develop and grow as years go by. The policy of the Post Office Department under the Conservative Government has been progressive, advanced and in the interests of the country.

The hon. member for St. John referred in a very slight way to the reciprocity pact, calling attention to the wheat that would be going into the United States to-day if we had had reciprocity. If that hon. gentleman would read the papers and look at the columns showing the prices which are being paid for wheat in Winnipeg and Minneapolis, he would find that day after day and month after month and year after year the price in Winnipeg exceeds the price paid in Minneapolis. How can he believe that farmers are anxious to send their wheat over there at the present time when they are receiving in Canada a higher price than they could possibly receive on the other side of the line? Does he not realize that the people of the United States last year were able to export to the markets of the world 173,861,000 bushels of wheat and more than 12,000,000 barrels of flour, while this country was able to export only a very small portion of that amount. Which shows that the United States are capable of producing enough wheat and flour to supply not only their own people but the people of other lands.

Our people have been anxious to promote the made-in-Canada campaign. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem to appreciate this made-in-Canada proposition. The hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) called attention to it, and tried to lead the members of the House to believe that it was not to their best interests to urge upon the people of Canada to make and to consume as much of the products of their own land as possible. Do not these hon. gentlemen realize that the best market is the home market, and that the made-in-Canada proposition is a live and progressive idea, and that people in Canada should gladly and willingly support it?

Do these gentlemen want us to call attention to the position in which they were placed in 1911 when they voted against the three dreadnoughts that should to-day be in the firing line of the British fleet?

Mr. PUGSLEY: They would not have been completed until next year.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: The ex-Minister of Public Works criticises this Government in its management of the affairs of Canada. Had these two battleships been completed and were to-day in the firing line of the British fleet, how proud the people of Canada would be. Does the hon. member for St. John not appreciate the fact that on the 5th day of August, when war was declared, the people of Canada were humiliated to think that they had done so little to aid the British Empire. Thousands of men in Canada hung their heads in shame to think they were unable to assist the Motherland in her defence. Who was to blame? Day in and day out, night in and night out, this Government did their utmost to carry this proposition through this House, so that assistance would be granted to the Motherland. They were doing just what the British Admiralty asked them to do. Any man who will read the memorandum that was placed before this Government in 1911 will realize that this Government was merely carrying out the wishes of the British Admiralty when they said that the best means whereby the Canadian people could assist the Motherland in the defence of the Empire would be by building three of the largest and best battleships that money could buy or science procure. The is the statement made in the memorandum, and the hon. gentlemen opposite did their ulmost to defeat that proposition.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. gentleman says if these battleships had been completed Canada would have been proud of them. Did not the right hon. the Prime Minister, at the time when it was proposed to build them, say that they would not be completed

until after 1916? It would be after the general election; that would take place before they were completed.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: That statement may have been made by the Premier of Canada.

Mr. J. D. REID: No, it was not.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, it was made distinctly and positively.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: But supposing that it was made, under the present circumstances if those two battleships had been in the dockyards of England in process of construction, men could have been put to work on them night and day during the last seven months, we are not so far from the year 1916 that we cannot appreciate the fact that the British Admiralty would have been able to have completed those two battleships, and that to-day they might have been in the firing line of the British fleet.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Why didn't you have the Niobe ready?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Let me call attention to the fact that the people of Canada have looked on with admiration at the splendid fight put up by the warship furnished to the British Admiralty by the Government of New Zealand in the battle off Heligoland.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What about the Australian Government's boat?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: And more than that, they were able to assist Admiral Beatty in the splendid victory he achieved in the North Sea. The cry with these gentlemen opposite was: "No need; no danger, no emergency; no menace; we know what we are talking about and there is no need for the Government to undertake this proposition." But the Premier had asked the British Admiralty how he could best serve them in that regard, and he is asking them to-day. This Government to-day are carrying out the wishes of the British Admiralty, and we are proud and glad to support them. But hon. gentlemen opposite are doing their utmost to discredit this Government in the eyes of Canada and the world at large, and if possible drive them to the country. We on this side of the House are glad that we have at the head of affairs in Canada such an honest, straight-forward, and business-like Governement, a Government which from time time to time gives to the people of Canada legislation as progressive as could possibly be expected from any Government.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 62, respecting the Bank of Alberta.—Mr. Douglas.

Bill No. 63, to incorporate the Catholic Truth Society of Canada.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill No. 64, respecting a certain patent of the Mills Equipment Company, Limited. —Mr. Northrup.

Bill No. 65, respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—Mr. T. J. Stewart.

THE BUDGET.

PROPOSED WAR TAXATION.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (resuming):

When the House rose at six o'clock I was calling attention to the fact that had this Government obeyed the wishes of the British Admiralty in 1911 and, had their policy not been thwarted in this House and defeated in the Senate by the Liberal party, Canada and Great Britain would to-day have been much better prepared for this war. Upon the shoulders of hon. gentlemen opposite, therefore, rests a great responsibility, and when called upon to give an account of their stewardship in the near future, they will cut a sorry figure before the people, when they have to tell them that their policy in this House so far this session has been to embarrass and hinder the Government in promoting the necessary legislation to help the Empire to bring this great struggle to a successful issue. When war broke out we had no great dreadnoughts to place in the firing line, and for that hon. gentlemen opposite are to blame. They do not dare to vote in opposition to the $100,000,000 asked for by the Government now, nor did they dare to vote last summer against the $50,000,000 for war expenditure, but they do dare to try to embarrass and obstruct and criticise necessary legislation. The Government now in power has done its full duty in this crisis. One hundred thousand of our brave soldiers have been armed and equipped and fed, and great credit is due to the men at the head of affairs who have been so successful in this undertaking. Apparently hon. gentlemen opposite are now taking up the time of Parliament with the object of driving the Government to the country, and if that is their wish, and if the Government should appeal to the country, these hon. gentlemen must expect very little sympathy

from the electorate. Look at what the colonies are doing in this great war; see the splendid work of Australia!

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Will hon. gentlemen opposite pound their desks when I remind them of the attitude taken by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, then Prime Minister, in 1902, 1907, and 1909, before the Colonial Conferences. When he was asked at these conferences to subscribe to the assistance of the British navy and the defence of the British Empire the attitude taken by him was in direct opposition to the best interests of the people of Canada at that time. While Australia and New Zealand were willing to subscribe from year to year towards the maintenance of the British navy, and towards assisting in the defence of the Empire, he told the conferences that Canada was not able to assist because she was building the Grand Trunk Pacific railway and establishing wireless telegraph stations. These were weak excuses, indeed, when the British Empire was calling for help from the Colonies, and when Australia and New Zealand responded so nobly to the call. But notwithstanding the delays and embarrassments which hon. gentlemen opposite are trying to bring about, we have no doubt that Great Britain will come out of this war successfully. She has so organized her resources and perfected her army and navy that her defeat is impossible.

When hon. gentlemen opposite refer to the British preference, they should remember that the British preference is extended to thirteen countries as well Great Britain, and that When Mr. Fielding, the Minister of Finance of the day, introduce the preference, he had no intention of making it a preference to be enjoyed by the Motherland alone.

I wish to give a few facts in regard to that preference. Of Canada's total imports, in 1896, previous to the British Preference being granted, 31 per cent came from Great Britain, whereas in 1908, under a Liberal Government, only 27 per cent came from Great Britain. Of the imports coming into Canada free of duty, in 1896, 22 per cent came from Great Britain, whereas in 1908, under a Liberal Government, notwithstanding all the Liberals say about preference, only 17 per cent came from Great Britain. The proportion of imports coming from the United States into Canada free of duty rose from 64 per cent in 1896 to 70 per cent in 1908. The value of the goods produced in the United Kingdom imported free into Canada amounted to $24,129,088 in 1914. Two and a half per cent advantage on that amount would be over $600,000. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite will try to influence this House to believe that the preference granted by the Minister of Finance in his Budget to the Motherland is not of any material assistance to that country, when I have shown that on free goods alone the Motherland will have a preference of over $600,000 over any of the other nations that are importing goods into Canada. The Budget of the Minister of Finance increases the British preference by 2½ per cent relatively to other countries. Take a case to illustrate that statement. An article worth $100 comes into Canada from England and a similar article worth $100 comes into Canada from the United States. The duty on the article from the United States is 30 per cent, or $30, whereas the duty on a similar article coming from England is 20 per cent, or $20. Therefore the British preference on that article would be $10. Under the new tariff the duty on an article coming from the United States is 37½ per cent, while the duty on an article coming from Great Britain is 25 per cent. The duty on an article worth $100 coming from the United States would amount to $37.50, and the duty on an article worth $100 coming from Great Britain would amount to $25. Therefore, the preference to the British merchant would be $12.50, whereas it was formerly $10. The Government is ready and willing to assist the Motherland in every way possible, and it also feels that it is its duty to protect its own industries that are likely to be interfered with by manufacturers in Great Britain.

The Budget of the Minister of Finance will stand for all time to come as a masterful, reasonable, sane, safe, sound business proposition. This Budget stands out in its statesmanlike qualities as the most advanced piece of legislation ever offered to the people of Canada. The tax on bank circulation required a knowledge and grasp of public finance that few men in Canada could have displayed as successfully as did the Minister of Finance. This legislation —I refer to the legislation pertaining to banks—may never disappear from the statute book, and all honour to the man who had the courage to initiate it. The Minister of Finance has kept the increased customs duties separate in order that they may not in any way conflict with the ordinary revenue, and in order that they may be dis-

pensed with at any time. The Minister of Finance has placed a tax on all financial interests for the first time in the history of Canada.

It is an easy matter for critics to tear down and destroy, and we know that new imposts are never popular even amongst people who feel that some tax must be paid. The Minister of Finance, in his Budget, took the country into his confidence. He clearly stated that works that have been commenced, like the National Transcontinental railway, the Welland canal, the Quebec bridge, would be completed, as it would be most impracticable and unwise to suspend them for one year. Suspension would have a bad effect on the labour market; and as labour assists in paying these taxes, why should it not be considered? Very little of this revenue is to be expended on new works.

The new taxes are war taxes rendered necessary by the war. The people of Canada will pay these taxes and pay them gladly. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem to recognize the fact that these are war taxes, and that the aim and object of the Budget in this regard is that the Minister of Finance may be able to conduct the affairs of this country in a reasonable and businesslike manner. They are war taxes that are collected from the people for the purpose of conducting the affairs of Canada. While it is true that $150,000,000 is being advanced to the people of Canada from the Motherland, it is also true and absolutely necessary that this Government shall provide sufficient funds to conduct the affairs of Canada without hindrance.

Never again in the history of Canada do I believe an Opposition will oppose a Budget in the manner in which the present Opposition is attempting to oppose the present Budget. The Liberals need to look ahead. Behind the present cloud the sun is still shining, and there are better and brighter days in store for the people of Canada. When this terrible war is ended and our brave boys walk triumphantly through the streets of Berlin, as I believe they will, and our statesmen sit down with the statesmen of England, France and Russia to arrange the terms of peace which they will secure from Germany, we all hope that it will be permanent peace—not a peace that will only last for a generation or for a hundred years, but a peace that will last for a thousand years. Then we shall find that the people will flock to our shores and develop our industries and that Canada will forge ahead.

Before closing, I want to say a few words in regard to a matter which, to my mind, vitally affects an important industry in Canada, namely, the flax industry. We have especially in western Ontario, a great deal of flax-producing territory and a great many flax mills. Practically all of these mills are standing idle to-day. An enormous area in the Northwest that has been producing flax also deserves consideration by the Government. In Ontario forty years ago we had sixty-five flax mills; twenty years ago there were only thirty-five of these in operation. In 1913, there were only twelve in operation, and in 1914 there were only nine. The total acreage of flax taken care of in the nine mills amounted to only 1,400 acres, just about what one large mill could take care of alone. The Department of Agriculture has apparently never taken any interest in this industry, and gradually the mills have been closed. I am referring to flax grown for fibre purposes, which is the only profitable purpose for which to grow flax. In the Northwest large areas have been seeded to flax. In 1910 the area under flax cultivation was 476,877 acres, of which 438,000 acres were in Saskatchewan, 24,577 in Manitoba, and 14,300 in Alberta. This acreage was sown almost entirely for seed-producing purposes.

Had it been sown in fibre-producing flax, and the fibre saved and retted, in this district alone they would have been able to produce a much greater quantity of seed per acre, and the fibre would have amounted to at least 100,000 tons. This sold at 20 cents per lb. would have brought a return to the western provinces amounting to $40,000,000.

Canada in 1911 grew 1,500,000 tons of flax straw. At last year's prices this would have yielded at least $60,000,000; and were it in Canada to-day it would be worth $100,000,000. The straw was burned in our northwest and only the seed sent forward. The seed brought a return of only $11,855,000. It is hoped that the Government will make a close investigation of these statements and figures which appear in the Census and Statistics Monthly for April 1911.

I call your attention to the fact that this war has demoralized the flax industry in Belgium, Russia, Germany and France, and the linen mills in Ireland, Scotland and the United States are in a serious position

to-day. They realize that unless some help comes from countries such as Canada to assist them in producing the flax fibre for the purposes of their mills, they are going to be seriously handicapped. Representatives of these concerns have been in Canada during the past few months urging many of us who live in districts where flax grows extensively to try to have these mills started and some of their products sent forward.

This year the whole Belgium export is cancelled, Germany has seized the whole stock of fibre, tow, yarns and linen. Germany having taken possession of the straw of the 1913 crop, held in reserve, and of the 1914 crop, harvested just before the war broke out and not marketed, there will be no flax sown this spring. For these reasons Belgium is out of the flax supply for three years.

This would appear to me to be Canada's opportunity. The improved methods used in handling the flax has made it a very profitable industry for the farmers. Pulling machines have been successful and the latest method of retting and caring for the flax have been the means of reducing the cost of handling to an enormous extent. The cotton industry of the southern States has tried to place the growing of flax in as much disfavour as possible. Canada cannot ever become great in cotton; she can become great in flax. If proper assistance is given I look forward not only to the old mills being operated, but to large mills being established in the Northwest as part of an industry which will add materially to the agricultural wealth of Canada.

I believe that a small commission should be appointed at the earliest possible date, whose duty it should be to send out literature from time to time to men interested in flax. That commission should visit the mills which have not been operated and induce them to reopen, and should see to it that sufficient seed is placed at their disposal at a reasonable price. Other duties of that commission would be: to visit each mill once at seeding time, harvesting, spreading, retting and turning, in order that they might obtain the best results; to see that the best of seed is used for planting purposes; to see to the proper grading of flax fibre for export; to investigate the new means of retting which are being introduced from time to time; to start the flax industry again in the province of Quebec if possible; to keep posted in the new European methods of handling flax; to find out ways and means of disposing of flax and its by-products in Canada; to assist the flax growers to co-operate with others in the importation of flaxseed from Holland; to devise some means whereby flax grown and scutched by the farmers on the farm in small quantities can be marketed to advantage; to devise a plan to settle disputes between the farmer and the flax buyer in regard to prices and to the standardization of flax both as to seed and to fibre. New Canadian strains should be developed; encouragement should be given in the way of baling the crop; lower freight rates should be secured; information concerning tests as to the exhaustiveness of flax on the soil should be disseminated. The farmers should be disabused of any prejudice they may have against flax growing, and if possible the establishment of paper mills in flaxseed centres should be encouraged in centres such as Saskatchewan where coarse straw can be profitably utilized. The United States, Ireland, Holland, France and other countries should be visited to inquire into and study their methods of treating flax. In short, every possible assistance should be rendered toward the development of this industry. I hope the Government will give immediate attention to this matter and that some assistance will be forthcoming.

In conclusion, I wish to congratulate this Government on the Budget and to say that it is a reasonable, fair, businesslike proposition, and that I have every confidence in the good sense and business management of the Prime Minister and his advisers.

Mr. L. J. GAUTHIER (St. Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, it is a good thing that the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) came to his " in conclusion," for up to that point the hon. gentleman had not mentioned the Budget. He took us through the history of the Liberal Administration from 1896; he spoke of dreadnoughts, of flax, of loyalty —of everything except the question which is now an issue between the two parties sitting in this House. I intend first to take up briefly the points that have been raised by my hon. friend. In the first place, he found fault with the hon. member for St. John City (Mr. Pugsley) for his attitude on revotes, and said that when that hon. gentleman was Minister of Public Works in 1908 there were a number of revotes. The hon. member for St. John City did not say that money should not be revoted, but he objects to revotes that involve extra taxation. The revotes of 1908 did not mean extra taxation laid upon the people. The hon. member for

Lambton goes on to say that the Opposition is embarrassing the Government while our boys are marching to the front. But the Opposition has declared that it is ready to vote any amount of money asked by this Government to go on with the war. I do not see how we can be charged with embarrassing the Government in the conduct of the war. Being willing to help the Government all along, it is nothing but right that we should criticise what we think is open to criticism. Otherwise, what was the reason for convening Parliament? The Government, having a majority in this House, has the duty of keeping the business of the country going, and they must take the responsibility of their actions. If the Opposition find that the manner in which the Government is fulfilling its duty is not according to what is right, it is their duty to criticise. But we do not want to embarrass the Government on account of the war—not at all; and we shall prove it before the debate is over.

The hon. member for East Lambton raised a question which ought to be settled at once for all. He said to the Opposition: If you are anxious for a fight, if you want to have an election, you may have it immediately. It is just as well that we should understand each other in this regard.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: I know that my hon. friend does not intend to misquote what I said. I did not use the word "immediately." I said that if hon. gentlemen wanted an election, it was up to this Government to pitch its tent right here and fight the matter out, and that if we could not convince hon. gentlemen opposite that they are in the wrong and we are in the right, the best thing to do would be to go to the country.

Mr. GAUTHIER: I have no objection to the correction of my hon. friend. He made two allusions to that subject during the course of his speech: first, I understood him to say that if we were anxious for a fight the Government should pitch their tent and fight to a finish. Secondly, he said that if the Liberal party wanted an election, we should go to the country. That is what I understood him to say, and I think the explanation he has made bears that out. We are not over anxious to have an election, but if the Government wants it, it will find us ready to face it.

The hon. member asks what the Government of the day did in 1907, when we were in the midst of a crisis. The Government of the day reduced its expenditure, while the Government of to-day is increasing its expenditure, that is the difference. We are opposed to the Government on this question of taxation, because they are increasing expenditures as well as increasing the burdens which have to be borne by the people.

My hon. friend says that every country is enlarging its public debt. To this assertion we do not object. When the Government at the war session asked us to vote $50,000,000, we voted the amount willingly. This year, when they ask for $100,000,000, we are ready to vote it without objection. We realize that this war in which our country is involved must increase the public debt. We are willing to shoulder part of the responsibility for the expansion of the debt, but we do not wish to be held responsible for the extra taxation that is to be imposed upon the people in a manner to which we take objection.

My hon. friend said that instead of building the Transcontinental the previous Government should have extended the Intercolonial to the coast. Having regard to the statistics concerning the Intercolonial at the present time, I think my hon. friend will realize that if the Intercolonial railway had been extended to the coast, the results would have been much less advantageous than those which will be obtained by the construction of the Transcontinental, which is built by a private corporation.

My hon. friend compares the price of wheat in Winnipeg with the price of wheat in Minneapolis. It is all very well to speak of a home market, but what is the use of having a quotation from the Winnipeg market and not having a consumer for the produce that is put on that market? I would rather have the consumer than the quotation.

The hon. gentleman sought to draw a parallel between the action of the Government in connection with the proposed contribution of $35,000,000 to the British Admiralty and the position of the present Administration in connection with the Budget. He said that the Government acted under the direction of the British Admiralty when they asked Parliament to vote $35,000,000 for the Mother Country. Evidently my hon. friend desires to intimate that this Budget of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has been drawn under the direction of the Admiralty. I think it is not fair that the Admiralty should be held responsible for anything the responsi-

bility for which rests upon the Government.

My hon. friend says that in respect of the $50,000,000 which have been voted, and the $100,000,000 which are being appropriated for war purposes, the Opposition did not and would not dare vote against the Government. I am not a scholar in the English language, and very often when a new word comes up in this House I go to the library and consult dictionaries and lexicons for the purpose of finding out the meaning of the word so employed. I have heard an hon. member in this House read an extract carefully prepared upon the words obsolete and obsolescent, and contend that the ships, which would have been tendered for under the Naval Act of 1910, would have been obsolete the moment the contract was granted. But quite recently the Government bought two submarines which had been rejected by the Government for which they were ordered; they paid for them $250,000, and they were not obsolete. It is the same with the extra-superfine distinction between the two words "false" and "untrue." The same applies to the word "truce." The two parties have entered into a truce which, according to the dictionary, is a cessation of hostilities. Listening as you do, Mr. Speaker, with careful attention to the speeches which are delivered in this House, would you believe, after having heard the speech which has just been delivered by the hon. member for East Lambton, that the party to which he belongs has entered into a truce and has ceased hostilities? When the two parties entered into a truce, the right hon. leader of the Opposition gave the Government a free hand in the direction of the affairs of this country. Parliament was summoned; the Government asked for a certain amount of money; we granted it willingly. All proposed amendments to existing laws which were suggested by the Government were willingly supported by the Opposition. When the session was over it was suggested that a French-Canadian regiment be formed in the province of Quebec. My right hon. friend and leader went on the public platform with his old political opponent and asked the young men to enlist, and the formation of a regiment was completed inside of three weeks. Would you be surprised to know, Sir, that at that very moment, when my right hon. friend and leader was respecting the truce which had been declared between the two parties, our friends of the Conservative party were circulating literature and cartoons with the professed object of preparing for an election, which, it was alleged, would be held on November 28, 1914?

[Mr. Gauthier.]

Mr. PAQUET: In the province of Quebec?

Mr. GAUTHIER: In the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. PAQUET: Would my honorable friend allow me a question? Does he intend to maintain that we have sent out for distribution in the province of Quebec pamphlets concerning a general election?

Mr. GAUTHIER: What I said was that at the very moment that my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was respecting the truce and giving as free a hand as possible to the Government, the Government was circulating in the Dominion of Canada literature and cartoons to prepare for an election that was proposed to be held on the 28th of November of last year.

Mr. PAQUET: I want to know from my honourable friend if, in the province of Quebec, the truce was observed by the Conservative party.

Mr. GAUTHIER: There are two reasons why these pamphlets were not circulated in Quebec: first, they were not translated; and then it would be of no use, because hon. members opposite are very well aware that it is no use circulating literature in Quebec when we have their own records on which to punish them at the next general election.

Mr. PAQUET: My honourable friend refuses to answer.

Mr. GAUTHIER: Mr. Speaker, I think I have answered my hon. friend. The hon. member for L'Islet will have an opportunity to answer before the debate is closed, and, without giving him advice—he had been in this House for quite a number of years before I had the honour of having a seat here—I ask him, he being with the majority, to be good enough to wait, as his turn is coming.

I speak in my own name and in the name of the riding I have the honour to represent. I have been in constant consultation with my people, and what I am going to say I say of my own free will and in my own name. I say to the Government that if they do not want to cut the expenditure, if they want absolutely an amount of $140,000,000 for public works during the present year, why do they consent to impose the burden of taxation on a part of the community which has done more than its share in the struggle which is going on? It is well known that the great majority of our boys who

are actually at the front, who have actually reddened the sands of the dunes in Flanders to assist Great Britain in the war that has been waged against her, and which she is fighting in order that she may have the respect of the world for her signature, these boys come especially from the mass of our population. They have supplied the flesh, the bone, the blood, the heart and soul of the nation. I claim then that they have done their share, and the burden of taxation should not be imposed on the mass of our toilers and our labourers. I would not care to make a speech on economics, I am not entitled to give the results of my study or of my reading, but in my opinion a community is composed of two portions, the part that has acquired wealth and the part that is building the country. When you ask the masses of the population to exert their strength, to put their hope, to spend their energies in developing the resources of the country, and they have accepted your invitation, I claim that they have done their share. But what would you say of the wealth owners of this country who can escape taxation in such a time of stress as the one we are going through? The Government has encouraged the made in Canada campaign. At the same time they are increasing the protection in favour of the manufacturer. What will be the result? The result will be that the manufacturer will get the profit because he will enhance the price of his produce and the consumer will pay a higher price, and the Government will get no profit, so that the tariff, as I see it, is nothing else than putting an extra burden of taxation on the shoulders of the poor classes of people with no profit to the Government and with further protection to the wealthy classes of our population. I say that this is unfair. I know very well that our protests in this House are of no avail but I say this, speaking for myself, and for my constituents, that if I had not the courage to stand here and speak my mind and the mind of those I represent I would not be worthy of the position I have received from the electors who have sent me here to speak in their names. I have no grouch against the manufacturers. I have no complaint to lodge against those who have acquired wealth; but I say to the Government, when you are putting the burden of taxation you should take care not to crush those on whom you rely for the development of the resources of this country and allow the rich and the wealthy to escape the burden of taxation. Indirect taxation, to my mind, always falls on the poor and direct taxation on the rich man, and I say that the burden of the taxation proposed in this budget, without entering into all the details of its provisions, should have been put on the shoulders of those who are in a better position to bear it. The poor man should have been let go, for his burden is heavy enough at present. But it will be increased by reason of the protection given to the manufacturer, for upon every article made in Canada the consumer will now have to pay a higher price. In my opinion it was not right for the Government to make the poorer classes bear the burden of taxation.

The party to which I belong has been called more than once the party of disloyalty, but let me remind hon. gentlemen that it was our party that put the British preferential tariff upon the statute book, and our party has upheld that policy on every platform in this country. That surely is proof that we are not disloyal. But this Government, by decreasing the British preference, is not only hurting the credit of Canada in Great Britain, but, what is more important, is raising the price of goods to the consumers of this country; for the manufacturer in Canada or in the United States or abroad who wanted to compete in our market with the goods made in England had to meet the prices of those goods. By raising the British preference, therefore, the Government is simply taxing every man, woman and child in this country, and at the very time when the working people of this country are clamouring for work. There is protection for the manufacturer, but no protection for the consumer.

One last word, and after thanking the House for their kind attention I will resume my seat. What do the bank statistics show that are sent broadcast throughout this country? According to the last reports of the chartered banks in Canada they have more money now than ever before. Is not that a proof that Canada has as much wealth to-day as she ever had before? Why is it that all this money is piled up in the banks in the name of every man, woman and child in the Dominion? It is because public confidence is gone; that is the only reason. Our men are as strong and energetic as they were before, our resources are as wonderful as they were before, and our credit is as good as it ever was before. We have more money than we ever had, but it

is all tied up in the banks because the owners do not wish to take any risks with it. And who is responsible for this? I say it is the Government of this country, because they are not only recklessly spending the revenues of this country but preparing to spend recklessly the money that will be exacted from our people by this unjust, unfair and unsound taxation.

Mr. F. S. SCOTT (South Waterloo): It seems to me but fitting that my first words spoken in this House should bear reference to the loss which this Parliament has suffered in the death of the gentleman who preceded me in the position which I now occupy. The more I have come in contact with the members of this House and heard their references to the late hon.

9 p.m. Mr. Clare the more I have been impressed with the high place which he occupied in the estimation and the affections of the men with whom he was associated here. In his home town of Preston the splendid industries with which he was identified stand as a monument to his ability as a business man. We in South Waterloo who knew him so well feel that so great was the work in which he was engaged and so widespread his influence throughout Canada that his loss may well be referred to as a national one.

I should also like to give expression on this occasion to the very great pride and pleasure that I feel at being permitted to serve in this House under the gentleman who occupies the high position of Premier of this Dominion of Canada. For ten years he was the chosen leader of his party while in Opposition. For more than three years he has been Premier of this country, during which time Canada has passed through perhaps the most difficult period in her history. I believe it is the verdict of the people of Canada to-day, and will be the verdict of the people more than ever in the future, that by the statesmanlike manner in which he has guided this country through this difficult time, the Premier has measured up to the best traditions of British statesmanship, and his place is secure in the honour roll of great Canadians.

The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier) who has just resumed his seat will pardon me if I do not follow in detail the various arguments he has advanced, but there are one or two points to which I shall refer. It has seemed to me as I have followed this debate, that after the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) had spoken for the gentlemen opposite, the field that has been covered since that time has been practically the same ground over and over again. I should just like to refer to one of the points that was made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, a point that was also emphasized very emphatically by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) this afternoon; and that is their insistence that the Government of the day should cut down expenditures. I confess, Mr. Speaker, that I have a very limited knowledge of the procedure followed by this House in the carrying on of its business, but it does seem to me that it would be a much more businesslike proceeding if hon. gentlemen opposite, instead of speaking in a general way about expenditures, would wait until the Estimates are before the House and then tell us which of them they object to.

The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier) also stated that the great burden of taxation in this Budget fell upon the people who were least able to bear it. Well, the Bank of Montreal, under this new taxation system, will pay into the treasury of this country $150,000 per annum, the Bank of Commerce $135,000 per annum, and the Imperial Bank $60,000 per annum, and the other banks will pay in like proportion. On the day following that on which the Minister of Finance brought down his Budget, I was in the office of the general manager of a bank in the city of Toronto, and he said to me: Our share of this taxation will be $60,000 a year, but the banks will not attempt to shift that burden on to their customers, with whom they have been doing business, but will cheerfully pay it, feeling that they are discharging a patriotic obligation which they owe to Canada and to the Empire. That, Sir, I have no doubt, represents the feeling amongst the banking institutions of this country.

I represent a constituency, important from an agricultural standpoint and important also from an industrial standpoint, and my constituents are intelligent people, who follow closely the discussion of public affairs, and I want to tell the Minister of Finance that I have not, up to the present, received a single complaint from them against the customs tariff as proposed in this war Budget.

I can compliment the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) on the manner in which he handled his subject in criticising the Budget, and I have found that the hon. gentlemen on his side of the House who have spoken since he did

have done him the compliment of largely following his argument. As I understand the position which the hon. gentleman and his party take with regard to this Budget, it is, that if the gentlemen who have been in charge of the affairs of this country during the past three years had been more careful in their expenditure, and had husbanded better the revenues of the country, there would have been no need for a war Budget. Well, the people of Canada know, the people of the world know, that as a consequence of this war the business and financial conditions of the world have been revolutionized, and that in every country, whether warring or neutral, it has been necessary to introduce unusual fiscal measures of the kind we are now discussing. In the neutral United States, which is far removed from the seat of conflict, shortly after the war broke out it became necessary to introduce special legislation to take care of the financial situation. Australia, New Zealand, every civilized country, has had to pass special legislation to meet the extraordinary conditions which have arisen. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) says: Had I been Minister of Finance during the past three years, and had I had surrounding me on the Treasury benches my chosen people, I would have so administered the financial affairs of Canada that it would not have been necessary to introduce any war Budget. I must admit that for the short time I have been in this House I have been very much impressed with the ability of the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. K. Maclean), but when he makes a contention of that kind, I feel I cannot pay equal tribute to his modesty. When the Liberal party in the Dominion advances such an argument, I am forced to think that the people of Canada will not be prepared to take them as seriously as they themselves.

Another point raised by the financial critic of the Liberal party was that these proposed changes in the tariff made the tariff so high that it became prohibitive, and that it would consequently restrict trade. I have no doubt that hon. gentlemen opposite are sincere when they say that this will be a high tariff, and perhaps they are sincere when they say it will restrict trade, but I certainly cannot agree with them in the conclusion they have arrived at in this respect. Let them look at the tariff which has been in force in the United States for the last twenty-five years, and let them average the duties of that tariff and then compare that average with the average duties in the war Budget now submitted by the Minister of Finance, and they will find that the average rate of duty in the United States has been considerably higher than the average rate in this proposed war Budget. And, Sir, I do not think it can be successfully contended that the tariff in the United States has not always supplied an abounding revenue for the needs of that country.

Particular stress has been laid by hon. gentlemen opposite on the changes proposed in the tariff with reference to the British preference. They say that under no circumstances would they touch the British preference, but I can tell them that if they occupied the Government benches to-day, and if they were to add that seven and a half per cent duty on raw materials and leave the British preference as it is, it would be a very serious thing indeed for Canadian industries. There are in my constituency a number of woollen mills, and they are owned by gentlemen, some of whom support the party opposite, but I want to tell those gentlemen on the other side of the House, that if they adopted such a policy as they propose they would adopt, it would not be very favourably received by that army of people who are engaged in our woollen industries. I submit further, Mr. Speaker, that in so far as the principle of the British preference is concerned, it remains unchanged by this Budget.

A great deal has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite about extravagant expenditure, and while I have no desire to weary the House by an array of figures, I would like to refer to four items of expenditure which this Government had to undertake during the last three years. During the short time the present Government have been in power they paid $56,000,000 towards the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, $10,000,000 for the Quebec bridge, $38,000,000 to the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, which they were obliged to pay under an interpretation of the Grand Trunk Pacific agreement, made by the Liberal Government, and $15,000,000 to prevent the Grand Trunk Pacific from being tied up in 1913. Here we have a total of $119,000,000 which had to be paid by this Government, and every dollar of which is a legacy from the Liberal Government and an obligation incurred by them which the present Government had to assume. I have no doubt that were I thoroughly to analyse the situation I would find other large sums of a like nature.

I would like for a moment to refer to a

matter brought up by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) in the part which he took in this debate the other night. The hon. member said that he would like to see a more equitable distribution of the taxes than the new customs tariff would give, and he advocated direct taxation. The Minister of Finance has introduced no new principles in his War Budget; he has simply extended the principles that have always underlain the customs tariff. Those same principles were in effect in the tariff that was in operation in this country between the years 1896 and 1911. In so far as my knowledge goes, I have never heard that the hon. member for Edmonton tried to induce the party with which he is identified to change from a customs tariff to a system of direct taxation.

The hon. member for Edmonton also said that the duties on lumber, cement and many other articles, to which I need not refer, affected the prairie provinces. It has been my privilege to visit the provinces of the West; and if I were to be asked what is the chief characteristics of the people of the West, my answer might well be that one of their chief characteristics is their deep-rooted loyalty to Canada and to the Empire. When the hon. member for Edmonton says that the people of the West will be affected by these taxes, if I know the spirit of the people of the West, I say that they want to be affected by these taxes, because they realize that when they are so affected, they are paying a patriotic debt which they owe to Canada and to the Empire.

Reference has also been made by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to the made-in-Canada campaign, and hon. gentlemen opposite have been inclined to hold it up to ridicule. I do not think that hon. gentlemen opposite properly appreciate the significance of this made-in-Canada campaign. What does it mean? Made in Canada means employment to Canadian industry. When our industries are busy and when our people are well employed, the Minister of Finance of to-day or the minister of to-morrow, whoever he may be, need not worry about the revenues of this country.

The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), not in this debate but on another occasion—and I followed his remarks with a great deal of interest—also paid his compliments to this made-in-Canada idea. His statement was that he was sorry to see this Government give its approval to it; that it savoured to him too much of the idea of "made in Germany," and that in so far as he was concerned, he was too good a Britisher to have anything to do with it. My prejudices against Germany do not carry me as far as that. The Canadian people have a great deal to learn from the German people. It will be a great thing for this country when our people have the same efficiency in all the walks of life that Germany has been able to instil into her people. We have also very much to learn from Germany in matters of education as applied to industry and also to agriculture. Canada cannot do better than take as an example what has been accomplished during the last forty years by the German empire. The development and growth of Germany can to a very large extent be attributed to the great assistance which she has received in the convenient open market which she has had, the free trade market of Great Britain. As a result of that great trade with Great Britain, the greatest market in the world, Germany has developed until she has become one of the greatest and most powerful nations in the world.

The point I would like to make is this, that what the German empire has done the Dominion of Canada in the future ought to be able to do. Compare for a moment the opportunities of the two countries. We have room here for sixteen German empires. German soil is not as rich as our own. The Germans have not the great wealth of forests such as we possess; they have not the great lakes for inland shipping; they have not sea coasts such as we possess; and yet we see what has been accomplished by Germany. As a result of this war, new trade routes will be built up; new business connections in the old land will be developed in a way never before known; but the empire to which we belong, whatever changes there may be, will come out of this struggle with a greater standing in the world and a greater influence for good amongst the nations than she has ever before possessed. With those changed conditions, a splendid field of opportunity is offered not only for colonial, but for British statesmen. If Great Britain, with the great trade which she will command in the future, is going to build up another giant, that giant should come from people of her own breed, it should spring from a people who ask no better future, for no nobler destiny than that they may be permitted to work

out their future as part of the British Empire.

So, it seems to me, the future promises a great opportunity for Canada, an opportunity to which our public men, our statesmen, should direct attention. Right Hon. David Lloyd George, Chancellor of the Exchequer, stated the other day that the cost of this war to Great Britain for the first year amounted to $2,500,000,000. An enormous debt will have to be assumed by the people of the Motherland. We know that a large part of the people of the Motherland have expressed themselves as being in favour of tariff reform and preferential trade. Now, my thought is this—that, as a result of the piling up of this debt and of the period of reconstruction which will follow, Great Britain will be compelled to adopt a customs tariff again; and when that time comes it should be the duty of not only Canadian but British statemen to see to it that there shall be secured for the products of Canada a preference in that market; and I know of nothing that will do more than such a preference to promote the welfare, the progress and the development of the Dominion.

I feel that I should not longer trespass on the patience of this House. I was told that when a new member rises for the first time in his place he is received in a very considerate way. That has been my own experience, and I must thank hon. members for the indulgent way in which they have received my efforts.

Mr. E. W. NESBITT (North Oxford): I congratulate the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Scott) on his maiden effort. I am sure we all must acknowledge that his speech in dignity and ability was all that we could expect. I join in his expressions of regret at the death of his predecessor, Mr. Clare. I am sure that we on this side regret that gentleman's death as much as do hon. gentlemen on the other side, for he was a very capable man, a man who had risen in the world by his own efforts, and who had proven himself a man in every respect.

I will not attempt to criticise my hon. friend's speech particularly, but I wish to offer one or two remarks upon it. He started out by telling us that if we would oppose the votes in the Estimates we should be doing our duty more than by criticising the Budget. When he has been longer a member of this House he will know that we do oppose many of the votes in the Estimates—and that is all the good it does. The hon. gentleman says that the banks are ready to pay the extra taxation laid upon them by the Budget. But these are public corporations and the individuals who control their operation do not pay a cent of this taxation out of their own pockets. Moreover, if that taxation becomes a burden on the banks they will simply charge it up to us poor devils who have to borrow money. That is human nature, of course; but it does not show loyalty or patriotism on the part of the banks. They are prepared to do their duty, no doubt; I am not saying anything against them; I shall have occasion to mention them later in my remarks.

The hon. gentleman says the whole business community is feeling the hard times brought on by the war. In his own town, as in many other towns in this Dominion, if it were not for the war—and I am sorry to give that as a reason; it is an unspeakable reason—the hard times would be a hundred per cent worse than they are to-day.

Mr. WILCOX: Don't you believe that.

Mr. NESBITT: I not only believe it, but know it; and in the constituency of my hon. friend who has just spoken I think they have contracts for shells out of which they make money. They do not make shells, woollens, and other goods for nothing, even for the Imperial Government. And so it is with many kinds of industries throughout this Dominion. Everybody knew these hard times were coming. The Minister of Finance warned us of them a year ago. I will go into that also later on. The hon. member for South Waterloo mentioned the woollen industries and said they could not stand the increased duty on the raw material unless the duty on the finished goods were also increased. I cannot agree with him. I know something about the woollen industry, in the same form as do the people in his own town—knitted goods—and I do not agree that the industry could not have stood an increase on the raw material. But we have been opposed to increased duties not only on the raw material but also on the finished article. The hon. junior member of Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) has told you distinctly that we were opposed to the increase of duties entirely.

The hon. member for South Waterloo tells us that Great Britain will be compelled to adopt a customs tariff when this war is over. As I do not have anything to do with the management of Great Britain's affairs, and as I find that the Cabinet in

that country are quite capable of managing their own affairs, I will not attempt to criticise their supposed future policy. I have no doubt that they will do what is best for the country at large.

When the Minister of Finance brought down his Budget about two weeks ago, I was not only surprised but much disappointed. He had shown such ability in handling the banking and financial situation in August, that I expected too great things of him, I suppose. I would like for a moment to examine the position in which we find ourselves. He tells us that the current expenditure for the year ending the 31st of this month will be $140,000,000; that the special and other expenses other than war will be $50,000,000, a total of $190,000,000. And he estimates a revenue for the year of $130,000,000. This means a gross deficit of $60,000,000 to be made up this year. The hon. gentleman goes on to say that we borrowed from Great Britain, not only the whole $50,000,000 of the war expenditure voted in August last, but $10,000,000 more, or $60,000,000 altogether. He proceeds to tell us that we issued for Dominion purposes Dominion notes to the amount of $10,000,000 in excess of the issue of $15,000,000 authorized last session. I think he told us the other night that he had really issued $26,000,000 in excess. He also said that we had borrowed over and above the $60,000,000, the sum of £3,000,000 on six months Treasury bills which fall due in June.

He borrowed also $6,500,000 on 1940-60 stock, and $5,000,000 from the Bank of Montreal. This $5,000,000, plus the $15,000,000 additional note issue, when added to the $60,000,000, makes $80,000,000 over and above the $6,500,000, or $86,500,000 that the hon. minister borrowed to carry on the finances of this country during 1914-15. We had in 1911-12, according to the Public Accounts, a surplus of $37,946,776. In 1912-13 the surplus was $56,630,366; in 1913-14, $35,789,921, a total for the three years of $130,367,063, and we borrowed $86,500,000 to carry us to the end of the fiscal year 1914-15. The people of this country are entitled to sympathy because of the fact that although during three prosperous years we had a surplus of $130,000,000, we had to borrow in 1914 $86,000,000 to pay our way. I sympathize with the people because of their having to bear that kind of burden. I would sympathize with the Finance Minister but for the fact that every time we on this side of the House suggest the curtailment of expenditure, we are greeted with jeers from the other side of the House, just as though we had no right to criticise expenditures; just as though there was no such thing in the financial history of this country as the curtailment of unnecessary expenditure. My hon. friend will have to pardon us for thinking that we are supposed to represent the people who send us here. The hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. J. E. Armstrong) this afternoon, and several hon. gentlemen on the other side, evidenced much indignation because we criticised what they are pleased to call war expenditures, but what we call current expenditures. Not a single dollar of the expenditure which is proposed to be raised by the increased taxation will be paid out as actual war expenditure. I should like to find the financier who would tell me, having regard to the Finance Minister's estimates for the coming year, how one dollar of this extra taxation will be paid even towards interest on the additional money that is to be borrowed. It is an absolutely impossible financial probability that any money will be left to be paid as interest on the increased loans after we pay our current expenditure as estimated for 1915-16.

I should like to read a short extract from the hon. Minister of Finance's Budget speech, as follows:

> As regards our borrowings from the Imperial Government, our arrangements are that we shall pay interest at the same rate as is paid by the Imperial Treasury upon its war loans, from the proceeds of which advances are to be made to us. At such time or times in the future as may be agreed upon between the British Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Canadian Minister of Finance, a Canadian war loan or loans will be issued and the borrowings from the Imperial Government repaid. It seems to me that no fairer terms could be named than those so generously accorded us by the Imperial authorities.

Great Britain is not only herself bearing the burden of this frightful war, but she is assisting her Allies, lending moneys to independent European countries and meeting the war expenses of all her dominions. And what are we doing? The Minister of Finance says that no fairer terms could be made; yet he immediately puts on an excess of tariff against the country that is struggling under that heavy burden. It is well known that Great Britain's exports during the last three or four months have fallen off to an enormous extent, and that she needs whatever assistance she can get from her dominions. If she ever needed it, she needs it now. We say that we send men to fight Britain's battles; are we sending men to fight her battles, or are we sending men to fight our own battles? I submit that when we make expenditures in

connection with the war and when we send men to the assistance of the Empire, we do so simply for our own selfish ends, for the simple reason that if anything should happen to Great Britain, where would we be? What would happen if we became a German colony to-morrow? We are sending our men, therefore, to fight our own battles, and we are charging Great Britain, upon any exports she may send to us, an additional five per cent in order to show our gratitude for what she is doing for us.

To hon. gentlemen who doubt our loyalty because we are criticising this Budget, let me say that we are prepared to vote the $100,000,000, as we voted the $50,000,000; all we ask is that it be properly expended. I think that the man who overcharges either the Canadian Government or the Imperial Government in the sale of war supplies deserves not merely to receive no further orders, but to be criminally prosecuted. The people of this country are making great efforts not only to pay the amount required for war expenditure, but also to contribute generously to the patriotic funds that have been instituted throughout the length and breadth of this land. There is probably not a woman in the land who has not been knitting something to send to the soldiers at the front; probably not a man in the land who has not sacrificed something during the last few months in order to assist the soldiers at the front. I say again that the man who purposely defrauds either Government in furnishing supplies ought to be criminally prosecuted, no matter who he may be. All we ask the Government is that they take every precaution not only to prevent fraud in this respect, but to assist the Motherland in every possible way to buy what she has to buy in this country at the lowest possible prices.

In 1915-16, after we have borrowed $86,500,000 to pay our expenses up to the end of this month, we have to borrow $204,000,000, including the war grant of $100,000,000. Outside of current expenditure we have to borrow during the fiscal year 1915-16, $104,000,000. Where in the name of common sense are we going to get it? The Finance Minister himself says that the channels—British channels—through which this money formerly came are now closed, and that they will be closed to the industries of this country, to municipal corporations, and to the provinces. But we have to get from some source $104,000,000 over and above the war loan of $100,000,000 and over and above the current revenue, which is estimated at $120,000,000, including excess taxes.

This is the position in which we now find ourselves. Now, what have we got to face it with? We propose to impose certain new taxes. The Finance Minister has put a charge of one per cent on bank issues and a charge of one per cent on the gross earnings of loan companies and insurance companies. The insurance companies are, after all, the fire insurance companies to a very great extent. Life and marine companies are exempt and the other companies are to pay one per cent on their gross revenue. The great fire insurance companies of this country, I have no doubt, will be perfectly willing to pay their share of this tax, as the banks are and as all of us will have to be; but at the same time is it not absolutely unfair that these companies, both the great English fire insurance companies and Canadian companies throughout the length and breadth of this land, will have to pay this one per cent while all the unlicensed companies that do business in this country and the underground companies will get off scott free. We force the Canadian and British companies to take out a license. They are of great benefit to the country because they pay enormous taxes on their realty and they are great lenders on gilt-edged securities, as their funds must be accessible at all times. We force these companies to pay one per cent and let the underground companies go scott free. The underground companies did a business in Canada last year of $250,000,000 insurance. The gross premum on that, I would think, would be something between $150,000 and $200,000. The great Canadian and British companies carry the ordinary business of the people of this country. The business that is done by the underground and mutual companies is largely the business of large corporations who can afford to put their premises in such a condition that they will be insured by these mutual and underground companies. My hon. friend will say that as they pay no licenses we have no right to tax them; but under clause 139 of the Insurance Act we take power to make them report to the Government, and if we have no right to tax them as they are we should make them pay a license in order to do business in this country, so that we can tax them and not be unfair to those who are doing business in a proper way.

I now come to the tariff. I may tell my hon. friend the Finance Minister that the tariff, so far as I know, will not be a reve-

nue producing tariff. I shall not suggest that the tariff is being enacted for the purpose of assisting, as some of my friends say, the large corporations or the manufacturers. I shall not suggest anything of that kind, but I am going to say that as far as I know business the tariff will not be a revenue producing tariff. I believe there would have been a greater revenue from the tariff as it was before than will be derived from the tariff as it is now, for the simple reason that on a great many articles the tariff is absolutely prohibitive. You take the one article of woollens. The Finance Minister said that he relieved the people who could not afford to bear the burden to a great extent. There is nobody who can afford it or who cannot afford but is forced to wear woollens in some manner or form. Practically all the clothes we wear in the winter are woollen or should be, and are to the extent of our power to insure their being woollen, so that every man, poor or rich, is taxed on this article. The tariff on woollens is raised from 35 per cent to 42½ per cent. Heaven knows that the man who cannot do business with a protection of 35 per cent should go out of business, there is no doubt about that. The tariff on cotton is also increased to a ridiculous extent, and so it is on such things as flannel and worsted and all manner of wearing apparel, which all the people of this country must get, for even if they wanted to go naked they could not because it is too cold most of the time. There is the difference between a revenue tariff and a protective tariff: My hon. friends on the other side of the House have always twitted us on this side that when we were in power we always kept up the duty; but I want to say that the inclination during all the time that the Liberal party were in power, led by my right hon. friend and leader, the inclination was downwards and the inclination to place more things on the free list was always there. We were increasing the free list every time. I counted the other night the articles in the old tariff that were on the free list and found there were 232. But in the tariff now brought down there are only about 100 articles on the free list that were on before. That is where we are going to feel the burden to a large extent. Let me mention one other article of interest to the farmer, of whom we are all talking more or less. He will have to pay 7½ per cent duty on number 9 and number 12 wire, or the wires that were free before, out of which fence is manufactured. There is hardly a farmer in Canada, either west or east, who does not have to buy wire fencing. There is not a farmer in Canada but will have to buy wire fencing because the old fences have largely gone to pieces. The Minister of Finance is charging the farmer in that one item about $175,000, if you take last year's importation as a basis. The farmer will be caused some regret if you raise the price of his fence somewhere in the neighbourhood of $3 per ton. My hon. friend might say that the farmer can buy his wire here. There is not the slightest fear but what the one or two industries that do draw wire in this country will raise the price of their wire to the utmost that they will be allowed to by the duty that is now imposed. There is no possible doubt about that, because they have been supplying very little of the wire used in Canada. I am not taking into account the wire used in the telegraph and telephone industries, and similar businesses. The wire to farmers alone will cost in the neighbourhood of from $175,000 to $200,000 if they use as much in the coming year as they did in 1914. And that brings me to what my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax has said we should do with the tariff this year. Hon. members on the other side of the House are inclined to laugh at our suggestion that the expenditure be curtailed. The first item I am going to speak about is the expenditure on the Hudson Bay railway. I know that my hon. friends on this side of the House promised to build that railway, but I have come to the conclusion, or almost come to the conclusion, that political parties are justified in certain instances in not keeping promises which they should never have made. My hon. friends on this side of the House have this virtue, that while they promised to start the Hudson Bay railway, they never did. They sent out surveyors and got reports on the route which, however, were not encouraging enough to induce them to start building.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE: Did they not let the first contract?

Mr. NESBITT: Not that I know of. At any rate they did not build any of the road. The Government are asking this year for a vote of $5,500,000 for the Hudson Bay railway. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) the other evening said that that could be cut down to $1,000,000 without hurting anybody. I say it could be

absolutely wiped out, and that if the Government of the day would pull up the rails and sell them to somebody else for whatever they would bring, they would earn the lasting gratitude of the people of this country. In my judgment the Hudson Bay railway has no more chance of earning money than Stefansson would have if he built a railway upon one of those islands where he is lost. They do say that there are some fish in Hudson bay. That could easily be proved, and if there are any fish there and we wished to sell them, the best possible way and the only reasonable way would be to extend the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario railway to some point on James bay, and the fish could then be brought out to the Transcontinental and transferred east and west to the great cities that would consume it. The reports that I have read of the country between Le Pas and Port Nelson show that there is certainly nothing else to bring out from that country unless they bring out the frozen ground once a year or so. We could make a saving of $5,500,000 on that item alone. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) has mentioned public buildings in Ontario.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: What is the hon. gentleman's view as to stopping the work on the Welland canal?

Mr. NESBITT: I would not stop the work, but you could easily reduce the expenditure on the canal this year, as you could all necessary expenditures.

Mr. BENNETT: I think the contracts are all let, with one exception. Which one would you stop?

Mr. NESBITT: My hon. friend knows that there is a vast difference between pushing on a work and letting it progress at a reasonable rate. My hon. friend knows it is not necessary to stop the contracts. A great many men were sent out of this country last fall. Somebody said just now, 100,000, but I believe it is nearer 50,000; at any rate most of the soldiers were working men, and their absence makes a great difference in the number of working men in this country. My hon. friend knows that the Government could ease up on the expenditure both at St. John and on the Welland canal, and on any other proper public works in this country, and thereby save several million dollars without doing anybody any harm. Now as to public buildings in Ontario. I see in the Estimates that $3,905,100 is required for this purpose. My hon. friend the other night said he would cut off $1,500,000 of that. I would cut off $3,000,000, and not a particle of harm would be done to anybody. There are a number of buildings here that are absolutely unnecessary to the towns that are supposed to require them. What would any business man do in our position? What could he do but curtail his expenditure and cut his coat according to his cloth, as the old saying is? Why, then, should not the Government do that? Why should we not, as representing the people of this country, do what the people want? Take the Barrie drill hall, for instance. There is no more need of a drill hall at Barrie at the present time than there is of one in Palestine. Nor does Berlin need another public building to accommodate the public. There is the Brantford drill hall. Good gracious, are we never to be done with Brantford? Within the last two years $275,000 was spent on a public building there, and now they want a drill hall at a cost of $75,000. We all know that drill halls are absolutely unnecessary this year, for practically no drills will take place. The Militia Department has cut out its annual vote for drilling, and quite properly, because the men who are going to the front are drilling together in different sections all over the country. We have found out that it is not drilling up and down a drill hall that makes a soldier. A soldier should be drilled out in the open weather and given some exercise. Even I myself find it necessary to go out after six o'clock for a walk of two or three miles, in order to keep myself alive after sitting here all day. Soldiers would be better if not drilled in drill halls. Some hon. gentlemen say that these drill halls are also used for Fat Stock shows. Well, let them hold the Fat Stock show in somebody's barn this year. It will not hurt them any. Collingwood also wants a public building at a cost of $35,000, and here is a drill hall for Galt at $45,000. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman who has just spoken would be glad to get that building in Galt, but the little bit of money that is spent in these towns does not do the general country any good. It does not do the good that would be done if the money was kept in the treasury or went to pay our debts, and it is the general good of the country that we are supposed to look after, not some individual who may get a few votes by our spending money in his constituency.

10 p.m.

Mr. FISHER: There is an appropriation for a building at Burford, I believe. What does my hon. friend think of that?

Mr. NESBITT: Yes, $25,000. I think it is a ridiculous expense.

Mr. FISHER: The village of Burford is in the constituency I represent, or that I endeavour to represent.

Mr. NESBITT: You represent it well. That is all right.

Mr. FISHER: Is my hon. friend aware that the villages of Drumbo and Princeton in the constituency that he represents, neither one of which is as large or important or progressive as Burford, are asking for public buildings?

Mr. NESBITT: I am aware of the fact that last year the village of Princeton, after seeing the example set by the village of Burford, came down here and asked for a public building. I am also aware of the fact that they asked for a building to cost only $5,000. I am also aware of the fact that there is a vote here of $25,000 for a building in Burford.

I am also aware that the revenue from the village of Plattsville is greater than the revenue from the village of Burford, I am also aware that the revenue from the village of Drumbo is greater than the revenue from Burford, I am also aware that the village of Plattsville is a much better village than the village of Burford, and I am aware of the fact that these villages were satisfied with the expenditure of $5,000. I am further aware, that if you put a building worth five or six thousand dollars in the village of Burford, it would be a palace alongside the rest of the buildings there.

Mr. FISHER: Is the hon. gentleman aware that the village of Drumbo also asked for a public building?

Mr. NESBITT: I told you I did.

Mr. FISHER: You are then aware that both places have asked for a public building?

Mr. NESBITT: Yes.

Mr. FISHER: Are you aware they have asked the member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) and myself to intercede for them?

Mr. NESBITT: I am not aware of that; they did not show good taste there.

[Mr. Nesbitt.]

Mr. FISHER: Does the hon. gentleman know that the village of Princeton revised its estimate as to what kind of a public building it wanted and that it now thinks it should have one costing $15,000?

Mr. NESBITT: I did not know that.

Mr. FISHER: Well, that is the fact. Let me put this last question to my hon. friend —is he in favour or is he opposed to public buildings for the villages of Princeton and Drumbo?

Mr. NESBITT: Ever since I have had a seat in this House I have expressed myself in favour of the principle of erecting public buildings for the purpose of collecting revenue in towns and cities throughout the country, in proportion to the revenues collected in these various places. I am stating to-night that I am opposed to these buildings being erected this year when the revenue is short, and I am stating to-night that if you want to build a house, Mr. Representative for Brant, and you have not the money and cannot borrow it, you cannot build the house, and the Government should be guided by the same principle identically. I repeat that I am absolutely in favour of erecting public buildings for the purpose of collecting revenue, in proportion to the revenue collected in each place, but I am not in favour of erecting a $25,000 building and putting a caretaker into it in a village like Burford, where the revenue is about $1,200 a year, and in view of the fact that the revenue is being collected now for an expenditure of probably three or four hundred dollars a year. I have not looked up the post office returns to-night to see what the revenue or expenditure in Burford is, but it is in the neighbourhood of the figures I have given. The expenditure on public buildings in the province of Ontario could be cut down, at the lowest calculation, $3,000,000 this year, without hurting anybody. We should wait for another year to see how the revenue will be then. I do not know anything about the province of Quebec in that respect, but I have not the slightest doubt that the expenditure for public buildings in all the other provinces could be proportionately cut down. Then take the Trent Valley canal, for which there is a vote of one million or one million and a half dollars this year, and I am quite sure that those people who go-out on picnic parties on the Trent Valley canal could, for the year to come, do so by motor, or rig, or walk. All they do on that canal is to hold picnic parties up and down, and therefore that

million and a half dollars to be expended there could be saved for this year.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Does the hon. member know what the depth of the Trent Valley canal is, and the size of the locks?

Mr. NESBITT: The depth on the sills is seven feet, I think.

Mr. BENNETT: It is eight feet two inches.

Mr. NESBITT: Leave out the two inches; I think on most of it you will get nearer to seven feet than eight feet.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: It is deep enough to cost a lot of money.

Mr. NESBITT: Yes, it is deep enough to pour a lot of money into it. There is no transportation waiting on the expenditure there and nothing would be hurt by waiting and saving that million and a half dollars for the coming year. Then as to the French river; I asked the Minister of Public Works last year what he is going to do about the French river, and he said he did not know, and I do not believe he knows yet, but everybody knows that to put a canal on the French river would be an absolute waste of money. I suppose there are a lot of people in this country who still in their imagination, fortified imagination I would call it, think we would be justified in going on with the expenditure on the Georgian Bay Canal. I am glad to say these people are scarce, because it would be a wilder and more foolish expenditure that the expenditure on the Hudson Bay Railway.

Mr. GERALD V. WHITE: What stand does the right hon. leader of my hon. friend take on that?

Mr. NESBITT: It does not make any difference to me what stand my leader takes on it; I am telling you what I think about it, and I am only speaking for myself. There was only one possible object in building the Hudson Bay railway and that was to cheapen transportation for the grain of the West, but how are you going to cheapen transportation when you have to haul that grain there and build elevators and store it from one year to the other. Any one who buys grain knows that when you have to carry it over for a year and pay interest charges you cannot get any benefit from cheaper transportation for the grain. Then, when you have got the grain at Hudson Bay you have to have a line of steamers to take it out and there is not a man living who would invest a dollar in a line of steamers which would work for three months of the year and lie idle for the other nine months. That is the plain fact about the Hudson Bay railway, and the Georgian Bay Canal would be a thousand times worse if that could be possible.

Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about throwing men out of work. There is no necessity to throw men out of work. These great enterprises, such as the Welland Canal, the Quebec Bridge, the improvements at St. John, N.B., can be gone on with in a reasonable way, and they will afford employment. The railways will have to make improvements and they will at least have to attend to the upkeep of their roads, and there is no fear of men being thrown out of work. When spring comes there will be lots of work for every one to do. We are now preaching from end to end of the land patriotism and production, while at the same time we are at every turn, by this new tariff, making the necessaries of life dearer for the men who have to produce, and we are making it harder every day for the farmer to get a fair profit from the results of his toil.

Many people believe that the farmers are making fortunes. There is not a cent of profit in farming at the present day unless a farmer has grain to sell, and there are not many farmers in Ontario that I know of that have any grain to sell. The men who have grain to sell are making a great deal of money, but the men who are raising cattle and hogs at the present price of grain are not making any money.

Not only does this new tariff not help the people of the country to produce more, but it retards the production of the country in every way. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance could wipe out $30,000,000 of the expenditure of this country without the slightest difficulty and let the estimated revenue of next year meet the expenditure for that period. I hope that he will see his way to do so. I have great faith in my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, and I hope that he will not be influenced by his colleagues and by those who say, "dash away and spend the money," to go on with such a wild-goose proposition as this tariff and the expenditure that he proposes by this year's Estimates.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver): I understand that the motion under which this debate is being conducted is for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means, and that it is usual on an occasion of this kind to consider the problem of the ways and means of the country. I have

followed the debate up to the present time with a considerable degree of attention and with a hope that we might hear from some of the members of the Opposition, whose right and proper duty it is to offer fair criticism, some constructive criticism, something in the nature of a suggestion to help the Government to meet the most critical financial period with which the country has probably ever been faced in its history; but up to the present moment I have failed to catch any constructive suggestion from hon. gentlemen opposite.

I desire to say a few words in reply to some of the arguments presented by my hon. friend the member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt). He seems to have based his arguments on this one proposition, namely, that the expenditures of the country for the forthcoming year should be reduced so as to meet the estimated revenue for that period. In fact, that seems to be the main argument adduced by hon. members opposite. It was rather interesting to observe the efforts of my hon. friend in wiggling his way through the Ontario Estimates. I was expecting him to criticise them at somewhat greater length; but the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Fisher), I think, rather upset him with some of the queries that he advanced.

The hon. member for North Oxford said that we should have cut off the further construction of the Hudson Bay railway at this time. Does he not remember that, when the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was Prime Minister of this country, and when he and his colleagues sat on this side of the House supporting him, they, in season and out of season, advocated the construction of the Hudson Bay railway? I was not a member of the House then; but I understand that my hon. friend supported and voted for that project.

Mr. NESBITT: I did not.

Mr. STEVENS: Did my hon. friend vote against it?

Mr. NESBITT: I never voted for it. I never heard it brought up.

Mr. STEVENS: That is very good indeed. The hon. member certainly supported the right hon. the leader of the Opposition when he was Prime Minister of this country, and in western Canada advanced the construction of the Hudson Bay railway as one of his main policies.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE: And they won their elections on it.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. STEVENS: Moreover, on no occasion in the history of this House did my hon. friend raise his voice against this project. I challenge any hon. gentleman opposite to produce a single vote from that party against that project while they were in power. The Government of the day, composed of hon. gentlemen opposite, entered into a contract for the construction of that railway, and the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) himself signed the contract.

Mr. GRAHAM: The then Solicitor General says that I did not do so.

Mr. STEVENS: What does my hon. friend say?

Mr. GRAHAM: I take his word.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the hon. gentleman deny that he signed the contract?

Mr. PARDEE: Whom would you rather believe?

Mr. STEVENS: I am bound to believe the hon. gentleman's statement. In any case, this fact cannot be gainsaid, that our hon. friends opposite supported and advocated the project. They signed the first contract and entered into contracts for the construction of that railway. The construction has been carried out by this Government to the satisfaction of the people of the West, and I believe the railway will prove a very satisfactory project. The question of the construction of railways, of the opening up of the vast territory of the West, has always been a question of great difficulty and danger. You, Mr. Speaker, and the older members of the House who have had the honour of sitting here for many years, will remember that when the Canadian Pacific railway was constructed it was prophesied by certain learned gentlemen in this House and out of it that it would be an absolute failure. Within thirty years the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has grown to be one of the largest and most reputable corporations in the known world. As the Canadian Pacific railway has more than vindicated the confidence placed in it by the Canadian people at that time, and as nearly every other project of a similar character constructed in western Canada has proved itseslf to be a successful venture, it is reasonable for the people of Canada to believe that a railway to that inland sea of Hudson Bay will also be a success. At least we who live in western Canada have faith in the great West, and we believe that the railway will be a success. Let me call

my hon. friend's attention to certain resources. He speaks of moving carloads of frozen earth. It has been demonstrated, as far as it has been possible to investigate, that the Hudson Bay is a veritable storehouse of fish which will supply the food markets of Canada and of the world, because it must be remembered that to-day we are shipping from Prince Rupert clear to the old land frozen fresh fish, and the Hudson Bay is a very much nearer shipping place than is the western coast. Therefore in fish alone there are vast possibilities in that section of the country. We have also vast areas of pulp timber in that district, which commodity is rapidly becoming of more and more value in the Dominion and is supporting one of our most valuable industries, and for which the market is increasing day by day. Therefore, when hon. gentlemen suggest that the project should be cut off, that it is wasteful expenditure, that it is extravagantly unjustifiable on the part of the Government, they should at least be thoroughly seized of the facts of the case before they make such suggestions.

My hon. friend also suggested that certain portions of the Welland canal could be stopped. I am not familiar with the details of the Welland canal other than this, that I know that a number of contracts have been entered into. The Government say--I shall be glad to be corrected if I am wrong —that no further contract shall be entered into in the immediate future, but that the present contracts shall be carried out.

Mr. NESBITT: I rise to correct the hon. gentleman. He says that I said that work on the Welland canal should be stopped. I distinctly stated that it should not be stopped.

Mr. STEVENS: I said that the hon. gentleman suggested that the work on the Welland canal should be greatly curtailed.

Mr. NESBITT: The hon. gentleman said I said it should be stopped.

Mr. STEVENS: I did not intend to say that. As I understand it, the Government is simply carrying out present contracts, some of which are fairly well advanced. Every one knows that you cannot stop a contractor after he has assembled a plant worth perhaps half a million dollars. Nor can you tell him in the middle of his work that he must go easy. The only way in which he can make money is to do the largest amount possible; the more he works his plant to capacity the more money he will make. I do not think it would be wise to restrain the efforts of these contractors. More than that, I am opposed to the cessation of public works in Canada at this time. There are thousands of unemployed to-day in all sections of Canada, the condition being attributable directly, in my opinion, to the great war in which we are engaged. And for the Government to close down the public works and throw thousands more out of employment, would be, in my estimation, nothing short of a public crime. My hon. friend mentions certain public buildings, and I was curious to note that he quoted public buildings in Barrie, Berlin and Brantford, which he said were unnecessary, but he had nothing to say about such works as the drill-halls in Guelph and Peterborough, costing about $250,000, which he voted for last year. But in the case of these constituencies represented by hon. gentleman on this side of the House, he certainly would like to see the work cut down.

Mr. NESBITT: I must again correct my hon. friend. I certainly never voted for an expenditure in Peterborough or Guelph such as he speaks about. I opposed such expenditures last year as I do this year. I did not enumerate all the places, but I opposed such expenditures generally.

Mr. STEVENS: These buildings were put up by the late Government, and the hon. gentleman, so far as I am able to learn, did not once raise his voice in opposition to them. Now, a word as to the construction of drill halls which my hon. friend ridicules, and says that we are not using them and that men cannot be drilled in a hall. In every large city in Canada to-day, and in my own city particularly, we have to rent building after building to accommodate the contingents that we are raising. We have no drill hall except a very old one, in Vancouver, yet we need accommodation for the training of the men of these contingents, and so we are forced to rent buildings. If we had more drill halls in Canada where we could assemble the troops we are raising in all parts of the country and where we could give them the preliminary training and drill and then give them the mass drill in the cities where they are assembled, we should be better off.

The hon. gentleman took exception to the Trent Valley canal. That is a work that has been under way for a great many years and it is one that the people of Canada demand shall be completed and put into suc-

cessful operation at the earliest possible date. Parts of it are being operated now and, I am informed, with very great advantage to the country through which it passes. So with the Georgian Bay canal. Personally, I have never been very enthusiastic about that work, but I look upon it as a matter very largely affecting the people in the eastern part of Canada. The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) would not object to that work going on. I think he would not say "Hear, hear!" to what his friend from North Oxford said. The hon. member for North Oxford said a moment ago unchallenged that he did not care for his leader or anybody else, that he was speaking for himself. It is a happy condition with these hon. gentlemen in the Opposition that they have the privilege of speaking for themselves without involving their party in the argument.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is one of the beauties of being in opposition.

Mr. STEVENS: It reminds me that possibly a great deal of the argument advanced within the last few days by hon. gentlemen is not—I was going to say is not quite sincere, but that would not be parliamentary; but what I mean to say is that many of the arguments on the question of expenditure are put possibly with the hope that the Government may be foolish enough to accept the advice and so injure themselves politically throughout the country. This Government could not possibly indulge in a more foolish act, in my estimation, than to curtail the expenditure on public works at this crisis in the history of the country. Now we have had very considerable criticism of the expenditures, and I shall ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments while we examine some of these expenditures. Because one of the things I have particularly remarked in this debate is that those hon. gentlemen who have criticised the Government fail, as my friend Mr. Joseph Martin puts it, to get down to brass tacks. While they offer criticisms, they do not show how improvement could be made. With regard to the increased expenditure we have certain items to which I wish to refer. First there is $8,730,000 in sinking fund. It is utterly impossible for us to avoid the inclusion of that sum in our Estimates. I am possibly mistaken in what I thought I heard an hon. gentleman on the other side say this afternoon. But as I understood him he said that his view was that this sum should have been included in the sum we borrowed from the Mother Country to carry on the war. What are the facts? The Minister of Finance has made an arrangement with the Imperial Government whereby all the moneys necessary for carrying on the war—that is war expenses and only war expenses—will be advanced on the general War Budget of the Old Land. That is an arrangement for which the Finance Minister deserves a great deal of credit. It would be absurd for us to seek to include in those borrowings the interest covering the same. We get the money on most reasonable terms—the same rate that the Imperial Government will pay, which are the best rates in the world. And surely that is a sufficient concession. It has been argued that this is not a War Budget but that it is presented as a War Budget merely to cover up the failure of the Government to administer the affairs of the country aright. I wish to discuss for a moment the facts of the war with a view to showing hon. gentlemen opposite—though they do not need it; they know it already—that the conditions now pertaining are produced directly by the war, if not by this war, then by the war of 1912. For we all remember that when the Balkan war broke out, and while it was raging, it was daily expected that the great powers of Europe would be dragged into the conflict in which we are to-day. The money interests of the world commenced hoarding funds against the possible outbreak for a period of two years. And it is well they did so, well both for this country and for the Motherland. For I believe that if it had not been for the wisdom of Lloyd George, the great Finance Minister of the Old Land, Mr. Winston Churchill and others we should not have been in the happy position in which we are to-day, immune from attack by foreign countries.

In my city we have two lines of steamships, one of which is operated by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Five steamships of this service, the Empress of Asia, the Empress of Russia—which are larger than any steamships running into Montreal—the Empress of China, the Empress of Japan and the Monteagle, were taken by the Admiralty at the outbreak of the war and, with the exception of the Monteagle, which has been returned, are being used by them to-day. What effect did this have upon trade? It had this effect: we could not get bottoms in Vancouver for the export of goods, and the consequence was that export trade on the western coast was absolutely paralysed. Steamships not only of the Canadian Pacific railway lines but of

the Blue Funnel lines, the Harrison lines, the Holt and other lines, were taken over by the Admiralty, and the tonnage on the Pacific coast at Vancouver, at San Francisco, Portland, and other ports, became so scarce that freight rates were doubled. To-day, therefore, we are precluded from export trade on the Pacific coast because of the lack of bottoms in which to carry our goods. Millions upon millions of dollars' worth of lumber trade which is offering to our lumber men cannot be accepted because there is no way of transporting the goods. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite coolly stand up in their places in this House and, seemingly indifferent to their responsibilities as representatives of the people, say that the war is not the cause of the present disrupted conditions of trade and commerce in Canada.

Again, what effect has the absolute cutting off of all borrowings had upon our trade and commerce? First, the Federal Government could borrow no more money, except for the purposes which I have mentioned; secondly, all provincial borrowings were shut off, with the result that many public works were stopped. Municipal borrowings were suddenly cut off, and in my province—and, I believe, in other provinces as well—the provincial government was forced to come to the assistance of many municipalities in order that they might be enabled to carry out ordinary works throughout the coming year. Lastly, industrial borrowings were cut off and the activities of the various industries of the country were curtailed. This was directly attributable to the outbreak of this war in Europe.

The shutting off of borrowings directly affected the steel industry, because the carrying on of industrial and municipal works for which large amounts of money were borrowed involved the use of a considerable amount of steel. The steel industry was so seriously affected that factories at Hamilton and on the Atlantic coast were shut down, or almost shut down. The practical cessation of building operations throughout the whole of Canada is directly attributable to the outbreak of war. Large financial concerns which formerly received money from the old land were unable to secure any further amounts; loans could not be advanced on mortgages, buildings could not be erected; practically every industry was affected. I think every hon. gentleman opposite must admit that practically the whole of the stagnation in trade which now prevails throughout Canada is directly attributable to the war.

Let us examine some of the items which have been criticised by hon. gentlemen opposite. What is the increase in respect of civil government? $174,000, which consists of statutory increases authorized by legislation passed by the very hon. gentlemen who now criticise this item. What would they have us do? Because the revenue of a post office falls considerably during the year, would they have us close the office and discharge the employees? The same applies to customs ports of entry. There has been an increase in the Post Office Estimates of $1,720,000. How is that increase being spent? Railway service, $405,000. That amount is devoted to parcel post. Up to the present time we have not been able to receive the full benefit which is to be derived from the operation of the parcel post system, but would hon. gentlemen opposite suggest that this newly-organized branch of the postal service be dispensed with? Rural deliveries, an increase of $350,000. In 1912-13 600 new rural routes were established; in 1913-14, 940; to-day there are 2,857 routes. The establishment of these rural mail delivery routes is but the carrying out of the avowed policy of this Government during and prior to the last election. Hon. gentlemen opposite have stated that we are not carrying out our promises to the electors; here is a case in which the Government is faithfully carrying out one of its solemn pledges to the rural districts of Canada, yet hon. gentlemen opposite criticise the expenditure necessary to make good the word of the Government in that respect. In 1913-14 48,000 additional rural mail delivery boxes were established in the towns, villages and cities throughout the Dominion. These are a great convenience to the farmers of the country and to those living in the outlying districts.

Mr. GRAHAM: Do the farmers not pay for their own boxes?

Mr. STEVENS: I presume they do.

Mr. GRAHAM: Then the Post Office Department obtains a revenue from that source; there is no expenditure.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend knows that a postal service cannot be expanded without very considerable cost to the community. He knows, too, that the postal service of this or any other country is not looked upon as a means for obtaining revenue; it is looked upon as a means of

communication and a system of enabling the rural districts to keep in touch with the affairs of the world.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think my hon. friend misunderstood me. He was quoting as an item of expense the number of rural mail delivery boxes that have been purchased by the Government. I was trying to point out that the farmers paid for these boxes; consequently there was no expenditure on the part of the Government.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend misunderstands me; I am afraid I have not the faculty of making myself clear. We expended in the expansion of this postal service $1,721,000. I was trying to give to the House some evidence of the fact that the Government has done some real work in this connection. I will repeat my statement; the Government established in 1913, 600 new rural mail routes and in 1913-14, 940. They had in 1912-13, 23,000 rural mail delivery boxes; last year this number was increased to 48,000. The cost of the boxes was borne by those who obtained them, but the cost of the service was borne by the Government. I mention this to show that the Government has done its utmost to give the people of Canada an up-to-date postal service, and I think they have succeeded in doing so.

The Estimates for the Mounted Police have been increased by $509,000. Do hon. gentlemen opposite object to that? No body of men in any country in the world are more worthy of admiration and of the support of the people than the Mounted Police of Canada. The staff of this splendid body of men has been increased for the purpose of keeping track of subjects of the enemy who may be leaving or passing through or coming into the western country. Pensions are increased by $139,000, the statutory increase.

Then, we have subsidies to provinces, another statutory increase which must be given, for which the Government, the Minister of Finance is not responsible. It amounts to $192,000. In agriculture, there is an important increase. Our hon. friends say that this Government neglects the farmer. How is this being spent? One important item of expenditure is testing seed. One great cause of failure and weakness among the farming communities of Canada has been carelessness in the selection of seed; we all know that. During the recent years the present Government, under the able administration of the Minister of Agriculture, has been trying to assist the farmer in the selection of his seed and has been testing it for him and helping him in every way. There have been increased expenditures in connection with the live-stock industry, and to enforce the Meats and Canned Foods Act. I have myself been impressing on the Government the necessity of increased vigilance in the inspection of canned fruits, meats, etc., and there have been great steps forward in this respect. There is also the Pest Act and the Fruit Branch. These are the items on which the money is being expended, and the increase is in each case thoroughly justifiable. The Government cannot carry out these works and keep their pledges unless they have some reasonable aid from the country in the matter of their finances.

As the hour is late, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Hon. W. T. White, the House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

Wednesday, March 3, 1915.

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

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

MR. H. P. DUCHEMIN.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. With reference to the charge brought to the notice of the Government by the member for North Cape Breton on June 10, 1914, as reported on page 5238 of Hansard, that one H. P. Duchemin, of Sydney, N.S., a commissioner appointed to investigate charges against, partisan officials, had embezzled over $75 of the public funds in connection with one item of his account, by charging six days remuneration and expenses for less than one day's work, has the Government investigated this charge?

2. If not, will the Government investigate this charge?

3. Has the said Duchemin been asked for an explanation?

4. What is the total amount paid by the Government to the said H. P. Duchemin for all services in connection with partisan investigations, including outlay since the date of appointment?

5. Is the said Duchemin still in the employ of the Government?

6. Is it the intention of the Government to take steps to recover from the said H. P. Duchemin the money so obtained by him?

Mr. CODERRE:

1, 2, 3, 5 and 6. For the Departments of the Interior, Marine and Fisheries, Militia and Defence, Post Office, Public Works, Railways and Canals and Agriculture, no information.

For the Customs Department, the answer is: The charge made by the member for North Cape Breton was looked into by Customs Department and inquired into by Auditor General and found to be not true. The report of the Auditor General on this matter appears on pages F 48 and F 49 of his report for 1913-14. Mr. Duchemin has been employed only when cases were sent him for investigation. There are no cases now before him from the Customs Department for investigation.

4. Customs Department, $1,190.66; Interior, $26.31; Marine and Fisheries, $1,691.10; Militia and Defence, $36.80; Post Office, $1,242.01; Public Works, $441.63; Railways and Canals, $1,928.60; Agriculture, $124.60.

UNEMPLOYMENT.

*Mr. VERVILLE:

1. Has any representation been made to the Government respecting the unemployed problem? If so, by whom?
2. What is the intention of the Government in that respect?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Representations have been made from time to time with regard to unemployment. A list of them could be brought down in the shape of a return, if so desired. The intention of the Government is to assist in every way that is practicable and reasonable.

MR. T. A. ANDERSON.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN:

1. Has T. A. Anderson been employed by the Government at any time during the years 1912, 1913, 1914 and 1915?
2. Is he still so employed?
3. What was the date of his appointment, in what capacity is he employed, and what is his salary or remuneration?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It would facilitate the answering of this question if we could learn to what department the hon. member alludes.

Question stands.

CUSTOMS VALUATION.

Mr. McCRANEY:

1. What were the values placed on the following articles by the Department of Customs, and the general tariff rate on each, prior to 21st September, 1911: breaking ploughs, gang ploughs, harrow, land packer, seeder, cultivator, reaper, binder (8 foot), fanning mill, hay rake (10 foot), mower (6 foot), wagon, sleigh, manure spreader, portable engines and threshing machines?
2. What are, or will be, the valuations and general tariff rates on each such article since the recent Budget speech of the Minister of Finance?

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. The Department of Customs does not fix the values for these articles. Imported goods are subject to valuation for duty purposes according to the fair market value as sold for home consumption in the country of export.

Different manufacturers sell similar lines of articles at different prices, so that values are not uniform.

Exporters are required to certify on invoices for entry at Customs the fair market value of the goods as sold for home consumption in the country of export.

The general tariff rates on these articles were as set forth in the Customs Tariff, 1907, with amendments as passed by Parliament.

2. Answered by No. 1.

Mr. MACNUTT:

What is the customs valuation of the following implements imported during the year ending March 31, 1914, and the duty collected on each class: breaking plough, gang plough, harrow, disc harrows, land packers, seed drills, cultivators, reapers, binders (8 foot), fanning mill, hay rake (10 foot), mower (6 foot), wagon, bob sleigh, manure spreader, portable engines, and threshing machines?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Department of Customs does not fix the values for these articles. Imported goods are subject to valuation for duty purposes according to their fair market value as sold for home consumption in the country of export.

Different manufacturers sell similar lines of articles at different prices, so that values are not uniform.

Exporters are required to certify on invoices for entry at customs the fair market value of the goods as sold for home consumption in the country of export.

The duty collected during the year ending March 31, 1914, on these articles was as follows:

	Value.	Duty.
Ploughs and parts thereof	$1,011,704	$202,340 05
Harrows and parts thereof	156,869	31,352 80

Land packers are not separately classified in returns to customs.

	Value.	Duty.
Seed drills	$ 99,497	$ 19,899 40
Cultivators and weeders and parts thereof	57,264	11,441 41
Reapers	38,300	6,702 52
Harvesters, self-binding	336,675	58,918 42
Fanning mills	16,411	4,102 75
Horse rakes	41,234	8,246 80
Mowing machines	47,857	8,375 21
Farm wagons	273,053	68,263 25

Bob sleighs are not separately classified in returns to customs.

	Value.	Duty.
Manure spreaders. .. ..$	42,181	$ 8,429 98
Portable engines with boilers in combination, and traction engines for farm purposes. ..	2,342,120	466,000 45
Threshing machine separators..	926,791	185,358 20

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY— QUEBEC TERMINALS.

Mr. GRAHAM:

1 Has work been started on the proposed terminal in connection with the National Transcontinental Railway terminals in the city of Quebec?

2. If so, what amount has been expended on this work up to December 31, 1914?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes.

2. $372,514.86 expended by the commissioners for lands, and $154,293.83 by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on tracks and buildings.

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Has the Government purchased what is known as the St. Malo Railway line, adjacent to Quebec?

2. If so, what was the price paid?

3. Has any contract been awarded for the rebuilding or repairing of the road, or any part of it?

4. If so, what is the estimated cost of such repairs?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes.

2. $175,000.

3. Yes.

4. $11,000.

CLOSING OF HUDSON BAY RAILWAY BRIDGE.

Mr. MOLLOY:

1. Is the Government or the Department of Railways aware that Manitoba provincial police are said to have enforced a blockade of the Hudson Bay Railroad bridge over the Saskatchewan river at The Pas, preventing access to the construction camps along the railway during a period from July 22, to about July 28, 1914?

2. Was any order issued or any instructions given by the Government or the department, authorizing this blockade? If so, what was the reason for such order?

Mr. COCHRANE: Copy of telegrams:

The Pas, Man., July 26, 1914.

Hon. Minister of Railways,
Ottawa.

Hudson Bay Railway bridge at Le Pas closed and guarded by provincial police, Conservatives are allowed to go up the line, Liberals absolutely debarred. We demand suspension of the regulation until July 30, 1914. Answer immediately.

A. J. Claney,
President The Pas Liberal Association.
Ottawa, July 27, 1914.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

J. W. Porter,
Chief Engineer,
Hudson Bay Railway,
Winnipeg, Man.

Wire explanation re following telegram received from A. J. Claney, The Pas, president the Pas Liberal Association, "Hudson Bay Railroad bridge at Le Pas closed and guarded by provincial police, Conservatives are allowed to go up the line, Liberals absolutely debarred. We demand suspension of the regulation until July thirtieth, nineteen fourteen. Answer immediately."

W. A. Bowden.
Winnipeg, Man. July 29, 1914.

W. A. Bowden,
Chief Engineer,
Department of Railways and Canals,
Ottawa, Ont.

Replying to your wire of twenty-seventh, regular train left for end of steel Tuesday, July twenty-first, again Tuesday July 28, as per regular schedule foreign gasoline cars are prohibited from running on Hudson Bay railway, some of the Liberal organization bribed nightwatchman and ran over the line with a light engine which accounts for precautionary measures taken by contractors.

J. W. Porter.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—GOVERNMENT HIGHWAY.

*Mr. COPP:

1. How much has the Government paid for the construction of a highway from lands of the Intercolonial railway at Sackville, N.B., to the new wharf at said place?

2. To whom were such amounts paid, and what services did each of the parties so paid perform?

3. Who was overseer of said work?

4. By whom was such overseer recommended?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. $1,007.48.

2. Pay-list, August, September and October, 1913: Bedford Crossman, labourer, $61.25; J. Hennigan Crossman, labourer, $16.62; Martin O. Crossman, labourer, $5.25; Thomas Crossman, labourer, $29.75; Percy Crossman, labourer, $50.75; Clifford Wry, labourer, $19.25; Jno. McCallum, labourer, $10.50; John McAlmon, labourer, $28; Alfred Milton, labourer, $10; Headley Godwin, labourer, $28; Winslow Milner, labourer, $5.25; Henry Crossman, teaming, $73.75; Murray Crossman, teaming, $95; Winslow Milner, teaming, $45.50; Edward Fillmore, teaming, $20; Thos. R. Fillmore, conductor, $103.75; total, $627.87.

Accounts, August and September, 1913: Edward E. Fillmore, August 27, 1913, 171 pickets at 15 cents, $25.65; 34 double loads brush at $1.75, $59.50. J. L. Black & Sons, Ltd., August 23, 1913, lumber, $8.98. Geo. Milton, September 26, planks, $8.98. W. D. Robson, September 26, wire fencing, $61.25. A. W. Chapman, September 26, gravel, $215.25. Total, $379.61.

3. Under supervision of District Engineer Stead and conductor of works, Thos. R. Fillmore.

4. By Mr. M. G. Siddall.

GOVERNMENT LABOUR BUREAU.

Mr. STEVENS:

1. Has the Government given consideration to the proposal to establish a national Government Labour Bureau?

2. If so, what conclusion has been reached?

3. If not, will the Government take necessary steps to have a Bill introduced at the next session of Parliament?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Government has the matter under consideration, and whenever any conclusion is reached, an announcement will be made in due course.

SASKATCHEWAN RURAL MAIL.

Mr. McCRANEY:

1. What rural mail delivery routes have been established in the Saskatoon electoral district?

2. How frequent are the deliveries of such route?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Asquith No. 1; via Arelea, Perdue, Crocusdale, Stoneyroyd, Hurdman Lodge, Eagle Creek (in part); Borden No. 1, via Great Deer, Halcyonia.

2. Semi-weekly.

GUYSBOROUGH-WEST ERINVILLE MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Who is the contractor for the mail service between Guysborough, N.S., and W. Erinville?

2. When was the contract made?

3. What is the contract price?

4. Who are the sureties?

5. What are the names of all parties who tendered for this service, and the amount of each tender?

6. If there is no regular contract at present, who is performing the service, and on what terms?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. George A. Peart.

2. Contract dates from 1st October, 1914.

3. $218 per annum.

4. James E. Hadley and J. Avard Fulton.

5. As the contract has not yet been executed it is not considered advisable to give the information at present. It will be furnished when the contract has been signed.

6. Answered by Nos. 1, 2 and 3.

WAR SUPPLIES—HORSES.

Mr. CARROLL:

1. Did the Officer Commanding 5th Mounted Rifles, Lieut.-Colonel G. H. Baker, refuse to accept seven horses which were purchased by Messrs. Palmer and Pallister at Sherbrooke?

2. If so, what were the reasons given by that officer?

3. Did Lieut.-Colonel Baker demand a board of inquiry to examine the said horses and report on their fitness for service?

4. If so, has the board been convened and their report submitted?

5. What is the finding of the said board in respect to the said horses?

Major General HUGHES:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. No.

4. Answered by No. 3.

1. Answered by No. 3.

YARMOUTH HARBOUR DREDGING.

Mr. LAW:

1. What amount was spent for dredging in Yarmouth harbour during the years 1905, 1906, 1907, 1908, 1909, 1910, 1911, 1912, 1913 and 1914, respectively?

2. What were the prices paid for dredging during wears 1911, 1912, 1913 and 1914, respectively?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. 1905-1906, $16,031.57; 1906-1907, $5,728.15; 1907-1908, $26,450.64; 1908-1909, $135,691.88; 1909-1910, $88,972.54; 1910-1911, $92,403.16; 1911-1912, $59,921.66; 1912-1913, $32,679.60; 1913-1914, nil; 1914-1915, $4,038.40; Total, $461,917.60.

2. 1911-1912: 28c per cubic yard and the expenditure was $59,921.66. 1912-1913: Class A $7 per cubic yard; class B 22½c per cubic yard, and the expenditure was $32,679.60. 1914-1915: 40c per cubic yard, scow measurement, for the removal of a small quantity, 10,096 cubic yards, costing $4,038.40, and involving the bringing of the dredge from St. John, N.B., and returning it to the same place.

SHELL-FISH COMMISSION.

*Mr. SINCLAIR:

What was the total cost of the commission appointed July 4, 1914, to investigate the shell-fish industry?

Mr. HAZEN: I find that no commission was appointed on July 4, 1914, to investigate the shell-fish industry. Possibly the hon. member for Guysborough may be mistaken in the year, or the year marked in this question may be a clerical error. A shell-fish commission was appointed in 1912, and if information regarding that commission is required, I may say that at the last regular session of the House a return was laid on the table giving all the information that could be given.

Mr. KYTE: The commission referred to by the hon. member for Guysborough was composed of Mr. O'Leary, Mr. Wilson and Mr. Maclean.

Mr. HAZEN: A commission composed of these gentlemen was appointed in 1912; full information with regard to that commission has, I understand, already been furnished this House.

PROPOSED SYDNEY-ST. PETER'S RAILWAY.

*Mr. CARROLL:

1. Is it the intention of the Railway Department or the Government to commence construction this year of a railway from Sydney, county of Cape Breton, to St. Peters, county of Richmond, through the Big Pond and East Bay district?

2. Has the department or Government decided on any location for such a road?

Mr. COCHRANE: The matter is under consideration.

17TH NOVA SCOTIA REGIMENT.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Who were the different officers commissioned to the 17th Nova Scotia regiment at Valcartier before they sailed for England?

2. Who are now the commissioned officers of said regiment?

Major General HUGHES:

1. 17th (Nova Scotia) Infantry battalion: Headquarters: Lieut.-Colonel, Lt.-Colonel S. G. Robertson; Major, Major D. D. Cameron; Major, D. Murray; Adjutant, Capt. C. E. Bent; Asst. Adjutant, Lieut. L. R. Cutten; Quartermaster, Hon. Capt. R. McMeekin; Transport Officer, Lieut. C. Hamilton, Catty; Signalling Officer, Lieut. N. F. McKee.

Attached: Medical Officer, Capt. A. Morrell; Paymaster, Hon. Capt. A. McKay; Chaplain, Hon. Capt. P. Goforth.

Company Officers: Captains W. H. Allen; L. O. Bentley; T. C. Reid; W. B. Coulter; A. Watson; D. C. Sheppard; W. Forbes; J. H. Creighton. Lieuts. G. W. Harris; E. M. Bentley; F. G. McDonald; J. E. Christie; F. D. Elliott; E. W. Mingo; C. J. Droggett; H. A. Duncan; J. M. Gillis; R. E. Russell; G. A. Ross; M. Brock; G. E. C. Eager.

2. Information not available. Impossible to say what changes have been made by War Office.

WATCHMEN ON RAILWAY BRIDGES.

Mr. MACDONALD:

What are the names of the men employed as watchmen on the different railway bridges in Pictou county at different times since August last on account of the war?

Mr. COCHRANE:

The following are the names of the men employed on the different railway bridges in Pictou County since August last on account of the war, as watchmen: Maxwell Brooks, Peter Beck, John Bone, John McDearmid, Russell Chapman, Clarence McKay, Alfred T. McLeod, James N. Matheson, W. R. Creighton, John A. McLeod, James McKenzie, Robert Purvis, William Conn, Wm. Fraser, John Pringle, Harry Forward, John R. McDonald, Eric M. Stranberg, Fred Ludwig, James Austin, John McVicar, Duncan McKenzie, John McCrae, William McGregor and Howard Robertson.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—UNION STATION CULVERT.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. What was the estimated cost of repairs to the culvert Intercolonial railway near Union station?

2. What has been the cost of said repairs to date?

3. Have the repairs been completed?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. $8,000.00.

2. $9,353.07.

3. No.

ST. PAUL'S ISLAND LIFE SAVING STATION.

Mr. KYTE:

1. Did the Department of Marine call for tenders during the year 1914 for certain work on St. Paul's Island, Cape Breton?

2. From whom were tenders received, and what was the amount of each tender?

3. What was the nature of the work?

4. To whom was the contract awarded?

5. Were any modifications made as to the time in which the contract was to be completed or changes in any other respect?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.

2. Siffroi Robichaud, carpenter and builder, Meteghan Centre, N.S., $8,940; E. C. Doyle, of Arichat, N.S., $9,940; W. S. Thompson, general contractor, Sydney, N.S., $16,175.

3. Dwelling for superintendent and life-saving staff.

4. Siffroi Robichaud.

5. No modification was made as to the date of completion, but the work was not finished strictly on time. The only modification in the contract was the substitution of a Thompson & Sutherland reliance hot water boiler for the Safford boiler specified. A drawback of $250 is being held to insure satisfactory completion of some trifling details as soon as spring weather admits of advantageous outdoor work.

MR. JOSEPH W. JOHNSTON.

Mr. KYTE:

1. Is Joseph W. Johnston an employee of the Department of Railways and Canals in connection with the St. Peters canal improvements?

2. If so, what are his wages?

3. How much was he paid for the months of

January, February and March, 1913, January, February, March, April and May, 1914, and January and February, 1915?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes.

2. $50 per month.

3.—

	1913.	1914.	1915.
January	$50	$50	$50
February	$50	$50	$50
March	$50	$50	....
April	....	$50	....
May	....	$50	....
	$150	$250	$100

MILITARY EQUIPMENT—WATERPROOF GARMENTS.

Mr. GAUTHIER:

1. Does the waterproof cloak or cape or other garment make part of the kit or equipment of a member of the active militia?

2. Did the equipment, kit or furnishings of the members of the first contingent contain any waterproof coat, cloak or other garment to protect the wearer from rain?

3. Has the waterproof or rainproof cape or cloak been supplied to make part of the kit and equipment of those who have enlisted with the second contingent?

4. Have the members of the first contingent been supplied with any means of protection against rain?

5. Have the members of the second contingent been supplied with any waterproof garment or cape?

6. Is it the intention of the Government to furnish the second and subsequent contingents with any waterproof cloak, cape or other garment as a protection against rain?

7. Are the soldiers of the Allied armies, and in particular, the army of Great Britain, supplied with a waterproof cape, cloak or other garment as a protection against rain and as a means of avoiding sickness and discomfort?

8. Is it true that the department of the British War Office that attends to the furnishing of clothing, supplies each soldier with a waterproof cape or other garment?

9. Is the department aware that every commissioned officer is said to have in his equipment a waterproof cape or cloak, and is this cape or cloak supplied by the department or purchased at the expense of the individual officer?

10. Is it true that long previous to the departure of the first contingent, an offer was made to the Government to furnish at the actual cost of material and labour, a quantity of khaki waterproof cloaks and capes, according to the recognized military pattern, and was this offer accepted or rejected?

11. Is it the intention of the Department of Militia and Defence to furnish every soldier and non-commissioned officer belonging to the second contingent with a waterproof cloak or cape or some other garment as a protection against the discomfort of rain and wet?

12. Is it the intention of the Department of Miltia and Defence to remedy the reported error in connection with the equipment of the first contingent by ordering a quantity of waterproof garments or capes in sufficient numbers to furnish one to each of the members of the first contingent?

13. Is it the intention of the Government to take proper precautions to protect the health of the troops that are going to the front from the Dominion by furnishing each and every member thereof with a waterproof cloak, cape or other garment?

14. Did the Department of Militia and Defence receive any complaints from members of the first or second contingents, or from any other citizen, in connection with the failure on the part of the Government to provide the troops with a waterproof cape or other garment?

Major General HUGHES:

1, 2 and 3. No.

4 and 5. Yes, greatcoat.

6. Nothing beyond greatcoat.

7. No garment other than greatcoat.

8. No.

9. If officers provide waterproof garments, they do so at their own expense.

10. Offers were made, but rejected.

11. No; nothing beyond greatcoat, which is considered more serviceable than a waterproof garment.

12. No; no error is admitted.

13. It is considered that where there is a choice between greatcoat and waterproof garment, the greatcoat is of much more protection than a waterproof.

14. No complaints were made by members of the first or second contingents. Some civilians did write, but recommendations were not approved.

MEGANTIC POSTMASTERS.

Mr. PACAUD:

1. How many postmasters were there in the county of Megantic on the 10th October, 1911?

2. How many were dismissed from office since that date, and what are the names of the post offices in which they acted?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. 75.

2. 13 postmasters have been dismissed since 10th October, 1911. The names of the post offices with dates of the postmasters' dismissals are as follows: Black Lake, 23rd December, 1911; Coleraine Station, 12th December, 1912; Cranberry, 21st December, 1911; Laurierville, 28th October, 1912; Lourdes, 12th January, 1912; Lyster Station, 29th November, 1911; Plessisville, 10th September, 1912; Plessisville Station, 3rd December, 1912; Pontbriand, 5th November, 1913; Robertsonville, 16th September, 1912; St. Désiré du Lac Noir, 3rd October, 1912; Thetford Mines, 10th April, 1913; Thetford Mines West, 11th April, 1913.

SUPPOSED GERMAN SPY.

Mr. MARCILE:

1. Is the Railway Department aware that a person has been arrested by the Intercolonial Railway police, supposed to be a German spy, having in his possession copies of plans of railway bridges and parts of line?
2. Does the department propose having an investigation to determine as to how he came into possession of these plans?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. A suspected German spy named Reinhold Riedel was arrested by railway detective near Metapedia and handed over to military authorities at Halifax. He did not have in his possession any maps or plans of railway bridge property.
2. Answered by No. 1.

FIRST EXPEDITIONARY FORCE.

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. What was the number of British-born in the first expeditionary forces?
2. What was the number of English Canadians?
3. What was the number of French Canadians?
4. What was the number of professional men?
5. What was the number of labour men or artisans?

Major General HUGHES: This information is not yet available in the Militia Department.

THE NATURALIZATION LAW.

Mr. COCKSHUTT:

1. Is the naturalization law, passed at last regular session of the House, now in force?
2. If so, when did it come into operation?
3. If not now in force, when will it become law?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Yes.
2. January 1st, 1915.
3. Answered by No. 2.

MR. RODRIGUE CHARBONNEAU.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE:

1. Is the Postmaster General aware that a post office employee at Ste. Agathe des Monts, whose name is Rodrigue Charbonneau, is said to have taken an active part in the recent by-election of Terrebonne?
2. What salary does the said Rodrigue Charbonneau receive?

Mr. CASGRAIN: There is no person of the name of Rodrigue Charbonneau in the employ of the Post Office Department at Ste. Agathe des Monts.

PICTOU COUNTY MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Were tenders called for the mail service between Hopewell and railway station, Pictou county?
2. Who were the tenderers, and what was the amount of each tender?
3. To whom was the contract awarded?

[Mr. Casgrain.]

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Yes, in June, 1912.
2. H. D. McLeod, at 21 cents per double trip.
3. H. D. McLeod.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. When was the contract for carrying the mail between Chance Harbour and Trenton last awarded?
2. Who were the tenderers for the same, and what was the amount of each tender?
3. To whom was the contract awarded?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. On the 8th May, 1914, for a contract which dates from the 1st June, 1914.
2. James W. Fraser, $195 per annum; D. Cameron, $290 per annum; John W. Fraser, $325 per annum.
3. James W. Fraser.

Mr. MACDONALD:

Who were the tenderers for the existing contract for mail service between Pictou and railway station, and what was the amount of each tender?

Mr. CASGRAIN: D. W. English, $780 per annum; Alex. Sarson, $783 per annum; Cliff English, $900 per annum. These tenders were considered too high and the tenderers were given an opportunity to submit lower offers, with the following result: D. W. English, reduced from $780 to $730; Alex. Sarson, reduced from $783 to $700; Cliff English, reduced from $900 to $750. An offer was also received from Daniel W. McKerracher at $690, which, being the lowest, was accepted.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. Macdonald: For a return showing the number of ships employed by the Railway Department, the number of men hired on vessels and on shore, and the amount expended for supplies, men and transportation from March 31, 1914, to December 31, 1914, in connection with the Hudson Bay railway expenditures.

Mr. Carroll: For a copy of all letters, telegrams, reports or proceedings and all other documents in connection with the purchase of remounts in the province of Quebec since August 1 last up to and including the recent purchases made in the Eastern Townships by Messrs. Palmer and Pallister.

Mr. Sinclair: For a copy of all Orders in Council, departmental instructions, reports, correspondence, telegrams, evidence and findings in the posession of the Government, or any department thereof, relating to a certain investigation held in British Columbia by Commissioner Davie, who was instructed to inquire into certain charges against the Captain of the dredge Mudlark.

Mr. Macdonald: For a return showing the names of all applicants for Fenian raid bounty

in the county of Pictou who have not yet been paid their bounty.

Mr. Macdonald: For a copy of all letters, papers, telegrams, evidence taken at investigations, reports and all other documents relating to the suspension or other action in regard to the charge of drunkenness against Newton Hopper, conductor on the Intercolonial railway, and to his subquent reinstatement.

Mr. Macdonald: For a copy of all letters, papers and other documents relating to the discharge of Dr. John McKenzie as medical doctor to the Indians of Pictou county, and to the appointment of Dr. Keith as his sucessor.

Mr. Kyte: For a copy of all correspondence, recommendations, letters and telegrams relating to the appointment of H. W. Ingraham as assistant registrar of alien enemies at Sydney, N.S., and to his dismissal from the said office.

Mr. Marcil: For a copy of all documents bearing on the payment made to C. R. Scoles, New Carlisle, Quebec, in July, 1914, of balance of subsidy voted to the Atlantic and Lake Superior railway, on the recommendation of the financial comptroller.

Mr. Michaud: For a return showing how much money was collected for customs duties each year for the last five years at Edmundston, Clair Green river and St. Leonard, N.B., respectively, and the salaries paid in reference to the said outports for the same period.

Mr. Macdonald: For a copy of all letters, telegrams, papers and other documents in regard to a proposed rural mail delivery service between Pictou and Saltsprings, Pictou county, and as to the arrangements for the existing service between those points.

Mr. Macdonald: For a copy of all letters, telegrams, papers and other documents relating to the mail contract between Chance harbour and Trenton, Pictou county, in regard to the existing contract.

Mr. Copp: For a return showing the estimated cost of fitting up the works of the Canadian Car and Foundry Company, Limited, at Amherst, N.S., for military purposes; what rent or other remuneration is being paid, or will be paid, this company for the use of its building; who are to supply the military provisions, including food for men, coal for heating and cooking, and food and other supplies for horses quartered on these premises, and the prices to be paid for same; if it is true that forms for tendering for such military supplies could only be obtained from the office of the sitting member for Cumberland county, and that in several cases forms of tender were refused to applicants; if the Government is aware that in the case of the supplying of hay, as alleged, not only were Liberals not allowed to tender for same, but supporters of the Government were informed they would not secure any part of the contract, if any of the hay to be supplied was to be purchased from a Liberal.

CUSTOMS INVESTIGATIONS.

On the notice of motion for production of papers being called:

Mr. Ross: For a copy of all letters, telegrams, Orders in Council and other documents in connection with the inquiry conducted by officials of the Department of Customs into allegations that W. T. Patten, of Coutts, Alberta, defrauded the said Department of Customs or did commit a breach of the customs law of Canada.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Customs): It has not been the custom of the department to bring down papers of this kind; they are always treated as confidential. The reason for this is that the publication of such documents might have the effect of injuring persons who had committed no breach of the customs law. I would therefore not care to agree to this motion passing, at least without further discussion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If there is objection to the motion it should be transferred to notices of motion for discussion when it comes up again.

Mr. REID: I have no objection to its being transferred, if necessary.

Motion transferred to notices of motion.

HOUSE OF COMMONS READING ROOM.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention to the habit of several members of taking the newspapers on file in the Reading Room to their own rooms and keeping them there, thus depriving other members of their use. It would seem reasonable that members who wish to have the newspapers in their private rooms should subscribe for them; or, if this practice is to be continued, additional copies should be provided so that one copy may at all times remain in the Reading Room. The men in charge of the Reading Room tell me that messengers and pages come there and take away papers, and so the curator does not know where they are. I think some remedy for this grievance should be found.

Mr. SPEAKER: If no other hon. gentleman desires to make observations on this subject, I desire to say that I shall take an early opportunity of consulting the curator of the reading room, and endeavour as far as possible to obviate the confusion that seems to have arisen.

Mr. MARCIL: Perhaps you will permit me to say, Mr. Speaker, that during my term as Speaker this difficulty arose. There is only one remedy, if you will allow me to suggest it, and that is that there should be a copy to remain constantly in the reading room. For, once a paper is removed, you do not know where it is.

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. D. C. ROSS (West Middlesex): I desire to make an inquiry of the Government with regard to a matter that I consider of very urgent public importance at this time of great need for the conservation

of our food supplies for Canada and the Empire. I refer to the foot and mouth disease which has approached very close to our borders, having reached Detroit. I would like to know from the Government if every precaution is being taken to avert this great provincial and national disaster. I would like to inquire further, whether, considering the danger that is threatened, and considering the increased price of cattle and the absolutely inadequate compensation that is made for cattle slaughtered in order to prevent the spread of the disease, it is the intention of the Government at this session to so amend the Act that proper compensation can be made to graziers and farmers whose cattle have to be slaughtered in the public interest and to prevent the spread of the disease?

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Customs): The Department of Agriculture are taking every precaution to prevent the foot and mouth disease entering Canada. An extra staff of employees has been placed at all ports of entry, and the head of that branch of the department, Dr. Torrance, is giving the matter special attention with a view to doing everything to prevent this disease entering Canada. As to the latter part of the hon. gentleman's question, that is a matter with which, I suppose, the Minister of Agriculture has been dealing, and in his absence I am not informed on the subject.

Mr. ROSS: In spite of the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, the matter should receive the Government's very prompt and serious attention.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): The Act as it is now on the statute books has been in force, I believe, for many years. The Minister of Agriculture has not brought to my attention any proposal to amend it. However, I shall inform him of what the hon. member has suggested and will ask a report from him in regard to it.

17th BATTALION NOVA SCOTIA HIGHLANDERS.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): I desire to read to the House some correspondence which I have had with Sir George Perley, Acting High Commissioner, with regard to some statements that have appeared in the press respecting alleged ill-treatment or neglect of the Nova Scotia battalion at Salisbury Plains. After hearing that a statement had been made, I think it was in the Morning Chronicle of Nova Scotia, I directed that an abstract be made of the allegations contained in the article and transmitted to Sir George Perley by cable. That was done accordingly in these terms:

Ottawa, February 25, 1915.

Perley, Dominion, London.

Halifax Chronicle publishes signed staff correspondence from London alleging Nova Scotians Salisbury brutally treated; Seventeenth Battalion Highlanders used for months as lackeys and scavengers for entire Canadian encampment; Colonel Struan Robertson relieved his command; left without equipment and boots; crowded like cattle in filthy camp; and left for weeks without qualified medical officer to cope with epidemic of disease; their condition worse than that of Belgians; also that regiment landed Salisbury without equipment and none received. Please ascertain facts and cable.

Borden.

I received from Sir George Perley the following reply:

London, February 26, 1915.

Prime Minister, Ottawa.

Without knowing facts personally feel confident Halifax Chronicle statement grossly exaggerated. Do not think from what I have heard that 17th were treated any differently from other Canadians.

Perley.

This morning I received the following:

London, March 2, 1915.

Prime Minister, Ottawa.

General Alderson informs me Crowell representing Halifax Chronicle called on him about three weeks ago asking questions concerning sanitary conditions at camp and particularly as regards 17th. Alderson gave him a few facts and Crowell then stated he regretted not having seen Alderson before and thought would be advisable for him cable his paper not publish article which he had written and forwarded. Alderson says 17th Battalion was under exactly same conditions as all other units 4th Brigade, that they were not crowded like cattle and were never left without qualified medical officer, that they had six cases meningitis and otherwise their health was very good.

Perley.

I have also this further telegram:

London, March 2, 1915.

Prime Minister, Ottawa.

Halifax Chronicle. Colonel Robertson was relieved command 17th Battalion. Have brought article attention Lord Kitchner, who says allegations writer quite untrue, and wonders whether there are any means bringing originator these malicious falsehoods within reach law, as such statements are calculated to have bad effects if not strenuously denied.

Perley.

CANADIANS AT THE FRONT.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Hon. CHAS. MARCIL: I desire to ask the Prime Minister if he has any informa-

tion with regard to the doings and fortunes of the Canadian troops in France. As he knows, of course, there is naturally a tremendous interest taken in the doings of our boys, and the public would be interested to know if anything further than that which has been published has been received.

Major General HUGHES (Minister of Militia): The information at hand is that the Canadian troops, first, second and third brigades, with the artillery, are in the firing line. We are in receipt from time to time of the casualty lists, and these lists are published. Hon. gentlemen can easily understand that it sometimes takes a day or two to get the news accurately, and we do not want to publish it until it is accurate; but as soon as we get it from the British Government, we first notify the friends of those concerned, and publish it immediately thereafter. If it would be of service, we could have the bulletins sent to the various waiting-rooms of the House of Commons for the information of members. The reports as to the behaviour and conduct of our soldiers under fire are just what we might have expected. On every occasion they have borne themselves as became the country whence they came. And, without boasting, I may say that the firing of the Canadians was most accurate and well-sustained.

STAMP DUTIES.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): Can the Minister of Finance tell us when the taxes which are to be collected by stamps are to come into force? In his Budget speech he made a distinction between certain classes of stamp duties, one class to apply immediately, that is, on 12th February, and the others coming into effect on a day to be fixed in the Act. I should like to know to what articles this last clause of the resolution is to apply, and whether stamps have been issued in connection with any of the articles, and if so, which ones?

Hon. W. T. WHITE (Minister of Finance): It is impossible at present to fix the date on which the stamp taxes will come into effect, because the Bill has not yet been passed by Parliament. My hon. friend understands that it has been the practice in the past for customs duties to come into effect at once,, and the Bill which will be subsequently passed so enacts. All commodities brought into Canada being under the control of the Customs, it is quite possible to enforce the law from the date of the Budget speech. But the case is different in regard to stamp taxes, and it is my intention to specify in the Bill the date on which they shall come into effect. My recollection is that in the Budget speech I stated that the stamp taxes on wines would come into effect at once. The stamp taxes upon other commodities, such as patent medicines, and the additional taxation upon letters, post cards and other documents will come into effect upon a date of which we shall give ample notice, and which will be mentioned in the Bill that will be introduced after the resolutions have been approved.

THE BUDGET.

PROPOSED WAR TAXATION.

Consideration of the proposed motion of Hon. W. T. White (Minister of Finance) for Committee of Ways and Means resumed from March 2.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver)—resuming): Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned last night I was seeking to demonstrate that the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite, that this was not a war budget and that the necessity for its introduction was due to the failure of the Government to properly carry on the Administration, were entirely fallacious, and I think the argument which I presented last night amply demonstrated that. But in order to make the point clear once more, I will remind the House of one or two things.

Hon. gentlemen opposite say that the condition which obtains in this country to-day is not due to the war, but to internal conditions. I suggested last night, and I shall do so again to-day, that the condition which obtains in Canada to-day is directly attributable to the war. The lack of shipping, the absolute stoppage of borrowing on the part of municipalities and provinces and industries, the cessation of building on account of lack of funds, the stoppage of railway development largely because it was impossible to get the money to carry on the great undertakings which had been under way for some years, and impossible to get the money to complete them, all these things had a direct effect upon the industries of the country, and especially on the steel industry. One thing which demonstrates that beyond all possibility of controversion is the closing of the stock exchanges throughout the world. If the war had nothing to do

with commercial conditions in Canada or on this continent, then I ask why did the great stock exchanges of the world close the day before war was declared, or on that particular day, or the day after, as the case may be, and stay closed for many months afterwards? And to this day the stock exchanges are controlling the minimum prices of stock. And not only that, but all stocks in Canada and throughout the civilized world have suffered a serious reduction in value; and we know very well that with the exception of the leading ones, stocks are unsaleable to-day from no other reason than the outbreak of war. Another argument I wish to suggest is this: Immediately after the outbreak of war, the United States, which is an absolutely neutral country, called a special session of Congress and brought down a special war budget of $100,000,000 to supplement the revenue of that country, which had suffered because of the outbreak of war and the consequent disruption of traffic and trade in that country. If it was necessary for a special budget of $100,000,000 to be brought down by the United States, a neutral country which of all countries in the world might calculate to profit by this war, surely it is not unreasonable for this Government to bring down a measure for the purpose of supplementing the falling revenues of this country, and which fall is directly attributable to the war.

It is claimed that this is not a war budget. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) said yesterday that not one-half of the revenue to be raised by this Budget would be expended. In other words, they quarrel with the extravagance of the Government, and then they quarrel with the Government because the revenue to be collected will not be expended. Now, if this revenue will not be expended on the general business of the country as provided for in the Estimates, it stands to reason that there will be a very large surplus, and according to the hon. member for St. John that surplus on current account will amount at the end of the present fiscal year to about $50,000,000 or $60,000,000. If we have such a surplus, it will undoubtedly be applied to the war expenses of this country. So that that argument of the hon. member for St. John falls to ground. The Government has also been strongly attacked in connection with the British preference. We have been charged with disloyalty. To quote the words of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff)—and I should hesitate to use such language on my own responsibility—they say to us:

> For God's sake, keep your unholy and disloyal hands off the British preference.

That was a pretty strong statement for the hon. gentleman to make. Now what are we doing? The statute provides that the British preference shall be 33 per cent below the ordinary tariff, and the Minister of Finance is simply carrying out the mandate in that statute. He is doing what is right, what is reasonable and fair, and I do not think it lies with hon. gentlemen opposite to reflect upon the loyalty of this Government or upon the loyalty of its supporters because the British preference has been increased.

The hon. member for St. John made another argument yesterday in connection with the French convention. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that he drew a very vivid picture of the ladies dressed in silks and satins and of the poor dressed in linen and cotton. He made a particular point of that, and drew a very vivid picture of the sufferings of the poor. His argument was that the Minister of Finance is exempting silks and velvets and other articles of that kind because he is compelled to do so by the French convention. But in his next breath the hon. member for St. John criticised the Minister of Finance for imposing a tax on wines from France, and he asked if the minister had any right to do that. He stated that we were increasing the tax on sparkling wines, which are mainly the product of France by 1,000 per cent, or from 15 cents, as provided by the French convention to $1.50. Now there is no consistency in an argument of that kind. In my opinion it is but a demonstration of the insincerity of the charges made by hon. gentlemen opposite during this debate.

Mr. GRAHAM: Will my hon. friend allow me a word in the absence of my hon. friend the member for St. John? His argument was not along that line. He argued that the Government was not maintaining the spirit of the French treaty. He was not against the tax on wines, but against the violation of the treaty with France.

Mr. STEVENS: I will read his own words. I do not wish to misquote any one, but my memory is fairly good on these points. I am sorry, by the way, that the hon. member for St. John is not in his seat to answer for himself. His words are as follows.

An hon. MEMBER: Look for the squid.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, I might say on that point that the hon. gentleman made another error in regard to squid, which he considered to be fertilizer whereas they are bait, and which does not appear in Hansard. This is a very convenient way of eliminating an error of that kind. The hon. member for St. John said yesterday:

> And while I am upon the French convention, let me ask my hon. friend if he thinks that he is entirely within his powers in imposing an additional stamp tax upon wine which comes from France and upon which, under the French convention, a specific duty has been imposed. Take wine of the fresh grape, not a strong wine; a specific duty is payable upon that under the French convention, under schedule C. It does not come under schedule B but under C and a specific duty is imposed upon it. You have raised the duty upon that by reason of this stamp tax 100 per cent. Have you the right to do it? You will say you have, because you will say that this is an Inland Revenue tax that you are putting on. Well, now, is it within the spirit of the French convention.

The object of the remarks of the hon. member for St. John was to criticise and condemn the Government because they had observed the terms of the French Treaty in exempting silks, velvets and other articles of that kind, which they were compelled to do. He sought to condemn the Government on the ground of making the taxation bear heavily on the poor instead of the rich. He did not argue anything in connection with the French Treaty that brought forth that statement, but it was a statement calculated to condemn the Government for something they had no control over. I am, therefore, I think, quite within my rights when I say with all respect to the hon. gentleman that this demonstrates the insincerity of his argument.

A great deal has been said in regard to the farmers, and we have heard the argument that this new tax will bear heavily upon them. As far as the West is concerned, and I have resided there for over twenty years, the farmers are quite willing to bear their share of taxation. I do not believe that they would thank any hon. member of this House to represent them as desiring to be immune, or to be relieved, from their fair share of taxation. There is no other class or industry in Canada which will benefit so much as the farming industry. My Rt. hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) stated clearly on Monday that it was not the intention of the Government to penalize the farmers by establishing a fixed price for their products at this time. He stated that they were going to have the right to get the fair market prices of their products which at present are very favourable. Why should the farmers not be willing, as I believe they are willing, to bear their just and fair share of taxation of this kind?

Another argument advanced yesterday was in connection with the duty on coal. It was stated that this Government let anthracite coal in free and taxed bituminous coal. It was also stated, in error, that bituminous coal was the coal of the poor people. As a matter of fact, the bulk of bituminous coal imported into

4 p.m.

Canada is used by the railways and large concerns for steam purposes, and is not used by the poor people at all. According to the hon. gentleman the importation last year of bituminous coal was $15,000,000, and of anthracite, $22,000,000. If these figures are correct, who consumes $22,000,000 worth of coal? My hon. friend would leave the impression on the House and in the minds of the people that this coal was consumed only by the rich, whereas, as a matter of fact, it is well known that anthracite coal is the coal of the householder throughout the length and breadth of eastern Canada, and that soft coal is the coal of the rich corporations who are ready and willing, I believe, to bear their just share of taxation.

I pointed out in connection with the increases yesterday that they were quite justifiable. I desire for a moment now to examine some of the decreases in the present Estimates on which a considerable reflection has been cast, and to show that the Government is doing its utmost to meet the situation with which it is faced at the present time. I remember that when the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) made his very able speech here a week ago, he criticised the Government in connection with the large expenditure for legislation. We find a reduction in the expenditure for legislation of $156,000, and a reduction in the expenditure for immigration of $263,000. Let me pause at this item for a moment. It has been claimed by hon. gentlemen opposite that the expenditure for immigration might be largely cut off. They say that immigration has fallen off, and that therefore this expenditure should be reduced to a very small amount. With that I do not agree at all, because it is utterly impossible to secure an organization, such as we have in connection with immigration, then discharge the members of that organization, and be able within a year or two to get them together again. There is another reason why it would be unwise to disorganize the immigration system, and it is that the immigration

department is not solely used as a "North Atlantic Company"; it is not solely used for the purpose of bringing in immigration. It is used for looking after the immigrants in the country. At the present time the whole force of the immigration department which can be spared is used in every port of entry in Canada looking out for alien enemies, looking out for those who might be coming into Canada with hostile intentions since the war has broken out. This department has very large and responsible duties to perform, which duties, as far as I am able to learn, they are performing with great credit to themselves and to the country. A substantial reduction has been made in the immigration vote, which shows very clearly that, while the Government are determined to maintain the efficiency of the department, they are at the same time exercising economy to the limit of their ability.

Another item which has been the subject of attack is that of public works. We have a reduction in public works of $14,833,000 under the present Estimates—$11,000,000 on account of income, and $3,800,000 on account of capital. The hon. member for St. John attacked this particular item in the Estimates, and claimed that it might have been reduced by a much larger amount. When he was Minister of Public Works he commenced in his own constituency works that involved an expenditure of $11,500,000, and the present Government is carrying on those very laudable public works in the harbour of St. John or in Courtenay Bay. Having let a contract, it is the duty of this Government to protect the contractors who have entered into the contract for this work, and see that no unnecessary delays are occasioned or obstacles placed in their way. A reduction of $14,000,000 in the Estimates is a very substantial reduction, and one which goes as far as it is possible for the Government to go without interfering with the condition of Canada and making it worse than it is to-day. It is the duty of the Government and of the Minister of Public Works to keep public works going on to the utmost of the capacity of the Government, in order to maintain employment throughout the various districts of Canada in these laudable and profitable public works. In the Estimates of the Department of Railways and Canals we find a reduction of $5,343,000. Again, I think that is a very reasonable reduction under the conditions which at present obtain. In Dominion Parks there is a reduction of $500,000, and in Trade and Commerce a reduction of $1,903,000. I am sorry to see that reduction, because I believe that in the Department of Trade and Commerce great work can be done, and I am confident that great work is being done, for never in the history of this country has the department counted as it is counting to-day under the able management of the Hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). I am sorry that the Government has seen fit to reduce his Estimates this year, becauses this country has an opportunity of picking up in the other countries a great deal of trade which prior to the outbreak of the war was held by Germany. It is an opportunity for us to expand our trade and commerce in various parts of the world.

I would like to direct the attention of the House for a moment to the argument advanced, namely, that no other country has increased its taxation. I have already referred to the United States, which has found it necessary, although it is an entirely neutral country, to increase its revenue by $100,000,000 by new taxation. Various means have been used, such as stamp taxes. Many of them are the same as those that we have introduced and some of them are of a different character. In Australia, which probably, because of its relation to the Empire, is more analogous to Canada than is the United States, customs duties, the probate dues and the land tax have been increased. The action of the Australian Government in increasing the customs duties is an exact parallel to the action of this Government. The customs tariff has been the method of raising revenue in this country ever since 1878, and even prior to that date. That method was accepted by hon. gentlemen opposite. They followed it through the fifteen years of their tenure of office. They did not deviate from our policy to an extent worthy of mention. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite: How could this Government or this House change the whole policy of the country at a time when we were engaged in a war which taxed the resources of this country? No sane man for one moment would advance the suggestion that the Government should do so. The British Government increased its customs duties, not to a great extent, because the British customs duty is not large. Here are some figures showing the increase: In the year 1912, the revenue derived from customs duties in Great Britain was £36,000,000. In the year 1914, largely because of the increase of duty after the outbreak of the war, the revenue from customs duties was £39,269,000, an increase of £3,269,000, or over $15,-

000,000. It is quite true that the British Government has increased its other forms of taxation, but I give this in answer to the argument of the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), namely, that no other country has tampered with its tariff.

It has also been pointed out to us, as a reflection upon the ability of this Government to carry on the affairs of the country, that our trade has fallen off. That has been considered by hon. gentlemen opposite as a serious offence on the part of this Government. I wish to examine the trade returns of two or three countries in order to show that we are simply a part of the great commercial system of the world, and that we suffer in common with other countries of the world because of the outbreak of this war and not because, as hon. gentlemen opposite state, of any fault or of any lack of administration of affairs on the part of this Government. In 1912, the imports into Great Britain were £744,000,000. In 1914, they were £697,000,000, a decrease of £47,000,000 or about $235,000,000. In 1912, the exports from Great Britain were £598,000,000. In 1914, they were only £535,000,000, a decrease of £63,000,000, or about $315,000,000. That would mean a decrease in the total trade of Great Britain of $550,000,000. That is in the Old Land, the trade of which is supposed to be buoyant at the present time. We are proud of the trade of the Mother Country, but—

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS: The hon. member for Red Deer says "Hear, hear." I am glad to hear him say "Hear, hear," but he is out of sympathy with his colleagues on the other side of the House, if he does not support their argument that this Government is to blame for the falling off in the trade of Canada, because we have simply suffered in common with other countries. I can give the trade of almost every country in the world, and every country has suffered because of the outbreak of this war. I will not, however, weary the House with further statistics of that kind.

I desire to draw the attention of the House to what I consider should have occupied more attention than has been given to it up to the present time, that is, the opportunity presented to the business men of Canada to extend their trade. We are discussing ways and means of carrying on the business of this country. It is the duty of this Parliament, not only to find the sinews of war, but to try to keep the avenues of trade as normal as possible, to try to readjust the disruption of traffic resulting from this war. It is our duty as legislators to seek new markets for our goods, and to try to take advantage of the markets which have been lost by the enemy.

One of the greatest markets opened to us to-day is that of Russia. Since the outbreak of war a line of steamships has been established plying between Vancouver and Victoria and Vladivostock in Siberia. This line of steamships is plying at the present time every two and three weeks between these two countries, and is carrying on a very profitable trade. I want to point out a few of the resources and possibilities of the country of which I speak. Russia is one of the largest and most compact countries in the world. It has an area of 8,648,000 square miles, an area hard for us to conceive. In 1815, its population was 45,000,000, and in 1912 170,000,000, an increase of 125,000,000 in about a hundred years. It is reasonable to expect that the ratio of increase will continue during this century, thus making a larger market as time goes on for the produce of this country and of other countries that are fortunate enough to deal with Russia. There are nineteen cities having a population of over 100,000, thirty-eight having a population of over 50,000, 3,465 having a population of from 10,000 to 50,000, and 728,157 villages with a population under 10,000. I quote these figures just to demonstrate the possible market in Russia for goods produced in other countries. We must not overlook the agricultural population. Agriculture is one of the greatest industries of Russia, and it is in a very crude and raw condition. It is only in recent years that they have commenced to use modern implements and machinery in agriculture. And here, in my estimation, is one of the finest markets for the manufacturers of Canada. Already, I understand, our farm implements have gained access to the Russian market, but only to a small degree. I understand that the Americans have a great hold on that market. But in a few moments I will bring figures to show that Germany has controlled Russia's market to a far greater extent than any other country. I shall not go into figures with regard to the birth rate, but will say generally that the birth rate in Russia greatly exceeds the death rate, which carries out the idea I have stated that there will be a great increase in the population.

The figures with regard to Russian finance are interesting. The revenue of Russia for

the year 1913, was $1,625,500,000, which is a very substantial revenue. From direct taxation they get $125,500,000; customs and excise $336,000,000; stamp duties $110,000,000; state monopolies $482,000,000, most of which comes from the sale of spirits—$418,000,000—; and telegraphs and post offices, $58,000,000. Let me pause to call your attention to the great revolution recently brought about in Russia. Not long ago, by a stroke of the pen, the Czar of Russia wiped out the liquor traffic of that country. This was to apply to the period of mobilization and was designed to protect the troops while mobilizing. The reform was found to work successfully, and the Czar extended the time to the termination of the war. Seeing that this worked better still and that it was received by the people with very great approval, he issued a third proclamation making the abolition of the liquor traffic in Russia a permanent reform, though it meant a direct sacrifice to the Crown of Russia of a revenue of no less than $418,000,000. This enormous sum will have to be made up by other forms of taxation. So far as we can learn, the people of Russia appreciate very highly the action of their Emperor in this matter. From State domains Russia receives a revenue of $502,000,000, made up of rents, $17,000,000, forests $46,000,000, and railways $363,000,000. Again I pause for a moment to call attention to the fact that Russia, which has been looked upon as the most backward of modern civilized countries, receives this revenue of over five hundred millions from State domains, including national railways. Her forests gave a clear profit of $29,000,000, and railways, of which they have 46,000 miles, 36,000 being government-owned, gave them a revenue of $363,000,000. Of course the expenditure on railways was almost as much as the revenue, but they do not undertake to make a great profit on the operation of their railways. We find also that Russia is not so far behind when we come to examine the nature of its governmental system. The debt of Russia in 1913 was $4,425,000,000, the interest on that debt being $202,000,000. The expenditures included $320,000,000 on railways, which left a profit of about $40,000,000. These figures may not have a direct bearing upon the argument I wish to present a little later, but I submit them for the information of the House and in order to inspire in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite and of the Government a belief in the possibilities of Russia as a new market for this country. Let me quote some figures as to agricultural production in Russia. These figures are for the year 1912, which is the latest year for which I could secure accurate information:

	Bushels.
Wheat	888,000,000
Oats	1,022,000,000
Rye	1,086,500,000
Barley	495,000,000
Other grains	350,000,000
Total	3,841,500,000

These are gigantic figures. They demonstrate that, for one thing, we cannot hope to find a great market in Russia for the export of agricultural products, and we might as well accept that fact, because Russia is a large exporter. Russia has a great area under cultivation,—256,000,000 acres in cereals; 11,000,000 acres in potatoes; 95,000,000 acres in meadows; 97,000,000 acres grazing lands; and area of forest of merchantable character, 1,200,000,000 acres. This gives us an idea of the vast extent of that country and its possibilities.

I shall not weary the House with further figures concerning production, but will deal briefly with the question of Russia's commerce. The exports of Russia in 1913, were from European ports $791,500,000, and from Asiatic ports, principally Vladivostock and other ports of the North Pacific Ocean, $81,000,000; total, $872,500,000. These European ports offer us a great opportunity for the exports of our machinery to Russia. Formerly, a large portion of the trade with Russia was carried on by Germany, but that trade has been shattered and will not be re-established for many years, if ever. That trade is open to the manufacturers of eastern Canada, and offers an enormous market immediately at the close of the war. Yes, and possibly before the close of the war, because our splendid battleships are at this moment hammering at the gates of the Dardanelles with bright prospects of breaking their way through to the Black Sea at an early day. As to the exports from the Asiatic ports, that more particularly pertains to our Pacific coast. The imports by Russia via European ports were $658,000,000, and by Asiatic ports $48,000,000, or a total of $706,000,000. Thus we see that the grand total of Russia's foreign trade is $1,178,500,000. This is more than double what that trade was in 1900, when it was only $749,500,000. This offers to Canada the brightest prospect of a market of any country in the world to-day, especially in view of the friendly sentiment that now exists which will lead to a willingness

to enter into negotiations for trade with us.

Let me examine for a moment the classification of this trade. As to exports, foodstuffs and raw and half-manufactured articles make up the bulk, an ' with this I shall not deal. But among the imports we find that raw and half-manufactured articles amount to $300,000,000. Manufactures amount to $227,000,000, including the following items: Machinery, $82,000,000; miscellaneous manufactures, $50,000,000, and semi-manufactured and raw metals, such as copper, lead, zinc and silver, $25,000,000. In these items we have a splendid opening for Canada. They have a large quantity of iron in Russia, and I do not expect that we shall be able to export to them iron ore. But for our lead mines in the West, for our silver mines, now lying idle for fifteen years, for our zinc mines which have been unproductive, there is a splendid opportunity. Russia imports $20,000,000 worth of fish for the supply mainly of the inland population. This offers a splendid opportunity for the export of fish from both the eastern and western seaboards of Canada.

I turn now to an examination of the sources of these imports. Russia imported from Germany $320,000,000 worth; from the United Kingdom, $85,000,000; from the United States, $37,000,000; from France, $25,000,000. In respect of other countries the figures are smaller. It will be observed that nearly all these exports to Russia came from Germany, amounting to $320,000,000, and consisting of manufactured articles, we have an opportunity of getting a substantial share of this trade, and I hope that the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the Government and this House will give some attention to the possibilities of trade expansion which exist in this respect. We can supply Russia with agricultural implements; Great Britain can supply her with woollens and cottons. I believe that a bright future is in store for the woollen trade of Canada if some attention is paid to it. Years ago large numbers of sheep were raised throughout Canada and large quantities of wool were produced. I have not the figures before me, but I think I am safe in saying that to-day we produce only one-tenth of the amount of the wool we produced in 1900. This is not as it should be. Our country is highly suitable to the production of wool, which, together with iron, is one of the great staple products in the world's market. The success of British trade and commerce many centuries ago was based upon the production of wool; later iron and steel played an important part in the expansion of that commerce. In the matter of the production of wool splendid opportunities are open to Canada, and I urge upon the Government the advisability of giving this important industry some attention. I would cheerfully support putting back in the Estimates of the Trade and Commerce Department that sum of $1,900,000 for the purpose of examining into the possibilities of some of the industries and opportunities of trade which I have mentioned.

In the cities and commercial centres of Russia a great demand exists for the metals which I have named—lead, zinc, silver—in semi-manufactured form. In Western Canada—and in some parts of the East, but particularly in my own province—we produce large quantities of copper. That copper is sent in raw or semi-raw condition in the form of mats to the United States, where it is manufactured into copper wire and other products of that nature. Copper is a product which enters largely into the manufacture of many articles and I would urge upon the Government the advisability of looking also into the possibilities of Canada's copper trade. In the Cobalt district we have the world's supply of nickel. This product, which we have a right to look upon as the peculiar heritage of Canada, should be developed by the people of Canada. Nickel, copper, iron ore—these industries are capable of vast development; the market is at our very door, as it were.

I understand that our Canadian steel factories are inactive to-day because of lack of demand for their products. Railway building has ceased; our railways cannot get money to extend or complete their lines and the result is a falling off in the demand for steel rails. But in the vast stretches of Russia in a few years railway mileage will be completed to such an extent as to exceed the activities of the United States or Canada in that respect during the last half century. A few years ago we looked upon Siberia as a barren waste. So did we look upon the vast Canadian Northwest. We were wont to think that only a narrow fringe of land along the boundary line was capable of profitable cultivation; now we find that we can grow wheat a thousand miles north of the boundary line. Siberia is to-day producing millions of bushels of wheat; Russian railway lines will have to be extended into new districts and new ter-

ritories, and the consequent demand for steel rails will be very great indeed.

I wish to draw the attention of the House to the direction taken by German trade during the last few years. In 1913 the value of German exports was: Agricultural, $432,000,000; raw minerals, $217,000,000; chemicals, $240,000,000; textiles, (woollens and cottons) $400,000,000. To what countries were these products exported? Great Britain imported from Germany $290,000,000 worth. Is there not a splendid opportunity for us to get a share of that trade? Some hon. gentlemen opposite will say: Well, you have added to the British preference and you are going to interfere with trade between the old land and Canada. I consider that argument to be absolutely baseless. All countries have had free access to the British market; we have received no preference whatever. For the sake of argument I will grant that when times again become normal I should like to see a large increase in the British preference, but I should like to see Canadian goods and the goods of the overseas dominions get a slight preference in the markets of the Mother Country. I think we are worthy of that consideration. Germany exported to Great Britain in the year 1913 $290,000,000 worth of products; why should we not have a preference over Germany? I think that one of the results of the war will be a change of sentiment along the line of preference in the markets of the Mother Country. Germany exported to France $173,000,000 worth of products; we have a chance to get into that market and to get a slice of that trade. $126,000,000 worth went into Belgium. I think that Belgium will open the doors of her markets to us more freely than she has done in the past. $321,000,000 worth of products, as I have said, went from Germany to Russia. The four Allies, Great Britain, France, Russia and Belgium, who are fighting side by side for the preservation of democracy in our modern civilization, imported from Germany a total of $910,000,000 worth of goods. Have we not a right to expect a certain portion of this trade at the close of this war? Argentina imported from Germany $60,000,000 worth; Brazil, $50,000,000 worth; Chile, $26,000,000 worth. Sweden, Denmark, Switzerland and Japan come next; they had a large import trade with Germany. My object in wearying the House with these figures was to impress upon the members and upon the Government the opportunities which are open to us to-day in respect of the extension of our trade. In my estimation it is just as much the bounden duty of this Parliament to look to the maintenance and extension of our trade connections as it is to strengthen the sinews of war. This being the case, I say that we should give these matters very careful consideration.

Last night when we were discussing this matter the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier) drew attention to the amount of money in our banks. He made a statement something to this effect: Why is there more money in the banks at the present time than there has been for some years, and why is it not let out for the use of commerce and the financial interests of the country? He said the reason was that the people had lost confidence in the Government of the country. That is a pretty strong statement, and yet the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe made it on the floor of the House. It is on a par with a number of statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite. The junior member for Halifax made a very serious attack upon the Government along this line. I shall quote some of his words, because I think the House should take cognizance of them. He was speaking not only for himself but for his colleagues of the Opposition, and, as he said, for the country also. We have always looked on that hon. member as a very conservative member of the House, and as an hon. gentleman who would state only what he believed to be true. I wish to draw his attention to his words, and I think that possibly on second thoughts he will realize that he has not treated the Government in a reasonable or fair manner. He said, speaking of the financial condition of the country and of the course of the Government:

> They are almost entirely responsible for our present financial conditions.

He goes on:

> I feel sure that the record of the expenditures of the Government during the past few years carries its condemnation. The facts prove that degree of recklessness and improvident administration of some branches of the public service which merits criticism and the withdrawal of the confidence of the country.

This is very strong language to be used in a war session when we have a truce. What sort of truce is it which will permit the leading financial critic who speaks for the Opposition to say that this Government has lost the confidence of the people of Canada? In my estimation there never was a time in the history of the Dominion of Canada when the people, from the Pacific

coast to the Atlantic, had more confidence in the head of the Government and his colleagues than at the present time. You can travel from the Pacific coast to the Atlantic seaboard, and the name of the Premier, the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden, is synonymous with all that is sound and good and conservative in Government; and for the hon. gentleman to cast these aspersions upon this Government cannot be allowed to pass without some recognition on the part of hon. members on this side of this House. I for one resent that attitude. I feel it to be an inopportune time to make such an attack. As far as I am concerned, I have never made, since the outbreak of war, a single political speech; and yet my hon. friends opposite have not risen to their feet in this debate without making the most partisan speeches on the Budget that I have listened to in the last four sessions I bring this to the attention of hon. members because I do not think that the thinking members of their party outside of this House will support them in the attitude they have assumed in this regard. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) made a statement last night which I think it my duty as a member of the House, in justice to my constituents, to reply to, no matter how weak or ineffective my reply may be:

> Unfortunately the Government have got the Dominion into this deplorable state by reason of their want of foresight and prudence.

He was speaking of the general condition of Canada:

> They have known that for at least three years that there was great danger that war might come between Great Britain and Germany. If they believed that, then surely three years ago they should have begun husbanding the resources of this country, they should have been saving money and putting it in the public treasury to meet the day of trial when it came.

Mr. Speaker, two years ago last fall the right hon. the leader of the Government and his colleagues, after consultation with the Imperial Government, brought before this House certain measures which, in the wisdom of the joint councils of the Empire, were considered necessary for the protection of the interests of the Empire at that time; and in view of the possible conditions which might obtain later on and which time has proven did exist at that time, a Bill was brought down here for the purpose of providing, just as the hon. member for St. John condemns the Government for not providing, for the defence of this Empire. It was thrown out by hon. gentlemen opposite and their colleagues in the Senate, and to-day, if we are suffering at all in this regard, we have them to thank and not this Government. Not only did they throw out this Bill, but when the name of the Right Hon. Winston Churchill was brought forward here as an argument in support of it, the very gentleman who condemned the Government on the floor of the House yesterday was the first one to rise and openly question the wisdom of the policy of Winston Churchill; he and the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) and the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) were the three chief sinners in this regard. They condemned the policy of Winston Churchill. I ask them to-day and I ask the House where would the commerce of the Empire have been to-day if it had not been for the wise provision and the insistence in carrying out his policy of that great war lord, the First Lord of the Admiralty at that time. We find that when the war broke out the Premier of Canada was ready for the emergency. In spite of the opposition placed before him and his Government two years ago and from then down to the outbreak of the war, he prepared the way for the protection of the trade of Canada; and I was proud when the war broke out to find how quickly the Government seized on the situation and met every emergency and condition with which the country was threatened. Yet for this the Government have been condemned and wrongly condemned by the Opposition in unmeasured terms during this debate. I desire to say that the Finance Minister, in bringing down this Budget, met the most critical condition with which the country has ever been faced, and met it well and wisely. He was looking after the interests of Canada, and I consider the provisions which he has made are provisions which will adequately meet the conditions.

I wish, in conclusion, to call the attention of the House to the measures which the Minister of Finance has taken, not only in the customs tariff, which we have fully discussed, but in the taxes upon banks, upon trust and loan companies, upon insurance companies, upon railway and telegraph lines, upon purchasers of railway and sleeping car tickets and upon persons carrying passengers, upon cheques and receipts, upon express and post office orders, upon letters and post cards and bills of exchange, etc. This is the type of legislation and taxation which has been adopted, and up to the present moment I have received not one

protest, and only one objection, and that was to the method of administration of the patent medicine tax. I am of the opinion that even that tax will be administered in such a way as to give satisfaction to the patent medicine industry. They did not object to the tax, but to the method in which it has to be imposed.

Mr. GRAHAM: Did they not think it was a little too high?

Mr. STEVENS: In most cases when any tax is imposed on men they will say it is too high, even if it is only one cent in a thousand dollars. The fact remains that the country has received this Budget with greater satisfaction and with greater expressions of patriotism than I have ever seen accorded any Budget in the history of Canada, and I think the Minister of Finance deserves great credit for its introduction.

Mr. A. B. McCOIG (West Kent): Mr. Speaker, in rising to say a few words on the Budget presented by the Minister of Finance a few days ago, I cannot quite agree with the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Stevens), for I have received a number of complaints from my constituency. I was very glad to hear the hon. gentleman pointing out to the agriculturists of this country the great possibilities of future trade with Russia and other countries. If we are to receive from these countries the great benefits that the hon. gentleman points out, I know that the members on this side of the House and the people throughout the length and breadth of Canada will all rejoice.

As the Postmaster General has just come in, I should like to direct his attention for a moment to some of the rural mail routes that have been established in the county of Kent. I believe that every route that has been established there has met with the approval of the people of that county. In the section comprising the townships of Raleigh, Tilbury East and Romney and the villages of Merlin and Wheatley, upon the Père-Marquette railway, a number of routes have been established. The Père-Marquette railway has a contract from the Government for carrying the mail to these villages, and up to a short time ago has given an extraordinarily good service. The people in that section were able to get in the forenoon the London morning papers, as well as the Toronto papers, which have received hundreds of applications from subscribers. But now the morning service from London has been discontinued, and the people are unable to get the Toronto papers until the next day. This, and the delay in getting their mail, has caused great inconvenience to them, and they are also inconvenienced by being unable to reach Chatham in any reasonable time in the forenoon. I am sure that the people in that section of the country, who have hitherto received a splendid mail service, would be very grateful if the Postmaster General would give this matter his immediate attention. If he cannot force the railway to give this service, I feel satisfied that an appeal to the Railway Commission would result in the train being again put on, and the people in that part of the country would then be able to get their mail and papers in good time. The people in the vicinity of the International Harvester Wagon Works and Cornhill's brickyard in Chatham township have also made an appeal for better mail service. There are more than sufficient men there to make up a village, but at present they do not care to come within the city limits of Chatham. But they are anxious for a better mail service and have asked for a post office. There is no mail delivery from the city and no rural mail route. The men have to walk a mile or two to the city post office to get their mail, and would greatly appreciate the post office they are asking for. I know the expense would be very small, and the mail carriers we have in the Chatham post office could take the mail to this particular point, where there is a store and a butcher shop doing a good business. The mechanics employed by the Harvester Company and Cornhill's brickyard could in that way get their mail, and the cost of the service to the Government would be very reasonable. If the hon. gentleman will give this matter his attention I am sure he will find that the cost will be small, and I have no doubt that he will grant the request and give these people a satisfactory mail service.

As I was saying, the hon. gentleman who has just sat down has spoken of the great possibilities of trade with the allied nations with whom we are battling shoulder to shoulder at the present time. I regret that the Minister of Agriculture is not in his seat, but I know that the Government will draw his attention to any remarks that they may think worthy of his consideration. I have here a pamphlet printed under the authority of the Minister of Agriculture giving the opinions of the different provincial ministers of agriculture throughout

Canada as to the duty of the farmers of this country at the present time.

Let me first read what the Hon. James Duff Minister of Agriculture in the Ontario Government, says:

I hold that the man who joins in the effort to keep up an adequate supply of foodstuffs in time of war is rendering service to his country only second to that being rendered by the man on the firing line.

Hon. George Lawrence, Minister of Agriculture for Manitoba, says:

Gentlemen, the faces of the nation are turned towards you. All eyes are expectantly upon you; for at such a time the Master of the Soil is the master of National Fate. War has a rapacious appetite, and great quantities of food are required not only while actual hostilities endure but long afterward while the consequent waste is felt.

Hon. W. R. Motherwell, Minister of Agriculture for Saskatchewan, says:

Germany, Austria-Hungary, Russia, France, Great Britain, all these countries in normal times, produce only a portion of their own foodstuffs, and Belgium is principally a manufacturing country. Therefore, we may well ask ourselves: "Who is going to feed the world?" and what greater part can we play than we are playing in providing supplies for the front, and thus further, and to the utmost, assist our struggling armies until victory crowns their efforts in this terrible conflict.

Addressing the farmers of New Brunswick, the Minister of Agriculture for that province says:

To the farmers of New Brunswick, this presents an opportunity, not only for patriotism, but for future profit to themselves, by placing them in a position to supply a market that will be open for a long time to come.

I am glad, in this way, to appeal to the agricultural classes of New Brunswick to unite with those who have in ways that are more apparent, gone to the service of the Empire, and lend themselves to the cultivation of the large acreage in this province which has heretofore not been utilized in this way.

In a public address delivered at the Sherbrooke fair, the Hon. Mr. Caron, Minister of Agriculture for Quebec, spoke about war and agriculture:

He stated that the time was particularly well chosen for helping educational work in agriculture. Never perhaps for the last forty years had the farmers such an opportunity as the present one, and it is to be hoped that they would all strive to increase production, not only in their own interest but also out of their loyalty to our country and our Mother Country. He also spoke of the gift of cheese made by the province of Quebec and stated that the Prime Minister had been told in England that the Allies would surely be victorious if there was no shortage of food.

As the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) says, this is not a time for us to put a high tax upon fertilizers, which are so necessary to the agricultural producers of this country. The Hon. Mr. Burrell states in this book that wherever we find a country producing more products at the present time than it formerly did, it is because that country is farming on advanced lines and utilizing fertilizers to a great extent. During my visit to my home on Saturday last I had a call from a gentleman who had placed his order for four tons of fertilizer in the latter part of last fall, and who had purchased a drill to put the fertilizer upon the land. If he were purchasing the fertilizer and drill to-day it would cost him $20 more than he had to pay last fall. He appealed to me to ask the Government, if they were unable to give the farmers the fertilizer in its manufactured state without any tariff against it, to do the next best thing and give them the materials which are used in the manufacture of fertilizer, so that they would be able to mix these materials themselves and get the results which are expected of the farmers by the people of Canada at the present time. In the province of Ontario it is estimated that an extra 100,000 acres of fall wheat were sown last fall. If that is the case, there will be 100,000 less acres to be sown with other grains during the coming spring. As my hon. friend from West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) said, we have at the threshold of our country the Foot and Mouth disease. This has prevented the sale of many of our cattle in the American market. It has had a tendency to throw upon the markets of Canada many cattle, and has greatly reduced the price of beef in all the great centres. There have been many farmers who have been unable to dispose of their cattle, and they will require pasture for them during next season. They will have to reserve for pasture the land that they had expected to break and sow to grain crops in order to pasture their stock. That again will reduce the acreage, not only in Ontario, but throughout Canada. This stock has to be fed, because it cannot be marketed at a profitable price. You will therefore appreciate the great importance of giving the farmers every assistance to procure their fertilizers at a reduced price, or at such a price as will enable them to respond to the appeal for greater production. I believe that the farmers of Ontario, who are as far advanced in agriculture as are the farmers in any part of the world, would prefer that the Government, instead of sending out lecturers to tell them what to do and how to do it, should take the money

which is being expended upon these men in the way of salary and expenses and expend it in the way of giving them assistance to produce larger crops. I feel satisfied that if this were done it would meet with general approval, and I am saying this by way of appeal to the Government to do what they can along this particular line.

Now, let us go a little further. The farmer is unable to produce what is expected of him, but what does he find confronting him? When the farmer goes to buy the implements that are required by him to enable him to successfully work his farm, he is met by an increased tariff of 7½ per cent, which he has to pay in addition to the tariff rate that he formerly had to pay. I read in Hansard that the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), in reply to my hon. friend from Medicine Hat (Mr. Buchanan), said:

> So far as our firm is concerned, there is no truth in that report of an increase. It has been decided by the firm that prices shall remain just as they have been.

We also read in the Press reports about the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) saying very complimentary things about the hon. member for Brantford and expressing gratification that his company had not seen fit to increase the prices of their goods. Notwithstanding the fact that the hon. member for Brantford has made that statement, I say that their prices have been advanced as between 1914 and 1915 as follows: Ontario footlift gang plough, advanced $1; Ontario footlift sulky plough, advanced $2; Walking Maple Leaf gang plough, advanced $1; Maple Leaf wide bottom plough, advanced $1; 12 different walking ploughs: 9 advanced 5 per cent; 2 the same; 1 advanced 10 per cent.

This is not hearsay. I am not trying to mislead the House. If the hon. member for Brantford were in his seat I am prepared to produce to him the private and confidential wholesale price lists of 1914 and 1915 copies of which I have. They are not the only manufacturers who are advancing their prices. There is not one manufacturer making agricultural implements but has advanced his prices and again I think I can give you the extent to which they have been advanced. The manufacturers have announced that there will be an advance of 5 per cent on the first of May of this present year which is not sixty days hence. I say without fear of contradiction that the manufacturers of this country have advanced the prices of agricultural implements which are so badly needed by the farmers to produce larger crops. Not only have they advanced the prices 5 per cent but they have reduced the allowances formerly made to the men who handle their goods and I can speak with authority on this subject because I am connected with a firm handling agricultural implements. The concessions that were made on large quantities and the assistance that was given in the way of setting up implements and wareroom rentals are all cut off. If my hon. friend the Minister of Finance and my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, question my statement they can appoint a commission and have representatives of the manufacturers and the agricultural implement dealers brought before them in Ottawa and any statement I will make will be borne out on oath. That is the position in which the farmer is placed when the Minister of Agriculture asks him to produce more and when the cry of patriotism and production is heard throughout the land. The Government have placed a barrier against the farmer as far as fertilizers and agricultural implements are concerned.

5 p.m.

In the counties of Essex and Kent we are under a greater burden than possibly the farmers in any other county in Ontario. In the first place we have a large variety of crops. We have the tobacco crop, the bean crop, the sugar beet crop and the corn crop, and each necessitates the purchase of special implements which in many cases are not manufactured in this country. To carry on these lines of farming successfully it is necessary that these implements should be brought in by the other side. Therefore, in that part of the country we are handicapped to a very large extent by the increased tariff which has been imposed against these implements. On almost every one of these machines there is a fertilizer attachment to enable fertilizers to be properly and economically placed upon the land in order that a larger crop may be secured. Corn planters with fertilizer attachments are brought in mostly from the other side because they are not manufactured in Canada. Tobacco planters are brought in from the other side and sugar beet planters, possibly with one exception are brought in from the other side. Corn binders, with some exceptions, are brought in from the other side, and the duty on them should remain at the same rate at which it was prior to 1915. Grain binders remain at the same price. Those

machines, however, which have to be brought in and used by farmers who wish to be successful, have all been increased in price. If this increase of 5 per cent, which has already been announced, and which the different manufacturers in Canada have agreed upon, comes into effect on the first day of May—and every agent representing the different companies are soliciting orders asking that they be given by the farmers before the price is increased —it will be a greater hardship upon the farmers of Essex and Kent than upon the farmers of any other county, because they are in the corn belt.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: In regard to the information that the hon. member has given the House as to the price charged by the manufacturers being in excess of what it was last year, was not that price issued previous to the delivery of the Budget speech?

Mr. McCOIG: The 1914 list was issued in the month of January, and the 1915 list was also issued in the month of January. I am not stating this of myself; but the farmers are saying that the manufacturers were farsighted enough to see that the tariff was going to be increased, and they arranged the prices accordingly so that they might be ready for the game. That is what the Government will be accused of, if it does not take some action to see that a fair deal is given to the users of these machines. Shredders and corn huskers are manufactured exclusively in the United States. These shredders and huskers are used by farmers' associations throughout all sections of the southwestern part of Ontario. Five per cent on a $300 husker and shredder will be an addition of at least $15 on an article that is not manufactured in Canada, and that does not give employment to one labouring man in this country, although it is used so extensively by the farmers, and enables them to carry on their corn-raising business successfully. The large corn belt of the Dominion is in the counties of Kent and Essex. The farmers are not complaining because no duty was put upon corn, but they contend that the implements required to harvest and finish the crop should be allowed to come in without an increase of duty, especially as they are not manufactured in this country.

In my constituency there are hundreds of horses for which we cannot find a market to-day. When the British and French Governments sent their representatives here, the Canadian Government asked them to leave the Canadian market for them to purchase horses in. If that is the case, it has proved very unfair to the horse-raisers of this country, because they are to-day able to supply ten times the demand that there will be from the Canadian Government for horses for army purposes. We find also the Government prohibiting the exportation of horses into the United States. If the exportation of horses fit for army purposes had not been prohibited, we would have been able to send our horses across the border and would have found a market with the British and French buyers, if the maximum is, as I hear it is, $217. I am ready for correction, if that is not the maximum price. If it is, we could send our horses into the United States and pay the $10 tax and supply a large proportion of horses for the British and French Governments. I understand that the maximum price in Canada is $175.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: That is not the case in Manitoba.

Mr. McCOIG: When Sir Adam Beck was at Chatham, he was shown a team supposed to be worth $400, and he said he could not purchase it as the maximum price was $175.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: I have known of horses being sold as high as $200. The horses were bought for what they were worth and not according to any maximum price.

Mr. McCOIG: The hon. gentleman for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) says that the same statement was made in Oxford county. Sir Adam Beck would have no object in making a statement that was not absolutely true.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: It is not true in Manitoba.

Mr. McCOIG: I am telling you what is true in Ontario, which is largely devoted to horse-raising. So far as the services of Sir Adam Beck are concerned, he did the best he possibly could in selecting horses in the county of Kent. Some of the men whom he had given him by the Government did not give to the Department of Militia the satisfaction that they should have given in making the selection of horses. It was a great mistake on the part of the Government to have incompetent men buying horses for the Department of Militia. It was a great mistake that the hon. member for Kings, N. S., (Mr. de Witt Foster) was allowed to purchase horses for the Militia Department. The hon. gentleman has the patronage of his riding. He chooses his veterinary surgeon, and he goes into a province like Nova Scotia

where he is well acquainted; and if the veterinary does not buy horses from the friends of the hon. gentleman, the chances are that he will be dismissed. By a return brought down the other day we were informed that the hon. member for Kings, N.S., purchased 428 horses, and, I think, 224 of them were purchased in his own riding. In other words, out of his own riding, he purchased more than half of the horses bought in the province of Nova Scotia. It has not been successfully contradicted, that a number of the horses purchased in Nova Scotia died on the train on their way to Valcartier. I have heard the statement made—and I do not think it has been contradicted—that at Halifax one of the horses was 30 years of age and died on the camp ground after it had been there for only a few days. If that is the case, it will do a great deal to damage the reputation of the horse industry of the Dominion of Canada, when members of Parliament are allowed to take their own veterinary surgeon, to go into a province and purchase horses. I understand that over 400 of the horses were rejected and were sold for a little over $50 apiece. What chance have the farmers to build up a horse industry in Canada so that they will be able to find a market in the other countries of the world, such as those mentioned by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens)? The Agricultural Department, in the pamphlets sent out encouraging horse-raising in Canada, offer this, that and the other thing to farmers who will raise horses. Not later than last Saturday a farmer said to me, "If you expect us to raise horses, we want you to explain one thing." I asked the farmer what that was. He said: "What contract does the Government give to a company in Montreal under which they lease thousands of acres of land at a very small rental?" I was not sure of the facts, but I have since got the contract, and here it is. It gives a lease of sixty-five thousand one hundred and twenty acres for a period of twenty-one years. The contract provides:

> And in consideration of the lease of said land to it, the Exchange has agreed to pay an annual rental of two cents an acre for the same; and has agreed that the Government of Canada shall have the right of pre-emption in respect to all horses raised by said Exchange on said land; and has agreed to hold and mature, until they have respectively attained the age of three years and six months, such of the horses as the Minister of Militia, in pursuance of said pre-emption right, may desire to purchase for military purposes, and which he may have selected before such horses have respectively attained the age of three years. The prices to be paid by the Militia Department for such horses are not to exceed two hundred and fifty dollars per animal on the range.

Now, if the National Live Stock Exchange is granted thousands of acres of lands belonging to the people of Canada at a rental of two cents an acre and are guaranteed by this Government the price of $250 for each of their horses, what chance has the farmer on the back concessions who is engaged in raising horses on land for which he pays $100 an acre, besides taxes, and taxes on top of that for fertilizer, implements and everything else? Is there any show for the farmer making anything along these lines when the maximum price paid him by the Government for a horse for military purposes is $175, and these people are getting $250 for a horse which probably is inferior to an Ontario-bred horse?

Mr. SAM. SHARPE: Does not the contract say that the price is not to exceed $250? It is not a guaranteed price.

Mr. McCOIG: The hon. gentleman is right.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: Will the hon. gentleman say where the land is located?

Mr. McCOIG: I have not taken up the time of the House with reading the numbers of the different ranges and townships. If the hon. gentleman will move for it, no doubt he can get a copy of the contract.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: The land is outside of civilization.

Mr. McCOIG: One would hardly suppose that it was in the city of Calgary. But it is presumably good pasture and well suited for the purpose of raising horses.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: What is the usual price for land for grazing purposes in the prairie provinces?

Mr. McCOIG: I have not such an abundance of information that I can answer the hon. gentleman. I have not been in Alberta. If the hon. gentleman, who is from the West, does not know the price, he can hardly expect an Ontario man to know.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: I think the hon. gentleman will find it very far from two cents an acre.

Mr. McCOIG: Now, if hon. gentlemen opposite have any intelligent questions to ask me I will try to answer them.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: It is to be hoped the hon. gentleman will answer others better than he has answered those already asked him.

Mr. McCOIG: We have heard from the hon. gentleman before. It seems to me it is hardly encouraging for the horse-breeders of this country that, at this particular season of the year, just when we should be considering the class and quality of horses we shall breed for another year, to have this competition brought in against this industry from which we in Ontario have tried to make some money and of which we have been proud. Now, let me go further.

Mr. WILCOX: Before the hon. gentleman leaves that point: Is it not true that under the agreement to which he has alluded the Minister of Militia is not bound to take the horses, but only has the right to take them if he needs them? The department is not bound to take the horses at $250 apiece?

Mr. McCOIG: That is just the objectionable point. If he does not need them, why rent this big piece of land at two cents an acre for the purpose of breeding horses? The hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Wilcox) claims to be a farmer and I understand he is to follow me in this debate. If he knows anything of horse raising he will surely see that the very thing he has stated is the reason why this agreement should not be entered into. The ministers should not set up this competition against the men who are trying to make a livelihood in the horse-breeding business.

A few days ago in the city of Chatham, we had a corn show. On that occasion we heard a good deal of that which has been discussed in this House, "Patriotism and Production." We hear a great deal of advice handed out to the farmers of this country from people whom we may call armchair farmers. That reminds me of a matter to which I had not intended to refer. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Wright) spoke of gentlemen on this side who are not farmers giving advice on agricultural subjects. But where are the farmers in this House to be found? Certainly not on the Government benches—they are all lawyers and doctors. It does not come with the best grace from a supporter of this Government to seek to discredit the representative here of an agricultural constituency who happens to be a professional man. On the occasion of this corn show in Chatham, it was startling to hear the statement of the representative of the Veterinary branch, Dr. Torrance, make the statement that between 12,000 and 15,000 hogs had been slaughtered in the counties of Essex and Kent last year and that $72,000 had been expended in remunerating the farmers for their losses. And farmer after farmer stood up and called that gentleman's attention to the fact that in many of the States of the Union they are using preventatives such as serum, against hog-cholera. We in Ontario are proud, as well we may be, of our college men. I know that some of the brightest and ablest of our young men are going into the veterinary profession. But when these young men are called upon to take part in slaughtering the hogs of the farmers, would not you imagine that if they were called in consultation they would be able to give some advanced ideas on this subject of the prevention of hog-cholera? The regulations say that when a hog is affected the whole herd must be destroyed. On this occasion, leading farmers in the counties of Essex and Kent told the Veterinary General that they did not want the money from the Government; that they thought the hogs should be slaughtered only when it was absolutely necessary to destroy them. He replied that, in accordance with the statute, it has always been the practice to destroy the whole herd if one hog is affected with hog cholera. In the United States a large number of hogs are being saved by the use of serum, and if a similar practice were followed in Canada the treasury would retain large sums of money which it would otherwise lose. A gentleman from the county of Essex had on one part of his farm a herd of Yorkshires; a few of the hogs were affected with cholera and the veterinary had the herd slaughtered. The veterinary wanted to destroy another herd on another part of the farm, but to this the farmer made strenuous objection. He said: Quarantine the hogs if you will, but give me an opportunity of finding out whether or not I can save them; they are pure-bred animals, and have cost me a great deal of time and money. The hogs were not destroyed; the farmer treated them in his humble way, and every one of them lived.

I have obtained a pamphlet on hog cholera, Bulletin No. 379 of the United States Agricultural Department, which was written by Dr. Dorset, Chief of the Biochemic Division, Bureau of Animal Industry. I shall be glad to hand this pamphlet to any hon. gentleman who is interested, but I should like the House to hear the

following extracts from Dr. Dorset's report. He says:

Practical tests of both methods.

As before stated, the serum has been tested by the Bureau of Animal Industry in an extended manner on farms under practical conditions, both the serum inoculations and simultaneous inoculation being employed at different times. In these practical experiments a number of hogs were generally left untreated, so that we might be sure that the herd actually had hog cholera and also to be able to determine better the action of the serum. In these tests approximately 2,000 hogs, located on forty-seven separate farms, were treated. Some of the herds treated were apparently perfectly well at the time, but were in a neighbourhood where hog cholera was prevalent. In other cases the disease was just beginning, as indicated by the sickness of one or two animals. In others the disease had progressed to a considerable extent, a number of the animals in the herd being sick at the time of treatment.

Since these results were obtained the department has brought this method of preventing hog cholera to the attention of the various State experiment stations and live-stock sanitary boards throughout the country and has proposed to them that they take up this work and prepare a serum for the benefit of hog-raisers, as the preparation of serum by the Federal Government on a large enough scale to supply the needs of the entire country seemed to be impracticable. As a result of this, a number of the States have taken up the work, and in practically all cases where a thorough test has been made they have confirmed the results obtained by the department with this method. We, therefore, feel safe in saying that this process will prevent hog cholera, provided due care is given to the preparation of the serum and to its application.

Dr. Dorset explains that in 1912, 29 per cent of 64,000 hogs treated had died. In 1913 only 7·7 per cent of 304,000 died, and in 1914 only 1·9 per cent of 6,000 died. If by the adoption of a serum treatment the Government can help the farmers to save their hogs, they will do away with large expenditures which have to be made at present and will also assist the farmers in their efforts to develop and promote this valuable industry.

Mr. WILCOX: What report is the hon. gentleman reading from ?

Mr. McCOIG: I announced that I was reading a bulletin prepared by Dr. Dorset, of the United States Agricultural Department. He reports that the supplying of serum throughout the United States would be too expensive, but that experiments were being made in the different states. I see no reason why the Canadian Department of Agriculture should not take action along similar lines, and, by the use of serum, save as many of the farmers' hogs as it is possible to save. This method would not only be economical, but it would also help the farmers to carry out the suggestion of increased production which is so often made at the present time. I am sorry that the Minister of Agriculture and the acting minister are not in their seats, but I think that the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance are sufficiently interested in this matter to bring it strongly to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture. Hundreds of farmers will be willing to permit the veterinaries to make the experiments in order that their hogs may be saved.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What is the date and number of the bulletin from which my hon. friend is reading ?

Mr. McCOIG: The number of the bulletin is 379, issued November 27, 1909. If we want to encourage the farmers to stay in the hog business and develop the hog industry, it is absolutely necessary that we have some assurance from the Government that action will be taken along these lines; that the whole herd shall not be slaughtered if the majority of the hogs are not affected, and that the farmers shall have the benefit of the system which has been so successfully carried out in the United States.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: Has the present Government not been carrying out experiments along those lines in the very district to which my hon. friend refers ?

Mr. McCOIG: So far as the county of Kent is concerned—I cannot say so much about Essex—I am in a position to say that the Government has not made any such experiments. The only experiment that has been made has been when a hog got sick to shoot him, to shoot the farmer's whole herd and put them in a hole with quick lime; and that puts the farmer out of the hog business for the next three months.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I understand they have been carrying on experiments.

Mr. McCOIG: That is the experiment they make—see how many they can shoot with one shot. That is the only experiment.

I would suggest that the Government should take some of the bright young men in the veterinary profession, call them to Ottawa, get the benefit of their experience, get them to experiment along the lines being followed in the United States, and it may thus be possible to make a big saving and to encourage the breeding and raising of hogs in the corn belt of Ontario. When cross-bred hogs are killed, the maximum

allowance is $15, but in the case of pure-bred breeding hogs the maximum is $50. In many cases, to successfully continue in the hog-raising business and get the proper results you cannot continue raising pure-bred hogs, you have to cross the breeds, as you, Mr. Speaker, having occupied a prominent position in the agricultural community you represent, very well know. For instance, if a man has the Tamworth and the Duroch, or the Chester White, or the Yorkshire, or the Poland China, or the Hampshire, each of which breeds is familiar to hon. gentlemen, if by crossing them he can get better results, why should he be compelled, in case of his hogs being killed, to accept only $15, when the man who sticks to the pure breeds gets $50? I remember one man, Mr. Smith, on the River road in Harwich, who had his breeding hogs on the rear end of his farm, but the pigs on the front end were supposed to be affected by the disease, and the Government officials went back and shot all the beautiful big breeding hogs and he received only $10 apiece for them. I ask the Government to consider the amendment of the Act so that some discretion will be left with the veterinary surgeons employed by the Government, and they will be able to pay the farmer, when it is necessary to slaughter breeding hogs, a fairer valuation.

Mr. WILCOX: With regard to the serum that is used for the treatment of hog cholera in the United States, the Government there does not pay for the hogs. Would my hon. friend approve of substituting the treating system for the paying system which the Government has established in this country? I have submitted the whole thing to the Veterinary Director General of Canada at the instance of Messrs. Hiram Walker and Sons, of Walkerville. The whole thing over-looked.

Mr. McCOIG: If the hon. gentleman is going to follow me in addressing the House it is useless for him to puncture his whole speech with interruptions for the purpose of giving the news to the farmers he represents that this is not the first time the attention of the Government was called to this question through the Veterinary Director General. As a matter of fact, that gentleman's attention was called to it at Chatham at a corn show and I am satisfied through some more urging of the question in this House and in other places the department will be induced to call upon the Government to have the Act so amended that it will comply with the requests of the hog producers of Essex, Kent and Canada in general. Representing, as I must say I have the honour and the privilege of doing, a large agricultural section of country and also a large manufacturing centre, I respectfully ask and will appeal to the Government to give these rambling remarks of mine every possible consideration. If they will do that I feel satisfied that to the cry of production and patriotism will be added progress and prosperity among the farmers and the labouring people of Canada.

Mr. A. De WITT FOSTER, (Kings, N.S.): Will the hon. member repeat the statement he made in my absence from the House a few moments ago with regard to the purchases of horses in Nova Scotia and the age of one horse in particular?

Mr. McCOIG: I read to the House the answers made by ministers of the Crown to questions asked by members. I also stated that it was generally reported that one horse that was purchased by the committee purchasing horses in Nova Scotia was bought in Halifax, was 30 years of age, and died in Valcartier camp a few days after it arrived there.

Mr. FOSTER: I wish, upon the responsibility of a member of this House, to give to that statement an unqualified denial, and to assure the hon. gentleman, that there is absolutely no truth in that statement or in other kindred statements which may be circulated either in Halifax or in any other part of the country. The veterinary surgeons who examined the horses were both graduates of the Ontario Veterinary College, two of the brightest and possibly the best qualified veterinarians who could be found in this country. There is absolutely no truth in that statement, as I myself was at Valcartier camp after the horses arrived there and had been distributed to the various units at the camp at Quebec.

Mr. McCOIG: Since the hon. gentleman has been kind enough to inform us of that, would he also inform us why, if two of the gentlemen purchasing horses were graduates of the Ontario Veterinary College, he thought it necessary to accompany them through the riding.

Mr. FOSTER: That is a question of policy which will probably appeal to the hon. gentleman when I tell him that when horses were purchased in Kings County during the South African war, it is generally be-

lieved that the same horse was sold four times over.

Mr. McKENZIE: How old was he?

Mr. FOSTER: He may have been as old as my hon. friend from North Cape Breton.

Mr. McKENZIE: Did they feed him on potatoes?

Mr. FOSTER: On potatoes and buckwheat both. Perhaps my hon. friend can appreciate that diet. As a matter of fact, it is generally believed that not only were horses in the province of Nova Scotia sold two or three times over, but that any and all kinds of horses were purchased and turned over to the Government, for imperial purposes I presume, and that various gentlemen in the County of Kings made large sums of money in connection with the purchase of those horses.

Mr. McKENZIE: And that was to be followed up on this occasion?

Mr. FOSTER: On this occasion the member for Kings (Mr. Foster) assisted only to the extent of signing the orders upon the Bank of Montreal, and seeing, so far as he could, that the purchases were carried through without any graft. I may say to the hon. gentleman who seems inclined to laugh that all horses purchased from Nova Scotia were considered by the veterinaries fit to be distributed to the different units, and were so distributed.

Mr. McCOIG: How does my hon. friend account for the fact that half the horses purchased from the whole province of Ontario were purchased in Kings County? Have they a better quality of horses there? Are the horses in the rest of the province inferior?

Mr. FOSTER: The quality of the horses in Kings County is excellent, and there are more of them.

Mr. O. J. WILCOX (North Essex): Mr. Speaker, as it is nearly six o'clock, I shall not launch upon the address I intended to deliver this afternoon; but it seems fitting that I should refer to one or two of the observations which have been made this afternoon by my hon. friend from West Kent (Mr. McCoig). Personally I hold that gentleman in the highest esteem and regard. I think he can claim that I am a friend of his, and he is a friend of mine. But since I have been in this House I have often observed my hon. friend getting in his work politically. I had a note here to congratulate my hon. friend because, when I jotted it down, it seemed to me that he was delivering an address very different from the tale of woe that has been given by his confreres in this debate. But he soon fell from grace. He landed on fertilizers first, like my friend with the squid, the hon. member for St. John. This big farmer of the Opposition stood up yesterday afternoon and proclaimed and enunciated the value, mind you, to the horny-handed sons of toil of a dose of squids applied to fruit trees, and when this farmer who understands all about agriculture was corrected by a young member of this House who had the temerity to tell him what a squid was, the hon. member for St. John walked out of the House and expunged the passage from Hansard.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: What is a squid?

Mr. WILCOX: A squid is an animal that has eight more legs than my hon. friend. It is used as bait for fish, or may be an imitation of lead that is used as a bait for fish. And this farmer of the Opposition was going to spray his trees and fungi and insect pests with squid, and the farmers of Canada would then be on the high road to prosperity.

That is a fair sample of the arguments that have been submitted by my hon. friend. My hon. friend from West Kent—look at his smiling now,—I must not praise him too much or he might pick the passage out of Hansard and show it to his electors if he thought it would do him any good politically. My hon. friend from St. John spoke yesterday of the enormous load that the Government is placing upon the farmers of this country by adding 7½ per cent to the tax on fertilizers and the materials which enter into that product. When my hon. friend had finished speaking I made my way to the Library. I was seeking information. I would not trust myself because I wanted to have absolutely accurate information. So I consulted one of the clerks in the Library, and he went through the Trade and Navigation returns and showed me that the total amount that will be raised by this increased tax upon the imports of all the materials which enter into the manufacture of fertilizers and upon the manufactured product itself, will be only $46,254. This does not constitute such a burden upon the farmers. Let me remind my hon. friends opposite that the farmers realize the issues that are now before the country.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Is fertilizer produced in Canada at all?

Mr. WILCOX: I think it is. I am not assuming that this is the total amount of fertilizer that is used, but I am speaking of the burden which it has been alleged will be placed upon the horny-handed sons of toil by reason of this increased duty. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, the House adjourned at six o'clock.

Thursday, March 4, 1915.

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

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill No. 69, to incorporate the Colonial Bank (Canada).—Sir James Aikins.

Bill No. 70, to incorporate the General Trust Company of Canada.—Mr. Douglas.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY.

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. How much money was expended by the Railway Department on the Hudson Bay project during the year ending December 31, 1914?
2. How much was expended on the railway proper?
3. How much on the terminals and harbour?
4. What amount was expended by the Marine Department on the project during the same period?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. $4,188,879.17.

2. $2,344,891.57.

3. Port Nelson terminals and harbour, $1,843,987.60.

4. Department of Marine, $45,676.77; Department of Naval Service: the sum of $40,164.98 was expended in surveying the Hudson bay and strait from April 1 to December 31, 1914.

WAR SUPPLIES—HORSES.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. How many horses have been purchased for cavalry and artillery purposes up to the present in British Columbia?
2. At what places were they bought, and how many at each place?
3. What was the average price?

Major General HUGHES:

1. Cavalry, 509; gunners, 280; total, 789.

2. Vancouver, 67; Ladners, 23; Westminster, 21; Victoria, 44; Sydney, 5; Duncan, 13; Nanaimo, 2; Courtenay, 5; Milner, 3; Abbottsford, 3; Chilliwack, 44; Forthaney, 3; Mission, 5; Clinton, 14; 115 Mile House, 6; 150 Mile House, 6; Dog Creek, 16; Gangranch, 95; Ashcroft, 18; Agassiz, 2; Nicola, 37; Kamloops, 149; Chase, 6; Salmon Arm, 6; Enderby, 7; Vernon,25; Kelowna, 22; Peachland, 1; Penticton, 16; Princeton, 3; Keremeos, 16; Grand Prairie, 24; Golden, 1; Athalamar, 12; Guichon, 32; Merritt, 30; Armstrong, 7; total 789.

3. $131.33.

RIGAUD ARMOURY.

Mr. BOYER:

1. What different sums of money have been expended since the year 1906, to this date, by the Department of Public Works and the Department of Militia, for the purchase, repairs, etc., in connection with the armoury building at Rigaud?
2. Is it true that the Government intends to sell the said armoury building?
3. What persons, societies, companies, corporations or any one else have offered to purchase said building, and what is the purchase price offered in each case?
4. Is it true that certain approved negotiations are being proceeded between the Government and one Archibald Macdonald, for the sale of the said building?

Mr. CODERRE:

Department of Public Works:

1. 1906—Purchase price	$3,000 00	
1908-09	1,524 20	
1909-10	631 32	
1910-11	1,360 53	
		$6,516 05

2. Yes.

3. (a) The Rigaud Granite Company; (b) $4,000.

4. Negotiations are completed with the Rigaud Granite Company, and the property has been transferred.

Department of Militia and Defence:

1. 1907—Repairs, $51.30; saddle racks, $53.90; cupboards, $40; acetylene gas apparatus, $50.

