DOMINION OF CANADA

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF

DEBATES

HOUSE OF COMMONS

DEPARTMENT OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE OF CANADA.
NOV 19 1948
LIBRARY

FIFTH SESSION—NINETEENTH PARLIAMENT

---

8 GEORGE VI, 1944

VOLUME I, 1944

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTY-SEVENTH DAY OF JANUARY, 1944, TO THE TWENTY-NINTH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 1944, INCLUSIVE

BEING

VOLUME CCXXXIX FOR THE PERIOD 1875-1944

INDEX ISSUED IN A SEPARATE VOLUME

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1944

HOUSE OF COMMONS

DEBATES

OF THE

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF

DOMINION OF CANADA

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

Thursday, January 27, 1944

FIFTH SESSION—NINETEENTH PARLIAMENT—OPENING

The parliament which had been prorogued on the twenty-sixth day of January, 1944, met this day at Ottawa for the dispatch of business.

The house met at three o'clock, the Speaker, the Honourable James Allison Glen, in the chair.

Mr. Speaker read a communication from the Governor General's secretary, announcing that His Excellency the Governor General would proceed to the Senate chamber at three p.m. on this day, for the purpose of formally opening the session of the dominion parliament.

A message was delivered by Major A. R. Thompson, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable house in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly the house went up to the Senate chamber.

And the house having returned to the Commons chamber:

OATHS OF OFFICE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 1, respecting the administration of oaths of office.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

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

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

The war is now in its fifth year. The coming months will witness decisive battles. They will demand a supreme effort on the part of all nations united in the cause of freedom.

It is true that the military situation is better than it was a year ago, and that cooperation among the united nations is closer than at any time in the past. At Washington, at Quebec, at Moscow, at Cairo and at Teheran, military plans for the coming campaigns were fully coordinated. Foundations were also laid for a united approach to the problems of transition from war to peace. The improved military situation does not, however, necessarily mean an early end of the war. Hostilities may continue for a long time in Europe, as well as in the far east. The German army is still very strong. There are no indications of any general deterioration of German resistance. Germany herself is protected by a vast outwork of conquered territory. She has been fortifying herself against invasion since the beginning of the war. Until the German army has been defeated, the allied nations cannot count upon an assured victory in Europe. Until the allied naval forces have grappled successfully with the main Japanese fleet there can be no assurance of an end to the war against Japan. Future operations will involve bitter fighting and heavy losses.

The winning of the war clearly remains the first of all objectives. My ministers believe it is their duty to see that Canada's war effort is firmly maintained until the enemy is defeated in Europe and in Asia. They believe the government's primary task, and the primary duty of the Canadian people, is to concentrate on the prosecution of the war. Our fighting men must be assured that there will be no diversion from this vital task and no relaxation of Canada's war effort. Till the war is won, the policies of my government will continue to be shaped to that end.

Our armed forces at sea, on land and in the air have added lustre to the name of Canada. The armed might of the united nations has been strengthened by Canadian mutual aid. In the combined allied assault upon the nazi fortress, all branches of the armed forces will have still heavier responsibilities.

While giving to the needs of the war precedence over all else, my ministers are resolved that, so far as the future can be foreseen, Canada will be in a position to meet the difficult situations which will have to be faced when victory is won.

As occupied countries are liberated from the enemy, it will be necessary to provide for the relief of destitute populations, and for the rehabilitation of devastated areas in those countries which have borne the brunt of the terror

and destruction of war. A measure to extend the principle of mutual aid so as to provide for relief, as well as for materials of war, will be submitted for your approval.

Canada's prosperity and the well-being of her people are bound up with the restoration and expansion of world trade. Export markets are essential to the efficient employment of vast numbers of Canadians. Larger imports are needed to raise the standard of living. In accordance with the principles of the Atlantic charter, the arrangements required to clear the channels of trade and promote the flow of goods among all nations after the war are being explored with other countries. Discussions will be advanced as rapidly as the exigencies of war will permit.

The revival of world trade and prosperity after the war will depend upon the speedy recovery of the occupied countries. During the period of transition, the provision of international relief will help to maintain full employment of Canadian man-power and resources.

My ministers believe that the time has come when all the nations now united in the common purpose of winning the war should seek unitedly to ensure an enduring peace. The dangers of future aggression can be removed, and world security attained, only by a general international organization of peace-loving nations. You will accordingly be invited to approve of Canadian participation in the establishment of an international organization to further national security through international cooperation.

While the post-war objective of our external policy is world security and general prosperity, the post-war objective of our domestic policy is social security and human welfare.

In the opinion of my ministers plans for the establishment of a national minimum of social security and human welfare should be advanced as rapidly as possible. Such a national minimum contemplates useful employment for all who are willing to work; standards of nutrition and housing adequate to ensure the health of the whole population; and social insurance against privation resulting from unemployment, from accident, from the death of the bread-winner, from ill-health and from old age.

Post-war planning falls naturally into three broad fields: preparation for the demobilization, rehabilitation and reestablishment in civil life of the men and women in the armed forces; the reconversion of the economic life of the nation from a war-time to a peace-time basis, and its reconstruction in a manner which will provide opportunities for useful employment for all who are willing and able to work; and the provision of insurance against major economic and social hazards.

A broad programme has already been developed for the reestablishment of veterans of the present war, and for the care of disabled veterans and the dependents of our fighting men and merchant seamen. You will be asked to approve a measure to provide war service gratuities for all who have served in the armed forces, and also measures to supplement the existing rehabilitation programme.

The maintenance of full employment will require, in the period of transition from war to peace, a rapid and efficient conversion of war industries, the enlargement of markets at home and abroad, intensified research into new uses of our natural resources, programmes of national and regional development, including housing and community planning.

Suitable peace-time uses for war plants are being sought, and plans are being made for their speedy conversion. To assist in the conversion of war plants and in the development of small and medium-scale industrial enterprises, the provision of additional credit facilities, for both fixed and working capital, will be required. To meet this need, your approval will be sought for the establishment of an industrial development bank as a subsidiary of the Bank of Canada. Expenditures on developmental work, in preparation for the transition of industry from war to peace, will be encouraged by suitable tax modifications.

To assist in developing post-war export markets for primary and secondary industries, a measure will be submitted to provide for the insurance or guarantee of export credits, and steps are being taken to expand the trade commissioner service abroad.

Provision will be made to expand research activities.

A measure to amend and supplement existing housing legislation will be introduced.

A considerable measure of social security is already provided under federal and provincial legislation, but the working out of a comprehensive national scheme, in which federal and provincial activities will be integrated and which will include nation-wide health insurance, will require further consultation and close cooperation with the provinces. My ministers will welcome opportunities for such consultation.

When suitable agreements are reached with the provinces, my ministers will be prepared to recommend measures to provide for federal assistance in a nation-wide system of health insurance, and for a national scheme of contributory old age pensions on a more generous basis than that at present in operation.

The family and the home are the foundation of national life. To aid in ensuring a minimum of well-being to the children of the nation and to help gain for them a closer approach to equality of opportunity in the battle of life, you will be asked to approve a measure making provision for family allowances.

My ministers believe that the time is rapidly approaching when a minister of the crown should be responsible for each of the three broad fields of post-war planning. You will accordingly be asked to approve the establishment of the following departments of government:

(1) A Department of Veterans' Affairs to have charge of the rehabilitation and reestablishment of members of the armed forces, and the administration of veterans' pensions and allowances;

(2) A Department of Reconstruction to promote and coordinate planning for national development and post-war employment; and

(3) A Department of Social Welfare to organize and to assist in administering activities of the federal government in the fields of health and social insurance.

Underlying efforts for the winning of the war and the solution of post-war problems is the necessity of preventing the inflationary effects of war. My ministers believe that to prevent inflation and to safeguard a basic standard of living it remains necessary to maintain the price ceiling and stabilization of wages and salaries.

To ensure economic stability for agriculture, you will be asked to make provision for a price floor for staple farm products.

Among other matters to which your attention will be directed will be the revision of the Bank Act, and the provision of adequate facilities for the exercise of the franchise by men and women serving in the armed forces.

Members of the House of Commons:

You will be asked to make financial provision for the effective prosecution of the war and for other necessary services.

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

I express, I know, the thoughts of all Canada when I say with what pride and admiration we have followed the exploits of our armed forces. At sea, on land and in the air, the fighting men of Canada, wherever they have served, have displayed the highest courage, endurance and skill. I give them your assurance that their lives are more precious to their country than all else, and that it is our supreme aim to ensure their early and victorious return to their homeland.

As I invite your consideration of the very difficult problems which will engage your attention in this momentous year, I pray that Divine Providence may guide and bless your deliberations.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That, until the house otherwise orders, the speech of His Excellency the Governor General to both houses of parliament be taken into consideration on Friday next, and that this order have precedence over all other business, except the introduction of bills, government notices of motions and government orders, until disposed of.

Motion agreed to.

STANDING COMMITTEES

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That a special committee be appointed to prepare and report, with all convenient speed, lists of members to compose standing committees of this house under standing order 63, said committee to be composed of Messrs. Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre), Michaud, Casselman (Grenville-Dundas), MacInnis, Taylor.

Motion agreed to.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) presented the following message from His Excellency the Governor General:

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons a certified copy of an approved minute of council appointing the Honourable T. A. Crerar, Minister of Mines and Resources, the Honourable J. L. Ilsley, Minister of Finance, the Honourable J. E. Michaud, Minister of Transport and the Honourable J. A. MacKinnon, Minister of Trade and Commerce, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons as commissioners for the purposes and under the provisions of chapter 145 of the revised statutes of Canada, 1927, intituled: An Act Respecting the House of Commons.

DEPUTY SERGEANT-AT-ARMS

Report of civil service commission respecting the appointment of Mr. John Laundy as deputy sergeant-at-arms.—Mr. Speaker.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the house adjourned at 4.22 p.m.

Friday, January 28, 1944

The house met at three o'clock.

PRISONERS OF WAR

TREATMENT BY JAPANESE—POSITION OF CANADIANS IN JAPAN AND JAPANESE NATIONALS IN CANADA

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, hon. members of the house will have read in the morning papers the reports officially issued by the office of war information at Washington of the suffering of those brave members of the United States forces who fell into Japanese hands at the end of a heroic resistance at Bataan and Corregidor. The evidence of Japanese brutality and organized sadism is so horrible and overwhelming as to be almost incredible.

Reports of Japanese maltreatment of prisoners of war in Malaya, Siam and Burma are not so complete, but are sufficient to indicate that there were, in those areas, similar brutalities and cruelties. In the British House of Commons this morning the Foreign Secretary told of the sufferings in those areas of British, Australian, Indian and Chinese prisoners of war. He also told the shocking story of the *Lisbon Maru*, a Japanese transport carrying United Kingdom prisoners of war from Hong Kong, which was torpedoed by an allied submarine. The Japanese held the prisoners, some of them wounded, under battened hatches, until the ship sank some thirty-six hours later. When some of the prisoners made their escape from the ship, they were fired upon in the water by the Japanese escort vessels.

In their distress at these shocking revelations I extend to the people of the United States, Britain, Australia, the Netherlands, India and China the sympathy of this house, and the sympathy of the people of Canada. We share to the full their feelings of pain and indignation.

In existing circumstances, hon. members will be particularly concerned to know of conditions affecting Canadian prisoners of war in the far east.

The government has naturally been gravely concerned over reports of conditions among prisoners of war in Japanese hands. Every effort has been made to secure information, and every possible method of improving conditions has been explored. In collaboration with the other commonwealth governments, official protests have repeatedly been made through the protecting power. The Japanese have ignored these protests, or made hypocritical or cynical replies.

According to latest reports, about one thousand Canadian prisoners of war have been transferred from Hong Kong to Japan; between five and six hundred remain in Hong Kong. It would seem that the prisoners at Hong Kong are not suffering nearly so much from ill-treatment and abuse as from neglect. They are suffering from the failure of the Japanese government to provide adequate clothing, food and medical care.

As yet, no reports have been received about the camps in Japan to which the Canadians from Hong Kong have been transferred. It is believed that these men are better off than they were in Hong Kong.

The government had hoped that the Japanese would be influenced by the protests made through the protecting power and the appeals made by the International Red Cross. Pending the results of these representations, it was thought that a public indictment of Japanese behaviour would not help our men in their hands.

The government and the Canadian Red Cross have been doing their utmost to make good the failure of the Japanese, by sending to our men the needed supplies, but the Japanese have largely frustrated our efforts. Some supplies went forward to the far east on the SS. *Gripsholm* in the first exchange of diplomatic officers and civilians in 1942. After loss and pilferage and months of delay, part at least of these supplies reached Hong Kong. But the supplies sent on the *Gripsholm* in 1943—at the time of the second exchange—were carried to Japan. Although weeks have passed, no word has been received that they have yet reached their destination.

A joint effort by the governments and Red Cross societies of Canada and the United States to send a shipload of supplies also failed because of the refusal of the Japanese to grant a safe conduct to the vessel which had already been loaded with supplies.

Negotiations with the Japanese government through the protecting power and the International Red Cross resulted in arrangements for the shipment of supplies to Vladivostok, thence to be transhipped to Japanese territory. The first shipment sent by the Red Cross societies of Canada and the United States reached Vladivostok months ago. Despite the previous negotiations, and despite the need of the prisoners of war for whom these supplies were destined, they remain in Vladivostok.

The Japanese also have done little to assist and much to obstruct the forwarding of mail to and from prisoners of war. The few letters which have been delivered have taken long months to reach the prisoners. Recently the Japanese placed a limit of twenty-five words on letters to and from prisoners of war.

The Japanese have been equally neglectful of their obligation to transmit reports through the protecting power and the International Red Cross. Reports of deaths of prisoners of war have been transmitted only after long delay. Reports of transfers of Canadian prisoners of war from Hong Kong to Japan are still incomplete.

All of this is in marked contrast with the treatment which Japanese nationals have received in Canada.

It is the duty of a belligerent to permit representatives of the protecting power and the International Red Cross regularly to visit prisoner of war camps. The Japanese have permitted some such visits to certain camps in Japan, but so far only one visit by a representative of the protecting power has been permitted at Hong Kong. After long delay, the International Red Cross was permitted to name a representative there, but so far we have not seen evidence that he is being allowed to carry out fully the usual functions of a delegate of the International Red Cross.

Although not a signatory to the convention relative to the treatment of prisoners of war signed at Geneva July 27, 1929, nor to the earlier conventions, the Japanese government at the commencement of hostilities, gave an undertaking to abide by their provisions. Japan has failed to live up to this undertaking.

Whether the Japanese government in Tokyo is unable, or unwilling to induce the military authorities outside Japan to act like human beings, the responsibility for inhuman treatment of prisoners rests none the less at Tokyo. This guilt will not be forgotten.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Prime Minister complete the record which he has read by naming the protecting power and indicating what steps that protecting power is taking with respect to the matters he has mentioned?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The protecting power is Switzerland. It would be a little difficult for me to indicate offhand the steps they are taking. There is a regular procedure adopted in these matters. The Swiss, being neutral, seek through negotiations with the government of Japan to have their authorized agents or representatives given free access to camps in which Canadian prisoners of war are detained. The degree of success their representatives may have depends upon how far the government concerned is willing to comply with the terms of conventions on the treatment of prisoners of war and do what is right in the matter.

Mr. GRAYDON: I suppose the diplomatic agents and the International Red Cross work in cooperation.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Oh, very closely.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

ROOMS AND SEATING ACCOMMODATION FOR NEW MEMBERS

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): I did not want to interrupt the proceedings when the Prime Minister was about to make a statement, but I rise on a point of privilege to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, and to that of the house, the situation which exists with regard to new members. In our party we have two new members, and neither of them has been allotted a room or a seat. That has been the experience we have had in previous sessions. There are in this house now, surely, a number of vacant rooms which were previously occupied by supporters of the government, and seats in the chamber which were occupied by supporters of the government. It seems to me the time has come when a reallotment of seats and rooms should be made, in order that new members may be properly and adequately accommodated, as I think is their just due. I bring this to your attention, sir, because I have taken the matter up with responsible officials and others ever since last October in the hope that this would be done before new members arrived for the present session.

Mr. SPEAKER: The difficulty to which the hon. member refers is not wholly attributable to anyone's fault, but rather arises out of the fact that we have a number of groups in the house and it is difficult so to redistribute rooms as to meet the convenience of all hon. members. The matter is a subject for discussion and consideration by the whips of the house. I can assure the hon. gentleman that if the whips consult with me I shall endeavour to cooperate with them, but I must also ask that there be cooperation from all sides of the house in the allotment of rooms.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I suggest that if there are to be applications for new rooms, we of this party might put in an application for a hundred and fifty or so after the next election.

POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

REPORTS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEES

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I desire to table the report of the advisory committee on reconstruction, and reports of five subcommittees: first, agricultural policy; second, conservation and development of natural resources; third, publicly financed construction projects; fourth, post-war employment opportunities; and fifth, post-war problems of women.

CENSORSHIP

PRESS AND RADIO—REQUEST FOR MAKING DIRECTIVES PUBLIC

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Hon. members will recall that at the last session a request was made for making public the directives regarding censorship of the press and the radio. I stated at the time that the government would have no objection to making public such of these directives as might not be prejudicial to the public interest. I now table these particular documents.

Mr. GRAYDON: Has the government found it in the public interest to make public many of them?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is, I believe, in the public interest to have these directives made public.

CRIMINAL CODE

EXECUTION OF DEATH SENTENCES—DEFENCE OF CANADA REGULATIONS

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Minister of Justice): I beg to lay on the table the order of His Excellency the Governor General in Council under section 1075 of the criminal code, dealing with the execution of death sentences, and also the report in pursuance of the provisions of paragraph 3 of the defence of

Canada regulations. No person has been detained under these regulations during the period from July 1, 1943, to January 25, 1944, and there has been no case in which the Secretary of State has refused to accept the report of the advisory committee.

ELDORADO MINING

ACQUISITION OF PROPERTIES AND ASSETS BY EXPROPRIATION OF CAPITAL SHARES

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): I wish to table order in council P.C. 535 of January 27, 1944, and before doing so I will make the following statement.

As a necessary means for the more effective prosecution of the war, the government of Canada has acquired all properties and assets of Eldorado Mining and Refining Limited, by expropriating all the capital shares of the company. Expropriation of the shares became effective as of three o'clock this afternoon.

Eldorado Mining and Refining Limited will in future be operated as a crown company, and will continue to carry on its present operations. The president, the directors and officers of Eldorado Mining and Refining Limited have been invited to continue to act in their present capacities, and have agreed to do so. There will be no change in existing arrangements affecting the employees of the company.

The directors of the company have agreed with the government that a fair value for the properties and assets of the company is represented by a price of $1.35 per share, and the directors and a number of other large shareholders have delivered their shares to the government at that price. The same share value is being offered to all shareholders of the company, and will be paid on delivery of the shares, properly endorsed, to the registrar and transfer agent, the Trusts and Guarantee Company Limited, Toronto.

I regret that for reasons of secrecy I am unable to give the house any further information on this subject. In the interests of military secrecy I hope that no questions about this matter will be asked until the necessity for withholding information no longer applies. I now table order in council P.C. 535 which effects the expropriation of all the capital shares of the company.

PRIME MINISTERS' CONFERENCE

INQUIRY AS TO PLANS FOR PROJECTED MEETING IN LONDON

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to make an inquiry of the Prime Minister, of which I have given him notice. Have plans for the projected meeting of the dominion prime ministers now been completed, and if so, can he indicate to the house the approximate date of the meeting?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): In addition to the dominion prime ministers I hope the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom will attend.

Mr. GRAYDON: I was taking my phraseology, as a matter of fact, from the statement which as I recollect it, appeared in the Regina *Leader-Post*, and which was given by the Prime Minister of Canada.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am afraid my hon. friend is seeking to excuse himself.

Mr. GRAYDON: I was trying to excuse the right hon. gentleman at the same time.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say to my hon. friend I have no more information which I am in a position to make public as to the time than what has appeared thus far in the press. The announcement made in the British House of Commons was, as I recall it, to the effect that the conference would be held some time before very long, but that there were reasons why it was not advisable to name the precise date. As a matter of fact the actual date has not yet been definitely decided.

Mr. GRAYDON: The Prime Minister intends to attend?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I hope so; yes. I have every intention of attending, unless prevented.

RADIO BROADCASTING

VACANCIES ON BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask a question of the Minister of National War Services? I understand that for almost three months there have been two vacancies on the board of governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. I should like to inquire of the minister why these vacancies have not been filled before this time, and also when we may expect an announcement with respect to the new appointees.

Hon. L. R. LaFLECHE (Minister of National War Services): May I first express my appreciation to the leader of the opposition for his having sent me notice of his question.

The question of filling the vacancies referred to has been before us for some time. It has been under very careful review. I had hoped to be in a position to make an announcement at the beginning of this session of parliament. May I say I hope to be able to do so within a very short time.

Mr. GRAYDON: I hope the minister will not forget the farmers, who have a claim in that respect—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. GRAYDON: Surely I may be allowed to interject—

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): This is a speech.

Mr. GRAYDON: I am not trying to make a speech, but I should like to complete what I had to say, just in a sentence; that is, with a reference to the farmers and also the newspapermen, who were mentioned the other day by the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker).

LABOUR CONDITIONS

REQUEST FOR OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS ORDER IN COUNCIL P.C. 9384

On the orders of the day:

Mr. S. H. KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): In view of the widespread and active protests by organized labour against the new war-time wages control order, P.C. 9384, will the Prime Minister consider setting aside a time for discussion of this order by this house, at an early day?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): It seemed to me that the first part of my hon. friend's question was an assertion of something which he alleged to be the case, but I am not sure that he is right in his allegation. As to the second part, the business of the session will have to be carried on in accordance with the regular procedure. All I can say at the moment is that each question will be brought forward for consideration at a time which seems the most appropriate to bring it forward.

CHILDREN'S UNDERWEAR

INQUIRY AS TO STEPS TAKEN TO INCREASE AVAILABLE SUPPLIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. K. FRASER (Peterborough West): I wrote the Minister of Finance in regard to this matter prior to the press release of November 11, 1943. What is being done at the present time in regard to speeding up the production of children's underwear? I ask this question because the hospitals are unable to get sizes one and two in children's underclothing and as a result have to cut down on the larger sizes available.

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): If the hon. gentleman wrote me about the matter, as he says, and as I have no doubt he did, I am sure I must have given him a full reply, and I shall write him again and bring the story down to date. Most careful efforts have been made, and very effectively, to increase the production of children's underwear. My recollection is that this production is considerably greater this year than it was in previous years, but I will confirm that fact.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): We must also remember that there have been more births during the past year, which has helped to aggravate the shortage.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

ADDRESS IN REPLY, MOVED BY MR. L. D. TREMBLAY AND SECONDED BY MR. W. A. TUCKER

The house proceeded to the consideration of the speech delivered by His Excellency the Governor General at the opening of the session.

Mr. L. D. TREMBLAY (Dorchester) moved:

That the following address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General of Canada:

To His Excellency Major-General the Right Honourable the Earl of Athlone, Knight of the Most Noble Order of the Garter, a member of His Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, Knight Grand Cross of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath, Grand Master of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, Knight Grand Cross of the Royal Victorian Order, Companion of the Distinguished Service Order, one of His Majesty's Personal Aides-de-Camp, Governor General and Commander-in-Chief of the Dominion of Canada.

May it Please Your Excellency:

We, His Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the House of Commons of Canada, in parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Excellency for the gracious speech which Your Excellency has addressed to both houses of parliament.

He said: (Translation): Mr. Speaker, if I have accepted with much pleasure the signal honour of moving the address in reply to the speech from the throne—a motion which the brilliant and genial member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker) has been called upon to second—it is because I knew that the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) with his characteristic tact, wished, in honouring the constituency of Dorchester, to include in that

tribute the worthy farming community of Canada whose members are so nobly doing their duty in this war. Our farmers—and I am rightly proud to single out those from Dorchester—have been quick to see where their duty lay, and in spite of the man-power shortage, in a conspicuous spirit of Canadian fellowship, they have achieved a general effort, by which our armies, our people and our allies have greatly benefited.

The right hon. the Prime Minister also wished to pay a sincere tribute to the Canadian army. Our young men and women, the sons and daughters of my former comrades who, true to noble traditions, are serving in this country or have gone to other lands in order to raise the bulwark of their gallantry against the onslaughts of barbarians who wanted to enslave the sons of freedom, are now adding a glorious page to our matchless history. To them Canada offers the tribute of her deepest admiration and her unfailing gratitude.

For more than three years, that is since I returned to the active army—for the second time in a quarter of a century—I have not been able to follow as steadily as I should have liked the debates of this house, nor the legislation which it has passed, but it is none the less true that I have constantly kept in touch with the worthy people whom I have the honour to represent here, and that my presence in the army has moreover enabled me to appreciate the spirit of the gallant youths who wear the uniform and so patriotically do their duty in the Canadian army.

In the present tragic times, an insight into the Canadian nation's sentiments makes us very proud of being Canadians. Indeed, among all the nations of the world, is there a single one which could, without feeling very proud of the fact, accomplish all that our young and valiant country, because of its perfect unity of purpose, has been able to contribute in the struggle of Christian civilization against nazi paganism? The incessant appeals to national unity made by our government leader have made it possible for our dear country to play a glorious part in the present world conflict and have assured universal admiration for us and the gratefulness of civilized nations to Canada, and I am firmly convinced that they will also have the effect of placing our country forever in the rank it deserves as a proud, young, valiant, gallant and freedom-loving country, among the free nations of the world.

The speech from the throne contains nothing that would be of a nature to repress such feelings on our part. Indeed, the legislative measures forecast inspire us with a brand of optimism that brings us real comfort in these times fraught with severe disturbances when apprehension reigns over too many sections of the country.

The realization of the fact that post-war problems engage and hold the attention of the government is really comforting.

Putting their sorry past experiences to account, and without forgetting that the primary objective must remain the indefatigable prosecution of the war to a victorious conclusion, the governments of the united nations have combined their efforts with a view to finding an immediate solution to the grave problems that offered such a tremendous challenge in the years that followed the first great war. The speech from the throne reveals, on the part of the Canadian government, a clear intention of facing these problems as well as a strong determination of finding an adequate solution.

It is not my intention to delve into all the points raised in the speech from the throne, but I propose to give special attention to some of the extremely important measures suggested in order to avoid such difficulties as have jeopardized social peace in the years subsequent to the first world conflict.

To win a war at the price of the supreme sacrifice and then lose the benefits of a just peace that should logically follow victory, would be, in my estimation, a catastrophe of the same magnitude as war itself. Our young men and women, the flower of our youth, who have sacrificed everything in order that their country be spared the horrors of war and may continue to enjoy happiness and freedom in order that we all be free to think, to speak, to pray, to worship God who has created us to His image and likeness; these young people, I repeat, these heroes, have a right to expect that on the glorious day of their return, they will not be condemned to destitution. Indeed, our government—and the Canadian people will be thankful to them for it—announces in the speech from the throne, measures that will be adequate to prevent such a condition.

(Text): On returning to this country in 1918, the veterans of the last war had to face conditions altogether different. Everything had not been foreseen as it has been to-day; and it is fitting at the present time to pay tribute to those gallant heroes of 1914-18 who so nobly exalted Canada and paraded the standards of their victorious regiments in foreign countries. By using persuasion, and at times even coercion, the veterans won or wrested from successive governments one concession after another, securing, one point at a time, recognition of the reestablishment programme they had mapped

out for themselves. True, perhaps this programme was never completely put into effect, but they did succeed in securing legislation at least as favourable as that adopted in any other country, or as that recorded in the statutes of any country totally unprepared to solve the problems raised by the return of such a large number of military men to civilian life.

If some old grumblers have at times felt an aching bitterness in their proud, great souls, they none the less at the outbreak of the present struggle spontaneously offered to serve once again their native land. And to-day we see them in the ranks of the veterans' guard, and on active service in England and in several other posts outside Canada, just as we find those who, declared unfit for overseas service, much against their will have been stationed at vulnerable points in Canada, or, armed with tommy guns or machine guns, keep watch over prisoners of war.

At this point may I be permitted to quote a few verses by Alan Horwood, published recently in the *Legionary*. They are these:

Their faces now are etched with lines of care;
The hoar-frost of the years is in their hair;
But sagging shoulders stiffen in salute
As youth swings by; but in their eyes the mute
And hopeless longing for the days when they
Marched to the bugles of another day.
They say that the old soldier never dies;
And that is true; till under sod he lies,
His martial spirit flames on undiminished
Till death blots out the light, and all is finished.
They did not shrink from duty when once more
Dark war clouds loomed, more deadly than before;
They vied with youth, eager to do their share
Of service, here, abroad, or anywhere.
And those the years had touched with gentleness,
Are serving with the troops in battle dress;
Holding the line, until to son and sire
Victorious bugles sound the call "cease fire."

To all my dear old comrades of the Veterans Guard of Canada, and particularly to that distinguished gentleman, Colonel H. R. Alley, worthy commander of the guard, may I at this moment pay the heart-felt tribute of my deepest admiration.

(Translation): Reverting to the speech from the throne, which is the subject matter of this motion, I desire, Mr. Speaker, to offer my heartfelt congratulations to the government for the outstanding place they have given to social legislation. They seem to have left no field unexplored. I wish to quote part of the speech from the throne:

Post-war planning falls naturally into three broad fields: preparation for the demobilization, rehabilitation and reestablishment in civil life of the men and women in the armed forces; the reconversion of the economic life of the nation from a war-time to a peace-time basis, and its reconstruction in a manner which will provide opportunities for useful employment for all who are willing and able to work; and the provision of insurance against major economic and social hazards.

A broad programme has already been developed for the reestablishment of veterans of the present war, and for the care of disabled veterans and the dependents of our fighting men and merchant seamen. You will be asked to approve a measure to provide war service gratuities for all who have served in the armed forces, and also measures to supplement the existing rehabilitation programme.

It is also foreseen by the government that if the country is to be spared another period of unemployment, those industries which now produce solely for war purposes will, immediately after the cessation of hostilities, have to be rapidly converted into peace-time industries. In order that this task may be made easier for the smaller industries, and so that the latter may not become an easy prey for greedy financiers and monopolistic interests, the government has the wisdom to provide for the establishment of an organization that will be a kind of subsidiary to the Bank of Canada, and through which the smaller industries will obtain financial assistance for converting their plants to peace-time production, which will enable them to keep on their payroll the workers they needed during the war.

May I be permitted, Mr. Speaker, to voice a personal belief? Although a staunch supporter of individual freedom and private enterprise, I loathe the economic liberalism which, under the fallacious pretext of giving free rein to private enterprise, opens the door to every kind of abuse. Economic liberalism is essentially based on a laisser faire policy, not on private enterprise. This economic liberalism enables monopolistic interests to build up their economic empire through the elimination of their legitimate competitors by corrupt practices, blackmail and brute force. The devotees of that liberalism, which is not to be confused with political liberalism, are precisely from that school of thought which proclaims that "might is right"; they belong to that section which, twice in less than a quarter of a century, has plunged the entire world into the dreadful abyss of war with all its disastrous consequences. Economic liberalism is, in the last analysis, the worst negation of individual freedom and private enterprise. It is the very opposite of Canadian political liberalism. Did not Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in a lecture on political liberalism which he delivered in Quebec city in 1871, state that:

The rights of every man, in our society, end precisely when they infringe on the rights of others.

That is one of the undying principles of Canadian liberalism, and the most outstanding disciple of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the right honourable the present Prime Minister, was not unmindful of it, in announcing measures that will safeguard the freedom of the weak against the usurpations of the powerful and the strong.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit that if the public powers are to check the greed of monopolistic interests, they must not themselves take over legitimate concerns.

As a matter of fact while rejecting economic liberalism, I am just as much opposed to those socialistic theoreticians who would establish a new order by a process of general levelling. Adopting the erroneous views of one theory would not cure the evils of the other. There is a group here advocating socialistic utopias. They affirm, in their conferences and conventions "that agricultural lands are and should remain national property" (Annual Conference of the British Labour Party, May, 1942). They proclaim that the Canadian farmer who, in his earliest youth, has courageously hewn his farm out of the virgin forest, is not entitled to leave it to his sons when, aged by prolonged and strenuous labour and feeling the weight of years, he has not enough strength left to pursue his appointed task (Excerpt from a statement of policy of the C.C.F., at Saskatoon, July 26, 1934).

They still further state, to hide their true designs, "that they do not intend to proceed to a general expropriation of farm lands already settled" adding that "not a single parcel of land will be granted to a private owner when they are in power." God grant that this may never come to pass! (Excerpt from the text book of the C.C.F. "Social Planning for Canada," page 259.)

Let them compete to their hearts' content in exaggerating the failure of economic liberalism and endeavour to drag our citizens on the still more slippery and more dangerous slopes of socialism, which inevitably lead to communism and bolshevism; it is all in vain, and I may state to the house and to the whole of Canada that the noisy and impassioned appeals of the Canadian socialist group will never influence the beautiful and sound type of Canadian, the farmer of Dorchester, the habitant of Quebec.