1909—Repairs, $1,186; incidentals, $18.

1910—Incidentals, $35; sheeting of walls and casing of windows, $550; heating system, $$400.

1911—Incidental repairs, $71.

1912—Contract for renewal of wharf on drill hall property, $2,245.

1913—Repair masonry work, $35.

1914—Painting roof, $250; repairs to wharf, $100; total, $4,985.20.

2. The control of this building was relinquished by the Department of Militia and Defence in favour of the Department of Public Works on December 8, 1914.

3 and 4. No information.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL COMMISSION.

Mr. KYTE:

1. Referring to the report of the Royal Commission to investigate matters in connection with the Trent Valley canal, dated 19th February, 1914, in which at page 5 the following paragraph appears as a part of said report:

"This report sets forth comparatively few of the irregularities and fraudulent practices in vogue in the office under Superintendent McClellan's supervision. He has not only practised deception and dishonesty himself but has condoned it, and winked at it in others, and he has proven himself hopelessly incompetent for the position he holds."

2. Is J. H. McClellan, the person referred to in the said report, now in the employ of the Government? If so, in what department?

3. When did the said J. H. McClellan enter the said employment?

4. What duties does he perform?

5. What salary does he receive?

6. Upon whose recommendation was the said J. H. McClellan so appointed?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am informed that Mr. J. H. McClellan is not in the employ of any department of the Government.

WAR SUPPLIES—SADDLES.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. From how many firms or private individuals has the Government or any department of the Government, ordered saddles since the 1st of July,1914?

2. What are the names of these firms?

3. How many saddles have been ordered from each firm?

4. How many saddles has each firm delivered up to date?

5. How many saddles has each firm yet to deliver?

6. What is the price each firm is receiving for these saddles?

Major General HUGHES: Answer to this question is being laid on the table.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oral answer.

Major General HUGHES: Stand as an order for a return.

Mr. OLIVER: In the absence of the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy), I suggest that there is no good reason why this question should stand as an order for a return.

Major General HUGHES: I am not going to discuss the matter; the paper is on the table and the hon. gentleman will have access to it.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. gentleman is prepared to lay the information on the table, I think that as this question is marked with an asterisk, an oral answer should be given.

[Mr. Coderre.]

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I think the rule ought to be adhered to. This question ought to be answered orally.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Objection has been made in the past by the Speaker himself and by hon. gentlemen now in Opposition to giving lengthy answers to questions that ought to be made orders for returns. It has been pointed out that pages of Hansard have been taken up with matters that are not of particular or general interest. We have endeavoured, in giving answers to questions, to follow the rule which the Speaker himself has laid down in the past in that respect.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Let it stand, then.

Question stands.

BELGIAN IMMIGRATION.

*Mr. VERVILLE:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to carry out the announced project of importing gunsmiths from Belgium to assist in the making of rifles at the Ross rifle factory, Quebec? If so, how many?

2. Would the Government be disposed to subsidize a movement in favour of a limited number of Belgian farm hands to cultivate sufficient land for the production of what is necessary for the sustenance of the imported gunsmiths and others? If so, to what extent?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. The Government has made no announcement on this subject, and it has not been under consideration.

2. The subject has not yet been under consideration. The Government is informed that the Belgian Government is strongly opposed to any movement looking to the emigration of Belgians. Inquiry has been made on the subject through the Canadian immigration authorities in London.

SEED WHEAT.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN:

1. How many bushels of wheat have been purchased by the Government to date for the purpose of supplying seed to the Western provinces?

2. What was the average price paid per bushel for such seed grain in each of the months of October, November and December, 1914, and January and February, 1915?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Purchased and contracted for 2,741,840 bushels of wheat.

2. Average price paid: October, 1914, $1.10; November, 1914, $1.13; December, 1914, $1.14; January, 1915, $1.49; February, 1915, $1.53 per bushel.

GUYSBOROUGH-CANSO MAIL SERVICE

Mr. SINCLAIR:

On what date was the renewal contract for carrying the mails between Guysborough and Canso awarded to Wm. McDougall?

Mr. CASGRAIN: On the 17th November, 1914.

IMPORTATION OF BITUMINOUS COAL.

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. What quantity of bituminous coal was imported into Canada during the year ending March 31, 1914?
2. What was the duty collected thereon?
3. What portion of this coal was imported by the railway companies?

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. 13,754,244 tons.
2. $6,144,582.56.
3. No information is available from customs records as compiled.

PASPEBIAC CUSTOMS OFFICE.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Where is the customs office situated at Paspebiac, Quebec?
2. Have the premises been leased or purchased, and if leased, for how long, from whom, and at what price per annum?
3. If there has been any change within the last three years in the location of the customs office, what was the reason of the change and who recommended it?

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. The customs records show that the Customs office is situated on the main road at Paspebiac at the "Old stand."
2. Premises are rented from Robin, Jones & Whitman, Ltd., at $100 per year, including heat and light.
3. Change was made September 1st, 1913, by the Minister of Customs in the public interest.

PASPEBIAC WHARF.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Has the Government acquired the wharf at Paspebiac, Quebec, owned by Robin, Coley & Co., or Robin, Whitman & Jones?
2. If so, what price was paid and who recommended the purchase?

Mr. ROGERS:

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

CANSO REDUCTION WORKS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. How many tons of fertilizer were produced at the Canso reduction works last season?
2. Has it been sold?
3. If not, is it available now for farmers, and at what price?
4. Up to what date will applications be received, and by whom?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. 91 tons.
2. Yes.

3 and 4. Answered by No. 2.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. Buchanan: For a return showing:

1. From whom food for men and horses, and all other supplies and equipment for the field battery now being trained at Lethbridge, have been bought?
2. If by tender, what date tenders were called for.
3. When tenders were opened and contracts awarded.
4. The names and post office addresses of all parties who submitted tenders.
5. Names of the successful tenderers, and the price in each case.

Mr. Law: For a return showing the names and addresses of all persons in Annapolis and Digby counties, Nova Scotia, to whom the bounty under the Fenian Raid Volunteer Bounty Act has been paid; the names and addresses of all persons from said counties whose applications have been rejected; and the names and addresses of all applicants from said counties whose applications have not been disposed of.

Mr. Macdonald: For a copy of all letters, telegrams, accounts, orders and all other documents relating to the purchase of horses for the Militia Department in the county of Pictou during the years 1914 and 1915 to date.

Mr. Marcil: For a copy of all documents bearing on the removal of the salmon retaining pond from Flat Lands to New Mills, N.B., and of all reports on the operations thereof, with a detailed statement of outlay and cost of removal, installation and operation.

Mr. Cruise: For a return showing the names of all parties drawing pensions at present from the Government.

2. The amount drawn annually by each.
3. What offices each held prior to superannuation.
4. What salary each was drawing prior to leaving service.
5. The length of their service.

Mr. Buchanan: For a return showing:

1. The total amount of relief orders issued to date in the Medicine Hat district under the control of H. H. Brown, relief commissioner.
2. The total expense to date in every way connected with these Medicine Hat orders.
3. Who vouched for the expenditures in question, and if more than one person, the names of the various persons, and for how much each did vouch.
4. The total travelling expenses, by whom they were ordered, by whom they were incurred, to whom and in what amounts they were paid, when they were incurred, and when paid.
5. What different means of travel were employed, how much was paid for each, and who were the persons so travelling in connection with relief work.
6. What sum has been charged to the relief work in the form of office rent at Medicine Hat.
7. Who recommended the appointment of H. H. Brown, and upon whose recommendation the other officials in connection with relief work in Medicine Hat district were appointed.
8. Upon what merchants in the Medicine Hat district, under H. H. Brown's control, were relief orders issued, the total amount of goods

supplied by each merchant to date, and how much money has been paid to each merchant to date.

Mr. Marcil: For a copy of all correspondence exchanged between the Government of Canada and of Quebec, or any minister or official thereof, in regard to the control of fisheries in Quebec province, as well as of all documents bearing on that question, together with a list of licenses granted by the Government of Canada for the present year.

Mr. W. Chisholm: For a return showing the names and addresses of all persons in the county of Brant, Ontario, to whom the bounty under the Fenian Raid Volunteer Bounty Act and amendment, has been paid; the names and addresses of all persons from said county whose applications have been rejected, and the names and addresses of all applicants from said county whose applications have not yet been disposed of.

THE CIVIL SERVICE—MR. ADAM SHORTT.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Quebec East): Mr. Speaker, by your leave I would call the attention of the House to a matter which in my judgment concerns and deeply affects the privileges of this House. I refer to an incident which took place some few days ago when the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) was addressing the House during the Budget debate. My hon. friend from St. John referred to a statement which had been made by Professor Shortt as to the number of dismissals and appointments under the present Administration, to which statement very strong exception was at once taken by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers). Perhaps in order that the House may be seized of the tenor of the incident, I had better read what took place. The hon. member from St. John said:

I have not that familiarity with the Civil Service that Professor Shortt, chairman of the Civil Service Commission, necessarily has. He is a gentleman who is in the employ of the Government; he occupies, I presume, a quasi independent position as chairman of that commission; he has made the statement, made it publicly, made it with deliberation that under this Government the appointments to the Civil Service in the lower grades are entirely a matter of patronage and he says that, whereas there have been something like 2,000 dismissals from the Civil Service, there have been some 10,000 appointments, making a difference of some 8,000.

The hon. member for St. John was interrupted by the Minister of Public Works in these words:

I would like to say that this is a statement that has been repeated so often in this House that hon. gentlemen opposite will possibly be beginning to believe it. No more dishonourable, no more dishonest, no more unfair—

[Mr. Buchanan.]

Then there was some confusion and interruption and the hon. minister proceeded:

I have repeated it twice, but I shall be glad to stay here and go on repeating it if it will be any benefit to my hon. friend. I was referring not to my hon. friend but to Professor Shortt and in that connection I want to say here and now that no more dishonourable, no more dishonest, no more unfair statement was ever made by any man than that made by Professor Shortt, chairman of the Civil Service Commission. It is an absolutely untrue statement.

These, Mr. Speaker, are very strong words, as I am sure that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works will be the first to admit. To charge a man in the position of Professor Shortt with being guilty of dishonourable and dishonest conduct is as grave a charge as can be made against any man. Professor Shortt occupies not only an official position in Canada, but I may say that he also occupies a very high position otherwise. He is chairman of the Civil Service Commission, and in that respect is amenable and responsible not to the Government but to the two Houses of Parliament. He is appointed under section 9 of the Civil Service Act of 1908, which enacts:

There shall be a commission, to be called the Civil Service Commission, consisting of two members appointed by the Governor in Council.

2. The rank, standing and salary of each commissioner shall be those of a deputy head of a department; and each commissioner shall hold office during good behaviour, but shall be removable by the Governor General on address of the Senate and House of Commons.

These words in the statute are the basis upon which I claim that the House has jurisdiction and ought to take cognizance of such a charge as is now upon the head of Professor Shortt. If an officer of this Parliament or of this country, a public servant in the capacity and of the character of Professor Shortt should be attacked by a Minister of the Crown as having made a dishonest and untrue and dishonourable statement, everybody will agree that the usefulness of the chairman of the Civil Service Commission would be very much impaired, to say the least. Professor Shortt's attention was called to the words of the minister, and in an interview which he gave the following day, the 26th of February, in the Free Press, he expressed himself as follows:

"I have only this to say," replied Dr. Shortt, "The official return is there to speak for itself. It is dated March of last year. I was simply quoting from the return, and I have nothing to do with whatever interpretation Mr. Rogers or Dr. Pugsley may place on that re-

turn. I had no information other than was contained in the return—for instance, I had no information about resignations.

"I made the statement that there had been two thousand odd dismissed and ten thousand odd appointed, not including the Post Office Department, merely incidental to a discussion of the outside service. Only two dismissals were reported in the inside service. I pointed out that this was not a matter of party politics so far as I was concerned. My remarks as reported were correct in substance. I repeat, they were founded solely on the information contained in the return and nothing else."

It does not seem clear to me—and I would be glad to have the explanation of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works upon this point, as to what was the particular statement made by Professor Shortt in this connection to which the minister takes exception. Dr. Shortt made two statements, viz., that there had been 2,000 dismissals and 10,000 appointments. I do not know and I would be glad to know from the Minister of Public Works whether he impugned the statement as to the 2,000 dismissals or as to the 10,000 appointments, or both. If I may be permitted to speak frankly to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, I would say that there has been something almost like quibbling over these dismissals; for later on in the debate the Minister of Public Works, addressing himself to the hon. member for St. John, spoke as follows:

He has surely not read the return himself or he would not venture to make that statement. **The return shows nothing of the kind.** Take the return of my own department for instance; in it 507 dismissals are credited and there are 700 odd resignations which Professor Shortt never takes into account.

I say with all candour to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works that I should be glad to be enlightened as to these resignations. Five hundred dismissals is a pretty good number, and seven hundred resignations seems to be a more goodly number. Resignation is a virtue we know, but there is such a thing as being virtuous under compulsion. I have not found in the course of my experience that the spirit of resignation in our time is so prevalent as to lead to seven hundred resignations in one department. The point, however is not whether these resignations were voluntary or not. I shall be very glad to take the word of my hon. friend upon that. But the point of the charge made by the hon. member for St. John was that there have been two thousand vacancies—whether those vacancies were caused by resignation or by dismissals—and ten thousand appointments.

Mr. SPEAKER: It seems to me that inconvenience may arise from the manner in which this matter is being brought before the House. I did not understand the right hon. gentleman to say that he was bringing it before the House strictly as a question of privilege. I take it that a discussion such as is now taking place should be based on a motion of some kind. It could hardly be brought before the House properly as a question of privilege.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I brought the matter up solely as a question of privilege.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am quite willing to hear the right hon. gentleman, but I submit that this is not a question of privilege. It does not come within that category.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If Professor Shortt was a member of the Civil Service he would be strictly amenable to the jurisdiction of the Government alone; and the House would have no control over him. But Professor Shortt is not an officer of the Government. The Government cannot remove him; they cannot control him; they cannot give him any orders. The only body which has any authority over Professor Shortt is the Parliament of Canada, the House of Commons and the Senate. If this be correct, then in my judgment this discussion comes within the privileges of this House.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not desire to prevent my right hon. friend from having the fullest opportunity of discussing this question. I do not understand, however, that he can go into some of the matters which he introduced into the later part of his remarks as a question of privilege, namely, the discussion of how many dismissals and resignations there have been. But I am perfectly willing now to move the House into Committee of Supply in order to give my right hon. friend and other hon. gentlemen the fullest opportunity of discussing this matter.

On the motion of Sir Robert Borden for Committee of Supply:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I was going to say that on this occasion I did not intend to discuss the number of dismissals or resignations. I am not in a position to do so, for I have never seen the return. I asked the Clerk of the House for the report, and I only got a partial one. I have never seen the complete report. The point to which I wish to call the attention of the

House is this: A public officer of this country, occupying under the law of the land a most important position and daily fulfilling the functions of that office, has been charged with conduct which has been characterized as dishonourable and dishonest. My point is this: Should an officer of this kind remain under the imputation that has been made against him without being given an opportunity to repel the charge? That is the only reason I have brought the matter before the House. My point is that the language of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works was so strong against that public officer, that he owes it to himself either to be more precise or to give Professor Shortt an opportunity to defend himself. That is the only thing I wish for. Professor Shortt has been impugned in violent language by the Minister of Public Works, and it is not fair that an officer of his importance should remain under that imputation. Professor Shortt staked his reputation on the statement he made. That statement may be true or not, but I say that Professor Shortt should be given an opportunity to vindicate his own words. After the Minister of Public Works has made such a violent charge against Professor Shortt as to say that he was dishonest and dishonourable, I say it is only fair that Professor Shortt should be given an opportunity to defend himself, and that this matter should be investigated. That is the only reason for my action to-day. As to the question of dismissals, we can deal with that later. I appeal to the spirit of fairness of the Prime Minister, and of the whole House, that an opportunity be given to have this matter investigated, and the responsibility placed where it belongs. If Professor Shortt has made a dishonest and dishonourable statement he is liable to the heaviest censure of this House; and if the language of the Minister of Public Works was not called for, then some justice must be done to the man who was attacked.

Hon. ROBERT ROGERS (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, let me say at once that I hope I would be the last man in this House who would venture to make any statement, implied or otherwise, upon any occasion, at any time, or under any circumstances, that I did not honestly and fairly feel I was justified in making. My right hon. friend suggests that the remarks I made upon the occasion to which he has referred affect the privileges of this House. I made the statement which I did, conscious of the knowledge of the circumstances ces, believing that I was right, and believing that I was justified in making that statement. I would not desire to be guilty of making a statement against Professor Shortt or against the most humble citizen of this Dominion of Canada that I did not believe I was justified in making. If my right hon. friend is willing to accept the statement of Professor Shortt, and to accept blame and condemnation at the hands of that gentleman, similar to the charge which Professor Shortt presumed to make against hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, why then let him take that responsibility. If my right hon. friend is willing to accept that position, and stand up here before Parliament and the country and commend Professor Shortt for such a statement, then my right hon. friend must settle it with his own friends on that side of the House, because when Professor Shortt made the statement which had been quoted by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), and to which I took exception the other night, he immediately went on to say:

> What he had said hits one party no more than the other.

If hon. gentlemen are willing to accept such a statement as that from Professor Shortt, and to take the responsibility for it, all I can say is that we on this side of the House do not propose to accept any such statement from Professor Shortt. My right hon. friend has quoted the statement made by Professor Shortt, following the reference to him in the House on Thursday evening last, and he has quoted correctly, I believe, from the Free Press what Professor Shortt had to say. Let me read these words because I think they are of importance:

> "I have only this to say," replied Dr. Shortt.
>
> "The official return is there to speak for itself." It is dated March of last year. I was simply quoting from the return, and I have nothing to do with whatever interpretation Mr. Rogers or Dr. Pugsley may place on that return. I had no information other than was contained in the return—for instance, I had no information about resignations.

My right hon. friend was careful to say that he had not studied the returns. These returns were laid upon the table of the House from every department of the Government and it is evident from Professor Shortt's statement that he had such returns. They were simple answers to very simple questions. The questions were:

> 1. How many employees if the Federal Government of Canada, including all services and all departments, have been dismissed from October 10, 1911 to the present date.
>
> 2. How many have resigned?

3. How many have deserted the service?
4. How many deserters have been punished?
5. How many new employees have been engaged or appointed by the present Government during the same period?

The answers are as follows from my particular department, and I am dealing only with the Department of Public Works for the moment:

1. Dismissals 511.
2. Resignations, 725.
3. None.
4. None.
5. 1877.

Professor Shortt acknowledged that he only had the return before him. If he had that return before him he had from the Department of Public Works a return showing that 725 resignations had taken place, and I am sure that my right hon. friend, during the fifteen years that he was in office never had a resignation that he did not have to fill the vacancy. No one knew or understood this better than did Professor Shortt. No one had a better knowledge of the facts and if you take all the resignations in the various departments, which were under the hand of Professor Shortt when he studied that report, you will find that there are very nearly 4,000 resignations to be taken from that 10,000 referred to by Professor Shortt. Was I not, therefore, justified in characterising the mischievous statement of Professor Shortt in the language I did in view of the fact that we have from day to day, not alone in this House, but outside of it, statements being made based upon the authority of the statement made by Professor Shortt with respect to a return that he misquoted unfairly. Not only that, but in view of his statement made the following day in the Free Press, I will go a step further and say that Professor Shortt's statement was not only dishonourable and dishonest but, according to his own statement, it is untrue, because he said there was nothing in the report in respect to resignations.

These are the circumstances which led to the language of which my right hon. friend complained and while it may have been strong I felt that it was justified. I felt that it was justified by reason of the fact that hon. gentlemen upon the other side of the House were referring to it and taking advantage of Professor Shortt's statement to have it circulated throughout the length and breadth of the country, that the Government had dismissed 2,000 officials and had replaced them with 10,000. Surely my right hon. friend, in view of the circumstances, will admit that this was a very unfair statement on the part of Professor Shortt because he admits himself in his interview that he had under his hand a copy of the return. That being so I say it was very unfair for him to make that statement and to place before this country a statement that is not borne out by the facts. I think it was the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) who first used these figures in the House. He was followed by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) and it was only when the statements were repeated by an hon. member with a knowledge of the conditions such as my hon. friend from St. John always has, that I thought it was time that we should correct the misstatements that were being circulated throughout the length and breadth of the country as coming from Professor Shortt. Not only did we have this statement made in this House, but we were having this statement of Professor Shortt's circulated in all parts of the Dominion. My hon. friend the member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), a few days previously, called to task hon. members on this side of the House for being guilty of keeping open the information bureau of the Conservative party in the city of Ottawa. He used rather strong language upon that occasion and was rather severe in his condemnation. Perhaps he will pardon me if I quote a few of the words that he was good enough to use:

> From the moment that war broke out the bureau was closed.

Referring to the Liberal bureau.

> So far as I am concerned, I have never seen a document emanate from it since that time, of a petty nature or of any other nature. Where is the laugh of my hon. friends now? Can they produce a leaflet or a document? Not a single one. And I should be wanting in common manliness if I did not assert it.

My hon. friend from Red Deer, as we all well know, lives only in the shade of Cobden and of Bright and he is evidently not aware that a very large portion of the Liberal party in the Dominion of Canada are getting their monthly leaflets to-day just the same as they were before the war started. It is to this particular little Liberal monthly I wish to draw the attention of the House to now. It was issued only a few days ago, on February 15, and I have a bundle of these leaflets here for the benefit of my hon. friend from Red Deer. This little bulletin for February undertakes to quote the same figures as did Professor Shortt. The article reads as follows:

Return tabled in the House of Commons February 12, giving statement as to dismissals and appointments in the Civil Service since the Government came into power in 1911 makes almost incredible reading, and throws into vivid light the extent to which the party axe has been wielded and how the influence of patronage has been invoked under the Conservative Administration. The return is admittedly not complete and was made up from the different departments on varying dates since the spring of 1911. Yet it shows a record of no less than 2,000 dismissals and 10,576 new appointments.

Such statements, emanating from the Liberal bureau and bearing upon the statement of Professor Shortt in respect to the matter under discussion, are being circulated broadcast. It is true that Professor Shortt went a little farther in that famous speech of his, in which he made that statement, and he went on to tell of an individual who had spoken to him about how rotten the patronage system was in the Dominion of Canada. Since I came here hundreds of people have spoken to me of how rotten the patronage system is in the city of Ottawa, but almost invariably those people have pointed to Professor Shortt as a living example of the abuse of the administration of patronage.

As regards my department, I have nothing to hide in respect to the return. In the outside service we have to account for 1,877 appointments, and as there were 511 dismissals and 722 resignations we, therefore, have to account for having made 669 new appointments during the three years covered by this return.

Mr. CARROLL: What about the 25 inside service appointments in the Department of Public Works?

Mr. ROGERS: I will come to the inside service later on. I am giving the outside service first, so that the matter will be understood by hon. members in all its details.

In the Chief Architect's branch, according to the return, we have to account for an increase of 244. In that branch of the Department we have had under the progressive administration of the present Government erected during the three years that we have been in office something over seventy new public buildings in various parts of the Dominion. Some of these require one or more caretakers, and others as many as six where there are elevators and furnaces to look after. Therefore the increase of 244 in the Chief Architect's branch is accounted for by the increase in the number of public buildings erected in the various parts of the Dominion.

On the staff of the Superintendent of Dominion Buildings we have an increase to account for of 99. This increase is rendered necessary on account of the engineers, firemen, watchmen and elevator men required for the buildings rented and occupied as Government offices, the new Mines Building, and the addition to the West Block. There is also the general staff of labourers and artisans required in connection with the general maintenance of buildings.

In the chief engineer's branch we have to account for an increase of 100, and this is accounted for by the addition of assistant engineers to the staffs of the 36 district engineers throughout the Dominion, rendered necessary by the increased number of harbour works during the past three years.

4 p.m.

The expenditure of the chief engineer's branch in 1911 was about $3,200,000, and in 1914, $7,700,000. That shows the necessity for the increased staff for carrying out the additional work.

The increase of 157 in the assistant chief engineer's branch, which has to do with the dredging operations of the department, is accounted for by the manning of new departmental plant, by the large British Columbia dredges having been put on double shift, and the natural increases in the crews of the various dredges and tugs throughout the Dominion to cope with the increased dredging operations. On account of the British Columbia dredges working a double shift, we have been obliged to add 100 employees. That accounts for 100 out of the total increase of 157. The department has now seven more tugs than it had in 1911. The expenditure for 1911 was $5,030,000, and in 1914, $6,200,000.

The increase of 69 in the telegraph staff is accounted for by the increased mileage of telegraph lines and the number of new offices opened since October 10, 1911. In 1911, the mileage was 8,639¾, and in 1914, 10,312, or an increase of 1,672¼. The number of offices in 1911 was 624, and in 1914, 671, or an increase of 47. The provision of operators for these offices and the line repairers for the additional mileage accounts for the increase in staff. The same answer applies exactly in the case of the inside service.

As regards the inside service in the chief architect's branch, I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that in 1911 the expenditure for public buildings was $4,150,000, and in 1914, $12,400,000. That shows the necessity for appointing an

additional number of architects and draughtmen and the same thing applies to the other branches of the department over which it is my privilege to preside.

Mr. PUGSLEY: To what date is the return brought down?

Mr. ROGERS: I have not yet been able to see the return, for the simple reason that I have several times asked the Clerk of the House for it, but I have always been informed that it is in the hands of Liberal members who have been giving it very close consideration. I hold in my hand a return of my own department.

Mr. PUGSLEY: To what date is that return brought down?

Mr. ROGERS: It does not give the date. Professor Shortt gives the date as March, 1914. I do not know whether he is correct or not; I would not like to say that he is.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will the returns of all the departments be given to us before we proceed with the discussion of this motion?

Some Hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend will see how very inconvenient it would be to have a proper discussion of the question without the return, and without knowing the dates to which they were brought down.

Mr. ROGERS: I have not given any consideration to that. I do not know anything about the return, not having been able to see it myself. I am only dealing with the facts as I find them. I complain of the circulation of a mis-statement which is being used for political purposes against the Government of the day, a mis-statement which neither Professor Shortt nor any other man is justified in making as against the present Administration. If we have had increases in the service, they have been due to the development of our country, and we have had only such increases as were necessary for the public service. I wish to express my surprise, and regret, that my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) should allow his little paper from the Liberal Bureau to circulate a statement of this sort and send it broadcast throughout the country. I would like, on behalf of my good friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark), to express my surprise that he has not been kept better informed as to what is going on at the Liberal headquarters. I hold in my hand a letter from a Mr. Godard, dated 26th February, attached to a circular in which he is making an appeal, and he uses this language:

Can you afford to be without this publication? The Canadian Liberal Monthly is published each month at the Central Liberal Information Office at Ottawa. It is prepared under the personal supervision and direction of the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should be very sorry indeed, let me say again, to use one syllable that could be regarded as harsh or unfair as against any individual in discussing any public question. At the same time, as a member of this Government, I do not propose to stand for mis-statements from Professor Shortt or anybody else. The documents and returns are placed freely on the table of this House for the benefit of hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not think these hon. gentlemen have anything to complain of in that regard and so far as I am concerned, they are at all times welcome to all the information it is possible to give them. At the same time, I hope that in future there will be no misrepresentations either by Professor Shortt or by anybody else with respect to returns that we lay upon the table of this House.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I desire to ask the Minister of Public Works if his position is that Professor Shortt is incorrect in stating that the increase in the appointments numbered 8,000? What Professor Shortt said was that ten thousand had been appointed and two thousand dismissed, giving an increase in the service of eight thousand. Does the minister controvert that statement that there was an increase of eight thousand in the service?

Mr. ROGERS: That is where my hon. friend goes wrong. I had hoped that I had made myself so clear that even my hon. friend would understand me. I said there were two thousand dismissals and four thousand resignations, a total of six thousand, and therefore the Government have to account to Parliament and to the people for an increase in the service of something like four thousand according to these figures. I have accounted for an increase in my own department of 669.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I took the trouble to examine this report about which there has been so much controversy in the House, and I made a table showing the exact figures contained in it, with the exception of the Mounted Police. I did not think it was fair to charge the Government with appointments to the Mounted Police, so I omitted from the table those appointments. There are two important departments of the Government that are not yet accounted for—Marine and Fisheries and Militia. The

Department of the Post Office whose figures were not in the original report, has been heard from by a special return laid on the table to-day. These figures I have added to complete the table, making the complete statement, so far as we have the returns as follows:

Department.	Dismissed.	Resigned.	Deserted.	Appointed.
Agriculture	45	93	..	579
Auditor General	..	4	..	14
Civil Service Commission	..	1	..	8
Customs	271	194	11	1,649
External Affairs	..	..	..	3
Finance	8	34	..	225
Indian Affairs	135	122	..	295
Inland Revenue	73	49	1	292
Interior	309	374	..	1,651
Immigration outside service	110	35	..	343
Justice	20	122	..	258
Labour	21	24	..	60
Public Works inside	4	24	..	125
Public Works outside	507	701	..	1,877
Public Printing	20	46	..	287
Railways and Canals	363	769	..	2,076
Railways and Canals inside	3	22	..	59
Welland Canal	10	32	..	225
Quebec Canals	10	8	..	26
St. Lawrence and St. Peters canals	79	31	..	128
Archives	..	3	..	17
Post Office	1,507	3,860	..	9,903
	3,495	6,548	12	20,100

Summary.

Appointed		20,100
Dismissed	3,495	
Resigned	6,548	
Deserted	12	10,055
Increase		10,045

This shows that the only mistake Prof. Shortt made was that of being within the mark. He said that the Government was responsible for 8,000 new appointments, whereas, according to the return that has been placed on the table of the House, they are responsible for 10,045, and two large departments have not yet been heard from. I must say that I am somewhat suspicious about this large number of resignations. It strikes me that the most dishonest and dishonourable thing in connection with the whole business is that dismissals have been characterized as resignations; that the various departments have not been honest enough to state the whole facts. These men did not resign; they were driven out of the service. Does any one imagine that 6,548 officials of the Government sent in their resignations without any pressure? We all know that such a thing never happened, and that these resignations ought to have been characterized as dismissals; that is where the dishonesty and dishonourableness comes in.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): I only intervene in this debate, shall I say, at the invitation of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. I am sure that in intervening I may well cast myself upon the sympathy of both sides of this House. I will tell my hon. friend why. He charged me with using strong language. That charge, coming from him at the present moment, is a very, very cutting charge. Why, Sir, I was literally afraid to listen to the quotations with which my hon. friend would back up his charge, because the point which has been raised by my right hon. leader has to do with a charge which, I think, some of us will characterize as mild. When we have to deal with a charge against a prominent public servant, that certain statements of his were unfair, untrue, dishonest and dishonourable, we are not dealing in lavender water in the way of language. The House will understand, therefore, that I really was afraid to hear my hon. friend quote what I had said. And what did this quotation amount to? It amounted to a statement made in this House on February 8 that the Liberal Bureau had not since the war broke out been issuing partisan literature.

Mr. ROGERS: Literature of any kind.

Mr. CLARK: The nature of the assertion was as I have stated. Well, that they have been issuing literature between the outbreak of war in August and February 8, when I spoke, is proved by the hon. Minister of Public Works giving a quotation from a document issued on February 15. I appeal to my hon. friend; should he really blame me very much for not knowing on February 8 what was going to be printed on February 15? He charges me with dwelling in the shades of Cobden. In what wonderful shades does he live or what powers of prophecy does he possess that he enables his colleagues in this House to know on February 8 what is going to happen on February 15?

Mr. ROGERS: I shall be glad to send over to my hon. friend the issues of the Liberal Monthly for October, November and December.

Mr. CLARK: If my hon. friend could have found anything in the issues of Novem-

ber and December to prove his case, he would have quoted it. Why did he quote from a copy of the Liberal Monthly published after I spoke? Because he could find nothing of a partisan nature in those published in November and December. But do my hon. friends read the Liberal Monthly, if their laughter means a contradiction of what I say? My hon. friend the Solicitor General says, Oh, yes. Then we may expect him to bring forth the partisan literature before even he, I am sure, will endeavour to prove a case against anything I said on February 8 by quoting something that was published on the 15th, a week afterwards. Hon. gentlemen opposite have an advantage over me, Mr. Speaker, in being regular students of the Liberal Monthly, for I do not happen to be a regular student of that publication. But before I made the statement in this House and after I made it I took occasion to speak to Mr. Godard, whose name has been mentioned in the course of this debate, and he assured me that nothing of a partisan nature had been printed. I myself read one or two issues published after the beginning of the war, and I found a very interesting historical account of the issues involved in the war, dealt with in a manner similar to the way in which they were referred to in the very able speeches of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister and my hon. friend the Solicitor General. Was that partisan literature? I was using this matter regularly in patriotic meetings, as all of us were, not with a view to helping party, but with a view to the justification of the common cause of our country in the eyes of the world. That is what was issuing from the Liberal Bureau, so far as my information goes, and what has been issuing from it even up to the present moment. That applies to the period preceding February 8, and it was that period only that I referred to when I spoke on February 8.

I want to say a single word about a very narrow point which has been brought to the attention of this House, and I want to say that word in a calm spirit. I do not admit the charge of my hon. friend that on the occasion to which he referred I used strong language, that is, judging language by such a criterion as I would bring to bear upon the language of my hon. friend. I do not admit using strong language, and I certainly do not want to use any on this occasion. I think that if the language used by the hon. minister with regard to Prof. Shortt had application anywhere, it was against those gentlemen who were using the figures on this side of the House, and not against Prof. Shortt. I will tell my hon. friend why. I read Prof. Shortt's address as it was reported in the press of this city. My hon. friend should recognize that Prof. Shortt was dealing with the Civil Service, and quoted these figures not with a view to comparing the acts of this Government and those of the last Government, but with a view to showing, in an impartial and non-partisan way, what he conceived to be the improper basis of the Civil Service. I am sure that hon. gentlemen opposite would not laugh at that if they had waited to hear what I had to say.

Professor Shortt in pointing out the unsatisfactory condition of the Civil Service in this country was following a very excellent example, he was following the example of the Prime Minister in many speeches made before 1911, speeches which in principle I am quite sure my right hon. friend would not now recede from. That is what I take in all fairness to be the object of Professor Shortt in delivering the address which he did on the Civil Service; and viewed from that standpoint the quotation of figures was an absolutely correct quotation of the figures as they had appeared in the returns up to that moment. He said there were 2,000 dismissals shown and there were 2,000 dismissals shown. Is that statement unfair, untrue, dishonest, or is the man making it dishonourable? He said there had been 10,000 new appointments and that is so.

Mr. ROGERS: Taking the place of resignations though.

Mr. CLARK: If he had been wanting to prove that they had been placed there not to fill the places of those who had resigned there would be some pertinence in what my hon. friend says now in interrupting; but Professor Shortt was simply dealing with the figures as he knew them, to show the unsatisfactory condition of the Civil Service. That is what I think to be the correct view of what Professor Shortt did. If the resignations, added to the dismissals, reduce the disparity between the persons leaving the service and the new appointments, it would weaken the argument which has been used by this side of the House about the extravagance of this Government. I concede that to my hon. friend. It would almost appear to me from the figures just given by the hon. member from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) that this is a matter which my hon. friend cannot afford to go into too deeply.

Mr. ROGERS: Oh, yes, we can.

Mr. CLARK: It would also appear to me—my hon. friend need not get excited, it is difficult for two of us to speak at once. I am saying that whether I have come from the shades of Cobden or elsewhere my hon. friend does not seem to know very much yet about this return or about what is going on in the Civil Service. However, I am not going into that. I simply wanted to make the admission I have made, that if the resignations added to the dismissals reduced the disparity between those receiving appointments and those going from the service that would weaken an argument used upon this side of the House; but, as far as a man claiming to be honourable, and I claim to be so, understands the meaning of language, that did not justify for one moment the language which was used by my hon. friend (Mr. Rogers); and if I have any knowledge of his character, the moment he sees that he will be the first man in Canada to withdraw the language. That is my opinion of him. It may be misplaced, but I hold it none the less. Nothing that Professor Shortt did justified the language which has been used by my hon. friend. I shall not go further into the question. I think I have cleared myself of the imputation, coming from a source that I was surprised to hear it come from on this particular occasion, of having used strong language. I made a simple statement, or I meant to convey to the House that from the bureau of the Liberal party at the time of the outbreak of war until the moment at which I was speaking, partisan literature had not been issued and that statement I repeat on the authority of those who have read the literature carefully. I am strongly disposed to believe this, because, as I have already pointed out, my hon. friend certainly did not quote any language in justification of his stating the opposite.

I shall not go into what my hon. friend called the progressive administration of this Government. We may admit the adjective if he gives it a shade of meaning which I myself would be inclined to attach to it at the present moment. It has certainly been a progressive administration in the matter of appointments to the Civil Service by the most favourable construction upon the figures of that return that could be put upon them, the construction of my hon. friend himself. There has been no extra business done in Canada, and there has been no extra prosperity to justify even this gap of 4,000 employees between the time when the late Administration was in power and the present moment. A progressive administration? Well, we are going to speak on the Budget some of these days and we will have something to say about the progress of this Administration and the progress of Canada under it. As I said, I intervened for a specific purpose, and having accomplished it I shall express to my hon. friend the hope that when he introduces a comparatively harmless quotation from anything I have said in the future on an occasion when his own language, which I do not think he has justified, is of the strongest possible description, he will not charge me with having used strong language.

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I think it is very necessary, in order that there may be a fair and proper discussion on the question, that we should know what the language was which Professor Shortt, of the Civil Service Commission, used at the Peoples' Forum on the Sabbath evening, which has been brought to the consideration of this House this afternoon by the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have in my hand a copy of the Free Press of February 15, 1915. Professor Shortt's address was given on the evening of Sunday, February 14. I read from the Free Press this report of Professor Shortt's remark:

> I have met men in the Canadian Civil Service who, though they hold positions under the Government, were quite ready to admit that the Civil Service system was rotten.

He speaks of a Civil Service system which continued for a period of 15 years during all the time my right hon. friend was guiding the destinies of this country. He goes on to say:

> Who took the place of the 2,000 civil servants who were reported in the House the other day to have been dismissed from the service, and his reply to his own question was just 10,000.

I ask hon. gentlemen to consider that language. He asked who took the places of 2,000 civil servants who were dismissed, and he answered 10,000. In other words, Professor Shortt endeavoured to convey the meaning to the people of this country that 10,000 men were employed to do the work that had been done by those 2,000. His language had been evidently chosen with the greatest possible care in order to convey that impression, that under this Government, five men are employed doing the

work that was done by one under the previous Administration. Could anything be more absolutely unfair—could anything be more absolutely—and I say it with consideration—untrue than that statement made by Professor Shortt? It is a statement which he must have known to be untrue. If he did not, then he had not read the return that had been laid before this House and which was the basis of the speech he was making at the Peoples' Forum; and if he made the statement without verifying it by reference to the return what can be said in his defence?

In view of the fact that the statement laid before the House in the return showed a very large number of dismissals, Professor Shortt, I say, was absolutely unjustified in making the assertions which he did make; and, further than that, his conduct in making that statement, I have no hesitation in saying to you, is unpardonable and indefensible, because he tried to create in the minds of the people of this country an impression of a state of facts, an impression that is absolutely false and untrue, because 10,000 men were not appointed, as he said in the careful language he used, to take the places of 2,000 men who had been dismissed.

When this statement was made public and the discussion of it commenced, I gave instructions to my deputy minister to have a careful statement made up with regard to my own department, showing the dismissals, the resignations, what superannuations had taken place, how many deaths had occurred, how many new appointments had been made, and how those who had been appointed were accounted for. Let me read that statement, or give a synopsis of it to the House; and I might say to the hon. member for St. John that it is dated February 25, 1915.

I find that in the Department of Marine and Fisheries Marine Branch, including all services and all departments, 464 have been dismissed from October 10, 1911, down to the present time. That number was entirely in the outside service; not a single dismissal from the inside service has taken place in my department since I became head of it in 1911.

Mr. CARROLL: Will that return be brought down?

Mr. HAZEN: It will be laid on the table of the House at once. The dismissals in the Marine Branch of my department have been 464, a small number in comparison with the Liberal dismissals made in that department after hon. gentlemen opposite came into power in 1896. In passing, let me say that my hon. friend from Guysboro (Mr. Sinclair) regretted these resignations as being of a most improper character. No wonder my hon. friend is suspicious about resignations, for if he will look at the records of the Civil Service after the year 1896, he will find resignation after resignation that was forced at the very point of the bayonet. And not only that; but he will find that man after man was removed from the fishery service on the ground that his services were no longer required, yet within a year his place was filled by some henchman of hon. gentlemen opposite. I have pointed out that there have been 464 dismissals in my Marine department. There have also been 340 resignations, and those resignations, so far as I know, are bona fide resignations; many of them made, no doubt, by men who had been taking a more active part in politics, and who, when the new Administration came into power, felt that, in view of the course they had taken, they were not justified in taking office under this Government which they had abused so bitterly. These were all bona fide resignations. What else have we? We find that there were 289 vacancies caused by death, ill-health, old age, superannuation, etc., to which no allusion was made by Professor Shortt in his speech at the People's Forum. Since I came into office, there have been altogether 1,608 appointments in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. How are they accounted for? To fill the places of dismissed officers, 464 to fill vacancies by resignations, 340; to fill the vacancies caused by death, ill-health, old age, superannuation, etc., 289. That makes a total of 1,093 vacancies. The new appointments were 515. How were these new appointments accounted for? Why, my hon. friends opposite are responsible for more than half of the appointments, because they were in consequence of legislation and administrative acts of hon. gentlemen opposite. What are they? We required crews for the Estevan, Bellechasse, and Dollard, all of which were in course of construction and under contract when I became minister. The number of men in those crews is 102. Seven men have been appointed to the Cheticamp life-saving station, and four men to the Prince Rupert buoy depot staff. Twenty lighthouses have been completed, and twenty lightkeepers

appointed. Dredge No. 12 came into commission and required a crew of 31 men; Dredge No. 13, a crew of 31 men; the tug Lavaltrie, 16 men; the tug Laviolette, 16 men; Hopper barge No. 1, 14 men; making in all 241 new appointments made necessary in consequence of what took place before this Government came into power. Is there a single gentleman on the other side of the House who will take exception to the appointment of any of those men? Will any of them be so bold as to deny that the appointments are in the public interest, and necessitated by the progress and development of this country?

Let me read to my hon. friends opposite the list of wharves that have been transferred by the Public Works Department, Under the law, these wharves when built are transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and we appoint wharfingers. Twenty-seven wharves have been transferred to our department, to which we have appointed 27 wharfingers. Was it not right that they should be appointed? Would it have been right to leave these wharves uncared for? And let me point out that the pay of these men has not cost the country one single extra dollar, because they are paid a percentage of the fees collected on the boats that use the wharf.

Mr. CARROLL: How could Professor Shortt give these figures when the return had not been brought down?

Mr. HAZEN: He had no right to make the statement he did without accurate information. Professor Shortt, an officer of this House, an official of this country, took occasion to make a speech that to my mind was animated principally by political animus, and which was for the purpose of discrediting the Government. Professor Shortt not only made a suggestion that was untrue, but practically made an untrue statement in not referring to the complete particulars. Let me continue my statement: fifteen harbours have been proclaimed during the same period, for which harbour masters were required to the number of 15. These men do not receive a salary from the Government, but a percentage of the fees collected at those harbours. To the meteorological stations throughout Canada, 51 new observers were appointed. The meteorological service has been extending very rapidly and is a most useful service. Will any one say that the small amount paid to these observers in the different parts of the country is unjustified, and not in the interests of Canada? To the two new life-saving stations that have been established since this Government has been in power, 14 men were appointed, and let me say here that when my Estimates are before the House I never meet with any criticism for having too many stations in Canada; the criticism from hon. gentlemen opposite always is that the stations are too few. My hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) has appealed to me on several occasions for more of these stations on the river and gulf of the St. Lawrence.

Mr. MARCIL: The minister will admit that it is most extraordinary that there should not be a life-saving station on the St. Lawrence. Only last year 1,200 lives were lost at Kimouski.

Mr. HAZEN: That is exactly what I was saying. I am finding no fault with my hon. friend. I am saying that I am constantly appealed to by him, and other gentlemen who are anxious for life-saving stations in different parts of the country. My statement has been verified by the hon. member for Bonaventure. No one says that these stations should not have been established, and that the men should not have been appointed.

I find that at the various agencies throughout Canada 16 new clerks have been appointed in consequence of increasing business; and every year more buoys, more lights, and more aids to navigation are required. Parliament makes a very generous appropriation for that service, and we attempt to spend the money in the public interest. One new agent was appointed at Fort William. Fifty-eight new light stations have been established in Canada, to which 58 light keepers have been appointed. One deputy harbour master has been appointed, four port physicians, and four steamboat inspectors. We have a steamboat inspector up in the district north of Edmonton where there was none before, and where the owners of steamers had the greatest difficulty in getting certificates for their vessels. In addition to that, we have appointed two port wardens, who are paid by fees; three receivers of wrecks, who are also paid by fees; one inspecting engineer, and 20 additional clerks to the inside service at Ottawa, whose appointments were necessary in consequence of the increasing business of the department.

That is the statement as far as my own department is concerned. If this return had been on the table of the House—and I have no doubt that a similar statement could be made regarding other departments of the

Government—would Prof. Shortt have been justified in saying that there had been 464 officials dismissed and that to take their places 1,608 had been appointed? That would have been quite as fair play as to make the statement he did about 2,000 officials being dismissed and 10,000 appointed in their places. I have no doubt that any other department of the Government could make a statement quite as satisfactory as the statement I have made, and I challenge the most careful scrutiny of this statement which I shall lay on the table of the House. With the introduction of the free rural mail delivery system, with the introduction of the parcel post system, with the extension to the people in outside parts of the facilities and advantages of the post office service, and with the enormous increase that has taken place in the customs revenue, would we not have expected Prof. Shortt, if he had wanted to be fair, to have said to those that he was addressing at the People's Forum on that Sabbath evening: Of course, as the country grows, extra officials must be appointed, and with a revenue to be collected $40,000,000 greater than it was before, or with a post office service whose work and income are largely increasing, it is only natural to expect that the country must employ officials to carry on the larger business the several departments have to do. No such idea apparently occurred to the learned professor. He was anxious to make the statement, and after carefully studying it beforehand, and after evidently reading the return which was put before the House, he stated that 2,000 men had been dismissed and that five men had been appointed to take the place of every man who had been dismissed, without reference to the increase in the growth of the business of the country, without reference to the resignations that had taken place, without reference to the superannuations that had taken place, the deaths that had taken place, and other causes as a result of which officials had to retire from the department in which they had been employed.

This discussion has been precipitated by the right hon. leader of the Opposition. He has brought Prof. Shortt in question before this House. He has brought the whole matter up for consideration. After my experience as a minister of the Crown for a period extending over three years I have no hesitation in saying that I do not think—and I think this is the opinion of my department, when I say my department, I mean the permanent men in the department—that Prof. Shortt possesses those qualities that make him an efficient member of the Civil Service Commission. In my department we have lived up to the Civil Service Act. When vacancies have occurred we have asked for a recommendation from the Civil Service Commission, and in more than one instance where we have asked that men be sent to the department men have been sent by the Civil Service Commission who were entirely unfit for the work for which we wanted them and to which they were assigned by Prof. Shortt.

Probably Prof. Shortt might have discharged the duties of his position with more credit to himself and more satisfaction to those who are the permanent heads of the different departments had he paid that attention to his duties which the importance of his position demanded. Let me read to this House a letter which, on the 22nd August last, and after the strongest representations had been made to me by the permanent head of my department, I addressed to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister:

Dear Sir Robert:

On the 20th of this month a letter was addressed by the Deputy Minister of Naval Affairs to the secretary of the Civil Service Commission respecting the issue of a certificate of qualification in favour of Mr. Charles Savary whom it is proposed to promote from subdivision A of the second division to subdivision B of the first division.

Mr. Savary is in command of the Cartier, and is in Ottawa at the present time and prepared to undergo his examination.

In reply to the request made by the Deputy Minister a letter was received from the secretary of the Civil Service Commission stating that it would be duly submitted to the commissioners on their return from abroad. Both of the commissioners are absent from Ottawa at the present time and we are informed that nothing in the way of promotion would be done until they returned. It seems to me most undesirable that the work of the commission should be suspended, and arrangements should be made that one of the commissioners at least be in the office at all times. The action of the commissioners is causing us considerable inconvenience, and no doubt other branches of the Civil Service are being also inconvenienced.

I thought it proper to call your attention to this matter so that on the return of the chairman of the commission arrangements might be made to the effect that that office should always be open and the work carried on.

It may be stated that absolutely nothing is being done through the Civil Service Commission at the present time beyond the merest routine. It seems to me a little less than disgraceful that a time like this should be selected by the commissioners to leave Ottawa when most of the departments of the Government are exerting themselves to the utmost, and that at

such a critical time the important duties of the Civil Service should be neglected.

Mr. MURPHY: At the time to which the hon. minister alludes, was not Prof. Shortt absent in the old country on Government business?

Mr. HAZEN: On his own business, not on Government business, I am informed. I took it to be my duty, in view of the inconvenience caused in our department, as represented to me by the permanent head of the department, to call the attention of the Prime Minister to the state of affairs on August 22 last, long before Prof. Shortt had delivered his speech at the People's Forum or put himself in a position of antagonism and hostility to the Government. That is what I have said regarding his qualifications for the position, and I have no hesitation in repeating that statement in the most explicit terms as the result of the experience that I have had in dealing with the Commission.

Now, Mr. Speaker, would it not have been fair for the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), when reading to this House the figures he had made up regarding the employees of the Department of the Interior, to have read the note there is on the statement that has been laid on the table of the House in regard to the Department of the Interior? The statement, after giving the number of men dismissed and the appointments and so on, said:

> Appointments include several hundred temporary employees at Ottawa who do not appear among the "dismissed" or "resigned." They were employed under the Civil Service Act for six months or so and allowed to go when their time expired.

It would not have served the purpose of the hon. gentleman to have read to the House that note of explanation in the report handed in by the Minister of the Interior. Nor would it have served his purpose, I suppose, to have read in the return of the Civil Service Commissioners a statement showing that when one man resigned eight were appointed to take his place. Possibly there was work for all those men to do; but any one could make the argument against Prof. Shortt in his own department that for one official who resigned eight officials were appointed to take his place, because the statement appears in the report that one resigned and eight extra employees were appointed to positions in that department. I do not suppose those eight men were appointed to take the place of the one man who was dismissed. I presume that the work of the Civil Service Commissioners has been increased as the work of the other departments of this Government has been increased, and that therefore they have found it necessary to appoint extra officials for the purpose of properly carrying on the work of their department. I do not want to trespass further upon the time of the House. I have given to the House the statement of the Marine Branch of my own department. I regret that it was not laid on the table of the House before; but possibly it is well that such has not been the case, because it would not have been up to date, and I understand that my hon. friend the member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) raised some point because he claimed that the figures of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) were not up to date.

Speaking from the standpoint of my own department, and I believe I can speak for all the members of this Government, I say that we are prepared for the most careful investigation of this matter, especially as to the new appointments that have been made. They were made in the public interest, and were necessitated by the growth and development of the public work of this country.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I listened as attentively as I could to the figures given by my hon. friend as to the appointments in his own department, and as I made them out, after he had shown us the necessity for the appointment of various people, there was still left about 100 entirely unaccounted for.

Mr. HAZEN: No. I will read the figures again:

To replace dismissed officers ..	464
To replace officers resigned and left the service	340
To fill vacancies caused by death, ill-health, old age, superannuation, etc.	289
New appointments..	515
Total	1,608

Of the 515 new appointments, 241 are due to work started by the previous Administration and completed after October, 1911, leaving 274 new appointments for which we are responsible. These 274 new appointments are made up as follows:

Wharves transferred by Public Works Department, for which wharfingers required (paid by fees), 27; harbours proclaimed, for which harbour masters required (paid by

fees), 15; meteorological stations throughout Canada, 51. A station does not necessarily mean a building; it just means a place where a man takes the rainfall, and so on.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is a position for which friends may make a recommendation.

Mr. HAZEN: These stations are scattered all over Canada, and no observer has been appointed except on the recommendation of Mr. Stupart, director of the Meterological Service.

Two life-saving stations, 14 men; additional clerks required at the various agencies, 15 men. New agent at Fort William.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is that a new agent?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes. We used to pay a sum of money indirectly to some other official. In view of the importance of the harbour, we desired to appoint an agent of our own.

Light stations, new, 58; deputy harbour master, 1; port physicians, 4; steamboat inspectors, 4; port wardens (paid by fee), 2; receiver of wrecks (paid by fees), 3; signal service operators, 2; inspecting engineer, 1; additions, inside service, 20; additions, outside service, 8.

The Canadian Government steamer Arranmore, the steamer that we purchased on account of the extra work that had to be done in Hudson strait and Hudson bay, required a crew of 47 men.

Mr. CARROLL: You did not mention that in your first statement.

Mr. HAZEN: I intended to do so. That ought to make a total of 274 new appointments.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It seems to me that my hon. friends the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries have both departed somewhat from the point brought up by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. The object which I understand my right hon. friend had in view and which he sought to accomplish was that, in fairness to the gentleman occupying such an important position in this country as the chairman of the Civil Service Commission, a gentleman who, while appointed by the Governor in Council, yet is not subject to the control of the Government, but to the control of the two Houses of Parliament, ought to be given an opportunity of justifying the language which he used upon the occasion referred to.

5 p.m.

That, I understand, was the point of the suggestion made by my right hon. friend. It must be borne in mind that Professor Shortt is not a member of this House. It must be borne in mind that he has been attacked behind his back, attacked where he has no opportunity to defend himself by justifying his statements or proving the truth of the statements he is alleged to have made, and which I have no doubt he did make, at the Forum upon the occasion to which hon. gentlemen have referred.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Were the members of the Government present at the Forum when Professor Shortt attacked their policy?

Mr. PUGSLEY: That was an assembly which was open to the whole public, including any member of the Government.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The meetings of this House are open to the public, including Professor Shortt.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But if he spoke in the gallery he would be arrested. Professor Shortt has the right, as any man has, upon the invitation of this House, to appear at the bar to explain his conduct. It does seem to me that the suggestion of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition is only fair—that this House, together with the Senate, having control over Professor Shortt so far as his continuance in office is concerned, not only has a right to appoint a committee to allow Professor Shortt to be heard and to take the evidence which may be given, but it is its duty to do so. It would be entirely out of place for Professor Shortt to make any reply to the statements made to-day by the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It would be unseemly for him to do so. When he was interviewed by the newspaper reporter after what had taken place in this House during my observations on the Budget, he very properly said he would not enter into a discussion on the subject, that the statement which he had made was a statement simply based upon the returns which had been laid before the House.

Mr. ROGERS: The hon. gentleman has hardly completed Professor Shortt's statement, as given in the interview. According to the interview which he gave out to the Free Press, he went further. He not only said he was simply quoting from the return, but said also:

I had no information other than was contained in the return—for instance, I had no information about resignations.

If he had the return, he had the information about resignations.

Mr. PUGSLEY: He may or may not so far as my knowledge would enable me to speak, because unfortunately we have not been able to see the return.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Professor Shortt did.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Not the return of all the departments—that has not been brought down.

Mr. BEST: Then, why did he make the statement ?

Mr. PUGSLEY: He made it from the returns which he had seen, returns brought down by the departments to which he had access.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That return showed 3,500 resignations.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My right hon. friend the Prime Minister, I suppose, may properly ask us to assume that Professor Shortt saw or ought to have seen that return. Whether he did or did not, I do not know, but surely —and I appeal now to the sense of fairness of my right hon. friend apart altogether from any partisan question, because I think that no such question ought to intrude in the discussion of this matter—surely is it not reasonable and fair, is it not in the public interest, is it not a matter of simple justice to Professor Shortt, that a committee of this House (the House having control over Professor Shortt), should be appointed to hear what he has to say, to give him an opportunity of justifying the statements he has made, to come here and defend himself from the attack which has been made upon him by the Minister of Public Works ? That hon. gentleman has stated that Professor Shortt has been guilty, not only of making an untrue and unfair statement, but of dishonourable and dishonest conduct. I say that if the Government does not give Professor Shortt that opportunity it will be doing a great injustice to an important civil servant. I have no warrant to speak for Professor Shortt, and I make no request of this House on his behalf. I have had no conversation with him since this matter came up, but I do say that the Government owes it as an absolute duty to Professor Shortt to give him an opportunity to be heard either at the Bar of this House or by a committee of this House. Why, Mr. Speaker, if this is allowed to go, if Professor Shortt is given no opportunity of justifying his statements to this House, it must destroy to a large extent his usefulness as a public servant. The Minister of Public Works has said that Professor Shortt has shown impartiality in one respect, and that is that, while condemning the condition of the Civil Service, he did not hesitate to throw blame upon the previous Government equally with the present Government. The Minister of Public Works was fair enough to Professor Shortt so far as that was concerned; but notwithstanding the evidence he had as to that, without taking the trouble to ask Professor Shortt as to the facts upon which he made his statement at the meeting referred to, he in this House, giving to his words all the very great weight which the words of a minister must always have in this Parliament, declared that Professor Shortt had been guilty of dishonourable and dishonest conduct. He brands Professor Shortt as a man not worthy to occupy the position of Chairman of the Civil Service Commission; brands him as a man hardly worthy to occupy the position of a private citizen in this country; brands him by the severest terms of opprobrium though he occupies a high position in the service of the people of Canada. That being so, I appeal to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, whether my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition is not making a fair proposition when he said that this matter should be taken up and Professor Shortt given an opportunity of vindicating himself, of showing the circumstances under which he used the language which is referred to, and what facts he had to justify —if he can justify—the language he used. Why, the meanest man in this country would be given an opportunity, outside of this Parliament, of defending himself and of explaining his conduct or justifying his language under such circumstances. Is it to be said, because my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, in the exercise of his best judgment and in the performance of the duty which devolves upon him as leader of one of the parties in this House, makes the suggestion that an opportunity to defend himself should be offered Professor Shortt, this should be made the subject of partisan discussion? Instead of considering the question solely and simply upon its merits, we are to be called upon suddenly to determine whether or not the Government has been justified in making the large number of appointments they

have made as the result of the resignations and dismissals that have taken place.

Hon. gentlemen are seeking to draw a red herring across the trail and to show that they are justified in the appointments which they have made. Upon another occasion it would be quite proper to discuss that matter, but I strongly object to hon. gentlemen bringing it into the discussion of the suggestion which has been made by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. But they have chosen to do so, and I, for one, am not opposed to engaging in the conflict with them, if they want to have the matter fully discussed. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says he has not a doubt in the world but that the returns of the other departments will show that no unnecessary appointments have been made. Has my hon. friend looked at the return? Is he able to pledge his word to this House that no unnecessary appointments have been made in the other departments of the service? I am in an unfortunate position, because I have not been able to see the return, but I am greatly impressed—and I am sure that this House and the country will be impressed—by the statement made by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) that from all the departments in regard to which we so far have returns there have been dismissed 3,495 employees; there have resigned—I presume that in the great majority of cases these would be compulsory resignations—some 6,548, and there have deserted, 12, a total of 10,055. We have further the information that there have been appointed, during the period in regard to which at this late date we have received information, the enormous number of 21,100 persons. Hon. gentlemen may talk as they like about the expansion of business in this country, but I say that nothing which has taken place within the last three years justifies that enormous number of appointments. Never in the past history of Canada has such a large number of appointments been made in the various departments of the Civil Service in the same period of time. Great expansion took place during the whole 15 years that the Liberal party was in power. Everybody knows that it was during that period that our western country began to develop. Everybody knows that between the years 1885 and 1895 the whole country was stagnant; there was no growth, no development. Villages were standing still; towns were dead; the grass was growing upon the streets of the cities.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. PUGSLEY: A pall of despair had settled over the country and people were leaving by hundreds, by thousands and by tens of thousands. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works was there at that time; he knows that what I am saying is true. I speak as one who knows, because I was one of the pioneers in that country. I went there as far back as 1881, and I have kept in close touch with it ever since. Sir, it was not until a vigorous, progressive and broad immigration policy was inaugurated by the Liberal party that the western country began to develop and its population began to increase. Immigrants came in from the United States, from England, and from practically all civilized countries, and a rapid and continuous expansion took place. That prosperity, progress and development continued until not many months after the present Government came into power; but to-day, in our great western country, and in the east as well, the conditions are practically the same as they were in 1895, not long before the Liberal party came into power.

Mr. CROTHERS: Was the hon. gentleman supporting the late Government in 1895?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Many people, Sir, supported the late Government in sorrow, because they saw—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. PUGSLEY: —because they saw that the late Government was doing nothing for the development and expansion of the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That was in 1895; that would be about the time that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister was supporting the Liberal party.

Mr. HAZEN: And my hon. friend himself was supporting the Conservative party at the same time. A fair exchange, perhaps.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I will not go into that sorrowful tale, with which my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is so familiar; besides, we have heard so much about it that it is hardly worth while. That was nineteen odd years ago.

Mr. HAZEN: But my hon. friend was reproaching the Prime Minister.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I did not do so until the Minister of Labour called my attention to the matter, and when one becomes

reminiscent it is not at all out of the way for him to consider the position occupied by other persons at the time referred to. That is my only excuse for referring to a subject of no importance so far as this question is concerned. But the point I want to make is that under the Liberal administration, during the whole 15 years of development, prosperity, increased population, increased business, increased customs revenue, increased postal revenue, increased inland revenue, increased revenue in all departments, there never was anything like the increase in the number of employees in a corresponding period of time that there has been during the three years that this Government has been in office.

My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has given a list of appointments that have been made in his department. He says that they were to take the places of persons who had been dismissed or who had resigned, or to carry on new branches of the department. But my hon. friend forgets that in addition to that there were a number of employees who were in ill health and a number who had grown old in the service and were incapable of discharging their duties any longer. The services of many of these men, who, as we know, are allowed to remain in the service, doing comparatively little work, might very well be dispensed with. Was it necessary, therefore, for my hon. friend to appoint strong, vigorous young men and women in the place of the 289 old persons who apparently had become unfit for further service? He not only makes these additional appointments of 515 persons, but presumably he fills the places of 289 employees who have grown too old to be of service in the department by appointing younger persons. One would think, therefore, that he must have had a large number of employees in his department whose services were not absolutely necessary. It is common knowledge in this country that this Government has been earnestly endeavouring to make jobs for scores and hundreds of people in various sections of Canada.

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I venture to say that the hon. gentleman who protests himself knows as well as I do that this is a fact, and I have no doubt that the same condition prevails in his constituency. Demands were made upon these gentlemen; improperly they yielded to them, and the result has been this enormous and unnecessary increase in the number of employees in the various departments. What does that mean? You have 11,000 more employees in the various departments of the Government than there were when this Government came into office in 1911. What does it mean? Is it too much to say that outside of those who are paid by fees, their salaries would average at least $800 or perhaps $1,000 each, taking the whole 11,000? At $1,000 each then, it means the enormous sum of $11,000,000 which has been added to the ordinary current expenditure of this country. It does seem to me that the burthen resting on hon. gentlemen opposite is not simply to condemn us because we bring these matters up, but to show us what have been the increases in the different departments and to justify those increases. To-day the Prime Minister made the motion that you leave the Chair in order to precipitate this discussion. He might, had he desired, have allowed the limited discussion to go on as to what should be done so far as Professor Shortt was concerned; but when my right hon. friend moved that you leave the Chair, immediately the Minister of Public Works entered upon a general discussion as to whether these appointments were justifiable or not, and spoke of the increase of the business in his department. He has been followed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. But they still leave us without this report; they cannot even tell us where it is. It is their business to keep control of it, and, if they cannot get the report, to furnish a copy of it. I have no doubt there is in the Department of Secretary of State a copy of this report. The Secretary of State never submits a return to this House without keeping a copy. I have no doubt there is in each department a copy of the report sent to the Department of State in order that they might make up the general report covering all departments. Is it unreasonable to ask that we should be furnshed with a copy of that report? Is it unreasonable to ask that this House should have an opportunity of looking into that report? It seems to me most unreasonable that we should be denied that opportunity. It looks as if hon. gentlemen were simply seeking to cast dust into the eyes of the people of this country in making assertions of a general character without giving us an opportunity of going into details and questioning the correctness of the statements which they make. I and other members of the House would like an opportunity to see the returns from the different depart-

ments. There is no excuse for not bringing down those returns before this late date. The returns were moved for by a member of this House at the session of 1913-14, but up to to-day, up to this very moment, we have not got the return of the Department of Marine and Fisheries; although my hon. friend the minister has addressed the House with regard to the subject, we find that we have not even his return before us, and we only got the return from the department of the Postmaster General to-day. There are some other departments the returns for which are not yet before the House. There is no justification for that delay. What is the use of members having the right to move for returns when they are to be delayed month after month, the delay running over into the following year. That is the case with returns which were moved for in 1913-14, so far as this subject is concerned. It is not fair to this House, or to those who wish to discuss the matter, that this return should not be here. Notwithstanding that the returns are not here, knowing as I do something with regard to the condition of this country, I submit that there is no excuse for the enormous number of appointments which have been made. Even in the case of the Department of Public Works, I submit there is no excuse for such a large increase in the number of appointments. The Minister of Public Works speaks of the increase in the work of dredging, and he refers to an increase of from $3,000,000 to $6,000,000. My hon. friend must be wrong in that, because if he will take the Estimates, which can be found in the Blue Book which has been submitted to Parliament, he will find that under dredging, on page 72, there is only $2,307,000. Would my hon. friend be good enough to state how he makes up the difference? Maybe he is right, and it is not contained on page 72, but in some other portion of the Blue Book.

Mr. ROGERS: The report which I sent over to my hon. friend was made up by the deputy minister, Mr. Hunter. I looked it over with him, and I am satisfied it is correct in every detail.

Mr. PUGSLEY: At page 72 it gives the dredging for the maritime provinces, for Ontario and Quebec, for Manitoba and Saskatchewan and Alberta and for British Columbia; it gives the cost of dredging plant in the maritime provinces and the other provinces, and the total is $2,307,000. It may be that under capital account, on harbours and rivers, there is some additional dredging which may give the increased amount, but it is certainly not under the head of dredging. My hon. friend says a large increase in the staff has been necessary for the purpose of rushing along the public buildings. I submit that is not justified by the interests of the country. When I was minister there was a large staff in the architectural branch. While the officials worked pretty zealously, I never saw any urgent necessity for making increases in the staff, and I do not think it was necessary for the minister to make increases in that branch of the department.

Mr. ROGERS: There was occasion for increase by reason of the fact that during the term that you were Minister of Public Works a large number of plans were made by outside architects. We have tried to change that and to have the plans made inside the department, as far as possible. Therefore the department required an increase in the staff for carrying out the work, especially in view of the fact that the department as a whole was spending only $14,000,000 in 1911, while in 1914 it was spending $28,000,000—just double the amount.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend is spending double the amount of money. That raises another question which we have already discussed as to whether that enormous expenditure of $28,000,000 is really necessary in the interests of the country. It all shows that when this Government came into power they were crazed by the degree of prosperity which they found all around them. They were like a young man, somewhat improvident, coming into a great inheritance; and they went to work to spend money just as rapidly as they could, and so they discovered at once that the late Minister of Public Works had not a sufficiently large staff, he had not enough architects to spend all this Government wanted to spend. The Department of Railways and Canals had not enough engineers to carry out their large ideas in connection with development, so far as that department was concerned, and they proceeded at once, not only to ask Parliament to vote this large additional sum of money, but to enlarge the staff of architects and engineers.

They proceeded right here in the city of Ottawa to rent a large number of new buildings, although when in Opposition they criticised the late Government for the number of buildings which we had rented. They told us then that we had more accommodation than was necessary for properly carrying on the work of the country, but when these gentlemen came into power they at

once proceeded to rent more buildings at a larger rental than we paid. These buildings necessitate a large number of elevator men, a large number of furnace men, and a large number of caretakers, and add enormously, and I think unnecessarily, to the expenses of the country. What my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works ought to have done was to have gone along slowly with the officials already in the employ of the Government. He ought to have been content to spend $12,000,000 in his department. That is a large sum of money. The minister tells us that the Government has erected eighty public buildings in Canada during the past year. Let the minister tell us how many of those buildings were urgently required to meet the public service, and how many of the postal building that have been erected throughout Canada were actually required. A great many of these post office buildings have been erected in towns where accommodation was formerly rented for a moderate amount, and served the public interest very well. I have in mind the case of a public building which the Minister of Public Works has erected in a county where accommodation was formerly rented. I do not think the rental could have exceeded $100, and yet the Minister of Public Works has erected a public building there at a cost of some $35,000 or $40,000.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In what county?

Mr. PUGSLEY: In my old county of Kings, N.B. The building is in a small village containing but a few hundred people. A beautiful village it is true, but when I was Minister of Public Works I had stated to Parliament that I proposed putting up there a pretty one-story building to cost about $5,000, which I thought would be ample for the purpose.

Mr. ROGERS: Did you ever build one for $5,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY: That was the first occasion on which I thought of putting up a building in such a small town as that.

Mr. J. D. REID: What about Humboldt?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Humboldt is two, three, four, five times the size of the place at which this building had been erected at a cost of some $35,000 or $40,000. What does this mean? Besides the cost of the building there is the cost of heating, the cost of a caretaker, and repairs have to be made from time to time. It will probably mean an expense ten times greater than

[Mr. Pugsley.]

was previously incurred in that place. And that is merely an instance of what has been done all over this country since this Government came into power. They have erected buildings in places which they stated, when in Opposition, did not require public buildings, and so have added to the public expense all around.

Before taking my seat I wish to say a word or to further on behalf of Professor Shortt, and in support of the suggestion which my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has made. I for one do not believe that Professor Shortt cares one iota for this Government or for this Opposition. When we were in office, I never saw any evidence that Professor Shortt showed any favouritism towards the late Government. In fact, in many cases the recommendations I made were turned down by the Civil Service Commission. But I recognized that the Civil Service Commission was an independent body entitled to the exercise of its own judgment. I recognized that it was when it was proposed to make the Civil Service Commission an independent body, that both sides of this House supported the proposition and expected the Civil Service Commission to take the Civil Service as far as possible out of politics. I have never seen any evidence of partiality towards the Liberal party from that Commission, and I do not believe that Professor Shortt's remarks on the occasion referred to were influenced in the slightest degree by his feeling in favour of the Liberal party or against the Conservative party. I do not think such an idea ever entered his head for a single moment.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has referred to the necessity of having some member of the Commission here continually to attend to business. I notice that in the Statutes of 1912 it was provided that the old Civil Service Act should be amended by giving the Governor General power to appoint three members to the Civil Service Commission instead of two. May I ask if that appointment has ever been made?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No, it has not.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why not? My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has read a letter complaining that some of the commissioners were absent. Why has the Government not exercised its power and appointed an additional member of the Civil Service Commission?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will give my hon. friend some information when he gets through.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I shall have no trouble in getting through before six o'clock. I would ask that complete returns from all departments be brought down; not these fragmentary returns, a return from one department one week and another return from another department the next week. If the Government will comply with the order that was passed by this House upwards of a year ago and bring down complete returns so that we can examine them, and if the Government will appoint a day for the discussion of the necessity of making this vast number of appointments, I think they will find a readiness on this side of the House to meet them in that discussion, and to take up the cases of individuals in the different provinces. But I think we have a right to say that we should have these returns before us, so that we can speak with intelligence and a degree of certainty in the matter. I thank my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) for having, after a good deal of effort, dug out some information from an unwilling Government. We have this fact: some 21,000 appointments have been made to fill the vacancies caused by some 10,000 dismissals, deaths, desertions and resignations. That is something, at all events, upon which we can go and something in regard to which I think we have a very good foundation for appealing to the people of this country. I think it justifies the charge which has already been made during this debate that this Government in its appointments at all events, if not in its carrying on of the general administration of affairs, has been guilty of reckless disregard in the way the people's money has been expended. Through mismanagement, and through failure to have due regard to those principles of economy which ought to govern those having charge of the administration of affairs, the Government have brought this country into a position which should give very grave concern to the people, and lead us even now to consider whether it would not be possible to engage on a work of retrenchment, by means of which many millions of dollars might be annually saved to the people of this country.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, it is no more than justice to the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) to say that the example of debating which he has given the House in the last half-hour is not at all up to the standard of which he is capable upon a subject that he is really interested in and upon which he has something to say. The hon. gentleman was under the unpleasant necessity of switching from the point of the discussion, into which the Opposition now wish they had never plunged, to a subject as dull, monotonous and time-worn as he could discover, and then engaging in a pathetic effort to drag that discussion along its weary length to as near six o'clock as possible. The discussion arose, with the interposition of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on behalf of the chairman of the Civil Service Commission who has been attacked in this House because, on the basis of a return—and one return alone—he made a public statement, though a civil servant of this country, that was at variance with the facts as shown in that return. If he made a statement at variance with the facts, plainly at variance with the facts and calculated to deceive and made it knowingly he made a statement which was dishonourable, dishonest and untrue. Did he make a statement at variance with the facts? Was it plainly at variance with the facts, and must he not have known that it was at variance with the facts? That is the point before the House, nothing more and nothing less. The statement he made, quoted in two newspapers in the city of Ottawa, was that the return, which he treated as one entity and no more, a copy of which return I hold in my hands, showed that the Government of Canada, since it came into office, had dismissed 2,000 employees of the Civil Service and in their places had put 10,000. That is the report of the Citizen; that is the report of the Ottawa Free Press. That statement is false, that statement is untrue, that statement is misleading, and that statement, on the professor's own showing, was false to his own knowledge. He says that he had the return, that he knew what was in the return, that that was all he knew, and taking that return and knowing what was in it, he said that there were 2,000 dismissals replaced with 10,000 appointments and nothing said about resignations. Both sentences were false, and he must have known that they were false because he had the return, and what some other return may say has nothing to do with that paper. What does the hon. member (Mr. Pugsley) expect to do for Professor Shortt by asking for an additional return which he says will show that what Professor Shortt said about this return is true? How can an additional return vary the facts of the present return? False! Two thousand dismissals were made, almost 4,000 resignations took

place which were mentioned, but beyond the dismissals and beyond the resignations there was an intervening hiatus which Professor Shortt owed it to himself and his audience to explain—the number of deaths, the number of superannuations and more than all, the number of temporary appointments—men who go on for certain purposes temporarily and then are left off the serivce. Why, take the report of the Post Office Department alone. Who is there who does not know, and no one better than Professor Shortt, that in every town and city in Canada at Christmas time there are many appointments made to the Post Office service? In my own city of about 7,000 people there are every year added to the post office staff one or two. Take that proportion all over Canada and thousands would intervene between resignations and appointments and the total number of appointees is thereby accounted for.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: Does my hon. friend mean to say that these temporary clerks appointed at Christmas time in towns and cities are included under the heading of appointments?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I certainly mean to say so and I mean to say further that Professor Shortt knew they were so included.

Mr. MARTIN: They are not so included.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have the Postmaster General's authority for the statement that they are so included, and I prefer to rely upon it.

Mr. MURPHY: Is my hon. friend referring to the report brought down by the Postmaster General to-day?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I am referring to this return. The hon. gentleman will see, if he looks at the return, that in many instances it is pointed out that temporary appointments are included and that the employees are of the class to which I have referred.

Mr. MURPHY: The post office return is not in the one that my hon. friend has.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very well.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Was the post office return in the statement to which Professor Shortt referred?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The post office return was brought down to-day.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. CLARK: Then, how could Professor Shortt know that these temporary appointments were included in the return?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Because it says so in several of the departments included in the return itself. Now I will read to my hon. friend from Red Deer. I intend to read to him a lot more just a little later, but I will read to him from the return of the Department of the Interior:

> Dismissals, 309; resignations, 374; deserters, none; punished, none; appointments, 1,651.

There would be a difference of 800 or 900 men. Then, it is said:

> The appointments include several hundred temporary employees at Ottawa who do not appear among the "dismissed" or "resigned" They were employed under the Civil Service Act for six months or so and allowed to go when their term expired.

In a number of other returns the relation of similar facts will be found and Professor Shortt owed it to his audience and to this Government to make that statement and not the statement he did make.

Mr. DEVLIN: That does not refer to the postal clerks who were appointed at Christmas time and to whom my hon. friend referred.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My statement as to postal clerks is absolutely correct. In the return in which postal clerks are referred to the postal clerks taken on at Christmas are included.

Mr. DEVLIN: But not in the return to which Professor Shortt referred.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, but the same principle applies in both cases and that is what Professor Shortt ignored or rather suppressed. Now is my hon. friend satisfied?

Mr. DEVLIN: I am satisfied that my hon. friend was wrong.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It takes very little to satisfy the hon. member. I interposed in this discussion—

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly. I make a very great effort to extend to my hon. friend the courtesy which he extended to me.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I thank my hon. friend for his forgiving spirit. He said he wanted to have a conversation with my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean). My hon. friend says he has a copy of a return which none of us on this

side of the House are able to find. Will he be good enough to have a copy of his copy made and laid on the table so that it may be accessible?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I went to get a copy of the return myself a few days ago and I found it was in the possession of the leader of the Opposition.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I will say to my right hon. friend that he found nothing of the kind. I had a partial return, but the main return I never had.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I was informed that it had been in the possession of my right hon. friend and that he had had copies made of it. I asked that one of the copies which had been prepared should be furnished to me and it was furnished to me.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My right hon. friend was more clever than I was, because I never had such a report.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My right hon. friend was not so diligent about the matter as I was.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. W. F. NICKLE (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, when this matter was first broached it did not seem one of very great importance, but as the discussion developed, and as two ministers of the Crown, speaking with great deliberation, and without doubt, realizing the weight their words will carry throughout the Dominion, have made certain charges against the chairman of the Civil Service Commission, it seems to me incumbent on this House to seriously consider the matter. If I understood correctly the position of the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), the members of the Civil Service Commission are beyond the control of the Government and can be discharged only on the joint address of the House of Commons and the Senate. It is not my intention to discuss the evidence submitted or the statements made here this afternoon; but I should not be discharging my duty as I see it if I did not explain to the House through you, Sir, that my spirit revolts at the finding of a man guilty on the ex-parte statement of a newspaper correspondent. If the chairman of the Civil Service Commission is guilty of the improprieties alleged; if Professor Shortt has drawn to himself since he came to Ottawa the attributes that he is alleged to bear, then I think it is the duty of this House to take into consideration the place that he ought to occupy. Those of us who were more or less interested in Civil Service reform welcomed the appointment of a Civil Service Commission. But when the chairman of the Civil Service Commission is charged with having so far forgotten himself as to become biased and partisan, it seems to me not unreasonable that an inquiry should be set on foot. If the ministers were sincere in the allegations that they have placed before the House and the country this afternoon, then it is incumbent upon the Prime Minister to name a committee of this House, if necessary, to act in conjunction with a committee of the Senate, to inquire fully into the conduct of the chairman of the Civil Service Commission. He owes it not only to this House and to each one of us who must bear a certain responsibility for the discharge of the duty of the Civil Service Commission, but he owes it to the country as well. For, if the Civil Service Commission breaks down it must be more difficult for the right hon. leader of the Government to put into effect one of the planks of his Halifax platform—Civil Service reform. I wish to say to the House and to the country through you, that if the condition is as serious as was represented to us this afternoon, I believe that it is incumbent upon the Ministry to name a committee of this kind or to call Professor Shortt before the Bar of this House so that there may be an opportunity for an investigation. If the charges made in this House this afternoon are proven to be true, no one will be more willing than I to see Professor Shortt removed from office. But if the charges are not true, it is not necessary for me to advise the House what should be done, because hon. gentlemen at all times know the courtesy that is demanded towards men who have been wrongly assailed.

Hon. W. T. WHITE (Minister of Finance): A few words will suffice for my contribution to this debate. Silence on my part, especially in view of the fact that my department was particularly referred to by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) this afternoon would be unfair to myself. With respect to the return which was referred to, or was alleged to have been referred to, by Professor Shortt in his address on the evening of the 14th February, I requested my department to prepare a statement with respect to that re-

turn, and I am sure that a memorandum from him will be entirely satisfactory to all the members of this House. And I desire, in fairness to myself as I have said, and in fairness to my department, to place the memorandum on Hansard. It is as follows:

The undersigned has had examination made of the answer rendered by this department to the above question. As in the case of all questions and returns to the House of Commons, the answer is given to the question as asked without argument.

The answer of the Finance Department was divided into two parts, (1) relating to the Finance Department with the office of the Assistant Receiver General, and (2) in relation to what is called Departments Generally, or the Char Service. The latter was included because the question comprehended all services and all departments.

(1) In the case of the Finance Department proper, the answer was given as follows:

That is the answer that was embodied in the return which was discussed here to-day.

Dismissed	1
Resigned	12
Deserted	..
Deserters punished	..
Appointed	26

The answer is absolutely correct; but to found an argument upon it as to excessive appointments would lead to error because in the question no mention is made of the members who died, who were superannuated or who were transferred; nor of vacancies existing. The following statement will show the net increase in the period referred to so far as the Finance Department is concerned:

Dismissed	1
Resigned	12
Superannuated	4
Died	4
Transferred	1
Vacancies existing Oct. 10, 1911	2
Total	24
Appointments	26
Net increase	2

Now, in the return made to the House, if we have regard, as Professor Shortt is reported to have had regard, only to dismissals and resigned employees on the one side and to new appointments on the other, the figures would be, for the former 13 and for the latter 26. That is to say, unless the statement were accompanied by the explanation I am now giving, it would appear that we had dismissed one, that twelve had resigned, and that we had appointed twenty-six to do the work that these thirteen had formerly done; whereas in reality the total increase in the staff of the department up to the date of the return, was 2. Now, my deputy goes on:

(2) Departments Generally.

In the case of the char service the return given was as follows:

Dismissed	7
Resigned	22
Deserted	..
Deserters punished	..
Appointed	199

During that time, however, twelve charwomen died so that the net increase was as follows:

Dismissed	7
Resigned	22
Deserters	..
Deserters punished	..
Died	12
Total	41
Appointed	199
Net increase	158

The statement shows that the net increase was 158, but if the return be interpreted as it is reported to have been interpreted by Prof. Shortt, then the figures would be as follows: dismissed, 7; resigned, 22; total, 29; appointments, 199, a difference of 170. But if Prof. Shortt had inquired—and he might very well have inquired, because no man in the city was in a better position to do so,—he would have ascertained that the increase in the char services during the period indicated resulted from the Government's occupying the following 24 buildings.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Additional buildings?

Mr. WHITE: Additional buildings, as follows: Central station, Blackburn building, 500 Sussex street building, Rideau club, 69 Vittoria street, Robinson building, old Union Bank building, 241 Wellington street, Hope building, 6th flat, 223 Queen street building, 328 Queen street building, Quebec Bank building, 265½ Wellington street, Masonic Temple building, Booth building, 14 Kent street building, 105 Vittoria street building, Journal building, 27 Cliff street building, old museum building, biological laboratory, McKay street building, two extra flats in Imperial building, new wing, East block. Unaccompanied by this explanation, it would appear that I had dismissed a number of these worthy charwomen, and had appointed in their stead not the number dismissed, namely 7, but, to do the same work, not less than 199.

Mr. CARROLL: Did you dismiss seven?

Mr. WHITE: I dismissed none of them. Since I took office I have refrained from

even considering such a trifling question as the dismissal of a charwoman for partisan or other reasons. My hon. friend's suggestion rather shows what would be in his mind if he were here and I were there.

Mr. CARROLL: I think my hon. friend said that seven were dismissed.

Mr. WHITE: They were dismissed for cause by the officers of the department.

An hon. MEMBER: For political partisanship?

Mr. WHITE: No, not for political partisanship. The hon. member for the city of St. John rather seemed to suggest that the renting of the buildings may have been unnecessary. The trouble with the hon. member for St. John and certain other gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, who have spoken not only on this occasion but recently in connection with the Budget debate as well, is that they evidently labour under the delusion that when they stopped governing, this country stopped growing. I would point out to my hon. friends that the sun continues its daily journey east and west through the heavens, even though a clock may have run down. The hon. member for Red Deer threatens to meet us at Philippi in the Budget debate. We will be there. Let me point out to him that the year before this Government took office the total trade of this country was $750,000,000. The year we took office it was $850,000,000; the next year it was $1,000,000,000, and the next year $1,100,000,000. When we took office the revenue of Canada was $135,000,000; the second year it was $168,000,000—the best by far in the history of the Dominion—and the next year it was $163,000,000. This year, of course, we have the war.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh; the war.

Mr. WHITE: I am surprised to learn that hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem to be aware that a war is now proceeding. It has been borne in on me on many occasions; it was borne in on me yesterday. Intellectual as my hon. friend the member for St. John is, he lacks the vision and imagination. While the great allied fleet has been smashing its way through the Dardanelles on the way to Constantinople, and, according to the despatches, the Allies and Turkish troops are in conflict on the plains of Troy, where gods and heroes contended in prehistoric times, what was my hon. friend discussing in this House? The duty upon squid. Reductio ad absurdum—fertilizers and squid. Having regard to the fact that there is in progress a war not only greater than any that has ever occurred in the history of the world, but greater than the aggregate of all wars that have ever taken place I would point out that the people will expect hon. gentlemen to get a proper sense of the perspective of the situation.

Mr. DEVLIN: That is not fair.

Mr. MACDONALD: What were you doing?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. WHITE: I would suggest that they get a proper sense of perspective in regard to the great war in which we are now engaged. But, to come back to the subject of our discussion, which is at least more important than the matter of squid—

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think the Budget mentioned squid.

Mr. WHITE: It does, but my hon. friend did not understand the Budget.

An hon. MEMBER: The people will.

Mr. WHITE: Yes, they do understand it. I would suggest to my hon. friends that they go to the reading room, turn over the pages of the newspapers issued in various parts of the Dominion, and see how many editorials they will find on the Budget.

Mr. GRAHAM: Quite a number.

Mr. WHITE: Not many. Some may be found in the paper of my hon. friend in Montreal, but not in many other papers. I wish to say this with regard to the matter under consideration.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE: If my hon. friends desire that I should speak to the question, I must ask them not to interrupt; if they interrupt, I purpose answering them. I am like the Scotchman who said he was a peaceful man, but if there was any fighting to do he was not going to take any blows lying down.

With regard to the matter under immediate consideration, I desire to say this: I have known Professor Shortt for many years. I have never on any occasion spoken ill of him; I have always spoken well of him. My right hon. friend called attention to a very important matter this afternoon in introducing this subject. He said that Professor Shortt was amenable not to this Government but to Parliament. As I understand the situation, the assertion of my right hon. friend is correct. I desire

to say further that I have no intention whatever of prejudging this matter. I have seen no contradiction by Professor Shortt of the report of his speech. On the contrary, I have before me an article published in the Ottawa Free Press of February 26 purporting to be an interview with Professor Shortt. There is no denial, so far as I can ascertain, of the report which was published in the Citizen on Monday, February 15, the day after Professor Shortt's remarks were made. If Professor Shortt is, as I believe he is, responsible to Parliament, that does not necessarily mean that his actions or conduct may not be criticised in a proper case by this House. But I would say that, occupying, as he does, a position quasi-judicial in its character, it is absolutely incumbent upon Prof. Shortt, or any man who may occupy that position, that he should not in any way intermeddle, or give the appearance of intermeddling, in party politics, that he should avoid the appearance of being influenced in the slightest degree by partisan considerations, in any statement that he may make. Without going into the question of whether he intentionally made these statements or not, Prof. Shortt is a man of very high intelligence, and he might have known, in fact I think he should have known, that in speaking as he did, he was placing before the public a statement which those to whom it might be of political advantage to use would not hesitate to avail themselves of, as they did, Mr. Speaker, as shown by the Minister of Public Works this afternoon.

Now, of what was Prof. Shortt talking? According to this report he was talking of patronage. Taking my own department, because I have risen only for the purpose of defending it, any one might infer, in so far as the returns from my department form a part of the total returns brought down, that, in the exercise of political patronage, I had dismissed twelve or more employees in the Finance Department and had replaced them with something over two hundred. Now, that would be what the public would gather from the statements made by Prof. Shortt, or alleged to have been made by him, and, so far as I can ascertain, not contradicted by him, in this report which has formed the subject of discussion this afternoon. As I have said, a man in Prof. Shortt's position should be absolutely judicial, absolutely impartial; he should have made his statement in such a way that if the naked figures went out they would be accompanied by such explanation as would set all the facts clearly before the public. He failed to do so and the impression went out to the country that this Government had dismissed 2,000 employees and substituted in their place 10,000 employees, and the public would naturally draw the conclusion, and hon. gentlemen opposite fostered that view, because they availed themselves at once of the information, that we had deliberately dismissed, under our powers of patronage, 2,000 employees and substituted 10,000 without additional duties. I say, and I go no further than this because I am not sufficiently familiar with all the facts and hesitate to prejudge the case, that Professor Shortt, in my judgment, was guilty at least of indiscretion, in making a statement of this kind without making also the necessary explanations, which have been given by my colleagues and myself here this afternoon. It is absolutely unfair to us, and has been made use of, presumably to our political disadvantage, by hon. gentlemen opposite, who now make on a question of privilege, an attack upon the Minister of Public Works for resenting the statement which has been used, as I have said, presumbaly to the disadvantage of the Government. My own view is that a man occupying a judicial or quasi-judicial position in this country should not interfere in politics at all, and should avoid statements that will reflect upon either the Government of the day or the Opposition. I would ask that from judges on the Bench, and I think we can ask no less from members of the Civil Service Commission.

The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) was disposed to take a charitable view of the matter. He said the fault lay with those who had made use of the figures, in a sense that Professor Shortt did not intend. Then I say he should at once chide his associates on the other side of the House for so quickly taking up, in a time of alleged truce, this statement, shown this afternoon to have been in substance and in fact absolutely false, and passing it on to the country for the truth, when it is not the truth, as I have shown conclusively in connection with my department, and as some of my colleagues have shown conclusively in connection with their departments. I would say that the judicial spirit, a spirit of the most strict and scrupulous impartiality, should be ex-

hibited by every member of the Civil Service Commission, because, as in the case of the judiciary, I hold that confidence, the confidence of every one in this House, of both parties, and of the Government and Opposition, confidence in the fairness and impartiality of the members of that tribunal, is the very foundation and basis of its usefulness.

Mr. MACDONALD: What does the hon. minister think of the suggestion of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) as to how this matter should be disposed of?

Mr. WHITE: I think over a great number of things that my hon. friend puts forward, and probably he would not mind if I would think over this suggestion also.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright): Mr. Speaker, I do not intervene in this debate for the purpose of discussing the relative merits of the understanding of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) and of Professor Shortt. The Minister of Public Works was discussing the return of his own department, and, as I understand it, Professor Shortt was discussing the returns of the different departments of the Government. But I would like to say a word respecting the appointments to the inside service and to the outside service, since the right hon. the Prime Minister has given us this opportunity, and we may not have another opportunity this session. But just before entering upon the very few remarks I propose to make, I would like to say to the Minister of Finance that we on this side of the House have always considered him too big a man to make a statement such as he made a few moments ago, when he said that we upon this side of the House do not thoroughly appreciate the gravity of the situation which confronts the Empire. I say that as regards myself, at least, and I am sure as regards every hon. member upon this side of the House, no more dishonourable, no more dishonest, no more unfair statement, Sir, has ever been made in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish to say to the hon. member that the use of such language is not permissible. He cannot apply such a word as "dishonourable" to a statement made by a member of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Take it back.

Mr. DEVLIN: I will take back anything which is against the rules of the House. I am not applying the words to the statement made by the Minister of Finance. I am saying, Sir, and I repeat, that so far as the statement refers to members of this House, no more dishonourable, no more dishonest, and no more unfair statement could be made.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot evade the rules in an indirect way. By the rules of debate, it is not permissible to impute dishonourable motives to any hon. member in this House.

Mr. DEVLIN: I submit to your ruling, Sir, as I always do in this House. I will say that it would be dishonourable, dishonest, and unfair for any hon. member of this House to have, upon the subject of the war confronting the British Empire at the present moment, feelings such as the Minister of Finance would have the House believe that hon. gentlemen on this side of House possess. Am I within the rules of the House, Mr. Speaker? I presume the only object of the Minister of Finance in making such a statement was to lead the country to believe that the Opposition, in discussing the Budget or any question which comes before the House, was trying to prevent the Government from carrying out all measures necessary, in their judgment, for the defence of this country. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that we upon this side of the House have as keen a sense of our responsibilities as members of this House as those who have imputed to us such unfair, dishonest and dishonourable conduct. I want to say further, that there are too many men fighting the battles of the motherland on the battlefields of Europe at the present time and directly related to us on this side of the House to allow us to forget for a single moment this awful war, if we had absolutely no other reason to remind us of our duties in this conflict.

I have but a few words to add concerning the Civil Service of this country. At Halifax the right hon. the Premier made the following statement:

> A thorough and complete reformation of the laws relating to the Civil Service should be put into effect, so that future appointments shall be made by an independent commission acting upon the report of examiners after competitive examination. I am convinced that we shall perform a great public duty by establishing in this country that system which prevails in Great Britain, under which a member of parliament has practically no voice in or control over any appointment to the Civil Service.
>
> To use the power of filling positions in the public service as a reward for party service and without regard to the character and capacity of the individual selected is a gross

breach of a solemn public trust... A private trustee so dishonouring his office would be subject to punishment by the criminal law.

When the right hon. Prime Minister made that statement the country believed that he intended to reform the Civil Service. Following that solemn pledge given to the people of this country, the Prime Minister brought from England Sir George Murray. Sir George Murray made a report upon the Civil Service. A great sum of money was spent in connection with the report but no action was taken upon it. Carrying out his pledge still further, the Prime Minister had investigating commissioners appointed throughout the country, to investigate into the acts of civil servants during the campaign of 1911. When the investigating commissioners found that civil servants were taking part in the elections, another step was taken, if not in all cases, at least in some which have come to my attention. The employee was very politely asked for his resignation. If he did not resign he would be dismissed. The employee consequently tendered his resignation under compulsion, knowing that the alternative would be dismissal. As many Grits as possible were got out of the service in that way, and we now find that to take the place of some two or four thousand civil servants—I am indifferent as to the figures—some ten or eleven thousand were appointed. Of course it is simply a question of proportion just how many Tories we required to take the place of a Grit. But if three Tories are necessary to take the place of one Grit who has been dismissed, and the country has to pay these three Tories, I think the country will say that it would have been better to leave that Grit in his place, and certainly cheaper for the country.

This patronage question has always been a disturbing one in this country. During some eight years I have had considerable experience in patronage myself, and I know pretty will what I am speaking of. I do not think there is an hon. member upon either side of the House who, if he spoke the truth, would not say that he would like to see patronage abolished. I am not speaking in a carping spirit, and I do not want to attack the Government or to lay any unnecessary blame upon it. I should like to see the Government find some way of remedying the condition of the outside service in this country. I understand that my right hon. friend could not very well place the whole outside service under one central commission. The right hon. gentleman has found fault with what the Liberal party have done. We undertook to reform the Civil Service. We began by appointing a commission to deal with the inside service, and in time we would have reached the outside service. But the party which replaced the Liberal party has not yet been able to come before the country and say what they purpose to do to reform this iniquitous system. How well I remember the Minister of Trade and Commerce holding up his hands with horror and saying: This system of patronage is iniquitous; you are appointing men to office upon the recommendation of members of Parliament; such a state of things should not exist. Mr. Speaker, I, too, believe that such things should not exist. I feel that if it were possible to deal with the outside service as a great employer deals with his help, it would be a great deal better for the country, and a great deal better for the members supporting the Government. It takes away from the usefulness of a Government supporter to be continually harassed by demands for Government positions. Take the case of the Minister of Public Works. I do not suppose there is a better natured man in the Cabinet than he. But what can he do? A dozen or twenty members get after him for appointments of their friends to the outside service. He would like to refuse, but he cannot; he is too good-hearted. Besides he is not paying the salaries himself; the country pays them. And so he takes on twenty or thirty or forty or a thousand or two thousand. It does not matter to him. Let the country pay. He is a good fellow, and the members will continue to support the Government. The late Postmaster General was even a better natured man than my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, for according to a return brought down he appointed some nine thousand men. He showed better nature there than I think any man in this House would have given him credit for.

Just a word of recommendation to the Prime Minister in closing. Get busy in connection with the patronage system. It has given trouble at all times in this country. It has been reported that during a coalition Government, the Government was upset because the members supporting the Liberal party could not conciliate the Tory end of the Cabinet, and the Tories could not satisfy the Liberal end in the matter of appointments.

I feel that the Prime Minister would like to do something better, and it is now time

for him to find some way in which to improve the outside service. I am very sorry that at the beginning of my remarks I may have been a little harsher with my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) than I had meant to be, but I know that he will not bear me any ill will.

Mr. W. T. WHITE: Not a bit.

Mr. DEVLIN: At this critical time in the Empire's history we all have a pretty strong feeling on the question of the war.

Hon. T. CHASE CASGRAIN (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, as I represent in this House what has been described as the most offending department of the Government, I desire to say a few words in defence of the administration of the Post Office Department. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Devlin) has said that it appears by the return which was produced here this afternoon that my predecessor made about 9,000 appointments during the three years covered by the return brought down. Although I hold no brief for my predecessor, Hon. L. P. Pelletier, who enjoys the reputation, in this House and in this country, of having been one of the best administrators that ever presided over the Post Office Department, I feel that it is my duty to answer the statement made by the hon. member (Mr. Devlin). I shall give a few figures to show the number of employees in the Post Office Department, and the extent of the business done by the department, during the last three years, which will, I believe, justify the increase in the number of employees. Do hon. gentlemen know that in the department in Ottawa we have over 700 employees, that outside of the department we have 8,000 employees, and that there are over 15,000 postmasters, making a total of about 23,700 employees, and, therefore, if within the last three years 8,000 or 9,000 appointments have been made, it need surprise no one. Hon. gentlemen upon the other side of the House will admit that during the greater portion of this period the business of the country was growing by leaps and bounds, and that, under such circumstances, it was not at all strange that 9,000 new appointments should have been made? The Post Office Department is not essentially a revenue producing department; it renders a public service to the country, which, to be effective, and to meet the demands of our modern civilization must be the very best that money can procure. I conceive it to be the duty of the Postmaster General to make our postal service as perfect as possible, and that is the duty I have set before me to discharge, whether I have a surplus in the department or whether I have a deficit. The post office cannot stand still; it must progress with the progress of Canada.

Let me refer to the reports of the Post Office Department for the last two years. I find in the report of the Postmaster General for the year ended March 31, 1913—

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Why not take the report for the year 1914?

Mr. CASGRAIN: I am coming to that, if my hon. friend will possess his soul in patience for one minute; it is a better report than the report for 1913 and I am leaving the choice morsel for the last. The report for 1913 says:

> There has been an increase of 2,151 miles in the extent of the system over which mails are carried by railway. The number of miles which mails have been carried by railway and water routes, and ordinary land routes is greater by 2,264,362 miles than it was for the year before.
>
> The estimated increase in the number of letters and post cards sent during the year is 73,252,000, which is about 11⅘ per cent more than the figures of 1912.
>
> Owing to the growth of the service in the directions mentioned, the expenditure has increased by $1,710,769.10, as compared with last year, but there was a surplus from the operation of the service which amounts to $1,177,671.86.

Then by the report for the year ended March 31, 1914. We find that there was an increase of 350 in the number of post office money order offices, and an increase of 38 in the number of post office savings bank offices. There was an increase of 648 in the number of new post offices which, multiplied by three, for the three years for which the report has been brought down, would give an increase of over 1,800 new post offices, with a corresponding increase in the number of employees in those offices. The report for 1914 says:

> There has been an increase of 913 miles in the extent of the system over which the mails are carried by railway. The number of miles which mails have been carried by railway and water routes, and ordinary land routes is greater by 4,278,257 miles than it was for the year before.
>
> The estimated increase in the number of letters and post cards sent during the year is 43,519,000, which is about 6¼ per cent more than the figures of 1913.
>
> The number of rural mail delivery routes has been increased by 940, and over 48,000 boxes have been erected on these additional routes.

One must also take into account the establishment of the parcel post, which necessitated the appointment of quite a number of new employees.

I repeat that the post office service cannot stand still, that it must keep on growing with the country, that an increasing number of employees is necessary to give a good service as the business increases, and that the department and the Government, instead of being blamed, as they have been blamed by hon. gentlemen opposite to-day, should have been eulogized and lauded for what they have done.

Let me call your attention to one or two facts. I wonder how many hon. gentlemen have ever been in the post office in the city of Toronto. I visited the post office in Toronto in the month of December last and I was astonished to see the increase in the business of that office and the volume of business carried on there. I observed the businesslike way in which the employees were working and that every employee was absolutely intent upon doing his work and doing it well. Do hon. gentlemen realise that within the last two or three years the business of the Toronto post office has so increased that to-day there is more business being done in the Toronto office than in the post offices in Montreal and in Winnipeg combined? It was incumbent upon the Post Office Department to man the Toronto post office so that that great and enterprising city should have a post office worthy of it. The city of Montreal is increasing in population at the rate of 50,000 a year. Do hon. gentlemen opposite think that the post office service in that growing city should be allowed to stand still? Surely it was good business to keep up with the times and so it was necessary to increase the number of employees in the post office in Montreal during the last two or three years.

Something has been said by my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) as to the report which was brought down and which includes in it the 9,000 employees who appeared to have been appointed during the last three years. I am told by the responsible officers of the department that this figure of 9,000 includes the temporary employees who are appointed for the rush seasons at Christmas and New Years, and that it includes also the employees whom the Post Office Department is obliged to take on during the summer months when a very considerable number of the ordinary employees are given their holidays. If you take the increased business of the post offices in the great cities into consideration, the establishment of new post offices and new systems, if you remember that in the interests of the whole community the post office service cannot be allowed to stand still while the country is making progress, and if you take into consideration the further fact that the number which is mentioned in that report embraces not only all the employees who have been appointed permanently but the temporary employees also, you must come to the conclusion that as to the Post Office Department we are able confidently to come before Parliament to justify our policy.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Customs): I do not wish to prolong this debate; but as Professor Shortt has paid a little attention to my department, I feel that it would not be fair to that department to let this discussion close without making a few remarks. The remarks of Professor Shortt that apply to my department are comprised in this short statement:

> Professor Shortt asked: "Who took the places of the 2,000 civil servants who were reported in the House the other day to have been dismissed from the service?" His reply to his own question was, "Just 10,000."

In the return submitted from my department, the question was asked: How many dismissals? The answer was: 271. In addition to that there was question No. 2: How many resignations? The answer was: 194 resignations. Professor Shortt, in his statement, never referred to the resignations; and therefore, as far as the Customs is concerned, I do not hesitate to say that his statement was false and untrue and dishonest in every shape and form. I also do not hesitate to say, knowing Professor Shortt, that the statement was made deliberately for the purpose of influencing the electorate of this country politically against this Government.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What does the hon. member know about Professor Shortt to make him believe that this statement was deliberately dishonest?

Mr. REID: Deliberately dishonest because he did not include some of the answers in the return brought down.

Mr. MACLEAN: That is not answering my question. The minister says his knowledge of Professor Shortt led him to the conclusion that that statement was deliberately dishonest.

Mr. REID: Professor Shortt, before he became Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, was a bitter politician, and from that time forward I have never learned that he has changed in that respect.

Mr. MACLEAN: Then, are all politicians or men interested in politics dishonest?

Mr. REID: Certainly not. I would not for one moment make that charge.

Mr. MACLEAN: That is what you say.

Mr. REID: I wish to state that if any man is appointed to and continues in a Government position, if he uses it for political purposes, he is dishonest.

I would not for one moment attribute anything unfair to the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), but I rose more particularly to correct a statement which he made, because I fear that it may go to the public and they may believe him where they will not believe Professor Shortt. If my hon. friend will refer to page 387 of the Unrevised Hansard, when the hon. junior member for Halifax—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. It is not permissible to refer to a previous debate.

Mr. REID: When the hon. member was addressing this House with reference to my department on the 23rd of January last, he made the statement that a return showed that in about two years in the customs service there were 271 dismissals.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. MACLEAN: I think the minister should have an opportunity of making his statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member cannot hope to evade the rule of the House in that way.

Mr. REID: I do not wish to evade the rule of the House, but I wish to say that I have heard the hon. junior member for Halifax make the statement that a return brought down in this House showed that there were 271 dismissals and 1,659 appointments. When he made that statement, I claim that in fairness to the Customs Department he should have stated also that the return showed 271 dismissals and 194 resignations. In other words, he made the same mistake as Professor Shortt did when he was making his speech in Ottawa on that Sunday evening. It was unfair to the Customs Department for the junior member for Halifax to let a statement of that kind go to the public from this House. If I did not take this opportunity of correcting his statement it would not be fair to my department.

9 p.m.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: At the time I made the statement, I did not know about the resignations.

Mr. REID: I take that answer as correct; but if I remember aright the hon. member's statement, he said he had a return that justified that statement.

Mr. CARROLL: Does the hon. member know the number of desertions in his department?

Mr. REID: I have not the statement before me of desertions, superannuations, deaths, or temporary employees; but the offices became vacant for reasons that I stated at the time. The statement made by Professor Shortt from the return which he had was not fair to my department. When I read the report of Professor Shortt's speech, knowing him as I did, I felt that it was made for political reasons. If not, why did Professor Shortt, if he wanted information, not come to the House of Commons and get the return laid upon the table of the House? Any one reading that return would know that it was not complete. There should have been more questions on it in order to give a full and complete answer. Professor Shortt has been Chairman of the Civil Service Commission for a number of years. He could have got officially from every deputy minister all the information he wanted as to the number of employees of each department, and then he would have been in a position to give a fair statement to the public.

Some hon. gentlemen opposite say that the Civil Service should be reformed. I was in this House prior to 1896. Hon. gentlemen opposite know that we had a Civil Service Act in force at that time. There was the inside service and the outside service; and hon. gentlemen know that the Civil Serevice Act made it necessary for officials of the outside service, in many of the departments such as Customs, Inland Revenue and others, to pass an examination for the different positions. When hon. gentlemen opposite came into power in 1896, they were not satisfied with our Civil Service Act and they immediately started to reform the Civil Service. This is how they reformed it between 1896 and 1911. In the Customs outside service there is a class of preventive officers who are appointed without examination and who are supposed to be employed for the prevention of smuggling along the border.

Immediately on the Liberals coming into power they appointed all the officials preventive officers. Instead of limiting the age to thirty-five years as the Civil Service Act requires for the Customs service, they en-

gaged them all the way up to seventy-five or eighty years of age, putting men into the service who were absolutely of no use whatever. After getting into power the Liberals thought it would be better to have a commission with Professor Shortt as chairman. Professor Shortt has ability, there is no doubt about that; but he certainly was a politician and a good one for the Liberal party. He started out to reform the Civil Service, and he was going to show how he could improve it by means of examinations. If I want a customs officer to-day, I have to get one who will answer questions, samples of which I will give. And when I quote these questions, I would like to know if there is a man in this House, from the right hon. gentleman who leads the House, down to the humblest member, who can answer them. If we want a locker, simply a man to open cases, etc., a labouring man, he has to pass an examination and to get a certain proportion of marks in each subject. For instance, he has to know a little about geography, so he is supposed to answer this question:

In what sections of Canada is lumbering an important industry? Where does the lumber for each section find a market?

From what places in western Europe do Canadians get silk, cotton goods, woollens, oranges, steel?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Are not those proper questions relating to the customs?

Mr. REID: They are not improper if you can get a man to answer them. But I venture to say the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) could not answer them himself. Now, if I want a clerk, he has to be able to answer some questions in history such as the following:

What were the Crusades? When did they take place? Name some important events connected with them.

Give an account of the French revolution of 1791, as follows: (a) Causes; (b) Prominent men who took part; (c) Important events.

He must know something of grammar, of course, and so he is asked to parse each italicised word and phrase in an extract which is given. And he is virtually told: If you cannot parse these words you cannot get into the Customs service.

Mr. GRAHAM: Cannot parse.

Mr. REID: Here are more questions in geography:

Where do the people of Great Britain and Ireland obtain the raw materials for the manufacture of silk, tobacco, cotton, woollen and leather goods?

Compare the climate of Manitoba with that of England. What natural conditions cause the difference?

Perhaps I ought not to give more for fear of making the whole Civil Service look ridiculous. But let me give one or two questions in arithmetic:

A person watches a train and finds that it takes 17 seconds to pass him. The train is 374 feet long. At what rate in miles per hour is the train travelling?

A starts on a journey at the rate of 3 miles an hour; 6 hours afterwards B starts after him at the rate of 4 miles an hour. How far will B travel before he overtakes A?

How many days will it take 30 men to do a piece of work which 20 men can do in 45 days?

Now, let me give a few figures as to my own department. In the inside service, in October, 1911, we had 198 employees, and in January of this year we had 232 employees, an increase of 34. In the outside service, I admit, there has been a large increase. We had 2,273 officers in October, 1910-11, and 3,144 in January, 1914-15, an increase of 871. But let me point out that our revenue for 1911 was $73,312,367.50, while in 1914 our customs revenue was $107,179,360.33. In 1910-11 we had customs entries to the number of 1,387,310 inwards and 404,664 outwards. In 1913-14 we had 1,898,110 inwards and 507,224 outwards, or, in round numbers half a million more entries inwards and a hundred thousand more outwards.

Mr. GRAHAM: Like the appointments—more inward than outward.

Mr. REID: There was good reason for every appointment made. The hon. member for South Renfrew knows, perhaps better than anybody else, the policy of his own party when they came into power. He knows that they dismissed every man on the St. Lawrence canals and then put on the same number as had been formerly employed.

Mr. GRAHAM: But there were not half so many as there are now.

Mr. REID: There are no more on the canals now than there were when the Liberals turned these men out.

Mr. MURPHY: Not in winter time.

Mr. REID: Talking of the winter time, when the Liberal party was in power they spent $35,000 in keeping the canals lighted, though they were all frozen up. I have shown that in my department there was a very large increase.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the revenue up to the first of the present month?

Mr. REID: I have not those figures before me, but I am very glad to be able to tell the hon. member that the revenue for last month was about $250,000 higher than for the same month last year.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: And the war still on?

Mr. REID: So far as the increase in the number of employees is concerned, the Customs Department is in the same position as the Post Office Department. We have opened some 54 new outports. We have had demands from the collectors of the large ports—Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Victoria and other important centres—for more employees; we have not appointed any more officials than the collectors and inspectors reported to be absolutely necessary. I think it will be agreed that in view of the large increase in revenue, very many more officials were required. The people will know, from the statements of fact that have been made from time to time in this House, that we were justified in increasing the number of employees in the Department of Customs. I rose not particularly to explain this phase of the question, but to correct the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) and to point out that the assertions that I heard him make in this House are not in accordance with the return that was brought down. The people will know, therefore, that the statement made by the hon. member cannot be accepted as a justifiable charge against the Customs Department.

Having regard to the utterances of Prof. Shortt, I care very little what assertions go forth in respect of my department. We all know what he is politically; we all know what he would do so far as the Civil Service and the Government are concerned. I believe that Prof. Shortt's statements were made deliberately to injure the Government, and I feel that after making those statements he is not entitled to very much consideration from this House, from the Government, or from the people of Canada.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton): There are a number of reasons why I should take part in this debate, but the chief one is that I could not resist the temptation to take advantage of the inspiration which would be afforded me by following the very excellent discourse which we have received from the Minister of Customs on the educational development of this country. I consider it a great pity that a man like the Minister of Customs should be obliged to devote himself to adding up columns of figures and worrying about customs houses and that sort of thing when the educational development of Canada is in need of his assistance. I endeavoured to follow him in the remarks which he made—I am an old school teacher—but in many respects he was a little too swift for me. I thought I would have some fun with him on the question of parsing, but he carefully avoided that subject; I do not think he is particularly fond of parsing. He kept away from analysis, too; analysis was never his forte. I have listened to his speeches in this House for the last 10 or 12 years, and I am in a position to say that they certainly would not stand much analysis. His composition is heresy of the first water; his theology is blasphemy. If there is any method by which the Prime Minister can make a shuffle in the Cabinet and have some one else take the position of Minister of Customs, I would advise him to do so, thus giving the country the benefit of my hon. friend's services as an educationalist—because that is his proper sphere.

The hon. minister was wont in the course of his remarks to discard almost everything as being too difficult. I wonder if he would permit us to discard certain difficult portions of the multiplication table. When I was learning the multiplication table I remember that seven times nine times were regarded as exceedingly difficult; perhaps the minister would, in his capacity as educationalist, direct his efforts towards having these portions of the multiplication table discarded. My hon. friend's attitude reminds me forcibly of the story of the negro who had three things to look after, two blast furnaces and a locomotive. Reporting in the morning, he said: The fires in the furnaces burned out and they were useless all night, and the locomotive was out of order; otherwise, everything was all right. The minister was coming down the scale so rapidly and throwing away everything as he came along that I thought he was not going to approve of anything. It would seem that the babe as he came from the cradle is the kind of officer my hon. friend wants for his department.

As to history, my hon. friend no doubt appreciates the fact that the history of the Tory party would be exceedingly embarrassing. As to geography, why should a Tory know where he is or where he is going? In respect of ordinary mathematics, particularly with regard to the cost of

things, the minister and his friends do not bother their heads very much. These things are all very embarrassing to my hon. friend; all defences—if the Prime Minister will pardon my referring to a stale legal phrase—are embarrassing. I would suggest that the Prime Minister give the Minister of Customs a free hand, and let him adopt as his ideal the style of education which Adam had when he was fresh from the hands of the Creator. I should like to find out from my hon. friend the kind of syllabus that he would prepare for submission to the high educationalists of the province of Ontario. So much for the question of education.

I know enough about the Prime Minister to believe that he would like to give everybody a fair show and a fair trial. I do not believe that the atmosphere with which he is now surrounded would change his attitude in that respect. The right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition has brought up a question which involves affording a gentleman who holds a high office in this country, a servant of the people, an opportunity of defending himself and of explaining his position. This high court of Parliament is not open to him; his position is such that he cannot very well defend himself on the platform. He has no right to ask a minister of the Government or anybody else in this House to meet him on the hustings for the purpose of discussing the matter, and he is, therefore, shut out from the ordinary means of defence which are open to other persons. I think, therefore, that it is but fair and proper that the right hon. leader of the Opposition should bring this matter to the attention of the House. I am sorry to find that the matter was dealt with in such a harsh and turbulent manner by hon. gentlemen on the Government side of the House. I observed to-day that the Minister of Marine was running at very high tension and on very high gear shortly after he commenced speaking. When the Minister of Marine has only very poor grist the mill goes at a tremendous rate of speed, the wheels sound very high; and I should not wish for any better evidence of very poor substance and very poor grist for his mill than the speed at which he was going to-day. He had nothing, and so it was like him to pour a continuous tirade of abuse on this man Shortt, who is not here to defend himself. I submit, with all candour, that I do not think it is an evidence of bravery on the part of big men to get absolutely fortified within the walls of this House, and, under the privileges which are theirs by reason of being members of Parliament, abuse a poor fellow who is tied hand and foot and cannot answer for himself. I am pleased to know that there was not very much of a case made out against this man Shortt. The awful noise that was made about his mis-statement turns out in this way: He says that 10,000 men were appointed anew by this Administration, within the last few years, over and above filling every office that fell vacant by any of the different ways by which vacancies occur. A return was brought down, or a calculation made from a return, which shows that not only 8,000 or 10,000 but 11,000 appointments were made, after providing for every resignation and every dismissal. That is the statement made by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) as I understand it. That is not all. There are some departments yet to be heard from. If it is true, and it is from the records of the different departments, that 11,000 extra appointments have been made over and above the number in office when this Government came into power, what is the trouble over the statement made by Professor Shortt? It reminds me of an old man I once knew who made a great fuss because some one said he was twenty pounds in debt. He said it was scoundrelly, rascally, and unfair—I am now following the vocabulary of the Minister of Marine—that he was not twenty pounds in debt. He was asked what his debt was, and he said it was not twenty pounds; it was 19 pounds, 19 shillings, and tuppence, which was just a half penny short of the twenty pounds. Even if Professor Shortt said that 10,000 had been appointed, what is the fuss about? He said 10,000 or 8,000, and we find 11,000 new men appointed. If that is true, why should there be such a fuss about it? It is simply proving that perhaps Prof. Shortt did not make his statement exactly in a way that would suit hon. gentlemen, but when it is all boiled down, when you come down to the hard facts, to brass tacks as the saying is, if $11,000,000 must be provided this year over the amount provided in 1911 to pay for the Civil Service, and only to provide for new appointments, there is no particular fault to be found with Professor Shortt except that he made that statement publicly. It has been said here that this man is a narrow partisan. I never so understood from any one I have talked with. I have not the honour of his acquaintance, but members beside me speak of him as rather an austere man,

who would not give way to anybody, who held opinions of his own and would not give them up. The first time I ever heard of him in Nova Scotia was when he was selected as chairman of a board of conciliation by the other members of the board, who agreed that he was a man eminently fair and just, and suitable to preside over a board to bring about a settlement of a labour dispute. From that day to this I have never heard of him as being a narrow partisan. However, be that as it may, I hope he will get justice at the hands of the Government, and if there is any defence necessary that he shall be given the fullest opportunity of making it.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries was very austere this afternoon about members of the Civil Service or any one who was receiving money from the Government for services, doing anything but just properly earning the salary paid to them. I wish to see how he is carrying out this austere system in his own department. I wish to know if he has kept his officers in the department over which he so ably presides right down to the rule which he laid down for Professor Shortt. Last winter, from my place in this House, I asked him if a certain man in Nova Scotia, named Fraser, residing in Queens county, was an officer in his department. He told me that he was an officer in his department. I find this winter that he is still an officer in his department. I find that in February last he was an officer in his department, and when he should have been looking after the affairs of his office and earning money for the minister, where do I find him ? I find him away down in the extreme northern part of the province of Nova Scotia, in the county of Victoria, electioneering. And what is said about him ? A certain trial took place down there, and a certain judge of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia made certain findings, one of them being:

> The following persons have, in my judgment, been proven at the trial to have been guilty of corrupt practices in this election,

Then he gives a long string of names. In that string is the servant of my hon. friend, W. E. Fraser, of Liverpool, Queens county, N.S. In that list the judge finds twenty-three men, exactly in the same category as the representative of my hon. friend the minister, and he finds them all guilty under the same charge. I submit to all the members of the Government, that not less than seventy-five per cent of that list are officials of this Government, men who are in the pay of this Government, who had gone out of their offices and so conducted themselves that this judge, who is certainly not anxious to find harsh things, unless he has to, finds twenty-three of them guilty, and so says in his judgment. This very matter was brought to the notice of the minister about a year ago, but he has never made the slightest inquiry as to how this man Fraser was attending to his business. He is still in the pay of the Government and will continue to be, and his salary will probably be raised owing to his useful services in the elections. That is only a sample of the way that public servants are basking in the sunshine of this Administration, knowing that the more they do in the way of political rascalities, the better they will be paid and the better they will be liked.

There is another matter which, in justice to myself, it is obligatory on me to bring to the notice of the House. I am particularly pleased that the Minister of Customs is in his seat, because, despite his regard for care and fairness, he has lately been exceedingly unfair to myself.

I see by yesterday's Hansard that he says that a certain statement I made in this House last year is untrue. I take it, Mr. Speaker, that I am permitted to look at last year's Hansard, and that I am not violating any rule in doing so. It was rather a strong thing for the Minister to say that I made a false statement, without ever asking me, who am a member of this House, whether the statement was false or not. If I made a statement in this House, and the minister in answering a question found it necessary to settle a question of fact one way or the other, I think under those circumstances a member of this House can expect to be given an opportunity of stating how he understood the facts before a minister undertakes to say, without ever consulting the member, that his statement is false. The question I am referring to appears on page 646 of Hansard, and was asked yesterday by the hon. member for Guysborough. The question was in respect to the services of Mr. Duchemin, who has been in the service of the Government for the greater part of the last two years. It has been found that that gentleman received last year money out of the coffers of this country to the extent of something like $6,380.48, and it is only fair that we who are to some extent responsible to the people should make inquiry as to how he earned that money. Last year, in my place in this

House, when the Estimates of the Minister of Public Works were going through, I made a statement which appears on page 5238 of last year's Hansard, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, and in justice to myself, I am obliged to read the very short statement that I made on that occasion. I wish to read it with a view to showing that what I said about Mr. Duchemin, who is a servant of this country, was in my judgment absolutely correct then, and is absolutely correct now; and when the minister undertook, in answering a question, to make the bald statement that I did not state the truth, I submit that he was in error and did not fully inquire into the facts. This is what I said when this matter was up last year:

Mr. McKenzie: I wish to refer briefly to investigations held under the Inquiries Act. In Nova Scotia we had headsmen in each county, sometimes one headsman for more than one county. In North Cape Breton and Victoria, in fact all the counties of Cape Breton and eastern Nova Scotia, we had a commissioner named Duchemin, who was a very active commissioner. I understand that the Orders in Council appointing those commissioners fixed their salaries at $15 dollars a day with incidentals, and they only received $15 no matter how many inquiries they conducted in one day. Mr. Duchemin is a man of my own profession, a barrister of some standing, a strong temperance advocate, a man who stands high in his church, and besides all his other virtues he is the editor of the Tory organ, the Sydney Post, in the city of Sydney. Being a prominent man and always preaching righteousness and truthfulness and honesty through his paper and on the platform, it strikes one as peculiar that there should be anything but the most rigid particularity and punctuality about anything that he would do. A man of such high standing would be expected to be very particular when he would come to deal with money matters in which he was personally interested, and where his own personal interests were put in contradistinction to those of the country. On September 6, 1912, Mr. Duchemin held court at a place called Big Bras D'Or in the county of Victoria. He there examined Captain George Livingstone, Captain Roderick McDonald, D. J. Morrison and H. G. McKay, Roderick Bain and Roderick McLeod. These investigations were held between 3 p.m. and 6 p.m. Under the Order in Council Mr. Duchemin would be entitled to $15 for the afternoon's services, besides his travelling expenses, etc. But I find that he submitted to the department six different bills with a full charge in every one of the bills, charging for that afternoon $128.95, while $20 would be about what he was entitled to. The items of the accounts, six of which are exactly alike, are as follows:

To travel, issuing notices, subpoenas, etc., conducting inquiries	$15.00
" Allowance for living expenses	2.50
" Ferry fare	.05
" Horse hire	1.00
" Paid for use of room for holding inquiries	.40
" Service of witnesses	1.00
To Stenographer copying evidence and reports..	$ 1.35
" Stationary and postage	.05
	$21.35

That is the alleged expenditure, Mr. Speaker, in connection with only one inquiry, and that is all that you have been charged for, what took place at Bras D'Or on that day. The Hansard report goes on:

The account in McKay's case is as follows:	
Allowance..	$15.00
Living allowance..	3.00
Witnesses, typewriting..	5.40
Total..	$23.40

You will observe, Mr. Speaker, that his dinner in the first instance only cost him $2.50. The same day he bought another dinner for $3, and there is a similar item in each of the six bills, so he took six dinners on the same day, and crossed the ferry five times to examine witnesses, when as a matter of fact there was only one sole, solitary inquiry, at which all the witness were examined in less than one hour and a half, and the proper charge for which was $21.35. The Hansard report goes on:

These accounts cover the six cases that were tried upon the same day, totalling $128.95, whereas $21.20 would have been the proper charge. The men who were investigated and finally dismissed were my political friends, and I was keeping tab on this inquiry. I knew the day on which it was to be held, but to make absolutely sure I wrote to Captain McDonald asking him about this investigation. He writes me from Bras d'Or on the 10th March, 1913, as follows:

Big Bras d'Or, Cape Breton,
March 10, 1913.

D. D. McKenzie, M.P.,
Ottawa, Canada.

My dear friend,—Yours to hand of the 8th instant, and in reply would say you are quite correct as to the date of the investigation. It was held on September 6, at three o'clock p.m., the whole being done between three and six o'clock p.m. The names of the parties who were investigated are as follows: George Livingston, sub-collector; Rod. McDonald, preventive officer; Rory Bain, D. J. Morrison, and Rod. McLeod, boatman; and H. C. McKay, lightkeeper, Bird island.

All those were investigated on the one afternoon at the time before mentioned.

On that occasion I pointed out to the Minister of Public Works that these things were absolutely correct then, and they are absolutely correct now. For an investigation of two and a half hours, this man, who was a servant of this Government, charged $128.95, when he should have charged $21.

The answer in yesterday's Hansard about which I am complaining is as follows

—Mr. Coderre answering for the Customs Department:

The charge made by the member for North Cape Breton was looked into by Customs Department and inquired into by Auditor General and found to be not true.

I submit to the minister that it is true, absolutely true, and I challenge his inquiry. I care not what the Minister of Customs may think of me, but I do think a great deal of my own veracity. I have been in this House for a great many years, and I am getting somewhat of an old man now to be told I go around this country peddling falsehoods against anybody. I challenge the minister or anybody else to point out where I ever made a statement on the floor of this House that was not absolutely correct. I submit that it is the duty of the minister who put on the records of the Parliament of this country against me that I made an untrue statement, to make inquiry and to apologize to me for making a statement which was not true. I say that that money was taken for an investigation and for services where it was not earned. I did not say it was embezzlement, I did not say it was theft; I did not characterize it at all. Before I made my statement I had asked the minister what the Order in Council allowed this man, and he told me it was $15 a day. I have not the Hansard under my hand but that is my recollection. It is well known that he was to get $15 a day no matter whether he made one inquiry or a dozen, or made no inquiry at all, but it was not the intention that, if he spent an hour or two and met with half a dozen or twenty people, he should send a bill in for each one, as was done in this case. I stand by the facts as shown by the record. I got the facts from the department. I moved for the returns, they were brought down and I have them in my possession. These are not my figures, but they are the figures of the department, and without the same testimony, without knowing the facts, the Minister of Customs comes down and says that a member of this House makes a false statement. I protest that when such things as these are said in the face of hon. members in the House who are able to defend themselves, it is not surprising to know what is said about Prof. Shortt, whose hands are tied and whose tongue cannot be used in his own defence in this House. I could not permit this to pass over without bringing it to the notice of the House. It is a duty between one member and another to protect the honour of members of this House, and no hon. member should be permitted to be put on record as being a falsifier when the facts do not bear out this accusation. These are the facts as I have stated them, these records were before the Minister of Customs when he made this statement, and I may say that I would not have noticed his statement at all had it not been called to my notice by an hon. gentleman. With reference to the record of Mr. Duchemin, the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) was asked by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair):

Does the minister intend to investigate the conduct of Mr. Duchemin?

Mr. Hazen: I have no such intention.

There is put before the hon. gentlemen who are responsible for the expenditure of the moneys of this country the record and conduct of one of their servants; they are asked: Do you propose to inquire into his conduct—and a responsible minister says: I have no such intention.

Mr. HAZEN: On what page of Hansard is that?

Mr. McKENZIE: Page 820 of Hansard, 1914. There are many other things that might be said along this line, but I must confess that my real purpose was to bring this record in regard to the matter to the notice of the House.

Mr. G. W. FOWLER (Kings and Albert): Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that all roads lead at last to Rome. Everything that the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) debates leads at last to Duchemin. The hon. member for North Cape Breton, who is sometimes quite witty and amusing, but at other times, oh, so doleful, and dreadfully dull and prosy, has, during the last three years, taken part in a good many debates; and, even if the subject matter was as far removed from Duchemin, or anything appertaining to him, as the poles are asunder, the hon. gentleman, with that peculiar cast of mind which works in subterranean and intricate passages, always comes back at last to Duchemin. Talk about the proverbial red rag to the male animal of the ox gender; that is not a circumstance to the name of Duchemin to the ex-judicial member for North Cape Breton. The hon. gentleman was very witty in the first portion of his speech, very amusing, but he did not amuse anybody half so much as he did himself. He enjoyed his time-worn, stale, mothbitten jokes much more than anybody else did. Even the admiring chorus of back-

benchers had to take second place to the hon. gentleman himself in that respect. The hon. gentleman told us that he was once a schoolmaster. We could have guessed that. He must have been for many years a schoolmaster and got into that narrow pedantic groove that schoolmasters sometimes fall into. But if we are to judge of the rest of his scholastic knowledge by the sample of arithmetic which he gives us, we must come to the conclusion that he was a very poor schoolmaster indeed and that he taught his pupils very badly. He told us that 19 pounds 19 shillings and tuppence—which is short for two pence—was within a half penny of twenty pounds.

Mr. McKENZIE: I will make the correction now. I meant 19 pounds, 19 shillings and 11 pence halfpenny.

Mr. FOWLER: Too late; too late—you have lost your ninepence ha'penny. Your pupils would be reduced to poverty if they followed your instructions in arithmetic. My hon. friend has spoken of Mr. Shortt, and very shortly of Mr. Shortt, but at considerable length of Mr. Duchemin. I do not propose to discuss the Duchemin question now. That has been discussed on several occasions, and I have no doubt that if the hon. gentleman ever meets Mr. Duchemin on a platform in any portion of Nova Scotia Mr. Duchemin will be able to take care of the hon. member for North Cape Breton. He speaks of Mr. Shortt as being a poor martyr who was tongue-tied. It would have been much better for Shortt if he had been tongue-tied. The trouble with Shortt is that he was not tongue-tied at all. He got himself into this trouble; he began it, and not with the statement the hon. member for Cape Breton said he made. I would have thought that when a man had for two or three years occupied a position upon the judicial bench of this country, and had worn the judicial ermine, he would have acquired some fairness of thought, some impartiality; but the hon. gentleman was just as destitute of that when he came off the bench as he was when he went on it. The hon. gentleman knows that he did not state the actual facts when he gave us his paraphrase of what was said. I will read for the benefit of the hon. gentleman, for he needs all the benefits that can come to him, what Mr. Shortt is reported actually to have said; and remember that Mr. Shortt has never to this moment denied what he did say. Therefore, we must judge him by the record. Some one has said that we should not judge him by newspaper reports; but if he does not deny these newspaper reports when the opportunity is given him, if, on the contrary, he glories in what he has said, it is not unfair, unreasonable, or unjust to judge him by the newspaper reports. He says:

> "I have met men in the Canadian Civil Service," he said, "who, though they held positions under the Government, were quite ready to admit that the Civil Service system was rotten." Professor Shortt asked who took the place of the 2,000 civil servants who were reported in the House the other day to have been dismissed from the service, and his reply to his own question was just "10,000."

Who took the place of the 2,000? 10,000 men took the place of the 2,000. That is what Shortt says. Could language be plainer? In the English language could you put a proposition more plainly than that? Prof. Shortt meant what he said when he said it, and he knew he was not speaking by the book when he said it. He knew that he was making a statement that was not correct when he said that 10,000 men took the places occupied by the 2,000 men that had been dismissed. That is the fault we find with Prof. Shortt. Tongue-tied! A martyr! Held up in this House to public derision and public shame! Like a lamb before his shearers, is dumb, he could not open his mouth! He is a brave man is Prof. Shortt. I will show you whether he is a brave man or not. If he had been an employee of this Government, subject to be dismissed from office for partisan conduct, and if he had made such a statement, I would say, however improper or unwise his statement was, it had at least the merit of being a bold one, because he took his business life in his hands when he made it. But what is the situation so far as Prof. Shortt is concerned? He was appointed under an Act which requires the joint action of both Houses of Parliament to dismiss him. He makes this statement. The Senate—that body upon the other side of the building. I look up and see some of the senators in the gallery. Gaze upon the faces in the front row up there—

Mr. SPEAKER—Order. It is not permissible to refer disrespectfully to the Senate.

Mr. FOWLER: You are not a mind reader, Mr. Speaker. How could you possibly know what I was going to say? What have I said that is disrespectful?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The rules of debate prohibit reference to the other branch of this Parliament in a disrespectful or an ironical way. The hon. member was leading on, although he had not gone that

far, to a point where he was likely to be out of order, and I thought it proper to call his attention to the fact.

Mr. FOWLER: I was going to speak in the most commendatory terms of the gentlemen sitting in the front row of the gallery. Mr. Speaker, you entirely misapprehend me. I was going to say what firm looking gentlemen they were; how when their minds were once made up to anything, they could not be changed, and that a strong majority of them were in favour of Professor Shortt. I would not say anything derogatory of the Senate. Perhaps I would like to be a senator myself some day, and surely I would not say anything derogatory of that most honourable body.

Mr. NEELY: Shame.

Mr. FOWLER: It is a good thing that it has come to you at last.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. FOWLER: Oh, that is the man, is it?

Mr. GAUVREAU: That is where my hon. friend is wrong as usual. I was not the man. I did not say a word.

Mr. FOWLER: Then why did my hon. friend get up? I did not name him and I did not point to him.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I never said a word at all.

Mr. FOWLER: When the shoe pinches we usually squeal.

Mr. GAUVREAU: You have a suspicious mind, that is all.

Mr. FOWLER: Our volcanic friend is erupting again. When Professor Shortt made that utterance he knew that the Senate would not consent to put him out of business for making a statement that would reflect upon the Government of the day. Therefore it was a cowardly act; and to represent him as a man that has been abused and vilified by the gentlemen on this side who have spoken concerning him, is to make a statement that is not in accordance with fact. Professor Shortt has been too kindly and too well used. He deserves much more severe castigation than he has received. A man occupy-

10 p.m. ing the position he occupies is supposed to be as impartial and judicial as a judge upon the bench in recommending men for public office, and to show the narrow, bigoted partisanship that Professor Shortt has shown, reveals that he is absolutely and utterly unworthy of the high office to which he has been appointed.

I am very sorry that the hon. member for St. John city (Mr. Pugsley) is not in his place. During the few moments this evening when I was absent from the House, the hon. gentleman referred to a matter regarding my county. I do not say that he did it intentionally in my absence. I do not quite know how he dragged it in, and I do not see what it has to do with the dereliction of Prof. Shortt, or with the utterances which he made one Sunday night when he should have been at church. My hon. friend said that there had been erected in the county of Kings, which I have the honour to represent, and which gave birth to that distinguished statesman the hon. member for St. John city—although I have never seen on the part of the inhabitants of that beautiful county any particular show of elation on account of that county having been the birthplace of that eminent statesman——

Mr. NEELY: Clever!

Mr. FOWLER: Another hon. member in pain over there. The statement my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) made regarding the public building at Hampton is altogether beside the fact. He misrepresented the population of the town. He misrepresented the amount of business carried on there. I am very sorry that my hon. friend is not here, because I am surprised that he would make such a statement about the county town of his native county.

My hon. friend also, as I am informed, stated that this was not the proper way in which to bring up this matter with regard to Prof. Shortt; that Prof. Shortt should be brought to the bar of the House; that this method of procedure was unfair and improper. Knowing the admiration that my hon. friend has for his leader, I am surprised that he should make such a statement, because it was his leader who brought this matter up. The hon. gentleman has had some experience himself with regard to matters of this kind. Let us see what he has done. Did he feel sorry, when he was lashing a certain gentleman, to think that that gentleman had not an opportunity to reply? Did that cause him to restrain his rage? No. A commission once sat in the province of New Brunswick investigating matters in connection with the Central railway. At the head of that commission was one of the most eminent jurists that the province of New Brunswick has produced, a man of high character, of unblemished

reputation, a man who has never stained with one blot the ermine which he wears.

I refer to the Hon. Chief Justice Landry, of New Brunswick. And because the Hon. Chief Justice Landry had the temerity to bring in a report supported by the evidence, absolutely, unqualifiedly supported by the evidence which condemned the conduct of the hon. member for St. John city, he abused, and vilified and lashed the Chief Justice in this House where that gentleman had no opportunity to reply. Yet he finds it a horrible thing that this ex-schoolmaster, Professor Shortt, should have his conduct characterized, even in the moderate way in which it was characterized by the Hon. Minister of Public Works. I am surprised, knowing my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works so well, that he restrained himself so much when he had such great provocation. I must not forget my genial friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark). He is an angel of peace; he says: Let there be truce, and—there is truce. Let me give something of what he said on the 8th of February last:

> The most violent form of partisan strife that can possibly be instigated in any country is a general election. I think everybody will agree that partisan discussion is at its best in a general election—or at its worst. Perhaps I ought to correct that: Perhaps it finds a lower level still in the literature that is issued prior to an election.

With that premise he makes out that the issuing of this partisan literature is worse, so far as bitterness is concerned, even than the discussion that takes place during the progress of the campaign. Well, if he is thinking of Grit literature, I should be inclined to agree with him; I think scarcely anybody will dispute the position he takes. He told us also in that connection, that with regard to literature:

> I want to claim before this House and the country that we on this side have an absolutely clean sheet. From the moment the war broke out the Bureau was closed.

Referring now to the bureau for the dissemination of noxious literature to persons of the Liberal persuasion throughout Canada,

> So far as I am concerned, I have never seen a document emanate from it since that time, of a party nature or of any other nature.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I am sure the hon. gentleman wishes to be fair.

Mr. FOWLER: Certainly.

Mr. CLARK: Of course, he will see that I previously defined the literature as party literature. I did not need to repeat that phrase at every step.

Mr. FOWLER: That is exactly what I am speaking about. I am going to be absolutely fair to my hon. friend, fairer even than the Minister of Public Works. The hon. member for Red Deer goes further:

> I have never seen a document emanate from it since that time, of a party nature or of any other nature. Where is the laugh of my hon. friends now? Can they produce a leaflet or a document? Not a single one. And I should be wanting in common manliness if I did not assert it.

Now, I am going to ask the hon. gentleman to take that all back. I know that he is a manly gentleman and I am satisfied that when I hold up to his gaze these printed documents, issued between the time war was declared and the time he made his speech, he will withdraw his statement. I hear an hon. gentleman say that this is not party literature. It is called "The Canadian Liberal Monthly". Let us find the October number, issued soon after the war broke out. We were all standing together shoulder to shoulder like the boys of the old brigade, heart beating close to heart in common defence of the Empire. That was the position we were supposed to occupy. I believe the hon. member for Red Deer was honest in his view, I believe that he was in earnest and that he was genuine. But what says this delectable sheet, this monthly effusion? How was it keeping the truce? I understand that it is issued once a month; which, perhaps is not unnatural seeing that it is a monthly. And under whose direction is it issued? That of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, a gentleman who has been spoken of as a chivalrous man, the wearer of the white plume. Let us see what this says: "A question for Mr. Foster," in big, black type. That refers to Sir George E. Foster, one of the brightest minds in this House, and Minister of Trade and Commerce in this Administration. And this "Question for Mr. Foster" is this:

> The French Government has just placed an order with a Pittsburgh firm for enough horseshoe nails to keep that firm going night and day for eighteen months. The Italian Government has just placed an order with a United States firm for $5,000,000 worth of saddles, boots and other leather goods. The Australian Government has just placed an order in the United States for a huge consignment of steel rails. All these goods could have been made quite as quickly and as cheaply and of equal quality in Canada. This question suggests itself —Is the Department of Trade and Commerce at

Ottawa doing anything or nothing to guide orders from friendly or allied Governments into Canadian channels?

I hear an hon. gentleman say: "No politics in that." Oh, no desire to injure the Government in that. Another fond delusion shattered. I see the hon. member for Red Deer shaking his head as he says: "No politics in that." I thought the hon. member would become indignant as soon as I read this. I should not have expected anything better from the hon. member immediately behind him, but I should have expected something better from the usually chivalrous member for Red Deer.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Would the hon. member allow a question in order to elucidate this matter? Is it not a fact that the Minister of Trade and Commerce in the documents emanating from his department shows that he is doing his utmost to get trade for Canada out of the war? And if that be the fact, does my hon. friend think he is guilty of partisanship in doing so? Or is he showing Canadian patriotism?

Mr. FOWLER: I remember that the father of " my Uncle Toby " was once asked a very pecurliar question—

Mr. CLARK: Never mind your Uncle Toby.

Mr. FOWLER: —a very peculiar question, which had as little bearing upon the subject under consideration as the question just asked by the hon. member for Red Deer has upon the matter which we are now discussing.

Could anything be more strongly partisan than an attempt to hold up to the execration of the people of Canada the Minister of Trade and Commerce and his department? Was it not partisan to allege that the minister was not doing his duty; that the department was not doing its duty to the Canadian people, who are making great sacrifices for the Empire; that contracts from foreign countries were, by reason of the supineness of the Department of Trade and Commerce, allowed to go to the United States? Does the hon. member for Red Deer consider that there is nothing of a partisan character in these allegations? In respect of all these books, pamphlets and monthlies, the same state of affairs exists. We find that during the time when this truce was supposed to be in operation, this literature was being circulated all over the country. I am sure that this was done without the knowledge of the hon. member for Red Deer, but I am sorry that I was mistaken in assuming that he would admit that this was wrong, and a violation of the truce.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I would if I knew it to be the case.

Mr. FOWLER: No man is so hard to convince as the man who does not wish to be convinced, and I am afraid the hon. gentleman does not wish to be convinced. But, to return to Prof. Shortt for a moment. Prof. Shortt forgot to tell his auditors on that fateful Sunday night—fateful for him—that in the very department over which he presides there have been two dismissals and resignations, and that eight persons have been appointed to take the places of these officials. This is but another instance of Prof. Shortt's unfairness in regard to these matters. The return says that in respect of the Civil Service Commission there were no dismissals, one resignation, one transfer to another department, no desertions from the service, no punishments, and eight appointments to fill two vacancies—a proportion of four to one. That was keeping up the average pretty well; why did not Professor Shortt be fair enough to make this known? This gentleman is deserving of the condemnation of this House and of this country, and he will receive it when the facts are known by all impartial people. He is deserving of more; if he gets his deserts he will be dismissed from the service of this country by joint address of the House of Commons and of the Senate of Canada.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Kings, Prince Edward Island): The discussion of this subject has taken a very wide range and several subjects have been brought up which are not quite germane to the matter under consideration. Sir, if things have happened in the other provinces of this Dominion as they have in the province of Prince Edward Island—occurrences with which I am personally acquainted—substantial proof is afforded of the statement made by Professor Shortt and by the hon. member for Guysborough this afternoon that enormous increases have taken place in the number of appointments to the Civil Service. In the Department of Public Works in the province of Prince Edward Island, under the Conservative Administration, one man was removed from office and four men were appointed to take his place. Under the late Administration there were three men in the office of the Public Works Department at Charlottetown. There

are now six men in that office, and the names of seven men on the pay roll. Charlottetown is an old established community; there is no more work going on now than there was some years ago.

Mr. ROGERS: I am afraid my hon. friend is mistaken in the statement which he has made; I think he had better revise it.

Mr. HUGHES: I am quite sure that I am not mistaken. The circumstances under which this removal was made are decidedly objectionable. Shortly after the change of government took place some persons in that province who were connected with the Public Works Department and others who expected to be connected with the department, approached the resident engineer and boldly demanded from him a rake-off on the expenditure. The engineer was surprised, and refused absolutely to countenance such a thing. Pressure was brought to bear upon him; other men were brought to his office to influence him, but he stood firm and refused to be influenced. They told him that they would get square with him. The resident engineer at that time was superintendent of dredging for the province. The captain of dredge No. 9 was removed and a new captain was appointed in his place. The new captain, without any authorization or instructions from the resident engineer, proceeded to do dredging for private parties without making any return. When the resident engineer heard of this, he called the captain to account and reprimanded him severely. Upon being asked what authority he had for doing this dredging, the captain said he had been instructed to do it by the persons who were responsible for his appointment. These persons were called in, and the engineer was threatened with dismissal if he interfered with the captain of the dredge. Was he dismissed? No, but he was removed—superannuated. The man who was trying to protect the Government and the people of Canada, although he was well qualified physically and mentally to do his work, was superannuated at $2,800 a year and other men were appointed to do his work. I brought this matter to the attention of the Minister of Public Works some years ago. He told me that he would have an investigation made, and that if he found the charges made to be correct, he would dismiss every man connected with the matter. No investigation has been held and no removals have been made except the removal of the one man who was trying to protect the department. Now, Sir, if things like that are happening in the other provinces of this Dominion, we have an explanation of the enormous expenditure that has taken place under this Government, and of the enormous increase in the number of public servants drawing pay from the people of Canada. These are statements that cannot be controverted, facts that have come within my own knowledge, and they are but an index of what is going on all over Canada. This debate has taken a turn this evening that led me to believe that I would be only discharging my duty by bringing this matter to the attention of the House and by publishing it, because I feel satisfied that what has been done in my province is but a small thing compared with what is going on in the other provinces, where great public works are in progress.

Mr. A. De WITT FOSTER (Kings, N.S.): I do not intend to delay the House at any great length, but I wish to say a word or two, as is my inalienable right as a member of this House, on the subject which has engaged our attention since early to-day. I was much interested in listening to the debate, particularly that phase of it which has dealt with the so-called political truce said to exist throughout the length and breadth of Canada, and with the proclaiming of that truce. Hon. gentlemen are no doubt fully seized of the fact that when the war broke out on August 4 and the political position of one of the great parties in this country was somewhat in danger, the first thing that was announced in the press was the so-called party truce. I wish to tell the House in what manner this so-called party truce was observed in the county from which I come, by hon. gentlemen opposite. No addresses were delivered in that county by myself on political topics. I did address a meeting or two upon patriotic lines, and I addressed a series of meetings in the county to stimulate recruiting, as I conceived that to be the most important duty of any member of Parliament, after the great crisis which came like a bolt from the blue on August 4, and plunged this country, in common with the British Empire, into the greatest war the world has ever known. I had announced a meeting in my constituency on a certain evening, when I saw a poster announcing a public meeting to be addressed by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), by the member of the Local Legislature for

Kentville (Mr. H. H. Wickwire), and by Sir Frederick Borden, the ex-member for Kings county. It was the annual meeting, at which the routine business of the Liberal party was carried on during the afternoon, and in the evening a public meeting was called, which was attended by a great many Conservatives of the town of Kentville and of the neighbouring country. They went to hear my good friend the hon. member for Pictou. I am bound to say that the hon. member for Pictou, in some parts of his speech, as he often does in this House, acquitted himself very creditably indeed. But, Sir, there was not one word said to stimulate recruiting in that county. The greater part of the speech of the hon. member for Pictou was an attack upon the Government, and upon the Prime Minister, and upon the hon. the Minister of Militia particularly, for not having replied to that statement in the Globe demanding that the Prime Minister and his followers accede to the request of the Liberal party, to say that no election would be held till after the war. The ex-member for the county, Sir Frederick Borden, said that the Prime Minister of this country was prostituting the honour of this country by refusing to say that a certain number of sessions would be held before the Government went to the country. Prostituting the honour of the country, Sir, when the right hon. gentleman was engaged, to my own certain knowledge, in eighteen or twenty hours' work a day in the interests of Canada and of the Empire. The references to the Minister of Militia at that time were along the same lines. The execrations of Heaven or of some other place were called down upon the Government for the manner in which they were conducting the affairs of the country. The hon. member for Kings county for the Local Legislature even went into the realm of scandal upon that occasion, he even went on to tell the people that if the lid were taken off, the scandals would smell to Heaven, a beautiful thing to happen in a county where we were endeavouring to raise, as we since have raised, some two or three hundred men to go to the front. Yet hon. gentlemen talk about a truce being declared and having been violated by gentlemen on this side of the House. I was convinced from the start, as the youngest member in this House, that a truce was declared because it was politically advantageous to the Opposition party declaring that truce, and the minute it became known, and they realized that such a truce would no longer be advantageous, then that truce would be broken. What of the detectives that it was said in the county were being stationed at Valcartier and throughout the country to watch the Government, to watch the details of this, that, and the other thing? This was keeping the truce!

In regard to the matter of recruiting, I think it was in my own hearing that the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), speaking in this House, said that if war broke out, in the interests of this Empire, he would stump the province of Quebec, so interested was he that Canada should do her part. I would ask how many meetings the right hon. gentleman has held in the province of Quebec to stimulate recruiting there? He has held one or two that I have heard about. I would like to ask how many recruits have been enrolled as a result of these meetings.

After the Liberal meeting of which I have spoken in my own county, I had a series of meetings at which I devoted about ten or fifteen minutes to answering charges levelled at the Government and myself at the meeting referred to, and for the remaining hour or two hours I did the best I could, as I have given of the best energy that was in me since the outbreak of war, in aid of this country and of the Empire.

Just a word or two with regard to Professor Shortt, a gentleman with whom I have but a very slight acquaintance. I am informed and have been led to believe that appointments to the inside Civil Service are based upon the results of competitive examinations. I know something about examinations, and the type of examination which has been set along a certain line, and I am bound to say that from my perusal of the type of questions that have been set at different times by the Civil Service Commission, a very great deal of fault might be found with the Commission itself; because in my humble judgment in some cases it is almost impossible to obtain the right man for efficient work so long as his appointment is to depend upon the results of the competitive examination set from time to time by the Commission under Professor Shortt. On one occasion, just a short time ago, the Civil Service Commissioin advertised for a technical man, a university graduate, a draughtsman to be utilized in the Department of the Interior, a man with special qualifications. A young man in my own riding spoke to me about the matter and I said to him, as I have said to all applicants who have spoken to me about positions, whether

large or small: There is the examination. There are the conditions laid down by the Civil Service Commission and by the Government. When you have fulfilled those conditions, when you have passed your examination and submitted your record, I will endeavour to see, if I can, that you get a fair show. That is all I will do for you or for anybody else. With regard to cajoling or pleading with any Civil Service Commissioner I should not deem it dignified in any respect for a member of Parliament to resort to that kind of procedure.

What I meant, Sir, by saying that I would endeavour to see that he got a fair show was simply this: If I could find out that Professor Shortt was keeping the position open for a graduate of McGill University or of Queen's University or of Dalhousie University or of Acadia University or of any other university in the country, I should think it my duty to bring it to the attention of this House and of the country. In regard to the particular case I was speaking of just now, a gentleman in my own riding applied for a position as draughtsman in the Department of the Interior. He is a graduate in Arts of the university from which I come, and has had a two years' course in draughtsmanship and science at the same university. Later on he went to Montreal, where he spent four years graduating in both branches of science. He is an expert draughtsman. At the age of eighteen he draughted his own plans, and built absolutely by himself an engine for his motor boat. He built the boat while going through college and sold it for $750, thus enabling him to pay most of his way through his arts course. He is a genius; a man who, I dare venture to assert, is not equalled in his varied qualifications by any gentleman occupying a position in the inside service of this country. He took the examinations prescribed, whatever they were, and in due course gave my name to the Civil Service Commission as one to whom they might apply for a certificate of character. I had known him for six or eight years, and I filled in the ordinary form provided for that purpose. The young man came to Ottawa and was put to work in the Department of the Interior by the Civil Service Commission. Professor Shortt was at that time abroad, whether on Government business or his own I do not know, and I shall therefore impute no motives. But directly Professor Shortt landed in the city of Ottawa the first thing he did was to dismiss this gentleman from the service. I sent him a courteous letter asking for the reasons for this man's dismissal. If the reasons had been that his work was not satisfactory to the department, all well and good; but the answer I got from Professor Shortt was that he had so many applicants whose qualifications were considered better than this young gentleman's that he had to dismiss him and appoint somebody else in his place whose qualifications were higher. I say he had no one whose qualifications were better than those of the young man to whom I refer, and I challenge any one, whether inside or out of this House, to give me the name of a candidate for that position and to state his qualifications alongside those of the gentleman to whom I refer. The proof of that is the fact that although this position was required to be filled in October last, that position for which a man is urgently desired is still vacant. The young man I refer to was dismissed after a month's work in the department. I was informed only yesterday that a new notice had been sent out asking for applicants for the same position. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether Professor Shortt was keeping that position open for some one from Queen's University or from some other part of the country? What were the reasons why he did not allow that man to keep that position which he had filled to the advantage of the country and with the commendation of all those with whom he was working? I agree with what has been said by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, that Professor Shortt has too many things to do. Speaking at public forums and travelling back and forth throughout the length and breadth of this country, he is far too busy a man to devote his time and attention to the important business of conducting the Civil Service of this country, and he should forthwith be relieved of the duties of Civil Service Commissioner, and given ample opportunity to indulge himself along other lines which he seems to find more congenial.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): I had not intended to intrude in this debate, which I am sure in the judgment of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House has run to a point where not much profit is to be gathered from the discussion. I would not have risen were it not for the fact that my hon. friend (Mr. A. De Witt Foster) has made a reference to myself which I think calls for some reply. Just a word or two in regard

to all this talk about political truce. What are the facts ? We might as well have them told fairly and squarely. Every one knows, at least every one on this side of the House and the Liberal party throughout the country, that when war came on the right hon. gentleman who leads us to-day as he has led us during so many years and whom we are so proud to follow, announced that so far as he and the Liberal party were concerned he did not propose to engage in political discussion, or to attack the Government's record in the ordinary public affairs of this country. Everybody knows he has kept his word, and that the right hon. gentleman has not appeared on any platform since the war began, except to ask the sons of his own race in the province of Quebec to come forth and follow the flag of old England. Everybody knows that a conference took place between the leaders of the two political parties in regard to the vacant seats in this House. Every one knows that an understanding was arrived at between them, that the men who should fill those vacant seats in this session of Parliament should be men of the same political stripe as those who formerly occupied those seats. And then Parliament met. So far as hon. gentlemen on this side of the House are concerned, so far as any agreement or truce between the political parties is concerned, everyone knows that there has been no such agreement between the political leaders in this country. I say on behalf of the Liberal party in this country, that from the time the war began those who know something about what party management is like in this country, know that we have refrained from political partisanship and from attacks on the Conservative party in this country, in regard to the war or the expenditure for the war. That is where the party stands at this moment, while we claim the right in Parliament to perform our proper functions as an opposition in regard to other matters. But if the right hon. the Prime Minister and the men who sit with him think it is wise to go to the people of this country and ask for a verdict, the responsibility rests entirely with them.

And now I come to the matter to which my hon. friend from Kings (Mr. Foster) has referred. The only occasion upon which I appeared on any political platform since the war began was when I appeared with my hon. friend Sir Frederick Borden, a man who is beloved by the Liberal party of this country, a man who can count as friends many hon. gentlemen who sit upon the other side of the House and who regard him as a man of great ability and one who has filled a high place during his long career as the representative in Parliament of Kings county. It would be well for this gentleman who succeeds him if, in the days to come, he could point to a record of achievement in friendships comparable in any measurable degree with that of which Sir Frederick Borden can boast to-day. I went to the meeting of the Liberal Association of Kings county. I did not attend the political organization meeting in the afternoon but I went to the meeting in the evening with Sir Frederick Borden. Did we make any partisan addresses, or arraign this Government upon their record, or discuss their political doings? Not at all, Sir. On the contrary speaking for myself, I stated what I have stated here to-night in regard to the attitude of the Liberal party in reference to the Government of this country to that time in December and I said I did not propose to discuss party questions, and that I did not think that in the position which Canada occupied in the Empire and the position in which this Empire stood, engaged as it was in this great war, it was proper at all that we should have a political contest or that we should discuss political issues at that time. I pointed out what the consequences would be if you precipitated an election at that time and the reasons why it should not take place. I made no personal attacks upon any one. When my hon. friend undertakes to say that Sir. Frederick Borden attacked his own cousin in that county where they were both born, I say on behalf of that cousin as well as on behalf of Sir Frederick Borden himself, that the hon. gentleman has not given a true version of what occurred at that time. Sir Frederick Borden discussed in a most dignified way, and from the standpoint of a public man who had occupied a high position in this country, the issues of war and the reasons why there should not be political discussion and a political contest. He spoke strongly, with all the knowledge that he possesses upon that question, and with that vigour which always characterizes his public utterances. When we think of Sir Frederick Borden we must always remember, when war's alarums come, when the sound of battle is heard throughout this land, that he gave his only son to the Empire, and the bones of his boy are lying on the veldt of South Africa to-day. His successor comes here with the story that we have heard to-

night about this distinguished public man to whom I have referred, and who is closely connected with my right hon. friend the Prime Minister by family and other ties. I would not have risen in this debate were it not to speak on behalf of my distinguished friend, Sir Frederick Borden, and in my own behalf in regard to the position which we took at this public meeting. From the time that it was apparent that war was going to take place between England and the Allies and Germany, hon. gentlemen in this House and my friends throughout the province of Nova Scotia associated with me have not engaged in political or partisan discussion. We have grounded our arms.

I think the suggestion made by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), who spoke immediately after dinner, was one which would be in the interests of this House to consider very carefully. What are the circumstances? We have Prof. Adam Shortt as chairman of a semi-judicial commission. Perhaps that is not a strictly correct description of his duties. However, he is chairman of that commission, and he stands in relation to the public service in very much the same position as a man occupying a judicial position. He cannot be removed from office except by a vote of Parliament. It is charged by these hon. gentlemen that he made a statement, which in the language of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) was untrue and dishonourable, and a great many other adjectives and adverbs were used by the hon. gentleman which I need not repeat in regard to Prof. Shortt. As far as I am concerned, I do not know the gentleman and do not know anything about him. However, it would be much more dignified for this Government if they thought that Prof. Adam Shortt is a man with the qualifications and qualities which the Minister of Public Works declares he has, to come before Parliament and impeach him. What would be thought if we were discussing the decisions and the acts of a man occupying the position of chief justice of one of the provincial courts of this country in regard to a statement which he might have made upon any matter which for the moment might form the subject of political discussion, and it was thought necessary for every hon. member to denounce that chief justice in all the moods and tenses in which Prof. Shortt has been denounced to-night? Would not the appeal be at once met by the Minister of Justice, as a gentleman who had formerly been on the bench, that high ground should be taken, and that the remedy which the law provided for those who have anything to say against a judge which would cause him to be impeached should be proceeded with in the regular way? In the history of this Parliament it will be found that on all occasions, if any hon. member sitting here in times past had any complaint to make of the conduct of any of the judges, the Minister of Justice and the Government took the ground that if there was any fault to be found it should take the form provided by law, that is, the form of an impeachment.

I am not going to go into the discussion of the question as to how many people were dismissed or how many people resigned or how many people were appointed in their places. I rose simply for the purpose of presenting the argument, and I appeal to the Prime Minister whether I am not absolutely right upon this question, that the proper course for the Minister of Public Works to take, if he has any complaint to make against Prof. Adam Shortt, is to make a motion in the proper way to impeach that gentleman before Parliament on account of the untruthful statement he is alleged to have made, or by reason of the fact that the qualities he is said to possess disentitle him further to occupy his office. If these gentlemen who have attacked him so viciously to-day have not the courage to proceed against Prof. Shortt by way of impeachment, then we have been simply listening to a lot of vapouring, and these denunciations will disappear before to-morrow's sun. I therefore submit that upon this question which has been brought before the House by the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, the Prime Minister is bound in duty, having regard to the statements that have been made by his colleagues, and the denunciations which have been put forth against Prof. Adam Shortt, to take the suggestion of his own follower, the hon. member for Kingston, and ask this House to proceed by way of impeachment against this gentleman. Otherwise, do not let us have the undignified proceeding of discussing these charges in this haphazard way about an official who stands in the same position, as far as Parliament is concerned, as would a chief justice of the court.

Mr. A. de WITT FOSTER: Will the hon. gentleman deny that, speaking on the platform at the meeting at which I was present, and at which meeting I took notes, he accused the Prime Minister of making a hybrid alliance with the Nationalists, and

proceeded to arraign Mr. Pelletier, Mr. Blondin and Mr. Nantel, and said, among other things, that Mr. Blondin had to shoot holes through the British flag in order that he might breathe the air of freedom?

Mr. MACDONALD: I have stated the general tenor of my remarks upon that occasion. I state again that I made no partisan speech, that I did not anywhere discuss the political issues before the country, except as I have stated, and that I made no such speech as that to which my hon. friend referred.

Mr. FOSTER: Do you deny it?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If there is no objection on the part of my hon. friends on the other side, I would like to make a few observations. Having moved that the House do go into Committee of Supply, I can only speak again by consent of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I assume that the right hon. the leader of the Government has the unanimous consent of the House.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: With regard to what my hon. friend the member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has said just now, I would venture to remind him that sometimes hon. gentlemen opposite have not exhibited the qualities, upon which he has lavished such eulogiums, in making reference to persons occupying positions upon the judicial bench, because I have it very well in my recollection as appearing upon the pages of Hansard that the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition has publicly accused judges of his own province of Quebec of having made subscriptions to political funds in that province. If the right hon. gentleman had taken the course which my hon. friend for Pictou says should have been taken on this occasion, we would hardly have such charges appearing in Hansard.

The speech of Professor Shortt was made on the 15th day of January. My attention was directed to it shortly afterwards, and I thought it my duty to inquire into this allegation which was bound to convey a certain impression to the public that I did not think could be supported by the facts. I did not propose to take any action in the matter except by way of investigation, and placing before the members of this House and the people of the country precisely what were the actual facts. I sent to the House of Commons and asked to have a copy of the return—of which I know nothing whatever, as it had not been brought to my attention, until I saw the observations of Professor Shortt as reported in the press. There was some delay in getting the return. It could not be found at first; but eventually I discovered that copies were being prepared, as I was informed, for my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Pardon me. I never asked for that return until two days ago; I never saw it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am speaking only of the information that came to me. I was informed that copies were being prepared for my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. It may be that the statement made to me was not accurate.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am stating precisely what I was informed, because I could not get the report when I first sent for it. The matter would have stood at that and would have been brought to the attention of the House in the way I have just now suggested, except for the fact that the hon. member for the city of St. John (Mr. Pugsley) saw fit to endeavour to make use of it in the House for a partisan purpose. On the 25th of February, ten days after this statement had been made by Professor Shortt and before I had had an opportunity of investigating the facts, the hon. member (Mr. Pugsley) brought the matter up in the House for the purpose of making a partisan attack on the Government. I quote his language:

11 p.m.

> I have not that familiarity with the Civil Service that Professor Shortt, chairman of the Civil Service Commission, necessarily has.

That is a very true observation, and I pause here to bring to the attention of the House the fact that any statement of this character coming from Professor Shortt would be supposed to come from a man having special knowledge and authority to make the statement. That matter ought to be taken into account by hon. members and ought to have been taken into account by Professor Shortt before he made that statement. The hon. member for St. John continued:

> He is a gentleman who is in the employ of the Government. He occupies, I presume, a quasi independent position as chairman of that commission; he has made the statement, made it publicly, made it with deliberation, that under this Government the appointments to the Civil Service in the lower grades are entirely a matter of patronage and he says that, whereas there have been something like 2,000

dismissals from the Civil Service, there have been some 10,000 appointments, making a difference of some 8,000.

He did not quote precisely the language of Professor Shortt as reported in the public press. Some consideration ought to be given to the fact that up to the present time Professor Shortt has not seen fit to modify or qualify in the slightest degree the statement reported in both the Ottawa papers that have been referred to. I quote in the Ottawa Citizen as follows:

> Professor Shortt referred to a return brought down in Parliament a few days ago showing the names of 2,000 men who had been dismissed since the change of Government. "Who," asked the speaker, "took the place of the 2,000?" The answer was, 10,000.

Is there any hon. gentleman opposite who will say that that did not convey to him the impression that this Government had dismissed 2,000 men and had appointed 10,000 men for the purpose of performing the same duties which had been previously discharged by the 2,000 men? I do not think any gentleman in this House or out of it will undertake to say that that is not the impression which would be conveyed to his mind by the language just quoted. I observe that later on in another newspaper published in the city of Ottawa on the 26th day of February, which was quoted by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, Professor Shortt alludes to this report of his speech. He also alludes to the discussion that had taken place in Parliament in regard to it, and he says he stands precisely by the report, nothing more and nothing less than the report. Possibly Professor Shortt did not see the report at all; he may have depended upon some statement in the public press as to what the report showed. I venture to say that, if he undertook to quote from the report without having read it, he chose an unfortunate course. And if, having read that report, he made in public the statement credited to him in the press, then his action was still more unfortunate. I do not think that any hon. gentleman on either side of the House could in his heart and conscience come to any other conclusion about that statement than that which I have just indicated. I am not going to attribute motives to Professor Shortt in regard to this matter. If there is any hon. member who is ready now to suggest that Professor Shortt did not use the language attributed to him and that he would like to make an explanation about it, I am perfectly willing to receive his explanation and to read it here in the House, in order that full justice may be done; or, if Professor Shortt desires an inquiry as to whether or not he used that language and denies that he ever used it, I would be perfectly willing to grant any inquiry that he might deem necessary for the purpose of justifying himself.

As his language has now remained unchallenged by him in any way, and as he did, as late as the 26th of February last, refer to the incident which took place in the House of Commons without seeking or desiring to modify in any way the report of his language on the 15th of February, I venture to conclude that there does not seem to be very much ground for any inquiry as to whether or not he did use the language attributed to him and which up to the present time has not been challenged by him.

Now, if I am to assume, as I think I am entitled under the circumstances to assume, that he did use that language, I venture to say that it was by no means a fair statement of the case and that it would be certain to convey an impression to the people of this country disadvantageous and unjust to the Government, and that without any warrant. I think I am within the reasonable judgment of every member of this House when I go that far at least. Prof. Shortt was speaking with special authority with respect to a matter that was supposed to be as much within his peculiar knowledge as within that of any man in Canada; and when he saw fit to ignore the fact that the very return which he had seen, or had not seen, contained over three thousand resignations, when he ignored the fact that a considerable number of civil servants had died during that period, that many had been superannuated, that others had left the service for other causes; when, ignoring all this, he saw fit to suggest that ten thousand had been appointed to do the work done previously by two thousand;—I desire in all moderation to say that I do not think his language could be characterized as quite fair to the Government of the day. If he desired to give statistics with respect to appointments and dismissals, he should have at least taken into consideration the elements to which I have just called attention. I think, if he had desired to put the case fairly before the people of this country, he should in all reason have taken also into consideration that in a country like this, a rapidly growing and expanding country, there would probably be some need of additional appointments within

a period of three years. But all these considerations were absolutely ignored by him.

I regret that the incident has been brought before the House and to the attention of the country by the methods which have been pursued. I would like to point out that when an hon. member on the other side undertakes to make partisan use of a statement which cannot be regarded as other than misleading, it is hardly to be expected that hon. gentlemen on this side will not resent it. It was promptly resented. My hon. friend for the city of St. John (Mr. Pugsley), following in the wake of the Liberal press of this country, by whom Prof. Shortt's statement was used for the purpose of bringing an unjust charge against this Government, saw fit to bring that question up in the House, and it was resented on the spot. We have had this debate to-day in consequence. I think it would have been better if the question could have been dealt with in the method I had intended in the first place—that is, by placing before this House a plain and unvarnished statement of the facts, and an explanation, so far as any explanation is necessary, as to the increase in the public service of this country. If the question has been brought up, with the result that has been made apparent to-day, Mr. Shortt and every one else concerned have only to thank my hon. friend from St. John City and my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. We have nothing to apologize for in respect to the appointments made to the public service. Hon. gentlemen on the other side have spoken of their desire to debate the question. I tell them here and now that whenever they desire to debate that question we are ready to meet them, and I shall be most happy at any subsequent stage of the session to give them all the opportunity for that debate which they may desire by moving the House into Committee of Supply whenever they so wish. Whether they desire to debate it or to make a motion with regard to it, we shall be ready to meet them, and to combat any arguments they may bring forward. The debate has been more or less discursive, and I shall not now enter into some of the matters, more or less personal to myself, which have been alluded to, as this is not the time or the place for that. I will not compare honours as to changes of political opinions with my hon. friend for the City of St. John, as I have never claimed to be in his class in that regard.

I shall see to it that the returns are made complete with all necessary details up to the present time. We shall have a return containing all the information that has been asked for, and some information, perhaps, that has not been asked for. We shall have that laid on the table of the House, placing all the information before my hon. friends on the other side, and we will invite them to bring forward any motion they desire on this subject of the appointments made to the public service.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (South Renfrew): I scarcely think I would have said anything in this discussion had it not been for two things: the remarks of the Minister of Finance (Mr. White)—the lecture, rather, that he proceeded to deliver to us on this side of the House—and the bland and childlike way in which my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) slid over his dismissals. He is an artist in a class all by himself. When he wants a man to resign or get out, he appoints him to some other position, perhaps some 200 miles distant at a smaller salary and without moving expenses.

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. gentleman cannot name one instance.

Mr. GRAHAM: Mr. Norris, of Chicago. Look it up. If my information is correct, the hon. minister asked him to go to Prince Rupert.

Mr. REID: I do not think the hon. gentleman's information is correct.

Mr. GRAHAM: Wait until my hon. friend hears what I have to say. My information is that a certain official who was in the employ of this Government in the city of Chicago at a fair salary was asked to go to a distant point, Prince Rupert, I think, at a smaller salary. This he refused to do, and he was decapitated by Order in Council. If my information is incorrect, I shall have to look up five or six other cases, but I give that to my hon. friend to think over for the night. In any case, outside of that altogether, the minister is an artist in his methods of decapitation. He spoke to-night of a time when I was Minister of Railways, and when we had so many men on the canals. The only extra men I think I ever put to work there were appointed upon the request of my hon. friend to have snow put on a certain bridge so that teams could get over in winter.

Mr. REID: I do not think my hon. friend wishes to misrepresent me. What I asked him to do at that time was to request the officials whom he was paying for looking after the bridge to put snow on the

bridge so that heavy loads would be able to cross. I did not ask him to put on any extra employees; the minister himself put them on to do work which could have been done by the men who were being paid to do it.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend took credit for it in his constituency.

Mr. REID: I did not.

Mr. GRAHAM: You cannot please some men, Mr. Speaker, whether you put snow on a bridge or whether you do not. Hon. gentlemen can understand that permanent employees are not engaged in running a swing bridge in winter; consequently we had to get men to put snow on the bridge in accordance with my hon. friend's request.

Mr. REID: The hon. gentleman knows that the man who looks after the bridge is appointed by the year.

Mr. GRAHAM: There was no man running the swing bridge in winter. But that is a small matter. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs, in the remarks which he made on this subject, did not show as much heat as the Minister of Marine did; he did not lecture us as did the Minister of Finance, and he did not do as well as the Minister of Railways, who did not say anything. He was a kind of happy medium, winking the other eye at the boys all the time.

I wish to refer for a moment to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. I have been in public life a good many years, and I have never made it a practice to display my loyalty by means of a brass band, nor do I find it incumbent upon me, in order to prove my own loyalty, to insinuate every time I stand up in this House that some other Canadian is not as loyal as I am. If that time should ever come, it would be the duty of the Government to have me interned until the war is over, because I would be either in favour of the enemy or not fit to be at large in this country. I hurl back into the teeth of the Minister of Finance of Canada his imputation of disloyalty on our part, and I tell him in the strongest terms that we on this side of the House are just as loyal as he or his friends. When it was said that we were disloyal, many years ago, he was one of us, and if we are disloyal, the Minister of Finance laid the foundation of that disloyalty, or was a party to it. We are not disloyal. The people of Canada from Prince Rupert and the Yukon across to the Atlantic ocean are as patriotic and as loyal as any people in the British domains, England herself not excepted. I think the Minister of Finance rather forgot himself when he lectured us along that line. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) has shown whether or not he is loyal; he has a son with the Princess Patricias, fighting in France at this moment in defence of his country. That empty seat to my left, once occupied by the Hon. Dr. Beland, attests more forcibly than any words of the Finance Minister or of anybody else the loyalty of that son of French Canada. Another hon. gentleman, a French-Canadian member (Mr. Gauvreau), has a son defending the great Empire to which we belong. Is this a time, when we are asking men of all races and of all nationalities in this country to stand shoulder to shoulder in the fight for liberty, for a Minister of the Crown to stand up and fling across the floor of the House the taunt that we are not seized of the importance of the fact that Britain and her Allies are breaking their way through the Dardanelles?

Mr. W. T. WHITE: I do not like to interrupt my hon. friend in the midst of the generous heat that he is developing in connection with this subject, but as a matter of privilege I desire to say that I made absolutely no charge whatever against the loyalty of hon. gentlemen opposite. When I referred to the fact that the war had interfered with the trade and revenue of the country during the past year, hon. gentlemen opposite burst into laughter. I said that they did not appear to me to realize that the war was in progress, and that they had not a proper appreciation, in my judgment, of the scale—a proper sense of perspective in regard to the war; otherwise, in connection with the matter to which I was referring, they would not have treated it so lightly.

Mr. McKENZIE: Why would we not have a proper conception of it?

Mr. WHITE: A proper sense of the scale or perspective, is what I said. If you will allow me, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of privilege, I desire to say that I have spoken on many occasions in this House and on many platforms throughout this country, and not only have I never impugned the loyalty of any member of the Canadian community, either Liberal or Conservative, but I have taken occasion to say on numerous occasions—and I reiterate the

assertion now—that I know of no disloyal citizen in the Dominion of Canada. I never made any such charge of disloyalty, and I desire my hon. friend to withdraw the assertion that he has made.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. WHITE: I was referring only to the fact that in my judgment there was not an appreciation of the fact that the war was proceeding; that is all I said.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not want to impute motives, but I am afraid my hon. friend has let his talking apparatus run away with his better judgment. I do not propose, so far as I am concerned, to allow my best friend to impugn my loyalty, here or anywhere else.

Mr. WHITE: It has not been impugned.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend, in his explanation, left out the very pith of what he said in the course of his speech. He turned to the hon. gentlemen behind him and, ironically speaking of something that the hon. member for the city of St. John (Mr. Pugsley) had said, he said that apparently we were not seized of the fact that at the present time the fleet of the Allies was breaking its way through the Dardanelles in an attempt to reach Constantinople. If that meant anything at all, it meant that we on this side of the House were looking at things in a small way and were not treating gravely the fact that our sons, our brothers and our fellow-countrymen are fighting in the trenches to defend our rights and liberties. If it meant anything, if it was intended to mean anything, it meant that.

An hon. MEMBER: What else could it mean?

Mr. GRAHAM: What could it mean but that we were not seized of the gravity of the position in which our great Empire is at the present time. I want to say that we are seized of it, but is that any reason, because the Allies' fleet is breaking through the Dardanelles, that we should stand silent and let anybody break into the treasury of Canada?

Speaking of the truce, after consultation with the great leader of the Liberal party, several meetings that have been called were cancelled after the declaration of war. I have attended a good many patriotic meetings and addressed several—without a brass band or the accompanying reporter, but I have never discussed politics one way or the other. I have read many red-hot political speeches of hon. gentlemen behind the Minister of Finance, who were cheering him a minute ago. I read some addresses delivered in Ottawa a few days ago, warm speeches. I do not object to them, I am not objecting to them, let them be made, because members of this House have a duty to perform. Sir, while this side of the House is ready to vote millions for the war, it is not ready to vote a dollar for graft. We are prepared to vote all the money that is necessary, as we did in August vote all the money that was necessary, to carry to a successful issue, the war in which the great interests of this country are involved, but we do not give up our right to criticise the administration of the affairs of this country. We are sworn as members of this House to do that. Shall we abrogate those functions, solely because somebody wants to dodge behind the fact that there is war? I say, Sir, that we ought to discuss, and the Government ought to invite discussion of these other questions; but their war appropriation can be put through without a word of carping criticism from this side of the House; but we are not going to be put in a false position.

Speaking of the truce, I am told that while in August we were voting $50,000,000 to carry on the war, pamphlets were being sent out from the city of Ottawa by the Conservative party under the frank of a prominent member behind the Finance Minister, whose name I shall give to the minister privately if he desires, attacking the Liberal party in the most bitter way. These pamphlets were sent back to me from the province of Ontario, having been sent out with the frank of an hon. member behind the Government, in August, when we were here, Sir, nearly in tears, trying to stand shoulder to shoulder, without a whimper of partisanship and without an element of discord in our ranks on either side. Is that keeping the truce?

I want to go further, now that hon. members have brought the matter up. The member for Kings (Mr. Fowler) has accused my hon. friend from North Cape Breton of getting around to a certain point no matter where he started from. My hon. friend from Kings got around to Kings, his own constituency, within ten minutes. But the mountain laboured and brought forth a mouse, so far as partisanship in the Liberal monthly publication is concerned. I know something of what I say and what instruc-

tions were given to the Liberal monthly publication from the time war was declared. The instructions were to give news and statements as to the conditions, but to make no party argument one way or the other—and it published part of the speech of the Prime Minister of Canada. And, Sir, all that the member for Kings could find was one small paragraph jogging the memory of the Minister of Trade and Commerce that we ought to get some of the war orders in Canada—and he has acted along that line. He did not take it as any great or violent attack, he took it good-naturedly as ministers always do. It helped him, as a little criticism always does, to get a greater hustle on. That was all my friend could find. What can I find, if I look? Let me look for a moment, and discover what I find. I find a leaflet which has been sent to a friend of mine during the past few weeks, since we have been in this House, as being circulated in western Canada. Here is a leaflet sent out, published by the Federal Press Agency, 47 Slater Street, Ottawa, Canada, Central publication and distribution office for the Conservative party of Canada. Here is one leaflet: "The aid which Laurier withheld from Britain was so much aid given to Germany." Here is a pamphlet, dated No. 6, 9-12, that would be the 12th day of the 9th month of 1914: "The vigorous and progressive western policy of the Borden Government." Party literature: Here is a good picture of the Prime Minister—no, it is not a very good one, I think I would have that one recalled. It is a worse one of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. Really, what I cannot see about this western publication is why the Minister of the Interior's photograph was not inserted instead of that of the Minister of Public Works, as the Minister of the Interior looks after the lands of the West. I find another one: "Liberals first advocated closure." This is an old pamphlet being circulated now, I suppose, as there was a greater stock on hand than there was demand for at the time. I come to another one, 14th of the 8th month, 1914, which I think would be August, ten days after war was declared. On the first page I find an insulting cartoon of my right hon. friend and leader which was sent broadcast through Canada: "Give credit to whom credit is due." This was sent out during the special session in August, after the outbreak of the war. I have another one: "The Liberals and the naval emergency: for the sake of a supposed party advantage they gambled with the future of the Empire." On the first page is another insulting cartoon of the right hon. leader of the Opposition. You say that was before the session in August. Was it? Listen to the first line of this pamphlet:

> The war between Great Britain and Germany has come.

It must have been after the opening of war, after August 4th, and here is a pamphlet sent out by the Conservative party of Ottawa, a document of 30 pages, beginning with ridicule of my right hon. friend, at the very time that we were joining hands, willing to stand side by side, for the great Empire to which we all belong.

Let me give another one, prepared at an earlier date, which I am told was distributed after the August session. If my information is wrong I shall stand corrected:

> The farce and the cost of the Liberal navy policy compared with the practical economical and effective policy of the Borden Government.

That has been distributed throughout the country during the last few months, I am informed. This is a pamphlet of eight pages printed and sent out by the Conservative party from their headquarters in the city of Ottawa. And my hon. friend from Kings talks about a truce!

Mr. A. De WITT FOSTER: I did not declare any truce.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend did not have to, he was buying horses.

Mr. FOSTER: That is more than you did for the Empire.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have another pamphlet here dated the 14th August: "Relief for the Western Settler." Talk about the war! Here is party literature being distributed through the West for party purposes, when we are supposed to have no parties. There is another one here called "Why the Three Dreadnoughts." This is a nice little booklet which reflects great credit on the printer, but it contains all the old line of attack on the Opposition. And here is a speech delivered by the right hon. R. L. Borden. I am not taking exception to that, for it was not very partisan; in fact, we helped to circulate it ourselves, we thought it so good. But if my hon. friends insist that that is breaking the truce we will have it recalled. Here is another one that has been circulated in Maple Creek, "The Borden Government the Homesteader's Friend." These are just a few of the pamphlets that are being sent out. Here is

one called: "Western Canada and the Liberals," which is being distributed very largely in the West. Then I come to the Federal Press Bulletin, which hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House will know. As my hon. friend from Kings would say, it is a weekly eruption, spelled w-e-a-k-l-y. Hon. gentlemen surely cannot deny that this is being circulated. It bears the date December 24, 1914, and contains an attack on the Liberal party, also an insulting cartoon of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. Keeping the truce indeed! Keeping the truce and sending out tens of thousands of this kind of stuff. I have another Federal Press Bulletin here, dated January 7, 1915, almost down to the minute. And these gentlemen talk to us about violating the truce, which, so far as truce was made, we have absolutely kept. But we refuse to be tongue-tied in criticising what we think wrong. Take all the money you want for the war, but we are going to criticise the other things this Government does, and we are going to criticise them as much as we like. This Federal Press Bulletin contains a two-column article pointing out how futile the Laurier boats would have been in comparison with the dreadnoughts.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That are to be.

Mr. GRAHAM: Two columns of that. Two columns of the most irritating partisan material that could be sent out. It points out that one party was practically against the Motherland. And this at a time when hon. gentlemen are saying, Truce, truce, don't hit us, don't criticise us, truce, there is a war on! And behind our backs they are sending out this party literature, giving us a stab in the back. The German nation has received the condemnation of the civilized world for having on several occasions fired on those bearing a flag of truce; but it is far worse for the people bearing the flag of truce to fire than to be fired on by others. Hon. gentlemen opposite say: You must not shoot, we are carrying a flag of truce. And at the same time they are circulating the most inflammable literature ever sent out by any party in the Dominion. My information may not be correct, but I am told that during the past few weeks thousands have been sent out from this city, and that about two thousand go out weekly. In the face of that, and after the speech of my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr J. E. Armstrong) on the navy, will hon. gentlemen opposite have the temerity to pretend that they are keeping anything that looks like a truce?

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: What was wrong with that speech?

Mr. GRAHAM: It would have been an elegant speech if it had been delivered in the heat of a campaign and when no war was on, or if the navy question was not a very live and debatable question between the parties. No man on this side of the House has discussed that question so far as I know, but it has been discussed by three speakers opposite as if to provoke a discussion on the great naval question, in order to get an excuse to appeal to the electorate. If hon. gentlemen opposite want to appeal to the electorate, let them do so. Do not do as you did in October, "stand shivering on the brink and fear to launch away." Make up your minds to go at it, if you want an election. But so far as the war is concerned, we on this side of the House will give the Government no excuse for appealing to the country on the ground that we are not with them on every dollar desired for the war.

Now I come to Professor Adam Shortt. There are more smiles now than when the ministers were speaking. Either the members of this Government are very timorous and easily irritated, or else there was something in this thing that really annoyed them. I do not know which it is. The Prime Minister was the coolest of the lot, but even he just slipped a little near the end and showed a little warmth. Who is Professor Adam Shortt? Some hon. gentlemen who criticised him to-night showed the strength of their criticism by declaring that they had never met the man, or had had no acquaintance with him. If I might venture an opinion—and I will try to substantiate it—the trouble is not altogether over what Professor Shortt said, but because Professor Shortt has stood in the way of hon. gentlemen opposite driving a coach and four through the Civil Service Act. I am not saying that so much about the members of the Government, but I am judging by the speeches delivered by hon. gentlemen behind them. I except the Minister of Customs for this reason. The Minister of Customs declared Professor Shortt a great partisan. Now I have known Professor Shortt for many years, and I have never heard him utter a political syllable. I do not know to this day what the politics of Adam Shortt may be.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Oh.

Mr. GRAHAM: I say that absolutely as a member of this House.

Mr. A. D. FOSTER: Who appointed him?

Mr. GRAHAM: A Government that carried on the affairs of this country much better than their successors have done, a Government that introduced the Civil Service Act and lived up to it. But hon. gentlemen opposite are trying to poke their fingers through it. The reason why hon. gentlemen opposite are so sore against Professor Shortt is not because of what he said at the Forum, but because he has prevented them from getting their friends into office in violation of the Civil Service Act. The Minister of Customs dealt with his incapacity as a commissioner, and not to any very great extent, with what he said at the Forum. He read copies of examination papers, not to show what Professor Shortt had said at the Forum, but to show that he was not fit for his position. I think I am safe in saying that the Minister of Customs left the impression that the examination papers he read out to-night were for positions as packers, and that class of position.

Mr. J. D. REID: I said clerkships.

Mr. GRAHAM: We will look up Hansard to-morrow. My hon. friend mentioned the closing of boxes and that kind of thing. That is packers' work, and that does not require the examination for clerks which my hon. friend pretended was necessary.

Mr. REID: It requires the examination for lockers, the preliminary examination, and they must pass that unless they are appointed preventive officers.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is getting away from what I am talking about; that is not the question. In the lower grades and in appointments such as that these examinations are not required.

Mr. REID: That is not a fact.

Mr. GRAHAM: Look at it and see if I am not right.

Mr. REID: They are required to pass an examination.

Mr. GRAHAM: They may be required to pass a very light examination, but my hon. friend has many men in his employ in the lower grades who have not passed any of the examinations that were referred to in this House this afternoon. If my hon. friend will look up the requirements of the law he will find that they have a very high standard, so high a standard that University men seek these positions in Great Britain and they get a very high class of officials in this way. The intention of the Civil Service Act, which was not perfect, I admit, was to give the Civil Service a start in the right direction so that hereafter men of the highest type, men educated in our universities and collegiate institutes, might be drawn to the Civil Service.

Mr. A. De WITT FOSTER: They were turned down.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not going into details. My hon. friend was trying to get a man into the department. I know Dr. Adam Shortt, and I say, in the face of everything that hon. gentlemen have said, that there is no higher-minded type of man in the Dominion of Canada than Adam Shortt. He has his peculiarities, as the Minister of Public Works and I have our peculiarities, but he is the soul of honour, and there is no higher type than Adam Shortt. I wish he were in the House to-night to reply to what some hon. gentlemen have said. I would like to see him on the floor of this House ready to discuss the great questions of the country, and if he were hon. gentlemen would find him a foeman worthy of their steel. I know the difficulties that ministers have with the Civil Service Commission—nobody better. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) smiles; he knows what I mean. I have had my difficulties with Dr. Shortt, and I have told him that he was wrong time and again, but I never imputed wrong motives to Dr. Shortt, because I believe he is incapable of entertaining motives other than those of the highest kind. What he was doing at the Forum was criticising our whole Civil Service system, and if you will read what he said carefully you will find that he took a fling at both parties. Of course, the present Government was in—that was the difference—but we had been in for a long time, and he criticised the Civil Service when the late Government was in power. He criticised the system very severely, and it was the system that we left that Sir George Murray was secured to investigate. Dr. Shortt thought that we had not arrived at the right kind of a system, that our officers were not divided in the proper way, that our work was not systematized, and that the ministers had too much to do. Dr. Shortt has always been largely opposed to our present system and wanted it

changed. Whatever he said on that occasion was meant to give an example of what he thought was wrong in our present system, and I do not think that he ever had any desire to impugn the motives or criticise the actions of the present Government. I know him as well as any man in this House knows him. As it is, the fact as to the figures must remain whatever Dr. Shortt said or did not say. The figures presented by my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) to-day show a chasm, to use the words of the hon. Finance Minister (Mr. White) between the sum of the dismissable, resignations, deaths and desertions—

Mr. J. D. REID: No.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think so—and the sum of the appointments equals about 11,000 people.

Mr. REID: There were no deaths in the returns.

Mr. GRAHAM: Well, leave out the deaths. It is said that civil servants seldom die and never of their own accord resign. I do not know whether that is true or not, but they seldom resign unless they are forced to. The people will be asking: Is the Government justified in adding these thousands to the expense of the country at a time when we have a deficit—the first deficit in many years? They may not be so particular as to what Dr. Shortt said or did not say. From the public standpoint I do say that when we have a man who has held important positions in one of the leading seats of learning in the Dominion of Canada, in a seat of learning which stands amongst the highest—that is Queen's University at Kingston, and I am proud to have some little connection with that university—when we have a man who has sent pupils out all over the Dominion to carry on their lifework, and who have carried with them a high respect for Dr. Adam Shortt, when we have a man who is in such a position that he cannot be touched by the House of Commons, one who occupies the position almost of a judge, I think it is as little as the Government can do to appoint some body before whom Dr. Shortt can come and put his side of the case as against the abuse which has been hurled at him by some gentlemen behind and on the Government benches. That is only fair to the dignity of this House, fair to the responsibility of the Government, and fair to a man who, notwithstanding what has been said, stands high and will continue to stand high in the estimation of the leading educationalists in the Dominion of Canada.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Sevigny in the Chair.

Progress reported.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, the House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

Friday, March 5, 1915.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That on Monday, the 8th of March, and on subsequent Mondays to the end of the session, Government notices of motion and Government orders shall have precedence after questions and notices of motion for the production of papers.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I will not object to this motion if the date is changed from the 8th to the 15th.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There is no objection to that.

Motion amended accordingly, and, as amended, agreed to.

17TH NOVA SCOTIA REGIMENT.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. KYTE: I desire to ask the right hon. Prime Minister if he has received any communication from Mr. H. C. Crowell, staff correspondent of the Halifax Chronicle, with reference to the telegrams from Sir George Perley referring to the 17th Regiment of Nova Scotia, and read to the House the other day?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, I have.

Mr. KYTE: Has the Prime Minister any objection to placing it before the House?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I can if desired. Mr. Crowell sent me a telegram saying he had not had a personal interview with General Alderson, but had had correspondence by telegram, and he repeated his statements as to the conditions and desired me to read this telegram in the House; to which I replied that as the substance of the telegram had already been communicated by him to the press, I saw no reason why I

should read it to the House, and that I had sent forward a request, through the Acting High Commissioner, to the War Office that an inquiry should be made into the subject, and that Mr. Crowell should be given an opportunity of appearing at that inquiry and making good his statement.

SEPARATION ALLOWANCES.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: I wish to ask a question with relation to separation allowances to the dependents of certain members of some of the contingents. In order to put the question properly, I am forced to ask leave to read a letter which I have received from the Regina branch of the Patriotic Association.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the letter is not a lengthy one and the hon. gentleman wishes to base a question on it, I think it would be permissible.

Mr. MARTIN: I shall read only the portions of the letter relating to the matter in question. It is a letter addressed to me by Mr. J. J. Franks, secretary of the Regina branch of the Canadian Patriotic Fund, dated March 1. Mr. Franks says:

> My work in connection with the Regina Branch of the Canadian Patriotic Fund puts me in close touch with the wives of the Canadian volnnteers for overseas service.
>
> There was great delay in issuing the cheques for the separation allowance for the dependents of the men of the first contingent but that was quite excusable. As great or a greater delay took place in issuing the cheques for the dependents of the second contingent men. I wrote a few forcible letters to the militia officials at Ottawa but they threw the blame on to the officers in charge of the different corps in Winnipeg for not sending in the necessary information, and I have good reason to believe that the chief fault lay in Winnipeg.
>
> The same unreasonable delay is occurring in connection with the separation cheques for the dependents of the men of the third contingent, now mobilized in Regina. Some of these men enlisted before Christmas, about the 19th or 20th of December, nearly ten weeks, ago and no separation cheque has been received by any of these men's dependents.

The question I wish to ask is whether the Minister of Militia knows whether or not these cheques have been sent up to the present time. If they have not been sent, I would respectfully urge upon the minister the necessity of sending this separation allowance immediately, as in any event it is very small.

Major General HUGHES: The separation allowances are not touched by us until we get the full returns from the various corps. I do not know anything about the second contingent in this regard, but the third contingent papers are scarcely more than in yet, and they must be verified. All these papers have to be verified, and it takes more or less time. The recruiting for the third contingent in Regina began only after Christmas, and there has hardly yet been time to get the papers sent out. However, I will have the matter looked into by the officials of the department.

QUESTIONS OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I desire to refer to a matter of privilege. My attention was called yesterday to the fact that one or more newspapers during the past week have alleged that I eliminated from Hansard a portion or portions of my remarks upon the Budget in reference to the Buy-in-Canada propaganda. I do not complain about the newspapers in question, because, as a matter of fact, the remarks that I did make did not appear in Hansard, and consequently there was some justification for the remarks made by the newspapers. When my attention was called to this, I was of the opinion that possibly I had been responsible for the elimination myself, but upon investigation I learned that I was not responsible, and I have the authority of Hansard officials to say that the deletion of this portion of my remarks was not due to myself. I should not take the trouble to refer to the matter had I not been charged with the elimination of my remarks in this respect, and consequently with receding from the position which I took with reference to the indiscriminate campaign in respect to the Buy-in-Canada propaganda, both of which charges were incorrect.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Did my hon. friend ever ascertain to what the elimination was due?

Mr. MACLEAN: Due to Hansard officials, I assume. But I might say that when my attention was called to it by an hon. gentleman opposite, I undertook to restore the substance of my remarks in the Revised Hansard and I presume that has been done.

Mr. MACDONELL: Are my hon. friend's remarks now included in his speech in the Revised Hansard?

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes. At least, I did everything I could to have them so included.

I do not think the Revised Hansard is out yet.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Mr. Speaker, I also desire to raise a question of privilege. Some of the newspapers have stated that I made a bull the other day in my speech on the Budget. My hon. friend from Essex (Mr. Wilcox) says that I walked out of the House and expunged the passage from Hansard. I desire to say that I did not, directly or indirectly, have any communication with the reporters on the subject. I do not think it would be proper for a member to go to Hansard and ask that a portion of his remarks be expunged. I presume that when corrections are made by members on the spot, the reporters exercise their judgment in getting out their report. I wish to assure my hon. friend from Essex that the statement he made on that occasion is entirely without foundation.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, perhaps you would permit me to give, on behalf of the Hansard staff, the explanation of these two incidents which was brought out this morning at a meeting of the Debates Committee. As to the incident to which the junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) has referred, the explanation is that the Hansard reporter relied on the typewritten copy of the speech handed in by the hon. member for Halifax, and forgot or neglected to interpolate in it the passage to which reference has been made.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is correct.

Mr. TAYLOR: As to the passage referred to by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), the Hansard reporter felt himself justified in using intelligence rather than mere mechanical skill, and, when the explanation by way of correction was made by the hon. member for St. John, the reporter let it go as explained instead of as the matter really occurred.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Quite properly.

Mr. TAYLOR: I have before me the transcription of what did occur, but I do not suppose the House is interested in it now

THE BUDGET.

PROPOSED WAR TAXATION.

Consideration of the proposed motion of Hon. W. T. White (Minister of Finance) for Committee of Ways and Means resumed from March 3.

Mr. O. J. WILCOX (North Essex)—(resuming): Mr. Speaker, it is with a degree of reluctance that I rise to take the part which I am expected to take in this debate. First of all, I desire to say that it is my hope and wish that all I may say may be in accordance with the best traditions of our constitution in regard to debate. I have no desire to speak in an unkindly manner, and should I err in the way of aggression it will be due to my youthfulness in this House, and not to any such intention. When the right hon. leader of this Government and my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition agreed to a truce, I had the hope and conviction that that truce would be kept. Considering what is now at stake—the far-reaching and comprehensive character of the issues with which this Government is called upon to deal, the principles of freedom and of liberty which have been won for us by the sweat and blood of our forefathers, everything in fact that is near and dear to us, and which has sprung up in the splendid democracy we have had in the past—it would have been well for us to follow the course of proceeding which was assented to by my right hon. friend the leader of the Government when he was leader of the Opposition in 1911. I should have thought that this debate might well have ended, as did the other debate to which I have alluded, after the hon. junior member for Halifax had had an opportunity of answering the Finance Minister's speech on the Budget. But, as I listened to the speech of the right hon. leader of the Opposition on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, my hopes fell; for he said that they were bound to criticise the Budget. I think it is true to say that we are living in an age of great achievements. We have boasted of what we have accomplished in this country in the forty years since Confederation. I believe that men on both sides of this House have proclaimed that growth, that development, and that expansion to the people of this country. But now, when everything which is dear to us is at stake—our cherished principles of government, and the liberty and freedom of our people—now is not the time for such wrangling as has taken place in this House during the past week. It has been stated that a truce has been agreed to. I am inclined to the view that my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition misunderstood the meaning of

the word "truce." I hold in my hand a clipping that appeared in one of the Liberal papers of this country on the 21st of November, 1914. I regard it as one of the smallest, the meanest pieces of political partisanship that has come under my observation during my public or private life. It reads as follows:

> Recently we have seen him (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) stumping in Quebec, calling upon the French Canadians to enlist for the European war.

The proper thing for my right hon. friend to do, a noble thing for him to do, but listen to the next sentence:

> The whereabouts and the action of the other party's leader at that time were remarkable by contrast. Sir Robert Borden has been golfing and dancing in Virginia and there has been no one to assume the leadership of his people at a time when the public sentiment needed to be stirred as never before in Canadian history.

A truce! A truce! Let me give another quotation. My hon. friend the member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) last night grew eloquent repeating the old story that he always gets off. The following appeared in the Brockville Recorder:

> This is a sorry comment on the vision of the Minister of Militia who should have known or found out the usual climatic conditions of Salisbury Plains.

This is a charge against my hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Major General Hughes). I will venture to assert in all fairness that no man in public life has had greater responsibilities cast upon him than Major General Hughes since war broke out. It is true he is not perfect; none of us are perfect. If we were perfect we would have no business in this chamber. We are human. The minister is human, and the criticism is—

Mr. FOWLER: Inhuman.

Mr. WILCOX: Yes, it is inhuman. Now, I have Webster's close by me here. What is the meaning of this word "truce?" I said a moment ago that my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition should have some regard for the action of his followers. He is still the leader, although I sometimes think my genial friend the member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) has clothed himself with the robes of leadership. What is the meaning of this term? Truce means pledge of fidelity, faith. Imagine the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) the other night calling out in a loud voice: Come on with your election. Pledge of fidelity! The hon. member for South Renfrew last evening said: If you want an election, come on. Pledge of fidelity! Then, truce is a Teutonic word; intermission of action, pain or contest, temporary concession, brief, quiet. When I think of what has occurred by hon. friends I think of that definition—brief, quiet. Truce? They have been endeavouring to undermine this Administration which I venture to assert, has had the greatest responsibility cast upon it since the 4th August, 1914, that has been cast upon the shoulders of any individuals who have yet been called upon to govern the Dominion of Canada. But there is another word. It is trousse. I think that the leader of the Opposition has mistaken the word, because the latter word means small implements that are used for surgical purposes. The people of this country realize what is going on in this House. They understand fully the motives of hon. gentlemen opposite. There is a lack of sincerity that is known throughout the length and breadth of this land. Think of the argument of my hon. friend from St. John, and apply that to the idea of a truce. My hon. friend from Assiniboia talked about extravagance and big taxes, and spent hours of the valuable time of this House in endeavoring to unload upon this Government the responsibility for the condition that exists as a result of the great war.

Well, Sir, to paraphrase what was said in the Senate of the United States some time ago: when this land, now fair, now beautiful, the most prosperous of all the belligerent powers, which are engaged in the greatest struggle known to civilization, shall have become desolate, prophesied by the hon. gentlemen opposite—big taxes, big burdens on the people,—of course there will be one remedy and that is squid. But, Mr. Speaker, let me remind you that that condition will not be brought about in this country by the wanderings and meanderings of hon. gentlemen opposite. They do not particularly care about what they call the big expenditures, because they realize as well as we the conditions which exist in this country. They know what the revenues of this country have been in the past, they know that the revenue of Canada for the past year has not been as great as in former years, and they know the reason why. It does seem to me that there is a lack of sincerity on their part, because as I see it, they are endeavouring to make the people of this country believe that the Gov-

ernment is responsible for the declining revenue, and therefore they say to the people: Put these rascals out and put us in. I want to say a word to my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, and to say it courteously; I would remind him of that very pleasant visit that he made to Tilbury during the election of 1908, when he addressed 5,000 people gathered there from the four constituencies that centre at Tilbury. The pathetic appeal he made to them on that occasion was: This is my last appeal to the Canadian people, I appeal to you this last time for your support before returning to private life, where I hope to live in peace the remainder of my days. Did the right hon. gentleman mean that? I do not believe he did because he came back in 1911, and we are always glad to meet him in Windsor and in the county of Essex, and he has a good many friends there, but not so many friends now as he had. In 1911 he again appealed for one more term to finish his work. And, after the election what excuse did he give to the people of this country for not living up to the pledge he made to the electors of Essex and Kent? He said he had consulted his wife, whom we all hold in the highest esteem and regard, and that she advised him to keep on. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is very great evidence of the congenial disposition of my right hon. friend, that he is so susceptible to the influence of his wife, but I do not know that the people of Essex took the right hon. gentleman very seriously when he made that statement. However, there was the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) looming up for leadership, and from the experiences we have had in this House we might consider that the hon. gentleman has almost assumed the role of leadership. I confess that when my hon. friend from St. John is in the House, I know of no man who can engender a greater amount of bitterness in the debates than he can. When the hon. member from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) was speaking on the Budget and criticising the big taxes, wasteful administration, and so on, I thought I could see the shades of Sir Richard Cartwright and visions of the Hon. William Paterson, who between the years 1867 and 1896 led off with just that same kind of talk as the campaign cry of the Liberal party. Well, Sir, it never brought any result other than long terms in opposition. Mr. James G. Blaine, the great American stateman, said in one of his books:

> It never pays to be a blue-ruin man in the United States. The people are not influenced by that sort of talk. They have an abiding confidence in our future and when dismal accounts are spread broadcast, they simply lose confidence in the authors thereof.

In the campaign of 1893, the Liberal party took about the same position they are taking to-day, and they talked of big taxes, big expenditure and debt. Here is an extract from the Liberal literature of that day:

> We cannot but view with alarm the large increase of the public debt and of the controllable annual expenditure of the Dominion, and the consequent undue taxation of the people under the governments which have been continuously in power since 1878, and we demand strict economy in the administration of the government of the country.

We all know what happened when the Liberals came to power; we all knew that between 1896 and 1911 the expenditure of this country increased by leaps and bounds and that the public debt thereof was added to. Now, here are the words of my right hon. friend:

> If we get into power we will follow the example of Mr. Mackenzie; and I say that although we may not be able to bring the expenditures to what they were under him, we can reduce the amount by two, yes three million of dollars per year.—Wilfrid Laurier.

He was not Sir Wilfrid then.

> For my own part, I do not hesitate to tell him that I consider a yearly expenditure of forty million dollars, or thirty-eight million dollars, altogether for the present resources of Canada. I say that it is a disgrace and a shame to the Government that have been entrusted with our affairs that they come down to ask us and ask an expenditure of $38,300,000 a year for federal purposes. Sir, the thing is utterly unjustifiable.—Sir Richard Cartwright.

Now, is it not a fact—and I call on hon. gentlemen opposite to witness—that Sir Richard Cartwright spent part of his public career in depicting Canada as abandoned by Heaven to all manner of evil fortunes? And what did he gain by it except a long period in the cold shades of opposition, followed by a spell of office which he had to recant by humbly adopting the very policy he had blamed for its imaginary woes.

> In 1909 we were taking $6,115,000 more in taxes out of the people than we should, and we spent $7,571,000 more than we should. An era of economy in expenditure should at once be entered upon.—Wm. Paterson.

Just such argument as we have to-day. The fact is that the outbreak of this war, this world struggle, frustrated every plan of hon. gentlemen opposite. They declared for a truce and started all over again, and all they have to fight on now is the present Budget which was brought

down since the war broke out. Now I do not think that conditions are so bad; I know they are not so bad. I believe that my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) in the remarks which he made upon the Budget was so far from the facts that when he reads over those remarks he will not take them seriously himself. The outbreak disturbed trade in this country as it disturbed trade in every civilized country in the world. The shock to international finance was enormous. In the general loss of confidence there arose an instantaneous and universal demand for gold all over the world. Huge volumes of securities were thrown upon the market and sold for what they would realize. Liquidation proceeded upon a colossal scale until the prodigious losses of individuals and the vast drains of gold from the financial centres compelled the closing of the houses of exchange of the world. This is the condition which this Government had to meet, and by reason of this condition the imports upon which we raised the revenues of our country did not reach their former level, and consquently the tariff, which constitutes the medium by which the revenue of this country is raised, was ineffective to produce a sufficient amount to run the affairs of the country. I think that is a reasonable and adequate explanation of the conditions that actually exist.

4 p.m.

Now, my hon. friend from St. John city dwelt at length upon the years 1908-9, 1909-10, 1912-13 and 1913-14. But he had nothing to say about the Estimates of 1910-11 which he himself had assisted to prepare and which the Administration adopted. The very principle which he condemned in the Estimates of 1908-9 was involved in the Estimates which he himself presented. The revenue of this country in 1909-10 was $101,503,710.93. In 1910-11 the revenue was $117,780,409.78, an increase of $16,276,698.85. The revenue of 1911-12 amounted to $136,108,217.36, an increase of $18,327,807.58. That year the Finance Minister was able to apply to the reduction of the public debt the sum of $122,591.32. The revenue in 1912-13 had increased under this progressive Administration to $168,639,903.45, an increase of $32,000,000, and in that year the Government had a surplus of $55,000,000. And in that year, after meeting all the obligations which they themselves had created, and also meeting the obligations which came over to this Government from the Government of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), the sum of $25,300,000 was applied to the reduction of the public debt. In 1914-15, the current year, when this great world's crisis arose on the 4th of August, the public revenue is unfortunately reduced to $120,000,000. The Government, therefore, have not the necessary funds to carry out the programme which, having regard to the growth and development of the country, they have anticipated putting into effect. My hon. friend the Finance Minister made some remarks during the course of his Budget speech, which I desire to quote:

> The revenue for the present year will, then, approximate $163,000,000.
>
> Let us now consider the expenditure. First of all, the ordinary Consolidated Fund expenditure will probably reach $126,500,000, or about $14,500,000 in excess of last year. At the last session of Parliament fairly generous appropriations were made for all divisions of the ordinary services of the country. The main increases will be found in Public Works (expenditure chargeable to income) and in the expenditure on account of post office, railways, agriculture, and militia. With the growth of the country the other services have required additional outlays, with the result that for the current fiscal year, as I have stated, there will be an increase in the expenditure on account of Consolidated Fund of about $14,500,000. A revenue of $163,000,000 and an expenditure of $126,500,000 leaves a surplus of revenue over and above the amount required for expenditure upon current account of $36,500,000.
>
> The surplus for the year, then, will be thirty-six million five hundred thousand dollars as compared with fifty-six million dollars last year.
>
> In connection with this matter of surpluses, it may not be out of place for me to point out that from the year 1902 forward there have been substantial surpluses of revenue over current expenditure, running from $14,000,000 in 1902-3 to $22,000,000 in 1909-10, to $30,000,000 in 1910-11. For the year 1911-12 our surplus was $37,000,000, for 1912-13, as I have stated, $56,000,000, and for last year, 1913-14, the figure which I have just given, $36,500,000. So we have had during the last three years the largest surpluses in the financial history of the Dominion.

It seems to me that these figures, which are absolutely correct—nothing needs to be taken from or added to them—are evidence of the fact that this Government is giving to the country a good clean, and honest administration and that the finances of the people have been properly administered by the hon. gentlemen who sit on the treasury benches.

In connection with the surplus which has accrued during the last few years, let me point out some of the obligations which this Government has been compelled to assume

We say that we are not responsible for the liabilities which my right hon. friend the present leader of the Opposition and his Government created. The legacies which were handed over by this Government to the present Finance Minister had to be accepted; the necessary money had to be raised by means of the machinery ordinarily used for that purpose in the country. I think it is not reasonable to place upon us the onus of responsibility for $178,000,000 of liabilities which were incurred by my right hon. friend's Government, and which the present Government was compelled to assume, as follows: National Transcontinental railway, $56,000,000; Hudson Bay railway, $9,000,000; Quebec bridge, $10,000,000; total, $75,000,000. To that $75,000,000 must be added the $5,000,000 of implementing money in connection with the sale of bonds to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, the $33,000,000 used for the purposes of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company debentures and the $15,000,000 loaned to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company for the completion of the line. These liabilities amount to the enormous sum of $178,000,000—$16, for every man, woman and child in Canada. The amount is still growing; the National Transcontinental railway, the Quebec bridge and the Hudson Bay railway are still unfinished. In view of the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite incurred these enormous liabilities and handed them over to us, the allegations and charges against the Minister of Finance made by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) and the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) do not come with very good grace. The Minister of Finance has given to this country as clean, as honourable and as honest a service as has been given by any gentleman who ever graced the dignity of the position of Finance Minister of Canada. We do not propose to allow my right hon. friend and his confreres in office to charge this Government with wilful extravagance when the large amount of money which is required is to meet obligations which hon. gentlemen themselves incurred. I could give many examples, but I want to give one in particular. In 1904 my right hon. friend addressed a large and influential meeting at Chatham. I have before me a clipping from the Liberal party paper, the Windsor Record, which reported ad nauseam his address on that occasion. It was fluent, it was eloquent, it was graceful, but it did not just pan out as he expected it would.

Let me read from the preamble of my right hon. friend's address in launching his Grand Trunk Pacific railway scheme:

> There is nothing so sweet or so true to the heart of man as is his native country. Even the old men amongst us who have come from the other side of the ocean, and have brought with them from far away an undying love for the land of their ancestors and the land of their birth, find that Canada becomes dearer to them as Canada advances and as the name of Canada spreads.

That is true. These are lovely words. This was fertilizing the soil for the statement that my right hon. friend was about to make before 5,000 people. Here is the Windsor Record's report of his address in presenting this scheme to the people of Canada. He said:

> It is true, and one is bound to be honest in these matters, if a man in the city of Chatham were to borrow $10,000 to build a house, and he built it, and as soon as it is built, if he could find a tenant who would pay him 3 per cent or 4 per cent on the cost of the house, if he borrowed the money at the same rate, he was not out of pocket a single cent.

That was the reasoning. Here is the statement to which I desire to draw the attention of the House:

> According to our contract the whole amount of money that will be taken from the Canadian tax payer for the construction of that immense railway from ocean to ocean will be simply the sum of $13,500,000, a sum less than our surplus last year. (Great applause).

I desire to state briefly the cost of this road from the statement of the leader of the present Government in speaking upon this question in 1904. What is the proposition? What is the position at present? Let us examine it for a moment. We are committing this country to obligations to the extent of $150,000,000. If we consider the probability that the bonds must be sold at 90 cents we are committing this country to obligations of the extent of $170,000,000; and the Grand Trunk Railway Company, the other partner to the contract, is committing itself to obligations to the extent of only $14,500,000, or a little less than $15,000,000. What is the result of the contract at present? The result is that 1,500 miles of railway built in the western part of Canada as part of an enterprise to which the Government contributes $150,000,000 or $170,000,000, and to which the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company contributes say $14,500,000, is to become the absolute property of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. If we are going to expend $150,000,000 or $170,000,000 for the construction of this line and hand over 1,500 miles

of the most profitable portion of it to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, what is the objection to our incurring the other $14,500,000 and owning the whole road?

I wish to draw the attention of the House to another phase of this question. My right hon. friend who led the Government in 1904 went to the people in my county, and in the quotation which I have read, which he will not dispute, he informed the people of that consituency that that road would be built for $13,000,000. I want to place on Hansard just what this road did cost from the official return laid upon the table of the House by the Minister of Railways and Canals:

Statement showing the cost of the eastern division of the National Transcontinental railway for the purpose of basing the amount of annual rental which the Grand Trunk Pacific railway will be required to pay under their agreement; based on the estimated cost submitted by the chief engineer at $161,307,800 and on the supposition that it will be completed and handed over to the Grand Trunk Pacific railway on the 1st January, 1915, and capitalizing the expenditure at 3 per cent as provided in the agreement for the purpose of the rental.

Estimated cost of complete road exclusive of interest at December 31, 1914	$161,307,800.00
Interest during construction at 3 per cent to December 31, 1913	15,136,289.00
Estimated interest on expenditure to December 31, 1914 ..	5,293,322.67
Capital cost for rental purpose at January 1, 1915	181,737,411.67
Interest on $181,737,411.67 at 3 per cent capitalized for 7 years (January 1, 1915, to December 31, 1922)	41,776,681.31
Capital cost estimated to January 1, 1923, for rental purposes..	223,514,092.98
Rental based on above	6,705,422.79

If the road does not earn 3 per cent in excess of working expenditure for the three years ending December 31, 1915, then the interest is added to capital for three years longer, adding $20,725,791.30 to capital cost; making the estimated cost of the railway for rental purposes, $244,239,884.28. Rental based on above, $7,327,196.54.

No allowance has been made in the above for betterment during ten years from January 1, 1915, to December 31, 1925. Should any betterments be made these would have to be added to the cost for rental purposes, and rental increased accordingly.

This country under the bargain made by my right hon. friend must pay without recourse on the bonds guaranteed on the mountain section $56,342,000. Interest at 3 per cent for seven years, which amounts to $11,831,820. The country must also pay the cost of implementing the bonds under the agreement of 1904, clause 8, which will probably amount to about $12,000,000, but which I am placing at the lowest estimate, $10,000,080. This gives a total of $259,929,019, which does not include the Quebec bridge, the cost of which has been placed at $17,000,000; it does not include the interest for three years on $188,528,470 at 3¾ per cent in case the net earnings of the eastern division are not sufficient to pay that rental, which would amount to $21,209,343, these two amounts totalling $38,209,343. Thus we have a grand total of $298,138,462 as the actual cost to the country of a road that was to be built at an actual outlay to Canada of $13,000,000.

In view of the great liabilities which the present Administration has had to take over from the late Government—the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Canadian Northern Railway, and the many other great national works to which I have alluded—it seems to me that the criticism of hon. gentlemen opposite will not be taken very seriously by the people of this country. I should just like to quote, as evidence of how my hon. friends opposite carried on the Government of this country, a statement made by Senator Taylor when he was a member of this House:

Mr. George Taylor (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, on the 14th December I moved a motion in this House asking for a return and the House granted an order which reads on the back:

Return to an order of the House of Commons, dated the 14th December, 1910, showing what amount has been paid by the Government during the last fiscal year for travelling expenses with the names and the expenditure in each case, under the following heads, viz.:

Railway, steamship, and other lines of transportation; private cars; pullman cars; tips to waiters; meals and hotel expenses for the following persons; ministers of the Crown; civil servants of all grades; immigration agents; and other persons employed by the Government on any special or other work.

It is signed by Charles Murphy, Secretary of State, but he adds to the return this statement:

And then Mr. Taylor gave the following list of supplies furnished in 1910 for the private car of the Transcontinental Railway Commission:

Trip.		Provisions.	Liquors.
1.	Plush for private car, $132.		
2.	Reid,.. .. .. .. $19 50		
	Lapointe.. .. .. 3 30		
		$ 22 80	
	Bate & Co.		$ 84 85
3.	Bate & Co.		72 17
4.	Moreland.. .. .. $5 00		
	Lapointe.. .. .. 6 60		
		11 60	
	Bate & Co.		64 40
5.	Yonge.. .. .. ..$14 94		
	Lapointe.. .. .. 4 75		
		19 69	
	Bate & Co.		94 05

6. Moreland	$21 00		
Lapointe	46 00		
Matthews	11 00		
		78 00	
Bate & Co.			242 05
7. Bate & Co.			126 00
8. Bate & Co.			108 00
9. Bate & Co.			147 00
10. Bate & Co.			99 12
11. Bate & Co.			102 00
12. Bate & Co.			120 16
13. Moreland	$18 00		
Lapointe	18 00		
		36 00	
			124 45
		$168 09	$1,384 25
Total supplies			$1,552 34

That was paid for supplies for the private car of the Trancontinental Railway Commission, for five trips which has assisted in spending two hundred and ninety odd millions of dollars on a railroad which was to have cost the people of this country, according to the figures I have already quoted, only $13,000,000. And that is only one sample, and many others could be given, of what hon. gentlemen opposite left to this Government. It seems to me that criticism of the conditions that exist in this country at the present time does not come with very good grace from hon. gentlemen opposite.

My hon. friend from St. John made a desperate attack upon the Government for raising the duty on fertilizers. He went into the realms of science as usual, and found out that squid was a very valuable thing for removing insect pests. My hon. friend has made allusion to that to-day, and I accept his statement. Nevertheless, my hon. friend made considerable reference to it. He absolutely thought that squid would be a panacea for all the ills to which the fruit life of this country is subject, and he based some argument upon it. But as my hon. friend has stated that he was mistaken—

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am listening with interest to the very eloquent, interesting and informatory speech which my hon. friend is making, but if he will pardon me—

Mr. WILCOX: My hon. friend is not going to interject a speech into my address if I have any rights in this House. If my hon. friend wants to ask me a question, I shall be courteous enough to allow him; but he is not going to interject a speech.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I wish to ask a question on the subject of fertilizers, and I wish to ask it now because I may not have the opportunity later on. We cannot tell when my hon. friend will come back to it again.

Mr. WILCOX: Let my hon. friend ask the question.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend has made the statement that the increased duties upon the imports of all the materials which enter into the manufacture of fertilizers, and upon the manufactured product itself, will be only $4,625.40. I want to ask my hon. friend how he reconciles that figure with the statement contained in the Customs Department report for the year ended March 31, 1914, which gives the value of the fertilizers, compounded or manufactured, brought into Canada during the year at $602,142. The duty on that would be upwards of $42,000, not $4,625.40, as stated by my hon. friend. How does my hon. friend reconcile those two figures?

Mr. WILCOX: I thought it was a question about the squid.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is much more important than the squid.

Mr. WILCOX: I was just coming to the fertilizer. I will be through with the squid in a moment.

Mr. KYTE: Squid is used as a fertilizer.

Mr. WILCOX: I think I can give my hon. friend a satisfactory explanation of those figures.

Fertilizers, imported	$602,142
Duty	58,248
War tax 7½ per cent	45,160
Phosphate rock	16,000
War tax	1,200
Fertilizers unmanufactured	3,073
War tax	231
Total importations	621,215
Total war tax	46,591

That makes a total importation of $621,215 and a total war tax of $46,591. I think that is correct. That is a few more dollars than my hon. friend stated but in the Hansard as quoted there is one figure left off. It reads $4,000 instead of $40,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Instead of $46,000.

Mr. WILCOX: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is a complete answer to it.

Mr. WILCOX: There are about 800,000 farmers in this country. My hon. friends opposite argue that it will be a great burden upon the farmers, but if we take the importation at $46,000, where as a matter

of fact it would be a burden of 5¾ cents a piece for the farmers of Canada.

I want to make a reference or two to something that was said by my hon. friend from West Kent (Mr. McCoig), He referred to the rural mail delivery, to the duty on agricultural implements and especially to the serum that is used for the treatment of hog cholera in the United States. My hon. friend from West Kent said hogs were gathered together in a block and shot and he also declared that the application of the serum which had been originated by Dr. Dorset in the United States had been effectual in stamping out hog cholera and that this system should be introduced into this country. This is rather an important matter. The hog industry is a most important industry and if the Government is not now adopting a proper system in regard to the prevention of hog cholera, I agree with my hon. friend from West Kent that it is a question worthy of the most serious consideration of those who are called upon to deal with it. Let me remind my hon. friend that this serum, according to the Veterinary General of Canada, was invented years ago. Why is it that during all the years that have past and gone our hon. friends opposite did not use it if it was a good thing? It was considered, it was studied by the Veterinary General then as it is being studied now, and it has been considered that it is not effectual as a remedy for hog cholera. There was in Essex and Kent a large outbreak of hog cholera during the past year and in this connection I would desire to place on record a quotation from a report handed to me by the Veterinary Director General. It is as follows:

> In the outbreaks which have occurred during the past summer in the counties of Essex and Kent, the first one was traced to a herd of hogs which were being fed with garbage collected in the city of Chatham. From this centre of infection the disease gradually spread until it was necessary to destroy over 6,000 hogs and no less than 195 premises have been infected.

Under the law dealing with these cases $72,000 was paid to the farmers of these districts for the loss sustained during this outbreak of hog cholera.

It has been held in Canada that the most effective way to stamp out hog cholera as soon as it is found to exist is to destroy the animal and to pay two-thirds of the value. In the United States hog cholera has been much more prevalent than it has been in Canada, because, I understand, that there is only the one section of Essex and Kent that is at all seriously affected by it. In the United States it extends over such a large area that it would be absolutely impracticable for the Government to deal with it in the way in which we deal with it in Canada because, if they were to undertake to deal with it in this way, it would probably result in the destruction of a large portion of the industry in the United States. According to the report of the Veterinary Director General, the serum to which my hon. friend has alluded is simply the blood that is taken from a hog which has had the cholera, and which is immune for a considerable length of time. That blood is injected into a well hog and that is supposed to make the hog immune for a period of about six weeks. The period is so short that it is not considered a practical cure. Then medical science has worked out another treatment for this disease. The virus of the disease, together with the blood of the hog, compose a serum which is injected into a well hog, and when this serum develops it is claimed that it will produce immunity for about three months. It has been proven conclusively by the best veterinary surgeons in the United States that this is not a practical cure, that it has in every instance been the means of scattering disease and the losses in the United States have been enormous where the treatment has been used. I submit that the Minister of Agriculture must look into this matter with very great care and caution when it is proposed to substitute a treatment which has not proved effectual in the United States for the system at present in vogue in Canada. It is a matter that is worthy of the minister's most serious and earnest consideration.

In regard to the rural mail delivery which my hon. friend from West Kent has referred to, it is a well known fact that it was the present Government that so changed the regulations as to make it possible for all the people of this country, in the rural districts where the population would warrant it, to have a rural free mail service. As a result of the progressive policy of the department in this connection I would think that the system had been extended all over the country and as far as I can learn the farmers very much appreciate the service which is so beneficial to them.

There are very few constituencies that have a greater amount of patronage than the riding of North Essex which I have the honour to represent, and when I listen to the criticism of my hon. friends opposite and contrast it with the clean administration and

the fairness with which I have treated friends of my hon. friends in the service, it seems to me that under no circumstances are our hon. friends at all thankful, and no matter what the Government do they will criticise them and that therefore we should not take them too seriously, as I am sure the people will not. There are in the neighbourhood of 150 civil servants of various classes at the port of Windsor, and since this Government came into power, only five have been dismissed of those over whom I have jurisdiction, and they were dismissed for reasons which I will not state now but which were absolutely good. In view of such a state of affairs, I submit to my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark), who is generally fair, that it is not necessary to defend the Administration on this score. In 1896, when the Liberals came to power, there was published in the Ottawa Free Press what it deemed to be the policy of the Liberal party on this question, about which we heard such a tirade of criticism yesterday afternoon. The Free Press said:

> The rank and file of the Liberal party will acclaim a plain statement of the need for a closer loyalty of the department to this accepted principal of party government—all patronage should go to the friends of the party. Every departure from this is an Act of disloyalty to the followers and supporters of the party.
>
> No Cabinet minister nor any supporter of the Liberal party can assault this position and be loyal to his party.
>
> Every new appointment every power of patronage, belongs by right of system and precedent to the members of the Liberal party.
>
> To appease a political foe by gifts of patronage is a sign of cowardice, or even worse.
>
> In the initial appointment or in the awarding of a government contract, it is expected that the party in power shall be loyal to its friends. Without such loyalty the party becomes disorganized.

Mr. Lister, who was then member for Lambton, speaking on the same subject, said:

> I take it that the principle propounded by my honourable friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is the true principle. Every man in this country so long as the law does not deprive him of the right to vote has that right. I would oppose to the very utmost the interference by anybody with that right. But the moment an official goes beyond it, the moment he becomes a partisan, then he takes his official life in his hands, and if the fortunes of war go against him he must have to cease to be a public servant in this country, I say, moreover, that if the government do not do their duty in this regard they will disappoint the Liberal party in this country. and further, they will disappoint certain office-holders because they expected to die officially if we succeeded to power. What is the law on the subject? What are the rights of these people? It is laid down in Todd's 'Government of the British Colonies," in these words:
>
> "But an active interference in political contests in opposition to the existing administration would constitute a sufficient offence to justify the removal of any public officer."

This policy was carried out to the letter, and I have here the list of dismissals made by the Liberal Government in 1896, and I find that there were dismissed nine officers and the whole carrier staff in the Windsor post office. M. K. Cowan, the then clever representative of South Essex, dismissed every officer with one or two exceptions in South Essex, in 1896, and he made it his boast how they had been so dismissed. I submit to the people whom I have the privilege of representing, and I submit to my right hon. friend, these facts as a comparison with what happened when the Conservative party came into power.

Hon. gentlemen opposite would endeavour to lead the people to believe that the present Administration has not given to the country efficient government. The Conservatives have been in power for three years, and I submit they have given to Canada the most successful administration of public affairs and the most useful legislation that any government ever enacted in the same period. Since the Conservatives came into power three years ago they have given more beneficial legislation to the country than the Liberal party placed upon the statute books during their whole fifteen years in office. I make that statement seriously, conscientiously believing it to be true, and I shall place on Hansard a few of the legislative measures enacted by this Government.

This Government has settled the boundaries of Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec, which was a vexed question in the country, and with which the Liberal party, when in power, were afraid to deal. The Conservative party came into office new, aggressive, and progressive, and they dealt with the question and settled it in a manner satisfactory to the people of Canada.

This Government initiated and had passed into law the Bill in aid of Agriculture, which appropriated $10,000,000 spread over a period of ten years, to be devoted to agricultural instruction throughout Canada. This was intended as an uplifting of the agricultural industry, which is the great industry of the country, by a system of education in all its branches. The basis of success in agriculture, as in all human effort, depends upon the knowing how. There is the science and the art of agriculture; the science is the knowing how

and the art is the putting of that knowledge into operation. The Minister of Agriculture, progressive and aggressive, placed in the Estimates $10,000,000, in order that the science of agriculture in its fullest details might be instilled into the minds and into the hearts of the farmers of this country, so that there may be brought about increased production which will be beneficial to all the people of Canada.

They have improved the steamship service to the West Indies and reduced cable rates to those islands, a great boon during the present war.

This Government have inaugurated a greatly improved tri-weekly mail service between Canada and Great Britain. They have also made arrangements in regard to insurance on the St. Lawrence and reduction of rates to Halifax, a thing highly beneficial to the people of this country.

They have a dry-dock under construction at Quebec, with similar dry-docks proposed for Halifax and Esquimalt.

This Government has undertaken the development of harbours at St. John, Quebec, Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton, Port Arthur, Fort William, Vancouver and Victoria. Imagine an Opposition talking about extravagance on the part of this Government which has only been in power for three years, which had to assume responsibilities in the interest of national growth, and to enlarge harbours in all these places I have named. My hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol) the other day stated that this was the first year in the history of Canada when more wheat went down the St. Lawrence to Montreal than went by way of New York, largely due to the progressive policy of this Government and the development of our national ports and harbours.

And there is the Naval Bill. I will not take time to more than allude to that this afternoon. But I have quotations here from the press to show the position of my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), who last evening got so warm on account of the truce. And, as to that, the Chief Whip of the Liberal party, who is under the direction of the right hon. leader of that party, went to South Huron in November, and at a Liberal meeting there, delivered a political speech. He took the ground there that if the policy of my right hon. friend of 1909-10 had been adopted, a Canadian cruiser might have had the glory of sinking the Emden.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

[Mr. Wilcox.]

Mr. WILCOX: I had not intended to go into—

Mr. PUGSLEY: What ship sank the Emden?

Mr. WILCOX: The Sydney. My hon. friend need not think he is so clever; I have been trying to lift up the hon. gentleman all I can, but I am afraid he is going down again. It is a fact, I believe, that hon. gentlemen opposite discarded their own Bill. And I am not discussing this thing in any partisan way. In 1911 they discarded by their own resolution the policy which they had previously

5 p.m. adopted. Is it not a fact that the Government in one day passed every clause of the Bill of which we have heard so much in this House? Is it not a fact that when this Government came into power, and when its right hon. leader went to England to consult the Lord Commissioners of the Admiralty, who have a thousand years of naval experience to guide them, they advised that, having regard to the conditions that existed, the wise and proper thing to do would be for Canada to construct three of the greatest ships that science could build or money could buy? Is it not a fact that the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the former Administration advertised for tenders for the construction of a Canadian navy, and that tenders were in on the 1st of May, 1911? Yet that Government, though it did not go out of power until the 21st of October, left those tenders for six months and never awarded a contract. Do we not know that, according to the speeches of the supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite, those ships were to be constructed practically in every constituency bordering on the water and in which there was a Liberal candidate? The opponent of Colonel Currie, the gallant member of this House who stands at the head of the 48th Highlanders in the trenches in France, argued that the ships would actually be built at Collingwood, on the Great Lakes. And when the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) pointed out that the Welland canal was not big enough to let those ships through to the sea, his opponent nearly fainted. Which shows—and I have here absolute proof of it—that hon. gentlemen opposite were dealing with this great question on a purely political basis. If the present Government had adopted the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, it would have taken four years to

construct the yards in which the ships were to be built. The Right Hon. Winston Churchill, First Lord of the Admiralty, said so. And it would have cost $75,000,000 to construct the docks on which these ships were to be built in Canada. And when we had these ships, we could not man them in Canada, because it takes years for the men to be trained. In the memorandum submitted to us by Right Hon. Mr. Churchill, First Lord of the Admiralty, with all the experience he had back of him concerning naval affairs, I take the following:

Minimum Time Taken to Obtain a Commission.

Officers:
Captain, 24 years.
Commanders, 18 years.
Lieutenants, 8 years.
Others (medical, clerical, etc.)
Midshipmen.

Minimum Time Taken to Obtain the Rating.

Seamen ratings:
Chief petty officers, petty officers and leading seamen (including signalmen and telegraphist branches, 6 to 12 years.
Able seamen, ordinary seamen, boys, 3 to 4 years.

Gunnery ratings:
Seamen gunner, 5 years.
Gunlayer, second-class, 8 years.
Gunlayer, first-class, 10 years.
Gunner's mate, 10 years.

Torpedo ratings:
Seaman torpedoman, 5 years.
Leading torpedoman, 8 years.
Torpedo gunner's mate, 10 years.

Minimum Time Taken to Obtain the Rating.

Men:
Engine room artificers, 6 to 12 years.
Stoker petty officers, including chief stokers and leading stokers, 4 to 12 years.
Stokers, 1 year.
Armourers, 4 to 12 years.
Electricians, 6 to 12 years.

Where were the men to come from to man these vessels? The First Lord of the Admiralty was absolutely clear in his correspondence in stating that it was impossible for the British Admiralty to man these ships. He says:

In 1909 the question turned upon the provision by Canada in the Pacific of a fleet corresponding to the Australian fleet unit, involving an initial expenditure estimated at £3,700,000, and maintenance of an estimated cost of £600,000 per annum. The Canadian Government did not think this compatible with their arrangements and suggested that they should provide a limited number of cruisers and destroyers which were to be stationed in the Pacific and Atlantic.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition would not agree to the adoption of such a plan as that suggested by Australia, because, forsooth, it did not make provision for the establishment of a fleet unit on the Atlantic.

The Admiralty agreed to help in the organization and manning so far as possible. Between that time and 1912 a commencement was made with the establishment of a Canadian naval force, but in those three years only small progress was made with the training of recruits and cadets and it would have been impossible for the Canadian Government to man a single cruiser.

That is what the First Lord of the Admiralty had to say. Who should know better than the members of the British Admiralty the conditions which prevail in this respect in Canada as well as in other parts of the Empire? The letter goes on:

The provision of two fleet units consisting of the most modern ships would divert from their necessary stations large numbers of very efficient officers and men which would have to be lent by the Admiralty. The case of the Australian unit stands on a different footing, for its establishment directly relieves the British ships hitherto maintained on the Australian stations, thus ultimately setting free a considerable number of men. Looking to the far greater manning difficulties which now exist than existed in 1909, the establishment of two such units would place a strain upon the resources of the Admiralty which, with all the will in the world, they could not undertake to meet.

It was evident, therefore, that we could not man ships in Canada; that it would take four years to build the docks and two years to complete the hull of a ship which would be able to accomplish the feat referred to by the chief whip of the Liberal party.

I am sure that even my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Public Works will admit that I am not addressing this House in any partisan spirit. I should not have referred to the navy at all if it had not been for the speech which the chief whip of the Liberal party thought it expedient and wise to make at the annual political meeting to which I have referred.

The issues of this war are vital to civilization, and vital to Canada. Let us bear ourselves through the struggle in the spirit of Abe Lincoln's war motto: "With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right—let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up this nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and orphan; to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace." I believe that that is the sentiment of the people of this country.

The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) is a Britisher at heart. I appreciate many qualities possessed by my hon. friend. I think he is a big man, and I shall be very much surprised if when he delivers his

address on the Budget he does not take a loftier view of the subject than that which has been taken by hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken in this debate. I know that I am speaking his sentiments and those of the whole people of this country when I say:

> To our British institutions and traditions we'll hold fast;
> We will follow old Trafalgar: nail our colours to the mast.
> We'll clinch the ties that bind us and give the world no cause to think
> That our Empire's chain will sever at its firm Canadian link.

Mr. O. TURGEON (Gloucester, N.B.): In rising to address this House on the question which is under consideration, you will allow me, Mr. Speaker, to divide the Budget speech of the hon. Finance Minister into two parts, the one part relating to the war and the other to what the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) calls the civil Budget for the year 1915-16. That part of the Budget which pertains to the war involves the Government's asking for $100,000,000 for the maintenance of Canadian soldiers at the front. Every British subject in the world to-day is only too proud to assist in the defence of the Empire and we on this side of the House, expressing the unanimous feeling of the whole country, will vote the $100,000,000 for the purpose of meeting the expenses of the Government in connection with the war during the next year as readily as we voted the $50,000,000 last autumn. I would vote $200,000,000 as freely as I will vote $100,000,000; my only apprehension is that the Government should have asked for more, thus not exposing themselves to the risk of running short of money. No one in Canada, the proudest of the sister nations of the Empire, would for a moment contend that we should not exercise every possible effort to assist the Empire in the present crisis. England entered into this war only after exhausting every effort to bring about conciliation between the belligerent powers. She is at war to-day for the maintenance of the integrity of smaller nationalities and to uphold principle of adherence to international agreements. When the violation of Belgium's neutrality was threatened by a foreign nation, the Prime Minister of Great Britain no doubt remembered those noble words of W. E. Gladstone when, on an occasion somewhat similar to the present, he said: "Britain cannot merely look on while the sacrifice of independence and freedom is in consummation." Great Britain would have been false to her great mission in this world if she had not taken the course which she has taken in connection with the war which is now in progress When I say we are here to help England, we are also here to help Canada. In helping England we help Canada, as it is our war just as it is the war of England. I was pleased the other day to hear the hon. member from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) say that it was the duty of Canadians at the same time to defend our heritage, the wealthiest that Providence has ever offered to humanity, with institutions under which we are free to cultivate the highest ideals of christianity, institutions the most liberal human hearts have ever cherished, institutions under which the rights of minorities are protected and all privileges of language and religion secured by perpetual treaties and the law of the constitution: and no man in the House will deny that it is Britain which has given to Canada those great institutions and which she is bound to respect and protect and preserve to the very last hour of her existence—and she is now fighting for her existence. We know that if our treaties and our constitution were once translated to the control of the Kaiser they would be treated as mere scraps of paper, which he would burn with the same barbarity with which he burned the cathedral of Rheims, and the other churches of France and Belgium. Every soldier who has gone or will go from Canada to engage in this war rests under that dual responsibility to the Empire and to Canada. It is useless to say that any one in this House or outside of it in Canada is not as desirous as any member of the Government to give all the money possible to aid in carrying on the war. The Canadian nation is willing to give, is willing to pledge its future in order to assist in relieving the Empire of the burden under which it labours to-day.

Having thus referred briefly to the war features of the Budget, I wish to discuss for a few moments some matters of international administration. But first I wish to warn the Government that in the expenditure of the money raised for war purposes they must be constantly on their guard against possible middlemen, possible agents, possible brokers who, like their fellows in every war that has occurred in any country, have sought to take advantage of war conditions to amass fortunes for themselves. I congratulate the Minister of Finance on having been able to place Can-

ada in such a position that the Mother Country has undertaken to furnish the $100,000,000 necessary for our war expenditure this year as well as the $50,000,000 which is now almost expended. But I would thank more particularly the members of the Government of Great Britain, who have been so generous in financing the allied countries in this war and have also advanced money to enable Canada to defray the expenses of administration in our own country. I believe it will inspire every Canadian to pay with double courage the amount of money which may be necessary to do our share towards carrying on the war.

We have heard a great deal since the Minister of Finance gave us his Budget to the effect that we should not criticise anything being done by the Government. This is not the time to criticise any expenditure in connection with the war; we voted the $50,000,000 at the special session in August practically without discussion; but when it comes to our own internal affairs, which must go on during the war, it is the duty of the Opposition to make full inquiries into all expenditures and to see that the Government of the day preserve a proper balance between the expenditure and the revenues of the country. It is under circumstances of such stress as we are undergoing to-day that a Government must show the greatest wisdom and foresight. We have been told that the revenue has decreased on account of the war and that all the trouble existing to-day in the financial condition of Canada dates from the 4th of August when the proclamation of war was made. While it is undoubtedly true that for some weeks after the declaration of war our trade was interfered with, that trade has since been restored to a large extent owing to the control of the seas by the British fleet, and no man in this House will deny that serious depression and a decrease of business existed in Canada long before the declaration of war. The figures of the Department of Trade and Commerce under the direction of the able minister at its head shows that before the declaration of war there had been a great falling off in business. For the twelve months ending the 31st of July last, the decrease in the customs revenue compared with the same period of the previous year was $20,000,000. The imports for the same twelve months were $577,906,000, some $114,000,000 less than the imports for the preceding twelve months.

I have taken those figures from the Department of Trade and Commerce. The Government have seen the revenues falling since July 1, 1913, but no measures were taken to meet the situation in the session of 1914. When this Government came into power, only three years ago, they found a surplus of $40,000,000 left them by the Liberal party. The next year they had a larger surplus. And now to-day they complain, as we have just heard from the hon. gentleman who preceded me (Mr. Wilcox), that they have had to carry out undertakings left to them by the preceding Government. We left them $100,000,000 of surpluses, which had been collected during the years when the sails of the ship of state were still feeling the inflation of the Liberal prosperity. But what has this Government done with that money? They have not built the Georgian Bay canal even. They complain of having had to spend money on the Transcontinental railway. We had a thorough discussion about that last year. When hon. gentlemen opposite came into power we had already built eighty-five or ninety per cent of the Transcontinental railway. They have now been three years in power and have not finished it yet, and part of the money that they have spent on it has gone to a commission which so far has proved nothing as to the quality of the road. Talk of prosperity! Last year it was my lot to spend two months in the West. I was there in June and July before the war broke out, and visited many of the farmers. Was there any great prosperity there? No. Prosperity had vanished from the West the year before. There was no great talk of prosperity from one farmer or the other. The first thing a farmer would say when approached on the question would be: We want wider markets; if we had them we should not be in such a bad position as we are in to-day.

Under the old Government the ordinary expenditure varied from $76,000,000 in round figures in 1908, to $86,740,000 in 1911. For the year ending March 31, 1912, our expenditure was $98,161,000. In 1913, $112,057,000; and in 1914 it rose to $127,384,000. That meant an additional charge of $6.14 per head of population. Has there been extravagance? We know that during the fifteen years of Liberal Administration the Liberal party granted railway subsidies to the amount of $25,140,000. The present Government in three years granted subsidies to the amount of $24,830,000. During the fifteen years of Liberal Admin-

istration the interest on the public debt was increased from $10,645,000 to only $12,536,000. Now, the Finance Minister announces that next year the interest on the public debt will amount to $21,500,000. In 1911 we had an expenditure of $87,000,000, and with that expenditure we had prosperity all over the country. Every man in the East and the West was happy and prosperous. In the small provinces just as much as in the larger. Ontario was so prosperous, indeed, than when my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition wanted to further the prosperity of the country by giving our farmers larger markets, hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends in Ontario said: Leave well enough alone; the country is prosperous enough. The country was so prosperous that they did not want to interfere with it. To-day, with an expenditure of $127,000,000 all we can do is to talk of unemployment. We hear nothing but unemployment from every province. Look around, Mr. Speaker, and see the state of unemployment, and then look up to Heaven for inspiration, for it is vain to look to this Government.

Mr. BURNHAM: That is the next place.

Mr. TURGEON: Yes, that is the best place, to be sure.

Mr. BURNHAM: I said the next place.

Mr. TURGEON: The war has not affected the industries of Canada so very much, although I am doubtful as to the future. In fact the war has given employment to many of our people. The equipment of our contingents and their maintenance abroad, for which we have borrowed $50,000,000 from the British Government, has helped the Government of Canada to reduce unemployment to a considerable extent. The contracts we have got from the British and French Governments have enabled factory owners of this country to keep their employees at work, if not full time, at least half time. If we had not these contracts, however where should we be? The other night the hon. member for St. Mary's, Montreal, (Mr. Martin) told us about the condition of the workingmen of Montreal. But I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what would have been the conditions of those men, and of the workingmen of Toronto, if we had not obtained contracts from the British and French Governments, and from our own Government? Not only that, but we are building eight submarines in Canada to-day for the British Empire. Eighteen hundred men are employed in that work, 900 by day and 900 by night, and there is a possibility of getting further contracts. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite used to say it would take twenty-five years to build ships in Canada. One of those submarines will be ready as soon as navigation opens on the St. Lawrence, and another will follow in a short time.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think they are being built by the Fore River Shipping Company, at Quincy, Mass., under contract with the British Government.

Mr. TURGEON: They are being built in Montreal for the British Government and are giving employment to Canadians in Montreal.

Mr. PUGSLEY: And to a good many Americans.

Mr. TURGEON: They may have brought some skilled workers over. All of these things are done in every new industry that is opened in the country. The Finance Minister told us that for the present fiscal year the current expenditure will be $140,000,000, and the capital expenditure $50,000,000, or a total of $190,000,000, and that he estimated the revenue at $130,000,000. Again I wish to be fair to the Minister of Finance as well as to the Government. I appreciate the fact that it was necessary to spend $2,500,000 for the relief of the districts in Saskatchewan and Alberta affected by the drouth last summer, and $7,500,000 for the purchase of seed grain for these districts. The minister, taking into consideration the commercial and industrial depression during the past year, has told us that there has been a rapid decline in the volume of imports and exports. For the nine months ended 31st December of the present fiscal year our total exports, of merchandise only, amounted to $350,000,000, as compared with $380,000,000 for the corresponding period of the previous year, a decrease of $27,000,000. During the same nine months our imports, of merchandise alone, were $391,000,000, a decline of $112,000,000, as compared with the corresponding period of the previous year. The minister has carefully demonstrated that the decrease in the exports was not so great as the decrease in the imports; the decrease in the exports being cut $27,000,000, and in the imports, $112,000,000.

He expressed the hope that we might, in the course of a few years, bring about

a balance of trade between exports and imports. I am in favour of such a balance of trade as may be practicable, but I would like to see it brought about not by the restriction but by the expansion of trade. I may be permitted to tell the Minister of Finance that if exports have not decreased so much as imports he must give credit to the fact that the American Government and the American people have opened their markets to a portion of the products of the farmers of the west, as well as to the lumber and fish of the eastern provinces. How much more would these exports have been decreased had not the United States, a year or eighteen months before, allowed the cattle, hogs and products of the west practically free into their markets ? It has been a great boon to the people of the west. These goods, however, were not allowed to go in free as they would have been under the reciprocity treaty under which our farmers would have had the benefit of free wheat, free oats and free cattle, and under which they would have been encouraged to go further into farming. Owing to the limitations of their market, a great many people in the west became discouraged, and some of them, as we know, went back across the frontier to the south. My hon. friend's revenue would have been much less but for the fact that large quantities of farm products have been enabled to go across to the great market to the south of us.

The same observation applies to the conditions in the maritime provinces, and for the conditions which we find there we have to thank Providence, or to thank the Government of the United States. Had not the Government of the United States taken the duty off lumber and fish, in what position would New Brunswick have been as compared with the conditions found there during the past few years ? Lumber and fish are the two chief industries of the maritime provinces, and agriculture has expanded according to the success of the lumber industry. It has been going along parallel with its prosperity or its adversity, and all the world knows to-day that if our lumbermen had not had the advantage of the free market of the United States during the last year or eighteen months, half of them would have been bankrupt.

I have it from the largest lumber manufacturers in New Brunswick. We hear a great deal of talk about the British market, but the British market was not available during the last two years for the lumber operators of New Brunswick, and if they had not had the market of the United States, where millions of dollars worth of their products have gone, how much would these figures representing the exports during the last few months have been decreased? The English market has been supplied from the shores of the Baltic. It is true that just now, on account of the war, the English market is open again to New Brunswick, as well as to the other provinces of Canada, but owing to the scarcity of vessels which has increased the tariff rates across the ocean all the profit that the business might possibly show have been absorbed. This will continue during the time of the war, which we hope may be short, but when the war is over the same conditions that prevailed prior to the declaration of war will be found to exist again and we will have to look to the American market for the products of our forests and fisheries.

Never in the history of New Brunswick have the fishermen got the prices they have received for their products of every kind during the last two summers. At the time of the declaration of war, had not the American market been granted to the fisherment of New Brunswick they would have been affected very unfavourably. For a few days, owing to the scarcity of vessels, those fish dealers who were dealing with the countries on the Mediterranean and with Europe generally had to keep the products which they had on hand because they could not ship them, but, fortunately for them, the American market demanded everything that they could command and at the very best prices they have ever had. This condition has prevailed during the last three or four months or since war was declared.

Now, the Minister of Finance is naturally under the necessity of asking Parliament for permission to levy a new tax in order to meet the requirements of the revenue. My hon. friend has called that a war tax. I want to be just to my hon. friend; I can hardly believe that we must attribute to him the adoption of the name " war tax". I imagine, from the last statement that he has given to the House, that he was not inclined to qualify as a war tax the amount of money which he is asking from the people of Canada to-day. I would have thought perhaps that my genial friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers), knowing that his old political weapons are worn out in Manitoba, might have looked for another term and might have suggested a " war tax".

Mr. PUGSLEY: A sort of taking name.

Mr. TURGEON: A taking name. However, we have to deal with it. The Government proposes an increase of five per cent on British imports, thus lessening the value of the British preference, and an increase of 7½ per cent on imports from other countries. Since 1897, when the Liberal Government gave a preference to British goods, the trade between England and Canada has greatly increased, with corresponding benefit to the industrial people of the Motherland. There has been a growing desire among the people of Canada, the farmers of the West more particularly, for a still greater preference for British goods, in the hope that the happy day might some time come when there would be free trade between Canada and the Motherland and Canada and the sister British colonies, just as there is between the provinces of this Dominion. That desire has been expressed by the farmers in the East and in the West, and while the Government may call this additional five per cent a war tax, I can assure them that the people of Canada will not be deluded by any such statement. In 1897, when the British preference was instituted, the value of the imports from Great Britain to Canada amounted to $30,000,000, but in 1914, these had increased to $240,000,000, and on this trade an additional 5 per cent taxation will have to be paid. We have recently heard in this House discussions on the necessity of controlling ocean rates of freight in the interests of the producers of this country, and with the prevailing scarcity of vessels on account of the war, and the abnormally high rates of freight, this is surely a very bad time to put additional taxation on British goods. By this tax you will, I believe, decrease the trade between England and Canada, and so you will have fewer ships carrying smaller cargoes and compelled to charge higher rates. A few days ago Lloyd George made a speech, in which he used this language:

> It is intolerable that the lives of Britons should be imperilled for the sake of a farthing an hour. During war, governments should have the power of settling differences so that work shall go on. If men are entitled to more money the Government should give it. I do not believe the parties involved will refuse to comply with the urgent command of the Government that there should be no delay.

In view of such a condition existing in England, does the Finance Minister think it a wise policy to legislate against British goods, in this the hour of Britain's distress.

The Conservative newspapers point to the fact that the increase on British goods is only 5 per cent, whereas the increase on goods from the United States and other countries is 7½ per cent, but under present conditions the increase of 5 per cent against Great Britain is a far greater barrier to trade between Great Britain and Canada than the increase of 7½ per cent on goods from other countries is a barrier to the trade with them. In sending goods to Canada, the United States is not hampered by war conditions, for they have their railways to bring their products to this country, and the distance is comparatively short. I believe it costs between 5 and 10 per cent more to bring goods to Canada from the Mother Country than from the United States, so that the whole British preference is practically wiped out. I ask the Minister of Finance if that thought occurred to him when he was increasing the tariff against British goods. The hearts of the Canadian people are with the Mother Country, and if we are to bear our share in the burdens as well as the glories of the war, is this not a time to refrain from further taxing British goods? Surely it is not a patriotic example to set to the sister British nations, or even to the people of the United States. I am sure that generous, loyal, proud, Australia will not view with equanimity this increase of taxation upon British goods. Australia is very sensitive in her feelings towards the Mother Country; Australia is loyal and faithful to contracts and agreements, and she is legitimately resentful of breaches of such contracts. Australia has recently adopted a new tariff, and she has given preference to British goods, which preference she has extended to all the sister British nations with the exception of Canada. What does the Minister of Finance think of that, notwithstanding the eloquent and patriotic message which the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in the name of the Prime Minister of Canada, sent to Australia on the occasion of the Australian man-of-war Sydney sinking the German steamer Emden and thus clearing the Pacific ocean for British trade? These are considerations that seem to me worthy the attention of the people of Canada. I express the impulse of my own heart at any rate, and I imagine that my feelings are the feelings of every Canadian to-day. I am sure the Minister of Finance, in the generosity of his heart, will allow me to ask him if he is not prepared to re-consider that portion of his Budget speech and strike off that 5 per cent addition to the tariff.

As six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

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

Bill No. 8, respecting the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company—Mr. Green—in committee.

On section 1—extension of time for construction:

Mr. OLIVER: Would the chairman of the Railway Committee please state what locality the completion of this unfinished portion will relieve?

Mr. LANCASTER: The line will run from Edmonton to Dunvegan, thence following the Peace river valley to Parsnip river, in British Columbia, thence to the town of Fort George. The company claim to have partially constructed this line, and they want an extension of time to complete it.

Mr. ROGERS: I think that two years is too long a time to give them within which to commence the construction of the uncompleted portion of this line.

Mr. LANCASTER: The usual terms of renewal are two years within which to commence construction and five years within which to complete. No representations were made to us that it would be desirable to make the time any shorter.

Mr. OLIVER: To what point is the road now completed? We would like to know what particular piece of road this extension would apply to. I am not opposing the Bill, but I want to get the information because the matter is very closely connected with my constituency.

Mr. LANCASTER: I am not able to tell the hon. gentleman exactly to what point the line has been built. We were assured that this line has been commenced, and we were asked for an extension of time. The province of Alberta is interested in this road, and before the committee passed the Bill the Minister of Railways telegraphed the Premier of Alberta to get his views on the subject. He was asked if he would be satisfied if the charter were renewed on the following terms—giving him the section exactly as read just now by the chairman. He answered that it would be well for the country to have the renewal granted in accordance with the terms of that section. The Premier of Alberta, therefore, knew what we proposed to do and approved our taking that course.

Mr. OLIVER: What I wish to know is this: to what particular point upon the proposed line does this extension of time purport to apply?

Mr. LANCASTER: I could not answer that question.

Mr. ROGERS: The Premier of Alberta may be correct in his view, but large settlements have for years been anxiously awaiting the extension of this line. The settlers have grown large quantities of wheat and grain, which are still in store pending the extension of this line of railway, and I think it would be extremely unfortunate if Parliament, by passing this Bill, should leave it open to the company to postpone the commencement of the line for two years. I do not think that we ought to take that responsibility upon ourselves until we are in possession of the whole facts in connection with the matter.

Mr. CARROLL: In the consideration of this matter by the railway committee the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett) took objection to our renewing the charter for the length of time stated, but other members of the committee who were familiar with the road said that the company were rushing it to completion just as quickly as they possibly could and that they had, through the sales of bonds guaranteed by the Government of Alberta, obtained practically enough money to enable them to complete the line. The member for Strathcona (Mr. Douglas) advised the committee that the company were proceeding with the work as rapidly as possible.

Mr. ROGERS: We are not discussing at this moment the date of the completion of the railway. If this clause passes we will give the company two years within which to commence construction of the line. There is great need for a railway in that locality, and I think we should consider the matter carefully before granting this extension. If as my hon. friend (Mr. Carroll) has stated, they have the money and are in a position to proceed with the work at once, why should we give them two years within which to commence construction?

Mr. OLIVER: I am probably more familiar with the conditions connected with

this matter than any other member of the House. Steel has been laid on this road up to a point about 270 miles from Edmonton, and within a comparatively short distance of the Smoky river. I understand that bonds have been sold with a view to carrying the road to Spirit river, a point opposite Dunvegan. Beyond Spirit river is what is called the Pouce Coupe prairie district, which is just outside the boundary of Alberta. The Alberta Government have guaranteed the bonds of the railway to the boundary of the province, or, in other words, to the end of the Pouce Coupe prairie. No doubt the railway company desire to build as fast as they can, but they are getting an extension of time now which applies to the road to Fort George, and, for the distance from Smoky river to Fort George, that is certainly a very reasonable extension. But for the short distance between Spirit river and Pouce Coupe, about 60 miles, I think there should be no such extension of time for completion. In the large settlement of Grand Prairie, where there is great need of railway communication, there are about 16 townships of solid settlement. The first settlers went there about five years ago, and have been going in ever since. To reach that district they made long and difficult journeys. They knew that when they went in there they would have to wait some time for a railway; therefore they went in, to use a western expression, fairly strong-handed. The country offered good opportunities; they have broken up large areas of land and have had a large production. During the first year or two the production was absorbed by the incoming settlers, but production has now out-run the possibility of consumption by increased settlement, and the Grand Prairie district is in the very greatest need of a railroad. The Dunvegan line does not run through Grand Prairie; it passes about 50 miles north of Grand Prairie city and Lake Saskatoon, which are the two principal points in the Grand Prairie settlement. The construction of this line under its present charter, therefore, does not affect the Grand Prairie settlement, but it does affect the Pouce Coupe prairie settlement, through which this line is intended to run. I am not strictly in order in discussing the charter of the Canadian Northern at this time, but I take advantage of this opportunity to point out that they have a line partially completed which runs through Grand Prairie, the distance from the end of the steel to Grand Prairie being about 200 miles. They have graded about 50 miles beyond that, so that they have about 150 miles of absolutely new construction to undertake in order to reach Grand Prairie. They, too, have sold bonds guaranteed by the province of Alberta, and they might be expected to engage in construction. Their work, however, has been at a standstill for two years, and the people of Grand Prairie, expecting that the road would be pushed to completion, have gone into heavy production and are in a condition of very grave disappointment at the present time. I do not know what can be done by this Government to compel the Canadian Northern to use the money that they have actually borrowed on the guarantee of the province of Alberta in order to build that line to Grand Prairie. Whether or not they have enough money I am unable to say, but there is no doubt about the fact that the money is in their treasury, the road is not being built and the settlers are in very great need of transportation facilities. If it is not possible to urge or compel the Canadian Northern to give the settlements of Grand Prairie railway communication some time within this present year so that the crop of last year, which is still in the granaries, may have an outlet and the people may be encouraged to put in a crop this year, I suggest that means be taken by this Government to arrange for the construction of a connection from the Dunvegan line to Grand Prairie, a matter of about 50 miles of prairie construction. I do not know what the Dunvegan Company may be able or willing to do, but I know that their track will be within 50 miles of the Grand Prairie settlement. This summer, with a reasonable amount of aid, they could reach the Grand Prairie district and relieve the congestion which now exists. The charter with which we are now dealing does not make any provision to that end. It carries the line within 50 miles of the Grand Prairie settlement, but it might as well be 500 miles distant so far as the actual marketing of the crop of that district is concerned.

Mr. LANCASTER: Would it help if this were amended from two to one year? We must fix some time for the commencement. I am inclined to think from what was said by the Minister of Public Works and the hon. member for Edmonton that we in the Railway Committee might have made it one year under the circumstances, but we must fix some time. The hon. member from Kootenay (Mr. Green) is in charge of the Bill and I would not care to make the

amendment in his absence, so I would suggest that the Bill stand till Monday.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not wish to urge any delay in the Bill, but I would have liked to obtained the information I ask for. I have been trespassing on the patience of the House in order to lay before them the actual conditions in regard to settlement and the means of railway communication there. If the Canadian Northern railway cannot give the Grand Prairie people railway communication within the current year, means should be taken to enable the Dunvegan people to do so.

Mr. ROGERS: I know, as has been stated by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), that the people of Grand Prairie are undoubtedly in great need of railway facilities. They are suffering very severely. The construction of this Dunvegan line takes the railway within 40 or 50 miles of the Grand Prairie settlement, and if we, by the passing of this clause, are going to extend the time for the building of this line of the Dunvegan railway as far as Dunvegan, we are going, in my judgment, to deprive the people of Grand Prairie of a railway for the next two years; and I do not think it would be the wish, intention or desire of the members of this House to do that because we have had deputations here already this year pressing strongly for an extension of the railway from some quarter, and I am inclined to believe the House may be asked to approve of a charter providing for the building of a line of railway into that particular district. I do not know what arrangements the Canadian Northern railway may have with the Alberta Government, and we are not responsible for that here. It would be impossible for us to give any information as to whether or not it is possible for the Government of Alberta to press the Canadian Northern railway to construct that 200 miles during the coming summer. I would very much doubt if that would be possible under the present conditions. But whether that be so or not, I think we would be making a very grave mistake in this House if we should undertake to give an extension of time for the commencement of the Dunvegan railway for two years' while those people in the Grand Prairie section are building their hopes on the extension of this line from which they would be able to construct a branch or make some arrangement by which they would be able to connect with this Dunvegan railway. I confess I am not very familiar with the facts. But in fairness to the people of that locality, who urgently need the railway, I think we ought not to go on with this Bill, and give this extension of time, until we have more information. I think we might let the Bill stand till Monday.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would like as one member of the committee to find out to what point the road is now completed. The Bill is a most peculiar one. It says:

> The Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company may commence to construct the uncompleted portion.

The steel might be laid on a portion of the line, but if the ballast was not down or the railway stations were not built they could say that portion of the line was uncompleted, and so defer the commencement of completion of it for two years. It seems to me that some point on the line ought to be mentioned.

Mr. LANCASTER: When the Bill was in committee some place was pointed out. I have an idea where it is, but I am not sufficiently sure to state distinctly in this House where that point is. It was pointed out on a map on the wall when the Bill was in committee.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does not my hon. friend see in what an uncertain state the Bill will be left? The Bill provides that they may commence to construct the uncompleted portion within two years. It does not follow that the Bill applies only to that portion which has not been commenced. It might apply to two or three hundred miles on which the steel had been laid, but which was not fully completed.

Mr. ROGERS: I think this had better stand until Monday night.

Mr. OLIVER: I just wish to supplement the information I have given, because I am afraid I shall not be here on Monday. The steel has been laid from Edmonton to McLennan Junction, 260 odd miles from Edmonton. Grading has been completed and steel is now being laid from McLennan Junction to the east bank of the Smoky river. From the Smoky river the right of way is being cleared for sixty miles to the Spirit river. I understand the bonds have been sold and that the money is available for constructing that part of the line from Smoky river to Spirit river. It is already in process of construction. The right of way has been cleared and the supplies were

taken in there this winter. So that part of the line must be considered to be in progress. That is the piece of road that goes nearest to the Grand Prairie section.

Mr. BRADBURY: Is the end of that sixty miles within fifty miles of Grand Prairie?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes. Grand Prairie is forty miles south of the line of the Dunvegan.

Mr. BRADBURY: If that line was completed it would bring the road within fifty miles of Grand Prairie?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes, even without being completed. For the last 25 of the 50 miles is within 50 miles of the Grand Prairie settlement; in fact less than that. So they do not need to build to Spirit river to be within 50 miles of Grand Prairie. They would be beyond that to a certain extent when at Spirit river. A branch line to Grand Prairie would probably leave the line of the Dunvegan at the crossing of the Burnt river, and follow the Burnt river to Grand Prairie, a distance of about fifty miles. I do not wish to be understood as wanting to delay the Bill. I am just giving this information because I am afraid I shall not be here on Monday. I would much prefer to see the Bill go through than to hold it up, but I think it has been unfortunately drawn for the purpose of expressing the idea that was in view. I am quite willing to accept the views of the Alberta Government, inasmuch as they are the people who are furnishing the money under their guarantee.

Mr. ROGERS: I am not objecting to that at all. I am prepared to accept the views of the Alberta Government. But in view of the representations that have been made as to the pressing necessity for this extension, I do not think that we should at this moment pass a clause that will give the railway power to delay construction for two years.

Progress reported.

Bill No. 20, respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company—Mr. Bradbury—in committee.

On section 2—extension of the time for completion:

Mr. ROGERS: I would like to take the same exception to this Bill that I took to the other, because I think the Railway Committee probably did not realize the importance of the extension of railways in Western Canada. A number of lines are enumerated here in which five years' time is to be granted for their completion.

Mr. LANCASTER: They are all commenced and partly constructed that section 2 relates to.

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, but five years for completion is a long time.

Mr. LANCASTER: That is the general thing.

Mr. ROGERS: That is a very great mistake, I am afraid.

Mr. LANCASTER: We always allow five years for completion.

Mr. ROGERS: I think five years is a very long time in western Canada, and I think that we are giving very wide extensions here. Clause 3 reads as follows:

> Unless the company commences within two years and completes and puts into operation within five years from the passage of this Act—

the powers of construction shall cease.

Mr. LANCASTER: That is an extension of time for a line that has not been commenced.

Mr. ROGERS: Most of the lines in clause 2 have already had extensions from this Parliament and now they ask for five years more.

Mr. LANCASTER: They have shown their bona fides by beginning.

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, but five years is a very long time for the people of the West to wait. I would like this Bill to stand until Monday.

Progress reported.

Bill No. 28, respecting the Toronto Eastern Railway Company—Mr. William Smith—in committee.

On section 2—extension of time for construction:

Mr. LANCASTER: All we did with this Bill was to strike out the words "or near" wherever they occur pursuant to the policy of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) who wants us, whenever possible to strike out these words and define the place where railways are to go in order to prevent the contention, not to use a stronger word, that goes on when locating railways. In paragraph (c) of section 2 we omit the words "Lake Scugog" and insert

"Port Perry," so that the road shall go from Port Perry to Lindsay.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

Bill No. 29, respecting the Van Buren Bridge Company—Mr. Michaud—in committee.

Mr. LANCASTER: The only amendment made to the first section is to add the words "in Canada" and we add a section 2 (a).

Mr. HAZEN: Has the hon. gentleman any information about the cost of the bridge?

Mr. LANCASTER: It will be a pretty expensive structure.

Mr. HAZEN: This bridge will cross the River St. John, which is the boundary line between New Brunswick and the State of Maine, and, therefore, this legislation will only permit bonds to be issued on the part of the bridge which is in New Brunswick. Is it intended to issue similar bonds on that portion of the bridge in the state of Maine?

Mr. LANCASTER: So I understand. It is a mutual arrangement I am informed and we are only legislating to give permission to put a lien on the property in Canada. The other part of the bridge will have to be dealt with by the authority of the state of Maine.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Mr. Michaud, who is in charge of the bridge, understood it would stand until his presence in the House. Perhaps it would be well to report progress.

Mr. HAZEN: I think it would. It appears to me that if this Bill gives authority to issue bonds only against that portion of the bridge in Canada, it would not afford much security to the bondholders.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I understand that by legislation in the state of Maine, bonds will be issued to cover the bridge and franchise in Maine, and then the company having the same authority in Canada, they will include the property in the United States and the property in Canada in the one mortgage. The total mortgage is $250,000.

Mr. HAZEN: That is what I wanted to know, whether it was $250,000 on each part of the bridge or $250,000 on the whole.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I understand that is the total mortgage.

Progress reported.

The following Bills were considered in committee, reported, read the third time, and passed, without discussion:

Bill No. 27, respecting the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 38, respecting the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company.—Mr. Taylor.

Bill No. 41, respecting the Athabasca Northern Railway Company.—Mr. R. B. Bennett.

Bill No. 12, to amend the Independent Order of Foresters Consolidated Act.—Mr. Glass.

Bill No. 16, respecting the Title and Trust Company, and to change its name to Chartered Trust and Executor Company.—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill No. 42, respecting the Canada Preferred Insurance Company.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill No. 45, respecting the Vancouver Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill No. 31, respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Taylor.

Bill No. 32, to incorporate the Brulé, Grande Prairie and Peace River Railway Company.—Mr. R. B. Bennett.

Bill No. 34, respecting the Manitoba and North Western Railway Company.—Mr. Cash.

Bill No. 37, respecting Pacific, Peace River and Athabasca Railway Company.—Mr. R. B. Bennett.

Bill No. 46, respecting the Western Dominion Railway Company.—Mr. R. B. Bennett.

Bill No. 36, to incorporate Northern Pacific and British Columbia Railway Company.—Mr. Taylor.

THE BUDGET.

PROPOSED WAR TAXATION.

Mr. TURGEON (resuming): Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair at six o'clock, I had reviewed the question of the British preference, and had made a suggestion to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance that he should repeal the increase of 5 per cent in the tariff rates under the British preferential tariff and solve the problem of raising revenue for the next fiscal year in some other way.

I wish now to consider the balance of the tariff, in which there is an increase of 7½ per cent on all imports, a measure which in my estimation is simply protection and is not calculated to bring in any large amount of revenue. Under the circumstances and in the hard times of which we

complain, this will simply add to the difficulties of the poor man, as the tariff is not distinctive; it is a flat increase which falls upon all alike and does not protect the poor man as opposed to the rich man. The Conservative papers of Canada since the announcement of the Budget by the Minister of Finance, have endeavoured to create the impression among our people that the new tariff tells as heavily against the Canadian manufacturer as against the importer, but I say it is protective in every part. It is protective even as to the importation of the raw materials, although, under this tariff, he will not get a refund of the duty which he has paid on these raw materials when he exports his manufactured goods to foreign markets. The Canadian manufacturer will be taxed on the goods that he imports, but he will be taxed only to that extent; while the importer of manufactured goods from the Mother Country or from other markets will be taxed not only upon the raw material but on the labour and the legitimate cost of his operations, and therefore the Canadian manufacturer still remains with an advantage from the tariff of three or four per cent as against imported goods, while he has the advantage of the 7½ per cent the importer will have to pay for all the goods he gets. This applies to all goods imported, to farm machinery of all kinds, except again for reapers and mowers, three or four articles which are generally bought by the larger farmers or by four or five or a dozen farmers clubbing together to get one of these expensive machines. Every other article that the farmer has to use, ploughs, forks, spades, shovels, trucks or wagons of any kind, are taxed more and more. We are calling upon the people to go to the land. We expect a larger acreage of arable land next spring. Many new settlers will go on the land and many young farmers will extend their acreage. Every one of these will be under the necessity in the early spring of buying new cultivating implements and will have to pay the duty on these articles. The western farmer buys his harvester or mower when his crop is practically ready for harvest. If he has been favoured by Providence and nature he can easily get credit from the banks or his friends, and buy the harvester or whatever else it is that he needs; but the poor farmer cannot so easily get credit in order to buy machinery to properly cultivate his land. So you see how this tariff works against the poor farmer, and particularly against the new farmer; and we are expecting a great many of them, especially in the spring.

This tariff bears upon every article. It is a uniform tariff. There is no preference for the poor man. As the hon. member for St. John said the other night, the linen and woollens used by the poor man are being taxed just as much as the velvets, embroideries and silks used by the rich. The fishermen in the maritime provinces have to wear woollens nine months in the year, and those articles are taxed an additional 7½ per cent. Other articles are being taxed. I would call the attention of the Minister of Finance to marlin twine, and remind him of the statement made by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) when speaking on the Budget a few days ago. He referred to the twine and corkwood used by lobster fishermen, and urged that they be put on the free list. It may be that the Minister of Finance has not thought of the condition of the lobster-fishing industry at the present time. But my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Prime Minister, who represent the maritime provinces in the Cabinet, should have had some thought for that industry. I am sure they have had during this winter correspondence enough from the lobster canners and the lobster fishermen. This industry of the maritime Provinces is in a precarious condition at the present time, and has perhaps been affected by the war more than any other industry. For lobster is a luxury. This product of the maritime province used to find a market in France, Belgium and Great Britain, and we know that those countries to-day are not in a position to buy this expensive luxury. A great deal used to be sent to Germany, and we know that none of our lobsters can go there now. For the next year, if not for the next two or three, this industry will have to find another market. The fishermen will have to try and introduce lobster as an article of food in the towns and villages of the maritime provinces as well as in Quebec and Montreal. I hope the Minister of Marine will give his attention to this industry at the present time and see if these articles cannot be put on the free list.

Mr. BLAIN: I might remind my hon. friend that no change is being made in the tariff with respect to binder twine.

Mr. TURGEON: The minister of Marine is well aware of the kind of twine I am speaking of.

This tariff is a protective tariff. The

Minister of Finance and the manufacturers of Canada are placing the people of this country in a curious dilemma. The manufacturers of Canada are appealing to-day to the people of this country to buy goods made in Canada. I do not object to goods made in Canada. When we ask for as low a tariff as possible on imports, it is because goods made in Canada cannot be sold at higher prices than goods imported. But what a dilemma the people of this country are in to-day. The manufacturers say: Buy goods made in Canada; while the Finance Minister says: I must have more revenue, and must therefore put a higher duty on the goods you use. If the people of Canada in the exercise of their patriotism pay heed to the Minister of Finance and import goods, the treasury of the Minister of Finance will be replenished, but the Canada-made goods will have to stay on the shelves of our merchants. On the other hand, if the consumers of this country buy goods made in Canada the Minister of Finance will have no revenue, and will not be able to balance his accounts as he calculates. So no matter how we take it, this is a mere protective tariff. I do not think the Minister of Finance can possibly get the revenue he expects from it. Again, although the tariff may favour the Canadian manufacturer and give him the home market, it practically forces him out of foreign markets by taxing his raw material. And no nation in the world can be prosperous until it has foreign markets. The United States, with a population of 100,000,000 people, tried to be satisfied with their home market; and the home market is all right to a certain extent, but a nation never reaches a very high place unless it has exports. Exports keep up the growth of the nation. Again, the people of Canada should at this time be trying to capture the markets of the world. This war should stimulate our manufacturers to search for foreign markets. While this war has closed many a market to Great Britain and Canada, it has also closed many markets to Germany. Markets that were practically, or largely, controlled by the German manufacturers, are now open to newcomers. It is the duty of the Canadian manufacturer to devote his activities to the opening up of markets, to the sending of our goods to the South American Republics, where Germany has had control of the markets, and to other countries the markets of which Germany will not be able to regain for some time and which neutral countries will not be able to supply. By this tariff you practically arrest or impede the activity of the Canadian manufacturer in the direction of extended markets. I am in favour of local markets, of home markets, but as I say to-day a special opening presents itself to the manufacturer and if he can command outside markets he will be able to do better in the local markets without charging so high for his products at home because, while he is devoting his activities to securing command of the foreign markets, he will develop activities also that will put him in a position to manufacture more cheaply and therefore sell more cheaply in the market of the Canadian people. You do not want to have a redundance of work. You cannot manufacture for your own people all the time. The products have to go out, and if you confine your activities to the home market you must necessarily operate at a greater cost than if you were to operate on a larger scale with a view to extending your trade and supplying larger markets.

Hon. gentlemen say that this is a war tax and that the people will submit. The people of Canada will submit to anything for the victory of the British Empire, will pay anything at all, but here we are considering our position as a people. We are not to take the position that we are bound to be submerged by this war. We must take the position that Great Britain is able to come out of this war victorious and we hope before many months are over that she will come out victorious and greater than ever before. We must not act to-day as though we expected to be a conquered nation and must therefore leave out activities to be resumed by future generations. It is the generation of to-day that has a duty to perform towards Canada and towards Great Britain and it is only by encouraging the activities of those engaged in agricultural pursuits that you can possibly bring prosperity to the country.

In my humble opinion we would not be in the position in which we find ourselves to-day if we had had those larger markets that were offered to us three years ago. Prosperity has declined as a natural consequence of the refusal of those wider markets to our farmers. The Minister of Finance is in this position, that he must say with me and every one: We were happy and prosperous until 1911, but now we are in a different position. As I said this evening I do not want to be offensive, but in my opinion the Conservative party are reaping the fruits of their erroneous education in 1911. I might use stronger language but I do not want to be interpreted as being a

disloyal man. I want to make it as mild as possible, and I say that the conditions with which we are confronted to-day are a result of the erroneous education which has been given to the people of Canada by the Conservative party.

We are told by speakers on the other side of the House that we offer no suggestions. I have made the suggestion that you strike out the increase of duty on British goods, then go on and consider also the other tariff of 7½ per cent and see what can be done with it. Do you want another suggestion? I suggest to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance that in place of the tax upon British goods he might bring in an income tax on the people of Canada. It is true that the Minister of Finance said that $2,000,000 might possibly be collected by such a tax. That all depends on how he starts. If you took the incorporated companies—the mortgage companies—and placed a tax of 10, 5 or 3 per cent upon the amount that is set aside every year for dividends, you would get a large amount of money which would help you to remove the tax upon British goods. If you took the salaries that are paid by corporations to their chief officials, or to the railway magnates who own personal property beside their railways, and if you placed a tax upon these amounts, you would raise a very large revenue and it would be a much more popular tax for the Government to impose than the tax that they have placed upon British imports.

My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) has suggested economy with respect to many items in the Estimates. There is no member of this House who views with more gratification than I do the rapid expansion of the commerce of this country, but let us candidly and frankly admit between ourselves that there is a large amount of money asked to be voted this year for public buildings and post offices. I am always pleased to see a post office erected in any village or town, but as long as we have war, or the conditions of war, let me tell my hon. friends on the Government benches that the town or village that has been for years without a post office or public building can possibly wait another year or until the war is over. I see that post offices are provided for indiscriminately in all portions of the country. You might save a good many millions of dollars by adopting that suggestion. I am not suggesting that the erection of these buildings should be put off indefinitely but that it should be put off for this year or until the war is over. My hon. friend from St. John has also proposed a decrease in the expenditure on the Hudson Bay railway from $5,500,000 to $2,000,000 or $3,000,000. I have been an advocate in this Parliament of the Hudson Bay railway for ten or twelve years. I have never changed my opinion and I believe it will be a good thing for the commerce of Canada and especially for the West. I do not say stop the construction of the Hudson Bay railway.

Mr. BRADBURY: Hear, hear.

Mr. TURGEON: I am for it. I defended it before my hon. friend was in this House, I have done it many times since and I am willing to vote for it again. But, you cannot reach the completion of the work for the season of navigation next summer. You may have the railway finished but you cannot have your harbour completed at Port Nelson, because there you require wharves and piers which will take years and years to build while, if you had placed your terminals at Fort Churchill you would practically have had a harbour ready for your purpose and would have been in a position to have opened up for trade next summer. This matter is decided now and as long as the people of the West cannot enjoy the benefit of the Hudson Bay route next summer let us go easy and wait another year to complete it. I believe that suggestion will appeal to the judgment of every practical man in Canada. While I believe the Hudson Bay railway will prove of great assistance to the trade of the West, my faith in all wordly matters is limited by practicability and we know that the trade will never be practicable for more than two or three months in the year, and as long as we cannot have the advantage of this route until July of the following year we had better wait until the war is over. These are practical suggestions and I am sure that if these items to which I have referred were removed you would not require any additional tariff taxation. Strike off many of these expenditures and practice economy wherever you can in every possible line. Develop the agricultural industry, encourage all the farmers possible to go upon the land, and you can do this by giving them the free markets for their wheat that you refused them three years ago and again last year. As I said before recess the Minister of Finance would have found that his exports would have decreased much more had it not been for

the advantage of the market that we had to the south of us. If free wheat had been given to the people last year the increase in production would have been very much larger than it has been. Although it was a bad season there would have been a much larger crop and our railways would have had more grain to transport. Our railways are to-day in such a position that they certainly cannot pay their operating expenses. The railways in Canada will never prosper unless through the prosperity of the farmer, and especially the farmer in the West. It may be said that all the wheat will be wanted for Great Britain should unfortunately the war not be over by next harvest. But, if that should happen, the Government has still power to reserve the wheat, and if the war should be over by spring, the farmer will know that no matter what crop he produces he will have the American market as well as the Canadian and European markets. This Canada of ours is not made only to be the granary of the British Empire; it is destined by Providence to be the granary of the world. Last winter, when in this Parliament we asked for free wheat, we heard many speeches about restricting the cultivation of wheat, and we were told by gentlemen opposite that the farmers of the West were wheat miners, and that they should stop growing wheat and go into mixed farming. I have seen in the West last summer on the one farm immense fields of wheat and immense fields of oats, and of barley, and of flax. Again, the farmers of the West were advised to go into the hog industry, but I can assure hon. gentlemen that the hog industry in the West is larger than the people of Ontario think. If the farmers of Alberta and Saskatchewan did not have the free markets of the United States for their pork, it would be sent to the Toronto market, and the farmers of Ontario would be reduced to taking four or five cents a pound for their pork.

Such, Mr. Speaker, are my views as briefly as I could express them as to the position in which the country is to-day. However depressed from a financial standpoint things may be for the moment, I am a Canadian who has faith in the resources of the country, and even if we have a crop failure for a year or so, and even if we have mal-administration by the Government in power, I do not lose faith in Canada, and I believe that in the end the Canadian people will get out of the difficulty and grow rich and prosperous.

I beg to say in conclusion that as far as the war is concerned we are all here as Canadians, and all ready to vote whatever money may be required to prosecute our share in the great struggle. But we have also to look to the internal condition of the country, and it is not for us to imagine that everything must be closed down because of the war. It is just because we are at war that we should double our energies so as to keep the people of Canada prosperous, and to enable them to repay to Great Britain the money which she is so generously lending us now, to enable us to participate in defence of human liberty. I trust that the Government will take into consideration some of my suggestions. I feel hurt as a Canadian that under present conditions the Government should have seen fit to put an extra tax on British goods, the more so, because I repeat that by curtailing expenditure and economizing, and providing measures to develop the energies of the Canadian agricultural population by giving them freer and wider markets, there would be no necessity for putting on additional customs duties. We have heard about a truce, and I believe that things now have gone along pretty quietly, but if any party has broken the truce, as was shown by the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) last night, the Conservative party are the sinners. Perhaps I might be accused of breaking the truce if I remind my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that we had the pleasure of a visit from him at Bathurst on the 12th of September last.

Mr. PUGSLEY: On a political mission?

Mr. TURGEON: I regret that the minister paid us only a very short visit. Having learned in the evening that the hon. gentleman was to be in my town the next day, and not being able to move around as quickly as formerly I used to, I ordered a carriage to take me to meet the minister at ten o'clock in the morning, so that I might pay him my homage as the representative in the Cabinet of my province, shake hands with him and give him the welcome of the county of Gloucester, but when ten o'clock came I was told that the minister had come and gone at nine o'clock in the morning.

Mr. HAZEN: I am an early riser.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: He was not in bed at all.

Mr. TURGEON: The hon. minister says "I am an early riser," but I did not expect

him to be such an early riser. I am sure that though his visit was short he found the conditions favourable as far as the industries in the town of Bathurst and that portion of the county of Gloucester are concerned.

Mr. HAZEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. TURGEON: I am very glad the minister did pay us that visit because he was able to see the buildings that are going up for the pulp and paper industries. The people of Gloucester and the people of Bathurst are not reserving their energies until after the war, they are busy all the time developing new industries. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries had scarcely left the town when I began to hear talk about an election. It may be that his friends did not report what he said accurately but at all events it was announced that we were to have an election within two months, and the leaders of the Conservative party who accompanied him prepared for a convention to choose the strongest man that could be found to defeat the member for Gloucester. His friends told us that it was done on the recommendation of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, but it may have been that they were indiscreet about his utterances, as sometimes they are about my own. At all events they said the minister told them to get ready for an election in two months, and if it did not happen within two months it would certainly come in the spring. At all events it is sure that shortly after the visit of the minister, the Conservative party organized a convention and selected a man whom they thought would be able to defeat the modest member for Gloucester. We were notified at the same time that the then Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) was to be present at that convention to address the electors, but in the interval his health got bad, and later on it was announced that the eloquent member for Dorchester (Mr. Sevigny) would take his place. We had the pleasure of a visit from Mr. Sevigny and he addressed the meeting after the Conservative candidate had been chosen, and he is reported by the St. John Standard to have said:

> Mr. Sevigny, M.P., Quebec, was then called on and in an hour's speech in French held the closest attention of the large audience, while he set forth most eloquently the splendid record of the Conservative Government.

I was most pleased to see my hon. friend from Dorchester (Mr. Sevigny) a while ago. But, if he is correctly reported, his speech could hardly be regarded as being in strict accord with the truce which had been made. He is one of the most eloquent members of this House from the province of Quebec, but apparently he came to take part not in a recruiting meeting, but in a political meeting. I was surprised to hear discussion of the probability of an election about the middle of September last year, only two or three weeks after we had departed from this House having agreed to unite all our energies in the prosecution of the war, and when we were engaged in the work for the patriotic fund, for Belgian relief and for the proper care of our boys who were going to the front. Yesterday fault was found with the publication of a paragraph in the Canadian Liberal Monthly as being a breach of the political truce. But this that I have quoted I think, is a case much more in point. I am glad that my hon. friend from Dorchester has now entered the House. I do not by any means find fault with him for visiting my constituency. I am glad to see by this report of his speech that he told his audience he would come again next spring. I shall be doubly pleased to see him in Gloucester county, in Bathurst or in Caraquet as he may prefer, and I hope to have the opportunity to make things pleasant for him outside of politics. It does not trouble me at all to see the Conservatives organizing. As the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) knows, I am ready for an election whenever it may come. But I have asked my people not to talk election until this war is over. We have given our pledge not to embarrass the Government, and have assumed that we are not to have an election while the war is in progress. When the war is over the Government will be at perfect liberty to have an election, and we shall be ready to meet them; but if they bring on an election during the war they must take the responsibility for it. So far as I am concerned, I am ready for the election to-morrow, or six months hence, or next year. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows that that is but a statement of fact. On former occasions he has come to Gloucester and his masterly eloquence has been listened to by the people there with attention and respect. My hon. friend from Dorchester has also received the commendation of the people there who have listened to him, but I believe his impression must be the same as that made upon the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and that each of

these gentlemen must feel that their eloquence in support of the Con-
10 p.m. servative party falls without effect upon the cultured minds of the electors of Gloucester.

Let us deal with the affairs of the country with the same energy and good will as before; and if the Government brings on an election before the war is over, let them assume the responsibility for it, as I have said. We have been accused of not realizing the conditions that face the Empire, whether in the Dardanelles, the North sea or elsewhere. Mr. Speaker, we do realize those conditions to-day, as we did yesterday and as we did months ago. Our wishes and aspirations join with those of the people of nearly all the world for a victory for the British Empire and the restoration of peace. And our hope is that that victory shall not be a mere compromise but that the war shall be prolonged, if necessary, until the Kaiser and militarism are overthrown, so that when peace is established it may stand forever. So that, in the eloquent words of the great American orator, Bourke Cockran, no more dreadnoughts, no more great armaments, may exist, but merely such means of force as are necessary to police the shores of every country, and that the millions upon millions now expended upon armament and wars may be used for the development of the nations to the glory of Christian civilization and the advancement in morals and in happiness of the people of the whole world.

Mr. G. H. BRADBURY (Selkirk): I am sure the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) will pardon me if I do not attempt to follow him in all that he has said. But I wish to refer to one or two of his remarks which have been in line with remarks made by other hon. gentlemen on that side of the House. He spoke as if the policy "made in Canada" was not a desirable policy to advocate at this time.

Mr. TURGEON: I think the hon. gentleman has misunderstood me. I approved of Canadian-made goods, price being the same; but I pointed out the condition in which we are when the Minister of Finance says: Do not buy Canadian goods; I want the revenue.

Mr. BRADBURY: I do not think the hon. gentleman has improved the matter. What he said was this: To advocate the policy of buying goods in Canada would be to deprive the Minister of Finance of revenue which he expected through his policy. Now, I wish to say to hon. gentlemen on that side of the House that the "made in Canada" policy is a policy intended to stimulate the great industries of this country and to give work to hundreds of thousands of men that are idle on the streets of Canadian towns and cities to-day. There is no doubt in my mind that it is a wise policy. If the Canadian people in days gone by had dealt more directly with their own great industries we should have had a greater industrial Canada than we have to-day. Under the wise protective tariff inaugurated by the great Conservative party in 1878 Canada has prospered That tariff was denounced by the Liberal party for the eighteen long years when they were in Opposition, but when they attained office they took this policy as their own, and Canada prospered under the protective tariff. The principle of buying goods manufactured in Canada is in keeping with the policy inaugurated by the Conservative party and carried out during all the time it has been in office.

To one who knows anything about the two great political parties of Canada, it is interesting to listen to the arguments advanced by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. The remarks of the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) are usually very moderate and very fair, and in listening to the hon. gentleman's speech the other day I was surprised that he had the temerity to make the statements and the charges that he did. He tried to fix on the leaders of the great Conservative party on this side of the House the stigma that rests upon the Liberal party: that of not implementing pre-election pledges. In view of the unsavoury record of hon. gentlemen opposite in the matter of pre-election pledges, I would have thought that no hon. gentleman on the other side of the House would have dared to mention the subject. During the course of his admirable speech the hon. junior member for Halifax said:

> They promised time and again by their leaders that if honoured with the confidence of the electorate, they would carry on the public services for a much less sum; and they professed much regard for the sanctity of public pledges given by political leaders. In their election handbook of 1911, I find this.

He then proceeded to read what I presume to be a paragraph from that handbook, as follows:

If there is one thing more clear than another in the government of a democratic country it is that political leaders should be held to a strict account for their pledges, and platforms. These form the basis of the contract between them and the electorate. These undertakings are solemnly given. They are not actionable in Courts of Law, and therefore all the more should they be held cognizable in the great moot court of the people, and their terms rigidly exacted.

On the basis of that item the hon. gentleman attempted to build the argument that the leaders of the Conservative party had made the pledge that if they were returned to office they would reduce the expenditure of this country. Later he said:

Is not the conduct of the Government in the circumstances open to the gravest censure? Was not this a fitting season for the Government to practise economy and implement its pre-election pledges? The present Government party, when in Opposition, promised, if elected to power, a reduction in public expenditure. Let us see if they have observed faithfully their pledges in this respect.

I desire to say that the hon. gentleman cannot quote any statement contained in the platform laid down by the Conservative party previous to their return in 1911 asserting that if returned to office they would reduce the public expenditure.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Go to Hansard and you will find it.

Mr. BRADBURY: I have looked at Hansard. I do not think the hon. gentleman can find any such statement; I venture to say that it does not exist, because no such pledge was given. What the leaders of the Conservative party said was that if they were returned to power they would handle the revenues in such a manner as to avoid waste. They condemned in the strongest possible terms the extravagance of the late Administration and the manner in which the public revenues were squandered under Liberal rule. But not a line was written or a word uttered by the leaders of the Conservative party pledging themselves to reduce expenditure. Why do I say that? Because the Conservative party realized that with the development and expansion of our growing country the expenditures were bound to increase. They realized that great public buildings would have to be erected in different parts of the country; that our waterways would have to be improved; that steps would have to be taken to develop the resources, commerce and industries of our country. The Conservative party complained not so much of the amount of money expended by the Liberal Government as they did about the manner in which the public funds of Canada were handled by them.

Mr. LAW: Did the hon. gentleman read all the manifestos issued by the Conservative party during the election of 1911? There were several.

Mr. BRADBURY: I think I read all literature that could be rightly called part of the platform of the Conservative party. No hon. gentleman on the other side of the House can produce a pamphlet issued under the authority of the Conservative party in which a pledge of that kind was given to the people.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Did the hon. gentleman read a certain manifesto in which the first paragraph was that the expenditure of $74,000,000 by the Liberal Government was extravagant beyond all possible defence?

Mr. BRADBURY: No, but if I had read it I could readily have understood it.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I can show my hon. friend a copy of that manifesto, which is signed by his leader.

Mr. BRADBURY: I could well understand the leader of the Opposition at that time using such language, because every man who sat on the opposite side of the House previous to 1911 contended that the expenditures were extravagant and that the finances of the country were handled in an outrageous and wasteful manner.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I can send you a library on that point.

Mr. BRADBURY: The hon. junior member for Halifax advocated that the expenditures on public works should be cut down. On page 387 of Hansard he is reported as saying:

Instead of the Government's asking for an expenditure of $20,000,000 for public works, they might have asked for $10,000,000 or less, and, if need be, they might have wiped out altogether expenditures for public works for the next fiscal year. I do not believe that the people of any province of Canada would have objected to the most drastic measures on the part of the Minister of Public Works during the present year and during the next fiscal year in connection with public works expenditure.

Then our hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) made this statement about the Civil Service:

We could reduce the number of officials, reduce them largely, and not interfere with the

public service. We could cut the cost of public works in two and not interfere with the public service... I understand that they are spending some $15,000,000 or $20,000,000 in Halifax. I venture the assertion that if the money was properly expended you could do all that is necessary for the development of trade in the city of Halifax for $5,000,000.

I do not think the junior member for Halifax would agree that the work in Halifax could be completed for $5,000,000. But what I want to point out is that we are to-day passing through perhaps the most critical period in the history of Canada. When we have thousands of men idle in the streets of most of our great cities, I claim that one of the most unpatriotic things that this Government could be guilty of would be to stop public works in this country or cut them down to such an extent as would limit the work that should be provided for the mechanics and labouring men of our cities. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) condemned public expenditure just as strongly as the junior member for Halifax.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I did not say that public works expenditure should be cut out; I said to reduce it to what it was in the year 1912 or 1911.

Mr. BRADBURY: The language I read is very plain, it is in Hansard. I do not know what the hon. gentleman meant to say, I am only quoting what he did say. The hon. member for St. John said that this was not a time to go on with large public works, while the people of this country were spending every dollar they had in charity. Mr. Speaker, the working men in this country do not want charity, the working men want work, and it is the duty of a patriotic Government, as far as possible, to give them that work. I think when the hon. gentlemen face their constituents they will find it difficult to explain to them the language which they have used in this House as regards cutting out public works in this country, which meant, if it meant anything, that the public works should cease and thousands of men be thrown out of employment. Let us see what one of the outside leaders of this great party has to say about this question. I hold in my hand a clipping from the Toronto Globe, and every one who knows anything about the Liberal party recognizes that the editor of the Globe has a good deal to do with the leadership of the Liberal party. I find this in the Toronto Globe of Wednesday, February 10, 1915:

When to Spend Public Money.

The time to spend public money freely is when private enterprise is on the ebb. If governments and public bodies enter upon huge programmes of public works when a building boom and a rush of railway construction are in progress the inevitable result is to attract to the country far more workers than it can provide employment for under normal conditions, and so to intensify the depression which follows boom conditions. This is precisely what is happening in Canada to-day. The Estimates introduced by the Minister of Finance make provision for carrying on public works begun in former years, but the financial situation is so difficult that practically no new works are to be begun during 1915 at the very time when the need for employment is greater than ever before in the experience of the building trades throughout Canadian cities.

It would be peanut politics to attempt to make party capital out of the situation. No Government in Canada, Liberal or Conservative, has ever deliberately curtailed expenditures upon public works in good times so that it might more freely provide employment during seasons of depression. In all probability this failure to take thought of the morrow has been the result of the belief of politicians that hard times dog their opponents only, and that the remedy may well be left for their opponents' consideration. The interests of the nation should be placed above party, however, and The Globe would like to see a healthy growth of public opinion in favour of husbanding the resources of the Dominion, the provinces, and the municipalities in boom periods so that public works may be undertaken at seasons of the greatest need. The work carried forward at such seasons would be done more cheaply and more thoroughly than under conditions of abnormal activity, and would render unnecessary the spending of vast sums on maintaining willing workmen in idleness.

My friend from St. John would allow the people of Canada to dole out charitv to the mechanics and working men; but The Globe, the Liberal organ, holds that it is peanut politics to preach a doctrine of that kind. The Globe says further:

There are many organizations engaged in the study of social conditions—Conservation Commissions, Unemployment Commissions, Social Service Commissions. They could do nothing more calculated to fill up the valleys of depression than to secure that public employment shall be at the minimum in Canada when private employment is at the maximum, and that the stress of hard times shall be lessened by the construction of public works during seasons of depression.

Hon. gentlemen opposite are trying to have it so arranged that the public works shall be at the minimum, that the public expenditures of Canada shall be cut in two. One hon. gentleman went so far as to sav that one large item of $5,000,000 in connection with the Hudson bay should be cut out

altogether. In view of these statements it is hard for me to know which party to believe, the Liberal party in this House or the Liberal leaders out of the House. It reminds me of the story of the gentleman who was visiting a neighbour's house and was charged by a vicious looking dog which went at him as if it was going to eat him. The host came out and said, "Oh, don't be afraid of him; can't you see he is wagging his tail?" The visitor replied, "Yes, but I do not know which end to believe." It is the same to-night, I do not know which end to believe, whether I should believe the junior member for Halifax and the hon. member for St. John, and the other members who have advised the Government to cut down expenditures and leave the workingmen to the charity of the people of Canada, or those who advocate a wise continuance of public works.

As it is getting late, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Rogers the House adjourned at 10.20 p.m.

Monday, March 8, 1915.

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

REPORT.

Report of the Department of the Interior for the year ended March 31, 1914, volume I.—Mr. Roche.

FRANCO-CANADIAN STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have seen a statement in the press to the effect that a steamship service has been inaugurated between France and Canada. Can the Minister of Trade and Commerce give us any information on that subject?

Sir GEO. FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): We have been informed that arrangements have been perfected by the British Admiralty by which eighteen vessels will be placed upon the service between our ports and Havre, France. The purpose of these vessels is to transport Government supplies, solely and entirely. It is calculated —and so far as I have seen the calculations, I think they bear out the basis on which they are made—that Government supplies and requirements will tax the total capacity of these vessels. There will be a tri-weekly service. That is the general plan, but all the details have not yet been worked out. If it happens that any one of these vessels is not filled to capacity by the supplies being sent to the British or French Governments, then other Government supplies furnished by private or company contractors may be transported. The service, however, is not meant for general trade.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Do I understand that there is no correspondence on this subject?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There is some correspondence, but we are expecting further correspondence on the subject. As soon as the correspondence is complete, it will be brought down. In the latter part of January the Government sent a representative to Great Britain for the purpose of conferring with the War Office and with the Admiralty, in order that some provision might be made for the transport across the Atlantic of supplies purchased in Canada by the British or the French Government. It was observed at that time that tonnage was becoming extremely scarce, and rates abnormally high. Mr. A. H. Harris, of the Canadian Pacific Railway, who went to England for this purpose, has just returned; and we are informed by him that, as stated by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, eighteen vessels have been assigned by the British Admiralty to this service, and withdrawn from other service. We are informed that the vessels will be available for this purpose from now until the end of the war. I understand that one or more vessels have already arrived on this side, and that one has been loaded and is now on her way back to Great Britain or France. Another advantage which will be of general interest is that, by this arrangement, the tonnage which has been used in carrying coal from Great Britain to Halifax for the use of the Admiralty at that port, and which has been heretofore used to a very considerable extent for the transport of these supplies, will, it is hoped, be available for general purposes, and in that way assist in supplying the general demands for tonnage to transport goods from Canada to the Mother Country.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the sailing port from Canada?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No definite sailing port has been fixed. I presume that the boats will sail from St. John or Halifax in

the winter, and, when navigation opens on the St. Lawrence, that all or the greater part of the tonnage will go by the St. Lawrence route. If it should appear that the necessities of transportation might be more advantageously met by the vessels sailing from ports in the maritime provinces, those ports would be available, and I have no doubt that suitable arrangements might be made to that effect with the British Admiralty.

UNITED STATES POTATO EMBARGO.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. B. B. LAW (Yarmouth): I should like to call the attention of the Acting Minister of Agriculture to a report I saw in the press a few days ago. It is headed "Canadian Potato is Under the Ban—United States Inspector's Report—Powder Scab Found," and reads as follows:

> Hon. Martin Burrell, Minister of Agriculture, in December last made an arrangement with the Department of Agriculture at Washington, by which permits were to be issued to shippers of Canadian potatoes allowing potatoes to enter the United States. This arrangement was to continue so long as there was no powdery scab found in any of the shipments. Unfortunately the United States inspectors have reported that they have found powdery scab in a shipment of potatoes from New Brunswick to Boston and have given notice to the Department of Agriculture that no Canadian potatoes will be permitted to enter the United States from Canada after the 5th of March, instant. The potatoes complained of in Boston were immediately purchased for export from Boston and there was no difficulty, in so far as the quality was concerned, with the country to which they were to be exported. The Department of Agriculture is investigating to ascertain if the statements made by the United States inspectors have any foundation.

I should like to ask whether these are the facts; whether the department has made an investigation, and whether potatoes can be shipped from Canada to the United States at the present time.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Customs): The statement is correct. The Department of Agriculture has been notified by the United States authorities, as intimated in that despatch. A carload of potatoes shipped to Boston was condemned by the United States inspectors. Some hon. gentleman considered the potatoes all right, and purchased and shipped them to Cuba. The Department of Agriculture, feeling that the American inspectors were not justified in condemning the potatoes, sent an inspector to Boston for the purpose of thoroughly looking into the matter. The inspector has not reported yet, but I shall be very glad to let the hon. gentleman see his report when it is received.

Mr. LAW: Then it is a fact that potatoes cannot be exported from Canada to the United States at the present time?

Mr. REID: That is the position.

Mr. MARCIL: From what province in Canada were they shipped?

Mr. REID: They were shipped from New Brunswick, and I have no doubt they were New Brunswick potatoes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Since this difficulty occurred, has the Department of Agriculture taken steps to supervise each shipment, in order that none of our potatoes so affected shall be exported?

Mr. REID: I understand that the Department of Agriculture has inspectors at all the ports, watching shipments very closely. If there is anything wrong with the potatoes, the inspectors do not allow them to go out of the country. Our inspectors think that the American authorities were not justified in condemning that shipment of potatoes to Boston. Every precaution is taken by the department to see that nothing is shipped unless in first-class condition.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Had this carload been inspected?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL: After the minister received notice about this carload of potatoes shipped to Boston or New York—I understood that it was at New York that the difficulty occurred—did he take any steps to have the car examined by an intelligent inspector, or was nothing done in the matter? The reason I ask is that the potatoes in question were shipped, not only from my own constituency, but from my own home. On Saturday afternoon I had the privilege of interviewing an inspector of the Department of Agriculture, a very capable man indeed, who had received his training at Macdonald College, and he assured me in the most positive manner that the cars were personally inspected by him. He said that he had inspected practically every potato, and could not think it possible that there should be a diseased potato among them. I mention that because I think the Government should know it, and I would like to know if any further inspection was made in Boston or New York.

Mr. REID: The hon. gentleman confirms what I said a few minutes ago, that in so far as the Department of Agriculture is con-

cerned the inspectors were taking every precaution to see that no potatoes left Canada except in proper condition. When Mr. O'Halloran, the Deputy Minister, brought this to my attention on Wednesday or Thursday of last week, I instructed him to send an inspector to Boston, to examine the potatoes thoroughly and make an official report. I do not see that I could have done other than that. At all events I gave instructions to do everything possible, to have them examined again thoroughly by an independent inspector and to make a report accordingly.

DISTRIBUTION OF SEED GRAIN.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Roche) to the fact that information has come to me to the effect that certain agents of the Government from Saskatchewan are refusing to accept applications for seed from men who are on patented lands and also that the Dominion lands agents at Wadena, Battleford and Biggar are refusing to take any applications from men who have received their patents. I would like to ask the minister if, in view of the statement he made to this House on February 10 in which he agreed that every application should be given proper consideration, he has instructed the agents to receive and consider every application properly, whether the land of the applicant is patented or not.

Mr. ROCHE: The policy which was announced here by myself is being followed out, I believe, to the letter. Instructions were sent to the Commissioner of Immigration, who has charge of this matter of the distribution of seed grain, to deal with cases coming from the holders of patented as well as unpatented lands in all deserving cases. Of course, there have been several thousand applications of cases that do not come under the enumeration that has been laid down, and they have therefore been refused. Mr. Bruce Walker was in the city on Saturday, and he told us that outside of the drought-stricken area 7,000 applications had been favourably acted upon.

17TH NOVA SCOTIA REGIMENT.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I would like to say to the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte), who asked me to lay upon the table of the House some telegrams from Mr. H. C. Crowell of Halifax, that I expected to have them ready to lay upon the table of the House to-day; but I find that there are some more to be filed and I will lay them on the table of the House to-morrow. I would like, however, to explain that it appears that the interview which was alluded to in the telegram from Sir George Perley was an interview with General Guy Carleton Jones, director of the Army Medical Service. The mistake occurred in this way, that the code word which was translated by the decoding clerk in this telegram as "Alderson" appears twice in the code book, and the decoding clerk selected the particular word which worked out as "Alderson." A further telegram from Sir George Perley explained that he had used the code word which appears elsewhere in the code book and which worked out as "Jones," and this was the word he intended to use. Therefore, Mr. Crowell is quite right in stating that he did not have an interview with General Alderson, but nevertheless there was an interview with Surgeon General Jones, Director General of the Army Medical Service in England. It was he, as I am informed, who had the interview with Mr. Crowell in which Mr. Crowell expressed the opinion that has already been communicated to the House.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

The House in Committee on Private Bills. Mr. Sevigny in the Chair.

Bill No. 8, respecting the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company—Mr. Green—in committee.

On section 1—extension of time for construction:

Mr. ROGERS: When this Bill was up on Friday night we had under discussion the time during which the company should have the right to start work, the provision being that it must be started within a period of two years. There was no disposition, as far as I understood the matter then under discussion, on the part of any person, to delay in any way the passing of the Bill, but in view of the fact that this railway company have already sold their bonds and have the money on hand, and as there is a pressing necessity for the construction of this line of railway, at all event from a point known as Smoky river to a point known as Spirit river, a distance of some fifty miles, it was thought that it might be well to make a reduction in the extension of time allowed for commencing the work from two years to a lesser period by reason of the fact that the conditions are favour-

able and also by reason of the fact that, as I understand it, those who are in charge of the work are not anxious for an extension of two years but are willing to carry on the work as soon as spring opens in so far as this fifty miles in particular is concerned. I think that perhaps the Chairman of the Railway Committee will be disposed to amend that clause and provide that work shall be commenced within a period of six months instead of two years. I think that would cover the difficulty, taken with the assurance we have from the railway people that they are going to go ahead with the work and that they propose to complete as speedily as possible the line from Smoky river to Spirit river.

Mr. LANCASTER: Under the circumstances, I do not see any objection to the suggestion of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Rogers). As I said on Friday night, we granted a time for commencing the unconstructed portions of these roads because some of the charters are already expiring. If we had been sure in the railway committee that none of these franchises would run out before His Royal Highness would give his consent to this Bill we would not have needed to have worried about the commencement. We would simply have said that they should be allowed five years to complete the uncompleted portions of their road. But the better opinion among lawyers is that when charters are expiring, or have expired, it is necessary to also give a time for commencing. Some of these franchises would expire in three or four days from now and it was necessary that we should resuscitate them. That is why the clause is worded as it is. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) remarked on Friday night about the peculiar language, and that is the explanation. If it were not so we would not have said anything about what is contained in the first five or six lines; we would simply have dealt with the time when they should complete the uncompleted portions of the road. In view of what was said on Friday night and, with the unanimous consent of the House, I will move to amend this clause by striking out the words " two years " and inserting in lieu thereof the words " six months " for commencement. I am assured by counsel representing the company that they propose going right on at once or as soon as this Bill is passed and the company do not object to this change. They will not object to being required to hurry on within six months. Therefore, in accordance with the suggestion of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, I move to amend section 1, by striking out the words " two years " in line three and inserting in lieu thereof the words " six months."

Mr. GREEN: I am sorry I was not in my seat on Friday evening when this Bill came up for discussion. I am not rising now particularly to object to the shortening of the time to six months. This Bill was discussed very fully in the Railway Committee, and it seems strange that it should for some reason or another have met with opposition, not only there but in the House. I wish to point out that this Bill is one that should receive every encouragement in this Parliament, because these people are railway builders; they are not people who are asking for anything unreasonable; they are in the business of building that particular railway, as evidenced by the fact that they have already built and have laid the steel upon 262 miles of that railway. Their charter expires on the 17th day of March, a few days hence, and it is necessary, as the Chairman of the Railway Committee pointed out, to have the extension granted at this particular time, so as to prevent its expiration, and inability to reinstate it if it is not signed by the Governor General before the date of expiration. These people have not only built the road so far, but they have the money on hand to continue construction. The line of railway is northerly from Edmonton to mile 131 where the railway crosses the Athabasca river. The bridge over this river is of steel on concrete piers. The route from the crossing of the river is generally westerly along the south shore of the Lesser Slave lake, and through the settled district just west of Lesser Slave lake. From the end of steel, grading has been done to a point a short distance east of Smoky river, and it is proposed when the frost goes out of the ground to continue the grading and lay the steel in a westerly direction. The intention is to construct the line of railway to Peace River block, where it will join with the Pacific Great Eastern railway, a line of railway which is being built through the province of British Columbia. Bonds for 350 miles of the railway, to the extent of $20,000 per mile, were guaranteed by the province of Alberta, the rate of interest being 4½ per cent. It is the intention of the company to push work vigorously for the obvious reason that the company is anxious to obtain all available

freight from Spirit River and from Grande Prairie. The company is seeking legislation at the present session to enable it to forthwith construct a line of railway from a point on its main line near Spirit River settlement through Grande Prairie, with the object of giving relief at as early a date as possible to the settlement in Grande Prairie.

When this charter was before the Railway Committee, objection was taken by some members of the committee that the government of Alberta, being interested as guarantors of the bonds, should be consulted. They were consulted by telegram by the Hon. the Minister of Railways, and he had a reply from the Premier of that province saying that they had no fault to find with the Bill as it was, and that under the contract for the guarantee, they were in a good position to protect the province from any attempt on the part of these people to forego construction at the present time. There is no desire at all on the part of the contractors to retard construction, because the line already built is of no service until it is extended to meet the requirements and to get the trade of certain districts which are settled. The country through which the line is already built is not settled to any great extent, and therefore these people are particularly desirous of continuing the work, so as to reach the settled districts. I repeat that I have no desire to oppose the amendment offered by the Chairman of the Railway Committee, that the period be reduced from two years to six months. I think, however, it would have been better to give a year, but six months is quite satisfactory to the promoters of the railway, and I think by the time this House meets again we will find that the railway has not only been completed to the confines of the province of Alberta, but that it has probably been connected up with the Pacific Great Eastern railway of British Columbia.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend (Mr. Green) says he cannot understand why there is opposition to this Bill, both in the committee and in the House. I desire, as a member, to protest against any hon. gentleman saying it means opposition to a Bill, simply because a member wants to have it put in proper form. The Bill in its present form is decidedly objectionable. It is all very well to say that the gentlemen who are building this road are railway builders. I know they are. I know that Mr. Macdonald, who is the principal party concerned in the building of the road, is a gentleman of the very highest character and may be expected to push the road forward as rapidly as possible. But, every time we pass a Bill in this House we are forming a precedent for future legislation, and under this legislation as it is, the company need not strike another blow, even on the portion of the road on which the steel has been laid, but which may not be completed because it is not ballasted or because station-houses have not been built. I cannot for the life of me see why it is necessary to put any provision in the Bill as to the commencement of construction upon the uncompleted portion. The road has been commenced under the provisions of the charter, and all that would be necessary would be to provide a time for completion, but under this Bill the company can lie down to-morrow and not strike another blow for two years, and not complete that portion of the road which may be practically constructed. That is why I took objection to the form of the Bill. I had no idea of opposing the measure, nor had I any idea of throwing any obstruction in the way of the company. I am quite sure that the Minister of Public Works, in the views he expressed in the committee, had no such thought either. But what I wanted was to endeavour to have proper legislation passed so that in regard to the road which is under way the company should be compelled to go right ahead with as reasonable speed as possible.

Mr. CARROLL: I fail to see how an amendment to this Bill, making it incumbent on the railway company to commence construction within six months, is going to assist in the speedy construction of the road. I would point out that the policy of the Railway Committee of this House, in recent years, has been to have some uniform time fixed, to which charters should be extended. I think the chairman of the committee will bear me out in saying that until last year the policy of the Railway Committee for the two previous years had been that where a railway company had not commenced the construction of a road to give it two years to commence and five years to finish, if it was an ordinary railway. Last year an innovation was made in the Railway Committee, and instead of granting two years, the policy of granting one year was adopted.

Mr. LANCASTER: My hon. friend can hardly call that a policy. What we concluded was that each tub should stand on its own bottom, and that each Bill should be

dealt with on its own unique facts and particular merits, believing that there might be cases in which in the interest of the public and not too harmful to the progress of the company, they should be cut down to one year. We did that in some cases and refused to do it in others. So far as I was concerned, I advised in the committee—perhaps advised is too strong a word to use—but I suggested that each Bill should be treated on its own special merits. And where one company might get two years to commence and five years to finish, another company might get only one year to commence, and, in fact, in some cases, it might not be found desirable to extend the charter at all. It was not a policy for any fixed time exactly that was laid down by the committee.

Mr. CARROLL: Until last year the policy of the Railway Committee was to give companies which had not commenced construction two years to commence and five years finish. Last year some of the members of the committee thought that was too long, and in some instances the time for commencement was cut down to one year. When the extension of time for this railway was challenged in the Railway Committee, I took the ground that if we were going to cut down the time in which to commence to construct the uncompleted portion of the road, we should also reduce the time for completion; that is, if we gave the company six months in which to commence construction, we should give it three years instead of five years in which to finish, because it is not going to help out the completion of the road to limit the time in which the company may commence operations and to let it have five years in which to complete. I am sure that every hon. member, whatever part of Canada he may come from, is anxious to see this road built; and if this amendment calling for commencement of construction within six months is to go through, another amendment should be made that the road should be finished within three years.

Mr. LANCASTER: My opinion is that it does not necessarily follow, that because you cut down the time for commencement of construction to six months, you should also cut down the time for completion from five years to three. When a company has commenced construction and has spent and is spending money on its road, for its own sake it will endeavour to complete the road as soon as possible, because it gets no revenue until the road is completed. Obstructions may arise preventing the completion of the road within the three years; and there is no harm in giving the company five years, so long as it is going ahead with the construction.

Mr. CARROLL: Why not give the company two years in which to commence construction?

Mr. LANCASTER: That is a different matter entirely.

Mr. CARROLL: The hon. Minister of Public Works is anxious for the completion of the railway, and he is right in taking the stand that he does. He will not, however, accomplish his purpose by giving the company a short limit in which to commence operations and five years in which to complete the road.

Mr. LANCASTER: He will accomplish it by forcing the company into an undertaking on which it will lose interest and from which it cannot possibly get any profit or revenue until the road is completed.

Mr. DOUGLAS: Very unfair discrimination is being shown against this railway company. Ever since I have been a member of this House, in the Railway Committee we have been extending charters for railway companies. A premium is being put on railway companies which do not do anything. This railway company has done more actual construction in a given space of time than any other company in Alberta. It has completed 262 miles of its line and has a service on that portion; it has in addition 25 miles of steel laid. This railway runs through a country which is not productive of freight or revenue up to the point which it has reached at the present time, namely 262 miles from Edmonton; but from now on the company is bound to make revenue by pushing its line forward. There is no question of commencement at all, because the railway company has never ceased constructing its line. It is doing construction work at the present time. It is merely on account of the fluctuations of the market that it is asking for an extension of time. I do not think that the committee is dealing fairly with this particular railway company in limiting it to six months for commencement of construction.

Mr. LANCASTER: The company is not raising any objection.

Mr. DOUGLAS: That is not the point. This section is not going to hinder the com-

pany in the least, because it is going right on at present with the construction of its line. The point is that there is unfair discrimination against this particular railway company. That is why I object to this section. It will not affect the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company, if you put the time to commence construction at ten days. This is the point: Is this committee going to single out this particular line of railway and insist on a six months' limit for commencement, when companies owning charters for railways going through this same section of country are doing nothing whatever to earn their charters?

As regards the settlement in the country through which this railway runs, I saw a clipping the other day which stated that in 1914 there were 1,280 homestead entries in the Peace River agencies and 913 in the Grande Prairie agencies. This railway does not project far into the Grande Prairie district; but when it reaches Spirit river it will come within fifty miles of the Grand Prairie country, and I am informed by men who know that during the coming summer this railway will reach the Spirit river, giving communication to the people of the Grande Prairie district within fifty miles of this railway. I do not contend that it will hamper the company in any way to insert the six months' limit.

Mr. ROGERS: I can assure my hon. friend that there is no intention on the part of any hon. member to place any unfair restriction on this particular railway or to treat it in any way that could be termed unfair. On the contrary, as I understand the disposition of hon. members on both sides, they are well disposed to give this railway company every assistance and every consideration possible. I was moved to make the remarks I did by reason of the fact that a couple of years ago we had a deputation from the Grande Prairie district, which is forty or fifty miles from Spirit river. This railway company had its charter; it had its bonds sold and had the money ready with which to go on and build the line from Smoky river to Spirit river. What the people from the Grande Prairie district had in view was the clause in this extension, namely, that the company was to have two years in which to build the line from Smoky river as far as Spirit river, a line which interests particularly the people of the Grande Prairie district. They were hoping to get a local line with which to connect with this railway, to enable them to ship their grain. On the deputation there was one farmer who had in his granary over 65,000 bushels of grain. Hon. members can understand the temper and feeling of people who grow grain in such large quantities as that: they pay very careful attention to the wording of any extension of time granted to any railway that is likely to give them relief. There is no objection on the part of this railway company to the time limit being fixed at six months. If the company were not satisfied with that time limit, and if there were any difficulty from any point of view, I would not press the point; but in view of the anxiety of the people of the Grand Prairie district for railway communication, I thought it only fair for us to give them such consideration as we could. So far as I am aware, there is no intention on the part of any hon. member to place any difficulty in the way of this company going on with its work. As all parties are agreed as to this change of time, I do not see why there should be any objection to it.

Mr. DOUGLAS: I am not voicing any objection; I am merely stating that it will not hamper the railway company to have this amendment inserted. If the minister is sincere in his desire to assist the people in Grande Prairie, he will take the same stand as he is taking at present, when the Bill respecting the Canadian Northern railway comes up.

Mr. NESBITT: Will this railway serve the people of Grande Prairie or will it not?

Mr. DOUGLAS: It will come within fifty miles.

Mr. NESBITT: That is a good distance to walk.

Mr. BUCHANAN: As regards these extensions of time for railways, last session I favoured a limited extension and I favour it to-day. I am also in favour of the view taken by the hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll), that the time for completion should be reduced if the time for commencement is reduced. Western Canada is plastered with railroad charters. Extensions are granted year after year, but construction is not proceeded with. Present financial conditions may be an excuse for delay in completing railroad lines, but generally speaking I think it would be better for western Canada if many of these railway charters were cancelled. Settlers

have been living in isolated districts in anticipation of the construction of railroads and their hopes are not being realized on account of these everlasting extensions. This applies to districts in all parts of Western Canada. The need is not so great in sections of the country which already possess railway transportation facilities, but I think that a railway company proposing to build into a section of the country where there are no railroads should not be given continued extensions of time; it is a discouragement to the people. If this general principle were adopted, the people of districts in western Canada which are not provided with railroads would be in a position to know whether or not they are to have railway communication.

Mr. GREEN: The hon. gentleman evidently did not hear the explanation I made a few moments ago. This is not a paper charter. The company have no objection to the reduction of time to six months, but it would be manifestly unfair not to treat them as other companies are treated so far as the time of completion is concerned. These people are on the ground, spending money every day on the construction of this railway. They have so much of it built that they must of necessity continue construction, or they will get no business. I am quite in favour of limiting the time in respect of companies with paper charters, but in view of the fact that these people have the money and are prepared to continue construction, I think it would be too bad if we should not meet them on all possible points.

Mr. GRAHAM: I cannot for the life of me see what good or harm this motion can do anybody. If the company were ready and willing to go on, the changing of the time limit would not hurry them a bit; if they were hanging back and did not want to go on, I would see some reason for the proposed amendment. It all depends upon what we mean by commencement. I have known holders of charters to work a team and scraper four hours, and call that a commencement of a railway line. Such provisions look well in the statute, but my experience is that anything we have so far done to compel companies to commence construction has not amounted to much. Almost anything may constitute a commencement; the important consideration is the time within which the line must be completed. If this motion is passed other companies will be asked to accept a similar condition. In some future application for extension of time, a reference to the statute will show that in this instance Parliament imposed a six-months' limit, and that, therefore, the same limit should be imposed in the case under consideration. This would, perhaps, make the proposed operations prohibitive.

Mr. LANCASTER: I think the Railway Committee should deal with each separate charter on its own merits.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is a good theory, but in many respects we are creatures of precedent; the special pleader
4 p.m. always quotes precedent. If by this proposed amendment anything were to be accomplished in the interests of the people who want this railway, there would be no reason why it should not be adopted, but, so far as I can see, it will accomplish nothing. If Parliament is afraid that the company will not proceed with the work, the six-months' limit will not make any difference; the company can go on just the same under the Bill as it now stands.

Mr. COCHRANE: I know the company will be perfectly satisfied with this amendment; otherwise I would agree with the hon. gentleman.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 3—electric or other power:

Mr. LANCASTER: This section was put in by the committee, as a condition of renewal, so that the provisions of the Bill will conform with our present policy with regard to water-powers.

Section agreed to.

On section 5—consent of municipalities for railway upon highways, etc.:

Mr. LANCASTER: Sections 4 and 5 were not in the original charter. They are our standard sections for the protection of municipalities in the matters mentioned, and were imposed as a condition of renewal.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

Bill No. 17, respecting the Canadian Pacific railway—Mr. W. H. Sharpe—in committee.

On section 2—extension of time for completion:

Mr. TURRIFF: To what particular branches of road does paragraph D of section 2 of chapter 96 of the Statutes of 1913 refer?

Mr. LANCASTER: That is from a point on the Kleinburg-Sudbury branch, between Bolton junction and Palgrave, and westerly through the counties of Peel and Halton to a point on the Ontario and Quebec railway near Campbellville.

On section 4:

The company may sell, lease or charter any steam or other vessels of the company to the Canadian Pacific Ocean Services Limited, an incorporated company, or to any other incorporated company duly empowered to acquire, hold, own, maintain or operate steam or other vessels upon such terms and for such considerations as may be determined by the boards of directors of the companies respectively.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): This clause and the succeeding clause in the Bill, which gives power to hold shares of the Ocean Services Company, make the most radical change that has yet been made in the policy of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. If I read this Bill aright, and if I understand the explanations that were offered at the Railway Committee, the proposal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is to sell to the Canadian Pacific Ocean Services, Ltd., a company that is to be organized, any of its steam or ocean vessels, upon such terms as may be determined on by the board of directors of the companies respectively. The Canadian Pacific railway has been a great national proposition in this country. It has been largely subsidized by the country in land, finished railway, money and many other concessions that were given to it. Eventually it was completed from ocean to ocean. It has been raised to the position of being the greatest railroad under any one corporation in the world. It has had a most successful career. The progress of Canada has been identified with that of the Canadian Pacific railway; and it may be said that the credit of Canada has been upheld, in a sense, by this railroad. Recently an announcement was made that there was to be a change in the policy of the railway, it was said that it was the intention of the company hereafter to segregate the extraneous assets of the company. That was announced by the president of the company at public meetings and at the meetings of the shareholders. I understand that the proposal of the company now is to dismember this great national railway in which Canada has such a vital interest, and that the first thing to be dismembered will be the ocean steamships. It was proposed, when this Bill first came to the Railway Committee that they were also to take away the lake steamships, but they found that they could not do that, and so withdrew that proposal. They propose now, in this very simple clause, to begin the dismemberment of the great Canadian Pacific railway, to take the ocean steamships out of its jurisdiction and put them under another company called the Canadian Pacific Ocean Services, Ltd. We got the information in the committee the other day that this Canadian Pacific Railway Ocean Services, Ltd., is a company that is to be incorporated under the Joint Stock Companies Act of Great Britain; and, once it is incorporated there, it is without the jurisdiction of the Canadian Parliament, and so the ocean steamship service is beyond any interference by the people or the Parliament of Canada. This new company, we were informed, is to have an immense capitalization. We have the old company and its great capitalization, and we are now having established in England another company with large capitalization and large bonding powers under British control, absolutely out of the control of Canada. You will notice that this Ocean Services Company is to acquire the steamboats on such terms and for such consideration as may be determined by the board of directors of the companies respectively. That is, the Canadian Pacific Railway is to appoint the directors of the two companies, and so can, on any terms it likes, transfer the ocean steamships to the new company, and thus remove them from the jurisdiction of Canada.

Was it the intention of the original charter that this great road should be dismembered and the assets passed over to another company over which we have no jurisdiction? I never heard of such a proposal as that, of Parliament giving up its jurisdiction over a matter of such great national interest as the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. NESBITT: Have we control over the ocean rates now?

Mr. MACLEAN: I say that we can get control.

Mr. NESBITT: Have we control now?

Mr. MACLEAN: I think we have. I will ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce whether he was not a member of the Royal Commission appointed in Great Britain to consider our jurisdiction in this matter. Until we find out just what our jurisdiction is, I do not propose to abandon the powers

we now have. I would find a way of controlling the ocean rates of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I am certainly not going to make confession in this House that we have no jurisdiction over that matter.

Mr. NESBITT: The hon. gentleman stated that we had control, and were giving up control.

Mr. MACLEAN: I am not going to argue that to-day. Non possumus is a very good argument, but I am not going to adduce it in this case. I do not think any one who knows that great road and the great work it has done could make such a confession at this time. What is happening is this: We are giving power to a British company over which we have no control. That is perfectly certain. Once this British company is created we have no control over it, and I contend that we can have control over ocean rates. The fifth clause provides that the Canadian Pacific Railway may guarantee the securities of the Canadian Pacific Ocean Services Limited. That is, we are not only putting the steamships outside the jurisdiction of this House by turning them over to a British company, but we are giving to the Canadian Pacific Railway power to guarantee the securities of a company outside of our jurisdiction. That is the effect of this Act. It is a very simple proposal, and yet to my mind the most radical proposal that was ever put forward in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. And the company brings it forward just after the Government have brought down an amendment to the Railway Act containing a clause for the regulation of the financial operations of any railway company in this country. One of the clauses of the Bill introduced by the Minister of Railways last session says in substance, that no company shall issue any stock, shares, certificates of stock, bonds, debentures, debenture stock, notes, mortgage or other securities without first obtaining leave of the board. Then there is this clause:

> The board as it deems the circumstances warrant, may refuse or may grant leave for the proposed issue or may grant leave for such part thereof as it is satisfied is reasonable and proper, and may in any case impose any terms or conditions it may deem proper.

Last session the Government committed themselves, and brought in a very good Bill to amend the Railway Act. The Bill contained the two clauses I have just read, namely, that the issue of securities by any railroad of this country must first be approved by the Railway Commission, who can impose terms in any respect they like.

Mr. CARROLL: Is that the law now?

Mr. MACLEAN: By reason of the lateness of the session last year the Government postponed its Railway Bill for another session. They have not brought down the Bill this year; so I have brought down a Public Bill in my own name, and it is now before the Railway Committee. So this radical proposal in connection with the Canadian Pacific railway is made just after the Government announced its intention of amending the Railway Act. My contention is that if the Government intend to make that Bill the law of the land—and I believe they do—this Bill of the Canadian Pacific Railway ought to be delayed until the Railway Act is amended. If the Government measure can wait for one session, so can the proposal of the Canadian Pacific Railway; or if one goes through, both should go through; and the amendment I shall bring up to-day will be in that direction.

I pointed out in the Railway Committee the other day that the Canadian Pacific railway was a great national undertaking, and that its original charter contained a clause which ought to be of great interest to the House to-day. What I am speaking of is partly set out in the preamble and partly in a subsequent clause. The preamble says:

> Whereas by the terms and conditions of the admission of British Columbia into union with the Dominion of Canada, the Government of the Dominion has assumed the obligation of causing a railway to be constructed, connecting the seaboard of British Columbia with the railway system of Canada; ... and it is necessary for the development of the Northwest Territory and for the preservation of the good faith of the Government in the performance of its obligations, that immediate steps should be taken to complete and operate the whole of the said railway;

And the last sentence in section 7 says:

> And the company shall thereafter and for ever efficiently maintain, work and run the Canadian Pacific railway.

We not only gave these bonuses and gifts to the Canadian Pacific railway, we not only built that road because it was an essential part of Confederation and because we had to do it in fulfilment of our obligation, but we imposed on the Canadian Pacific railway—and it is imposed on no other railway in this country—that the

undertaking should be maintained as a railway for ever, and as a first class railway at that. And now, before we have revised our Railway Act, we propose to allow this company to begin its work of dismembering its assets. For this proposal, as shown by a statement of Sir Thomas Shaughnessy's the other day, is only one of a series of movements to dismember this railway. They first propose to dismember the steamship service.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have not read the original charter. Does it provide that the Company must establish a line of ocean steamships ?

Mr. MACLEAN: I do not say that it does. But a great national unde taking has grown up by reason of the aid given to that company by this Parliament; and now that company proposes to enter upon a policy of dismemberment.

Mr. J. D. REID: Not to dismember the railway

Mr. MACLEAN: This means the dismemberment of the railway, as I shall show. Sir Thomas Shaughnessy pointed out the other day that it was the intention of the company to segregate their extraneous assets. In plain English, that is they are going to dismember the road; they are going to cut the limbs off the trunk; and I call that the dismemberment of the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. MARCIL: Can the Canadian Pacific Railway sell their steamers to another company ?

Mr. MACLEAN: Perhaps they can, but I am not going to give them power to put the security of the Canadian Pacific Railway behind this other company.

Mr. LANCASTER: Where is the vice in what the hon. gentleman has just said?

Mr. MACLEAN: I am coming to the vice. I can hardly get a chance to make my case here. You would think I had a most vicious intention judging from the attitude of some hon. gentlemen towards my proposals, whereas I am merely trying to protect the public interest in regard to this Canadian Pacific railway which we have subsidized so generously in the past. Sir Thomas Shaughnessy says that he proposes to segregate the extraneous assets. He is going to lop off the steamship company. Hon. gentlemen say he can do that already. I do not know whether he can or not, but I am not going to help him to do so by legislation in this House. He said: I am going to dismember the lake steamship service which is absolutely a part of the service within Canada. He found he could not do that so he withdrew from that position. He has further stated that they are going to dismember the lands and townsites and put them under another company. If they get that power they will then dismember the express, hotel and telegraph system and in the end we will only be a trunk line of railway with a capitalization of $235,000,000 or more and the other securities that have been issued on the Canadian Pacific Railway. All other assets will be put into other companies with different capitalizations. The result will be that the Canadian Pacific Railway and its associates and all the work that it is now doing under the original charter, and it is doing all this work under the original charter, will have a capitalization of two or three times what the capitalization is at present and the people who pay the freight will have to pay heavier charges as a consequence. It is not in the public interest that we should allow the company to dismember its various assets. Counsel for the railway when they appeared before the Railway Committee stated that they intended to keep control of these assets, that the stock of the new company which they would receive for the steamships which they sold would be placed in the treasury of the Canadian Pacific Railway. When they were asked if they had any objection to a clause being put in this Bill defining that, and saying that the Canadian Pacific Railway shall hold all this stock for the benefit of the public, they refused to consent to it. They may have some other intention in regard to the stock. It may be that they propose to distribute this stock in the new company among their shareholders or it may be that there will be a new melon cut for the benefit of those in whose interest this legislation is being asked. It is not in the public interest that this great railway should be dismembered or that the proceeds of the dismemberment should be used by the company for the benefit of the shareholders. There is no guarantee that such a distribution among the shareholders will not take place. Do we want to have control of ocean services in Canada? Do the people of Canada suffer now from the fact that heretofore we have not been able to control ocean services in Canada whether they were connected with our railways or not? Is it not the case that a commission appointed by one of the provinces of the West found that the high freight

rates in connection with the movement of the grain of the West was due to the high ocean freight rates? That was found to be absolutely the case. The millers of the country are on record as protesting against excessive ocean freight rates. The people of Ontario and the boards of trade of Ontario and of Montreal have protested against excessive ocean freight rates. To-day the fact exists that, notwithstanding all we are doing for the farmers of the West, notwithstanding the distribution of seed grain and of feed, the farmers of the Canadian West, at the prices which they have obtained in recent years for their wheat, will not be able to stay on their land and make a living if they get the same kind of treatment in regard to ocean freight rates that they have got in the past five years. Notwithstanding the fact that the farmers of the West are faced by the conditions brought about by the war, notwithstanding that the railways have recently got an increase in the freight rates in the West, or some modifications—perhaps it may have been a reduction—the railway companies are now down before the railway commission asking for an increase in rates. When the West is stricken by one thing and another, and especially by reason of the recent bad year—not by the war—

Mr. GRAHAM: A restricted market.

Mr. MACLEAN: I am not for a restricted market. When we are faced with these conditions, two things happen: The Canadian Pacific Railway is getting absolutely clear from its steamships so that the Parliament of Canada cannot control it in that respect, and it is getting ready to put up the freight rates and to dismember all the other portions of the system over which Parliament has had control. Is that a thing to do to-day? We are likely to have further trouble in the Canadian West if we allow the Canadian Pacific Railway to take these steamship lines away and put them under a British company, thus leaving them free to raise the rates. At the same time we are going to allow them to evade this new law, which the Government proposed last session and which I have introduced this session, giving the Board of Railway Commissioners control over the capitalization of railway companies. It is not good policy to do that. It is not in line with the policy of Sir John A. Macdonald, who built this Canadian Pacific railway. He built that road for ever, and the bigger it got the better pleased he was with it. The greater it became from his time to that of the Administrations subsequent to him the more it became the pride of this country. But now like a flash, and in two innocent little paragraphs, the Canadian Pacific Railway is here asking for power to dismember itself.

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes, they are asking for power to take away these steamship lines. They came with a proposal to dismember the lake steamships. Here is what Sir Thomas Shaughnessy says—

Mr. LANCASTER: That was all amended in the Railway Committee.

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes, it was all very nicely fixed up. Sir Thomas Shaughnessy said:

> It is only another step in the direction of eliminating from the direct operation of the railway company items that do not relate to the railway property itself.

The railway property itself, according to Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, means the road bed and the stations, but all the other things are not considered a part of the railway. He would dismember this great corporation that we have built up, take away all these auxiliary services and leave only the railway service. That was not the original intention. That is not how this road has grown to the enormous proportions which it has attained to-day. Now we have before us a proposition for its dismemberment, its breaking up, and we have information to that effect in this statement by Sir Thomas Shaughnessy given to the public the other day.

What is the real object of this Bill? In view of the fact that we are likely in this Parliament to get jurisdiction over the steamship lines, they are going, with our assistance if they can, to place the steamship lines in a British company over which we shall have no jurisdiction. They are going to establish this British company for the creation of a great steamship service. This British company, with its large capital, will have ships on the Atlantic and ships on the Pacific, and own the vessels that the Canadian Pacific Railway own to-day, but not under the jurisdiction of this Parliament.

Mr. MARCIL: Are not all the Canadian Pacific Railway steamships at present registered in England?

Mr. MACLEAN: There is another of these questions that they bring up.

Mr. MARCIL: I merely wanted to know for information.

Mr. MACLEAN: I do not know whether they are or not, but we will admit that they are. Now I am coming to the point, and that is where we will be tested by the people of the country. We do propose to allow this dismemberment to begin, and it is proposed to allow it to apply to the ocean steamships, and it is proposed to create a British company outside our jurisdiction. That may be possible, and at all events it is being done now, and no matter what any hon. member may say, or no matter what excuse he may offer for the Canadian Pacific Railway, I want to ask him whether he is prepared to do this? After we have created this great company and taken over these steamships, here is the next clause of the Bill:

> The company (that is, the Canadian Pacific Railway) may guarantee the securities of the Canadian Pacific Railway Ocean Services, Limited.

Now, the Canadian Pacific Railway Ocean Services, Limited, is, as everbody will see, for the express purpose of creating a great sea monopoly beyond control of Canada, beginning with the boats of the Canadian Pacific Railway on the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, and every ocean they may go upon. And when they have done that and when they have lopped this limb off and given it to the other Company, they propose that this Parliament of Canada shall authorize the Canadian Pacific Railway to endorse the securities, no matter to what extent, that may be issued by this foreign company, in order to create and build up and strengthen the greatest sea monopoly that ever was in the world. There will be no monopoly on the seas equal to this new monopoly the Canadian Pacific Railway propose to build up. They propose to put boats on every sea, they propose to put them under the jurisdiction of a British Act, where we have no control whatever, and they propose to do it all on the credit of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Canadian Parliament is asked to endorse that proposal and to give this power. Goodness knows it is bad enough to stand all we have stood in the past, and it is bad enough for the farmers of the Canadian West to have suffered from excessive ocean rates in the past. And we are distributing free seed grain among the farmers of the West, and when these great railways are coming to ask for higher rates, is that a time to go a step further and give to the Canadian Pacific railway power to guarantee the securities of this company, for building up a great monopoly to unfairly treat the people of Canada? There is the issue, and that is the issue that will come home to the people of this country, and that is the issue I present to the Government and especially to the Minister of Railways. I say that is not good policy. I say it is not good policy at this time to give this great power of segregation. I say it is absolutely mis-policy; I say it is against the public interest; I say it is against the interests of the farmers of the West that the Canadian Pacific Railway should be allowed to cut a rod to beat the backs of our own Canadian people. That is the issue, and you cannot get away from it, and that issue is now up to this Parliament. What business have we to allow the Canadian Pacific Railway to build up a corporation outside of our own country, and on the strength of its own credit, in order to use unfairly the people of Canada? There have been excessive ocean charges in the past, and the Canadian Pacific Railway feel they are in a way responsible, because they are in the great ocean combine, and they fear we might find a way to get at them through the commission of which the Minister of Trade and Commerce is a member, and to put them under our jurisdiction. I know there is a way yet to be found to get them under our jurisdiction with regard to these ocean freight rates, and now they are trying to get away from that. Are we going to let them get away from us under this clause which empowers them to endorse the notes of this foreign company and this hostile company to the Canadian people? And it is to be a hostile company to Canada so far as ocean rates are concerned. They are trying now to get away from our jurisdiction; they fear we have jurisdiction, or that the Empire will find a way to get jurisdiction over them, and at such a time we are letting them go and giving them these privileges which they can exercise as they like. If the Bill to amend the Railway Act, introduced by the Government last session, was good law, and if the same Bill which I have introduced this session is good law—

Mr. CARROLL: Suppose the amendment to the Railway Act had been passed last year, how would it affect this matter?

Mr. MACLEAN: It would affect it to the extent that the Canadian Pacific Railway would not be allowed to guarantee these

bonds without the consent of the Railway Commission.

Mr. CARROLL: I think the hon. gentleman is wrong there.

Mr. MACLEAN: Why should that Act not provide for that?

Mr. CARROLL: Does the hon. gentleman think he is referring to the Act correctly?

Mr. MACLEAN: I think so. Anyhow, if such a provision is not there it ought to be there, and what the Minister of Railways undertook to do was to put the securities of these railway companies under the control of the Railway Commission. That is what they are doing in the States, that is what we ought to do here, but we are very slow in doing it, and while we are slow in doing it the Canadian Pacific Railway is trying to get away from us. Is it calculated to advance the settlement of the Canadian West that we should let these steamships get away from us and let them get under a foreign company?

Mr. MARCIL: Does the hon. gentleman call a British company a "foreign" company?

Mr. MACLEAN: As regards this legislation, yes. I am surprised at the loyalty of the hon. gentleman from the Baie des Chaleurs.

Mr. MARCIL: The hon. gentleman is old enough to remember the discussion which once took place in this House on the word "foreign."

Mr. MACLEAN: I did not take part in that discussion. At all events, the least that can be said of this is, that it is an extraneous company; it is a company over which we have no control, and it is to be incorporated so that we cannot have control over it. But we have control over the Canadian Pacific railway, and we have control over the securities of the Canadian Pacific railway, and that is a point which is easily grasped by the ordinary people of this country, and we are allowing the Canadian Pacific railway to endorse the securities of a company that is to build up a great ocean combine over which the people complain we will have no control.

Mr. MACDONALD: How could one company build up a combine within itself?

Mr. MACLEAN: In the very way that the Canadian Pacific railway has built it up now. The Canadian Pacific railway is a member of the North Atlantic steamship combine, and if I were the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Minister of Railways, before I would pass this legislation I would say to the Canadian Pacific railway: I will allow you to do some of these things if you first give us a pledge that you will come out of the North Atlantic steamship combine. The dominant force up to date in the North Atlantic steamship combine is the Canadian Pacific railway, and the people most ill-used under it are the people of Canada.

Mr. MACDONALD: How can it be the greatest; what about the Cunard line and the White Star line?

Mr. MACLEAN: They are not greater than the Canadian Pacific railway, but even if they are, they are out of our jurisdiction, and if the little villain is under our jurisdiction let us get hold of him. Let us not let him escape because there is a bigger villain elsewhere. You can argue from now until doomsday, but the point is that at a time when our western farmers and our Canadian merchants generally are complaining of excessive railway freight rates, and excessive ocean rates, and at a time when the doctrine is being set up that we have no jurisdiction over ocean rates, we are allowing the Canadian Pacific railway to put its ships into another company, and we are giving it the power to guarantee the securities of this foreign company to an unlimited amount, to create a still greater ocean combine and to terrorize the people of Canada to a still greater extent in the future. That is not good Canadian policy; that is not the National Policy; that was not the intention of Sir John A. Macdonald. It is not an up-to-date policy in connection with this great railway proposition. In the States to-day they have ordered some of the companies that built up extraneous assets to dismember. For instance, a lot of the coal companies which became railway companies, and railway companies which became coal companies more than they were railway companies, have been ordered by various authorities to disband, and to reorganize, and they have reorganized into other companies.

An hon. member near me says that is what is proposed to be done by this Bill. If the Canadian Pacific Railway do this, let us have control of the way in which they do it. Let us not give them a free hand to do as they like. When they are doing it, let us not give them a free hand to use the credit of the Canadian Pacific Railway

Company to build up the greatest ocean combine in the world. My contention is that they should not be allowed to use their capitalization for that purpose. We did not build up the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and give them land and money and railway lines for the purpose of letting them use their capitalization for the establishment of an outside ocean steamship service that we cannot control, that will put up the freight rates and that will put our farmers out of business. If we allow the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to form an independent steamship company, we shall have to go a step further and find a remedy. That remedy will be the creation of a great ocean service, and we cannot entrust it to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. If this dismemberment which is under way goes on, we shall have to create a great merger with which to fight the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in this policy. We may have to merge two or three railways that at the present time have a hard struggle for existence, and to link them up with the Canadian Pacific railway and the Transcontinental. If we do that, we shall have to buy ocean steamships, and we may have to pay a very much larger sum now for the chartering of ocean steamships than we would have had to pay some time ago. If this dismemberment goes on, we shall have to nationalize the railways and our steamships on the oceans, or we may as well let our farmers in the Canadian West go out of business. It is a crazy-quilt policy to subsidize and to encourage farming in the West, and then in the East to allow a great company to create on the ocean a steamship monopoly with which to take all the products of the farmer away from him, following the policy of some American companies in the early days, which said: How much can we take from the farmer and still keep him as a poor man on the land? In western Canada we have pretty nearly reached that stage at the present time; and we would have done so if it had not been for the increased prices that the farmers are getting this year because of the war. If Siberia should go more into wheat production; and if that great country Persia, that may be opened up by reason of this war, and the countries in the valley of the Tigris and the Euphrates, which is a better wheat-growing section than is western Canada—do the same, our farmers under our excessive freight rates will be put out of business.

These freight rates are charged by a company which we are allowing to pass out of our jurisdiction and on the flotations of stock on which we are placing no limitations. The Canadian Pacific Railway can give this steamship company any amount of credit, and there is not a line in this legislation to provide that, if the company wants to do certain things, it must go to some authority and get its approval. By this Bill, the company can do as it likes; it can issue stock to its shareholders at a low rate, as was done recently. There has been no control of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the past, and it does not propose that we shall have any control of it in the future. Is the Parliament of Canada about to give the power to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to do this thing that is improper and contrary to the interest of the public? The Canadian Pacific Railway Company are asking for this power, and I gather that the Government proposes to give it to them. I do not, however, propose that they shall have that power without my protest and the protest of the portion of the country from which I come. The people of Ontario are against the capitalization of railway companies being beyond Government control. Last year the Government took over the control of the finances of the Canadian Northern Railway Company. That is a beginning, and a good one.

Mr. MACDONALD: Was that what the Government did last year?

Mr. MACLEAN: We have control of the capitalization. We may not have control of the securities, but some of them at least are guaranteed by the Government. We took control of the capital stock. The amount of that is stated in the Act and the company cannot increase it. That company was compelled to put all its operations into one system, and we have it more or less under control. We ought to have the Canadian Pacific Railway Company under control. This legislation is not in the public interest, and it is not legislation that we should put through during this time of war.

It has been stated that it is the policy of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to dismember certain of its operations, such as telegraphs, hotels and lands. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company to-day owns lands that it got from the Government or that it purchased by means of money that came from the Government, that are worth from $200,000,000 to $500,000,000. It is proposed

next to take out those lands and put them into a like independent company, and use that as a melon for distribution among its shareholders. These lands and moneys which were given to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were ear-marked for the benefit of the undertaking and not for the benefit of the shareholders. The contention is made that the shareholders can do as they like with these things. They can do what they like only in the light and interpretation of the Act of Incorporation which was for the creation of a great transcontinental railway for the purpose of binding the provinces together. The railway company has used those lands and moneys to build itself up to the strength to which it has attained, and it should therefore not be allowed to dismember. It is not good policy to allow it to take this land out of the company. I want to see the Canadian Pacific Railway Company keep itself intact. If it has in its treasury enormous reserves, which it is now trying to get rid of, those reserves are dedicated, consecrated and ear-marked according to my interpretation of the original charter, for the mitigation of railway freight charges and not for excessive dividends to the shareholders. Are we to sit quietly by and to allow this dismemberment to go on until there is nothing left but the trunk with the severed limbs?

If the Canadian Pacific Railway Company sells these steamships now to the new company, there is no intention that the proceeds realized from the sale shall be used for the reduction of the existing capitalization. The dismemberment is to go on, but the old capitalization is to remain, and the new proposition is all on new capital. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company in a very short time—and it says it is to keep in touch with all these new companies and to have control of them in some way—will have a capitalization of $500,000,000 instead of $250,000,000, as it is now. We are therefore authorizing a great exploitation and increase of the securities of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in one way or another, and we are not keeping control of it. We have some control over the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in regard to certain stock issues, because the company has to come to the Governor in Council and get authority to issue it. I believe the Government of the hon. gentlemen opposite gave the company that authority on two or three occasions.

Under this most dangerous legislation the credit of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will be used to build up a great ocean combine, over which our people will exercise no control. The new organization will not be subject to Parliament or to the Governor in Council; I would propose that at least it shall be subject to the control of the Railway Commission. For the reasons which I have given here in committee, I submit that this clause and the one following it are against the public interest. I propose to vote against them, and later to submit an amendment.

Mr. TURRIFF: I think it will be agreed that there is a doubt as to whether we exercise control at the present time over the ocean freight rates of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Perhaps we do, but if we do not it is possible for the Government of Canada to secure that control. Last session the Government introduced a Bill to that end; I do not know why it was not brought up this year and put into effect before the introduction of such legislation as this. I should like to ask any hon gentleman—the hon. member who has charge of the Bill (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) or the Minister of Railways—what disadvantage the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is subjected to at the present time by reason of the Canadian ownership of these steamships? Does any one suppose for a moment that by organizing a new company and having the bonds secured by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company can get money any cheaper than they can get it under their own name? No company can get money cheaper than the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; I imagine that even the Government of Canada cannot do it. Why, then, do they ask Parliament to-day to authorize the withdrawal of their ocean and coast steamships from the control of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company? Why do they ask Parliament to place this steamship service under the control of what my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) calls a foreign company, and what I call a foreign company, because it will not be subject to the control of the Canadian people?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: The coasting vessels at Prince Rupert and Vancouver would, under this legislation, also pass out of our control.

Mr. TURRIFF: Yes, they are engaged in the coasting trade. This new company might as well be incorporated in Germany as in Great Britain, so far as our control of it is concerned. I ask again: under what

disability is the Canadian Pacific Railway Company labouring at the present time? Has Canada not treated them well? Have we not given them almost everything they asked for? Have we made any unfair or unreasonable exactions from them in the past? I will admit that they have given us good service. They are a big corporation; they have a big business, and they have conducted it, generally speaking, on good business principles. But has the company anything to complain of in respect of its treatment by the people of Canada or by the Government? I think it will be universally admitted that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has absolutely nothing to complain of. What, then, are the grounds upon which they ask Parliament to have this steamship service withdrawn from the control of Canada, from the control of the Canadian Parliament, from the control of the Canadian people? There must be some reason.

Mr. COCHRANE: They never have been under the control of Canada; they have been registered in England right along.

Mr. TURRIFF: The minister says they have not been under Canadian control. But on every occasion upon which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company wanted money to buy boats or to acquire other properties, they came to this Parliament for authority to issue stock; so that we have an indirect control, at any rate. Moreover, if the Prime Minister would reintroduce and have passed the legislation that he introduced last year, absolute control would be secured. In view of what has been done for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the people of Canada have a right to control its operations. What have the people done for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company? We built $32,000,000 or $33,000,000 worth of railway, and handed it over to them—for nothing. We gave them 25,000,000 acres of land—for nothing. We gave them other assistance and other bonuses to help the company along. And can it now be said that the people have no right to exercise any control over the doings of this company? Can it be said that all the money which the people assisted the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to raise was used in the building of the Canadian Pacific railway or its branch lines? Any one who would say that has a very superficial idea of the ramifications of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as it exists to-day. I am speaking now of the operations of the company in Canada. Let us see what they control in addition to their ocean and coast steamers and their Great lake fleet. They have a string of hotels from the Atlantic to the Pacific. They have lands given them by the people and lands purchased by themselves—lands which are now townsites, worth millions and tens of millions of dollars. The people of Canada put up part of the money with which these purchases were made; the Government of Canada gave them permission to issue bonds to secure the money to buy these townsites and other properties. They have a large amount of money invested in smelters and in mines in British Columbia. The money that they put into these industries was supplied partly by the capital this Parliament authorized the company to raise and partly by bonuses given them by the people of this country. Look at the timber they own at the present time. They are now asking that the steamship services only be separated from the company, but I have here an interview with Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, in which he intimates that they propose that all outside properties shall be eliminated from the control of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company proper. They have spent millions of dollars on irrigation lands. We granted them authority to sell securities to obtain money for that purpose; in a little while they will separate these properties also from the main company. Then they have telegraph lines, electric railways, express companies. The Hull Electric railway, which runs into Ottawa, is owned by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. In a short time, according to Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will ask permission to withdraw all these outside interests from the control of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company proper. Do they propose at the same time to reduce the capital of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company? Not at all. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company are just a little afraid that possibly the Canadian Parliament may ultimately control their ocean freight rates, and they are taking steps to prevent this before the legislation of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, introduced by his Government last year, is put into force. Shall we stand idly by and make no protest while that is being done?

5 p.m.

Mr. CARROLL: How does the legislation of last year amending the Railway Act affect or conflict with this Bill?

Mr. TURRIFF: Not being a lawyer, I probably do not understand the matter very well; but in a general and rough and ready

way, I think I understand this; and I think my right hon. friend the Prime Minister and the Minister of Railways must have understood it in the same way when they introduced the legislation giving power to the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada to supervise the securities that were issued by the railway companies. I think that would go so far as to cover not only the issuing of the securities themselves but the guaranteeing of securities of any subsidiary company, and if it did not give such power the Act should be so amended as to give it. So I do not think we can get away from the fact that at the present time we are in the very good position of being able, in view of the legislation introduced by the Government last year, to have control of the capitalization and the securities issued by these different railway companies and other companies.

Let us see how it is going to affect those who have to pay the freight rates. The hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has spoken of its effect on the western farmer. He never said truer words in his life. We talk about the disadvantage the war has been to everybody. So it has in many ways, but financially the war has been a godsend to the people of the West; and if it had not been for the high prices obtained for the last crop there would have been a much greater protest from the West against the passage of any legislation such as we are now considering than there has been. Let us see the position in which the western farmer will be when this legislation is passed. Prices are high now, everybody, particularly the Government, is urging on the farmer to go in for production and patriotism. Well they need not bother about the patriotism end, the farmers are as patriotic as they are; nor need they bother about the production. There is no occasion to tell the farmer, if he has a field ready to sow, to sow it, if he can get the seed.

Mr. BRADBURY: But he has to get the seed.

Mr. TURRIFF: In some cases he has to get the seed, but there is no need to lecture him on the growing of his crop or on patriotism. Let us suppose that this war ends sometime during the coming summer, as I think in all probability it will. Great Britain has a year's food on hand to-day. I have no doubt that France is in much the same position. These countries that are at war are not going on a margin of one or two months' food supply, they have a huge supply of food products on hand and when the Dardanelles are opened in the course of a few weeks there will be an outlet for an immense amount of food supply and you will find that all the Allies will be well stocked up. Supposing the war ceases next fall, what will happen? Do you think the high prices will be maintained? Not for one moment, there will be a slump in the prices of food products, and a big slump. Then where will the farmer be? I make the statement without fear of contradiction that to-day it cost from 6 cents to 8 cents a bushel more to take wheat from Fort William to Montreal than it did three or four years ago. Why? The railroads are not charging more to bring it to Fort William, there has not been very much increase in freight rates on the Great Lakes; the great bulk of the increase has been on the ocean end. The ocean freight rates have been increased so that, as I say, there is now a difference of from 6 to 8 cents a bushel.