If the right honourable the present Prime Minister has always enjoyed and still enjoys the support of old Quebec, it is because such qualities as fairness, broadmindedness, moderation, tolerance and Canadianism of the purest vintage, which are among his characteristics, are equally possessed by the people of the province of Quebec. All Canadians, after four years of war under the King government, have every reason to know that their affairs are well looked after. The many beneficial measures alluded to in the speech from the throne will receive, from the various sections of the country, the enthusiastic approval they deserve, for their adequateness is understood by all and they fulfill the wishes of our people.

It is my privilege, in this house, to represent a typically Canadian constituency. Indeed, Dorchester in inhabited by the four nationalities that have, more than any, contributed to the formation of the Canadian people. In our hearts, Canadians of English, Scottish, Irish and French descent live as neighbours, esteem one another, fraternize together and, who would believe it, go so far as to love one another and set up happy homes. They are all true Canadians. Even though they retain, as they should, the strong ties that bind them to their country of origin, none the less, they are bound by all the fibres of their soul to Canada, which occupies, indubitably and irrevocably, the first place in their affections.

I am proud to proclaim that racial prejudice is not to be found in Dorchester, where every one entertains for his neighbours the consideration and esteem due to his fellow-citizens. The great majority of my constituents are farmers, the most peace-loving of citizens, who cherish their land, families, church and country. They work hard from morning till night and, since Canada has called her sons to the defence of their homes and families, they have increased their efforts to fill the growing demands for their crops. Many of their sons and daughters have answered the call to arms, and, unfortunately, a number of them will never see their homes again; those who remain labour and pray, hoping for the day of victory. We may well call them "Our own good people."

These excellent folk, Mr. Speaker, ask no privileges and hope for no favours. All they require and expect from their government is fair consideration and the share that legitimately belongs to them. They are glad to notice that once again, the present government has shown its interest in the farmers by introducing legislation to guarantee that they will enjoy fair prices for their products after the war.

During the present war, the government has very wisely established a price control organization to fix on certain products, a ceiling which could not be exceeded under severe penalties. Such a control was evidently necessary to avoid inflation. The farmer has not complained but has willingly submitted to

these restrictions adopted in the general interest. When he has protested—I have strongly criticized myself, in certain cases—it was because some over-zealous or stupid official had not made any allowances for special circumstances.

However, it is comforting to know that to-day, the government guarantees that prices now paid for agricultural products will be maintained for a certain period even after the end of the war.

Another fact which the Canadian people will not fail to appreciate fully is connected with family allowances. The speech from the throne states as follows:

The family and the home are the foundation of national life. To aid in ensuring a minimum of well-being to the children of the nation and to help gain for them a closer approach to equality of opportunity in the battle of life, you will be asked to approve a measure making provision for family allowances.

It is said in the speech that the family is the foundation of national life. That is a truism which unfortunately has not always been reflected in legislation, but it is a principle which, if applied to our national life, will give the very best results, provided the needs of the whole nation are taken into account.

The value of a nation lies, indeed, in the sum of individual values of which it is composed; accordingly, it is of prime importance for the whole nation that in each family every child should enjoy a minimum of comfort, medical care and educational facilities so that he may develop fully and become an asset for the nation. During the present war, army physicians have ascertained beyond any doubt that the number of young men physically unfit for military service is much greater among the poorer working classes than among well to do families.

Family allowances and social insurance will remedy a social inequality which has especially affected the children from destitute families, and they will afford to those children, toward whom fate has not been generous, the means necessary for their physical and moral development. Such a legislation derives from the very best Christian principles and it is worthy of the man who can rightly be called the main initiator of social legislation in Canada.

On October 9, 1942, the man to whom I have just referred, that is to say the right hon. the Prime Minister himself, made the following statement in a speech delivered at the congress of the American Federation of Labor:

(Text): Before the war, we talked about the conservation of natural resources. Unhappily, we heard much less about the conservation of human resources—the lives and health and happiness of men and women and children. To-day, our aim is total mobilization of resources and of man-power for the waging of total war. When the war is over, we must seek, above all else, to use our natural and material resources to conserve human resources—to promote the health and happiness of all the people. Our resources of land, of sea, of forest, and of mine, were given to man by the Creator for the preservation, and not for the destruction of life. The people of no country can be made happy, contented, and prosperous except by safeguarding the lives and welfare of the many, and by protecting from injustice and misfortune the homes of the humble in the land.

(Translation): Mr. Speaker, humanity ranks foremost among all the qualities of the right hon. Prime Minister, and in thanking him for his social legislation, I have no hesitation in saying: In this respect Canada will forever be grateful to you!

In the fine reports presented by the committee on reconstruction, it is suggested that the benefits granted the farmers of the western provinces by the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act be extended to the farming classes throughout Canada. Such legislation would materially benefit our farming population and I dare hope that the government will see fit to implement this recommendation of the committee. I have in mind particularly those farmers whose swamp lands would require drainage and those whose farms are eroded or flooded by the rising waters in the spring or during the rainy seasons. I have in mind all those farmers who wish to improve their farms but who, unfortunately, are not in a financial condition to bear personally the cost of such improvements.

In the province of Quebec, the Gobout government is bravely and efficiently fighting the electricity trust, and we hope that as soon as the war is ended the rural areas will be electrified. I would ask the federal government to give this question of major importance to our farmers their immediate consideration and to co-operate fully with the provinces, for electricity in all rural regions would above all else benefit our rural classes and bring them comfort and happiness.

Among the suggestions not mentioned in the speech from the throne but which many figures in the business world have taken upon themselves to present to the Canadian public in speaking on the post-war period, there is one to which I should particularly like to call attention: I refer to the matter of mass immigration which is already advocated in some circles. Fortunately, our present government does not seem to consider at all seriously the exaggerated claims made by those wholesale removers; I should like to congratulate the

hon. Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Crerar) who wasted no time in denying the rumour which a clamorous politician, well-known in the province of Quebec, circulated a few months ago with a great deal of publicity, in the constituency of Dorchester, if you please! The attitude adopted by the immigration branch in its last annual report which was tabled in the house to-day still seems to me the only one that is reasonable and logical:

> It is recognized everywhere that Canada must first of all look after the reestablishment of the members of her armed forces and their families, and at the same time direct Canadian war industries towards peace-time enterprises. Only after the war shall we be able to understand the full import of this task.

Further on, I find the following:

> Canada should not make the mistake of giving preference to transportation over settlement, mistake which has occurred in the past. Some people think that at the very moment, it is possible to draw up plans which would even include figures; others believe that only time and the economic development of the country will solve this problem.

Without the shadow of a doubt, I belong to the latter class, and I say that until the time when we have reinstated our fighting men in civilian life and found for each one of them some remunerative and useful employment, it ill becomes these transportation magnates to speak to us of immigration.

Mr. Speaker, another figure, and a very eminent one in all respects, has recently made some untimely declarations which caused a great deal of press comment and gossip in general. Indeed! I am no great statesman, and still less of a diplomat, but like all my fellow-citizens, I love my country, I am proud of its history and I dream of a wonderful future for it. I want Canada to be great, I want her beautiful, I want her strong and vigorous, I want her prosperous, and I want her always to be united. She has developed scores of remarkable men, heroes and saints. Divine Providence has always willed that at the very heart of our nation there should be statesmen, leaders, able to guide the country towards its most glorious destiny, and long may it be so!

Why, then, must distinguished personages, hailing from across the Atlantic, come to us from time to time and with look inspired and an air of mystery, shower upon us instructions which we shall term indiscreet to say the least? The latest edition of these mysterious travellers is attempting, it seems, to refloat the foundered ship of the Imperial Federation.

If such is the case—but I will have you note, Mr. Speaker, that I am no prophet, that my eye is not veiled in mystery and that I am not actuated by mystical inspiration—but if such is the case, may I, speaking simply as a Canadian, tell this distinguished but indiscreet gentleman that in the year of grace 1944, just as in 1897 and in 1902, that to-day as in the time of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, "this sugar-coated pill portends nothing good." And I trust that, just as the Canadianism of Laurier triumphed over the Imperialism of Chamberlain, so to-day that of King will outwit the intrigues of Halifax.

Mr. W. A. TUCKER (Rosthern): Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the motion which has just been moved so ably and eloquently by the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Tremblay). To be asked to move this motion I have always considered a great honour and privilege. It is doubly so on this occasion, moved as it was, by a very dear old friend and comrade in arms.

I should like at the outset to express to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) my thanks for the honour he has done to the constituency of Rosthern in asking me to second this motion. The federal riding of Rosthern is a new constituency, set up in 1933 from four former constituencies, and has been represented in this house by many distinguished men. However, the part in which I live enjoys what is probably a unique distinction, in that it has been privileged to elect to this house two prime ministers. It started out in 1896, as part of the old constituency of Saskatchewan, by electing the great leader of the Liberal party, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and in 1926 it elected to this house the present Prime Minister. If I could leave out of account, Mr. Speaker, the present member, I would say that my friends and neighbours of Rosthern certainly know how to pick their representatives.

(Translation): From my earliest youth, I have learned to admire the beloved figure of one of our greatest statesmen, Sir Wilfrid Laurier. When I became a member of this house, I soon realized and felt that among my good friends were to be found many of my French speaking colleagues, and in particular the honourable and distinguished member who has just moved the motion of which I am the seconder. For many years I sat in this house with the late Right Honourable Mr. Lapointe, and I acquired the conviction that he was a very distinguished leader and a great Canadian. I have also learned about the large share which the French speaking Canadians have had in the development of our Canada. I mean the valiant pioneers who came and built their homes in the loneliness of the forests, the brave missionaries who risked death and tor-

ture so as to teach Christianity to the Indians, the courageous French-Canadians who repulsed the invaders during the American revolution and during the war of 1812, thus proving on two different occasions their loyalty to Canada and to their king. I refer also to my gallant French speaking comrades of the Great War, and of the present war, and to the loyal cooperation of French Canada since the outset of the hostilities. With all these things in mind, as an English speaking Canadian, I wish to pay a humble tribute of respect and admiration to my French speaking compatriots for the part they have taken in building the great and powerful nation that Canada is today.

(Text): I am very proud to have the honour to represent in this house the constituency of Rosthern. Like the hon. member for Dorchester, I can say mine is a truly Canadian seat. Within it there are many people of non-English speaking origin. In the dark days of 1940 I said this about those constituents of mine of non-English origin, as reported in Hansard of June 13, page 762:

I should not be doing my duty to my fellow-citizens of non-English-speaking origin, many of whom to-day are in the armed forces of our sovereign—in the first division, for example, there are probably more boys of Ukrainian origin than their proportion of the population of Canada—if I did not tell my fellow members that from an intimate knowledge of thousands of people of non-English-speaking origin I know they are just as loyal to Canada and our empire as the members of this house of commons. It is our duty to let them know that we trust them, and together we will then go forward as a united people regardless of racial origin and place the name of Canada high on the roll of the nations of the world where tolerance is preached and practised.

The truth of this statement has been well borne out by the record of service of the people from my constituency. I would just call to mind the casualty lists which have appeared from time to time and the record of those decorated for bravery. The first two boys decorated from the little town of Rosthern, where I live, were respectively of French-Irish origin and of Mennonite origin. In regard to the people at large, in the last victory loan the quota set for the district surrounding the little town of Rosthern was $62,000; the amount subscribed was $81,650, or 131 per cent of the objective.

I realize that above all else the request that I second this motion to-day is intended as a tribute to the armed forces, of which I am again privileged to be a member in this war as in the last. Speaking of their efforts in this war, as a member of the Canadian corps I feel I cannot pay them a higher tribute than to say that they are worthy successors of that grand fighting body which distinguished itself so highly in the first great war.

With regard to the boys serving in the Royal Canadian Air Force, I do not think I can pay them a higher tribute than to say that they too have shown themselves to be worthy successors of those who wrote the name of Canada high in the list of nations by their contribution in the last war.

As regards the Royal Canadian Navy, I think they would feel that I could pay them no higher tribute than to say that by their contribution, by their sacrifices in this war, they also have proved themselves worthy upholders of the great traditions which have been built up by the British navy under such leaders as Drake and Nelson.

I believe that the story told by Ralph Allan, war correspondent, in last Saturday's Winnipeg *Tribune*, about a young soldier from western Canada, is worth telling as indicative of the kind of young fellow we have right in our armed forces to-day. Here is what the correspondent said:

I am thinking now of a little battle in which fifteen kids from this part of the country attacked a company of Germans. They got into trouble but they kept going. Eight of them got back, seven didn't. The story of one of them I remember particularly well. He was covering his section with a Bren gun and a German bullet smashed his foot. Badly hurt, weak, dazed with pain, he left his gun and crawled painfully over the battlefield to a ridge that gave him cover. He was safe now. He would live; a minute before he had been going to die.

And then the youngster lifted his head a little and listened to the dreadful sounds of battle a hundred yards ahead. He didn't have to see to know that on the fire-swept slope from which he had found sanctuary his pals were fighting against terrible odds. The kid looked back over the valley that beckoned to life.

Then, painfully he crawled the other way, to where he had come from before. He found his Bren again and sprawled out behind it with his broken foot and started shooting. He stayed with the gun, shooting, until he was killed.

Reading of such an exploit, we long to find words to express our admiration, our unfathomable gratitude, our boundless affection and our sympathy for the loved ones that are bereaved. Words seem to me to be totally inadequate, and in this connection I thought of Lincoln's Gettysburg address, in which he said:

We cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men living and dead who struggled here have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. It is for us the living rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here

dedicated to the great task remaining before us that 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.

In order to carry forward the work which our own boys are making possible, I think we should try to know the cause for which our Canadian fighting men are giving their last full measure of devotion and which we who send them there must never allow to fail. First and foremost, I think, is the safety of their homes, their loved ones and their country. If this war is not won, so that that safety shall be secured, their sacrifice will have been indeed in vain.

As pointed out in the speech from the throne, this war is not yet won. Tremendous exertions and sacrifices may yet have to be made before it is. If our enemies discern the slightest weakening in support of the war, or in determination or unity on our part, they will undoubtedly be encouraged to hold out, and more precious lives will be lost. Nothing should go forth from this country, either from this house or out of it, either in word or in deed, which might in any way encourage our enemies and endanger a single Canadian life. I most earnestly commend the government for bearing this in mind in putting the first emphasis on the winning of the war, and for the measures brought forward in the speech from the throne for utilizing all our energies to that end.

The greater our superiority in material equipment, in planes, in tanks, in guns, the less will be the loss of life. To those who are concerning themselves solely with after-the-war plans, I say this. Such plans are worth nothing unless enough fighting men in the united nations are willing to risk and, if necessary, to give their lives in order to defeat the nazis and the Japs.

How much would the nazis and the Japs care for, or how long would they tolerate, plans to make our people better off, if they got us under their control? The statements of their own leaders, and their actions, regarding which we have just heard something more in this house to-day, show us what we might expect in that regard. Unless we win this war, Mr. Speaker, such plans are no more than a barren intellectual exercise.

What next are our men in the armed services concerned about? I think it is that a lasting peace may be achieved whereby their children may not have again to undergo the horrors of war in order to preserve their very existence. This means that steps must be taken to ensure that an enemy who

threatened our existence twenty-nine years ago, and again threatened it three years ago, shall not be permitted to make a third attempt, thereby plunging the world intc the measureless misery of war. Certainly those who lost loved ones in the last war, and those who have lost loved ones in this war, will agree with me—and I should hope that everyone else who has been more fortunate will also agree—that certain steps should be taken. First I would suggest this that Germany and Japan must be so treated in this war that it will be utterly impossible for future leaders of such countries again to persuade their peoples that war is a desirable thing.

Secondly, to ensure that those countries do not attempt to take revenge for what has been done in this war to beat them, I suggest that they should be disarmed for all time to come. Arming for the alleged purpose of self-defence ultimately again may mean arming for aggression.

Thirdly, and more important than all, I suggest that some form of world organization should be established that will have not only the will but the power to maintain world peace and prevent further aggression by any other nation in the future.

In this connection I feel that I should say something about the speech that was delivered recently in this country by Lord Halifax. So far as I am personally concerned I feel that we should continue on our course of moving toward complete sovereignty within the British commonwealth of nations; that we endorse wholly the plans of the government to support to the greatest possible extent the establishment of an international organization to maintain world peace. We are, of course, willing and anxious to confer with the other members of the British commonwealth as a sovereign nation in regard to advancing our cause in this war and in regard to protecting world peace thereafter; but if it is to be suggested that we reverse our course and retrace the steps which we began to take seventy-five years ago on our way to complete sovereignty and autonomy within the commonwealth under great leaders like Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Sir Robert Borden and our present Prime Minister, then I say that I do not think such a course is either feasible or desirable. I do not think it is in the best interest of either Canada or the British commonwealth and empire itself.