Mr. MARCIL: May I point out that before reaching the sea, on the Atlantic seaboard, flour that used to sell in my constituency at from $5.75 to $6 a barrel is now selling at $8 and $8.50 a barrel.

Mr. TURRIFF: That has nothing to do with the question we are now discussing.

Mr. MARCIL: I am trying to say that regardless of the ocean rates there has been an unjustifiable increase in the price of flour in Canada.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: So much the worse.

Mr. TURRIFF: I do not think it has anything to do with the question I am discussing; but I shall give the answer to my hon. friend's question. The big milling companies bought wheat last Fall, millions and tens of millions of bushels, at 80 cents and 90 cents a bushel, and later on they perhaps bought it at a $1 a bushel. Owing to manipulation, to a certain extent, but partly to the big demand in European countries, not only the countries at war but those that expected that they would be drawn into the war, putting in huge supplies of wheat, the price went from $1 up to $1.50 and $1.60 a bushel, and the mills are therefore charging for flour which they grind from wheat which cost them less than $1 a bushel, the price they would charge if they had paid $1.50

and $1.60 a bushel. That accounts for the increase in the price.

Mr. MARCIL: The enhanced price does not go to the farmers in the West.

Mr. TURRIFF: A great deal did not, because the large proportion of the crop had been sold before the 1st of January last year, so the farmers did not get the advantage of the whole increase in price. The great bulk of the crop was sold before the price reached $1.50 a bushel. Many farmers thought that when wheat got to 90 cents or $1 a bushel it was a good price, and it was, and they sold for that good price. But I do not think that argument has much to do with the question that we are now discussing. The freight rates have been increased, and that increase has taken place partly for transportation before the produce reaches the ocean, but largely for carriage on the ocean.

Mr. STANFIELD: How does the hon. member account for the fact that since this war broke out, in England freight rates have increased more than 100 per cent?

Mr. TURRIFF: That has nothing to do with the question, and the only way I can account for it is that the Government of Great Britain had commandeered hundreds of vessels that were engaged in carrying freight.

Mr. STANFIELD: I am speaking of the railroad freight rates in Great Britain.

Mr. TURRIFF: Because I think in England they are not a bit better than we are; and when the railroad magnates think they see a good chance to do the people oy extra freight rates they have probably taken advantage of it.

Mr. STANFIELD: The Government took over the railroads as soon as the war broke out.

Mr. TURRIFF: I do not know anything about freight rates in England, and I do not care what they do there. If they do wrong there that is no reason and no excuse for doing wrong in Canada, and I do not think my hon. friend will say it is a good excuse. But here is a company under no disability whatever in Canada, coming to Parliament with a very mild-looking couple of clauses in another Bill altogether, having nothing to do with ocean shipping; and with these two mild-looking clauses they propose to take out of the jurisdiction of Canada forever any possible

[Mr. Turriff.]

chance of having any say whatever in connection with ocean freight rates. I say there is absolutely no justification for it. I assume that the Prime Minister was in earnest when he introduced his legislation last year, providing for the regulation of ocean freight rates. That legislation has not yet come into effect; it is still before Parliament; and if, before that legislation is put in force, he allows the Canadian Pacific railway to withdraw from the scope of that legislation a large portion of their assets, then he will be responsible for something that should not be done and for which the Government will be held strictly to account.

The farmer in Canada has got to the limit of what he can stand. If it had not been for the higher prices obtained this year on account of the war, not a dollar would have been made out of last year's crop, even by those who had a good crop. And remember how the burdens of the farmer are to be increased this session. Here are the railroads clamouring before the Railway Commission for an increase in freight rates. They say the increase will not apply west of Port Arthur; but how can it be said that the West will not be affected by the increased rate from Port Arthur down to the Atlantic, when our western wheat goes over that line, and when a lot of the stuff we use in the West is drawn over that line from the East? But that is not all. It is proposed to increase the cost of producing wheat to a very large extent. The Government is increasing the cost of everything the farmer uses in producing his wheat. The Railway Board is likely to increase the freight rates, I understand, and now we have the Canadian Pacific railway trying to withdraw their steamships from the control of this Parliament, so that they can do any mortal thing they like in the way of increasing freight rates on the ocean.

Mr. LANCASTER: How can it hurt the farmer of the West? The Bill is for the purpose of strengthening the Canadian Pacific Railway in their competition on the Seas. For the Canadian Pacific Railway has not a monopoly of ocean traffic; it has to compete with the steamship companies of Great Britain and of the United States and of foreign countries. This Bill will strengthen the owner of Canadian vessels in his competition with other steamship companies.

Mr. TURRIFF: What disability is the company under at present?

Mr. LANCASTER: As I understand it, they want to be able to conduct their business in a business-like way. I do not want to interject an argument into my hon. friend's speech; but it strikes me that this Bill is very much in the interests of the people of Canada, because it keeps everything that the commission has control over limited to the seaboard. The companies cannot mix their rates as partly land and partly ocean, which might be done if they were not separate companies. I cannot see anything in this Bill except the strengthening of the Canadian Pacific Steamships in their competition with steamship lines of other companies of foreign nations. I do not see how that can hurt the Canadian farmer or the eastern or western citizen.

Mr. TURRIFF: The Canadian Pacific railway is not conducting its ocean business in a businesslike way, simply because it is a branch of the main company.

Mr. LANCASTER: It is not a branch of the railway at all. The whole argument of my hon. friend is based on a fiction.

Mr. TURRIFF: It is a part of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The boats were secured by the money of the Canadian Pacific railway. Where else was the money obtained? This proposal, that the Canadian Pacific railway should have power to guarantee the securities of this new company, will not relieve the Canadian Pacific railway in the slightest degree, except in this sense: it will relieve them for the future from control by the Parliament of Canada. In view of the fact that the legislation before us will have the effect of enabling the Canadian Pacific railway to enter into combines and to secure a greater monopoly of ocean traffic than they now have, and in view of the legislation introduced by the Government last year, surely it would be the part of wisdom for this House to say: We will let this Bill stand for a year, until the Prime Minister makes good the legislation introduced last year. If we do that we shall not be hurting the Canadian Pacific railway. They have gone on for years with their ocean service as a branch of or as a part of their main company; they have not suffered at all, and they are not suffering to-day. They have any amount of money in their treasury, and if they have not, they can get it just as readily through the present company as through the proposed new company. So we should be imposing no hardship whatever on the Canadian Pacific railway by delaying this Bill. What good reason can be brought against allowing the Bill to stand? It is quite possible I may be absolutely wrong in the views I hold on this subject, but I think it would be best for the Bill to stand until next session when, during the recess we shall have had an opportunity of learning more about it. Surely that is not asking too much, especially when there is a great possibility that its enactment may be to the detriment of the people who use the railway and the ocean service of the Canadian Pacific railway. Take my own constituency, absolutely an agricultural constituency, practically a wheat-growing constituency. The fact that it costs our farmers from 6 to 8 cents a bushel more than it did a year ago to send wheat to the Old Country means that every farmer of the West is being deprived of that 6 or 8 cents a bushel, and when the war is over they will not be able to stand these increased rates. This war will have one effect, and hon. gentlemen opposite, and the Government especially, should not lose sight of it. In the West to-day to one farm occupied you will find two farms empty, in township after township; and that is not in the drouth-stricken area, but in districts that had a good crop last year. How is that? Simply because the farmer is finding it harder every year to make a living.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Low prices and high freights.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Narrow markets.

Mr. TURRIFF: And combines, monopolies, high freight rates, and the tariff. It means that you are going to drive the farmers from the land, not by hundreds, but by thousands. I may be wrong in thinking that this legislation will have that effect. But I think the Canadian Pacific railway is no better than another company; it is just as ready as the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Northern railway or any other steamship company to take the last cent from the farmer in freight rates. The farmers have not been able in the past to stand the high rates, and many of them have been driven off the farms. I fear that this legislation will have the effect of driving thousands and thousands of our farmers off the land. It makes me tired to hear this propaganda of getting people back to the land. That is beginning at the wrong end. What is wanted is legislation that will enable the farmer who is on the land to stay there. If you enable the farmers to stay on the

land, you do not have to bother about a propaganda to get them to go back to the land. There are thousands of people living in cities who would be glad to go on the land if they felt they could make a living from the land. But you are going the wrong way about it by introducing this legislation in view of the fact that the Government brought down legislation dealing partly with this question last year. I would suggest that this whole matter be left over until another session. Then we could take up the matter and thresh it out on its merits.

Mr. NESBITT: Suppose the Government did control this steamship company and did control the rates, what benefit would it be? Where would we benefit from it?

Mr. TURRIFF: According to the argument of my hon. friend, we might better dissolve the Railway Commission. Has it been of no advantage to have the Railway Commission controlling rates? I think it has.

Mr. NESBITT: But they have controlled them under the system of allowing them to pay, have they not? They have not fixed railway rates at less than it paid the railways to carry the stuff?

Mr. TURRIFF: Three or four years ago the ocean companies were charging very much lower rates than they are at the present time, and we did not hear of any great difficulties among the ocean steamship companies. They were declaring good dividends until some men got together in New York and London, merged these companies and issued a large amount of watered stock upon which they have not been able to pay dividends. But there is no doubt that on the actual amount of money invested in these steamship companies they were making good returns.

Mr. NESBITT: Were they making money in these companies?

Mr. TURRIFF: They were paying dividends.

Mr. NESBITT: Then why did they sell? If you were making money out of a corporation, would you sell out?

Mr. TURRIFF: I would not hesitate to sell if I were making money out of it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: May I ask if this Bill stands over until the Government bring down the measure that was introduced last session, would not that measure apply to all steamship companies as well as to the Canadian Pacific railway?

Mr. TURRIFF: I think so. I think that would be the advantage of having this legislation passed instead of discriminating against other companies by giving special advantages to the Canadian Pacific railway. If this Bill is passed this session, and next session the right hon. the Prime Minister brings down and passes the legislation to which my hon. friend has referred, there may be disabilities as against other companies that he has exempted this company from.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This Bill would not have any such effect, because if this Parliament has power to pass the legislation which was proposed at the last session applying to all steamship lines, the legislation would apply equally to the Canadian Pacific Ocean Services Limited. In our desire to try and get rates reduced, and it is a very laudable desire and one in regard to which my hon. friend from Assiniboia has always proved himself to be the friend of the western producers, we ought not to be unfair to the Canadian Pacific Railway simply because it is a great and successful company which, as has been said by the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean), has done so much for the development of Canada and, indeed, whose development and prosperity have been wrapped up to a great extent with the prosperity and development of our country. Parliament at this session has given the Grand Trunk Railway Company identically the same powers as those which are asked for by the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. LANCASTER: The Bill was passed on the same day as this Bill was held up.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The powers are exactly the same.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Will my hon. friend read them?

Mr. PUGSLEY: They are in different language, but the effect is exactly the same.

Mr. MACLEAN: Read them, please.

Mr. PUGSLEY (reading):

> The directors of the company may from time to time, as often as they deem expedient and in such manner and upon such terms as may be mutually agreed upon—

The very language to which my hon. friend takes exception in this case.

—make advances to or assist any company, now or hereafter incorporated, of which the capital stock issued and outstanding, or a controlling amount thereof, is now or may at the time of any such advances or assistance be held by or in the name of, or for the benefit of the company, and may acquire, hold, guarantee,—

That is the word to which my hon. friend takes such strong exception.

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY (reading):

—guarantee, pledge, sell or otherwise dispose of shares, bonds, debentures or other securities of any such company and for any such purposes may use the proceeds of any class of stock heretofore or hereafter issued by the Company, and upon the acquisition of any such shares, bonds, debentures or other securities may exercise all the powers of holders thereof and receive any dividends or interest paid thereon.

Under that section the Grand Trunk Pacific, or the Grand Trunk Railway Company, could to-morrow organize lines of steamships both on the Atlantic and the Pacific, put them under the name of another company and guarantee the stock and other securities of that subsidiary company. Then we find that the Canadian Northern Railway Company have segregated their steamship line from the railway; the steamships are owned by the Canadian Northern Railway Company, but held in the name of The Canadian Northern Steamships, Limited, and owned in the same way as it is proposed that this company may own the steamships of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. We ought not to discriminate against the Canadian Pacific Railway simply because it is a great company and has done so much for Canada, while giving the same powers exactly to the Grand Trunk Railway Company and recognizing the right of the Canadian Northern Railway Company to have the same powers when they organized the Canadian Northern Steamships Limited.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE: Did not this Parliament at the last session, when granting the loan to the Canadian Northern Railway Company, combine the Canadian Northern Steamship Company with the Canadian Northern Railway Company proper, and are we not doing exactly the opposite in this case?

Mr. PUGSLEY: At the last session the separate existence of the Canadian Northern Steamships Company Limited was not wiped out, but the company was connected as a steamship company the same as all other subsidiary companies with the Canadian Northern Railway Company, and all we did was to require that they should be merged together in the sense of all the securities which were to be issued being chargeable upon the mortgage. The reason was that as the Government was guaranteeing the bonds of the company to the amount of $45,000,000 it required that all the assets of the Canadian Northern Railway Company and of the subsidiary companies, some twenty or more in number—

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Should be put in a convenient form for giving security.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, should be covered by the securities. The Canadian Northern Steamship Lines maintained their identity just the same as the twenty or more subsidiary companies continued their identity. I remember a very strong argument was urged for preserving the identities of these companies at that time. If Parliament has the power to regulate the rates of ocean steamships, it will have the same power after this Bill passes to regulate the rates of the Canadian Pacific Ocean Services Limited as it will have in regard to the Donaldson line, the White Star line, the Allan line, the Beaver line and all those various lines of steamships now crossing the Atlantic. Surely we ought not to discriminate as against one railway company in respect to its steamships, and not control the rates exacted by the other lines. If Parliament can pass a law such as is proposed, there is nothing in the Bill now before the House to prevent a statute after it is passed being effective as against the lines of the Canadian Pacific Oceean Services Limited just as much as in respect to any other lines of steamers. In regard to the right of the Canadian Pacific Railway to be allowed to do what they seek power to do, I asked my hon. friend from South York as to whether or not the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was ever obliged by statute to establish steamship lines. I thought that might have an important bearing upon the consideration of this Bill. He has admitted, and I have no doubt that it is the case, that there is no obligation, that there never has been any obligation, on the part of the Canadian Pacific Railway to establish or operate steamships on either the Atlantic or the Pacific. There is nothing to prevent that company, without any violation of its charter and obligation to the Canadian people, disposing of all its steamship lines to-morrow.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Has it not created a public service under that original charter ?

Mr. PUGSLEY: It created it through money earned by the railway, I presume, and which otherwise would have been distributed to its stock-holders. I presume that certain earnings of the Canadian Pacific railway, instead of being distributed to its stock-holders, have been used for the acquisition of these steamships. I can understand that as a matter of purely domestic arrangement within itself, it may be very convenient for the Canadian Pacific railway to organize a separate company, just as the Canadian Northern has done, to operate its steamship lines. My hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) talks of segregating the assets, and he says the Canadian Pacific railway may come here by and by to separate the hotel system from the railway. What of it; we have allowed that to be done by the Grand Trunk company. This magnificent hotel, the Chateau Hotel at Ottawa, is not owned by the railway company, but by what is known as the Ottawa Terminals Company. The hotels at Edmonton, Regina, Prince Rupert, and in the Rocky mountains, are owned, as I understand it, by the Grand Trunk Pacific Development Company, and not one of them by the railway company. Where would be the harm and who would object if the Canadian Pacific Railway to-morrow were to organize a great hotel company, in which would be vested these various hotels, so that they would be managed separately from the railway company ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: If these hotels are in the railway proposition now, and they do segregate them, do they propose to cancel the capitalization which now represents them in the capitalization of the company ?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Let me ask my hon. friend what would happen if they sold these hotels outright ?

Mr. MACLEAN: They should put the money represented by them into the capitalization.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I presume the money would go into the treasury and if Parliament has any control over it well and good. But undoubtedly they have the power to sell such of their property, outside of their railway, as they think it advisable to dispose of. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company could to-morrow sell all their steamers, and they could to-morrow sell all their hotels. Where is the objection from the public standpoint to they themselves organizing a separate company to manage these steamships or to manage the hotels? Wherein is the objection to their having the power to guarantee the securities of the subsidiary companies, so that the money may be raised at a lower rate in the markets of the world, and thereby the charges upon the public less than if the subsidiary companies were obliged to pay a higher rate of interest upon the borrowed moneys. I can see no reason at all which would induce me to vote against the Bill, which I believe is entirely one of domestic concern for the Canadian Pacific Railway.

There is another consideration for those of us who are interested in Canadian ports—I suppose all members of this House are interested in Canadian ports, although some may be interested more than others because of local circumstances and considerations—and it is that we should not impose disabilities upon any railway company in respect to its line of steamers which would have the slightest effect in inducing it to discriminate against Canadian ports, or to disregard the business of Canadian ports and attempt to carry the trade through the ports of the United States. Suppose the Grand Trunk Railway Company were to come to-morrow to get authority to organize a great line of steamers upon the Atlantic, and to organize a subsidiary company for the purpose of owning and managing these steamers, and have power to the parent company to guarantee their bonds. Surely we would give that authority at once. We want to make Canadian ports favourite ports for ocean business. If we were to impose disabilities upon the Canadian Pacific Railway, and discriminate against them as compared with other lines of railway owning steamships, one could very well understand what might happen. They might dispose of their steamers altogether to companies in which they would have no interest and over which they would have no control, and instead of preserving that business to Canadian ports we might be doing very serious injury to the trade of these ports. I say, encourage by all means possible the enlargement of the ocean fleets of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and if they want it—and they would not come to Parliament unless they thought it would be an advantage to them in their financial operations and in the operation of their steamship lines—I say by all means

give them the widest possible powers. Then, if we can pass a general law applicable to all steamship companies, which would enable Parliament or the Railway Commission to control the rates, by all means pass it and make it applicable to all steamship lines as well as to the steamers of the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE (North Ontario): It seems to me that Parliament is attempting to do this session exactly the opposite of what it did last session in the case of the Canadian Northern Railway Company. Last session we spent a great deal of time to compel the Canadian Northern Railway to combine its various companies and various assets into such a corporation as would enable it to give certain securities to this Parliament for advances made. In the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway now, we are apparently dismembering the corporation, and separating it and weakening it, and, to a certain extent, losing the control which Parliament has at present over it. I was present in the Railway Committee, and I listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion that took place there, and I am free to say that I was greatly impressed by the argument presented by the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean). The Canadian Pacific Railway is a mighty corporation; it has been built up with the great assistance of the Canadian people, who gave them 25,000,000 acres of land and $25,000,000 in money. We are all proud of the great enterprise, and no person wants to hamper it in any shape or form. In any remarks I may make I wish it to be understood that I have no hostility whatever to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have always been friendly to the company, and I like to see it prosper as the country prospers, but it seems to me that every member who registers his vote in favour of this proposition is voting against the public interest of this country. We are now in practically what is a war session, and it was understood that no important legislation would be enacted outside of war measures, and the railway company will not be hampered if this legislation rest for a year or so, in order that Parliament may become seized of all its ramifications.

I moved in the Railway Committee that these two clauses should be referred to the Railway Board. We have there an expert body in Mr. Drayton and his associates. Mr. Drayton made a trip to the old country for the purpose of investigating these ocean rates and this very question, and I moved in the Railway Committee that the whole subject be submitted to him, in order that he might if necessary suggest safeguards in connection with this legislation. If it is dangerous legislation we should have expert opinion on it. It was said in the Railway Committee that there was no precedent for any such thing, but I remember two or three years ago in the Private Bills Committee, when a water-power Bill came up for consideration, I moved that it be referred to the Conservation Commission, headed by Sir Clifford Sifton, and that motion was carried. Sir Clifford Sifton and his expert associates went into the merits of the Bill, with the result that they reported against nine of the fifteen clauses. Why should we be paying these expensive commissions, if we cannot use them when we desire to? If these commissions can give us any assistance or any advice to protect the public, why should we not get it from them? Why should we be opposed to submitting this Bill to the Railway Commission to see if they cannot arrange proper safeguards to regulate ocean freight rates? The sense of the committee was against adopting my motion, and it did not pass.

There is no question to my mind but that a most important thing in a young and progressive country like ours, is to have favourable freight rates. That is important, not only to the western farmer but to the Ontario farmers and the Canadian farmer generally. We are shipping cattle and hogs and farm produce in Ontario, and these ocean shipping combines are sucking the life-blood out of the Canadian producer. We must not confess our inability and impotence to provide a remedy. We should grasp the question and devise means whereby we can have control over these ocean rates, and we should not be in too great hurry to pass this legislation. Why not consider it carefully and let the matter come up at a future session of Parliament? The member for South York pointed out that we are allowing the Canadian Pacific Railway to guarantee the bonds of a foreign corporation, and we are facilitating them in getting away from the control of this Parliament and of the Railway Board. An article on the front page of Saturday Night, March 6, 1915, discussed the question of freight rates, and it is startling to hear of the enormous and staggering increases that have taken place in ocean freight rates during the past year. Judge J. W. Alexander, Chairman of the United States Committee on Merchant Mar-

ine and Fisheries, in a recent article in defence of that Government's Ship Purchase Bill, which it may be stated has been practically talked to death, and will probably be heard from no more, gives some astonishing figures in connection with this subject. The article is as follows:

> Since the outbreak of the war, ocean freight rates between New York and Liverpool have increased on grain, cotton and flour from 300 to 500 per cent, and the increases between New York and Rotterdam have been much greater. From Baltimore to European ports (exceptng Germany) rates have been increased on grain 900 per cent; on flour, 364 per cent; on cotton, 614 per cent. From Norfolk to Liverpool rates on grain have been increased from 157 to 200 per cent; on cotton, 186 per cent. From Norfolk to Rotterdam the rates on cottom have been increased 471 per cent; to Bremen the rates have increased 1,100 per cent, namely, from $1.25 per bale to $15 per bale. From Savannah to Liverpool the rates have been increased on cotton 25 per cent; to Bremen the rates have been increased on cotton 900 per cent. From Galveston to Liverpool the rates have been increased on grain 174 per cent; on cotton, 361 per cent; to Bremen the rates have been increased on cotton 1,061 to 1,150 per cent.

People naturally say that war conditions increase the rates, and that seems to be true. The rates, however, are continually being increased, and the western farmers are complaining about the unjustifiable increases. Is this Parliament, then, quietly to permit the Canadian Pacific Railway to transfer its steamship lines to a company with a foreign register in order to escape any restriction that we may impose upon it?

It has been pointed out by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) that Sir Thos. Shaughnessy, president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, has stated that it is the intention to separate the assets into various companies. The capital of the company, however, is to remain the same. Are we to sit by and pass legislation allowing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to transfer part of its assests to another company and to increase the aggregate capital without any increase of assets? That is the effect of this legislation, namely to transfer the ships from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to a subsidiary company, without reducing the capital of the parent company. Therefore, the aggregate capitalization is going to be increased by the capitalization of such subsidiary company. If we are to do our duty to the people of this country, we cannot permit this process to go on any longer. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company should conform to any restrictions that this Parliament may impose upon it; we should not lessen those restrictions; we should not facilitate the separating of those assets, and we should not allow them to be transferred to a company beyond our jurisdiction.

When this matter was before the Railway Committee, I suggested to Mr. Beatty, counsel for the Canadian Pacific Railway, that it would be quite proper and interesting for this House to know the relative earning power of the steamship line as compared with the earning power of the railway. I do not know whether any information was brought down or not; but it is important, as it is at the present time and will be for some time to come an important earning power of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The company is anxious to separate that earning power from the earning power of the railway, so as to conceal its great earning powers. That earning power should go to the benefit of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the parent company; and if the total profits exceed 10 per cent, the company has automatically to reduce its freight rates to the farmers.

Mr. COCHRANE: The company has done that now.

Mr. SHARPE: Has the company submitted itself to the jurisdiction of the Railway Board?

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes.

Mr. LANCASTER: Two years ago.

Mr. SHARPE: That is all the more reason why the proposed amendment should be accepted. We all know that the Railway Board has done excellent work. If we have confidence in the Railway Board, then why refuse the amendment of the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean)? The hon. member does not say: This shall not be done. He simply says: It shall be done by a board in which we have the greatest confidence. We have confidence in the Railway Board, which is not going to impose onerous conditions upon the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. It will deal with that company fairly; it will not impose conditions upon the company that will drive it to American ports. Why should we refuse a reasonable amendment which provides that these transfers shall be made and the proceeds of these sales shall be employed only for such purposes and upon such terms as the Railway Board shall designate? That is a very reasonable proposition.

My hon. friend the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) asked: What disability will the Canadian Pacific Railway be under if it is allowed to remain just as it is to-day? The steamship lines were built up out of the earnings of the company. The people of Canada paid for them. Why do we not compel the company to register its ships under Canadian register? The only excuse offered to the Railway Committee by Mr. Beatty, counsel for the Canadian Pacific Railway, was that it would simplify bookkeeping to transfer the ships. With all respect to that gentleman, I think that is an absurd reason. It is no reason for this Parliament to allow such a radical change to take place as regards the policy of the Canadian Pacific Railway. If it is only to simplify bookkeeping, we should stay our hands, because we know that, with all the ramifications of a company like the Canadian Pacific Railway, it has a proper system of bookkeeping. That is no excuse to offer to reasonable men legislating in the interest of the people of Canada.

This legislation is aiming to do just the opposite of what we were doing before. When we wanted the Canadian Northern Railway securities, we spent days and weeks compelling the Canadian Northern to form one holding company into which to put all its assets. We wanted it to put all its assets into one basket, so that we would know what they were. In this case we are allowing the Canadian Pacific Railway to divide itself up into several companies, and we are weakening the control that we should have over it. I trust that the amendment of the hon. member for South York will receive endorsation at the hands of hon. members.

Mr. CARROLL: I did not hear the hon. member for South York move any amendment to the Bill.

Mr. LANCASTER: We are on section 4.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: My amendment is on the Votes and Proceedings.

Mr. LANCASTER: It has not been moved yet.

Mr. MACLEAN: It will be moved at the proper time.

Mr. CARROLL: The hon. member proposed his amendment before the Railway Committee. If sections 4 and 5 contain all the atrocious things the hon. member says they do contain, I would have no hesitation in voting against the passage of those two sections. I do not see, however, that the hon. member for South York or the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) or the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) have shown us that any of the things will happen which they say are going to happen by the passage of this Bill. When this Bill came before the committee, section 3 read as follows:

> The company may sell, lease or charter any steam or other vessels of the company to the Canadian Pacific Ocean Services, Limited, an incorporated company, or to any other incorporated company.

That gave the Canadian Pacific Railway Company power to sell, lease or charter its boats on the Great Lakes. It was immediately seen that this matter took the boats on the Great Lakes and the inland boats of the railway company away from the jurisdiction of the Railway Board under which they are at present. The proposal was at once made in the committee that an amendment should be put in as follows:

> Excepting the inland river and lake boats of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

The Canadian Pacific Railway Company did not oppose that amendment, and this shows their recognition of the fact that the ocean liners of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are not and never were under the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners. This legislation, therefore, does not attempt to put these services outside the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company may sell, lease or charter their boats, or may dispose of them in any way they may desire, and they ask that in doing so they may guarantee the stock of the Canadian Pacific Ocean Services Company or any other incorporated body which may purchase or acquire those boats. Is that an unheard-of thing? Certainly not; we are doing it every day. We are doing it in connection with all railway companies; why should we not do it in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company? The new company is paying for these boats not by handing gold to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but by means of bonds and securities. It is provided that the company may subscribe for, purchase, take, acquire, hold, guarantee. Is there anything unbusinesslike in that? Is there anything in this legislation which will prevent the Board of Railway Commissioners from exercising any control of ocean rates which they do not exercise at the present time? The hon. member for South York spent two

days in the Railway Committee and an hour in the House to-day arguing this point; he is as clear about it now as he was then, and that is as clear as mud. It is recognized by the best legal talent in Canada that the Board of Railway Commissioners have no jurisdiction over ocean freights at the present time; how in the world can this proposed legislation take away from them that which they have not?

At six o'clock the Committee took recess.

The Committee resumed at 8 o'clock.

Mr. CARROLL: It has been suggested that one way in which this Government could make the Canadian Pacific Railway subject itself in the way of giving the Railway Board jurisdiction over its freight rates would be to compel the Canadian Pacific Railway to have its boats registered in Canada. I believe that if that were done it would result in the ocean liners controlled by the Canadian Pacific Railway and other companies plying to ports in the United States. I do not think that would be to the advantage of the people of Canada, much less to the farmers of the West who have grain to ship across the Atlantic. The member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) said that this legislation would frustrate or defeat the object this Parliament had some years ago in incorporating this company and assisting it financially. I fail to follow him there. He cited a clause of the Act of incorporation which said that the Canadian Pacific railway should continue to be operated as a first-class railway. I fail to see how, if this legislation passed and the Canadian Pacific Railway was allowed to lease or sell or charter their boats to an independent or subsidiary company, that would in any way interfere with the line continuing to be operated as a first-class railway. If there were anything in this Act which would be to the disadvantage of the farmers of the West or to any class or portion of the people of Canada, I do not think this committee would for an instant think of passing the Bill. How is the farmer going to be affected? The farmer in the West at the present time may appeal to the Railway Board, in so far as transcontinental freight rates are concerned. The farmer in the West is not in a position to appeal to the Railway Board in so far as ocean freight rates are concerned because the Railway Board has no jurisdiction and does not pretend to take to itself jurisdiction over ocean freight ratet at the present time. The only trouble and the real difficulty that was in the Bill has been removed by the amendment made in the Railway Committee to clause 4, excluding from the operations of that clause the inland boats of the Canadian Pacific railway, so that it cannot dispose of them to a subsidiary company. The whole thing appears to me to be a business-like transaction. I do not believe that the Canadian Pacific Railway has in view the undoing of the farmers of the West or of any portion of the population of Canada. The Canadian Pacific Railway are running this road as a money maker like others and in running it they must give a fair measure of justice to the people of Canada. If they do not this Parliament is here to make them do so. If they attempt to raise transcontinental rates we will have recourse to the Railway Board; but I do not think there is much danger of such an abuse in view of the fact that they now have two transcontinental lines competing with them. My friend from South York is reading into these clauses things which the clauses do not contain. I am afraid he is gifted, if you can call it a gift, like one or two of the clans of the Highlands, with second sight and can see things nobody else can. There would be a great deal in his contention, everything that he is arguing for, if our Railway Board to-day had jurisdiction over ocean rates. They have not that jurisdiction, and therefore we are not giving to the Canadian Pacific Railway any privilege which they have not now, with the possible exception of guaranteeing the bonds of this subsidiary company.

Section agreed to.

On section 5:

The company may subscribe for, purchase, take, acquire, hold, guarantee, pledge and dispose of shares, bonds and other securities of the Canadian Pacific Ocean Services, Limited, and of any other company to which the steam or other vessels of the company may be sold, leased or chartered.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: This is the clause that authorizes the Canadian Pacific Railway to endorse all this capitalization of the proposed new company. It is said that we have no jurisdiction over ocean rates or over this company. We have jurisdiction, I think, over ocean rates, certainly it has not been proved to me that we have not, but we have jurisdiction over the Canadian Pacific Railway, and they are here to-day as suppliants. The history of progressive legislation in Great Britain, in this country, in every country, is that grievances have been rectified when the persons who have acted unfairly have appeared before the

legislature as suppliants. The Canadian Pacific Railway is here to-day as a suppliant. It has imposed most unfair charges upon the people of the Canadian West for ocean transportation. It has done this because it entered into a combine on the north Atlantic; and it proposes now to make a still greater combine, and we have the company now under our legislative control, and it is proposed by this legislation that we should part with that jurisdiction and permit them to endorse any capitalization in connection with outside companies.

Mr. LANCASTER: What are we letting them out of in this Bill?

Mr. MACLEAN: I am asking that we shall keep them under control, that we shall say they must not endorse the bonds of this company without the consent of Parliament and of the Railway Commission of Canada. That is my proposal, and that is the thing that I wish to see adopted. Why should we say that we have no power, and let the company do what it likes with the credit we gave to it and allowed it to build up to its present position? It should not be permitted to lend this credit to another company. And grant that we gave permission to the Grand Trunk, as has been said, then we did wrong. I was in the committee the other day when that was up.

Mr. LANCASTER: You never said a word.

Mr. MACLEAN: Perhaps not. The hon. gentleman did not.

Mr. LANCASTER: I fixed the Bill up.

Mr. MACLEAN: My great crime is that I do not watch everything; and if I try to watch one thing I am inconsistent. Probably the worst vice one can have is inconsistency. And then they say you are irrelevant, illogical, or the draughtsmanship is bad, as some of the lawyers say when you draw up an amendment. But Parliament never achieved any reforms without taking advantage of what it already possessed. We can secure a great deal in the public interest if we keep the capitalization of this railway under the control of Parliament or of the Railway Board. I have been through all this, and heard these charges of irrelevant and illogical argument, and of your statement being as clear as mud, and all those other polite things. And then the things you meet on the street. I could not go down the street to-night without having somebody say to me: "Oh, did you get that off?"—as if I was loaded with bile and wanted to get it off. I went through all this in connection with the regulation of express charges in this country. The Minister of Justice and the man who aspired to that position told me that I was most illogical, that my draughtsmanship was bad, and that the jurisdiction did not apply. They have tried to keep express companies out of our jurisdiction, but they are now in it. Lawyers in this House would say: Oh, you have no jurisdiction over an express company, because it owns a boat service on the lake, or because some of the goods are carried by stage; and for a while the railways said we had no jurisdiction over the freights on inland waters in this country. But we have the jurisdiction now; we have acquired it in some way, but we should never have acquired it if we had confessed that we had no jurisdiction. We have some jurisdiction over the Canadian Pacific Railway in regard to freight rates. We have sent the Minister of Trade and Commerce on a commission to ascertain just what our jurisdiction is. But it does not do to confess you have no jurisdiction.

The argument of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) was practically: Oh, you are making fish of one and flesh of the other. Now, I may be inconsistent; we all may be; but a progressive measure has never been put on the statute book in order to cure some grievance or to improve a certain condition, which did not do some injustice in some way to somebody. That is how reforms work out. They do not work out by clear-cut logical statements, but by Parliament trying to attain something. Reform is worked out by judges bending the law in the line it is supposed to move, or ought to move. There is always some injustice and some irregularity, but eventually you get progress. From my experience in Parliament I should say that the way to get reform—and it is a way that seems to be more disapproved than any other—is to follow the good old English method. When we have a corporation here as a suppliant for increased powers—and we have them every year—we should say to them: If you want relief we are going to examine your character; if you are asking for relief in regard to ocean steamship rates, why are you in the North Atlantic combine? Why will you not submit your rates to us? If we followed that method we should be constantly progressing, and should get legislation in the public interest. I do not care how irrelevant the argument may be, or what it may lack in clearness, but I say we should not abandon our position and

give this railway unlimited power to use its credit for the benefit of a steamship company outside the jurisdiction of Canada.

Mr. NESBITT: Are the Canadian Pacific Railway now in the North Atlantic combine?

Mr. MACLEAN: I do not know; they were in it as big as could be.

Mr. NESBITT: Was it not proved at the investigation in the United States last summer that the Canadian Pacific Railway were not in the combine?

Mr. MACLEAN: They have been in the combine, and have led the combine; just as they own the Allan line to-day and profess not to own it.

Mr. NESBITT: I understood they were proved not to be in the combine.

Mr. MACLEAN: It has not been proved. They have been in the combine; they are in it now; they are directing the North Atlantic combine, and are going to direct it more when they have this legislation. It is against the public interests that they should be given this power to guarantee the securities of a company outside of our control. They are under our control now and we should say to them: If you are going to use this power, you must use it subject to the approval of the Railway Commission of this country, as laid down in the Government Bill of last session and in the proposed amendment I have on the Order Paper this year.

Mr. NESBITT: The hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has made serious charges against the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Minister of Railways must know something about this, and I should like to hear what he has to say about it. He has been looking over the Bill. He was in the Railway Committee the other day when the Bill was up.

Hon. FRANK COCHRANE (Minister of Railways and Canals): Everything seems to have been discussed but the point of the Bill. I do not think there is any question of our power to pass legislation to control any ships that come within the three-mile limit or into our harbours. Would it do us any good to force this company to submit its rates to the Railway Commission or to the Government or to whomsoever it may be? It would only antagonize them, and drive them to other ports. I think there are three things which will help to get us lower ocean rates. First of all, we might make an international agreement with the United States in reference to a board; so that these ships could not be driven from Canadian ports to Boston, Portland or New York, which have all the time better rates than our own ports. There has been a little effort to bring that about. Another great thing is in regard to insurance. Insurance on vessels using Canadian ports is much higher than on vessels using American ports; that is a very serious thing, not only for ocean liners, but for tramp ships as well. Take Halifax or Quebec in the summer. These ports are then no more dangerous to approach or leave than Boston, for instance. In fact, I think either of the two ports I have mentioned is preferable to Boston. If we follow the advice of the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. F. Maclean) and tell the Canadian Pacific Railway that we will not allow them to guarantee the bonds of the stock of this new company which they propose to create, this new company could get along without this help, but could not sell its stock or bonds in the market of the world as easily as it could if the Canadian Pacific Railway were behind it. The main reason for this legislation, as explained to me by the Canadian Pacific Railway, is because the British Government has commandeered nearly all their ships. That has caused freight rates to go up. They do not know when the boats will be given back to them, nor how many may be sunk before the war ends; so they have incorporated a company in England, and we all know how Lloyd George looks after companies there. They want to get these ships started at once; and the more ships we have on the Atlantic the lower the freights will be. Another great factor is the growth in our shipping, although it has not grown like American shipping. Again, there has not been much inducement to tramp steamers, which in my opinion are a greater leveller of freights than anything else. I do not see any harm in the Bill. The views I have on this question are very much in line with those contained in the speech made by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley.) I think he laid down the case very clearly from all the different points of view. I think we would be only cutting off our noses to spite our faces if we accepted the amendment which has been given notice of. I do not agree that we have any control over ocean freight rates at the present time and I am of the opinion that the

Bill should go through. Some hon. gentlemen have talked all around this question, but they have not touched upon the real point at issue.

Mr. MACDONALD: I think that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) has come closer to the practical question in regard to the control of ocean freight rates than my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) did in considering this question. The problem of lower freight rates is one in which not only the farmer is interested but every man who is connected with the production of raw material or produce of any kind which he desires to send abroad. Every producer in every province of the Dominion who looks for a market in the Motherland, to which country our exports have increased very rapidly within the last ten years, is particularly interested in the problem of how to get these products carried to the old country as cheaply as possible and equally interested in getting what he purchases in Great Britain brought back to this country at the lowest possible figure. The question of what the freight rate upon these articles may be at any particular time does not depend upon any internal condition in this country. The whole thing is a problem of supply and demand and those men who have lived in the maritime provinces where we have had some connection with shipping interests know that within the last five years, indeed, down to a year and a half ago, and even later than that, the freight rates for our vessels that were owned and doing business there were at the very lowest possible ebb. Within the last year the conditions have entirely changed and between 2,000 and 3,000 of the freight-carrying vessels of the world have been withdrawn from that service; the exact tonnage I do not know but I know that this large number of the vessels have been withdrawn in consequence of which a very much less tonnage is offering, or is available, for the purpose of carrying our produce to and fro. The consequence is, just as in any other lines of business in the world, that the cost of transportation has increased because there are fewer people in the business of transportation. There is another thing that hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this question seem to have forgotten and that is that Great Britain controls the carrying trade of the world upon the seas and the people in Great Britain are very much interested in getting all they can out of their ships when the time for their harvest has arrived, so to speak. There is a greater demand for vessels now than at any time in the past, and the ship-owner of England, not being a special philanthropist, has taken advantage of the excessive demand for his tonnage just the same as a man in any other business would. My hon. friend comes in and says that because that is so, in this year of grace 1915, when the Canadian Pacific Railway asks us to pass a measure in the financial character of which there is nothing extraordinary, we should hold them up and not let this measure pass without stipulating that they cannot have anything to do with this new steamship company unless a clause is inserted in the Bill that freight rates shall be under the control of the Railway Commission.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: I did not say that.

Mr. MACDONALD: Is not that the whole purport of the hon. gentleman's argument upon the holding up of the Canadian Pacific Railway the question of the control of ocean freight rates?

Mr. MACLEAN: No, I have never argued that.

Mr. MACDONALD: Then what was my hon. friend talking about?

Mr. MACLEAN: My argument was that the control of the securities of the company should come under the Railway Commission.

Mr. MACDONALD: Who is going to regulate the freight rates?

Mr. MACLEAN: I did not say; we will find a way later on, but in the meantime do not let the control of our securities pass out of our hands.

Mr. MACDONALD: I was listening to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MACLEAN: Listening to some of your friends on the other side of the House.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend is not going to disclaim his association with my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff)?

Mr. MACLEAN: I did not say it.

Mr. MACDONALD: If he did not iterate and reiterate that in the course of his speech I do not know what he was talking about in regard to ocean freight rates.

Mr. MACLEAN: I did not say it.

Mr. MACDONALD: Then, what did my hon. friend mean?

Mr. MACLEAN: I meant what I have just said; I proposed that the Canadian Pacific Railway, should only give its endorsement to the securities of this other company after these securities had been approved by the Railway Commission.

Mr. MACDONALD: What about ocean freight rates?

Mr. MACLEAN: You must ask those who dealt with that question. I said ocean freight rates were a grievance in this country and, in the meantime while they were a grievance, we should not let the control of the securities of the Canadian Pacific railway in connection with shipping pass out of our hands.

Mr. MACDONALD: I think I am accurate in what I say. My hon. friend means that we should not give the Canadian Pacific Railway this legislation unless we do something in regard to ocean freight rates. We have power in this Parliament to pass legislation by which we shall say that the Board of Railway Commissioners, or some other board, should fix the rates to be inserted in all bills of lading or charter parties in connection with the carrying of goods of different classifications, but the Minister of Railways and Canals has pointed out that our jurisdiction in this matter would cease the moment any ship passed the three-mile limit or whenever we attempted to legislate beyond the confines of our country. But in the meantime, after putting that legislation into effect, there is this problem, that we have the United States to the south of us, and an exporter in Canada at any point west of Quebec would divert his export trade to the American ports where there are no such limitations, no railway commissions, and ship his goods in that way. That is the way it would work out. That is the actual business result of it. At the same time we could not by any possibility control by our legislation here the freight rates which the English shipowner might ask the shipper on the other side who wanted to ship his goods to Canada. Our lumbermen and our fishermen in the maritime provinces are quite as much interested in this question of freight rates as are producers of other classes in different parts of Canada. We are in this unfortunate position that, while Canada thirty years ago was at the very top of the list in the shipping world when she built her wooden vessels, she to-day has practically no vessels on the sea at all. Unfortunately our iron and steel industry had not been advanced to that point, when our wooden vessels disappeared from the sea, that we could roll and combine steel plates into ships in the way in which this work was done by the steel men of England who had a long lead on the people of any other country in the steel industry. To-day we have practically no Canadian merchant marine. As a consequence England's shipowners control this business, as to freight, as to transportation and as to all those questions of the sea and until you can make what might be called an international arrangement with England by which the English and Canadian Governments, or some joint commission to be appointed by both, would have supervision over the question so that you could make it work at both ends, any action by us would be entirely inadequate and inoperative. In order to make that provision entirely effectual you would have to have an international arrangement between Great Britain and the United States by which the freight rates would be just the same in both countries. It seems to me that that is a fair statement of the actual business conditions in regard to ocean freight rates. I would have liked to have heard from the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), who has given this question his special attention, a statement of his views upon this question because it is a most important one. The fault I have to find with my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) is that the proposition as it is contained in the Order Paper in regard to this particular legislation in reference to ocean freight rates would be entirely inoperative and inadequate and there would be no sense in putting it on the statute books.

The question of the control of the capitalization of the company may open a very wide door. It is a question whether or not due publicity as to the assets of a company and other information given to the public with regard to any stock issue would not be quite as advantageous as to make it compulsory for any large enterprise to come to any particular board in this country to get a certificate of character. Suppose one of our large railway companies contemplating a bond or stock issue came to the Board of Railway Commissioners and succeeded in getting its approval of the right to issue the stock or bonds, it would be at once urged by investors abroad, in the event of any

failure on the part of the enterprise, that Canada through her properly constituted authorities had given a certificate of character to that enterprise and to the right to make that stock or bond issue, which misled the investor, and that might result in very great injury to the credit of the whole country in the future. On the other hand, if you have proper publicity in regard to the status of a company arranged for, then the investors would have to make their own investigations and take their own risk. It does seem to me that my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has not made any case which would entitle the House to say to a company that comes here with an ordinary business proposition, that it should be held up by the imposition of conditions which are entirely unnecessary and which would be inoperative and inadequate.

Mr. TURRIFF: I wish to ask the Minister of Railways why the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should go to Great Britain for incorporation of the Canadian Ocean Services, Limited, instead of getting incorporation in Canada?

Mr. COCHRANE: The ships owned by them at present are registered in Great Britain, and I suppose whatever new ships they get will be acquired out of the funds guaranteed by the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not know of any other reason.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The English Joint Stock Companies Act is stricter even than Canadian legislation of a similar character, if my memory serves me correctly. The English law is very strict with regard to safeguards against undue capitalization, and it is also very strict as to the returns that are required to be made public by any company incorporated under it. The English law is so much stricter than ours, and some of its provisions seem so desirable, that not long ago I directed the attention of the Minister of Justice to it, with a view to having some of the safeguards in the English Joint Stock Companies Act adopted in this country, and I am inclined to think that that could be done with very great advantage. I venture to think that no company, whether the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other, would seek to incorporate a subsidiary company under the English Joint Stock Companies Act, with a view of getting any undue advantage in the way of capitalization.

I am sure that every hon. gentleman in this House realizes that the control of freight rates upon the Atlantic is a very different thing from the control of railway freight rates in Canada. A railway in this country is absolutely subject to our own jurisdiction, it is incorporated under a statute of this Parliament, and it can be held to very strict account under the provisions of the Railway Act. The road can only be operated in this country where it is built, and it is subject to the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada. But when you undertake to regulate freight rates upon the Atlantic, you are face to face with a very different proposition, and legislation for the purpose of regulating ocean rates, if it were not framed with the most careful consideration for conditions which vary much more with respect to ocean carriage than with respect to land carriage, instead of benefiting the producers of this country desiring the advantage of cheap transportation, might put them in a very much worse position than they were in before, for the simple reason that ocean tonnage urgently required in Canada might be driven elsewhere. We have had the matter under consideration more or less for the past two years, and we have made investigation, not only on the other side of the Atlantic but in the United States. We have even had under consideration the possibility of obtaining joint action by Canada and other countries, for the purpose of exercising control. I am not very familiar with the subject of ocean rates except in a general way; but it must be borne in mind that even before the shortage of tonnage which was created by the outbreak of war, there had been—as has been represented to me and as I have reason to believe—considerable advance in the cost of ocean transportation for the reason that the cost of labour and materials and of supplies had advanced. I think it has been demonstrated in this discussion that as to any control which we might desire to exercise or which we can reasonably and adequately exercise over ocean freight rates, this Bill does not prevent us from exercising it in the future. We shall have just as good right to exercise that control if this Bill is passed, as we would to exercise it now.

I listened very attentively to the argument on the point that this Bill tends to create a monopoly and affords greater facilities for entering into a combine, and I am bound to say that I have been unable to appreciate the force of such argument, although I realize the desirability of our preventing combines in respect to

rates upon the ocean, or rates upon the land either. I cannot see that the formation of this new company would tend to facilitate a combine. The allegation has frequently been made here that the so-called Atlantic conference has tended towards the increase of rates; but so far as I can see, the establishment of any such conference in the future would not be in any way facilitated by the organization of a separate company in this case. As a matter of fact, in the United States they are forcing companies to do that which the Canadian Pacific railway desires to do now of its own accord. Legislation in the United States, and the decrees of the various commissions which have been established in that country, have prevented one corporation from carrying on the business of a railway and the business of a steamship company at the same time. They have also prohibited railway companies in the United States from being interested in coal areas and carrying on the business of coal companies.

It would seem to me that if the steamship company proposed in this Bill had been organized years ago by capital provided by the Canadian Pacific railway or by those who were interested in that company, and if the proposal were made here to-day that it should be merged in the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, there would be even a louder cry than that which is put forward in opposition to this Bill now.

As to weakening the Canadian Pacific Railway company, I cannot see that this Bill weakens it, and I think the company is pretty thoroughly able to safeguard its interests. As a matter of fact, there is not a great deal of change in the situation, as far as I understand it. The company up to the present time has invested a certain amount of its capital in the acquisition of steamship lines on the Atlantic and on the Pacific. Its ownership in those steamship lines would enable it to sell or dispose of them, so far as I understand the legal effect of the various Acts under which the Canadian Pacific Railway has acquired that ownership. What the Canadian Pacific Railway proposes to do is to organize a separate company, incorporated under the English Joint Stock Companies Act, with all the safeguards to which I have alluded, and it proposes that the ocean-carrying business of the Canadian Pacific Railway shall be transacted by this company and not by the parent company.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

As far as control of rates is concerned, if the allegation be true that the profits from the ocean carrying business of the Canadian Pacific Railway are very large, the separation of that business in this distinct way is an advantage to the public rather than a disadvantage, because it will prevent any juggling with the receipts from the railway carriage and those from the ocean carriage, which might otherwise be possible. At all events, if it does not absolutely prevent that, it will make it more difficult. The Railway Commission would be able more distinctly to know that the profits of the ocean business were, as distinct from the profits of the railway company considered purely as a railway company.

The purpose of the Bill is almost altogether administrative, endeavouring to put the business of the Canadian Pacific Railway into a position in which it will be easier to carry on the ocean-carrying business as distinct from the land-carriage business.

The only difference in the situation created by this Bill is this, namely that the Canadian Pacific Railway owns the steamships directly to-day, and that after this Bill has passed and after the steamships have been transferred to the new company which is to be organized, the Canadian Pacific Railway will own the steamships in effect although not directly, because it will hold the stock which represents those steamships. There will be no difference in substance although there will be a difference in administration.

It has been argued very strenuously that the stock may be distributed and divided amongst the shareholders of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The Company cannot distribute its stock amongst the shareholders if it proposes, as I should imagine it would propose, to retain control of the ocean-carriage system, because if it distributes its stock amongst its shareholders, it will at once lose control, and the purpose which the company had when it embarked upon the business of transportation across the Atlantic and across the Pacific would cease to be effective. I would not therefore be inclined to attach importance to the idea that there would be any distribution of this stock, because the stock held by the Canadian Pacific Railway will represent the control which it must exercise, unless it proposes to go out of the ocean-carrying business.

So far as the guarantee of bonds is concerned, it is a very common thing amongst

railways—and I think it is a very common thing in the legislation which has been authorized by this Parliament for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—to give to a major railway company—if I may use that expression—the power to guarantee the bonds of another company which it purchases or leases. It is precisely that principle which has been brought into this Bill, namely, the purpose of enabling the Canadian Pacific Railway a very great corporation with very great assets, to guarantee the bonds in order that the money which is to be raised for the purpose of adding to the steamship lines of the Canadian Pacific Railway may be raised at the lowest possible rates of interest. So far as that goes, it is manifestly a proposal in the interest not only of the whole enterprise but of the people of this country at large.

Mr. CARROLL: Would the value of the stock of the present shareholders of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company be decreased in any way by the transfer of the assets in the shape of ships, supposing the stock were given to persons who did not hold stock in the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I suppose the assets represented either by money or by stock would be in the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I do not see that it would affect the situation assuming that they were sold at their actual value. What impressed me was this, that it merely amounts to a change in the form of ownership. The Canadian Pacific Railway has direct ownership in those steamships under conditions as they are at present. After this proposal is carried out, that interest which it now possesses will be represented by stock held by the Canadian Pacific Railway in the new ocean steamship company. Do I make myself clear to my hon. friend?

Mr. CARROLL: Yes.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It does not affect the capitalization of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which remains the same; but that which was represented by the ownership of those vessels will, after this proposal is carried out, be represented by the stock held by the Canadian Pacific Railway in the company which owns the vessels. Therefore, I cannot see that there will be any actual or substantial change in the assets of the Canadian Pacific Railway which will be affected by this Bill.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I thought the question asked was: Are the rights of shareholders of Canadian Pacific Railway stock safeguarded under this legislation? Take, for example a man who owns 1,000 shares of Canadian Pacific Railway stock. After the ships are removed from the company, what does he get in lieu of that security; or is it in the power of the company to say: We will take the ships away from the assets, and we will leave you what you have? Will the new company give the Canadian Pacific Railway Company something in lieu of the consequent depreciation in the value of the stock?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Matters affecting the disposal or utilization of the assets of the company are left by the shareholders and directors. We are entitled to assume that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, when they sell these steamships, will get a reasonable price for them, and that that price will be represented either in money or in stock. I understand the proposal is that the price shall be realized in stock. The stock which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will receive will represent the value of the vessels. Instead of a direct ownership, there will be an indirect ownership through the stock, but the value will be there just the same as it was before.

Mr. NESBITT: I think we all wish to be absolutely fair in matters of this kind, even in respect of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I asked the hon. member for South York if the Canadian Pacific steamship services, as at present incorporated, are a part of the North Atlantic combine. He said that they are. My memory is most distinctly the opposite. Last year when the United States appointed a commission to investigate the North Atlantic combine, it was found, not only that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had absolutely no connection with that combine, but that they were its chief competitor.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM: I am not inclined, like some hon. gentlemen, to chide the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean). I believe, with him, that we get no reforms of any consequence unless some one begins to agitate. Sometimes agitations are made too soon; sometimes too strong; but no harm can result from genuine agitation which in the opinion of the agitator is necessary to effect some reform. I admit that some beneficial results have been accomplished in respect

to certain matters which the hon. member for South York first brought to the attention of the House, and I think that credit is due him for these results.

The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) did the natural thing when he requested the Government to insert in this Bill a clause providing for control of ocean freight rates, because the company, in a general way, promised to do something along that line. When I had the honour of being Minister of Railways and Canals and the late Justice Mabee was Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners, we conducted negotiations with the authorities in Great Britain looking to the inauguration of a scheme for the control of ocean freight rates. Justice Mabee expressed the view that we could control ocean freight rates, but, as has been pointed out by the Minister of Railways to-night, the control which we would exercise would be, in a large measure, unimportant; if Canada acted alone, the control exercised would not be sufficiently far-reaching. The present Solicitor General on one occasion took me to task for not getting the ocean freight rates under control, and he himself proposed to do it. The hon. member for Assiniboia was merely calling upon the Solicitor General to make good his promise, but it has not been a very easy task. I think the Government did send the present Chairman of the Board of Railway Commisioners to Great Britain to inquire into this matter. I do not know what information he gained, but I venture the assertion that he did not get much farther than I did. The reasons are quite apparent. This is a problem that cannot be solved by one country or by two countries; I am inclined to think that it could not be solved even if Great Britain, the United States and Canada were to unite in their efforts to solve it. Great Britain owns a large proportion of the world's shipping, but many other countries as well are concerned. The negotiations which the late Government were conducting in this matter came to an abrupt termination. After it had been determined that it would be unnecessary and unprofitable to conduct any further correspondence, I discussed fairly and frankly with some of the authorities the prospects of carrying out such an arrangement. Some of the difficulties were made manifest, and are manifest now to those who understand the subject. Great Britain owns perhaps 90 per cent of the shipping of the world, and anything that we should do would be ineffective unless Great Britain co-operated with us. We could impose a license fee upon vessels landing goods at Canadian ports, but if we did that and some other country did not do so in respect of its own shipping, Canadian ports would be avoided. I discussed with men in authority the advisability of our co-operating with the United States in the matter, and it was agreed that our co-operation would solve the difficulty to a certain extent. But the chief difficulty which exists in connection with ocean or lake freights is not found in the control or management of railways. The Prime Minister made that quite clear. Any one who buys a ship can run it, but only the proprietors of a railway can manage a railway. Hon. gentlemen sometimes forget that if the Board of Railway Commissioners undertook to control freight rates on the ocean, they might be obliged, owing to changed conditions, to change rates as often as they had a sitting. Under regulations of the Board of Railway Commissioners, transportation companies are not allowed to carry freights at less than the rates agreed upon. To do so would be discrimination, for which a fine is imposed. Supposing a man wants to send a cargo to Canada from a point on the other side of the Atlantic or Pacific. In order to get a proper freight rate on that cargo, he wires to his agent on this side to see if he can get a return cargo, because ships, like railway trains, cannot give fair rates unless they get a cargo both ways. It quite frequently happens that the agent on this side can arrange for a return cargo at a very much lower rate than that which is usually charged, but, if the Railway Commission had previously fixed a certain freight rate, the steamship would be liable to a fine if the return cargo were carried at a lower rate. It is much more difficult to regulate ocean freight rates than it is to regulate railway freight rates. There are several difficulties in the way; I sympathize with the Government in that they are finding it not easy to do something in the accomplishment of which their predecessors did not exactly succeed.

9 p.m.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Public ownership of steamships would solve the difficulty.

Mr. GRAHAM: Perhaps public ownership of steamships would do it, but that is not applicable to the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners. That would not apply to that jurisdiction. I was referring to the remarks of the hon. member for

Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), for which he had good reason. But unless we are prepared to go the length of purchasing a line of steamships, then I say the difficulties are almost insurmountable unless all the other countries will come in. Even if they did come in, I see the other difficulty, it would suppress the tramp steamer. My hon. friend says they are doing business, and after all the tramp steamers enable us to get very cheap rates at times on special cargoes, and are often regulators of freight rates.

As to the guaranteeing, I am a firm believer in the opinion that we will soon have to do something in Canada to regulate our large mergers; but in this respect I shall make a confession. Owing to a difficulty that I seemed to have when I was a member of the Government in finding just what the Canadian Pacific Railway was earning on its railway and what the operation of the road was costing, I was trying to study out some means by which I could have this company separated into two parts so that we could, in a clearer way, get at the real cost of the construction and operation of the railway. I had that in my mind, and I was wondering about it and had consulted one or two of my best advisers on railway matters as to how that could be brought about so that, once and for all, we could find out what would be a fair rate to impose on the Canadian Pacific Railway in respect of rail freights. Now I find they are making this very separation, and I really think it is a good thing for the Dominion of Canada that we are getting the railway away from the steamship line. With the steamship separated from the railway I think we will be in a far better position to control rail rates.

Mr. JAMESON: Will the hon. gentleman explain to the committee how we will have better control of the railway when the steamship lines are separated?

Mr. GRAHAM: It is hard to explain; but if my hon. friend had endeavoured to go into the earnings of the Canadian Pacific Railway when the steamships were so interminably mixed up with the railways that it was difficult to say just what part of the profits belonged to the railway and what part belonged to the steamships, he would realize the difficulty of arriving at a just conclusion as to the profits of the railway company.

Mr. JAMESON: That does not affect our control.

Mr. GRAHAM: The control of the Board of Railway Commissioners or the extent to which they exercise it depends on what is a fair return to the railway company for its investment and operation; and if you cannot tell what the investment is or what the cost of operation is exactly, you cannot tell what is a proper rate to impose on the railway.

There is yet a question between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Government as to whether the Government controls the Canadian Pacific rates by land at present. The Canadian Pacific Railway have never relinquished the right which they say exists under their original charter concerning rates.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Has my hon. friend seen the Order in Council passed on that subject?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have not seen it, I was told such an order exists. My own opinion was that the Railway Board should control the rates.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What has happened is this. The litigation between the Government and the company, initiated just before my hon. friend became Minister of Railways, was brought to a conclusion by an arrangement under which the Canadian Pacific Railway admitted that its rates were subject to the control of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada. We withdrew the litigation on their express and explicit agreement, which is attached to the Order in Council, that henceforth the rates should be subject to the control of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada. This agreement was made a year ago last November and there cannot be the slightest doubt that the Canadian Pacific Railway, in respect of its rates, is absolutely subject to the control of the Board of Railway Commissioners and has been ever since the 7th day of November, 1913. As a matter of fact, before that, by an informal agreement, the company had been assenting to the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, as I am informed, but reserving, nevertheless, their right to raise the question if they saw fit to do so at any time.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Order in Council had slipped my mind. I remember now that it was handed over to me on one occasion. The situation before the Order in Council was passed was that the Canadian Pacific Railway agreed tacitly to the control of the

rates, but reserved the right to raise the question under the old statute.

As to the guaranteeing of the bonds, the present is a very peculiar and exceptional time. Our securities, in common with all others, do not find such a ready sale at the present moment as we would wish. We are interested at the present moment very deeply in seeing that any securities that Canada has to offer through any of her great undertakings ought to be of the highest character and bring the highest price. This is not essentially a new organization at all, it is the separation of an old organization, which has a very high position, and rightly so, in this country into two integral parts, distinct and separate one from the other. The Canadian Pacific Railway, as I understand, are not asking permission to guarantee the bonds of some new organization in which to speculate in securities or of which the business will be speculative; they are simply asking that when they detach from the parent company the steamship line the parent company, which will still, in another way, own the child, may see it through by guaranteeing its securities. I think the situation is altogether different from what it would be if a new company were being organized and, at the present moment, when it is essential not only to the company but to the credit of Canada that the securities should be gilt-edged, I think no harm can be done by allowing the parent Canadian Pacific Railway Company to guarantee the bonds of its offspring, this new company, which really is part of itself. It is not an outside organization, it is not a new organization or company, but simply the old company dividing itself into two parts and asking that what is called the parent company may be allowed to look after the other company in the way of guaranteeing its bonds.

As to the position of the shareholders, I think the Prime Minister has stated that clearly. I might say in passing that the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) will agree with me that the Canadian Pacific Railway never neglects its shareholders. The shareholders in the Canadian Pacific Railway Company proper will be part proprietors of every asset the Canadian Pacific Railway gets from the steamship company; and while the Canadian Pacific Railway will hand over to the other company the steamships, the steamship company will give them something in lieu of the steamships in which every shareholder will have a proprietary right as a stockholder in the original company. I am as anxious as any person can be for the control of freight rates, and will support any measure for that purpose that can be properly worked out. But this is something that will require international action, and cannot be successfully done otherwise.

As regards the guaranteeing I see no reason why, under these peculiar conditions, I should not support the action of the committee in allowing the parent company to guarantee the assets of the company which is simply being detached.

Mr. TURRIFF: My right hon. friend has made one thing clear at all events, and that is that the Canadian Pacific Railway, in going to Great Britain for incorporation, are not going where the regulations will be less strict. My right hon. friend has explained that the conditions are even more strict in many respects. We all know that no company likes to be under strict regulations; they much prefer lax regulations, and latitude to do what they want. Therefore this company has not been incorporated in Great Britain in order to be under less strict regulations. There must be some other reason, and I think that reason has been made very clear. They are anxious to escape from the control of this Parliament. They do not wish this Parliament or the Board of Railway Commissioners to control their freight rates. If that is not the case, they would never have incorporated the company in Great Britain, where the regulations are much stricter than here. I want to put a further point up to my right hon. friend. Suppose that the railway legislation introduced last year had become law.

Mr. COCHRANE: If it was the law, it would not touch this.

Mr. TURRIFF: We shall see whether it would or not. Suppose it had become law last year. Under that legislation the Board of Railway Commissioners would have had the right to regulate the issues of securities by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. That is what the legislation is for. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways may shake his head, but if the legislation was not for that purpose why was it brought down?

Mr. COCHRANE: It was for railroads, not steamships.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend seems to forget that at that time as at present,

the steamboats were a part of the Railway Company.

Mr. LANCASTER: No, they are not.

Mr. TURRIFF: They are a part of the assets of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The steamships are bought with the proceeds from stock authorized by this Government—if you do not choose to go further and say that they were partly bought with the cash, land and bonuses given to the Canadian Pacific railway. If that legislation had passed and become the law of the land, I am satisfied that, before issuing securities to raise money to buy further steamships for enlarging their fleet either on the Atlantic or on the Pacific, the Canadian Pacific Railway would have had to secure the approval of the Board of Railway Commissioners. Apparently the Canadian Pacific Railway see that very well. I have no doubt that, when the Prime Minister brought down the Railway Bill last year, they imagined he was anxious to have it passed; and although they believe that it will not be introduced this session, as my right hon. friend has stated that he did not intend to bring in any legislation this session except what was necessary in connection with the war, the Canadian Pacific evidently expect that at the next session of Parliament this legislation will be put on the statute books, and that by that legislation they would be prevented from doing what they proposed to do by this Bill. They believe that they would have to secure the approval of the Board of Railway Commissioners.

If the Government put this Bill through they must assume the responsibility. My right hon. friend further states that there is no likelihood of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company giving any part of the stock of the Canadian Pacific Ocean Services, Limited, as a bonus to the shareholders of Canadian Pacific stock, because in that case they might lose control of the steamship stock. But I would like to point out to my right hon. friend that they could give 49 per cent of that stock as a bonus, and still retain control of the company. They could even give 75 per cent of it to the shareholders of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and still retain control for all practical purposes.

Another point was mentioned by the Minister of Railways, by the hon. member for Pictou, and by the Prime Minister. They all presupposed that if the railway or steamship company had to get the approval of the Board of Railway Commissioners for an issue of stock or securities, or for their freight rates, the Commissioners would be unfair to them. I do not believe any hon. member of this House thinks anything of the kind. I think every member of this House believes, and has a right to believe, that the Board of Railway Commissioners would be perfectly fair both to the railway and steamship company, and to the public of Canada. I think there is no force at all in that argument.

My hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) brought up another point in connection with earning the 10 per cent. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister states that that is now entirely eliminated, that the Canadian Pacific Railway by Order in Council are absolutely under the control of the Railway Commission so far as railway rates are concerned. But to my mind that is the very strongest argument why this Bill should not be passed. Because if, as was pointed out here to-day, the ocean carrying end is going to be the big profitable end, it would be quite possible for the Canadian Pacific Railway to give certain through freights, credit the small end to the railway company and the big end to the steamship company, and in that way avoid earning over 10 per cent on the railway line, which is under the control of the Railway Commissioners. They could make what profits they liked on the steamship end and we could say nothing about the matter.

Mr. LANCASTER: Does the hon. gentleman not realize that the Board of Railway Commissioners would have control over the railway just as they have over the rates of any other railways, no matter whether a steamship service is at the end of the line or not. The Board of Railway Commissioners cannot allow the Canadian Pacific Railway to charge lower or higher freight rates than any other railway under the same conditions, whether there be a steamboat service at the end or not.

Mr. TURRIFF: I realize that perfectly. My hon. friend knows I am perfectly right. A railway and steamship company could keep their books to show as much profit as they liked on the steamship end, and as little as they liked on the railway end.

Mr. LANCASTER: If the books were kept separate, would not the Railway Commission be able to ascertain much more easily whether there was any wrongdoing in connection with the bookkeeping, than if there

was one set of books for, say from Liverpool to Winnipeg or from Liverpool to Calgary? Would it not be easier for the commission if the books were kept separate? Would it not be an assistance to the Railway Commission if a Bill of this sort should pass? It struck me directly I saw the Bill that it would.

Mr. TURRIFF: It would be if we had control at both ends, but this whole legislation is for the purpose of evading any possible future control. I imagine that that is the object that the Canadian Pacific Railway have in view. I cannot see any other object. A railway company of the magnitude of the Canadian Pacific Railway comes here and gives us as an excuse for this legislation that they are taking incorporation for the steamship end of their company in Great Britain where the conditions are much more onerous than they are here, as was pointed out by the Prime Minister, and they tell us that they are doing this to simplify book-keeping. Nobody takes that seriously. Nobody would imagine that the Canadian Pacific Railway would do that for the purpose of simplifying their book-keeping. It is too absurd to be credited for one moment. There is something else behind it and as far as I have been able to judge by the debate, and by the character of the legislation before us, the only conceivable object is to have that end of their business withdrawn from any control by this Parliament through the board of Railway Commissioners in the future.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In what way does this withdraw it?

Mr. TURRIFF: Because there is a question that we have not that power now. Under the legislation they have to come to this Parliament for power to guarantee the bonds of this company and if we have not got the power then it is quite possible we might get it. The legislation goes a long way to convince me that the Government thought we had the power. If we have not we could get it. But if this legislation is passed it is out of our hands forever and we will not be able to get it. If this legislation goes into force well and good, the Government, of course, will take the responsibility for it, but if my hon. friend was in earnest last year in his proposed legislation I think in all fairness to the country and to the different railway and steamship companies this legislation ought to be held over until the legislation brought down last session is dealt with by the House.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: It has been said by the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) how well the company look after the interests of the shareholders. Certainly they do. Do they look after the interests of the public? What is happening to the public in this case? I want to call the right hon. the Prime Minister's attention to his argument that we are following the procedure of the United States in compelling the companies here to dismember as they compel them to dismember in the United States.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I did not say that we were compelling them to dismember.

Mr. MACLEAN: No, but the point I am making is that in the United States, when they were compelled to dissolve, they were compelled to cancel the capitalization. There is no reduction taking place in the capitalization of the Canadian Pacific Railway and no claim that there is. The same old capitalization continues and the same old argument will be made that we have taken the assets out and left the capitalization. They will come to the railway committee and say: We have to pay a ten per cent dividend on $225,000,000 or whatever their stock is. When the ex-minister says that his object was to keep them in order, did he try to have the capitalization that would be represented by the separation cancelled? No, the capitalization keeps to the same amount and if you wish to protect the public interest you ought to compel the company to cancel the capitalization. The hon. member for Renfrew is willing to allow the Canadian Pacific Railway to continue to do what it likes with its capitalization. Does he know that it made another recent issue of stock and sold that stock for less than it was worth to its own shareholders? Does he justify that? There has been so much of that in the past that the public demand the control and regulation of capitalization. They demanded it so strongly that the Government conceded it and put it in a Bill introduced last session. It ought to be made law this session when this Bill is going through. Certainly we should take that up next session, or we should take it up now so that these two matters might be dealt with concurrently.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE: It looks as if the Canadian Pacific Railway, by this legisla-

tion, is anticipating the railway Bill that it is proposed to bring down next session regulating the issue of securities by new companies, and the placing of these issues under the control of the Railway Board. The hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane), the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham), and all the hon. members of this House who have supported this Bill, and who are against the amendment moved by my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean), place their opposition to that amendment on something that does not exist in fact; my hon. friend does not pretend that the amendment will accomplish the control of ocean freight rates. He does not pretend that his amendment will have any control over ocean freight rates, but he says it will control the issue of securities by railway companies, the very object that the railway Bill will accomplish when it goes into force. Hon. members who have opposed the amendment of my hon. friend have not dealt with the question of capitalization and the effect of increasing the capitalization of the Canadian Pacific Railway and its subsidiary companies. Assuming that the capitalization of the Canadian Pacific Railway at the present time is $300,000,000, including the railway, the railway tracks, lands, hotels and steamship companies, if this Parliament allows them to separate their assets into several companies, leaving the railway with the parent company, the capitalization will still remain at $300,000,000, a subsidiary land company might be formed with a capitalization of $150,000,000, a steamship company with a capitalization of $40,000,000 and a hotel company with a capitalization of $10,000,000, which will increase the capitalization by $200,000,000; so that instead of a total capitalization of $300,000,000, the Canadian Pacific Railway will have a capitalization of $500,000,000, without any increase in the value of the assets. That is what is going to happen under this legislation, and what my hon. friend from South York wants to do is exactly what is proposed to be done and there is the Bill which is promised next session. My hon. friend says: Do not press this Bill now before the House until next session, but if you do, put in this amendment so as to control the capitalization of the Canadian Pacific Railway. When this Bill was before the Railway Committee, the counsel of the Canadian Pacific Railway said that it was the intention that the stock in the subsidiary company was to be handed over to the Canadian Pacific Railway in return for the steamship. I asked him if they intended to divide that among the shareholders or to retain it in bulk in the treasury of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He said that it would remain in bulk in the treasury of the Canadian Pacific Railway. When it was proposed that it should be kept in the treasury of the company instead of being divided among the shareholders in the form of a melon-cutting, they would not accept an amendment to that effect. It looks as if they were evading and anticipating the principle of the amendment which the Minister of Railways and Canals desires to apply to all the railway companies in the country, viz., that the securities issued by railway companies shall be under the control of the Railway Commissioners. We would all have confidence in the ability, fairness and integrity of the Railway Board in dealing with applications for the issue of securities. They are not going to impose any unfair conditions upon the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other company, but they will take into consideration the circumstances in connection with each issue. The effect of this legislation will be to increase the capitalization of the Canadian Pacific Railway by $40,000,000 without increasing their assets one cent. It is not fair to the public who will have to pay rates, in addition to those now paid, sufficiently high to provide dividends for this increased capitalization.

On the preamble:

Mr. TURRIFF: I wish to move this amendment, of which I have given notice:

That the following clause be added to the Bill as clause 6:

That the freight rates charged by the company shall be subject to the approval of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada.

Amendment negatived.

Bill reported.

On the motion for the third reading of the Bill:

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN moved in amendment:

That the said Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be recommitted to the Committee of the Whole for the purposes of amending the same by inserting the following:

5a. The said transfer or sale of the company's said steam or other vessels above authorized shall be subject to such terms and conditions as may be imposed by the Board of Railway Commissioners and the company shall not invest in or guarantee the securities of the said Canadian Pacific Ocean Services, Limited, or any other corporation to which it may sell or transfer its said vessels without the leave of said Board of Railway Commissioners first

had and obtained. And the Board may specify the purposes for which the proceeds arising from the sale or transfer of said boats by the Company may be used.

He said: I move this amendment for the reasons which I gave this afternoon in the committee.

Amendment negatived on division.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

Bill No. 20, respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company—Mr. Bradbury—in committee.

Mr. LANCASTER: The only amendment made to this Bill is that we have stricken out the words "or near" where they occur, so as to make it sure as to the places where the railway shall go. We have inserted after the word "company" in the second line of section 2, "subject to the restriction in the routes herein contained"—the restriction simply being that we struck out the words "or near" wherever they appear.

Mr. GRAHAM: You are not making the road run like a rail fence?

Mr. LANCASTER: The intention is to make it run to places and not only near to places.

Mr. DOUGLAS: I suppose the chairman of the Railway Committee will have no objection to inserting a provision that this road shall be started within six months, the same as in the former Bill.

Mr. LANCASTER: I do not know that the conditions are the same. I said it a dozen times last session, and I said it two or three times this session, that where the change is made from two years to six months or any other period to commence the road, it is only done where a case has been made out for it. There was a good case made out to-day for limitation in a certain Bill. I want to say finally, and I hope people will understand me, that, so far as I am concerned, my understanding is that if the policy of the Railway Committee was changed last year it was not changed to any hard and fast rule as to time, but on the understanding that each Bill should be dealt with on its merits, and there is nothing inconsistent in making the period six months in one Bill and two years in another, if the facts justify it.

Mr. DOUGLAS: The railway from Strathcona to Calgary is included in the Bill and there are ten miles of that line built and graded and a bridge erected, but not an inch of steel has been laid. There has been no work done on it for four years, and the company is asking for an extension of time to five years in which to complete and two years in which to start work.

Mr. LANCASTER: They have commenced part of it.

Mr. DOUGLAS: Yes, they have graded ten miles and they have left it lying there for four years. There is more need for the six months' clause in this particular Bill than in any Bill I have known to come before this House.

Mr. LANCASTER: Why?

Mr. DOUGLAS: The Canadian Northern is a live corporation. This proposed line will be in competition with the Calgary and Edmonton Railway, and it has been promised to the people for a long time. The company actually started operations and then suddenly stopped, and now they are asking for two years in which to recommence.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Government are partners in the Canadian Northern, they own 49 per cent of the stock, and I think they should set a good example and begin work within six months.

Mr. BUCHANAN: I went on record this afternoon about these extensions of time to railways, and I would point out that this company is asking power to complete a line and put it in operation within five years, but there is nothing in this Bill as to when they shall commence. The Bill says:

Unless the Canadian Northern Railway Company, hereinafter called the "company", completes and puts in operation within five years after the passing of this Act, the following lines of railway, all of which have been partly constructed, the powers of construction conferred upon the company by Parliament shall cease and be null and void, as respects so much of the said lines as then remains uncompleted.

There is included in this Bill a line from Calgary to Lethbridge. There has been some work done on that line, but I do not think anything was done during the past year. I would like to have some guarantee that this company shall recommence construction at once. Five years is altogether too long a period to give them to complete the road. When the end of the five years approaches, the company will probably start to do some work and then they will come back to Parliament and ask for a further extension of time, and put up the argument that they have done something. There ought to be some guarantee given to the House and to

the country as to when this company intends to start work on this line. The bonds on this particular line have been guaranteed by the province of Alberta. The province is anxious that construction should be commenced, and while I do not know the purport of the message the Premier of Alberta sent to the Minister of Railways about it, I think he made the statement that the money had been raised and is in the bank, ready for the Canadian Northern the moment they undertake construction of this particular line.

Mr. COCHRANE: You refer to that one piece of line?

Mr. BUCHANAN: Yes, I am speaking of the particular branch which affects my section of the country. I do not believe an extension of time over too long a period should be given to any company. I think there should be some guarantee given to Parliament that the construction of these lines should commence within at least a year, and especially the lines which have been guaranteed by provincial governments. This particular line, to which I am referring, was incorporated and the bonds guaranteed in 1909, and, although they have done some grading, I do not believe that any steel has yet been placed on any part of that road which has been under construction. While the financial conditions are bad this year, still there is money in the bank which the Canadian Northern can use in the construction of this particular line. I would like to have a statement from the Minister of Railways as to whether the Canadian Northern will be compelled to commence the construction of the lines, the bonds of which have been guaranteed by provincial governments.

Mr. COCHRANE: If with respect to any line or branch line included in this Bill, the bonds of which have been guaranteed by the Provincial Government and sold and the money in the bank, the hon. gentleman moves an amendment to cut the time for commencement down to a year, I would be inclined to support him.

Mr. TURRIFF: What proportion of the common stock of the Canadian Northern Railway Company does the Government now own?

Mr. W. T. WHITE: 40 per cent.

Mr. TURRIFF: We have in this Bill a proposition from the Canadian Northern Railway Company to grant extension for five years to complete those branches that were commenced over five years ago and that had a certain amount of work done on them. The settlers along those lines are patiently waiting every year for the work to be completed and nothing is being done. As the Government is now owner to the extent of 40 per cent in the Canadian Northern Railway Company, if it does not see that the company goes on and completes those branches, it will certainly have to assume 40 per cent of the condemnation of the settlers of those particular parts of the country. With the Government owning such a large proportion of that stock, it is its bounden duty to see that something is done. There is absolutely no excuse for any railway company grading two or three miles of road, as was done in my part of the country a few years ago, in order to prevent another road from coming in, and then as soon as the other road is shut off, stopping work for five or six years. As the Government is the junior member of the Canadian Northern to the extent of 40 per cent, it should see that that kind of work is discontinued in the future, or it will have to assume the responsibility for it.

Mr. BUCHANAN: In connection with the line to which I was referring, I am prepared to move an amendment that construction be commenced within a period of one year and that the line be completed and placed in operation within three years.

Mr. COCHRANE: Is that part of the line guaranteed?

Mr. DOUGLAS: This line is guaranteed by the Alberta Government, and the Canadian Northern solicitor gave the Railway Committee the assurance that it was going on this year, so that this amendment will not counter their wishes.

Mr. COCHRANE: Have the bonds been sold and is the money in the bank?

Mr. DOUGLAS: A certain proportion of the money is in the bank.

The CHAIRMAN: I have to declare this amendment out of order, because no notice has been given of it.

Mr. COCHRANE: With the consent of the House it can be moved.

Mr. PUGSLEY: There is no objection to it.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Buchanan moves an amendment:

That the following paragraph be added to clause (f): always provided that the railway

line provided for in clause (f) shall be commenced within one year and put into operation within three years from the passage of this Act.

Mr. LANCASTER: If the House is unanimous, I am not objecting to this amendment, but I do not think that is the right way in which to bring about the amendment that the hon. gentleman wants. We have to look at the whole Bill. Section 2 reads:

Unless the Canadian Northern Railway Company, hereinafter called "The Company completes and puts in operation within five years after the passage of this Act the following lines of railway—

I think we would have to insert before (f) another section making what I have just said apply down as far as (f) and no farther, and then say that they may commence within one year and complete within five years this other railway. That is the proper way to make the legislation. Otherwise it will be very confusing, and it is not the usual way in which we pass such Bills.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not think the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Buchanan) will have any objection to the suggestion made by the Chairman of the Railway Committee. The amendment was drawn very hurriedly, and I am satisfied that in the way in which it was drawn it would be perfectly clear and intelligible because it is a rule of construction that an exception to a general clause always governs the general clause. It might, however, be better to arrange it as the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) suggests; that is, section 2 would go down to the end of clause (e); then before (f) make a new section 3, which would read as follows:

Unless the Canadian Northern Railway Company, hereinafter called "the Company", commences to construct within one year from the date thereof and completes and puts in operation within three years after the passing of this Act the following line of railway which is in course of construction, the powers of construction conferred upon the company by Parliament shall cease and be null and void as respects so much of the said line as remains uncompleted.

And then go on to (f). That might be more in accordance with the general policy of the drafting of the Bill. I am satisfied that the hon. member for Lethbridge will accept that suggestion.

Mr. LANCASTER: Is the hon. gentleman of opinion that we should mention here the time within which the line should be commenced?

[The Chairman.]

Mr. DOUGLAS: Yes, because work has been suspended for two or three years.

Mr. LANCASTER: But the line has been commenced.

Mr. BUCHANAN: They did some work in 1912 and probably some in 1913, but I am satisfied that nothing was done in 1914. They did do some grading a short distance out of the city of Calgary, but what I want to make sure of is that they will recommence construction.

Mr. LANCASTER: I submit this amendment for the approval of the Committee:

10 p.m.

That section 2 terminate at the end of subsection (e), and that the following be inserted as section 2a:

Unless the company commences to construct within one year and completes and puts in operation within three years after the passing of this Act the unfinished portion south of Calgary of the line of railway which the Alberta Midland Railway Company (since amalgamated with the company) was authorized to build by chapter 45 of the statutes of Alberta for 1909, as set out in paragraph 4 of the schedule of such Act, namely: From Calgary to the confluence of the Little Bow and Belly rivers, thence in a southwesterly direction to a point at Lethbridge, the powers of construction conferred upon the company by Parliament shall cease and be null and void as respects so much of the said line as then remains uncompleted.

Section amended accordingly, and, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported.

Bill No. 29, respecting the Van Buren Bridge Company—Mr. Michaud—in committee.

Mr. PUGSLEY: When this Bill was before the Committee on a previous occasion I stated that Mr. Michaud, who was in charge of the Bill, was absent; but I think he expected to return to-day, and as the Government have taken Mondays after to-day I would not ask that the Bill stand over. The American legislation ratifies the mortgage as applied to the American side of the bridge, and this legislation ratifies it as applied to the Canadian side, so that the whole bridge is covered by the $250,000, which is not an excessive amount for a bridge of this character.

Mr. LANCASTER: In the Railway Committee we sat for some time past the hour of adjournment to oblige Mr. Michaud, who was anxious to go away but wished to have

this put through. I understood that he wished me to have it put through the House in his absence.

Mr. HAZEN: There is no objection to the Bill passing.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

Bill No. 58, respecting the Casualty Company of Canada—Mr. Macdonell—in committee.

On section 3—section 7, chapter 63, statutes 1911, enacted by section 4 of chapter 100, statutes, 1913, repealed:

Mr. GRAHAM: What does section 4 mean?

Mr. W. T. WHITE: In the absence of the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell), in whose name the Bill stands, I might explain that the company has changed its original plan. When the Act of 1913 was passed the company intended to carry on the business of accident and sickness insurance. It now proposes to go ahead with a more limited programme for the present, and it has asked for a change whereby it shall be permitted to commence the business of plate glass insurance when it has $50,000 of capital subscribed and $15,000 paid up and to continue to add to its business as provided in section 3 and in accordance with the terms of this Act. The insurance department is quite satisfied that the amount of subscribed capital in each case is sufficient for the class of business to which it relates.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

The following Bills were considered in committee, reported, read the third time, and passed, without discussion:

Bill No. 53, to incorporate the Marcil Trust Company.—Mr. Marcil.

Bill No. 59, respecting The Empire Life Insurance Company, of Canada.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill No. 43, respecting The Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Company, and to change its name to The Huron and Erie Mortgage Corporation.—Mr. Marshall.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

EMPLOYMENT OF T. A. ANDERSON.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN:

1. Has T. A. Anderson been employed by the Department of the Interior at any time during the years 1912, 1913 1914 and 1915?
2. Is he still so employed?
3. What was the date of his appointment, in what capacity is he employed and what is his salary or remuneration?

Mr. ROCHE: As far as the Department of the Interior is concerned, no.

NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING AND PRINTING.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN:

What amounts of money have been paid by the Government for advertising and printing in each of the years 1912, 1913 and 1914, to each of the following newspapers:—The Regina Province, the Moosejaw News, the Saskatoon Star, and the Prince Albert Herald?

Mr. CODERRE:

Agriculture, 1913-14—

Regina Province	$16 64
Moosejaw News	16 64
Saskatoon Star	11 20
Prince Albert Herald	16 64

Auditor General, 1912—

Prince Albert Herald	$246 75

Customs—

	1912.	1913.	1914.
Regina Province	$6 72	$ 17 84	$24 00
Moosejaw News	....	108 00	82 75
Saskatoon Star	....	36 20	18 49
Prince Albert Herald	....	20 00	.....

Indian Affairs—

	1912.	1913.	1914.
Moosejaw News	....	$24 64	$52 88
Saskatoon Star	30 80	30 20	6 00
Prince Albert Herald	65 04	34 72	38 16

Interior—

	1912.	1913.	1914.
Regina Province	$620 80	$577 12	$420 56
Moosejaw News	15 00	84 00	407 96
Saskatoon Star	260 73	626 72	670 94
Prince Albert Herald	254 26	453 20	619 50

Militia and Defence—

	1912.	1913.	1914.
Regina Province	$23 40	.....	$21 24
Moosejaw News	.....	$19 20	11 80
Saskatoon Star	.....	39 75	14 75
Prince Albert Herald	.....	19 20	.....

Mounted Police—For advertising and printing in each of the years 1912, 1913 and 1914 to each of the following newspapers:

Regina Province	$294 85
Moosejaw News	60 00
Saskatoon Star	113 33
Prince Albert Herald	389 75

Naval Service 1912—

Saskatoon Star	$27 95
Prince Albert Herald	24 08

Post Office—

	1912.	1913.	1914.
Regina Province	$12 60	30 24	77 28
Moosejaw News	.....	33 04	78 96
Saskatoon Star	.....	.....	26 45
Prince Albert Herald	.....	.....	10 76

Public Works—

	1912.	1913.	1914.
Regina Province	$ 4 00	$126 44	$177 00
Moosejaw News	.....	.....	92 08
Saskatoon Star.	.....	76 35	50 60
Prince Albert Herald	13 20	110 28	14 56
	$18 00	313 07	$334 24

Printing Bureau—The Saskatoon Star, $20.70 in 1914 for printing only.

Trade and Commerce—	1913.	1914.
Regina Province	$21 84	$150 15
Moosejaw News	.....	73 90
Saskatoon Star	.....	160 09
Prince Albert Herald	.....	50 99

PRINCE ALBERT PROPERTY PURCHASE.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN:

1. What properties have been acquired by the Department of Public Works in the city of Prince Albert since January 1, 1912?
2. From whom were such properties acquired?
3. What was the total price, and the price per foot in each case?
4. For what purpose were such properties acquired?
5. What was the date of each purchase?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. None by the Department of Public Works.

2, 3, 4 and 5. Answered by No. 1.

MOOSEJAW PROPERTY PURCHASES.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN:

1. What properties have been acquired by the Department of Public Works in the city of Moosejaw since the first of January, 1912?
2. What was the total price paid, and the price per foot paid, for each of such properties?
3. For what purpose was each property acquired?
4. From whom were such properties acquired?
5. What was the date of each purchase?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Lots 21, 22 and 23, block 122.
2. $22,000, or about $2.35 a square foot.
3. For Immigration hall.
4. Wm. Hannah.
5. 26th January, 1914, date of certificate of title.

And—

1. Lots 1, 2, 3 and 4, block 125.
2. $60,000, or about $5.20 a square foot.
3. For custom warehouse.
4. Jacob Errett.
5. 3rd March, 1914, date of certificate of title.

SASKATOON PROPERTY PURCHASE.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN:

1. What properties have been acquired by the Department of Public Works in the city of Saskatoon since the first day of January, 1912?
2. From whom were such properties acquired?
3. What was the total price, and the price per foot in each case?
4. What was the the date of each purchase?

[Mr. Coderre.]

5. For what purpose was each property acquired?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Lots 1, 2 and 3, block 170.
2. Anthony Le Jeune.
3. $122,500, or about $5.78 a foot.
4. 21st February, 1914, date of certificate of title.
5. On which to erect a public building.

WAR SUPPLIES—OVERSHOES.

Mr. DOUGLAS:

1. What was the list price of all overshoes supplied the troops, both in England and Canada?
2. What discounts, both trade and cash, were allowed by the firms supplying these goods?
3. What firms supplied these goods?

Mr. HAZEN (for Major General Hughes): Tenders were obtained from the following firms:

	List price.	Price paid by Department.
Canadian Consolidated Rubber Co.	$2 pr.	$1.96 & $1.85 pr.
Gutta Percha Rubber Co.	2 "	1.70 $1.85 "
Kaufman Rubber Co.	2 "	1.85 per pr.
Independent Rubber Co.	Not known.	1.85 " "
Columbus Rubber Co.	Not known.	1.85 " "

PICTOU COUNTY MEDICAL EXAMINERS.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. What doctors acted as medical examiners for the volunteers in Pictou county in August last under instructions from Major Graham?
2. Why were they removed and others appointed?
3. Who recommended the new appointees?

Mr. HAZEN (for Major General Hughes):

1. None.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

COUNTRY HARBOUR GAS BUOY.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has the notice been received that the gas buoy at Country Harbour is out of order?
2. If so, when did such notice reach the department?
3. What action was taken?
4. Is the said buoy now in commission?
5. During what portion of the calendar year 1914, was this buoy in commission?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. No. It has been in commission since November 13, 1914.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

4. Yes.

5. 1st January to 6th March; 18th April to 21st October; 13th November to 31st December.

STELLARTON PUBLIC BUILDING.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Has any site for a public building been purchased at Stellarton, N.S.?
2. If so, from whom was it purchased, what was the price, and when was it paid?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. A site was expropriated by Order in Council dated April 30, 1912.

2. (a) Held by Mrs. Mary A. McKay; (b) valued at $4,000; (c) compensation not yet paid.

RICHARD J. HALL.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has Richard J. Hall been appointed a veterinary inspector?
2. If so, what are his duties and salary?
3. What are his qualifications for the position?
4. By whom was his appointment recommended?
5. Is there to be any separation or other allowance paid in addition to his salary? If so, how much?

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. No.

2, 3, 4 and 5. Answered by No. 1.

WAR SUPPLIES—CANVAS SHOES.

*Mr. MURPHY:

Referring to the purchase of 95,000 pairs of canvas shoes at a cost of $190,000, as set out on pages 58, 59 and 60 of the memoranda respecting work of the Department of Militia and Defence, European war, 1914-15, as follows:

	Pairs.	Price per pair.
Ames, Holden, McCready.	36,500	$2 00
Tetreau Shoe Manufacturing Co.	36,500	2 00
Louis Gauthier Co.	22,000	2 00

And to the further purchase of 45,000 pairs of canvas shoes at a cost of $90,000 as stated by the Minister of Militia and Defence in his reply to a question reported on page 419 of unrevised Hansard for 1915, as follows:

Names of Contractors.	No. ordered.	Price per pair.
Cook and Fitzgerald.	5,000	$2 00
Dufresne and Galipeau.	5,000	2 00
Dufresne and Locke.	10,000	2 00
Jas. Muir Co.	10,000	2 00
Brandon Shoe Co.	5,000	2 00
Regal Shoe Co.	5,000	2 00
E. T. Wright Co.	5,000	2 00

1. Were the 95,000 pairs of canvas shoes supplied the officers and soldiers of the first contingent?
2. If not, what use has been, or will be made of them?
3. What use has been made of the 45,000 pairs of canvas shoes?
4. If they are still in the Government stores, when, and to whom, will they be issued?
5. Have any more canvas shoes been ordered in addition to those above mentioned? If so, how many pairs?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. The quantity supplied to troops of the 1st Division, Canadian Expeditionary Force, was 75,000—not 95,000; the two items of 10,000 pairs each given on page 60 of the memoranda respecting work of the Department of Militia and Defence, European War, 1914-15, being a clerical error, and a duplication of two items of 10,000 each on page 59 of the same memoranda.

Canvas shoes were supplied to all non-commissioned officers and men of the 1st Division.

2. Of the balance, a proportion were sent to Salisbury, and the remainder were held in Ordnance charge for distribution to non-commissioned officers and men of the 1st Division, and for various drafts for Overseas.

3 and 4. Answered by No. 2.

5. No.

TRANSPORTATION OF FIRST CONTINGENT.

Mr. GRAY:

What sums have been, or are to be paid by the Government to the Canadian Pacific Railway, Grand Trunk Railway, and Canadian Northern Railway, respectively, for land and sea transport in connection with first contingent?

Mr. HAZEN:

	Canadian Pacific Railway.	Canadian Northern Railway.	Grand Trunk Railway.
Land transport paid	$416,636	$ 16,151	$ 84,134
Land transport outstanding ..	40,331	100,231	57,631
Ocean transport paid	458,992	162,977	
Ocean transport outstanding.		28,810	
	$915,959	$308,169	$141,765

BLOOD INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Has the Indian Department made a lease of the Blood Indian reserve for grazing purposes?
2. If so, to whom, and what are the terms of the lease?
3. When does the lease expire?
4. If a lease has not been made, what are the arrangements the Government has made of a temporary character for grazing on the reserve?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. No.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

4. Since the termination of the former lease $3 per head per annum has been charged for grazing privileges.

WATCHMEN ON RAILWAY BRIDGES.

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM:

What are the names of the men employed as watchmen on the different railway bridges in Antigonish county at different times since August last on account of the war?

Mr. COCHRANE: Names of men employed as watchmen on the different railway bridges in Antigonish county, as follows: John McPherson, Angus McDougal, John R. Boyd, Colin F. McDonald, J. A. McDonald, John Kiely, Gabriel Chisholm, Thomas Kiely.

HALIFAX OCEAN TERMINALS.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

What was the total expenditure in the calendar year 1914 at Halifax for the ocean terminals on account of the railway construction contract and on account of the docks and piers contract, respectively?

Mr. W. T .WHITE:

Mr. COCHRANE: Total expenditure in the calendar year 1914 at Halifax for the ocean terminal on account of the railway construction contract was $1,181,355.78. Total expenditure on account of docks and piers contract at Halifax was $285,811.10.

TOTAL EXPENDITURES FOR 1914-15.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

What are the particulars and amounts of all expenditures made on capital and special account respectively from April 1, 1914, to March 1, 1915?

Public Works capital		$ 9,440,894 73	
Railways and Canals capital:			
Canals	$4,989,901 91		
Intercolonial and connected railways	4,964,867 79		
Towards the construction of a railway to connect Montreal with the National Transcontinental Railway	250,000 00		
Hudson Bay Railway	4,340,337 06		
Quebec Bridge	2,963,616 58		
National Transcontinental Ralway	6,777,255 98		
Prince Edward Island Railway	604,976 66		
		$24,890,955 98	
			$34,331,850 71
Railway Subsidies:			
The Fredericton and Grand Lakes Coal and Railway Company		111,579 96	
The Canadian Northern Ontario Railway		2,343,335 80	
The Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway		18,449 17	
St. John and Quebec Railway		59,581 32	
Ha Ha Bay Railway		16,158 72	
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway		138,980 56	
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway		405,120 00	
Kootenay Central Railway		504,622 21	
Canadian Northern Pacific Railway		178,077 80	
Canadian Northern Alberta Railway		262,080 00	
The Algoma Eastern Railway		13,022 87	
The Alberta Central Railway		209,768 00	
The Kettle Valley Railway		369,497 28	
			$ 4,630,273 69
Charges of Management and Loan Account			683,855 99
			$39,645,980 39

The above represents the payments which passed through the books of the Finance Department from April 1, 1914, to March 1, 1915.

MEDICINE HAT POSTMASTERS.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. How many postmasters have been removed from the service in the constituency of Medicine Hat since October 1, 1911?

2. What are the names and the name of the post office in each case?

3. What was the reason for the removal in each case?

4. In how many cases were investigations held?

5. In how many cases were investigations asked for but not granted?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Thirteen.

2 and 3.

Name of Post Office.	Name of Postmaster.	Reason for Removal.	Date of Removal.
Barney	Mrs. J Enright	Change in site of office	27 August, 1913.
Brooks Station	J. H. Binns	Political partisanship and neglect of duty	4 April, 1913.
Copeville	G. R. Cope	Change in site of office	11 December, 1912.
Doran	Mrs. Vedee Hiêreth	Change in site of office	28 January, 1914.
Empress	Wm. Robertson	Change in site and unsatisfactory management of office	23 June, 1914.
Faith	Jas. Sergeant	Political partisanship	19 March, 1914.
Grassey Lake	H. A. Driggs	Political partisanship	11 July, 1912.
Hardieville	J. M. Greep	Abandonment of office by postmaster	28 May, 1914.
Leavitt	M. Allen	Non-residence of postmaster	13 July, 1912.
Lethbridge	E. M. Higinbotham	Removal of post office to new public building	9 October, 1914.
Seven Persons	H. H. Foster	Unsatisfactory management	18 February, 1914.
Warner	F. L. Shepard	Postmaster delivering private accounts without prepayment of postage	13 October, 1912.
Websdale	A. E. Websdale.	Change in site of office	24 November, 1913.

4. Eleven.

5. In one case, that of the Lethbridge post office, removed to the new public building, an investigation was suggested to the department, but the transfer of the post office to the new postmaster had already been made.

WINNIPEG RESIDENT ENGINEER.

Mr. MOLLOY:

1. Who is the Dominion Government resident engineer in the city of Winnipeg?
2. How many men are employed on his staff?
3. What are their duties?
4. What is the salary paid to each?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. John Sweeney.

2. Nine employees on this staff, including Mr. Sweeney.

3. Five assistant engineers, one foreman for Manitoba, one clerk accountant and one stenographer.

4. John Sweeney, district engineer, $2,500 per annum; A. J. Stevens, sr., asst. engineer, $2,300 per annum; D. A. McIntyre, foreman for Manitoba, $2,000 per annum; L. H. Fournier, assistant, $2,000 per annum; F. de C. Davies, sr., assist. engineer, $1,700 per annum; Geo. Burbridge, sr., asst. engineer, $1,500 per annum; Chas Steele, clerk-accountant, $1,500 per annum; Barrett Wood, jr., asst. engineer, $75 per month; Miss L. Simpson, stenographer, $900 per annum.

JUDGES' PENSIONS.

Mr. PROULX:

1. How much has been paid by the Federal Treasury since 1867 to retired judges for pensions or retiring allowances?
2. How much for each year since the said date?

Mr. W. T. WHITE:

Year.	Amount.
1868	$ 10,533 28
1869	15,294 22
1870	17,592 21
1871	17,847 31
1872	15,499 92
1873	15,499 72
1874	22,906 06
1875	29,187 45
1876	27,666 00
1877	32,122 00
1878	34,024 27
1879	44,888 92
1880	49,062 41
1881	49,025 95
1882	54,196 90
1883	59,098 51
1884	58,580 05
1885	58,804 75
1886	55,114 78
1887	59,076 18
1888	62,038 20
1889	62,144 72
1890	58,007 62
1891	57,839 85
1892	49,866 47
1893	51,530 84
1894	49,495 55
1895	48,864 66
1896	52,759 75
1897	58,672 12
1898	63,527 96
1899	65,429 39
1900	62,750 98
1901	63,088 10
1902	53,208 27
1903	56,991 05
1904	69,407 68

Year.	Amount.
1905	$ 55,238 3
1906	91,909 25
1907	81,990 21
1908	126,359 82
1909	124,401 83
1910	143,365 26
1911	151,428 00
1912	145,464 09
1913	173,866 03
1914	175,668 99
To Feb. 28, 1915	155,922 25
	$3,177,258 13

WAR SUPPLIES—HORSES.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. What are the names of the persons authorized to purchase horses for army purposes in Alberta?

2. What salary or other remuneration does each person so authorized receive?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. At Calgary, E. J. Legg, B. S. Mitchell; Cochrane, R. F. Bevan; Vermilion, P. G. Pilkie; Medicine Hat, L. S. Manzer; Okotoks, Geo. Scott; Edmonton, W. R. Lowes.

2. Ten dollars per diem and expenses.

Mr. LAW:

1. Have any horses been purchased in the county of Kings, N.S., by the Militia Department since the outbreak of war?

2. If so, from whom were such horses purchased, and what prices were paid for same?

3. Who was the purchasing agent for said horses?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.

2. Messrs. Keever, Mackay & Moore. Average price paid, $171.09.

3. The principal veterinary officer for Canada and his assistants.

OTTAWA-HULL POSTAL RATE.

Mr. DEVLIN:

Is it the intention of the Government to establish a rate of one cent upon letters between Ottawa and Hull? If not, why not?

Mr. CASGRAIN: Ottawa and Hull are separate cities, and are, moreover, situated in different provinces. A drop letter is one that is posted and delivered in the same office and to have it otherwise would necessarily lead to an increase in the rate, as the department could not afford to carry letters from one office to another at a one-cent rate per ounce. If such were the case there would be no object in maintaining a two-cent rate per ounce for letters. If this privilege were given between Hull and Ottawa, it could not be withheld from all other places in Canada. To carry letters in Canada at the one-cent rate per ounce, in view of its long distances and sparse population, is not at present a possibility.

OTTAWA AND HULL TOWN PLANNING COMMISSION.

Mr. DEVLIN:

1. Has a commission been formed to prepare plans relating to the cities of Ottawa and Hull?

2. What is the salary, if any, of the commissioners?

3. What was the date of appointment of said commission?

4. What amount has been expended for the said commission by the Federal Government?

5. What amount, if any, has each of the cities of Ottawa and Hull contributed toward expenses of said commission?

6. Has said commission prepared any plan of improvement for said cities of Ottawa and Hull?

7. If so, has such plan been submitted to the Government?

8. If not, what is the cause of the delay?

Mr. W. T. WHITE:

1. Yes.

2. No salary.

3. Commission was appointed by Order in Council of September 12, 1913.

4. $57,724.65.

5. No amount has as yet been received on this account. Under the terms of the Order in Council of September 12, one-half of the cost is payable by the cities named jointly and rateably according to population.

6. Final plans have not yet been submitted.

7 and 8. The report of the commission is almost completed, and will, it is expected, with the final plans, be ready for presentation to Parliament before the close of the present session.

WALLACEBURG CUSTOMS OFFICER.

Mr. GORDON:

1. What salary did the customs officer at Wallaceburg get during the last four years of the Liberal Government?

2. What does the present officer get?

3. Has he an assistant? If so, what does he get?

4. What duties were collected during the last eight years?

5. What rent is being paid for an office?

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. 1908 $1,000, 1909 $1,200, 1910 $1,200, 1911 $1,200.

2. $1,400.

3. Yes. D. F. Johnson, $850. R. D. Purser, $850.

4. 1906-7 $10,182.22, 1907-8 $125,161.39, 1908-9 $244,213.26, 1909-10 $231,957.64, 1910-11 $269,539.72, 1911-12 $275,490.68, 1912-13 $316,481.70, 1913-14 $361,992.75.

5. $15 per month.

LEVIS DRY DOCK.

Mr. BOIVIN:

1. Did the Government call for tenders for the building of the dry dock at or near Lévis, Quebec?
2. How many firms submitted tenders and what are their names?
3. To whom was the contract given?
4. At what price, and upon what conditions?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.

2. Six: M. P. and J. T. Davis, O'Brien and Doheny, Sir John Jackson, Holbrook, Cabot and Rollins, The Sherman Salter Company, Laurin and Leitch.

3. Contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer: Messrs. M. P. and J. T. Davis.

4. (a) Schedule prices which amount, approximately, to $2,721,116. (b) The ordinary conditions governing regular contracts, with date of completion 17th July, 1916.

FISH REDUCTION PLANTS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

To whom was the fertilizer produced at the Government reduction works at Canso, N.S., last season sold, and at what price per ton?

Mr. HAZEN:

To individual farmers and to the United Fruit Growers Association of Nova Scotia at $20 per ton f.o.b. reduction works.

Mr. LAW:

1. How many tons of fertilizer were manufactured at the Canso fish reduction plant during the years 1913 and 1914 respectively?
2. At what cost per ton was it manufactured?
3. Was it sold by tender or otherwise?
4. To whom was it sold and at what prices?
5. Where were deliveries made?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. In 1913, 151 tons; in 1914, 91 tons.

2. The total cost of operation in 1913 was $19,450.18. 151 tons of scrap and 15,272 gallons of oil were produced.

The total cost of operation in 1914 was $16,058.38. Ninety-one tons and 7,072 gallons of oil were produced.

3. Otherwise.

4. In 1913 it was sold to A. N. Whitman, Halifax, at $32 per ton f.o.b. works.

In 1914 it was sold to the farmers and the United Fruit Growers Association at $20 per ton f.o.b. works.

5. Answered by No. 4.

Mr. LAW:

1. How many tons of fertilizer were manufactured at the Clark's harbour fish reduction plant during the years 1913 and 1914, respectively?
2. What was the cost of same per ton?
3. Was it sold by tender or otherwise?
4. To whom was it sold and at what prices?
5. Was it sold delivered at any point or f.ob. plant?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. In 1913, 98 tons; in 1914, 81 tons.

2. The total cost of operation in 1913 was $11,121.36. Ninety-eight tons of scrap and 3,480 gallons of oil were produced. In 1914 the total cost of operation was $10,137.74. Eighty-one tons of scrap and 4,868 gallons of oil were produced.

3. Otherwise.

4. To farmers at $20 per ton f.o.b. works.

5. Answered by No. 4.

WAR SUPPLIES—BICYCLES.

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. How many bicycles were purchased for use by the first overseas contingent?
2. From what persons or firms were they purchased?
3. What was the price paid for each?

Mr. HAZEN: 450 bicycles, military pattern, were supplied by the Canada Cycle and Motor Co. of Toronto at $62 each.

EMPLOYMENT OF A. GENEST.

Mr. McCRAE:

1. Is A. Genest an employee of the Post Office department at Sherbrooke?
2. If so, what are his duties, and at what salary?
3. Has he been constantly at work?
4. If he has been off on leave of absence, how long, and for what cause?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. A. Genest is an employee of the Sherbrooke post office.

2. He is a first-class clerk, grade A, with salary at the rate of $1,600 a year.

3. The records show that Mr. Genest has reported for duty each day, but on account of the disease from which he suffers, he has not been able to work the regular hours of duty.

4. Absences from duty on account of illness—pulmonary tuberculosis: 1903, 31st March, 1 day, with pay; 4th to 12th April, 9 days; 1904—15th March, 1 day; 1905—10th June, 1 day; 1906—27th December, 1 day; 31st December, 1 day; 1907—1st to 14th January, 14 days; 20th January to 25th March, 65 days; 30th December, ½ day; 1909—9th and 10th February, 2 days; 20th to 25th April, 6 days; 1912—23rd March, 1 day; 1912-13—9th May, 1912 to 8th May, 1913, 1 year; 1913, 9th May to 14th October, 159 days, without pay. Mr. Genest has been in the service since the 7th March, 1893, and since that time has always given good service to the department.

MEDICINE HAT RURAL MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. How many requests have been received by the Post Office Department for the establishment of rural mail routes in the constituency of Medicine Hat, Alberta?
2. How many routes have been established, and where are they located?
3. (a) Are any new routes contemplated? (b) If so, where?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Eleven.
2. None.
3. (a) Yes; (b) Four routes from Lethbridge—north, south, east and west, also one route from Excel.

SEED WHEAT.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN:

Referring to answered question by the Minister of the Interior on the 4th day of March, with respect to seed wheat, are the prices therein stated f.o.b. Fort William, or are the prices quoted the ones which were paid at the local points of delivery in Saskatchewan?

Mr. ROCHE: Prices quoted were f.o.b. cars at points of purchase.

SASKATCHEWAN INDIAN LANDS.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN:

1. What was the total acreage of Indian lands sold in the province of Saskatchewan in each of the years 1912, 1913 and 1914?
2. What was the average price obtained for Indian lands so sold in each of the years 1912, 1913 and 1914?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. In 1912, 755 920-1000 acres; in 1913, 276 25-1000 acres; in 1914, nothing sold.
2. In 1912, $32.65 per acre; in 1913, $17.99 per acre; in 1914, no sale.

SASKATCHEWAN SCHOOL LANDS.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN:

1. What was the total acreage of School lands sold in the province of Saskatchewan in each of the years, 1912, 1913 and 1914?
2. What was the average price per acre obtained for school lands sold in the province of Saskatchewan in each of the years 1912, 1913 and 1914?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Total area of school lands sold in the province of Saskatchewan in each of the years 1912, 1913 and 1914, is as follows: 1912, 103,707·01 acres; 1913, 661·38 acres; 1914, 597·48 acres. Total, 104,965·87 acres.

2. Average price at which the lands were sold: 1912, $19.30; 1913, $25.33; 1914, $16.35.

In addition to the above there was also realized from the sale of town lots in 1913, $9,757.

[Mr. Casgrain.]

EMPLOYMENT OF W. W. DAVIDSON.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN:

1. Has W. W. Davidson, of Moosejaw, been in the employ of the Department of the Interior at any time during the years 1912, 1913, 1914 and 1915?
2. If so, what was the date of his appointment?
3. In what capacity is he employed, and what is his salary or remuneration?

Mr. ROCHE: In so far as the Immigration Branch is concerned,

1. Yes.
2. September 1, 1914.
3. Relief supervisor; $150 per month.

ICL. RY. LUMBER CONTRACTS.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Is Alex. Pratt or I. P. A. Pratt, of Matapedia or Sellarville, Quebec, saving lumber for shims, tops and bottoms of cars for the Intercolonial railway?
2. If so, is the work done under contract, and what prices are paid?
3. If under contract, were tenders publicly called for, and at what date?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes. P. R. and A. Pratt, of Matapedia, P.Q.

2. Yes At the following prices:

Shims, 7 inches wide by 12 inches long—¼-inch, $3.65 per 1,000 f.o.b. Matapedia; ½-inch, $7.30 per 1,000 f.o.b., Matapedia.

Shims 3 inches by 7 inches by 7 feet—$245 per 1,000 f.o.b. cars, Matapedia.

Shims 7 inches wide by 24 inches long—1½-inch, $43.75 per 1,000 f.o.b. cars, Dawson Siding; 1¼-inch, $51.02; 2-inch, $58.32; 2¼-inch, $65.65; 2½-inch, $72.90; 2¾-inch, 80.22.

For spruce for car decking, $16 per M. ft., b.m., delivered f.o.b. cars, Dawson Siding, near Matapedia.

3. For shims: Yes, on 23rd October, 1914. For spruce: On December 29th, 1914.

MATAPEDIA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. MARCIL:

Has an agreement been arrived at between the municipality of Matapedia, Quebec, or any party there, and the Department of Railways and Canals, regarding a supply of water for fire protection or domestic purposes, and what is the nature of the agreement?

Mr. COCHRANE: It is proposed to grant, by way of a lease "during pleasure," to Alexander Pratt, Lynch Dube and Cie., Robert Ferguson, John A. Robertson, John A. Ryan, Thomas V. Woodman, Sarah Smith and S. M. Adams, of Matapedia, P.Q., unincorporated, but known under the name of the Matapedia Water Supply Company, about one million gallons of water per

annum at six cents per thousand gallons, for water supply and fire protection at that place. This lease has not yet been executed.

LETHBRIDGE POSTMASTERSHIP.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. What was the reason for the dismissal of Edward N. Higinbotham, as postmaster at Lethbridge, Alberta?
2. Was an investigation asked for?
3. Was an investigation held?
4. If so, what was the result of the investigation?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. On the 23rd September, 1914, the departmental officers were instructed by the Postmaster General that as soon as the Lethbridge public building was ready for occupation it was the intention to appoint a new postmaster, and the Superintendent was requested to keep in touch with the progress made, and as soon as it was ready for the department to take possession to inform the Postmaster General so that the change could be made without delay. This was done in accordance with instructions, and the Post Office Inspector, on the 9th October, was instructed to make the change.

2. In a petition in favour of the late postmaster, which was received at the department in November last, it was suggested that an investigation should be made, but the appointment to the postmastership and the transfer of the post office to the new incumbent had already been made.

3. No.

4. See answer to No. 3.

ICL. RY. COAL SUPPLY.

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM:

1. Has the Railway Department called for tenders for coal for the Intercolonial?
2. If not, when will tenders likely be called?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. No.

2. Date not yet settled.

EXPORT OF CANADIAN HORSES.

Mr. TOBIN:

Has an Order in Council been passed prohibiting the sale and export to the United States of Canadian bred horses from four to eleven years old? If so, when was such Order in Council passed?

Mr. J. D. REID: An Order in Council was passed on August 7, 1914, which prohibits exports to any place other than the United Kingdom or any British possession of "Saddle, draught and pack animals, suitable for use in war."

QUEBEC RURAL MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Have any rural mail routes been established in Bonaventure, Gaspé and Rimouski counties?
2. If so, where are these routes situated in each county?
3. What is the cost of each service, and were tenders called for?
4. Did the Department refuse to establish any routes? If so, where, why and when?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. No.

2. See answer to No. 1.

3. Although no routes have been established, tenders were called for a proposed route from St. Fabien, County Rimouski, and contract was awarded on January 27, 1915, at the rate of $700 per annum; but as the necessary fifty per cent of the eligible residents failed to subscribe for boxes, the route could not be put into operation. Tenders were also called for in February, 1914, for a proposed route from New Richmond Station No. 1, County Bonaventure, but were excessive.

4. Yes. In the case of St. Fabien proposed route, fifty per cent of the eligible residents have not yet remitted payment for their boxes as above mentioned, and until they do the regulations prohibit the inauguration of the service. In the case of the New Richmond Station proposed route, all offers for the performance of this service have been too high, and until a reasonable offer is received the Department will not establish the service.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. J. J. Hughes: For a return showing—1. What quantity of spirituous liquors, proof gallons, including ale, wines and beers, was taken out of bond between August 6 and August 21, 1914, at each port of the Dominion.

2. What quantity of cigars, cigarettes and tobacco was taken out of bond between the above mentioned dates at each port of the Dominion.

Mr. Murphy: For a return showing—1. From how many firms or private individuals the Government, or any department of the Government, has ordered saddles since the 1st of July, 1914.

2. The names of these firms.

3. How many saddles have been ordered from each firm.

4. How many saddles each firm has delivered up to date.

5. How many saddles each firm has yet to deliver.

6. The price each firm is receiving for these saddles.

Mr. Murphy: For a return showing—1. From how many firms or private individuals the Government, or any department of the Government, has ordered cloaks or great coats since the 1st of July, 1914.

2. The names of these firms.

3. How many cloaks or great coats have been ordered from each firm.

4. How many each firm has delivered up to date.

5. How many each firm has yet to deliver.

6. The price each firm is receiving for these cloaks or great coats.

Mr. Murphy: For a return showing—1. From how many firms or private individuals the Government, or any department of the Government, has ordered forage caps since the 1st of July, 1914.

2. The names of these firms.

3. How many forage caps have been ordered from each firm.

4. How many each firm has delivered to date.

5. How many each firm has yet to deliver.

6. The price each firm is receiving for these forage caps.

Mr. Murphy: For a return showing—1. From how many firms or private individuals the Government, or any department of the Government, has ordered socks since the 1st of July, 1914.

2. The names of these firms.

3. How many socks have been ordered from each firm.

4. How many each firm has delivered up to date.

5. How many each firm has yet to deliver.

6. The price each firm is receiving for these socks.

7. If any complaints have been received from any officers, soldiers, or private individuals in regard to the quality of these socks.

8. If the Canadian soldiers have been supplied with a sufficient number of these socks to keep them comfortable and warm while on active service.

Mr. Fowler: For a return showing: Whether it is the intention of the Government to increase the salaries of any members of the Civil Service at this Session of Parliament; the names of the persons whose salaries are to be increased, and to what department or departments they belong; the special reasons for such increases; what amount of money would be required to cover said increases in the coming fiscal year, by classes.

Mr. Murphy: For a return showing: From how many firms or individuals the Government or any department thereof, has ordered blankets since the 1st of July, 1914; the names of these firms; how many blankets have been ordered from each firm; how many each firm has delivered up to date; how many each firm has yet to deliver; the price each firm is receiving for these blankets.

Mr. Murphy: For a return showing: From how many firms or individuals the Government or any department thereof has ordered soldiers' uniforms since the 1st of July, 1914; the names of these firms; how many Oliver equipments have been ordered from each firm; how many of these uniforms each firm has delivered up to date; how many each firm has yet to deliver; the price each firm is receiving for these uniforms.

Mr. Murphy: For a return showing: From how many firms or individuals the Government, or any department thereof has ordered Oliver equipments since the 1st of July, 1914; the names of these firms; how many Oliver equipments have been ordered from each firm; how many each firm has delivered up to date; how many each firm has yet to deliver; the price each firm is receiving for these Oliver equipments.

[Mr. Murphy.]

Mr. Kyte: For a return showing: From how many firms or private individuals the Government, or any Department of the Government, has ordered kit bags since the 1st of July, 1914; the names of these firms; how many kit bags have been ordered from each firm; how many each firm has delivered up to date; how many each firm has yet to deliver; the price each firm is receiving for these kit bags.

Mr. Kyte: For a return showing: From how many firms or private individuals the Government, or any department of the Government, has ordered towels since the 1st of July, 1914; the names of these firms; how many towels have been ordered from each firm; how many each firm has delivered up to date; how many each firm has yet to deliver; the price each firm is receiving for these towels.

Mr. Kyte: For a return showing: From how many firms or private individuals the Government, or any department of the Government, has ordered bicycles since the 1st of July, 1914; the names of these firms; how many bicycles have been ordered from each firm; how many each firm has delivered up to date; how many each firm has yet to deliver; the price each firm is receiving for these bicycles.

Mr. Mackenzie: For a return showing: From how many firms or private individuals the Government, or any department of the Government, has ordered winter shirts since the 1st of July, 1914; the names of these firms; how many winter shirts have been ordered from each firm; how many each firm has delivered up to date; how many each firm has yet to deliver; the price each firm is receiving for these winter shirts.

Mr. Law: For a return showing: From how many firms or private individuals the Government, or any department of the Government, has ordered suits of underwear since the 1st of July, 1914; the names of these firms; how many suits of underwear have been ordered from each firm; how many each firm has delivered up to date; how many each firm has yet to deliver; the price each firm is receiving for these suits of underwear.

Mr. William Chisholm: For a return showing: From how many firms or private individuals the Government, or any department of the Government, has ordered cotton shirts since the 1st of July, 1914; the names of these firms; how many cotton shirts have been ordered from each firm; how many each firm has delivered up to date; how many each firm has yet to deliver; the price each firm is receiving for these cotton shirts.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm: For a return showing: From how many firms or private individuals the Government, or any department of the Government, has ordered trousers, breeches and pantaloons since the 1st of July, 1914; the names of these firms; how many trousers, breeches and pantaloons have been ordered from each firm; how many each firm has delivered up to date; how many each firm has yet to deliver; the price each firm is receiving for these trousers, breeches and pantaloons.

Mr. Carroll: For a return showing from how many firms or private individuals the Government, or any Department of the Government has ordered flannel shirts since the 1st of July, 1914; the names of these firms; how many flannel shirts have been ordered from each firm; how many each firm has delivered up to date; how many each firm has yet to deliver; the price each firm is receiving for these flannel shirts.

Mr. Carroll: For a return showing from how

many firms or private individuals the Government, or any department of the Government, has ordered service shirts since the 1st of July, 1914; the names of these firms; how many service shirts have been ordered from each firm; how many each firm has delivered up to date; how many each firm has yet to deliver; the price each firm is receiving for these service shirts.

Mr. Wm. Chisholm: For a return showing from how many firms or private individuals the Government, or any department of the Government has ordered motor cycles since the 1st of July, 1914; the names of these firms; how many motor cycles have been ordered from each firm; how many each firm has delivered up to date; how many each firm has yet to deliver; the price each firm is receiving for these motor cycles.

Mr. Kay: For a return showing how many customs officers were employed at the customs port of Abercorn, Quebec, on September 20, 1911; the names of these officers; what salary each one received; the total amount of salaries paid the officers at this port; how many customs officers are employed at the port of Abercorn at the present time; the names of these officers; what salary each one receives; the total amount of salaries paid to the officers at this port.

Mr. Kay: For a return showing how many customs officers were employed at the customs port of Highwater, Quebec, on September 20, 1911; the names of these officers; what salary each one received; the total amount of salaries paid the officers at this port; how many customs officers are employed at the port of Highwater at the present time; the names of these officers; what salary each one receives; the total amount of salaries paid to the officers at this port.

Mr. Kay: For a return showing how many customs officers were employed at the customs port of Mansonville, Quebec, on September 20, 1911; the names of these officers; what salary each one received; the total amount of salaries paid the officers at this port; how many customs officers are employed at the port of Mansonville at the present time; the names of these officers; what salary each one receives; the total amount of salaries paid to the officers at this port.

Mr. W. M. Martin: For a return showing what fractional areas of homestead lands or otherwise in the province of Saskatchewan were sold in the year 1914; the name of the purchaser, and the price paid in each case.

Mr. Graham: For a copy of recommendation to council for the appointment to the Customs Staff in 1908 of F. Norris, as preventive officer.

2. A copy of instructions sent either to S. W. McMichael, chief inspector of customs, Toronto, or to F. Norris, instructing the latter to take up the work at Chicago, July, 1910.

3. A copy of recommendation to council setting out the reasons for retirement of said F. Norris, November, 1913.

4. A copy of the correspondence between the Canadian Government and the Imperial Government concerning a proposed arrangement for placing the Canadian immigration under the same roof as the British Consulate at Chicago.

Mr. Law: For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Mr. P. B. Hurlbert, postmaster at Springdale county, N.S., and the removal of the office.

Mr. Devlin: For a return showing all amounts of money expended upon public works in the counties of Wright, Pontiac and Labelle from October, 1911, to date.

Mr. Devlin: For a return showing the number of appointments to the Inside Service and to the Outside Service since October, 1911, of persons resident in the county of Wright; the number of dismissals from the service since October, 1911; the number of resignations from the service since above date; with the names of parties at whose request such resignations, if any, were tendered.

Mr. Rhodes: For a return showing the amounts of money expended, in construction work or repairs, apart from salaries paid to permanent or yearly officials or employees, in the Departments of Public Works, Railways and Canals, Militia and Defence, Marine and Fisheries, and Agriculture, within the county of Cumberland, during the fiscal years 1896 to 1911, both inclusive, together with the particular purpose of each expenditure, and where expended.

Mr. Macdonald: For a return showing the quantity of Oliver equipments purchased since August 1, 1914, the persons from whom they were purchased, the price paid to each contractor, and the dates of their delivery. Also a copy of all complaints received from any quarter in regard to the equipment, and of any action, departmental or otherwise, taken in regard to the same.

Mr. Bourassa: For a copy of all letters, petitions, telegrams and correspondence between the Hon. L. P. Pelletier, ex-Postmaster General, and any person or persons of the county of Lévis, which during the month of April, 1912, had any connection with the appointment of G. A. Marois to a position in the customs office at Quebec, and the appointment of J. E. Gingras as postmaster of St. Romuald and Etchemin.

Mr. Lanctot: For a copy of all letters, telegrams, or other documents in connection with a United States military officer named Stewart, who was attached to the regiment of mounted rifles now mobilizing at Ottawa, and the names of any other foreign military officer who have been given commissions in the Canadian expeditionary force over the heads of qualified Canadian officers; how many such officers were appointed, with the reasons therefor.

Mr. Kyte: For a return showing the names, ages, nationalities and place of birth of all who have enlisted in Canada for overseas service in the present war; distinguishing between the first, second and third contingents.

Mr. Tobin: For a copy of all letters, telegrams, reports of proceedings and all other documents in connection with the purchase of remounts in the province of Quebec since August 1 last, up to and including the recent purchases made in the eastern townships by Messrs. Palmer and Pallister.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, the House adjourned at 11 p.m.

Tuesday, March 9, 1915.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES FOR 1914-15.

A message from His Royal Highness the Governor General, transmitting Supplementary Estimates for the year ending March 31, 1915, was presented by Hon. W. T. White (Minister of Finance), read by Mr. Speaker to the House, and referred to the Committee of Supply.

UNITED STATES POTATO EMBARGO.

On the Order of the Day being called:

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Customs): When the Orders of the Day were called yesterday, I explained to the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell), that I had instructed the Deputy Minister of Agriculture to send a special inspector to Washington to investigate the claims made by the American officials with regard to the potatoes condemned at Boston. I discussed the matter with the Deputy Minister of Agriculture this morning and I find that the potatoes, after being condemned, were immediately purchased by some person in Boston and at once shipped to Cuba; so that when our inspector arrived at Boston to make his investigation the potatoes were not to be found. Mr. O'Halloran, the deputy minister, tells me that the potatoes were inspected by two United States federal inspectors. They condemned the potatoes. They sent samples to Washington and the report of Mr. Orton, the plant pathologist of the Department of Agriculture in Washington confirmed their report. It was on this confirmation of their report that the potatoes were condemned. Mr. O'Halloran tells me that they are endeavouring to get samples of potatoes from Cuba, the country to which they were shipped, and when they succeed in getting the samples we will be able to give a further report.

CANADIAN TROOPS IN ENGLAND.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I would like to inform the House that additional information has been received that the troops numbering about 4,000, who were despatched some time ago, have reached Great Britain in safety; that they are stationed at different points, where very suitable accomodation has been provided for them, and that they are all in good health and spririts.

[Mr. Speaker.]

NAMES OF ENLISTED CANADIANS.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I desire to ask the Government when we may expect the publication of the names of those who have enlisted, including those who have already gone to the front as well as those who are in Canada. It is a matter of a good deal of interest to many people in Canada, and if the list could be issued in parts it would be of great advantage to the public.

Major General HUGHES: A great many of the lists are ready now, but we are waiting until they are completed before issuing them. I had expected that they would have been ready before this, but the Printing Bureau is pretty well loaded up with work. We will press the matter forward as rapidly as possible.

THE BUDGET.

PROPOSED WAR TAXATION.

Consideration of the proposed motion of Hon. W. T. White (Minister of Finance) for the Committee of Ways and Means, resumed from March 5.

Mr. G. H. BRADBURY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, when the House rose on Friday night I was drawing attention to the criticisms offered by the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) and the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley). I had remarked upon the temerity of the hon. junior member for Halifax for having challenged this side of the House in the matter of implementing its pre-election pledges. I think that a party with such an unsavory reputation as far as its pre-election pledges are concerned ought to hesitate before making any such statement as that which was uttered by the hon. junior member for Halifax. I also criticised the attitude taken by the hon. junior member for Halifax regarding the cutting down of the Estimates for public works; and I wish to quote his words now, and when I do, perhaps what I said on Friday night will be better understood. Speaking of the Estimates of the Public Works Department, the hon. junior member for Halifax said:

> Can the Minister of Public Works himself submit to the House any fair defence for his request to Parliament to vote practically $20,000,000 for public works expenditure in 1914-15? I do submit, and in fairness, I think, having in view the circumstances prevailing throughout Canada this year, and throughout the world for that matter, that instead of the Government's asking for an expenditure of $20,000,000 for public works, they

might have asked for $10,000,000 or less, and, if need be, they might have wiped out altogether expenditures for public works for the next fiscal year. I do not believe that the people of any province of Canada would have objected to the most drastic measures on the part of the Minister of Public Works during the present year and during the next fiscal year in connection with public works expenditure. Many of these projected works were without justification, the necessity for others have at least temporarily passed away by reason of the declining business of the country. Expenditures for these purposes should have been reduced to the minimum this year and next year.

The hon. member for St. John, taking the lead from the hon. junior member for Halifax, followed along the same lines. He had been advising my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) to cut down the expenditure on public works. The minister asked him across the floor of the House if he would be willing to have the Estimates cut down for his own county, and his reply was:

I would not be worthy of my position as a member of this House if I did not answer "Yes" to that question. I would not be worthy of the confidence of the people of my constituency if I were so cowardly that I would not dare to stand up in my place and give an answer to that question in the affirmative. Therefore I say that in these times of stress and trouble the amount proposed for St. John harbour of $1,500,000 might very well be cut down during this year to $750,000. The work could go on, and a great deal of work could be done for that money.

When he was making these observations, I interjected a question across the floor of the House, asking him if it was not wise for the Government of this country to spend money when times were hard to provide work for the working people of this country. His answer was:

That is right, if you have the money in the Treasury. But is this the time to tax the people of this country, when, as I have said every dollar, every cent, they can spare is being given to charity.

Right here I want to emphasize what I said on Friday night. The artisans and working people of this country are a self-reliant, independent class of people. They are not looking for charity, they do not wish to be pauperized, they want to be provided with work, and it would be an unpatriotic act of this Government, or of any provincial government, or of the authorities in any city in Canada, to follow the advice given by the hon. member for St. John, to reduce their expenditure on public works at this time, if they could possibly secure the money to go on with these works. A more unpatriotic position could not be taken by hon. gentlemen representing great cities, such as Halifax and St. John, which cities must have thousands of men out of employment, than to ask the Government not only to cut the Estimates, but if necessary to eliminate them altogether and to stop all public works. What position do these hon. gentlemen occupy in connection with the great organs that represent them in this country? I find on looking over the files that the Toronto Globe discusses this matter. The Globe is the mouthpiece of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House; in fact, its editor is looked upon as the outside leader. When there is any trouble in this House, we generally find the editor of the Globe—

An hon. MEMBER: Reverend.

Mr. BRADBURY: The reverend editor of the Globe sitting in the gallery encouraging hon. gentlemen by his smiles, and perhaps even by his enthusiastic applause. Therefore I think I can refer to him as the outside leader, without being offensive. Here is what he said on the 10th of last month. The editorial is headed: "When to Spend Public Money," and is as follows:

The time to spend public money freely is when private enterprise is on the ebb. If governments and public bodies enter upon huge programmes of public works when a building boom and a rush of railway construction are in progress the inevitable result is to attract to the country far more workers than it can provide employment for under normal conditions, and so to intensify the depression which follows boom conditions.

This is precisely what is happening in Canada today. The estimates introduced by the Minister of Finance make provision for carrying on public works begun in former years, but the financial situation is so difficult that practically no new works are to be begun during 1915 at the very time when the need for employment is greater than ever before in the experience of the building trades throughout Canadian cities.

It would be peanut politics to attempt to make party capital out of the situation. No Government in Canada, Liberal or Conservative, has ever deliberately curtailed expenditures upon public works in good times so that it might more freely provide employment during seasons of depression. In all probability this failure to take thought of the morrow has been the result of the belief of politicians that hard times dog their opponents only, and that the remedy may well be left for their opponents' consideration. The interests of the nation should be placed above party, however, and the Globe would like to see a healthy growth of public opinion in favour of husbanding the resources of the Dominion, the provinces, and the municipalities in boom periods so that public works may be undertaken at seasons of the greatest need. The work carried forward at such seasons would be done more cheaply and more thoroughly than under conditions of abnormal activity and would render unnecessary the spending of vast sums on maintaining willing workmen in idleness. . . .

There are many organizations engaged in the study of social conditions—Conservation Commissions, Unemployment Commissions, Social Service Commissions. They could do nothing more calculated to fill up the valleys of depression than to secure that public employment shall be at the minimum in Canada when private employment is at the maximum, and that the stress of hard times should be lessened by the construction of public works during seasons of depression.

And yet, in the face of this pronouncement by the Globe, hon. gentlemen opposite are endeavouring to induce this Government to lessen its expenditure and to reduce work in this country to a minimum, thereby throwing tens of thousands of Canadians out of employment. The reverend gentleman who wrote that article described the conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite as "peanut politics," and I commend that description to them. No more unpatriotic move could be made by any man or body of men in Canada than to endeavour to induce municipalities or governments to curtail expenditure in these trying times. I believe it to be the duty of every great city, every municipality, and every government in Canada, to spend every dollar they honestly can on legitimate works, for the purpose of providing labour for our people. We cannot afford to lower the standard of our workingmen, by making them subjects for charity.

I wish Mr. Speaker, to devote a little time to making a comparison between the records of hon. gentlemen who occupy so serenely the Opposition benches to-day, when they were in power with the record of the Conservative Government now in office. The junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) had the temerity to chide the Conservative party for having violated its pre-election pledges. I wonder where the Liberal party stands in that respect. Let me refer to some of the promises made by the Liberal party before they came into power in 1896, and how well they implemented them. It will be remembered that just previous to the election of 1896, and many of us are old enough to remember that campaign, these hon. gentlemen, having been for eighteen long years in the cold shades of opposition, travelled throughout Canada and in every city, every village, and every concession, preached to the farmers the doctrine of discontent, trying to make them believe that they were the men who were paying the taxes and were being bled white by this awful protective tariff, and promising what they would do to relieve the situation if they came to office. I quote from one of the planks in the Liberal platform of 1893:

We cannot but view with alarm the large increase in the public debt and the controllable annual expenditure of the Dominion; we demand the strictest economy in the administration of the government of the country.

That is an admirable declaration for a political platform, and one which if lived up to would have redounded to the credit of the Liberal party. But what was their record when they came to power? In 1896, when the Liberals assumed office, the public accounts show that the national debt of Canada stood at $258,000,000, and in 1911, when they went out of office, they had managed, not to decrease the national debt, but to increase it to $340,000,000, or an increase of $82,000,000 during the fifteen years they were in power. But that does not tell one-half the tale. The Conservative Government had been in office for eighteen years, and it had laid the foundation of Canada's greatness, so that prosperity was in full tide when the Liberals came to power, and with a buoyant revenue the Liberal party that was pledged to reduce taxation and expenditure took out of the pockets of the taxpayers of this country, in the ten years immediately preceding their defeat in 1911, $311,486,000 more than the Conservative party took in any ten years previous to 1896. Therefore, when you add this to the $82,000,000 of national debt, which they heaped upon this country, you can form some idea of the manner in which the Liberals implemented their pledge of economy to the people of Canada. I believe the Liberals never intended to carry out that pledge; it is quite clear to-day that the pledge was made to catch votes, and in that they succeeded. But the Liberal party stands before this country guilty of having violated every pledge they gave to the people of Canada previous to 1896. But that is not all. These gentlemen opposite have now the temerity to charge the Conservative Government with having increased the public debt since it came into office. True, this Government has increased the public debt, but let us see why. I find, on looking over the official returns, that on the 31st of March, 1912, the first year the present Government was responsible for the expenditure, the public debt stood at $339,919,460, and on the 28th of February just past, the debt had risen to $401,891,909, or an increase of $61,972,000 in the last three years.

But, Mr. Speaker, how was this debt increased and what was the cause of the increase? The increased debt under the Conservative Government, was incurred

entirely for the purpose of taking care of liabilities left to it by the Liberal party when it went out of office. It was a legacy, Sir, left to this Government, and this Government was in honour obliged to accept it and provide for it. I shall give to the House a statement of what it has cost this Government to care for some of the undertakings that the Liberal Government rushed into so recklessly, previous to their defeat in 1911. In order to care for these liabilities left them by the Liberals, it was necessary to provide no less a sum than $178,000,000. For the fiscal years 1912-13 and 1914-15 we find the following expenditures on works which were in progress when the present Government came to power; on the National Transcontinental railway which was undertaken by the Liberal Government against the advice of the Conservative party; the present Government expended $56,000,000, and on the Hudson Bay railway $9,000,000.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: Does the hon. gentleman object to the construction of the Hudson Bay railway?

Mr. BRADBURY: I will answer that question in a minute or two. On the Quebec bridge, which was undertaken by the Liberal Government, the present Government was obliged to spend $10,000,000. It is a monument to the shame of the late Government that a great undertaking like the Quebec bridge should have been permitted to be placed in the hands of incompetent men, and that it should have cost not only the loss of $6,000,000 to the people of Canada, but the loss of 80 lives of our citizens through the neglect of the men constructing and managing that bridge. That makes a total of $75,000,000.

Then there was the implementing clause in connection with the sale of G.T.P. bonds. The bungling finance of the late Government necessitated the providing of $4,994,416 to pay the difference between the price at which the bonds were sold and their par value. This was something to which the late Government committed this country through incompetence or something worse.

Then, there was the caring for the balance of the issue of £14,000,000. Six million eight hundred thousand pounds of Grand Trunk Pacific bonds had to be provided for. The present Minister of Finance, in order to save the country an additional loss of $6,000,000 or $8,000,000 or $10,000,000, took up the bonds at par, and paid $33,093,333. Therefore since coming into office this Government has had to provide these enormous sums in order to pay the liabilities left on the hands of this country by the late Administration. Mr. Speaker, had it not been for these liabilities which the Government had to meet, had it not been for the war, the national debt of this country would not have been increased by one dollar. In fact, it could very easily have been reduced, and would have been reduced. This, Sir, is my answer to hon. gentlemen opposite who try to make capital out of the fact that the national debt of this country has been increased by the present Government.

How do our hon. friends opposite stand in regard to the pledge which they gave to the people in 1896 to reduce the national expenditure of this country? They stand on that count just as they stand on every one of the pledges which they gave to the people previous to 1896. Every pledge that they gave was ignored and violated by the Liberal party. The people of this country at length awoke to a realization of the class of men who were in control of the destiny of this country up to 1911.

These hon. gentlemen who are criticising the public expenditures of to-day, who are advising the Government to curtail them, are on record as having promised the people that, if they were returned to power in 1896, they would reduce the public expenditure of the country, although at that time it was very small in comparison with what it has reached at the present time. In 1896, one of their pledges was:

> We cannot but view with alarm the large increase of the public debt, and the controllable annual expenditure of the Dominion, and the consequent undue taxation of the people under the governments that have been continuously in power since 1878.

The Conservative party had been in power since 1878, and that was what was worrying the Liberal party.

> We demand strict economy in the administration of this country.

The right hon. gentleman who to-day leads the Opposition made this pledge:

> If we get into power, we will follow the example of Mr. Mackenzie; and say that, although we may not be able to bring the expenditures to what they were under him, we can reduce the amount two, yes, three millions of dollars per year.

Then there was the pledge of the late Minister of Finance, Sir Richard Cartwright:

> For my own part I do not hesitate to tell him that I consider a yearly expenditure of $40,000,000 or $38,000,000 altogether too large for the present resources of Canada. I say, it is a disgrace and a shame to the Government

that have been entrusted with our affairs that they come down to us and ask for an expenditure of $38,000,000 a year for federal purposes. Sir, the thing is utterly unjustifiable.

I could go on reading pledge after pledge made by these hon. gentlemen to reduce the public expenditures of this country. I hold, Mr. Speaker, that a public pledge given by party leaders to the people of this country on the verge of an election is just as sacred and should be lived up to just as carefully and as scrupulously as a promise or pledge given in any business transaction.

But what has been the record of hon. gentlemen opposite on this question? In 1897, the first year in which the right hon. gentleman who to-day leads the Opposition, was responsible to the people in this country, the current expenditure was $38,349,760. That is the amount at which the right hon. gentleman found the expenditures of the country when he took office. The capital expenditure was $3,523,000, which makes a total of $41,872,760. In 1902, five years afterwards, the Liberal Administration, with its promise to the people to reduce expenditures still warm on its lips, had increased the current expenditure to $50,759,392, and the capital expenditure to $10,078,638 or the total to $60,838,030. The expenditures still kept going up until 1911. It was a growing time, and the Liberal party was spending the people's money like a drunken sailor throwing away his money recklessly. In 1911 the current expenditure had risen to $87,000,000, and the capital expenditure to $35,000,000, or to a total of $122,000,000. But in 1912, the current expenditure for which the late Government was responsible, had risen to $109,000,000, and the capital expenditure to $46,000,000, or to the total of $155,000,000. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite criticise Conservative ministers for having brought down an estimated current expenditure for this year of $140,000,000. This is the record of the Liberal party as to the manner in which it has implemented its pledge to reduce the expenditures of this country.

I would like for a moment to draw the attention of the House to the percentage of increase in expenditure. The total disbursements under the late Government increased by 178 per cent in the fifteen years it was in office. The increase per head was 85 per cent. Let me give a ten-year record, which is worth placing on Hansard. The ten-year record of expenditure under the Conservative party previous to 1896 shows that it had expended on public works in this country $423,358,000; whereas the late Government, pledged to reduce the expenditures, during the ten years after it had come into office, had spent $919,748,517, or an increase of $496,390,517. The per capita expenditure in 1896 was $8.80, and in 1911, $16.40, just double what they found it on assuming office.

This is the record of the Liberal party, showing how it implemented its pledge that if returned to office it would reduce the public expenditures. I do not know that I should have taken up even a moment of the time of the House in reviewing this question—for the people are thoroughly conversant with it—had it not been for the taunt thrown across the floor, the charge made that the party now in power deserves censure for not having implemented its pre-election pledges.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The hon. gentleman has not attempted to answer that.

Mr. BRADBURY: I have answered it by denying it, and by showing that hon. gentlemen opposite cannot prove it. The onus of proof lies upon the hon. members who made the charge.

Mr. MACLEAN: You have answered it simply by referring to the pre-election pledges of hon. gentlemen on this side a quarter of a century ago.

Mr. BRADBURY: These pledges given a quarter of a century ago were given by the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who still leads that party. And I hope he will live long to lead it. He is still with us and is still responsible for the policy of the Liberal party.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. BRADBURY: I find that these hon. gentlemen have a record on the question of the tariff. They went up and down this country for years denouncing protection. And I will read just one or two of their pledges, for it will be of interest to the younger members on the other side of the House, who do not know what their friends were committed to in days gone by. Sir Richard Cartwright said:

> I say our protective system was a huge mistake in so far as it was honest at all; and in so far as it was not honest, it was a huge scheme of robbery. . . Their ideal is protection; ours is free trade. We will never desist until this country is freed from the incubus that has been weighing it down for fifteen long years.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition spoke in the city of Winnipeg on one of his western tours. I remember well his coming to my own constituency, and speaking

in the town of Selkirk, bringing with him the late Hon. D. C. Fraser, then member of this House for Guysborough; and I remember very well that at this meeting this is what he said:

> The people of this country, the inhabitants of the city of Winnipeg especially, are toiling for a master who takes away a very large portion of your earnings, the earnings for which you toil and sweat for privileged masters, for those who use protection which I claim is bondage. If the Government take away from you any portion of your earnings, be they large or small, to give them to somebody else, that Government is as much a robber towards you as is the highwayman who puts a pistol to your head and says: your purse or your life. I denounce this policy of protection. Protection cannot be defended on any fair principle.

I also wish to call the attention of the House—because it affects my own province—to the utterance on behalf of the Liberal party of that day, by a leading member of the Liberal Government and the pledge he made to the people of the West:

> Return us to power, and we will give you free trade as they have it in England. That is the Liberal policy. We will no longer tolerate the policy of the Conservatives which robs you for the benefit of a handful of manufacturers. We will at once and for ever wipe off the statute book the villainous protection policy which has stunted the prosperity of the whole country and taken the heart's blood out of the people of Manitoba. Free coal oil, free clothing, and free implements you will have if the Liberal party are returned to power.

This is the statement of Hon. Mr. (now Sir Clifford) Sifton, a man who was the right-hand man of the present leader of the Opposition when at the head of the Government, and the strongest of his ministers from the West; in fact, he was known as the dictator of the Liberal policy; and this is the pledge he gave, speaking for his party. And what did they do when they came into power? One of the first things, Mr. Speaker, was to take into the Senate two of the greatest sinners, perhaps, so far as the West is concerned—Sir Melvin Jones and Hon. Mr. Frost. That is the way they carried out their pledge to give the farmers free implements. And for long years they did not even touch the duty on farm implements. At length they made up their minds that they must do something, that the farmers of the West could not be fooled all the time, and on the eve of an election they reduced the tariff on agricultural implements from 20 per cent, where the Conservative Government had left it, to 17½ per cent. And the farmers were told by Sir Clifford Sifton that 17½ per cent was only a revenue tariff. This is the manner in which they fooled the farmers of the West into supporting them. They managed for fifteen years to pull the wool over the eyes of the farmers of the West by their promises to do something year after year. But the day came when the farmers had their eyes opened. As soon as the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had the temerity to attempt to impose the reciprocity pact upon the people of this country, as soon as he attempted to make Canada an adjunct of the United States, the farmers of Canada turned him out of office.

What was their success in dealing with the tariff, in eliminating "every vestige of protection," as they promised to do? On every platform in Canada these pledges were made by responsible men and repeated by those irresponsible, that if the Liberals were returned to office they would eliminate every vestige of protection from the tariff. But in fifteen years of power, they succeeded in reducing the tariff just about two per cent. Why, Sir, the greatest reduction ever made in the National Policy tariff was made by the Conservative party itself, made by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). And he is not a free trader. This party does not pose before the people as being a party of free traders. We believe in the National Policy; we have advocated it in season and out of season; we believe in fair protection to farmer and manufacturer alike; there is no hypocrisy in the position we occupy before the people. But hon. gentlemen opposite declare themselves to be against protection. My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) on all occasions since being placed in opposition has preached the doctrine of free trade—a beautiful theory but utterly impracticable in this country, and proven impracticable in the world generally. History tells us that when Cobden introduced free trade in England, he declared that within a few years the world would adopt free trade. And to-day we find that the world is protectionist everywhere except in Great Britain.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Hear, hear.

Mr. BRADBURY: "Hear, hear," says the hon. gentleman——

Mr. CLARK: What is the matter with Great Britain?

Mr. BRADBURY: Great Britain has prospered in spite of free trade, by reason of her great marine power and by direct taxation. My hon. friend will not tell me that free trade prevails even in Great

Britain. He knows that it collects a large part of its revenue to-day from tea and other commodities of that kind, which we allow to come into this country free for the poor people. The hon. gentlemen who now occupy the Opposition benches had control of the affairs of this country for fifteen years. In that time they became the close and intimate friends of the great manufacturing industries of this country. But to-day, when they are in the cold shades of Opposition, there is nothing too hard or too cruel for them to say about the manufacturers. We will have the same old story from the Opposition benches before many years have passed that was preached by the Liberal party before 1896; the policy of blue ruin is starting to show in the faces of hon. gentlemen opposite, and we will have it proclaimed from every platform that the country is going to the dogs because they are not ruling its affairs. But it will take a good deal of persuasion on the part of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition and his eloquent friends to convince the people of this country that it will be a safe proposition to restore the Liberal party to office.

I wish now to refer to a few more of their many violated pledges, although time would not permit me to discuss them all. One plank in their platform was very interesting and very important in the West, that was the cry: The land for the settler and not for the speculator. Here is the plank in their platform:

Public land for the actual settler.

The sale of public lands of the Dominion should be to actual settlers only and not to the speculators, upon reasonable terms of settlement and in such areas as can be reasonably occupied and cultivated by the settler.

I want to say without any reservation that when that plank was put in the platform of the Liberal party it did more to win hundreds of votes from settlers in Manitoba even than their anti-protection plank, because there was a growing feeling that the lands of this country were being exploited by large speculators and that the poor settler was not being taken proper care of. How did the Liberal party implement that pledge? Did they keep the land for the settler or did they hand it out to the speculators, their special friends? You will all remember how they handled the Saskatchewan land deal. This notorious transaction has been spoken of in every part of Canada. Some 250,000 acres of land that is to-day the choice land of the Saskatchewan valley was sold to political friends for $1 per acre. This was divided up so that the boys would get a share of the rake-off on these lands. You all remember that the Premier of Saskatchewan was charged by a paper in Moosejaw with having received $12,000 as his share in this land transaction. This was on the eve of an election, if I remember aright. He immediately took proceedings in court, bringing an action for libel claiming $25,000 against the paper. The case was hung up until after the election was over and then his attorney withdrew the case and paid all the costs. That does not look like the act of an innocent man. But he was not the only one. It is rumoured on pretty good authority that a Government official in a high position received $25,000 of this stock; but he was timorous and returned the stock, and then three weeks afterwards repented and tried to get the stock back but did not succeed. This is the manner in which the Liberal party of Canada started out to implement their pledge to keep the land for the settler. Here was a magnificent area of land, 250,000 acres in extent, which in all fairness ought to have been divided up among the poor settlers who were looking for good land—settlers who, on account of transactions of this kind, have been crowded on to poor lands, some of them utterly unfit for settlement, while the good lands near the railways have been given away to Liberal friends, the speculators. This is one instance of how they implemented that pledge.

4 p m.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Was not that land which was sold to the Saskatchewan Land Valley Company sold on the condition of actual settlement?

Mr. BRADBURY: Mr. Speaker, it was, and the condition was such a liberal condition that any man or set of men could have fulfilled it. However, it makes no difference what the condition was, we had the actual settlers in that country who wanted land, who were hungry for land; but they were crowded away from the centres and from the railways on to the poor lands in the different provinces—and here were men who secured this land, 250,000 acres, for $1 an acre. These lands to-day are worth from $40 to $50 an acre.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is it not true that before the Saskatchewan Land Valley Company got this land and began to bring in settlers there was a territory over 60 miles in length along that railway on which there was no settlement, although the railway had been

built for a number of years, because the general impression was that it was not good land, or land which was fit for settlement?

Mr. BRADBURY: The answer to that is very simple. It may not have been thrown open to homesteading at the time and consequently no homesteaders could get on it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend is entirely mistaken; the land was all opened to homesteading.

Mr. BRADBURY: I do not want to deny the hon. gentleman the opportunity of asking questions. What I have said was stated many times before.

Mr. CARVELL: And denied many times.

Mr. BRADBURY: We have the proof of the pudding to-day; we know what has taken place, and we know that a more glaring and outrageous scandal never was perpetrated on the people of Canada than the sale of these lands to this company; and the proof of it is that much of the stock of this company was divided up amongst a bunch of political friends. But I pass from that.

What has their policy been in connection with grazing leases? The hon. member for West Kent (Mr. McCoig) criticised the Government the other evening for having given away or sold cheaply some grazing lands for the purpose of raising horses. The hon. gentleman is young in this House and young in public life, or he would not have referred to this matter; for what does the record show? It shows that one outfit or one combination of political friends secured nearly four hundred thousand acres of grazing lands on irrevocable leases for twenty-one years at the nominal rent of one cent an acre, I think, and they were given the right of purchasing ten per cent of that land at one dollar an acre. That is how hon. gentlemen opposite attempted to assist the poor people of this country, the farmers' sons who are looking for homesteads, and many of whom are to-day being crowded out of their own districts and forced to go farther west or farther north to lands many of them utterly unsuited for cultivation.

Then, we have the irrigation land deal. A few of the friends cleaned up a million and a quarter of money on that. Then there was the Blairmore townsite, a notorious case at the time. Many hon. gentlemen in this House will remember the man who got this townsite for something like $480—a townsite that was worth to the people of Canada at least two or three hundred thousand dollars. Hon. gentlemen opposite gave this townsite to a political friend. The man has since died, so I will not go any further into that. Then there was the exploitation of timber lands. I heard the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) wax eloquent the other evening over the high price of lumber on account of this extra tariff. If the party that he has followed so long and so ably and faithfully had conserved the timber resources of the Northwest Territory and of Manitoba, we might to-day have been in a position to give to our people cheaper lumber than we can now give them. These timber lands are held by a few men, Liberals, who got them for a song.

Then, there was the exploitation of the fisheries. You all remember what they did with our fisheries. They gave all the fisheries north of lake Winnipeg—a kingdom in itself—to their political friends for the nominal sum of $10 a year, with the right to fish in Hudson bay—a most glaring outrage, I think, in view of the fact that our fisheries are one of the most valuable assets we have in Canada to-day. After this matter was exposed in the House the leases were cancelled, as they ought to have been. The pity is that the policy of restoration did not go farther and force some of these men who had received our timber lands and our coal lands in the manner they did to restore at least a portion of them to the Crown.

Then, we have the St. Boniface land deal, engineered by one of the Commissioners of the Transcontinental railway. The evidence shows that $161,000 was cleaned up on that deal. Hon. gentlemen opposite have had the temerity to throw a challenge across this House regarding the manner in which pledges are kept, and I am giving these few examples to show the people of Canada how hon. gentlemen opposite implemented, when in office, the pledges they gave to the people of this country. They have not shown, nor can they show one pledge given by the leader of this side of the House that has not been kept.

I want to refer for a moment to another pledge given to the people of this country —the pledge in regard to prohibition. Perhaps no question is receiving such earnest attention from the people of Canada to-day as the question of prohibition, the question of curtailing in some way the sale of liquor. On the eve of an election, when this was a live question, the right hon. gentleman saw his opportunity and pledged himself to give the people of Canada a plebiscite, and to

make good that plebiscite if it was carried by the people.

I want to refer for a moment to one or two of the pledges the right hon. gentleman gave. In 1895, just the year before the election of 1896, the present leader of the Opposition held a large meeting in Carleton Place, and spoke as follows:

> The Liberal party has pledged itself in convention at Ottawa that whenever in power they would take a plebiscite on the question as to whether the people want a prohibitory liquor law or not. The answer is not in my hands, it is in the hands of the people, and according to their answer such legislation they will have at the hands of the Government.

That was a fair and distinct promise given to the people of Canada. If you vote for prohibition, the right hon. gentleman in substance said, I, as Premier of this country, will implement that pledge.

Mr. WILCOX: What was the hon. gentleman reading from?

Mr. BRADBURY: From a very admirable speech by a gentleman named Mr. Bennett, which is found on page 4305 of the Hansard Debates of April 25, 1900.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is it ancient or modern history?

Mr. BRADBURY: It is ancient history, like a good many of the promises made by hon. gentlemen opposite. The right hon. gentleman went to the city of Winnipeg. He found the prohibition question a very live one in Manitoba, as it has been since and he took the opportunity of renewing his pledge there. He said:

> He pledged his honour that as soon as the Liberals came into power they would take a plebiscite of the Dominion by which the party would stand, and the will of the people would be carried out even were it to cost power for ever to the Liberal party.

No promise could have been clearer, no stronger words could have been used; and yet, when the voice of the people of Canada voted in favour of prohibition by a majority I think of something like 13,000, the Government closed their ears. The book was closed and nothing was done. But there is a little history in connection with that matter. Every one who took any interest in that question at that time will remember that the different provinces of Canada, with the exception of the province of Quebec, voted largely in favour of prohibition. I forget the exact figures, but the majority for prohibition was one hundred thousand or more. The result of the poll in Quebec could not be ascertained for days and weeks. There was a feeling throughout the country that the ballot boxes were stuffed, and an investigation proved that to be absolutely true. Let me just read what was found to prevail at some of the polling stations. In Quebec Centre, poll 23, 105 votes were polled when there were only 101 names on the polling list. They polled a splendid percentage between them.

Mr. WILCOX: All against prohibition?

Mr. BRADBURY: All against prohibition. At No. 1 poll, West Quebec, there were 114 votes polled and 115 on the list; at No. 2 poll, 111 polled and 114 on the list, and at the Lachine poll, Jacques Cartier, there were 108 votes polled and 111 on the list. I only quote these few figures to show that the suspicion of the temperance people who were earnest and anxious for temperance legislation at that time was amply justified. I do not believe there is any province in this country which is more interested on this question to-day than the province of Quebec. They have made great strides since those days and they are in line with the people of Canada on the question of prohibition. Some of the strongest legislation that has been passed by any of the provinces has been passed by the province of Quebec during the last few years. They have made wonderful progress in regard to this question. But they were under the tutelage at that time of men who did not want prohibition put up to the Government of that day. While the promise was given, it would have been a calamity in the eyes of some of the leaders of that day for any Government to have introduced prohibition. But the day is coming, and it may not be as far away as some think, when this will be a live question again in this country and the records of hon. gentlemen opposite will stand out before the public as a warning, and will show whom the people can trust on great questions of this kind.

If this were only the record of the Federal Government, led by my right hon. friend, it would not be so bad. But we found the Manitoba Liberals very apt pupils of my right hon. friend who leads the Opposition. They took hold of this question right on the eve of an election. They said to themselves: This is a good election cry; it is something we can sweep the province with; and Mr. Greenway, Premier of Manitoba, in 1892, advocated

prohibition and said to the people: We will have a plebiscite, and if you vote for prohibition you will get it. What was the result? There were 45,573 voters on the lists in Manitoba at that time; 18,637 voted for prohibition and only 7,115 against. Did they get prohibition? Why, the Liberal leader took the same position in Manitoba as the Liberal leader has taken in the Federal House here. Mr. Greenway simply pigeon-holed the result and allowed the matter to stand as it stands at the present time. Although he had two and a half times as many votes in favour of prohibition in Manitoba as had been cast against it he still refused to act. The province of Ontario was in the same position under a Liberal Government. But another election was coming on in Manitoba at a time when the Greenway Government was discredited and was in a very tight box. The people of Manitoba are an easy people, at least they were once very easily fooled and cajoled by the Liberal leaders. In 1898 Mr. Greenway again submitted the question of prohibition. This time prohibition was carried by a majority of 9,000. Still there was no prohibition. The leaders of the Liberal party never implemented the pledge they gave to the people. It would seem that the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition to-day and the great Liberal leaders of Canada had been close and apt students of the German historian Bernhardi, who had taught that no pledge or promise should be kept unless it redounded to the interest of the party or state that was affected. That is what caused this great war that is going on to-day. The British Government, in its own defence, and in defence of its honour, determined to keep the promise it had given to the Belgians to protect the neutrality of their country. If the Liberal party of Canada had had control of a situation of that kind they would have had no difficulty in getting out of the responsibility as they have got out of other pledges that they have given to the people of Canada. I have devoted all the time I intend to give to this phase of the question.

Mr. CARVELL: Hear, hear.

Mr. BRADBURY: I think I have convinced even the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell), that it is not safe for the Liberal party to charge this side of the House with not implementing its pledges. I now wish to discuss one or two phases of the present Budget as referred to by our hon. friends on the other side of the House. My hon. friend the junior member for Halifax, during his discussion of the subject said:

> But the general tariff to-day, as amended is such as to diminish the value and destroy the purpose of the preferential tariff to Great Britain.

This is a question, Mr. Speaker, that nearly every hon. gentleman who has spoken from the Opposition benches has dealt with. The fact is that when you go into this matter you find that the changes in the tariff have not materially changed the preference given to the British manufacturer. The British manufacturer occupies the same position relatively that he did before. The proposition before the House increases the general tariff by 7½ per cent and makes only 5 per cent of a reduction in the British preferential tariff which still leaves the preference in favour of Great Britain 2½ per cent better than it was before. Just an illustration; take item 453 in the Customs Tariff an you will find that on machinery the British preferential tariff was 15 per cent and the general tariff 27½ per cent. That is what it was before this change took place. That gave Great Britain a preference of 12½ per cent. Now the new tariff adds 5 per cent to the British preferential tariff rate and 7½ per cent to the general rate. That makes the duty, under the British preferential tariff, 20 per cent and, under the general tariff, 35 per cent, giving a preference in favour of Great Britain of 15 per cent or 2½ per cent better than it was. The same thing applies to item 567 which deals with clothing. Under the old tariff the preferential duty was 30 per cent and the general rate 35 per cent, giving Great Britain a preference of only 5 per cent. The new tariff, which we designate as a war tax, although that is disputed by hon. gentlemen opposite, adds 5 per cent to the British preferential tariff and 7½ per cent to the general tariff. The result is that we find that the duty on clothing from Great Britain is 35 per cent, while the duty under the general tariff is 42½ per cent. The preference given to Great Britain in that case is 7½ per cent, or 2½ per cent better than it was.

It is very difficult to understand, Mr. Speaker, how hon. gentlemen opposite make out that the British preference has been destroyed, in view of the fact that the British preference as a whole is as great to-day as it was before this Budget was brought down, and in some things it is greater. The tariff has not touched

mowers, or reapers, or binders, or binder twine, and all these things are just in the same position as they were. And yet we have the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) and other hon. members waxing eloquent over the manner in which the farmers of this country are being taxed.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: Would the hon. gentleman mind telling us how many reapers and binders and mowers were imported from Great Britain?

Mr. BRADBURY: Reapers and binders are not imported from Great Britain, but the duty of 7½ per cent that is applied to all other items is not applied to these items. The Government of this country did not place an extra duty on these implements.

Mr. CARVELL: Ask him about ploughs.

Mr. BRADBURY: I will tell my hon. friend something about ploughs before I finish. We had in this House a few years ago the Minister of Finance of the late Government, a very eminent man, a man who was looked upon by the Liberal party, and indeed by Conservatives, as one of the big men of Canada; I refer to the Hon. Mr. Fielding. Let us see what position the Hon. Mr. Fielding now takes with regard to this Budget, and let us compare it with the position taken by his Liberal friends in this House. If Mr. Fielding were in the House now, sitting beside his old leader, I venture to say the criticisms that have been offered to this Budget never would have emanated from the Liberal party. I quote from the Journal of Commerce, of which the Hon. Mr. Fielding is editor, and in its issue of Friday, February 12, 1915, dealing with the Budget, it says:

> Increased taxation is not at any time welcome, and therefore Mr. White's budget is not likely to be regarded as a thing of joy. But taxes which at another period might evoke sharp criticism may be accepted under present conditions with something like equanimity.
>
> While expenditure had increased, the revenues were no longer flourishing. The war, no doubt, added to the diminution of income. But even if there had been no war, additional taxation would have been inevitable. Whether the money was required for one purpose or another, the situation to the Finance Minister was the same. He had to raise more revenue.

I commend this to hon. gentlemen opposite.

> If there are any who are disposed to criticise his method they would do well to reflect whether any better and more convenient way could have been taken. The exemptions that have been made show the minister had a commendable desire to avoid, as far as he could, the placing of additional burdens on those least able to bear them. Some of the minor taxes may prove more irritating than profitable, but they are not unjust. The addition of five per cent to the tariff on British goods, and seven and one half per cent on other goods, is the main feature of the Budget. If the question were one of permanent fiscal policy, these additions would, of course, be open to grave objection. But they are imposed to meet what we all hope is a temporary condition, and if those who for the moment may profit by them distinctly understand this, and govern themselves accordingly, there will probably be little objection to this portion of the Budget.
>
> Altogether, Mr. White seems to have made the best of a troublesome situation.

This is the opinion of the late Liberal Minister of Finance in reference to the Budget, and he was once looked upon by his own party as one of the greatest men in Canada; in my opinion he was the greatest finance minister the Liberal party ever had. These are his opinions; this is his advice to his party, and, comparing Mr. Fielding's remarks with the remarks of the hon. gentlemen opposite who are making this carping criticism on the Budget, the comparison places them in a very awkward position before the people of Canada. We had the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), a few nights ago in this House, in his wild heroics, raising his hand to Heaven and declaring: keep your unholy and disloyal hands off the British preference. Just imagine the hon. gentleman waxing eloquent over this matter, and this in the face of the advice of the great Finance Minister of his own party, which warns him to be careful in his language, and points out to him that there was no better way to deal with the situation than that in which the present Finance Minister has dealt with it. But, Mr. Speaker, the attitude of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) does not deceive any one; it does not deceive the electors in the West and it does not deceive the members in this House. So much for the British preference. Some hon. gentleman a few moments ago spoke of ploughs, and the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Buchanan) and the hon. member for West Kent (Mr. McCoig) have both referred in this debate to the increased duty on ploughs. The hon. member for Medicine Hat said:

> I have here a clipping from the Winnipeg Free Press of Tuesday, February 23—

The Free Press is a very dangerous authority to quote on a question of this kind.

> —containing the report of an interview with Mr. H. W. Hutchinson—

Mr. Hutchinson is a life-long Liberal, a man no doubt anxious to cast suspicion upon any act performed by the Conservative Government and ready to raise agitation or

ill-feeling amongst the farmers, so as to make them dissatisfied. This is the man whom the hon. member (Mr. Buchanan) quotes in this House as an authority.

—vice-president and managing director of the John Deer Plough Company—

an American institution. Then the hon. member for Medicine Hat goes on to quote the following language from Mr. Hutchinson:

The prairie farmers will, of course, be called on to pay the duty. We have been already notified by Canadian manufacturers that prices will be increased to us and we have already begun to prepare a new price list for the sale of our commodities. On every walking plough there will be an increase in the price paid of from $1 to $2; on every sulky plough an increase of $4; on every drill an increase of $5.

Later on the hon. member (Mr. Buchanan) quotes Mr. Hutchinson as saying:

On every gang plough an increase of $6; on every wagon an increase of $7, and on every disc plough an increase of $8.

This is a quotation by the hon. member (Mr. Buchanan) from an interview given by Mr. Hutchinson, the agent of an American manufacturing concern, and the inference he intended to leave on the House was that the Canadian manufacturers had increased their prices on farm implements. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that on examination it will be found that the Canadian manufacturers have not increased the price of these goods since this tariff came down. If there have been any increases—they are very small, and I will cite them to the House later—they were made months before the tariff was thought of, and just in the ordinary regulation of the prices of the different machines. I have here a letter from the Cockshutt Plow Company, and the Cockshutt Plow Company owes it to itself to make this explanation.

I hold no brief for this company; but I am glad to be put in possession of facts that warrant me in saying in this House that the Canadian manufacturers were too patriotic to take advantage of the circumstances in order to increase the price of those ploughs, when they might have done so. This letter, which was written after the hon. member for West Kent (Mr. McCoig) spoke, reads as follows:

Mr. McCoig has, I notice, been making a statement in the House from our "Private and Confidential" lists in which he states we have advanced our prices for this season. Mr. McCoig being an implement man knows that each year a price list is issued (ours appearing in December) with such changes as are rendered necessary by the cost of production.

This list that was complained of was made up in December, 1914.

He saw fit to give only the increases and not the decreases.

As a matter of fact the ploughs that he named were advanced about 50 cents each, and not on account of the tariff, but to meet increased cost. These ploughs he referred to are a type that are sold in Eastern Canada and are not suitable for prairie use, and not one single type of these ploughs suitable for Canadian trade is made in the United States. As an implement man Mr. McCoig knows this, or else he does not know his business.

He goes on to say:

The Maple Leaf gang he refers to was not advanced in price—last year it was quoted without straightener. This year it is quoted with straightener at $1 more, so here also he is mistaken.

That explains the dollar increase in the cost of the gang plough.

The Ontario Footlift gang plough to which he refers is a new and improved design, and appears in our list for the first time, last year's pattern having been discarded.

He also in his speech infers that on May 1, our prices will again be advanced 5 per cent. How does he know? Who told him? We certainly did not, and we have already publicly stated our prices had been made for the season and would stand, so Mr. McCoig is wrong again.

This is an answer to the hon. gentleman who has been trying to make it appear that the Canadian manufacturers have been taking advantage of the situation in order to raise the prices of their ploughs to the farmers.

Let me give some of the reductions that have been made: Grain binders, 4·5 per cent; corn binders, 1·7 per cent; S.D. hay rakes, 4 per cent; hay tedders, 3 per cent; seed drills, 1·3 per cent; No. 2 cultivators, 1·6 per cent; No. 5 cultivators, 10 per cent; No. 3 disc harrows (16x16), 8 per cent; lever drag harrows, 3·4 per cent; two-way sulky ploughs (2B), 7 per cent; two-way sulky ploughs (1B), 13 per cent; gasoline engines, 7 per cent to 13 per cent, according to size.

The increases are: Reapers, 5 per cent; land rollers, 3 per cent; 16-tooth cultivators, 3 per cent; footlift sulky plough, 6 per cent. On 21 types of walking ploughs listed, 9 were increased 5 per cent; 1 was increased 5½ per cent; 1 was increased 10 per cent; and 10 remained the same.

That is a pretty fair answer to the statement made by the hon. member.

I hold in my hand the Cockshutt Plow Company's list for 1915, which is red-inked, showing the reductions that have been made. Some of the items that affect the farmers of the West are as follows:

Grain binders: No. 3 binder, 5 foot with sheaf carrier, $5 decrease; No. 3 binder, 6 foot, with sheaf carrier, $5 decrease; No. 3 binder, 7 foot, with sheaf carrier, $5 decrease; No. 3 binder, 7 foot, with sheaf carrier and pole truck, $5 decrease; No. 3 binder, 8 foot, with sheaf carrier, $5 decrease.

That reduction runs through the whole list. I am authorized to say that the list as it stands to-day is lower than it was in 1914, and that it will not be increased.

Mr. MACNUTT: Is that decrease made to the farmers or to the dealers?

Mr. BRADBURY: It is made to any man who wants to purchase those implements. You can buy them or a dealer can buy them. That is a complete answer to the statements made in the Winnipeg Free Press interview which was used by my hon. friend the member for Lethbridge (Mr. Buchanan). I am satisfied that that hon. member would not have read that interview in this House if he had understood the situation.

There is another article affected by this tariff, namely, cement. Hon. gentlemen opposite have a record onthis. My hon. friends, the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) and the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), who I am sorry is not in his seat, have devoted a good deal of time to endeavour to make the people believe that they are being injured by this tariff to the extent of the increased duty.

Mr. TURRIFF: So they are.

Mr. BRADBURY: The hon. member says, "So they are." The hon. member waxed eloquent against the great merger that was permitted to be formed. There is an old opposite have a record on this. My hon. they first make mad." If the hon. member had reflected on the attitude of his party towards that merger when it had an opportunity of preventing it, he would have hesitated before making such a statement. I had the honour of having a seat in this House when the merger was formed. I was sitting on the opposite side, and I called the attention of the late Minister of Finance to this merger and warned him of what might happen. I received a very unsympathetic reply, and no action whatever was taken to control the operations of the merger of which the hon. member is complaining to-day.

Mr. J. D. REID: I think the hon. member for Assiniboia supported that legislation.

Mr. BRADBURY: I am quoting from Hansard of 1912-13, volume 1, page 400. I asked the question:

[Mr. Bradbury.]

1. Has the attention of the Government been called to the cement merger that has taken place, by means of which the Canada Cement Company, Limited, has taken over ten of the largest cement companies of Canada with a capital of $30,000,000 and that on account of this merger the prices of cement to the consumer has been very much increased?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to take action to protect the public against this merger, which threatens to be a huge combine, thereby increasing the cost of cement which is almost a necessity to-day in great works?

Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance): The Government are aware from information in the public press, that a number of cement manufactories of the Dominion have been consolidated under one large company. Whether this consolidation has unduly enhanced the price of cement is a disputed point.

The law provides two methods of dealing with combinations which unduly enhance prices.

Then, the former Minister of Finance goes on to point out that the citizens can take action, but that he, or the Government responsible, refuse to take any action. Why? You have not far to go to find the reason—the promoters of the cement merger were leading Liberals. The late Senator Cox, the present president of the company, Senator Edwards, Senator McKay—all leading Liberals—are the men who created this merger. If this is a combine, the Liberal party are entirely responsible for it.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: What year is that Hansard?

Mr. BRADBURY: It is 1912-13.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: The hon. gentleman has made a mistake in the date.

Mr. BRADBURY: Yes, I have given correctly the date of the book from which I am now quoting, but I had a mistake in the date in this way: I am quoting from quotations made in a speech of my own of that year. But it was on the 16th of November, 1909, that I called the attention of the House to this matter. And what was the attitude of my hon. friend from Assiniboia at that time? Though he sat in this House then, he never raised his voice against this merger. And the hon. member for Edmonton, who was a trusted member of the Government of that day, had nothing to say. These hon. gentlemen, like others on that side, when in office were great friends of the combines and mergers; but since leaving office they have changed their attitude and are now trying to fool the farmers again.

Now, I wish to deal with the cement question as affected by the present tariff. The hon. member for Assiniboia says:

Now my hon. friend comes forward and puts an extra duty of 7½ per cent on cement. . . .

Is he saving it to the farmer or to the town or villages that are using cement for paving, or to the business man who uses cement in putting up buildings? Is he saving it to any user of cement? No, Mr. Speaker, he is not, he is handing over a bonus of thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars to the greatest combine and merger that we have in Canada today.

This is the merger which he himself allowed to be created, against which he did not raise his voice, though I was trying to prevent it in 1909. I wish to make the same statement about cement that I made about ploughs and farm implements a few moments ago. I am assured by the president of this cement "merger-combine," as my hon. friend called it, that there is no intention to raise the price in Canada. They have facilities to produce a surplus of two million barrels a year; they can control the situation to-day; and they say they have no intention of increasing the price of cement to the people on account of this tariff.

What was the situation? In 1894 the tariff on cement was 40 cents a barrel, including a duty on bags. In 1897, the duty was 43 cents a barrel. In 1905, under hon. gentlemen opposite it had been increased to 53¾ cents a barrel, and in 1906 it was reduced to 51¾ cents a barrel. Now, the reciprocity pact which these hon. gentlemen were so anxious to foist upon the people contained a provision, which, had it gone into effect, would have reduced the duty on cement to 46½ cents a barrel, including the duty on bags. In 1913 the duty was reduced by the Conservative Government—the present Government—to 43 cents a barrel. It has always been the pleasure of the Conservative party to reduce the duty on commodities to assist the farmers and poor people of this country. The present increase in the tax makes the duty on cement 53½ cents a barrel—puts it back where it was in 1905 under the Liberal Government; and in view of their own record, I do not think hon. gentlemen have any reason to complain. On account of this awful war, we have had to increase taxation, and so the duty on cement is raised until it is one-quarter cent a barrel less than it was under the Liberals in 1905. In 1912, it will be remembered we had a cement famine—cement was needed all over this country. The present Finance Minister took advantage of a clause in the Customs Act to cut the duty on cement in two. And at once he and every hon. gentleman on that side including the hon. gentleman from Assiniboia, attacked the Government for doing it.

Mr. TURRIFF: No.

Mr. BRADBURY: I can produce the record.

Mr. TURRIFF: No.

Mr. BRADBURY: I take the hon. gentleman's word. I have not his record, but I have that of the hon. member for Edmonton. The hon. member for Edmonton charged this Government with having been actuated by a desire not to help the farmers but to influence an election. That was the position taken by the Liberal party. It happened that there was an election in Saskatchewan. But people in the West and all over Canada were in need of cement, and thousands, and ten of thousands, of men without employment because cement could not be had. And when the Government cut the cement duty in two these hon gentlemen were unpatriotic enough to denounce this Government for having done what it could to assist the farmers, declaring that the Government was not doing it for the good of the people but to influence an election. I do not think, in view of the record of hon. gentlemen opposite on this question, that they have any ground to stand upon nor any warrant for the charges they make that the present tariff will be an imposition upon the farmers. I have no hesitation in saying—and I am speaking by the book—that the price of cement will not be increased one cent a barrel in this country by reason of this tariff. The farmers of Canada will not refuse to pay their share of the war tax.

I have taken up a great deal more time than I had expected, but there are some things that I feel I must deal with. The hon. member for Edmonton makes a great noise about the stamp duty on letters. He makes this statement:

Then $300,000 is expected on insurance premiums, $7,000,000 from increased postal rates, and $3,000,000 from railway passengers. It appears to me that the ordinary man who uses the postal facilities is bearing an unduly heavy share of this burden of taxation, while the great financial interests are bearing an unduly light proportion.

Then he goes on, lower down:

While the ordinary man who posts a letter pays $7,000,000, the man who rides in a railway train pays $3,000,000. The principle of direct taxation is sound, but this is not the way I would do it.

What are the facts? We want to be fair in regard to these questions. Any man who knows anything about the postal system of Canada knows that the great business houses of Canada, the banking institutions, insurance companies and other

great corporations, pay the largest proportion of the postal revenue. I venture to say that not 50 per cent of this postal tax will be paid by the ordinary man in Canada; it will be paid by the large corporations such as the banks. I have one bank in my mind now which is paying out $150,000 a year in postage. These are the institutions that are going to bear the burden of taxation in this as in nearly all other matters. That goes to show how unfair the criticism from the opposite side of the House on this question has been. If these gentlemen had taken the advice of their ex-Finance Minister they would not have found themselves in the awkward position they are placed in to-day, on account of their unpatriotic criticism of the present attempt to handle a difficult question.

I cannot close without referring to another matter which affects my own province, that is, the question referred to by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) and the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt). During their speeches both of these gentlemen condemned the construction of the Hudson Bay railway.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I desire to correct my hon. friend. I did not condemn the construction of the Hudson Bay railway.

Mr. NESBITT: I did.

Mr. BRADBURY: Perhaps I had better qualify my statement. The hon. gentleman objected to the expenditure provided for the Hudson Bay railway this year.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Of $5,500,000.

Mr. BRADBURY: He advised the Government to cut the $5,000,000 estimate down to $1,000,000. His friend behind him went one better and said:

> The first item I am going to speak about is the expenditure on the Hudson Bay railway I know that my hon. friends on this side of the House promised to build that railway, but I have come to the conclusion, or almost come to the conclusion, that political parties are justified in certain instances in not keeping promises which they should never have made.

This kind of reasoning is exactly what caused this war that is going on today. My hon. friends while on this side of the House had this virtue, that while they promised to start the Hudson Bay railway they never did. They sent out surveyors and got reports on the road which, however, did not assist the late Government in keeping its pledge to complete this road. But the fact is that they did not have courage enough or honesty of purpose enough to implement the pledges they had given to the people because they had pledged themselves in 1908 that if they were returned to power the farmers of the Northwest could take their grain to the Hudson bay ports within three years. That was a distinct pledge given to the people of the West, and I say they did not have honesty or fairness enough to implement that pledge. My hon. friend says they did not start the building of the road; but they did start to build a bridge across the Saskatchewan which cost a large amount of money, and the road was in that condition when the Conservative party came into power. I shall quote what the hon. gentleman did say, I want to be fair:

> When we come to the Hudson Bay railway and the terminals at Port Nelson, while I have always been in favour of the construction of that railway, yet we ought to pause, and instead of proposing to expend, as the Government is doing, $5,000,000 during this year on that railway and terminals, the Government, in fairness to the people of Canada, ought to cut that amount down to the sum of not more than $1,000,000.

That is his proposition. But I find that the hon. member for North Oxford was a little stronger. When Mr. Sharpe asked: "Did they not let the first contract?" my hon. friend from North Oxford said:

> Not that I know of. At any rate did not build any of the road. The Government are asking this year for a vote of $5,500,000 for the Hudson Bay railway. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) the other evening said that that could be cut down to $1,000,000 without hurting anybody. I say it could be absolutely wiped out, and that if the Government of the day would pull up the rails and sell them to somebody else for whatever they would bring, they would earn the lasting gratitude of the people of this country. In my judgment the Hudson Bay railway has no more chance of earning money than Stefansson would have if he built a railway upon one of those islands where he is lost. They do say that there are some fish in Hudson bay.

This, Mr. Speaker, coming from a man who occupies the prominent position in his party that my hon. friend does, the man who was sent to Ontario during the reciprocity pact discussion to tell the manufacturers that they had nothing to fear—"We do not intend to reduce the duties, you are all right"—sent there by his leader, a man chosen for the most important committees in the House, I say the hon. gentleman must have been—

Mr. NESBITT: Would my hon. friend repeat what he said about my being sent to tell the people in Ontario. I do not take back anything I said about the Hudson Bay railway.

Mr. BRADBURY: I am glad you do not.

Mr. NESBITT: But I want to know what the hon. gentleman says about my having been sent to tell the people of Ontario. Just repeat that.

Mr. BRADBURY: What I said was that during the discussion in this House, as every hon. gentleman remembers, the hon. gentleman had been in Ontario, in his own constituency, I think, and he told the manufacturers that they had nothing to fear.

Mr. NESBITT: That is not what you said. I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker. You said that I was sent by somebody. Now, who sent me ?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. BRADBURY: I will tell the hon. gentleman before I get through. The hon. gentleman stated to these people, to the manufacturers, that they had nothing to fear. He said: " The present Government, if reciprocity comes into force, are not going to lower the duties." When these words were read by an hon. member to the right hon. gentleman who now leads the Opposition in this House, then the leader of the Government, and the right hon. gentleman was asked if the hon. member for Oxford had been authorized to do this, the answer was that he was only speaking or only announcing the policy of his party.

Mr. NESBITT: The hon. gentleman is only quibbling. I asked him a straight question. He said a few moments ago I was sent by somebody. Now, why don't you repeat what you said and not try to quibble ?

Mr. BRADBURY: I object.

Mr. NESBITT: You have talked long enough without taking up any more time. Why don't you state what you said ? You know it was not true.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: The truth cuts.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Selkirk has the floor and is entitled to a hearing and attention.

Mr. BRADBURY: In connection with the building of the Hudson Bay railway and in connection with the position that the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House seem to take through their quasi-leader from Oxford, I want to say that there is not one man in the West who dares enunciate this doctrine west of the lakes, not one. I want to say that the Hudson Bay railway was promised by the Liberal party. In 1908 the present leader of the Opposition gave the people of the West to understand that, if his party was returned to power, the Hudson Bay railway would be completed within two or three years at the most, that the grain from the West could then be taken over that road to the markets of the world. The conduct of the Liberal party with respect to this railway is just in keeping with their attitude on every great question that affects the people of this country. They are one thing in one province and another thing in another province; one thing with one class of people and another thing with another class. It is a double-faced policy, and I might say a double-barrelled policy, which will affect some hon. gentlemen opposite who come from the West in a manner that will not be satisfactory to them.

Mr. TURRIFF: Don't worry about us.

Mr. BRADBURY: My hon. friend will have his own troubles. He will have lots to worry about without my worrying for him.

Mr. TURRIFF: I will take care of them.

Mr. BRADBURY: I want to say just a few words about the railway situation. The railway situation in Canada has been made anything but a pleasant one, by reason of the reckless legislation of the right hon. gentleman and his friends on the other side of the House. Just on the eve of an election the right hon. gentleman guaranteed bonds to the extent of thirty-five million dollars to induce and assist the Canadian Northern to become a transcontinental line. I hold that that was one of the most reckless projects ever undertaken by the late Government, except perhaps the building of the Transcontinental, which was a huge mistake, a blunder that has cost the people of this country hundreds of millions of dollars. If we had the millions of money that have been wasted in the building of the Transcontinental, we should not have to borrow one dollar to conduct our share of this war. If the late Government had not encouraged the building of the Canadian Northern round the shores of lake Superior, creating another transcontinental line, we should not, perhaps, be in the awkward position we are in to-day. The policy of the Conservative party was the only sane policy for this country. If that policy, which included the extension of the Intercolonial railway, the purchasing or taking over of the Canadian

Pacific railway lines around the shores of lake Superior, and giving running rights to all roads, had been carried out, we should then have had one road coming through that barren country instead of three, and our railway situation would not be as it is to-day, a burden upon the people and a yoke around the necks of the farmers of the West. The building of that Transcontinental railway has robbed the farmers of the West of the opportunity of securing a fair reduction in freight rates, a reduction to which they were justly entitled, and which they expected to get when this railway was foisted upon the people of this country. I should like to point out to hon. gentlemen opposite that they are responsible for the position that the farmer of the West is in to-day in regard to freight rates. We could have had a much greater reduction in rates if our systems had not been duplicated. And if I know anything about the signs of the times and about the railway situation, the day is not far distant when the Government of Canada will be forced, in defence of the people, to take over as government undertakings one or perhaps two of these great Transcontinental systems. That has been made necessary by the reckless spending of public money, by the reckless use of Government guarantees by hon. gentlemen opposite. When my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) was criticising the Government for going on with the construction of the Hudson Bay railway, I noticed that his friends from the West all sat smiling; they did not cheer; but they did not contradict him. They allowed it to go out to the country that their opinion was that this road should be stopped and the rails pulled up. But the farmers of the West will have something to say about that. I should like to ask some of these gentlemen from the West whether they are in favour of this road? Is my hon. friend from Assiniboia in favour of the Hudson Bay railway or not?

Mr. TURRIFF: Since my hon. friend has asked me the question I am quite ready to answer. There is no doubt at all that it was the late Government that undertook to build the road. My hon. friends opposite had promised to build the road for 20 years, but had done nothing. I quite agree with the remarks of my hon. friend from St. John, and would say that the Hudson Bay railway, in common with all other enterprises, might well be given less money this year, until an equilibrum is obtained between our revenue and expenditure.

[Mr. Bradbury.]

Mr. BRADBURY: The hon. gentleman has not answered the question I asked. I asked whether he was in favour of building the Hudson Bay railway.

Mr. TURRIFF: Yes.

Mr. BRADBURY: The fact that the Hudson Bay railway was not started by the late Government although they had given a pledge is no surprise to anybody who knows how the Liberal party has implemented other pledges it has given to the people of this country.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the railroad was not started by the late Government?

Mr. BRADBURY: The building of the railway was not started by the late Government. Surveys were made by the late Government and a bridge was under construction. The late Government was committed to the whole of this project both by promise and by money allready expended.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The contract was actually let.

Mr. BRADBURY: But you did not carry out your pledge to give this road to the people within three years of the election of 1908. What is the difference between the two parties? The present Government has been in power only about three years and this railroad is fast nearing the Hudson bay. We are assured of the completion of the road in 1916, and our western crop in the fall of that year will be able to go over that road to the European markets. So, as a western man, I say it is most unpatriotic for the Liberal party to denounce the proceeding with the construction of this road as we are doing at the present time. If we adopted the suggestion made by the hon. member for St. John, and backed up by my hon. friend from Assiniboia to cut down the expenditure by four-fifths, what would happen in the West? We have nearly three thousand men working on that road to-day; two thousand of them would have been turned on the streets without work. That is in line with the whole action of hon. gentlemen opposite when they were in power. They spent the revenues of this country lavishly, and now because the Government of the day is trying to care for the situation, trying to prevent our working men and artisans from becoming paupers and subjects for charity, as my hon. friend from St. John suggests, hon. gentlemen opposite are

criticising the expenditure that we propose to make at the present time.

In conclusion, let me add just a word in regard to the distribution of seed grain in the West. It has been a great boon to the farmers.

I want to say to the Government that I believe they could extend their activities along the line of assisting farmers in the northern part of Manitoba, and I suppose the same condition prevails in other provinces. We have a large acreage of very difficult land that is settled by thousands of people. In the northern part of my constituency I suppose I have 15,000 or 20,000 people settled on land that is very difficult to bring under cultivation. I have suggested to my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Roche), and I do it again here from my place in the House, that some active assistance should be given to districts of this kind in the matter of cultivation. I claim that the Government could very well devise some means by which a certain acreage on each of the homesteads where poor people are settled could be cleared and broken up with large power machines so that the people might be put in the position to become producers in a short time. I believe it will pay the Government to render some assistance in the way of providing stock in some of these districts. The northern part of Manitoba is a dairy proposition. We could make it one of the finest dairying districts in Canada if those poor people had a start. I commend it to the serious consideration of the Government and I would ask them to see if it is not possible at a very early date to assist the settlers in that district in such a way as will enable them to become self-sustaining producers. Unfortunately, in some of these districts, we are forced to resort to relief work during the winter months. I hold it is a mistake to have to dole out relief, year after year, to the settlers. We ought rather try to make these people self-sustaining by giving them something they can make a living at. By selling them a few head of cattle on deferred payments perhaps you would enable them to get into a position to make a livelihood and to pay back the advance in a few years. The Government would not lose one dollar on the investment and the farmers would be a great deal better off.

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the crisis that exists in the Empire to-day, notwithstanding that Canada is doing its full share in providing both men and money to assist in the defence, notwithstanding that the Opposition has made pledges both inside and out of this House to assist the Government in every way possible in doing what is necessary for the defence of the Empire, we find that these hon. gentlemen have raised every obstacle possible in connection with this Budget. The quibbling argument advanced by men on the other side of the House that this is not a war tax is unworthy of the hon. gentlemen who make this statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. It is not permissible to say that the conduct of another hon. member is unworthy. It must be assumed that what he does is done with a proper motive.

Mr. BRADBURY: I will qualify that by saying that the statements made by the hon. gentlemen are entirely worthy of the hon. gentlemen who made them. The attempt is made to create the impression that the taxes that are levied are not war taxes because the dollars that are going into the revenue are not going directly into the war fund. Every hon. gentleman knows that the interest on this borrowed money has to be met, seven or eight millions of dollars. Every man in this House knows that we are making provision and ought to make provision, if we are doing our full duty to the men we have at the front, for perhaps a large pension list, and in this way I say that every dollar of this money going into this increased tax may be considered just as much a war tax as the money we are borrowing from Great Britain. I believe that when these hon. gentlemen have the chance of meeting their constituents they will find that the opinion of their constituents is that they made a huge mistake in taking the attitude they have taken in this House regarding the Budget that is before the people at the present time.

Mr. THOMAS MACNUTT (Saltcoats): Mr. Speaker, I am not going to attempt to follow the arguments of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bradbury) who has just taken his seat. He dealt, in the first part of his speech, with ancient history. Later on he made some statements that I do not think are in accordance with the facts. He said, amongst other things, that the imposition of higher taxes under the tariff would result in the lowering of prices in Canada, and that the manufacturers are too patriotic to charge any more on account of the additional protection which they have obtained.

I want to speak more particularly on behalf of the farmers of the West with reference to the effect this tax will, in my opinion, have upon production which is bracketed with patriotism. I have no doubt that the farmers of the West, and farmers generally, will continue to be patriotic, but I am very much afraid that this tariff will have the effect of reducing production rather than increasing it. The people in Canada generally are behind the Government and would be behind any Government in connection with matters appertaining to this war. They would not desire to do anything to embarrass the Government as long as they were legitimately endeavouring to assist Great Britain and her allies in bringing this war to a successful termination. But it does not follow that domestic concerns should not be criticised. This Budget refers to domestic matters. I see that the speech of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. White) is headed in Hansard "Proposed War Taxation." I think it should be changed to "Proposed Deficit Taxation," because if it were it would be fairer. The hon. Minister of Finance made this quite clear himself in his statement to the House, and I will quote a few words from what he said with reference to this matter:

> So far as concerns our special war expenditures which may reach one hundred million dollars I should be disposed, if we had not such heavy and uncontrollable capital expenditure to meet, to recommend that we should pay at least a part of it from current revenue. But it is obvious upon a consideration of the figures which I have submitted that we shall not by any reasonable supplemental taxation measures be able to close the gap between revenue and expenditure much less to pay a portion of the principal of our special war outlay. In the circumstances I have no hesitation in proposing to the House that we shall borrow the full amount required under this heading.

And further on:

> It is therefore the intention of the Government to negotiate for a continuance of the arrangement which I have mentioned with the Imperial Government for the purpose of procuring the funds necessary to meet our special war expenditure.

That is proof that this proposed tariff and direct taxation is not for the purpose of carrying on the war or of maintaining our soldiers at the front. It is claimed, with a good deal of justice, that the deficit as between revenue and expenditure mentioned by the Minister of Finance is the result of extravagance and mismanagement. I am not going to deal with that phase of the question because it has been already fully treated in this debate. There is a deficit, and no matter who is to blame, the people must pay it. But the right people should pay it and in proportionate amounts. I believe that the farmers under this Budget will have to pay more than their proportionate amount. Although the hon. member (Mr. Bradbury) says the additional tariff will make articles cheaper, I think it goes without saying that it will raise the price of everything we have to purchase on which an increased duty has been placed. The farmers, as everybody else, will have to pay for their clothing and for the necessaries of life. In addition they will have to pay the extra tax on their farm implements. The hon. member read a price list to show that the prices would not be increased, but would probably be decreased on the articles he referred to. If that be so, this is not a revenue tax at all, because foreign goods will not be imported. The additional taxation would have to be added to them and consequently it would discourage importations, and all goods would be made in Canada, and there would be no revenue coming to the Government. There is no doubt, however, in my mind, that the manufacturers, unless they have over-produced, will most decidedly take advantage of this increased taxation to put up the prices. The Toronto News makes this statement:

> The farmers should be pleased with the exemption of binder twine and agricultural implements from the general tariff increase.

The Toronto News evidently thinks it is an authority on western matters, just as most eastern men who have gone to the Pacific coast come back and think they know all about it. But when the Toronto News speaks about agricultural implements, it shows how little the editor of the News knows about farming. There is only one class of implements which is not included in the increase in the tariff, while it is made to appear that there are four—binders, harvesters, reapers and mowers. They are simply all harvesters, and mowers also are harvesters, so that there is only one class of implements that is exempted and that class is of no service in the production of crops, although they certainly save the crops. There may be others besides the Toronto News who do not know what agricultural implements are required, and I consequently will give the names of some of them: a breaking plough, gang plough, harrow, land packer, seeder, disc, cultivator, fanning mill, hay rake, wagon, buggy, sleigh, etc. Fence wire, lumber, and cream separators, will be included in this additional taxation.

The greatest asset the Dominion has is her undeveloped agricultural land. Manufactures are very important, but they can only legitimately be a result and not a cause of prosperity. The manufacturers cannot create wealth, they may acquire it and distribute it or retain it, but they do not create it. We would be all glad to see the manufacturers doing well and prospering, but they cannot prosper unless the land is occupied and the people on the land are prosperous. How are you going to make the agriculturists of this Dominion prosperous? We have millions of acres of unoccupied land to-day which should be under cultivation. It has been the object of every government in this country to try and settle the western lands and that has been accomplished with more or less success. But the success in that direction is not continuing at present and it is because the conditions are not made sufficiently inviting for people to stay on the land. It is well enough to talk about "back to the land," but you cannot compel people to go back to the land or to stay on it when they get there. The only way you can get people to remain on the land and to cultivate it properly is to surround them with reasonable comforts and remove the obstacles and difficulties in their way. The farmers do not ask for special privileges, but they do ask that unnecessary burdens should not be placed on them. We find that the men on the land are not satisfied to remain, and that is the case even now, although the increased prices of products occasiond by this unfortunate war are temporarily inviting. However, I believe there is not a farmer in Canada who would not sooner take much lower prices, and have no war, if that were possible I believe that the prices of farm products will increase on account of the war, but that will only be a temporary condition and things will go back to the normal when the war is over. It is the duty of this Government to institute a policy, in the interests not only of the farmers, but of the manufacturers and the business men and all the people. A policy could be inaugurated which would make the farmers feel that they are getting some of the wealth they create and render them content to remain on the land. I believe that the West could be made inviting to the right kind of men. There are many ups and downs in the farmer's life, but if many of the burdens that are now placed on them were removed, not only would those who are still on the land feel like extending their operations but others would be induced to come and the country would be developed. Quotations have been made from an interview with Mr. Hutchinson, but there are so many good points in that interview that I wish to place it all on Hansard. I may say that if the John Deer Company increases the price of implements every other manufacturer will do the same. The prices are generally all about the same no matter who makes the implement, so that I think there must be a combine among them. This is the interview with Mr. Hutchinson:

H. W. Hutchinson, vice-president and managing director of the John Deere Plough Company, was asked by the Free Press yesterday for an opinion on the effect on western Canada of the increased duty on farm implements. Mr. Hutchinson has expert knowledge on this subject, having been most intimately connected with the trade in this country for many years.

In reply to a number of questions he stated that he fully recognized the need for a very large increase in the Dominion revenue. He was of the opinion, however, that it would be a very grave mistake at the present time to impose a heavy burden on the prairie farmer, on whom the burden of this tax, should it be imposed by the Parliament, would instantly fall. An advance in the price of tillage implements would inevitably have the effect of checking cultivation which, under the stress of the present conditions, ought to be encouraged in every possible way. The proposed tax, Mr. Hutchinson pointed out, would be much higher than was generally supposed owing to the fact that in addition to imposing the duty the Government also made what might be deemed an arbitrary valuation of the imported goods, thus in reality greatly increasing the percentage of the tax. Mr. Hutchinson also pointed out that although the Government of Canada during the past four years had apparently reduced the duty on certain agricultural implements, there had been no real reduction owing to the fact that the arbitrary valuation placed on the imported goods had been greatly increased, so that the total revenue was not affected.

That does not quite agree with the statement made by the hon. member for Selkirk.

"The prairie farmers will, of course, be called on to pay the duty," said Mr. Hutchinson. "We have been already notified by Canadian manufacturers that prices will be increased to us and we have already begun to prepare a new price list for the sale of our commodities. On every walking plough there will be an increase in the price paid by the farmer of from $1 to $2; in every sulky plough an increase of $4; in every drill an increase of $5; in every gang plough an increase of $6; in every wagon an increase of $7; and in every disc plough an increase of $8; with similar advances in the prices to the farmer of all kindred tools. The margin on which dealers do business is so small that no part of the burden will be borne by them. It will all be passed on to the farmer.

"When I was in Ottawa some time ago I made inquiries regarding the arbitrary revaluation of imports by appraisers. There is no provision which I could find in the Customs

Act for this re-valuation. After a great deal of investigation I discovered that although provision was not made for a re-valuation in the Customs Act, Parliament had given the Board of Appraisers power to arrange for this re-valuation. As a result of this arrangement farmers will be called on to pay a duty not of 27½ per cent, as they supposed, but of 32½ per cent, the increase at the present time being from an actual duty of 21 per cent to an actual duty of 32½ per cent. I wish to say in the strongest possible way that the proposition to impose this great additional burden on grain growers under the present circumstances would be a mistake from every point of view. An increase in revenue is needed but it should come from some other source and the attempt should not be made to secure money for government purposes in such a way as to impede or check the growing of wheat which will be so greatly needed in Europe in the near future.

"I think it desirable to point out in this connection, when it is proposed to ask the farmers of the country to pay this large extra sum of money, that the concessions which are said to have been made to farmers in recent years were not real. Both the premier and Mr. Rogers in former years promised reductions in the tariff to farmers. There was an apparent reduction in the duty of binders, harvesters and mowers. The valuation of these imported goods was, however, arbitrarily increased so much that prices in 1914 were higher than they were in 1913. Certain implements have been by the Government admitted free of duty, such as traction ditching engines. These implements are, however, not made in Canada and there was consequently no interest in this country asking for protection. The same thing is true of binder twine, of which there is very little produced in the Dominion.

"Every financial man in Canada realizes how important it is that production of food should be greatly increased in the Dominion. Men are being encouraged to leave the cities where they are not productively employed and to go on the land. The present proposal to increase the duty on tillage implements to 32½ per cent would counteract every effort that is being made and will prove in many cases the last straw which will break the back of the man who is trying to secure a start in life as a farmer."

That interview is from a non-partisan source, given by an experienced man, and it was worth while taking up a little time to read it.

There is an increase on everything that a farmer uses in connection with his production. There was a wonderful increase in dairy produce when cream separators were put on the free list. Fence wire is in great demand amongst the farmers; but it will now be made dearer, and the use of it will be decreased instead of increased. Several schemes have been devised to endeavour to get men back to the land, but this seems to be a scheme to reduce production.

There is one implement that should certainly not have been interfered with—the manure-spreader. It takes about 18 months before raw land will produce. A great deal of land in the West has been cultivated for many years, and there are enormous masses of manure and old stack bottoms throughout a great part of the West. These should be on the land. The season is short; hand-spreading is slow; labour is dear; these heaps remain where they are, and they are going to waste. If farmers could obtain manure-spreaders cheaper, the production would be vastly increased. Land that is now producing a certain quantity of grain could be made to produce 50 to 100 per cent more by the use of manure-spreaders. They are, however, almost out of the reach of the farmers now, and they will be still farther removed from his reach by the increased duty. Is that in the interest of increased production? I think not.

I was at a convention of the Saskatchewan Grain Growers' Association, held about three weeks ago at Regina. About 1,200 accredited delegates were there, and also a large number of interested visitors. During the session, which lasted five days, a great number of resolutions were brought before the convention and were intelligently discussed. There were at that convention intelligent and clever men who, in my opinion, were fit to sit on the front benches of this House. There are also large similar associations in Manitoba and Alberta. To show the attitude of the Saskatchewan Grain Growers' Association in the present situation, I will read a couple of resolutions passed at their convention. One is as follows:

1. Resolved, that this convention reaffirms our demand for wider markets, and free trade with the Mother Country.

2. That this convention is in favour of raising the immediate deficiency, and eventually the bulk of the requirements of the country by a system of taxation of graduated income tax, a tax on land values and stamp duties.

Another is as follows:

Whereas, the British Empire, of which the Dominion of Canada is an integral part, is engaged in a dreadful war with a powerful, astute and rentless enemy;

And, whereas, the Empire has engaged in this war not with the purpose of conquest or aggrandisement, but in defence of a basic moral principal of international jurisprudence;

And, whereas, the Saskatchewan Grain Growers' Association has ever been loyal to Canada and the Empire;

Therefore, be it resolved, that this, the annual convention of the said association, express hereby its hearty approval of the action taken by the Central Executive in instituting a Saskatchewan Grain Growers' Patriotic Fund;

And, further, that we will encourage and support both the Cash Contribution Fund and the Patriotic Acre Fund, as set forth by circular published by the general secretary.

This is an indication that the farmers are prepared to pay their share of the expenses of the war, and that as citizens of the country they are prepared to bear their share in assisting any fund made necessary by the war, such as the Belgian Relief Fund, the Red Cross and the Patriotic Fund. Every delegate of the Saskatchewan Grain Growers' Association has pledged himself to give the gross product of at least one acre to one or another of those funds. He is giving, not the net, but the gross product, because if you deduct all the expenses, there might be very little left. The gross product, however, will amount to something, and it will mean a huge contribution from the farmers. This contribution is not meant to advertise the association in any way. These farmers know that they have certain responsibilities, and they are willing to bear their share of the burden.

The method they believe in for raising the necessary funds is the imposition of a tax on land values and a graduated income tax. Under the land value tax, I think that farmers themselves will perhaps have to pay more than any other class of people, as they have more land. But for my part I think it would be an excellent plan to raise the revenue in that way. We have a municipal system throughout the country from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and the collection of this tax would simply mean an additional column or two in the tax notices. In Saskatchewan, a supplementary tax is collected from the farming land of one cent an acre, for the benefit particularly of the rural schools, and that only requires, as I have said, an additional column in the tax notice to collect it. The municipal collectors, I think, get five per cent for collection, and the money is sent to the Government. A similar system could be employed for the collection of a Dominion revenue along the same lines. Then, those who have incomes of a certain size could bear their fair share of taxation. In this way we could pay for war expenses and make up the deficit which, as I have said, the people must pay whether the Government is justified in its general expenditures or not.

However, the greatest objection that most of us have to this Budget is the decrease in the British preference, and that decrease is brought about, no matter how hon. gentlemen may manipulate the figures to show the contrary. It is quite clear that imports from Great Britain will be discouraged. We borrow money from the British people and the British Government to carry on our part of the war, and then we tax their trade to make up for the waste and extravagance that has gone on in Canada. That is not very encouraging, nor does it fit in well with the remarks attributed to an hon. gentleman opposite that he belonged to the "Imperial party" and that it was a good thing for the Empire and for Canada that the "Imperial party" was in power at this time.

Generally speaking, direct taxation is the best way to raise the increased revenues desired. But though it is a direct tax, I think the tax on letters and postcards is not justified. I doubt very much if the Government's revenue can be increased in that way. Years ago, under the old rates of postage, there was always a deficit in the Post Office Department of many hundreds of thousands of dollars. Postal rates were reduced, and I believe I am right in saying there has been a surplus ever since, although salaries were raised and the service extended very materially. Judging by the experience of the past, I fear that people will be discouraged by this tax from writing as much as before. Take the matter of postal cards and picture cards,—millions of these cards are posted especially by young people because the expense in each case is a trifle. But when it is made to cost two cents instead of one cent to send a card—an increase of one hundred per cent—I doubt that half as many will be sent. Business men also will curtail their correspondence and advertising circulars a great deal.

It is almost six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, and, as I desire to finish before you leave the Chair, I will omit reference to a number of matters which otherwise I shou'd have dealt with. Let me state, briefly, my reasons for being opposed to the new tariff schedules:

Much of the expected increases would not be required if expenses were curtailed.

The tariff charges are more protective than revenue-producing.

Greater production of foodstuffs will be discouraged.

Unnecessary and unequal burdens will be inflicted on the farmers without adequate returns.

The cost of living will be increased, especially to the poorer classes.

There is every indication that higher protection will be maintained.

It is a direct blow at closer British connection.

Referring especially to one of my con-

clusions, that "there is every indication that higher protection will be maintained," I have just time to quote from the remarks of the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell):

> My hon. friend cavils at protection. Protection seems to be the red rag that angers Liberals in this House and out of it. I have no apology to make for protection; I am a stalwart protectionist. Protection has built up Canada. When this country is in straitened circumstances, as it will be more or less, and as all other countries will be owing to the war, and after it is over, it will be protection and the protectionist interests and the National Policy over again that will rebuild this country and put it back where it was before the outbreak of the war, and make it even more prosperous than ever before,

I gather from that that these additional taxes will be maintained. Let me quote a few lines from the analysis of the Budget by the Financial Post:

> The increase in the general import tax of 5 per cent on preferential and 7½ on our general tariff should encourage more manufacturing in Canada; but to get its full value the Minister of Finance should make some announcement as to its permanency.

I think we have every reason to fear that this increased tax is not for the purpose of producing revenue, but to protect the manufacturers of Canada, increase their profits and thereby retain their friendship. But business men do not all take the same view. Every hon. member, I have no doubt, has received a circular sent out by Mr. Stewart E. Bruce, of Toronto, in which he says:

> As a business man I consider this tax levy ill-advised and ill-considered and I have given my objections in detail.

It is fortunate that we can find a man here and there, even in Toronto, who is not a slave of protection. But they are rare indeed. As it is six o'clock, I will bring my remarks to a close.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 8, respecting The Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company.—Mr. Green.

Bill No. 20, respecting The Canadian Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Bradbury.

THE BUDGET.

PROPOSED WAR TAXATION.

Mr. RICHARD BLAIN (Peel): Mr. Speaker, on the 4th of February this session of Parliament was opened. It will be remembered by the House and by the country that the war in which we are now engaged was declared on August 4, 1914. The first question the Canadian people asked themselves when war was declared was: Have we a Government in power in which the people of Canada have implicit confidence; have we a Prime Minister at the head of affairs who is able to cope with the task, and who has also the confidence of the whole Canadian people? The right hon. gentleman who leads the Government (Sir Robert Borden) was equal to the task at the commencement of the war; and during this session of Parliament he has shown himself fully equal to the burdens placed upon him, and he will, I am sure, be able to take his part in this great struggle to the satisfaction of the whole Canadian people. When Parliament was called in August last the eyes of all Canadians were centered upon the city of Ottawa and upon the Government. Everybody expected that some important legislation would be introduced, and that some additional war taxes would be placed upon the Canadian people. The people had made up their minds to bear those taxes, whatever they were, cheerfully, as the Canadian people always do in matters of this kind. An amount of $50,000,000 was voted in the special session of August, 1914. There was practically no criticism in the House; there was no disappointment in the country, and the people of Canada felt pleased to think that the Government were willing to face this matter fairly and do their part in the great struggle. The war continued, and Parliament was again called together on the 4th of February, 1915, the session in which we are now engaged. On the 11th of February my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) introduced his Budget, termed the War Budget. The people of Canada again expected, when this session was called, that some war taxes would be placed upon them, and the Budget that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance introduced is called, and will go down in history as, the War Budget. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance presented his Budget in a way that met with the approval of all members of this House. There was no word of partisan warfare, there was nothing to stir up the Canadian people and make divisions among them. It was presented in a fair and honest way, a business presentation of an important Budget. I think the thanks of the whole Canadian people are due to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance for having been able to

meet his task and present his Budget in the manner in which he did. Naturally there would be a great deal of thought by the Canadian people upon this Budget. Almost every person in this country, being a Canadian and interested in the welfare of Canada and the Empire, was anxious to know what it contained. Every Board of Trade engaged in the great commercial interests of Canada was interested in the Budget. The agricultural classes, from one end of Canada to the other, were particularly anxious about the Budget presented by my hon. friend. The manufacturers, towards whom some of our friends on the other side are not too kindly, being large employers of labour, naturally asked themselves the question: How will this Budget affect trade? and I am bound to say—and I think this House and the people of Canada will agree with me—that no Budget was ever presented to the people of Canada that met with such universal approval as the one introduced by my hon. friend on the 11th of February. The financial critic on the other side of the House, the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean), had eleven days from the date of the introduction of the Budget on the 11th of February down to the 23rd of February, when he rose in his place to discuss the Budget and to present to the people of Canada the Opposition's opinion upon it. It is currently reported that my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax consulted his friends. Everybody would expect that he would consult his friends. The Opposition had a caucus in the meantime to consider, I suppose, among other things, the Budget that was presented. To that I offer no objection. My hon. friend the junior member for Halifax, I understand, had the co-operation and the help of a gentleman not now in this House, who is very conversant with budgets, who has had the honour of introducing many in this House himself; and, after all this, the hon. gentleman's criticism was mild.

He could not raise very much objection. He was unable to single out with any emphasis those portions of the Budget to which he objected; and when the people of Canada read what my hon. friend had said they concluded that the best the Reform party in this House could do was to make only a mild criticism of the Budget introduced by the Minister of Finance. The Journal of Commerce, Montreal, discussing the Budget, said:

> Altogether Mr. White seems to have made the best of a troublesome situation. It will be much easier to find fault with his proposal than to offer any better as a temporary and convenient money-raising scheme.

I understand that the Hon. Mr. Fielding, the ex-Minister of Finance, is the editor of that paper; so no doubt he is responsible for that utterance. That is a statement from a gentleman whose opinion on budgets is worth something. He says that the Minister of Finance has made the best of a troublesome situation. Why troublesome? Because the people of Canada were engaged in a great struggle, are engaged in a great struggle now. The Finance Minister not only had to provide for the large expenditure that is going on from day to day, but had to meet many and great obligations placed upon the people of Canada by my hon. friends opposite. That meant an enormous expenditure. At the same time, on account of the disturbed condition of trade resulting from the war, the Minister of Finance was confronted with people in every part of the country saying that they feared unemployment; and unemployment there was in small measure, I think.

Some hon. gentlemen opposite have made strong statements in this House to the effect that the Minister of Finance should have cut down the general expenditure of the country. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance has cut down the general expenditure. He was absolutely frank when, in presenting his budget to the House, he said:

> So far as expenses are concerned the policy we enunciated in August we shall continue. Our estimates contain no new items, and as to items which they include we shall proceed with works not already under contract only as we feel justified having regard to the financial situation.

That was an honest statement. And so careful was the Minister of Finance that there should be no misunderstanding in this House or out of it as to how trace should be kept of the money raised by the Budget, that he said:

> The revenue obtained from the present tariff changes will be separately shown in the Trade and Investigation returns of the Department of Customs. By this we shall know the precise amount collected through the customs under the provisions of the War Revenue Act.

Surely that was a fair statement; there was nothing to conceal; there was no quibbling as to whether this part of the Budget was for a war tax and that part for another purpose. The statement was made on behalf of the Government that, in so far as the new Budget presented to this

House was a war Budget, the Minister of Finance would see that a clause was placed in the Customs, returns giving the revenue obtained from the present tariff changes, and showing exactly how that money was being received. Surely that was frank; surely that was what the people of this country expected from my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, so careful a man in financial matters. Surely there was nothing to provoke criticism from the other side of the House lest any taxes collected under the war Budget should be devoted to other than war purposes.

I think that the Opposition led by my right hon. friend has not done itself justice as a party. When we assembled in August last they made a few declarations that they would assist the Government, that they did not propose to carry on political hostilities, that whether bound or not bound they were going to have a truce, that they would give every possible assistance to the Government in providing ways and means for carrying on our share in this great struggle. But when the Minister of Finance introduced his Budget this session it seemed as if a change had come over the Opposition. The Minister of Finance presented his Budget to the House on the 11th of February. On that day the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) attacked the Government at once. He attacked the Government at the close of the speech of the Finance Minister; he attacked the Government when my right hon. friend the Prime Minister moved:

1. That it is expedient to provide that a sum not exceeding one hundred million dollars ($100,000,000) be granted to His Majesty towards defraying any expenses that may be incurred by or under the authority of the Governor in Council during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1916,

and so on. What did the hon. member for St. John do when that resolution was introduced? He rose in his place and attacked the Government right on the war resolution introduced by the leader of this Government. He made the statement that some persons down in New York were declaring that they represented the Canadian Government, and were trying to give contracts for this Government and for the British Government. Surely that did not look as if the Opposition were trying to assist this Government; for if any purchases had been made, either for the British Government or for this Government, they must have been made in part out of the $50,000,000 appropriation voted last August. My hon. friend from St. John made a very long speech, in the course of which he read an article from an Ottawa newspaper that I think condemned himself and his speech as well:

As a consequence of the misrepresentations that have been made to business firms in the United States and Canada by persons who have fraudulently styled themselves agents of the British and French Governments, it has been considered advisable by the Government to publish the following list of purchasing agents for military purposes of the allied governments.

And continuing in that statement is a list of the gentlemen representing the British Government, whose head office was in Montreal, and of the gentlemen representing the French and Russian Governments. And notwithstanding the statement in the hand of my hon. friend—a plain statement made by this Government and given to the newspapers so that every one might understand the situation—the hon. member for St. John attacked the Government, and charged that somebody had been in the United States buying ammunition for the war at exorbitant prices, prices that far exceeded the regular prices of ammunition in that country. Surely that does not look like wanting to assist the Government. Surely that savours of partisanship. My hon. friend went on in that long speech condemning the Government. The same day the hon. member for St. John attacked the Government for the purchase, under the guidance of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), of two submarine vessels. He stated that an Order in Council had gone through to buy two submarine vessels for $1,050,000. He attacked the Government upon that in his speech, a copy of which I have here. He makes an effort—and to his own satisfaction, I suppose, succeeds—in connecting Sir Richard McBride, Premier of British Columbia, with this transaction in a way that he thought was very shady. All he had to do, as my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries stated in his reply, was to walk across the floor of the House and ask my hon. friend if there was an error in the Order in Council passed by the Government for the purchase of these submarines. My hon. friend states in his speech that if my hon. friend had crossed the floor and asked him that question he would have told him that an error had taken place in the figures and that when the error was detected the correction was made in the proper and legal way, so that the amount put through for the purchase of the two submarines finally was the exact amount that was paid for the submarines

—$1,150,000. The hon. member for St. John spent a long time discussing that. I might point out that while hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are making an effort to convince the country that they are assisting the Government, we find the hon. member for St. John, on the day the Budget is introduced, attacking the Government on two points in a partisan way that does not do credit to the hon. gentleman who, I am very glad to see is now in his seat. My hon. friend is a master at all that sort of thing. He has sat on both sides of the House and has a great advantage. My hon. friend is able to put to good account all that he learned on this side of the House while in the Government and on the other side while in Opposition. Whatever may be said in the country, whatever may be said either in the East or in the West, if these hon. gentlemen propose to continue this political, partisan discussion in this House, they will be unable to make the people of Canada believe that they are assisting the Government in discharging their responsible duties.

During this discussion many hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have endeavoured to poison, if possible, the minds of the farming interest of Canada against the Government, because, forsooth, they are imposing some taxes upon the people. In the early history of my hon. friends opposite such a policy was pursued by their leaders. There was an effort made by the Reform party some years ago to put the farmer against the balance of the citizens of Canada. They pursued that warfare with some success. They told the farmers that if there was protection at all placed upon the statute book that protection must be paid for by the farmer, that the manufacturer was the gainer, and that the farmer was the loser.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAIN: My hon. friend says, "Hear, hear." I do not expect any change in my hon. friend. I may say to my hon. friend who says "Hear, hear," that he cannot fool the farmers that way now. The farmers do not require any special defenders in this House, because they are able to take care of themselves both here and in the country as well. The farmers have flourished under the protective tariff and it does not do my hon. friends opposite much credit, because, after condemning the protective tariff when it was introduced by the Liberal-Conservative party many years ago, and promising that it would all be taken off the statute books when they came into power, they were in power for fifteen years and you would have to search the tariff with a microscope to find out any changes that these hon. gentleman made in the way of a reduction. They condemned the Liberal-Conservative party for protection; but when they came into office they adopted the very same policy. Then my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark), who the other day tried to stir up the farmers and to make it appear that they were opposed to this Government and to the proposed tariff taxation, will have a very difficult task on his hands to make the farmers in the West believe that protection is all against their interests. He will have a greater task on his hands because he supported a Government that maintained protection. My hon. friend could have performed that task perhaps more successfully, if, when he was sitting on this side of the House he had proclaimed the same belief that he now gives expression to. He came into the House in 1908 when his party were in power, and if my hon. friend's voice had been heard from his place at that time condemning the Government for protection and refusing to give them his support, and if he had continued in that policy while he was there and also while he was on the Opposition benches, he would have a record. But the best he can do is to say: My actions show that I supported protection, that I supported it to the letter when my party was in power, the same policy that is now on the statute books under this Government I now condemn. That is my hon. friend's position. Whenever my hon. friend has taken the floor he has taken rather special pains to point out that this taxation provided for in the Budget that we are now discussing, presses very severely upon the farmers and the poor man. I say: away with that sort of argument. The poor men of this country do not require such defenders, the farmers are strong and brave, the poor men are willing to take up their burdens with the rest, and the farmers will condemn any gentleman in this House who is trying to suggest that they are not willing to bear their fair share of the burdens that are placed upon us by this war.

It is not at all difficult to show that this Government has done much for the farmers of Canada. When the Liberals were in power the cry came loud and long that the farmers in Western Canada required government-owned elevators, but the Liberal

Government did nothing. Also, when the Liberals were in power there was much complaint about excessive freight rates, but these complaints were unheeded, and government-owned elevators were only established when the Conservatives came into power. It was the party now led by my right hon. friend Sir Robert Borden that erected in western Canada four splendid large elevators which cost the treasury of Canada $4,000,000. There would not be so much to complain of did hon. gentlemen opposite tell the farmers of Canada what this Government has been doing for them, but these gentlemen have a way of their own, and that way is to cover up everything which this Government has done and to try to set the farmers against the Government. While the hon. gentlemen opposite are insidiously doing this, they are at the same time endeavouring to make the people of Canada believe that they are here this session for one purpose, and one purpose only, and that is to assist the Government in meeting the great difficulties which to-day present themselves. Well, the people of Canada will read the speeches of these hon. gentlemen opposite and they will put the proper estimate on them, and their opinion of such tactics will not redound to the credit of my hon. friends opposite.

In this Budget the farmers have not been neglected. I have in my hand a speech made by the Hon. Mr. Fielding, Minister of Finance in the Liberal Government, who, in presenting the Budget in 1906, stated that some farmers in Canada were in favour of protection while some were opposed to it, and that certainly the farmers would not support a government that would take off protection on their products and leave it on the products of other industries. It is an undoubted fact that many of the farmers of Canada believe in protection just as other classes of the community do, and the farmers who believe in protection are not confined to one side of politics only, or otherwise they would have put the late Government out of power long before they did. I think that is a fair test to apply. The Liberals promised many things, especially in western Canada, but when they came to power they did not keep their promises, and yet the farmers of the West did not hurriedly vote them out. To quote a few articles upon which farmers will have increased help under the war Budget, I may mention: Butter, eggs, pork, oats, potatoes, apples, peaches, strawberries, plums, cabbages, onions and celery, and these represent a much larger number of products on which the farmers will have help under this Budget. We have competition from the United States on many of the articles I have mentioned. There have come to Parliament and to the Government in past years large delegations pointing out that the market gardeners of the United States were dumping their products into Canada, against the best interests of our own farmers. Whatever may be said about this Budget, it is an undoubted fact that there is some special help given by it to the farmers, which, I am sure, the farmers will appreciate.

While hon. gentlemen opposite are talking about assistance for the farmers, they should not overlook the fact that at this very session of Parliament the Government is doing much for the farmers of the West; and I am glad to be able to say there is no protest from the people in any part of Canada against the policy of the Government in this respect. In southern Alberta and Saskatchewan last summer, there was a great drouth, and in many places the crops were almost a total failure. I might mention in this connection that in northern Ontario last year there was a partial crop failure; and, while the Ontario Government is now making provision to help the farmers in that region they are not asking the Parliament of Canada for any appropriation to assist them. The people of Ontario feel it to be their duty to help their friends in the northern part of the province when they require help, and the Government of the province of Ontario is rendering that help cheerfully. In addition to that, the people of Ontario are willing to bear their share of the burden, if it is a burden, and to support cheerfully such help as the Government of Canada is giving to the farmers of the West. Recently, when speaking in this House, the Minister of the Interior, discussing the aid given to farmers in the drouth belt of Saskatchewan and Alberta, said:

> I know that the banks have been very cautious in the past in advancing farmers money for that purpose, but I also know that my colleague, the Finance Minister, has been in touch with the head officers of our Canadian banks. He asked them to loosen up, to let the farmers have more credit. As a result of this intercession by the Finance Minister, the general managers of our Canadian banks instructed their western bank managers to meet all legitimate demands. The head officers in the East state they are quite willing to advance money on fair security. . . Up to the 31st March this year our estimates for seed grain and relief

amount to somewhere in the neighbourhood of $5,800,000, which amount will be supplemented next year for relief to the extent of $3,000,000 or $4,000,000. The expenditures, if we were to act upon the applications that are being made to us at the present time, would amount to in the neighbourhood of $11,000,000. That is a pretty serious expenditure for this Government to assume, especially during a time of financial stringency. . . Not only have we had to supply seed grain but also provisions to keep a number of these people alive during the winter months, such as groceries, the necessaries of life and fuel; and for relief of this kind we have expended $2,500,000, which is included in the $5,800,000. . . In addition to that the farmers say: What is the use of giving us money to purchase seed grain, or giving us seed grain unless we have our stock in condition to put that grain in? We recognize the validity of that argument, and we shall supply them with feed for stock during the months in which they will be engaged in putting in their crop. I think that we have been dealing very generously and very reasonably with the requests that have been made to this Government.

I cite this language of my hon. friend the hon. the Minister of the Interior, to remind the House that the Government is not neglecting the farmers of the West, and to remind these gentlemen who try to poison the minds of the western farmers against the Government now in power, that they had better learn what the Government has done and is doing for the welfare of the farmers of the West before they expect the farmers to believe what they say.

There has been a good deal of discussion in this House with regard to the preferential tariff. I have here a statement showing a number of industries in the United Kingdom which will be materially assisted by the War Budget. This statement gives the marginal preference under the Customs Tariff of 1907 of the late Government and the margin of preference under the war revenue Bill.

Industries.	Margin of Preference under— Customs Tariff, 1907. Per cent.	War Revenue Act. Per cent.
Galvanized sheet iron or steel	5	7½
Canada plate, Russia iron and terne plate	5	7½
Cutlery	10	12½
Wire rope	7½	10
Wire cloth	7½ to 10	10 to 12½
Silverware and plated ware	12½	15
Lead	5 to 10	7½ to 12½
Crockery and earthenware	10	12½
Window and plate glass	5 to 12½	7½ to 15
Lead pencils, pens and penholders	12½	15
Tobacco pipes and smokers' material	12½	15
Cotton spinning	7½	10
Cotton weaving	7½ to 12½	10 to 15
Knitted goods	10 to 12½	12½ to 15
Clothing, cotton and wool	5 to 12½	7½ to 15
Gloves	12½	15
Fur dressing and manufacturing	5 to 10	7½ to 12½
Cordage and twine	5	7½
Machinery for spinning and weaving	None.	2½
Machinery, heavy and special	12½	15
Chemicals	None to 2½	2½ to 5
Tin plate	None.	2½

That is a list of articles coming from England to Canada which will have under the present Budget an increased preference. It is an important list and one that should be considered by my hon. friends opposite when they are endeavouring to prove that the preferential tariff, in so far as it is affected by this Budget, should be changed. I heard one hon. gentleman opposite say that it should be wiped out altogether, and that the goods coming from Great Britain should come in free. I do not see what my hon. friends opposite are trying to do other than to excite the minds of the old country people, who are coming into Canada in large numbers, against the present Government and to make them favourable towards hon. gentlemen on the other side. My hon. friends know that these people are coming in Canada in large numbers for the purpose of making their homes here. They are bringing their wives and families and are locating here. Of the large number of immigrants that have come into Canada in the last few years, it could not be expected that all would locate upon farms. Some of them have grown-up families, and they come into the towns and villages and other centres of population. For my part, I believe in a policy that will build up manufacturing in Canada, and that will help men of capital to employ labour. This policy when properly understood by the old country people, will meet with their approval. My hon. friends opposite will not succeed very well by trying to point out to the old country people that because, forsooth, my hon. friends are in favour of a preferential tariff with Great Britain, they should receive the support of the old country people as they come and locate here. In that respect my hon. friends will be altogether disappointed.

My hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) the other day stated that the trade conditions of this country were not particularly disturbed by the

war, and he mentioned in particular the iron and steel industry. I have here from to-day's Montreal Daily Mail a statement, the heading of which is: "War had serious effect upon the Scotia Steel Company—the company was hard-hit by war." The article reads as follows:

As was to be expected, every part of the company's operations was affected by the war. In the first place, as was well known in the trade, the Scotia Company had sold a large amount of its iron ore at the beginning of last year to Germany, and, of course, these sales could not be consummated after the war broke out. On this account the iron ore mines had to be shut down and at the same time the general recession in the steel trade in Canada was so immediate that practically all the iron and steel departments were idle for a large proportion of the last half of the year. During all this time the company was also confronted with the problem of meeting the cost of keeping the mines unwatered and maintaining the plant, all of which naturally caused serious inroads to be made upon the profits of the first half of the year. Under these unusual and unprecedented conditions, the showing made is regarded as satisfactory. The situation is already much improved and the indications are that from now on further improvement should be the rule.

Notwithstanding the depressed conditions of the steel industry we were able to keep the most of our plant in operation during the first half of the year. In view of the fact that Parliament had provided for assistance to two of the Transcontinental railways, to the extent of $50,000,000, a very large part of which it was understood would be expended in equipment we felt justified, from negotiations then pending in assuming that there would be considerable improvement in our business during the last six months of the year.

The outbreak of the war not only destroyed these expectations, but it very seriously interfered with all our operations. We had sold our output of iron ore for the year principally in Europe, and on the first of August had about 120,000 tons mined and ready for shipment. As further shipments to the continent were impossible, we immediately suspended mining operations and our ore mines have since been idle. Not only the profit on all the ore on hand at Wabana, but also on all ore which would have been mined during the remainder of the year, was lost to the company.

I read that article for the benefit of my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax, who stated that the war has not seriously affected the trade of this country. The Scotia Steel Company is in his own province of Nova Scotia. His own province follows Ontario in its war taxation. I read the following article:

The first direct provincial taxation in the history of Nova Scotia since Confederation is now proposed by Premier Murray, who introduced a Bill in the House of Assembly yesterday called the Provincial War Tax Act.

Under its provisions it is proposed to levy a tax of one mill in the dollar on all assessable property in the municipalities, towns and cities of Nova Scotia. The tax, it is estimated, will produce $117,000 additional revenue. The provincial deficit at the end of the fiscal year was $113,000.

[Mr. Blain.]

Premier Murray intimated that this would not be the only new taxation Bill to be presented at this session of the Legislature.

So it is found that even in Nova Scotia war has something to do with disarranging trade.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: How much?

Mr. BLAIN: So much that the legislature of the hon. gentleman's own province was compelled, according to what I have read, to place a war tax upon the province, He shakes his head. Well, I propose to take the word of the provincial premier to the effect that, following the example of Ontario, he is introducing a war tax. What would that mean? I would ask my hon. friend.

Mr. MACLEAN: The hon. gentleman is quite right in saying that a new revenue Bill has been introduced, but I do not admit that it is made necessary by the war. There was a loss of revenue prior to the declaration of war, and I think that the Nova Scotia Steel Company has been busier since the outbreak of war than before.

Mr. BLAIN: Does the hon. gentleman suggest that the war has helped trade in Nova Scotia?

Mr. SINCLAIR: There is not the slightest doubt that the large orders received for war materials have greatly helped the position of the Nova Scotia Steel Company and that that company is in a better position than when the war broke out.

Mr. BLAIN: The hon. gentleman differs in his view from his friend beside him, and the Premier of Nova Scotia—who is a Liberal—seems to think that the situation calls for a war tax, the first time since Confederation. I assume that he would not introduce a war tax if he did not think it necessary. War tax made necessary by the war.

Now, I wish to say a word or two with respect to the trade of Canada. Figures have been compiled showing that during the last two years $1,309,209,000 worth of goods of every kind have been imported into Canada. Everybody knows that Germany has been a great competitor in the industrial life of the world and that large quantities of its goods have come into Canada. In answer to hon. gentlemen who say that manufacturers propose to increase the prices of goods because of the increase in duties, I wish to say that in conversation with a very large manufacturer in western Ontario, I asked him the plain question: "Do you propose to increase the prices of

your manufactured goods because of the war tax"? His answer was "No," and that, I believe, will be the answer of many manufacturers throughout Canada. I said: "How do you propose to manage your business successfully, seeing that you have to pay additional duties upon your raw material"? And, by the way, that is something which is never stated by hon. gentlemen opposite in discussing this matter. They always represent this as an increase in the tax on the manufactured article and declare that the farmer will have to pay it; they fail to see that this is a uniform tax upon the people generally, including the manufacturers. If the manufacturers import raw materials into this country, under this tariff they will have to pay on materials from Britain 5 per cent more and on materials from the United States 7½ per cent more. The manufacturer with whom I was talking said: "Although we have to pay an increased tariff on raw material, we do not propose to make any increase in the price to the consumer; we are going to make a portion of this enormous quantity of goods that is imported into Canada every year." And that will be the answer of the manufacturers generally—that prices for this year are on the same basis as those for last year, and they the manufacturers, will continue to furnish goods to the people of Canada at the same prices as last year and will maintain their prosperity by increasing their output to fill those portions of the market that were filled in other years by the importation of goods from abroad. I have a card under my hand sent out to his customers by a large manufacturer in Ontario stating that former prices are withdrawn, and on the bottom of the card is a note that a price-list will be issued with reduced prices.

9 p.m.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What does he manufacture?

Mr. BLAIN: Boilers, radiators, and steam-heating goods.

Mr. MACLEAN: I am told that the manufacturers of fertilizers have increased their prices since the introduction of the new tariff.

Mr. BLAIN: Will the hon. gentleman give us his authority?

Mr. MACLEAN: I do not speak by authority, but I think the information is pretty reliable.

Mr. BLAIN: I am afraid it would please my hon. friend if they did increase prices. His colleague from the city of St. John (Mr. Pugsley) seemed to be particularly anxious on the fertilizer question.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. gentleman will find that the farmers are anxious too.

Mr. BLAIN: It is the only specific article the hon. gentleman dealt with. He looked into the Budget very closely, and is very conversant with it, yet the best he could do was to attempt to prove that fertilizers should be on the free list. For my part, I say these fertilizers can be and will be manufactured in Canada. That is the answer. And I would ask the hon. gentleman whether he would rather have them imported from the United States and Germany, or would he rather have them made in Canada?

Mr. PUGSLEY: As the hon. gentleman has had the courtesy to ask me a question, I would point out to him that in the manufacture of fertilizers it is very important to get the raw material. You want nitrates, you want potash, you want phosphates—

Mr. EDWARDS: And squid.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is hardly worthy of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) to introduce into such a discussion as this remarks which have no bearing upon the subject. My hon. friend from Peel will bear in mind that nitrates, potash, phosphates and other ingredients of fertilizers were all on the free list until this Budget was introduced. If they are to be made in Canada, you must have the natural elements in order to compound them.

Mr. BLAIN: I understand some have been imported from Germany.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Potash from Germany and nitrates from Chile.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Are you going to make the potash in Canada ?

Mr. BLAIN: If the friends of my hon. friend had their way we would not manufacture very much in Canada.

Mr. MACLEAN: Answer that question.

Mr. BLAIN: Yes, although my opinion may not be very valuable on this point, I shall be very much surprised if the people of Canada do not find themselves fully equal to the task of making and manufacturing in Canada all the fertilizers required by the people of Canada.

Mr. MACLEAN: I asked my hon. friend if he thought we would manufacture potash in Canada now, under the new tariff.

Mr. BLAIN: I say that we may not be able to manufacture potash, but we will manufacture something that will take its place. My hon. friend beside me says they are making potash in Canada at the present time.

There has been some criticism by newspapers of the present Budget, although not very much. In the main, the newspapers have applauded the Finance Minister for his Budget. I have here a paper which does not usually give much help to the Conservative party. It is the Christian Guardian, published in Toronto on February 17. The article is headed, "Canada's War Budget," and reads:

Canada needed to raise $30,000,000 by extra taxation this year in order to meet part of the extraordinary war expenses, and the problem for the Finance Minister was to raise that amount with the least possible friction. There were rumours that tea and sugar, tobacco and liquor would again be singled out for special attention at the taxgatherer's hands, but wisely, we think, tea and sugar have not been further burdened. Instead there is a general increase of 7½ per cent intermediate and 5 per cent preferential. . . Evidently the new tariff has aimed to spread the increased tax as lightly as possible over the whole community, and there will probably be little objection to it. The money has to be raised and the new taxes will not be specially burdensome to any one class.

That is from a paper that does not usually give support to the Conservative party. Since this Government faced the war problem they have had to purchase a very large quantity of goods. Their ambition was to purchase these goods in Canada as far as possible, and I do not think there has been any criticism against the Government upon that point. They have aimed fairly, regardless of politics, to see that manufacturing establishments that could make these goods were given orders. That applies not only to the goods purchased by this Government, but to goods purchased for Britain, Russia and France. For example, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce had control of the purchases of blankets for the French Government. Did he assist his political friends particularly in these purchases? Let me point out to the House what was done. He called the blanket manufacturers of Canada together, regardless of politics. He had the advantage of their knowledge and discussed the question as to what the price for blankets should be if they were purchased in Canada for the French Government. After a somewhat prolonged discussion, they arrived at a price that was regarded by them and by the Government as a reasonable and fair price, considering the price of wool and workmanship. The price was submitted to the French Government and it was satisfactory to them—60 cents per pound. Did the Minister of Finance suggest that these orders should go to Liberal Conservative supporters? No; he made it broad and clear that every manufacturing establishment in Canada that could make blankets should send to Ottawa and receive an order for as many blankets as it could make up to a certain day. That was the proposition of the hon. gentleman who was representing the Government in respect to the purchase of blankets for the French Government. The blanket manufacturers from all over Canada came and received their orders, and the blankets were made, and I think, in the main, the transaction was very satisfactory to the people of Canada as well as to the French Government. That applies also to other large purchases that were made by this Government for the British Government; and I may say that, although there is some criticism about the goods manufactured for the soldiers, I had the privilege of seeing some articles that were sent from France as a sample for the Canadian manufacturers to go by in making another line of goods, and the articles made by the Canadian manufacturers surpassed altogether the sample, which is a proof that, after all the Canadian manufacturers find themselves in a position to supply a very large quantity of goods and to make them equal to the requirements of the British, French and Russian Governments.

The Toronto Globe undertook to criticise the Government in two articles, one of which I shall read. The Globe of January 19 said:

Put Names on War Supplies.

There is one effective way of putting crooked contractors for army supplies in the pillory, and that is by requiring that all makers of cloth, clothing, shoes, and equipment shall stamp their name in some indelible fashion upon the articles they make. It is already observable that contractors, discussing the failure of supplies to come up to requirements, are certain that it was "the other fellow" who put shoddy workmanship into articles on which men's lives depend. There should be a means of checking up vociferous contractors. No other would be half so effective as the production of the defective articles with the name of the maker stamped upon them. The Militia Department should lose no time in insisting that all army contractors put their names upon their product as a guarantee of good materials and honest workmanship. The country is paying the top price for war supplies

and has a right to demand that the contractors play fair and provide goods of the highest quality.

That was a mild criticism by the Globe. No other inference could be taken than that the Government were not insisting on the manufacturer putting his name on the article produced by him. If the Globe had been anxious to do the fair thing by the Government in power and to assist them in their difficulties and the task they are facing, all they had to do was to go or write to the department and ask them for a copy of the tenders. I have a copy in my hand. This is the notification sent from the department to successful tenderers:

Department of Militia and Defence, Ottawa.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that your tender of the —, instant for the supply of certain goods has been accepted as follows:

Please note that delivery should be made at ——— and should be completed not latter than ———. The supply must conform to the sealed pattern and specifications in every respect, and each article must bear the manufacturer's name and the date of manufacture.

All the editor of the Globe had to do before poisoning the mind of his innocent readers by suggesting that the Government had failed to compel the manufacturer to put his name and the date on the article he was making for the Government, was to write or ask the department for a copy of the tenders; and he would then have seen that the Government was careful enough to insist that every man who manufactured goods for this Government must put his name and the date on his goods. Therefore I say that that kind of argument will not have much effect upon the electors of this country.

I had some other statements to make, but I have already spoken much longer than I had intended. I say that, in my opinion, the Budget is satisfactory to all classes of people in Canada. The people of Canada have implicit confidence in the Prime Minister and in his Government. Whatever criticism has come from the other side of the House, no gentleman was able to stand in his place and say that any department of the Government was neglecting its duties in these perilous times; for every department had met the situation strongly and honestly; every department had measured up to what the people of Canada expected from it. Whatever may be said about the enormous expenditure of money, the $50,000,000 that has been expended and the $100,000,000 that will be expended, the people of Canada believe that they have an honest Government in power, which is meeting the situation strongly, and fully carrying out what the people of Canada expect from them; namely, that in this important crisis we should bear our full share both for Canada and for the Empire.

I want to say one word in regard to the clothing, boots, and other supplies furnished to our soldiers. I was told in conversation with a gentleman who was born in the old country, and who had lived alongside Salisbury Plain and played there when he was a boy, that he could not believe the statement he had read that there was wet weather and very deep mud on Salisbury Plain. He said that he had played upon Salisbury Plain in his early boyhood days, and that it was almost impossible then to find a blade of grass upon the Plain. I am mentioning this in order to point out that, no matter how this Government may have been criticised in regard to the clothing, boots, etc., supplied to the soldiers, the greatest enemy was the wet weather at Valcartier camp and the exceptionally wet weather experienced at Salisbury Plain; and over this the Government had no control. The people of Canada must understand that Salisbury Plain was selected as a training camp for our soldiers, not by this Government, but by the Government of Great Britain and by the War Office; and I have no doubt that they selected it as the proper and the best place they could provide for the purpose. While some part of the clothing and boots and shoes may not have stood all that was expected of them, I repeat that it was not because of their quality, but because of the extraordinary weather conditions experienced at Valcartier and Salisbury Plain. I think it is only fair that I should mention this, not particularly in defence of the Government, because I do not think they require any defence, even on that point, but in order that the people of Canada may fully understand the facts in connection with the articles I have mentioned.

I am sure that when the people of Canada have had a better opportunity of studying this Budget, when they understand it more fully, when hon. gentlemen opposite have made all possible criticism of it, the people of Canada will say with one voice that this Government and the Finance Minister have placed before the country a uniform and satisfactory Budget which is in the interests of the people of Canada—and I am sure the people of Canada will bear their burdens cheerfully, whatever they may be—a Budget that will meet with the approval not

only of the people of this country, but of every part of the British Empire.

Mr. ROCH LANCTOT (Laprairie-Napierville): Mr. Speaker, before I proceed with the few remarks I have to offer to this House I wish to refer to the speech delivered in the course of this debate by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury). I find that he is reported on page 760 of Hansard to have used the following words:

> The hon. gentleman cannot quote any statement contained in the platform laid down by the Conservative party previous to their return in 1911 asserting that if returned to office they would reduce the public expenditure.

Now the Montreal Gazette dated August 15, 1911, a conservative paper, has the following article:

> Conservative Policy.
>
> What the Party is Pledged to Carry On.
>
> The Liberal Conservative party gives its pledge to carry out the following policy if returned to power:
>
> (1 A thorough reorganization of the method by which the public expenditure is supervised. The increase in what is known as ordinary controllable expenditure from $21,500,000 in 1896 to nearly $74,000,000 in 1911 is proof of extravagance beyond any possible defence.
>
> R. L. Borden.

Mr. LANCTOT. (Translation): Mr. Speaker, on the 18th of August last, Parliament was summoned in extraordinary session. The object in view was the organization of a contingent of 22,500 men, to be sent to fight with Allies in France and Belgium. The Government then asked and obtained, for those objects, a vote of fifty million dollars. The Minister of Militia set immediately to work to put the contingent on a proper footing. The men of that contingent spent a few weeks at the Valcartier camp to complete their military training. On October last, those men went to England, and on arriving there were sent to Salisbury Plains to complete their training. Since then they have given a good account of themselves on the battlefields, whatever may have been alleged to the contrary, on the 18th of February last, by the Toronto Evening Journal which showed its lack of patriotism to the extent of stating that our Canadian contingent, after making a favourable impression on its arrival in England, was no longer in a position, after several months of training, to do honour to Canada when its services were needed in action.

It was with satisfaction that, personally, I voted the 50 millions to defray the contribution which we deemed it proper that a country such as ours should vote.

But, Mr. Speaker, I believe that such help must be proportionate to our resources, and that we have no right to indulge in inconsiderate and uncontrolled expenditure. The help which a son must give to his father should be proportionate to his resources and to the needs of his father, and if we must accept that proposition as being absolutely logical and reasonable, we must also infer that we have now greatly exceeded the limit of our obligations.

Let us calmly look into the situation, having solely in view the performance of our duties as representatives of the people.

It is universally conceded that England has all the money that she wants. We know, through the Minister of Finance himself, that we go to England to obtain the very moneys that have been appropriated for our war expenses. Is not that sufficient evidence that instead of fulfilling an obligation, we have on the contrary imposed upon ourselves an immense sacrifice?

In view of the present financial situation in England and in our own country, is it not evident that our sentiments of loyalty and the deep indignation felt at the atrocities committed by those blood-thirsty Germans have been the sole motives of our spontaneous participation?

But, Mr. Speaker, I ask this House, are we then justified in leading the country into bankruptcy? No, unless it can be shown that our participation to the full is the only guarantee of the certain success of the Allies. And as a member of this House is expected to fully speak his mind, let me say right here that the interest we have in this war, however great it may be, is far from being equal to the interest of England or of the other independent nations engaged. We are only a self-governing colony, and we have no war to wage here for the conservation of our sovereignty, as other nations have, and that makes an enormous difference. If we had to follow the dictates of certain visionaries, we would exhaust, nay we would have already exhausted at this moment our resources in men and money, and, I say, under what circumstances?

The chancellor, Lloyd-George, has just announced that England is in a position to make loans to foreign nations so as to keep the war going five years more. He also stated that France has enough money to last her more than two years. Then, our Minister of Finance is bound to acknowledge that we have to go to England to get the money

which we desire to apply to that war. Then again, Lord Kitchener stated that he has an army of more than two million men, and General Joffre has a million and a half of reserves. In the face of such statements, which considering the high standing and responsibility of those making them are beyond cavil, would the people of Canada think that we are justified in bleeding the country any further? I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the most practical and patriotic way for us to contribute effectively to the war and to the aftermath of the war would be to let our population give itself up entirely to the improving of our agricultural resources, through the encourragement of intensive farming, so that a large part of the world may be secure against all danger of famine, a danger which has already assumed such a threatening aspect.

The House will perhaps allow me to quote an extract from an editorial in the Westminster Gazette:

> We are told that Canada desires to carry its contribution in men to 150,000, before next fall, should that number be required. It is needless to say that we do not believe that such a sacrifice will ever be required from the Dominion. We fully acknowledge that Canada will be with us in the present war to the extreme limit of its resources. But we hope that the recruiting which is going on in England will suffice, and that we will never be obliged to make such a call to Canada. We must not forget that what is required from Canada during the present conflict is a double service. That country must remain the granary of the Empire, and if we are to achieve victory in this war, the men working in the Canadian fields will help us in that victory just as effectively as those who expose themselves to the fire of the enemy.

Mr. Speaker, during the session of August last, the hon. Minister of Finance, with a view to providing for the requirements of this war, moved that the House should resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means in order to raise the customs and excise duties on articles and foodstuffs which are generally taxed in times of war. Those articles were particularly coffee, sugar, spirits and tobacco.

The hon. minister expected that the imposition of those duties would yield an additional revenue of fourteen millions. Now, in spite of that additional revenue, the deficit announced by the hon. minister for the fiscal year ending on the 31st of March next will be at least 60 millions, not including the 50 millions voted in August last for the war.

At this session, the hon. minister comes down with proposals for additional taxation for war purposes, and how does he proceed? Is there anything in his words of a nature to reassure the people? The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) stated a moment ago that the people of Canada never received from a Finance Minister so satisfactory a statement as the one of this year. Let me say to the hon. member that he has not visited all the electors of this country; and as representing the county of Laprairie-Napierville, I challenge contradiction when I say that I have not yet met either a Conservative, a Liberal or a Nationalist favourable to this alleged war tax and to such a participation to the full, yea, which has reached such proportions that we are well nigh on the eve of bankruptcy.

If I am not mistaken, the hon. minister has informed us that the English Government had advanced the 50 millions voted last year, and was ready to advance the 100 millions that are now asked for, and even more if that is necessary. If such is the case, the tax asked by the hon. minister is not intended for the payment of those sums or part of those war loans, but rather to cover a part of the deficit occasioned by the extravagances of this Government.

Why should we impose those new taxes on the people? Why not wait until those 150 millions are spent, and then we could give our note, as all business men do, and pay that note at maturity.

No, you will not deceive the electors of Canada as easily as you think. You have taken them by surprise in 1911, but you will not succeed in any further attempt, if that is what is contemplated. The people realize fully what is the object of such a demand; that is easily discernible; the tax is intended to make up for the deficit of this year and for the one of next year, which every one says will be of 200 millions, including the war expenses. Such is the result of the extravagances of this Government.

And what is the cause of all that? The reason must be found in the fact that we have in this Administration only one man having previously held office. I mean Sir George E. Foster, the present Minister of Trade and Commerce, to whom the Government have not seen fit to confide the portfolio of Finance, because he might have been a source of embarrassment to them, and whom they promptly sent out as trade commissioner to the antipodes.

I have often heard the hon. minister taking to task the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and in flaming words denounce the extravagance of the Laurier Ad-

ministration. He may have been sometimes in the right. At all events, he was wont to say that a party which was spending 70 millions for the ordinary expenses of the country was surely extravagant, and he used to add that if ever the Conservative party should resume power it would surely reduce the expenditure. Accordingly, they were careful that Sir George Foster should not be put in charge of the Department of Finance.

The present Minister of Finance (Mr. White) never previously having held office, or occupied a seat in this House, of course lacked the requisite experience.

The hon. Prime Minister seems to me wanting in energy, and that is why we see every one of his colleagues doing exactly as he pleases. I say that this Government is too costly, that extravagance is too rampant, and that is why we are heading towards bankruptcy.

A moment ago, I heard the hon. member for Peel saying that the people are satisfied since his party has reached power. When hon. genetlemen assumed office, there was an annual surplus of 30 to 40 millions, and after three years and six months we see an increase in the gross debt of nearly 200 millions, and of over 80 millions in the net debt. That is why the present Government have seen fit to increase the taxes at the session of August last and at this present session to nearly 45 millions. And yet they will try to make the people believe that everything goes well and that the present Administration have only "clean politics" to their credit, in fact that they are a Government of honest men. You may rest assured that the people are well enough posted as to the capabilities of this Government.

I was saying a moment ago that the present Government has only been in power three years and six months. Honourable gentlemen claim that they diminished the public debt during the three first years of their régime. To that, I can only answer: If you have done so well during the three first years, you have managed the affairs of the country very badly during the last five months. We will discuss that. In 1911, the elections took place on the 21st of September. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) had only had five-twelfths of the Estimates submitted to the House. Now, on that very year, the Laurier government could only go on with the public works to the extent of those five-twelfths. The Liberal party having undergone defeat hon. gentlemen assumed power. During the following session of November, we were asked by the new Government to pass seven-twelfths of the Fielding Estimates. You remember, Mr. Speaker, that there were very few new items submitted to the House, with the exception of the three famous dreadnoughts which were to cost 35 millions.

Reference has been made to dreadnoughts; I wish to refer to them myself, and I must ask, would the country be richer if those dreadnoughts had been provided for two years ago, or would England be in a better position to conquer on sea to-day with those three dreadnoughts still on the stocks?

Mr. BELLEMARE, (Translation): Will the hon. member allow me to ask a question. Does he mean to say that Canada would be richer if the Laurier navy was now in existence?

Mr. LANCTOT. (Translation): I am very glad to be asked that question. If the Liberal government had remained in power, I presume that the Laurier bill, passed in 1910, would have followed its course, and that we would have to-day three or four cruisers to protect our coasts. We would not have been forced to buy two submarines which had been refused by the government of Chile, and to pay $400,000 more than the price agreed between the builders and the Chilean government.

Mr. BELLEMARE. (Translation): Is my hon. friend not aware that the two submarines which have been bought in Vancouver are used as destroyers?

Mr. LANCTOT. (Translation): The hon-member surely will not contend that submarines are not a part of a navy. At any rate, those submarines are not in the Pacific ocean, and are not worth any thing because they have not been built in accordance with plans and specifications.

I wonder in what situation we would be to-day if the Government had succeeded in the Senate, as they succeeded in the House, in putting through their famous policy of dreadnoughts, even though the hon. member for Maskinongé managed to get in because of his opposition to all expenditure savouring of militarism to the Laurier navy, and to any war contribution whatever proposed by the Borden Government, claiming besides that he was a representative of the people who would not hesitate to take a firm stand and say: Now, gentlemen, I am here with a mandate of the electors of Maskinongé, I am neither Conservative nor Liberal, I am in favour of the people who have elected me, I intend to keep my pledges to my consti-

tuents, and I must protest against all such expenditure made by the Government in power. I have been elected to oppose any government indulging in all such expenditure, either for a navy or for a war contribution. It is the first time I hear him, and he will certainly regret having asked me such a question.

But let us see what has been done by that honest Government which to-day boasts that it has so well managed our affairs during those last three years. The hon. member for Toronto-south (Mr. Macdonell) who spoke after the member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) stated that his party had diminished the debt and completed the Transcontinental; and some of those hon. gentlemen have even gone so far as to say that the Transcontinental had cost this government 116 millions. Let us see what are the facts:

In 1911-1912 the expenditure reached..	$21,110,683.05
In 1912-1913 the expenditure reached..	13,730,733.48
In 1913-1914 the expenditure reached..	12,683,701.97
In 1914-1915 the expenditure reached..	6,511,551.00
Total..	$54,836,679.50

It is true that we have spent some millions, but we have that railway as an asset, whareas you have only the bare expenditure. Since those honorable gentleman reached power, they spent for various other purpose enormous amounts which have given no return whatever. I may first point-out in support of that view what has been going on in the Department of Public Works. There were public works that had to be carried on in the county of Laprairie. I am considering Laprairie, because I happen to know that county better than some others. In 1911, out of a total of $27,000 we have had five-twelfths of that amount and that other seven-twelfths of the money have only been expended in the following spring, after the Conservatives had assumed power. At the time the Liberals were in power, we had only one foreman to supervise the works. What happened after these gentlemen had assumed power? They appointed ten, some people even say twelve foreman, to help spend the other seven-twelfths.

Such are the methods followed by this Government in carrying out public works. there are as many foremen as workmen, a fact that has fallen under my notice, not only in my county, but also, last summer, in the Lower St. Lawrance, where I was then visiting. At the St. Irénée wharf, at Rivière Ouelle and at Rivière du Loup, there were two foreman and only one workman on the job. I must say I was somewhat taken aback on witnessing such squandering of money. At St. Irénée, $5,000 had been voted for the wharf, and that amount would certainly have been sufficient if the number of foreman had not been so large and if there had not been such a waste of money. However, I see that in this year's estimates an additional appropriation of $10,000 has been made to carry the work to completion.

In the county of Laprairie, over a distance of 8,000 feet a highway has been built, varying in height between five and ten feet. With a view of preventing its washing out by the St. Lawrence the district engineer, Mr. L. J. Michaud, recommended the construction of a stone wall eighteen inches thick. That wall was to be cemented in accordance with certain plans and specifications. The contractors did not comply with those specifications, and were content with building a dry stone wall, only six to nine inches thick. However for the purpose of deceiving, the wall was covered with a light coating of cement, which heavy rains washed away in the fall, leaving only a crumbling wall, with gaps of six hundred to fifteen hundred feet. Onlookers were amused saying that the Germans had come during the night and effectively bombarded the place. What is the reason of it? It may be found in the fact that the man who has the patronage in that county is waiting, to complete those works, for the federal and provincial elections. When engineer Michaud wanted to do his duty, he was immediately suspended. I am bound to blame the engineer for not having his duty despite all threats. He should have given up his position, rather than be derelict in the fulfilment of his duty. At all events so far, we have only got a portion of that famous "King Edward highway" on which work was started in 1910.

But we are told; you have also spent money yourselves, and in certain cases employees have been cheating the Government. There does not exist, I dare say, a single Government which is not more or less cheated by its employees. But there is a great difference between the expenditure for which the Liberal Government is responsible and that made by the present Government. Thus, in 1910, the ordinary expenditure chargeable upon the Con-

solidated Fund, amounted to $79,411,749.12, in 1911, to $87,774,198.32; in 1912, to $98,161,440.77; in 1913, to $112,059,527.41; in 1914, to $127,284,472.99; in 1915, to $140,000,000 and in 1916 it will be another $140,000,000.

One of my political friends was saying to me a few days ago that he had lately met a great politician of this country—now out of politics—and that he had asked him what he thought of the present Government, and if he could see no way to reduce expenses. And he answered: 50 millions could be easily taken out, but I say at least 40 millions.

What is the reason for the increased expenditure? It may be detected in the increased cost of administration. Thus, in 1911-1912, we spent on account of civil government, fisheries, mines, and geological surveys, immigration, quarantine, Indians, public works, customs, dominion lands, post offices; $33,321,660.41. In 1913-1914, for the same services; $50,570, 553.53; in 1915-1916, we are asked to vote $60,230,128.62.

We can thus see that the present Government spends, in round figures, 27 millions more than in 1911-1912. True that the public works of the present Government cost 12 millions more than in 1911-1912. However there remains on civil government account the further enormous amount of $15,000,000. And I am not far from agreeing with the statement recently made by professor Shortt that the 2,000 men who had been removed from office had been replaced by 10,000 newly appointed officers.

But, speaking of civil servants, we do not see everything. The report which has been brought down does not mention the commissions of enquiry which have covered the country, nor does it speak of the secretaries, or of the briefless barristers whom the Government employs the whole year round, and who would be dying with hunger if only this Administration did not happen to hold power.

I will only mention two cases—and there are hundreds of similar ones—Mr. Bergeron who has been a member of this House during some twenty years, and who is costing us lots of money. He has the misfortune of always losing his elections, but finds some solace elsewhere, being secretary of a commission in British Columbia, called the Indian Reserves Commission. From March 1913 to March 1914, he worked like a Trojan and managed to furnish 366 working days in the year. That is a record.

[Mr. Lanctot.]

Mr. GAUVREAU: That was a leap year.

Mr. LANCTOT: At $30 a day and no time lost, Sundays as well as week days. And that reminds me of a story. Once upon a time there was a candidate in the county of Laprairie, when the famous Curran bridge was under construction, and lucky owners of wooden derricks were being paid $50 a day by the Government; and as they were being paid for Sundays the same as for week days, that candidate used to say that the $50 for Sundays were for praying God, so that the iniquities of the Conservatives might be forgiven.

In my county, every one will be of the opinion—and I dare say the hon. member for Maskinongé will bear me out in this—that a man who draws $20 a day may well afford to pay his board. But such is not the case of Mr. Bergeron. I find in the Auditor's Report the following item: 366 days board at $10 a day. Surely, he has a good appetite and it cannot be said that he is a dyspeptic. That makes the good round sum of $3,660 only for board, and you have not come yet to the end of it. That man is also fond of taking automobile rides, and when he travels by railway he takes mighty good care to secure a seat in the parlor car, and at times the state-room.

According to that report, Mr. Bergeron drew both for salary and board $11,180; however the report states further that he has been paid $140 in excess, and I have no doubt, knowing Mr. Bergeron as well as I do, that his account of next year will be reduced in proportion.

But that is not all, and according to the Auditor General, there is, for travelling expenses of Mr. Bergeron in British Columbia, an additional item of $1,568.91 for automobiles, cabs, board, etc.

I have been told that Mr. Bergeron is now in Montreal, and from what I know of him I am confident he will not waste any time.

Then we come to the case of Mr. Ferguson, K.C., who has been drawing $50 a day, and has earned during 317 days $15,850. Besides that, he has an additional account for board, cabs, autos, etc., totalling about $2,000. It may also be interesting to note that the mere printing of his initials on his trunk has cost us the trifle sum of $37.

But there is another man who is costing still more to the country, and that is the hon. Minister of Justice, who enjoys a State pension. In 1867, the object of the legislators, in framing the law for the superannuation of the judges, was to provide

for the retirement of those who, by reason of age or infirmities, had become unable to administer justice, and might even inflict grievous losses on litigants. I told the hon. Minister last year that he should introduce a bill providing that, so long as he remained Minister of Justice, he should abstain from drawing his pension as judge. The hon. Minister simply answered with a smile. But this year, he got angry when the leader of the Opposition saw fit to make him the same reproach. So that I am making some headway with my state pensioner. I offered him to meet him in St. Anne division, and discuss the matter with him. I am still waiting for an answer.

It is not his duty, as Minister of Justice to make laws or amend the bad ones? Let him give up his pension, and he will command our admiration. It is true that he would lose $4,666 a year. But I have been told that he has other jobs on hand, in Montreal or elsewhere. What is the outcome of it all? It is that the minister being unable to attend personally to his duties, the salary of his deputy-minister was increased to $10,000. And not only that, but as he spends all his time in administering estates in Montreal, we are obliged to adjoin to him two chief clerks in his department with a salary of $4,000 to $5,000 each a year.

Hon. gentlemen on the other side are always telling us that everything is serene, that everything is all right and that the country is prosperous. But following on the statement of the Minister of Finance, that we may expect a deficit of 200 millions next year, I do not think that those gentlemen are sincere when they thus praise the Government.

There is a talk of elections. Well, as far as I am concerned, I declare that I would be happy to have an election in Laprairie-Napierville, either right now or in two months, and I am sure that the people of the country will overthrow this Government which has so badly managed our affairs for the last three years.

Mr. A. BELLEMARE (Maskinongé). (Translation): Mr. Speaker, considering the grievousness of recent developments, I beg to call the attention of the Government to the following proposal:

"To provide the farmers of each province with seed grain of superior quality and chosen by experts, which would be sold and delivered at cost price to every farmer who applies for it. We should even pay, if possible, the freight to destination. In such manner, we would be sure to see the provinces of Quebec and Ontario with the maritime provinces take to the growing of wheat during next season."

By such means, the Government would greatly assist the farming community, because, after all, a time will perhaps come when the ears of grain will be of greater service on the battlefields than even muskets or bayonets. Indeed, what would be the use, for the Government, of sending soldiers, if the Allies, our friends, should be famished.

The best way to be of service to the Empire, is to make a granary of Canada, and in support of that opinion, I will quote an article of a London paper, the Westminster Gazette, dated 6th of November last, and which says:

> We fully acknowledge that Canada will be with us in the present war to the extreme limit of its resources. But we hope that the recruiting that is going on in England will be sufficient, and that we will never be obliged to make such a call for men to Canada.
>
> We must not forget that what is required from Canada during the present conflict is a double service. That country must remain the granary of the Empire, and if we are to achieve victory in this war, the men working in the Canadian fields will help us win that victory just as effectively as those who are exposing themselves to the fire of the enemy.

We see in that paper, which is published in the very heart of the Empire, that they set a higher price on the foodstuffs than on the thousands of men who could be sent at our own cost, and a great many papers in Canada proclaim the same necessity.

The Press of Montreal of the 16th of November says:

> The opportunity of increasing our agricultural production is no longer put in doubt. The war will reduce enormously the ordinary output of the wheat crop in Europe. Among the millions of men enrolled under the flags of the nations at war, how many are there not who have been taken away from the cultivation of the land?
>
> Canada contains an immense number of agricultural lands which have never been cultivated, and which are only waiting for the ploughshare in order to yield enormous crops.
>
> As regards the farms already under cultivation, only a little more care and better methods are often necessary to increase the yield two-fold or even three-fold.
>
> Intensive agriculture is now in order on our continent, because it is easy to foresee the day when the millions of men whose estates have been ruined by the war will expect to receive from our soil the wheat which will save them from starvation. The new world will become the granary of the old world. In view of the present situation, is it not the duty of the Government to lend a helping hand to private initia-

tive, so as to allow the carrying on of the agricultural development which has now become a necessity.

Let me quote also the Devoir of September 2, last:

Of the 20 million men engaged in the conflict, a large proportion, and probably the majority, belongs to the rural class. A considerable number were also engaged in industries connected with agriculture: agricultural implements, chemical fertilizers, manufactures of sugar, dairying industry, etc. From ten to twelve millions of men, who were busy helping to develop the world's patrimony, and to produce the necessaries of life, will now have for their sole object, during the next year or perhaps two years, destruction and devastation.

And elsewhere:

The famine which is threatening the world, if the governments and peoples do not immediately take means to prevent it by drastic and exceptional measures, will exceed in its extent and horror all the disasters of the war.

We see in those two papers that a very pressing appeal is made to the Government.

I will go farther, and I will now quote from the bulletin recently published by the hon. Minister of Agriculture under the head of "The Agricultural War Book."

In that pressing appeal to the farmers of the country, the hon. minister says:

Europe has mobilized about twenty million men. A great number of those men were engaged in the cultivation of the soil, in the countries just now at war. Even in neutral countries, a great many producers have been called to the colours in provision of a possible conflict. It is difficult for us to understand the extent to which the production of the great agricultural countries of Europe will suffer through the departure of so many millions of farmers. And all those men, not only then cease to produce, but they become destroyers.

If the war lasts until next summer, the output of the European lands will certainly fall below that of the preceding years. Even by looking at the situation under its most favourable light, we see that the output of the whole world will be barely sufficient in 1915 to meet the demand for foodstuffs. Canada has promptly answered the call of the Mother Country by sending men and equipment. But Great Britain needs not only men, it needs also food for this year and next year. We are now sending our surplus; let us prepare to send next year a still greater surplus.

We may foresee that wheat and the other foodstuffs will be this year a source of considerable profit to producers, and we may also be sure that those Canadian farmers who, through some additional efforts, will increase the extent of their wheat crops and other crops, together with the number of their cattle, will contribute in the most effective manner to the support of the Empire in this hour of peril.

I desire to call particular attention to those words of the hon. minister: "Great Britain needs not only men, she must have also food this year and next year." Indeed those remarkable words confirm my opinion that we should, even if it is necessary, send fewer men to the war, and spend a little more for agriculture, because after all the sinews of war is presently not so much a matter of money, as is generally thought, but rather wheat and the other foodstuffs.

With the realization of that project, our work will be doubly useful, being of use for the support of our armies and the improvement of the agricultural class.

I have spoken of that proposal at different places, and namely in the county of Maskinongé, which I have the honour to represent in this House. All are ready to respond to any offer of assistance which the Government may extend for the carrying out of that scheme, because I have often heard the remark: "Where can we find at a reasonable price the seed-grain which will be needed right to begin with?"

While visiting my county, I have been able to see by the numerous notices and circulars which are being widely circulated in the rural communities that the Minister of Agriculture spares no pains to give a new impulse to agriculture in all its different branches.

Among the principal means which have been advocated in this educational campaign, I see that they attach a great importance to lectures on agricultural topics. I certainly do not undervalue the importance of the theoretical teaching, but nevertheless we must never lose sight of the practical side of the question; and that is the principal justification of the proposals which I have the honour to submit to the House.

Of what use, indeed, would it be for the Government to send lecturers advocating intensive farming, if nothing practical comes out of it?

We have had in the past many lecturers who have visited our provinces, and the outcome has been rather disappointing in view of the energy expended.

The province of Quebec which is better known to me than any other has magnificent agricultural lands in fine condition, and which would produce abundant crops of wheat; but in order to accomplish that, it must not be forgotten that the farmers will have to be provided with all the seed-grain they may need.

That proposal seems to me of a most urgent nature; because the world's production of wheat, in 1914, according to the

estimate of Broomhall, has fallen to 3,615,000,000 bushels as compared with 3,840,000,000 in 1913, or a total shrinkage in the world's output of wheat of 233 millions of bushels.

The United States, in 1914, had the largest crop of wheat on record. It was estimated at 892 millions of bushels, as compared with 763 millions in 1913, or an increase of 129 millions of bushels.

The above statistics go to show the necessity of immediate action and the opportuneness of my proposal.

Should the Government be in a position to do even more towards furthering such a plan, we would be greatly pleased, for after all if it be so important to develop by all possible means the growing of wheat in our provinces, it is equally important not to lose sight of the other foodstuffs which may also be much needed.

With regard to that, I will give an extract from Le Canada, in which I find the following under date of 3rd of December last:

> It is certain that the high price paid for wheat this fall must have been a great encouragement to farmers for the development of that particular crop. Indeed, wheat at $1 a bushel is a real gold mine for the farmer.
>
> Our farmers of the province of Quebec, who as a rule do not grow much wheat, should try this year to sow a few acres of it, even if it be only tentatively, as the high prices paid for that cereal should be an inducement to them.
>
> But, at all events, we must suppose that they will not fail to increase their sowings of oats, barley and peas, because those cereals will certainly remain for a long time yet at prices never reached heretofore.
>
> Lands should no longer be left in hay in order to save work. Although hay will still continue to be very remunerative this year, the grain crops will certainly be a much better investment.

On the other hand, I am satisfied that the farmers of all the provinces, with the encouragement they will get from the Department of Agriculture, will promptly abandon their old methods of culture and devote themselves on a much larger scale to the growing of cereals, and more particularly wheat.

At the outset, they may find it up-hill work, but there can be no doubt that the results will be far more satisfactory.

As regards myself, I owe it to the hon. minister to state that the country fully appreciates the efforts made by his department to ensure the well-being of the agricultural community and encourage intensive farming, and I have no doubt that the Government will take in very serious consideration the proposal which I have had the honour to submit.

Let me say again that we have here a splendid opportunity to show our practical sense. Let us bear in mind that it is no use to send a lumberman in the woods to fell trees unless he be provided with a good axe.

It may be objected that it will be infringing on the powers of the provinces. I say: No, for under the terms of the resolution of the 4th of February last, which is now before the House, it is provided that 100 millions shall be appropriated for war purposes. I notice in clause D the following words:

> "(d) the carrying out of any measures deemed necessary or advisable by the Governor in Council in consequence of the existence of a state of war."

Now, any measure taken by the Governor in Council may, under that clause, if carried, be considered as necessary in consequence of the state of war in which the country is at present; and it seems to me that the department would be justified in distributing seed-grain in all the provinces outside of the West and in appropriating for that purpose an adequate proportion of the items which will be voted for the defence and the security of Canada and the Empire.

Mr. LANCTOT. (Translation): While the hon. gentleman is on his feet, will he be so kind as to inform the House of his views as to the war tax?

Mr. BELLEMARE. (Translation): What tax do you refer to?

Mr. LANCTOT. (Translation): The duty of 7½ per cent.

Mr. BELLEMARE. (Translation): Well, I hope the hon. gentleman will move against the imposition of such a duty, and then he will find out how I will vote.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, listening to the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) and the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain), one has to come to the conclusion, if these hon. gentlemen take themselves seriously, and they generally are serious minded persons, that they regard those of us on this side of the House as being a most horrible class of people. The hon. member for Selkirk is very much concerned about our patriotism. But this is not so serious a matter as that which troubles the hon. member for Peel who looks upon us as a lot of poisoners. Apparently, in his opinion, there is nothing

that we are not prepared to poison; we poison the minds of the farmers, we poison the minds of the people of Great Britain and there are few things that we do not poison. However, these hon. gentlemen are quite willing to mix with us on different occasions. I am sure that if these hon. gentlemen took themselves seriously they would not consent to mix us in such a friendly way as they do. Hon. gentlemen opposite in this debate are prepared to discuss everything on earth except the Budget. The hon. member for Peel did deal with the Budget for a little while, but he apparently thought it was a dangerous subject and shied away from it as soon as he possibly could. Hon. members are more anxious to find fault with their opponents for their alleged wrongdoings, which have nothing to do with the Budget, than they are to discuss the proposal brought before us by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. White). If these hon. gentlemen, who have so much to say about the failure of the late Government to materially reduce the tariff, would take the trouble to look up some of the financial returns of their own Government and make a careful computation therefrom they would find that had the same average rate of duty, which was collected during the financial year ending June, 1896, the last year in which their friends of the Conservative party were in power in the old days, been charged on the imports of Canada during the thirteen years and nine months from June 1897, the year in which the Fielding tariff came into operation, to March 1911, we would have been obliged to pay in customs duties some $90,000,000 more than we actually paid, and had we during that same period of thirteen years and nine months, paid at the same average rate which was collected from 1879, the year of the introduction of the National Policy tariff, to 1896, there would have been collected from us in customs duties an extra $112,000,000. These sums may seem very trifling to hon. gentlemen opposite but I think they would have some difficulty in explaining them to the people of the country or satisfying the people that these sums were so small after all. I do not propose to defend the late Government because of their failure to decrease the existing duties more than they did. I think they should have made greater decreases than they did but that is no reason why we should not give them credit for the reduction that they did make and which these hon. gentlemen opposite seem bound to deny.

I want to say a word or two in regard to some of the criticisms of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Wright), who seems very much displeased with the farmers of the West. This hon. gentleman thinks that the farmers of the West have been very derelict in their duty in not sending more representatives here who are farmers. He thinks that they should have sent all farmers here. If my hon. friend would only look at that in a fair way, I think he would come to the conclusion that this only shows the broadmindedness of the farmers of the West. It shows that they only want to be represented here by people who understand their situation as well as that of the whole country and who are able to deal with the subjects that come up here for consideration irrespective of whether they come from the farms or the towns. But my hon. friend is not quite fair to the western farmers or to their representatives. If he takes the trouble to properly inform himself he will find that there are several farmers occupying seats on this side of the House who represent western constituencies even if he does not include myself in that category. My hon. friend says:

> Some time I would like to see some seat on the Opposition side occupied by a real farmer, one of those men who are actually suffering from the conditions that prevail in the West at the present time.

My hon. friend has his wish gratified now. I am actually suffering by the conditions which prevail in the West under the present Government. At the present time I have more money than I personally own locked up in western farming operations, and during the time that the hon. gentleman's political friends were in office before I spent twelve years working on a farm. Talk about suffering! Surely any man who has farmed in the West for fifteen or sixteen years under Conservative rule, or misrule, should have suffered sufficiently to satisfy a harder heart than that of the hon. member for Muskoka. My hon. friend says that he is a farmer. He is willing to admit that I have some knowledge of actual conditions in the West and in that he is more kind than the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) who on a previous occasion in this House inferred that I was not a proper farmer, but merely a miner of the soil. My hon. friend (Mr. Wright) claims to be a farmer and I suppose that he means that he is a real farmer. Well, the Guide calls him a blacksmith and general merchant and agent. If a gentleman who occu-

pies all these positions can be classed as a real farmer I do not see that the time I spend in my law office can disqualify me from being classed as a farmer. My hon. friend also owns a farm in the West, I believe. I understand his farm is in my constituency. I have heard a great many complaints from our Ontario friends about our mining the soil instead of keeping an unlimited supply of live stock. I never heard that my hon. friend was any better in that particular than the rest of us. He occasionally visits his farm in the West and I suppose he gives some directions as to the farming or mining operations carried on there. I have no doubt he rakes off the profit from the mining operations but he scorns to remain and spend them in the wild and woolly West. Instead of that he speeds eastward and spends that money in the more refined atmosphere of Muskoka. In the old days we talked about our buckboard farmers. My hon. friend apparently prefers to be classed as a parlour car farmer or an absentee landowner.

My hon. friends opposite find fault with hon. members on this side of the House because, while we agree that all possible assistance should be given to Great Britain in these days, and while we agree that we should contribute whatever money is necessary in order to give that assistance, we object to the mode in which that money is to be collected by the Government. Their objection is unreasonable but we are perfectly justified in the course we are pursuing because it is our duty to criticise wherever we find the Government failing to collect the money that is required in the way in which it should be collected. At present we know that our forces at the front are engaged in a severe conflict, but it strikes me that the taxpayers of Canada have also a stern battle before them in financing not only the war operations but also the ordinary operations of the country in this time of stress. Our soldiers at the front look to their commanding officer for directions and it strikes me that the commanding officer, if he is a wise man, will take counsel with, and seek the advice and even criticism, of those who are about him. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance at this particular time occupies the position of commander in chief of the taxpayers of Canada but the law requires that Parliament shall be called together to consult with him. I think it is our duty to consult with him with respect to whatever measures he puts before us. If we fail to offer criticism or advice to the hon. gentleman we are derelict in our duty. A clear duty devolves upon Parliament as well as on the ministers. To follow this simile farther; a general at the front is bound to make whatever progress he can, but he is bound also to safeguard the lives of his men. In the same way the minister should feel that he is bound to guard the money of the ratepayers. If he takes more than is necessary to accomplish his proper purpose, he is blameable, and if we endorse such action we are also blameable.

It has been made abundantly clear in this debate that the Government is largely responsible for the present shortage in our revenues; but I do not propose to discuss that at the present time. We have also had a good deal of discussion on the question as to whether or not this is a war tax, and neither shall I go into that question at any very great length. It is admitted on all hands that no part of the money which will be raised by this tax will be used to pay any part of the expenses of the prosecution of the war. It is claimed on the other hand that this deficit has been caused by war conditions, and that may be true as to a certain amount of it. In support of that contention, we are told that in the United States they also had to place extra taxes in order to make good a deficit said to have been caused by war conditions. This illustration of the United States may be very good so far as it goes, but it does not go far enough to help the Finance Minister very much. We are told that the revenues of the United States are suffering because of this war to the extent of over one hundred million dollars. If we try to find out what, under similar conditions, the revenue of Canada would suffer, we must use the test of population, and if we do that we find that Canada's revenue should suffer to the extent of less than ten million dollars, although the Minister of Finance asks us to raise thirty million dollars, and that without touching the war expenditures at all. It seems to me that, while both the United States and Canada are commercially affected by the war, naturally the United States should lose more in her revenue than we, because we are engaged in fitting out a very large force of our own, and the equipping of that force brings a great deal of money to our manufacturers and our traders, and should be a benefit to all classes. Besides this, we receive a preference from the Mother Country in the matter of contracts, because we know that the Mother Country is very anxious to look

to us for as much of her war supplies as we can possibly furnish. It is true the United States will reap some benefit in that way, but that benefit must be very much less than ours. There is, therefore, no reason why our deficit on account of war conditions should be even as great in proportion to our population as the deficit in the United States because of the same conditions.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Is it not a fact that the Allies have placed enormous contracts with manufacturers in the United States?

Mr. THOMSON: That is quite true. I have said that the United States is reaping considerable benefit from that, but I am sure my hon. friend knows that if it is a matter between giving a contract to us and to the United States, Great Britain will give us the preference. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but I do not think he means it. He must be aware of the fact that if we are not getting a preference in this respect it is the fault of our Government, who are not performing their duty unless they see we are getting a preference, but I am quite certain they are performing their duty in that particular and that we are getting a preference. Therefore the loss per capita we sustain will not be as great as the loss sustained by the United States.

I notice that the United States did not raise any part of the revenue it required from customs tariff. It is all raised from direct taxes. It seems to me that, when it was necessary at this particular time to raise all the money we possibly could at the least possible expense to the tax-payer, that was a wise plan. If that were the main object of the Minister of Finance, I am satisfied he would have adopted the same principle as that adopted in the United States, and that he could raise all the revenue necessary to make up the deficit from direct taxes. But I do not think that is the main object of the Minister of Finance; I think his main object is not to raise revenue, but to put money into the pockets of his political friends the manufacturers of Canada. The range of direct taxation adopted by the United States is very much wider than that adopted by our Minister of Finance. It seems to me that if the minister had followed the same wise plan as did the Government of the United States in the matter of direct taxation, and collected from these other institutions at the same rate as he has collected from those where he has adopted the principle of direct taxation, he would have no difficulty as to the required revenue, and indeed in my opinion he would have a great deal more than he will get under his present scheme. I do not purpose going through these particular items that are subjected to a direct tax in the United States and not in Canada, but let me refer to one particular matter. The Minister of Finance lays a special tax on wines, but he leaves other liquors alone. The United States not only puts a tax on wines, but also on ale, beer, whisky, brandy, and other intoxicating liquors. It may be said that if we adopted the same principle in Canada it might affect the consumption of intoxicating liquors, and therefore we would not get so much revenue as we expected. Well, if it did affect the consumption of liquors that would not be altogether an unmixed evil, and I do not think it would render our people any less able to face the conditions. Besides that, the American Government is not only taxing these things to the consumer, but it also taxes the manufacturer of these articles. Of course I know that would seem rank heresy to the Minister of Finance, and we can hardly expect him to adopt such a suggestion. He would not think of taxing the manufacturer. He is quite willing to tax everybody else in the country for the benefit of the manufacturer, but he would not think of taxing the manufacturer, and therefore there is very little use in making such a suggestion to him.

I notice that the Minister of Finance proposes to increase a great number of items in our tariff by 7½ per cent on the general tariff, and 5 per cent on the preferential tariff. I do not know what proportion of these goods the minister expects to come in under the preferential tariff and what proportion under the general tariff. I think, however, that the general rule has been that about one-fourth of our imports have come in under the preferential tariff, and if we make our calculation on that basis we will find that the general increase on the things affected by the proposal of the minister will be 6⅞ per cent. So that if we calculate at 6⅞ per cent on the articles we shall import, that might indicate the extra amount we shall receive, provided there is no decrease in our imports. I am satisfied, however, that the minister has carefully calculated and studied out what the effect of this increase will be. I have made some calculations, and I think I have a pretty fair idea of

what was in the mind of the Minister of Finance as to how much he expects the imports of the country to decrease. We can tell fairly well what we have to pay extra on the articles we import. We know that exporters generally sell at a minimum profit. It is not true that manufacturers dealing in the home market sell at a minimum profit, because protection is an institution erected for the benefit of the manufacturers to prevent that, and to render it unnecessary to sell at a minimum profit in the home market. We know very well from experience that the manufacturer does not sell at a minimum profit in the home market; but when he exports he sells as a rule at a minimum profit, because he has to sell at as low a profit as he possibly can afford in the foreign market, where he meets with competition from all the world, and unless he can meet competition he cannot enter the market. We cannot therefore expect that outsiders shipping into this country will be able to sell their manufactured articles except at the old price plus the duty.

The question then comes up as to whether or not our home manufacturers will increase their prices. It is quite plain that the minister has formed the conclusion that the manufacturers will increase their prices, but that they will not increase them to an amount equal to the increase in the tariff. That is quite clear from the conclusions announced here as to the amount of money which the Minister of Finance expects to receive from the extra taxation. If he expected that the home manufacturers would not increase their prices in the least, he would know very well that instead of getting any increased revenue from the tariff by means of the increase which he made, he would get a vast decrease. If that were the case, not only would he fail to receive the necessary money to make up the decrease in the revenue, which he expected to do, but he would have to make other provision in order to get money to pay for the ordinary expenses of the country, because it would be unreasonable to expect that our imports would continue to any fair proportion of the present extent. They would practically cease if the manufacturers undertook to sell at the present prices.

I have looked up the trade returns, and I find that these proposed increases may naturally be expected to affect about $500,000,000 worth of our whole imports. If these imports will not be decreased by the change, and if one-fourth of them will come in under the preferential tariff, we should obtain $34,375,000 from the proposed tariff increases. The minister, however, expects only between $20,000,000 and $25,000,000. Therefore he probably expects that some $40,000,000 of the manufactured goods which we now import will be made in Canada. I think, on goods classified by the Government as manufactured goods, we collect considerably over 25 per cent duty; but if we put it at 25 per cent, we shall lose by reason of the decreased imports $12,750,000. I suppose in that case the Government will expect an increase in the importation of raw material needed for those home-manufactured goods.

The tax on raw material is very low. If we put it at 8 per cent, we shall be making a liberal allowance. If we have an increase of $8,000,000 in our imports of raw material, we shall receive from the present duty and the proposed increase $1,030,000 extra. This amount taken from the $12,750,000 leaves $11,720,000 to be deducted from the sum of $34,375,000 that we would receive, were there no decrease in our importations. This would reduce the extra revenue we should receive from that source to $22,655,000, which is about what the minister expects. I do not believe he will receive that amount. It is quite likely that the imports of manufactured goods will decrease by $100,000,000 instead of $40,000,000, in which case our revenue will drop to about $5,000,000, and the increase in home manufacturers and decrease in imports would require to be only a little more than that to wipe out his whole proposed increase in tariff revenue.

But if this tax increases our home manufacturers even by $40,000,000 and decreases our imports by a like amount, what will be the effect on the consumers? Will the manufacturer raise his prices? Surely he will. Otherwise we may expect the leopard at once to change his spots. If he raises his prices even by half the amount of the increase in the cost of imported articles, there will be a tremendous increase in the cost of living to the Canadian consumer. Not only will the price of the imported article be increased, but the cost of the home manufactured article also. I have been unable to obtain an official statement of our home manufacturers since 1910, but it seems quite plain that the value of our home manufacturers is at least four times that of our manufactured imports. Our imports of manufactured goods affected by the pro-

posed increase will be approximately $400,000,000. Therefore our home-manufactured goods affected should amount to $1,600,000. Let us add even $40,000,000 to that and calculate the cost to the consumer added by the proposed tariff increase, and we shall find that, even if we count only on the home manufacturers charging us one-half of the increase, we shall be paying an additional $56,375,000 into the pockets of the manufacturers. Add to this the $22,655,000 we shall pay to the Government under the proposed increase, and you will find that the minister proposes to collect from the Canadian tax-payer $78,030,000 in order to have a little more than one-fourth of that sum paid into the public treasury. If the increase in our home manufactures and the decrease in our manufactured imports is $100,000,000, the position of the consumer and the public treasury will be infinitely worse. If a general at the front should show such disregard for the men under him as the minister is showing for the money of the Canadian tax-payer, he would be court-martialed.

We have heard a great deal about the campaign for buying goods made in Canada. That campaign is all right, providing it is properly handled; but as carried on to-day it is merely a scheme to rob the public. That scheme is rolled up in the old flag in order to give it an air of respectability. Manufacturers should encourage buying in Canada by manufacturing and selling better and cheaper goods than the consumer can buy elsewhere. They can well afford to do that under the present tariff, which is already largely in their favour. The manufacturers will have no trouble at all in doing that if they will make an honest effort. If they do that, they will not need any expensive literature or public meetings in order to boom this "Made in Canada" campaign. Then the consumer could well afford to pay the extra tax in some other way. But the minister should arrange that what we pay shall all, less reasonable expenses, go into the public treasury. As he has arranged the tax at present, we shall pay $3 or $4 into the pockets of his manufacturing friends in order to pay $1 into the public treasury. This is not a tariff for revenue; it is a tariff for the enrichment of the manufacturers and the enslavement of the public.

As regards the proposal of the Minister of Finance, I have another serious objection, which has been dealt with to a certain extent by other speakers. I refer to the increase in the tariff on goods imported from Great Britain. It is quite plain that Great Britain at the present time is in a peculiarly bad condition as far as exporting goods is concerned. The cost and the danger of shipping her goods are very much greater than they have been in the past, and are very much greater than the extra cost and danger experienced by her greatest competitor, the United States. If the present Government allows Great Britain to come in under the present tariff and charges the United States and other countries 7½ per cent extra, I believe the United States will still be getting a preference and will be in a still better position as compared with Great Britain than the position in which it was before, because the United States has none of these dangers and none of the increased cost that Great Britain has. The minister knows that, and he knows the duty that we owe to the Mother Country in her time of extremity. It seems to me that the minister is more unfair than is apparent from a casual glance at this Budget. In the existing tariff I find there are twenty-one items in which a duty of from 5 per cent to 25 per cent is charged on foreign products, and no duty is charged against Great Britain. But, under the hon. minister's proposal, these will be entirely wiped out, except the inconsiderable items of limes and crude lime-fruit juice. Furthermore, I find that, according to the last trade returns, we were importing about 21 1-3 per cent of our total imports from Great Britain. Under the minister's proposals there are certain exceptions made, certain lines of goods to which the increase will not apply. I find that of these excepted only 18 per cent come from Great Britain. So, the blow to Great Britain is more severe than appears at first glance. We have heard a great deal of patriotism. I am not going to accuse any one of lack of patriotism, but, surely, if such an accusation could rest against any one, it would be against the minister who, at this particular time, when the need of Great Britain is so great, when she is in such a crisis, when the dangers to her shipping are so great, when she is undertaking greater financial burdens than ever were undertaken by any nation in the world's history, places these obstacles in the way of her trade. It seems to me this is the time when Great Britain might have been shown consideration, instead of discriminations being made against her as is done. The Finance Minister makes complaint that others do not show a proper sense of the perspective of the

situation. Surely, he is the last man in Canada who can afford to administer such censure as that; surely if any one is blameable from that point, he is the man.

It is alleged that it is necessary to increase the tariff in order to give employment to working men. But what about the cry, "Back to the land," about which we hear so much? What about the statement that there are not sufficient labourers to seed, harvest and thresh the grain necessary for the very salvation of the Empire? Would it not be better to send the surplus men, if we have them, to work the land, to produce wheat, meat, eggs, butter and other things that will be of use to the Empire, rather than ask us to put our hands into our pockets and pay out $56,375,000 to the manufacturers in order that a few men may be employed and our manufactures increased by $40,000,000? According to the Government's figures, that would only give employment to about 18,000 men who, according to the Government figures, would receive only $8,250,000 in wages. We are asked to pay $56,375,000 into the pockets of the manufacturers in order that they may give $8,250,000 to the labourers. Would it not be better to pay that $8,250,000 direct and keep the rest in our own pockets and then give these unemployed men useful employment in the production of foodstuffs beneficial to Canada and the Empire?

We hear a great deal of talk about the farmers. I am not talking about this matter from the standpoint of the farmer, but from the standpoint of the consumer. The consumer is the one to be considered but the Finance Minister considers only his protected friends. The consumers are willing to pay into the treasury everything really needed, but they are not willing to pay untold millions to the manufacturers. It would be better for the Empire, for Canada and for the unemployed that we should pay $8,000,000 direct to them and save the balance of the money, and let these men employ themselves in a way more useful to the country. It would be better for all parties except the manufacturers. But I think the manufacturers have had more than their share; I think they have done well enough; and I think they would be well advised to let well enough alone.

Mr. J. H. FISHER (Brant): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to occupy the time of the House for more than a very few minutes; but there are one or two matters I would like to refer to.

First, I desire to congratulate the Minister of Finance upon the splendid way in which he presented his Budget to this House, and also upon the general satisfaction with which it has been received throughout the country. At the present time, every one realizes that he must bear his share of the increased expenditure of the country and I am quite sure that all classes will cheerfully do so. From my own constituency I have not heard one word of protest or complaint in regard to the tariff, in fact the only complaint I have heard at all came from a Liberal paper which complained that a duty had not been placed on binder-twine.

There is one matter to which I desire to refer before going on with the consideration of this subject, and that is the remark made by the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) the other night in regard to a beautiful village in my constituency. I think I have one of the finest constituencies in the Dominion. The township of Burford is one of the finest in the Dominion, and the village of Burford, which was singled out for attack by the hon. member, is one of the finest villages to be found in Canada. The hon. member for North Oxford, the other night, in reply to a question that I put to him said that a twenty-five-thousand-dollar public building in a village like Burford would look like a palace beside the other buildings. I cannot let that go unchallenged, because Burford is one of the most progressive, up-to-date and progressive villages in Canada; and the fact that I have been able to get a twenty-five-thousand-dollar building for that village should not excite the jealousy of the hon. member for North Oxford. I made him an offer the other night that if he wishes to get a public building for the village of Drumbo or the village of Princeton, in his own constituency, I would give him my assistance, and I was sure the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) would assist also; that in fact we had both been asked by constituents of the hon. member to give him that assistance. The hon. gentleman said, in reply, that he was not aware of it, but his constituents had shown very bad judgment.

That may be the case, but I believe that these places are entitled to public buildings, and I am sure, as I have said, that both the hon. member for South Oxford and myself will be pleased to give him any assistance in our power in obtaining them. The hon. member for North Oxford has been a friend of mine for many years. When I first knew him he was at his best, and at

that time, I believe, he was a Conservative. I am sorry to say that since then he has fallen from grace.

He also referred to the fact that there was a vote in the Estimates for an armoury at Brantford, and he wanted to know if we were never going to be done with Brantford. I want to say that an armoury in Brantford is needed, and we are proud of what Brantford and the town of Paris and the county of Brant has done in the way of sending soldiers for the defence of the Empire. Nearly 1,000 men have enlisted from the city of Brantford, Paris and the county of Brant; and if it was necessary I am sure we could send another 1,000. Thus I do not think the hon. member should have any fault to find because we are asking for an armoury for Brantford. It is a military centre, one of the best in Canada, and it is certainly entitled to the amount placed in the Estimates for the armoury.

But by many, if not all, the speakers on the other side of the House the suggestion has been made that at a time like this the Government should curtail the expenditures, more particularly in regard to public works and public buildings. This is not the opinion that I have heard expressed in many places on many occasions; on the contrary, I have heard the opinion expressed that the Government should prosecute vigorously all public works in order, as far as possible, to relieve the situation and give employment to those who are out of work, largely owing to the war. The cry everywhere is that more public works, municipal, provincial and Dominion, should be undertaken in order that the unemployment situation may be relieved to some extent at least. Many municipalities are endeavouring to do this, and in my opinion it is the duty of this Government to carry on all the public works for which they can find the money; and I know that that policy will be approved by the people at large and that the policy of the Opposition, as expressed in this debate, that important public works should be either stopped or greatly curtailed will not be considered to be in the best interests of this country. I hope that the public works which are being carried on in Canada will not only be continued but, where it can fairly be done, increased, thus giving all the employment possible.

There is another matter that does not seem to appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite, and that is the made-in-Canada movement. If I remember rightly, the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) spoke very lightly in regard to this movement. To be sure, his remarks do not appear in Hansard, but I believe that has been satisfactorily explained. I can assure him, however, that the

11 p.m.

remarks of the hon. gentlemen opposite who make light of this movement do not express the opinion held throughout the country. Take the section of the province of Ontario from which I come. That is an important industrial as well as farming centre, and the people there all firmly believe in this movement. Not alone the artisans of Hamilton, Dundas, Brantford, Paris, Guelph, Berlin, Galt, Waterloo, Woodstock, Preston and other manufacturing centres, but the merchants and farmers as well realize the importance of the made-in-Canada movement. The artisan knows that increased demand for Canadian-made goods means more work and better wages for himself, and consequently more comfort for his family; the merchant knows it means more and better business, while the farmer has learned the value of the home market and knows that it means a better market for everything he has to sell. This view is shared by Liberals and Conservatives alike.

I should like to read a few short articles on this movement taken from the Brantford Expositor, the leading Liberal organ in the section from which I come, and I would commend these extracts to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. After quoting an article from the Canadian Courier, the Expositor, on the 14th October, 1914, said:

> The Courier does well to impress upon Canadians the serious danger which threatens the Empire as a whole, and the need of readiness for still greater sacrifices than any which have thus far been made. The responsibilities in this regard must not be minimized. But, on the other hand, there is no need to be downhearted. While the war brings serious responsibilities, and must involve a considerable derangement of trade, it also brings great opportunities for adopting measures which will in due time extend our commerce and greatly increase employment. A large amount of business hitherto done by European countries, and by the Mother Country as well, is open for seizure, and with properly directed effort a good deal of it must come to Canada. Then we are being taught, as never before, the advantages of trading more largely within ourselves, and of giving preference to agricultural products and manufactured goods which are grown or made in Canada. There is, consequently, need of courage and determination at this crisis, and if these are properly displayed the time will assuredly come when we will confess that the great

sacrifices occasioned by the war have not been made in vain.

On the day previous to that, October 13, the Expositor published an article with the heading, "A Good Creed for Canadians:"

I believe in Canada.
I love her as my home.
I honour her institutions.
I rejoice in the abundance of her resources.
I have unbounded confidence in the ability and enterprise of her people, and I cherish exalted ideas of her destiny among the nations of the world.
Anything that is produced in Canada, from Canadian materials, by the application of Canadian brain and labour, will always have first call with me.

On November 4, 1914, it published another article, from which the following is an extract:

To keep prosperity in Canada and the spectre of hard times out, just means that from now on the people of Canada will consider their own business of first importance, will spend their money for the goods made in Canadian factories. It is the importance of maintaining Canadian pay-roll that puts us all on the same level.

Again on January 30, 1915:

The people are anxious to give preference in their purchases to goods that are the product of Canadian industry, but they must be made more familiar with the nature and extent of these articles. An educational campaign backed up by frequent exhibits in every city and town in the country of made in Canada goods will do much to increase the activity of the manufacturing establishments of the Dominion.

On February 9, 1915, the Expositor contained a number of economical epigrams, of which I will read two or three:

Now that the real estate soap-bubblers are out of business in this country we are again estimating the value of land by the number of smokestacks. There's more money in the made-in-Canada habit than in the subdivision habit.
God made the farm, but man makes the factory. The factories of Canada, created by Canadians are entitled to the admiration of every farmer in Canada.
Half the world does not know how the other half lives, and half the people of Canada might just as well say they don't care how the other half live so long as they deliberately keep them out of work by buying imported goods.

These are clippings from the most prominent Liberal paper in that section of the country. I am sure that after listening to these extracts, every member in this House will agree that the made-in-Canada policy has taken a strong hold on the people of Canada, and, as the importance of the question is better understood, this hold will continue to grow. I might say that the editor of the Brantford Expositor is Mr. T. H. Preston, a gentleman who stands deservedly high in the councils of the Liberal party in Canada, a former member of the Legislature at Toronto, and, if I am correct informed, he was at one time offered the leadership of the Liberal party in that House If he had accepted it I am sure he would have filled it with credit to himself and to the Liberal party. The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) is a personal friend of Mr. Preston, and I am sure will endorse what I have said with regard to him.

There is another matter that I wish to refer to briefly, and that is in reference to dismissals and appointments in the Indian Department. It may be that it would be better to allow the Minister of the Interior to deal with this question, but as I have a large Indian reserve in my constituency I naturally feel somewhat interested. The statement was made by the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) that there had been 135 dismissals and 295 appointments in the Indian Department. As far as they go, these figures are correct; but the statement is not complete. From the statement made by the hon. member for Halifax it would appear that the appointments exceeded the dismissals by 160. But what are the facts?—135 employees were dismissed, 122 resigned, 17 left the service, and 14 died; thus leaving the dismissals, resignations, etc. 288 as against 295 appointments, or a difference of only 7. This puts the matter in a very different light, and what is true of the Indian Department I am satisfied will be found to be true of many of the other departments. I was led to give these figures because I knew that as far as the reserve in the county of Brant is concerned, there had been only one resignation and only one appointment, and that appointment was made at the request of the Indians themselves. I could not understand the figures when they first came out but after getting the correct figures and the complete statement I can easily see where the mistake occurred.

I also wish to say a word in regard to the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Fripp) to permit of the exercise of the franchise by the men who have enlisted for active service. I was not present when this Bill was presented and discussed, and I therefore wish to take this opportunity of saying that while there may be some considerable difficulty in arranging the details as to how the vote should be

taken—and I believe the committee are finding great difficulty—I sincerely trust that a satisfactory way will be found to overcome it. If there is one class of men in the Dominion who above all others should have the privilege of casting their votes whenever an election may come, it seems to me that it is those men who have left their homes and all that is dear to them, and are now fighting the battles of this great Empire, and who are prepared to die for her if necessary. In my own county we are proud of the fact, as I have already said, that nearly one thousand of our best young men from the city of Brantford, the town of Paris, and the county of Brant have enlisted for active service. I consider that it would be a matter for regret if these men, many of whom have taken a prominent part in public affairs, should be deprived of the right to cast their votes. I know a great many of them personally, and as I say a great many have taken a prominent part in public affairs, and it does seem a shame that these men should be deprived of the franchise. I know they are great difficulties in the way, but similar difficulties were overcome at the time of the American war, the war between the North and South; and at the election between Lincoln and McClelland, nearly 120,000 northern soldiers in the field cast their votes. I am sure there must be some way of overcoming these difficulties, and I sincerely trust that the committee having the matter in hand will find a solution.

In conclusion—and I think, Mr. Speaker, you will agree that I have kept within my limit very well—I wish to congratulate the hon. Minister of Finance upon his splendid speech, and upon the presentation of a Budget that has, I believe, already commended itself to a large majority of the people of Canada. Let me also say that whenever the present Government may see fit to appeal to the electors I am satisfied that they will again be returned to power by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. B. B. LAW (Yarmouth): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of attention to the remarks made by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Fisher), and I must congratulate him on the very moderate tone of the speech which he has delivered on this occasion. If the hon. gentleman will pardon me, there are only one or two matters in his speech that I care to refer to. The first is the matter of public buildings. The hon. gentleman seems to think that the Government should go on putting up public buildings as in ordinary times of peace. He says that all public works should go on for which they can find the money. That is a very broad statement. I presume that the hon. gentleman means, provided the country can afford it or can borrow the money. I am probably as much in favour of public buildings as the hon. member for Brant, but I think that this is a time when the Government should cut out some of the public buildings which are provided for in the Estimates, and which will no doubt be criticised when the Estimates come up. I believe that the erection of public buildings in different parts of the country is a necessity, provided they are in proportion, not out of proportion, to the population; and many have been built in the last two or three years which were altogether out of proportion to the population.

The hon. gentleman has referred to the fact that the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) was a Tory some years ago. I should like to inform my hon. friend that, if this Budget passes without any amendment, there will be more Conservatives who will have their eyes opened at the next election, and who will turn to the Liberal party and give their support to it.

I should not occupy the time of the House in continuing this discussion were it not that I consider this the most important matter that has been brought to the attention of the people of this country for many years. I wish to say at the outset that I am in hearty sympathy with the Government in asking this Parliament for an appropriation of $150,000,000; and I am prepared to vote any further amounts which the Government may consider necessary in order to prosecute this war to a victory which shall be lasting, which will mean the end of militarism and of Kaiserism, and which will give freedom and protection to the smaller nations of the world. In saying this I feel that I am voicing the sentiments not only of every member of this House, but of Canadians as a whole.

But what I do object to is the levying of increased taxes and burdens upon a portion of the people under the guise that the money so raised is for war purposes. If we look at the present situation of the Government, and inquire what has led to the most humiliating position in which it now finds itself, only one conclusion can be arrived at. I maintain that the de-

ficit of $60,000,000, the largest in the history of our Dominion, which the Finance Minister was compelled to present in making his Budget speech, is the result in part of gross extravagance and absolute waste by the present Administration. The hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) in his speech the other day said that this Budget was historic, and I agree with him. I sincerely trust that Canada may never be called on to witness another Budget with such a large deficit as this. From 1896 to 1911 times in Canada were exceedingly prosperous, due largely I maintain to wise administration and careful expenditure of the public money.

At the time the Liberal party went out of power our ordinary expenditure was about $80,774,000. But what do we find, Sir? Almost immediately upon the present Government taking the reins, Providence seemed to hide his face, and hard times to take possession, and the revenue to fall off. What, Sir, I would ask, would any sane and competent board of directors of any large business concern do under these circumstances? Would they continue to add to their staff of employees, increase wages, pay dividends out of capital, and generally increase their expenditures? I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you would say such a board should be dismissed; but, Sir, this is what the present Government have done, and they cannot deny their record. Instead of curtailing their expenditure, let us see what they have done. Their ordinary or consolidated fund expenditure for the last four years and their estimated expenditure for the coming year are as follows:

1912..	$ 98,161,000
1913..	112,059,000
1914..	127,384,000
1915..	140,000,000
1916 estimated..	140,000,000

I know, Sir, that comparisons are sometimes odious, but I ask you to compare the management of the present Finance Minister with that of the Hon. W. S. Fielding, Finance Minister under the Laurier Administration, and what do we find? When in 1908 and 1909 the revenue was showing a slight falling off, the then Finance Minister commenced to trim his sails and get ready for a storm if it should come. Without crippling a single industrial or other enterprise in Canada, he was able by his sagacity and good judgment to announce in his Budget speech a substantial surplus.

I think the present Finance Minister is also open to criticism for not cutting down his expenditures during the present fiscal year; but can there be any justification whatever for the remarkable and extravagant Estimates placed before this House at this session for 1915-1916, in face of the hardest and most trying times in the history of Canada? I say, Sir, most emphatically no. There can not be any excuse offered whatever, and only one interpretation can be put upon it, and that is that the expenditure of so large a sum under present conditions is only intended for political and party advantage.

I think a fair way to judge any Government, be it Conservative or Liberal, is to a large extent by their attitude while in Opposition, and just here it is interesting to note the manifesto issued by Mr. R. L. Borden, now the Prime Minister, in 1911.

This was the Conservative party's platform in that year:

> The Liberal-Conservative party gives its pledge to carry out the following policy if returned to power.

The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain), in speaking this afternoon, considered that a pledge given by a party or a Government was as sacred as any pledge that could be given in the world and I agree with him. Here is what the Conservative party pledged itself to carry out if returned to power:

> A thorough reorganization of the method by which the public expenditure is supervised. The increase in what is known as ordinary controllable expenditure from $21,500,000 in 1896 to nearly $74,000,000 in 1911 is proof of extravagance beyond any possible defence.

It is interesting to note that instead of the expenditure being $74,000,000 it has practically been doubled under the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite. On April 26, the present Prime Minister, then Mr. R. L. Borden, moved the following resolution:

> That the public assets have been depleted and the public expenditure has been largely and unnecessarily increased by reason of the unsystematic improvident and extravagant methods of the present Administration.

An hon. MEMBER: In what year?

Mr. LAW: 1907. You will find the quotation in volume 4 of Hansard of that year, page 7856. If these words were transposed to apply to the present Government, I would agree with the right hon. the Prime Minister in every word and sentence which he expressed. I would ask if these hon. gentlemen have carried out their pre-election pledges? I leave it for the people of Canada to judge them by their work. They

seem to have taken as their model one of their members who, when they had come into power and at the full flush of victory, said: "Dash away and spend the money no matter where it comes from." Let me read some remarks made by the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Geo. Foster) in a speech delivered by him on March 17, 1908, which shows that he cannot be in sympathy with the course adopted by the Minister of Finance and the other members of the Government. I quote from page 5165, volume 3 of Hansard, 1907-8. He says:

In 1890 when the first stress of hard times came the aim of the Government was to lighten the load of taxation upon the people and in that year taxation was taken off the common necessaries of life to the amount of $521,755. In 1891, pursuing the same course the Government struck the duty entirely off all raw sugar, and reduced the duty on refined sugar, and in the years from 1891 to 1895 the relief given to the tax payers in that respect alone was $19,851,995, counting the decreased duties upon a nearly equal consumption.

You will notice that that is entirely different from what they are doing at the present time. He goes on to say:

But, Sir, there was another way in which the Government aided in that time of trouble. It economized in expenditures. I think a Government should always set an example to the country. I think a government ought to act very largely as a business man or as an individual having a business and a home would act, and economize in the matter of expenditures when depression is on.

That is entirely in contrast with what the present Minister of Finance is doing. Instead of economizing, the expenditures are increasing by leaps and bounds and in order to put the people of the country in a position to meet these increased expenditures they are putting on customs taxation and also what they call war taxes. Then the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce goes on:

In 1890 we spent $41,770,332.
In 1891 we spent $40,793,208.
In the five years succeeding we spent on an average in round figures $42,000,000 a year. So that by this economy in expenditure we thereby saved to the country money which we would have had to have borrowed and the burden of carrying which would have laid upon the people. As showing the reduction in this respect, in 1891 $41,702,383 was expended as against $43,518,198 in 1889. In these two ways the country was helped to go through the period of stress and by that help it came out all the better.

I am sure that if the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government had placed the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce in the position occupied by the hon. Minister of Finance the country would not find itself in the position that it is in to-day. He believed, as many in this House and out of it believe, that when times are hard it is not wise to increase the expenditure but rather to economize and thus relieve the burdens of the people. I am sure that when I give the next authority that I am going to refer to on the condition of affairs, namely, that of Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, the expression of opinion will be taken as coming from a man who probably understands the conditions in Canada as well as, if not better than, any one else. Sir Thomas Shaughnessy says:

"The individual, the community, the nation, fully understand," says Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, "that in war times sacrifices have to be made. These they are willing to undertake, as they are necessary for the integrity of the Empire. At the same time they will accept the extra burdens with the better grace if they are well convinced that proper caution and economy are exercised in the disbursement of the extra taxes and the administration of affairs." Our cursory examination of the Estimates does not make it evident that the same drastic cut has been made in the cost of administering our public offices as have been made by the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other well conducted business establishment in the Dominion.

The Financial Post of February 20 says:

We are in full accord with Sir Thomas Shaughnessy when he says that the country cheerfully assumes its special Imperial burdens at this time but the task would be less onerous if accompanied by a public conviction that the administration of public affairs was being adjusted to a war basis as done in industry and commerce generally.

The plain fact seems to be that the Government have decided to continue all public works already started and to maintain current expenditure on a normal basis. No railway, business or any undertaking of a private character is at present on a normal basis. All have had to economize; the Administration should not hesitate to act as the people it represents have had to do. Every department practically asks for more money than it did a year ago, although the taxpayer who furnishes it has extraordinary private difficulties to face, as well as the provision of the sinews of war.

These authorities, I am sure, will not be questioned.

Now, Sir, I wish to say this, if I thought for one moment the increased tariff was for war purposes, and would be kept on only during the present war and its consequences it would receive my hearty approval, with some exceptions and prominent among them the lessening of the British preference. But to my mind it is a tariff for the manufacturers to increase the cost of every article of clothing and food worn and used by the already over-taxed and burdened labouring and poor man as well as the farmers and fishermen, even down to the fertilizers, which is a necessity for every farmer to use in the lower provinces at all events,

and the coal oil, lard, beef, pork, beans and many other articles, which I do not wish to take up the time of the House in enumerating, and which our hardy fishermen use, even to cork which is used only and entirely by them. I maintain, Sir, that our fishermen who are habitually risking their lives in the prosecution of their daily duties should not be further burdened with increased taxation, while the rich and affluent who wear silks and satins are not paying any increased duty on these articles. I say, Sir, this is discrimination with a vengeance, but like all protective tariffs it always bears harder on the poor man than on the rich.

I was somewhat amused to hear the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) telling the people of this country that the manufacturers of Canada would not increase prices on their goods, and I shall be glad if such is the case, but I must be allowed to say that I doubt the statement because in many cases the manufacturers do not require much of an excuse to do so. I think this is a time when they will take advantage of their opportunity.

Let me deal for a moment with the reduction of five per cent in the British preference. To my mind this is a part of the tariff that should not have been touched, but if touched at all, it should be to increase it rather than to decrease it. May I ask are these gentlemen who propose this reduction, the same and belonging to the same party, who in 1911 went up and down this country waving the flag and advertising their loyalty from house tops! Can it be possible it is they who intend to borrow from England millions of dollars; in fact every dollar which our participation in this war will cost and thus show their gratitude to the Motherland in this her hour of deepest affliction, when she is sacrificing her best blood; yea her life almost to preserve justice and liberty and to defeat and overthrow forever despotic militarism. I have only to answer that in my humble opinion this is the basest ingratitude. This is not the time to lower the British preference, but rather it is the time to increase it. I believe it would have received the cordial support of the people of this country had the Government decided on that policy. Let me read for a moment an article taken from the Winnipeg Tribune which puts the case in a nutshell. The Tribune is, I am told, an independent paper, and in its issue of February 6, 1915, it very nicely heads this article, "A Trick on the People". The Tribune says:

"Canadian" writes to the Tribune to the effect that he supports a family of five, on a moderate salary, and contributes regularly from his wages "the sum of $5 per month to the Patriotic Fund—$60 per year, which I give cheerfully—and I am ready to give more, if called upon. But," he adds, "my blood fairly boils at the intrigue and the trickery of our politicians. The imposition of a tax of 42½ per cent on the clothing of our soldiers' children, and 37½ per cent, on the shoes to protect their feet, arouses the deepest anger and resentment within the breast of any full-blooded man born with the instincts of British liberty in his make-up. The tax is a disgrace and a humiliation to Canada. It is not a revenue or a war tax as you have well said in your journal. Surely our manufacturers of clothing and blankets are not cripples that they require a tax of 42½ per cent as a bonus; because, as we all know, prices are governed by the tariff. Competition at home is a myth if the Government only stands in and shuts its eyes to the combinations that are formed right and left to bleed us, as our notorious un-British tariff permits."

"Canadian's" feelings are those of ninety-five out of every hundred men in western Canada. Premier Borden and the Hon. Mr. White, have evidently played sharp with the people in raising the tariff on clothing, woollens, and articles previously taxed beyond the highest revenue producing point. It is plainly a protective move, because it is taking, by legislation or by force, money out of the pockets of the vast majority of our citizens and placing it in the pockets of a few. To think that under the guise of "war taxes" such a trick should have been played on the people is enough to arouse the justifiable indignation manifested in the letter of "Canadian."

It will be found that there are a good many people in this country who endorse the views expressed by this writer.

As to the duty on cotton-seed meal, which is not made in Canada, I find that the new tariff will increase the cost to the farmers from $2.40 to $3 per ton. This article is used very extensively in the maritime provinces, and probably in the upper provinces as well. It has to be imported from the United States and the 7½ per cent increase will largely increase the cost of this product, which the farmers cannot do without.

I maintain that the increased cost of fertilizers and feed, which are fundamental to the success of our farmers, may lead to their not using the quantity they might and ought to otherwise use. Just a word as to the tax on fertilizers and feeds used by the farmers. If my information is correct, Great Britain has no duty on plant food. Australia goes so far as to give financial aid to farmers to purchase fertilizers, and even the United States, a highly protective country, does not charge any duty on fertilizers used by farmers. The Farmers' Advocate of London, Ontario, puts the case very well when it says:

While on this point we might also mention cotton-seed meal and cake. This was formerly free, but is now subject to the new impost. It is difficult enough, feeders know, to feed stock at a profit under present conditions and cotton-seed meal has helped them out some this winter, but it is forced up by the new tariff 7½ per cent, or between $2.40 and $3 per ton. This means that it will cost the feeder just that much more to produce dairy products and meat, and yet he is told to produce more. Encouragement is in order. Cotton-seed meal, is not manufactured in Canada. Even the "dumping clause" in the tariff has no application to this material which is not of a "kind or class made in Canada." It seems that there is room for reconsideration of this item.

I sincerely trust, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Finance may see his way clear to leave off the dutiable list this important article of feed, which is so extensively used.

I had intended to refer to the war tax upon patent medicines. I know that this tax is very unpopular indeed, and I have had several letters from druggists in my own town objecting to it, but as I have read in the papers that the minister intends reducing the duty, from ten per cent to four per cent. I presume there will not be quite so much objection to it.

As regards the extra postage of one cent on each letter and one cent on each postal card, the Government is making an absolute mistake in dealing with the matter in that way. In 1896, when the Liberal party came into power, there was a deficit of nearly $1,000,000 in the Post Office Department. Sir Wm. Mulock, who was Postmaster General at that time, reduced the postage from three cents to two cents, and since that time there has been a surplus in the Post Office Department, due very largely and almost altogether to the fact that the postage was reduced. By raising the postage to three cents, the revenue will decline and the Government will have a loss rather than a gain. The result of such a policy will be seen later on.

There is just one matter more to which I wish to refer. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) spent a great deal of time on prohibition, although I do not know what it has to do with the Budget. I want to put myself on record as a prohibitionist, first, last and all the time. The hon. gentleman seems to blame the Liberal party and the late Liberal Government for not passing a prohibitory measure. Neither the hon. member for Selkirk nor any other hon. gentleman opposite can point to any temperance legislation passed by the Conservative party during the eighteen years they were in power previous to 1896 or during the last three or four years they have been in power since 1911. If the present Government desire to bring in a prohibitory measure, I am prepared to support and to vote for it at any time. There are one or two other matters to which I would have referred if the hour had not been so late.

Mr. H. B. TREMAIN (Hants): Mr. Speaker, the question which is now before us has occupied the attention of the House for some time; yet I ask your indulgence and that of the House while I offer, in support of the Budget, a few observations which appear to me to be pertinent. I have listened attentively to the criticisms made by hon. gentlemen opposite to the financial statement presented by my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance; and while they are varied and lengthy, they do not appear particularly helpful, since no serious alternative solution of the problem has been advanced from the Opposition benches, for the purpose of making up the deficit created largely through war conditions. It is undoubtedly true that, before war was declared, Canada with all other world communities, was suffering the consequent reaction caused by a period covering some ten or fifteen years of speculation, extravagance and over-development in many lines, brought about largely through unreasoning optimism and the more or less greed of the individual which lures one on to reap a speculative gain where one has not sown the productive crop of earnest, sustained work and endeavour.

We all hear it frequently advanced in a more or less jocular vein, always with an apparent undercurrent of earnestness, that during the administration of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, Providence smiled on his administration and provided large crops and good times for a country apparently governed in accordance with the beneficent plan of the Deity. If this is so, it might logically be expected that the Opposition should also assume responsibility for any unfortunate factors resulting from the policy pursued by them while in power, especially as the seed of speculation sown during that period was nurtured and developed by a lavish capital expenditure in this country on transportation facilities furnished, in my opinion, for years in advance of the present needs of even a country of Canada's potential possibilities, thus materially assisting through these vast expenditures to create in this country an era of extravagance and speculation, the effects of which confront us to-day, making the acute con-

ditions that we are facing through the war and the consequent interruption of trade even more acute. As I have said, it might logically be expected, since the Opposition eagerly point out and take credit for the favourable factors of the situation just outlined, that they should also assume the responsibilities for the consequences of the policy pursued by the late Liberal Administration.

If this point is well taken, as I believe it to be, no doubt the hon. gentlemen opposite might pertinently ask why the expenditure on capital and revenue account shows an increase rather than a decrease since the present Administration took office; but when it is remembered that heavy capital expenditures made by the present Administration were largely placed on their shoulders by the late Liberal Administration, whose committments in connection with the National Transcontinental railway and whose policy with reference to guarantees and bonuses to the Canadian Northern railway, made it imperative that the national credit of Canada be maintained in the money markets of the world, and in accordance with this necessity that these enterprises be carried through to a successful termination. With these facts in view, the criticism of increased expenditure by the present Government on capital account is more or less of a boomerang, if made for the purpose of showing, in comparison, the economy and superior business methods of the late Administration.

My hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in the role of financial critic of the Opposition, made a speech in his customary good taste; and considering the exigencies of the times and the necessity of providing campaign material to the followers of his party in the country, he carried out with skill and address the task of making the best of the situation in an effort to impress on the electors that the large deficit faced by this country was not created through war conditions, but was resultant from the reckless expenditures of the present Government.

When quoting figures to justify this contention, he, of course, carefully, as becomes an experienced parliamentarian, avoided any reference to the large committments inherited from a Government of which he was a strong and consistent supporter. He points out the necessity of economizing in expenditure—we all agree that this is necessary—but does he particularize as to what public works should be discontinued? I think not. In any event, he does not furnish a comprehensive list of such. He no doubt fully realizes the safety of the policy of dealing in generalities in this respect as opposed to that of particularizing those unnecessary works at present, in his judgment, being carried on in opposition to the dictates of prudence and economy.

He dwells on the amount of money expended on the Civil Service, but does not apparently favour an arbitrary reduction of say ten per cent in salaries. He believes the number of Government employees excessive; but does he advocate dismissals of a large number from the service? It seems to me that in the remarks of my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax, he furnishes us with a shining example of destructive criticism, effective, no doubt, from the standpoint of an Opposition member, who is not obliged to lay down a constructive policy to replace that which he endeavours to discredit, a policy necessitated by the present situation, brought about largely through conditions arising from the war now raging in Europe.

I might also point out that the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) in an interesting speech dwells on the fact, and complains somewhat bitterly of it, that in laying down a policy to increase the revenue of the country, the manufacturers are benefited through increased protection. I believe in the principal of protection for a country in Canada's present stage of development, situated as we are adjacent to a great manufacturing country like the United States, whose industries are highly developed and efficient in the production of their output; but at the same time I am not an unreasoning protectionist, and would not personally advocate, save for revenue purposes or to assist in the solution of the grave and acute problem of the unemployed, any further general revision of the tariff upward at present.

But it seems to me somewhat unreasonable to oppose a policy which seeks to increase the revenue necessary to provide fixed charges in the way of interest on our war loan, and also to provide for the carrying on of necessary public works, merely on the ground that at the same time, through some additional protection, it will enable many industries running on half time, or closed down temporarily, to operate profitably, thus re-employing labour, and in this way alleviating the problem of the

unemployed, which problem is causing the greatest anxiety to thoughtful students of conditions in industrial centres. Even in the maritime province, which have not been as seriously affected as other parts of the country, only large orders for war supplies, and munitions, prevented the situation at many points from becoming indeed serious. The hon. member from Assiniboia complains that the burden of taxation rests on the farmer. Does it not rest to as great an extent on the salaried classes—on the inhabitants of cities and small towns?—and on all classes alike? Apart from a policy nearly approaching confiscation, how can the moneyed classes be made to bear anything save a similar percentage of taxation on their purchases, to that borne by the farmer, or the working classes, when such revenue is raised through excise or by an indirect tariff tax? The only way to make men of large means contribute in a greater volume to the revenues of the country seems to us to be through the levying of a direct tax on large incomes, say over $20,000 or $25,000 per annum. I am personally not averse to any such methods, but if the burden of taxation is inequitable and does not rest as heavily on the wealthy as my hon. friend from Assiniboia thinks it should, I might point out that the party which he supports, and which, in my opinion somewhat hypocritically, poses as the special friend of the working classes, appears to have made little if any effective effort to solve the problem during the period from 1896 to 1911, while they had the power to do so.

The Liberals were returned on a policy opposed to protection, but the percentage in general decrease of the tariff during their term of office was trifling when considered in the aggregate, as my friends opposite well know.

The difference in the theory of government held by individual members opposite and their putting into practice of these economic theories, dear to the hearts of many of our Opposition friends, is indeed startling, and impresses the thoughtful throughout the country with the fact that the Liberal party out of office were prodigal in promise and in power furnished the country with a striking example of being bankrupt in fulfilment of the promises so prodigally made.

My hon. friend from Assiniboia knows that this Government is rightfully assisting in every way the farmers in the West, by providing a large sum for the purchase of seed grain, a policy in which we all concur. No one appreciates more than I do the economic importance of the farmer, or is more ready to concede that the basic economic prosperity of Canada rests primarily on the development of natural resources, the greatest of which, in this country, is agriculture. But surely, my hon. friend does not contend at the present time, that the farmer wishes to avoid his proportion of the increased taxation which the existing grave situation necessitates levying on this country. I think the farmer of this country is not surpassed by any class in devotion to the democratic principles for which this great Empire of ours is engaged in a life and death struggle, and that he does not ask that he be relieved of his share of the burden which it is our duty to shoulder, so that we in this country may render effective aid to the Empire of which we form no unimportant part.

It appears to me unfortunate that many politicians, in an effort to make capital for their party, frequently engage in an attempt to place manufacturer against farmer, when both are so necessary to the development of an evenly balanced and prosperous nation. The growth of industrial centers means the prosperity of the farmers adjacent to those centers who are engaged in mixed farming, and I hope and believe that the continued growth and development of large manufacturing centers in the West may eventually lead to that large measure of co-operation existing between the majority of farmers in Ontario, Quebec, and the maritime province and the industrial classes in the manufacturing centers.

It is unfortunate that at times in this great country of ours, apparently, designing demagogues for political advantage attempt to place class against class and creed against creed, and thus create jealousies and mutual recrimination that sometimes threatens to bring about sectional divisions of thought on geographical lines. This appears to me not only reprehensible but dangerous. And it is the sincere hope of many people of independent thought in this Dominion of ours, that as years go on, the force of public opinion will prevent this policy being carried out to as great an extent in the future as it has been carried out in the past. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place myself on record as being opposed to the breaking of the party truce. Mutual recrimination on both sides seems to be largely responsible for this. I do not think that the majority

of unbiased Canadians wish to see this country, during the war, engaged in undignified strife and the consequent turmoil of a political campaign. This surely would not be a very creditable procedure on the part of Canada and Canadians until absolutely necessary through lapse of time. Even then, in my opinion, Canada might well see what course is pursued in Britain with reference to an election, before embarking in the bitterness of party strife engendered by the widely divergent views held by the two great parties on the Naval policy alone.

It seems to me that some of my hon. friends have been unfair to the hon. the Minister of Militia, even after making the broadest allowance for party feeling. I have no doubt some mistakes may have been made in the Militia Department; the man who does nothing never makes a mistake, but I think that the prompt despatch of 30,000 Canadian troops now gallantly engaged in battling for those principles dear to us, a fitting tribute to the energy and driving power of the Minister of Militia, on whose shoulders has rested a burden far too heavy for the shoulders of many of his uncharitable critics.

In conclusion, I would appeal for a greater measure of co-operation between the two great parties during the grave crisis through which our Empire is passing. When the victory of democratic communities is achieved, over the forces of autocratic despotism, represented by Kaiserism, then and not till then, let our political warfare again be waged, and when the efforts of our Empire and her Allies have resulted in victory, crowning the forces of righteousness, it should be time enough to re-engage in party recrimination and strife in this country.

At the next election the supposed misdeeds of an Administration faced by a gigantic task such as no Government in the history of Canada has coped with in the past, or will likely be called upon to face in the future, can then be brought to the attention of the electorate for a favourable or unfavourable verdict,—until then the interests of the country should be placed above politics, and would seem to me to demand a temporary cessation from petty political bickering and strife.

On motion of Mr. Douglas (for Sir Wilfrid Laurier), the debate was adjourned.

DEATH OF JAMES W. RICHARDS, ESQ., M.P.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid for the adjournment of the House:

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I think it but fitting that reference should be made to the passing of one of our colleagues in this House; I refer to the Hon. Mr. Richards, of Prince county, P.E.I., who passed to the great majority in this city some two hours ago. Mr. Richards was a man who had a great many friends in this House. He came here with a ripe experience of public life, a man born, I think, but certainly educated as a boy in Prince Edward Island; he grew up to be honoured and respected by his fellows and was elected to the legislature there, occupying continuously a seat in the Legislature of Prince Edward Island as the representative from Prince county for some thirty years. He was promoted to be a member of the Government of his province, and, after serving his province well in that capacity, he was elected in 1908 to a seat in this House. He was not a man who was aggressive; it was a little difficult, perhaps to become acquainted with him; but those who know him best esteem him most. He came to us with a ripe experience, and he has gone from us full of years, having given a full life to the service of his province and of the Dominion of Canada. He brought to us, as I have said, diffidence; but he had an unobtrusive ability which was esteemed and recognized by all who knew him. I am sure the House will be unanimous in expressing regret at the loss of so valuable a member and in expressing sympathy with his family.

Hon. J. D. REID: I had not heard of the death of our esteemed friend Mr. Richards, and we on this side of the House join in expressing our sympathy with the family and friends of the deceased member. I certainly am expressing the feelings of every member on this side of the House in endorsing all that my hon. friend has said. Mr. Richards was a faithful member of the House of Commons, always very attentive, and he was respected by every member. I have had the pleasure of sitting in the House with the late Mr. Richards ever since he became a member. I came to know him very well, and found him to be a very genial, kind-hearted man. We join with the hon. member for South Renfrew in expressing our deep sympathy with the family of the late Mr. Richards in their bereavement.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12 o'clock midnight.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Speaker: HON. THOMAS SIMPSON SPROULE.

WEDNESDAY, March 10, 1915.

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

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

INTERNED ALIENS AT PETAWAWA.

Mr. PROULX:

1. How many prisoners or aliens are interned at the Petawawa military camp?
2. What is the cost per day or week for their board?
3. How many officers and men are in charge at the said camp?
4. Have these officers and men had any previous military training?
5. What is their remuneration?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. 564.
2. 29 cents per day.
3. 1 camp commandant, 1 medical officer, guard, 5 officers, 157 men.
4. Yes, annual training.
5. Lieutenants, per day, pay, $2; field allowance, 60 cents; subsistence, $1.50; captains, per day, pay, $3; field allowance, 75 cents; subsistence, $1.50; majors, per day, pay, $4; field allowance, $1; subsistence, $1.50.

BITUMINOUS COAL IMPORTS.

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. What quantity of bituminous coal was imported into Canada during the year ending March 31, 1914?
2. What was the duty collected thereon?
3. What portion of this coal was imported by the railway companies?

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. 13,754,244 tons.
2. $6,144,582.56.
3. The coal imported by the railway companies is not compiled separately from other bituminous coal importations, in the customs returns.

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY.

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Is there a Mr. Begg employed in the Kingston penitentiary?
2. If so, how long has he been so employed?
3. Was his name mentioned in the report of the commissioners appointed to investigate the condition of things at the Kingston penitentiary?
4. If so, what did the report say concerning him?
5. Has his position been changed or his salary increased since that report was made?
6. If so, what position does he now hold, and what is his salary?

[M. J. D. REID.]

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Yes.
2. Since October 1, 1902.
3. Yes.
4. The matter is dealt with on page 25 of the report which has been laid on the table of the House, and whereof a copy is annexed to this answer. (Report filed with Clerk of House).
5. His position has been changed. In view of the recommendation made by the commission, it was thought desirable that Mr. Begg be transferred from the hospital to another department. The salary attached by statute to this new position is larger than that he formerly received.
6. Clerical assistant in the office of the accountant, salary, $1,200 per annum.

WOOL STORAGE WAREHOUSE.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Has a request been made to the Government for the establishment of a Government warehouse for the storage of wool at Lethbridge?
2. Has a request been made for the appointment of a wool inspector at that city?
3. Is the Government aware that the granting of these requests would be of assistance to the woollen industry in southern Alberta?
4. Is it the intention of the Government to comply with these requests?

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. The Government has had its officials considering these suggestions, as well as others that might assist the wool growers industry.
4. Under consideration.

DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. Has the Department of Trade and Commerce sent the following reply to the secretary of the Metabetchouan Company, Quebec:

Ottawa, January 21, 1915.

"La Cie de Metabetchouan,
Quebec, Que.

Weekly Reports.

Dear Sir,—

In reply to your postcard of the 9th instant, I regret that I am unable to comply with your request, as the Weekly Report is not printed in French.

Yours faithfully,
R. Grigg,
Commissioner of Commerce."

2. If so, what is the minister's reason for not having such Weekly Reports printed in French?

Mr. FOSTER:

1. Yes.
2. The Weekly Report has been issued since 1904, and is distributed to commercial bodies, manufacturers and wholesale business men in Canada. The practice as to

printing and distribution is the same as followed since the commencement of the publication, although the quantity has largely increased. From 1904 to 1910 the department had not received half-a-dozen requests for copies in French. During 1913 and 1914 five inquiries have been received for the report in French. The cost of a French edition would be about $4,000.

WAR SUPPLIES—HORSES.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE:

1. How many horses were purchased by the Government in the riding of North Ontario since 1st August, 1914?
2. From whom were the horses purchased, and what was the price paid for each?
3. Who was the purchasing agent?
4. What sum was such purchasing agent paid for his services?

Major General HUGHES:

1. 276.

2. Purchased by Major S. E. de la Ronde, 1914:

James Bradley, 1 horse	$165 00
T. Marcella, 1 horse	165 00
P. Watters, 1 horse	150 00
H. E. McCool, 2 horses	300 00
J. Gleason, 1 horse	167 50
O. Jennings, 1 horse	160 00
G. Hayes, 1 horse	150 00
O. Macdonald, 2 horses	320 00
W. Fitzpatrick, 1 horse	150 00
P. St. Cyr, 1 horse	150 00
M. Dunn, 1 horse	150 00
M. Moriarty, 1 horse	150 00
T. O'Brien, 1 horse	150 00
R. H. Scott, 2 horses	340 00
J. J. Conde, 1 horse	170 00
J. E. Dolan, 5 horses	850 00
W. Gordon, 1 horse	155 00
J. Roland, 1 horse	125 00
T. Roland, 1 horse	125 00
Jas. Barr, 1 horse	170 00
J. D. McLean, 1 horse	125 00
J. A. McLean, 1 horse	125 00
G. A. Beatty, 1 horse	165 00
R. Connie, 1 horse	160 00
J. A. Cochrane, 1 horse	160 00
A. Keon, 1 horse	150 00
R. Bennie, 2 horses	350 00
J. E. Cameron, 1 horse	165 00
A. Greise, 1 horse	170 00
L. O. Christian, 1 horse	150 00
P. Kennedy, 2 horses	330 00
J. L. McGuire, 1 horse	157 00
S. S. Robinson, 1 horse	150 00
A. G. Whitman, 1 horse	150 00
A. Kennedy, 1 horse	150 00
C. Wilson, 1 horse	140 00
J. Binnie, 1 horse	125 00
W. Haltz, 1 horse	175 00
P. DesJardines, 2 horses	330 00
J. A. Wilson, 1 horse	165 00
G. Vailliant, 2 horses	300 00
T. Shepherd, 1 horse	150 00
G. Milkie, 1 horse	140 00
R. Scott, 1 horse	145 00
J. Dagner, 1 horse	125 00
R. Freeland, 2 horses	340 00
F. O. Parent, 1 horse	$ 140 00
J. R. Livingston, 11 horses	1,771 00
W. W. Murray, 11 horses	1,804 00
C. Billy, 11 horses	1,815 00
Geo. Barr, 1 horse	150 00
A. J. McGillis, 4 horses	670 00
A. Landriau, 1 horse	160 00
H. Cooper, 2 horses	245 00
J. McGregor, 2 horses	330 00
W. S. Fraser, 3 horses	475 00
G. Pauchke, 1 horse	150 00
A. Gould, 1 horse	140 00
H. A. Johnson, 1 horse	145 00
R. C. Fraser, 1 horse	95 00
J. A. McDonald, 19 horses	3,135 00
P. Fournier, 3 horses	395 00
J. J. Davidson, 4 horses	665 00
W. Davidson, 2 horses	300 00
E. Freeland, 1 horse	150 00
R. Irvin, 1 horse	135 00
H. H. Robinson, 2 horses	325 00
A. Gould, 1 horse	140 00
J. Jones, 1 horse	155 00
Jos. Hamilton, 2 horses	335 00
A. Zahuka, 1 horse	160 00
R. H. Hamilton, 1 horse	150 00
P. P. Shepherd, 3 horses	510 00
J. A. Livingston, 9 horses	1,520 00
A. Lavelle, 1 horse	150 00
R. Fortier, 1 horse	140 00
B. Thompson, 1 horse	160 00
Colonial Lumber Co., 36 horses	6,300 00
J. Kilgour, 2 horses	300 00
P. Hamilton, 1 horse	165 00

Purchased by A. L. Palmer, 1915:

J. A. Brennan, 2 horses	315 00
J. Coyle, 1 horse	155 00
W. Piche, 1 horse	130 00
W. Cavers, 1 horse	150 00
G. Cardiff, 1 horse	170 00
W. Roach, 1 horse	160 00
J. Doolan, 1 horse	155 00
T. Brennan, 1 horse	140 00
J. Dunlop, 1 horse	160 00
W. Young, 2 horses	310 00
L. Cameron, 2 horses	320 00
L. A. Maine, 1 horse	160 00
J. W. Smith, 1 horse	155 00
J. Wallace, 1 horse	160 00
L. Laughlin, 2 horses	290 00
J. Fitzpatrick, 1 horse	165 00
Geo. Black, 2 horses	310 00
W. S. Fraser, 1 horse	150 00
O. Wright, 2 horses	300 00
M. McBride, 1 horse	140 00
N. W. Beach, 1 horse	165 00
P. Fournier, 2 horses	275 00
J. Manion, 1 horse	145 00
R. Barber, 1 horse	150 00
J. Lasway, 1 horse	155 00
V. Nougent, 1 horse	155 00
S. J. Low, 1 horse	150 00
A. L. Stackhouse, 2 horses	310 00
G. A. O'Connor, 1 horse	150 00
J. King, 1 horse	155 00
T. Fulton, 1 horse	165 00
A. C. Millar, 1 horse	160 00
D. Egan, 1 horse	170 00
R. R. Freeland, 1 horse	170 00
R. Benny, 1 horse	170 00
C. McLean, 1 horse	155 00
H. McBride, 1 horse	140 00
W. Olmstead, 1 horse	190 00
D. McCaskill, 1 horse	160 00
S. Ross, 3 horses	453 00

J. Stevenson, 1 horse	$ 160 00
W. Biggs, 1 horse	165 00
N. C. Giroux, 1 horse	155 00
R. Gould, 1 horse	165 00
T. Somerton, 1 horse	200 00
J. Fulton, 2 horses	310 00
T. Connors, 1 horse	160 00
W. C. Ross, 1 horse	185 00
W. Robinson, 1 horse	150 00
J. Millar, 1 horse	160 00
Y. Millar, 1 horse	150 00
G. Clarke, 1 horse	140 00
J. Linsay, 1 horse	145 00
E. W. Morton, 1 horse	160 00
P. W. Mulligan, 1 horse	150 00
R. A. Fraser, 2 horses	310 00
O. Collons, 1 horse	150 00
T. Kane, 1 horse	150 00
A. McBride, 1 horse	155 00
R. A. McDiarmid, 1 horse	410 00
C. Y. Colters, 1 horse	150 00
R. Hawthorn, 1 horse	150 00
J. A. Suttle, 1 horse	200 00

3. Major S. E. de la Ronde, year 1914. Mr. A. Z. Palmer, year 1915.

4. Major de la Ronde, being already an official of the department, received no extra remuneration for the purchase of horses. Mr. Palmer was paid at the rate of ten dollars per diem.

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. How many of the horses purchased for the first overseas contingent were sold by auction at Quebec last autumn?

2. (a) What was the total amount received by the Government from the proceeds of said auction sale, and (b) what were the total expenses incurred therewith?

3. What has been the amount expended for feed and care in connection with such horses from the time when the overseas contingent sailed to the date of the auction sale?

4 How many of such horses were offered for sale without finding purchasers, and were either killed or given away?

Major General HUGHES:

1. 481.

2. (a) $25,855; (b) $1,292.75.

3. Estimated, $3,056.

4. None.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Did the officer commanding 5th Mounted Rifles, Lieutenant-Colonel G. H. Baker, refuse to accept seven horses which were purchased by Messrs. Palmer and Pallister, at Sherbrooke?

2. If so, what were the reasons given by that officer?

3. Did Lieut.-Colonel Baker demand a Board of Inquiry to examine the said horses and report on their fitness for service?

4. If so, has the board been convened, and their report submitted?

5. What is the finding of the said board in respect to the said horses?

Major General HUGHES:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. No.

4 and 5. Answered by No. 3.

[Mr. Sam. Hughes.]

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Did Sir Adam Beck act as purchaser of remounts for the first contingent?

2. If so, how many remounts were purchased by him, and what was the average price paid per horse?

3. What was the average, per horse, to cover all expenses in purchasing the said horses?

4. Were the owners from whom the said horses were purchased paid by Government cheque, or were they paid for by Sir Adam Beck, by his own personal cheque and he afterwards reimbursed?

5. Were the said horses branded at time of purchase, or only after arrival at Valcartier?

6. If the latter, why were the regulations as laid down in Mobilization Orders 1913 not complied with?

7. What qualifications has Sir Adam Beck that would enable him to determine the different types of remounts required for the various branches of the service?

Major General HUGHES:

1. Yes.

2. 334 horses, average price $166.08.

3. $7.50 per horse.

4. Paid by order on Bank of Montreal, signed by Sir Adam Beck, and the Veterinary Inspecting Officer, and endorsed by the seller of the horse.

5. Horses were branded at the time of purchase.

6. Answered by No. 5.

7. Is an excellent judge of horses, as well as being a thoroughly honourable gentleman desirous of serving Canada and the Empire in the hour of need.

Mr. McCREA:

1. Did the Department of Militia advertise, or has it advertised, to buy horses at Sherbrooke and other points in the Eastern townships for the 5th Mounted Rifles now in camp at Sherbrooke on different dates, and at different places?

2. If so, were buyers present at places so advertised prepared to buy horses?

3. How many horses were bought at each place, and at what price for each horse?

4. What were the total expenses in connection with the said buying, including advertising, wages or compensation of the buyers and expenses, also wages or compensation of veterinary, and all other expenses in connection with said horses that were bought?

Major General HUGHES:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. Actonvale—3 horses: 1 at $172.50, 1 at $172.50, 1 at $190. Sherbrooke—7 horses: 1 at $165, 2 at $300, 1 at $150, 1 at $175, 1 at $150, 1 at $150.

4. Estimated expenses, $129.40.

DUTIES ON MICA.

Mr. DEVLIN:

1. Have representations been made to the Government by any person or persons in the county of Wright since October, 1911, rela-

tive to the duties upon the importation of mica?

2. If so, what was the nature of such representations, and by whom were they made?

Mr. W. T. WHITE:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

ICL. RY.—LEVIS STATION.

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. What is the estimated loss as a result of the destruction by fire of the Lévis station?

2. For what amount was such insured, what was the amount of premium paid therefor, and what was the name of the company and the company's agent who solicited and obtained the risk?

3. What was the amount received by the Government in settlement of such loss by fire?

4. Is it the intention of the Government to rebuild said station? If so, will it be rebuilt on the present site? If not, what other site has been selected?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. $57,849.20.

2. Station was not insured.

3. Answered by No. 2.

4. Yes. Positive location not yet decided upon.

G. H. PICKLE, SHERBROOKE.

Mr. McCREA:

1. Is J. H. Pickle an employee of the Customs Department at Sherbrooke?

2. If so, at what salary and what are his duties?

3. Has he been constantly at work, is he, or has he been off on leave of absence, how long, and for what cause?

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. The customs officer's name is G. H. Pickel and he has been off duty from April 1st, 1914, to February 1st, 1915, on account of sickness subscribed to by usual medical certificate, and in accordance with the custom that is in force with all departments of similar cases.

A. B. GILLIS, WHITEWOOD, SASK.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN:

1. Has A. B. Gillis, of Whitewood, Sask., been in the employ of the Department of the Interior or the Militia Department any time during the years 1912, 1913 1914 and 1915?

2. If so, what was the date of his appointment, in what capacity was he employed, and what was his salary?

3. Is he still employed?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. No.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

W. J. GALLON, REGINA.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN:

1. Has W. J. Gallon, of Regina, been in the employ of the Department of the Interior at any time in the years 1912, 1913, 1914 and 1915?

2. If so, in what capacity, for what length of time, what was the remuneration and date of appointment?

Mr. ROCHE: No.

PORT OF HALIFAX NIGHT WATCHMEN.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Were two customs night watchmen at the port of Halifax, Messrs. Connolly and Lavers, recently dismissed from the service? If so, upon what grounds?

2. Have any persons been appointed in their stead? If so, whom?

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. The services of Officer Connolly (aged 62) and of Officer Lavers (aged 63) are being dispensed with, the inspector of customs having reported that they are unable to perform their duties in the customs service.

2. F. C. Graham and N. F. Sutherland have been added to the customs staff at Halifax for watchmen's duties and other services.

GEORGE E LONGARD, BAYSIDE, N.S.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Was George E. Longard, of Bayside, Halifax county, N.S., appointed to any office under the Government?

2. If so, what are his duties, and what salary is he paid?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.

2. To take fishing bounty claims and distribute cheques in payment thereof. $85 for the season's work.

GEORGE ROBINSON, CAMBRIDGE, N.B.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Was George Robinson, of Cambridge, N.B., appointed a special fishery officer for the provinces of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island?

2. If so, what are his duties, and what salary is he paid?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes, for New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island.

2. To examine streams and afford the department detailed information in regard thereto, to enable it to decide intelligently on the stocking of streams from the hatcheries; to prevent mill owners in New Brunswick from allowing sawdust or mill refuse to pass into the water, and to assist the regular officers in preventing violations of the law. $600 per annum.

CARDINAL STATISTICAL OFFICER.

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. What is the name of the statistical officer of the canal at Cardinal?
2. When was he appointed?
3. What is his salary?
4. Has an assistant to him been appointed?
5. If so, when, and what is his salary?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. George Reid.
2. April 13, 1912.
3. $1,000 per annum.
4. No.
5. Answered by No. 4.

CARDINAL CANAL—REMOVAL OF HOUSES.

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Did the Government call for tenders for the removal of three houses which were situated on the Government property beside the canal at Cardinal?
2. If so, how many tenders were received?
3. Who sent in the tenders, and what was the price of each?
4. Who was the successful tenderer, and has he completed the work?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes.
2. Eight.
3.

Name.	Engineer's office.	Frame house No. 2 south side canal.	Frame house No. 3.
Frank Rourke..	$ 50 00	.....	.....
Unsigned	45 00	.....	.....
E. V. Dodge. ..	107 50	$82 50	$105 50
B. W. Knight ..	115 00	*60 00	75 00
Francis Rourke.		62 00	.....
Aden Richmire.	100 00	45 00	.....
John Barkley.		50 00	100 00
S S. Rogers..		77 52	105 51

*The tenders accepted; superintending engineer notified on November 7.

As the offers for the engineer's house were considered too low, none of them were accepted.

On the 29th November, the department received a letter from Mr. C. D. Sargent, superintending engineer, dated 28th November, covering an offer from E. V. Dodge, dated 26th November, of $135 for the engineer's house, which was recommended for acceptance by the superintending engineer and the Chief Engineer of the department, and was accepted.

4. E. V. Dodge. Work is completed.

YARMOUTH MARINE HOSPITAL.

Mr. LAW:

1. Are the drugs and medicines used at the Yarmouth Marine hospital purchased by tender?
2. If not, from whom were they purchased during the years 1913 and 1914, respectively, and what were the amounts paid?
3. How many seamen during the years 1913 and 1914 were treated outside the Marine hospital?
4. Why were they not treated in the Marine hospital?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. No.

2. In 1912-13, $4.20 from Messrs. Ingram and Bell, Toronto. In 1913-14, $91.15 from B. F. Trask, Yarmouth.

3. 1912-13, one seaman at the Yarmouth hospital. In 1913-14, one seaman at the Yarmouth hospital.

4. 1912-13, Seaman Leonard Allan of the vessel Westport met with an accident necessitating amputation of one limb. Upon the suggestion of Dr. Wilkinson, port physican, he was taken to the Yarmouth hospital and treated there at the rate of $1 a day, to avoid expense of having special nurses at the Marine hospital. 1913-14, C. Muise, seaman of the vessel Condor. This sailor was admitted at the Yarmouth hospital on his own request, saying he would defray expenses; when about to leave it was found he had no funds, and upon recommendation of the collector of customs the department allowed fifty cents a day, the same as would have been paid to the Marine hospital.

MATTATALL LAKE POST OFFICE.

*Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Was Alfred H. Bonnyman, of Mattatall Lake, Colchester county, N.S., postmaster, dismissed from office?
2. If so for what cause?
3. Was there an investigation and by whom?
4. Who was appointed to the position and on whose recommendation?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. No. A petition was received from the residents representing that the post office was situated at one end of the district and recommending that it should be removed to a more central and suitable location. A report was obtained from the post office inspector, which showed that the post office was in too close proximity to the Lake Road post office, being only one mile distant from that office. The Postmaster General directed, therefore, that the post office should be removed to the site proposed, which is one and a half miles further from the Lake Road post office. This necessitated a change also in the postmastership.

2 and 3. See answer to No. 1.

4. Mr. George H. Fisher, on recommendation of Mr. John Stanfield, M.P.

NOVA SCOTIA ELECTORAL LISTS.

* Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Have the electoral lists for any of the electoral divisions of Nova Scotia for 1914, been printed by the King's Printer?
2. If so, what are the divisions for which the said lists have been printed?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. Yes.
2. Cumberland, Halifax, Hants, Kings, and Pictou divisions.

POST OFFICES CLOSED.

* Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. How many post offices have been closed in the Dominion of Canada since January 1, 1914?
2. How many of the total number were closed by reason of the decrease in the business of said offices?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. 1,255.
2. 35. There have been 1,110 offices closed on account of the establishment of rural mail delivery.

MONTREAL-CAMPBELLTON STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. How much was paid in the year 1914 for the Montreal-Campbellton, N.B., steamship service?
2. To whom was the money paid?
3. Was the amount computed per round trip, and what was the amount paid per trip?

Mr. FOSTER:

1. $9,615.25.
2. The Gaspé and Baie des Chaleurs Steamship Company, Limited.
3. Yes. $384.61.

SHIPPING CASUALTIES.

*Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What is the number of casualties at sea and on the inland waters of Canada in connection with sailing vessels of Canadian register for the year ending December 31, 1914?
2. What is the number of lives lost in connection with casualties referred to in question No. 1, if any?
3. What is the number of casualties at sea and on the inland waters of Canada in connection with steamboats or vessels propelled other than by sail, of Canadian register, for the year ending December 31, 1914?
4. What is the number of lives lost in connection with casualties referred to in question No. 3, if any?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. At sea, 82; inland, 3.
2. At sea, 14; inland, 0.
3. At sea, 49; inland, 29.
4. At sea, 38; inland, 1.

ST. JEAN L'EVANGELISTE MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Who is the contractor for the mail service between the post office and railway station at St. Jean l'Evangeliste, Quebec?
2. (a) What is the price paid, (b) when was the contract awarded, and (c) were tenders called for?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Georges Frenette.
2. (a) Twenty cents per trip, which amounts to $125.20 per annum. (b) 1st August, 1914, for a contract to date from 1st September, 1914. (c) Yes.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. Law: For a copy of all letters, telegrams, vouchers, pay-rolls, correspondence, specifications and tenders for the construction of the new fog-alarm station at Cape Roseway, Shelburne county, N.S.

Mr. Thomson: For a copy of all reports, petitions, letters, telegrams and other documents in connection with the dismissal of W. M. Thomson from the postmastership at Fort Qu'Appelle, and of any petition or petitions for his reinstatement, and of all correspondence in connection therewith.

Mr. Ethier: For a copy of all letters and correspondence between D. McDonald, superintendent of the Intercolonial, at Lévis, P. Brady general superintendent at Moncton, or any other official of the said Intercolonial railway and Théophile Bélanger, commercial traveller of the city of Montreal, concerning certain claims made by the said Théophile Bélanger for delay of baggage in transportation between Drummondville and Matapedia, in May, 1913, also all reports made bearing upon such claims against the said Intercolonial railway.

Mr. Ethier: For a copy of all petitions, correspondence and other documents in connection with the dismissal of Emile Cyr, postmaster at St. Hermas, county of Two Mountains.

THE BUDGET.

PROPOSED WAR TAXATION.

Consideration of the proposed motion of Hon. W. T. White (Minister of Finance), for the Committee of Ways and Means, resumed from March 9.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of summarizing the arguments which have been presented on this side of the House, on the subject now before us, and to present my views upon it in as concrete a form as possible. When at the opening of hostilities in the month of August last the Government announced that it had offered the services of Canada to the Government of Great Britain, if these services should be found useful, we on this side of the House, His Majesty's loyal Opposition, the Liberal party of Canada, declared at once that to this policy we would offer no objection, but on the contrary that we would give it loyal support.

To that engagement, then announced, we have been absolutely faithful. We would have deemed it contrary to our dignity and to our duty if we had at that moment, by word or deed, in any way impeded the Government in the heavy responsibility it had assumed.

But it would be equally contrary to our dignity and to our duty were we to fail to point out most seriously the laches and deficiencies which mar the resolution introduced by the Government, as it asserts, in consequence of the war, but, as I believe, only under colour of the war.

The attitude which we have assumed has in some quarters been animadverted upon in rather severe language. To the objections which have been urged against our course I for my part cannot pay any respect. The view represented by these objections, if it were to be adopted, would constitute a very serious stricture upon parliamentary institutions. It would mean that parliamentary institutions, while good enough in time of peace, would have to be discarded in time of war. It would mean that the Government, which in time of peace under our system, should be kept under rigorous observation, in time of war should be given an absolutely free hand. It would mean that the Opposition, which in time of peace has the right to approve or to disapprove, to oppose or to consent, would in time of war be inhibited from any criticism, even though wrong were to be rampant under our eyes. I have not so read parliamentary history. If the war with Germany had been wrong in principle, if it had been causeless or purposeless, if it had been without justification, we would have been ready to so express our opinion. For that course there are abundant precedents. There is the precedent of Charles James Fox, who in 1800 severely blamed William Pitt for rejecting the peace overtures of Bonaparte. There is the precedent in almost our own day of John Bright and Richard Cobden criticising and condemning the war of the Crimea, representing it as useless if not criminal—a judgment which, by the way, has been pronounced by history to have been absolutely correct. Here the case is different. We were of the opinion that Great Britain was supremely in the right; that she was engaged in a war the most sacred that she has ever waged. Being of that opinion, we did not hesitate to give to the Government our adherence when it proposed that Canada should bear her share in the war. To that course we have been absolutely true.