Recent conferences between great world leaders, and statements emanating therefrom are most encouraging. But the problem of organizing world peace is not going to be an

easy one. That has been shown by the experience of the last war. To try in some way to restore the nations which have tried to defend themselves against aggression to something like their former strength and at the same time not to put absolutely impossible burdens upon the conquered nations will be indeed a very difficult task. I for one suggest that all the nations who will be represented at that conference should send to it their most able, most experienced statesmen and those who have learned to work together in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that our present Prime Minister may be spared in health and strength in his present position to give the benefit of his long experience in the service of mankind as leader of Canada's delegation at the peace conference following the war. There is another reason why I should like to see him there. It has at last come to be recognized that high barriers to world trade are inimical to the best interests of the nations of the world. The Prime Minister has always fought for that principle. He achieved the lowering of tariff barriers when there was not the universal agreement that there is to-day. But to use the fluid period after the war, a period which must be seized on if there is to be any general reduction of world tariffs, will require a man who believes heart and soul in it, and who has had experience in negotiating along those lines if the opportunity is not again to be missed.

I recall that one of President Wilson's fourteen points had to do with the lowering of tariffs, and we know what happened after the peace conference following the last war. Unless every country in the world sends to this peace conference men who believe in the principle of razing tariff barriers, and know how to carry it out, once again the hopes of the world will be frustrated in this regard.

This leads me to a question which is in the minds of many members of the armed forces. What will be their economic condition on their return to civil life? There is common agreement in regard to those who are injured and to their dependents. Everybody agrees that they should be looked after to the extent that they should not suffer on account of having served their country. But what of the man or woman who returns in health and hopes to be reestablished? Everyone knows there is great misgiving on the part of the members of our armed services as to what will happen to them after peace arrives. They are concerned with getting reestablished on a self-supporting basis. I find that there is a lamentable lack of knowledge on the part of members of our armed services of what has already been provided by parliament in regard to looking after them after the war.

Provision is made for those problems being discussed with the men by officers and padres. I happen to be connected with headquarters staff of one training brigade, and the padres tell me that they have not the information as to what the government actually has done in regard to plans already carried into effect. I am told that overseas in England there have been discussions on what Great Britain is doing, but there is very little knowledge of what Canada is doing, and for that reason there is a feeling that nothing is being done.

As a matter of fact a well-known United States publication had this to say about what we have already accomplished:

> There is already in operation, however, one system which is probably the most generous, definite and enlightened yet adopted by any member of the united nations. It is that of our neighbour, Canada. It assumes that every man or woman who returns from the battle front, whether disabled or not, is entitled to careful assistance and guidance back to stability and self-sufficiency.

I urge that full knowledge of what this parliament has done and does should be made available to all members of the armed forces in order that they may have no fear that they can not be reestablished on a self-supporting basis when they return to civil life. I know that the task of reestablishing a million ex-service men and women, and those who have left their jobs to work in war factories, is a tremendous one. There is a feeling that no government can possibly deal with such a task. In regard to that I would say to them that a government which organized the titanic war effort which we have organized can certainly look after that problem when it is not harassed with the problem of carrying on the war. Its willingness to do so is shown first of all by what has already been done, as indicated by the quotation I read from the United States publication, and secondly it is reinforced by what is foreshadowed in the speech from the throne.

Paramount in these plans, I believe, are the provisions for the three new departments, particularly the department in regard to veterans' affairs. I most heartily commend the government for deciding to set up that department. Looking after the veterans who come back wounded or injured is only one part of the problem of rehabilitating the veterans. Setting them up in civil life in order that they may become self-supporting is, after all, most important. War veterans' gratuities are very good. Unemployment relief benefits are very good and are necessary, but, after all, the thing that the service man or woman is worried about is a chance to earn his or her

own living. A separate department should be able to look after that problem much better than if it were spread over several departments. The Veterans' Land Act should be administered in such way that the difficulties that followed the administration of the Soldier Settlement Act will be avoided. The provision to assist veterans in establishing themselves in business, in regard to building their homes or improving their homes, is something that I think will be greeted with a great deal of satisfaction.

The reconverting of our factories from war-time to peace-time uses after the war will be a stupendous task. It is important from two points of view that it be done quickly, in order to reabsorb into industry as many people as possible, and so that their productive capacity may be made available as early as possible in order to step up the standard of living of our people. The Department of Reconstruction which will devote its entire energies to this work should be able to make a real contribution toward the well-being of Canada.

I am sure hon. members will realize how much I personally commend and appreciate the proposal to establish an industrial development bank, as a subsidiary of the Bank of Canada, to assist in providing funds for the reconversion of war plants, both in regard to capital expenditure and working capital. This is veritably a step in the right direction.

Above everything else, however, the principle in the speech from the throne which I believe the people of Canada, both service personnel and civilians, will rejoice to see accepted is the recognition by our government of an obligation to guarantee to our citizens a national minimum of social security and human welfare. In his book, "Industry and Humanity", written twenty-five years ago, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) set out certain ideals which we should seek to attain in regard to better social security. It is not often that a young man who dreams of a programme for the betterment of his country is given a chance twenty-five years later, as prime minister of his country, to begin to carry out in such large measure as is proposed in the speech from the throne that programme. Already we have had some indication of the devotion of the right hon. gentleman to humanitarian principles in connection with the enactment under his government of old age pensions, pensions for the blind, unemployment insurance and the Prairie Farm Assistance Act, which is in the same category. I do not need to dwell upon the extent to which the first three measures I mentioned are appreciated by those whose lives they have made much easier and happier. In regard to the Prairie Farm Assistance Act, not a farmer in the west with whom I have come in contact has failed to express his appreciation for what has been done in giving him some measure of security against crop failure through drought which, it has been shown through experience, must be expected from time to time throughout that area. I should like to say just how much we in the prairie provinces appreciate that measure of security, and we do thank the government for having given it to our part of the country.

In the programme outlined in the speech from the throne there are certain definite proposals to provide social security which I welcome. A guaranteed minimum price for staple farm products is something for which representatives of all parties have struggled, both in this house and out of it; and speaking on behalf of a farming constituency I should like to say how much that step will be appreciated by the farmers of this country. There is a feeling that the farmer is just as much entitled to minimum prices for his products as the labouring man is entitled to minimum wages, and I rejoice that this measure of security is being given to our farmers. They will feel that they need not fear after this war a collapse in prices such as we saw following the last war; and just here I should like to add a word of commendation in regard to the policy of the government which made it possible to attain something approaching parity in the prices of farm products. This house knows that I for one have felt that the anti-inflation programme should not be permitted to freeze the primary producer in a position of permanent economic inferiority, and I wish to thank the government most earnestly and sincerely for having found a way to maintain the anti-inflation programme and at the same time to see to it that the farmer obtained some measure of justice through an increase in the prices of the things he has to sell.

The provision for family allowances is something about which we should all be very happy. This principle has been recognized in our law ever since we provided for income tax exemptions on account of the children of those in the higher income brackets; but it only helped those with incomes sufficiently high to require them to pay income tax, and did not help those who needed such assistance even more, the people who did not have incomes sufficient to be subject to income tax. If it is good enough for the richer man, Mr. Speaker; if it is good enough for the more highly paid labouring man, who get enough to pay an income tax and receive the exemption,

then I say it should be good enough for the poor man who does not come in either of those categories. Furthermore, anyone who has a large family will appreciate that as a result of our system of heavy indirect taxation, our sales tax and so on, the bigger your family the more you pay in taxes every time you have to buy anything for your family. Certainly if you have to buy eight pairs of shoes you are going to pay far more in taxes than if you have to buy only one pair. Then if war comes we expect the young lad belonging to a large family to go out and risk his life equally with the boy from a small family, though perhaps the one lad may not have had nearly the same chances in the way of education and so on. If the state claims the right to ask a boy to give his life, then it should guarantee to him a minimum standard of well-being in childhood.

I commend the government most heartily for the other proposals to provide more social security contained in the speech from the throne, but I cannot now take time to mention them, because for a moment I should like to deal with the war effort of this country. We now have in our army some 470,000 men, in our navy some 70,000 men and in our air force some 185,000 men, a total of 725,000. In the women's branches of these services we have enlisted more than 37,000, a total of both men and women in the services of more than 762,000. Unfortunately, we have had casualties (not including the wounded) of over 19,000. More than 1,000,000 persons are working in war plants and associated industries, while another 2,100,000 are engaged in agriculture and essential civilian employment. About seventy per cent of all males in Canada fourteen years of age and over are in the armed forces, in war industry or in essential civilian employment.

I have not time to give the figures I should like to give in regard to the great contribution agriculture has made, but production has been stepped up to a marvellous degree notwithstanding the depleted numbers of those engaged in this occupation, depleted by enlistments in our armed forces and entry into war industries. For example, our milk production has been stepped up from some 15,000,000,000 pounds to 17,400,000,000 pounds; the production of creamery butter has increased from 254,773,000 pounds to 312,310,000 pounds; our beef production has increased from 618,000,000 pounds to 886,000,000 pounds; our feed grain from 456,000,000 bushels to 734,000,000 bushels, and our flaxseed from 1,508,000 bushels to 17,911,000 bushels. In each instance the first figure represents the average for the period from 1935 to 1939, and the last figure the production for 1943. Our shipments of bacon to the old country amounted to 330,000,000 pounds in 1940 and by 1943 that had risen to 675,000,000 pounds.

In regard to our production of munitions, I feel that it represents almost a miracle of organization and accomplishment. Canada should be proud of the whole organization, from the minister to the youngest lad in a munitions factory. We have already produced, since the beginning of the war, 80,000 artillery units, a million machine guns and rifles, 600,000 military vehicles, 55,000,000 rounds of heavy ammunition, three billion rounds of small arms ammunition, radio equipment to the value of $308,000,000, five hundred naval vessels, over 200 merchant ships, with a total tonnage far exceeding 2,000,000, and over 9,000 aircraft.

I should like now to say a few words with respect to the accomplishments in connection with the commonwealth air training plan. Under that scheme we have now turned out over 50,000 aircrew. In recent months we have been turning out each month more than twice the number of pilots who fought and won the battle of Britain. May I also pay tribute to the minister of that department, who, particularly in those difficult days in 1940, kept the plan going, even under circumstances where it seemed almost impossible to do so.

I should like to say a word about finance. The total cost of the last war was $1,670,000,000, and that figure covered the cost of demobilization. The cost of this war, estimated to March 31, 1944, will be $10,824,000,000. The successful fight against inflation is not only helpful now, but will make much easier our reestablishment after the war is over. I am particularly happy that this great programme has been financed without having to resort to borrowing from abroad, because the interest we shall have to pay on the debt will remain in Canada, and will be subject to future taxation. Further, we have drained off large profits due to the war, to help pay for the war, another procedure for which I must commend the Department of Finance.

There are a great many other aspects of our war effort upon which I should like to comment, had I time to do so. I have in mind particularly the industries of fishing, lumbering, transportation and mining, each of which has made a magnificent contribution to our war effort.

I believe no one will deny that Canada's contribution to the war has been titanic; but, more important is the fact that our effort came at a time when it made all the difference

between victory and defeat. In 1940, when the issue was swaying in the balance, when it was not certain whether or not Great Britain would go down, the fact that our young airmen were in the air, that our army was on the shores of Great Britain, and that Britain knew we were at her side, may have made all the difference between victory and defeat.

But, sir, of very great importance is that that has all been accomplished without destroying the unity of this country. Many people argued that we should not take any great part in the war, because it would inevitably mean the destruction of unity in Canada. Well, under the leadership of our present Prime Minister that titanic effort has been accomplished without destroying our unity. The end of this war will find Canada more united, more conscious of her great national strength, and respected the world over, with an agricultural, industrial and financial system and the trained citizenry to assure us of a standard of living as high as that of any nation on the face of the earth.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we face a bright future; but we should never forget that that future has been made possible by the bravery of our brave sons, and that of brave people the world over. Let us therefore, in so far as it lies within us, make up our minds that that future will be worthy of the sacrifice which made it possible. Let us approach our problems in the spirit of that gallant British airmen who, writing to his mother just before going into combat in which he was killed, said: "I shall have done my duty to the utmost of my ability. No man can do more, and no man calling himself a man can do less."

On motion of Mr. Graydon the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the house adjourned at 5.10 p.m.

Monday, January 31, 1944

The house met at three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

DEBATES—RESIGNATION OF PARLIAMENTARY REPORTER (FRENCH)

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the house that the Clerk has received the resignation of Hector Benoit, Esquire, Parliamentary Reporter, French, House of Commons, which has been accepted subject to ratification by the house, and I have directed the Clerk to lay on the table of the house the correspondence and my recommendation in relation thereto.

[Mr. Tucker.]

DIVORCE

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF 1930—JURISDICTION OF COURTS IN PROVINCE OF MARRIED WOMEN'S DOMICILE

Mr. GEORGE BLACK (Yukon) moved for leave to introduce bill No. 2, to amend the Divorce Jurisdiction Act, 1930.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

LIVE STOCK

PRESS REPORT WITH REGARD TO SLAUGHTER AND SALE OF ANIMALS BY QUEBEC FARMERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. K. FRASER (Peterborough West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Finance, under whose administration the wartime prices and trade board comes, a question with respect to an item that appeared in the Montreal *Standard* of Saturday. It says that a new plan by which Quebec farmers will be allowed to slaughter and sell their animals themselves in future has been adopted by arrangement with the wartime prices and trade board.

Does this arrangement apply also to Ontario and the other provinces?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I shall have to look into the newspaper report and see whether there is any truth in it. I do not know whether there is or not.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): True enough. I confirmed it this morning.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Friday, January 28, consideration of the motion of Mr. L. D. Tremblay for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I shall have to ask the indulgence of Your Honour and of the house if I follow my notes more closely than I have been in the habit of doing. I am anxious to condense my remarks and deliver them in the minimum amount of time, in order to set an example that perhaps may be followed by the house in time to come.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Mr. GRAYDON: I was looking at the other side of the house when I said that.

When I rose, sir, to take part in a similar debate a year ago I raised my voice in protest against the time lost in the house in the traditional and extended congratulations which are usually showered upon the mover and the seconder of the address. In parliament, as in many other phases of our national life, we have to make up our minds to leave some of the habits of yesterday behind. These are days of change and reform and having this in mind I hope that the mover (Mr. Tremblay) and the seconder (Mr. Tucker) will fully understand and appreciate the motive which lies behind my comparative silence with respect to their very excellent efforts. Were they not both members of His Majesty's armed forces, I would have refrained from creating another precedent in this debate. Both of them are comparatively young men; both of them have served with distinction in two wars. That in itself constitutes a word of tribute more eloquent than my words could convey.

It is appropriate that the first point I cover in this address should be the war. It is not yet won. True, we have reached the stage where the fear of losing it has been to a large extent removed, but with the most serious fighting and the heaviest casualty lists yet to come, it is in my opinion utter nonsense to talk as though the war were practically over. Would to God it were!

Mere words will fail to appraise appropriately the contribution of Canada's armed forces at sea, on the land and in the air. Their magnificent part in the pulverization of vital German industries; their heroic fight in Sicily and Italy; their daring exploits on the oceans of the world, have added a new lustre to Canada's already great reputation among the nations of the globe. It can be safely said —I should say, proudly said—that the Canadian armed forces rate second to none among the war's very best participants.

Labour, agriculture, industry and business generally have made on the civilian front a giant contribution towards the winning of the war, but the brunt of our effort is being carried by those in our armed forces. Our contribution as civilians, however great, suffers in contrast to theirs. When this war is over, this Canada of ours which has been ready to give and to pay heavily to win the war must equally be prepared to do the same thing for the establishment and the maintenance of peace and for the rehabilitation of our armed forces.

It is difficult to say what the general terms of the speech from the throne mean for the veterans of this war. Only close scrutiny of the legislation proposed will give any indication of how far the government is prepared to go. When our men and women come back they will be thrown into competition for a livelihood in our nation with those who have been receiving a very much larger share of the national income than our fighting forces. Let me therefore impress upon the government the necessity of giving to our discharged men and women sufficient aid and support to put them on better than an even basis so far as cash is concerned so that they will have a fair chance in the competitive struggle for a fuller and more abundant life. Our forces have not been niggardly in their sacrifices for us. Let us not be niggardly with them when it comes our turn to pay.

The government has never been too frank with the people of Canada with respect to the conduct of the war. It is high time it was. Our people are demanding satisfactory and straightforward answers to these questions:

(1) What does the abandoning of the seventh and eighth divisions in Canada mean?

(2) What does it involve?

(3) Why were these two additional divisions constituted in the first place?

(4) What were the underlying reasons for the change?

(5) What is being done with our big home defence army?

(6) Is it going overseas?

(7) Is it going to remain in Canada and if so, is its personnel to be directed back to civilian activities?