We went further: Not only did we give our support to the Government, but we thought it would be more in accordance with the fitness of things that we should refrain even from discussing those domestic problems which always divide a free people. In so far as I had command of my party, I gave directions that no literature coming from a source which I could control should be of a party character. That injunction has been reasonably well fulfilled, and it has been fulfilled under great provocation, because, as a matter of fact—as was stated the other day by my hon. friend the member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham)—every week from the official bureau of the Conservative party torrents of the most controversial kind of literature have been issued. It came to such a point that in the month of December one of my friends brought me a whole batch of such literature and asked me with some indignation: "What are you going to do?" After having looked at it, I said to my friend: "It seems to me that the Conservatives are more partisan than patriotic; we will show them that we are more patriotic than partisan, and we will not change our course." We did not change our course. It would not follow, however, and certainly it was never intended by me nor by any of those who sit around me that, when we were summoned to Parliament and called upon to pass judgment, to sanction or not to sanction the measures brought down by the Government in consequence of the war, we were to abdicate our judgment and to sit here as recording machines, simply to register the decisions of the Government. We are still of the opinion that the war is the supreme issue; but if we believe that in the method of carrying on the war, in the policy proposed by the Government, there be errors of judgment or otherwise, then it is our imperative duty to cry halt, to show the mistakes, to point out the true course, and to use every endeavour to prevent the mistakes from being carried into effect. When we come to matters of this kind, it is always well to refer to England, where parliamentary government is certainly better understood than in any other part of the world. The situation in Great Britain is exactly the same as in Canada. There the duty of the Government and the rights of the Oppositioin have been again and again discussed, and the judgment of the country has sanctioned the course pursued by both parties. It may be well here that I should quote in this respect an article of great authority, published in the Saturday Review, giving opinion upon the very ques-

tion which exists in England as it exists here to-day. I commend to the House the following language:

The brillant speeches of Lord Curzon and Lord Selborne last week will help to remind the Government that the right of criticism and inquiry is claimed in war time as well as in peace. It would be quite fatal to the Parliamentary system if this right were for a moment in question. It would reduce our political system to absurdity if the duty and function of an Opposition automatically ceased whenever the Government of the day was called on to grapple with a big and critical problem. In time of war, as in time of peace, it is the duty of the Opposition to watch constantly and jealously the men to whom the task is given of employing to the best of their ability the resources and wisdom of the country. In time of war this task mainly resolves itself into finding the right men for the work in hand, and in securing that they shall have all the support they require in material and in authority.

* * * * * *

The Opposition must consider itself as deputed to guard against any wasting of the nation's manhood or treasure. Should the Opposition become aware of, or should it reasonably suspect, incompetence or bad faith in any responsible minister or in any political group, it is its duty to speak out and call the accused to a strict account Such action has nothing to do with party politics.

* * * * * *

The Opposition cannot surrender its right of criticism and thorough inquiry into such matters as these without grossly failing in its duty to the country.

* * * * * *

An Opposition in war time must not be factious, but it must be watchful, critical.

* * * * * *

The Opposition is bound to reserve to itself the right to question the Government, to watch closely and perpetually its political conduct of the war, to express any misgiving or disagreement it may feel frankly and distinctly.

To this I may add the comment of a paper published in this city, a paper which is not unfriendly to the Government; I refer to the Evening Journal. In its issue of a recent date we read:

War and Party Politics.

Australia and New Zealand have had general elections since the war broke out, and some of our Canadian papers are pointing to these as illustrating the fact that domestic politics do not need to be suppressed in war time. Would it not be better to look to the view of both parties in the Mother Country? When the Imperial Parliament met in November, "This," said Premier Asquith, "is not a proper time for dealing with any matter of domestic politics," and the view he thus expressed was taken willingly by both sides. Practically the whole attention of the House was devoted to the war and matters arising out of the war. A fine example of the surrender of party to patriotism was given by Mr. Austen Chamberlain when, with the approval of the leader of the Opposition, he accepted Mr. Lloyd George's invitation to co-operate with him in making the Budget proposals as workmanlike as possible. These proposals were not such as he himself would have submitted, but once they were laid before the House he consented, without prejudice to his own views, to resume the Treasury consultations which proved so useful at the outbreak of the war. By this proceeding the path of the Finance Bill was set free from difficulties which might have hindered its progress.

Mr. Bonar Law held as an exception that every member and every newspaper had a right to attack any member of the government who might be doing his work inefficiently. And nobody questioned that.

I commend these words to the attention of the House. You will see that in Great Britain the Opposition were consulted by the Government as to their financial proposals. This is a matter of record and of history. I might go further than this newspaper goes and say that at all stages of the war, from the first to the present day, the Opposition have been kept in constant consultation by the powers that be; they were consulted as to military operations, and at every step were asked to give their advice. It was not so in this country. We were not consulted. If we had been honoured in the same way—not that I claim anything in that respect, but representing here a great party comprising almost half of the population, having views of their own on many of the financial problems which now confront us, claiming to be as patriotic as the other side, and claiming to have done their duty as amply as was in their power—I say that, if we had been consulted, we should have been happy to give our views as to the policy to be pursued. I do not say that our views would have been accepted; but certainly there would have been an effort on my part at all events to give way on some of my own views, and I might have felt it right to ask the other side to give way on some of their views also, so that we might have been unanimous in policy as we have been unanimous in the objects which policy is to serve. But we were not consulted. I do not complain of this; I have no right to complain. But my hon. friend the Finance Minister has no right to complain either if to-day we have to take issue with him, and take issure sharply, upon the resolutions which he has laid before the House.

In his opening speech in presenting these resolutions to the House, my hon. friend laid the financial situation of the country before us, and everybody admits that that situation is a serious one. He told us that for the year which is to close on the 31st of this month he expects a revenue of $130,000,000 and an expenditure of $140,000,000, leaving a deficit of $10,000,000 upon consolidated fund account. Besides this,

there is $50,000,000 of expenditure on capital account and $50,000,000 of war expenditure, making a discrepancy, a chasm, between revenue and expenditure of $110,000,000. The situation for next year is still more serious. The hon. gentleman tells us that for next year he does not expect a revenue of $130,000,000, but of $120,000,000 only, while he expects a total expenditure of $200,000,000, leaving a deficit of $80,000,000. This is exclusive of war expenditure, and when that is added there will be a deficit of $180,000,000 between revenue and expenditure for the year. This is a serious situation, a situation the gravity of which we cannot dispute. The figures would be staggering but for the enormous resources of Canada. They do not stagger me. But I do not hesitate to say that the situation is such that there is danger that Canada will be seriously hampered unless that situation is very carefully handled.

Now, my hon friend has a policy to meet the situation; and what is it? As to the war expenditure, he has been very lucky; he has had the good fortune to have opened for him the Imperial Treasury. He appealed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer has told him that he will provide all the money required for the war. So far as war expenditure is concerned, therefore, the hon. gentleman is free from anxiety; he has only to provide for the other expenditures. But the domestic situation is almost as serious as the other. And as to that domestic situation, the only policy the hon. gentleman has to offer is additional borrowing and additional taxation, a double method which, he will admit, is neither novel nor ingenious. There was another method called to his attention by my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) when he opened the debate on this side, a method which, I am sure, must have suggested itself to him more than once, a method which, if he had adopted it, would have saved him a tremendous amount of worry and anxiety. This method, however, some evil genius prevented him from accepting—the method of economy and retrenchment. The hon gentleman, perhaps, has not yet perceived, though I almost think he must have perceived it, that economy and retrenchment are words not to be found in the vocabulary of the party with which he has cast his fortune.

The hon. gentleman had ample warning of the situation which was coming upon him. He has a very serious task before him, and I sympathize deeply with him in his efforts to meet it. But while, as I repeat, he has had due warning of what was coming, I fail to see any precaution he has taken to meet the difficulty. The prudent mariner when he sees the clouds gathering upon the horizon, at once prepares his ship to meet the danger. He slackens speed, lowers his fires, and keeps his power well in hand. It would have been well had my hon. friend considered that example and prepared accordingly. But he did nothing of the kind. He did not slacken speed, nor did he lower his fires. On the contrary, he threw more coal into the furnace until the supply was exhausted; and when the storm struck his craft he was left pounding helplessly, and helplessly drifting. Is this an exaggerated statement? Is this an unfair presentation of the case?

Let me ask, what has been the attitude of my hon. friend since he took office? He took office in October, 1911. In that year we spent on consolidated revenue account something like $98,000,000. He will tell me—and I agree at once—that for this expenditure he is not alone responsible, that he simply spent upon the basis of the Estimates which had been prepared by his predecessor, Mr. Fielding. Then, take the year following: Instead of $98,000,000, he spent $112,000,000, an increase of $14,000,000. In the year after that he increased the expenditure to $127,000,000, an increase over his first year of $29,000,000. And for the present year, he tells us, he expects to spend $140,000,000, or $42,000,000 over the expenditure of 1912. Thus in three years he spent in excess of what would have been spent in three such years as that in which he took office, the sum of $85,000,000. How happy he would be if he had been more careful and if he had this $85,000,000 to-day in the treasury to face the situation in which he now finds himself. But he has not. Has my hon. friend been made wiser by his experience in the matter of expenditure? Coming to Parliament with announcements of more taxes and more borrowings, can he claim that in his contemplated expenditure for the coming fiscal year he is as economical as he ought to be? Can he say with justification that he could not have applied the pruning knife to the Estimates instead of resorting to increased taxation? In 1912 my hon. friend spent $98,000,000 on consolidated account; this year he proposes to spend $105,000,000 or

$7,000,000 more that he spent in 1912, and he proposes to spend on capital account something like $44,000,000. Would it not have been possible for my hon. friend to have cut down those large figures? In view of the stress under which we are labouring at the present time, in view of the necessity of providing money for war purposes, in the face of a huge deficit, does my hon. friend believe that he is justified in making these large demands upon the country? Would it not have been better for him to have gone back to the expenditure of 1912?

It has been stated by almost every hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who has taken part in this debate that we must have large expenditures on public works. I have no objection to expenditures on public works; I quite approve of expenditures on such revenue-producing works as are needed for the development of the country. But are these the kind of public works my hon. friend has in contemplation? It is true that some of them belong to this class. I approve of expenditures upon canals, upon railways, upon works which will give employment to many persons who are now unemployed. But I ask the attention of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House to the fact that there is in the Estimates, to be provided for out of consolidated revenue fund, a contemplated expenditure upon public works of $22,000,000. This amount, which is made up of more than 600 different items, is to be expended upon small works, such as public buildings, post offices, postal stations, armouries, barracks, drill halls, and things of that kind in various parts of the Dominion. Unemployment does not exist in the rural parts of the country, and the expenditure of this $22,000,000 will give no relief to present conditions of unemployment. Would it not have been possible for my hon. friend to have applied his pruning knife and to have cut off a good deal of this expenditure? If I were in the position which I occupied at one time, if I had upon my own shoulders the responsibility of determining these matters, I would have decided that under the existing circumstances, no such expenditures as these should be made during the present year. I admit that some of these works may be useful; but the greater number of them are purely ornamental and all can be postponed. If we had such abundant revenues as we had some years ago, these expenditures might be indulged in; but in these times of stress I think that it would have been better policy to have said: We will cut off all but what is indispensable so that we shall not have to resort to taxation which in view of the prevailing conditions must be doubly oppressive. Whether or not the war is considered, everybody agrees that the financial situation of the country at the present time is serious. Hundreds and thousands of men in all the large cities of Canada are begging for work and cannot get it; distress prevails in all those communities. Is this a time, I ask, to make these large expenditures? I submit, with all deference to the judgment of the free people, that economy and retrenchment, not more taxation and more expenditure, is the proper policy under present conditions. But my hon. friend the Minister of Finance takes another course. Ignoring retrenchment and economy, he goes on spending money as in the days of plenty. Instead of retrenchment, he proposes new taxation; that is the chief feature of the resolution which he lays before us. In regard to my hon. friend's resolution I have this to say to him: in my estimation, although labelled war expenditures and war taxation, these taxes and expenditures are not war measures at all; the object of this resolution is simply to benefit the privileged and protected classes.

The resolution which my hon. friend has brought down may be divided under three heads: first, special taxes; second, a general increase in the customs tariff; third, an increase on British goods. Let me consider in consecutive order these three phases of his proposals.

First, the special taxes. My hon. friend has been extremely moderate in his tax of one per cent upon banks, loan companies, trust companies and some insurance companies—he has not taxed all insurance companies I do not know why; perhaps we shall find out later. These powerful corporations will have reason to believe that they have a friend at court—I should say a friend not at court, but in the very seat of power. The pin prick with which he merely scratches their epidermis will cause them no hurt at all; it will simply create in them a feeling of pleasant surprise that they have been let off so easily. The increase in postage, in one case of 33 per cent, in the other of 50 per cent, is in my humble judgment, a very doubtful experiment; I doubt if my hon. friend will get much revenue from that source. In 1896 the Finance Minister of that day (Sir Geo. Foster), in his Budget speech, made this statement:

> There is now a deficit of nearly $800,000 between the total receipts and the total expendi-

ture of our post office service, and this, I fear, makes the time somewhat distant when what otherwise might be fairly asked for can be granted: that is, a reduction of postage rates in this country.

That is the view which was taken at that time by the Minister of Finance—a man of ability, as everybody knows—but he had not the courage which was manifested by some other men who came after. Four or five years afterwards the Postmaster General was my colleague, Sir William Mulock. He took the position that by reducing the rates of postage he would increase the revenue to such an extent as to wipe out the deficit which existed in the Post Office Department.

After a slight decrease in the first year the revenues immediately became buoyant and have been increasing ever since; so that today the surplus is larger than was the deficit in 1896. Does my hon. friend expect that, by increasing the tariff as he proposes, he is going to benefit the treasury to any extent? It is doubtful, I repeat, and time, and time alone, will tell.

As to the other items included in the special taxes, I have nothing to add to what has been said by my colleagues who have already spoken. But there is one item to which I would call the special attention of the House, and to which I take absolute objection; that is, the taxation upon railway travelling. In my judgment, the taxation in that respect is absolutely unfair to the poorer people, and wholly to the benefit and advantage of the rich. My hon. friend has placed upon railway travelling what he calls a horizontal tax. He provides that every purchaser of a ticket costing over one dollar and not more than five dollars shall pay an additional five cents; and on a ticket costing over five dollars—for each five dollars and, in addition, for any fractional part of five dollars, he shall pay five cents. Further, he provides that every purchaser of a berth in a sleeping car or a seat in a parlour car shall, in addition to the regular charge for the berth or seat, pay ten cents in respect of each berth bought, and five cents in respect of each seat bought. I say that the basis of this taxation is absolutely wrong. There are three classes of railway fares in this country: second-class, first-class, and parlour car. The taxation upon railway travelling should have been graduated so that the burden would fall the lowest upon the second-class traveller, and the highest on the user of the parlor car; so that this tax would weigh less heavily upon the poor, and would weigh more heavily upon those who best can afford it. Let us suppose this tax has come into force. Here are two men going to the railway station to buy tickets say to Montreal. One of the men belongs to the working class. He may be out of employemnt, a man who has lost his job in Ottawa and is trying to better his fortunes by going elsewhere. He has carefully calculated the price of a second-class ticket. He has his thumb upon it, when he is told that his ticket will not carry him over the railway unless he pays an additional five cents. He fumbles in his pocket. He may or may not find the five cents. If he has not, he has to give up his trip. If he finds five cents, he has to give up some luxury, nay, some necessary of life. The other man belongs to the wealthy class, and we have many of the wealthy class in this country, thank God. This man may be a young swell, the scion of wealthy parents, who never yet earned an honest dollar in his life, and who thinks no more of the price of the ticket than of the stump of his cigar. Or he may be an old gentleman who has retired from business after having made his pile. To him the railway ticket is not even a consideration. Or he may be a professional man deriving a large revenue from his profession, so absorbed in it that he has not even a thought to give to any such consideration as weighs upon the mind of the first traveller. He may be one of this class or one of many more. Whoever he may be, he thinks so little of the payment of his first-class ticket that when he has it he does not even enter the car for which he has paid the price. He forthwith buys another ticket which gives him a seat in the parlour car, one of those palaces on wheels upon which modern art has lavished all the luxury of the age. He goes into the car and falls into a seat covered with velvet. If the seat is not soft enough for his limbs, he is propped up with pillows and cushions by coloured attendants. The Queen of Sheba dazzling the Orient, even the Orient, with the splendour and gorgeousness of her retinue and equipage, was not surrounded with such luxury as this modern epicure. And for that luxury a benevolent Government taxes him the sum of only five cents. I ask my hon. friend and hon. gentlemen opposite whether that policy is right; whether they do not agree with me that this tariff was made, not for the poorer classes, but for the benefit of the wealthy classes. If it is true that the poor widow who out of her want put two mites in the treasury of the temple gave

4 p.m.

more in the sight of God than the rich man who gave much of his abundance, it is just as true that in the sight of that just God the poor man is wronged who out of his want is taxed just as much as the rich man out of all his wealth. I say to my hon. friend that his whole conception of the basis of this taxation is wrong, and I hope that on reflection he will agree with me. When you have poverty as you have it at this moment, when you have want as you have it at this moment, it is not fair that the same degree of taxation should be placed upon the poorer classes as upon the wealthy classes. My hon. friend does not seem to have given any heed to this consideration, and it is my duty to call it to the attention of the House, and to ask my hon. friend to revise this resolution when the proper times comes.

I now come to the other resolution dealing with the increase of the Custom tariff. My hon. friend has told us that his primary object was to raise revenue. Does he call this a war tariff? Does he pretend that when he made that increase he had in view the revenue of the country—that his primary object was to raise revenue? If my hon. friend had had for his primary consideration the raising of revenue, he would have made not a horizontal but an undulating tariff, so as to weigh less or more according to circumstances. If my hon. friend had had in view simply the raising of revenue, and not, as I said a moment ago, the idea of benefiting the privileged and wealthy and protected classes, he would have selected some articles on which he could have raised a maximum of revenue with a minimum of inconvenience and loss. But he has not done that. He is raising his revenue in such a way that he must and will have a minimum of revenue with a maximum of inconvenience and loss to the community. My hon. friend says that we have to provide for the war, and he gives this tariff as a painful necessity of that war. He says that the ordinary revenues of the country will not suffice, and that he must look elsewhere. If that is the object he had in view, I ask him why he put his tariff upon articles which we do not import? What revenue does he expect from articles which we do not import at all? He knows very well that that will give him nothing at all. What is his object, then? Sir, we are living in hard times. Unemployment is only too prevalent; at this moment there are in every community men to whom the providing of the daily bread is an arduous problem. That is the consideration which my hon. friend should have had first of all. What revenue does he expect from the articles which go upon the tables of all classes, especially upon the table of the poor? These articles are not imported into this country, and therefore the tariff on them will not produce revenue. I ask my hon. friend what revenue he expects from the duty on meats, or cereals, or things of that kind. He knows very well that the revenue from these sources will not fill the hollow of his hand. But it is possible for speculators to speculate upon the prices, in order to make wealth for themselves at the expense of poor people. That is what is going on, and my hon. friend has never seen it. He has made his tariff universal. It will profit somebody, but it will not be the treasury of the country that will profit by it. Still, to this there are some exceptions, and these exceptions only prove the rule. My hon. friend has exempted wheat and flour. I do not blame him for it; on the contrary, I quite approve. He did not give us the reason why he did it. He was wise in this; better no explanation at all than a poor excuse. But the reason is very obvious: my hon. friend would not dare to take upon himself at such a time as we are now confronted with to put additional taxes upon the bread of the people. He shrank from it, and we approve of his doing so; but I ask him, if he shrank from placing a duty on wheat and flour, would not a parity of reasoning have forced him also to exempt all other classes of food? He did not think it.

There is another item in the tariff as to which, for my part, I would like to have some explanation. My hon. friend has made a general increase which places an increased customs duty upon spirituous liquors of all kinds. I would have expected that he would have done what has always been done under such circumstances, imposed a corresponding excise duty. He did not. In the month of August, when he increased the customs duty upon spirituous liquors, he also put a corresponding excise duty on liquor. This time he did not; and what is the reason? If there is an article which ought to be taxed, which has always been taxed under all systems of taxation, it is wines and spirituous liquors. But he did not see fit to impose an excise duty. I am told and I understand that at present there is a financial advantage to the distillers of the country in that item. They have to their advantage 7½ per cent upon what they produce, which I understand means 25 cents per gallon upon the total

production of the country. I make this statement with some diffidence, because I have not had time to look carefully into it myself; but I have it on good authority that the duty, ad valorem, will produce at least 25 cents per gallon, and, if there is no corresponding excise duty, an immense advantage accrues to the distiller, because the production exceeds 9,000,000 gallons, and that would mean something like $2,000,000 more of profit. That is the situation that we have before us. I charge against my hon. friend that upon this point the principle on which he has acted is altogether wrong, and that the whole thing is unacceptable to the intelligence of the people.

But that is not all. This tariff, says my hon. friend, is a war tariff intended to help England in the most stupendous struggle in which a nation ever was engaged; yet, would you believe it, the last feature of this tariff is to put an additional duty upon British goods and give a blow to British trade. Only a few weeks ago my hon. friend approached the British Government to help him in his difficulty; only a few weeks ago he applied to the British treasury for a loan to help him carry on the affairs of this country and to discharge the obligations with which he is confronted; and, having been relieved of his obligations, my hon. friend returns a blow which, I am sure, never was expected by the British Government when he applied to them for the loan which he obtained. It was only a few weeks or months ago that Mr. Lloyd George, speaking of the situation in which England was placed, stated that in the last resort the battle would be won not by the armies in the field but by silver bullets. And everything that has taken place since goes to show that the judgment of Mr. Lloyd George at that time was well founded. The powerful armies which have been fighting with one another for the last six months with varying success and with no marked result on one side or the other, may continue to do so with little progress. Already it is apparent that this war is to be a war of attrition, that the power will win—shall win—whose resources will enable it to withstand the struggle the longest. Germany understands that to-day. Germany, having failed to crush France, having failed to crush Russia, understands that if she wins at all it can only be in one way, and that is by ruining the trade of Great Britain. If she can ruin the trade of Great Britain she can hope for success; but unless she is able to dislocate the trade of Great Britain, her hope of success is gone. Therefore Germany has adopted new tactics, and one of her tactics is to destroy the trade of Great Britain. She has surrounded the British Isles with a cordon of submarines with instructions to pounce upon every ship that comes in or goes out. To-day we learn that three ships have been sunk in that way. On top of all this, all the trade that may escape the submarines and reach its destination in Canada will fall under the taxing machine of the Canadian Government. Is this what we had reason to expect? Is this the policy which my hon. friends ought to have adopted under such circumstances as those with which we are now confronted? When the policy of decreasing the duties on British goods was adopted in 1897, it was adopted as a bond of union as well as an economic measure, and everybody will agree that it has been reasonably successful. It has increased our trade with Great Britain in such a way as we never expected it would; it has more than trebled our imports; it has more than quadrupled our exports; and under it Canada has been prosperous as she never was before at any time in her history.

I am well aware that this policy never was popular with a certain large section of the Conservative party. They never dared attack it openly; they waited for their opportunity, and England's danger they made their opportunity. If we were not in war times, if we were living now in times of peace, I would remind these gentlemen opposite that that policy contributed in no small degree to the era of prosperity which it was the good fortune of the Liberal party, under Providence, to bring to this country. I would remind them that four years ago, when we wanted, not to let well enough alone, but to make well enough better than it was, when we wanted to improve our trade relations with our neighbours in the United States, one of the arguments of our opponents was that freer trade with the United States meant the prevention of freer trade with Great Britain. I would remind them that there are only two countries with which we trade to any great extent Great Britain and the United States; and I would call the attention of the House to the strange conduct of the victorious party who four years ago would not let us sell to the United States and who this year will not let us buy from Great Britain.

But these are war times, and it is not the occasion to discuss economic problems.

Great Britain is at war, Canada is at war, and when Great Britain is at war and when Canada is at war, to attempt to curtail the trade between Canada and Great Britain is not a Canadian idea; it is at best a German conception: When Parliament met on the 4th of February last we were prepared to go far with our friends on the other side of the House in these strenuous times; we were prepared to give up a good many of our own ideas in order to meet them; we were prepared to make sacrifices in order to have unanimity of opinion; but we were not prepared to go that far, and that far we shall not go. To-day, therefore, we have to part company with them, and for these reasons I move, seconded by Dr. Pugsley:

That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved :

This House is ready to provide for the exigencies of the present situation and to vote all necessary ways and means to that end, but it regrets that in the measure under consideration duties are imposed which must be oppressive upon the people whilst yielding little or no revenue, and that the said measure is particularly objectionable in the fact that instead of favouring, it is placing extra barriers against Great Britain's trade with Canada, at a moment when the Mother Country is under a war strain unparalleled in history.

Hon. W. T. WHITE (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the amendment proposed by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, and the more salient features of the criticism directed by the junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) against the Budget. But before entering upon my argument I desire to call attention to a remark made by the leader of the Opposition to the effect that we need not complain if he takes issue with us upon this Budget. I desire to say to my right hon. friend that we do not complain. We welcome the issue that my right hon. friend presents upon this Budget or any other issue he may desire to bring forward. We ask no indulgence except that indulgence which is the courtesy passing between members on both sides of this House and between Government and Opposition. Let me say to the right hon. gentleman distinctly that we have no complaint; we are prepared to meet fairly and squarely the issue which he has presented to us.

And, Sir, what was the substance and the gist of the attack made by the junior member for Halifax, the financial critic of the Opposition, against the Budget which I had the honour to present to the House? He said: You have been extravagant in the expenditure of public moneys; the war is not the cause of your financial condition; that additional measures of taxation were unnecessary; you should retrench expenditure and establish an equilibrium between income and outgo. He said further—I desire to state his case as strongly as he would state it himself—that our fiscal proposals were unscientific and inequitable and that the British preferential rate should not have been raised. My right hon. friend to-day associated himself with that line of argument, and indeed so have all other members on that side of the House who have spoken since the junior member for Halifax addressed the House.

My hon. friend seemed to be quite at home when dealing with the topic of extravagance, and well he might. The Administration of which my right hon. friend was the head, and of which my hon. friend from Halifax was a strong supporter and almost a member, with the most intimate knowledge of its counsels, ran such a career of unbridled extravagance—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh.

Mr. WHITE: Yes, unbridled extravagance, especially during the late years of its existence as a government, that its continuation for any considerable length of time would have ruined beyond redemption, during the present generation, the credit of this Dominion.

I speak with a full realization of the gravity and seriousness of the charge that I am launching against the late Government. No man has had a greater opportunity of realizing that extravagance than I have, because upon my shoulders has fallen, in consequence of that policy of uncontrolled prodigality, of utter wastefulness and of reckless extravagance, a heavier load than has rested on the shoulders of any Minister of Finance since Confederation. I am not complaining. I am not the man to complain. I have always been able to see my way through. I saw my way through in the year 1913, when, in the midst of that great financial stringency brought about by the Balkan war and by the shadow of this great war cast before, I was struggling with the consequences of the ruinous railway policy launched by hon. gentlemen opposite. In the midst of this war, which is not only the greatest war in the history of the world, but greater, as I said the other day, than the aggregate of all wars of all history. I see my way through, just as I saw it through in August last, when the outbreak of this tremendous struggle threatened to over-

whelm the finances and the commerce of the world. I saw my way through then. I see my way through now, and at no time since the outbreak of this war have the prospects been so good, so far as the country is concerned, as they are to-day.

Upon every debate on the Budget I have heard reiterated, ad nauseam, statements about the overflowing treasury and the rich estate bequeathed to this Government. In the past I have refrained from speaking of the subject, because I have always put national considerations before immediate political advantage in discussing subjects in the House. To-day, while I propose to speak on some of those subjects on which in the past I have remained more or less silent, I desire to say that having regard to my position and to those national considerations, and to possible misunderstandings of my utterances, I shall exercise the restraint which I have always exercise since I have had the honour to occupy the position of Minister of Finance.

I propose to say something about the overflowing treasury and the rich legacy bequeathed to us by hon. members opposite. What is the test of a solvent estate and a rich legacy? Is it that the bank account is not overdrawn? Is it that there is some cash on hand or on deposit? In estimating the value of an estate, do we not take into consideration liabilities direct and indirect, debts owing, notes of hand, endorsations, guarantees given by the decedent who left the estate? Is it a rich legacy, if the legatee with a certain sum of ready money, is left also the obligation of millions of dollars of liabilities? That is the kind of rich legacy that I have inherited as Minister of Finance—some ready money in the treasury, but obligations, not of millions, not of tens of millions, but literally of hundreds of millions of dollars of direct and indirect liability, that I have had to meet since I have become Minister of Finance of this country, obligations due not to any action on the part of this Government, but to the mismanagement and reckless expenditure of the Government that preceded us in office. Did I succeed to a rich legacy when called upon, on account of the flagrant maladministration of the preceding Government, to find, as I have said, not only millions, not only tens of millions, but hundreds of millions of dollars, a very considerable proportion of which is inevitably lost to this Dominion? There is an old saying: "Give them time and the chickens always come home to roost." I propose to see that those chickens rest upon the proper side of this Chamber, that is to say, with hon. gentlemen opposite. The financial chickens are coming home to roost, and my hon. friends opposite cannot leave them with us. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister cannot stand sponsor for the financial chickens that have been coming home to roost during the last two years—and the end is not yet.

To deal with all the aspects of the mismanagement of the late Government when in office would require a special session of Parliament. I propose to deal with only a few of them.

During the year 1913 and the early part of 1914, during the financial stringency to which I referred a few moments ago, we had the burden of completing the railway policy initiated by the Government of my right hon. friend, of repairing the consequences of his mistakes. I say to him now that his railway policy, in its potential consequences, is fraught, and has always been fraught, with the utmost danger to the Dominion of Canada.

Take the National Transcontinental railway from Moncton to Winnipeg, the eastern division. Let me ask my right hon. friend: When he went to the country in 1904 what was the estimated cost of that section? His Minister of Finance in this House estimated that cost at $60,000,000, and my right hon. friend told the people of this country—I will explain his method of calculation, because I desire to do no injustice to him—that the cost would be $13,000,000. He estimated his $13,000,000 in this way: The interest upon $60,000,000 is $1,800,000 a year. For seven years, the period during which no interest was to be paid by the Grand Trunk Pacific, the interest would amount to about $13,000,000. His theory was that, after the end of the seven years, the Grand Trunk Pacific would pay interest at three per cent upon the cost, and that consequently the entire cost to the people of Canada would be $13,000,000. He gave the impression to the people, when appealing to them on this issue, that $13,000,000 would be the cost of this road, and the Minister of Finance said that $60,000,000 would be the cost. What has been the cost? $200,000,000, more than enough to pay for Canada the cost of this great war, in which we are fighting for our liberties, and the liberties not only of the Empire, but, as I verily believe, of the world. The difference between the cost estimated by his Minister of Finance and the actual

cost of the Eastern division of the National Transcontinental would pay the entire expenditure for which the Government has asked Parliament under two Bills of Appropriation, namely $50,000,000 and $100,000,000. Were the sections built simultaneously? Was the road built continuously as contemplated by the contract or was it built upside down, wrong end first—as a crazy carpenter would attempt to build a house by starting at the chimney, trusting to leave it in the air while he finished the rest of the building? The line from Moncton to Lévis was built and it was left there, the ties rotting, the rails rusting, trees growing on the right of way, while contractors, favoured contractors, refrained from going ahead with the vital link between Winnipeg and Cochrane. And what is the result? Conceived in 1903; started in 1905, what is the result to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company? What has been the cost of the prairie section by reason of the delay? That prairie section is still under construction after all these years. Will they get through the prairie section, which is still in the period of construction, for less than $45,000 or $50,000 a mile instead of the $20,000 a mile that was estimated? And will they get through the mountain section at less than from $80,000 to $100,000 a mile instead of the $50,000 or $60,000, as was estimated? You ask me, what bearing that has on the question? I will tell you. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) talked about freight rates. I say that, having regard to the bungling in the building of the National Transcontinental by hon. members opposite, the hon. member for Edmonton should either rise in his place and repudiate the action of the late Government with regard to the building of the Transcontinental or he should never mention the words freight rates again in this House. These things belong to the past, but the evils they entail live after them. Out of the respect I bear my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) I hope that his title as a statesman in this country will not rest upon his railway policy. The cost of this bungling and of the mistaken policy for which he is responsible will be visited upon the taxpayers of Canada to generations yet unborn.

What has this to do with the burdens which I have had to assume as Minister of Finance? On account of the delay in the construction of that road, on account of the position of the prairie section and of the mountain section still in the period of construction without the earning power which they could reasonably have been expected to attain had the line been completed in time, I had to advance $15,000,000 by way of loan to "finish the work" of my right hon. friend as he would put it. And at the last session of Parliament legislation was put through under which we guaranteed $16,000,000 of additional bonds to enable them to complete. Last fall, in order to save this railway of his, this child of his imagination as he calls it, in order that Prince Rupert might be linked up with Winnipeg, I had to find $6,000,000 for that road. And my right hon. friend will rise in his place and criticise me in this House for that action. But it was the right thing to do under the circumstances, and I am prepared to defend it here or anywhere.

And let me ask the right hon. gentleman, who was responsible for the so-called "implementing legislation"? One of my first tasks, one of the first burdens I had to take up as Minister of Finance, was to find the sum of $5,000,000 to hand over to the Grand Trunk Pacific by reason of the judgment of the Privy Council on this so-called implementing legislation, which showed up in the most unmistakable fashion the bungling of the late Government. More than that, in order to save the situation, I had to purchase $33,000,000 of the securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company guaranteed by the Dominion of Canada, and they are in the vaults of the Treasury to-day.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: And purchase them at par.

Mr. WHITE: And, as my right hon. friend suggests, I had to purchase them at par. In connection with the implementing bungling and other bungling of the late Administration, I had to find no less a sum than $40,000,000, at a time when the markets of the world showed greater stringency, than at any time, I suppose, in the lifetime of any one here. Yet hon. gentlemen get up and talk to me about the "rich legacy" I had, about the "solvent estate" that was handed over to me. And they call me "the prodigal son" because I had to take care of these obligations which they had incurred. Talk about large families! If obligations were children, my right hon. friend would truly, like George Washington, be the father of his country.

Let me ask my right hon. friend who has made an attack upon me to-day—and I must say I was surprised at its demagogic character; it did not seem to me to be quite in keeping with his ability as a statesman

and parliamentarian—let me ask him, who bungled the Quebec bridge? Who let the contracts for the eastern division of the National Transcontinental? Does he say that we should repudiate these contracts entered into by his Administration? For that is what is implied in the criticism of hon. gentlemen opposite. At least $25,000,000 or $30,000,000 will be required before the Quebec bridge is completed—I mean the total expenditure. Who conceived it? At whose instance was the work commenced and the contracts let? Am I blamable because I was obliged to find money for all these purposes, for the purposes of these huge enterprises undertaken, some of them most unwisely, by hon. gentlemen opposite when they were in power?

Now, let me say this to my right hon. friend—and I say it because I want him to remember it and the people of Canada to know it: upon four accounts alone during the last four years $125,000,000 had to be found for works undertaken during the incumbency in office of my right hon. friend. That is greater than the entire revenue of Canada in the year preceding that in which we took office. So that, if he is basing his criticism of me upon revenue as well as expenditure of the year before we came into office, he must write off the revenue for one year.

So much for direct liabilities. But what about indirect liabilities? What about guarantees? Who initiated the policy of guarantees in this country? My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. $125,000,000 were given in guarantees by his Government; $70,000,000 to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and, I think, about $55,000,000 to the Canadian Northern Railway. Through the action of my right hon. friend these companies became involved with the credit not only of the Dominion but necessarily of the provinces as well, and the result is that we have been obliged to take the action for which we have been most severely criticised by hon. gentlemen opposite and in some places throughout the country. We have inherited not a rich legacy, but obligations such as have devolved upon no Government that ever held office in Canada; obligations for which we are not in the slightest degree responsible. These facts cannot be controverted; I defy any hon. gentleman to get up and say that I did not have to find the money which, as I have stated, I have been obliged to find. With what face does the hon. member for Halifax charge this Government with extravagance! When the charge of extravagance is passed from this side of the House to the other side, there is only one course for hon. gentlemen opposite to adopt, and that is to put up the white flag and throw up both hands, because no possible defence is open to them on the facts.

The hon. member for Halifax said:

> There never was the slightest effort on the part of this Government to establish an equilibrium between income and outgo.

What are the facts? My hon. friend had absolutely no justification for that statement; he knew better. In 1912-13, the year after we took office, we had the largest surplus in the history of this country. I have not changed the methods of bookkeeping which prevailed under my predecessor—that cannot be controverted—and up to this year we have had to our credit as a Government the largest surpluses in Canada's history. Can the hon. gentleman say that we have not established an equilibrium between income and outgo when we reduced in 1912-13 the national debt of Canada by not less than $25,000,000? I want to say this to the hon. member for Halifax and to my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. On March 31, 1914, less than one year ago, the net debt of Canada was less than it was when this Government took office. Let me talk to my right hon. friend about debt. He has probably never been in debt, because he has no appreciation of what it means. He never had any appreciation of the meaning of debt when he was in office, and he needs some education in that respect even now. My hon. friend cannot get away from these figures, because they are official. From September 30, 1911, about the date we took office, to July 31, 1914, the end of the month preceding the outbreak of the war, the increase in the debt of Canada was only $8,000,000. That was under Conservative administration. But for the period of two years and nine months preceding September 30, 1911, the Liberals, under my right hon. friend the present leader of the Opposition, increased the net national debt of Canada by $70,000,000—nine times the amount of the increase—during the same period under Conservative administration. And, forsooth, we are extravagant. Well, I think that from this forward we shall not hear very much about extravagance from hon. gentlemen opposite. What is proposed by my hon. friend the member for Halifax? He says, drop public works. Then the hon. member for the city of St. John, coming along to conduct a sort

of salvage operation to pull my hon. friend the hon. member for Halifax off the rocks, says: Let us stop in the Pickwickian sense; in other words, let us slow down.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Not a bad idea.

Mr. WHITE: If my hon. friend does not mind, I will give him a little attention later; there is something coming to him, just as there is to the hon. member for Halifax. This is what the hon. member for St. John, quoting the hon. member for Halifax, said:

> They might have wiped out altogether expenditures for public works for the next fiscal year.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is not fair. Read my statement.

Mr. WHITE: I am quoting from the remarks of the hon. member for St. John. Let me ask the hon. member for Halifax this: What did he mean when he said, "Establish an equilibrium between income and outgo"? If he did not mean that we should cut out $60,000,000 of public works expenditure, I would like to know what he did mean. I estimated a revenue of $120,000,000 and an expenditure of $180,000,000 on consolidated revenue fund and capital account. If he says, as he did, that we should establish an equilibrium between income and outgo, that means that we must cut out $60,000,000. The real fact of the matter is that the hon. member for Halifax said a great number of things; he was hedging in the matter.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: All I ask the Minister of Finance to do when criticising my remarks about public works expenditure on consolidated revenue account is to quote me fairly and correctly.

Mr. WHITE: I am trying to quote my hon. friend's remarks fairly. I understood him distinctly to say—and if I am wrong it is open to him or to any other hon. member to correct me—that the remedy was to stop public works. The hon. member for St. John, as I say, was engaged in salvage operations; he was stirred to his depths by the proposal that public works should stop. Let us see what he said. I have it here; it is one of the finest passages in parliamentary history, if not in all literature. He says, quoting the hon. member for Halifax:

> They might have wiped out altogether expenditures for public works for the next fiscal year.

Then he adds this immortal touch, so far as literature is concerned: "That is, if need be."

Mr. PUGSLEY: That was a good word.

Mr. WHITE: What policy did I announce in regard to public works? In my August Budget and in the present Budget I said that there were no new items in the Estimates, that as to public works we should proceed only as the sources of revenue from which expenditure might be defrayed were apparent. I met the situation. My Estimates of last year were $210,000,000. The Estimates I have presented to the House for the coming year are, according to my Budget, in the neighbourhood of $190,000,000; as compared with $210,000,000 last year. Let no man say that we are not trying to meet the situation. But we are not going to lose our heads. We are not going to destroy this country. My right hon. friend, too, and I am surprised at him, is evidently in favour of stopping public works. I want to recall to my right hon. friend, for probably he has forgotten it, just how strongly public works weighed on his mind years ago, just what importance he has in the past attached to the subject of expenditure on public works. I do not know anything that could have been closer to his heart. For what did my right hon. friend say at the Imperial Conference in 1907, on a motion by Dr. Smartt in which it was set out by way of resolution:

> That this Conference—considers it to be the duty of the dominions beyond the seas to make such contribution towards the upkeep of the navy as may be determined by their local legislatures—

That is, by this Parliament and other parliaments.

> —the contribution to take the form of a grant of money, the establishment of local naval defence, or such other services, in such manner as may be decided upon after consultation with the Admiralty.

What did my right hon. friend say upon that occasion? He said:

> I am sorry to say, so far as Canada is concerned, we cannot agree to the resolution. . . We have too much to do otherwise; in the Mother Country, you must remember, they have no expenses to incur with regard to public works.

Public works weighed so much on the mind of my right hon. friend at that time! They weighed more heavily on his mind than the supreme question of contribution to the defence of the Empire. He said:

> Whereas in most of the colonies, certainly in Canada, we have to tax ourselves to the utmost of our resources—

And here he is to-day complaining about taxes!

—in the development of our country, we could not contribute or undertake to do more than we are doing in that way. For my part, if the motion were pressed to a conclusion, I should have to vote against it.

That is the importance and the weight my right hon. friend attached in 1907 to the question of expenditure on public works. He put it even before the matter of contribution to the defence of the Empire. In view of what my right hon. friend said in 1907 and thinks to-day, unless his views have materially changed since, I would ask him what his choice would be to-day if he had to choose between shutting down public works under contract in this country, and bringing down a $100,000,000 Bill, representing what we propose to expend in the defence of the Empire?

Mr. BRADBURY: Public works.

Mr. WHITE: I do not say what his choice would be. I asked that question.

And now I come to the genial and urbane member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley). I was afraid he might be thinking I had overlooked him, but no one can overlook him in this House. The other night I was impressed by a word that my hon. friend used. He does not often use it; it is a word that we would hardly associate with the hon. gentleman, although we hold him in very high esteem and regard. It was the word "sacrifice." He said, in substance, that the Hon. Mr. Fielding, when Finance Minister, had come to him in 1908 when the financial stringency was on, and said: "Really, you must cut down your Estimates." And the hon. member for St. John tells us that he cut them down fifty or sixty per cent. It seems strange that the hon. member for St. John should so willingly cut down his Estimates.

Mr. PUGSLEY: A very sensible thing to do.

Mr. WHITE: We shall see how sensible it was. I always finish stronger than I begin. This was a case of such conspicuous, such unusual, such extraordinary sacrifice on the part of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Public Works, knowing his predilection for public works as I did, that I looked this matter up, and this is what I found—too bad all these figures are on record. In 1906 the Estimates were $14,000,000. In 1907, for nine months, $10,000,000, which is about $13,000,000 for the whole year; and in 1908, after my hon. friend had made the sacrifice, $15,000,000. What a sacrifice was that, my countrymen! And what a job he was putting upon the Minister of Finance if he presented Estimates for double that amount, that is, $30,000,000, as compared with $13,000,000 the previous year. Of course he could afford to cut them down. He probably put the $30,000,000 in so that he could cut it down to $15,000,000, and still be considered in excess of the previous year. What year was that? An election year, 1908. It seems passing strange that the ex-Minister of Public Works should in such a year, an election year, say just as a matter of course: "Oh, well, my colleague, the Minister of Finance, has just cut mine down fifty or even sixty per cent; but it is a sacrifice which I am glad to make at this time."

Now, then, have we heard enough on the question of extravagance, that charge put forward against this Government? I say, Mr. Speaker, that the late Government were inventors, originators, parents, progenitors and propagators of the most inordinate, reckless, purblind and wilful extravagance that this country or any other British country has ever known. And the figures I have given and the statements I have made prove it. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) put forward a most extraordinary assertion, and this time I will quote it. This is the statement he made in criticism of the Budget, and this is the second heading that I shall deal with:

I am of the opinion that our customs revenue will be found to have fallen but little as the result of the war. . . . I personally do not believe our loss in revenue is in any substantial degree attributable to the war.

That was a most extraordinary statement for the financial critic of the Opposition to make. I said the other night, and I desire to say it now as a foundation for the observations I propose to make, that there are certain things in this House that are taken as presumed; and one of them is the personal loyalty of every man in this House. If I have to say that my hon. friend from Halifax is not or was not aware of the effect of this war upon the trade of the world, that he has no adequate realization of its consequences, I do not desire to be taken as in any way reflecting upon his loyalty, because the two ideas are not in the least connected. It is not necessary that I should explain that to a man of the intelligence of my hon. friend from Halifax.

Let me point out to this House what was the situation created by this war not only in this country but in other countries. Stock exchanges of the world closed, trade cut off at once, automatically, with all enemy countries, international exchange absolutely collapsed, no transactions inter-

nationally possible financially and few commercially because the German raiders were threatening the commerce of the seas, finance and commerce all over the world almost prostrate, freights increased, risks of shipping so great that ship owners would not hazard ocean trips! Yet my hon. friend from Halifax says that in his opinion it ought to have had no appreciable effect upon our customs receipts. I pointed out in my Budget speech that this Dominion had been borrowing no less a sum than $1,000,000 a day up to the time of the outbreak of the war. That borrowing was cut through as with a sword. How did we bring in the million dollars a day that we borrowed? My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) is an economist of repute and even of renown. I ask him: how did we bring in the million dollars a day that we borrowed? Did we bring it in in gold? My hon. friend from Red Deer will be able to explain to the House that you could not bring it in in the form of gold. Great Britain would never part with a million dollars a day in gold. When we borrow in Great Britain we really import our borrowings; they may not come from Great Britain, they may come from some other country. In the past we have been importing from Great Britain and the United States but the million dollars a day that we borrowed from Great Britain came in in the form of imports. How do I raise my customs revenue? From imports. My hon. friend's proposition is that you can cut off borrowings of a million dollars a day, and cut off imports representing a million dollars a day, and yet there will be no effect upon your revenue. A million dollars a day represents $300,000,000 and more per year and my hon. friend says that it will have no effect whatever upon the customs revenue of the Dominion. I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is an affront to the intelligence of this House to argue that the war has had no effect upon the revenue of Canada. That cessation of borrowing at once diminished building operations throughout this whole country. Buildings that were under way, railway construction that was projected, stopped instanter. Why? —because the funds were not forthcoming. Moratory legislation in London prevented for months the payment of even the funds which have been provided for in advance. Yet my hon. friend says that it ought to have no effect upon the revenues of the country. My hon. friend pays an unintended compliment to this Government if he asserts that Canada is the sole exception in all this world and that the war on the gigantic scale upon which it has been waged has not had any appreciable effect upon the imports of this country. Let me give my hon. friend a few figures and I shall use figures very sparingly. These are official figures and they are not open to contradiction. Take the foreign trade of the United Kingdom; there was a decrease in imports in July last of 3.9 per cent. In June it had been only .1 per cent. In August, such was the effect of the war, that the imports of the United Kingdom dropped 24.3 per cent; in September 26.6 per cent; in October 28.1 per cent and in November 18.2 per cent.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Is that as compared with the previous year?

Mr. WHITE: As compared with the previous year, showing that the imports of the United Kingdom, which had begun to drop by July, decreased 24, 26 and 28 per cent for the months succeeding the outbreak of the war and the argument is that the war has had no effect upon Canadian imports. Take the United States, the great Republic to the south of us, and what is the position there? Why, the position is very similar. There had been an increase in United States imports to the end of July. In the months of March, April, May, June and July the increases in the imports were 17.6 per cent, 18.9 per cent, 22.8 per cent, 20 per cent and 14.8 per cent. Then what happened? Then came the war, and when I stated the other night that the war came along, arguing that it had had a definite effect upon this country's trade, I was met with a burst of laughter. The returns of the United States show that up to the month of July there had been an increase in imports from abroad. In August there was a 5.7 per cent decrease, in September an 18.1 per cent decrease, in October a 3.6 per cent increase, in November 14.7 per cent decrease and in December a 37.7 per cent decrease. The same is true of Australia and I have the record in my hand.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Give the figures for Australia.

Mr. WHITE: I do not want to weary the House. The returns for Australia for the months of March, April, May, June and July showed an increase of 17·3 per cent, 4 per cent, 15·4 per cent, 2·9 per cent, and 11·9 per cent respectively. Then what happened when the war broke out? In August there was a decrease of 4·5 per cent; Sep-

tember a decrease of 30·5 per cent, and in October a decrease of 28·3 per cent. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite tell me that the war has had no effect upon the revenues of this country. The sole exception in all the world is Canada ! What a compliment—an unintentional compliment—to this Government that could bring about such a modern miracle !

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is not a compliment to this Government, but it is a compliment to Canada.

Mr. WHITE: I am very glad that my hon. friend has interrupted me, because I recall something that I had inadvertently overlooked. My hon. friend was speaking about the way they acted during the consulship of Plancus. Hon. gentlemen who have read their Horace will remember the consulship of Plancus, who flourished in the days of ancient Rome. Let me tell my hon. friend what happened in the year 1908, the year to which my hon. friend wanted to draw our attention. What were the total estimates for nine months of the year 1907, the year of the great panic ? They were $75,000,000, or for the whole year, $100,000,000. Next year, 1908, the year in which my hon. friend made, not a sacrifice hit but a sacrifice, the estimates of expenditure were $124,000,000, and in 1909 they were $133,000,000. Excelsior was his motto.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does that include capital as well as current expenditure ?

Mr. WHITE: The same kind of money is required to provide for capital expenditure as is required to provide for current expenditure. I want to please my hon. friend. He knows how I would like to please him, and I have the figures. If my hon. friend—

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will my hon. friend answer the question ?

Mr. WHITE: Certainly I will answer the question when I come to it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Well, you have stated that the amount of the expenditure, or the estimates for 1908 was $124,000,000. Does not that include a large amount of capital expenditure ?

Mr. WHITE: Undoubtedly. It includes all the Estimates.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would it not include over $40,000,000 of capital expenditure ?

[Mr. W. T. White.]

Mr. WHITE: I would not say how much. I said that the total Estimates were $124,000,000 for 1908.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Capital expenditure is very different from current expenditure.

Mr. WHITE: We will come to that in a moment. We expect patience from my hon. friend, because we associate with him an almost Jovian complacency. The total expenditure in 1905-6 was $83,000,000, and in 1911-12, only five years afterwards, it was $137,000,000. My hon. friend has asked me as to consolidated fund expenditure, and I answer him that in 1905-6 it was $67,000,000 and in 1911-12 it was $98,000,000. My hon. friend has also asked me about capital expenditure. The minor public works do not trouble a finance minister; what troubles him are these great undertakings we have inherited from the Liberal Government. It is not a question of finding a few dollars for a post office; it is a question of finding tens of millions of dollars, a considerable portion of which will be lost to the Dominion, in respect to some of these ill-advised projects which were undertaken by hon. gentlemen opposite. The capital expenditure in 1905-06 was $12,000,000, and in 1908-09, under this excelsior policy—I had almost said this German policy of extension—it had reached $42,000,000, or 3½ times what it was four years before. And yet I am charged with extravagance by these gentlemen opposite. Let me ask my hon. friend how he met that?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Why don't you answer his question?

Mr. WHITE: I have answered it.

Mr. MACLEAN: You have not touched upon it at all.

Mr. WHITE: I have at hand no figures other than what I have given, but I may before I finish be able to answer the precise question put by my hon. friend.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister will get these figures?

Mr. WHITE: I will get them and they will discomfit my hon. friend considerably. Let me ask hon. gentlemen opposite how they provided this money that they required to meet the rising expenditure in 1905, 1906, 1907, and 1908, which culminated in the enormous expenditure of 1911-12. Let us see what is the difference made by them between the British preference in the

year 1900 and the British preference in 1907. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) put a statement as to this upon Hansard, and I have it here, and I will ask the right hon. the leader of the Opposition one or two questions concerning it. I want to test him and to find out whether he is absolutely—I am not permitted to use the word "sincere"—but whether he is really in earnest in asking why we raised the British preference. I ask my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, and I ask my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) who is to follow me in this debate, to give attention to what I say now. I ask my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition why did he, as shown by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), raise the British preference on dry white lead from 3½ per cent to 20 per cent; why did he raise the British preference upon white lead in oil from 16⅔ per cent to 30 per cent, or just about double, and why, above all, and to this I direct the particular attention of the hon. member for Red Deer, did he raise the British preferential rate on wool cloth from 23⅓ per cent to 30 per cent; why did he increase the British preference on wool clothing from 23⅓ per cent to 30 per cent; why did he increase the British preference on silk clothing from 23⅓ per cent to 30 per cent; why did he raise the British preference on paints from 16⅔ per cent to 20 per cent; on varnishes from 13⅓ cents per gallon and 13⅓ per cent ad valorem to 20 cents per gallon and 15 cents ad valorem? Did my right hon. friend do that for the purpose of adopting a protectionist policy, or did he do it because he needed revenue? There is no escape from the dilemma I present to my right hon. friend. He must say, if he answers at all, that he did it to give greater protection to Canadian industries, or he must say on the other hand, that he did it to get revenue, and there is no other possible answer open to him. And if the right hon. gentleman admits he did it on the ground of protection, then what does all this talk against protection mean from hon. gentlemen opposite, and what has my hon. friend from Red Deer to say to that. And if my right hon. friend admits that he did it not for protection but to raise revenue in order to meet the enormous increase in the expenditure of this country during the year in which this change in the British preferential tariff was made, then I say to him, if he had to do it then to get revenue, with what face can he say now—in presence of the greatest war in history, with finance and trade collapsed, and with our imports and borrowings cut off—you should not for the purpose of raising additional taxation, have increased the rate of British preference. We have not decreased the British preference. We have increased the British preference in the sense that it is more advantageous to the British manufacturer to-day than it was when I brought down my Budget.

My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) declares that additional taxation is unnecessary, and he says: establish an equilibrium between your income and your outgo. I estimated that for the coming year $180,000,000 was necessary and I said that on the basis on which we then were of customs and excise duty, our revenue would be $120,000,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: How much of that is on capital account?

Mr. WHITE: I think $40,000,000 was estimated on capital account, and $140,000,000 on the other.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. member for Halifax did not include that.

Mr. WHITE: Then he should not talk of establishing an equlibrium between the income and the outgo. As we all know, there are public works in this country under contract, and the honour of this Dominion is involved in carrying out the contracts, and it is the same kind of money I have to find to pay capital expenditure as to pay consolidated revenue expenditure, and it represents the extravagance of hon. gentlemen opposite. What is the remedy? My hon. friend from Halifax disclaims and says: "I did not say to stop all public works." I accept the hon. gentleman's word. There is no fairer member in this House than he, and I accept his word when he says he had reference to consolidated fund expenditure only. But what in substance is said to the people of Canada by hon. gentlemen opposite, and what is the effect which they intend to produce by this debate? Is it not to say to the people: The policy of the Liberal party is to stop expenditure on public works in this country, to reduce the $180,000,000 to let us say $140,000,000. The hon. member for St. John has added the words, "if need be." Well, if he were sitting on this side of the House I do not think it would be a case of need be; I think he would be able to see that there would be no

need to reduce the expenditure so far as he was concerned.

But what about the Civil Service? We have an organized Civil Service extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific. What are you going to do with it? Are you to break up your organization and dismiss your officials when you may need them a few months hence? The hon. gentleman says that we have increased consolidated fund expenditure from October, 1911, by some $40,000,000.

The mistake made by hon. gentlemen is precisely what I pointed out the other night. Why, they think that this country has stood still. What are the facts? The year before we came into power the total trade of this country was $750,000,000. The first year that we were in power one-half or a little more than one-half of which year belonged to hon. gentlemen opposite, the trade was $850,000,000; the next year it was $1,000,000,000, and the next year it was $1,100,000,000. Has the country stood still? What about the extension of parcel post? What about the money that we have been obliged to raise on account of the bungling policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, to which I have already referred? Where is that money coming from? The machinery of the Government has had to be increased throughout the entire country. Of course, it had to be increased, if we were to meet our obligations as administrators of the affairs of this country. Therefore, it is only to be expected that the consolidated fund expenditure of Canada will increase. There are items in the Estimates which I announced that the Government would not proceed with until the sources of revenue from which they were to be defrayed were apparent; but I would point out to hon. gentlemen opposite that in this country there is such a thing as uncontrollable expenditure; and when contracts or obligations are entered into regarding the finishing of the National Transcontinental, regarding the completion of the Quebec bridge, regarding all those different works undertaken by hon. gentlemen opposite, is it to be laid down that in order to avoid this expenditure, we are to break those contracts, to do a dishonourable thing and to render ourselves liable to actions on the part of those contractors who have their plants established and who are going ahead with the work in good faith?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is it not true that in all the contracts of the Public Works Department, and, I think, also in all the contracts of the other departments, it is provided that, where the appropriation is exhausted, the contractor has no remedy, but must wait for further appropriations or can go on and wait for his money until Parliament votes it?

Mr. WHITE: I am surprised at my hon. friend, who is a lawyer, putting forward an argument of that character. It is true that in most of the contracts there is that clause. I will suppose my hon. friend to be a contractor—and he knows something about contracts. He has asembled a plant and has spent $1,000,000 or more on his plant, and has several thousand men employed. Does my hon. friend mean to say that when a contract is entered into, although there is a saving clause of that character, the Government of this country is entitled to say to the contractor: "Quit work, and suffer whatever loss you may sustain?" Such action is absolutely unjustifiable.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Government has done it frequently.

Mr. WHITE: Some consideration might arise which might make it expedient to follow such a course; but if the Dominion Government closed down its contracts and threw thousands of men out of employment, what would be the next duty of the Government? To start relief works throughout the country in order that the men might not starve. As Minister of Finance I have had requests from provinces and from municipalities to assist them or to attempt to increase their credit with financial institutions in order that they might take care of the wholly abnormal situation respecting unemployment forced upon them by the war. An appeal was sent out yesterday to the Dominion Government and to all the provinces and the municipalities to create a great fund for the purpose of taking care of the unemployed. We had a member of the Opposition—and the curious thing is that the Opposition have such an elastic policy on this as on all other questions—we had the Mayor of Montreal the other night not protesting against our continuing public works, but asking us to go on with more public works. Hon. gentlemen opposite speak about our extravagance and the works that we have undertaken. The right hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) within the last year or so have said: Yes, we are in favour of the Welland canal; go

on with it; and in addition to that, go on with the Georgian Bay canal. What is the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to expenditures? Have they been wise in their day and generation? Did they foresee this war? If they did, what accounts for their action in 1912? If we were to close down those public works, we should simply aggravate a situation which is bound to be serious enough in war time, and we should not save the expense, because we should have to establish relief works in order to relieve unemployment. It is a fortunate thing for the people of this country that they have in office at the present time men who do not become panic stricken, who do not lose their heads, who do not say: Stop all the public works in this country; but who say: We will proceed with such work as will afford employment and with those works especially which, at the present time, we have under contract for completion, having regard to the honourable discharge of our obligations, and we will do the best we can with the fiscal measures which we have proposed to this House and with such borrowings as we may be able to accomplish in the money markets of the world.

My hon. friends, the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) and the member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), the other night said: "What would any private business man do? Of course, he would shut down at once." The case of a private business man and the case of a government are two very different things. A private business man has no obligations outside of his own business and his own family. He can say: As for me, I will cut down my expenditure; I will dismiss every employee I have. To the credit of the business men of Canada be it said that they have not adopted that policy. A private business man would say: What have I to do with seed-grain distribution in the West? What have I to do with drought-stricken districts? What have I to do when calamity overtakes a portion of this country? He would certainly say: I have nothing to do with these matters; I am a private citizen. The position of the Government, however is different. Government is much wider than business. Government is as wide as humanity. It touches humanity at every point. Business is only a division of politics, and public life is much wider than business life or private life. Therefore, the policy that might be adopted by a private individual is not open to the Government of this country to adopt, if we are to have any regard for the obligations that devolve upon us, charged as we are with the administration of the affairs of this country.

My hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) says: "No new taxes are necessary." Does my hon. friend, who is the financial critic of the Opposition, mean to say that no new taxes are necessary at this juncture? I point out again that, from the right hon. the leader of the Opposition down, there has not been an appreciation—I say it with all respect and with absolutely no intention of imputing any improper motive—of the effect of this war not only upon the trade and commerce of this country, but upon the financial position in which we necessarily find ourselves, and which we have not sought after. In the Budget speech I stated that next year we should require to raise no less a sum than $300,000,000. I am sure most of the hon. members realize what $300,000,000 means. Are they aware that every day of the year, if we except Sundays, I shall have to provide no less a sum than $1,000,000 for the expenditure of this country on war and on purposes other than war? Our expected revenue for next year was $120,000,000, so that there is a difference of $180,000,000 to make up. Yet the hon. junior member for Halifax says: "No new taxes are necessary." I tell hon. gentlemen opposite that if they do not understand the situation the people of this country do understand the situation; and one reason why my Budget was so well received—as it has been well received—throughout the country, was the profound and instinctive judgment on the part of the people that we had faced our situation and not temporized with it.

Now, the money for war is borrowed; and my hon. friend put forward this view: You are obtaining so much from the British Government. But we are borrowing the money just as much as if we had borrowed it in the open market. We increase the national debt, we are liable for the interest, and Canada is obliged to pay just as if she had borrowed the money in London, or in Paris, or in New York. There is no gainsaying that. What is the use of trying to draw a red herring across the trail? Canada is committed this year to an expenditure of $300,000,000—almost two and a half times the estimated revenue without this war taxation.

My hon. friend from Halifax, followed by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, says that this is not war taxation. I confess, I had expected better from the right hon. leader of the Opposition, for such a statement is the very acme of

absurdity and partisan misrepresentation. I have been abused a good deal about employing the title, "War Revenue Bill," and I propose to discuss the matter for a few minutes. I have been likened to a man who puts out a fraudulent prospectus. But I am not thin-skinned; I do not rise and indulge in heroics at such a charge; I respect the members of this House, and I think I have their respect, even if we do occasionally fight each other. But I have been likened to a man who puts out a fraudulent prospectus, stating this is war taxation when it is not.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE: That statement, "Hear, hear," does more credit to the hon. gentleman's partisanship than to his intellect. All this money belongs to the one fund. Let me put it to my hon. friend from St. John City: Supposing that, instead of borrowing $100,000,000 from the Imperial authorities, I had borrowed that $100,000,000 in London, or New York or Paris. I should have had my revenue of $120,000,000, the estimated revenue on consolidated fund account, and also the $100,000,000 I had borrowed. Does any one mean to say that if, in order to meet that situation and prevent our national debt from increasing at an alarming rate, I bring down a measure for additional taxation to assist the revenue, that is not war taxation? The funds are not earmarked, the money I borrow in London and the money I raise here are all available for the purposes of Government—for the expenses of civil government, for consolidated fund expenditure, for capital expenditure, and for providing the cost to Canada of this war; these are all mingled in the same fund. I think it is the pettiest quibble ever put forward by a great party to say that this is not war taxation. Take the tax that I am denominating especially a war tax—though they will all be included—that is, the stamp duty. I shall have to pay, and if hon. gentlemen will look at the Estimates they will see that I shall have to pay, at least $7,000,000 of interest upon the debt that we have incurred on account of this war; it is a melancholy thing for me to be obliged to say—we shall have to provide, if we may at all depend upon the calculations of those experienced in these matters who should be able to make their calculations with a fair degree of accuracy, a pension list, and I am afraid a growing pension list, of between $4,000,000 and $5,000,000 a year. Does anybody grudge that a portion of these taxes should be used for the purposes of paying the interest upon this war loan and for a pension list which will insure to the widows and children of those who have given up their lives for the country that they shall not be reduced to penury? Are those war taxes or are they not? Now, come to the other taxes, the sums I am raising by means of tariff increases. What has caused me to raise the tariff? I pointed out that my borrowings were cut off in the markets of the world; I cannot go to the London market and get a dollar except with the consent of the British Treasury. And we are a belligerent, Mr. Speaker. One million dollars a day this whole country, including Governments, Dominion and Provincial, municipalities, corporations and individuals were borrowing and importing, and we were deriving our revenue from duties upon these imports. If that is cut off and I have to replace it, does any one dare to rise in this House and say that that is not war taxation? What caused it? The war. The man in the street knows it was the war; there is not a child of ten years of age in Canada who does not know that it was the war; and hon. gentlemen opposite well know it is the war.

Now, the taxation proposed is the minimum measure which the Government could adopt unless it deliberately shirked its financial responsibilities. I say further that even if the $10,000,000 that my hon. friend from Halifax, according to the hon. member for St. John City said should be cut off, or even if $20,000,000 could be cut off the policy still is to raise money by additional taxation in order that the finances of this country may be dealt with in a proper way and that our debts may not increase at too rapid a rate. I have some regard for those who are coming after me; and I say it is the bounden duty of the people of this country—and I know they will discharge that duty willingly, loyally, patriotically—to meet the very moderate taxation having regard to the responsibilities we are assuming, that this Government is imposing in order that we may pay a share of the expenditures devolving upon the Government immediately or indirectly due to this war.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. WHITE (resuming): Before resuming my argument, I desire, in compliance with the request of my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax, to place upon Hansard details of the expenditure for the years 1906-7 and 1907-8, the last being the year in

which, according to his own statement, the hon. member for St. John City (Mr. Pugsley) made his historic sacrifice. I stated this afternoon that I would supply the information, and that it would not be particularly comforting to the hon. member for St. John City.

This afternoon I gave the total expenditures for the years 1907 and 1907-8. In order that the record may be complete, perhaps it would not be out of place for me to mention the figures again. The fiscal year 1906-7 was one of only nine months; during that period the total consolidated revenue fund expenditure was $51,000,000. Add one-third for the three months omitted, and you have $68,000,000 as the approximate expenditure on consolidated revenue fund account for the fiscal year 1906-7 if it had been of the ordinary period of twelve months. For 1907-8 the consolidated fund expenditure was $76,000,000, and for 1908-9 $84,000,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What was the expenditure for 1909-10, which was the year the Finance Minister cut down his ordinary expenditure?

Mr. WHITE: I beg my hon. friend's pardon; it was in 1907 that the financial stringency occurred in this country, and it was in the following year that the Minister of Finance attempted to cut down the expenditure. But the figures for 1909-10 are just as strongly against my hon. friend as those for 1908-9, because if we assume that the consolidated fund expenditure for 1906-7 was $68,000,000, then for 1909-10 it would be $79,000,000.

Mr. MACLEAN: How much less than that of the preceding year?

Mr. WHITE: On consolidated fund account, $5,000,000 less than that of the preceding year. As to capital expenditure—because there is capital expenditure in the Department of Public Works and in the Department of Railways as well as consolidated fund expenditure—for the nine-months period of 1906-7 the expenditure on capital account under the late Administration was $11,000,000. 1907-8 was the year of the financial stringency, and the only one in respect of which a comparison may be made with the present period so far as the question of the reduction of expenditure is concerned. For the year 1907-8 the capital expenditure had grown to $30,000,000, almost double what it would have been during the preceding fiscal year had that year been a period of twelve months. It is no wonder that in 1909 my predecessor insisted on cutting down the Estimates, because for the fiscal year 1908-9 his expenditure on capital account had grown from $11,000,000 three years previously, from $14,000,000 two years previously and from $30,000,000 one year previously, to the colossal sum of $42,000,000. I wish to point out to my hon. friend that during the fourteen months of which the fiscal year 1907-8 was a portion and during the remainder of the calendar year 1908, my predecessor borrowed on the London market no less a sum than $110,000,000. I may hold the record as a war borrower, but my predecessor holds the blue ribbon among finance ministers as a peace borrower.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will the Finance Minister state the purposes for which his predecessor borrowed that money?

Mr. WHITE: He borrowed it to meet the consequences of the extravagance to which I have referred. He borrowed it because the late Government, instead of being able to build the National Transcontinental railway for $13,000,000 as estimated by my right hon. friend the present leader of the Opposition and $60,000,000 as estimated by the late Minister of Finance, (Mr. Fielding), found themselves confronted with an expenditure which has run into $200,000,000. Mr. Fielding did not want to borrow the money; he was obliged to do so, and he borrowed $110,000,000 within a period of thirteen or fourteen months. There has been nothing like it since Confederation.

Following up that line of argument, and to give the remainder of the detailed information asked for by the hon. member for Halifax—for the comfort, too, of the hon. member for the city of St. John—I may say that the total estimates presented to the House for the nine months ended March 31, 1907, amounted to $74,000,000. Add one-third to that and you get approximately $100,000,000 for a period of twelve months. For the fiscal year ended March 31, 1908, the aggregate of the Estimates was $124,000,000, and for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1909, the total Estimates were $133,000,000. Yet hon. gentlemen charge me and this Government with extravagance.

Now we come down to the particular department over which my genial friend the member for the city of St. John presided. I have under my hand a statement prepared by my deputy as to the total public works estimates, capital and income,

presented to the House for a certain number of years. I find that for the nine months ended March 31, 1907, the main consolidated and supplementary consolidated estimates for the entire year amounted to $10,000,000. Add one-third, and we have approximately $13,000,000. In the following year, in which my hon. friend says that he made a sacrifice, we find that it had run up to $15,000,000, and in the next year, in which my hon. friend the member for Halifax claims the sacrifice was made, it had run up to no less a figure than $20,000,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: How much of that was against consolidated revenue and how much against capital?

Mr. WHITE: I have told my hon. friend. The figures I have given are on consolidated account. The figures on capital account run into a much larger sum. I am glad my hon. friend has drawn attention to this, because there was an omission in my statement. The main consolidated and the supplementary consolidated for the year ending March 31, 1907, was $7,685,000. Add one-third to that and we get approximately $10,000,000 on consolidated fund account. For the fiscal year ending March 31, 1908, we have on consolidated fund account $12,000,000; for the year ending March 31, 1909, nearly $17,000,000. Now my hon. friend has the information.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The reason I asked was that the minister previously gave $10,000,000 for 1907—for the nine months, I presume. One-third added to that would make $13,000,000. Then, for the next year the minister gave $15,000,000 instead of $12,000,000.

Mr. WHITE: My hon. friend now has the corrected figures, which sustain the contention I advanced this afternoon, that my hon. friend, although he may not have realized it, did not as a matter of fact make a very notable sacrifice in 1908 in connection with cutting down his expenditure.

When the House rose, I was about to deal with the taxation measures which I introduced to the House and to the country upon the occasion of the Budget speech. What was the object, Sir, of those taxation measures? The object was to supply a portion of the expenditure which we are making in connection with this war, and to maintain upon a proper basis the financial credit of this Dominion. Notwithstanding any suggestion of my right hon. friend to the contrary, that was the only purpose; and there was no other purpose whatsoever. I say now to my right hon. friend that this Government and any Government confronted with the situation with which we have been and are confronted, must either impose further taxation or cease sending troops to the front. I say on my responsibility as Minister of Finance that we must raise additional revenue by the imposition of further taxation or cease sending troops to the front to participate in the defence of Canada and the Empire. And I defy any man in this House to controvert that statement. Does any hon. gentleman suppose that we should be justified in pursuing the weak financial policy of resting with a revenue of $120,000,000 when we are confronted with the necessity of raising for the coming year no less a sum than $1,000,000 a day, excluding Sundays, or a total of $300,000,000 a year. Into what financial position would this Government and this country drift if I should fail to face the situation, if I should temporize with it? I should be derelict in my duty if I did not resolutely cope with this situation. The public of this country expect me to discharge my full duty in that regard; and I have done it. I say further that, giving this House and the country the benefit of such financial experience as I have had, instead of raising too much money by taxation I have erred, as I intended to err, on the other side; and I pledge my reputation as a financier that the leading financiers of the world would say: You have not gone far enough, you should have raised more money by taxation instead of less money. But I am content to bear that criticism, for, as a matter of fact, on account of the profound dislocation of business, on account of the condition of this country by reason of the war, it was my desire to impose as small a measure of taxation as was consistent with dealing with this matter on a reasonably proper basis.

If hon. gentlemen opposite are heart and soul with this Government in the prosecution of this war, and I make no comment as to their intentions or motives, I say they must take one of three courses. There is no alternative left to them. They may either say: Cease sending troops to the front; and I do not understand them to say that; they may as an alternative suggest another method of supplementing our revenues, so as to meet the situation with which we are

confronted, or, if they are sincere in their statements that they desire to co-operate with the Government in prosecuting this war, they must concur in the proposals of the Government. There is no escape from those three positions.

Mr. MACDONALD: In his Budget speech did not the hon. Minister of Finance say that he proposed to borrow in England all the money that was necessary for war expenditure ? And did he not proceed to justify that on the ground that posterity would pay it?

Mr. WHITE: My hon. friend seems to have failed to grasp the significance of what I pointed out this afternoon. This money is borrowed; the interest on it must be paid; and in addition to that, I must borrow large sums of money in order to carry on the business of the country, including the capital and special expenditure.

Mr. MACDONALD: The interest on the war expenditure will not be $8,000,000.

Mr. WHITE: In addition to borrowing the $100,000,000 from the Imperial Government, I shall have to borrow during the coming year the difference between $120,000,000 and $200,000,000, or raise a part of it by revenue; and I propose to raise a part by revenue, and borrow the balance. Does my hon. friend think that, at a time when I am increasing the national debt by borrowing $100,000,000 for war, I should not have had regard at all to the fact that I shall have to borrow $50,000,000 or $60,000,000 in the open market, and further increase to that extent the national debt of this country? What would my successor in office say if I adopted the weak financial policy of saying there shall be no increase in taxation; we will not face our situation at all; we will borrow all the money? I doubt very much if we would be permitted to borrow on the London market unless we showed as a matter of fact that we were prepared to shoulder a portion of our expenditures for this coming year.

No proposal has been put forward as an alternative to the fiscal measures I introduced here for the purpose of supplementing the revenue. There is the situation which exists, and the facts cannot be controverted. This Government, on account of the war, as I showed conclusively this afternoon, is face to face with a situation in which there is a difference, a gap, between estimated revenue on the old basis and expenditure of no less a sum than $180,000,000, of which I shall borrow $100,000,000 from the Imperial Government. That leaves over $80,000,000 still to raise. I ask: where is the alternative proposition brought forward by hon. gentlemen opposite? I have shown conclusively that unless we are going to dishonour the Government by breaking contracts entered into by hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to large public works in this country, unless we are going to stop all expenditure of money upon public works and turn hundreds, if not thousands, of men out of employment whom we would have to support afterwards by means of relief work, we must raise additional revenue.

No suggestion of a feasible character is forthcoming from any hon. gentlemen opposite. The only hon. gentleman opposite—and I honour him for it—who came forward with a suggestion—and I now propose to show that it is entirely not feasible—was the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. MacNutt). I did not have the pleasure of listening to the hon. gentleman yesterday, although I read his remarks, and as I understand him he said that we should have raised the additional revenue required by an income tax and a tax upon land. I dealt with the income tax proposition in the Budget, and I pointed out conclusively that upon the basis of the American income tax upon individuals we could not hope to raise more than $2,000,000. I pointed out another consideration. Municipalities and provinces assess individuals upon income. I see in the reports in the papers that the province of Ontario and the province of Nova Scotia are imposing a tax upon income, personal property and real property. My hon. friend suggests that we should pile Pelion upon Ossa and Olympus upon both, and add to the taxes of the municipalities and the provinces, by which we would not be able to raise more than $2,000,000. What about the expensive machinery of collecting that amount, and how long before the revenue would come in? There must, in the first place, be an assessment, and there must be an opportunity for appeal against that assessment. There must be tribunals created throughout the country for the purpose of hearing appeals and settling assessments. There would be an appeal from all these bodies, and afterwards there has to be provided the machinery for collection. How much would be left of the $2,000,000 which we would raise from any such tax? Supposing I raised the whole of it, supposing I raised $2,000,000, let us say $3,000,000, let us say $4,000,000, what does it amount to

in Dominion finance? Nothing has impressed me more than the total inadequacy of the suggestions which come from various parts of the country, and which, although the people who make them are not blameworthy, show that they simply do not understand the situation or the futility of the suggestions they make for meeting the financial needs of the Dominion. Their idea is that we might raise $4,000,000 or $5,000,000 in this way. At a rate of expenditure of a million dollars a day how long would it last? Sometimes that amount is paid out inside of half a day. I must cope with my situation, I must take measures that are adequate to meet the situation, and I say that an income tax would be a broken reed as far as Dominion finance is concerned.

Take the land tax. In various papers the suggestion has been made to tax all unoccupied land. There has been brought to my attention by municipalities for months past this state of affairs. They have taxes outstanding that we cannot collect. I am not going to specify the parts of the country in which this condition particularly obtains. They say: Will you arrange for us to get credit at the bank, because we cannot collect taxes; they are in arrears, one, two or three years. Let me ask this House, this body of intelligent men: How much would I raise in ready cash, how many millions of dollars could I take from the owners of unoccupied land in this country and within what time could I take it? The obligations of the Dominion must be met on the nail. Bills come in and the cheques must issue. I cannot wait for the slow processes of an income taxation measure. I cannot wait for the slow processes of a measure of taxation upon unoccupied lands. Not only that, but I must always bear in mind the supreme fact that I referred to in the Budget that, under the British North America Act, while it is open for the Dominion to impose direct or indirect taxation, as far as the provinces and municipalities are concerned, they are limited absolutely to direct taxation; and I lay down the principle, and I think it is a sound principle, that unless the national necessities imperatively so demand, the Dominion Government should not invade the field to which the provinces of Confederation are confined. The only suggestion of a constructive character is that made by the hon. member for Saltcoats. No other suggestion has been put forward that is feasible or practicable. There are three alternatives, three propositions and I will mention them again. The Opposition to be consistent, if they agree, as I assume they do, in our participation in the war, must say: Cease sending troops; or they must suggest an alternative, a feasible and practicable method of obtaining revenue, or they must agree with the proposals of this Government. They have done, Mr. Speaker, not one of the three—absolutely not one of the three. I await some other suggestion that will solve the problem. This Government is in its present position through no fault of its own. We are not responsible for the enormous expenditure undertaken before we came into office, we are certainly not responsible for the acts of the German Emperor in bringing on this war. Our problem was to devise ways and means. I call attention to what I said in August. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition says: You are taxing the poor man, you are letting the well-to-do man escape, you are taxing necessities and not taxing luxuries. When I heard my right hon. friend say that I wondered if he had overlooked the August session. I taxed practically to the limit, liquors, cigars, and tobacco, and I said at the time that I expected my fiscal proposals would, on the basis of the past year, raise a revenue of about $14,000,000. But I subtracted about one-third from it and I thought we might get an income of $10,000,000 if things were at all as we expected. I pointed out that on account of the situation that existed, with the uncertainties and vicissitudes of a war like this, I put forward my view with the utmost hesitation and diffidence. I am on record as saying that. But I calculated that we might get in the neighbourhood of $10,000,000 for a twelvemonth year and I said that I hoped to get about $7,000,000 for the balance of the fiscal year from August to end of March current. My hon. friend must not overlook that. I taxed there what are known as sumptuary articles, articles which are certainly not necessities but luxuries and which the people can do without. I taxed articles of that kind, and I calculated to raise a large revenue, and now I am confronted with the situation which I have disclosed in full to the House. And, what have I done? It is my duty to devise ways and means to meet the situation, and my only motive in bringing down these fiscal proposals is to enable this country to meet in part the expenditure of this war, and to

maintain the credit of the Dominion of Canada.

I divided my fiscal proposal into two parts: special taxation and general taxation. My right hon. friend had a good deal to say about my special taxation, and he was pleased to treat it with a good deal of levity and some ridicule. I do not believe the right hon. gentleman understands it. My right hon. friend referred to the tax upon railway tickets, and let me ask him a question in connection with that. Is he not aware that it is a fundamental principle of taxation that if you carry a tax beyond a certain point—and it requires very nice discrimination to fix that point—you defeat your own purpose? This question of putting a tax on railway and pullman tickets is a matter that gave me a great deal of concern and I inquired into it most carefully. Let me tell my right hon. friend that, had I raised unduly the tax upon railway tickets the inevitable effect would be that those who live near the border in Canada would travel over the railways of the United States to their destination. It occurred to me at once that there should be a larger tax upon sleeping-car and parlour-car seats, but let us take the case of a person who is travelling from Montreal or Toronto, or from Windsor, or from Chatham, or from London, through to Winnipeg or Vancouver, and what would have happened if I placed a larger tax on railway tickets? Why, they would simply go to their destination via United States railways. I had to give attention to the same thing in connection with my proposal respecting the taxation of tickets upon steamships; I had to consider the competition of the United States steamship lines.

I did not bring down an undigested measure to this House; I thought this thing out. My right hon. friend speaks about the poor man travelling on a second-class ticket; and in that connection let me make my hon. friend acquainted—because I do not think he knows—with the proposals. In the first place, so far as railway tickets are concerned, up to one dollar there is no taxation whatever. It is only when a ticket costs over a dollar, and from one dollar to not more than five dollars, that there is a tax of five cents, or a maximum percentage of five per cent. On tickets valued over five dollars for each additional five dollars or fractional part of five dollars which the ticket costs the charge is five cents. Will the right hon. gentleman tell me how any poor man is injured by that? It is a small tax, and it would seem to me that it is only a five cent matter that the right hon. gentleman wants to talk about. My right hon. friend this afternoon drew a picture—and it seemed to me it was a demagogic picture—of the pampered son of wealthy parents, who he said had never done an honest day's work in his life. Well, there is many a man who is the son of wealthy parents—I never had that advantage myself—who is not dishonest. But the right hon. gentleman pictured this son of wealthy parents, lolling in luxury, with pillows surrounding him, such as the right hon. gentleman is accustomed to, in the pullman, and no doubt he spoke as one having experience. My right hon. friend, no doubt, travels in that way all the time; he travels in luxury, and whether he travels on a pass or not I do not know. I hope he does; I have no objection whatever to his traveling on a pass. My right hon. friend overlooked another thing—as to whether he intentionally overlooked it or not I have very great doubt—but, take a chair car ticket from Toronto to Hamilton, which costs 25 cents. A man pays 5 cents on that, which is a percentage of 20 per cent. The poor man is taxed only 5 cents if he chances to buy a ticket which amounts to one dollar in value, or a maximum of 5 per cent, and the man who habitually takes a chair car, and pays 25 cents for the privilege, is also taxed 5 cents, or 20 per cent, just as he would in respect to a dollar or a two dollar charge for a chair. Adding it all together, you will find that the man who habitually uses a chair car will be fairly heavily taxed, and that is a factor in the case. Had we increased the tax on the sleeping-car tickets and the chair car tickets—and the same will apply to the ordinary ticket—beyond a certain point every man who lives near the border would in all probability travel by the United States, if he is going to a western point, in order to save any heavy tax that would be imposed on him.

This measure was thought out carefully, Mr. Speaker. I do not like hon. gentlemen opposite to think that I bring down any half-baked or ill-digested measures to this House. Although I do make mistakes, as any man may, and a man who never makes mistakes never makes anything, I feel that I have made no mistake in these fiscal proposals.

My right hon. friend has also spoken about the poor man having to pay an increase of 50 per cent upon the letters he mails. That was not a fair argument, and I will tell you why. Who writes the most letters in this country? Is it the business house or the ordinary man, or the poor man,

speaking generally? The ordinary man does write an occasional letter, but the business houses of this country are writing hundreds of letters every day. And that is where that tax is going to fall. It is going to fall upon the men who can afford to pay it, and I would have a much poorer opinion than I have of the people of this country if I thought that the men, on behalf of whom these appeals ad misericordiam are put up, were unwilling to pay their mite in order to assist in this war we are waging for civilization. At the autumn session I exhausted the revenue possibilities on liquors, cigars and tobaccos, and what was I to fall back upon —unless I was going to put this country in a position in which its finances would be unsound and incapable of sustaining the situation created by the war—except the tariff? The point escaped the observation of my right hon. friend, or he intentionally overlooked it, that in order to raise additional revenue under the tariff as it existed prior to the 12th February last I was obliged to put a tax upon free goods and raw materials. I know as well as anybody knows that when you get beyond a certain point you are not likely to increase your revenues, and of course that is common knowledge to every man who knows anything about taxation measures. Where was I then to meet the requirements of the situation? I had to tax raw material and I had to tax free goods, and consequently I imposed a horizontal increase of 7½ and 5 per cent. What followed from that? It followed necessarily from that—and I do not believe any hon. gentleman in this House will get up and say it could be avoided—it followed necessarily from that, that I was obliged to increase the duty upon the finished article. If to-morrow my right hon. friend were a manufacturer in this country, and if the duty upon his coal and his raw material and his partly finished product were increased, what would the position be, if we failed to increase also the duty upon his finished article ? Only one thing would happen to him—he would have to give up business. Therefore, it follows that when I was obliged, as I was, to increase the duty upon raw material and upon the partly-finished product used by the manufacturers and business people of Canada for the purpose of making the finished product, I was obliged also to raise the duty upon the finished product. Any other course would have been fraught with the most disastrous consequences to the business interests of this country. No other course has ever been pursued by any Minister of Finance in this country, including the Minister of Finance who preceded me. So far as I know, there never was any increase, if the tariff had been at all properly adjusted before, in which an increase in the duty upon raw material was not accompanied by an increase in the duty upon the finished product. That is trite and commonplace knowledge.

Hon. gentlemen opposite raise the objection that the manufacturers will benefit. Have they taken into consideration the fact that I am trying to raise by these tariff changes some $20,000,000 to $25,000,000; that I am taxing raw material; that I am taxing free goods that the manufacturers had available before; that I am taxing the partly-manufactured product used as raw material by the manufacturers ? If the manufacurers have to pay that increase, as they will have to do, must they not have an increase on the finished product ? Since I have been in this House, hon. gentlemen opposite have never ceased to criticise adversely the industrial interests of this country. If I am right in stating that I was obliged to resort to the tariff—and to impose a duty upon free goods and raw material, and no alternative has been put forward by hon. gentlemen opposite—then is it an answer to say that the manufacturers are getting an increase upon their finished product ? What will hon. gentlemen opposite do with the manufacturers if I am obliged to impose this duty? Will they drive them out of Canada? Will they destroy their establishments and thus throw hundreds of thousands of men out of work? If my argument is sound, that I had to resort to the tariff, then there is absolutely nothing in the contention of hon. gentleman opposite that I should not resort to it by reason of the fact that an increase is made upon the finished product of manufacture.

Let us see what these industrial institutions mean to this country. The Government has a large family to look after. We have not only the farmer, but the artisan, the labouring man, the industries and the business men of this country. We must look after them all. There is no better friend, so far as I know, of the farmer of this country than I am. There is no kind of farm work that I have not done in my time; there is no man in a better position to know the needs of the farmers than I am in, and since I have been in this House, I

have never denied to the Minister of Agriculture, and I never will deny him, any sums of money that he considers necessary for the purpose of furthering the farming industry, the great basic industry of this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite have spoken about increases made on Consolidated Revenue Fund. Let them compare the Estimates for agriculture for this year with those of four or five years ago. Yesterday I brought down an estimate for no less a sum that $10,000,000 to relieve, in proper cases, those in the drought-stricken districts in the West, and to assist them in purchasing seed grain for the coming crop. With due respect to hon. gentlemen opposite, I say that these taunts against the Canadian manufacturers and the industrial establishments and the workingmen and artisans of this country should be stopped. Will my hon. friend the member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) share in those taunts that are flung across the floor of this House about the privileged classes; that is to say, those engaged in industrial pursuits in this country? According to the last census returns there was no less a sum that $1,200,000,000 of capital invested in industrial concerns in Canada; there were no less than 500,000 artisans and employees supporting themselves and their families by the products of their labour in those industrial establishments; and those men were paid no less a sum that $250,000,000 per annum. Since the outbreak of war the business interests of this country have not complained; they have manfully borne their burden, and in some cases it has been a heavy one by reason of the cutting off of our borrowings and the diminution of capital expenditure. They have tried to hold their organizations together; they have tried to give such work as they could to their work people, and they deserve not recrimination, not denunciation, but the credit that should be accorded to all Canadian citizens when they are doing their duty to themselves and to those in industrial relationship to them.

Made in Canada! My hon. friend the member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) says: "Made in Germany." My hon. friend is an economist: he has studied political economy. When I speak about economics, I always feel that my hon. friend understands me, and I understand him when he is speaking about economics. Let me ask my hon. friend this question: when a private individual determines to economize, when he finds that he must curtail his expenditure, what does he do? He does a great number of things for himself which he formerly engaged others to do; he makes a number of things for himself which he formerly paid others to make. Take the case of a nation. When a time like this occurs and when war dislocates the business of the world, what does a nation immediately do without knowing the principles of economics as my hon. friend and myself understand them? The nation says nationally: If we increase our imports too greatly at this time, and if our exports do not increase sufficiently to meet them, unless we are borrowing, what will happen? We must export gold. My hon. friend the member for Red Deer knows that just as he knows the tables in mathematics. That is axiomatic. And what is the feeling underlying the instinct of the Canadian people in favour of this movement? It is that at this time—I do not say another time, because the movement has taken form at this time—what we can manufacture in Canada to advantage we want to manufacture in Canada in order that we may be able to keep our establishments going, maintain our staffs, keep our operatives employed and add to the general prosperity of the country. Is there anything wicked about that?

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Only stupid.

Mr. WHITE: The hon. gentleman passes a very serious reflection upon a number of very worthy people in this country in saying that those who are in favour of made-in-Canada goods at this time are simply stupid. I do not think they are stupid at all.

My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), referring to the tax on banks and trust companies, spoke with a great deal of humour about our touching the epidermis of the banks and trust companies. Now, I will ask him, and I will ask the hon. member for Red Deer who is to follow me, a question: We are taxing the Bank of Montreal about $150,000 a year; we are taxing the Bank of Commerce about $135,000 a year; we are taxing the Imperial Bank about $60,000 a year; and other banks in proportion. If my right hon. friend the late Prime Minister was of the opinion that that is good legislation and mild legislation as a taxation measure, will he explain to the hon. member for Red Deer why it was that in the year 1904 he raised the British preferential rate on woollen goods from 23⅓ to 30 per cent? If it was a revenue measure, he would have derived more revenue from adopting the course I have adopted.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mere titillation.

Mr. WHITE: He refrained from titillating. Why, he actually raised the British preferential rate upon granite headstones, so that those that a man left behind after he had gone to the grave would have to pay a heavier tax upon their importation from Great Britain.

The right hon. gentleman spoke about our tender treatment of the distiller. Why, he asked, did you put on an increased customs duty without putting on a compensating excise duty? In his airy fashion he had overlooked the fact that we are imposing higher taxes up the distiller for all the raw material he uses, including coal, and also upon the machinery which turns out his product.

The right hon. gentleman talks about the British preference, about the Government and about hon. gentlemen on 9 p.m. this side never having been in favour of the British preference. Who brought forward the idea of a British preference? He knows as well as he knows that he is sitting in that chair that, although we have raised, as I shall show we were bound to raise, the British preferential rate, we have increased the preference or advantage to the British manufacturer. Let me give a simple illustration that my right hon. friend will not fail to understand. Let us assume that upon a certain line of goods the general tariff previous to my bringing down my fiscal proposals was 30 per cent, and that the British preferential tariff was 20 per cent. On $100 worth of goods brought into this country what would have been the preference in favour of the British manufacturer? Ten dollars. Increase the general rate by 7½ per cent, make it 37½ per cent, and increase the British preferential rate by 5 per cent, making it 25 per cent, and how much now has the British manufacturer by way of advantage over his foreign competitor? Twelve dollars and a half as compared with ten dollars which he had before. Hon. gentlemen will say: You block them from coming into the country. Take the free list alone, amounting to about $25,000,000 of goods coming in from Great Britain. Nobody supposes that a tax of 5 per cent is going to prevent the Canadian people from buying these goods. If hon. gentlemen opposite put forward their contention—and I am not controverting it—that the consumer pays the tax, I say that upon this list of goods formerly free and now subject to this increased duty the people of Canada will pay the tax, and they will pay it gladly because they know its purpose and object.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

What is preference? Preference is the advantage which one nation enjoys in the markets of another as compared with competing nations. Any one knows that who knows anything about fiscal matters at all. Now, the list of free goods representing importations from Great Britain of $25,000,000—take these alone, to say nothing of the others—and what was the position before I brought down my fiscal proposals? The position was that the British manufacturer was competing on even terms with foreign nations in this market. What is the position to-day? The position to-day is that we have increased his preference, and he is in a better position with regard to those goods than he was before February 11, 1915. That statement cannot be controverted. It is absolutely axiomatic; it is the truth, and the people know it is the truth.

There is another fact in connection with this matter that I would commend to the consideration of the hon. member for Red Deer, my fellow economist in this House. We are increasing our exports to Great Britain, and I hope we shall continue to do so. The hon. member for Red Deer will not deny that if we increase our exports to Great Britain, we will necessarily increase our imports. Apart from the dislocation of ocean traffic caused by the war, no man need tell me that the fiscal measures which I have introduced will be any obstruction to British trade with Canada; I say the result will be quite the contrary. It is true that if our merchant marine is not on the sea; if our ships are commandeered or requisitioned, as they were last fall on the Atlantic and on the Pacific, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens), there will, of course, be interruption of trade. But that interruption of trade will not be due to my fiscal proposals; it will be due to the war, and primarily to the German Emperor, for whose acts I must disclaim responsibility.

I am going to assume that hon. gentlemen opposite are absolutely sincere in the contentions that they put forward in this House. My right hon. friend said: why did you raise the British preferential rate? Any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who has studied the subject knows that if we raise the general rate we must raise also the British preferential rate. Take the case of iron and steel manufactures. I ask the attention of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) to this point. They have to pay duty on ore, coal, coke and other materials; I explained to the House why I had to levy a tax on raw

materials. Will the hon. member for Pictou rise in his place and say to me: You would be justified in increasing to Canadian manufacturers the duty on ore, coal, coke and other materials, without increasing the British preferential rate also? What would be the effect of this upon the great industry in the constituency of my hon. friend the member for Pictou? It is perfectly obvious that the British manufacturer would get in his coal free, his coke free, his ore free and his raw material free, and if I did not increase the British preferential rate as well as the general rate, I would destroy these Canadian industries. I said once before in this House, and I say now, that I am not here to destroy; I am here to construct and to build up. Take the case of hides and tanning material. Does anybody mean to say that we are not obliged to increase the British preferential rate upon leather when increasing the duties on hides and tanning materials? In what position would the leather manufacturers of Canada be, if, having to pay an increased duty upon hides and tanning materials, they had not the benefit of the British preferential rate upon their finished product in order to put them on a parity with the British competitor in this market? The same thing applies to woollens. If, for the reasons which I have given, I increase the duty upon foreign wool, dye-stuffs and other material used in the woollen industry, must I not increase also the British preferential rate upon the product of the woollen manufacturers? I could give instance after instance of a similar nature. Take the cotton spinning and weaving industry. Could manufacturers of these products afford to pay 7½ per cent duty on raw cotton if the yarn and fabrics produced in Great Britain from similar material were allowed entry at customs at the British preferential rates in force previous to February 11? I think I have, therefore, sufficiently disposed of the arguments advanced by my right hon. friend with regard to my fiscal proposals in so far as they relate to the British preference.

I have been abused with respect to the action of the Government in the matter of the British preference. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) the other night invoked the Deity; he said: "For God's sake, keep your unholy and disloyal hands off the British preference." He challenged us that night to appeal to the country, and I observed the next morning—without surprise—that the clock in the tower had stopped during the night. My hon. friend knew his man. He and I are on terms of amity and friendship; if he had addressed that remark to the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), the evening could not have ended without tragedy. He felt safe, however, in accusing me of having unholy hands and of being disloyal. He knew that I knew I was not disloyal; and I knew that he knew that I knew that he was not disloyal, and no harm resulted. But it is not a very desirable thing to be called disloyal.

The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) said in the debate on the Address—and I adopt the sentiment that he expressed: "Let the Government place itself behind the man in the trenches." That is what this Government has been doing and intends to do. From the outset I said as Finance Minister—and my leader has said it before me—that our first business is war until this war is concluded. Shall we send our flesh and blood to the front and haggle over a matter of taxation necessary to maintain them there? Our object, as I have said, is to raise money for the prosecution of this war, either directly or indirectly, and I believe the people will pay it cheerfully, loyally and patriotically.

The attack upon this Budget has signally failed; and it failed because it was fundamentally unsound. The speech of my hon. friend from Halifax, which he had ten days to prepare—and I should like to know the perplexities of mind that he experienced in preparing that speech—was a case of special pleading. I have often heard that the duty of an Opposition is to oppose. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe it. I say it is the duty of an Opposition to oppose in a proper case; and I say that this is not a proper case in which the Opposition should oppose. I have disposed this taxation in such fashion that the people of this country regard it as equitable and just. I have placed taxes upon luxuries; I have taxed liquors; I have taxed tobacco to the utmost it will stand, and there is a point beyond which you will diminish, and not increase, your revenue. I have imposed taxes upon the financial institutions of this country. I have imposed taxes which will fall the most heavily upon those in this country who are best able to sustain that burden; and I have had to fall back upon the tariff in order to raise the larger part of the money required to enable us to do our duty in this crisis. Mr. Speaker, I hope I shall not be taken as disrespectful to the Opposition. Nothing could be further from my thought, but sometimes

it has been borne in upon me that the debate upon this Budget has been trivial in character. War on a scale unprecedented in all history; some fifteen or twenty million men engaged; the Germans and Allies facing each other upon a front resting upon Holland and Switzerland in the West, and extending from the Baltic to the Carpathians in the East; and there is now proceeding before our very eyes one of the greatest operations in the world, one of the most spectacular, one of the most dramatic —the forcing of the Dardanelles.

What is the expenditure of Great Britain to-day, and how is she facing it? The expenditure of Great Britain herself in this great contest is no less than ten million dollars a day; ten million dollars a day with a population of forty-five million.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: And free trade.

Mr. WHITE: My hon. friend had better not be too sure about free trade. The future may hold surprises for many as to free trade. The expenditure of Great Britain is ten million dollars a day; and Lord Kitchener is raising an army of one and a half or two million men. We in this country are raising troops and equipping them and forwarding them with the utmost despatch possible with our limited facilities. Why have we limited facilities? Why? I have never heard any expenditure seriously criticised in the House except the expenditure of the Militia Department. If the Militia Department had not been starved, if the organization had been better maintained, we should have been better able to bear the strain so suddenly imposed upon us in August last. We should have had more equipment for the troops, more clothing and ammunition, and we should have been in a much better position to take our part in this war. But there was no vision in the criticism of hon. gentlemen opposite, and where there is no vision the people perish.

The real question is: are we to do our share in this war or are we not? We have taken the people of this country at their word. They say send one contingent, send two contingents, send three contingents, send every man that wants to go. But I want to point out that war is made not only with men, not only with armaments, not only with munitions, but it is made with money. The people must be prepared to sacrifice not only blood, but treasure. If not, where is the Imperial spirit? And the people of this country are prepared not only to send money, but they are prepared to pay the reasonable measure of taxation which this Government is imposing.

Now, what do these charges of extravagance amount to? Are they not frivolous and vexatious at a time when the Government is struggling, and struggling successfully, with the greatest crisis with which the public men of this country have ever been confronted? I ask my right hon. friend who occupies a conspicuous position in this House and in this Dominion and in the Empire this question: In view of the fact that he himself raised the British preferential rate, and in view of the facts that I have brought to his attention to-night as to the necessity for increasing the British preferential rate not only on grounds of revenue, but by reason of the necessity of adjustment, was he wise this afternoon in bringing forward his criticism of the Government, and endangering, to some extent, the public credit of Canada because of the weight that may attach to his words? My right hon. friend's words carry beyond the walls of this House; they carry across the sea. And I ask him, has he represented the situation fairly or has he represented it unfairly? With regard to the British preference, I think he has represented it unfairly. And if his words when they go across the sea have any adverse effect upon the credit of Canada, I ask him if that is co-operation in this crisis with which the Empire is confronted.

My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) made a couple of serious charges against me this afternoon. He virtually charged me with false pretenses. He said that under the colour of a war tax I had deliberately raised this tariff, not for the purpose of revenue, but for the purpose of assisting the privileged classes of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE: Hon. gentlemen say "hear, hear." That is to say that all I have stated here to-night is untrue. That is to say that, as Minister of Finance, I have not been sincerely desirous of raising by additional measures of taxation sufficient revenue for the purpose of meeting the increased expenditure due to this war, and maintaining the credit of this Dominion. Hon. gentlemen seem to participate in that charge made against me by the leader of the Opposition. In substance they say, or at least those of them who said "hear, hear" that under colour of this war tax it is my intention, not to raise additional revenue, but to assist the privileged classes of this country. Mr. Speaker, I shall

not do myself the injustice of denying it. I have too much self-respect to deny a charge of that kind if it is pressed home. My right hon. friend has charged me virtually with false pretenses, and he read an article from which I took one phrase because it was the gist of his attack upon me for increasing the British preferential rate. This was the phrase I took: "Suspect bad faith." That was in the article that was read by my right hon. friend this afternoon. That is that if bad faith is suspected it is not to be supposed that the Opposition will agree in the proposals of the Government. What was the innuendo, taking that remark, or utterance, in connection with the subsequent remarks of my right hon. friend? I desire to say this: My right hon. friend has introduced this amendment regarding the British preference condemning this Government for, as he states, placing extra barriers against Great Britain's trade with Canada at a moment when the Motherland is under a war strain unparalleled in history.

My right hon. friend has suggested my motive in increasing the preferential rate. I wonder if it would be out of order if I suggested his motive in moving his amendment? I may be wrong, but I have a very clear idea as to the right hon. gentleman's motive in introducing his amendment. Let me ask my right hon. friend if there is anything upon his heart, or his conscience, that induces him to move this amendment? I would ask my right hon. friend to take the drama of Macbeth and refer to the sleep-walking scene in the fifth act, in which Lady Macbeth, looking upon the hand stained with the blood of King Duncan, says: "All the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten that little hand." My right hon. friend the Prime Minister, acting upon the prescient advice of the Admiralty, two years ago introduced into this House the Naval Aid Bill, whose purpose was to assist in the naval defence of the Empire. My right hon. friend obstructed and killed that Bill. I say to him now—I say it with great respect, I say it without any imputation except upon his statesmanship, certainly not upon his loyalty—that all the amendments, whether relating to the British preference or otherwise that he may move now or at any other time, will never obliterate the memory of the action which he took in connection with the Naval Aid Bill.

In conclusion, I desire to make a somewhat deliberate statement. I say to my right hon. friend that there are two ways in which it is possible to oppose effectual participation by the Government in this war. Firstly, such participation may be directly opposed. This has not been done. Secondly, participation can be opposed by opposition to measures, such as our fiscal proposals, necessary and essential to the carrying on of the Government of this country, the fulfilment of our contractual and other honourable obligations, the maintenance of the credit by which we are enabled to prosecute the war. It is obvious that we cannot prosecute war abroad unless we are in a position to carry on our affairs at home, pay the interest upon our public debt and preserve our financial credit in international markets. The policy of the Opposition as exhibited in their criticism of this Budget would not permit this to be done. As to their attitude upon this war Budget at this the most critical period of the Empire's history, I pass no further comment than to say that the people will know, appreciate, weigh and understand. They desire this Government to carry on this war with all its heart and all its soul and all its strength. This is what we propose to do. This we conceive to be our mandate from the people of Canada. If the right hon. the leader of the Opposition doubts whether we have this mandate, let him say so. My right hon. friend may rely upon it that we shall not fail to take all necessary measures to ensure that Canada continues with the will of its people to carry out its whole duty to itself and the Empire.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I think you, Sir, as an old parliamentarian, whom we all very much respect, will agree with me that in the main the discussion upon the Budget has been free from acrimony, and on the whole has been a credit to both sides of the House. I think it possible, Sir, that you may have detected beneath the discussion in the main an underlying sentiment that the average member of this House has no intention whatsoever that the Government or the Parliament of this country shall be diverted from the main business of the Empire and of Canada at this moment. As I did in the short August session, so I have pleasure in doing now. I should like, if I may be permitted, to voice the general satisfaction, which I believe exists in this country, and is reflected in Parliament, at the prompt

and energetic action of the Government in regard to what they have done to back up the flag of the Empire in this war. There has been no holding back on the part of my right hon. friend the leader of the Government (Sir Robert Borden), and I have pleasure in bearing testimoney to the fact in spite of the somewhat provocative peroration of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White). The right hon. leader of the Government shows to this country in his own person in no small degree those qualities of doggedness and pertinacity which are the heritage of our race and which have done much to found the greatness of the Empire, and which will, please God, settle this war as it should be settled. I should like to add, which I do very sincerely, that I am personally glad that my right hon. friend has, if he did nothing else in the public life of this country, secured his niche in the temple of great Canadians.

Having said so much, I must say that I think it necessary to state that there is an inability on the part of some hon. gentlemen on the other side who have spoken—and I think on the part of the Minister of Finance—to distinguish between a policy and the method by which that policy is carried out. I really think the Minister of Finance fails to make that distinction. I would rather not have made any reference, even as I propose to do now, by way of illustration, to the difficulties we had on naval defence a couple of years ago, but I am encouraged to draw an illustration from circumstances into which the Minister of Finance, for purposes best known to himself, has dipped somewhat freely. Two years ago there was a good deal of doubt in this country as to the feasibility of submarines being of any use in naval warfare; I think there was a great deal of doubt on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite about the feasibility or usefulness of submarines. The advent of war banished that doubt very quickly, because the Government proceeded to buy a couple of submarines, and I endorsed their action, immediately the war broke out. There was a similar doubt two years ago about the possibility of building ships in Canada, but to-day with the blessing of the Government opposite, submarines are being built in Montreal. I do not raise this except as an illustration of the necessity of distinguishing between a policy and the method by which that policy is put in operation, and I respectfully submit to the Prime Minister and his followers that if it be good to buy submarines now, and if it be good to build them in Canada now, it cannot have been so bad two years ago.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: May I ask my hon. friend to what remarks he is alluding when he mentions my opposition, or our opposition, to submarines two years ago?

Mr. CLARK: My right hon. friend's strong point is perhaps not imagination, but if he will compare our speeches at that time with his policy, I think he will be able to make out where the two parties stood.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Subject to correction by my hon. friend, I do not remember the question of submarines having come up at all, but I may be mistaken.

Mr. CLARK: If my hon. friend's memory is bad and he needs enlightenment, I with very great diffidence and deference refer him to an utterance of mine in which I read a whole article from the British journal known as the Economist, pointing out that the German dreadnoughts were a mere delusion, and that when war came, if it did come, their action would be exactly as it has proved to be, and that before risking their dreadnoughts they would endeavour to put British shipping out of commission by submarines. I was dealing with a somewhat dangerous matter—not dangerous from the point of view of argument, because if the events of the war have not convinced hon. gentlemen opposite that there were two sides to this question, then I am sure nothing that I can say would convince them—not dangerous from the point of view of argument, but dangerous from the point of view of having any acrimonious discussion about anything touching upon the defences of the Empire at the present moment. I was proceeding to illustrate the principle I have laid down: that it is necessary to distinguish between a policy and the method by which it is carried out. It is so in regard to this Budget. The Minister of Finance comes to this House and he says: our policy is to raise the necessary money to carry on this war—I ought to say he said "my" policy. We are agreed upon that policy, but does the Minister of Finance suggest for a moment that being agreed upon the policy of raising whatever money we need, we are to stroke every "t" and dot every "i" which his immature experience leads him to put down on a fiscal

measure in this country. Let me give the Minister of Finance one or two illustrations of the foolishness of such an intellectual attitude. Let me suppose that a farmer has sent his son to the front, and many of them have—which is more than my hon. friend will ever do, but that is an accident. The farmer having sent his son to the front, I should say that he is making a sacrifice to help somewhat to carry out this war. But when the Minister of Finance comes down to the House and says to this farmer, or to many such farmers: we propose to raise the money by which your fighting sons are to be kept at the front by making it more difficult for you to buy your agricultural machinery, then I say there are two sides to the question as to whether that is the proper way to carry on the war successfully; and especially so when that difficulty to buy agricultural machinery is created by giving tariff pap to the people who are engaged in the manufacture of agricultural machinery. Red Cross work is presumably helping the war at the front—" help the boys at the front," to use the words of my hon. friend from East Lambton—but when the Government comes down and says: we propose to add to the price of the woollens which the Red Cross workers knit into socks for the soldiers at the front, we say there are two opinions possible about that proposal being helpful in carrying on the war. When a woman parts with her companion in life, who goes to the trenches, presumably she makes sacrifice enough when she gives up her husband of many years and stays at home—and we know many have done it—to look after two or three children; but when a Minister of Finance comes down to this House with a proposition which amounts to going to that woman who is keeping the children at home, and saying to her: you have given your husband up to the trenches, that is magnificent; we are are a good protectionist Government and we propose that you shall build up the woollen manufacturers of eastern Canada by paying more for the socks of the children that you are looking after at home, we say there are two sides to the question as to whether that is a proper way to carry on the war.

Having cleared the ground by laying down a principle and trying to illustrate it, I come to the Budget of my hon. friend, and although he said at the opening of his very long speech to-day that he did not mind criticism of the Budget, like every one who makes a speech of three hours' duration, he is liable to forget at the end what he said in the beginning, and from his closing remarks one would think he minded very much; because, if his closing remarks had any meaning at all, they were a lecture delivered to this side of the House on daring to question his financial omniscience. In the Budget speech of my hon. friend, he produced a speech which was admirable in form, but, in my judgment, execrable in substance, and that is the most I can say for it. The speech that we have heard to-day was execrable both in form and in substance. Despite my hon. friend's having spoken for three hours this afternoon and evening, he has absolutely failed to shake the attack made upon his Budget by the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean). The power of my hon. friend's attack was manifest at the moment it was delivered. My hon. friend the member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) was put up to reply to the speech of my hon. friend the member for Halifax. He spoke for a short time before dinner, and it was manifest to every one that he was so shaky that he would need to get reinforcements during the recess. Therefore it was no surprise to me, when my hon. friend the member for South Toronto resumed after recess, to find that he was flanked by the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), who had moved across a great many benches in order to sit near him. I cannot help reflecting to myself that, when the protectionist lawyer from South Toronto is joined by the protectionist manufacturer from Montreal, the consumers of this country bear a striking resemblance to a certain man who once went down from Jerusalem to Jericho.

Just as the speech of my hon. friend was not shaken by the speech of the hon. member for South Toronto, it certainly was not shaken by the mixture of declamation and sophistry to which we have listened in this House this afternoon. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance has come out in a new light to-day. I am told by old parliamentarians that just before the election of 1896, the Prime Minister of that day, of whom I desire to speak with the very greatest respect, was so much in the habit of using the personal pronoun and of relating his own personal deeds, that in the ensuing general election the people of the country were perforce compelled to say to him: You have done so much and told us so much of your doings that we do not want you to do any more. I cannot help thinking that in this case coming events cast

their shadows before, and that our hon. friend will be relegated to the obscurity from which he came. As the first personal pronoun resounded through this Chamber, and as my hon. friend passed from one wave of passionate utterance to another about what he had done, the thought occurred to one inevitably: What a mercy it is, not that we have such a Government in this country, but that the country had such a saviour as my hon. friend. My hon. friend reads Shakespeare. He has referred my right hon. leader to the play of Macbeth. I would advise him to read Hamlet's advice to the players again—he has read it before—and to pay particular attention to the phrase, "And tear not a passion to tatters." I do not know whether my hon. friend resents very much any imputation of insincerity, but his mood this evening was so different from his usual good nature and smiling countenance that I wondered whether he was not for the moment playing a part. What was there to make all the sound and fury about? I did not see anything in the beautiful oration of my right hon. leader to have vexed him in that way. There was nothing that was not really of the choicest description.

My hon. friend has referred to the right hon. the leader of this side of the House as a demagogue. The two orations will be read with very different feelings by the great majority of intelligent Canadian citizens. What was this long speech to which we have listened? For two years and some months before the war put an end for the time being to political controversy, the Government opposite had as its main argument the tu quoque argument. It is distressing in the extreme, the moment we resume to some extent political controversy, to find that my hon. friend has learned nothing during his period of rest from controversy, but that he comes before us to-day with a tu quoque argument, couched, it is true, in very much stronger language than he has ever used in this House before the war, but I excuse him on that account, because the war does affect people and there is no doubt whatever that the strain to which he has been subjected has acted to a slight extent upon his brain.

My hon. friend spoke of the unbridled extravagance of his predecessors. The question this country is concerned about is the present Budget, not the Budgets of years and years ago. The people are too busy trying to keep body and soul together under this Government to be very much interested in ancient history. I warn my hon. friend that that is the case. He spoke of the uncontrolled prodigality of the late Administration, and he told us that they had loaded him with obligations and burdens. His were the mighty shoulders upon which rests all the trouble that has descended from the previous Government.

Hon. W. T. WHITE: It is a legacy.

Mr. CLARK: There is a double answer to my hon. friend's tu quoque argument after all. What was he doing in politics or in private life before 1911? If we can believe what he said during the election of 1911, up to the reciprocity election he was a devoted follower of my right hon. friend. If that be true, my hon. friend was taking part with my right hon. leader in building up those burdens and those obligations. Therefore, there is a certain political fitness that, when he has emerged into his present position, he should have a good share in bearing the burdens which he has helped to build up. That is the first answer. Yet if we impugn his sincerity, he is awfully angry with us. Was he altogether sincere in speaking of the unbridled extravagance of the party of which he was an associate at the time they were in power? Was he sincere in speaking of uncontrolled prodigality? If he was, he was one of the prodigals and one of the unbridled men.

There is another answer to my hon. friend which is perhaps more to the point. If he was aware of the burdens and the obligations to which he became the heir why did he proceed to increase the ordinary expenditure of this country by tens of millions of dollars? When he speaks again he will have something else to do than to put so many questions to me—though I hope not to neglect any of them—he will have something to do in answering the question I have put to him. If he knew that these terrible obligations and burdens had come upon him, he had one duty in the world, and one only as a primary duty, and that was to begin at once by careful economy to cure the evils which had been sent down to him.

Hon. W. T. WHITE: They were incurable.

Mr. CLARK: My hon. friend tells us that he was the heir of obligations and burdens. In spite of these obligations and burdens he went on to claim that he had larger surpluses and had reduced debts more than his predecessors had ever been able to do. Does my hon. friend really deceive himself so much in the case of—I do

not want to use a strong word—self-concentration in which he is bound up? Does he deceive himself to the extent of thinking that he had anything to do with these surpluses? Does he deceive himself to the extent of thinking now that his Government in the first two years they were in office, had anything to do in providing surpluses? Is he quite fair in blaming his predecessors for his obligations and burdens and pluming himself upon the surpluses and reduction of debt? Surely it is a fair argument that for the first two years this Government was in power, if they received the obligations and burdens that their predecessors sent down to them, they received from their predecessors the money with which careful financiers would have tackled those obligations.

My hon. friend when he boasts of those surpluses, reminds me of the younger son of a distinguished family who asked that the portions of goods coming to him might be given to him, and then took himself into a far country. I have no doubt that the associates with whom he foregathered there thought that as long as his money lasted, that that younger son was an admirable financier; but when he got among the husks no doubt they formed a different opinion of him. There is this to be said of the prodigal, that experience in his case was a wise teacher and sweet were the uses of adversity. But the experience which produced in the prodigal son a salutary attack of penitence has had an effect upon my hon. friend which resulted in a lamentable exhibition of ill-humour and egotism.

With regard to the comparison of the two Governments, there is this to be said about the previous Government—that if they were extravagant they had the money to do it with. That is a statement the accuracy of which I think the hon. gentleman will not deny. Now, I am against extravagance whether in prosperous times or in adverse times. I learned some of my finance from the speeches I used to hear from my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) when he was in Opposition. I found him a good financier; I found in his speeches many words of wisdom, following up lessons in finance which I had learned from the greatest financiers in the old country. I am against extravagance whether on the part of the Government or on the part of an individual, and whether in adversity or in prosperity. But if I have to choose between a Government spending an income which it has and a Government borrowing to spend, I prefer the former. The difference between the two is that between a successful man of business and a man who is in the hands of the money-lenders and who borrows to pay interest on previous borrowings. That is what I have to say in regard to my hon. friend's tu quoque argument. There are other points in what he said this afternoon to which I hope to refer before I resume my seat, but I do not propose to be drawn away by, what for want of a better word I may call, his arguments from looking at the present conditions of the country as revealed in the Budget, and the proposals for relieving that condition.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Budget statement of my hon. friend revealed a lamentable condition of finance in this country. And unfortunately it is true that the lamentable condition of finance revealed by the Budget finds a reflection in the conditions of our people outside of this Chamber. Deficits and debt in Parliament are accompanied by poor trade and a good deal of destitution and unemployment among the people. The Minister of Finance has attributed, or has been very anxious apparently to attribute, this condition entirely to the war. Well, I like to be candid, I like to be fair; and I am bound to say that in my humble judgment conditions have been aggravated by the war. I do not think it possible to deny that the conditions have been agravated by the war. But there is a possibility for two opinions as to how far the war has operated in this direction. The Minister of Finance talks as if there was no possibility of an argument upon this subject. I should like to point out to hon. gentlemen opposite that a very distinguished member of this House, the hon. member for West Toronto (Sir Edmund Osler) has made a public speech in which he strongly states an opposite opinion. And, after all, we cannot brush to one side an opinion on a financial question uttered by the hon. member for West Toronto. That hon. gentleman was an authority on finance in this country before the Minister of Finance had ceased wearing long clothes. The hon. member for West Toronto made a speech in which he said that conditions had been saved in this country by the war, that orders had come to this country which had put business in motion and which meant $200,000,000 to the common people. In any case, I want to point out this in answer to the argument advanced by the Minister of Finance: to prove his point that the finances of this country have been thrown into disorder almost entirely by the war, what did he do? He quoted the trade figures of

10 p.m.

Australia to prove that in Australia a similar condition of affairs had come about.

He quoted the trade figures of the United States to show that the war had brought about the same condition of affairs there. I understood my hon. friend to state—I should like his attention upon this point and correction if I am wrong—that in both Australia and the United States the figures of imports were showing an increase before the war. Has it not occurred to my hon. friend that there is a very striking difference on that point between Canada and these other countries? I should have thought that candour and courage in argument would have led my hon. friend at that point to deal with the unanswerable figures given by the hon. junior member for Halifax. The hon. member for Halifax quoted the figures of our import trade from January of last year down to August of last year, when war broke out, and by those figures he showed that contrary to what was the case in Australia and the United States, month by month, through January, February, March, April, May, June, July, there was an average decrease in the imports into Canada of over $10,000,000 a month. Surely those figures needed to be met. What did my hon. friend say with regard to that argument? Not a syllable. He did not controvert them, because they were incontrovertible proof that bad times were severely upon Canada before the war came at all. My hon. friend shakes his head. Was a decline of over $10,000,000 a month in the imports not a sign that bad times were approaching? It is capable of exact proof that after two and a half years of administration by this Government, when nobody was dreaming of war, there was every evidence that Canada was passing into a condition of commercial depression; and that condition has since been aggravated by the war.

I have on the sheet that is now in my hand some headings of columns which I myself took from newspapers in the month of July last. I took them for a specific purpose. I was going to give an address upon the times, and I took these headings as the best rough and ready evidence I could get of what was the condition of Canada at that time. I find amongst them this heading: "Canadian Pacific railway stock reaches a new low level." Canadian Pacific railway stock, worth less, I take it, than it had been for 17 years; less, at any rate, than it had been since it reached its maximum during the 15 years when my right hon. friend was at the head of Government. I find another heading: "A further large falling off in customs revenue." Another: "Fifty-three per cent decrease in immigration into the country." Remember that these are all from newspapers published previous to last July. I find another heading: "Proposed deportation of unemployed." I find in the Canadian Courier, an independent journal, of a date preceding the outbreak of hostilities, a statement to the effect that the most serious problem for Canada at the present is the question of the unemployed. These rough and ready pieces of evidence were found by myself in reading the newspapers of Canada before there was any question of war at all. I take it, Sir, that the hon. Minister of Finance cannot in his light and airy way dispose of that question by saying: in my first year I had a surplus; in my second year I had a surplus, and in my third year I had the war. Before the war came at all two years had sufficed for this Government to get in its work and they would have proceeded from surpluses to deficits and destitution and unemployment if never a shot had been fired on the battle field.

It is pertinent, however, to ask hon. gentlemen opposite: why should war produce the bad results in Canada which we all deplore? We still have the home market. As a free trader, I think that is a fair question for me to put to my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster.) Hon. gentlemen opposite have deafened me ever since I came to Canada about the splendid chance of prosperity we get by nursing the home market. Well, there are no German ships or guns here; we still have the home market. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce used to dwell upon the glories of interprovincial trade. We still have interprovincial trade; why should we have hard times? The real value of war from the fiscal standpoint is that it reveals protection in operation. Protection is the sworn foe of foreign commerce, and for the purposes of restricting foreign commerce gun-boats are far more effectual than tariffs. You have protection put in operation by gun boats, and the results do not seem to be to the liking of protectionists, because they say: we have hard times, and the war has produced them. But if they believe in protection; if they believe in their made-in-Canada propoganda, in the home market and in interprovincial trade as the real panacea for the fiscal needs of a country; if they believe in these things, war has just produced what protection would have produced if carried out to its

logical issue. As I say, they do not like the result; it would be wonderful if they did, for the result proclaims in characters unmistakeable, so plain that he who runs may read, that the National Policy is a palpable failure. It is a palpable failure as a revenue producer, because it is a palpable failure as a trade producer. There is one point that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance appealed to me on in respect of which I agree with him; that his failure of revenue is due to failure of imports. There we are at one, though I cannot congratulate him in being equally at one with every one on the other side of the House.

I noticed that my hon. friend listened with very great interest and attention and with frequent applause to my hon. friend for Muskoka (Mr. Wright) when he spoke the other day. My hon. friend the member for Muskoka gave it as his deliberate opinion that this country would be very much better off if we reduced very largely both our imports and our exports; or rather, he said we should be as well off as we are now. I submit to the member for Muskoka that we are just as well off as we are now because we have reduced both our imports and exports.

I think that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance might use a little of his spare time to teach elementary economics upon his own side of the House. The National Policy has failed as a revenue producer because it has failed as a trade producer. It is now admitted by my hon. friend that our prosperity was due to borrowing. It was due, as I have frequently contended in this House, to the freest of free imports, and was not due to protective tariffs at all. The National Policy has not only failed in these respects; it has failed as an industry builder. For, Mr. Speaker, it is well worthy of remark that for forty years under both political parties—I am not here to defend all that has been done under this head by the Liberal party in the past—we have had the doctrine proclaimed that you must build up cities in this country for that home market to which we are now reduced by the conditions of international trade. We have this peculiar situation to-day, that the farmers of the country, especially the western farmers, who have never had any real benefit from protection, who cannot have any real benefit from protection because they produce more of their products than are used in the country—they are exporters, and the price of their stuff is as a rule settled abroad—the farmers are reasonably prosperous; not, I think, with all due deference to my hon. friend from Assinboia (Mr. Turriff), as prosperous as he would represent; the price of wheat has gone up; the price of pork at the present moment is very poor in western Canada; the price of beef on the foot is very poor in western Canada; but still the farmers are getting reasonably good prices; and they are getting them, not by the help of protection, but in spite of it. It is in the towns that we have our destitution; these towns that have been built up by the National Policy, where industries were to exist, where everybody was to be made prosperous, and upon which the farmers were to depend upon for their prosperity. It would seem, then, that the National Policy is breaking down as a builder of industries. How has this condition been met by the Government? I do not think I have exaggerated; I should be very sorry to. I hope I am a loyal and patriotic Canadian, though I am only an adopted son in Canada. I do not want to say anything which would hurt my adopted country, any more than I want to say anything to hurt the Empire in the struggle in which she is now engaged. I hope I have not exaggerated.

I have tried to depict fairly what is the condition of this country at the present moment and I turn to ask the question, how has the condition been met? In regard to the way the Government has met the situation let me quote what the Minister of Finance said concerning our special war expenditures:

> I have no hesitation in proposing to the House that we shall borrow the whole amount required under this heading.

Now, that is very specific language. There was a tendency towards the end of the speech to which we have just listened, for my hon. friend the Minister of Finance rather to qualify and depart from the position which he took in the words:

> I have no hesitation in proposing to the House that we shall borrow the whole amount required under this heading.

That is, under the heading of special war expenditure. Very well.

I define absolutely the attitude of hon. members on this side of the House. I say, and not only I say, but it is notorious that we all say: we agree. You are borrowing $100,000,000; we agree. But immediately the Minister of Finance makes that statement, he sets out to give us an account of the whole list of new taxation in the country, the whole series of new taxes, and after

he had got through the description of those taxes he went on in his Budget speech as follows:

> These, Mr. Speaker are the proposals of the Government, having as their object the raising of additional revenue rendered necessary by the war and our participation therein as a belligerent.

Now, it seems to me that these two statements are at variance. Even in the brief speech in which he introduced his Budget my hon. friend was not quite consistent in the two statements he made. The fact is that the case for new taxation is not established. And as I understand the difference on this point between the two sides of the House, I should like to state it thus: the Government proposes to borrow the whole money which they are spending on special war expenditure; we agree. The Government need in addition $7,000,000 for interest and the nucleus of a pension fund. The drain upon the pension fund cannot be great, fortunately, for some little time to come. As I understand the amendment of my right hon. friend, it raises no objection to getting the money for the interest on the pension fund by some method of direct taxation. I so read the amendment of my right hon. friend, because it would be impossible to speak of direct taxes as burdening the people without giving revenue. I take it, then, that this is the position as between the two sides of the House; with the consensus of both sides the money for the carrying on of the war is being borrowed; the interest and the nucleus of a pension fund are being provided by direct taxation, because my hon. friend only needs $7,000,000 for interest, and the minimum sum he expects to get from direct taxation is $8,000,000, although the Toronto Star has calculated it at $14,000,000. Then where is the justification for the increase of the general tariff and for the obstacles against trade. I hold very strongly—and in this I think we are in general agreement on this utter failure in four hours of talk by the Minister of Finance, and in a great many more hours by hon. gentlemen behind him, to give any justification for increasing the customs taxation at this very serious juncture in the country's history.

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance rather pooh-poohs the idea of our recommending economy, because when an individual gets hard up or is in straitened circumstances he has to economize. I do not know where my hon. friend learned his economics. Personally, I think I can quote very high authorities for the position that a nation's economics should be conducted upon the same principle as an individual's economics. John Bright once said: "I make no distinction between the morality that ought to guide a man and that which ought to guide a nation." I take it that moral principles are involved in the way that a man or a nation raises money and spends money. I do not agree with my hon. friend that the nation can learn nothing from the individual in this matter. What is a nation? An aggregate of individuals. Does my hon. friend mean to tell me that a departure from sound economic principles which ruins a man can be undertaken by a nation? I do not agree with him for one minute. I stand with John Bright in declaring that the same economic principles in the main which guide a man ought to guide a nation. My hon. friend the junior member for Halifax used a notable phrase in regard to this Government's extravagance. He said that they had exalted extravagance to a virtue. We have had hon. gentlemen getting up in this debate and backing up that kind of thing. They say: The Government must go on spending even if they have to borrow. I wonder when we ever should be economical. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance condemns extravagance on the part of his predecessors who had plenty of money to spend, and he justifies extravagance on his own part when his revenues are falling and when he does not have the money to spend. I stand in this matter with Cobden. So far from exalting extravagance to the height of virtue, Cobden used the epigram that I remember twice being quoted by Mr. Gladstone, "Public economy is public virtue." If my hon. friend the Minister of Finance had not retired from the House I would have strongly commended that short statement to him. It is very brief, and I have no doubt it has been conveyed to him many, many times by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Geo. Foster), who really cannot view the shortcomings of this mere tyro in finance with anything like equanimity.

Mr. Winston Churchill, who is at the head of a great spending department which might be allowed to be extravagant at the present time if ever a department was—Mr. Winston Churchill, in the midst of the war, making a speech in the House of Commons and

talking of the new departures on the part of the British Admiralty, had this to say:

> Everything in our power will be done to avoid extravagance. We shall therefore welcome the advice of businessmen where they can help us.

As my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition said this afternoon, the Government of Great Britain calls to their assistance the Opposition in the House of Commons and in the House of Lords, and Mr. Winston Churchill also has asked that he should have the advice of any business men who could help him to conduct the great spending department of the Admiralty on economical lines. The Minister of Finance, when he was constructing his Budget, instead of calling to his councils the Opposition, and especially my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, whose long experience in Government would enable him to give much valuable information and advice, appears to have consulted with the Canadian manufacturers.

My hon. friend the junior member for Halifax, in arraigning this Government, was interrupted by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister with a question and the question of my right hon. friend reminded me of a celebrated programme called the Halifax programme. I was surprised at my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, because I remember reading that modern evangel promulgated in the city of Halifax, and I remember many expositions of it by my right hon. friend. I do not apologize for quoting the statement which was made in one of these expositions by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister to the effect that an expenditure of a little over $100,000,000 by the late Government was prima facie evidence that the Government was corrupt. When my hon. friend the Finance Minister, or any other hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, turns and asks us where he could begin economizing I think it is a perfectly logical procedure on his part to consult the Prime Minister. He must have had some ideas, if he was sincere, when he promulgated this gospel. I was surprised at his addressing his colleague in the representation of Halifax and putting to him the question as to whether he would consent to begin economizing in the city of Halifax. If he had been as sincere as the early projectors of the original evangel, who began at Jerusalem, Halifax is the very place that he would have begun to put into practice the gospel which he preached previous to 1911.

I appeal to my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce in the best of good humour, because I am perfectly sure that he has had many a serious interview with this Cabinet. I told him when he joined it that he was a schoolmaster amongst children, that he was the only gentleman who had had any previous Cabinet experience, and the country is paying dearly for the fact, because he has been utterly powerless either by advice or example to restrain those with whom he is associated. My hon. friend in the year 1908, with an expenditure of about $108,000,000 for current and capital account, made a speech in this House in which he said:

> The rapid pace that has been set and the recklessness of the expenditures that have been undertaken have obliterated all the old rules, all the old lines in reference to expenditure.

If that was the case with an expenditure of $108,000,000 a year what are we to say about the old lines and the old rules when the expenditure for the same object has got up to $160,000,000? Then, plaintively in that address, after making this statement he asks: Whither are we rushing? I wonder if he ever addresses that inquiry to his colleagues in the Cabinet. If not I would strongly urge him to do so and especially to try and enforce the inquiry upon the present holder of the portfolio of Finance. The fact of the matter is that the Prime Minister made a fatal error in the original composition of his Cabinet, and I would advise him at once, if he wants to guide this country through to a saner and stronger financial position, to transpose a certain couple of ministers. The Minister of Finance would have made a splendid Minister of Trade and Commerce. Especially would he have excelled in the performance of the duties of the Department of Trade and Commerce which are described as those of the chief commercial traveller of Canada. The Minister of Finance has a smile that my hon. friend without portfolio opposite knows would be valuable in a commercial traveller, but a smile is no good to a watch dog. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has a smile, but he wears it in his heart. My hon. friend, if he had been given the portfolio of Finance and had been entrusted with the proper duties as the watch dog of the treasury, would have kept his smile most effectually when his present neighbour, the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) and others came to him to make the drains for their spending departments which have landed the country in the posi-

tion in which it is in at the present time. But the Government do not see fit to appeal to the Prime Minister or the Minister of Trade and Commerce for lessons in economy. They do not wish to have them put in practice at the present time, and they have decided upon other proposals.

Let me say at once that the proposals of taxation which the Finance Minister has brought down for the approval of this House are absolutely lacking in initiative. I congratulate the Government upon their direct taxation; I congratulate them on embarking on direct taxation at all. The imposition of direct taxes is a very joyful spectacle for one who has been preaching the economic doctrines that I have been preaching in Canada for a number of years past. I have heard many men, since I came to Canada, ask: Where would you get your revenues if you established free trade and do away with tariffs? the people of this country would never stand for direct taxation; you will not have it for generations. Well, Mr. Speaker, war is a fine fiscal schoolmaster, and the war has brought us to a position in which this country has gone in for direct taxation, and I congratulate the Government upon introducing it. But the choice of the Minister of Finance in regard to his direct taxes has, as my right hon. leader has pointed out, not been quite fortunate. He has passed his direct taxes almost in every case right on to the consumers of the country, and to that extent he has failed to carry out direct taxation as it is carried out in the old country where the greatest burden is borne by the people who are most able to pay the taxes.

I think the Minister of Finance offered to the House, both when he introduced his Budget and again to-day, an extremely weak argument in opposition to an income tax. When he introduced his Budget he said that the income tax in Great Britain was mostly gathered upon huge investments. My recollection is that the minimum income paying tax in England is $1,000 a year, and I do not think the Minister of Finance is correctly informed in making the statement he did. I pointed out a year ago, I think in my Budget remarks, that at that time an income tax had been imposed in the United States, an income tax existed in Germany, that an income tax existed in France, and that surely the statesmanship of Canada was not absolutely so deficient that it could not come near the statesmanship of these various countries. I noticed the other day Russia, one of the Allies, had imposed an income tax for war purposes, and the minimum income paying the tax is $500 per annum. If our Allies are doing this, I do not see why Canada should not have put on a good fat tax upon large incomes, and I want to say that while such a tax would have this merit that it followed the example of all other civilized countries of the world, it would have had the approbation of the great masses of the people of Canada. It is a fair tax because according to the first principle of taxation we ought to gather our taxes as much as possible in proportion to the ability of the tax-payer to pay. I am perfectly certain that a good fat tax upon big incomes would have been a popular form of taxation, and a better form of taxation than many of the vexatious stamp duties which the Minister of Finance has lightly borrowed from the United States. Australia is a country to which we may look for comparison, and sometimes for guidance. Australia is well worthy of imitation in a great many ways. I do not think that hon. gentlemen opposite would be inclined to impugn the loyalty of Australia; I am perfectly sure that they, as we, felt a thrill of joy and satisfaction when the Australian battleship "Sydney" captured the German commerce-destroyer "Emden." What has Australia done in this matter of direct taxation? Australia, for the purposes of this war, has raised $5,000,000 by a federal probate duty, in addition to the probate duty already imposed by the various states.

The Minister of Finance, while commending the courage of the hon. member from Saltcoats (Mr. MacNutt) for mentioning a land tax, brushed aside a tax upon land values as a thing that was almost unworthy of his consideration. I do not know whether the Minister of Finance knows that Australia, for war purposes, is raising $13,500,000 by a land tax, in addition to the land taxes gathered by the various states of the Commonwealth. I want to put this to the members of the Government, as well as to members on my own side of the House, that the breakdown of protection in the matter of raising revenue will compel the statesmanship of Canada, sooner or later, as it has compelled the statesmanship of Germany, of the United States, of Russia, of England long ago, to seek direct taxes for carrying on the federal government, leaving the trade of the country free to develop the wealth in the country, which can be taxed as it is in England. Then all your taxation would go to the treasury and none of it to pamper and to feed special interests. I

want to point out that land-value taxation is attracting increasing attention in Great Britain and in the United States, where the doctrine of taxation of land values was first promulgated. It has been employed in our own provinces in the West with a very great degree of success, and I want to emphasize the fact which my hon. friend from Saltcoats mentioned: that the grain growers of the prairie provinces, as well as the grange of Ontario and the United Farmers of Ontario have through their delegates in every case unanimously carried a resolution in favour of the taxation of land values in preference to raising additional obstacles against the trade of Great Britain at a time when Great Britain is at war.

Meantime, let me say further about this tariff policy of the Government, that it is a policy lacking not only in initiative, but, I think, lacking in common sense. I will tell you why, because I do not want to use strong language without being able to justify it. The National Policy has failed, else why betake ourselves to direct taxation as the Government has done in this case? The National Policy has failed as a revenue producer, and the policy of the Government is lacking in common sense because they propose to help that failure by more National Policy. I do not think that is a rational procedure. If a medicine is killing every patient that gets it, I do not think it is common sense procedure to administer extra doses of that medicine to the next patient who comes along. It is possible at this juncture to look at the history of tariff in this country. Its history has now been prolonged to such an extent that we can trace the trail of the serpent by the slime it leaves. The National Policy was introduced into this country in 1878. Looking at these years, I have always, since coming to this country, allowed it five years to get into operation, and I have compared the trade of Canada in 1883 with the trade of Canada in 1895, these being the last twelve years that the old Conservative Government was in power.

I have again and again pointed out in this House that in 1895, 17 years after the introduction of the National Policy, the foreign commerce of Canada was smaller by $6,000,000 than it was in 1883, twelve years previously. That is a very significant fact. You yourself, Mr. Speaker, sat in this House at that time, and you saw the trade of the country stationary year after year, until in 1895, after seventeen years of the National Policy, it was lower than it was in 1883, and the condition of the country generally was in keeping with the trade figures.

The other day I came across a quotation from the News-Advertiser of Vancouver, of February 1, 1895, giving an account of a board of works meeting twenty years ago, in which I read:

> Mr. H. A. Ball submitted an elaborate scheme of a poor farm in the East End Park where the hungry could be fed and work found for them.

That was after seventeen years of the National Policy in Vancouver. That was when the political forefathers of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) were running the affairs of the Dominion. I should think he would recognize a likeness between those times and now. The failure was so evident to my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce that, financier and statesman as he was, he faced the situation. What did he do? What my hon. friend the Minister of Finance is doing now—administer more National Policy? No, he reduced the tariff of this country very considerably, although the reduction came too late to save his party. His party went out of power in 1896; my right hon. friend came into power; and despite statements which I have never considered very fair on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite that nothing was done to reduce the tariff during the fifteen years that my right hon. friend was in power, in 1897, following the example, as I freely admit, of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, my right hon. friend reduced the tariff very largely. One hundred and fifty articles were put upon the free list and the British preference was introduced. It is no wonder that my right hon. friend says, as he said this afternoon, " Here we draw the line."

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance, forsooth, impugned the motives of my right hon friend as if the British preference were a new thing with him. So far as actual legislation is concerned, my right hon. friend is the father of the British preference in this country. The result of his introduction of the British preference was that just as British goods come here, so British immigrants and British capital come here; and the thing that my hon. friends opposite cannot get over at the present moment is that, for the fifteen years during which my right hon. friend and his colleagues guided the destinies of Canada, Canada was inhabited by a prosperous, wealthy, contented, and happy people. It goes without saying, that with all

due allowance for the war, the National Policy in a much briefer period had brought about in the beginning of last year when there was not any war the very condition of affairs which existed in this country in 1896, when the upholders of the National Policy were sent about their business, because their policy had proved a failure. What is the cure for this depression? Is it to be more National Policy? Is it to be a made-in-Canada campaign?

Mr. SAM SHARPE: Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARK: My hon. friend the member for North Ontario says, "hear, hear." I would like him to go down to Toronto or Montreal and explain his made-in-Canada campaign to the thousands of unemployed there.

Mr. SHARPE: I would like my hon. friend to come to Orillia or any of our towns and say that the made-in-Canada campaign is a stupid policy.

Mr. CLARK: I would not do so without explaining the campaign. Of course, my hon. friend does not understand how stupid it is, but I will explain that point to him. I would like my hon. friend to go to his own city, in which he has spoken in favour of this made-in-Canada campaign, and explain how the National Policy is going to cure the problem that you have resulting from the National Policy which you have followed so far. Let my hon. friend say to one of those unemployed men, of whom there are thousands in the cities throughout Canada; You are having too many imports because that is the meaning of the National Policy campaign. If it means anything, it means that imports are a curse. I do not know what my hon. friends think about imports. If the made-in-Canada campaign has any meaning, it means that you are going to exclude imports. Yet my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce tells us that the country is depressed because we do not have imports any longer. Let any hon. gentleman opposite go to one of the unemployed in Toronto and say: We want fewer imports into this country at the present moment, and let him explain the economics of the policy. If the unemployed man were thoughtful he would say: When Laurier was in power, we were importing largely and we were prosperous; I was getting three good square meals a day then, and I have difficulty in getting them now either for myself or for my family. I imagine that my hon. friend opposite who was on this mission would have to tell that poor workman that he was getting too many imports at this time; that they were bad for him; that he needed dieting. He is getting the dieting all right. The imports were all right—the imports into the country accompanied by sufficient imports into the stomachs of the workingmen of the country. There must be a reason for that fact.

I wish I had time to tell hon. gentlemen opposite of some experiences that I had the last time I spoke on protection in England. When I was in England in 1906, I took part in the campaign there. The agitation was along exactly the same lines when Mr. Chamberlain was trying to impose protection upon the old country. His party was telling the people of Great Britain that carpenters were unemployed there because Britain was importing too many window-sashes and doors from Canada. They were having a made-in-Canada campaign in Great Britain. It does not look so well when we see it from this side, does it? Protection is supported by the same fallacies everywhere.

Where was the fallacy? Why did not the workingmen of Britain listen to the argument as it was put to them over there? Because teachers who knew something of economics immediately came along and said to the workingmen of Britain: It is very true that we are importing large numbers of doors and window sashes from Canada; but the peculiar thing is this, that statistics prove that carpenters in Britain have least unemployment when we are importing the most doors and window-sashes from Canada. Does my hon. friend the member for North Ontario (Mr. Sam. Sharpe) begin to see some light upon the made-in-Canada proposal? Why was it that carpenters were busiest in Britain when they were importing the most doors and window-sashes? Simply because they were busiest in the building trade, and the carpenters of Britain were making better money at hanging the doors made in Canada than they could make in making the doors.

Is there any wise economist on the other side who will tell me that the people of Great Britain do not know their business? Will the hon. member for North Ontario undertake to go to Britain and teach this made-in-Canada policy to Mr. Lloyd George, and improve the narrow fiscal understanding of Mr. Asquith and Sir Edward Grey? I think not.

How will the new tariff act? According to the minister who is responsible for it, it will not only raise revenue, but also promote agriculture and industry. Well, I

never heard a prophecy that I think less likely of fulfilment than that one. If it is going to get revenue, how is it going to promote the made-in-Canada campaign? It is difficult to tell what the exact result of the tariff will be, but I venture to say that it will raise the cost of living for every man, woman and child in Canada. It will raise the cost of living as a result of the action of the Government which my hon. friend from Brantford supports, and it will raise that cost of living at a time when he has been engaged in trying to persuade the same Government to fix the price of foodstuffs in Canada. And I commend to him the consideration of the monumental nature of his inconsistency in that attitude. It will certainly raise the price of everything that we buy for clothing, everything that we buy for production, and nearly all we buy for food. That is the one certain result of the tariff as it is being imposed by the Government.

The Minister of Finance gets very angry with us on this side of the House if it is even suggested that that is the object of the tariff. Well, I would only say that there are many utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite that would lead us to believe that that would be the effect of the tariff in any case, and that the effect will be produced, not so much by reason of the price of imported goods, as by reason of the price of goods produced in this country. I do not know how many hon. gentlemen noticed the interruption of my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) the other evening. I think it was when my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turiff) was speaking. He was talking of the tariff upon axle greese, and my hon. friend from Peel very innocently said: Could not we make all that in Canada? Then, as my hon. friend from Assiniboia pointed out, what becomes of the proposal to get revenue by this means? On the one hand, the Minister of Finance tells us that these new taxes are going to give him $20,000,000 to $25,000,000 for the year—and he calls them war taxes, forsooth, though he has told us already that he is going to borrow all the money for the war—and, on the other hand, the follower of the Minister of Finance tells us that he proposes that as much of these goods as possible should be made in Canada. It is impossible that the tariff should at once raise revenue and promote the industry of the country. It never did so. Wherever the protective tariff is introduced it fails as a revenue producer, as the minister told us this afternoon it must do. The real objection to the tariff legislation of this Government is in this, that by raising prices to the consumer of almost everything used in this country, it builds up the fortunes of a limited class of our people at a time when everybody else in this country is learning how to suffer patiently. I pictured in my opening remark the

11 p.m.

farmer who has sent his son to the front and is left on the farm to make his living there. To complete the picture I need to introduce between the farmer and his son the gaunt and greedy figure of the tariff beneficiary who is prepared to line his own pockets by the financial suffering of those left at home while the son who has gone into the trenches is shedding his blood for his country. The real iniquity of these proposals at this time is in this, that while every man, woman and child outside of the beneficiaries of the tariff is learning to spell letter by letter, and to write in tears and blood, the word "Sacrifice!" the tariff beneficiary is there with his hands out for his subsidy. I am glad that I stand with those who are prepared to sacrifice and not with those who are seeking subsidies. Then my hon. friend from Victoria, and other hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, with unctuous patriotism on behalf of others say that they are quite sure the farmers of the West will be quite prepared to make their share of sacrifice.

An hon. MEMBER: They will.

Mr. CLARK: Yes, their share. They make their sacrifices in sending their sons to the trenches; but they do not propose—the workmen of our towns do not propose—to make a further sacrifice in the case of unjust taxation to the Moloch god of protection. That is the issue between us in regard to this question of tariff taxation and of "sacrifice" which falls so lightly from the lips of hon. members opposite, and I am glad to say falls so thoughtlessly also. The policy of the Government is short-sighted. What is the good of sending lecturers on production all over Canada, and at the same time putting these obstacles in the way of production. Production depends on power to exchange. You erect barriers against international exchange and then go to the farmer and say: Produce more but do not seek markets in which to sell your produce. It would be as rational to say to a man: Breathe freely, it is good for your health; and at the same time to put a string around his windpipe. You

prevent your foreign trade by tariffs, and then you say to the farmers: For goodness sake, in these serious times, produce more. Short-sighted!

Now I come to the British preference. The short-sightedness, I think, comes out especially in connection with the British preference. The Minister of Finance put some question to me in regard to the British preference, and indulged in that flippant sophistry which usually finds its expression in the columns of the Toronto News, about the preference not having been lowered. The amendment of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition does not say anything about the preference. It says there are additional obstacles being placed against British trade. That is what the amendment says, and that is what the tariff is doing—putting additional obstacles against British trade. No denial is possible to that simple statement.

Of course, my hon. friend comes along with his arithmetical and proportional calculation and says: but we are not doing so badly to Britain as we are to the other countries of the world. But what consolation is that to Britain? Suppose my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works—which God forbid—had fallen into the hands of the Germans, and his family had fallen into the hands of the Germans with him. Suppose they had said that he was so wicked a character that they would cut off both his hands and gouge out both his eyes; would it have been very much consolation to any remaining member of my hon. friend's family if they had taken from my hon. friend only one hand or only one eye? That is all there is to this childish argument. What is the good of talking about Britain still having a preference in the market if you are making the tariff so high that she cannot compete with our own producers? That is my answer to my hon. friend's economic refinements which he makes with such abundance and such a profuse use of the first personal pronoun.

What was the other question my hon. friend put to me? He said: "Were the duties against British goods raised by my right hon. friend for the purposes of protection?" I am enough of a Scotchman to answer my hon. friend's question by asking him another, and the other question I want to put is this: if my right hon. friend raised the duty on some specific British import to the point that it became a protective duty, how is my hon. friend going to get a revenue by raising it still higher? I trust that some of my hon. friend's colleagues will draw his attention to my answer to his question. War taxes? How can these be war taxes? If my right hon. friend made the tax protective and barred the goods from the country, or largely so, are they going to be admitted when my hon. friend raises the tax still higher? They know that there is only one answer to that question; it is a protective tax; it is a tax to protect the home producer. Do not let us hear any more about sacrifice just at this point in the argument.

My hon. friend's policy is short-sighted because, inevitably, we are handing over business to the United States. The United States, we are told, have imposed war taxes, but they have been sensible enough to do so not by way of raising the tariff, but by imposing a very large number of direct taxes. They have found out the fallacy of tariffs over there. It is a piece of absolute folly, hurtful to Canada, to put a tax, for example, on wool, at the very time when the United States are admitting wool free into their country, thus freeing the hands of their manufacturers. If you go to almost any manufacturer in Britain to-day and ask him why he prefers free trade to protection, he will say that it is because as a manufacturer he has done better under free trade. If you ask him why, he will say because of the cheap rate at which he can get his raw material. But in the terrible times through which we are passing and which are still in front of us, the highest wisdom of this Government in restoring the manufacturing industries and the prosperity of the commerce of this country is to be found in their following a road diametrically opposed to the road which has led Britain to the commercial and manufacturing supremacy that she has in the world to-day.

My hon. friend's policy is short-sighted, because after this war every one of us knows that we shall need British capital again. My hon. friend says that the present depression of trade exists because we cannot get capital. I want to call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that he has in his Budget taken the best way to debar British capital from this country. Just as when the British preference was first introduced, goods came and our goods went in payment, which is the basic principle of all international trade, so the people came, capital came and prosperity came. My hon. friend has reversed all this, with the zeal of a pervert.

Hon. W. T. WHITE: Don't you believe it.

Mr. CLARK: Don't believe what? Is my hon. friend not putting on these taxes?

Mr. WHITE: Do not believe the theory that you are putting forward.

Mr. CLARK: I am not dealing in theories. My hon. friend is the theorist for this Government, and the theory he puts forward to-night in this very connection was the most extraordinary that I ever heard come from a man who professes to be an economist. I hope he will not include me in his class any more; he is in a class absolutely by himself. My hon. friend puts forth the theory to-night that these tariffs of his will not bar out trade. Then what becomes of the "Made in Canada" propagandism? I said it was stupid, but it is worse than that if the tariff will not bar out trade. I will have to correct myself and call it wicked as well. Trade, as a rule, is not founded on sentiment. When the Investors' Review and the Economist, both journals of very high standing, animadverted to the disadvantage of the increased obstacles which my hon. friend has put on against British trade, they did not do so on the ground of the effect on Britain. They know something about trade and finance over there, and both these trade journals lamented the increased obstacles against British trade on the very grounds which I have now been bringing before the House; because of their hurtfulness to Canada and the Canadian people. They both support the fiscal policy which has made Britain what she is to-day in the hands of Mr. Lloyd George and his colleagues, who were in Parliament and preaching sound economics at the time when my hon. friend had scarcely escaped from the schoolmaster's rod. These papers lament the fiscal legislation that my hon. friend is introducing because of its hurtfulness to Canada. But I will say that if ever sentiment entered into relations of trade I would have thought it would do so at the present moment in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite. This is a view that is being held by large numbers of British people in this country. I have a couple of sentences that were written to me by an Englishman in Winnipeg the other day; the writer will be recognized as an Englishman by the straightforwardness, honesty, sincerity and strength of his speech. He says:

> Every one I hear talking thinks it is nothing less than a stab in the back, a real piece of treachery, helping the enemy. To borrow the whole cost of the war from England and then turn round and tax her goods extra, ostensibly to find the money to repay her, but really to give the tariff hogs a little more swill, is rotten.

That is how Britishers in the constituency of my hon. friend (Mr. Rogers) are talking about this tariff.

Hon. ROBT. ROGERS: That gentlemen is not acquainted with many people out there.

Mr. CLARK: My hon. friend may be mistaken on that point. In the last election Winnipeg gave a popular majority against the Government of which my hon. friend was once an ornament of about 8,000. My hon. friend should not be too sure about what he knows of the people of Winnipeg. My friend, Mr. Dixon, who was elected on that occasion by the biggest majority ever given, I think, a provincial candidate in Manitoba, is a free-trader and single-taxer, who came originally from the city of Nottingham. There are more people there who have fiscal light than my hon. friend dreams of. The last trial of strength was not very strong in support of the view which has just been expressed by the hon. gentleman, for whom I have a very great regard, so great a regard that I would not like him to live in a fool's paradise in this matter. Instead of spending his time studying electioneering politics I would recommend that he study economics, and then when he runs up against a propaganda like Dixon's he will be able to deal with it with arguments of a different kind to what are used in practical politics.

I wish the Government even now would repent on this matter of the British preference. I say it sincerely, I would not put a tax on British goods just now; and a man is always sincere when he commends others to take the course he would have taken himself. I would not put an additional obstacle against British goods at this time. I would have been too fearful of linking up myself, even in thought, with what has been done by the enemies of my country. If I may repeat what has been said by my right hon. leader this afternoon: "I would not fight British trade with tariffs at the time that the Germans are fighting it with submarines." It would be most impolitic to do so when British trade is doing so much for the world as it is doing. My hon. friends will tell me it is not Britain's trade, it is the Navy. Of course, it is the Navy. But what built the Navy? Protectionists will never build a navy. The last thing protectionists want is ships. If you

go in for the home market and interprovincial trade, which have failed you so lamentably at the present moment, and for the made-in-Canada propaganda you will never build many ships. The Navy is the direct result of trade. It is the final outcome of the commercial and the colonizing and civilizing qualities which are the glory of the British race. British trade is to-day the chief support of the Allies, Mr. Speaker, it is more than that. It is itself the chief ally. It is British trade which is bringing succour to the poor and needy Belgian refugees. It is British trade which is enabling Britain to finance her own outlying dominions and the smaller belligerents states. It is British trade which is keeping open the ports of the North American continent and of all neutral states. It is British trade which is saving to-day the civilized world. Hon. gentlemen opposite think the time fitting to obstruct that trade, and at the same time propose to throw extra burdens on our own people. We on this side of the House most confidently believe that in this most serious crisis it is not wise either to obstruct your commerce or to burden your people.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (South Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer a few remarks with regard to the motion now before the House. After listening to the addresses on the Budget that have been delivered here this afternoon and to-night, I can imagine that at this late hour hon. gentlemen are pretty well loaded up with the subject, and that nothing new or interesting can now be said with regard to it. It is just about a month ago that the Budget was delivered in this House. For nearly two weeks we were living in expectation of the Opposition's taking up the discussion of the Budget; but adjournment after adjournment took place, until finally the financial critic of the Opposition replied. To-day we have listened to an address from the right hon. leader of the Opposition, who has moved an amendment dealing with one phase of the Budget. I believe that at this particular time in our history we should consider the questions that come before Parliament in a sober, serious manner, that matters should not be considered lightly or with levity. I regret to have come to the conclusion that that has not characterized all the addresses that have been delivered in this House.

I have listened with a good deal of interest to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Michael Clark), after addressing the House for an hour and a half. I have heard him on previous occasions dealing with public questions in this House, and I must say that I have often listened to him with a good deal of interest. But the very fact that to-night he has not been up to his usual standard is an indication that he found the subject a very difficult one. We all recognize in the hon. member for Red Deer a keen debater, a man with a logical mind who is quick to detect and reach the weak joints in the armour of his opponent; but to-night, if we are to judge by the vehemence and lung power which he displayed, I think he was sadly lacking in the arguments he is usually able to find. I shall attempt to deal with just a few of those he has advanced. We have listened with interest and sometimes with amusement to the arguments he has advanced in favour of that old hobby of his, free trade. We have heard him denounce protection to-night in a manner that would indicate that he was thoroughly sincere in that respect. But the hon. member for Red Deer is somewhat like the parrot that once found himself in difficulties, and who, after coming to a sober realization of the plight he was in, came to the conclusion that he had talked too much. I have heard the hon. member for Red Deer deal with protection from a different standpoint to that which he assumed to-night. I remember that he had made a speech on protection two years ago, and I took the trouble to find out whether he was always the ardent free trader that he is to-day. When I heard him denounce this made-in-Canada propaganda I could not help thinking that I had heard him on a similar subject in the past, and on looking over the records—and you can find his name displayed on almost every page of the records of that year—I found that the hon. gentleman did not always denounce the made-in-Canada movement that we hear so much about to-day. In fact, he championed it, and a very able and eloquent champion he was. I wish to quote a few remarks that he made in this House in March, 1913, which will be found in the Unrevised Hansard, page 4648. He said:

> The simple fact is that Canada cannot afford these dreadnoughts, sending money out of the country without recompense in the shape of developing industries within the country.

That was the attitude of the hon. gentleman at that time. Is that the song he sings to-day? No, he preaches an entirely

different doctrine. He was a made-in-Canada man at that time.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Is there anything inconsistent between defending my own house against a burglar and buying something from a neighbouring store?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: No, but I am inclined to think that if the people of the British Empire had been of the same opinion as the hon. gentleman on that occasion the burglar would be in possession to-day and we would be paying tribute to our neighbours. We would not be sending our men over to help Britain in the fight that is now engaging the attention of the civilized world. He goes further; he says that of the $91,000,000 of an increase in our trade of the previous year, only $9,000,000 represents the increase in exports. That means that we increased our borrowings to such an extent that our increase in production will barely suffice to pay the interest on our increased borrowings. To-day he says: Buy in the cheapest market and sell wherever you can. He denounced protection and he cited figures down to the year 1895. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that down to the year 1896 when the Liberal Government came into power, they had denounced protection and they had proclaimed what they would do with it if returned to power. Was it any wonder that the manufacturers of the country, that the people who desired to invest money in industrial development, were nervous at the possibility of those gentlemen being connected with the Government of this country? We know as a matter of fact notwithstanding the professions that were made at the time, the manufacturers were privately assured that if hon. gentlemen opposite came into power they would not repeal the protective tariff. Is it to be wondered at that capital obtained confidence after the late Government had been in power a few years? People realized that the protective tariff had come to stay, and that hon. gentlemen opposite were not sincere in their professions when they said they were going to repeal the protective tariff. Confidence having been established in the minds of people interested in manufacturing industries that protection was the policy of both parties, a great development took place between the period to which I refer and the present time. Year after year we have seen industries springing up, and we have secured the investment of hundreds of millions of dollars in different lines of manufacture. I know that the hon. gentleman from Red Deer does not like to hear this and in order to get away from a conscience that is troubling him he has, I believe, walked out of the House. I do not intend to devote further time to that subject.

The protective tariff that he has attacked to-night has been attacked also by hon. gentlemen opposite. They still sing that old song that we heard so much of in 1911—unrestricted reciprocity. The hon. leader of the Opposition said to-day: In 1911 you debarred us from selling to the United States and now you are going to prevent us from buying from Great Britain. Does he not realize that the markets of the United States are freer to us to-day than they were when reciprocity was an issue? Is it not a fact that we can sell more freely to the United States under the conditions that exist to-day than we could have done had reciprocity come into effect? I have the best of authority for making that statement and I am going to quote my authority. After the Wilson tariff had come into effect, my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) was in the United States, and he was calling upon the President. The Globe of November 27, 1913, contains the folowing allusion to this subject:

> Representative James R. Mann, the Republican floor leader of the House who has followed Canadian tariff matters closely, was asked what trade relations might be discussed between the Canadian Premier and President Wilson, Mr. Mann said: "I do not see what object Premier Borden could have in discussing trade questions with the President or the present Administration. I cannot understand what more could be obtained by Canada by way of trade benefits than the Dominion can now have under the Underwood tariff law. The United States gave Canada much more in the Underwood tariff reductions than the Canadian reciprocity proposed to give. While the latter Act was intended to be reciprocal, the Underwood Act is not, and Canada does not have to give anything in return.

That is pretty good authority. Yet in face of that we find that on March 7 of last year the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) who, I am sorry to find, has not been able to attend during the last few days on account of illness, made this statement in a public address delivered at Buffalo:

> "If an appeal were made now to the Canadian people," said Mr. Lemieux, "there would be an overwhelming majority in favour of the reciprocity pact."

That is also taken from the Globe of March 7, 1914. We had a similar statement from the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon), who is an ardent advocate of reciprocity. I can imagine what the condition of affairs would have been if at the

present time reciprocity had been in existence. With a war in progress in the old land and tariff entanglements that would be bound to create differences between us and the United States, the situation would have been one full of embarrassment. I have not admired the course of the United States during the whole progress of this war, and I am pleased that we have no entanglements, no alliances of any kind, but that we are able to assist the Empire in whatever manner we choose.

I want to call the attention of the House to a remark made by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition in his address this afternoon. He was referring to the truce which he claimed had not been observed on this side of the House. I have heard this question during the past few days discussed in the House. I have been quite of the opinion that there was no truce for some time past, if ever. I heard my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) make a statement that he and the leader of the Opposition had cancelled some meetings which they had intended to hold and that they had observed the truce. I can quite understand why they would cancel meetings at the time the war broke out. I can imagine what sort of a reception the leader of the Opposition would have had if he had gone out through this country holding political meetings at that time in view of the record which he established for himself in preventing Canada from doing her part to assist Britain in strengthening the naval forces of the Empire. He well might withdraw, but the Liberal press in this country, day in and day out, have continued to discuss political questions not at all as if a truce existed but as if they were going to avail themselves of every opportunity of gaining a political advantage. I want again to quote from the Toronto Globe which, as the House well knows, is the organ of the Liberal party in the province from which I come. In its editorial column it says:

"Our policy," said Sir Wilfrid, speaking of the attitude of himself and his supporters during the long session, "was that we should have two fleet units, one on the Atlantic and one on the Pacific, to take the places of the British squadrons which had been removed from these waters. . . . We on this side of the House are as ready to bear our burden, to discharge the duty we owe to the Motherland as British subjects, as any others can be; but we want to do it in the manner which was adopted by all parties at one time, when this question was approached free from party bias, by the organization of a Canadian navy on lines compatible with the autonomy of Canada." The

reference here is to the naval debate that grew out of the resolution of Mr. Foster in 1909.

Sir Wilfrid pointed out at some length, and with great clearness and emphasis, the effect of the removal of the North American squadron from the North Atlantic Ocean: all Canadian exports would, in the event of a foreign war, have to pass into and through the United States, to be carried to their destination under the flag of that country. The present war has made plain the prophetic character of this presage. The presence of a few German cruisers meant for a time serious derangement of British commerce, not merely on the Atlantic, but also on the Pacific and Indian Oceans. If Canada had, under the Borden Administration, carried out the Canadian naval policy, in co-operation with Australia and in accordance with the terms of their agreement of 1909, these German cruisers would never have produced a tithe of the alarm and destruction they caused.

This is the Liberal policy as outlined by the Liberal leader in Parliament. It purports to provide for the defence of Canada on both oceans, and also of Australia and New Zealand.

That editorial was contained in the Toronto Globe of November 25, 1914, and other editorials of a similar nature have appeared in that and other papers, all of which goes to show that the Liberals have not been keeping the truce. The Winnipeg Free Press also contained similar statements, one of which I shall read:

Among the nations of the Empire, Australia stands higher now in the sight of all the world by reason of the achievement of the cruiser Sydney of the Australian navy. Canada in 1909 adopted the Canadian navy policy by unanimous vote of the Dominion Parliament, on a resolution moved by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and seconded by Mr. Borden. This Dominion entered into an agreement with the Commonwealth of Australia to co-operate on the Pacific with Dominion navies. That agreement was abandoned by the present Government of this country. Would it not have been a fine thing if a cruiser of the Canadian navy, say the Winnipeg, had chased down and destroyed the Emden?

I would point out to hon. gentlemen opposite that they have not observed the truce, when their press contains such articles as these by which they are deliberately attempting to mislead and influence the people of this country. In 1909 the three Dominions, Australia, New Zealand and Canada, decided to share the burdens of naval defence. All three Dominions started even and Australia built a whole fleet unit and New Zealand built a battle cruiser in 1909, but down to nearly the end of 1911, when the late Government went out of power, we find that Australia and New Zealand had completed their part of the contract and Canada had not done anything. The Liberal Government did not attempt to do anything with regard to naval defence; it was a matter of procrastination with them. Not a ship was

built, not a keel was laid, not a contract was given by the Liberal Canadian Government during all the time they were in power. To-day they say: why we were just on the verge of doing something when the change of Government took place. I say, Sir, that tenders called for by the late Government were received on the 1st of May, 1911, and shortly after that, on the 12th day of May, Sir Wilfrid Laurier and two of his ministers, went to England to attend the Imperial conference, there to throw cold water on Imperial matters. They arrived back in Ottawa on the 12th of July, the dissolution of Parliament took place on July 29th, and the election was held on the 21st of September. During all these summer months the tenders were lying in the office pigeon-holed, and the Government never made any attempt to let a contract. This showed that they were not sincere in what they were professing to the people of this country; it proved that they had no intention whatever of carrying out the policy they were preaching with regard to naval defence: I believe that the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) gave us an insight into what was the custom and habit of the Liberal party, not only when in power, but when in opposition, when the other day he stated in this House: that he had come to the conclusion that political parties are justified in certain instances in not keeping promises which they never should have made. Is not that a nice doctrine to preach? That political parties should not keep promises which they should never have made. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Nesbitt) did not go so far as to say that if it was going to have any political effect it might be a good thing to make these promises and to not observe them afterwards. Later on, in his speech, the contention of the hon. member (Mr. Nesbitt) was that the present Government should not only ignore what the late Government had done with respect to the building of the Hudson Bay railway, but be done with the whole thing. He indicated that the late Government, although they had made extensive and expensive surveys, and had made a careful estimate as to the resources of the country through which the railway passed, were not absolutely convinced they were justified in building that road. The impression he would leave on the minds of the people is, that this was one of the promises that the late Government would be justified in breaking. In contrast to that, let me point out that at a political meeting at which I was present not very long ago, during the South Huron by-election, the right hon. the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), late Minister of Railways, were present, and if I remember corectly, and I think I do, the hon. member for South Renfrew said: the Tory Government we now have in power in this country have done nothing; they have not put any practical legislation on the statute books; it was not they who initiated the Hudson Bay railway, I signed the contract for the building of that road, and all the credit should go to the Liberal Government and not to the present Government. What are we to think when we find a member of the Opposition getting up in this House and asking us to denounce the building of the Hudson Bay railway now, and to disregard the contract that had been entered into by our predecessors? Is that the kind of honour we want to see on the part of governments and political parties in this country? I say no, and I hope that such a damnable doctrine as that will receive the treatment it ought to receive from the people of Canada. That is not the kind of honour we want to see inculcated into the youth of this country? I may say that a more pernicious doctrine was never preached by any political man in this country than that which fell from the lips of the hon. member for North Oxford on that occasion.

I want to make a few further references to this truce, which has been violated by the Toronto Globe, by the Winnipeg Free Press, and by almost every Liberal candidate who has been nominated during the past few months. The most offensive partisanship has been displayed by these gentlemen at these conventions, and it has been published broadcast in the Liberal press throughout Canada. I want to say, Sir, that the record of the Opposition with regard to the construction of the navy is just exactly in keeping with the doctrine that was preached by the member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt). I want to say, further, that only on January 19 of last year we had a statement from the leader of the Opposition in this House, which gives a pretty fair index of what was in his mind, and, indeed, the same idea was expressed by many hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. The right hon. gentleman said:

> Emergency? Who speaks to-day of emergency? Twelve months have passed since my right hon. friend the Prime Minister introduced his measure. Twelve months and more have passed since that time when he saw the German peril. He saw Germany almost ready to jump at the throat of Great Britain. He saw clouds

on the horizon; he saw these clouds rent by lightning; he heard the murmurs and rumbling of distant thunder. But my right hon. friend to-day lives in peace. The atmosphere is pure, the sky is clear.

Those were the predictions of the right hon. gentleman just one year ago. Two years ago he succeeded in defeating the proposition introduced by the Prime Minister of Canada to render some assistance to the British Empire, and to remove the stigma and reproach standing against us to-day that we have never done anything for the Empire; that we have been receiving favours at the hands of Great Britain, and that we have never displayed the manliness to assume a share of the burdens of Empire. When the Prime Minister brought down that measure it was defeated by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition and those who sat behind him in this House and by his followers in the Senate. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), who was heartily in accord with the policy of his leader, on the same day, January 19, 1914, made the following statement:

> The whole case of contribution was a case of emergency, and the emergency disappeared when the fleet went to Gibraltar. And if it disappeared at that time, where is the emergency to-day? My right hon. friend knows, and every one of his supporters knows, that the fleet has been dispersed to the seven seas and the German fleet with it—and every lover of civilization is very glad to see that come about. And that dispersal of the fleet is the second absolute justification of all that the Opposition did last winter, whether it was in the House of Commons or in the Senate.

That shows where the influence exerted in the Senate came from.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition says: "In Great Britain the Government have called the Opposition in and have consulted with them as to conditions in regard to the war; they have taken them into their councils. He complains: We have not been taken into the councils of this Government; consequently, you need not complain if we criticise you to-day. Let me tell the right hon. gentleman that the attitude of the Opposition in the old country was not the same as the attitude of the Opposition in Canada. They have not displayed the same disposition that has been displayed here year in and year out by hon. gentlemen opposite. During all the years that my hon. friends were in power and during the few years that the present Government has been in power, my hon. friends opposite day in and day out have exerted themselves to prevent Canada from assuming her part of the burden of the Empire. Is it any wonder, with a record such as that, that the hon. leader of the Opposition was not called into the councils of the Government. He says: Do not complain if to-day we are criticising the course of the present Government. Is it pique that influences the right hon. gentleman? Is he so sensitive because he has been left out that he finds it necessary to criticise the Government on a question of this kind with the Empire engaged in the most serious war that has ever taken place in the history of the world, with millions of men armed to the teeth, with the contesting parties locked together to-day in a death struggle, each realizing full well what defeat or victory will mean to them? Is this a time for a political leader to exhibit a disposition of that kind and to complain that because he has not been consulted by the Government, he will criticise it?

The right hon. gentleman occupied most of his time in picturing the grave injustice which would be done to the poor man, and how the wealthy man was going to escape practically scott free. He referred to the tax on railway tickets. He did not tell hon. members that the wealthy man was taxed twice to the poor man's once. The wealthy man is taxed when he purchases his ticket and also when he takes a seat in the Pullman car. I could not see any force in my right hon. friend's argument. I have taken the trouble to look the matter up, and I am still of the same opinion.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Would my hon. friend not consider it a reasonable proposal that a second-class ticket should bear a smaller rate of taxation than a first-class ticket bears?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I do not see that there is very much difference. As a matter of fact, I think most people travel first-class in this country.

Mr. SINCLAIR: You would get all the more revenue, then.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I think the explanation given by the Minister of Finance this afternoon covered that matter thoroughly.

At the outset of the remarks of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) he referred to the purchase of submarines by the present Government, and also to a speech that he had delivered some time ago with regard to submarines and the part they were going to play in the war of the future. I do not know whether I have the speech to

which he referred or not, but you can find the name and the speeches of the hon. member for Red Deer plastered all over Hansard of that session. In that year, 1913, he made the following statement:

> My thirteenth point is that this gift of money at this particular juncture of the world's history is from the point of view of science a most unwise policy. If I am right in my reading of the future I believe that science will join with religion to end war and I think that science in the end will prove a more powerful factor than religion, because religion has taken a long time about it. I submit that from a scientific point of view Canada is behind the day in going in for the construction of dreadnoughts. Before the dreadnoughts are completely built we may find that we might as well have thrown the $35,000,000 into Deptford basin. The future war is to be a war of airships, and, when you have have a war of airships, you will soon have the end of war as far as civilized people are concerned, because when airships get into business the people who make the war will be hit. If an airship can cross from Germany and drop a shell upon the Imperial House of Commons and possibly strike the Minister of War or the Minister of Foreign Affairs they will arrange their policy in such a way as to avoid war.

In order to point out the frivolity that has characterized hon. gentlemen opposite in their discussion of these questions at this time, I want to say that never in the history of the world has the efficiency of the dreadnought been so demonstrated as it has been during the present war. What do we find to-day? We find that the fortifications on the Dardanelles are being blown to pieces by British dreadnoughts. We find that the dreadnoughts in the North Sea are guarding the commerce of the world. The enemy has been simply wiped off the ocean. In the battle which took place at the Falkland Islands was victory not due to the fact that we had ships sufficiently powerful to get within range of the enemy? The cause of the loss we suffered off the coast of Chili, was owing to the fact that our ships were not able to get within range of the German ships before they were sunk. And yet we find in this House that, in spite of conditions such as I have indicated the hon. member for Red Deer, with all that wisdom with which he believes himself possessed still refers to what he said two years ago and contends that the submarine and the airship are going to settle the wars of the future. We are more concerned with what is taking place at the present time than with what may take place five, ten, fifteen years hence. Just one year ago when hon. gentlemen opposite were taunting the Prime Minister by saying that the emergency had passed, what was that right hon. gentleman doing? Was not he organizing a committee composed of the heads of the various departments in order to prepare for just exactly what took place a few months later, so that when war broke out between Great Britain and Germany we found ourselves in a position to proceed immediately owing to the work that had been done?

I wish to quote just two or three remarks made by other speakers. The hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) spoke on this subject on June 20, 1914, Hansard page 51. This is what I find recorded in Hansard as having fallen from the lips of the hon. gentleman who is to-day criticising, or attempting to critise the Government for what they are doing to provide the sinews of war and to remove the stigma, the reproach and the shame from our escutcheon that rests there to-day:

> There was presented to Parliament last session a measure providing for an expenditure of $35,000,000 for the construction of three battleships and the presentation of them to the British Admiralty. This policy was urged upon the ground that Britain's supremacy was imperilled and that a great conflict was imminent between two great European powers. Tokens and signs we were told were not wanting. There were pealings of thunder and flashes of lightning, premonitions of this terrible naval conflict between two great naval powers, and upon this ground we were urged, cajoled and threatened to support this measure of the Government. We were told it was purely an emergency policy: that the Government had in mind the adoption of a permanent policy which they would shortly present to Parliament. Several months have at least elapsed since then. The evidence of the emergency conditions and of the European Armageddon has vanished: time has vindicated the position which the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House took upon that occasion. The relations between Great Britain and Germany have improved immensely since then.

That is, since a year before when the Government of Canada were endeavouring to do something that would render effective aid to the Government of Great Britain.

I said that the Government had organized a committee of the various heads of departments associated with the head of the Militia Department to make preparation for what was apparently inevitable owing to the action of the German people. During every session since I became a member of this House the Opposition have concentrated their energies on the criticism of the Militia Estimates. They ridiculed the idea of this country being called upon to do anything in defence of the Empire. They sneered at the men who wore the King's uniform. The men who are sitting in this House to-day who have not volunteered for service threw slurs at the men who at that time

12 p.m.

were wearing the uniform. I would call attention to the remarks of the hon. member for Caleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell). These remarks were made on the 1st of June, 1914, just two months before war broke out:

The principal cause of the trouble with the minister—

That is, the Minister of Militia.

—and his top-heavy militia is the report of a general by the name of French, who came to this country some years ago, and in my judgment his visit was one of the greatest misfortunes that has befallen Canada.

I told the late Minister of Militia publicly and privately that in adopting the ridiculous and unreasonable report made by this gentleman, he had committed a great mistake. It might be all right if General French was reporting on the conditions in Bulgaria, or Russia, or Germany, or even Italy, but when it comes to a country like Canada where there is not a possibility of trouble, his ideas are ridiculous. There is no more possibility of a war breaking out between Canada and any country in the world than there is of the Minister of Militia or myself, committing suicide between now and to-morrow morning.

The department brought over a man like General French and he lays out the country in divisional areas. That was not enough and they had to increase the divisional areas and get more officers. That was not bad enough, although the Lord knows it was pretty bad. Last year they brought over another of these gentlemen, General Sir Ian Hamilton. I do not think we have suffered so much from his report as we did from that of General French, because the most of the damage had been done already; perhaps I am not voicing the sentiment of every one in this House, and I presume I am not; but I want to give the minister credit for getting rid of this foreign—

He heard a hiss pass through the House at that, and so he said:

—I will take that word back. This English General Inspecting Officer, or whatever you call him. When I was in Germany, I admit that I could see the result of the military training there: you could see it as the men walked along the street. In Canada you do not get enough military training for it to be of any benefit physically. All you get in the militia of Canada is that you teach about 25 per cent of the men in Canada how to get drunk.

This was the hon. member for Carleton's estimate of the men who belong to the militia of this country. I say that a more contemptible insult was never hurled at the men wearing the King's uniform. These words are on Hansard, and they will remain a reproach against the hon. member for Carleton as long as he lives and does not volunteer for service in order to remove the reproach that stands against him. And what did we hear from another hon. gentleman, also very close to the late Government, and now one of the chief whips of the party of hon. gentlemen opposite?

The Minister of Militia has not been hoping to build up a militia which may be and which ought to be useful; he has been simply building up a militia which may be called out at any minute. His idea is absolutely wrong, and it is not a good idea for the young people of Canada to grow up with. I am in favour of the militia, but a minister who is in charge of the Militia Department of the Dominion of Canada and who is building up a militia day in and day out along the lines that to-morrow we may be at war with somebody, has not got the right idea in mind and is imbuing the spirit of war into the souls of the people of this Dominion. There is no question about the necessity of a militia, but why should we spend in militia the enormous sum we are spending to-day is more than I can understand.

[Mr. Sutherland.]

Numerous criticisms of this kind were hurled against the militia expenditures and the Minister of Militia. Hon. gentlemen opposite to-day contend that we should reduce the expenditure of this country. Is this one of the items that they want reduced? Have they the hardihood to say: We do not approve the enormous war expenditure you are making? No; they say: We are heartily in sympathy with the voting of $100,000,000 or whatever sum may be required. I ask the hon. member for Red Deer: Is it not well that the Government should be prepared for the situation which has arisen? If hon. gentlemen opposite were sincere in the professions which they have made during the course of this debate; if they were anxious to unite with the Government of the day in rendering whatever aid they could to the Empire, they would not have made the flimsy criticisms which they have made in connection with the proposals of the Government.

On June 1 last, just two months before the outbreak of war, the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) made the following remarks:

I agree that according to his own judgment he has been doing his best.

That is, the Minister of Militia.

But he is far too enthusiastic in the course he is pursuing. He is far ahead of his time; in fact, the time will never come in this country when the expenditure he proposes will be justifiable.

Mr. Sam. Hughes: Take care; do not be too sure.

Mr. Guthrie: I do not take much stock in these warnings given by the minister at Victoria and Toronto as reported by the newspapers in those cities. We must realize and I am sure his colleagues do realize—that this is a country of peace and not of war.

These are the sentiments of hon. gentlemen opposite as expressed before war was declared. They criticised with all the vigour which they could command the estimates of the Militia Department. What do they say to-day? The hon. member for South Well-

ington said that he did not take much stock in the statements made by the Minister of Militia at Victoria and Toronto. Have they not turned out to be correct? Is there a man in this House or in this country who will say that the Minister of Militia from the outset has not displayed wonderful foresight and organizing ability in connection with the mobilizing of the troops at Valcartier a few weeks after war was declared? After the troops had been drilling, shooting and undergoing strict discipline for a few weeks, a murmur of impatience arose from many hon. gentlemen opposite because the troops were not being hurried to the front. I believe it would have been better if the men had remained at Valcartier longer than they did; the training that they were undergoing there was hardening them for the work which they will have to do. The unfortunate weather conditions which they encountered when they crossed the water were such as even the authorities in Great Britain could not be expected to foresee, and I believe that the men were not physically as fit when they went to the front as when they left the Canadian shores. But it is to-day a standing compliment to this Government and to the Minister of Militia that these troops were mobilized and sent to the front in such a satisfactory manner. I want to say that if there is a man in the country who objects to the war tax, the best thing he can do is volunteer for service at the front. The men who are prepared to pay the taxes realize that they are not making much of a sacrifice compared with that which is being made by the men who have gone to the front.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The hon. gentleman says that gentlemen on this side of the House or anywhere in the country who oppose this Budget ought to volunteer for active service. May I ask the hon. gentleman why he does not volunteer himself?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I am not objecting to the sacrifice that hon. gentlemen opposite are objecting to; that is just the point I want to emphasize. The man who objects to contributing by way of taxation to the defence of the Empire ought to volunteer for active service and thus show that he is prepared to make some real, actual sacrifice.

Mr. SINCLAIR: No one is objecting to the war tax, so far as I know. I never heard of any objection.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is the so-called war tax to which we object.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: That brings me back to the matter that I thought had been effectively cleared up by the Minister of Finance this afternoon.

Mr. SINCLAIR: There are two resolutions on the Order Paper, one relating to a war loan, and the other to domestic affairs. I should like to hear my hon. friend's opinion of the one relating to domestic affairs.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: During the course of his remarks the junior hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) said:

> I understand hon. gentlemen opposite to contend that the falling revenue and the fresh taxation imposed is due to the war. If I am not correct in this, let the correction come now. At any rate, this point is worthy of investigation. I personally do not believe that our loss in revenue is in any substantial degree attributable to the war.

The hon. gentleman does not believe that the falling revenues are in any degree attributable to the war. Yet the revenues of the United States, a country which is in a position to reap enormous benefits from the war; a nation which has shown no inability to take advantage of opportunities to make financial gain, have been galling to such an extent that they have been obliged to resort to war taxes. Some months previous to the war large financial concerns in this country suddenly began to experience a condition that was somewhat unusual. Several months before war was declared one of the largest transportation companies in the world, with most of its assests in Canada, experienced a condition of affairs that to many seemed unfathomable. How was that? It was owing to the fact that for months previous to the declaration of war, early in August last, it was decided by those responsible for the war that the war should take place in the near future, if the date had not actually been fixed. We find that the stock of the Canadian Pacific railway, one of the greatest corporations in the world, had fallen from $280 per share to as low, recently, as $155 per share. What was the effect upon the other large transcontinental lines in this country which had not developed traffic to the same extent as the Canadian Pacific railway, and which did not possess the wealth of that company? The condition of these other lines was such that they had to come to the Government for assistance; and in order to prevent these roads from going into the hands of a receiver the Government found it necessary to do something in order to carry them over for the time. Hon. gentlemen opposite are well aware of that. They know perfectly

well that these conditions existed not only in Canada, but in other countries. There was a falling off in our revenues, and as the Minister of Finance pointed out to-day, and pointed out so clearly that I am satisfied hon. gentlemen opposite are well seized of the weight of the arguments he advanced, it was necessary in order to meet the falling revenues of the country, to increase the customs taxation of this country.

The hon. gentleman also referred to pensions. To-night I received a letter from the Militia Department with regard to a young man from my own town who went over with the first contingent. He has already been injured so that his eyesight is seriously affected for ever, and the notice says that he will become eligible for a pension. You may rest assured, Mr. Speaker, that as the days go by, dozens and scores and hundreds —thousands I am afraid—of the men who are to-day across the water or mobilized here ready to depart at a moment's notice, will have to be compensated by means of a pension for the injuries received during the war. Many things have to be considered in connection with this.

There is one other matter I wish to refer to before sitting down, and that is the remarks on the British preference made the other night by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). Those remarks have already been dealt with by the Minister of Finance, but I wish to call attention to them again. We have heard hon. gentlemen opposite wax indignant, not when they were accused, but when their record was held up before them, and when after having spelt it out to themselves they came to the conclusion that the record reflected on their loyalty. The hon. member for Assiniboia said:

> Tax the banks and the trust companies and the insurance companies; tax every one, make them pay what money you want; but for Heaven's sake keep your unholy and disloyal hands off the British preference.

He waxes indignant when he thinks that this Government have done anything that could be interpreted as touching the British preference. As a matter of fact, what the Government have done is to increase the British preference by 2½ per cent. That is the interpretation, and the only interpretation, of their action. But what did the hon. member for Assiniboia say a couple of years ago? He is reported on page 4684 of the unrevised Hansard of March 3, 1913, to have used these words:

> If we are to provide ships does it not seem reasonable that, as far as possible we should build them at home?
>
> [Mr. Sutherland.]
>
> I am not going to say that it might not be advisable in the first instance, as far as large vessels are concerned, to have them built in the Old Country.

That is the very thing we were contending for. We wanted the dreadnoughts built in the Old Country, so that we could render at the earliest possible moment effective aid to the Empire. He goes on:

> Why not make a start now. Why not use a part of this $35,000,000, that we are proposing to send out of the country, to establish the necessary shipyards in our own country, where these vessels could be built by our own men and out of our own material as far as possible. Do you think that it will appeal to the labour men, or to the farmers who supply the the food stuffs for these labouring men, to have this money sent out in a lump sum to another country.

To another country, mind you, not to our own country or to the British Empire, but to another country. He was afraid that we were going to send the money to a foreign country to assist its working men and deprive our farmers of a home market. He was strong on the farmer, the western farmer as he called him. He goes on:

> I know this policy does not appeal to the farmers that I represent. They take the ground that if we are going to spend $35,000,000 on war vessels, it should be spent at home. That is the policy that ought to appeal to Canadians, and that would appeal to my hon. friends on the other side of the House if it were not for the arrangement between the governing party and the Nationals. We are spending millions of dollars to bring people into the country, and here we are sending millions out of the country instead of providing work at home for the people that we are bringing in. Hon. gentlemen opposite are always ready to advocate the home market. Where are their home market principles on this occasion? Why do they not carry out the policy of building up the home market? It would be quite easy to do, it would be in line with what they have been advocating for many years.

This is the hon. gentleman who says: "Keep your unholy and disloyal hands off the British preference." He was not willing to allow British workmen to build British men-of-war to be paid for by Canadians. That is what this super-loyalist on the Opposition benches said, this man who says, "Keep your unholy and disloyal hands off the British preference." How loyal, how patriotic they are to-day! What a change has come over them during the past few months! And let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that in view of the record they have made for themselves, not only during the time they were in power but when they were in Opposition, I believe the people of this country are justified in coming to the conclusion that these gentlemen endeavour to trim their sails to catch every breeze that

blows, that they are opportunists pure and simple, and that they were opportunists all the time they were in power; that the reproach against them to-day is that they were not sincere in their professions of loyalty to the Motherland and to the British Empire in the statements they made in this House and out of it.

I have another quotation here which I thought might interest the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) who is I believe to follow me. On March 3, 1913 the hon. member for Guysborough said:

> No Canadian will ever get a dollar of the money.

He is speaking of the money to purchase the dreadnoughts to be used in increasing the effective naval forces of the Empire. He is a strong protectionist now; he is not so much worried about the British preference as he is about the Canadian workman.

> No Canadian workman will be engaged in the building of the ships, and no Canadian material will go into them. The fact that the Government will have something to do with the letting of the contracts on the other side of the water will not give very much comfort to the people of Canada when they know that all the money is going out of the country and that the workmen of the Old Country, who are already overcrowded with work, will get the benefit of it.

He was afraid that those dreadnoughts would be built, that they might be available, that they would not be built in Canada, but that they would be built by British workmen. It is so characteristic of hon. gentlemen opposite that, as I said at the outset, Hansard is chock full of it. I have run across another statement from the hon. member from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) which goes to knock out the argument that he has been advancing here with regard to the made-in-Canada propaganda which, according to that hon. gentleman, is not only wicked but stupid. His argument was just as strong, just as conclusive as that of the hon. member for Guysborough, and perhaps a little more so, along the same line, that these boats should be built in Canada. He said:

> The simple fact is that Canada cannot afford these dreadnoughts, sending money out of the country without recompense in the shape of developing industries within the country.

He was a great protectionist at that time.

I want to make one or two references to a matter which has already been touched upon by the Finance Minister. I am taking this from the Globe of March 14, 1904. The right hon. leader of the Opposition delivered an address in Toronto, and I believe that on the following night he delivered a similar one in Guelph. The meeting was during an election campaign in which there was no issue but this great transcontinental railway that he was going to leave as a monument to his skill as a statesman. My right hon. friend was picturing this project to the people in that delightful manner of his that is so captivating, and he led the people to believe that we were going to have the very best transcontinental line. He declared that in order to demonstrate that it was the shortest route all you had to do was to take a rule and draw a straight line across the map of Canada which straight line would show the transcontinental railway. This is what he said:

> I will not bore you with figures; I will give you the figures compiled by the experts of the Finance Department, who calculate that what we would pay in interest for seven years represents a sum in cash which, if it were put in the bank to-day, would amount to a little more than $13,000,000, and a little less than $14,000,000.

He had it figured out pretty closely between $13,000,000 and $14,000,000.

> That is all we would have to pay for the struction of the road if—

Then he qualifies it with the word "if" that comes into almost every statement that he makes:

> —if our expectations and contracts prove to be as accurate as we think they are. I ask you, my fellow-citizens, if we can get that tremedous railway for $14 000,000 do you think that will be so very heavy a burden for the Canadian taxpayers, when I tell you that the surplus we had in the year 1902-3 was $14,000,000, and last year, 1903-4 it was $15,000,000? This is the project I have to lay before you, this scheme and plan of the Government.

He was prophesying what that road was going to cost. We have to-day some definite knowledge as to what the cost of this road is likely to be. We had a statement from the Minister of Finance this afternoon that that portion of the road from Winnipeg to Moncton has cost this country $200,000,000. The hon. member for Guysborough asked why it is necessary to impose taxes outside of the war tax? It is just in order to meet contingencies of that kind. There are on the road west of Winnipeg large obligations that this country will have to meet. Speaking in the House the other day, I pointed out that one of the most serious questions that the people of this country, particularly the farmers, had to contend with is the transportation problem, and I said that I did not look forward with much confidence to the future or entertain the hope that we would be able to lessen the cost of trans-

portation. I said that there were three transcontinental railways nearing completion, with the Hudson Bay railway also under construction, with nothing like sufficient traffic to keep them busy, and that under these circumstances it would also be impossible for us to have low rates. We have pursued a most reckless and extravagant policy in regard to our railway construction, and the question is one that requires to be most carefully considered by Parliament and the people. I do not envy the task which confronts my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) in regard to these matters. We know that as a matter of fact the eastern portion of the transcontinental railway should never have been built, and that if the policy that the present right hon. Prime Minister had at that time in mind of extending the Intercolonial, upon which this country has expended enormous sums of money, westward to the lakes, had been adopted, it would have been more in the interests of Canada. That would not meet with the approval of hon. gentlemen opposite. They did not wish to encourage the Government ownership of railways. No, they would prefer to give some rich corporation advantages in that respect. Previous to the election of 1911, hon. gentlemen opposite who were then in power, guaranteed the bonds of the Canadian Northern railway for that portion of their line from Montreal west to Port Arthur, to the extent of $35,000,000. Their action on that occasion made it necessary for the present Government to again come to the assistance of the Canadian Northern railway, and everything that has since been done in that respect is a sequence of the course of hon. gentlemen opposite previous to the election of 1911.

We have heard considerable criticism of this Budget from hon. gentlemen opposite, who have declared that the proposals contained in it are not in the interest of the people generally and the farmers particularly. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) was very strong on axle grease. He said: They are going actually to increase the British rate on axle grease. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) was very strong on squid. He thought it was a terrible thing to increase the duty on squid. It seems that fertilizer was what he had in his mind.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think it is out of order at half-past twelve o'clock for the hon. gentleman to indulge in untruthful remarks.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I made no reference to the duty on squid. What I called attention to was the fact that squid had been made free, and the Government was boasting as to that. They had put a duty on fertilizers and many other things, and they were claiming credit for making squid and one other article free.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: It is quite evident, judging from the last remarks of the hon. gentlemen, that he is a little bit hazy yet as to what he did say. I have a distinct recollection that he associated squid with the fertilizers, and I think other hon. gentlemen who heard him will bear out my recollection. I want to say, Sir, that the increase in the duty on raw materials and free imports made it necessary that the tariff should be increased on the finished products. That is quite clear to every one who looks at the matter with an unprejudiced mind. So far I fail to have received a single objection from any one of my constituents against the Budget proposal, and indeed I have failed to see even a serious criticism of the Budget in the press of the country. I think it is a great compliment to the Minister of Finance that his proposals have been received in the manner in which they have by the people of Canada, and I deeply regret that hon. gentlemen opposite have not displayed a different spirit towards the policy of the Government at this particular time in the history of the Empire. I could understand them if they said: We do not approve of what you are doing, but in view of the seriousness of the situation, and in view of the fact that it is necessary for us to present a united front to the enemy and to assist the Motherland in every possible way in this crisis, we will defer our criticism for a future occasion. Had they done that, I think their action would have commended itself better to the people of this country. Let me commend to these hon. gentlemen opposite the patriotic words of Kipling:

> Oh, East is East and West is West,
> And never the two shall meet,
> Till earth and sky stand presently
> At God's great judgment seat.
>
> But there is neither East nor West,
> Border, nor breed, nor birth,
> Where two strong men stand face to face,
> Though they come from the ends of the earth.

Had the right hon. leader of the Opposition met the leader of the Government in this spirit, he would, in my opinion, stand much higher in the opinion of all Canadians than he does now.

Mr. JOHN H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): It is a very late hour for me to ask the indulgence of the House for a short time. My great difficulty in answering my hon. friend from South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) is not on account of the argument he has put before the House, but on account of the fact that he has been speaking to the wrong resolution. If you will refer, Mr. Speaker, to the order paper you will find there are two resolutions, one which relates to ways and means, and which concerns altogether our domestic affairs, and the other which relates to the borrowing of $100,000,000 to carry on the war. The resolution that is before the House is that relating to our domestic affairs, and the second resolution has not even been moved yet. When that resolution is called, I am quite sure it will pass without a dissenting voice; but it is a curious thing that my hon. friend has made a two hours' speech on a resolution that has not yet been called. Why should we have from him a long speech about dreadnoughts and about war, on a resolution that is not yet before the House? I think I can suggest a reason, and I think that reason is that this domestic resolution which we are discussing involves some explanation from Government supporters which my hon. friend is not prepared to give. For example, there is a deficit of $80,000,000 in connection with our domestic affairs, and it was due to the House that the hon. gentleman should have endeavoured to explain that. He did not do so, but he treated us to a long dissertation about dreadnoughts and matters that have no concern at all with what we are now discussing. My hon. friend must not think that he can answer criticisms of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House by telling us that the British and Allied fleets are pounding their way through the Dardanelles. That is a fact, and we are glad to know it, and we join with my hon. friend in wishing them Godspeed, and I may tell him that we are doing just as much to help them along as he or any other member on that side of the House.

I do not want to say anything at this stage that will open up old sores, but if I did venture to make a remark I might say that if my hon. friend and the Government that he supports had not made a football of the Canadian navy for party purposes, we would have at least four light cruisers of the style of the Australian light cruiser Sydney which did such splendid work in this war, to keep the trade routes open for British commerce, and to assist the old land in the struggle.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Why did you not build them?

Mr. SINCLAIR: The dreadnoughts which my hon. friend is talking about could not be ready for use at the present time. The contest in this House in regard to dreadnoughts took place in 1913. Perhaps it will be news to my hon. friend that the Queen Elizabeth, the newest dreadnought of the British fleet, was launched in 1912 and that it has taken the mechanics of Great Britain from that day until a month or two ago to prepare her for the work she is doing now in the Dardanelles. The dreadnoughts spoken of by my hon. friend would be to-day on the stocks in some shipyard in Great Britain, even if the Government had got their policy approved of, whereas if the Government which he supports had gone on with the Canadian navy proposed by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, we would have at least four ships to assist the old country in the fight which is now raging.

The question as to the truce between the two parties has been discussed a good deal in this House. My hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) has made the statement at a meeting in his city that there is no truce, and that there never was a truce. I beg to differ from him. No hon. gentleman who listened to the discussion which took place at the special session in August last, could come to the conclusion that there was no truce. My hon. leader on that occasion stated the position that the Opposition took in regard to this matter, and it was accepted very kindly by the leader of the Government and he complimented the leader of the Opposition on the patriotic stand he had taken in declaring that we should show a united front to the world in this awful struggle. They both acted on the truce that was then entered into, the proof of which was seen in the case of the by-elections. No candidates were put up in any of the constituencies in these elections, showing that it was well understood by both the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition that there was a truce between the parties at the time. This side of the House never had any notice from

the leader of the Government that the truce was broken, until we saw the speech of my hon. friend published in the newspapers. The question the people of this country are asking is: Is this Government really desirous to devote their whole attention to the war, or do they regard it of more importance to score another victory against the Liberal party than they do to defeat the Kaiser.

Is that the position they take? In Great Britain it is well understood and well known that there will be no election until after the war is over. As a result there is no party strife. Mr. Speaker, what would you think of the British Government if you were forced to the conclusion that they thought more of their salaries and of their places than they did of the fate of the Empire at such a time as this? I would like to have the same opinion of the Canadian Government as I have of the British Government, but if there is to be a truce, it ought to be a fair and honourable truce, and it ought to apply to both parties. There were indications in October last that the Government was preparing for an election. Large quantities of Conservative literature were sent out from the Conservative headquarters at Ottawa. A number of Conservative conventions were called in the West at the same time. The word was passed around to the faithful in the country. In the maritime provinces there was straws showing how the wind was blowing. It has been the custom in the maritime provinces for many years that the repairs to the Intercolonial should be done in the summer time, when the days are long and the weather fine; but to the astonishment of every one, the order came in the month of October, as I understand, to start out the working gangs on the Intercolonial.

Mr. COCHRANE: That is not true.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I was so informed, and I believe my information to be true. It was about the same time that the announcement was made at Winnipeg that seed grain was to be given to every one in the drouth-stricken districts in the West. A section of the Cabinet was somewhat outspoken on this question of an election. The hon. leader of the Government in the Senate at a public meeting of his friends in the city of Calgary is said to have stated in a confidential tone of voice that an election might come as a thief in the night. The Prime Minister himself was silent. So far as I know, he said nothing. That reminds me of a story that is told about a Presbyterian minister who received a call from another church where there was a bigger congregation and a larger salary. There was a good deal of local curiosity as to whether he would accept the call or not. He was very popular in his congregation. One of his congregation thought he could find out something by interviewing the minister's little son Willie. Accordingly he asked Willie if his father was going to leave. "Well," Willie said, "I cannot tell you—father has been praying over that question for the last three or four days; but while father has been praying, mother has been packing the trunks." That is something like the case here. While the Prime Minister was praying over the question of an election, the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Railways were packing the trunks. If the Prime Minister desires to have a truce from party strife and a quiet time to devote his whole attention to the war, he can have it by making a frank statement to this House; but he must not ask us on this side of the House to go to the jury without having an opportunity of stating our case.

I wish at the very outset to say that I was much pleased with the frank and candid statement of the Minister of Finance in his Budget speech at the opening of this debate. The tale was a very sad one, but he told it in plain language. He told us frankly that, leaving the war Budget out of the question altogether and dealing only with the ordinary and capital expenditure for the fiscal year ending on the 31st day of the present month, the country was face to face with the staggering deficit of $60,000,000. He frankly admitted that he saw no means of raising all this money from the revenue with which to meet the inevitable bills as they are presented for payment. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance is in the position of a bankrupt debtor who admits his liabilities and confesses that he has not the money with which to pay them. In order that there may be no question on this score, let me refer to his own language. In speaking of the fiscal year ending March 31, 1915, the Minister of Finance says:

> Taking all the foregoing into consideration, the increase of Canada's national debt for the year would probably aggregate $110,000,000. In this I am, of course including our expenditure for war.

The war expenditure for the past year, as every one knows, is $50,000,000. It is only fair that we should allow the interest on that, amounting to $2,500,000; but we have $110,000,000 of a deficit, according to the

minister. $52,500,000 of that deficit must be charged to the war, and $57,500,000 must be charged against the present Government.

For the fiscal year 1915-16 this is the forecast of the hon. Minister of Finance:

> Assuming that our total cash requirements for all purposes whatsoever, including our war expenditure, will amount during the coming year to over $300,000,000 while our revenue on the present basis would yield only $120,000,000 we are faced with the problem of raising by additional taxation and borrowing a sum in excess of $180,000,000.

To close the account for the year ending March 31, 1916, the minister tells us that he must borrow the unprecedented sum of $180,000,000. The war loan, including interest, accounts for $105,000,000 of that amount, and, therefore, we have to increase the public debt by the enormous sum of $75,000,000 to maintain the middleman in affluence and to keep the pot boiling. In other words, leaving the war altogether out of the question, the minister proposes to add to the public debt for the year ending March 31, 1916, the enormous sum of $132,500,000. That is a staggering addition to the public debt in the short space of two years.

During the fifteen years of Liberal rule, at a time when the country was engaged in great enterprises and was making enormous expenditures in such great public enterprises as the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Quebec bridge, the deepening of the St. Lawrence channel, the aids to navigation along the coast, the total increase in the public debt was $149,000,000, so that, apart from the war altogether, this Government proposes to add about as much to the public debt in two years as the Liberal Government did in fifteen years. If this enormous addition to the public debt was on account of the war, we would not complain; but there is not one dollar of the $132,500,000 for war expenditure.

The minister informs us that our whole war outlay is to be borrowed from Great Britain. It is a matter of regret that we did not show a little more independence. It is well for us that Great Britain is rich and also so generous. Great Britain has enormous burdens at the present time. It has been stated in the House to-night that no less than £2,000,000 a day is required to keep the army and navy going at the present time. Great Britain has to finance her allies; she is assisting a number of the smaller nations of Europe, and she is also assisting the colonial dominions, Canada is a rich country, and should do something for herself. On looking at the bank statement issued at the end of the year, I find that the people had on deposit in the chartered banks, including the Government savings banks, the enormous sum of $1,067,118,549. It would seem to me that we ought to have been able to float a loan in Canada, and to do something on our own account instead of borrowing the whole amount from Great Britain as we are doing at the present time.

In any criticism that I offer on this occasion to these proposals, I want to draw a clear distinction between what I call the extravagance and recklessness of this Government and the proposed war expenditure. I desire to express my cordial approval of the provision made for carrying on the war. I need not say that the struggle is of such vital importance to Canada and the Empire that we should not hesitate to throw all we have into the scale and mortgage our future if necessary in order to win. No country has ever gone to war with cleaner hands or with a more righteous cause. Every Canadian should be proud that we have an opportunity of taking some part, even though it be a small part, in the world's greatest struggle for freedom. We have our party differences in this House, but there is no difference on the declared policy of the Government to assist Great Britain to fight this war to a finish whatever the cost. We on this side desire to emphasize the fact that the Government can count on us absolutely to see the business through; but we will insist on honest administration and on proper treatment of our recruits. Attempts are being made here and there to gain some political advantage for the Conservative party out of the war. All such attempts should meet with the condemnation of every right thinking man in Canada. It has already been pointed out that campaign documents of this character have been issued from the bureau of the Conservative party. My hon. friend from North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) whom I regret not to see in his place, is said to have made a speech—I was going to say a hot-air speech—at a place called Hot Springs not long ago, in which he said that it was fortunate for Canada that the Imperialistic party was in power at the present time.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I should like to know from the hon. gentleman who says "hear, hear," what claim the Tory party has to the title of the Imperialistic party? What did they ever do to entitle them to the name? If anybody knows anything that the Conservative party ever did to entitle them

to that name, I wish he would stand up and tell us about it. There has been one step and only one taken since Confederation that had imperialistic significance, one step that touched the imagination and won the applause of men of British blood the world over. That step, as you will remember, was greeted with enthusiasm by England's great Imperial poet and by Her great Imperial statesman, the late Joseph Chamberlain. You will understand that I refer to the British preference. And this "Imperialistic" party supported by my hon. friend from North Ontario voted against the British preference.

There are two incidents of recent Canadian history that everybody remembers. The Tory party four years ago hitched up with the National party of Quebec. Now, it is a matter of history that the leader of the Natonalist party dictated the names of three members of the first Cabinet of the right hon. leader of this Government. Why did the leaders of the Nationalist party leave the Liberal party? The reason given in the province of Quebec is that the Liberal leader was too British for them; and in searching about for some party that was less British than my honoured leader, they allied themselves with hon. gentlemen opposite. I hope they feel at home there. We have a saying in our part of the Dominion, and I have no doubt that you have it in Ontario, that birds of a feather flock together. This "Imperialistic" party took to their bosom the gentleman who said it was necessary to shoot holes in the British flag in order to be free. They showered honours upon him, first making him Deputy Speaker, and then taking him into the Cabinet and giving him a seat at the Council board. I suppose that is regarded as an Imperialistic move by my hon. hot-air friend from North Ontario (Mr. Sam. Sharpe). That is incident number one. Number two is this present proposal to add 5 per cent to the tax on all British goods. Is this a time to strike a blow at the trade of Great Britain, when the old country is engaged in a struggle for her very
1 a.m. existence? With the enormous increase in freight rates and war insurance this 5 per cent is a heavy addition to the expense of doing trade at present between Great Britain and Canada. If hon. gentlemen will go to the reading room and turn up the files of the New York Herald, they will see that four or five months ago grain could be carried from New York to Liverpool at 2s. 6d. a quarter, and to-day it takes 7s. 6d. a quarter to carry the same grain. Rates of insurance have gone up enormously. So the handicaps against British trade are so great that it is almost impossible to carry on business with Great Britain at all. And on top of all this hon. gentlemen opposite come in with a 5 per cent additional tax on British goods. One can imagine the astonishment with which the news was heard in London, especially when a few months before the British Government had agreed to advance to the Canadian Government the whole war expenditure to be made by this country. I think I can see the blush on the face of the Canadian High Commissioner when he handed in the news to the British Government. One can imagine the feelings of the Kaiser when he heard the news that he had another ally in addition to the Turks, when he learned that he would not need submarines to stop trade between Canada and the old country, but that the Canadian Government would see to it that British trade would be crippled. One does not like to speak of it. Tell it not in Vienna, publish it not in the streets of Berlin, lest the daughters of the enemy rejoice, lest the daughters of the uncircumcised Hun triumph. Does my hon. friend from North Ontario regard that as an imperialistic move? I am glad to say that the Commonwealth of Australia has taken a different course; it has taken the patriotic course and is not interfering with the tariff on British goods. Australia, like Canada, found it necessary to raise money, and in December they made a new tariff. They increased their general tariff from five to ten per cent on a large number of imports, but almost without exception they have left British imports without an increase. There is no flag-waving party in Australia. Australia is British in the true sense of the word. As has already been remarked in the House to-night, there is more than one way in which Canada can take a lesson from the Commonwealth of Australia.

We all recognize that Canada is passing through a period of hard times. We may differ about the cause. Statesmen on this side of the House saw the depression coming prior to 1911, and they endeavoured to provide for it by opening new markets for Canadian products. Their efforts were frustrated, and Canada is having a taste of the depression that existed prior to 1896. There is a disposition on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to attribute the hard times to the war. Everybody who

has a good memory knows that that is not true. It will not be denied that real estate began to decline early in 1913. The receipts of the great railway corporations fell off long before the war. The Customs revenue began to decline about twelve months before the war broke out. In December, 1913, some of the large industrial concerns in Montreal closed their doors and thousands of men were turned out of employment.

Mr. GLASS: Is it not a fact that the financial conditions prevailing in 1912 were directly due to the war which was then taking place in Europe?

Mr. SINCLAIR: What war was that?

Mr. GLASS: The Balkan war.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I do not think my hon. friend can show that that was the case; I feel quite certain that he cannot.

I was pointing out that as early as December, 1913, many of the large industrial concerns in Canada had practically closed their doors. As a matter of fact, it has been shown that the war has actually had a favourable effect upon conditions in many parts of Canada. I could produce the evidence of many witnesses on that point. Reference has been made to the statements of a gentleman whose opinions are bound to be respected by hon. gentlemen opposite. I refer to the hon. member for West Toronto (Sir Edmund Osler), who is president of the Dominion Bank. The annual meeting of the Dominion Bank was held on January 22, 1915, and the following is an extract from a report of that meeting:

> In moving the adoption of the report, Sir Edmund Osler, the president, took occasion to discuss somewhat plainly some current misconceptions regarding commercial and banking affairs. He intimated that the business situation in Canada at the present time was being assisted rather than injured by the circumstances arising out of the war. The prevalent depression, he thought, had been little intensified by the outbreak of hostilities, and it had, in fact, been relieved to an extent by the higher values which it had placed upon the country's produce and by the employment produced by the orders for war materials.

That is the view of the hon. member for West Toronto, and I do not think any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House will oppose it. I may also give the opinion of Mr. H. H. Richardson, general manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia, who keeps in close touch with business affairs in Canada. At the annual meeting of the Bank of Nova Scotia he used the following language:

> To be quite frank, those who blame the present depression on the war are only hugging a delusion.

These are the views of hard-headed business men, and they must be accepted. If hon. gentlemen opposite want an explanation for the hard times through which Canada is now passing, they must look for it nearer home. Confronted with these serious conditions, what have hon. gentlemen opposite done? Have they found a solution of the difficulty? Have they attempted to find a solution? The only panacea they have suggested is that we should borrow more money and spend it on party favours. Economy has been mentioned, but economy is the last thing this Government thinks about. On the contrary, they have indulged in the most reckless extravagance ever since they took office. We on this side of the House knew that a crisis was approaching in the financial affairs of this country. That crisis could not be avoided; the reckless extravagance of the Government was bound to bring it about. If my hon. friend the Minister of Finance sets the house on fire he must not complain when he sees it burn.

In 1911 my hon. friend fell heir to a fat surplus. In his first Budget speech of that year he admitted that the surplus left him by the late Finance Minister was $30,000,000. Accepting the slogan of my prodigal friend the hon. member for Queens, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Nicholson), "Dash away and spend the money," the Minister of Finance proceeded to dissipate it—a million here, two millions there, five millions somewhere else, fifteen millions to Mackenzie and Mann in one year and forty-five millions in the next. Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die; but we will have one belly-full anyway—that was the spirit in which they embarked on their prodigal career. They spent the resources of this country like a drunken sailor spends his wages; now they find that it is all gone and they are face to face with an enormous deficit. That is not what the people had a right to expect from the Conservative party; that is not what they promised prior to 1911.

My hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Hon. J. D. Reid)—I am sorry he is not in his seat—was a great economist prior to 1911. I remember that he and his associates held up this House for over two days and two nights discussing sixpenny tips that the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave to waiters in the city of London. When my hon. friend was in opposition he set his

face like a flint against extravagance; when he got over on the other side and secured a seat in the Cabinet his face was not in the least like flint—it was rather like pudding. He has been one of the greatest sinners in the matter of extravagant expenditure.

Hon. gentlemen opposite promised a reduction in expenditure. Some hon. gentlemen have had the hardihood to deny this, but we can produce the proof. The leader of the Conservative party on August 15, 1911, published in the Montreal Gazette the manifesto of the party, upon which the election was run. It was headed: "Conservative Policy; what the Party is Pledged to carry out." I quote the first paragraph:

The Liberal Conservative party gives its pledge to carry out the following policy if returned to **power:**

1. A thorough reorganization of the method by which the public expenditure is supervised. The increase in what is known as ordinarily controllable expenditure from $21,500,000 in 1896 to nearly $74,000,000 in 1911 is proof of extravagance beyond all possible defence.

A long list of other pledges and promises follow, and the whole is signed "R. L. Borden." There is the pledge, Mr. Speaker, but where is the fulfilment? Upon what occasions have the Government made any attempt to live up to that promise? Has there been any attempt to effect a thorough reorganization of the method of supervising expenditure? I venture to say that never since the days of McGreevy and Connolly has there been so little supervision of expenditure as there is to-day.

The Auditor General is supposed to look after grafters and persons who are trying to rob the treasury, but he is now busy looking after the ministers. The Auditor General recognized that in times of war, the Government must have a freer hand; accordingly, he arranged with them that Orders in Council would be issued authorizing special expenditures. But the Government did not adhere to that arrangement. For months the Department of Militia spent money right and left without any supervision whatever, and after the illegal expenditure had reached the sum of about $5,000,000 the Auditor General had to step in and refuse credit to the Finance Minister. This is what the Auditor General said:

This is a clear violation of the War Appropriation Act, and also of the understanding on which I consented to the issue of a letter of credit. I have, therefore, to request that you will inform the Department of Militia that their letter of credit is no longer available for payments on account of war appropriation, and to further cheques may be drawn for the purpose until the provisions of the Act are complied with.

[Mr. Sinclair.]

I regret the necessity for this action, but I have no other course open to me. I know it is a very serious matter to place any obstacle in the way of the Militia Department when the country is at war, and with this in view I consented to an arrangement which could not in any degree hamper the department. In return I had every right to expect that the Minister of Militia and Defence would not only carry out the agreement of his officials, but that he would also respect the direction of Parliament

(Signed) J. Fraser,
Auditor General.

So far as I know, the Finance Minister made no reply to that statement. But there you have the practice of the department; and I submit that that is supervision with a vengeance. I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 1.15 a.m. Thursday.

Thursday, March 11, 1915.

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

PRIVATE BILL INTRODUCED.

Bill No. 71, respecting the Sterling Life Assurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Macdonell.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Correspondence between the Auditor General and the Militia Department.—Major General Hughes.

Copy of Order in Council P.C. 304, regarding establishment of ranks of Lieutenant-Commander, Engineer Lieutenant-Commander, and Lieutenant-Commander, R.C.N.V.R., in the Royal Canadian Navy.—Mr. Hazen.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

WAR SUPPLIES—HORSES.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Who is Mr. Woodworth, who purchased horses for the Militia Department in the county of Pictou in 1914?

2. Where does he reside, and what is his occupation?

3. Were the horses he sold his own horses, or did he act as a middleman?

Major General HUGHES:

1. Mr. Woodworth purchased no horses for the Militia Department in Pictou county in 1914.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

THE CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. DEVLIN:

1. Did the Right Honourable, the Prime Minister, when leader of the Opposition, make the following statement at Halifax:

"A thorough and complete reformation of the laws relating to the Civil Service should be put into effect, so that future appointments shall be made by an independent commission acting upon the report of examiners after competitive examination. I am convinced that we shall perform a great public duty by establishing in this country that system which prevails in Great Britain, under which a member of Parliament has practically no voice in or control over any appointment to the Civil Service.

"To use the power of filling positions in the public service as a reward for party service and without regard to the character and capacity of the individual selected, is a gross breach of a solemn public trust. A private trustee so dishonouring his office would be subject to punishment by the criminal law."

2. If so, what was the object of making such a statement?

3. Have any appointments to the Civil Service been made since October, 1911? If so, how many?

4. If any, have the appointments to the inside or outside service been made upon the recommendation of a member of Parliament?

5. What steps, if any, has the Prime Minister taken to implement the above mentioned Halifax pledge?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. The language quoted consists of certain statements detached from their context but is substantially correct.

2. To impress the importance of the subject upon the people and upon the Government then in power. The purpose had considerable success as the then Government within a few months thereafter introduced the reforms effected by the Civil Service Act of 1908.

3. Appointments have been made to the Civil Service since October, 1911. A return to be brought down as soon as the necessary information has been compiled will indicate the number.

4. Appointments to the inside service are made upon the certificate of the Civil Service Commission under the provisions of the Civil Service Act. Appointments to the outside service are made upon the responsibility of the Government and after careful inquiry as to the character and capacity of the individual selected. For the purpose of obtaining such information the Government is ready to receive assistance from members of Parliament or from other persons who are capable of giving reliable information as to such character and capacity. The recommendation of a member of Parliament or any other person is not alone or of itself sufficient for the appointment of a public officer, as character and capacity must be taken into consideration by the Government.

5. The public steps which have been taken by the Prime Minister are within the knowledge of the hon. member asking the question, as they are on record in Parliament. As to other steps which have not yet been made public, any necessary announcement will be made in due course.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—ABUTMENT CONTRACTS.

Mr. WILLIAM CHISHOLM:

1. What was the estimated cost of the Intercolonial railway abutments recently built near Antigonish?

2. What was the contract price for the construction of said abutments?

3. What was the actual cost of said abutments?

4. How many tenders were received for said work, from whom, and at what figures?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. $22,100.

2. Amount based on schedule prices, $13,941.60.

3. Not in a position to state, as certain matters are still unsettled.

4. Nine; from the following: C. Edgar Whidden & W. E. Landry, Antigonish, N.S., $17,804; McDonald & McIntosh, Elderbank and Antigonish, N.S., $13,941.60; Walter McNeill, New Glasgow, N.S., $17,499.52; Chisholm, McGillivary & McDonald, Musquadoboit, N.S., $16,701.60; Roderick R. McLellan, Antigonish, N.S., $16,783; A. W. Girroir, Antigonish, N.S., $16,162; A. McGillivray, Antigonish, N.S., $14,088.20; K. A. Morrison, Ottawa, Ont., $17,492.20; E. R. Reid & E. M. Archibald, St. John, N.B., and Middleton, N.S., $22,106.

MR. A. GOBEIL.

Mr. KYTE:

1. When did A. Gobeil retire from the position of Deputy Minister of Public Works?

2. How long was he in that office?

3. What was the amount of his retiring allowance under the statute?

4. Is he employed by any department of the Government at the present time, and what is the nature of such employment?

5. What is the total amount he receives from the Government at the present time?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. 1st July, 1908.

2. Appointed deputy minister on 1st January, 1891.

3. $2,160.

4. No.

5. $2,160.

JOHN W. McLEOD.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Is John W. McLeod employed in the Department of the Interior or by the Conservation Commission?
2. If so, in what capacity?
3. Where are his headquarters?
4. What is his salary?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. Yes, in the Department of the Interior, temporarily.

2. Making an investigation in conjunction with McGill University into the present and future supply of timber for coal mining in Nova Scotia.

3. He has no fixed headquarters outside of Ottawa.

4. One hundred dollars per month.

RECRUITING AT HALIBURTON.

Mr. KYTE:

1. How many men have offered their services to the Minister of Militia from the township of Haliburton, and what are their names?
2. How many were accepted, what are their names, and where are they now stationed?

Major General HUGHES: The hon. member is not very well up in his geography. There is no such place as the township of Haliburton. There is a county of Haliburton and a village of Haliburton. If the hon. gentleman refers to the riding I have the honour to represent, the riding of Victoria and Haliburton, I may say that there have been 411 raised directly up to a week ago and about 80 since, making about 500 raised for the first contingent, 250 for the second, and 150 for the third. Nearly 1,000 men, all told from that riding have volunteered, directly or indirectly for active service.

THE LATE JOSEPH LeBLANC.

*Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. With reference to a statement made in the House of June 9, 1914, by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries relating to the request of Mrs. Margaret Richard, of Port Felix, N.S., for assistance for the adopted child of the deceased sailor Joseph LeBlanc, namely:

"Our information is that this child, who was living with him, was a nephew, and that the father of the child is living and is well able to provide for it.'

Who furnished this information to the minister?
2. Is it in writing?
3. If so, will the minister lay it on the table of the House?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Information is based upon a letter from Captain Stuart of C.G.S. Canada, addressed to Admiral Kingsmill, and dated April 10, 1914; contents of letter result of statement made by E. Richards, cousin of the deceased.

[Mr. Coderre.]

2. Yes.

3. Yes. The following is a copy of the letter above referred to:

Canada, Shelburne, Friday 10, 1914.

Dear Admiral Kingsmill,—I received your letter of April 6th in reference to J. LeBlanc who died last summer in Montreal General hospital. On inquiries from his cousin E. Richards, who is a fireman on board, LeBlanc was not married, but apparently was taking care of a boy, his brother's son, whose mother was dead and who I suppose Mrs. Margaret Richards now has charge of. As the father of this child is still alive, I can't see why Mrs. Richards has to take the responsibility.

LeBlanc's Government service dated from April 11, 1913 to July 29, 1913, a little over three months. I will make further inquiries the next time I visit Whitehead.

I remain,

Yours sincerely,

C. J. Stuart.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—ENVELOPES.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE:

1. Does the administration of Government railways make use of a certain kind of envelopes known as Window envelopes, made by the Transo Paper Company, Chicago?
2. Can those envelopes be procured in Canada?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes; one lot of one-piece envelopes with transparent window was purchased from Business Systems, Limited, of Toronto, on January 24, 1914.

2. These envelopes are not made in Canada.

LAKE ST. JOHN HYDROGRAPHIC WORK.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE:

1. Has the Government during the past two years had certain hydrographic work done on lake St. John, with a view to discovering if it were possible to dam the waters in the Grande Décharge canal, lake St. John, either by means of movable locks or otherwise?
2. If so, (a) at whose request was such work done, (b) what was their nature, who received instructions concerning them, and (c) what report was made to the Government?
3. What was the cost of such work?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.

2. At the request of the Chambre du Commerce du Saguenay. (b) District Engineer Amiot was instructed to make a survey and prepare plans; (c) No report has yet been received at headquarters.

3. $2,862.74.

POST OFFICE REVENUES.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE:

1. What has been the revenue of the Quebec city post office for the year ending the 31st March, 1911?
2. What has been the revenue of the same post office during the year ending the 31st March, 1914?

3. What has been the revenue of the Montreal city post office during the same two years?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1, 2 and 3:

	1911.	1914.
Quebec ..	$ 160,968 62	$ 184,362 24
Montreal ..	1,152,177 27	1,625,615 86

RIMOUSKI DREDGING.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. During the years 1913-1914 was any dredging or deepening work done on a little river between Lake St. Mathieu, county of Rimouski, to the station of St. Fabien on the Intercolonial railway?

2. If so, what sums were expended on such work?

3. Was such work done by day labour or by contract?

4. Who directed and superintended such work?

5. Were certain sums paid to certain people for damages sustained on account of the said work or otherwise, and what are the names of the said people, and the amounts received by them?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.

2. $4,849.15 in 1913; $997.33 in 1914.

3. Day labour.

4. The district engineer, Mr. J. C. Taché, and a foreman, Joseph Belanger.

5. Yes. $415 were paid to Messrs. Ernest Dionne and Honoré Chouinard, $400 of which was in settlement of their claims, and $15 for payment of legal expenses incurred.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—BRIDGEKEEPERS.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE:

1. What are the names of the persons who have been appointed as bridgekeepers on the National Transcontinental railway between the Escourt station and the Lefebvre station?

2. What is the salary of each of such persons?

3. By whom were these persons appointed, and on whose recommendation?

Mr. COCHRANE: The Department of Railways and Canals has no information.

DUTIES ON SPIRITUOUS LIQUORS.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE:

1. What is the amount of the duties paid on the spirituous liquors that were in the customs, from the 7th to the 21st August, 1914, and addressed to the following importers of the city of Quebec: Langlois & Paradis, Whitehead & Turner, Naz. Turcotte & Cie., J. B. E. Letellier, A. J. Turcotte & Fils, A. Toussaint & Cie., N. Rioux & Cie., Ledroit & Frère, Gagnon, Garant, Ltée., La Cie Européenne, Quebec Preserving Co., L. H. Levasseur, Joseph & Co., Geo. Patry, Geo. & Ed. Couture, Lévis, A. Carrier & Fils, Lévis?

2. What quantity of liquor was delivered to each of such importers during the said period?

3. What are the amounts that have been readjusted between each importer and the department on the goods delivered between the 7th and 21st August, 1914?

4. In what way did the Government fix such readjustments, and did it fix the amounts thereof?

5. Are there still any accounts or settlements pending, and which are the importers whose accounts have not been finally settled?

Mr. J. D. REID: It is not customary to give information as to the business of private individuals with the department.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question dropped.

ILE KAMOURASKA LIGHTHOUSE.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE:

1. Who recommended Mr. Charles Blondeau, of St. Pascal, as inspector of construction work at the lighthouse in Ile de Kamouraska?

2. How many trips did Mr. Blondeau take to the said Ile de Kamouraska during the construction of the lighthouse.

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Mr. W. A. Potvin, of Fraserville, and Hon. L. P. Pelletier.

2. There is no evidence in the department to show how many trips were made. The department received three signed progress estimates and a final report from the inspector, and the department's agency officers at Quebec report that the inspection was satisfactory.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—SUBSTRUCTURES FOR BRIDGES.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. Who obtained the contract for the construction of the concrete piers between Montjoli and Matapedia?

2. How many piers were built during the season of 1914, and what was the cost of each of them?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. There were no concrete piers constructed between Montjoli and Matapedia within the last year, but two new substructures for bridges were constructed, for which contract was awarded to R. B. Stewart, of Derby Junction.

2. The two new substructures for bridges cost $4,893.94 and $3,864.15, respectively.

SHERBROOKE, N.S., AND MOSHER'S RIVER MAILS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Who is the present contractor for carrying the mails between Sherbrooke, N.S., and Mosher's River?

2. What is the date of the contract?

3. (a) What is the duration, (b) and amount?

4. What is the name of the previous contractor?

5. What is the yearly amount paid to the former contractor?

6. Why was the previous contract cancelled?

7. What are the names of the sureties under the existing contract?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. This is a section of the mail route between Sherbrooke and Sheet Harbour. The contractor for the whole route is J. S. Cameron.

2. Executed 15th May, 1912.

3. (a) From 1st April, 1912, to 31st March, 1916. (b) $3,293 per annum.

4. Matthew McGrath.

5. $3,334 per annum.

6. Mr. Cameron represented to the department that his contracts had been cancelled in the years 1897 and 1910, before they were due to expire. This was found to be the case, and instructions were given by the Postmaster General on the 29th December, 1911, to terminate McGrath's contract by giving the three months' notice provided for in the contract and to invite public tenders.

7. Matthew McGrath and Alexander F. Cameron.

KILLARNEY AND MANITOWANING MAILS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

Is it the intention of the Postmaster General to establish a daily service during summer months between Killarney and Manitowaning, Ontario?

Mr. CASGRAIN: Application has been made for a daily mail service between Killarney and Little Current (not Manitowaning), but the department has not yet completed inquiry into the matter.

WEST ARICHAT CUSTOMS.

Mr. KYTE:

1. How long has the office of collector of customs at West Arichat been vacant?

2. Who is performing the duties of collector at the present time?

3. Have any applications been received for the position? If so, what are the names of such applicants?

4. Have any petitions or recommendations been received favouring any of such applicants?

5. By whom are such petitions or recommendations signed?

6. When will such appointment be made?

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. The customs preventive station at West Arichat has been closed from 30th November, 1914.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3, 4 and 5. Applications or petitions for appointments are regarded as confidential.

6. When the services of an official are considered necessary.

[Mr. Sinclair.]

NOVA SCOTIA INDIAN SUPERINTENDENT.

Mr. CARROLL:

1. Has William Gore Foster, of Dartmouth, N.S., been appointed to the position of inspector of Indian reserves?

2. If so, on what date was the appointment made and what is the salary to be paid him?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Mr. Foster has been appointed Indian superintendent for the province of Nova Scotia, his services to be available for such other work in the maritime provinces as the Department of Indian Affairs may require of him.

2. He was appointed by Order in Council of 18th September, 1914, at a salary of $1,800 a year.

WAR SUPPLIES—HORSES.

Mr. BOULAY:

Who had charge of the purchase of horses required for the militia or the first contingent, in the province of Quebec, from the 1st of July, to the 1st December, 1914?

Major General HUGHES: The principal veterinary officer and his assistants.

Mr. DOUGLAS:

1. Has the Government withdrawn the commission for the purchase of horses for army purposes in Alberta?

2. If so, will a new commission be appointed and when?

Major General HUGHES:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

Mr. LAW:

Referring to information given to the House by the Minister of Militia on February 24, that 224 horses were purchased in Kings county since August 1, for military purposes, and on March 8, that a certain number of horses were purchased in Kings county from Messrs. Keever, McKay and Moore, at an average price of $171.09.

1. Is this intended to convey the idea that the principal veterinary officer for Canada purchased 224 horses in Kings county from Messrs. Keever, McKay and Moore?

2. If so, has the Government the names of the private individuals who sold these horses to Messrs. Keever, McKay and Moore, and what are they?

Major General HUGHES:

1. Yes.

2. We have not the names.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. E. Lapointe: For a copy of all documents, correspondence, reports, recommendations, notarial deeds, etc., connected with the purchase of land for the erection of a drill hall at Montmagny, P.Q.

Mr. E. Lapointe: For a copy of all documents, investigations, reports, correspondence, etc., relating to the burning of certain buildings be-

longing to the Trois Pistoles Pulp and Lumber Company and to André Leblond, near Tobin station, on the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. Sinclair: For a copy of all Orders in Council issued since October 11, 1911, appointing commissioners to investigate partisanship, and also appointing all Royal or other commissions, respectively.

Mr. Carroll: For a copy of all letters, correspondence, etc., relating to the appointment of William Gore Foster, of Dartmouth, N.S., to the position of inspector of Indian reserves.

Mr. Marcil: For a copy of the report of Dr. Wm. Wakeham, on the extent of the losses sustained in the Baie des Chaleurs and Gulf of St. Lawrence, in the storm of June 5, 1914, together with a statement showing the number of claims, received and those entertained with names of claimants and their residence and amounts paid to each, together with a copy of other documents bearing on this question.

Mr. Sinclair: For a copy of all correspondence, recommendations, petitions, contracts, tenders and other papers and documents between January 1, 1914, and the present date, relating to the letting or the renewal of contracts for carrying His Majesty's mails in localities situated either wholly or partly in Guysborough county.

Mr. McKenzie: For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relative to the dismissal and investigation of John J. McDonald, at North Sydney, in the riding of North Cape Breton anl Victoria, and of the evidence taken and reports of the investigation held by H. P. Duchemin, in regard to same, and a detailed statement of expenses of such investigation.

Mr. McKenzie: For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams, and other documents relative to the dismissal of Captain John Arsenault, at Sydney Mines, in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria, N.S., and a detailed statement of the expense in connection with said investigation.

Mr. McKenzie: For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams, and other documents relative to the dismissal of Frank Dunlop, of Graves Point, at Sydney Mines, in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria, N.S., and the expenses of such investigation in detail.

Mr. McKenzie: For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams, and other documents relative to the dismissal of Joseph Day, at Little Bras D'Or, in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria, and of the evidence taken and reports of the investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to same, with a detailed statement of expenses of such investigation.

Mr. Sinclair: For a return showing: 1. Number of employees of the Intercolonial railway retired from the service during the year 1914, under the provisions of the provident fund.

2. Number of employees dismissed or retired from the service during said year without receiving any assistance from the provident fund.

3. Total amount paid to employees under the provisions of the provident fund for the years 1911, 1912 and 1913.

Mr. Kyte: For a return showing: 1. What medical supplies or other materials have been purchased since August 1, 1914, by the Government, or any department of the Government, from Mr. E. Powell, Ottawa.

2. What quantities of these goods have been purchased from him and what prices were paid.

3. Whether the Government, or any department of the Government, prepared a schedule of rates to show what constitutes a fair and reasonable price for such goods purchased.

4. Whether a careful check has been made to see that a fair and reasonable price was charged.

5. The total value of the goods delivered by Mr. Powell up to date.

6. The total value of the goods which have been ordered from Mr. Powell but which to this date have not been delivered.

Mr. William Chisholm: For a return showing:

1. What medical supplies or other materals have been purchased since August 1, 1914, by the Government, or any department of the Government, from Mr. S. J. Stevenson, or the Waverley Pharmacy.

2. What quantities of these goods have been purchased from him and what prices were paid.

3. Whether the Government, or any department of the Government, prepared a schedule of rates to show what constitutes a fair and reasonable price for such goods purchased.

4. Whether a careful check has been made to see that a fair and reasonable price was charged.

5. The total value of the goods delivered by Mr. Stevenson, or Waverley Pharmacy, up to date.

6. The total value of the goods which have been ordered from S. J. Stevenson, or Waverley Pharmacy, but which to this date have not been delivered.

Mr. Carroll: For a return showing: 1. What medical supplies or other materials have been purchased since August 1, 1914, by the Government, or by any department of the Government, from Mr. W. B. McDonald, of Ottawa?

2. What quantities of these goods have been purchased from him and what prices were paid.

3. Whether the Government, or any department of the Government, prepared a schedule of rates to show what constitutes a fair and reasonable price for such goods purchased.

4. Whether a careful check has been made to see that a fair and reasonable price was charged.

5. The total value of the goods delivered by Mr. McDonald up to date.

6. The total value of the goods which have been ordered from Mr. McDonald, but which to this date have not been delivered.

Mr. Kyte: For a return showing: 1. What medical supplies or other materials have been purchased since August 1, 1914, by the Government, or any department of the Government, from Mr. T. A. Brownlee of Ottawa.

2. What quantities of these goods have been purchased from him and what prices were paid.

3. Whether the Government, or any department of the Government, prepared a schedule of rates to show what constitutes a fair and reasonable price for such goods purchased.

4. Whether a careful check has been made to see that a fair and reasonable price was charged.

5. The total value of the goods delivered up to date.

6. The total value of the goods which have been ordered from Mr. T. A. Brownlee but which to this date have not been delivered?

Mr. Boulay: For a return showing : 1. The total number of employees under the Federal Government on the 23rd June, 1896.

2. The number on the 21st September, 1911.

3. How many public employees were dismissed or left the service in any manner from the 23rd June, 1896, to the 21st September, 1911.

Mr. Carvell: For a return showing: 1. How many nurses have been sent to the front by the Government to aid in the work of caring for the sick and wounded soldiers.

2. The names of said nurses.

3. Whether or not all were graduate nurses.

4. If so, from which hospital each graduated.

5. Whether all the nurses who have been sent to the front have passed the special military training course, for which provision is made by the Department of Militia.

CANADIAN TROOPS IN FRANCE.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I beg to inform the House that the following telegram was received yesterday from Sir George Perley, Acting High Commissioner in London:

Just received letter General Alderson in which he makes following statement: "Our men have now been in trenches over a week and I am very glad to be able to say that they are doing quite remarkably well. I knew they would do well but they have done much better than I expected and all has gone with less trouble than I anticipated. All artillery, infantry, engineers, medical people, supply, etc., have settled into their places and work in way that makes me both pleased and proud."

NOVA SCOTIA POSTAL SERVICE.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. G. W. KYTE (Richmond, N.S.) asked for leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing the question of the postal service in Nova Scotia.

And leave having been granted,

He said: For some weeks great complaints have been made with respect to the carriage and delivery of mails in the constituency which I represent, and in other constituencies as well. The hon. Postmaster General a few evenings ago in discussing the work of his department explained the development which has taken place in the postal service of the Dominion of Canada during the last three or four years. The expenditure in respect of that service now amounts to $13,000,000 a year. The report of the Postmaster General for the fiscal year ended March 31 last disclosed the fact that a great many rural delivery routes and other conveniences have been established throughout the Dominion of Canada. I respectfully submit that we in the eastern part of the province of Nova Scotia do not participate in these additional conveniences which are enjoyed in the other sections of Canada. If confidence in the postal service is withdrawn, the very foundations of civil life are shaken. I have here a letter which I received a few days ago from an official in the province of Nova Scotia, in which he makes complaint regarding the postal service in the part of the country over which his jurisdiction extends. He says:

I have been the prime mover in the agitation for improvement in our mail accommodation; but, unfortunately, I have had occasion to make so many complaints for some time past of delay and miscarriage of mail, that I have doubtless made myself obnoxious. When I got tired sending complaints to Halifax, I began sending them over their heads to Ottawa and, I am sorry to say, with no better results, until at last I made my bow and retired from the contest, promising not to trouble them any more.

Since I am on the subject, I may as well say that the same causes of complaint continue. There is not a week that mail does not go astray or get delayed en route. Within the last week the Halifax newspapers, on which we depend for the daily news, miscarried twice. The enclosed letter will disclose a flagrant case. I sent a parcel of blank forms of school returns to the teachers at Port Hood for their semi-annual returns. Subsequently, a letter came from the secretary of the school board asking me to forward a set of blanks, which I did. Some days afterwards a telegram comes, asking why I did not send the required forms. The third consignment reaches in due course, and, as you will see by Mr. Murphy's letter, the other two parcels came sauntering leisurely along some days later.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Would my hon. friend give the name?

Mr. KYTE: I shall be very glad to give the name to the Postmaster General. I do not think it desirable to enter the names of private citizens upon the published records of Parliament. Another gentleman in the county which I have the honour to represent, and to whom I had arranged that Hansard for this session should be sent daily, writes:

I have not received a copy of Hansard the last two weeks, and I have received but four copies in all since Parliament opened.

Parliament opened on the 4th day of February last. As I said, I had made arrangements to have a copy of Hansard sent to this gentleman daily; but up to the date on which he wrote, the 5th of March, he had received only four copies and had not received a copy for two weeks. Another gentleman for whom I had made a similar arrangement writes me that up to the 15th of February he had not received a single copy of Hansard from the Printing Bureau. I may say, in justice to the officers of the Printing Bureau, that before I thought of bringing this matter before the House I communicated with them and they satisfied me that the failure to deliver Hansard to the gentlemen to whom I refer cannot be traceable to them as they gave satisfactory proofs that they mailed

Hansard every day. I have another case which affects myself more particularly, and as it does affect me more particularly I regard it as the most serious case of all. On the 11th day of January last I wrote a letter addressed to my hon. friend for South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll). That letter should have reached him on the evening of the 11th day of January. On the 15th day of January he wired me asking why I had not sent him the letter which he expected. I communicated the non-delivery of this letter to the post office inspector at Halifax, who immediately undertook to trace it, but up to the present hour without success. This is quite easily understood as the letter was not registered and there was no way in which it could be traced through the various post offices that it would pass through en route. Suffice it to say that this letter, which was an important communication and one which I was very desirous should reach my hon. friend in due course of mail, has not yet come into his hands. Another letter which I addressed to him on the following day which should have reached him on the 12th day of January did not reach him until the 16th, some four days afterwards, and the delay in that case was caused by the letter having been mis-sent in another direction to another post office. These matters are too important to be allowed to continue and, while I have no reflections to make upon the hon. gentleman who is now discharging the important duties of Postmaster General, I am bound to say that the conditions which we have at present are those which he inherited from a not over punctilious predecessor. From time to time in this House, members representing the party to which I am associated have felt called upon to protest against the numerous changes of postmasters in the province of Nova Scotia. For many years we had a system of post offices that were in charge of postmasters who had served a considerable time in those offices and who, by training and experience, were calculated to give every possible satisfaction. After the change of Government there was a demand for the universal dismissal and official execution of these postmasters, particularly those who happened to be in sympathy with the late Government. As a consequence of this demand these competent and well trained officials have been dismissed from office and a band of men quite untrained and unqualified has taken their places. In so far as this is a reflection upon the Government I am willing that that impression may remain. I think it is too bad, however, that the public service should suffer in the manner I have described. I would urge the Postmaster General to take such steps as will give us some reasonable assurance that the postal service will be conducted more satisfactorily in the future. I know of one case where a man living in my community, having undergone a serious surgical operation in an hospital in a neighbouring county, on his return found it necessary to communicate with the medical man under whose treatment he was. He addressed three letters to the medical man in question, none of which had reached its destination upon the 30th day of January at the time I left home, notwithstanding that the letters had been written some two or three weeks before and should have reached their destination within 24 hours. There is another case of a woman living in my neighbourhood who suffered for many weeks from a serious illness by which she was reduced from comparative affluence and comfort to a condition of great distress. A friend of hers sent a generous benefaction to her by letter addressed to the post office where she received her mail. This letter was not received, and when inquiries were especially made it was found that this letter remained in the post office for four weeks, notwithstanding that the person to whom it was addressed had every day sent messengers to that office for her mail. I know other instances which I would be glad to discuss with the Postmaster General which would seem to indicate that there are grounds for public confidence in postal service being weakened. I fear very much that there are some postmasters who have an idea that, since their friends are in power and they have been selected to fill these offices on account of party services rendered by them, they are at liberty to set at defiance certain rules and regulations which heretofore have been regarded as binding. I fear that there is not that secrecy existing in the post offices in some places in Nova Scotia that it is necessary and desirable should exist. I know cases where persons not at all connected or associated with the post office staff have the run of post offices in some small centres, and no person mailing letters at these post offices has the assurance that the addresses, if not the contents of the letters, will not be disclosed to those who have an interest in ascertaining this information. If reports be true, we are upon the eve of a general election in this country, Important confidential correspondence in re-

lation to the election campaign must necessarily pass through post offices. I take the responsibility of saying here to-day that there are certain post offices in my county where I would not take the risk of mailing confidential correspondence during an election campaign. I desire to make this statement in order that the Postmaster General may make a note of it, and issue warnings to these postmasters that the public have a right to repose some confidence in their discharge of their duties, and that no trifling with the mails will be permitted. I know of an instance where, in a municipal election campaign, certain correspondence was supposed to have been deposted in the post office upon the eve of that election. On the day subsequent to that, a day when the post office was not supposed to be open, two persons not associated with the post office were seen coming out of it, one of whom shut the door as he came out and put the key in his pocket. That information satisfied me that in this particular case the public interest is not safeguarded, and a proper appreciation of his obligation is not felt by the postmaster. I have information to the effect that in another election campaign in this country some two years ago, not in the province of Nova Scotia, 90 per cent of the campaign literature which was mailed in certain post offices in one constituency was never delivered to the persons to whom it was addressed.

The statements which I make here this afternoon are made in absolute good faith, and with a full knowledge of the responsibility which should rest on any hon. member who undertakes to make such statements in this House. But I repeat that, in addition to the specific complaints which I have made this afternoon, there are many others which I might very well bring to the attention of this House; but I do not desire to delay the proceedings. All I ask at the present moment is that the hon. Postmaster General will give such instructions to his inspectors as will enable them to ferret out the cause of the non-delivery of the mail in the instances I have referred to, and in those instructions give a warning that postmasters cannot in future interfere with the mails and letters passing through their offices without running the risk of being summarily punished for such an offence, even though they have been appointed to their offices by the hon. gentlemen at present occupying the Treasury benches.

[Mr. Kyte.]

Mr. WILLIAM GRAY: I should like to ask the hon. member whether the late Government, when they came into power in 1896, did not dismiss competent men and put incompetent men in their places?

Mr. KYTE: I can only speak of knowledge concerning my own constituency; and with respect to my own constituency I desire to tell my hon. friend that from 1896 to 1911 not one postmaster was dismissed in the county of Richmond, which I represent. Every man who had been appointed by the Conservative Government previous to 1896 was continued in his office, and he has continued to hold up to the present moment.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton): I have much pleasure in confirming, as far as my personal knowledge goes, the observations made by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte). I think his observations in bringing this matter to the notice of the Postmaster General ought to be of some service, and ought to bring into existence such a condition of affairs between the postmasters and the department that the postmasters should know that they are not to be at all events encouraged in conduct of that kind. I wish to say to the Postmaster General that to my knowledge the post office in the Tory centres in the part of eastern Nova Scotia that I know is just a place that is occupied by Tory heelers for their meetings at all hours and at all times, Sundays not excepted. While the Postmaster General cannot follow these men into their offices and see that they take proper care that the letters are not opened or interfered with, there is one thing which I think he can do; and that is to prevent the post office from being a place of common resort of the kind I have mentioned. If the Postmaster General will make inquiry into the situation which I speak of, he will find that in all the villages where changes and new appointments have been made since the last general election, the postmasters think they are there as political agents of their friends, and that the post office is of course the proper place in which to gather and discuss political matters; and if they suspect any letters that may be going through they take such steps as may be advised, in order to obtain the desired information. That is a condition of things that should not exist; it should be removed. A little over a year ago a local election took place in the county of Victoria. The chief

Tory organizer of the province of Nova Scotia, Dr. Hayes, who was on that occasion black-listed and disqualified by the judge of the Supreme Court—

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is travelling outside what is permissible on this motion, which is to inquire into the unsatisfactory condition of the postal service now in Nova Scotia.

Mr. McKENZIE: It so happens, Mr. Speaker, that I have no particular gift by which I can say everything that I have to say in just one word; and that it is necessary for me to make two or three sentences before I come to the real sentence. I was going to say that this man has commandeered the post offices down there.

Mr. SPEAKER: If I understood the hon. gentleman correctly, he was speaking of an occurrence that happened over a year ago. Of course he cannot, in that case, be addressing himself to the present condition of the postal service in Nova Scotia.

Mr. KYTE: I think, from the wording, that the notice is not limited to the present condition of the postal service.

Mr. SPEAKER: The notice reads:

The unsatisfactory condition of the postal service in Nova Scotia.

I presume that has reference to the present condition.

Mr. McKENZIE: I submit that the condition of terror under which postmasters are held by Tory officials existed then, and exists now; it is a continuous trespass, as it is known to the law. I submit that we can speak of this condition as having commenced over a year ago, and as having continued to exist up to the present time. I submit that it is quite proper to go back, if we can, to the origin of the disease, and follow it up to its present stage. I submit that that was the condition over a year ago, and that it is the condition now.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. It seems to me that my ruling ought to be respected. A notice worded as this is must be taken as referring to the present.

Mr. McKENZIE: I say that this condition exists by reason of the interference of Tory officials in the county of Victoria. I say that the chief official of the Tory party in the county, who is the chief adviser of the Premier in Tory matters in that province, a man who has been blacklisted by a judge of the Supreme Court, terrorizes and commandeers the post offices, and that in the county of Victoria or any other place where he is doing this you cannot get a postmaster to do his duty; for this man goes about telling them he is authorized by the department at Ottawa to dismiss them if they do not carry out his behests. That is the condition, and if I am not to speak of it as in the past I bring the conditions as in the present to the notice of the Postmaster General, so that he may deal with it. I wish to keep strictly within the motion that is before the Chair, but I did not know that it contained a word which restricts us to the very present. I submit to the Postmaster General and to the Government that not only the post office, but every other public service or utility in Nova Scotia, including the telegraph service, is being dealt with in the same way. They commandeered the telegraph service at that election. Thousands of messages were sent out and the minister knows they were not paid for. The man in charge, who is still in the service of the Government, swore that he put those messages through free, without a cent being paid, and he is still the man to whom we must go for our telegrams in the county of Victoria. The condition being such as this man has sworn to himself, I submit to the Postmaster General that he cannot be too severe in dealing with matters of that kind.

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (South Cape Breton): I do not wish to take part in this discussion except to corroborate something that has been said by my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte). In the first or second week of January last I had occasion to write to the hon. member for Richmond on a matter of importance not only to ourselves personally, but to a large number of other people. In the ordinary course of mail I should have had a reply to my letter on the 12th or 13th of January. On the 14th or 15th of January, not having received a reply I telegraphed the hon. member for Richmond to ascertain why he had not answered my letter, and in regard to certain inquiries I had made with reference to some engagements in which we were both concerned. He telegraphed back that he had answered my letter, and gave me the desired information. My hon. friend also wrote me a letter on the same subject. While I should have had the letter on the day it was written, I did not receive it for four or five days afterwards owing

to the fact that the postmaster at the place of mailing the letter had sent it to another post office which bore no resemblance either in name, spelling or otherwise, to the place to which the letter had been addressed. I am not making any charges; I do not know who was responsible for this, I do not know whether the person who mislaid this letter did it wilfully or not, but there is some looseness or laxity certainly in the post office where the matter occurred. There are other instances that affect myself in the matter of sending out literature, but I am not going to make any comment upon them. It may be the fault of nobody. In the county I represent, people are coming and going, it being a great industrial centre. Very often the literature I send out—Hansards and that sort of thing—is returned to me here. I am making no charge, but I wished to corroborate the statement of my hon. friend from Richmond in reference to the two letters that he addressed to me in the month of January.

Hon. T. C. CASGRAIN (Postmaster General): I thank the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) for having drawn the attention of the House to these matters, which are of considerable importance. I beg to express the regret of the department that he has been put to inconvenience by not having had these letters transmitted through the mails as they should have been. I am a little surprised that any complaints made about the very unsatisfactory manner in which the post office seems to have been conducted in his town have received no answer.

Mr. KYTE: The letter of the official that I read to the House has no reference to the post office in my town. He lives in another part, and his statement has reference to another post office.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I would ask my hon. friend to kindly come to the department and give me further particulars. I cannot punish any of these men without hearing them; I have to give them fair warning. If it is necessary to hold an investigation, we certainly shall do so. It will be my endeavour to make the postal service as perfect as possible. Anything that money can do to promote that end will be done by the department over which I have the honour to preside.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is a fair conclusion to draw that if anything goes wrong in the administration of the post office it is done through intention or design. I have had instances in my own experience which are of a much stronger character than anything which has been mentioned this afternoon, and I have not thought for one moment of attributing the result to any intention to do wrong. I remember about six years ago I sent an important and urgent letter from Halifax to Ottawa. It reached Ottawa nearly three weeks after I had despatched it, having gone to Vancouver and having returned from Vancouver by slow stages. It was important for many reasons that the letter should have reached Ottawa in due course. I did not, however, jump to the conclusion that any Liberal partisan in the post office had done this from design. My hon. friends on the other side seem to have come to an unwarrantable conclusion. During nearly the whole of a year, about five years ago, a business man in the city of Ottawa sent to me almost daily three or four letters which had occupied in their transmission to him two or three times, and sometimes four or five times, the length of time that would have been necessary. I used to forward these communications from this business man to the Postmaster General for the purpose of directing his attention to the unnecessary delay. In a very large country like this such delays will from time to time occur. So far as the aspersions which have been cast on the postmasters of Nova Scotia are concerned, I regret that hon. gentlemen who have spoken this afternoon should have gone so far as to cast what I believe to be undeserved reproach upon a class of men who, I believe, are inspired by a sincere desire to do their duty. On their behalf, until some definite and concrete case of maladministration is brought to the attention of the Postmaster General and dealt with as it ought to be dealt with, I desire to repudiate any such aspersions on the postmasters of Nova Scotia. I have had experience of them when they were very largely Liberal appointees, and I found no occasion to reproach them then. I think that no greater occasion for reproach is to be found against those who have been appointed by the present Government. I shall make inquiries as to what the hon. member for North Cape Breton and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) has said in regard to Dr. Hayes, and ascertain what Dr. Hayes has to say in regard to these accusations. They have not been brought to my attention before, but

4 p.m.

with all due respect to the hon. member, I venture to think that it will be found he spoke beyond warrant and beyond the limit of what he should have said, when he made these charges against Dr. Hayes this afternoon. So far as the distribution of campaign literature is concerned, I have heard of reproaches of that kind for the last fifteen or seventeen years, and a great many of them when my hon. friends on the other side of the House were responsible for the administration of the Post Office Department. I know that in the election of 1904 my own political friends made the declaration that they verily believed that not more than 25 per cent of the campaign literature which was sent out in very large quantities from Ottawa ever reached the destination for which it was intended. I do not know whether that is the case or not. I simply desire to remind my hon. friend that we have heard a good deal of these charges during the past seventeen years and before we came into power.

Motion to adjourn the House negatived.

GRANBY MAIL DELIVERY.

Mr. BOIVIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Casgrain) to an article which appears in the Leader-Mail of Granby, of Friday, March 5, 1915. It is also in connection with the post office service, but in this case there are no officials to blame. The statement is as follows:

> The morning mail missed the train again on Wednesday. This is a matter which should be taken up vigorously by the Board of Trade. There is too much doing these days to allow us to quietly submit to being without mail for twenty-four hours. There is no good reason why the mail bags should not be brought from the city direct by the Central Vermont. Under existing arrangements they come to Farnham by Canadian Pacific railway and if this train is late the Central Vermont comes along without them. Telephone requests that the bags be put on the freight which follows the passenger train here do not bring any results and we have to wait for the evening train to pick up the bags and bring them along. Will the Granby Board of Trade, which has been suffering from drowsiness lately, kindly wake up and attend to the matter.

Under the present arrangement the town of Granby, with a population of 5,000, receives a closed mail in the morning on the train from Montreal and the registered mail on the evening train. This closed mail is placed on the Canadian Pacific railway train at 8.25 in the morning. The mail is thrown off at Farnham and transferred to a train which leaves Montreal via the Central Vermont at 8.35 a.m. If the Canadian Pacific railway train is fifteen or twenty minutes late in arriving at Farnham, the mail has missed the connection with the Central Vermont train and remains on the station platform during the entire day. I would ask the Postmaster General if some arrangement could not be made by which this morning mail, instead of leaving at 8.25 by the Canadian Pacific railway, could be placed directly on the train which leaves the Bonaventure station at 8.35, and thus save this inconvenience.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I will look into the matter, and if it is possible to remedy the evil I will have it done.

17th NOVA SCOTIA REGIMENT.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have received a telegram from Sir George Perley, which sets forth the substance of General Alderson's reply to Sir George Perley's letter regarding the allegations of Mr. H. C. Crowell. General Alderson states that the only word of truth in the whole article is that Colonel Robertson has been replaced. He further says that all the nonsense about the 17th Battalion being used as scavengers, etc., is pure invention.

POSTAL WAR STAMPS.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. STEVENS: Referring to the following clause in the new proposed taxation, under the heading of Special Taxation:

> On every letter and postcard posted in Canada a war stamp of one cent.

Does this clause apply to mail emanating from this House under the frank of hon. members? If not, in my opinion, it should.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will bring my hon. friend's inquiry to the attention of the Minister of Finance, and I will give an answer to-morrow.

THE BUDGET.

PROPOSED WAR TAXATION.

Consideration of the proposed motion of Hon. W. T. White (Minister of Finance) for the Committee of Ways and Means and the proposed amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto, resumed from March 10.

Mr. JOHN H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): In the resolution now before the House the Minister of Finance requires to explain

a deficit of $80,000,000. He ought also to deal with the Estimates submitted to the House. Permit me to pick out a couple of sample items such as a new dredging plant for Manitoba and the inspection of pickled fish. When listening to the speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, I could not help wondering what the bombardment of Constantinople had to do with a dredging plant for Manitoba or with pickled fish. I was curious to know the purpose of this item of $33,000, to provide a new dredging plant for Manitoba. I did not know that any dredging was required in that province. I made some inquiries, and it was hinted to me that the Minister of Public Works was promoting this scheme, and that his idea was to dredge a track for the prairie schooners in order that there might be facilities afforded to carry cargoes of homestead inspectors for use at the next election. I do not know whether that explanation is the proper one or not; but if it is not it is for the Minister of Public Works to explain.

Mr. HENDERSON: Not worth while.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Why, let me ask, did not the hon. Finance Minister deal with the questions before the House? It looks to me as if one of those resolutions is kept on the Order Paper in order to reinforce the other.

When the House adjourned last night I was dealing with the question of a pledge given to the people of Canada by the Prime Minister a few days before the last election. I read the first clause of his manifesto, which was published on the 15th day of August, in the Montreal Gazette and signed by the Prime Minister. In this pledge he promises on behalf of his party, if elected, a thorough reorganization of the methods by which public expenditure is supervised. That pledge has not been redeemed. I pointed out to the House that there never was a time in the history of this country since the days of Connolly and McGreevy when there was such a lack of supervision of public expenditure as there is to-day. In order to prove my case I produced correspondence laid on the table only a few days ago between the Minister of Finance and the Auditor General. You can see by that correspondence that things went so far and that the expenditure was so loosely made, in one department of the Government at all events, that it became necessary for the Auditor General to step in and stop the payment of the cheques of the Minister of Finance at the banks.

I want to produce another witness, an hon. gentleman who supports the Government. I refer to the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. William Smith). You, Mr. Speaker, know that there is in this House no more loyal supporter of the present Administration than the hon. member for South Ontario. It will be conceded that that hon. member would do things for his party that he would not do for himself. He attended a meeting of the Horse Breeders' Association at Toronto on the 2nd day of February, 1915. He took occasion to make a speech, and I will read a paragraph from the report of it published in the Toronto Telegram, which I understand is a Conservative journal. Here is what my hon. friend says:

> Perhaps the course of the Government has not met with universal satisfaction, and no doubt there is good reason for this. What I am about to say, I say as a supporter of the Government and with a due sense of the significance of my words. As far as I can see, gentlemen, there is going to be a considerable graft in this business. I fear the tactics we condemned in connection with the Boer war remount purchases are to be repeated. This should not be. Men have been sent out to buy who might play a game of marbles, but who cannot buy horses.

There you have the opinion of a gentleman who is supporting the Government. His opinion was evidently given very reluctantly. He knows what is taking place, because if there is anything he knows well, it is horses. That want of oversight in the purchase of horses was not confined to the province of Ontario. In the province of Nova Scotia there was one gentleman detailed to purchase horses who would also, I have no doubt, be all right at playing marbles. Every one knows that the Militia Department is besieged day after day by contract brokers, patronage hunters, middlemen, and cattle of that character. All you have to do, if you do not know the facts, is to go down to the headquarters of our war department and see for yourself. There you will find them in hordes, like the army worm. I have very much sympathy with my hon. friend the Minister of Militia, who wished that he had the power to turn his quick-firing guns upon them. That is the way the business of this Government is being done in Ottawa; and outside in the rest of Canada the business of the country devolves upon patronage committees. In the town in which I live the recruiting officer could not select a medical doctor to examine the recruits volunteering for service without submitting to the dictation of a patronage committee. That is how the Minister of Finance is standing behind the boys in the

trenches. It makes a man's blood hot to think that at a time like this, when so many of our people are making great sacrifices, when over fifty thousand of the best blood of Canada are risking their lives in the country's service and every day adding to the number, when some twenty thousand of our countrymen are at this moment somewhere in the blood-soaked swamps of Flanders exposed to the hardships and dangers of war for the defence of their country. All honour to them for their patriotism and courage and devotion to duty. But what shall we say of the grafters, and the jobbers, and the patronage hunters who in this hour of their country's need are thinking only of themselves and of what they can steal for their own pockets or for the reptile funds of their party? The Auditor General is the only safeguard we have; and it would appear from the correspondence laid on the table that he is spending a good deal of his time at present looking after the ministers. It is a Godsend for the people of Canada that we have an Auditor General and that he is a man of integrity and courage. Otherwise they would steal the Mace off the table and the carpets off the floor of this Chamber. I pointed out in connection with the pledge given by my right hon. friend the leader of the Government (Sir Robert Borden) that he stated in his manifesto that a yearly expenditure of $74,000,000 was extravagance beyond all defence. To-day instead of $74,000,000 we have an ordinary controllable expenditure of $140,000,000. Now, Sir, if there was no excuse, no possible defence for an expenditure of $74,000,000 in 1911, when my right hon. friend wrote that manifesto, how can there be any defence to-day for the enormous expenditure of $140,000,000? If there is a defence we should like to hear it. For, I submit, that in the whole course of this debate no one on the other side so far has attempted to make a proper defence on that question. The people are asking throughout the country, Could this staggering deficit be avoided? I submit that it could. All will agree that with honest administration and the practice of economy it could have been greatly reduced. I will venture the statement that if the grafters and middlemen and patronage hunters and partisan committees had been driven out the Minister of Finance would not have to meet Parliament to-day in the humilating position he finds himself.

My hon. friend to-day says he could not interfere with contracts because the honour of Canada is at stake. That is a new theory for hon. gentlemen opposite. They were hardly warm in their seats before they cancelled a contract made by the former Administration in my own constituency for the construction of a branch railway. The former Postmaster General has admitted in this House that he cancelled hundreds of contracts. A return was placed on the table last year showing that he cancelled no less than five hundred contracts for carrying the mails throughout this country. Many of these contracts were entered into after public tender and competition, and many of the men whose contracts were cancelled were ruined in the operation. But he claimed the right to do that on account of the fact that there is a clause in all Government contracts that enables the Government to cancel. It is a new doctrine for hon. gentlemen opposite that they cannot cancel contracts. Where was the "honour of Canada" in the cases of these five hundred contracts? Where was the honour of Canada in the case of the railway contract in my county.

Referring again to the deficit why should not this Government live within its income? The people are practising economy. They are endeavouring to live within their incomes. The late Government lived within its income. If this Government cannot live within its income, permit me to suggest that they should be requested politely but firmly to step aside and make room for a Government that can. If you ask me to be specific, I will venture a few suggestions. In the discussion which took place in this House a few days ago, it was pointed out that the official staff appointed throughout this country since this Government came into power has been increased by the enormous number of ten thousand new officers. I know very well that explanations have been made, and I am quite willing to make allowances for all these explanations. But after the explanations had been submitted, after allowance has been made for what can be said on behalf of the ministers, we are forced to the conclusion that there was utter recklessness in securing positions for their partisans. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid), whom I am glad to see in his place, is one of the most plausible of ministers in making explanations. But we all know the Minister of Customs. His method of appointing officers has been exposed at various times in this House. My hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte) gave one case that happened at Red Island in his

county a few days ago. The Minister of Customs dismissed an officer there because there was nothing for him to do; and then immediately afterwards appointed a party friend to do nothing at an increased salary —nearly twice as much as the former officer had. I pointed out a similar case in my own county. The hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. Chisholm) also exposed a case of that character in connection with the department of my hon. friend, in Antigonish. In that case it appears that a preventive officer was dismissed because there was nothing for him to do. The report of the inspector stated that the officer had not struck a blow for nine years—and made no report to the Government for that length of time. In the face of that report the officer was very properly dismissed. But a party friend, one Moses Delorey, had to be looked after, and he insisted that he must have his reward. The Minister of Customs was up against it.

Mr. J. D. REID: He is doing good work since.

Mr. SINCLAIR: So, what did the minister do? He put Moses Delorey in the place of the dismissed officer. But the salary was not large enough, and in the face of the report of the inspector, he did not like to increase the salary. So he appointed the same gentleman as an inspector of food. This "inspector of food" is residing in a country district where no inspection of food is carried on.

Mr. REID: I did not do that.

Mr. SINCLAIR: No, but the Minister of Inland Revenue did. The return shows what was done. This man has for two years been drawing a salary as inspector of food; and outside the porridge pot in his own kitchen he has inspected nothing yet. In my own town, a few miles further west on the Intercolonial railway, a young man by the name of Cavanagh was dismissed from the customs service by my hon. friend because there was no work for him to do.

Mr. REID: That was a good reason.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Yes, if it was true, but what happened? In the place of this man, for whom he could find no work, my hon. friend appointed two men, at substantial salaries, to do the work Cavanagh had been doing. Similar instances could be found all along the three thousand miles between Cape Breton and British Columbia. In the face of examples of this kind, what is the use of hon. gentlemen opposite trying to refute the accusation that they have increased their staff of officials to such an extent that their action has become a public scandal? The number of new appointments, after making allowance for resignations and dismissals, is placed at 10,000. One hon. gentleman estimated that these appointments would cost the country in salaries an average of $1,000 each. I think that that estimate is high. Some of these persons occupy important positions in the inside service, and, of course, draw correspondingly large salaries; but some are employed in the outside service at salaries which are not so high. But if we estimate the average salary at $500, that means $5,000,000 a year, or $16,000 a day, which is required to pay this increased official staff, the great majority of whom have been unnecessarily appointed to positions in the public service since hon. gentlemen opposite came into power. In view of these circumstances, what is the use of telling us that we are doing a patriotic act when we pay five cents additional a bottle on patent medicine, or two cents instead of one for a post card?

My second proposal is that the Government should abolish the middleman. I am glad the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) is paying attention; he was the great critic of the middlemen when he sat on this side of the House. The middleman has had four fat years.

Mr. J. D. REID: He had about fifteen when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power.

Mr. SINCLAIR: He never flourished as he does at present. Suppose we abolish the middleman; let us go back to the honest old system of tender and contract and throw the business open to the other half of the population. I have not the slightest doubt that if the business of government were properly and honestly carried out, we would save $8,000,000 or $10,000,000 a year.

Another device employed by hon. gentlemen opposite since they came into power is the appointment of royal commissioners. In this way hon. gentlemen succeeded in finding fat jobs for men like Mr. A. B. Morine, Mr. H. P. Duchemin and a multitude of others whom I could mention. Go over the history of this Government in its first year of power, and you will find appointments of this kind by the score. A return, which was placed on the table of the House only a few days ago, disclosed

the fact that no less than 132 of these commissioners, mis-called royal commissioners, were appointed. Amongst them were commissioners to investigate the Civil Service, commissioners to investigate the Transcontinental railway, commissioners to investigate the shell-fish industry, commissioners to investigate the sardine industry, commissioners to investigate partisanship by the score. According to the return, as I have said, 132 of these commissioners were appointed. The late Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) himself appointed 61 of the 132. It is only fair, however, to explain that in some cases there were duplications; men like Mr. H. P. Duchemin and others were appointed by more than one department. But the cost to the country of these 132 commissioners must have been enormous. I have no idea what the actual cost has been; it has not been laid before the House. One of these scavengers traversed the eastern section of the province of Nova Scotia, leaving behind him a trail of ill-will, perjury and injustice, and for his services he was paid $6,681.71. I do not know what the Government paid the other 131, but if they paid them at the same rate, the cost would be nearly a million dollars, $881,892. Is it any wonder that the Finance Minister finds himself in difficulties and short of money?

Let me give you another instance of wastefulness which occurred in my own constituency. The Government cannot be accused of spending money in my constituency; it is one of the constituencies that have had a rest since this Government came into power. The only expenditure made in my constituency during the whole four years was a wasteful expenditure: I refer to a railway survey made by the Minister of Railways last autumn. After the Government cancelled the contract for the construction of the Guysborough railway in 1912, I endeavoured to elicit from the Minister of Railways as to what course the Government intended to take. He replied that he had made provision for a survey. I explained that a survey was unnecessary; that the road had already been surveyed and that the minister would find in his office the profiles, plans and details which would give him all necessary information. That was in the year 1912. In 1913 I again brought the matter to the attention of the minister, asking him if he had made a survey. The following reply, which will be found on page 2009 of Hansard, 1913, was given by the minister:

> The Minister of Railways and Canals investigated this matter of a branch line from Sunny Brae to Guysborough, and after discussing it fully with the engineers it was ascertained that the preliminary surveys were sufficiently complete to determine the feasilbility of the line and that no further surveys would be required until it was decided by the Government that the line should be constructed.

In the face of that answer, in which the Minister said that no further survey was necessary and that he had ample information in his office, in the autumn of last year, when it was thought that an election was coming, the minister sent seventy-seven men into my constituency to make a survey. Some of them were heelers of the party from Montreal, and some from Moncton, and some from other places. A few local men were employed, but the minister could not find Tories enough in my constituency to do this work. According to information which I received from the Minister of Railways only a few days ago, the cost of this survey was over $20,000; yet in the Estimates for the current year not a dollar is provided for the construction of the road.

Owing to this and other extravagances the Finance Minister must have more money, so he has decided to get $30,000,000 from the people by taxation this year. His plan is to add 7½ per cent to the general tariff and to impose 5 per cent additional on British goods; a tax of 1 per cent on bank circulation—of which I entirely approve; taxes on railway tickets, telegrams, express orders, money orders; increased rates of postage: a letter which formerly cost two cents will cost three, and a post-card which formerly cost one cent will cost two. Taxes are placed also on bills of lading and on patent medicines. The tax on patent medicines has been very strongly objected to. Patent medicine is regarded as the poor man's doctor; it is used almost exclusively by people who cannot afford a doctor's prescription. I am not going to discuss the matter further than to say that the fishermen of Nova Scotia, who were promised free medicine by the Prime Minister in the manifesto issued by him before the election of 1911, will be amazed when they learn how the Tory party are keeping their promises.

An income tax has been proposed. I would be inclined to favour an income tax; the Minister of Finance objected to it, for reasons which, to my mind, were not very forcible. With his large staff of officials he should not have to engage the services

of additional employees in order to collect an income tax. The hon. Minister of Customs himself figures in the list of appointments to the extent of 1,649 new officials.

Mr. J. D. REID: That is not correct. The hon. gentleman is not stating that correctly.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Substracting from that the number who died or were dismissed.

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR: There was a large increase was there not?

Mr. REID: I said there was an increase but the hon. gentleman did not explain it correctly in the first instance.

Mr. SINCLAIR: My hon. friend did not wait for my explanation, after we make all allowances, there is a very large increase.

Mr. REID: But there has been a very large increase in the revenue and new offices have been opened.

Mr. SINCLAIR: At present there is a very large decrease in the revenue.

Mr. REID: No there is not, the revenue is increasing now.

Mr. SINCLAIR: It is increasing for the last month but that is only temporary, the decrease has been very marked for the whole of last year.

Mr. REID: No, it has not.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Well then, the hon. gentleman's returns are not correct, my proposal is that the Minister of Customs could furnish a staff of men throughout this country who could collect the income tax without burdening the country with a new set of officers. There is one thing I would like about the income tax, it would afford some of those millionaires in Toronto and Montreal who have been accustomed for many years to shout loyalty, an opportunity to do something more substantial for their country than singing God save the King and waving the flag.

I wish to enter my protest against the 7½ per cent increase in the general customs tariff. My chief reason is that it will increase the cost of living, which is already too high. It will not produce much revenue, it will put perhaps $3 in the pockets of the combines for every dollar it will into the treasury of the country. Besides it is done without any discrimination, no account is taken of the large number of articles of which there is no importation. These articles are taxed just the same and from them not a dollar will come into the treasury of the country. A very large amount will be extracted from the pockets of the people by this means. Take, for example, the item of unbarked marlin, a kind of twine that is used on the coast of the maritime provinces by the fishermen for making lobster traps. Under the old Government that twine was admitted free. Under the present Government it is taxed 25 per cent.

Mr. J. D. REID: There has been no change in the tariff there, the hon. member knows that well.

Mr. SINCLAIR: My hon. friend knows too that he put a different construction on that item of the tariff since he came into office.

Mr. REID: That is not in accord with the facts, and it was thoroughly explained.

Mr. SINCLAIR: My hon. friend cannot deny it; we have had the matter discussed several times in the House and it has been proved beyond all question that a different construction was put upon that item of the tariff after my hon. friend came into power.

Mr. REID: It never was.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I can prove it from the importers who imported the article. For 15 years it came in free until my hon. friend took office.

Mr. REID: It never was.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The tariff schedule itself shows it, but at the present time there is none of that cordage imported into Canada. That is a statement that my hon. friend will not deny. It is completely controlled by the cordage combine at Halifax or Montreal, wherever its headquarters are. The consequence is that the 25 per cent is at present squeezed out of the fishermen of the country and no cordage is imported. What will happen under the new tariff? Any one can see that in place of 25 per cent the fishermen will have to pay the cordage combine 32½ per cent. Why was that not put among the excepted articles? That is only one of a very large number of items of which there is no importation in respect of which the people will be oppressed with a heavy tax and not a cent will reach the treasury. It is clear that the war is being made a pretext to confer a boon on the combines at the expense of the consumers of this country.

It has come out during one of the discussions in this House that the Conservative party issued a pamphlet claiming that they

knew about the war for some two years before the war took place and that we innocent people on this side of the House did not know anything about it, that we could not recognize an emergency when we saw it. All I can say in reply is that if they really did know, there is no parallel in all history for their conduct unless it be the well known case of Nero who kept on fiddling while Rome was burning. When the crash came they were totally unprepared, both by land and sea. They had allowed the barnacles to accumulate on the bottom of the Niobe in Halifax. She was partly dismantled; some of her machinery was stored in a warehouse on a wharf in the dockyard. The officers had been encouraged to desert. The officers of the Naval Department were engaged in preparing a book on how to cook fish instead of preparing for war. A few days before war broke out the departmental report for the year was issued. I received my copy of the departmental report on the 6th day of August, just two days after the war broke out. I opened it eagerly to find whether the naval defence which we had in this country was in a good state of preparation. On the eighth page of the book I found the following:

> Owing to the decision of the Government not to continue H.M.C. ships Niobe and Rainbow in full commission, the course of exercise and training for these ships has been discontinued and they are at present manned by nucleus crews.

That is what I found in the Naval report issued about the time war broke out. A few days after they got very busy in the dockyard at Halifax. A force of men was put on, a double shift was set to work, the ship was refitted and prepared for sea. That was the condition of our naval vessels when war broke out. What, let me ask, was the condition of the militia? Was it any better? The Militia Department, on an expenditure of about $12,000,000 during the previous fiscal year, was in very little better shape than the navy. The treasury was empty; the Finance Minister had been scraping the bottom of the pot for months before the war came. There was no clothing for the troops, no boots were ready for the soldiers. It has come out in the investigation that there was not even a specification in the department to tell what kind of boots a soldier should have for active service. There were no blankets, and socks were as scarce as blankets. Even the camp at Valcartier was not ready, the stumps had to be taken out, it all had to be cleared and drained and a water supply put in. There was absolutely nothing ready but a long list of honorary colonels. Yet we are told that these gentlemen knew all about the war two years before it broke out! At the time of the Boer war some years ago, with a yearly expenditure of only $1,700,000 on militia, the country was much better prepared than it was on this occasion. Permit me to remind hon. gentlemen opposite of the promptness with which the country responded in the case of the Boer war. The president of the Transvaal Republic declared war against Great Britain on the 9th day of October, 1899. On the 30th day of October of the same year, just 21 days afterwards, the steamship Sardinian was sailing down the St. Lawrence bearing the first contingent to a distant part of the world to fight for the flag, the men all ready and equipped. That is the way the late Government met the emergency in 1899, not, of course, on such a large scale—

Mr. GLASS: Could the hon. gentleman tell how many men were sent at that time?

Mr. SINCLAIR: I have not the number here. I do not pretend it was anything like the same number as has been despatched at the present time; but I am pointing out that the Department of Militia, as managed and controlled by the late minister (Sir Frederick Borden), was in a state of preparation to respond to the call of war, and in the short space of three weeks he was able at least to do something; whereas the present department was not able to do anything in anything like that space of time. Let me suggest that my hon. friends will do well to suppress that pamphlet that has now become so well known and notorious, if they have not done so. If not, it is bound to do harm to them. The Canadian voter is the last man in the world to tolerate incompetence, especially at such a critical time in the country's history as the present.

I am glad to see that the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) is in his seat; I want to have just one word with him. My hon. friend from West Peterboro, when he spoke, rattled some old bones and attempted to revive the old navy debate. We have no objection on this side of the House to revive the navy debate. We are ready to discuss that question at all times. My hon. friend poses as a philosopher, and I am free to admit that there is a thin veneer of philosophy outside of his outside skin.

But when you scratch him you find a Tory; and a Tory of that type that is peculiar to the province of Ontario, the type that

relies more on kindling prejudices against my honoured leader than on the justice of their cause. His patriotic soul was wrestling over the use of the word "may" in that clause of the Naval Service Act which permits the Canadian navy to be used for the defence of the Empire. The word "may" did not suit him. In that word he saw a deep plot to wreck the Empire; and he wanted some word like "shall" or "must," I suppose, substituted for "may." He had no faith in the Canadian people. That is what was underneath the suggestion he made in that speech.

Mr. BURNHAM: It is only a portion of the Canadian people that I have no faith in.

Mr. SINCLAIR: That is what was at the bottom of his suggestion. It is the same old Tory heresy that, in the early part of last century, placed his party against the granting of responsible government to this country; it is the same spirit that placed his party in England against granting self-government to the Boers a few years ago; the same spirit that, a few months ago, almost turned the British Isles into an armed camp over the question of home rule for Ireland. I am sorry that that spirit still lives in the backwoods of West Peterboro. But, suppose we had put the word "must" in. Do you think that would have made any difference? Would it have been respected by the present Government? Suppose we had put the word "must" in the British Preference Act. Would that have prevented my hon. friend the Minister of Finance from driving a horse and cart through it at the present time? Certainly not. My hon. friend knows that very well. But of course I am well aware that that speech of his was for consumption in West Peterboro. It is a well known fact in this country that he won his last election there on a bogus cry. He has practically admitted it in the House.

Mr. BURNHAM: I appeal to the House against such an assertion as that. He has no right to say that I admitted such a thing in the House. The statement is false.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I appeal to you, Mr. Speaker. I say it is not false. I say it is true, and I can prove it by the records of the House.

Mr. BURNHAM: Do so.

Mr. SINCLAIR: My hon. friend openly admitted in the House that the question that was discussed in his county and on which he ran in 1911 was the Ne Temere Act. And what was the promise that my hon. friend made his electors? Did he not know at the time he made that promise that the highest legal authorities in this country had decided that this Parliament had no power to deal with the Ne Temere? Was he not well aware of that? But in face of the knowledge of that fact, he made the promise to his electors that, if elected, he would see that a uniform marriage law was passed for this country. Has he fulfilled the pledge he gave?

Mr. BURNHAM: I do not run the whole House.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Has he attempted to carry it out? He was well aware at the time he made it that he could not carry it out. He must have been aware of it. And now he is trying to stir up another question that he expects will do service for him in the backwoods of the same riding. I think I have dealt sufficiently with that question.

I do not wish to detain the House any longer; so, to sum up:

1. I am cordially in favour of the proposed war loan. I am also in favour of such taxation as may be necessary to meet the interest on the war loan. I am prepared along with my colleagues on this side cordially to support any measure that will enable the Government to give effective assistance to the Empire in the supreme crisis through which it is now passing. To quote from my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), "millions for war, but not a dollar for graft."

2. I am opposed to the 7½ per cent increase in the general tariff because it is levied without discrimination. It will bear most heavily on those classes of the community least able to pay. It will not produce any substantial amount of revenue, and it cannot fail to enrich the combines.

3. I am especially opposed to the 5 per cent additional impost on British goods. By this impost, we are treating Great Britain as a foreign country, and are striking a blow at British commerce. If ever there was a time when the interests of British trade should be safeguarded it is at the present, when the old land is engaged in a struggle involving its own existence and our future.

4. This is not a war Budget. If it were, I would cordially support it. We have the admission of the Honourable Finance Minister that not one dollar of the money to be collected under this Budget outside the interest on the war loan, will go to prosecute

the war; and as a matter of fact the interest on the war loan will be borrowed as well as the principal.

5. The Government, in face of decreasing trade and a falling revenue, should have adopted a policy of retrenchment and economy; and if the Government had done this during the past four years, nay, if they do so now, this increased taxation will not be necessary.

I shall vote for the amendment.

Mr. S. FRANCIS GLASS (East Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate for the first time in the debates of this House, and I trust that I shall not transgress any of its rules. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Sinclair), and yesterday I listened with an especial interest to my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark), because, from the views he has enunciated on previous occasions in this House, and the stand he has taken as a free trader and a Cobdenite, I knew that he was a lucid and clear speaker. I am not sure, however, that my views on the question of protection have been changed by hearing the able remarks of the hon. gentleman. I knew that he had lived in the old land, where free trade has for so long stood the test of time and given such satisfactory results. I am also not unmindful of the fact that the great German Empire and the great country to the south of us have, by protection, on entirely different systems, built up their trade and grown wealthy, possibly to an even greater extent than the Motherland herself. I believe that conditions in the old land make free trade the desirable policy for that country to pursue. But so far as Canada is concerned, there has never since protection was adopted been submitted to the people of this country an alternative fiscal policy which met with their approval, or which they were prepared to try out. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) has referred to the panacea which the Government of the day applied to this country in 1911, in order to try and relieve our people from the ills that, in the Government's opinion, existed at that time —a time when the revenues of this country were buoyant, and the country in a prosperous condition. Our hon. friends, in their wisdom, thought it good policy to undo the splendid structure that had been built up through the years under protection by casting in their lot with the United States, and opening up to them the markets of this splendid country. I am glad that the hon. gentleman has given us the opportunity of considering that question of reciprocity again, and I can only say that if it should be the desire of the Opposition to discuss with the people again the same subject the Government are prepared to take the issue to the people, and I have no doubt the result will be the same as it has been since 1878. We have had similar policies enunciated at different periods in our history since 1878, and they have been submitted to the people. It seems to me that hon. gentlemen opposite take the view that the people do not really know what they want. They have had the question tested before by an appeal to the people and the country has supported the policy of protection.

The present situation is an extraordinary one. Nothing like it has ever at any time faced us in this country, and as hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have expressed their views on financial affairs as they are now, they seem to want to impress on the country and to try to convince themselves—although I cannot believe that they are convinced—that the great war now raging is responsible only for the amount of money that we actually expend in aid of the military that we send to help the Mother Country. Surely hon. gentlemen opposite do not believe any such thing. Surely they do not believe that the conditions of war are not responsible for the decreasing revenues of this country, or that there are not losses to the country resulting from the war conditions in Europe which are entirely aside from the expenses that will be incurred in equipping the forces we are sending to the front. The failure of so many intelligent citizens to realize and appreciate the tremendous effect of this war on finance, commerce and industry throughout the whole world is to me surprising.

The world's population to-day is estimated at 1,620,000,000 people, and of these 925,000,000 reside in the countries and their colonies affected by this war. The total area of the globe, exclusive of the polar regions, is about 52,000,000 square miles, and of this the countries engaged in the war represent an area of 28,500,000 square miles. Five continents are engaged more or less in the fighting. The greatest wars of the past centuries were but trifling as compared with this mighty conflict. To-day armies aggregating 15,000,000 of the flower of the world's manhood have been summoned from field,

forest, mine, and factory. The great armies of England, France, Germany, Austria and Russia are facing each other in deadly combat along a battle line of over 1,000 miles. The war has already cost $8,500,000,000, it having been in progress for six months, and that represents an expenditure of $17,000,000,000 a year, or $47,000,000 a day. The world's trade is estimated at $40,000,000,000, and of this total the nations at war and their colonies represent $25,000,000,000. The commerce and finance of the whole world are so closely related and interdependent that it might be said that the arteries of the whole world are as closely associated as the arteries of the human body, and yet with these conditions prevailing in the great countries of Europe hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House virtually tell us that these conditions are in no way responsible for the shrinking revenues. The war has driven the powerful German marine off the high seas, and the foreign trade of Germany, Austria and Belgium, representing 22 per cent of the trade of the whole world, has practically vanished. These countries did with our country, as well as with the United States, a large volume of trade. Importation from these countries has absolutely vanished. That, necessarily, must diminish the revenue of Canada. Many of the agencies of transportation have been destroyed. Trade routes being deranged, demoralization and partial destruction in every branch of commercial and industrial activity is in evidence. During the year England's exports decreased by $475,000,000 and her imports by $355,000,000 making a total decrease in her foreign trade of $830,000,000. Notwithstanding her enormous importation of food stuffs her imports in January last fell off $3,000,000 and her exports for the same month decreased $98,000,000. We know that in England large numbers of men have been withdrawn from the factory and the farm to fight in the trenches of France in defence of the Empire and that there is to some extent a dearth of labour in the larger factories and industries of England which are employed very fully at the present time. It is not surprising that it should be so. Belgium's trade of $1,500,000,000 is gone entirely and her fields are laid bare.

5 p.m.

Going back a little beyond the present conditions I asked a question of my hon. friend from Guysborough last night which he did not answer. The question was if my hon. friend did not know that a war existed in the year 1912 and that the conditions brought about by reason of the war were conditions that led to the stagnation and to the interruption of commercial activity throughout the whole world. I referred to the Balkan war. The Balkan war, was a live, active war in that year and as a result of that war $450,000,000 of the capital of the world was obliterated. The increased outlay by armaments for the war and the gradual rise in the world's standard of prices, were the chief factors contributing to the financial depression of the time being. If hon. gentlemen wanted to be fair they would not condemn the fiscal policy of this country which for so many years has justified its existence and has been the source of a large revenue, and a source of strength in the development of our many industries. They would not deride that policy which the public six or seven times had endorsed as the correct policy of this country, nor blame the policy of protection for the conditions that prevailed at that time, which, were, as hon. gentlemen must know, directly due to the world disturbance in finance and commerce. Reciprocity was the panacea suggested by my hon. friends. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) said last night:

> We all recognize that Canada is passing through a period of hard times. We may differ about the cause. Statesmen on this side of the House saw the depression coming prior to 1911, and they endeavoured to provide for it by opening new markets for Canadian products. Their efforts were frustrated, and Canada is having a taste of the depression that existed prior to 1896.

The hon. gentleman seemed at that time to have a vision of the future, a thing that hon. gentlemen opposite have not been troubled with in the past, because if they had that clear vision of what would come as the result of submitting that policy to the people of this country, they would have preferred the honour of serving their country as leaders in this House to going down to ignominious defeat as the result of submitting that policy to the people. If hon. gentlemen opposite wish to challenge the Government again on that issue, I am sure we shall be prepared to meet them in the country, and I have no doubt as to what the result will be when the question is submitted again to the people.

Our friends have to some extent derided the campaign, as we may call it, of patriotism and production. I have even heard hon. gentlemen, who are interested in matters of agriculture and who represent agricultural districts, ridicule this policy. It will be an unfortunate thing for

this country if the time ever comes when a man engaged in agricultural production thinks there is nothing more to learn. I have the honour to represent a district which is peculiarly an agricultural one. In fact, I have not in the whole constituency even an incorporated village of any kind. My constituents are a very intelligent and progressive people. The Ontario Government has established in my county a district representative of the Department of Agriculture. It is the farmers who are progressive and enterprising, and who wish to be up-to-date who read the literature sent out and who attend the lectures that are given by that representative. A patriotism-and-production meeting was held in my district last month. At that meeting I learned from the district representative in our country of the splendid results obtained by our young men in what was called the acre-profit competition in the province of Ontario last year. In my own district, in the county of Middlesex, there were three farmers' sons, one of whom, as the result of the information he had obtained and the interest he had manifested in the lectures, was able in the competition to produce from one acre 501 bushels of potatoes, at a cost of $32.50, which were sold at 40 cents per bushel, giving a profit of $168 per acre. The other two boys from the same district were within ten bushels of these results. Each of those three boys produced an average of over $160 clear profit per acre as a result of the effort they had put forth in intensive production. The campaign, as the matter has been laid before the people, is encouraging them, not so much to a greater acreage as to a better production. The great problem is that of labour. Until that problem can be solved it will be difficult to increase production. The farmers of our country are working late and early, and are unable to procure sufficient labour. Notwithstanding that, I do not think any one denies that it is quite within the bounds of possibilities to apply more science to the development of agriculture, and by that, and by a little better tillage, to produce larger results on the same acreage.

There are three ways in which a farmer can increase production: first, by the application of increased labour; secondly, by the application of more intelligent and scientific methods, and thirdly, by application of increased capital. I do not say that these three are entirely independent of each other. On the contrary, they are very closely connected. No one of them can be applied by itself alone. Each carries with it the necessity in some measure of both of the others. Pure bred stock, tile drains, improved buildings —all these things make for better production and essential pre-requisites for them is capital. The tendency of the whole financial world is to draw capital away from the farms. We find in all the small towns the banks establishing branches. The object of this is to collect the savings of the farmers and to distribute them in the commercial centres, applying the money to commerce and industry. This is the natural thing to do but works injury to farmers themselves who used increased capital for their operations. It cannot be denied, however, that agriculture is awakening to higher and to greater possibilities. The situation within the Empire in this world crisis calls upon our people for increased production. The people in this country are largely responding to that call. To fulfil these requirements, to meet the urgent demands of the Empire, the present need is for a large increase in the amount of capital available for rural credit on conditions suitable for agricultural enterprises? What in view of the situation is required? What can be suggested by way of remedy? It is an economic certainty that every enterprise promptly responds to the magic touch of prosperity. Let the farmer have an experience of this, and you will see agriculture expand. Better returns to the farmer need not mean higher prices to the consumer owing to improved marketing, improved methods of transportation and storage facilities, not operated in the interest of the railways and the middleman, but in the interests of the producers and consumers. If scientific production is a good thing, then why not scientific marketing and scientific distribution? We cannot enlarge our farming activities unless the means to supply the capital is provided.

The question of credit for farmers is one which I think is of greatest importance. This is one of the problems that, I hope, this Government will be able to meet. We are told, when a subject of this kind is presented, that it offers difficulties. But in spite of the difficulties the situation has been grappled with in the United States. A movement was commenced over a year ago to meet the growing needs for extended rural credits. A commission was appointed under the authority of Congress to go abroad and make a study of this whole matter, especially the organization and operation of rural credit associations in Europe. On its return the commission made a report, and, as a result, a Bill was introduced in both Houses of Congress embodying the ideas and plans of this com-

mission. This is called the Moss-Fletcher Bill. The McCumber Rural Credit Bill was later introduced as an alternative plan; and finally the Bulkley-Hollis Bill, an amendment to the Agricultural Appropriation Bill, was the one which met the approval of the Banking and Commerce Committee of the Senate and was reported to the House of Representatives by a committee of that body. So the Bill has made good advance.

Some plan should be devised to enable farmers to organize co-operative credit associations throughout Canada with the assistance of the Government given under proper safeguards. The matter would imply using of the credit of the Government in a business-like way to reduce the enormous interest the farmers now have to pay. The great difference between the credit required for farmers and the credit required for ordinary commercial purposes is that the farmer requires a loan for a longer period than the ordinary commercial or industrial loan is expected to run. The application for credit should be supported by the Government in such a way as will give to the farmer, under proper safeguards, the assistance of the Government. That, to my mind, will go further to solve the problem of production and the problem of labour on the farm than anything else. It is of primary importance, above all other things. The interests of the farmer imperatively demand that we should have legislation extending direct Government aid to the tiller of the soil. Cases have come within my own observation, and in my own township, of farmers with a large area of grazing land, but without the capital to buy the necessary stock, and so their land goes to waste. I have seen more failures, I think, directly as a result of the want of capital to carry on the work of farming than from any other cause affecting my own district. I do not say that there are many who are in that unfavourable position. In fact they are comparatively few, because the farmers of that district are progressive. And I find that the most progressive farmers there are those who do not sell their grain at the first price the market will give them after threshing, but they feed that grain to the stock on the farm, and so, as they say, their grain leaves the farm on the hoof. These are the men who are making a success of farming in our district.

Now, I have said there are difficulties in this matter. They have had difficulties to face in their efforts to solve this question in the United States. Sam Warren defines difficulty as being only a word indicating the degree of strength requisite for accomplishing particular objects; a mere notice of the necessity for exertion; a bugbear to children and fools, but only a stimulus to men. There may be difficulties surrounding this question, but I believe that the more the problem is pressed upon the Government, the sooner a way will be found to solve it. I believe that Agriculture should be the most important department of the whole Government. We have our experimental farms, as we call them, in different parts of the country. And while these accomplish a good deal, in my humble opinion, the system of appointing district representatives in the various communities where they can become practically the agriculturists' doctors, right among the farmers themselves, is accomplishing a great r measure of good even than the work of the experimental farms. I hope the time will come when agriculture will be deemed of so much importance in this country that in every county at least, if not in every township, we may have a demonstration farm right in the midst of our people, which can be carried on with profit, and which will arouse the interest of the farmers in the most up-to-date and scientific methods of agriculture.

It has been stated, and it seems most unfortunate if true, that in Ontario, notwithstanding the enormous production of that province, they are not producing half of what the farms are capable of producing. I have given a good deal of thought to this matter and have discussed it with our representative including hon. gentlemen who are here representing constituentencies in the great West and who are endeavouring to make a good living out of farming in that country. I believe the time will come when they will follow the information that can be given in their agricultural schools in their several districts, and when the farmers there will not sell their oats at 25 cents a bushel and their barley at 30 and 35 cents, nor will they sell their wheat at the ridiculously low prices that have prevailed, but will feed their grain to stock and send it off on the hoof so that a twenty-five cent bushel of oats will represent a dollar or a dollar and ten cents before it leaves the farmer's hands. Our friends on the other side constantly complain of the tariff. But I believe the time will come when they will get interested in these lines. When the great West becomes a leading industrial district the demand from that

country for extensive changes in the tariff will entirely disappear.

In regard to the patriotism and production campaign throughout the country, I desire to say a word though the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) is not here. I would respectfully say that I think the campaign would have been productive of even better results if the advertising campaign had preceded the meetings. I believe that the information gathered by the Department of Agriculture and issued in bulletins from time to time does not accomplish its full purpose, because the means of distribution is not what it should be. We have discussed this in the agricultural committee of this House and have not been able to suggest a method which would give the best distribution for this literature which, properly distributed, would be so valuable to the farmers of this country. I have thought, and still think, that it would be a good plan if bound catalogues of the publications of the department were in every rural reading library throughout the country. Then the man who is interested in live stock, the man who is interested in horticulture, the man who is interested in field crops, may send for the particular literature dealing with the special branch of agriculture he is particularly interested in.

I want to touch briefly on the matter of reciprocity, because that subject may, perchance, be a live issue when another appeal is made to the people. The inconsistency of hon. gentlemen opposite in connection with this matter is amusing. I have a clipping from the Winnipeg Telegram in which reciprocity is recommended because eggs in Minneapolis are only 29 cents a dozen while in Winnipeg they are from 35 to 45 cents a dozen; because butter in Minneapolis is from 29 to 34 cents a pound, while in Winnipeg it is from 30 to 40 cents a pound. In the last reciprocity campaign hon. gentlemen opposite attempted to convince the people of cities and industrial communities on the one hand that the effect of reciprocity would be to lower to them the prices of these commodities, and on the other hand, that the farmer would get a better market on the other side for his produce. Hon. gentlemen were so inconsistent in the matter of reciprocity that they could not interest the people in it. It has been said that protection is foolish, and that if it were abandoned the country would be better off. But if it were not for the duties which keep them away, would American capital and American manufacturers invest half a billion dollars in establishing industries all over our country? Almost every member of this House has within his own constituency evidence of the fact that American manufacturers are establishing branches in Canada. My hon. friend the member for North Essex (Mr. Wilcox) probably knows better than any one else what the effect of reciprocity would be upon the large industrial district of which his constituency is a part. You cannot convince the farmers of that district that the markets of Detroit are better for his produce than the home market. He has the big markets of London, Toronto, and other places, and to these markets, taking advantage of the protection which he is afforded, he may ship his vegetables and other produce. The automobile industry in my hon. friend's constituency has grown to enormous proportions; notwithstanding the financial pressure which exists at the present time, it is expanding rapidly. The question naturally resolves itself into an inquiry as to what would be the benefit of reciprocity to the farmers. It has been repeated time and again—and it certainly must be evident to any hon. gentleman in this House—that a market that produces a surplus of 300,000,000 bushels of wheat cannot be the natural market for the products of this country.

I believe that hon. gentlemen opposite look upon the Globe as orthodox. I have a clipping from that journal of the issue of February 13, which says:

> The price of Canadian wheat is fixed not in Winnipeg but in Liverpool. The price of cattle and hogs on this side of the border cannot long remain materially above that of food animals in the United States. The value of Canadian cheese is set by the volume of consumption in the trenches of Flanders and the mills of Lancashire.

In the same editorial the Globe deals with the question of radial railways, which is a project with which I have a good deal of sympathy. It says:

> If the farmer needs radial railways and better roads to help him in marketing, the Government should come to his aid in organizing such services. Even the social side of farm life might be benefited greatly by united effort. Whatever is needed to turn the stream of settlement to the land should be done cheerfully and with the good-will of all classes of the community. Ontario's prosperity, like that of the Dominion at large, must spring from the presence on the farms of contented and prosperous food producers.

Under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite the people of this country had this matter presented to them practi-

cally every year under a different name, but on each and every occasion they turned it down. There is no doubt that there was in the mind of our great neighbour to the south another object than that of trade expansion. One could quote hundreds of sayings taken from the American press which really represented the true and inward view of the people of the United States at that time. The following newspaper extract deals with ex-President Taft's views on the subject:

The world price of wheat and the other principal grains grown in this country is, as the president truthfully maintains, fixed, not in the United States, but abroad, where the surplus from this continent is disposed of. Canadian wheat is wanted, he says, as grist for the Minneapolis millers, whose plant has a capacity 35 per cent greater than what is needed to grind the wheat of the United States. "Canadian wheat can," he said. "be imported and ground into flour without materially reducing the demand for or price of United States wheat, and the surplus will be sent abroad as flour."

If this is the whole effect of the free entry of our wheat into the United States, how are our farmers to benefit? The president confesses that the arrangement is in the interest of United States flour manufacturers grinding for the export trade.

Canadian flour manufacturers also grind for the export trade, and the markets to which their product goes are the same as those to which the Minneapolis output goes.

But the president sees one result that will be of material benefit to all the farmers in the United States.

He saw a result that would benefit the United States, but if you take something from the farmers of Canada and give it to the farmers of the United States, then you deprive our farmers of their rights. The editorial goes on to say:

Live stock men and dairy farmers there will get the benefit of the bran and shorts that are by-products of the flour made in Minneapolis mills from Canadian wheat.

And, of course, if United States farmers gain those advantages, Canadian farmers will lose them.

The President's view as to prices was emphasized by the following remarks which he made on the subject:

But I do think that reciprocity will enlarge the reservoir or the supply of farm products for our people, and thus prevent undue enhancement of prices beyond the present standard. If this be the case, then neither the farmer will be injured nor will prices increase.

The following words of the ex-President are very significant:

"I always feel an impatience, perhaps an unreasonable one, in having to argue the questions of schedules with reference to the advantage of the reciprocity agreement with Canada, because it seems to be that the reasons for adopting it are deeper and wider than are to be found in comparison of percentages and rates with respect to special localities and special businesses."

Another clipping which I took from the Southern Lumber Journal, sets out very clearly the intent or expectation of the worthy President of that day. It is as follows:

Be that as it may, the people of the United States through their representatives in Congress and the United States Senate should straight-a-way demand that negotiations be instituted without delay by Secretary of State Knox for the peaceable annexation of Canada; but, for annexation, if it should have to come about through conquest. If there is any virtue in the reciprocity treaty as ratified by the United States Congress and signed by the president some days ago, it is to be found in the fact that this instrument lays the foundation stone for the annexation of a country that should have long since been a part of the United States.

President Taft and the advocates of this measure have made this plain in many of their speeches and addresses on this subject.

Whatever the United States goes gunning for she usually lands, and history is ever repeating itself. For instance we might cite Cuba, the Phillipines and other instances of conquest and practical annexation during the past few years. These are but illustrations of what we can do when we try. We are to-day the first and greatest country among the nations of the earth, and with Canada and her wonderful resources added to our already world-wide and all powerful assets, we could easily say "peace be still" and make the other nations of the world come and go at our beck and call. . . .

What would have been impossible and out of the question a few years ago, may now be considered within easy reach.

The great Liberal party of the Dominion of Canada standing behind this proposal of reciprocity which was a veiled effort from their standpoint for annexation:

National and international lines are likely to be upset in many places on the world's map before another decade.

They were prophets that time. Literature of that kind and articles of this manner were cast broadcast before the people of the United States. It is the custom of hon. gentlemen opposite to look at the blue and dismal side of everything, and we have had examples of that during this debate. According to them, this country is in a deplorable condition. This reckless, extravagant Government has brought it to this position. My hon. friend who has just sat down, referred to the increase in the Civil Service. Why, in Great Britain the Civil Service Estimates increased from £29,000,000 in 1907 to £55,000,000 in 1914, and the Estimates for the present year are a million and a half pounds greater than those of last year. Whatever may be the cause, with all the prosperity of commerce and business and

development, and with all the wealth that our Mother Country boasts, they have found it necessary to increase their Civil Service in keeping with the development of their country. I do not think our hon. friends have been fair in their criticism of the Civil Service administration. The hon. minister tried to explain from time to time that many recent appointments to office, resignations and dismissals, represented those temporarily appointed. We all know that, for example, in connection with surveys and public works during the summer men are engaged for five or six months and then quietly retire from the service.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Does not the hon. gentleman think that if these gentlemen he speaks of were gentlemen who were dismissed at the end of six months they would appear on the other side of the account? We have from the various departments a number of appointments and dismissals. If a man were appointed for six months and relieved from the service no doubt his name would appear as a dismissal.

Mr. GLASS: That explanation was given by the minister, but I would answer my hon. friend's question by asking him this one. Will the hon. gentleman say that to his knowledge there are at the present time 10,000 more civil servants than there were in 1911?

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am going wholly by the return placed on the table of the House by the Government.

Mr. GLASS: The returns do not show that. I know it is very easy to twist or rearrange figures to suit a purpose.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The fact is that the returns show a larger number, for 515 additional officers in the Marine and Fisheries Department are not included in that 10,000, and we have not yet heard from the Department of Militia. In addition to that, the return only covers about two years.

Mr. GLASS: I have not made any particular study of this, and I was only stating the figures given me by my hon. friend. But I think that if my hon. friend wanted to be fair and to give the proper information to this House, he would endeavour to find out from the Department. The fair comparison would be not the increase in appointments but the increase in the number of employees now in actual service. That comparison would be a proper and fair one; if the increase were unreasonably large in proportion to the increase and development of the work in the departments there might be some cause for criticism, but there is no ground for criticism along the lines my hon. friends have pursued. This gloomy picture that is painted of our country and the conditions that exist here is not justified by the actual results as shown in the buoyant statements of the banks, with their large reserves and deposits, and also in the statements from loan companies and insurance companies. Under the existing circumstances there has been a surprising growth in our railway earnings and remarkable improvement in the bank balances and clearings. All along the line the tide seems to have turned. On the 30th of January the banks of this country had a total paid-up capital and reserve of $227,203,192. The deposits in the chartered banks in Canada were $996,877,212, the deposits elsewhere were $91,807,007, making a total of deposits of $1,088,684,219. But the increase in the deposits for January over the corresponding month in the year 1914 is very striking. These are things that come close to us and are indications of improved conditions. The increase in the amount of deposits this year over January, 1914, was $21,929,917. In addition to the capital invested in these banks, our loan companies have a paid-up capital of $59,700,000. I have not the figures of reserves of loan companies but in many cases the reserve exceeds the paid-up capital and I do not think I would be very far mis-stating the fact if I said that the reserves were equal to the paid-up capital. We have invested in our manufacturing industries in this country $1,247,583,609; in railways $2,250,000,000; in canals $102,000,000. Our factory output amounted to $1,600,000,000, and the wages in our factories to $241,000,000. These figures are for 1910. The returns for this year show large increases over them. It does not look to me as though this country were in a deplorable condition financially, and I think that all along the line the tendency is towards improvement.

Hon. gentlemen complain about the cost of the administration of the Post Office Department in Canada. I find upon investigation that even in the United States the total revenue of the post office from 1865, the time of the civil war, to 1913, was $3,775,000,000 and the cost of operation for the same period was $4,555,000,000. There was that difference between the revenue and the cost of operating the Post Office Department of that great country. From 1884 until

1914 there have been almost constant deficits in the Post Office Department of that country. In 1902 the deficit amounted to $2,961,169, and in 1909 to $17,479,770. The aggregate deficit in the United States Post Office revenue from 1884 to 1914 reached the enormous total of $210,544,802, or an average yearly deficit of $7,797,955. That is in the great country south of us, with their much more dense population than that of Canada and their enormous revenue. Looking at that record we have reason to be proud of the administration of the Post Office Department in Canada.

The development of the parcel post system and of rural mail delivery has been a matter of very great interest to the farmers of this country. I do not know that any department of this Government has ever had to undertake a matter more difficult or complex than the arranging of rural mail routes throughout this country. The work has been done well. From the district I represent, a pretty large area, I have not received a single complaint of the service that has been given by the department. When we want to get an estimate of the prosperity of this country we sometimes look at the annual bank reports. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that the present condition of the country is due to the gross extravagance of this Government. Let me read from the proceedings of the annual meeting of the Royal Bank of Canada which was held on January 8, 1914. Mr. E. F. B. Johnston, K.C., in seconding the adoption of the report, said:

> Personally, I have great confidence in the vigour and elasticity of Canada and its people. Compared with many other countries, people in Canada do not know what hard times mean. The fact is that financial stringency in Canada is generally caused by over-prosperity. Many business men of Canada during the past two or three years have been doing $200 of business on $100 capital. If they had confined their business relatively in volume to the amount of capital they had invested in it, they would not be hard up.

He goes on:

> We may ask on an occasion like the present: What of the future? I am very sanguine as regards Canada. Let us look at some of the evidences of prosperity which are laid before us:

Then after giving certain figures in regard to England, he says:

> Coming to our own country, we find a pronounced feeling of hopefulness. From every province comes the voice of prosperity.

That was the optimistic opinion expressed of the conditions in the fall of 1913 by the director of one of our banks at that time. The Minister of Finance too, when the Budget of 1914 was brought down in this House, was considerably optimistic as to the future of Canada; for then, neither he nor any one else knew of the great conflict that was lurking in the rear. Let me now turn to the annual meeting of the Royal Bank which was held on January 14, 1915. Sir Herbert Holt, the president, in moving the adoption of the report, said:

> The outbreak of war was followed by a convulsive derangement of international exchange and general trade. Stock exchanges were closed, in many countries a moratorium was proclaimed, and a financial catastrophe of world-wide proportions was only averted by the wise and timely action of the British Government in providing through the Bank of England, powerful machinery for sustaining and protecting credit during the war, and for twelve months after peace is concluded. Much credit is due to the Canadian Minister of Finance for the emergency measures so promptly introduced to protect the situation in Canada. The efficiency of these is demonstrated by the fact that the business of the country has pursued its ordinary course, and we enjoy the distinction of requiring no recourse to a general moratorium.

And further on, he says:

> Having no misgivings regarding the final outcome of the war, we venture the prediction that its economic effect upon Canada will be beneficial, although the magnitude of the struggle is without precedent. Previous wars during the past half century (namely, the war of Prussia against Austria in 1886, and against France in 1870, the South African war and the Russo-Japanese war) were all followed by active and expanding trade, but in each case, only two countries were engaged, as against the inclusion of nearly all Europe on the present occasion.... If the present war be long-continued, the European nations involved may become financially prostrated for many years. Even if the war is not long-continued, the flow of capital from Great Britain to this country is not likely to be resumed for a considerable time, and new constructional work will therefore be retarded. On the other hand, we reap distinct commercial advantages from our geographical position and remoteness from the scene of warfare, which permit us to prosecute our farming and manufacturing industries unmolested in spite of our participation in the conflict.

That is the opinion of the president of the Royal Bank. I have said before that I believe the time will come when our industries in the great West will be so developed that they will impress even our friends in the West that our home market, which industries alone can build up, is a matter of some interest to them; and when that time comes we shall not hear so much of the cry for free trade. I should like to give the House some figures taken from the report of the Royal Bank, from which I

have already quoted, giving the number of factories in this country by provinces, the capital employed, employees, salaries and wages, and the value of products.

1913—	Establishments.	Capital.	Employees.	Salaries and Wages.	Value of Products.
Alberta	334	$ 34,166,900	8,079	$ 5,052,530	$ 21,747,275
British Columbia	748	142,404,000	38,558	19,955,400	75,473,700
Manitoba	505	55,491,000	20,053	12,630,800	62,126,500
New Brunswick	1,329	41,814,700	28,654	9,623,400	41,000,900
Nova Scotia	1,702	92,137,800	33,336	12,303,000	61,007,100
Ontario	9,201	689,168,540	276,430	136,174,500	671,130,000
Prince Edward Island.	508	2,330,000	4,354	614,600	3,618,500
Quebec	7,592	378,441,000	183,124	80,368,600	406,167,950
Saskatchewan	199	8,125,000	3,761	2,240,970	7,329,300
	22,118	$1,444,078,940	596,349	$278,963,800	$1,349,601,225

The total value of the products from all the factories was $1,349,601,225. Those figures show how this country has prospered under the tariff, and I do not think they furnish any reason for discouraging our optimism. I have said that the evidence all round shows that conditions in this country are not deplorable. In Winnipeg last year, in spite of the adverse conditions, 91 charters were obtained for industries, and 22 new industries were established in that city. Twenty-four of the companies that obtained charters had a capital of from forty to sixty thousand dollars; 24 a capital of from eighty thousand to one hundred thousand dollars; 6 a capital of two hundred and fifty thousand dollars, and 8 a capital of one million dollars. The prospects in that section of the country for the coming year are most encouraging. Since 1913 a great many more acres have been brought under cultivation, and the area under crop this year will be very much larger than last year. But, estimating the crop for next year on the basis of the area under cultivation in 1913, the value of the crop, at present prices, would be $293,281,218, as against $94,604,616 in 1913.

The estimated increased production and price of wheat alone for the coming year will be more than three times what they were in 1913.

A Conservative estimate of the oats, barley, flax, hay, live stock and dairy production, in which the prices for oats are placed at an advance of 100 per cent, barley at 100 per cent, hay at an advance of 30 per cent, with dairy products, live stock and flax unchanged, implies an increase in the returns to the farmers of the west of something like $88,206,758, as compared with a return in 1913 of $63,816,307.

This article goes on to say that

It is reasonable evidence that the farmers' crops for 1915 ought to approximate in value to him something like $381,487,976.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. GLASS (resuming): Before the House took recess, I was endeavouring to point out conditions as they exist at the present time, and to show that from all evidences Canada has more reason for optimism than for pessimism. The condition of transportation companies, the improvement of banking conditions and trade generally point to a hopeful outlook. Hon members of the Opposition have endeavoured in the course of their arguments to impress upon us the necessity for economy at such a time as this, but I do not know that they are any more impressed with the need for economy than are the members of the Government. It is simply a matter of difference of opinion as to the best way in which to conduct the affairs of the country at this time. If one wants to see the dark side of a question, it is quite easy to exaggerate conditions. I have here a clipping from the Globe under date of March 5, 1915, only five days ago, which says:

Economy is contagious. Talk of hard times, whether warranted or not, is certain to cause a tightening of purse-strings. That industrial corporations not injured but aided by the war have reduced wages is a natural though a lamentable development, the glut of the labour market making it possible. The encouragement toward business as usual will have but little influence on men who see a chance of increased profits by improving opportunities, but there is no ground for a general tendency toward personal economy by those who do not fell any pressure in that direction. Farmers have not lost their market by the war, and so far as prices have been affected the tendency has been upward. Their position, so far as production and returns are concerned, has been improved. But it is worthy of note, and perhaps to be regretted, that they have been affected by the contagion of the economy irresistibly forced on many city workers. Instead of more freely patronizing mercantile and industrial establishments in accordance with the better markets they are enjoying, the farmers have been inclined to fall into line with the prevailing habit.

The prosperity of agriculture is a matter for congratulation. The farmer has borne the heavy end of the load, and it is always cause for general satisfaction when he comes into his own. Our dependence on him is revealed and confessed in the request that he increase his output. The individual farmer, knowing how ignorant the wisest adviser must be regarding the personal considerations surrounding the operation of his farm, may resent advice as to methods or general operations. But the advice to enjoy the good things within reach and extend liberal patronage to other industries now feeling depression may be regarded from a broader outlook. The farmer has no ground for fearing the influence of the war. His business can never be ruined. He may be injured by taxation or by the obstruction of trade routes, but the world will continue to demand all he can produce. In the matter of markets he has nothing to fear. It is in the interest of the province and the Dominion at large that the farmers fully enjoy the prosperity that has fallen to them through the necessities of an unprecedented situation. By thus benefiting themselves they will confer a still wider benefit on their fellow-citizens now, in many cases, sadly in need.

Agriculture is the great basic industry of Canada, and its products yield practically $1,000,000,000 a year. At a time like this, when the demand for gold is so great, and when the impossibility of increasing our borrowings is so evident, the fact that the farmers of this country can produce from the soil products to the value of $1,000,000,000, is a matter of congratulation and should dissipate all pessimism.

Before recess, speaking of the development of the business of this country under our wise and prudent tariff policy, I said that this country was justified in adopting that policy by the experience of countries in Europe and on this side of the Atlantic which had adopted protection. The wealth of all the countries of the world has grown enormously during the past century. Sir George Paish, who is an authority on statistics, says that the wealth of the United Kingdom in 1814 was computed at $12,500,000,000, while a conservative estimate would place it now at about $85,000,000,000, or an increase of about 580 per cent, while its population has grown 130 per cent. The income of the British people has increased 700 per cent—from $1,500,000,000 to $12,000,000,000. We all admit that the United Kingdom has prospered under free trade to a degree which must be gratifying to that nation, and the colonies take just pride in that prosperity. For the sake of comparison I want to point out that the wealth of the United States in the same period has increased from about $1,750,000,000 to something like $150,000,000,000, or nearly 8,500 per cent; and the income of the people has risen from less than $500,000,000 to about $35,000,000,000 a year, a matter of 6,500 per cent. To those who uphold the doctrine of free trade we admit that it has done in Britain what protection has done to a larger extent in this country. If the nation to the south of us, following along on the lines of protection, has built up such powerful industries and has so developed its factories, and has increased its wealth to such an extent as is shown by these figures, we feel that the conditions that prevail in the United States should prevail in Canada and that it is our duty to protect our Canadian workmen. We have evidences everywhere of the benefits of protection. A clipping I have here shows how necessary it is for the large factories in the United States to establish factories in Canada.

"Our company is now incorporating in Canada and will build a factory at Toronto," said Mr. Booth to-day, "simply because our tariff policy is wrong. Canada is a great, aggressive vitalizing country commercially and a great market. It is naturally a commercial unit with the United States, but tariff walls separate the two countries, and we are forced to go to Canada with a factory to escape the Canadian products without asking for reciprocal advantage in their markets for 30 to 35 per cent burden their tariff imposes. Meanwhile, the Wilson administration is proposing to open our markets to our manufacturers."

That is a condition which existed some time ago. We know that Governor Foss in the state of Massachusetts, in appealing to his people, drew particular attention to the fact that $500,000,000 of American capital had been invested in industries in Canada because they were compelled to come to this country to obtain the market of which they were deprived by reason of the tariff of Canada against them. I do not see how, with such evidence before us, there can be any ground for arguing that this policy has not been a good policy for our country.

My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) in his closing remarks made one or two observations to which I wish to refer. I am surprised that my hon. friend should draw any comparison between the conditions under which the contingent was sent to fight for the Mother Country in South Africa in 1899 and the conditions under which the immense body of troops was organized to assist the Empire in the present crisis. I am surprised also that he should refer as he did to the efforts of the Militia Department in the organization of the camp at Valcartier. It is quite possible that, with the short time at the disposal of the department and the very extraordinary conditions that existed, mistakes may have been

made in connection with that camp, but I think it 'is a tribute to the capacity of this department of the Government, and of the Government itself, that so enormous a camp should have been organized in so short a time, gathering men from the four quarters of this great country, equipping them, and sending them out within the space of a few weeks. I had the pleasure of visiting the camp myself, and was very much impressed with the wonderful executive ability and energy displayed and with the wonderful things accomplished in so short a time. The contingent for South Africa, to which my hon. friend alluded, and which he compared with the contingents that the Government is sending forward to-day, consisted, if my recollection serves me well, of about three thousand men. I do not know how many trained regular soldiers we have in the country at this time, or how many we had at that time, but I think that a draft of men could have been made at twenty-four hours' notice from the regulars stationed in barracks of the Dominion at that time, and there would be no reason why that contingent should not have sailed within a week of mobilization. Aside from that, we know that at that time the sea was not menaced with hostile ships. In the present case, it took a considerable time to get our men across the ocean. We know that care was necessary, and that the Government showed its wisdom in taking precautions against molestation by pirate submarines or enemy battleships on their way across the sea. It is a tribute to the power of the British navy, as well as to the organization completed here, that so large a number of men—I understand the largest body of armed men that up to that time had ever been transported across the Atlantic, were carried in safety. And to-day they are in the trenches, fighting for Canada and for the Motherland. We realize that this war is no more the war of the Empire than it is the war of Canada. We do not regard ourselves as fighting England's battles, but as fighting our own battles. And if there is one thing on which this country and the Empire are to be congratulated more than anything else, it is that Britain's command of the sea enables commerce to cross and re-cross absolutely unmolested. If we have so little commercial disturbance in our country to-day it is due directly to the power that the British navy wields. In view of the protection that has been afforded us not only now but in former times and that has thrown its sheltering arm around our country, we are responsive to the call of duty, which is the call of privilege, to serve the Mother Country in this trying time.

My hon. friend from Guysborough also referred to the British preference. I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite who do not see eye to eye with us in this matter how they can logically oppose the increase of the preference unless they oppose increase in the duty on raw materials. The revenue has to be raised, and they concede, I believe—I do not see how they can refuse to concede—that we must have raw materials for our industries. A small duty must be paid on those materials in order to produce revenue. Now, in Great Britain raw materials are free, though they come from the four quarters of the globe. Would it be just to our manufacturers here to propose that they should pay a tax of 7½ per cent on raw materials and allow the manufacturers of England, who have their raw materials free, to send their products here to compete with our labour? In other words, is it reasonable that we should put a handicap of 7½ per cent on our manufacturers? Even if it were said that the handicap is not so great, the best that can be said is that while the increase is generally 7½ per cent the increase under the preference is 5 per cent. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been trying to draw a red herring across the trail on this subject of the preference. I think the Finance Minister put the matter very well yesterday when he defined "preference" when he said that a preference was an advantage given to one country over competing countries in the markets of another country.

The net result of the increase in the British preference is that to the extent of 2½ per cent Britain is given a greater advantage over foreign competitors in the Canadian market than she had before. I do not think for one moment that there will be any criticism of this increase in the old land; nor do I think that there is any just reason why hon. gentlemen opposite should criticise it here. Evidently their only reason for doing so is to attempt to prejudice the minds of the people by asserting that we are fighting the Mother Country with tariffs while our men are fighting in the trenches. If we had taken any action other than that which has been taken, I am sure it would have been a gross injustice to the manufacturers of this country.

I have watched with very much interest the course taken by hon. members of the Opposition for many years past, and I have

observed that they have never been exactly in unison on the tariff question. Their attitude in that respect reminds me very much of a tug-of-war, twelve men on each side, pulling a rope in different directions. If six of the twelve on one side should desert and pull for the other side, I fancy they would picture very vividly the attitude of hon. gentlemen of the Opposition with regard to trade and tariffs: one section pulling for protection, another for exemption from taxation in respect of matters in which they are particularly interested; another for free trade. We have to get away from these conditions; we have to get away from provincialism in tariff matters. The policy this Government proposes to pursue is to adopt —as indeed, they have adopted—a national tariff which shall benefit all people in all parts of our country. I thought the designation "mixed pickles," given by a newspaper to the wants of the Liberal party, was very good. I will read the article; it is entitled, "A Catalogue of Liberal Wants":

An extension of public enterprise to help mitigate conditions of unemployment. The cessation of all expenditures on public works. A generous assistance in money and men to carry on the war. No additional taxation. A wider success for the made-in-Canada campaign. Free trade and direct taxation. No taxation for other than war-purposes.

These wants are just about as consistent as the opinions of hon. gentlemen with respect to trade and tariff matters.

There has been a falling off in immigration; let us examine this question for a moment and endeavour to ascertain how we stand in the matter of immigration as compared with other countries. I have the following clipping taken from the Winnipeg Telegram of a few days ago:

War has in great measure checked the flow of immigration from Europe to America.

I presume our friends would say that the reason for this check is due to the tariff policy of this Government. (Reading):

It is true that a partial check, owing to the commercial depression, common to the American continent, had taken place before the outbreak of hostilities, but the most marked decrease has become evident since the beginning of August. Nor while the present conflict is maintained is there any possibility of a reversion to former conditions, but rather a still further falling off.

Canada has not suffered more than the United States. In the latter country the decrease in immigration from Europe for 1914 was 45 per cent, or well over half a million.

If this statement is correct I see no reason why our tariff policy should be condemned, because so far as immigration is concerned we are not in so bad a condition as our friends across the line.

I have said that figures can prove almost anything; I believe they can be changed to substantiate arguments which would not otherwise be capable of proof. The total immigration into this country from 1911 to 1914 was 1,141,957. From 1897 to 1910 it was 1,575,029. It will appear, therefore, that the immigration for three years under the present Government amounted to almost as much as it did during the first fourteen years of the administration of the late Government. The immigration policy which our friends of the Opposition had adopted—praise and credit is due them for this—was commencing to bring results; the greater part of the immigration which took place under their administration came in during the latter part of that period of fourteen years. For the ten years from 1897 to 1906, the first ten years of their administration, the total immigration was 832,383. From 1896 to 1911 the immigration was 1,142,788. The flow of immigration into this country had commenced to slacken before the present war. Why? By reason of the Balkan war to which I have previously referred. Our friends opposite seem entirely to forget that the Balkan war of 1912 was largely responsible for the conditions which prevailed in this country during the year 1913. Those who wish to be fair in their criticisms and who have confidence in the assertions of the financiers of Europe and of this country, realize that the direct cause of the industrial stagnation and interruption of commercial activity in 1913 was due to the Balkan war. War does not create capital; it destroys it; and one of the results of the Balkan war was that a total of $450,000,000 was wiped out and withdrawn from the world's capital.

I could present to the House a great many reasons why, having regard to the circumstances, we should be gratified with the manner in which the affairs of the country are being administered at the present time, but they are so palpably apparent to any student of present conditions that I am sure there is no reason why I should present them.

If we are true to ourselves, if we do our full duty to our country, we will not go about whining about hard times. There is no country under heaven to-day that has greater reason for self congratulation and thankfulness for the conditions prevailing in it than Canada. In the providence of God it is to be hoped that this horrible

war may be brought to a speedy and satisfactory conclusion. The sooner peace comes the sooner trade and commerce will be restored to normal conditions. Whatever the future may hold, the people of this country will meet the problems that will arise fearlessly, as in the days gone by. We will march on to our destiny side by side with the great country to the south of us, building up a nation on the northern half of this continent that will be worthy of and true to the traditions of the great British Empire. I have often thought in connection with this great war of the immortal words of Tennyson in his call to the colonies:

> Sharers of our glorious past,
> Brothers, must we part at last?
> Shall we not, through good and ill,
> Cleave to one another still?
>
> Britain's myriad voices call:
> Sons, be welded, each and all,
> Into one imperial whole,
> One with Britain, heart and soul—
> One life, one flag, one fleet, one throne.

May that be our destiny.

Mr. W. S. LOGGIE (Northumberland, New Brunswick): Mr. Speaker, I followed with very much interest the remarks of the hon. gentleman from Middlesex (Mr. Glass). He made a very moderate speech, somewhat lengthy perhaps, but that of course is to be pardoned. He touched on many matters which to my mind are hardly relevant to the discussion of this Budget. He referred, among other things, to the reciprocal trade proposals that were before the country in 1911. He anticipated that that might be a live issue in the coming election. I may tell the hon. gentleman that in my judgment it will not be an issue in the coming election. Conditions have changed since it was a live issue. So far as the maritime provinces are concerned, we appreciate very highly the reduction of tariff made by the United States. It has been a great boon to the producing interests of the maritime provinces. It has enabled the producer to earn a very much better livelihood than ever before. The pockets of the producers have been very much enriched because of it and I do hope that although we may be compelled under the present circumstances to put an increased duty on natural products from the United States, our friends across the line will not change their tariff which is so favourable to our Canadian interests, especially in natural products. The hon. gentleman has asked if it would be justice to put a duty of 7½ per cent on raw material coming from the United States or a foreign country into Canada to be manufactured in Canada, and not put a corresponding duty on the manufactured article. The hon. gentleman must not forget that at the present time the manufacturer has an extra duty over and above the 7½ per cent, ranging from 20 per cent to 30 per cent; and with reasonable facilities and with capital procurable at a not unreasonable rate of interest, there is no reason why manufacturers in this country should not compete successfully with such a duty as this in their favour.

If the Minister of Finance were in his seat it would give me very much pleasure to convey to him my congratulations on the Budget which he presented to the House. It also would give me very much pleasure to say that I would have been glad to have been here to listen to that address. I regret that I was not able to be here, and the reason I assign for not being able to be here is the war. I am quite sure if I were asked to establish that, I could establish it with as much success as has attended the attempt which has been made to establish that a customs duty applied for current revenue is a war tax. Let me join hands with the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House in saying to the Government that they have our hearty sympathy and our support in the efforts that they have made to stand by the Mother Country in this time of extremity. It is certainly a great struggle that the Empire is engaged in, and to Canada as a daughter nation I am sure it gives pleasure to be able to do our little part in sending our sons to the front to fight the battles of the Empire, which are practically our battles, because on the success of the Empire depends the freedom of our firesides. I wish heartily to concur in the vote for $100,000,000 for the prosecution of the defence of the Empire. I also consider it a pleasure to be able to congratulate the Finance Minister on the very favourable arrangement he has made for securing money on reasonable terms for this great purpose; and I say further that if another $100,000,000 is required we shall come to the rescue and do our part. We shall not fail to do our full duty as His Majesty's loyal Opposition to support the Government in their aid to the Empire for the defence of this great, young nation of ours. If I may be allowed to quote from Holy Writ, "To-morrow shall be as this day, and much more abundant." We are willing to give $100,000,000 to-day; and to-morrow, if

more is required we shall give it abundantly. Having said that, I am bound to support the Government in so far as regards the money that is to be used for war purposes. The Finance Minister tells us that he will require in the near future $100,000,000 as a principal; and that the interest on this sum and on the sum already borrowed will be approximately $7,000,000 a year. He lays before this House a plan, to be followed later by a resolution as to how this $7,000,000 is to be collected. He proposes special taxes on letters, bills of exchange, bills of lading, cheques and so on, which he tells us will give him approximately eight to ten million dollars. He tells us that it will take approximately $7,000,000 to pay the interest on the war loan already borrowed and on the war loan he expects to borrow during the coming fiscal year. Now after he has taken that $7,000,000 from the revenue he expects to get from the special taxes, there will still be a few million dollars to the good, which could be used for the nucleus of a pension fund, or for other purposes in connection with the war.

So far as I have gone, I am in entire accord with the Government of the day and with the proposals that the Minister of Finance has brought down. But the Minister of Finance has presented another resolution to the House. He tells us that he wants $20,000,000 to make up the shortage, if I may so call it, between revenue and expenditure on consolidated account; and he proposes to tax, with a few exceptions, all raw material coming from foreign countries or from the United Kingdom. Mr. Speaker, I realize that this is not an easy situation to explain. When it was suggested yesterday, that the tax raising the duty on raw material now free to a 5 per cent and a 7½ per cent basis, and imposing light taxes on manufactured articles, was not a war tax and should not be considered as a war tax, the Finance Minister showed some heat. But I do not think he demonstrated last night that the customs tax he proposes is a war tax; and I must take issue with him on that part of his Budget. Inasmuch as the Government is borrowing $100,000,000 from the British Government for war purposes, and imposing a special tax to raise the interest on that amount, I say that all full provision has been made for the $100,000,000 and the interest thereon, and that it is not fair, it is in a sense misleading, to say that all the money that is to be raised is to be applied to war purposes, when, as a matter of fact, it is going to consolidated account to make up the shortage between revenue and expenditure. But that is not all. On every entry that comes through the customs house in future, and that is coming through the customs house to-day, there is a clause at the bottom, "War tax, 7½ per cent," and in that way every merchant in this country gets the impression that the 7½ per cent is being used for war purposes, whereas it is going to make up the shortage between revenue and expenditure on consolidated account. But even that is not all. The merchant, having paid his 7½ per cent, tells his customer that he has paid 7½ per cent into the treasury for war purposes, and then he in turn charges his customer 7½ per cent. Let me illustrate what I mean by a letter from John Millen & Sons, a wholesale firm in Montreal:

> We beg to advise that owing to the recent increase in customs tariff announced on the 12th inst., it will be necessary for us to advance our prices to meet this additional cost. Therefore, until such time as we can rearrange our list prices and discounts we will add the 7½ per cent war surtax to all invoices for imported lines of motor supplies, and we would advise you to make the same increase in your prices to your customers.

For the moment, I am not so seriously objecting to the 7½ per cent, but what I do seriously object to is that it is passed down from the custom house officials to the wholesale merchants and on to the customer that this money is for war purposes, when actually it is going to make up the $20,000,000 shortage between revenue and expenditure on consolidated account.

I wish to say a word in regard to this increased taxation, because I shall support the amendment before the House. I regret I cannot support the whole proposals of the Government; but there are exceptions. I think it is only fair to say that, under the exigencies of the case, I am willing to hold up my hand and vote to-day for $100,000,000, and I congratulate my hon. friend the Minister of Finance for being able to get this money so easily. And, further, I will hold up my hands and vote to-morrow for another $100,000,000 if needed. I am willing to meet the exigencies of the situation in a liberal manner so that the Government shall not be handicapped in the prosecution of the war and in doing their full duty to the Mother Country as well as what is necessary for the protection of our own homes. The amendment reads as follows:

> This House is ready to provide for the exigencies of the present situation and to vote all necessary ways and means to that end.

I concur in that—

—but it regrets that in the measure under consideration duties are imposed which must be oppressive upon the people.

Are they oppressive upon the people? That is the question we want to ask? Is my right hon. leader correct in putting that statement before the people?

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. LOGGIE: Well, let us see.

Mr. GRAHAM: They decide the case before they hear the evidence.

Mr. LOGGIE: In 1908 the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) deplored the taking of money from the pockets of the people, money that he said was their capital. We had raised the amount of taxation per capita from $5.50 in 1896 to about $11. As a matter of fact, the rate of taxation in 1910 was about $11. Under the present tariff the per capita tax was, in 1914, $15, approximately. What does that mean to the average family of five people? It means that the present tax per annum is no less than $75. The Minister of Trade and Commerce bewailed the taking of a very much less sum out of the pockets of the people. I want to show the House how this new tax works out. I said that the tax as it exists to-day amounts to $75 per family. To that you add this 5 per cent and this 7½ per cent respectively—I do not mean together—and you have the result that you are adding about one-third to the taxation of the people by this new Budget. In 1914 the rate of duty collected on goods imported into Canada was 15·648 per cent, including all goods dutiable and free. One hon. gentleman the other night calculated what the increased rate would be, that is to say, the horizontal rate all round, and I think he said that it would be 6·7 per cent, or something like 6⅞ per cent. To make the calculation easier I have assumed that 5 per cent on a certain amount and 7½ per cent upon another certain amount, taken together, will be about 6 per cent. That means that you are increasing the duty—not the rate of duty on the original invoice—but the duty itself by 33⅓ per cent, and you are making the cost of living go up by $20 per capita or equal to $100 per family, by this increased taxation that you propose to levy upon the people.

But that is not all that it is costing the people of Canada. If that were all I do not know that it would be so very serious. All the goods that are consumed pay this extra duty. Only about 25 per cent of the goods that are consumed in Canada are imported; the other 75 per cent are made in Canada. Do the consumers pay an equal advance on the goods made in Canada? Can I demonstrate that they do? Without demonstrating that I have shown that taxation is increased by 33⅓ per cent under this proposition, and when I tell you that the increased tax must be added to the other 75 per cent of the goods consumed you will agree with me that the proposition of the Government is most burdensome to the people.

Let me present that part of my plea to the House. For a good many years barbed wire and spring wire came into this country free. Before the 12th February the price that was ruling in Pittsburg was about $2 per 100 lbs. That was the base price, and what is meant by the base price is the price of barbed wire and not of plain spring wire. Since this Budget has come down the price of barbed and spring wire has been advanced by the Canadian manufacturers 7½ per cent, or 15 cents per 100 lbs. During the year 1914 the importation of barbed wire amounted to 23,000,000 pounds, valued at $504,000, while the importation of plain spring wire amounted to 71,000,000 pounds, valued at $1,308,000 in round figures. This wire, let me repeat, has in the past come into Canada free. The 7½ per cent duty amounts to $126,000. If next year we import the same quantity of barbed and plain wire the farmers will pay to the Treasury $126,000. That is not all. If that were all I do not think I would have so much to say. The statistics are not available as to the exact quantity of home-made wire that is consumed in Canada. I have estimated, on the best information that I could get, that two-thirds of the wire consumed in Canada is made by the wire mills in Canada, and that one-third of the amount used is imported.

9 p.m.

The importations are largely in the western provinces. I suppose transportation is the cause of that. The people in my district who use this wire use only the domestic article. I know nothing about the importations, but I know that the increased duty has enabled the manufacturers to say that the price has gone up by the amount of the increase in the duty. Therefore the farmers of Canada will be taxed for barbed wire and spring wire $253,000, which will go into the pockets of the manufacturers, besides $126,-

000 which will go into the Dominion treasury. That is exactly how this taxation will work out. It is reasonably fair to state that it is burdensome. If the burden cannot be helped, that is another matter. It is the duty of the Government to see if there is not some other way to find the money than to make the taxes upon the farmer and the artisan burdensome.

I want to refer to barrelled pork which at the present time is dutiable. The total importation of barrelled pork in brine in 1914 was 11,960,408 pounds, valued at $1,210,473. On this value we paid a duty of $237,525.46. The total importation of barrelled beef in brine was 1,503,606 pounds, valued at 116,000. The duty paid on it was $12,000. The total importation of bacon and hams was 7,000,000 pounds, valued at $1,250,000, and the duty paid was $140,000. The duty collected by the customs on these three items therefore amounted in round figures to $390,000. If you add 7½ per cent more duty you get an increased taxation of $180,000. If that is all, it means that the consuming public must pay that same rate of duty to the packers of the Dominion, because, because their prices are put on a par with what these goods can be laid down for. I think I would be safe in saying that the packers in Canada produce more than half of the barrelled pork, and beef, and bacon and hams that are consumed in Canada. Therefore, on this food commodity the people of Canada will be paying a taxation of $379,000. I think that every hon. member should understand the whole effect of the proposals of the Government.

Yesterday the Minister of Finance, in referring to the legislation under the war revenue Budget, said:

> Does any person grudge any portion of those taxes?

I say no. But he says:

> Now, come to the other taxes, the sums I am raising by means of tariff increases. What has caused me to raise the tariff? I pointed out that my borrowings were cut off in the markets of the world; I cannot go to the London market and get a dollar except with the consent of the British Treasury.

If the money cannot be got except in this way, the people of this country must bear the burden. The minister, however, does not tell us in that statement that he cannot borrow the difference between the current revenue and the current expenditure of $20,000,000. If he could borrow it, it would have been very much better to borrow it. It is only fair that future generations should to some extent bear the brunt of the extreme situation in which we are placed. If the money cannot be raised, and if the minister can suggest no other means of raising it, then I suppose the majority of the House will approve of the proposals of the minister. I presume that he considers there is no other way to get that money.

While I will not find so much fault with the 7½ per cent he is putting on foreign goods and raw materials imported into Canada, I take strong exception to his attempt on this occasion to tax the raw material and the manufactured article imported from the United Kingdom.

The hon. Minister of Finance asked us what he is to do about it. He tells us that he has to put a duty of 7½ per cent on the dyes and other raw materials entering into manufactures, which duty the Canadian manufacturer must pay. He referred especially to cotton. I think he might very well have said to the Canadian manufacturers: We must put on this duty of 7½ per cent, but I want to show you where you will have the benefit as against the British manufacturer even though there is no change in the duty on goods from the United Kingdom. How could he have done it? In the first place he could have pointed out that the duty of 7½ per cent on raw materials does not amount to more than 3 per cent on the finer line of manufactured textiles. On cheap grey cottons and common duck, it might be as high as that, but on the finer goods I think he could easily have shown that this duty of 7½ per cent on the raw material would not have amounted to more than 2½ per cent on the manufactured article. On the other hand, what is the British manufacturer up against? Let me tell you a little experience I had a few days ago. I sent some canned lobsters to New York for forwarding to France, and I booked freight ahead for a certain proportion of that consignment. Later I found I had another shipment to make and I asked the broker for the rate. During the interim ocean rates had gone up nearly a hundred per cent. Now, if the Canadian merchant—putting it that way in this case, though the same applies to the manufacturer—wishes to buy the goods from the manufacturer and bring them across the ocean to compete with Canadian manufacturers, is not he obliged to add these extra rates of transportation to the cost of the goods? Will not that help the Canadian manufacturer to compete at any rate to the extent of 2½ per cent? More than that, might not the minister have said to the Canadian manufacturer: The British manufacturer must

transport that cotton from New Orleans to the United Kingdom at double rates of freight, and we will not touch the duties from the United Kingdom either on raw material or on manufactured articles. My hon. friend from East Middlesex (Mr. Glass) told us the British preference was not decreased, and that the British manufacturer has now a greater preference in our markets against the foreign manufacturer. I do not deny that. But would it not have been a magnanimous thing for Canada to have " let well enough alone," to use an expression at one time very popular with hon. gentlemen opposite, especially when we help ourselves by helping the trade relations between the Motherland and this great daughter Dominion? So I think it was unwise—I do not say it was unpatriotic, because I do not believe there is an unpatriotic man in the House—to touch these duties under present circumstances.

I have shown that this duty on raw materials would represent only 2½ per cent on the manufactured article. And what protection—if I may use the word which hon. gentlemen opposite have sought to make their own, but which they have urged very strongly upon us—what protection has the Canadian manufacturer of cotton or woollen textiles as against this 2½ per cent represented by the duty on raw material? I have a little table here which I will not take time to read, but the general result of which I will give. On woollen goods that come into this country from the United Kingdom there is an average duty of 25 per cent. And do you mean to tell me that the Canadian manufacturer cannot afford to pay 2½ per cent when he has a protection on the manufactured article of 25 per cent? It seems to me the minister might very well have gone that far. I think that is a good reason why I can support the amendment presented by my right hon. leader. That amendment states that the Government's fiscal measure is particularly objectionable because it places extra barriers against British trade. Another reason—and I have dealt with that also—is that while this means increased taxation especially on goods from the United Kingdom, it will yield little or no revenue. Certain commodities do yield a very little revenue, but as to others, I think the amendment sets out the facts as they are.

The Minister of Finance asked us three questions yesterday, or he put the matter before us in three phases. He practically asked us to answer these questions: first, shall we cease to send troops? Well, so far as I am concerned, I say send more troops if needed. Second: he puts it up to us to suggest an alternative method. Can I suggest an alternative method? Yes, my suggestion is that the British preferential tariff be not disturbed.

Mr. BURNHAM: Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to tell the House where the preference would be if we had free trade ?

Mr. LOGGIE: I do not know what the hon. gentleman means; I think he should be a little more explicit. Free trade—does my hon. friend mean with the whole world ?

Mr. BURNHAM: Just as you like.

Mr. LOGGIE: Very well; I will take it just as I like. My suggestion is that the present rate of duties on goods from the United Kingdom be not disturbed.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Answer the question.

Mr. LOGGIE: The question arises: can we get the money in any other way, and how much do we require ? In 1914 we imported from the United Kingdom non-dutiable goods to the value of $28,000,000, in round figures. As there are several commodities to which the increased rate does not apply, I put it down at $25,000,000, which, at 5 per cent, would yield us $1,250,000. In the same year we imported from the United Kingdom dutiable goods to the value of $100,000,000, in round figures, which, at 5 per cent, would yield us $5,000,000. So if my suggestion is of any value, we would require $6,250,000 to take the place of the revenue to be derived from the proposed increase in the British preference. I have on previous occasions pointed out to the House that pork, which is the chief food of the lumbermen and fishermen, is already over-burdened with taxes. It was my privilege and my duty to tell the Government led by my right hon. friend the present leader of the Opposition, that the duty on pork under the late Administration was burdensome. What is the result of increasing the duty upon pork by 7½ per cent ? When hon. gentlemen do this, they add $1.50 to the price of each barrel of pork. In other words, the duty on a barrel of pork is now $5.50, and the fishermen pay three cents per pound into the treasury of the Dominion of Canada for every pound of pork they eat. Instead of doing that I would make the fishermen pay more on his tobacco. If he is

bound to use tobacco, let him use it and pay duty upon it, but make the taxes upon pork as reasonable as possible. I would suggest that the rate of duty on spirituous liquors be increased by 50 per cent and the duty on tobacco be increased by 25 per cent. The man who smokes a cigar is in a better position to pay an extra 25 per cent duty than the fisherman is to pay an excessive duty on pork. If this were done the money would be obtained without increasing the British preference. Money talks; it was Lloyd George who said that silver bullets count in this war; so do silver bullets count in connection with the tariff. I have had some financing to do myself; I have been mighty hard up some times, and I know what it is like. I know, too, what it is like to borrow, and I sympathize with the Minister of Finance in that respect. I put these proposals forth on my own responsibility; I have not suggested them to hon. gentlemen beside me, but I believe they are worthy of the serious consideration of the Minister of Finance.

I frankly affirm that I cannot agree with all my hon. friend's proposals. I do believe that he should not place upon the necessaries of life any additional taxation if it can possibly be avoided. No increase should be made in the taxation upon goods coming from the United Kingdom. It is my judgment that this is necessary not only in the interests of Canada and of the Empire, but in the interests of our standing in the Motherland as well. I concur, therefore, in all my hon. friend's proposals but one; this I do heartily, and with pleasure. I suppose that the suggestions I have made will not be accepted by hon. gentlemen opposite, but I submit them for their careful consideration. I realize that this is a solemn occasion; I realize that we have to do our duty by our homes and our firesides; by our country and by the Empire of which we are all so proud. I take second place to none so far as loyalty is concerned; I will hold the talismanic flag as high as any hon. gentleman in this House. I hope the Government will do their full duty under the conditions which now confront us. Circumstances may arise after the House is prorogued which may call for extreme exertion. And if they do call for extreme exertions, if the Government of the day use their best judgment and act wisely, they shall have my support and sympathy in everything that can be done to bring this war to a successful issue.

But let me utter one word of warning. While I say all this, the Government must expect to be criticised for the management of this money. If they do not use this money economically and honestly, and see that it is administered honestly, they must expect to be called to account and to be criticised. That is our duty; we would fail to do our duty to the country at large and to our King if we did not hold them responsible for the proper discharge of their duties and a proper dispensing or paying out of this war fund. We undertake to return to the Imperial Government this money. We undertake to pay the interest in the meantime, and we are bound to see that those who have charge of the treasury benches so use their privilege that they can render an honest account, so that the people of Canada will be proud of the part which Canada has taken in the defence of the Empire on this momentous occasion.

Mr. JAMES BOWMAN (East Huron): Mr. Speaker, coming as I do from a county which is considered one of the leading agricultural counties of Ontario, I might say in the Dominion of Canada, I think it is my duty to say a few words with regard to the application of this Budget to the various industries in my county.

Before doing so I wish to tender my most hearty congratulations to the Minister of Finance for the very efficicent manner in which he has conducted the finances of this country since taking office. His work during the past three years has shown the master hand, and his ability has never shone forth with greater brilliancy than in introducing this Budget. The minister was called upon to devise ways and means to meet extraordinary circumstances, which have been brought about in this country by the war, resulting in a falling off of the trade of this country, with a consequent decrease in the amount of revenue collected and available to meet ordinary expenses. Then, too, several million dollars must be provided as a nucleus for a pension fund for our soldiers, and also a sum of $7,000,000 as interest upon the war loan, the $150,000,000 which has been raised for the purpose of mobilizing our soldiers and sending them to the front to fight in defence of the Empire. The minister had to devise ways and means to meet these expenditures, and in doing so he had a choice of three principles as the basis of the method of collecting taxation. Two of these principles have been tried in this country. We had the policy of revenue tariff which was tried some years ago, prior to 1878. It was then put in practice by a Liberal Government. That tariff was 15 per cent in the beginning, and was afterwards

increased to 17½ per cent. It is unnecessary to tell the people of this country the position in which Canada stood at that time. It was anything but good; our manufacturing industries were closed, our labouring men thrown out of employment. As a result of that, the business men of this country sent a delegation to Ottawa to wait on Sir Richard Cartwright, then Minister of Finance, asking that he give a measure of protection to the interests of this country. However, he ignored their request, they had to go home unsatisfied. But it was not very long until a man rose to the occasion in the person of that great statesman, Sir John A. Macdonald. He espoused the policy of protection and made it a plank in his platform during the election of 1878, with the result that he carried this country with an overwhelming majority. He continued that policy of protection consistently for the 18 years that his Government was in office, subject of course to certain regulations which were necessary to comply with the needs of the country. During that time what were our Liberal friends in this country doing? They were still advocating a revenue tariff. In 1891 they advocated unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, and later on, prior to the election of 1896, they advocated free trade as they have it in Great Britain. During that time the people of Canada rejected these policies; they rejected the revenue tariff and also reciprocity with the United States; and prior to the election of 1896 Hon. Edward Blake, who was considered one of the leading statesmen among our honoured friends, challenged them before they talked of free trade as being practicable in Canada, to devise some possible plan whereby the revenue needs of this country could be met in any other way than by placing a duty on goods similar to those which were produced in this country. That was the challenge thrown out by the Hon. Edward Blake. The hon. gentleman opposite never devised any feasible plan nor have they done so up to the present time. What did they do? They were returned to power in 1896. They were not returned as a result of the policies which they had advocated, but they were returned on an issue that was foreign to the fiscal policy of this country. They had the opportunity of their lives when they came into office. The right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), a man of ability, I admit, had told the people of Canada that if he was placed in power he would give them free trade as they had it in Great Britain. He told the farmers in this country that the manufacturers were nothing but a lot of robbers and that if he was placed in power he would abolish every vestige of protection. I say to the right hon. gentleman, and I am sorry he is not in his seat, that then was the opportunity, if he was sincere in what he told the farmers of this country, to give free trade as they had it in Great Britain. But, Sir, what did he do? It has been said, and it has not been denied, that he gave an assurance in secret to the manufacturers of this country that, if returned to power, he would see that their interests were conserved and their protection retained. Let that be as it may. We are satisfied that after Sir Wilfrid Laurier was elected in 1896 he took to his bosom the manufacturers of this country who, he claimed, were robbing the farmers of Canada. During the election, I think in Centre Toronto, Mr. Bertram, the Liberal candidate, was authorized to give the assurance to the manufacturers of Centre Toronto that their protection would not be abolished; and on the strength of that Mr. Bertram was returned as a supporter of the hon. leader of the Opposition. I will go further, and say that during the fifteen years the right hon. gentleman was in power he consistently carried on the policy of protection. What did he do when he went out of office in 1911, after he had entered into that reciprocity agreement with the United States, and was asking for the people's mandate upon it? He said to the manufacturers of this country: I have always befriended you, and I am going to befriend you still; I am going to see that your protection still remains; and he had nothing to say regarding the best interests of the farmers of Canada.

In this connection let me read what the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt)—and I am sorry he is not in his seat—said in the reciprocity campaign. He spoke at a meeting in the city of Woodstock, and is reported by the Toronto Globe as follows:

> He could not see that the manufacturers would be touched very much, as few articles manufactured in Canada were affected. He was sure the Bain and Woodstock wagon companies would compete in the world's markets, even with 2½ per cent reduction in the tariff. He thought the manufacturers opposed reciprocity because of what might follow, the "thin edge of the wedge," but he had been assured by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Fielding that nothing of the sort would follow. They had gone as far in the farmers' interest as they would.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier was asked whether he had given Mr. Nesbitt authority to give that assurance, and this is what he said:

The statement made by the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) was quite consistent with our policy; it was nothing new, and he had perfect authority, not only he but every member on the Liberal side, to make that statement.

The present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) asked Sir Wilfrid Laurier this question at that time:

Did the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance authorize the member in question to make that statement?

And Sir Wilfrid Laurier replied:

I have answered that already. It is perfectly true. The hon. member for North Oxford and every Liberal member had such authority; he was not kept in ignorance of our policy in this matter and knew it well. He only stated what is our general policy.

I think that this is conclusive evidence that the Liberal party when in power were protectionists. The manufacturers were their friends to the very last. In 1911, the year the Liberal party went out of power—and it was the farmers of this country who put them out—the Liberal party said to the farmers: We ask you to sell your products in a free market, and to buy in a protected market.

What is the history of the fiscal policy of this country? From 1878 to 1911, when hon. gentlemen opposite went out of power, the policy of protection was consistently carried out. May I give some further precedents to show that the policy of protection is the only policy upon which to build up Canada as a great nation. Every country in the world, with the exception of Great Britain, is to-day fostering its industries under that very policy. We have Germany, a great country, a country which has developed her manufacturing industries and her agricultural industries until to-day she is able with a smaller area than the province of Ontario to support a population of nearly seventy million people. We have the United States, a great nation, which has developed wonderfully in the past under that policy. She has grown up under it, and to-day has a market of which hon. gentlemen opposite are jealous; they envy it, and that market was built up under the policy of protection. And that is what we in Canada intend to do. But I think I can hear the voice of my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) pointing, as always, to Great Britain as an example; but what are the facts in connection with Great Britain? Great Britain has free trade at the present time; but what were the circumstances in 1847, when she discarded the protective tariff? She was supreme so far as the development of her manufacturing industries was concerned; she had cheap labour; she had great natural resources; her commerce reached out to every country in the world; and therefore Great Britain thought it was an opportune time to set an example to the other nations of the world. But that example was not followed by the other nations. To-day we see other nations forging ahead, and actually depriving Great Britain in her own market of the sale of many of her products for which she should have a ready sale at least in her own market. In view of all this, I think the judgment of our Finance Minister is such as to be worthy of commendation by the people of this country. He has maintained the policy which has proved successful, not under the Conservative party alone, but under our Liberal friends opposite.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask, where stand our friends on the Opposition benches to-day? They have gone back to the old position that they held prior to 1896; they are back now to decrying the manufacturers of this country, calling them robbers, the oppressors of the farmers of this country, and every imaginable name that they can possibly get their tongues around. The farmers of this country to-day, of whom I am one, are intelligent people. They are not going to be misled by any political—I was going to say clap-trap, but I understand, Mr. Speaker, that you would rule that out of order—so I will say the farmers are not going to be misled by any political deception. The Liberals are telling the farmers to-day that the manufacturers have set out to rob them. It is very strange that, as soon as they get out of power, they should tell the farmers that the manufacturers are trying to rob them. That is very difficult to understand. Speaking as a farmer, speaking in my own interest as a farmer, and I have every respect for the agricultural class in this country and wish to see it succeed, I think it is the greatest mistake to try and create a cleavage between the manufacturing, agricultural and labouring interests in this country. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) last night said that protection is not a builder of industries. I disagree with the hon. gentleman in that regard. What do we find is the fact? Take the census of 1910. We find that there are no less than 19,000 manufacturing establishments in this Dominion and that these manufacturing establishments represent an

investment of $1,240,000,000, all of which is adding to the tax-paying power of the country. They have 500,000 employees in their employment paying to these men, as the reward of the labour which they give, the very large sum of $230,000,000 per year. This money which is being paid out in wages is distributed through the length and breadth of Canada and around these industries have grown up large urban centres. I might mention the city of Montreal with its half million population, the city of Toronto with its 400,000, London, Hamilton, Ottawa, Winnipeg, Calgary, Edmonton, Vancouver and many other places of equal note. What is the result? Where does the farmer realize the benefit from protection? These great cities that have grown up around manufacturing industries are affording farmers a great home market. That home market is consuming a very large percentage of our farm products. Notwithstanding that I think I can hear the echo of the voice of my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) when he puts up a very strong plea, a wail of pity, for the farmers of this country. He says that the poor farmer has to pay 7½ per cent additional taxation on the fence wire and fertilizers which he uses. He says that this is a very heavy tax on the farmer; but why did not my hon. friend point out to the members of this House the increased market that this policy has built up for the farmer?