Recently the three chiefs of the navy, army and air force were transferred overseas. Does this mean that the government believes that all danger to Canada has been largely removed? If so, why the necessity for the maintenance of this big home defence army? Even at this late date it is essential that the whole story of the home defence army's constitution and its present and future role should be explained fully and frankly by the government to this house and to the people of Canada.

Canadians, too, are confused as to what is going on overseas. Why was the Canadian Army constituted as it was in the first place? Whose idea was it? If the plan was good, why was it abandoned? If it was bad, why was it approved in the first place?

Many rumours are in circulation regarding the resignation of General McNaughton. Public interest demands that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) should at once give a full and frank explanation of the facts in this regard, letting the chips fall where they may.

The Prime Minister has stated that he is going to attend, at an early date, a conference of British commonwealth prime ministers. There are strong, but we hope not irreconcilable, views abroad in Canada with respect to our position in the commonwealth and with respect to our relations with the world at large. It is unfortunate that the speech from the throne mentions only the latter.

It is well that the views of all sides should be carefully weighed and considered. The views of the government would be particularly welcome, but it is not our intention to embarrass our own Prime Minister, or the representatives of other parts of the commonwealth, by tossing controversial issues into this debate when common sense indicates that every effort must be made to secure a united front in a united Canada in a greater and more powerful British commonwealth.

A very noticeable omission from the speech from the throne which justified curiosity is the failure to mention the burning question of post-war civil aviation. There is no single economic subject fraught with such important effects and ramifications of a world-wide character which is so vital to Canada as commercial aviation. People are asking if we are to be pawns in the great international game. Are we to stand by inactive in this field while the United States, Great Britain, Russia, China, Holland, Sweden, Free France, and many other countries, determine what our part is to be in the international scheme?

Canada is playing a dangerous game. Canada cutting in at the last minute will be of little use. Already official reports from United States sources are saying that the northwest route through Canada is credited with considerable glamour, but little commercial importance. In other words, they are already seeking to discount our geographical advantages.

Canada has earned a place in aviation far greater in importance than her proportion of operated air routes. The commonwealth air training plan, the vast distribution of arctic and sub-arctic landing fields, the weather-reporting facilities and other advanced operational achievements warrant her claiming an important role in all international post-war aviation deliberations. Yet, for some strange reason, the speech from the throne remains silent on this tremendously important subject.

The Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) has recently attended a commonwealth air conference in London; and he should be in a position to inform this house and this country where Canada stands in any agreements or proposed agreements that have been entered into or discussed. To what extent are we collaborating with the United Kingdom on this important matter? How far have negotiations proceeded with the United States?

There is grave and general concern throughout Canada that delay and inertia on the part of the government may lead to our position becoming, in the critical period ahead, nothing more than a point of geographical convenience when final arrangements have been concluded. Our people want to know and to be assured that full and beneficial use will be made of the vast and strategic ground facilities now available in Canada. How is the superior knowledge and experience of our trained people to be utilized to the greatest advantage; and what benefits are we to reap from our favoured position as the most economical trade route between industrial centres in the United States and the markets of Europe and Asia? Parliament is entitled to have, at a very early date, a full report on this vital matter.

In agriculture, opportunism and a series of short-run moves are still being substituted for a definite, comprehensive, long-term policy. John Bracken's Lethbridge bill of rights for Canadian farmers has had some effect upon the government's indecisive agriculture position—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Don't laugh.

Mr. GRAYDON: That is rather a hollow laugh, but I cannot blame the hon. members for that. I am going to repeat this, because I know it is of tremendous interest to all:

John Bracken's Lethbridge bill of rights for Canadian farmers has had some effect upon the government's indecisive agricultural position; and, as in the case of our Winnipeg platform, parts of our policy will, no doubt, be adopted. Why did the government wait until after a call from Canada's next prime minister to adopt a policy of putting a floor under the prices of agricultural products?

It is extremely significant that the government should have waited until after it had been in power for eight years, and until the plan had been incorporated as part of the Progressive Conservative agricultural policy, before undertaking to establish floor prices for farm products. What Canadian farmers will want to know is why the government did not see fit to adopt this price floor policy during those pre-war years when the prices which they actually received were only a fraction of what they were justly entitled to and of prices ruling to-day.

During the period this government has been in power, the annual average cash price received for No. 1 Northern wheat, basis Fort William, was as low as 62 cents a bushel; that of No. 2 oats, 29 cents; that of No. 2 barley, 40⅞ cents and that of rye, 40⅞ cents. The prices received at the farm were, of course, very much lower than this. Annual average egg prices were down to 17½ cents. Prices received for hogs, butter fat and cheese were, at certain times, just about one-half as high as those ruling to-day; while good steers sold for as little as one-third of their present value. If reasonable floor prices are needed at present and in the future, they were no less necessary in the earlier years of this administration's tenure of office. Farmers were just as entitled to reasonable floor prices in peace time as they are now in the later period of the war.

I shall not now go over each of the thirty points enunciated by our leader at this time. I shall refer only to two of these planks, leaving the others until a more detailed examination of the agricultural policy can be made in the house.

Here is point No. 8:

> To bring about an expansion of our export markets and thereby higher standards of living generally, we shall be prepared, in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic charter, to progressively lower the barriers to trade; we shall set up a special export agency charged with the responsibility of promoting international trade, maintaining and expanding export markets for primary products, ensuring that domestic prices shall not be depressed because a small surplus may happen to result in making low export prices apply to both; and developing a positive programme of international collaboration, on the part of both exporting and importing countries, with a view to furthering the exchange of commodities and better international understanding and goodwill.

I mention also point No. 21, which deals with the increasingly important matter of agricultural research. A brief debate took place on this subject in the house last session. I now call upon the government to establish at once a national network of efficiently staffed research laboratories in order that agriculture will have at least as efficient research facilities as industry itself.

The government's policy respecting our production and export of bacon to Britain has been one of pronounced instability, fraught with sudden and frequent changes and guided by hindsight, rather than foresight. Various pronouncements of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) and his department, ostensibly designed to guide our farmers in the matter of future production, have served only to create serious uncertainty and considerable bewilderment. The variation of the arrangements with Britain regarding bacon has resulted in disappointment and dissatisfaction on the part of the agricultural population of Canada. Since the last session of the house, the wholesale slaughtering of brood sows and the general disintegration of the whole bacon industry have belatedly forced the government to give hog bonuses. The irreparable damage already done is a clear indication that these bonuses were long overdue.

Canadian farmers are willing and ready to produce enough hogs to meet Britain's bacon needs. But they quite properly feel that, if they do, the government should go at least part way to stabilize their position. This is but one of many striking examples which indicate the urgency for a forthright, vigorous, agricultural policy for this dominion.

Let the farmers of Canada contrast the single reference to agriculture in the speech from the throne with John Bracken's Lethbridge bill of rights for agriculture, and let them form their own conclusions as to where their friends in public life are. The speech from the throne and the government policy generally is bleak and barren when contrasted to the masterly programme for the relief of agriculture and the liberation of rural people as envisaged in the Lethbridge speech. It is significant that the only useful reference to agriculture in the speech from the throne was taken from John Bracken's address at Lethbridge itself.

Labour will look in vain in the throne address for either sympathy or a broad national labour policy. Not a single concrete proposal is to be found which would indicate that there are plans on foot to give labour its rightful position in the national partnership. High-sounding phrases about safeguarding the basic standard of living and standardizing wages and salary are poor and lame excuses for a government which should have established long before this a national labour code for Canada. The farmer is now having company; labour is joining him in that great group of forgotten men in the dominion.

This government embarked upon a programme of war production without adequately consulting labour or inviting it to share the responsibilities of administration, but let me caution the government that no programme of rehabilitation and reconstruction can succeed without the active cooperation of the labour movement.

Schemes for providing social security are not effective substitutes in themselves for higher earning power and continuous employment. All these plans can do is to spread the national income more evenly. There is grave danger that they may collapse and that inflation will result unless the national output of consumer's

goods is maintained at a higher level than ever before. Let us remember that the first and foremost concern of labour is jobs and lots of them with good wages and good working conditions. The incentive to produce must never be allowed to weaken or else the administration of these grandiose schemes of social insurance will be like trying to spread an ounce of butter on an acre of bread—their benefits will hardly be felt.

Surely labour has a right to expect better consideration than the treatment accorded under the wartime wages control order, P.C. 9384, and by labour I mean to include organized labour, unorganized labour and that great section of salaried workers whose wages or salaries have been frozen by the government while their taxes and maintenance charges have been continually increasing. Why did the government not submit this wages control order to parliament by way of legislation, so that the people's representatives could express an opinion on it before it became law? Among other things this order, passed a month or so before parliament met, provided for the incorporation of the cost of living bonus into the wage rate structure and, at the same time, denied to labour that fundamental principle of British justice which declares that a man is innocent until he is found guilty. Against the provisions of this order labour has been rasiing its vigorous voice, and beside labour this Progressive Conservative party stands and joins in their chorus of protests. Why does the government continue studiously to ignore the leaders of labour and deny them a place in the formulation of policies affecting labour? Let us not forget that labour has its rights as well as its responsibilities and obligations. It has fulfilled its obligations at all times and will continue to do so in the future, but it must be also given its rights.

There is talk that the government is going to bring in a labour code wherein the jurisdiction of the federal government will apply to war industries only. This has not been announced because it is a matter of government policy, which apparently has not been quite completed. If this is so, the government is making a colossal blunder in flying in the faces of eight out of nine provinces in Canada who are in favour of a national code covering all industry. The whole project is thoroughly impracticable. Men and women working in a plant, partly on war orders and partly on peace-time work, will find themselves under different codes. People engaged in the same type of work, one producing for war and the other producing for peace, will find that their conditions are regulated by different authorities altogether. The rapid change and transition from war-time activities to peace-time pursuits in itself will show how completely impossible the whole policy must be.

Labour and management must press forward in the future as two great and harmonious partners, under legislation designed to give justice to both. I call upon the government to cease this endless bickering in labour matters; and let us have a code covering all our industries. Then let labour and management sit down together and perfect that partnership which we know is possible, but towards the accomplishment of which no all-out effort seems to have been made.

The government has recently set up a War Assets Corporation, constituted for the purpose of disposing of war materials classified as surplus or obsolete. In the disposal of such material the greatest care and caution must be exercised. At the end of the war, surplus goods will include raw materials, and any indiscriminate disposal of these might very easily lead to the creation of monopolies by those obtaining them. Before the selling process gets under way, I believe that a judicial inquiry should be made into the details of materials purchased, cost prices and use made of them in so far as crown assets of Canada are concerned. The operations of the corporation should be carried out openly. The Canadian people are entitled to know whether value has been received for materials for which they were so heavily taxed. A report should be submitted for the scrutiny of the people of Canada, detailing value received for material classed as obsolete or surplus, and giving information as to the use to which it is being put.

In the war-time economy, many small businesses have been squeezed out of existence. The small storekeeper, the man running the little enterprise, the farmer and others, have suffered. The little fellow should have an equal opportunity to obtain the materials to be disposed of by the War Assets Corporation. It is the job of the government to give every opportunity possible to these people for expansion and prosperity in the post-war period.

It is true that the speech from the throne speaks of the establishment of an industrial development bank to assist in the preparation for the transition of industry from war to peace. I hope that the little man of Canadian business will get the same kind of treatment as big men when this bank swings into operation. There will be some lifting of eyebrows by the farmers of Canada when they find that the principle of credits as envisaged by the setting up of this bank has not been

extended by the government to cover their situation as well. The government has followed in many instances the Winnipeg platform, but it has failed to adopt one very important plank in that platform, and that is the proposal for a central farm bank. Why cannot agriculture be treated as well as industry in connection with credit facilities provided by the government?

National selective service earned for itself the title of "Canada's greatest war-time muddle". For quite some time it had no real competitor; but to-day its position in this regard is being seriously challenged by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. The C.B.C. has lost the confidence of the people of Canada. I wish that statement were not true. I have been one who has believed that public ownership of our broadcasting facilities, working alongside our private stations, could be made a satisfactory method of handling this vital and delicate means of communication. To-day public ownership in this field is being so seriously threatened that I am expressing grave concern that unless something is done right now, we are apt to have a complete collapse of the whole structure which was so well established in the earlier days of radio.

The government has consistently let radio matters drift in Canada. For years there has scarcely ever been a full board of governors sitting at one time. In one instance, the government permitted a vacancy to stand for eighteen months without filling it. To-day we have the spectacle of two governorships vacant for three months; and of even more importance is the fact that there has been no general manager since early last fall when Doctor J. S. Thomson went back to Saskatchewan university. There has been talk of legislation to improve the corporation's structure; but the speech from the throne gives no hint that this is in prospect.

To the recommendations of the radio broadcasting committees from year to year the government has turned a deaf ear in connection with many of their proposals. The fact is that radio is looked upon as Canada's most important departmental orphan. Its constitution has never been properly clarified, and nowhere is there confidence in those directing its affairs. In the middle of this massive muddle, a second network has been put into operation. In some quarters this move is being viewed with grave concern, largely perhaps because there is no confidence that the present structure of the C.B.C. is in a position satisfactorily to direct anything in the nature of new works.

The question has been raised in the press that the C.B.C. has gone "commercial". If it has, a number of very important points are at once raised, points which concern not only the press of Canada but the citizens of this dominion as well. The government deserves the just condemnation of an outraged public for its lackadaisical happy-go-lucky policy which has allowed this corporation aimlessly to drift into comparative uselessness, instead of directing its course into a field of greater and increasing public service. There is not a minute to be lost. Let the government act at once.

The rehabilitation of those in our armed forces, in our war plants, in industry and agriculture, will call not only for the greatest ingenuity on the part of the government, but as well for the same patriotic fervour on the part of our people as has characterized them in the conduct of the war. Our nation has, of its own free will, raised billions of dollars for its security and defence. When the war is over it can scarcely be less interested in the security of the individuals who comprise our nation, and especially of those who have assisted so vitally in the defence of our security. Canadians have experienced full employment, and our service men and women will be and should be satisfied with nothing short of that when hostilities cease. The wheels of industry must be kept turning; but production must be deflected from the demands of war to the demands of peace, from goods of destruction to the necessary peace-time consumable commodities. Into the flow of employment resulting from such a transition, preferred places must be found for the men and women out of our armed services. Our veterans, men and women, will not be content with blueprints, plans and promises. They will demand effective action. They have not been remunerated on any elaborate scale for the invaluable service they have been rendering us; and they are fully entitled to every opportunity which will assist in making them contented and satisfied citizens of a grateful country.

Second in importance to the paramount consideration of winning this war as quickly and conclusively as possible is the obtaining of full and gainful employment for all our people who are able and willing to work.

To achieve this objective, hand-outs by the federal government will be neither a sufficient nor a satisfactory solution. The dole has gone forever. The cooperation of business and industry will be essential if full employment for our people is to be achieved and especially if it is to be maintained. In a recent estimate, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell)

has revealed that to-day two million Canadians are in jobs which did not exist before the war broke out and most of which will terminate when the war is over, or before. Thus it should be very easily realized that the employment problem facing our country cannot be solved by an incomplete uncoordinated effort.

If the methods of the government to mobilize and utilize our man-power for war are to be the criterion for its effort to meet and solve the post-war employment problem, little hope for success can be held out to our people. Despite the optimism of the Minister of Labour, the operation and administration of national selective service has been a bitter and disillusioning experience for the Canadian people. The government sought and were accorded unlimited powers for the full mobilization of our man-power; they obtained all the necessary—and perhaps some unnecessary—machinery. But they lacked the will and the courage to put it into effective operation at the proper stage of our man-power difficulties.

It is well to recall that in the pre-war period, agriculture, industry and business provided ninety-five per cent of the employment of Canada. And it is only with the cooperation of agriculture, industry and business that long-range plans for the reconstruction period and after can be effective. The people of Canada have accepted with good grace the curtailment of their freedom for the purpose of winning this war. In our peace-time economy they will demand fair wages, fair prices for farm and factory products, and above all freedom to run their own lives. Bureaucracy must go.

Hampering and unnecessarily restrictive measures upon industry and business will do nothing to advance the achievement of full employment. It is well and readily recognized and accepted by the vast majority of Canadians that there must be adequate controls designed to prevent the growth of monopolies and cartels. The Progressive Conservative party stands resolutely against this usurpation by private industry of the place of public power, but will continue to fight to the last ditch in the interests of the small business man, the farmer and the worker. Our belief is that plans should now be in progress which will give all business, all industry, big or little, including agriculture, its legitimate place in our economy, with reasonable opportunity for prosperity in the future.

There is little evidence in the speeches made recently by the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) and the Minister of Munitions and Supply that any well thought-out or coordinated plan to meet the employment problem has been concluded. Speaking in Vancouver on December 13 last—and I might say this is not all he said at that time—the first mentioned minister had this to say:

> We propose having in readiness a great programme of public-assisted enterprise, public works, development projects of all sorts, so that there may be a bridge on which we can cross the gap between war and peace.

Important words, those. In the same day, speaking in Toronto, the Minister of Munitions and Supply stated:

> With our post-war planners thinking in terms of public works and government dole, is it any wonder that the advocates of socialism are finding many disciples?

This is scarcely a striking example of the cooperation and coordination which the government will have to exercise in the solution of post-war employment.

No team work there, and not in agreement with what the Minister of Pensions and National Health said on the subject, the first subject with which he dealt at that time. I suggest that there should be established a new department of government that will integrate all aspects of our economy in its transition from war to peace, problems such as industrial reconversion, readjustment of war workers, demobilization of soldiers, and post-war employment. All the plans for the transition from war to peace must perfectly mesh.

Let there be no mistake; a reemployment division of selective service will not be enough. This war is likely to end in the way it started, that is, in consecutive cycles, not suddenly and abruptly, as did the last great war. And this means that we must be ready now to meet the problems of the aftermath as they arise. The speech from the throne would seem to indicate that the government sees the end of the war in sight, and our entry at a not too far distant date in the era of transition from war to peace. The people of Canada have been very patient in their submission to the greatest network of bureaucratic controls this nation has so far experienced. I charge the government that they have exceeded the limits of vital war necessity and urgency in their rush towards bureaucratic government. The present administration has gone to such lengths in encouraging bureaucracy that our democratic form of government is actually in peril. At this stage of the war's development there cannot any longer be any real necessity for our citizens tolerating the continuance in toto of such a system, which might easily be perpetuated into our peace-time economy.

The rights and privileges of parliament as the trustee and servant of the people which, under the stress of war, have practically ceased to exist must be fully and promptly restored. I believe that our present Prime Minister, in 1935, strangely enough when attacking another government, laid his finger on the most critical spot relative to his own administration now. This is what he said, at page 36, volume 1, of *Hansard,* 1935:

> I have said that one of the supreme efforts of this administration has been stealthily to alienate the authority and control of parliament, to take power into its own hands and away from parliament with respect to many of the important affairs of the nation.

No words of mine could more adequately be utilized in criticism of the present administration than the Prime Minister's own language on that occasion.

To show how far bureaucracy has gone, let us look at the legislative products since September 1, 1939. I recognize that perhaps this is not the proper yardstick to apply, but it is at least the yardstick which generally indicates the trend. Parliament since that time, the beginning of the war, passed statutes covering 838 pages, a total of 369 thousand words. Proclamations, orders in council, war orders and regulations covered a total of 5,791 pages, with a total of 2,895,500 words. It is a shocking situation and fraught with danger if parliament does not now take the reins of government into its own hands and seal the doom of bureaucratic government. The people are tired and sick of it all. Our party has already declared itself, and I again emphasize that declaration:

> The watchwords of the future must be decentralization, not centralization; cooperation, not state dictation; expanding production, not scarcity; and widening areas of trade, not restrictive practices. The alternatives are continued chaos, on the one hand, or regimentation on the other—chaos with its frustrations, or regimentation with its deadening effect on the impulse to produce, its inevitable tendency toward dictatorship, and the certainty that all material increase will be skimmed off to nourish a growing bureaucracy.

No patriotic citizen of Canada would ask the government, in the midst of urgent war expenditures, to lower the general level of taxation. No such request has yet been made, and I am not making it to-day. No such request is likely to be made. Nevertheless if there shall be some lessening of governmental expenditures in the days ahead, I call upon the administration to give consideration to relieving the small wage-earner in the lower brackets from the comparatively heavy taxation which at present he must endure. He is not kicking. That great section of our population only kicks when they can endure things no longer. It would seem, however, that some relief might properly be given to these people if expenditures are on the down grade and the war pressure is being somewhat lifted. The whole question of the relationship between absenteeism in industry and the income tax should be the subject of much more serious consideration than the government seems to have given the subject to date. Let us not be small as a parliament when we deal with the little men of our nation. Our little men are the biggest assets our country has.

And, speaking of income tax, I want to raise my voice in vehement protest against the complicated methods and procedure used in gathering the taxes from our people. Two things must be wrong, having in mind the confusion among our citizens. Either the incidence of our income tax system is inadequate and impractical, or else the forms on which the returns are made should be altered and changed and simplified. I think nearly every hon. member will agree with me when I say that a lot of people in Canada simply throw up their hands in holy horror and confusion when they see an income tax return. Unless all our people are going to turn into accountants there will be conflict and confusion so long as the present system of levying taxation and making returns in connection with it is followed. People are not nearly so concerned about paying taxes as they are hopelessly confused as to how the taxes are computed. Let us unwind the red tape which surrounds the income tax and make it simpler for the citizens of Canada. Why make a Chinese puzzle out of one of the most important parts of our national business?

Last session I pointed out in vain the necessity for sweeping away a lot of our legislative cobwebs. The Prime Minister thought that war time was not a good time to consider any changes in house rules and procedure, so I lost my case. But, like a lot of other judges who have subsequently found themselves wrong in both facts and law, the Prime Minister has seen fit to now accept my suggestion. He and the nation have, however, lost a year in the meantime; for only now are we to have a special parliamentary committee to see how the House of Commons rules and procedure can be modernized and brought up to date.

Frankly, I have been disgusted and discouraged over the unbusinesslike way in which parliament has been conducting itself. I think the country feels the same. If this nation is to take its part in a new order in a new world, surely it is not too much to expect that parliament shall give a lead in that direction. None

of us is wholly blameless for this state of affairs, but surely that is an additional reason why we should seek to reform both parliament and ourselves. We may as well be frank. My remarks last year on the debate on the address were perhaps too long. The Prime Minister himself, I recall, rebuked me at that time for the length of my speech, and then, proceeding to ignore his own advice, he spoke for an hour and a quarter longer than I did. I hope that on this occasion he will follow the advice he gave me at that time and that we shall both show parliament and the country that we are capable of condensing our remarks.

Our system of setting up committees is outmoded and outdated, and we do not operate very well the system we have, either. For proof of this, let us look at our session which has just ended and which covered the major part of 1943. The standing committee on agriculture and colonization did not sit until 115 days had elapsed from the opening of the session. The radio broadcasting committee did not commence its business until 123 days had elapsed from the opening of parliament, while the war expenditures committee began its closed door sessions 171 days after parliament had convened. One of the last things parliament did last session before its adjournment was to set up this war expenditures committee, which should have been convened many months before.

I should observe, I think, at this point that this committee's usefulness was gravely impaired by the fact that the government majority in the committee insisted upon its subcommittee deliberations being in camera. It is about time that the lid was blown off these in-camera sessions of the war expenditures committee. It is little short of a national disgrace that the people of Canada should not know something about the investigations of these contracts. I am opposed to the whole system of pulling down the blinds, closing the shutters and locking the doors when public contracts are being investigated.

As a matter of curiosity and concern I checked up the details in relation to the meetings held by standing committees from 1936 to 1943 inclusive. In those eight years the committee on agriculture and colonization sat in only six of the eight years—that is, it sat only for short times in six out of the eight years—for a total of seventy-one days in the eight years. Yet during that period agriculture passed through one of the most critical and trying stages in its history.

To give some idea as to the outmoded system exemplified by standing committees, I draw the attention of this house to the industrial and international relations committee. It has not sat since 1936, although labour and foreign affairs have constituted, in the meantime, two of the most important matters of national concern. It is hard to imagine that work could not be found for this very important committee during that whole period of time.

Then, again, why should two major matters be lumped together under the umbrella of one committee, while a separate committee sits for such subjects as debates, printing, standing orders and privileges and elections? Four separate committees for these subjects and only one committee to cover the whole area of labour and international relations. The whole thing does not add up. The whole thing does not make sense.

I hope that the new committee will commence its work with courage and determination to see that parliament, its methods, its rules and its procedure are taken out of the mothballs, dusted off, and made to work efficiently for the people of Canada.

To our left and much too far to the left for most people in Canada sits a group in the house to which I desire to direct a few remarks this afternoon. They will not be abusive remarks, because we have to learn in this country that our enemies at the moment do not happen to be Canadian, and, furthermore, that only by calm analysis and the utilization of light rather than heat in dealing with party programmes and policies will this nation get anywhere in the end. I have never cared for violent public denunciations of political parties or their supporters, but I take this opportunity of denying what seems to be an implied claim by the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party that they have some monopoly on the will and desire of citizens generally in Canada to see this nation reaching her maximum national stature. No group or no party has a right to make such an implied claim. The Progressive Conservative party yields to none in its desire and, if I may say so, in its capacity, to achieve that objective.

Our party stands for a programme of rational reform, as opposed to a policy, on the one hand, of rigid reaction, and a policy, on the other hand, of reckless revolution. Our party stands pledged to remove the abuses and reform the present system. We will go right up to the precipice on the pathway of rational reform with the C.C.F. or any other party, but at the edge of the precipice we must part company with those who would lose their balance and plunge headlong over the cliff into the unfathomable depths of chaos and revolution below.

Our party stands for a policy of expanding production as the basis of prosperity. Our

job, as we conceive it, is to distribute abundance rather than ration scarcity. The economic organization of yesterday was unable to achieve or to sustain that expanding production without which full employment could not be acomplished. State socialism can never achieve it; for socialism is rigid, centralized and coercive. The only hope of a steadily expanding national income lies in the cooperation of the state with all organized enterprise, whether it be private, cooperative or government-owned. As our party sees it, the government must join with those engaged in industry, commerce, agriculture and finance to plan for full, steady and growing production, and complete employment with as little loss of individual freedom as possible. Our party is out to free Canada from the bonds of bureaucracy, while socialism, in our opinion, can only plunge Canada further into the underbrush of red tape and administrative controls.

The policy of the C.C.F. is, to say the least, an elastic one. It stretches all the way from the Pacific coast, where its leader there calls loudly for the militant, revolutionary kind of socialism, with a few policemen and gaols thrown in for good measure, to the easy-going but relatively harmless pie-in-the-sky theories of the hon. member for York South (Mr. Noseworthy). The variation of opinions in the C.C.F. party constitutes a danger signal for the people of Canada, who are anxious to know which way the party is going. Not much wonder the vast majority of farmers in Canada are looking with suspicious eyes upon this movement which never seems to be able to make up its mind how long it would let the farmer mind his own business were it ever to achieve power.

It is a favourite political pastime of some C.C.F. leaders to refer to the "old-line parties". I have no objection if they want to make it singular, because one of the boasts of the present Prime Minister is that Liberalism dates back so far. But Progressive Conservatism cannot truthfully be tied up with any old-fashioned policies or doctrines. From the Winnipeg convention emerged a new policy, and a new leader. Actually, many are of the opinion that old-fashioned parties now in Canada are the Liberals and the C.C.F.'s. Apart altogether from age, however, the C.C.F. party has developed certain characteristics which brand it as a typical old-line party to-day.

I thought that the old days of presenting political promises to the electors of Canada in bushel baskets had gone forever. There was a time not many years ago when people looked down upon the public man who made a speech full of promises. They almost ostracized from society the man who would issue a pamphlet full of promises. That branded the politician as an old-fashioned old-timer in the field. But those days are back again and, strangely enough, ushered in by the party that likes to call itself the herald of the new order. Not only are the promises made in speeches and in pamphlets, but so great has been the volume of promises to the Canadian people that the C.C.F. have had to call in the bookbinders to assist. With all this plethora of promises to swallow, the citizens of Canada will be fortunate if they escape several attacks of acute political indigestion before the next general election. Canada has witnessed nothing like it since confederation. Let Canadians be certain that the cures now being prescribed for our national ills are not worse than the ills they are designed to cure.

The Progressive Conservative party has taken the initiative from one end of the country to the other in the battle against socialism. We are recognized as the main spearhead of Canada's fight against it. When this time comes, we shall call upon all those who oppose socialism, with all its regimentation and bureaucracy, to follow the leadership of John Bracken and the Progressive Conservative party. By that means, and that means only, can Canada stay on the safe road towards rational reform.

It is pretty generally acknowledged throughout the dominion that the present tired, weary administration has lost the confidence of the people of Canada. To look over the present House of Commons and contrast it with the present state of public opinion makes this Commons appear little short of a dream chamber. The government right now controls this parliament by what the Prime Minister in 1935 under parallel circumstances called a "mechanical majority." The weakness of the present administration throughout the country is admitted by its own friends. In its own good time it will be compelled to throw the torch of leadership and responsibility. That torch I predict will be caught by a vigorous Progressive Conservative party led by its able and experienced leader John Bracken, who will be called to save this nation from the chaos of socialism and disaster.

The speech from the throne may properly be said to be a combination of the Winnipeg platform, John Bracken's reform speeches, a death-bed repentance, and several dying declarations. It lacks the real crusading reform spirit to be found in either the Winnipeg manifesto or Mr. Bracken's subsequent addresses, but the effect of both of these factors can be seen in many parts of the throne address. The character of the speech indicates that the

Prime Minister has momentarily taken an eye off the war and is now looking over his broken-down political fences.

I was under the impression that the present Prime Minister did not like reform programmes ushered in close to the time of a general appeal to the public. My belief was based upon the Prime Minister's words as found in his address as leader of the opposition in a similar debate to this in 1935, when the then administration brought down its reform for security plan. On that occasion the present Prime Minister, standing where I am to-day, had this to say:

> In other words, I want votes, that is why the Prime Minister to-day brings in this programme of social reform so-called, on the eve of an election. . . .
>
> Looking at the speech from the throne, I have come to the conclusion that his policies are a sort of *omnium gatherum*. They are intended to take in a little of everything he can discover in anybody's policy.

How applicable the Prime Minister's words of 1935 now become in relation to the present speech from the throne. I toss them back to the Prime Minister as an appropriate comment on the present government's programme, and I repeat the Prime Minister's own words:

> . . . his policy is intended to take in a little of everything he can discover in anybody's policy.

And I go further along the pathway then chosen by the present Prime Minister when he urged upon another prime minister at that time to bring down at once the legislation forecast in the speech from the throne, in order that it may receive the careful scrutiny and consideration of the elected representatives of the people.

Let us get this programme down out of the clouds to where we can see what it really is. It may well be that these lofty high-sounding phrases mean very little in the way of reform to the Canadian people. I hope that it will prove more than a smoke-screen to blind the electors so that they cannot see the tragic failure of this government's administration. The government has done some attractive political window-dressing. Let us see now what they have on the shelves inside. What is on the shelves is what counts. Let the government bring forward its measures so they can be judged by what they are, not by what the government hints they may be. No speech from the throne in itself ever accomplished anything for the Canadian people. All the vague generalizations this one contains will accomplish nothing either. Let us have the measures which the government proposes. They alone can do anything for Canada. Then we shall see wherein the government's plans are adequate or inadequate to meet the challenging problems of these days.

Turning to the speech from the throne, this is what we find:

Mutual aid for destitute populations! No one opposes that. Let the measure be brought down.

Expansion of world trade? No thinking person but supports that. Bring forward the measure, not a promise.

National security and enduring peace by international cooperation! Brave words that have become hackneyed by over-use. No one in the world but prays for that. Bring down the bill.

A national minimum of social security, full employment, a higher standard of nutrition, more adequate housing, social insurance against unemployment, accident, ill health, old age and death of the bread-winner! Why has the government let eight years pass by without these? No one opposes these principles. Introduce the bills so that they may be enacted into law.

Rehabilitation and reestablishment of returned soldiers! Transformation of war-time to peace-time economy, insurance against social and economic hazards! Let us have, not words, but specific proposals. Adequate plans will find no objectors.

War service gratuities! By all means, and as quickly as our parliamentary system will permit, and let us err on the side of generosity when we are doing it. Tax modifications! This government seems to know how to modify them only one way—upwards for all, which has led to absenteeism by many, even when maximum production is needed as never before.

Expansion of trade commissioner service! A belated admission of previous failure. Research activities! The government's record in this respect is one of lost opportunities.

Housing plans! Health insurance! How long have these been promised, now to be resurrected in an election year? I suggest that the government bring in the legislation as soon as possible.

More generous old age pensions! We are in favour, but the government's repentance in an election year carries no sense of confidence.

A minimum of well-being for the children of the nation by family allowances! After two decades of opportunity to do so the government now in its dying days makes a preelection bid for votes. There is a problem to be met in the care and health and training of children, and it should be met without

delay. Until we see the legislation, however, we are unable to tell whether or not this high national purpose will thereby be achieved. Let us have the bill forthwith.

Floor prices for agricultural products! The government in this, as in other matters, will be judged by its actions, not its promises. Not until the fifth year of war did fair treatment for agriculture occur to them. They let many agricultural prices remain at less than half what they are to-day for long periods after they came into power. What will the wheat growers, who got sixty cents a bushel or less for their wheat, and live stock men, who suffered equally, and dairy farmers, who were producing cheese and butter and milk and eggs far below the cost of production—what will all these think of a government which waited eight years to suggest a floor price, and then only after our party had proposed it? Nearly every agricultural commodity has, within the life of this government, sold at less than half of to-day's figure. Why no floor price till the government is threatened with defeat?