It has been claimed by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House—it was contended by the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean)—that this extra tariff of 7½ per cent would not be one that would bring very much revenue to the treasury. What does that mean? If it does not bring in revenue to the treasury it means this: We are now importing millions of dollars worth of manufactured articles. These goods, if they are right—and I am taking it for granted that they will be right—will all be manufactured in Canada thus bringing millions of additional capital into this country to build up additional factories, employing additional labour, paying out additional wages and, as a consequence, increasing the great home market for the farmers of Canada.

I was surprised the other evening to hear my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) put up a pitiful wail for the farmer of Canada. He said the farmer had to pay this additional tax upon the fertilizer which he uses, but in the next breath the hon. member said that he would like to have free food. He would like to see these things placed on the free list. The hon. member for Carleton, New Brunswick (Mr. Carvell), I think in the session of 1912-13, was asked by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) if, should he get into power, he would abolish the duties on eggs, butter, and so on. The hon. member for Carleton said that he would, that that was his position. Then we have the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) yesterday getting up and declaring himself in favour of free food. What does that mean to the farmers? I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to appeal to this country on the free food question. They are trying to draw a red herring across the trail, and they are trying to deceive the labouring classes in the cities in order to gain some political advantage. The good

10 p.m.

citizens of Ottawa, Montreal, Toronto or any other of the cities, are too wily to be trapped by any such appeal as that. They know that protection means the building up of industries, that it gives them employment, and that they would not get that employment if these industries did not exist. They know that protection to industries cannot exist if you do not give protection to the farmers. The working man therefore says: If this policy gives me employment at a good wage I am in a position to pay to the farmer a fair price for the products that I use. If you will allow me to apply a phrase which the late Goldwin Smith used at one time with reference to commercial union between Canada and the United States, I would say that this great policy of protection couples together the interests of the manufacturer, the farmer and the artisan, that it puts them all together as one economic whole, and that if you destroy the interests of one you destroy the interests of all. The attempt has been made at various times in this House to show that the United States is a great market for Canadian farm produce. It was also declared here to-night that the farmer has no protection upon anything which he has to sell. I want to read to the House the list of a few articles under the heading of provisions which come into Canada in competition with the farm products of this country. During the fiscal year 1914 we imported 8,000,000 lbs. of butter. We are not producing sufficient in this country to meet the demand. I contend that the additional 7½ per cent that is levied by this Budget will be a great advantage to the farmers of Canada in conserving that market for them. I am going to give you

a list of articles that we import from the United States. During the year 1914 we imported from the United States 10,000,000 dozens of eggs. We are not producing enough eggs to supply our market, and therefore the additional tariff of 7½ per cent is quite an advantage in our own markets. We also imported 5,758,000 pounds of lard. lard compound, 934,000 pounds; bacon and ham, 7,150,000 pounds; beef, fresh chilled or frozen, 235,000 pounds; beef, salted, 1,496,000 pounds; dried or smoked beef, 1,204,000 pounds; mutton and lamb, 3,825,000 pounds; pork barrelled in brine, 11,950,000 pounds; or we took from the United States in the fiscal year 1914 no less than $7,615,000 worth of provisions. With the additional duty of 7½ per cent, which is applied under this Budget, we give the farmers a very great advantage.

We have come to a period in this country where the cry is: "Back to the farm." It would not have been necessary for us to have that slogan sounded throughout the country, had the late Government given attention to the agricultural industry. In the county from which I come, and which is one of the best agricultural counties in this Dominion, under the Liberal Administration, in the ten years from 1901 to 1910, we lost nearly 8,000 of our rural population by migration from the farms to the cities. That looks very bad for the agricultural industry in my part of the country. Was anything done by the Liberal Government to remedy that condition of affairs? They had every opportunity; and if they had taken such a deep interest in the farming industry, they would have in time applied a remedy. Nothing, however, was done, and to-day we are forced to use our utmost endeavours to get the people back to the land. I must give this Government, under the leadership of the right hon. the Premier, credit for what it has done for the agricultural classes.

At the very first session of this Parliament there was a grant brought down by the Minister of Agriculture to assist the various provinces along the lines of aid to agriculture. At the succeeding session an additional grant of $10,000,000 was brought down by the Minister of Agriculture, that grant to be divided over a period of ten years, which would mean $1,000,000 a year to be given to the provinces for the purpose of assisting that great industry. That is having its effect at present, and the farmers have never been in a better position than they are in to-day.

[Mr. Bowman.]

Rural mail was introduced by my hon. friends opposite, but it is no credit to them, and if I were in their place, I simply would conceal that bit of information. They instituted the rural mail delivery in some ridings where it was of some political advantage, and so it was used as a political expedient. Do you think the farmers in my riding could get rural mail under the late Government? No, but the farmers in North York and South Oxford and Wentworth and other Liberal ridings could. The present Government are now giving rural mail, irrespective of political considerations, to the farmers of this country wherever the population warrants it, and that is of great advantage to the agricultural industry, because of its convenience and the addition it makes to the comforts of farm life.

Parcel post is being initiated by this Government, and no doubt in time it will be very largely developed. I am sorry that the Postmaster General is not in his seat, because I wish to throw out a suggestion to him. The zone system was inaugurated in connection with parcel post for the protection of towns and villages throughout the Dominion from any encroachments or inroads which might be made upon them by the large wholesale businesses such as Simpson's or Eaton's, of Toronto. While it is perfectly right and proper to have that zone system to protect the small towns and villages, it is very unfair to the farmers living at a certain distance from Toronto and other large centres. People speak about the high cost of living. If we want to reduce the high cost of living, let us abolish that zone system on farmers' products coming from Western Ontario to the city of Toronto. It would be the means of giving to the people of Toronto cheaper farm products, and would be a convenience to farmers living more than twenty miles from Toronto. It is unfair to place an extra tax upon farmers living beyond the zone limit. A farmer living close to a city has a greater advantage because he has that home market at his door all the time. Therefore, I would suggest to the Postmaster General that he should take this matter into consideration and try to have the zone system not apply to farm products coming to the various cities in this Dominion.

We have done much to help the farmers of the West. In the first place I just wish to remind my hon. friends opposite who come from the West and who have been speaking about free wheat and the American markets, that if the people of the West want any aid, let them come to the province of Ontario, or to Nova Scotia, or New Brunswick, and

we will willingly hold out to them a helping hand. We have helped them by building up transportation facilities for them, and in many other ways. Therefore, I say to the western members: Be careful never to introduce a policy that will sever the connection existing between the East and the West. We have assisted the farmers of the West by building interior and terminal elevators. This Government has gone ahead with the building of the Hudson Bay railway, the contract for which was entered into and signed by the late Government. I was disappointed to hear the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) say that if he had his way he would tear up the rails on that road. Was the hon. member in the House when this road was initiated by his Government? The hon. gentleman does not answer my question. If he sat quiet in his seat and allowed a proposition like that to go through Parliament without protesting, he did a thing that was very wrong in view of the opinion he holds. And had I done so, I certainly would not come to this House to condemn that road and say I was in favour of having it torn up. I have better hope for that road and I hope that it will prove a benefit to the people of the West.

This Government has removed the duty on ditching machines. Under the late Government they were dutiable, but as soon as this Government came into power they placed these machines on the free list, a decided benefit to the farmer.

Another very important matter is the reduction in duties on agricultural implements. This Government has reduced these duties from 17½ to 12½ per cent, giving to the people of the West a greater advantage than the late Government was giving under the Reciprocity Treaty of 1911. When cement became scarce in this country and the price was extortionate, this Government cut the duty in two in order to secure this article to the people at a reasonable price. This is an illustration of the vigilance exercised by this Government in maintaining the interests of our agriculturists.

The hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) asked what advantage it would be to the people of Canada to have a tax on wool. If these gentlemen were looking to the interests of the farmers, they would see what advantage it would be. The sheep-raising industry of this country has been ruined; our farmers had to go out of the business, for they had to compete with the world, and prices were low.

Mr. NESBITT: May I ask the hon. gentleman is he sheep farming?

Mr. BOWMAN: I was at one time.

Mr. NESBITT: But you do not carry it on now?

Mr. BOWMAN: No.

Mr. NESBITT: Would the hon. gentleman be surprised to know that sheep-farming has been profitable within the past few years?

Mr. BOWMAN: And this legislation will make it more profitable.

Mr. NESBITT: So far as I am concerned, though I carry on sheep-farming, I do not think it will help me a bit.

Mr. BOWMAN: Probably the hon. gentleman has no faith in protection. In speaking to his friends on the quiet, I think he will admit next year that his profits have been greater than this year. It is strange that the hon. member for North Oxford should say that the extra duty on fertilizers and fencing wire will be a burden on the farmer because they will cause him to pay much more for the goods, and yet that it is no protection to the farmer to have a duty of 7½ per cent placed on the wool he sells. If the hon. gentleman thinks that is a logical way of treating this argument I am satisfied.

While this Government has done much for this country, there is something else that can be done. If the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) were in his place I would throw out this suggestion: We have millions of acres of waste land in this country. We are talking about greater production, we are talking of back to the land. There is nothing that would give a greater incentive to greater production than giving the farmers cheap money to drain waste lands. We have millions of acres of these lands; and is it unreasonable for me to say that money should be given to the farmers at 3½ or 4 per cent to carry on the work of drainage? In the province of Ontario we have a fund to assist tile drainage. But if a farmer wishes to take advantage of the system he cannot get the money, because the fund is so limited. This Government is giving assistance to agriculture. Why cannot they give assistance to the province to provide a fund that shall afford farmers money to drain their farms at a reasonable rate? Under the Drainage Act, for instance, the security is good and there is no obstacle in the way—our municipalities are the security under this Act. In one township municipality of my riding the amount ex-

pended in drainage is a quarter of a million dollars. Repeat that all over Canada and it means a very large amount. The farmers cannot afford to pay 5½ or 6 per cent for money to be invested in the drainage of these waste lands. While I admit that the condition of agriculture is improving, I say that it can be still more improved. No people in this country are more deserving than the agricultural class. Theirs is the basic industry of this country, and they are certainly deserving of the attention of any Government.

In my opinion, the time for free trade or a revenue tariff policy in this country has gone by. There was a time when it would have been possible to treat on free trade lines with the United States. I refer to the time of the termination of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, and that termination, I believe, was brought about in 1866. The people of Canada, both Conservatives and Liberals, asked for a renewal of that treaty. It was of advantage to Canada at that time —we had no other markets. But we were turned down by the United States. As a result the fathers of Confederation met and in 1867 they laid the foundations upon which to build a great nation here in Canada. In accordance with the principles adopted at that Confederation we have built our transportation lines east and west and are developing trade along those lines. Are you going to enter upon a policy that would ruin the transportation lines of this country, disorganize trade and make us again subservient to the United States, the very party that turned us down when we wanted a favour? I say no. I say the people of Canada will never submit to such a policy; and any party that goes to the people making any such demand of them will be rejected at the very first opportunity.

In conclusion, it is to me a pleasure indeed to have the opportunity of serving under the leadership of Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Laird Borden. He is a man of whom this country feels proud; he is a broad-minded man, and a worthy successor of that great chieftain, Sir John A. Macdonald, who so loved this country that he said: "A British subject I was born and a British subject I will die."

Mr. ARTHUR B. COPP (Westmorland, N.B.): In the few observations that I purpose making to the House this evening on the subject matter of this debate, it is not my intention to follow the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Bowman),

[Mr. Bowman.]

in his attempt to defend the Government for the condition of affairs which is set out in the Budget laid before the House by the Finance Minister. I may say, however, that I was extremely pleased after listening for a short time to that part of my hon. friend's speech which had reference to protection, to hear him at last admit that the policy laid down and followed by the Liberal party during the fifteen years they were in office, was the very policy that he himself advocated. He said he was delighted to be able to say that credit was due the present Government for reducing the duty on agricultural implements coming into Canada from the United States. If it is a good thing to reduce the taxation on agricultural implements coming from the United States into this country for the use of our agricultural classes, would it not be equally beneficial, I ask my hon. friend, to reduce the taxation which is now imposed on other articles and commodities which the farmer needs?

I was somewhat afraid when my hon. friend offered his congratulations to the right hon. Prime Minister that he might place the right hon. gentleman on a plane equally as high as that which the hon. Finance Minister himself, according to his own statement yesterday, has attained. If the hon. Finance Minister had been here, I suppose the hon. gentleman would hardly have had the temerity to say what he did in reference to the right hon. Prime Minister this evening.

My hon. friend argued this matter from many different standpoints. I should not have asked the indulgence of the House to-night were it not for communications which I have received from my constituents in the county of Westmorland and from persons in other constituencies thoughout the province of New Brunswick in regard to matters affecting the agricultural welfare of this country.

I listened attentively to the hon. Finance Minister when he presented his statement to the House the other day, and I want to do him the honour of saying that I rather admired the ability and ingenuity with which he carried out the task of presenting to the House in a most optimistic manner the most pessimistic Budget or financial statement ever offered to any Parliament by any minister of finance since Confederation.

When the hon. junior member for Halifax, who, I believe, is called the financial critic of the Opposition, replied to the hon. Minister of Finance, I think I may be pardoned

for saying that he performed the task assigned to him with a very great deal of ability. In a calm, deliberate, dispassionate, but none the less emphatic and convincing manner, he laid before this House his ideas and his arguments with regard to the finances of Canada. He showed by facts and figures—and this has been admitted by all hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken in this debate—that a serious condition of affairs prevails in Canada at the present time. It is not my intention to go through the Budget from beginning to end, with the intention of quoting figures or making computations or comparisons; that has already been done by my hon. friend the financial critic of the Opposition. I have listened day after day to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, with the hope of hearing some answer to the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Halifax.

The first hon. gentleman to volunteer his services in the defence of the Government was my hon. friend the member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell), who is not now in his seat. After some general arguments as to the public expenditure of this country, and an elaborate exposition of the made-in-Canada propaganda, he finally disposed of the argumnts of the hon. member for Halifax in the following crushing and trenchant manner:

> I desire to say a word or two about the Budget. I believe that this Budget has been received with more satisfaction than any Budget ever produced in the history of this country. There has been little criticism of the Budget so far as I am aware; we know that party criticism creeps to the surface at the slightest opportunity.

After a few sentences in regard to the wonderful Budget brought down by the hon. Finance Minister, he concluded by saying:

> What does my hon. friend suggest in substitution of the Budget that has been brought down?

Subsequently the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) disposed of the arguments of the hon. junior member for Halifax in the following words:

> It would be far better for him (Mr. Oliver), and better also for the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) to have taken the Minister of Finance and the rest of the Government party into their confidence, and told them how to construct this Budget, and wherein they are in error.

These hon. gentlemen, if we take them seriously, think that it is the duty of the Opposition to instruct hon. gentlemen opposite how to construct their Budget and arrange their tariffs to suit the conditions as they exist.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition yesterday informed the House that he had not been consulted in regard to the framing of the proposed tariff schedules in any manner, shape or form. I do not claim that the right hon. leader of the Opposition had the right to be consulted on that occasion, but if he was not consulted, why do hon. gentlemen opposite ask hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to instruct them as to how to arrange their tariff legislation?

I would say further that if these gentlemen are sincere there is one way, the constitutional way, to get information from this side of the House. In the first place, if they found themselves absolutely incompetent or unable to grapple with a question as they apparently have admitted they are, it is their duty to go to His Royal Highness the Governor General and hand him their resignations in a proper and constitutional manner. If that were done and my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) were recalled to office he would do as he did in 1896, when on assuming office he found a condition of affairs similar to what we find to-day, and he at once, by his ability, in a systematic and businesslike way, restored calm and confidence out of confusion and chaos. He did this in 1896 and he would do it to-day and do it without imposing additional taxation upon the poor people of this country. That is my argument in answer to hon. gentlemen opposite when they ask us on this side of the House to come over and tell them what we would do under the circumstances. It reminds me very much of a young physician who, shortly after commencing practice, being unable to properly diagnose a case, saw his patient becoming gradually weaker, until when the patient was in the last throes he called in a more experienced practitioner. The doctor thus called in said it was too late, that the patient was beyond recovery. The young physician then said: "What would you have done under the circumstances?" Our friends on the other side see ruin and bankruptcy in Canada, as they say in effect, and find that they have to impose a direct tax on the people to carry on the ordinary affairs of the country; and then they say to us: What would you do under the circumstances? I think that is not a fair proposition. While during the last year I was not a member of the House and do not know just what attitude members on this side adopted towards the appropriations of last year, I do not think that we should be held responsible for last year's

expenditures. That money was voted and that money and more has been expended. But when hon. gentlemen ask suggestions from this side of the House in regard to the ensuing year, our friends on this side have said again and again that they believe the proper thing for the Government to do is when they find themselves face to face with this unparalleled condition of affairs in Canada, to call a halt and consider where they are drifting and what they are doing. Every hon. member should be honest and fair with regard to this matter.

The hon. members for St. John and Halifax made the suggestion to my hon. friends that we believe the proper thing to do was to curtail the expenditure. The line of demarkation between the hon. gentlemen opposite and hon. gentlemen on this side of the House seems to be something like this: Our friends opposite say that it is the duty of the Government to spend money freely and lavishly, to go on with all public works to as great or a greater extent than in the past for the purpose of keeping our men employed and at work throughout the country. To a certain extent that is a fair argument. We on this side of the House have suggested that instead of placing increased taxation on the people of this country for the purpose of keeping men employed by extensive public works in Canada the Government should curtail, not stop absolutely, the public works.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have spoken as if we proposed to stop all public works. We would not stop all works but, instead of increasing the expenditure and taxation, we would curtail expenditure and keep taxation at the present level or possibly a lower level. That is the line of cleavage between the two parties in this House. The proper course for the Government would be to retrench and curtail rather than continue the lavish expenditures of the past two or three years, an expenditure which has rendered it necessary for them to levy direct taxation. I believe that in approving of such a policy as this I am voicing the sentiments of my constituents.

My hon. friends' hearts apparently bleed for the workingman. I do not want to suggest the least trace of insincerity on the part of the hon. gentlemen; but I do say that the man who makes the most money out of public expenditure is not the man who uses the shovel or the pick or the man who goes down and does manual labour; it the contractor who holds the big contracts who makes the big money out of public expenditures in Canada. Therefore I say that the ordinary individual as a rule would be better off if the expenditures were curtailed to some extent, and thus save the workingmen the increased burden of taxation. I spoke of the workingmen not getting proper treatment at the hands of the contractors. I would remind the House, and the Minister of Railways particularly, that after the war had been declared in August last, when the manufacturing concerns in our town were closed and the workingmen were walking the streets without money to pay their rent or to buy succour and clothing for their families, the Government purchased or agreed to purchase a certain line of railway running from the town of Sackville on the Intercolonial to Cape Tormentine; a distance of 40 miles. I am not criticising that action, because I am in favour of the taking over of branch lines, and this was a branch line that it was proper to take over. But the road was in such condition that the Government had to start at once to make repairs on the same. And I want to tell the Minister of Railways, whether he knew it or not—I do not suppose he did—that while our local labouring men were walking the streets of Sackville, this Government brought in foreigners, a large proportion of them Austrians and Germans I am informed, to do that work. I think that was an unreasonable and unfair thing to do. Our local men were entitled to the work on that road, but instead of that they were put aside and foreigners brought in.

My hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) in addressing this House the other night made what struck me as rather a peculiar criticism of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. First of all he talked about a party truce; and I am not here to say anything for or against the truce except this. It has been said that a party truce had been arranged. Personally I know nothing about whether such a truce was entered into or not. I do know that before war was declared the leader of the Opposition had arranged to hold some meetings in large constituencies in the West in the interests of the Liberal party, and, incidentally, if they were in the interests of the Liberal party they would be in the interests of Canada; but immediately on the declaration of war the right hon. gentleman cancelled all these engagements. The war session of this House was called, and so far as I have been able to hear from hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House there was absolute unanimity in regard to the war measures brought down in that session.

Suggestions have been thrown out from both sides of the House that even during that period there was not strictly a truce, as literature was being sent out from the printing bureaus because it could be franked and go free. I do not know anything about that. Before the present session was called, I presume that some truce was arranged in regard to filling the vacant constituencies, and as a result of that I had an easy way of entering this House, and I appreciate the honour of representing my constituency. But if I felt that in coming to this House in that way I was sanctioning any party truce, that my tongue was bridled, that I could not offer criticism in regard to the matters that I believe to be deserving of criticism, much as I appreciate the honour of representing my constituency, my conscience would not have allowed me to accept the nomination and a seat in this House. That is my feeling with regard to the party truce. Following the party truce still further, the question of an election arises. But I am not here to discuss the question of an election. I think I know enough about politics to know that the Government of a country are not influenced very much by what an Opposition may say as to the right time to hold an election. I do not expect this Government to take us into their confidence, or to be influenced by anything we might say in regard to an election. But I think I am voicing the sentiments of every hon. member in this House when I say that no one who has been through many campaigns is anxious to start on another one. We all fight rather shy of elections, the Government as well as the Opposition. Let me say further that I should not consider myself worthy of the honour of representing my constituency if I allowed myself to be influenced in what I believe to be proper criticism by the fear that my sayings might bring on or put off an election, or that the question whether there would be an election or not should influence me in refraining from offering what I believe to be just criticisms on the actions of the Government. Following the remarks of my hon. friend from East Lambton, he said that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House were embarrassing the Government. Well, that is an admission to begin with that the criticisms being offered are somewhat embarrassing. He went farther and said that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House were rising in their places and trying to embarrass the Government with their criticisms, at a time when it was confronted with one of the greatest crises in the history of this country. I grant that. But I want to say that the Government are not the only ones concerned in that question; the people of Canada are confronted with the same question. I believe I am voicing the sentiments of every man, woman and child who knows what war is, when I say that every one in this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific has just as much at stake in this war as any member of the Government and fully realize that responsibility.

Mr. CARVELL: Even including the Finance Minister.

Mr. COPP: Even including the Finance Minister. My hon. friend from East Lambton painted a beautiful picture of our gallant soldiers marching to the front and going into the trenches, while hon. gentlemen on this side of the House were embarrassing the Government by their criticism. If the hon. member had gone a little further he could have painted a better picture. He might have made it more explicit, more emphatic to the people of Canada. When he pictured our gallant soldiers going into the trenches, he might have said that they were clad in khaki uniforms bought from political friends at a very large profit, their feet encased in shoes made of split cowhide with shanks of wood and paper manufactured by unscrupulous dealers without proper inspection and making a handsome rake-off on the transaction. But my hon. friend did not go quite that far. He shed copious tears over the fact that we were embarrassing the Government. He might have shed a tear for our gallant soldiers who for months or weeks, whichever it may have been, were exposed in this class of boots to the wet and slush of the training grounds of Valcartier and of Salisbury Plain.

The Montreal Daily Star, discussing the boots worn by our gallant soldier boys, says that it is more than a scandal—it is a crime. That is the evidence and information we have in regard to this boot question. If everything in connection with the equipment, supplies, and munitions of war had been carried on in an honest and fair manner, then I say that the criticism we have to offer to this Budget should not embarrass the Government; it should be a distinct advantage to them, for it gives them an opportunity of explaining away all the suspicions which my hon. friends opposite say they have not heard of.

Let me tell my hon. friends, if they have never heard it, that this country is seething with suspicion in regard to public contracts for materials for war purposes. We are not breaking any party truce, we are not doing any more than our bounden duty in pointing out to the people what has been done and what we believe has been done. We have voted $50,000,000, which has been expended during the past six months, and $100,000,000 more is to be voted by this House. I have not heard a single suggestion which would indicate that any hon. member of this House was not perfectly willing to vote $100,000,000 and, yea, more if necessary. My hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) hit the nail on the head the other night when he said that we are prepared to give millions for defence but not one dollar for graft. Yet we are told we are disloyal because we offer these criticisms and because we call upon the Government to show that there has been no graft in connection with these contracts.

So much in a general way. I said at the outset that I wanted to speak particularly for one or two classes of people. I am sorry that I have not had the experience of the hon. gentleman who told us this evening that he was a farmer. He said that he believed that the Government had done more for the farmers of Canada than any Government has done for many years. I am not in a position to say whether they have or have not. I do not want to offer any undue criticism of the Government in regard to any matter in which they believe they are doing the right thing. I do not know anything about the farming industry in the province of Ontario, but I know something of the agricultural interests in the province of New Brunswick. I speak more particularly of this matter because I have been asked in numerous letters and telegrams that I have received from my own constituents to bring up the question of fertilizers and agricultural implements on which the duty will be increased by the tariff arrangements that have been brought down by the Minister of Finance. Many of the letters and telegrams I have received are not from political friends of mine, but are from very strong supporters of the Government, who, I suppose, will continue their support. I am not here talking politics. I want to draw to the attention of the Government as seriously as I can the condition of the farmers in my own province, especially in the county which I have the honour to represent, and to point out how they are affected by this proposed duty on fertilizers. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance says they must have a certain amount of revenue, that they need money, that money is the backbone of the war and of the country and that they must have it. I have no quarrel with my hon. friend in regard to that. I may have a tender feeling for the farmer, but I do feel that this proposed tariff arrangement places entirely too heavy a burden upon the agricultural industry of this country.

My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) the other night referred to the question of fertilizer. I want also to refer to this article which is so important to the farmer. I understood the hon. gentleman who preceded me to say that they did not use a great deal of fertilizer in Ontario, and that it was not in as general use there as it was in the maritime proinces. I am sure that they use very little of this fertilizer in the western provinces, because the peculiar soil which they have there does not require the use of large quantities of fertilizer for the production of crops. Those who are attempting to make a living on the farms of the maritime provinces have to depend almost entirely upon fertilizers for plant food. The farmer in the maritime provinces has not the large acreage that the farmer in the west has. The farmer in New Brunswick with a farm of 50 or 75 acres is considered to have a large farm. The farmer who undertakes to make his living off 50 or 75 acres, or even less than that, must have a very large yield per acre; therefore he must use a great deal of fertilizer to secure that large production per acre.

An hon. gentleman who addressed this House a few days ago only told
11 p.m. half the story when he said that there had been only $45,000 paid in duty on fertilizers imported into this country during the fiscal year ended March, 1914. He referred only to the manufactured article used by the farmer. He left out the ingredients that go to make up this compound, and most of which ingredients have hitherto come into Canada free. The increased duty on compounded and manufactured fertilizer upon the basis of our importation during the fiscal year 1914 will be $46,438.55. Then, we must take into consideration the ingredients that go to make up the manufactured fertilizer that is imported and manufactured or mixed at home. The increase on acid phosphate alone will be $7,356.07. In

addition, there were free imports of blast furnace slag, phosphate rock, fish offal and refuse, crude bones, bone dust, and charred bone, guano and other manures, nitrate of ammonia, kainit and potash, chlorate of potash, potash muriate, and nitrate of potash, amounting to $1,008,539 on which the duty will be, under the 7½ per cent increase, $75,640,.42. The whole increase to the farmers on fertilizer imported into this country will therefore be not $45,000, but $75,640.42. The whole increase to the is a mere bagatelle. In view of the fact that the largest quantity of this fertilizer is used in the maritime provinces it means quite a large bagatelle to the farmers in that part of the country.

That is not all the burden that has been placed upon the farmers and agricultural people of our country by the proposed increase in duties brought down by the Minister of Finance. Take the very question that my hon. friend spoke about with regard to the agricultural implements that are being imported into Canada. Take the customs returns for the year ended March 31, 1914, and take the different machinery, such as cream separators, ploughs, mowers, fencing, barbed wire, spring wire, threshing machinery, cultivators, seeders, manure-spreaders and other items, and you will find that the increased duty that will be imposed on the farmers of this country will amount to $701,727.37. It is really a direct tax on the farmers, although imposed on the articles indirectly. Seeds, which were formerly on the free list, are now subject to a duty of 7½ per cent, and on seeds alone the duty amounts to $15,705.71.

Let me recapitulate as follows:

Increased duty on fertilizer ..	$130,435.04
Increased duty on farm machinery, wire fencing, etc.	701,727,37
Increased duty on seeds	15,705.71
Total	$847,868.12

The farmers of this country will have to pay that amount in excess of what they paid under the late Government for the things they must have for their farm work. It is more than a mere bagatelle to the farmer. That amount, however, is not the worst feature of the tax on the farmers. While the farmers are paying that amount to the Dominion Treasury, they are paying to my good friends the manufacturers of this country the sum of $2,543,604.36. I estimate that on the basis that, for every dollar's worth of goods that we import from foreign countries, we use three dollars' worth of goods manufactured in our own country. I believe the proportion is even greater than three to one. I have no quarrel with the manufacturers. While I am referring particularly to the case of the farmers and agriculturists, I have never had occasion during my short political career, when referring to matters such as this, to offer sympathy to the farmers. Sympathy is not what they want. They are not beggars. They do not want sympathy, they want fair treatment. You are treating the farmer fairly when you are giving him—as the old Government did—fertilizers practically free. Until 1913 he had his fertilizers absolutely free because the basic slag was brought in free. If I remember aright, during the session of 1913 the Government, or the Board of Customs, arbitrarily placed basic slag among the manufactured or mixed fertilizers with a tariff rate of 10 per cent. That was done upon the request of one individual who manufactured basic slag in Cape Breton, in the province of Nova Scotia, in order to assist this firm in maintaining high prices and thus sacrificing the interests of every farmer in Canada to that extent.

My hon. friends have spoken considerably and we have seen a great deal of advertising in the press supporting the Government in regard to the patriotism-and-production campaign. That is the splendid phrase and I think there is nothing that would so please the people of this country as to realize that this Government is giving them something in the way of patriotism and production. I find that my hon. friends from New Brunswick have been holding a number of meetings under that heading. Those meetings are held, as I understand, under the patronage of the Minister of Agriculture of this Government, in conjunction with the Minister of Agriculture of the Provincial Government. In the county of Westmorland they have been telling the farmers how they can increase their production. I was somewhat sorry to find that the gentlemen who were going through the county of Westmorland telling the farmers how they could get a bigger production on the farms were a dental surgeon, Dr. Price, from the city of Moncton, and a merchant, Mr. F. B. Black, from the town of Sackville. I want to be absolutely fair. They had with them a gentleman by the name of Mr. Blair. I do not know what position he holds, but I suppose he is an agriculturist. I do not want to say anything that would be offensive, but it seems to me that the meetings held throughout the province of New Brunswick, under the patronage of the Minister of Agriculture, who has not been able to be in the House

for some time, and of the hon. Minister of Agriculture for the province of New Brunswick, instead of having as their object patriotism for Canada and greater production on the farm, they have as their object patriotism to the Conservative party and the greater proportion of Conservative votes in the province of New Brunswick. That seems to be more in keeping with the attitude of my hon. friends in the province of New Brunswick. The Government should consider well what it means to a very great portion of the population of this country to increase the duties on the raw materials of the farmers who use them to turn out their finished product and give it to the people of this country.

Now, I wish to follow that line of argument for a moment, and I promise you, Mr. Speaker, that I will not draw it out too long. For every dollar of extra cost you make the farmer pay in carrying on his work of production, with a view to building up these great cities which, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bowman) says, are built up by the protective tariff, you make the consumer pay on the goods that he and his family consume. There are to-day in this country many men who are not able to earn even the necessaries of life; and as soon as the duties are increased and it costs the farmer more to produce his bushel of wheat or oats, his ton of hay or his pound of beef, that extra expense goes to the consumer of that article. And the consumer for whom I speak especially, and speak with all sincerity, is the workingman of our country. When the Government levy taxation upon a class of people who are not able to pay it, they are doing injustice to the country, and I believe that they will regret in a short time that these taxes are imposed upon the people.

I have numerous letters and telegrams dealing with these matters. It seems very strange to me that hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the other side have declared that the farmers are absolutely satisfied, that they have not had a single comment to show that there is any opposition to these measures. I would not like to insinuate that these hon. gentlemen have had suggestions from the farmers, but I should like to know what the Acting Minister of Agriculture must have thought as his supporters one after another have arisen and declared that they have had no word from their constituencies with regard to this matter. Do the Government say they have had no protest from New Brunswick with regard to increasing the duty on fertilizers? We have the evidence of the Minister of Agriculture of the province of New Brunswick himself, who speaks officially for every farmer in that province, that he had sent in protest after protest to this Government in regard to fertilizers. Yet hon. gentlemen say that everybody is satisfied and everybody loyally willing to pay these taxes. No doubt they are loyal, and those of them who are able to pay are quite willing to do so. But you cannot get blood out of a post, and there are hundreds, and thousands, and tens of thousands of men in this country to whom the imposition of this unjust and iniquitous tax will prove a heavy burden and one, that I believe, they will not be able to bear. If hon. gentlemen opposite have heard nothing against this measure, I should like them to read the Farmers' Advocate, a farming journal published in the province of New Brunswick. Here is a long article—I do not propose to read it—giving a most logical and cogent argument against this increase in the duties.

Mr. GRAHAM: That paper is published in London, Ont., too.

Mr. COPP: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: Not by Liberals either.

Mr. COPP: I do not know that it makes it any stronger that it is published by Conservatives. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Graham) may have more faith in Conservatives than I have. It is a journal published in the interests of the agriculturists of this country. I believe the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) will bear me out when I say that the farmers of New Brunswick are trying, and I believe sincerely trying, to place agriculture on a stronger and better foundation than that on which it has rested in the past. That being so, I think the hon. gentleman might have used his influence with this Government; and if he had even in this one partcular induced his colleague the Minister of Finance to say "We," instead of "I," and to take him into his confidence, he might have been able to save his farmer friends in the province of New Brunswick. I know he has a tender feeling for the farmers, as I have myself. I believe that if he had used his influence, as he would have done had he taken the matter seriously—as seriously as I believe he is taking it now—he would have taken some measures to see that our people are not so over-taxed, for, incidentally, taxing the farmers is taxing the labourers as well as every other consumer.

Taking the customs returns for the fiscal

year ending 31st March, 1914, and working them out on the basis of the imports into Canada during that year, I gained some striking information. If you turn to page 441 of that report, you will find that in the province of New Brunswick during that year we imported $6,907,434 worth of dutiable goods. It may sound local to speak of my own province, but I wish to bring it close home. On these imports we paid a duty of $2,201,144.66. We imported also $7,477,125 worth of goods free of duty. This makes our total importation $14,364,559. Now, I have taken the trouble to compute what this increase of duty will mean to the province of New Brunswick. If the same quantity of goods are imported as during the year to which I refer, the taxes on our dutiable goods will be increased by $518,-057.55. The goods formerly on the free list and now subject to a duty of 7½ per cent will amount to $560,784.37. This makes the total increase of duties to be paid $1,078,841.92. Bringing that nearer home, I find that my own county of Westmorland—for the advantage of having my Conservative friends to carry on the affairs of Government for the last three years, while they have been going headlong into expenditure—will pay into the public treasury, in addition to what it paid under the late Government, $136,539.26.

I have made a further computation for the benefit of my Conservative friends who represent constituencies in the province of New Brunswick. The price that Charlotte county will pay for the privilege of having a Conservative member in this House is $64,709.82. I have every respect for the hon. gentleman who represents that constituency (Mr. Hartt), but I rather believe that $64,000 annually is more than he is worth to the county. The county of Kent will be charged $74,590.56 for the privilege of participating in the arrangement made by hon. gentlemen opposite. The constituency of Kings and Albert will pay $92,772.10 for the part which they took in putting the Conservatives in power in 1911. The county of York will pay $96,000. These are merely a few of the computations; hon. gentlemen who represent other constituencies in the province of New Brunswick may figure it out for themselves. These figures are emphatic indications of what it means to the people of the maritime provinces—yes, to the people of the whole Dominion—to have my right hon. friend the present Prime Minister at the head of the Government and to have as his colleague and Minister of Finance the hon. gentleman who, to use his own words, has had placed upon his shoulders a burden heavier than that borne by any other Minister of Finance in the Dominion of Canada.

I do not know why hon. gentlemen opposite have imposed this taxation upon the people on the pretext of its being a war tax. I presume they have their own reasons for doing so. I do not want to throw out the insinuation that they are trying in any way to deceive the people in regard to this matter, but is it possible that hon. gentlemen opposite really believe in their heart of hearts that they are paying a war tax when they buy a one cent postage stamp to put beside the two cent stamp on a letter? For that two cent stamp, if for nothing else, hon. gentlemen opposite will give the late Liberal Administration credit. Do hon. gentlemen believe that the purchase of that extra one cent stamp constitute the payment of a war tax in every sense of the word? Have hon. gentlemen considered what the people will think of this extra taxation? Would it not have been just as well, instead of having two stamps, to make the postage three cents and have done with it, the extra cent going to the Post Office Department? Hon. gentlemen might just as well have come to this House and said frankly: we are going to increase the rate of postage to the rate which prevailed in 1896. That is what it means to the people of this country. The hon. Finance Minister addressing the House yesterday, said that this tax was a mere bagatelle so far as the people were concerned; that it was the businessmen who wrote hundreds of letters who would have to pay the tax. The businessman who writes hundreds of letters is well able to write them and to pay the additional postage, but when the mother sends her weekly or monthly letter to her son in the trenches, she will be called upon to pay an extra cent on that letter. I do not think that is the kind of loyalty which should be shown by the people of Canada. The hon. minister said yesterday: we are taxing the banks; the Bank of Montreal will pay $150,000 a year. Does my hon. friend, great as he is in finance, in arithmetic and in economics, think that he can hoodwink the people by making such an assertion? Did he ever see a financial institution in Canada or anywhere else that could not find some means of turning the screw another notch in order to take the extra cost out of the people who do business with them? It is the people who will have to pay, not the banks; that cannot be refuted.

I believe that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals has been guilty

of carelessness or laxity in respect of the Intercolonial railway. I do not believe that the hon. Minister fully realizes what this railway means to the people of the maritime provinces. Hon. gentlemen have heard this question discussed year after year in an abler manner than I can ever hope to discuss it, even if I had time. The Intercolonial railway was built by the Dominion of Canada as a bond of confederation between the maritime provinces and the great provinces to the West. Many things, perhaps, were done in the early days of our history that would not be done under the present conditions; many things are done to-day which would not have been carried out then, but if it were not specifically set out clause by clause it certainly must at least have been implied that the Intercolonial railway should be built and operated to give the people of the maritime provinces an efficient and up-to-date service. To-day the Intercolonial railway is not being operated in the interests of people who live along the line. The hon. member who represents the county of Colchester (Mr. Stanfield) as well as other hon. gentlemen who represent constituencies served by the Intercolonial railway, will agree with me in this assertion. The taking off of the Ocean Limited, the best train that ever ran from Halifax to Montreal, makes the Intercolonial railway subservient to the Canadian Pacific railway. It takes away the traffic, and the man going from Halifax to Montreal who in nine cases out of ten would take the Ocean Limited, to-day takes the Canadian Pacific railway because it saves time and is a better service. My hon. friend says that the Ocean Limited will be restored as soon as trade brightens up; but by that time travellers will have become accustomed to using the Canadian Pacific railway, and it will be difficult to induce them to change back. The people in northern New Brunswick and in Nova Scotia I believe are greatly dissatisfied with the present condition. The Minister of Railways and Canals has increased the freight rates on the Intercolonial railway and makes the excuse that he does this because he wants to make the Intercolonial railway, as far as possible, a paying institution. I would advise my hon. friend, instead of increasing the freight rates on the people who use that road, to cut down the salary of the manager of the Intercolonial railway from $20,000 to $10,000 and save money there, instead of increasing the salaries of the higher officials. The gentleman who to-day is living in Ottawa on a superannuation retiring allowance looked after and ran the Intercolonial railway as well as it is run to-day, and I think the largest salary he ever received was some $6,000 a year. For the same work to-day, if you figure out the number who are employed as assistant superintendents and this, that and the other, you will find that where it formerly cost the Dominion of Canada from $6,000 to $10,000 it is costing now from $60,000 to $70,000 for the same service. While we pay the extra wages, we are not getting as good service as under the old arrangement from our old friend who for so many years so ably presided over the destinies of that railroad.

Many things have been said during the debate contrasting the administration of the present Government and the late Government. Taking the pledges and platforms of the two parties and reading them as they have been read during this debate, we find a wonderful conglomeration of platforms and promises, fulfilled and unfulfilled. But that is neither here nor there; the people of Canada hold the present Government responsible for the present situation of affairs in this country. They are the gentlemen who are responsible. My hon. friend may talk about the Liberals and we may talk about the Conservatives; these are the fashionable names for the parties. But we can go a little further, we can refer to the Liberal party as the revenue tariff party, believing in as much interchange of commodities with foreign countries as possible, at as low a tariff rate as possible and with as many items on the free list as possible while the other party believes in high protection. Go a step further down and it is nearer the truth to say that the Liberal party is the party whose main object is the interest of the masses of this country, while the Conservative party is the party who has the interest of the classes at heart. It is for the people of this country, comparing the record of the Liberal party for the fifteen years of their administration and the Conservative party for the three years they have been in power, to make their choice; sooner or later the record of these parties and the present condition of the country must be left to the jury of our country, and whatever their verdict may be the members on this side of the House will be satisfied to abide by it.

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

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, the House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

INDEX

FIFTH SESSION—TWELFTH PARLIAMENT, 1915.

Abbreviations.—1r., 2r., 3r=first, second, or third reading. Amdt.=Amendment. Com.=Committee. Con.=Consideration. Div.=Division. M.=Motion. Ref.=Reference. Rep.=Report. Res.=Resolution. Sec.=Section.

Aberdeen Association—franking privilege, 1370

Achim, Mr. Honoré (Labelle)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Trade of Canada, 11
Members at the front, 12
Canada and the war, 13
Defence by Belgians, 14
Experimental farm for Labelle, 2072

Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 4

Adulteration Act Amendment Bill (Maple Sugar). 1r., 1644. 2r., 1790. Com., 1790. 3r., 1993. *See* 2313

Adulteration of food—maple sugar, 1785

Aeroplanes, reported appearance of, 144

Agricultural implements. *See* Taxation

Agriculture
Agricultural Instruction Act, administration of, 2107
Animals, health of, 611, 1286, 2053, 2087, 2108
Bulletins, 2083, 2088, 2092
Cold storage, 2084
Dairying industry, 2080, 2103
Department
Estimates, 1228-1242, 2055-2109
French language in, 2077
Salaries, 2055
Experimental farms, 2056
Hog cholera, 627
Horses, 1230, 2104. *See* War supplies
Insect pests, 2078, 2109
Live stock, 309, 348, 2087, 2092, 2093, 2104
Meat and Canned Foods Act, 2090
Potatoes
Diggers, tariff on, 1174
Embargo on, 719, 772, 991, 1229, 2078
Powdery scab in, 2078
Shipment regulations, 1229
Seed grain. *See that title*
Seeds, improvement of, 2106

Aikins, Sir James A. M. (Brandon)
Boots, army, 2442
Food exports, government control of, 537
Recruits' attestation papers, 1988

Alberta
Military training area, 1557
Miners, unemployment of, 493
Oil leases, 48
Relief distribution, 242

Alert, revenue steamer, 1646

Aliens
Assistance to, 1218, 2053
Deportation of, 2122
Interned at Petawawa, 828, 998
Registration of, 48, 1147, 1733
See Criminal Code Amendment Bill

Allison. *See* War

Ames, Mr. Herbert B. (Montreal, St. Antoine)
Canadian patriotic fund, 394

Amherst
Armoury, 389, 1395, 1977, 2035
Camp, 1290, 1395
Custom house, 1646
Post office, 436, 1396, 1975
Redstone Company, 1864

Ammunition, distribution of, 1652

Anderson, T. A., employment of, 605, 761, 996

Animals. *See* Agriculture

Anticosti lightship, 309

Antigonish-Sherbrooke mail service, 46

Architect, Dominion chief, appointment of, 1958, 1961, 1966, 2184

Arichat mails, 1184

Armstrong, Mr. Joseph E. (East Lambton)
Budget, 577
Record of the Government, 580
Reciprocity, 582
Naval affairs, 582
British preference, 584
Flax industry, 585

Armstrong, Mr. J. E. (East Lambton)—*Con.*
Dominion elections—hours of polling, 1911
Inland navigation rates, control of, 43, 249
Taxation—gravel and sand, 1163

Arthurs, Mr. James (Parry Sound)
Canadian patriotic fund, 402
Dominion elections, 1919

Astronomical observatory, western, 1585, 1893

Atlantic and Lake Superior railway, 1468

Atlases
Dominion electoral, 2307
Immigration, 1576

Auditor General
Office of—non-employment of French Canadians, 2318

Australia, steamship service to, 1292

Aviation school, 1989

Bagot county mail service, 141

Baie des Chaleurs railway, claims against, 518

Ball, Mr. R. J. (South Grey)
Budget, 955
Government expenditure and employment, 955
War contracts, 956
Tariff and taxation, 956
The war and trade, 957
Dominion elections—hours of voting, 1914

Ballot, patent, allowance for, 1591

Bananas, tariff on, 1167

Bank Act Amendment Bill (loans for seed grain). Res., 1242. 1r., 1246. 2r., 1349. Com., 1349. 3r., 1359.

Banks and banking
Borrowings from Government, 147, 476
Finance Act, 1914, continued, 477

Barker, Hon. Samuel (East Hamilton)
War supplies—horses, 2103

Barnard, Mr. Geo. H. (Victoria, B.C.)
Submarines, purchase of, 107
Titles to real estate, fraudulent, 1223

Bathurst harbour, 46

Battlefields, historic, 1716

Bedard, L., dismissal of, 1652

Belgium
Emigration from, 632
Relief for, 1676

Bellemare, Mr. A. (Maskinongé)
Budget—agricultural production and the war, 809
Intercolonial railway ties, 309

Benjamin, H., employment of, 241

Bennett, Mr. R. B. (Calgary)
Bank loans for seed grain, 1356
Budget, 1089
Canada and the war, 1090
Fiscal policies, 1091
Expenditures on public works, 1094
Protection and free trade, 1096
Home market, 1097
British preference, 1101
Controverted elections, 1924, 2009, 2025
Dominion elections, 1899
Experimental farms, 2060
Ferguson, Mr. T. R., report of, on Department of Interior, 2592
Parliament, members of, and government contracts, 2141
Relief for western farmers, 73, 1336, 1338
Senate, the, 2336
Soldiers, votes for, 2233, 2261, 2274
Supreme Court jurisdiction, 2054
Taxation—insurance companies, 1179
War supplies—horses, 2096

Bennett, Mr. Wm. H. (East Simcoe)
Canadian patriotic fund, 397
Freight rates, inland navigation, regulation of, 259
Grain shortages at elevators, 1946
Soldiers, votes for, 2257, 2475

Bickerdike, Mr. Robert (Montreal, St. Lawrence)
Capital punishment, 42, 127, 281, 1763
Immigrants, inspection of, 1574
Prison reform, 1761

Binders, imports of, 1649

Blain, Mr. Richard (Peel)
Budget, 794
British preference, 799
Trade of Canada, 800
Fertilizers, 801
War supplies, 802
Dominion elections, 1906, 1913

Blais, A., dismissal of, 1652

Blondin, Hon. P. E. (Minister of Inland Revenue)
Excise goods in bond, transfer of, 1644
Maple sugar, adulteration of, 1644, 1790
Inland Revenue Department
Appointment of temporary officials, 1644, 1868
Deputy Minister, pamphlet of, 1724
Estimates, 503-513, 1717-1727, 2313

Blue-books, printing and distribution of, 1595, 2310

Boivin, Mr. Geo. H. (Shefford)
Granby mail service, 905
Lévis dry dock, 767
Patent shovel shield, 437, 1235
Shefford mail service, 1287

Bonaventure
Mail service, 769, 994, 2297
Purchase of war supplies in, 994

Boots, army, purchase of. *See* War Supplies

Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert (Prime Minister)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Services of the Governor General, 20
Loyalty of Canadians of foreign origin, 20
Decease of members, 21
Army boot contracts, 21
Causes of the war, 22
Canadian contingent, 24
Aeroplanes, reported appearance of, 145
Aviation schools, 1989
British Columbia better terms commission, 2316
British North America Act, proposed amendment of. *See* Parliamentary representation.
Budget, 1058
Proposed war taxation, 1058
Conference with Opposition, 1058
Tariff proposals, 1060
British preference, 1061
Length of debate, 1064
Canadian High Commissionership, 2318
Canadian Manufacturers' Association, correspondence of, 2189, 2461
Canadian Pacific railway ocean services, 749
Canadian patriotic fund, 395
Canadian representative at Washington, 2315
Capital punishment, 140
Conservation Commission, 2324
Controverted elections, 1995, 2007, 2014, 2020
Copyright, 203
Divorce bills, 1988, 2187
Dominion elections, 2143
Dominion notes, issue of, 1537
Expropriation of lands for military purposes, 1549
External Affairs, department of, 2318
Farquhar, Colonel, death in action of, 1283
Food exports, government control of, 551
Fort Erie shooting case, 333

Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert (Prime Minister) —*Con.*
Franco-Canadian steamship service, 718
Government buildings rented—alleged misconduct of officials, 2050
House of Commons
Bowles, Mr. W. C., resignation of, 1526
Business of the House, 206, 1187
Committees, select standing, 74
Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees, election of, 41
Representation in. *See* Parliamentary
Correction of clerical errors in Act (1914), 1557, 1994
Intercolonial railway branch lines, 1543
Lake of the Woods Technical Board, 1394
Liquor manufacture, suggested suspension of, 2327
Medical Council of Canada, 1251, 2316
Ministerial changes, 207
Monuments, erection of, 1251, 1252
Mounted Police, Royal Northwest, 1249 2322, 2326
National Transcontinental railway, operation of, 2125, 2135
Newspaper attacks, 2190
Nickel, export of, 3
Nova Scotia
Military forces, 561, 612, 687, 720, 905, 1432, 1441, 1500
Postal services, 904
Parliament, members of, and government contracts, 2143-2146
Parliamentary representation—proposed amendment of British North America Act, 1460, 2327, 2340, 2342. *See* Prince Edward Island
Prince Edward Island, parliamentary representation of, 327, 1460. *See* Parliamentary representation
Public Accounts Committee. *See* War supplies
Railway capitalization, 290
Reindeer, experiments with, 2315
Robertson, Lt.-Col. Struan. *See* Nova Scotia military forces
Senate. *See* Parliamentary representation
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 679
Soldiers
Comforts for, 293
Payment of, 2320
Votes for, 337, 2200, 2213, 2259, 2469, 2477, 2537
Submarines, purchase of, 105, 946, 955
Taxation—liquor duties, 1154
Unemployment, 2320
Valcartier land claims, 1549

Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert (Prime Minister) —*Con.*

War
Appropriations, 93, 1397
Canadian expeditionary forces—statement of mobilization and organization, 2364
Canadian troops in France, 204, 909
Engineering corps, 1525
Expenditures, statement of, 1397
Fair wages in war contracts, 38
Nova Scotia military forces. *See that title*
Pensions, 1188, 1394, 1450
Supplies, purchase of
Ammunition, 93, 1455
Binoculars, 2605
Boots, 21, 144, 204, 2450
British Government, for, 38, 2461, 2614
Carleton Drug Company, 2605, 2614
Committee of Council, 1246
Generally, 93, 945, 2461, 2538, 2602, 2610, 2614, 2617
Horses, 2098-2102, 2606, 2613
Shells, 38, 2614
Western farmers, relief for, 1330

Boulay, Mr. H. (Rimouski)
Agriculture in Quebec, 2076
Anticosti lightship, 309
Budget, 984
French Canadians in Government service, 985
Judges' pensions, 987
Aid to agriculture, 988
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, payments to, 1864
French language in Department of Agriculture, 2077
Immigration inspectors and the French language, 233
Intercolonial railway
Bridges, 897
Cement posts, 309
Dining car employees, 1485
Passenger service, 1485
Madawaska postal service, 1388
Marine service in Rimouski, 1256, 2304
Matapedia road, 2178
Ore refined in United States, 309
Voters' lists, errors in, 2309
War supplies—horses, 898, 1455

Bounties on lead and petroleum, 1936

Bourassa, Mr. J. Boutin (Lévis)
Dismissals, 1652
Intercolonial railway
Chaudiere employees, 1785
Lévis station, 831

Bourassa, Mr. J. Boutin (Lévis)—*Con.*
Lauzon dry dock, 1647
Lévis quarantine station, 241, 1290
National Transcontinental railway—Quebec terminals, 518
St. Romuald post office, 518
Telephone disinfectants, 2531
War supplies—horses, 830

Bowman, Mr. James (East Huron)
Budget, 930
Rival fiscal policies, 930
Development under protection, 932
Aid to agriculture, 934

Boyer, Mr. Gustave (Vaudreuil)
Lévis shell factory, 519
Maple sugar industry, 513, 1794
Rigaud
Armoury, 631, 993
Dredging, 390
Wharf, 1786
Scales in cheese and butter factories, inspection of, 513
St. Zotique wharf, 390
War supplies
Horses, 388
Saddles, 521

Bradbury, Mr. George H. (Selkirk)
Budget, 715, 772
Pre-election promises, 716, 776
Expenditures on public works, 717, 772
British preference and the tariff, 781, 782
Cement merger, 784
Hudson Bay railway, 786
Seed grain distribution, 789
Experimental farms, 2066
Pollution of navigable waters, 3, 118
St. Peter's Indian reserve, 1321, 1882

Bristol, Mr. Edmund (Toronto Centre)
Inland navigation freight rates, regulation of, 254

British Columbia
Better Terms Commission, 2316
Labour troubles, 497
Militiamen on active service, 151
Steamship services, 1300

British North America Act, proposed amendment of, 1459, 2327

Brooks-MacNally mail service, 994

Brouillard, Mr. Ovide (Drummond and Arthabaska)
Gilbert, R., employment of, 1787
Stanfold model farm, 1993

Buchanan, Mr. William A. (Medicine Hat)
Alberta
Coal industry, 492
Oil leases, 48
Relief distribution, 242, 2188
Bank loans for seed grain, 1244
Blood Indian reserve, 763, 1323
Brooks-MacNally mail service, 994
Coal imports, 521
Coutts quarantine area, 150
Experimental farms, 2066
Food exports, government control of, 540
Lethbridge
Customs staff, 521
Field battery, 1646
Immigration inspector, 150, 1567
Postmastership, 143, 769, 1364, 1367
Wool storage, 828
Medicine Hat
Homestead inspection, 2123
Postmasters, 764
Rural mail service, 768
Mounted Police, Northwest, 1284
Oil and gas leases, 241
Railway charters, extension of, 724, 758
War supplies—horses, 631, 1146
Western farmers, relief for, 58, 947, 1244, 1340. *See* Bank loans
Wrentham post office, 142

Budget debate, 80, 352, 404, 442, 562, 613, 689, 709, 772, 833; amendment (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), 841, 905, 955, 999, 1058; div., 1141. *See* Taxation

Bureau, Mr. Jacques (Three Rivers and St. Maurice)
Cap de la Madelaine wharf, 2120
Inland Revenue, Deputy Minister of, pamphlet of, 1724
Maple syrup, adulteration of, 1792, 1800
St. Maurice river slides and booms, timber for, 2184
Soldiers, votes for, 2288, 2491
Taxation—postage stamps and war stamps, 2539
Three Rivers
Dredging, 2175
Harbour works, 2155
Public building, 1786

Burnham, Mr. John H. (Peterborough West)
Budget, 404
Unemployment, 405
British preference, 408
Eastern peril, 409
German menace, 411
Free trade, 413
Made-in-Canada movement, 414

Burnham, Mr. John H. (Peterborough West) —*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
Balance of trade, 415
Ethics and industry, 416
Civil service, old men in, 1871
Controverted elections, 2011
Dominion elections—hours of polling, 1907
Grain shortage, compensation for, 1956
Immigration and old age pensions, 1573
Mail carriers, remuneration of, 1374
Naval service, 1660
Peterborough government employees, 1285

Burrell, Hon. Martin (Minister of Agriculture)
Agricultural Instruction Act, administration of, 2107
Agriculture, Department of
Estimates, 2055
Bulletins, 2083, 2092
Cold storage, 2084
Dairying industry, 2081, 2103
Exhibitions, 2085, 2109
Experimental farms, 2056, 2058, 2072
Foot and mouth disease, 2088
Horse breeding, 2104
Live stock industry, 2092
Meat, inspection of, 2091
Potato scab, 2078
Public health, 2108
Parliamentary representation, 1994
Seeds, improvement of, 2106

Cadwell Sand and Gravel Company, 1166

Calgary civil servants, 1184

Calmer-Telfordville mail service, 1187

Canada Grain Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 1644. 2r., 2030. Com., 2030. 3r., 2191. Sen. amdt., 2532

Canada Temperance Act, referenda under, 1590

Canada Year Book, 1938

Canadian expeditionary forces. *See* War

Canadian Manufacturers' Association and war supplies, 1667, 2189, 2461

Canadian Northern Railway Company, payments to, 150

Canadian Pacific railway
Capitalization, control of, 286, 726
Ocean services, 749

Canadian patriotic fund, 143, 1446, 1864

Canadian Patriotic Fund Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 204. 2r., 393. Com., 393. 3r., 404

Canadian Peace Centenary Association, 2315

Canadian Peat Society, 1865

Canadian representative at Washington, 2315

Canadian War Contingent Association, 2122

Canadian Wheatlands Company, 2188

Canadians in California, status of, 1189

Canals, 491, 632, 832, 1710, 1712
For individual canals, see their titles

Canning public building, 1979

Canso
Fish reduction works, 633, 767
Military guard, 1556

Cape Breton, customs service in, 222, 225, 227, 1650

Capital punishment, abolition of, 42, 127, 264, 1228, 1761

Cardigan-Annandale mail service, 1648

Cardin, Mr. P. J. A. (Richelieu)
Richelieu postal service, 1287

Cardin, D., employment of, 1993

Cardinal canal, 832

Carey, J. M., employment of, 993

Cariboo island breakwater, 308

Carleton retaining wall, 390

Carrick, Mr. J. J., M.P., service of, 561

Carroll, Mr. W. F. (Cape Breton South)
Aliens, registration of, 1147, 1733.
Bank loans for seed grain, 1352, 1358
Benjamin, H., employment of, 241
Budget, 989, 1012
Party truce, 1013
Naval question, 1014
Free trade, 1015
Proposed new taxes, 1016
Manufacturers and prices, 1018
Labour and the tariff, 1021
Liberals and the war, 1021
Aid to Belgium, 1022
Canadian Pacific railway ocean service, 743
Canadian patriotic fund, 393
Cape Breton customs service, 222, 225, 227
Explosives in mines, 1601
Food exports, government control of, 550
Foster, W. G., employment of, 898
Inland navigation rates, 255, 1687
Intercolonial railway—service of Mr. Gutelius, 1483
Iron and coal imports, 244

Carroll, Mr. W. F. (Cape Breton South)—*Con.*
Kelly, Edgar, employment of, 241
Livingstone, C. P., appointment of, 150
Miller, J., patent of, 1990
Mines Department, 1600
National employment bureau, 484-490
New Waterford
Postal service, 1360
Recruiting, 392
Customs service, 227
Nova Scotia
Fire insurance rates in, 1284, 1399
Postal service, 903
Patent medicines, alcohol in, 1717
Railway charters, extension of, 722
Smuggling, alleged, in Cape Breton, 222
Sydney pilotage commissioners, 1265
Sydney-New Waterford mail service, 1361
Sydney-St. Peter's railway, 608
Valcartier camp stores, 308
Vancouver Terminal Company, 1262
Voters' lists, preparation of, 1594
War supplies—horses, 607

Carslake Hotel purchase. *See* Montreal

Carvell, Mr. Frank B. (Carleton, N.B.)
Budget, 1066
The party truce, 1066
Revenue and expenditure, 1068
Taxation proposals, 1071
British preference, 1079
Canadian Northern Railway Company, 760
Civil Service appointments, 1144, 1285
Controverted elections, 1924, 2151
Dominion elections
Hours of polling, 1906
Voters' lists, 1897
Fraudulent titles to real estate, 1221
French, Field Marshal Sir John, 1444
Horse exports, 1234
Intercolonial railway
Fredericton land purchase, 168, 1475
Freight rates and trains, 156, 167
St. John and Quebec railway agreement, 1473
Militia—engineer services and works, 1513
Pollution of navigable waters, 124
Potato embargo, 719
St. John Valley railway, 46, 173, 1473
Soldiers
Pay of, 2320
Votes for, 2352
Southampton railway investigation, 142
Taxation
Agricultural implements, 1174
Customs valuation, 1154
Fertilizers, 1076, 1166
Tobique Indian reserve, 187, 193

Carvell, Mr. Frank B. (Carleton, N.B.)—*Con.*
Valley railway, 142
War supplies
Hay, 140, 241
Imported munitions, duty on, 1506
Motor truck tires, 1290

Casgrain, Hon. T. Chase (Postmaster General)
Aberdeen Association and the franking privilege, 1370
Montreal postal service, 1378, 2296
Parliament, members of, and government contracts, 2145
Pollution of navigable waters, 125
Post office
Contingencies, 1360
Department staff and salaries, 1359, 2295
Dismissals, 1367
Estimates, 1359-1394, 2295-2298
Letters for soldiers, 1419, 1422
Mail bag locks, 47, 1393
Mail carriers, payment of, 2297
Outside service, 1360, 1371
Parcel post, 1371-1375, 1384
Rural mail service, 1379
Stamps, sale and use of, 1391, 1393, 1422, 2297, 2624
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 661

Cattle. *See* Agriculture

Censorship, 1264, 1448, 1496, 1506, 1618

Charbonneau, R., employment of, 610

Chesley public building, 1646

Chisholm, Mr. Alexander W. (Inverness)
Campbell, Daniel, weights and measures official, 511
Cheticamp
Live-saving station, 1633, 1636
Marine medical service, 1269
Intercolonial railway branch lines, 1482, 1702
Inverness harbour improvements, 2052
McLeod, Mr., dismissal of, 1606
Navigable waters, removal of obstructions in, 347
Steam trawling, 246, 2306

Chisholm, Mr. William (Antigonish)
Antigonish-Sherbrooke mail service, 46
Eastern Extension railway land damages, 1469
Fenian raid bounty, 1546
Immigration to Nova Scotia, 1558
Intercolonial railway
Abutment contracts, 895, 1286
Branch lines, eastern Nova Scotia, 1478, 1482

Chisholm, Mr. William (Antigonish)—*Con.*
Intercolonial railway—*Con.*
Bridges, watchmen on, 763
Coal contracts, 769
Nova Scotia
Indians, 1308, 1310, 1312
Inland revenue officials, 507
Postal service, 1380
Oil for fuel, imports of, 143
Taxation—postal rates and stamp taxes, 1413
War supplies—clinic thermometers, 307, 521

Civil Service
Appointments, 213, 218, 1144, 1285, 1591
Commission, 992, 1612
Dismissals, 213, 218
Militia service, civil servants in, 312, 522
Reform, 895, 1189
Speech of Mr. Adam Shortt, 213, 232, 471, 634

Clark, Mr. Hugh (North Bruce)
Agricultural reports, 2083
Prison reform, 1766
Soldiers, votes for, 2282, 2351

Clark, Mr. Michael (Red Deer)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 27
Made-in-Canada campaign, 28
Canada's paramount duty, 30
Spending of monevs. 31
Party literature, 31
Election talk, 32
Claims of the Empire, 32
Budget, 863
Submarines in naval warfare, 864
Financial comparisons, 867
Home markets and the National Policy, 869
Borrowings or economy, 870
War and taxation, 872
Income tax, 872
British preference and made-in-Canada campaign, 873, 876
Effect of the new tariff, 875
Canadian patriotic fund, 404
Dismissals, 1366
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 640
Soldiers, votes for, 2201, 2217, 2468
Taxation
Income, 1197
Postage stamps and war stamps, 1415
See Budget
Western farmers, relief for, 67
Wetaskawin settlers, grievances of, 1565

Clarke, Mr. W. A. (North Wellington)
Budget, 1050
Canada and the war, 1051
The Government's tariff policy, 1051
Revenue and protection, 1051
Western conditions, 1052

Coal. *See* Mines

Coast Guard, steamer, 1866

Coasting trade, 296, 1933

Cochrane, Hon. Frank (Minister of Railways and Canals)
Canadian Pacific railway ocean services, 746
Canals
Soulanges, 1712
Staff, repairs, etc., 1713
Trent, 1712
Welland, 1710, 1713
Government purchase of railways, 1540, 1681
Hudson Bay railway, 1861
Intercolonial railway
Branch lines
Eastern Nova Scotia, 1467, 1477, 1482, 1701
Chatham, 1492, 1686
Bridges, 1492, 1686
Cape Breton improvements, 1687
Fredericton land purchase, 171
Freight rates and trains, 164
General management, 1489
Halifax terminals, 1688
Highway protection, 1687
Moncton
Death claim—Mrs. O'Rourke, 1475
Improvements, 1691
Subway, 1397
Mulgrave car ferry, 1473, 1693
Operation, 1472, 1690
Quebec solicitor, 1708
Rolling stock, 1695
Safety appliances, 1698
St. John and Quebec railway agreement, 1473
National Transcontinental railway
Construction, 1859
Government operation, 1802, 1816, 2128
Montreal connection, 1711
Quebec
Bridge, 1710
Terminals, 1860
Railways and Canals Department
Estimates, 1467-1495, 1685-1713, 1859
Staff and salaries, 1471
St. John Valley railway, 184

Cockshutt, Mr. William F. (Brantford)
Food exports, government control of, 526, 556
Naturalization, 610
Soldiers, votes for, 2266

Coderre, Hon. Louis (Secretary of State and Minister of Mines)
Canada Temperance Act, referenda under, 1590
Dominion electoral atlas, 2307
Mines Department
Electric smelting, 1602, 2313
Estimates, 1599-1612, 2313
Explosives in mines, 1601, 1604
Geological survey, 1607-1611
Investigations and experiments, 1603, 2313
Staff and salaries, 1599
Tar sands for road making, 1604
Printing and stationery, 1591
Scientific literature, international catalogue of, 1590
Secretary of State, Department of
Estimates 1588-1598, 2307
Staff, salaries, etc., 1588, 1589
Vincent, Mr. J. U., pamphlet of, 1724
Voters' lists, preparation of, 1594

Colcleugh, F. W. R., employment of, 1648

Cold storage. *See* Agriculture

Cole Harbour wharf, 517

Collingwood Ship Building Company, 519

Conservation Commission, 2314, 2324

Consolidated Fund expenditure, 1290

Contrecoeur public works, 1651

Cookshire post office, 1991

Copp, Mr. A. B. (Westmorland, N. B.)
Amherst
Camp, 1290, 1395
Military buildings, 1395
Redstone Company, 1864
Budget, 936
Economy or taxation, 938
The party truce, 938
Tariff burdens on farmers, 940
Patriotism-and-production campaign, 941
New Brunswick and war taxes, 943
Intercolonial railway management, 944
Grand Trunk Pacific railway, labour conditions on, 498
Intercolonial railway
Branch lines, 1685, 1706
Employees, enlistment of, 245
Management, 1487, 1491

Copp, Mr. A. B. (Westmorland, N.B.)—*Con.*
Intercolonial railway—*Con.*
Moncton
Death claim—Mrs. O'Rourke, 1475, 1713
Shops, 1696
Subway, 1397
Operation, 1708
Sackville, accommodation at, 606, 1693, 1706
Wages, payment of, 498
Mount Allison military instruction, 1524
New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island railway, purchase of, 152, 1685
Post Office
Employees, inefficiency of, 1392
Rural mail service, 1390
Sackville
Home guard, 1517
Pilotage, 1266
Post office, 153
War supplies
Hay, 1289
Horses, 520
Seasickness cure, 152

Copper exports, 312

Copyright, protection of, 196, 1226

Corn imports, 152

Cost of Living Commission, 1395, 2625

Country Harbour gas buoy, 762

Courts. *See* Justice

Coutts quarantine area, 150

Cream exports, 294

Criminal Code Amendment Bills. 1r., 47, 205. 2r., 284, 304. Ref. to select Com., 476. Com., 1218. 3r., 1291. Sen. amdts., 2053

Crothers, Hon. Thos. W. (Minister of Labour)
Cost of Living Commission, 2625
Labour
British Columbia, troubles in, 497
Department
Estimates, 481-498, 501-503
Staff and salaries, 481, 502
Disputes, settlement of, 494
Employment bureaux, 485-490
Farm labourers, distribution of, 490
Grand Trunk Pacific railway, conditions on, 498
Railway construction and labour, 502
Railway employees, voting of, 2504
South Wellington mine disaster, 207
Technical education, 495, 502

Crothers, Hon. Thos. W. (Minister of Labour)—*Con.*
Labour—*Con.*
Telegraphers, conditions of employment of, 2532
Unemployment, 483, 493, 501
Wages
Payment of, 498
War contracts, on, 490, 503
Welland canal, on, 492

Cumberland rural mail, 1649

Customs
Agricultural implements, valuation of, 605
Alert, revenue steamer, 231
Department
Appointments and dismissals, 218-222, 228
Employees in war service, 217
Staff and salaries, 217-230
Fraudulent importation of horses, 229
Investigations, 611
Smuggling, alleged, 222
See Taxation

Customs Tariff War Revenue Bill. Res., 89, 1150, 1168. 1r., 1217. 2r., 1400. Com., 1400. 3r., 1405. *See* Budget, Special War Revenue Bill, *and* Taxation

Dagneau, John, employment of, 1866

Dairying Industry. *See* Agriculture.

Davidson, Mr. Avard L. (Annapolis)
French, Field Marshal, 1446

Davidson, W. W., employment of, 768

Delisle, Mr. Michel S. (Portneuf)
Dorion, C. N., employment of, 521
Government reports in French, 828
National Transcontinental railway
Portneuf claims, 993
Quebec terminals, 993
Quebec county telegraph service, 1187, 2122
St. Gilbert de Portneuf postmaster, 307
War supplies
Horses, 520
Motor trucks, 1186

Demers, Mr. M. Joseph (St. John and Iberville)
Allison, J. Wesley, services of, 1145
Horses, embargo on, 150
Adulteration of maple sugar, 1798
Montreal postal station, 1651, 2528

Descarries, Mr. Joseph R. (Jacques Cartier)
Budget, 1022
Canada's share in the war, 1023
Expenditures and taxation, 1024

Devlin, Mr. Emmanuel B. (Wright)
Civil Service reform, 895
Dominion elections—hours of polling, 1911
Georgian Bay canal, 1971

Devlin, Mr. Emmanuel B. (Wright)—*Con.*
Hull
Inland revenue service, 1871
Post office repairs, 1985
Mica duties, 830
Ottawa-Hull
Postal rate, 766
Town-planning commission, 766
Patent medicines, 1717
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 659

Doherty, Hon. C. J. (Minister of Justice)
Aliens
Assistance to, 1218
Registration of, 1734
Canadians in California, status of, 1190
Canadian patriotic fund, 204, 393
Capital punishment, 264
Controverted elections, 1920, 1994-2030, 2148
Copyright, 201, 1226
Criminal Code amendments
Aliens, assistance to, 1218, 2053
Bawdy house, inmate of—penalty, 1227
Committee, select, on, 476
Dramatic copyright, infringement of, 1226
Military stores, fraud in sale of, 305, 1226
Real estate titles, fraudulent, 285, 1220
Doherty, Hon. C. J., pension of, 209, 1727
Dominion elections
Hours of polling, 1915
M. for select com., 205
Railway employees, voting of, 2499, 2501, 2502
Voters' lists, 1895
Dominion police, 1732
Exchequer Court
Expenses, 1731
Reports, 1730
Expropriations at Valcartier and Three Rivers, 1739
Insurance companies—licenses, 1247, 1399
Judges
Additional, for British Columbia and Alberta, 1428
Militia, in active, 1728
Salaries of, 1732
Superannuations in Quebec, 1186
Justice Department estimates, 1727, 2186
Maple sugar adulteration, 1793
Parliament, members of
Active service, on, 351, 440
Government contracts, and, 2143, 2145
Parliamentary representation, 1788, 1929, 1994
Penitentiaries
Kingston
Management, 1775
Release of Thomas Riley, 2259

Doherty, Hon. C. J. (Minister of Justice)—*Con.*
Penitentiaries—*Con.*
Prison reform, 1775
Ticket-of-leave system, 1736
Soldiers, votes for, 1643, 1874, 2195, 2229, 2259-2294, 2343-2364, 2462-2528, 2533-2538, 2625.
Solicitor General, office of, 1736
Supreme Court
Expenses, 1730
Jurisdiction—appeal in provincial election cases, 1988, 2053
Winding-up Act amendment, 2121, 2195

Doherty, Hon. C. J., judicial pension of, 209, 808, 987, 1727

Dominion Controverted Elections Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 1714. 2r., 1920. Com., 1920, 1994, 2148. 3r., 2154. *See* Supreme Court Act Amendment Bill

Dominion Elections Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 1714. 2r., 1895. Com., 1895, 2139. 3r., 2148. Select Com., 205. *See* 1527, 1929

Dominion lands and parks, 231, 1894

Dominion Notes Bill. Res., 1528. 1r., 1539. 2r,. 1653. Com., 1653. 3r., 1653. *See* 146, 479.

Dominion police. *See* Justice

Dominion Trust Company, 519

Dominions, overseas
Peace terms, and, 2627
Status of, 439

Dorion, C. N., employment of, 521

Douglas, Mr. James (Strathcona)
Agricultural literature, 2082
Calmar-Telfordville mails, 1187, 1376
Camrose, public building for, 1979
Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company, 723
Homesteaders' wood rights, 1560
Killam mail route, 244
McInnes, T. R. E., employment of, 1864
Nice, Mr., employment of, 1991
Oil lease, George McRae, 243
Pope land lease, 993
Ribstone, village of, patent of, 243
Seed grain distribution, 1281
Strathcona postal service, 1376
Wainwright park, 236
War supplies
Horses 898, 1234
Overshoes, 762
Wetaskawin settlers, grievances of, 1560, 1565, 1566

Dredging. *See* Public works

Drill halls. *See* Militia

Duchemin, H. P., payments to, 604, 667, 948

Duck Mountain
Homesteaders, 992
Timber reserve, 1577

East Erinville post office, 519

Edmonton
Public building, 2044
Rifle range, 1552

Edwards, Mr. John W. (Frontenac)
Barriefield military road, 1515
Budget, 458
Government dismissals, 459
Government administration and expenditure, 459
Trade conditions, 462
The United States market, 463
Tariff increases, 464
British preference, 464
Tariff on agricultural implements, 467
The war crisis, 469
Cement duty, 469
Capital punishment, 136
Cheese inspection, 513
Dismissals, government, 459, 1366
Experimental farms, 2063
Farmers' relief, 1240
Hog cholera, 1286
Hughes, Major W. S., 435
Meat inspection, 2090
Parcel post, 1384
Patent shovel shield, 1236
Royal Military College, 1519
Penitentiaries
Kingston, 136, 515, 1740, 1773
Release of Thomas Riley, 2459
Stoney Mountain, 390, 1185

Electric smelting. *See* Mines

Emigration to United States, 242

Employment bureau. *See* Labour

Escuminac wharf, 1287

Estimates. *See titles of departments and subjects*

Eureka, steamer, 1265, 1268

Exchequer Court. *See* Justice

Excise, 1717

Exhibitions, 2085, 2109

Experimental farms. *See* Agriculture

Explosives. *See* Mines

External Affairs, Department of, 2314, 2318

Farmers Bank, depositors of, 391

Farmers' relief. *See* Western farmers, *also* Richmond county

Farquhar, Colonel, death in action of, 1283

Fenian raid bounty, 242, 1545, 1651

Ferguson, Mr. T. R., report of. *See* Interior

Finance
Charges of management, 1715
Expenditure of Canada, 435, 764
Revenue of Canada, 152

Finance Act, 1914—proclamation continued, 476

Fish and Fisheries
Advisory board, 1270
American vessels, regulation of, 1650
Behring sea claims, 239
Bounties, 94
Breeding, 1278
Departmental estimates, 1270-1280, 1643
Exhibit at Toronto, 1277
"Fish and How to Cook It"—booklet, 239
Grants to fishermen, 2123
Herrings—regulation of prices, 1786
Hudson bay fisheries, 1280
Inspection, 48, 1271, 1279
Licenses, issue of, 1275, 2302
Lobsters
Close season, 45
Hatcheries, 1278
Seed, 309
Undersized, 1150
Officers, 1270
Oyster culture, 1275
Pickled fish, 48, 1278
Protection service, 1622
Quebec, in province of, 994
Reduction works, 633, 767
Shell-fish commission, 607
Steam trawling, 243, 246, 311, 312, 1622, 2305
Tidal waters, fisheries in, 116, 1270
Transportation, 80, 1494

Fisher, Captain E., employment of, 517

Fisher, Mr. J. H. (Brant)
Budget, 817
Expenditures on public works, 817
Made-in-Canada movement, 818
Indian Department, 819
Votes for soldiers, 819

Flour, Canada's gift of, to Great Britain, 1646

Food
Exports, government control of, 526, 556
Inspection, 2090

Foot and mouth disease, 611, 2053, 2087

Forest reserves, 233, 1579

Fort Erie shooting case, 143, 332

Fort William harbour improvements, 1970-1975

Foster, Mr. Arthur De Witt (King's, N.S.)
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 674
War supplies—horses, 629, 1033
Yarmouth harbour, 1289

Foster, Hon. Sir George E. (Minister of Trade and Commerce)
Belgian relief, 1676
Bounties on lead and petroleum, 1936
Budget, 999
The war and party co-operation, 999
Canada's finances, 1001
Protection or free trade and revenue, 1003, 1011
Financial inheritances of the Government, 1004
Methods of taxation, 1006
The tariff, 1008
British preference, 1009
Canada's part in the war, 1012
Canada Year Book, 1938
Civil Service appointments, 1872
Customs valuations, 1404
Freight rates, ocean, lake and river, 215
Gold and silver marking, 1875
Grain Act
Administration of, 1939-1954
Amendment Bill, 1644, 2191, 2532
House of Commons
Easter adjournment, 1645
Government business, 1787
Nickel export, 1937
Pit props, trade in, 1934
Steamship services, 1291. *See that title*
Trade and Commerce, 212, 1291, 1931. *See that title*
War
Appropriations, 1664, 1670
Supplies
Committee of Council on, 1666
Communications from Canadian Manufacturers' Association, 1668

Foster, W. G., employment of, 898

Fournier, L. H., employment of, 521

Fowler, Mr. George W. (King's and Albert)
Controverted elections, 1925
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 669

Fraser river, removal of obstructions in, 2303

Fraserville harbour, 392

Fredericton land expropriation, 168, 1475

Freight rates
Lake and ocean, supervision of, 215, 351
Inland navigation, control of, 43, 249

French Canadians
Civil Service, in, 985, 2318
Military service, in, 1149, 1442, 1445, 2189

French language
Blue books in
Printing and distribution, 1596, 2310
Translation, 504
Department of Agriculture, in, 2077
War stamps in, 1205

French river improvements, 1991

French, Sir John, Field Marshal, 1443

French Treaty and war taxes. *See* **Taxation**

Fripp, Mr. Alfred E. (Ottawa)
Votes for soldiers, 334

Furois, E., employment of, 1993

Gallon, W. J., employment of, 831

Garland, Mr. W. F. (Carleton, Ont.)
War contracts, 947

Gas inspection, 508, 1720

Gaspe
Deferred elections in, 1903, 2147
Purchase of war supplies in, 994
Railways, 518
Salmon fisheries, 116, 2302
Steamer service, 307, 833, 1286, 1301

Gaspé Bay anchorage, 998, 1449

Gauthier, Mr. Louis J. (St. Hyacinthe)
Budget, 586
Criticism of the Government, 587
Party truce and the war, 588
Taxation and protection, 589
British preference, 589
St. Denis rural mails, 993
War supplies—waterproofs, 609

Gauvreau, Chas., employment of, 390

Gauvreau, Mr. Charles A. (Temiscouata)
Auclair expropriation, 1729
Fraserville harbour, 392
Intercolonial railway
Gutelius, Mr. F. P., 141, 309
Hay, cutting of, 1710
Ice contracts, 79
Riviere du Loup shops, 141
Lake Temiscouata postal service, 79
Louisville
Mails, 1288
Public building, 1288, 1459

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A. (Temiscouata)—*Con.*
Malécité Indians, 1308
Menace newspaper, 991
Mousseau, P. A., employment of, 1992, 2122
Temiscouata postal service, 392
Genest, A., employment of, 767, 1185, 1368
Geological survey. *See* Mines
Georgian Bay Canal commission, 1145, 2183
German, Mr. William M. (Welland)
Admiralty court procedure, 1732
Bank loans for seed grain, 1245
Canadian patriotic fund, 1309
Controverted elections, 2000, 2010, 2016, 2152
Point Abino signal service, 1256
Soldiers, votes for, 2246, 2259, 2287, 2345, 2464, 2506
Solicitor General, office of, 1735, 1738
Taxation—patent medicines, 1423
War supplies
Bicycles, 995
Boots, 315
Welland canal, wages on, 491
Gilbert, Arthur, employment of, 1787, 1993
Gillis, A. B., employment of, 831
Girard, Mr. Joseph (Chicoutimi and Saguenay)
Agriculture in Quebec, 2073
Glass, Mr. S. Francis (East Middlesex)
Budget, 913
Tremendous effect of the war, 913
Patriotism and production, 914
Credits for farmers, 916
Reciprocity with the United States, 917
Conditions of trade and finance, 919
Canada's share in the war, 922
British preference, 923
Immigration, 924
Dominion elections—hours for voting, 1910
Privilege—the member for West Lambton, 2460
Gobeil, A., employment of, 895, 1458, 1962
Gold and Silver Marking Bill. 1r., 1645. 2r., 1875. Com., 1875. 3r., 1876.
Gordon, Mr. David A. (East Kent)
Wallaceburg customs collector, 766
Government Railways Purchase Bill. Res., 1539. 1r., 1544. 2r., 1681. Com., 1681. 3r., 1685.
Graham, Hon. George P. (South Renfrew)
Bank loans for seed grain, 1349
Budget, 1130
Party co-operation and the war, 1130
Public expenditure and the late Government, 1132
Graham, Hon. G. P. (South Renfrew)—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
Railway obligations—Canadian Northern and National Transcontinental, 1133
Reduction of expenditure, 1136
War taxes or not, 1137
British preference, 1140
Cadet corps, 1518
Capital punishment, 136, 137
Cardinal canal
Removal of houses, 832
Statistical officer, 832
Civil Service—temporary appointments, 1871
Coal imports, 633, 828
Collingwood Shipbuilding Company, 519
Dairying industry, 2081
Food exports, government control of, 554
Georgian Bay canal, 966
Commission, 2183
Horse breeding, 2105
House of Commons stenographers, employment of, during recess, 1360
Hudson Bay railway, 436, 631
Intercolonial railway
Expenditures, 1492
Halifax terminals, 1689
Level crossings, 1688
Kingston penitentiary—employment of Mr. Begg, 828
Morris, F., employment of, 151
National Transcontinental railway
Construction expenditure, 1859
Government operation, 1802, 1841, 2124, 2134
Quebec terminals, 606
Ocean freight rates, 751
Parliament, members of, and government contracts, 2144
Pollution of navigable waters, 124
Public health, conservation of, 2107
Railway capitalization, 289
Richards, James W., M.P., death of, 827
St. Thomas armoury, 1866
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 681
Soldiers, votes for, 336, 2262, 2274, 2350
Trent canal—claim of Cory & Laverdure, 1712
War
Appropriations, 1667
Canadians, enlistment of, 1447
Members of parliament on active service, 439
Supplies
Canadian Manufacturers' Association, communications from, 1667, 2189, 2461
Clothing, 2531
Salisbury Plain, at, 306

Grain
Administration of Act, 1939-1957
Amendment Bill. 1r., 1644. 2r., 2030. Com., 2030. 3r., 2191.
Distillation of, 2624

Granby mail service, 905

Grand Trunk Pacific railway
Expenditures on, 437, 1864
Labour conditions on, 498
See National Transcontinental railway

Gray, William (London)
Canadians in California, 1189
Dominion elections—hours of polling, 1908
South Wellington mine disaster, 207
Transportation of Canadian forces, 763

Green, Mr. Robert F. (Kootenay)
Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company, 721
Real estate titles, fraudulent, 1222

Gutelius, Mr. F. P., 141, 309, 1483, 1489

Guysborough
Branch railways. *See* Intercolonial
Fishery guardians, 313
Mail service, 519, 607, 633, 897, 1185

Half-breed scrip, 1287

Haliburton, recruiting at, 896

Halifax
Chartered steamers, 1647
Customs night watchman, 831
Military headquarters staff, 1514
Permanent force, supplies for, 2529
Public Works, 1458
Terminals, 764, 1688

Halifax and Eastern railway, 1466

Hall, R. P., appointment of, 763

Harbours. *See* Public works

Hawkesbury-Grenville bridge, 1648, 1992, 2176

Hazen, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries)
Cheticamp life-saving station, 1635
Dredging, 1252
Fish and Fisheries
Advisory board, 1270
Breeding, 1278
Departmental officers, 1270
Exhibit at Toronto, 1277
"Fish and How to Cook It"—booklet, 239
Grants to fishermen, 2301
Licenses, issue of, 116, 1275, 2302
Hazen, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries)—*Con.*
Oyster culture, 1275
Protection service, 1622
Steam trawling, 1622, 1624, 2305
Tidal waters, fisheries in, 1270
Fraser river obstructions, removal of, 2303
Hudson bay
Fisheries, 1280
Hydrographic surveys, 1626
Navigation, 1627
Karluk, steamer. *See* Stefansson
LeBlanc, seaman, 1642
Live-stock inspection, 348
Marine
British ships, transfer of, 1057
Coasting trade, 299
Government steamers, 312, 338, 1255
Hydrographic surveys, 1626
Ice breaking, 339, 1255, 1267
Life-saving service, 351, 1633
Lighthouse and coast service, 1256-1260, 1267
Maritime road, 1267
Masters and mates, examination of, 340
Navigation
Aids to, 1258
Obstructions to, 347, 2303
Schools of, 346
Pilotage, 1265
St. Lawrence ship channel, 1252
Seamen, sick and distressed, 1269
Shipping casualties in 1914, 833
Signal service, 1264
Steamboat inspection, 1270
Unseaworthy vessels, 345
Wrecking plants, 349
Wrecks, investigations into, 342
Marine and Fisheries estimates, 338-350, 1252-1280
Naval service, 237, 1612, 1654, 2298
Navigable waters, pollution of, 121
New Brunswick shale industry, 1608
Northern waters, patrol of, 1631, 2298
Parliamentary representation, 2332
Prince Edward Island winter mail service, 348
Quebec Harbour Commission—resignation of Sir William Price, 1966
Richard, Mrs. Margaret, claim of, 1642
St. John custom house, 1982
Shelburne fishery inspector, 1271
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 642
Stefansson expedition, 1631, 1632, 2298
Submarines, purchase of, 100
United States flag, alleged flying of, on wireless station, 1617
Wireless telegraphic service, 1263

Hepburn, Mr. B. R. (Prince Edward, Ont.)
Steamboat rates, 257

Higenbotham, E. N., dismissal of, 1364

High Commissioner, Canadian, 391, 2318

Homesteaders' wood rights, 1560

Horn, Werner, extradition of, 44, 79

Horses
Export to the United States, 150, 1230
Breeding, 2103
Fraudulent importation of, 229
See War supplies

House of Commons
Business of the House, 206, 687, 1187
Committees, select standing, 74
Deputy Speaker, election of, 41
Easter adjournment, 1645
Members
Active service, on. *See* Senate and House of Commons
Government contracts, and, 1242, 2139
Indemnity of, 2309
Officials, appointment of, 144, 1526, 1863, 2258
Reading room, taking of papers from, 611
Representation. *See* House of Commons Representation Act Amendment Bill, Parliamentary representation, *and* Prince Edward Island
Sessional employees, 2109
Stenographers, post-sessional employment of, 1360
Voters' lists, preparation of, 1594, 2111, 2309

House of Commons Representation Act Amendment Bill (correction of clerical errors). 1r., 1557. 2r., 1788. Com., 1788, 1929, 1994. 3r., 1994.

Hudson bay
Fisheries, 1280
Hydrographic surveys, 1626
Navigation, 1627

Hudson Bay railway
Construction, 436, 1861
Cost of mileage, 631, 1148
Le Pas bridge, closing of, 606
Wages of employees, 1395

Hughes, Major W. S., appointment of, 435

Hughes, Mr. James J. (King's, P.E.I.)
Brudenell wharf, 2114
Budget, 1027
Financial administration, 1028
Taxation, prosperity, and revenue, 1029
Governments and expenditures, 1030
Civil service administration, 1032
War contracts, 1033

Hughes, Mr. James J. (King's, P.E.I.)—*Con.*
Cardigan-Annandale mail service, 1648
Charlottetown
Harbour, 2114
School of navigation for, 347
Controverted elections, 2013
Cost of Living Commission, 1395
Drill halls, use of, 2036
Earl Grey, steamer, sale of, 312
Enlistment from the active militia, 1456
Fenian raid bounty, 1545
Food exports, government control of, 543
House of Commons reading room, 611
Liquors and tobaccos in bond, 314
Little Sand breakwater, 2117
North lake harbour, 2114
Potatoes, exportation of, 1229, 2078
Prince Edward Island
Mail service, 348, 1378, 1385
Marine life-saving service, 351, 1637
Parliamentary representation, 316, 331
Public works, 2114
Railway, 1704, 1707
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 673
Souris life-saving station, 1637
Taxation—cheques, 1203

Hughes, Hon. Major General Sam (Minister of Militia and Defence)
Allison, J. Wesley, services of, 1145, 1452, 1508, 1669
Ammunition, purchase of, 1451-1455, 1506-1512, 1669, 1867
Aviation, 1989
Boots, army, purchase of, 2455
Cadet corps, 1518
Canadian troops in the firing line, 613
Censorship, 1448
Dominion arsenal, 1506
Duty on imported munitions, 1506
Edmonton rifle range, 1553
Engineer services, 1513
Enlistment. *See* Recruiting
Fenian raid bounty, 1546
French Canadians, enlistment of, 1442, 1445, 1447
Haliburton recruiting, 896
Halifax headquarters staff, 1515
Home guards, 1516
Militia estimates, 1428, 1496, 1544
Motor trucks, purchase of, 1146
Nova Scotia military forces, 1396, 1436
Permanent force, Canadian, 1515
Prince Rupert Rifles, disbandment of, 1522
Recruiting, 438, 1680, 1989
Rifle ranges, 1553
Robertson, Struan, Lt. Col., 1396, 1436

Hughes, Hon. Major General Sam (Minister of Militia and Defence)—*Con.*
Royal Military College, 1522
Salisbury Plain, supplies at, 439
Schools of military instruction, 1524
Shooting by sentries, 2124
Training camps, 1457
Valcartier
Camp, 1514, 1553
Land claims, 523, 1513, 1549
War
Appropriations, 1662
Supplies. *See that title*

Hull
Inland revenue service, 1871
Post office repairs, 1985

Hydrographic surveys. *See* Marine

Ice-breaking. *See* Marine

Immigration
Agencies, 1558-1562
Inspection, 233
Officials suspended, 243
Oriental, 1576
Philadelphia agent, 522
Statistics, 1147

Indians
Blood reserve, 763, 1323
British Columbia, 1324, 1892
Department estimates, 1306-1328
Education, 1325
New Brunswick, 1317
North West Provinces and Territories, 1319-1324, 1876
Ontario and Quebec, 1306-1309, 1328
Nova Scotia, 1310, 1325
St. Peter's reserve, 1320, 1877
Tobique reserve, 187
Trust fund, 1327

Industrial disputes. *See* Labour

Inland Revenue Amendment Bills
Temporary officials, appointment of. 1r., 1644. Res., 1868. 2r., 1874. Com., 1874, 3r., 1994
Transfer of excise goods in bond. 1r., 1644, 2r., 1868. Com., 1868. 3r., 1868

Inland Revenue Department
Deputy Minister, 438, 1723
Estimates, 503-513, 1717-1723, 2313
Staff and salaries, 503, 1717

Insect pests. *See* Agriculture

Insurance
Amendment Bill (renewable term policies). 1r., 351
Companies Extension of Time Bill. Res., 1246. 1r., 1249. 2r., 1399. Com., 1399. 3r., 1400. *See* Taxation
Department, 1716

Intercolonial railway
Abutment contracts, 895, 1286
Atlantic sugar refinery site, 150
Bathurst spur, 46
Block signals, 1690
Boulay, Messrs., employment of, 2530
Branch lines in eastern Nova Scotia, 44, 519, 992, 1467, 1473-1483, 1700
Bridges
Strengthening of, 1492
Substructures of, 897
Watchmen on, 608, 763
Cape Breton facilities, 1699
Cement posts, contracts for, 309
Chaudière employees, 1785
Coal tenders, 769, 1147, 1688
Courtenay bay spur line, 1698
Eastern extension land damages, 1469
Employees on military service, 217, 245
Envelopes, importation of, 896
Equipment, 1698
Estimates, 1472-1495, 1685-1704, 1706
Fish transportation, 80, 1494
Fredericton land expropriation, 168, 1475
Freight rates and trains, 156
French-speaking employees, 1485
German spy, suspected, 610
Ice contracts, 79, 311
Lévis station, 831
Management, 1483-1493
Moncton
Death claim—Mrs O'Rourke, 1475
Improvements, 1397, 1691
Mulgrave car ferry, 1693
Operation, 1472, 1706
Prince Edward Island car ferry, 1473
Pugwash spur line, 391, 1693
Quebec, solicitor for, 1708
Receipts and expenditures, 143
Riviere du Loup shops, 141
Rolling stock, 1695
Sackville improvements, 606, 1693, 1706
Safety appliances, 1698
Shims, contracts for, 768
Ties, contracts for, 309
Union station culvert, 608
Wallace spur, 391, 1694
See Government Railways Purchase Bill.

Interior Department
Estimates, 231-237, 1281, 1558-1585, 1893
Ferguson, Mr. T. R., report of, 2539
Staff, salaries, etc., 232, 1558, 1570

International railway service, 1470

Iron
Imports, 244
Ores, 309, 2313

Jameson, Mr. Clarence (Digby)
Unseaworthy vessels, 345

Johnston, J. W., employment of, 608

Jordan East breakwater, 390

Judges Act Amendment Bill. Res., 1428. 1r., 1428. 2r., 1544. Com., 1544. 3r., 1544.

Justice
Admiralty court procedure, 1732
Department estimates, 1727, 2186
Dominion police, 1732
Exchequer Court
Expenses, 1731
Reports, 1730
Judges
Militia, in active, 1728
Pensions, 765, 1727
Salaries, 1732
Superannuation in Quebec, 1186
Solicitor General, office of, 1735
Supreme Court
Expenses, 1730
Jurisdiction—appeal in provincial election cases, 1988, 2053

Kamouraska lighthouse, 897

Karluk, steamer. *See* Stefansson

Kay, Mr. William F. (Missisquoi)
Cream exports, 294
Krans, J., employment of, 1185, 1286
Maple sugar, adulteration of, 1785
Philipsburg-St. Armand mail service, 249, 313, 995
Rural mail carriers, payment of, 2297
Soldiers, votes for, 2255
Stanbridge rural mail service, 995

Kelly, E., employment of, 241

Kemp, Hon. A. E. (East Toronto)
Dominion elections—hours for polling, 1908

Killam mail route, 244

Killarney and Manitowaning mails, 898

Kingston penitentiary. *See* Penitentiaries

Kitsilano Indian reserve, 1892

Knowles, Mr. William E. (Moosejaw)
Exchequer Court reports, 1730
Experimental farms, 2057, 2061, 2071
Gold and silver marking, 1875
Homestead entries, cancellation of, 1868
Inland Revenue Department appointments, 1870
Soldiers, votes for, 2262, 2267

Krans, J., employment of, 1185, 1286

Kyte, Mr. George W. (Richmond, N. S.)
Arichat mail service, 1184, 1372
Bank borrowings from Government, 147
Bourgeois river-Cannes mail service, 1389
Budget, 449
Canada and the war, 449
Government's financial record, 450
Economic conditions, 451
Cement duty, 452
Civil service, 452
Revenue and expenditure, 454
Fishermen and the tariff, 455
The war taxes, 457
Capital punishment, 138
Customs Department dismissals and appointments, 219, 222, 898
Dominion elections, 1912
Dominion notes, 146
Fenian raid bounty—claims of widows, 1545
Fishing bounties, 94
Food exports, government control of, 547
Gobeil, A, employment of, 895, 1458, 1962
Grandigne Ferry mail service, 1184, 1372
Haliburton recruiting, 896
Intercolonial railway
Atlantic sugar refinery site, 150
Eastern Nova Scotia branch lines and extensions, 992
Management, 1490, 1493
Johnston, J. W., employment of, 608
Loans, Imperial Government, to Canada, 146
Mail carriers, pay of, 1371
Nova Scotia
Indians, 1310, 1312, 1317, 1325
Military forces, 481, 561, 687, 1396, 1428
Postal service, 900, 1389
Parliamentary representation of Maritime Provinces, 325
Richmond county
Customs service, 219, 222, 228
Railways, 992
Robertson, Lt.-Col. *See* Nova Scotia military forces
St. Paul's Island life-saving station, 608
Squid imports, 244
Steam trawling, 1622
Trent Canal commission, 632

Kyte, Mr. George W. (Richmond, N.S.)—*Con.*
War supplies
Binoculars, 2188
Medical, 149, 1866
West Arichat customs, 898

Labour
British Columbia troubles, 497
Department
Estimates, 481-498, 501-503
Staff and salaries, 481, 497, 502
Disputes, settlement of, 245, 297, 494, 501
Employment bureau, national, 352, 484-490, 607
Fair wages in government contracts, 240, 391
Farm labourers, distribution of, 490
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, employees of, 498
Railway construction, inspection of, 502
Telegraphers, conditions of employment of, 1786, 2532
Unemployment, 308, 483, 492, 605, 2320
Wages
Payment of, 498
War contracts, on, 38, 40, 240, 490, 503
Welland canal, on, 491

Lachance, Mr. Arthur (Quebec Centre)
Foreigners, deportation of, 2122
Lauzon dry dock, 1866
Montmagny, wreck of, 1867
National Transcontinental railway—Quebec terminals, 1818, 1867
War supplies—sheepskins, 1866

Lafortune, Mr. David A. (Montcalm)
Budget, 1033
Nationalists, 1034
School question, 1039, 1049
Tobacco culture, 1041
Agriculture, 1041
Highways, 1046
Bankruptcy law, 1047
Exhibitions, 1047
Cattle embargo, 1048
Insolvency Act, 1048
Capital punishment, 276
Montcalm postal service, 1385
Privilege—report in Montreal Gazette, 1057
St. Jacques l'Achigan public building, 2322

Lake St. John hydrographic work, 896

Lake Temiscouata postal service, 79

Lake of the Woods Technical Board, 1394

Lancaster, Mr. Edward A. (Lincoln and Niagara)
Canadian Northern Railway Company, 708, 758

Lancaster, Mr. Edward A. (Lincoln and Niagara)—*Con.*
Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company, 705, 721
Life insurance—renewable term policies, 351
Private Bills
Senate amendments, 1371
Suspension of rules, 1527
Toronto Eastern Railway Company, 708
Van Buren Bridge Company, 709, 760
Vancouver Terminal Railway Company, 990

Lanctot, Mr. Roch (Laprairie-Napierville)
Budget, 804
Canada's participation in the war, 804
The war taxation, 805
Government extravagance, 806
Expenditures on public works, 807
Payments to Mr. Bergeron, Mr. Ferguson and the Minister of Justice, 808
Doherty, Hon. C. J., pension of, 808, 1727
Furois, Eugene, employment of, 1993
Gauvreau, C., employment of, 390
Grand Trunk Pacific expenditure, 437
Judges' pensions, 1727
Laprairie protection works, 437, 2156
Laprairie-Napierville rural mail service, 1380
Montreal resident engineer, 437
Pelletier, Hon. L. P., trip of, 2529
Pettet, W. V., employment of, 2123
Quebec bridge, 437
Rhoda, steamer, 2531
St. Lambert post office, 1648

Land speculation. *See* Real estate

Lapointe, Mr. Ernest (Kamouraska)
Audette, L., employment of, 2122
Cardin, E., employment of, 1993
Charbonneau, Rodrique, employment of, 610
French, war stamps in, 1204
Ile de Kamouraska light, 897
Intercolonial railway—envelopes, imported, 896
Lake St. John hydrographic work, 896
National Transcontinental railway
Bridgekeepers, 897
Station employees, 1143
Quebec
Post office revenues, 896
Grain elevators, electric power for, 2123
Roy, F. X., employment of, 992
St. Anselme government employees, 1993
St. Germain de Kamouraska wharf, 2163
St. Mathieu dredging, 2173
Soldiers, votes for, 2507

Lapointe, Mr. Ernest (Kamouraska)—*Con.*
Taxation
Cheques, 1202
Spirituous liquors, 897
Theberge, J., employment of, 2529
Valcartier
Lighting, 2123
Lumber supplies, 2122
Vallée, L. O., dismissal of, 436

Lapointe, Mr. Louis A. (Montreal, St. James)
Montreal barracks, 2035
War taxes, 1217

Laprairie protection works, 437, 2156

L'Assomption
Public employees from county of, 2528
Wharf, 1145

Last Mountain Lake dredging, 311

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid (Quebec East)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Progress of the war, 15
Significance of the struggle, 16
British sovereignty and the Dominions, 17
Conscription, 17
Canada's expenditure on the war, 18
War contract frauds, 18
Aeroplanes, reported appearance of, 144
Budget
Attitude of the Opposition, 834, 1065
Financial situation of the country, 836
The Government's financial policy, 836
Retrenchment and economy, 837
The new taxation—special taxes, 837
Taxation on railway travelling, 838
Customs tariff increases, 839
Taxes on British goods, 840
Proposed amendment, 841
Civil Service—speech of Mr. Adam Shortt, 634
Controverted elections, 1995, 2008, 2021
Dominion notes, 1536
Farquhar, Colonel, death in action of, 1283
Ferguson, T. R., report of, 2568, 2620
Fort Erie shooting case, 332
High Commissionership, Canadian, 391
House of Commons
Bowles, W. C., resignation of, 1526
Business of the House, 206, 1188, 1787
Deputy Speaker, election of, 41
Easter adjournment, 1645
Intercolonial railway branch lines, 1540
Killarney-Little Current mail service, 898
Maple sugar, adulteration of, 1791
Ministerial changes, 208

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid (Quebec East)—*Con.*
National Transcontinental railway
Construction, 1859
Government operation, 1813, 1842, 2127, 2138
Quebec terminals, 1860
Naval Service of Canada, 1661
Nova Scotia military forces—language of Minister of Militia, 1440
Parliament, members of, and government contracts, 2143, 2147
Parliamentary representation
House of Commons, 328, 1789, 1994
Senate, 1460, 2327, 2341
Pollution of navigable waters, 123
Privilege—Federal Press Agency leaflet, 2189
Railway employees, voting of, 2500
Seed grain, bank loans for, 1243
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 634
Soldiers, votes for, 2206, 2280, 2348, 2360, 2464, 2484, 2524, 2536, 2627
Supreme Court jurisdiction—appeals in provincial election cases, 2054
Taxation
Bananas, 1167
Corporations, 1192, 1196
Customs valuations, 1404
French Treaty, articles under, 1215, 1422
Insurance companies, 1178
Money orders, 1205
Penalties, 1586
Postal rates and stamp taxes, 1415
Railway tickets, 838, 1198, 1200
Spirits, 1153, 1156
Telegraphic messages, 1192, 1194
Valcartier land claims, 522, 1546, 1739, 2621
War
Expenditures, 1142, 1398
Supplies, purchase of, 144, 2617
See Address *and* Budget

Lauzon dry dock, 1647, 1866, 1971

Lavergne, Armand, Lt.-Col., 1517

Law, Mr. Bowman B. (Yarmouth)
Amherst
Armoury, 389
Post office, 436
Budget, 820
Favourable to war appropriation, 820
Taxes and governmental extravagance, 820
Conservative party platform, 821
British preference, 823
Duties on fertilizers and feeds, 823
Postal rates, 824
Prohibition, liquor, 824
Chaplain to oversea forces, 242

Law, Mr. Bowman E. (Yarmouth)—*Con.*
Fish reduction works, 767
Fisher, Ward, fishery inspector, 1271
Indians, Nova Scotia
Claim of Dr. A. J. Deveau, 1314
Yarmouth agent, 1310
Jordan East breakwater, 390
Long Beach lobster pond, 309
Port Hawkesbury public building, 1981
Potato embargo, 719
Schools of navigation, 1260
Shelburne
Fishery inspector, 1271
Fog alarm, 389
Taxation
Fertilizers and feeds, 823, 1165
Letters and postcards, 1207
Newfoundland partridge berries, 1167
Toronto Home Guard, 243
War supplies—horses, 766, 898
Wrecking plants for Bay of Fundy, 350
Yarmouth
Cattle purchases in, 309
Fishery guardians, 313
Harbour, 607
Marine hospital, 832
Postal service, 313, 1361
Yarmouth-St. John steamship services, 1305

Le Blanc, seaman, 896, 1639

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe (Rouville)
Architect, Dominion chief, appointment of, 1958
Aylwin irrigation tract, 2571
Copyright, 196
Emigration to the United States, 242
Farmers Bank depositors, 391
Gobeil, A., employment of, 1965
Labour unemployment, 308
Mail bag locks, 46
Pelletier, Hon. L. P., testimonial to, 211
Prince of Wales fund and government loans, 244
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 2625
Quebec Harbour Commission—resignation of Sir William Price, 1965, 1966
Royal Society of Canada, accommodation for, 245
Soldiers
Free postage for, 338
Votes for, 2516
Taxation—patent medicines, 312
War supplies
Boots, 48, 244
Canvas shoes, 389
Cartridges, 242
Medical, 308, 315
National Drug Company, 312
Slippers, 389

Leonardsville dredging, 312

Lethbridge
Customs staff, 521
Field battery, 1646
Immigration inspector, 150, 1567
Postmastership, 143, 769, 1364
Wool storage, 828

Lévis
Dry dock, 767
Quarantine station, 241, 1290
Shell factory, 519

Life-saving *See* Marine

Liquor
Bonded, 314, 897
Inspection, 1720
Manufacture, suggested suspension of, 2327

Live stock. *See* Agriculture

Livingstone, Charles P., appointment of, 150

Loans
Canadian Government, to banks, 147, 476
Imperial Government, to Canada, 146, 522

Lobsters. *See* Fisheries

Loggie, Mr. William S. (Northumberland, N.B.)
Budget
Reciprocal trade with United States, 925
Canada's part in the war, 925
Financial requirements, 925
Taxation proposals of Government, 926
Barbed wire, 927
Pork, 928
Raw materials, 928
British preference, 929
Chatham public building, 1982
Grain for distillation, 2624
Intercolonial railway
Chatham branch, 1493, 1685
Transportation of fish, 1494
Newcastle wireless station—alleged flying of United States flag, 1616
Soldiers, votes for, 2256

Longard, G E., employment of, 831

Longueuil, dredging at, 438

Louisville
Mails, 1288
Post office building, 1288, 1459

Macdonald, Mr. Edward M. (Pictou)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Members of Parliament at the front, 36
Purchase of war supplies, 37
Fair wages and war contracts, 37
Newfoundland and Confederation, 39

Macdonald, Mr. Edward M. (Pictou)—*Con.*

Alberta coal miners, unemployment among, 494
British Columbia militiamen on active service, 151, 1544
Budget
Criticism of Government, 1103
The Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Budget, 1105
Proposed taxation not for war, 1106
Borrowings, from England, 1106
Liberal administration, 1108
The Minister of Finance, tariff and expenditures, 1108
National Transcontinental and Canadian Northern railways, 1111
British preference, 1111
Naval question, 1113
Political parties and the war, 1114
Canadian Pacific railway ocean services, 747
Canadian patriotic fund, 398
Cariboo Island breakwater, 308
Coal
Areas in Nova Scotia, 1609
Lands, government, leases of, 1611
Controverted elections, 2002
Dominion elections, 1908
Expenditure of Canada, 435
Fair wages, 490. *See* Address
Fenian raid bounty, 242
Indians, Nova Scotia, 1310, 1313
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, amendment of, 245
Inland Revenue Department, administration of, 503
Insurance companies—extensions of time, 1248
Intercolonial railway
Branch lines, 1477
Bridge watchmen, 608
Claim of Mrs. Higgins, 1477
Coal tenders, 1147
Pictou harbour bridge, 1477
Receipts and expenditures, 143
Train service, 142, 167
Union station culvert, 608
Liquor manufacture, suggested suspension of, 2327
Macdonald, Wm., employment of, 1288
McLeod, J. W., employment of, 896
McNeil, Wm., employment of, 1648
Members of Parliament on active service, 36, 439
Naval service, 1621. *See* Budget
New Glasgow
Dredge pontoons, cost of hauling, 1992
Mails, 517

Macdonald, Mr. Edward M. (Pictou)—*Con.*

Nova Scotia
Coal areas, 1609
Indians, 1310
Military forces, 608, 1434, 1499
Parliamentary representation, 2338
Patents, renewal of, 1261
Pictou (county)
Fishery guardians, 245
Mail service, 244, 610, 995, 1288, 1458, 2126, 2188, 2297
Medical examiners for volunteers, 762
Pictou (town) winter freight handling, 246
Pictou Island telephone service, 143, 1258
Pit props, trade in, 1934
Prince Rupert Rifles, disbandment of, 1522
Real estate titles, fraudulent, 1222
Revenue of Canada, 152
River John customs sub-collectorship, 142
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 676
Soldiers, votes for, 2251, 2476, 2484, 2505, 2533
Stellarton public building, 763
Suckling, Rev. W. T., military chaplain, 1867
Taxation—cheques, 1409
Technical education, 245, 495, 496
United States flag, alleged flying of, at wireless station, 1618
Vale railway, 245
War supplies
Boots, 2430
Fair wages and war contracts, 37, 490
Horses, 388, 520, 894, 994, 2123
Oliver equipment, 1992
Wireless stations, control of, 1618

Macdonell, Mr. A. C. (Toronto, South)
Budget, 367
Answers to Opposition critics, 367
A satisfactory budget, 369
War loans and taxation, 371
Protection and British preference, 373
Public debt and expenditures, 375
Opportunities for Canada's trade, 377
Dominion elections—hours of polling, 1903, 1914
Soldiers, votes for, 2249
Vancouver Terminal Company, 1262

Maclean, Mr. Alexander K. (Halifax)
Banks, Government advances to, 478
Budget, 352
The war supply, 352
Ordinary revenue and expenditure, 353
Government's pre-election pledges, 354
Expenditures by departments, 355
Methods of meeting expenditures, 360
Buy-in-Canada propaganda, 360

Maclean, Mr. Alexander K. (Halifax)—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
Falling imports and revenues, 360
Tariff taxation, 362
British preference, 364
Wool duty, 365
Cotton, 366
Bituminous coal, 366
Economy versus taxation, 367
Coast Guard, steamer, 1866
Controverted elections, 1923, 2012, 2148
Dominion elections
Hours of polling, 1903, 1916
Railway men, voting of, 1903
Voters' lists, 1896
Dominion lands, administration of, 232
Dominion notes issue, 1534, 1653
Dredge No. 7, 1866
Expenditures, public, 764, 1290
See Budget
Fish and fisheries
American vessels, regulation of, 1650
Modus vivendi licenses, 1275, 1277
Halifax and Eastern railway, 1466
Halifax
Chartered steamers, 1647
Customs night watchman, 831
Headquarters staff, 1514
Terminals, 764, 1688
Permanent force, 2529
House of Commons sessional employees, 2109
Humphrey Colonel, retirement of, 1514
Loans, Imperial Government, to Canada, 522
Longard, G. E., employment of, 831
Naval service, 1613
Niobe repairs, 151
Noreen, steamer, 1396, 2188
Petite Riviere fishery guardian, 1396
Privilege—newspaper misrepresentation, 688
Robinson, G., employment of, 831
Royal Print and Lithographing Company, payments to, 1864
Shubenacadie post office, 1866
Taxation
Insurance companies, 1184
Telegraphic messages, 1193
Trade and Commerce, 1292
Atlantic ports, 1299
Cuban trade, 1294
Tufts Cove dry dock, 1647
Tyrian, steamer, 1786
Wade, W. W., dismissal of, 1395
War
Appropriation, 1662, 1676
Expenditures—reference to Public Accounts Committee, 945
West Indian trade, 1295

Maclean, Mr. William F. (South York, Ont.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Parliamentary institutions and the war, 33
Menace to American democracy, 34
Evil of militarism, 35
Banking facilities in Canada, 1353
Dominion elections—hours of polling, 1905
Food exports, government control of, 544
Nickel, exportation of, 3, 78
Railways
Capitalization, control of, 78, 285, 726, 744, 756
Bridges, construction of, in towns and cities, 78, 285, 1150
Taxation—insurance companies, 1181
Transportation, 261

MacNutt, Mr. Thomas (Saltcoats)
Budget, 789
Increased taxation and the farmers, 790
Saskatchewan Grain Growers' Association resolutions, 792
Taxation of land values and income, 793
Objections to new tariff, 793
Customs valuation of agricultural implements, 605
Northwest coal leases, 1148
Peart, L., employment of, 308

McCoig, Mr. Archibald B. (West Kent, Ont.)
Budget, 622
Kent county mail service, 622
Tax on fertilizers, 623
Agricultural implements, 624
Horse raising, 625
Hog cholera, 627
Taxation
Fertilizers, 1162, 1164
Gravel and sand, 1163

McCraney, Mr. George E. (Saskatoon)
Aberdeen Association—franking privilege, 1370
Alexander divorce bill, 1894, 1987, 2187
Bank loans for seed grain, 1352
Controverted elections, 2027
Customs tariff
Articles exempt from increased duties, 246
Valuation for duty, 605
Nova Scotians in the west, 1560
Public works, expenditures on, 1971, 2035
Real estate titles, fraudulent, 47, 284, 1223
Rosthern customs, 79
Saskatoon
Customs collector, 79
Public building, 2043

McCraney, Mr. George E. (Saskatoon)—*Con.*
Rural mails, 607
Schrader grazing lease, 1560, 1562
Western farmers, relief for, 56

McCrea, Mr. Francis N. (Sherbrooke)
Barachois wharf, 2185
Genest, A., employment of, 767, 1185, 1368
Live Stock Commissioner Giard, 2084
Pickel, G. H., employment of, 831
Horses for the war, 830
Sherbrooke mounted rifles, supplies for, 314, 1512

McCurdy, Mr. F. B. (Shelburne and Queens)
Intercolonial Railway—Sunnybrae branch, 1479, 1481
Nova Scotia military forces, 1503
War supplies—boots, 2419

McDonald, D. A., employment of, 1186, 1288

McInnes, T. R. E., employment of, 1864

McKenzie, Mr. D. D. (North Cape Breton)
Alert, steamer, 223, 230, 1646
Behring sea fisheries claims, 239
Budget
Royal commissions, 975
Canada's share in the war, 976
Criticism of the Government, 977
The Government's financial administration, 978
National Transcontinental railway, 979
Canada's finances and the war, 981
Public works expenditure, 982
Controverted elections, 1922
Duchemin, H. P., payments to, 667, 948
Fenian raid bounty, 1546
Food exports, government control of, 545
French River breakwater, 2053
Gobeil, A., employment of, 1967
Grain trade, 1954
Ingonish
Fishermen, 350
Wharf, 2112
Intercolonial railway
Branch lines, 1481, 1491
North Cape Breton requirements, 1699
Trains, 166
McDonald, D A., employment of, 1186, 1288
Masters and mates, examination of, 340
North Cape Breton
Bonded warehouses, 1650
Customs service, 221, 225
Rented government buildings, 1288, 2049
Telegraph lines, 2180
North Sydney public building, 1981
Nova Scotia
Postal service, 902
Telegraph and telephone service, 2180

McKenzie, Mr. D. D. (North Cape Breton)—*Con.*
Parliamentary representation of the Maritime provinces, 321
Printing Bureau—pay of women employees, 1593
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 665
Soldiers, votes for, 2273, 2358, 2485
Smuggling, alleged, in Cape Breton, 223
Sydney Mines public building, 1981
Taxation
Penalties, 1418
Stamp taxes, 1417
Witness, alleged improper detention of, 1555
Wrecking plants, 349

McLean, Mr. Angus A. (Queens, P.E.I.)
Experimental farms, poultry on, 2056
Charlottetown, car-building for, 1697
Marine life-saving stations, 1637
North Lake boat harbour, 2114
Prince Edward Island parliamentary representation, 324, 1462, 2331
San Francisco exposition, 2086
Real estate titles, fraudulent, 1224

McLean, Mr. H. H. (Sunbury and Queens)
Soldiers, votes for, 2256, 2259, 2268, 2276, 2472, 2487, 2535

McLeod, Col. H. F., command of, 561, 1441

McLeod, J. W., employment of, 896

McMillan, Mr. John A. (Glengarry)
Military training camps, 1456
Montreal—Carslake hotel purchase, 1289
War supplies—horses, 2100

McNeil, W., employment of, 1648

McQuarrie, Major, resignation of, 2528

Mail bag locks. *See* Post Office

Maple sugar. *See* Adulteration

Marcil, Hon. Charles (Bonaventure)
Baie des Chaleurs railway, 518
Bonaventure rural mail service, 769, 994, 2297
Bouilton, E. A., employment of, 2121
Canada, steamer, stranding of, 344
Canadian Peat Society, 1865
Carleton, Que., retaining wall, 390
Civil Service
Commission, 992
Promotions, 1959
Controverted elections, 2017, 2030
Dagneau, John T., employment of, 1866
Demonstration farm for Gaspé or Bonaventure, 2068

Marcil, Hon. Charles (Bonaventure)—*Con.*

Dominion elections
Candidates having government contracts, 2143
Deferred elections, 1903, 2147
Drinking water, supervision of, 1600
Escuminac wharf, 1287
Farmers in Quebec, aid to, 291
Fish and Fisheries
Fisheries in tidal waters, 116, 994, 2302
Fishermen, grants to, 2123, 2300, 2301
French
Blue-books in
Printing and distribution, 1596, 2310
Translation, 504
War stamps in, 1205, 1412
French Canadian battalion, 22nd, 1149
Gaspé
Deferred elections in, 1903, 2147
Purchase of war supplies in, 994
Railways, 518
Salmon fisheries, 116, 2302
Steamer service, 307, 833, 1286, 1301
Gaspé bay anchorage, 998, 1449
Grain trade and flour prices, 1957
Immigration, 1572, 1575
Indians, Quebec, 1307
Inland Revenue Department, administration of, 1720, 1870
Insurance Department, 2372
Intercolonial railway
Lumber contracts, 768
Matapedia, subway for, 1698
Liquors, inspection of, 1158
Maple sugar, adulteration of, 1794
Marine life-saving service, 350
Matapedia
Road, 1289, 2178
Water supply, 768
Montreal post office, 1377, 1986, 2296
New Carlisle, public building for, 1287, 1985
New Mills salmon pond, 2301
Parliament, members of, and government contracts, 2143
Paspebiac
Customs office, 633
Wharf, 633, 2161
Peat experiments, 2122
Port Daniel mail service, 1992
Postage stamps, sale of, on Sunday, 2297
Printing bureau, 1591
Quebec
Fisheries, 116, 994
Rural mail routes, 769
Superior court judges, 1186
Repatriation, 1571

Marcil, Hon. Charles (Bonaventure)—*Con.*

Restigouche river
Bridge, 1148, 1682, 2177
Dredging, 1289, 1648, 2172
St. Jean l'Evangeliste mail service, 833
Scoles, C. R., payments to, 1468
Soldiers, votes for, 2264, 2268, 2344, 2485, 2516, 2538
Taxation—telegraphic messages, 1406
War supplies, purchase of, 994

Marcile, Mr. Joseph E. (Bagot)

Bagot county postal service, 141
Budget, 1052
British navy and the war, 1053
Government's financial methods, 1055
The new taxation, 1056
German spy, suspected, arrest of, 610
Valcartier camp supplies, 149
War supplies
Boots, 149
Horses, 315

Marine

British ships, transfer of, 990, 1057
Coasting trade, 296
Department
Estimates, 338-350, 1250-1270
Staff and salaries, 237
Earl Grey, sale of the, 312, 339, 1255
Empress of Ireland investigation, 339, 343
Hydrographic surveys, 1626
Ice-breaking, 339, 1255, 1267
Life-saving, 350, 1633, 1638
Lighthouse and coast service, 1256-1260, 1267, 2304
Maritime road, 1267
Masters and mates, examination of, 340
Navigation
Aids, 1258
Hudson Bay, 1628
Obstructions, removal of, 347, 2303
Rates, inland, control of, 43, 249
St. Lawrence, 1057, 1252
Schools, 346
Pilotage, 1265
Seamen, wrecked and distressed, 1269
Shipping casualties in 1914, 833
Signal service, 1264
Steamboat inspection, 1270
Steamers, government, 312, 338, 1255
Steamship services. *See that title*
Unseaworthy vessels, 345
Wrecking plants, subsidies for, 349
Wrecks, investigations into, 342

Martin, Mr. Mederic (Montreal, St. Mary's)

Maisonneuve leased post office, 2050
Unemployment, 501, 2320

Martin, Mr. William M. (Regina)
Aberdeen Association—franking privilege 311
Advertising and printing, payments by Government for, 761
Anderson, T. A., employment of, 605, 761, 996
Bank loans for seed grain, 1355
Carey, J. M., employment of, 993
Coal royalties, 520
Davidson, W. W., employment of, 768
Duck Mountain timber reserve, 992, 1577
Food exports, government control of, 539
Gallon, W. J., employment of, 831
Gillis, A. B., employment of, 831
Homestead inspectors, superfluous, 231
Homesteads and pre-emptions, statistics of, 996
Horses, fraudulent importation of, 229
Hudson Bay railway, 1148
Immigration, 1147, 1570, 1572
Indians—St. Peter's reserve, 13, 19, 1888
Inland navigation rates, control of, 253
Inland Revenue frauds, 512
Interior Department, administration of, 231 1570
Judges in active militia, 1728
Last Mountain lake dredging, 311
Maple Creek land office officials, 997
Militia separation allowances, 688
Real estate titles, fraudulent, 1225
Regina
Mounted police quarters, 311
Property purchases by Department of Public Works, 762
Customs ports, 228
Regina-Moosejaw
Water supply, 311
Riding Mountain timber reserve, 1577
Sabistons—half-breed scrip, 1287
Saskatchewan lands, Indian and school, sales of, 768
Saskatchewan river water power, 235
Saskatoon land office officials, 997
Soldiers, insurance, 390
Swift Current land office officials, 997
Taxation—agricultural implements, 1169-1172
Western farmers, relief for, 49, 632, 720, 768, 1150, 1329, 1342, 1355

Masters and Mates. *See* Marine.

Matapedia
Road, 1289, 2178
Water supply, 768

Mattatall Lake post office, 832

Medical Council of Canada, grant to, 1251, 2316

Medicine Hat
Homestead inspector, 2123
Postmasters, 764
Rural mail service, 768

Megantic county postmasters, 609

Meighen, Hon. Arthur (Solicitor General)
Budget, 1115
The Opposition's criticism, 1116
War taxes, 1117
Diminished revenues, 1118
Retrenchment of expenditure, 1119
Industrial protection, 1122
Aid to railways, 1125
Taxation for revenue, 1127
Land tax and income tax, 1129
Ferguson, Mr. T. R., report of, 2573
Grain trade, 1955, 2030, 2193
National Transcontinental railway—proposed government operation, 1823, 1838
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 653
Soldiers, votes for, 2220, 2347
Solicitor General, office of, 1737
Western farmers, relief for, 68, 1332

Menace newspaper, 991

Merner, Mr. J. J. (South Huron)
Food exports, government control of, 536

Meteorological service, 1268

Metric system, 1785

Michaud, Mr. Pius (Victoria, N.B.)
Edmundston post office, 1390
Herrings, exported, price of, 1786
Horn extradition case, 44, 79
Indians, New Brunswick, 1319
Intercolonial railway
Freight rates in New Brunswick, 165
Mail service, 1390
International railway service, 1470
Metric system, 1785
Oil for fuel, 294
Stamp taxes, 1210
War supplies—horses, 246

Middlebro, Mr. William S. (North Grey)
Boots, army—report of special committee 2372

Middlesex county Indians, 518

Military stores, fraud in sale of, 205, 304, 476, 1226

Militia and Defence
British Columbia militiamen in active service, 151
Cadet corps, 1518
Civil servants in militia service, 312, 522

Militia and Defence—*Con.*

Department
Coal supply, 2319, 2326
Estimates, 1428, 1496, 1544, 2319
Dominion arsenal, 1506
Drill halls, 2035
Duties on imported munitions, 1506
Engineer service and works, 1513
Fair wages clause in contracts, 240, 391
Motor trucks, 1145
Officers' allowances, 1447
Permanent force, 1515, 2529
Petawawa camp, 240, 1185
Railway engineering corps, 1525
Rifle ranges, 1553
Royal Military College, 1519
Schools of instruction, 1524
Training areas, 1556
Valcartier camp, 240, 391, 1514, 1552, 2122, 2123
See War

Mines and Minerals
Coal
Imports, 244, 521, 633, 828
Leases, 1148, 1611
Royalties, 520
Western industry, 492
Department
Estimates, 1599, 2313
Staff and salaries, 1599
Electric smelting, 1602, 2313
Explosives, 1601, 1604
Geological survey, 1606-1611
Investigations and experiments, 1603, 2313
Oil. *See that title*
Peat
Canadian Peat Society, 1865
Experiments, 2122
Radium-bearing ores, 1609
Tar sands for road making, 1604

Ministerial changes, 207

Mizonnette lighthouse, 46

Molloy, Mr. John P. (Provencher)
Fournier, L. H., employment of, 521
Hudson Bay railway bridge, 606
Winnipeg
Resident engineer, 765
Volunteers, 313

Moncton. *See* Intercolonial railway

Montmagny, wreck of, 1867

Montreal
Armoury—fair wage clause, 240
Barracks, 2035
Carslake hotel purchase, 1289, 2528. *See also* Postal Station A
Dismissals of public works employees, 1652

Montreal—*Con.*

Postal station A, 1651, 1986, 2186, 2528
Postal Station L, 2528
Post office, 1377
Resident engineer, 437

Monuments, erection of, 1251, 1252

Moosejaw
Property purchases by Department of Public Works, 762
Water supply, 311

Morphy, Mr. H. B. (North Perth)
Compensation to workmen by railways, 514
Controverted elections, 2003
Real estate, fraudulent titles to, 1225

Morris, F., employment of, 151

Morris, Mr. James (Chateauguay)
Maple sugar, adulteration of, 1794

Mounted Police, Royal Northwest, 1249, 1284, 2322, 2326

Mousseau, P A., employment of, 1992, 2122

Murphy, Hon. Charles (Russell)
Canadian Northern railway, payments to, 150
Canadian patriotic fund, 143
Canadian War Contingent Association, 2122
Dominion Trust Company, 519
Fort Erie shooting case, 143
French river improvements, 1991
Hall, R. P., appointment of, 763
Immigration officials, suspension of, 243
Marriage laws, 436
North Bay recruiting, 1991
Nottar, H., death of, 150
Ottawa and Hull town-planning commission, 241
Overseas dominions, status of, 439
Pollution of navigable waters, 123
Princess Patricia regiment, 391
Soldiers, votes for, 2204, 2470
Valcartier camp—payment of accounts, 312
Victoria Memorial Museum, 153
War supplies
Boots, 2395
Canvas shoes, 763
Horses, 149, 314, 520
Overshoes, 315
Saddles, 632

National Drug Company, 312

National Gallery of Canada, 2182

National Transcontinental railway
Bridge keepers, 897
Construction, 1859

National Transcontinental Railway—*Con.*
Government Operation Bill. Res., 1802. 1r., 1859. 2r., 1894. Com., 2124. 3r., 2139, 2195
Investigating commission, expenses of, 44
Montreal connection, 1711
Portneuf claims, 993
Quebec
Bridge, expenditure on, 437, 1864
Terminals, 518, 606, 993, 1867
Station employees, 1143

Naturalization, 610, 1598, 2317

Naval Service
Department
Estimates, 237, 1612-1621, 2298
Staff and salaries, 237
Forces and expenses, 1613, 1614, 1654
Northern waters, patrol of, 1630, 2298
Stefansson expedition, 1630, 2298

Navigable waters
Pollution of, 3, 118, 204
Removal of obstructions in, 347

Navigation. *See* Marine

Neely, Mr. D. B. (Humboldt)
Budget
Commercial depression, 959
Trade policy of the Government, 960
Decreased trade and revenues and the war, 961
The tariff increases, 962
Manufacturers and consumers, 963
The made-in-Canada movement, 963
Methods of increasing revenues, 964
Taxation of British imports, 965, 969
National Transcontinental railway, 966
Canadian Northern railway, 968
Hudson Bay railway, 969
Opposition alternative proposals, 970
German population of the west, 970
Live stock industry, 2094
War supplies—horses, 388, 2095, 2098
Western farmers, relief for, 61
Wood, E. C., land patent of, 151

Nesbitt, Mr. Edward W. (North Oxford)
Budget
Hard times and the war, 593
Problems of the Minister of Finance, 594
Taxation of loan and insurance companies, 595
The new tariff, 595
Reduction of expenditures, 596
Soldiers, votes for, 2283, 2480
Taxation—insurance companies, 595, 1180, 1183
War supplies—boots, 2414

New Brunswick steamship services, 1301, 1304

New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island railway, purchase of, 152

New Carlisle, public building for, 1287, 1985

Newcastle wireless station—alleged flying of American flag, 1616

Newfoundland
Partridge berries from, 1166
Steamship services, 1295, 1301, 1303

New Glasgow
Dredging, 1992
Mail service, 517

New Waterford
Mail service, 1360
Recruiting, 392

Nickel Export Regulation Bill. 1r., 3. Ruled out, 43. *See* 78, 1937

Nickle, Mr. William F. (Kingston)
Canadian patriotic fund, 401
Kingston penitentiary commission, 1767
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 655
Soldiers, votes for, 2244

Niobe and Rainbow, His Majesty's Canadian ships, 45, 151

Noreen, steamer, 1396, 2188

Northern waters, patrol of, 1630, 2298

Northrup, Mr. William B. (East Hastings)
Vancouver Terminal Railway Company, 990

Nottar, H., shooting of, 150

Nova Scotia
Coal areas, 1609
Electoral lists, 833
Military forces, 481, 561, 608, 612, 687, 720, 905, 1396, 1428, 1496
Postal service, 900, 1380
Public works. *See that title*
Steamship services, 1301, 1304

Nova Scotians in the west, 1559

Oil
Fuel, 143, 294
Leases, 241, 243

Oliver, Hon. Frank (Edmonton)
Alberta
Military training area, 1556
Public buildings, 2044
Animals, diseases of, 2089
Architect, Dominion chief, appointment of, 1960
Athabaska Landing public building, 2044, 2298

Oliver, Hon. Frank (Edmonton)—*Con.*

Athabaska river dredging, 2775
Banff and Calgary civil servants, 1184
British Columbia public buildings, 2045
Budget, 378
An extraordinary budget, 378
The financial situation, 379
War loans, 380
Means for increasing revenue, 381
Tariff increases, 383
Western agricultural production, 386
Canada Year Book, 1938
Canadian expeditionary forces, 2370
Canadian patriotic fund, 395
Coal, sub-bituminous, 1604
Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company, 705
Edmonton
Public buildings, 2044
Rifle range, 1553
River bank, protection of, 2169
Explosives in mines, 1606
Ferguson, Mr. T. R., report of, 2539, 2601
Grain trade, 1951, 2030, 2191
Homestead maps, 237
Homesteaders' wood rights, 1566
Hudson Bay
Navigation, 1627, 1629
Railway, 1861
Kitsilano Indian reserve, 1892
Kootenay bay wharf, 2171
Lethbridge immigration inspector, 1569
National Transcontinental railway—proposed government operation, 1850, 2136
National parks, Canadian, 236
Parliament, members of, and government contracts, 2145
Pigeon lake improvements, 2168
Prince George mail service, 2298
Printing Bureau and public printing, 1597
St. Peter's Indian reserve, 1876
Saskatchewan and Alberta government telegraph lines, 2179
Senate, powers of the, 2330
Soldiers, votes for, 2240, 2271, 2292, 2344, 2356, 2463, 2476, 2495, 2504, 2533
Stefansson expedition, 310, 1630, 1632, 2300
Sturgeon river improvements, 2170
Tar sands, 1605
Timber regulations, 1566
Valcartier camp, 1552
War
Appropriation, 1677
Pensions, 141
Supplies—horses, 766, 1867, 2102
Water-power investigations, 235
Weights and measures, inspection of, 511
Western farmers, relief for, 66

Ottawa

Buildings rented by Government, 148, 308, 2047
Dominion buildings, 1968, 2037
Victoria Memorial Museum, 153, 1969
Woods and Canadian buildings—cost of electric lighting, 1651

Ottawa and Hull

Postal rate, 766
Town-planning commission, 241, 766

Ottawa river storage works, 2181

Pacaud, Mr. Lucien T. (Megantic)

Megantic postmasters, 609

Papineau, Mr. Louis J. (Beauharnois)

Charge of corruption, 1144
Civil service, increase of, 1588

Paquet, Mr. Eugene (L'Islet)

Budget, 971
Nature of the war, 971
Patriotism and production, 972
The public expenditures, 973
The war taxes, 974

Pardee, Mr. Frederick F. (West Lambton)

Civil service—dismissals and appointments, 218
Controverted elections, 1995, 2153
Dominion elections—hours of polling, 1913
Drill halls, expenditures on, 2035
Gobeil, A., employment of, 1964
Philadelphia immigration agent, 522
Motor trucks for Militia Department, 1145
Taxation—gravel and sand, 1160, 1163, 1164
Wrecks, investigations into, 343

Parks, Canadian national, 236

Parliament, members of, and government contracts, 1242, 1901, 2140

Parliamentary procedure

Bill, re-committal of, with instructions, 2195
Divorce bills, on, 1987, 2187
Member, having begun speech, temporarily yields floor to intervening speaker, by consent of House, 999
Previous debate, reference by members to, 1765
Printing of parliamentary documents, rule for, 1057
Private Bills—suspension of certain rules, 1527
Resolution
Affecting postage submitted by private member, 338
Moved after notice, 1159
See Speaker

Parliamentary representation
British North America Act, proposed amendment of—address to the King, 1459, 2327
House of Commons Representation Act of 1914, correction of clerical errors in, 1557, 1994
See Prince Edward Island

Paspebiac
Customs office, 633
Wharf, 633

Patent medicines
Composition of, 1717
Tax on, 1208, 1423

Patent shovel shield, 437, 1235

Patents, renewal of, 1261, 1284, 1989

Patriotic fund. *See* Canadian

Peace
Canadian Centenary Association, 2815
Terms of, and the overseas Dominions, 2627

Peart, L., employment of, 308

Peat. *See* Mines

Pecuniary Claims Convention, 1740

Pelletier, Hon. L. P.
Testimonial to, 211
Trip of, 2529

Penitentiaries
Begg, Mr., employment of, 828
Kingston, 136, 271, 515, 1740
Prison reform, 1049, 1761, 1775
Release of Thomas Riley, 2459
Stony Mountain, 390, 1185
Tickets of leave, 1736

Pensions, 1188, 1394, 1450

Perley, Sir George H.
Acting Canadian High Commissioner, 2318
Speech of—status of Overseas Dominions, 439

Peterborough, government employees in, 1285

Petite Rivière fishery guardian, 1396

Pettet, W. V., employment of, 2123

Phillips-Wolley, Sir Clive, appointment of, 151

Philipsburg-St. Armand mail service, 249, 313, 995

Pickel, G. H., employment of, 831

Picton armoury, 1145

Pictou (county)
Fishery guardians, 245
Mail service, 244, 610, 995, 1288, 1458, 2123, 2188
Medical examiners for volunteers, 762

Pictou (island) telephone line, 143

Pictou (town) winter freight handling, 246

Pilotage. *See* Marine

Pit props, trade in, 1934

Pollution of Navigable Waters Bill. 1r., 3. 2r., 118. Ref. to special Com., 204.

Pope lease on Knee Hill Creek, 993

Port Arthur
Drill hall, 2038
Harbour improvements, 1970-1975

Port Daniel mail service, 1992

Post Office
Closed offices, 833
Contingencies, 1360
Department staff and salaries, 1359, 2295
Dismissals, 1363
Estimates, 1359-1394, 2295-2298
Franking privilege, 311, 905, 1370, 2296
Free postage for soldiers, 338, 1419
Mail carriers, payment of, 2297
Mail bag locks, 46, 1393
Motor cars, 1391
Outside service, 1360, 1371
Parcel post, 1371-1375, 1384
Post cards, stamps on, 1205
Rural mail service, 1379, 1384
Stamps, sale and use of, 1391, 1393, 1422, 2297, 2624

Potatoes. *See* Agriculture.

Power, Mr. William (Quebec West)
Salisbury camp, 1504

Prince Albert property purchase, 762

Prince Edward Island
Car ferry, 1704
Immigration officer, 1575
Mail service, 1378, 1385
Marine life-saving service, 1637
Parliamentary representation, 316, 1459, 2327, 2331
Public works, 2114
Railway, 1704, 1707
Steamship services, 1303
Winter mail service, 348

Prince of Wales fund, 244

Prince Rupert Rifles, disbandment of, 1522

Printing Bureau, Government, 1591-1597, 2307

Prison reform. *See* Penitentiaries

Private Bills discussed
Alexander, Charles Isaac, divorce bill, 1894, 1987, 2187
Canadian Northern Railway Company, 708, 758
Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company, 560
Canadian Pacific Railway Company, 725
Casualty Company of Canada, 761
Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company, 705, 721
Lohmann Company, patent of, 1261, 1284
Millen, J., patent of, 1989
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company, 966
Toronto Eastern Railway Company, 708
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company, 967
Van Buren Bridge Company, 709, 760
Vancouver Terminal Railway Company, 990, 1262

Prostitution, houses of, 1227

Proulx, Mr Edmond (Prescott)
Aliens at Petawawa, 828, 998
Architect, Dominion chief, appointment of, 1958, 1961
Dominion elections—candidates and government contracts. *See* Parliament.
Dredge No. 7, 1647
French Canadians and the war, 1442
Furniture for government offices, 1868
Georgian Bay Canal Commission, 1145
Hawkesbury-Grenville bridge, 1648, 1992, 2176
Home militia, 312, 522
Judges' pensions, 765
L'Orignal post office, 1363
Minister of Militia and the war, 1517
Parliament, members of, and government contracts, 1242, 1527, 1901, 1929, 2140-2146
Petawawa camp, 1185
Picton armoury, 1145
Privilege—Ottawa Evening Journal, 991
Soldiers, votes for, 2291
Taxation—income, 1197
Telephones, free, for government officials, 1970
War supplies, purchase of
Horses, 994
Housewives, 1650
Oats and hay, 1397

Public Accounts Committee. *See* War supplies—investigations

Public health, conservation of, 2107

Public works
Architect, Dominion chief, appointment of, 1958, 1961, 1966, 2184
Buildings
Alberta, 2044
British Columbia, 2045
Manitoba, 2040
New Brunswick, 1981
Nova Scotia, 1975
Ontario, 2034, 2185
Quebec, 1983
Saskatchewan, 2042
Department
Engineering branch, 2181
Estimates, 1958, 1961, 2034, 2111, 2155
Dredging
Dredge No. 7, 1647, 1866
Maritime provinces, 1289, 1648, 1992, 2171
Ontario and Quebec, 1252, 2172
Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, 2175
Expenditures, 2035
Harbours and rivers
British Columbia, 1970, 2170
Generally, 2155
Manitoba, 2166
New Brunswick, 1972, 2117
Nova Scotia, 2051, 2111
Ontario, 1970, 1975, 2164, 2184
Prince Edward Island, 1975, 2114
Quebec, 1971, 2119, 2155, 2185
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 2167
Slides and booms, 2184

Pugsley, Hon. William (St. John City)
Allison, J. Wesley, services, of, 1451, 1506
Amherst post office site, 1975
Ammunition, purchases of, 1451, 1506
Architect, Dominion chief, appointment of, 1960
Bank loans for seed grain, 1244
Budget, 470, 562
Proposed taxation, 470, 563
Civil Service—statement of Mr. Adam Shortt, 471
Public works expenditures, 473, 564
Militia expenditures, 564
Stamp taxes, 569, 573
Coal tariff, 570
Farmers and the tariff, 570, 575
Duty on fertilizers, 571
French treaty imports, 573
British preference, 576
Canadian Pacific railway steamship services, 738
Censorship, 1448, 1496, 1506

Pugsley, Hon. Wm. (St. John City)—*Con.*

Civil Service
Appointments, 1873
War service, government employees on, 217
See Shortt
Controverted elections, 1922, 1997, 2008, 2017, 2151
Cost of Living Commission, 2625
Dominion elections—candidates and government contracts, 2140
Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company, 722
Ferguson, Mr. T. R., report of, 2584
Inland Revenue, pamphlet of Deputy Minister of, 1725
International railway, government acquisition of, 1682
Leonardsville dredging, 312
Lobsters, sale of undersized, 1150
McLeod, Colonel H. F., battalion of, 561
Medical Council of Canada, 1251
Militia Department coal supply, 2319
National Transcontinental railway, 1829, 2130
Ottawa—buildings rented by Government, 2047
Palmerston public building, 2037
Parliament, members of, and government contracts, 2140, 2146
Parliamentary representation, 1461, 2333
Patent ballot, allowance for, 1591
Printing, government, 1595
Privilege—omission in Hansard, 689
Public works expenditures, 1362. *See* Budget
Railway employees, voting of, 2503
Real estate, fraudulent titles to, 1219
St. John
Custom house improvements, 1982
Harbour improvements, 1972
Secretary of State, Department of, expenditure of, 1590
Seed grain. *See* Western farmers
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 213, 471, 647
Soldiers, votes for, 2226, 2353, 2463, 2477, 2490, 2503, 2538
Submarines, purchase of, 94, 110, 946
Taxation
Banks, 1195
Corporations, 1195
Fertilizers, 571, 1159, 1395, 1400, 1402
French Treaty, articles under, 573, 1212, 1216
Insurance companies, 1179
Postal rates and stamp taxes, 1419
Proprietary or patent medicines, 1425
Spirits, 1155
Telegraphic messages, 1194
See Budget

Pugsley, Hon. Wm. (St. John City)—*Con.*

Transatlantic steamship services, 1298
Vancouver immigration building, 2046
War
Appropriations, 91
Supplies
Agents, 40, 2461. *See* Allison
Ammunition 1451, 1507, 1669
Bicycles, 767
British Government, 2461
Horses, 1230-1232
Western farmers, relief for, 1329. *See* Bank loans

Qu'Appelle postmastership, 436

Quebec (city)
Bridge, 437, 1710
Harbour Commissioners, 2123
Price, Sir William, resignation of, 1965, 1966
Harbour improvements, 1971
History of port, 1962
Postal revenues, 896
Terminals, 1860

Quebec (county) telegraph service, 1187, 2122

Quebec (province)
Aid to farmers, 291
Fisheries, 116, 994, 2302
Steamship services, 1301
Superior court judges, superannuation of, 1186

Quebec and Saguenay railway, 2532, 2625

Radium. *See* Mines

Railways
Capitalization, control of, 78, 261, 285, 726-758, 1150
Employees, voting of, 2498
Extension of charters, 706, 720, 758
Labour conditions on construction work, 502
Mail contracts, 1375
Wages, payment of, on, 498
Workmen's compensation, 514
For individual railways, see their titles

Railways and Canals Department
Estimates, 1467-1495, 1685-1713, 1859-1863
Staff and salaries, 1471

Rainville, Mr. Joseph H. (Chambly and Vercheres)
War supplies—boots, 2408

Real estate titles, fraudulent, 47, 284, 476, 1219

Regina
Mounted police quarters, 311
Property purchases by Government, 762 2188
Water supply, 311

Reid, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Customs)
Agriculture
Department estimates, 1229-1240
Farmers' relief, 1239
Potato embargo, 719, 749, 991, 1229
Civil Service—stenographers, 1472
Customs
Agricultural implements, valuation of, 605, 1170
Alert, revenue steamer, 23
Department
Appointments and dismissals, 218, 228
Employees on war service, 217-219
Estimates, 217-230
Staff and salaries, 217-230
Investigations, 611
Smuggling, alleged, 223
Spirits, valuation of, 1155
Duchemin, H. P., payments to, 952
Fraudulent importation of horses, 230
Patent shovel shield, 1236
Patents, renewal of, 1261, 1284, 1990
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 662
Toronto custom house, 2039
War supplies—horses, 1230-1235

Reindeer, experiments with, 234, 2315

Repatriation, 1571

Restigouche river
Bridge, 1148, 2177
Dredging, 1289, 1648

Rhoda, steamer, 2531

Rhodes, Mr. Edgar N. (Cumberland)
Amherst
Armoury, 1977
Car-building, 1696
Post office, 1975
Cumberland mail service, 1649
Intercolonial railway—Wallace spur line, 1694
Nova Scotia military forces, 1496, 1501, 1551

Ribstone, village of, patent of, 243

Richard, Mrs. Margaret, claim of, 896, 1639

Richards, J. W., M.P., death of, 827

Richelieu county mail carriers, 1287

Richelieu river wharves, 995

Richmond county, Quebec, farmers, relief for, 1238

Riding mountain timber reserve, 1577

Rigaud
Armoury, 631, 993
Dredging, 390
Wharf, 1786

Rimouski (county)
Dredging, 897
Purchase of war supplies in, 994

River John customs sub-collectorship, 142

Robb, Mr. James A. (Huntingdon)
Corn imports, 152
Drill halls, 2035
Flour, Canada's gift of, to Great Britain, 1646
Grain trade, 1346, 2032, 2192
Maple sugar, adulteration of, 1792
Rural mail service, 1384
Seed grain, purchase and distribution of, 1346
Taxation—Customs valuations, 1403, 1405
War supplies—horses, 249, 1232, 2099

Robertson, Struan, Lt.-Col. *See* Nova Scotia military forces

Robinson, George, employment of, 831

Roche, Hon. W. J. (Minister of the Interior)
Astronomical observatory, western, 1585, 1893
Duck mountain timber reserve, 1578
Forest reserves, 1578
Homestead maps, 237
Homesteaders' wood rights, 1565
Immigration, 1558, 1569-1577
Agencies, 1558, 1564
Oriental, 1576
Indians, 1306-1328. *See that title*
Interior Department
Estimates, 231, 1281, 1558
Ferguson, Mr. T. R., report of, 2551
Staff, salaries, etc., 233, 1558, 1570
Irrigation—refund, 1894
Lethbridge immigration officer, 1568
Nova Scotians in the west, 1559
Parks, Canadian national, 236, 1894
Schrader grazing lease, 1564
Seed grain. *See* Western farmers
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 232
Timber protection, 233, 1565, 1578
Tree culture, 233
Water-powers, development of, 234
Western farmers, relief for, 53, 292, 948, 1281, 1329, 1344, 1348
Wetaskawin settlers, grievances of, 1561
Yukon placer mining rights, 514, 1868

Rogers, Hon. Robert (Minister of Public Works)
Architect, Dominion chief, appointment of, 1958, 1968, 2184
Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company, 705, 720
Gobeil, A., employment of, 1962-1968
House of Commons—business of the House, 1787
Militia Department coal supply, 2326
National Transcontinental railway—government operation, 1857
Public works
Buildings, 1961, 1975, 2034, 2185
Department
Estimates, 1958, 1961, 2034, 2111, 2155
Staff, salaries, etc., 1958, 2184
Dredging, 2171
Harbours and rivers, 1970, 2051, 2111, 2155
Miscellaneous, 2181
Roads and bridges, 2176
Slides and booms, 2184
Telegraph lines, 2179
Seed grain. *See* Western farmers
Senate, powers of the, 2328
Shortt, Mr Adam, speech of, 471, 636
Telephones, free, for government officials, 1970
Victoria Memorial Museum, 1969
Votes for soldiers, 336
Western farmers, relief for, 62

Ross, Mr. Duncan C. (West Middlesex)
Foot and mouth disease, 611, 2053, 2087
Middlesex county Indians, 518

Rosthern customs receipts, 79

Royal assent, 2210, 2628

Royal Print and Lithograph Company, payments to, 1864

Royal Society of Canada, accommodation for, 245

Roy, Col. Alex., retirement of, 1516

Roy, F. X., employment of, 992

St. Anselme government employees, 1993

St. Antoine de Richelieu wharf, 995

St. Armand rural mail service, 1289

St. Denis rural mail service, 993

St. Gilbert de Portneuf postmaster, 307

St. Jean l'Evangeliste mail service, 833

St. John, N.B.
Custom house improvements, 1982
Harbour, 1972

St. John Valley railway, 46, 142, 173

St. Lambert post office, 1648

St. Lawrence. *See* Marine

St. Mathieu dredging, 2173

St. Paul's Island life-saving station, 608

St. Peter's Indian reserve. *See* Indians

St. Romuald post office, 518

St. Thomas armoury, 1866

St. Zotique wharf, 390

Sackville
Home guard, 1517, 1706
Pilotage, 1266
Post office, 153
Railway accommodation, 606, 1693

Saskatchewan
Homesteads and pre-emptions, 996
Indian lands, 768
Land office officials, 997
School lands, 768

Saskatoon
Customs collector, 79
Public building, 2043, 2326
Public Works Department property purchases, 762
Rural mail service, 607

Schaffner, Mr. F. L. (Souris)
Bank loans for seed grain, 1355
Boissevain postmastership, 1369
Capital punishment, 136
Experimental farms, 2058, 2064
Food exports, government control of, 531
Freight rates, 258
Taxation—proprietary medicines, 1208, 1211

Schrader grazing lease, 1562

Scientific literature, international catalogue of, 1590

Scott, Mr F. S. (South Waterloo)
Budget, 590
The late Mr. Clare, M.P., 590
Taxation of banks, 590
British preference, 591
Government railway expenditures, 591
The made-in-Canada movement, 592
Canada's opportunities, 592

Secretary of State, Department of
Estimates, 1588, 2307
Staff, salaries, etc., 1588, 1589

Seed grain, distribution of. *See* Western Farmers *and* Richmond County

Seguin, Mr. Paul A. (L'Assomption)
L'Assomption (county), public employees from, 2528
L'Assomption (village) wharf, 1145, 2119
St. Lin public building, 1984

Senate. *See* Parliamentary representation *and* Senate and House of Commons

Senate and House of Commons Act Amendment Bills
Independence of members. 1r., 1242
Members on active service. 1r., 351. 2r., 439. Com., 439. 3r., 441

Sharpe, Mr. Samuel (North Ontario)
Bank loans for seed grain, 1352
Canadian Pacific Railway Company's ocean services, 741, 757
Canadian patriotic fund, 1864
Ottawa—Woods and Canadian buildings—cost of electric lighting, 1651
War supplies
Horses, 829
Ammunition, 1652

Sharpe, Mr. Wm. H. (Lisgar)
Binders, imports of, 1649
Food exports, government control of, 547
Grain trade, 1954
Hudson Bay navigation, 1629

Shefford county rural mail service, 1287

Shelburne
Fishery inspector, 1271
Fog alarm, 389

Sherbrooke Mounted Rifles, supplies for, 314, 1512

Shipping. *See* Marine

Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 213, 232, 471, 634

Shovel shield, 437, 1235

Shubenacadie post office, 1866

Sinclair, Mr. John H. (Guysborough)
Aliens, registration of, 48
Amherst
Custom house, 1646
Post office, 1396
Belgian relief, 1676
Budget, 889, 905
The party truce, 889
Canada's financial problem, 890
War expenditures, 891
Imperialism and nationalism, 891
Canada's period of hard times, 892
The Government's financial administration, 893
Political patronage and war contracts, 906

Sinclair, Mr. John H. (Guysborough)—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
The new taxation, 909
Fishermen and the tariff, 910
Naval policy, 911
The member for West Peterborough, 911
Summing up, 912
Canning public building, 1979
Canso
Lobster hatchery, 2530
Military guard, 1556
Reduction works, 633, 767
Cole Harbour wharf, 517, 2051
Copper exports, 312
Country Harbour
Gas buoy, 762
Wharf, 2114
Duchemin, H. P., payments to, 604
East Erinville post office, 519
Fenian raid bounty, 1651
Fish and Fisheries
American vessels, regulation of, 1650
"Fish and How to Cook It"—booklet, 239
Lobsters
Close season, 45
Hatcheries, 2530
Pickled fish, inspection of, 48
Shell-fish Commission, 607
Steam trawling, 243, 311, 312, 1623, 1625, 2306
Transportation, 80
Guysborough
Branch railways. *See* Intercolonial
Fishery guardians, 313
Mail service, 519, 607, 633, 897, 1185
Halifax public works expenditures, 1458
Intercolonial railway
Branch lines, eastern Nova Scotia, 44, 519, 1467, 1480, 1700
Fish transportation, 80
Ice contracts, 311
Imported stationery, 1697
Mulgrave car ferry, 1693
Pugwash spur line, 391
Wallace spur line, 391, 1694
Isaac's Harbour lobster hatchery, 2530
Le Blanc, seaman, family of, 896, 1639
Marine
Canadian shipping registry, 45
Coasting trade, 296, 1933
Shipping casualties in 1914, 833
Mattatall lake post office, 832
Military stores, fraud in sale of, 205, 304
National Transcontinental railway investigating commission, 44
Naval Service, Department of, 238
New Harbour breakwater, 2051
Niobe and Rainbow, Canadian ships, 45

Sinclair, Mr. John H. (Guysborough)—*Con.*
Nova Scotia
Electoral lists, 833
Military forces, 1438, 1502, 1550
Ocean freight rates, 216
Phillips-Wolley, Sir Clive, appointment of, 151
Pit props, trade in, 1934
Post offices closed in Canada, 833
Printing, government, 2308
Public works, expenditures on, 2039, 2047
Richard, Mrs. Margaret, claim of, 896, 1639
Shortt, Mr Adam, speech of, 639
Soldiers
Cerebro-spinal meningitis among, 2529
Votes for, 2263, 2268, 2345
Taxation
Letters and post cards, 1413
Patent medicines, 1424
War supplies—boots, 48

Soldiers. *See* Militia *and* War

Soldiers Voting Bill. 1r., 1874. 2r., 2195. Com., 2258, 2343, 2462, 2533. 3r., 2538. Senate amdts., 2625. *See* 334, 1643

Solicitor General, office of, 1735

Soulanges canal, 1712

Southampton railway investigation, 142

South Wellington mine disaster, 207

Speaker (Hon. T. S. Sproule), rulings and statements of
Bills
To be introduced by resolution:
To increase salaries, 1644
To regulate exports, 4, 43
Questions as to details irregular on 2r., 2201
Motion for ref. to com. only after 2r., 262
House not to instruct on Bill in possession of com., 387
Private bills—suspension of certain rules, 1527
Re-committal, with instructions, 2195
Blue books, printing and distribution of, 1596, 2311
Committees, power of, to administer the oath, 304, 306
House of Commons
Reading room, 611, 1863
Sessional employees, 2109
Irrelevancy, 1049
Members, irregular references to each other, 577
Patent medicines, sale of, 1718

Speaker (Hon. T. S. Sproule)—*Con.*
Printing of parliamentary documents, rule for, 1057
Privilege, questions of
Newspaper articles not such, 991, 2460
Political pamphlet, statements in, not such, 2190
Question containing unadmitted allegation of fact, also referring to unofficial matter, irregular, 2532
Report from Com. of Supply not receivable on day resolutions have been agreed to by Com., 2323
Resolution affecting postage not movable by private member, 338
Voters' lists, preparation of, 1594
See Parliamentary procedure

Special War Revenue Bill. Res., 87, 1175, 1191. 1r., 1217. 2r., 1405. Com., 1405, 1586. 3r., 1588. *See* Budget *and* Taxation

Squid imports, 244

Stamp taxes. *See* Taxation

Stanbridge East rural mail service, 995

Stanfield, Mr. John (Colchester)
House of Commons
Members and government contracts, 2142
Sessional indemnity, 2310

Stanfold township, model farm for, 1993

Steamboats. *See* Marine

Steamship services
Australia and New Zealand, 1292, 1300
Canada
British Columbia, 1300
Gaspé, 1301
New Brunswick, 1301, 1304
Nova Scotia, 1301, 1304
Prince Edward Island, 1303
Quebec, 1301
China and Japan, 1300
Cuba, 1294
France, 718
Great Britain, 1291, 1293, 1297
Newfoundland, 1295, 1301, 1303
South Africa, 1295
West Indies and South America, 1295

Stefansson expedition, 310, 1630, 2298

Stellarton public building, 763

Stevens, Mr. H. H. (Vancouver)
Budget, 599, 613
Expenditures on public works, 600, 616
Estimates for the year, 603

Stevens, Mr. H. H. (Vancouver)—*Con.*

Budget—*Con.*
Financial and trade conditions and the war, 613, 617, 620
French treaty rights, 614
The new taxation, 615
Canada's foreign trade opportunities, 617
House of Commons—members' franking privilege and war stamps, 905
Kitsilano Indians, 1892
Militia Department coal supply, 2319
National labour bureau, 607
Vancouver Terminal Railway Company, 990

Submarines, 94, 107, 946, 955

Suckling, Rev. W. T., enlistment of, 1867

Supply, Committee of, 212-240, 338-351, 481-514, 1228-1242, 1249-1283, 1291-1328, 1359-1394, 1428-1458, 1466-1525, 1544-1585, 1588-1643, 1685-1714, 1715-1783, 1859-1863, 1876-1894, 1930-1987, 2034-2053, 2055-2121, 2154-2186, 2295-2320. *For details see titles of departments and subjects.*

Supply Bill (for 1915, $14,766,499.39; for 1916, $156,496,333.73). Res., 2371. 1r., 2r., Com., and 3r., 2372.

Supreme Court Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 1988. 2r., 2053. Com., 2053. 3r., 2055.

Sutherland, Mr. Donald (South Oxford)
Budget, 878
Made-in-Canada movement, 878
Protection and the reciprocity pact, 879
The political truce, 880
Naval policy, 880, 887
Opposition criticisms, 883
War taxation, 885
British preference, 886
Experimental farms, 2069
Food exports, government control of, 548
Horse breeding, 2106
Meat inspection, 2091
Soldiers, votes for, 2285

Sydney-St. Peter's railway, proposed, 608, 992

Tar sands. *See* Mines

Tariff. *See* Taxation

Taxation, War
Customs
Agricultural implements, 1169-1175
Bananas, 1166
Exempted articles, 246, 1151
Fertilizers, 1151, 1159, 1162, 1395, 1400
Gravel and sand, 1160-1165
Newfoundland partridge berries, 1166

Taxation, War—*Con.*

Customs—*Con.*
Resolutions, 1168
Revenue, estimated, 1169
Silk, 1167
Spirits, 1152
Tea and coffee, 1168
Valuation, 605, 1152
Special
Bank circulation, 1191
Bills of exchange, cheques, etc., 1177-1205, 1407
Corporations, 1191-1197
Date of operation, 613
French treaty, articles under, 1211-1216
Department of Justice, opinion of, 1422
Insurance companies, 1178, 1191, 1405
Letters and post cards, 1206
Exempted postal matter, 1413
Loan and trust companies, 1191
Modifications, proposed, 1177
Money orders, etc., 1205
Penalties, 1411, 1418, 1427, 1586
Postal rates and stamp taxes, 1412-1421, 1586
Proprietary or patent medicines, 312, 1208, 1423
Resolutions, 1175
Revenue, estimated, 1208
Railway tickets, 1197-1201, 1406
Telegraphic messages, 1192, 1406
Vessel tickets, 1201
Wines, 1208-1216, 1422
See Budget, Customs Tariff War Revenue Bill, Special War Revenue Bill, *and* Ways and Means

Taylor, Mr. James D. (New Westminster)
Hansard, omissions from, 689
Vancouver Terminal Railway Company, 1262

Technical education, 245, 495, 502, 1146

Telegraphers. *See* Labour

Telephones, free, for Government officials, 1968

Temiscouata postal service, 392

Terminal elevators. *See* Grain Act

Thoburn, Mr. William (North Lanark)
Soldiers, votes for, 2270
War supplies and Canadian Manufacturers' Association, 1669

Thompson, Mr. Alfred (Yukon)
Aviation school, Canadian, 1989
Silver-lead bounties, 1937
Trade with Russia and South America, 1935
Yukon, the, 1580-1584

Thomson, Mr. Levi (Qu'Appelle)
Bank loans for seed grain, 1352. *See* Western farmers
Budget, 811
Conditions in the west, 812
The new taxation, 813
Tariff increases, 814
Made-in-Canada campaign, 816
British preference, 816
Qu'Appelle postmasters, dismissal of, 436
Western farmers, relief for, 60, 1341, 1352

Three Rivers
Harbour, 2155, 2175
Public building, 1786

Timber protection, 233, 1560, 1566, 1578

Tobin, Mr. Edmund W. (Richmond-Wolfe)
Colcleugh, F. W. R., employment of, 1648
Cookshire post office, 1991
Horses, embargo on, 1235
Prices of feed and foodstuffs, 2080
St. Mathieu, dredging at, 2174
Richelieu river wharves, 995
Rimouski dredging, 897
Richmond county, Quebec, farmers, relief for, 1237
Vezina's Corners postmastership, 1991
War supplies—horses, 830, 1146

Tobique Indian reserve, 187

Toronto
Customs examining warehouse and postal station A, 2039
Harbour improvements, 1975
Home guard, 243
Post office building, 1970

Trade and Commerce
Commissioners and agents, 1930-1936
Department
Estimates, 212, 1291, 1931
Reports in French, 828
Staff and salaries, 212
China and Japan, 1931, 1932
Russia, 1931, 1935
South America, 1934, 1935
West Indies, 215, 1295

Trawling. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Tree culture, 233

Tremain, Mr. H. B. (Hants)
Budget, 824
Opposition criticisms, 824
Protection and revenue, 825
Interest of the farmers, 826
Party co-operation necessary, 827

Trent canal
Commission, 632
Construction, 1712

Truax, Mr. R. E. (South Bruce)
Chesley public building, 1646

Tufts Cove drydock, 1647

Turgeon, Mr. Onesiphore (Gloucester)
Bathurst harbour, 46
Budget, 700, 709
The war expenditures, 700
Financial conditions in Canada, 701
Taxation and British preference, 703, 712
Tariff and protection, 709
Economy of expenditure, 712
Encouragement of agriculture, 713
The war and a general election, 714
Controverted elections, 2024
Mizonnette lighthouse, 46
Parliamentary representation, 1465
Privilege—St. John Standard, 145
Soldiers, votes for, 2509

Turriff, Mr. John G. (Assiniboia)
Budget, 417
The war expenditures, 417
Ordinary expenditures, 418
The increased taxation, 420
The Civil Service, 423
Retrenchment and economy, 424
Farmers and the tariff, 426, 430
Taxation of British goods, 429
Canadian Northern Railway Company—extension of time, 759
Canadian Pacific Railway steamship services, 733, 754
Dominion elections
Hours of polling, 1911
Voters' lists, 1898
Ferguson, Mr. T. R., report of, 2572
Fisher, Captain E., employment of, 517
Food exports, government control of, 542
Freight rates, proposed increase of, 351
Grain trade, 1944, 1947
Hudson Bay railway—wages of employees, 1395
Inland navigation rates, 253
Inland Revenue, Deputy Minister of, 438
Intercolonial railway—payments to Messrs. Boulay, 2530
Longueuil dredging, 438
McQuarrie, Major, 2528
Maple sugar, adulteration of, 1793
Nickle, export of, 1937
Ottawa—buildings rented by Government, 148, 308
Privilege—Toronto Evening Telegram, 480
Railway capitalization, 288
Regina property purchase by Government, 2188
Soldiers, votes for, 2269, 2274, 2518

Turriff, Mr. John G. (Assiniboia)—*Con.*
War supplies
Automobile tires, 1145
Comforts for soldiers, 292
Field glasses, 155
Pails, 152
Razors, 307
Western farmers, relief for, 71

Tyrian, steamer, repairs to, 1786

Unemployment. *See* Labour

Union Life Assurance Company, 2317, 2372

Valcartier Camp
Accounts, payment of, 312
Fair-wage clause in government contracts, 240, 391
Land claims 522, 1546, 1739, 2621
Lighting, 2122
Lumber contracts, 2122
Selection, 1513
Stores, disposal of, 308
Supplies, destruction of, 149

Vallée, L. O., dismissal of, 436

Valley railway, operation of, 142

Vancouver
Harbour
Commission, 1875
Improvements, 1975
Terminal Railway Company, 990

Verville, Mr. Alphonse (Maisonneuve)
Belgian immigration, 632
Budget, 1081
The Government's taxation policy, 1081
Public works expenditures, 1083
The made-in-Canada movement, 1083
Taxation of coal and raw materials, 1084
Effects of high tariffs, 1085
War and democracy, 1088
Carslake Hotel Company, claims of, 2528
Contrecoeur public works, 1651
Dominion elections—hours of polling, 2498
Fair-wage clause in government contracts, 240, 391
First Canadian contingent, British-born in, 610
Food exports, government control of, 540
Laprairie government road, 2159
Montreal—dismissals of public works employees, 1652
Post office
Branch offices, 2296
Registered letters to members, 2296
Public works and industrial distress, 2040. *See* Budget
Railway employees, voting of, 2498, 2502
Soldiers, votes for, 2264, 2289, 2498, 2508

Verville, Mr. Alphonse (Maisonneauve)—*Con.*
Taxation—railway tickets, 1198
Telegraphers, conditions of employment of, 1786, 2532
Unemployment, 605. *See* Budget
Winnipeg immigration officials, 392

Vezina's Corners postmastership, 1991

Victoria Memorial Museum. *See* Ottawa

Voters' lists, preparation of, 1594

Votes for soldiers. *See* Soldiers' Voting Bill

Wade, W. W., dismissal of, 1395

Wallaceburg customs collector, 766

War
Canadian forces—statement of mobilization and organization, 2364
Censorship, 1264, 1448, 1496, 1506, 1618
Cerebro-spinal meningitis among soldiers, 2529
Chaplains, 242
Enlistment, 438, 1456, 2531
Civil servants, 233, 312, 522
Expenditures, 1142, 1397. *See* War Appropriation Bill *and* War supplies
First Canadian contingent, 610, 763
France, Canadian troops in, 204, 909
Home guard, 1516
Payment of soldiers, 2320
Pensions, 141, 1188, 1394, 1450
Princess Patricia regiment, transport of, 391
Railway engineering corps, 1525
Recruiting. *See* Enlistment
Seeley, Colonel, command of, 1284
Shooting by sentries, 332, 2124
Soldiers
Cerebro-spinal meningitis among, 2529
Life insurance, 390
Mail matter for, 338, 1419, 1422
Payment of, 2320
Votes for. *See* Soldiers' Voting Bill
Supplies
Agents, employment of, 40. *See* Allison
Allison J. Wesley, services of, 1145, 1452, 1508, 1669
Ammunition, 91, 242, 1451, 1506-1512, 1669, 1867
Automobile tires, 1145
Bicycles, 767, 995
Binoculars, 2188, 2372, 2602, 2605
Boots, 21, 48, 144, 149, 204, 244, 2372, 2450
British Government, for, 38, 2461, 2614
Canadian Manufacturers' Association, correspondence of, 1667, 2189, 2461
Canvas shoes, 389, 763
Carleton Drug Company, 2602, 2605, 2614

War—*Con.*

Supplies—*Con.*
Clinic thermometers, 307, 521
Committee of Council, 1246, 1666
Corruption, charge of, 1144
Fair wage clause in Government contracts, 240, 391
Field glasses, 155
Hay, 140, 241, 1289, 1397
Horses, 149, 246, 249, 314, 388, 520, 607, 631, 766, 829, 894, 898, 994, 1146, 1230-1235, 1455, 1867, 1993, 2095-2196, 2602, 2606, 2613
Housewives, 1650
Investigations
Boots: notice of m. for special Com., 144; ref. to Com., 204; rep. of Com., 2372
Public Accounts Com.: ref. to Com., 945; announcement, 2538; rep. of Com., 2602
Medical, 149, 308, 315, 1526, 1866
Motor trucks, 306, 1145, 1186, 1290
Oliver equipment, 1992
Overshoes, 315, 762
Pails, 152
Razors, 307
Remounts. *See* Horses
Ross rifle, 306, 439
Saddles, 521, 632
Salisbury camp, 306, 439
Seasickness cure, 152
Sheepskins, 1866
Shells, 38, 2614
Fair wages in manufacture of, 490
Shovel shields, 437, 1235
Slippers, 389
System of purchase, 2602, 2610, 2614, 2617
Waterproof garments, 609
See Militia
Taxation. *See that title*

War Appropriation ($100,000,000) Bill. Res., 91, 1397. 1r., 1399. 2r., 1653. Com., 1653. 3r., 1681

Warnock, Mr. David (Macleod)
Waterloo lakes park, 236
Western farmers, relief for, 65, 1333

Washington, Canadian representative at, 2315

Water-power investigations, 234

Ways and Means, Committee of, 87, 1150, 1168, 1191; rep., 1217. *See* Budget *and* Taxation

Webster, Mr. John (Brockville)
Technical education, 1146

Weichel, Mr. William G. (North Waterloo)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Tribute to Their Royal Highnesses, 4
Great Britain and the war, 5
Financial and trade conditions, 6
Made-in-Canada movement, 7
German-Canadians, 8
Unity of the Empire, 9
Deceased members, 10

Weights and measures, inspection of, 505, 510, 1720

Welland canal
Construction, 1710, 1713
Wages, rates of, 491

West Arichat customs, 898

West Indies, trade with, 215, 1295

Western Farmers Relief Bill. Res., 1328. 1r., 1349. 2r., 1544. Com., 1544. 3r., 1544. *See* 49, 632, 720, 768, 947, 1150, 1242, 1281; *also* Bank Act Amendment Bill

Wetaskawin settlers, grievances of, 1560, 1565

White, Mr. Gerald V. (North Renfrew)
Pembroke drill hall, 2039

White, Hon. W. T. (Minister of Finance)
Bank borrowings from Government, 147, 476
Bank loans for seed grain, 1242-1246, 1350, 1358
Battlefields commission, 1716
Budget, 80
Revenue and expenditure, 81, 82
Organization of oversea forces, 81
Debt and borrowings, 82
Special taxes, 85
Tariff taxation, 86
Economic conditions, actual and prospective, 90
Budget—amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 841
Reply to criticisms, 841
Expenditures of late Government, 841, 848, 853
National Transcontinental railway, 841
Public works, 845
World-wide effects of war, 846
British preference, 849, 860
Public works and labour, 850
Proposed war taxation, 851, 854
Opposition alternatives, 855
Tax on railway tickets, 857
Postage, 857
Customs taxes, 858
Industrial and agricultural interests, 858
Taxation of banks, 859
Canada's share in war, 862

White, Hon. W. T. (Minister of Finance)—*Con.*
Casualty Company of Canada, 761
Finance—charges of management, 1715
Dominion notes, issue of, 146, 479, 1528, 1653
French treaty and war taxes, 1211, 1422
Loans, Imperial Government, to Canada, 146
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 655, 682
Taxation, war
Customs
Agricultural implements, 1169, 1173
Bananas, 1166
Exemptions, 1151
Fertilizers, 1151, 1160, 1401
Gravel and sand, 1165
Newfoundland partridge berries, 1166
Revenue estimated, 1169
Silk, 1167
Spirits, 1152
Tea and coffee, 1168
Special
Bank circulation, 1191
Bills of exchange, cheques, etc., 1177, 1202-1204, 1407
Corporations, 1191-1197
French treaty, articles under, 1211-1216, 1422
Insurance companies, 1178, 1181, 1191
Letters and postcards, 1206
Exempted postal matter, 1413
Loan and trust companies, 1191, 1405
Modifications, proposed, 1177
Money orders, etc., 1205
Penalties, 1412, 1427, 1586-1588
Postal rates and stamp taxes, 1412-1422, 1586, 2624
Proprietary or patent medicines, 1209, 1423
Railway tickets, 1198-1201
Revenue estimated, 1208
Telegraphic messages, 1192, 1406
Vessel tickets, 1201
Wines, 1211-1216, 1422
See Budget
Union Life Assurance Company, 2317, 2372

Wilcox, Mr. Oliver J. (North Essex)
Budget, 630, 689
Tax on fertilizers, 630, 695
Party truce, 689
Revenue and expenditure, 692
Obligations of Government, 693

Wilcox, Mr. Oliver J. (North Essex)—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
Hog cholera, 696
Political patronage, 696
What Government has accomplished, 697
Naval question, 698
Vital issues of the war, 699
Taxation
Fertilizers, 1162
Gravel, 1161, 1165

Wilson, Mr. Charles A. (Laval)
Capital punishment, 1228
Lavergne, Armand, Lieut.-Col., 1517
Real estate, titles to, 1222
Roy, Alex., Col., retirement of, 1516

Winding-Up Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 2121. 2r., 2195. Com., 2195. 3r., 2195.

Winnipeg
Immigration officials, 243, 392
Public buildings, 2041
Resident engineer, 765
Sewage, 2167
Volunteers, 313

Wireless stations, 1263, 1616, 1658

Wood, E. C., land patent of, 151

Woodworth, T. C., employment of, 2123

Wrecks. *See* Marine

Wrentham post office, 142

Wright, Mr. William (Muskoka)
Budget, 431, 442
Tariff policy, 431
Protection in Canada, 433
British preference, 434
Farming conditions in the west, 443
Trade and industry, 447
A non-partisan tariff board, 448
Experimental farms, 2072
Grain trade, 1952, 2192
Parcel post, 1385

Yarmouth
Fishery guardians, 313
Harbour improvements, 607, 1289, 2113
Marine hospital, 832
Postal service, 313, 1361

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 514. 2r., 1218. Com. and 3r., 1218. Sen. amdt., 1868

Yukon territory, 1393, 1580