Our criticism of this government in these matters is that for eight years it has not brought forward enough progressive social or agriculture or labour legislation, and only now, in an election year, comes forward with these dying declarations.

Not as a challenge to the general principles of this overdue programme announced by the government in the speech from the throne but rather as a protest against certain grave omissions therein, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) the following amendment:

That the following words be added to the address in reply to the speech from the throne:

"We respectfully submit to Your Excellency that this house regrets that Your Excellency's advisers have:

(a) Failed to make adequate provision and to implement promises already made for the immediate needs and employment of the men and women of the armed forces on demobilization;

(b) Failed to provide adequate measures whereby agriculture can make its maximum war- and peace-time contribution through a stable and effective long-term programme;

(c) Failed to establish such a national code for labour as will ensure maximum production and give to labour its rightful place in our national partnership; and failed to provide for the correction of the unfairly coercive and restrictive clauses in the 1943 wartime wages control order;

(d) Failed to lessen bureaucratic controls and regimentation and to recognize and restore the supremacy of parliament; and failed to halt the continuing infringement of provincial rights and the centralization of authority.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon), when he began to address the house this afternoon, craved its indulgence because, as he said, he intended to follow very closely the notes which he had before him. I must crave the indulgence of the house if I attempt to speak without any notes. To tell the truth I have not had time to write out a lengthy speech, nor have I had the good fortune of having others who would write it for me. What the house and the country will be particularly interested to know is whether the speech to which we have just listened is that of the hon. leader of the opposition, whom I see immediately opposite, or whether it is the speech of the leader of the Conservative party.

Mr. GRAYDON: Is the Prime Minister serious? I know he was indulging in a little humour at the beginning of his speech, and I do not want to answer him if it is one of those humorous quips of his; but I cannot imagine that he is serious in what he is saying. However, if he wants an answer to what he has said I shall be glad to give it to him. I made the speech myself, and any speech given in this house by me has been prepared by myself. I want the Prime Minister to accept that statement, because I do not want him or anyone else to make any insinuations with regard to any leader. I do not think it becomes the Prime Minister of Canada.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am much obliged to my hon. friend for the statement he has just made, because I would repeat that what I think the people of Canada are interested in particularly, what hon. members are interested in, is not the views of my hon. friend or his qualifications for preparing orations, but the views of the leader of the Conservative party in this country. We have opposite a great party that over a year ago chose a new leader, and the country is anxious to know the views of that leader. It is anxious to have those views expressed in this parliament. May I say at once, since my hon. friend has brought the name of Mr. John Bracken into the debate this afternoon, and has spoken of John Bracken's bill of rights, of the Winnipeg convention at which John Bracken was elected, and much else connected with John Bracken, that I believe not only hon. members of this house but the people of Canada generally are anxious to see John Bracken in person, and if he is to continue as leader of his party to see him in this House of Commons.

Apart from all else, as the leader of this House of Commons, I have a certain obliga-

tion to the house to see that long and honourable traditions are maintained. I would draw the attention of hon. members and of the country to the extent to which in Canada we are departing from the spirit of representative parliamentary institutions. It may come as a surprise to some to learn that though we are now in the fifth session of the nineteenth parliament, during all that time since this parliament opened, the great party opposite has not had a leader in the House of Commons.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Oh! That is pretty tough on me.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No. My hon. friend was not leader; he was acting leader.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I was the leader until I retired.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend acted very well at times and sometimes very badly.

Mr. GRAYDON: I suppose that applies to the Prime Minister too.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The hon. gentleman was not leader of the Conservative party. May I draw this further fact to the attention of the house. The Conservative party, or the Progressive Conservative party, or whatever name it went by at the time, has not had a leader elected to the House of Commons during the life of this parliament. There have been two leaders of the party who have not been returned to this House of Commons during this parliament. The late Hon. Doctor Manion was the leader of the party at the time of the last election. Doctor Manion was defeated. My hon. friend (Mr. Hanson, York-Sunbury) has said he acted as leader until the party was in a position to choose a leader. Then the party chose a leader. As was expected under our system of government where all who take a part in parliamentary proceedings are supposed to represent the people, are supposed to have a constituency which they represent, the leader first chosen, Right Hon. Arthur Meighen, went before the people in his capacity as leader, asking to be returned for a constituency that he might take his seat in this House of Commons. He was defeated; he was not returned, and the party continued on without its leader in the House of Commons. That lasted for thirteen months. Then we had this Winnipeg convention at which John Bracken was elected, and at which he began to put forth bills of rights or other documents of high importance to legislative bodies. But up to the present time John Bracken has not found a seat. He represents nobody so far as representation in this House of Commons is concerned. I say—

Mr. GRAYDON: That would be more applicable to my right hon. friend than to Mr. Bracken.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I say, standing here speaking for the rights of the people in their parliament, that the only man who has a right to speak in the name of the people as a leader is one who occupies a seat in this parliament or who has received the approval of the electorate, giving him the right to speak as a representative. The fact that Mr. Bracken sat in a provincial legislature for a number of years does not entitle him to be regarded as a representative of the people of Canada at this time in dealing with the public affairs of this parliament; much less does it entitle him to put forth bills of rights and have those bills of rights quoted in this House of Commons when he himself is not here to stand up for them.

May I direct the attention of my hon. friend, since he has referred to a "bill of rights," to the fact that the Bill of Rights was an important statute enacted for the purpose of securing to the Commons of Britain, and to the parliament of Britain, its rights and privileges. One of the rights and privileges of free people is that there shall be a free parliament, and that their representatives shall sit in that parliament to determine the laws and policies that are to govern. What is to become of parliamentary institutions if we begin to substitute for membership in the House of Commons itself, or in parliament itself, some form of absentee leadership? That is a new development in the political life of our country—absentee leadership over a period of years.

My hon. friend knows that so far as this side of the house is concerned we have been prepared to facilitate the entry of Mr. Bracken into the House of Commons—

Mr. GRAYDON: As you did for Mr. Meighen.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The people expressed their opinion.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): No, no.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I may say that any leader who cannot obtain a seat is not one who ought longer to claim the right to lead a political party.

Mr. GRAYDON: My hon. friend was in exactly that position.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am just directing attention to the change that is coming over the spirit of our political institutions when

it begins to be the custom to have leaders of parties, who claim they are to be at the head of an alternative government after a general election, direct their followings from outside parliament altogether.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Your friend Mitch Hepburn did that, did he not?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: He is no example.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): He was your friend then.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That makes the position of my hon. friends worse and worse.

Mr. PERLEY: He succeeded.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: However, this is not a joking matter. It is not for me to say what road, either to success or to ruin, the hon. gentlemen opposite should take as we approach a general election, but it is for me in my position as leader of this House of Commons to point out that the place for the leader of a political party which hopes to be in a position to form a government, is in the House of Commons in the position of leader of the opposition.

May I here direct attention to the pertinancy of what I have just said. Parliament has given to the position of leader of the opposition a place of exceptional significance and importance. There has been assigned by statute to the leader of the opposition a position which places upon him certain definite obligations, one of which is to be in parliament and to watch the administration, to criticize the administration fairly, and presumably also to make known what alternative policies he would present to those which are being proposed. He draws a salary similar to that of the members of the government. Now, I submit that parliament never intended that that position should be occupied by someone acting in the place of the leader of the party, however amiable and delightful he himself might be. Considering the importance of the great questions which have to be decided in this parliament this year, I hope that before very long the leader of the Conservative party opposite will find it possible—if it is possible at all for him to do so—to get into this House of Commons and let us have the opportunity to debate these questions face to face.

May I point out also the invidious position in which I am placed if I venture to take issue with anything that Mr. Bracken may say; immediately it will be said that Mr. King is saying something in the absence of the person who has made the statement. Well, I wish to say what I have to say to Mr. Bracken in his presence, and I want that presence to be here in the House of Commons. I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will believe that the government is most sincere when I say, on behalf of the government, that if, in any way, we can facilitate Mr. Bracken's entry to this House of Commons at an early stage in this session we shall be happy to do so, because I believe the people of this country have the right to see, not how Mr. Bracken performs in matters of political organization outside this house, but how he conducts himself in matters of debate here when the house is in session.

I have said what I have said because my hon. friend attached so much importance in the course of his remarks to Mr. Bracken and his bill of rights. With much of what my hon. friend has otherwise said I am in accord. He did endorse in many directions a large part of the proposed legislation which is put forth in the speech from the throne.

Mr. GRAYDON: Look where it came from.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend now says, "Look where it came from". But he does not deny he has endorsed much of what the government has proposed to this parliament, and for that I wish to thank him.

I should like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the address. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) said he was going to save time and cut short his remarks in that particular. It is one of the traditions of the House of Commons that when hon. members speak at the opening of a session some cognizance should be taken of the manner in which they speak on such an important occasion. I for one, being rather fond of preserving traditions where they are worthy of preservation, have great pleasure this afternoon in complimenting most warmly both the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Tremblay) and the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker) upon their splendid utterances in moving and seconding the address in reply to the speech from the throne. The leader of the opposition has drawn attention to the fact that, for some years, both hon. gentlemen have been members of this house, that both are veterans of the last war, that both are on active service in the present war, performing useful service in our country, and that both have regretted that for reasons which are apparent they do not find it possible to serve overseas. However, each has been setting a fine example to others by the manner in which he has sought to serve the country's interests both in parliament and in the armed forces. These hon. members are similar in the respects which I have mentioned. They are similar also in another respect which is important at this time. They

are the fathers of fairly large families, and as such are in a position to speak not only as veterans on such matters as demobilization and rehabilitation of the forces, but, also as heads of families on the significance of the social legislation which is proposed in the speech from the throne. I am glad they have expressed themselves so strongly in favour of it.

There is one other point I should like to mention in regard to these two hon. gentlemen. One comes to us from the province of Quebec; he is of a race and religion different from that of the other hon. gentleman, who comes to us from the prairie provinces. In the speeches delivered by these two hon. gentlemen, however, we find that unity—unity in diversity—which is perhaps the greatest of all the outstanding features of our country. We are a united country, though we may have diverse elements; and our unity could not have been better exemplified than it was in the two admirable addresses which were delivered on Friday last.

This afternoon the leader of the opposition began his remarks, quite rightly, by emphasizing the fact that the war is continuing, and that it was or should be the most important of all considerations before us at this time. Later, however, in the course of his remarks my hon. friend said that he thought either the speech from the throne or the government itself had given evidence of a belief that the war would be over somewhat soon. May I immediately take exception to any statement of the kind. I wish I could say to this House of Commons that I believed the war was nearing an end. It is perfectly true that conditions are much better than they were a year ago. We have great reason to be thankful for the tremendous gains which have been made in the course of the past year; that the Germans have been driven out of Africa; that Italy has surrendered unconditionally; that the Italian fleet is now under the control of the allied powers; that Sicily has been successfully invaded and liberated, and that Italy has been invaded. We can be thankful that the Russians have had such great successes, and also that on the other side of the world the United States, Australian, New Zealand and British forces have had the great successes which they have achieved up to the present in their battles against the Japanese. But it remains true as far as both Germany and Japan are concerned that to-day these countries still occupy a very considerable proportion of conquered territory, and that the fighting is still taking place on that conquered territory. In Europe, while Russia is making a magnificent fight, the Germans are still on Russian soil. In Italy, while the British, United States and Canadian forces, and others allied with them, are making a magnificent fight, the Germans still are in possession of the greater part of that country. At the present time Germany is surrounded by a group of conquered countries which serve as outer defences to her immediate territory. Those countries which have been overrun are providing Germany at present with resources which she needs, in the way of man-power, food and raw materials. Their peoples are being made to work and to serve the interests of Germany, which itself remains a perfectly intact fortress. Similarly in the orient Japan controls the many countries and islands which she has taken from the Netherlands, the British and others, and Japan is being supplied with labour and materials in a way which helps to serve her ends and needs.

So, Mr. Speaker, while we have great reason to be thankful for the progress which has been made, it would be wrong to assume that there is like reason to believe that there will be an early conclusion to this war. I have followed the progress of the war, I think, as closely as any man in Canada, and I am sure I am only giving the experience of others who have sought to follow it closely, as well as my own, when I say that I have been surprised at how long it has taken, in the light of the expectations that have been cherished, to reach the different objectives that have been attained along the way. Let me remind hon. members here of what their views were at the time Africa was invaded by the United States armies, and at the time the British were fighting along the north coast of that continent. It was thought first that it would be a matter of only a few weeks before the Germans and Italians were driven out, then of a few months, but as it turned out a very much longer time was required. When this house adjourned last July our forces, along with British and American forces, had entered Sicily. We thought it was going to be a matter of only a short time until Sicily and then Italy were conquered. Certainly when the Italian mainland had been successfully invaded by the allied forces it was felt that it would be only a short time until Rome would be in the possession of the allied powers. Well, Rome is not yet under allied control, and no one can say how long the Italian campaign may last.

We know that in all probability Europe is to be invaded from the west as well as the east and south, but does anyone realize how difficult that invasion is going to be? I want this afternoon to leave that thought, above all others, with hon. members of this house. As I

see it, our country, in common with Great Britain and the United States, is facing as appalling a situation as these countries have faced at any time. I do not wish to exaggerate the difficulty of invading Europe, but I do wish to draw attention to the fact that invasion means not merely a successful landing of troops on the continent of Europe and the combined action of different armed forces, but also that once men are on the soil of Europe they have to be maintained there. And they will have to be maintained with supplies brought, in large part, from this continent, across the Atlantic. I need not go into details, because I think hon. members have a pretty clear conception of what the facts of the situation will be. But I do say at once to the House of Commons and to the people of Canada that I am far from believing there is going to be an early conclusion to this war. For that reason I believe parliament must continue to make the winning of the war its first and main objective.

Listening to my hon. friend this afternoon I must say I was surprised, particularly when he dwelt at such length upon matters pertaining to general elections compared with the time he devoted to the present situation in Europe.

Mr. GRAYDON: I was going by the speech from the throne.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, my hon. friend has his own responsibility.

Mr. GRAYDON: So does the Prime Minister.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: He has his own responsibility.

Mr. GRAYDON: The speech from the throne was filled with everything except the war.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend spoke on his own responsibility, and it was for him to do what I am seeking to do now, namely, to impress the house with the importance of winning the war, before all else.

My hon. friend has just said that he was following the speech from the throne. May I repeat to the house the paragraph which I believe to be the most important appearing in the speech from the throne. It is in these words:

> The winning of the war clearly remains the first of all objectives. My ministers believe it is their duty to see that Canada's war effort is firmly maintained until the enemy is defeated in Europe and in Asia. They believe the government's primary task, and the primary duty of the Canadian people, is to concentrate on the prosecution of the war. Our fighting men must be assured that there will be no diversion from this vital task and no relaxation of Canada's war effort. Till the war is won, the policies of my government will continue to be shaped to that end.

That is the policy of the present administration. In so far as it lies within our power, we intend, in the house, to endeavour to concentrate on measures relating to the winning of the war, until the war is won—and not, I pray, to devote our time to too great consideration of matters which may be more concerned with the winning of elections than with the winning of the war.

Before proceeding further, may I say, so that hon. members may know exactly where the government stands in relation to elections, that I have already made clear to the people of Canada, in an address last September, at a time when members of different parties were saying that we were going to have a general election before the end of the year, that so far as I was concerned, and so far as the government was concerned, we hoped to carry through to the end the trust which had been given to us by the Canadian people, when they returned us to power, a trust that we would put forth the utmost effort in the winning of the war, and direct the affairs of Canada to that end. We intend to do that. Unless prevented, in some way which it would be impossible to control, from carrying on the affairs of government as they must be carried on if we are to win the war, we intend to continue with that work, and not to interrupt it by any general election until the war is won. The people of Canada do not want a general election at this time of war. Our men fighting overseas do not want an election, if it can be avoided, until after victory is achieved, and we are in a position to welcome them and all our armed forces home as a victorious army.

A prime minister is placed in a very difficult position when he is asked to give any undertaking to the country that he will not, in any circumstance, have a general election. It is running counter to the spirit of British institutions, when as regards the time of an appeal to the people any government binds itself in any final way. For that reason I have found it necessary, as I do to-day, to say that situations may arise in which it will be impossible for the government to carry on, with the authority it should have in a time of war. Some questions might arise which would make it necessary that an appeal to the people be made to settle an issue, and get on with the work of winning the war. I see no reason for either at the present time. I have no desire for and no thought of seeking to find an issue of the kind. What I am determined to do, if

God gives me health and strength, is to stay in the position I am in at the present time until this war is won. Then, if circumstances warrant, the people will be given their full rights and powers to decide as to what administration they may wish to have in office during the next parliament, whether they wish the present administration to be returned to office or some other to take its place.

I have not forgotten the fact that there is a constitutional limitation upon the duration of a parliament. But this parliament may continue, I believe, until June of next year, if that should be necessary—the war continuing, meanwhile. And, short of that, I repeat it is the intention of this administration, with the cooperation of members of parliament generally, to carry on with the prosecution of the war to the utmost limit of our power.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I ask the Prime Minister one question?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. GRAYDON: If I understood him correctly, on another occasion he said he was opposed to any extension of the life of parliament; is that so?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, I am opposed to parliaments extending their own terms of office. I think one of the greatest mistakes made in this country was the extension by one parliament of its own term of office. I cannot say what situation might exist a year or more hence, at which time it might be necessary for parliament carefully to weigh all aspects of the situation. But, certainly, unless there are very strong reasons to the contrary, I would wish to see no extension of the term of parliament, and to see the people secured in their full rights to return to this House of Commons for the period allotted under the constitution the government they wish to represent them.

I have made this statement mainly in the hope hon. members will realize that so far as possible their first duty is to cooperate with the government in getting on with war measures. I am sure they will so regard the situation.

Before saying a further word, however, I should like to join in what has been said by the leader of the opposition respecting our armed forces, what we in Canada think of our fighting men and the part they have taken in the war. It is difficult to realize that to-day some of the men who are serving overseas have spent no less than five of their Christmas seasons away from home. If one stops to think what that means in the way of privation to men who have the great duties and responsibilities which all of them have, one will appreciate what is owing to these men. I do not confine my remarks to the men who have been longest in the forces—naturally they are very much in our minds—but I say that this parliament of Canada is prouder than words can express of the manner in which the men and women in the armed forces of Canada have borne their part in this titanic struggle.

I do not speak merely of the growth of the forces. We know how the navy has expanded, as well as the army and the air force. We know what has been done in the way of the production of munitions and supplies of all kinds. I am not thinking of quantities or numbers; I am thinking of individual human lives and of what each life in the fighting forces of Canada to-day represents in the way of personal hardship endured and service given to our country.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): And sacrifice.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: And sacrifice. I was coming to that in just a moment. I should like those who are in the armed forces to-day, whether they are serving at sea, in the air or on land, to know that they are first and foremost in the minds of the Canadian people. We want them to know that we are proud of their skill, of their endurance, of their achievements, and that we intend to see that they are not disappointed in the backing which they will expect to receive from the people's representatives in the House of Commons and members of the Senate of their country.

I have not the time to-day to go into many of the matters to which my hon. friend has referred. I agree with him that it is desirable that we should seek to reform in some particulars some of the things to which perhaps we have grown too accustomed. As my hon. friend has frankly stated, one of these is the length of speeches. I gladly accept his challenge made this afternoon and would say at once that I intend to make only a few remarks before concluding, except on one subject about which I am obliged to speak at a little greater length. I should like to see this House of Commons get down to business just as quickly as it possibly can. We have a heavy legislative programme.

In connection with the carrying out of our programme, it has been suggested that the rules of the house should be revised. As the leader of the opposition has pointed out, the government has decided to have a committee appointed immediately to undertake a revision of the rules and procedure. It is true that I

took exception last session to this committee being appointed on the score that I did not think it was wise in a time of war to revise the rules and procedure of the House of Commons. But I have since come to the conclusion that this war may be much longer than some of us believed at the time I made that particular statement, and I think it is as well that we should at once take cognizance of the necessity of making some revisions of our rules and procedure to enable us the better to cope with legislation pertaining to the conduct of the war itself. I am prepared to say this afternoon that if hon. members are agreeable the government will, if necessary, interrupt the debate on the speech from the throne to enable committees to be appointed immediately. I am informed that the striking committee already has a list of the names of those who are to be on the standing committees, and we should therefore be in a position to have these committees constituted immediately. It is the intention of the government to have some of the committees that existed last session reestablished, namely, the committee on reconstruction and rehabilitation, and the committee on social security. I understand that the names of the members of those committees are ready to be presented to the house at any moment. There is also the committee on war expenditures and the committee on radio broadcasting.

A new committee having to do with the elections act is to be established in order to ensure adequate facilities for voting by members of the armed forces wherever they may happen to be.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Is it intended that the activities of that committee and the legislation to be brought down after it has made its report will be limited only to the taking of the soldier vote, or is there to be a general revision?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, it is a revision with reference to the vote of members of the armed forces.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is what we understood.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think that covers the committees that the government has in mind reconstituting or appointing at the present time. Those committees may be appointed at once.

I have another suggestion which I should like to make to hon. members, and I hope they will consider it favourably. I am not putting it forward at the moment or until I learn at first-hand the sense of the house. I believe with members generally that much more of the work of parliament could and should be done by committees, and that we would save much general discussion if that were more largely adopted as a method of procedure. We have been accustomed to sitting just half a day on Wednesdays. I believe that we would make more progress during the session if one day in the week were reserved entirely for the work of committees. Members of parliament complain that they cannot serve on committees and watch proceedings in the house at the same time. I am sure it would be a convenience to members generally if there were one day which they could devote entirely to the work of the committees.

Mr. GRAYDON: Now that the right hon. gentleman has brought up this matter, has he given any thought to an alternative scheme under which the time of parliament could be utilized to better effect with a different division of work as between the committees and the house?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, I have given a good deal of thought to it. One aspect to which necessarily I have had to give the most thought is how the government itself can adequately cope with the questions that come before it from day to day as the issues become larger and more serious, with the war reaching the stage which it has reached at the present time. As hon. members know, the cabinet is obliged to meet every day. In addition there is the war committee of the cabinet which is concerned immediately with policy in respect to all the important matters that come up in connection with the war. Ministers of the crown cannot, I believe, give the time that is needed for the careful consideration of the war and other measures that come before this parliament during a war session at the stage the war has now reached without having some day which they can regard more or less as their own for purposes of careful consideration of the different measures. I believe that if, after all committees are appointed, it were generally understood that Wednesdays would be devoted to the work of committees, we would be serving alike the interests of parliament and the interests of the nation.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The Prime Minister is suggesting that there should be no Wednesday sitting?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am suggesting that for consideration. But that would not mean for a minute that the members will not be fully occupied. I think the public would understand that there will be plenty of work for all to do. It will result, I believe, in a

fuller attendance in the house when we are dealing with important matters, and in much less discussion and help to avoid undue prolongation of the sessions.

I shall leave it to my colleagues in the government to take up other matters which have been referred to by my hon. friend (Mr. Graydon).

There is, however, one question which I shall necessarily have to deal with because it has become an issue in the country at the present time. The leader of the opposition stated that he noticed that the speech from the throne had to do with international organization—but that it made no special reference to what I presume he meant were the constitutional relations within the empire. My hon. friend himself made no statement on that important question. May I say to him that I think the country will wish to know where the Progressive Conservative party stands on the question raised of the relations of the different parts of the empire, as it will wish to know where the government stands and where the other parties represented in this house also stand.

May I say that I hope the debate on the address will not be made the occasion for the discussion at length of matters that pertain to external affairs. There is an appropriate time for different subjects to be discussed. I would myself have preferred to say nothing whatever to-day on the matter to which I have just referred if it were not that statements have been made from sources I cannot ignore, and the country is expecting that I should make a statement of the government's position. But there will be during the course of the session an opportunity, when the estimates of the Department of External Affairs are before us, to discuss fully all matters of foreign policy, and I would hope that that would be the time at which such further discussion as may be necessary on some at least of these matters would take place.

I notice in a dispatch from Britain that on January 27 the question was raised in the House of Commons at Westminster as to whether the government did not think a debate on empire affairs at this stage was necessary in view of certain views recently expressed on empire relationship. The acting leader of the house, the deputy Prime Minister, Mr. Attlee, said that he thought such a discussion would not at that stage serve a useful purpose, and that other opportunities might come. I mention this simply that hon. members will see I am not taking a different view in suggesting another time for the discussion of foreign affairs than in the debate on the address. I am not seeking to rule out such a discussion, but I am seeking indirectly to shorten, if that is possible, the time that most certainly would be taken by such a discussion in the debate on the address.

The question that has come very much to the fore in the last few days is whether there is to be a common policy for all parts of the empire or commonwealth on foreign relations, defence and other matters—a single or common policy as distinct from each nation of the British commonwealth having its own policy on foreign affairs, on defence and on other matters. Let me say at once that, so far as consultation is concerned and cooperation in matters of foreign affairs, defence and the like, as between the different parts of the British empire or the British commonwealth of nations, whichever one prefers to call it, I feel that there cannot be too close consultation and cooperation. I feel that too great an effort cannot be made to ensure careful coordination of these policies, and for my part, wherever opportunity has presented itself in the past or may present itself in the future, I intend to do all that lies within my power to see that there is, among the different nations of the British commonwealth of nations, full consultation, cooperation and coordination, where possible, of all of these particular policies.

I have no very great fear that this consultation and cooperation will not take place. It has steadily grown during the past couple of decades. We have reached to-day an effective method of consultation and cooperation that has not been surpassed at any time in the history of the British empire. It is capable, I believe, in certain particulars, of further development. The whole development, I would say, has been towards perfecting arrangements for effective consultation and cooperation on all matters of common interest and concern.

The suggestion of an organization of the relations between the different self-governing parts of the empire or nations of the commonwealth which would help to centralize their activities is not a new one. It has been made time and again over many years in the past, and each time it has come up for consideration some assurance has been given, where it has been dealt with at imperial conferences or meetings of premiers, that the nations of the commonwealth need not fear in the least any invasion of their complete autonomy in shaping their own policies. I should like to give the house in succession the assurances that have been given at different imperial con-

ferences. Here may I say that I regret that this question should come up at this time, because I do think, involving as it does discussion in the press, in public assemblies and elsewhere, it is to a very considerable extent taking the minds of the people off the immediate thing, which is the winning of the war. Why we need worry to-day about the form of organization which the empire is going to take after the war, I cannot understand. I think the thing to-day is to win the war, and when the war is won there will be plenty of time to consider what changes in organization, if any, may be necessary.

Just at this point, lest I should forget it, I have been asked the question at different times whether an address which was recently made in Toronto and which dealt with this particular subject had been brought to my attention before it was delivered. I wish to say to the house that I had no knowledge whatever of what was to be said or of what actually was said until after that particular address was made.

Near the close of the last war there was what was known as the imperial war conference of 1917. The suggestion was made by that conference that there should be a meeting for the purpose of considering constitutional relations within the empire. From that day to the present no conference that has been held in Britain has sought in any way to attempt to form an organization which would deprive in any particular the different legislative bodies of the commonwealth of full control over their own affairs.

The first conference of prime ministers which was held after the war took place in 1921. At that conference—I believe that Canada was represented by the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen—the following resolution was passed:

> The prime ministers of the United Kingdom and the dominions, having carefully considered the recommendation of the imperial war conference of 1917 that a special imperial conference should be summoned as soon as possible after the war to consider the constitutional relations of the component parts of the empire, have reached the following conclusions:
>
> (a) Continuous consultation to which the prime ministers attach no less importance than the imperial war conference of 1917, can only be secured by a substantial improvement in the communications between the component parts of the empire. Having regard to the constitutional developments since 1917, no advantage is to be gained by holding a constitutional conference.

That was the view taken after the last war, in 1921, that no advantage would be gained by having a conference to deal with these particular questions of constitutional relations within the empire.

The next imperial conference came in 1923. I was present at that conference, as one of the representatives of Canada. That conference had occasion to deal with questions of foreign relations, communications, signature and ratification of treaties, and matters of defence. The position taken by the conference in these matters is set out very clearly in the following statement, under "Foreign Affairs". After the conference had discussed foreign affairs at some length the statement concludes:

> This conference is a conference of representatives of the several governments of the empire; its views and conclusions on foreign policy, as recorded above, are necessarily subject to the action of the governments and parliaments of the various portions of the empire, and it trusts that the results of its deliberations will meet with their approval.

There was this statement with regard to defence:

> The conference gave special consideration to the question of defence and the manner in which cooperation and mutual assistance could best be effected, after taking into account the political and geographical conditions of the various parts of the empire.
>
> The conference affirms that it is necessary to provide for the adequate defence of the territories and trade of the several countries comprising the British empire. In this connection the conference expressly recognizes that it is for the parliaments of the several parts of the empire, upon the recommendations of their respective governments, to decide the nature and extent of any action which should be taken by them.

The next conference came in 1926. I was also present at that conference. It was not until 1926 that any conference attempted to develop what might be known as a formula which would set out the existing relations between the different parts of the empire; but at that conference a committee, which was headed by the late Lord Balfour, did present a statement which was adopted by the conference, and which set out in the clearest manner possible the views of the different representatives as to interimperial relations. I read from the report of the conference of 1926:

> All the questions on the agenda affecting interimperial relations were referred by the conference to a committee of prime ministers and heads of delegations, of which Lord Balfour was asked to be chairman.

The committee reported as follows:

> We were appointed at the meeting of the imperial conference on October 25, 1926, to investigate all the questions on the agenda affecting interimperial relations. Our discussions on these questions have been long and intricate. We found, on examination, that they involved consideration of fundamental principles affecting the relations of the various parts of

the British empire *inter se*, as well as the relations of each part to foreign countries. For such examination the time at our disposal has been all too short. Yet we hope that we may have laid a foundation on which subsequent conferences may build.

I quote further:

The committee are of the opinion that nothing would be gained by attempting to lay down a constitution for the British empire. Its widely scattered parts have very different characteristics, very different histories, and are at very different stages of evolution; while, considered as a whole, it defies classification and bears no real resemblance to any other political organization which now exists or has ever yet been tried.

There is, however, one most important element in it which, from a strictly constitutional point of view, has now, as regards vital matters, reached its full development—we refer to the group of self-governing communities composed of Great Britain and the dominions. Their position and mutual relation may be readily defined. They are autonomous communities within the British empire, equal in status, in no way subordinate one to another in any aspect of their domestic or external affairs, though united by a common allegiance to the crown, and freely associated as members of the British commonwealth of nations.

And a little further down:

Every self-governing member of the empire is now the master of its destiny.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that no words could be clearer than those in defining the present position; and I must say that the position as thus defined is the position which this government accepts as the present one and which it desires to see maintained.

In regard to defence:

The conference gave much consideration to the question of defence, and to the methods by which the defence arrangements of each part of the empire could be most effectively coordinated.

In dealing with defence the first item that is set forth is this:

The resolutions on defence adopted at the last session of the conference are reaffirmed.

The statement there of what was reaffirmed at the previous conference is:

The conference affirms that it is necessary to provide for the adequate defence of the territories and trade of the several countries comprising the British empire. In this connection the conference expressly recognizes that it is for the parliaments of the several parts of the empire, upon the recommendations of their respective governments, to decide the nature and extent of any action which should be taken by them.

There was, I believe, a further conference in 1930 which was attended by Mr. Bennett. I have looked through the proceedings and am unable to see anything which in any way alters the force of the position that was taken at previous conferences in regard to inter-imperial relations. There was an economic conference which was held in this city in 1932, but it did not touch the question of inter-imperial constitutional relations. There was a further conference in London in 1937, the year of the coronation. I had again the honour of representing Canada, along with others, at that conference. At that conference foreign affairs, defence and constitutional questions were all on the agenda for discussion. I have a copy of the report of the conference and this is what is stated with respect to foreign affairs and defence. The chairman made the following statement:

Though we shall discuss other important subjects, we are agreed that questions of foreign affairs and defence shall be our main subjects.

During the discussion emphasis was laid on the importance of developing the practice of communication and consultation between different governments as a help to the coordination of policies.

The conference recorded the results of its deliberations on the subject of foreign affairs, and this is the pertinent paragraph:

While no attempt was made to formulate commitments, which in any event could not be made effective until approved and confirmed by the respective parliaments, the representatives of the governments concerned found themselves in close agreement upon a number of general propositions . . . they declared their intention of continuing to consult and cooperate. . . .

And in the matter of defence—

The conference gave close attention to the subject of defence, and considered ways in which it would be possible for the governments concerned to cooperate in measures for their own security.

In the course of the discussions, the conference found general agreement among its members that the security of each of their countries can be increased by cooperation in such matters as the free interchange of information concerning the state of their naval, military and air forces, the continuance of the arrangements already initiated by some of them for concerting the scale of the defences of ports, and measures for cooperation in the defence of communications and other common interests. At the same time the conference recognized that it is the sole responsibility of the several parliaments of the British commonwealth to decide the nature and scope of their own defence policy.

At that conference I made a statement of Canada's position in regard to imperial conferences, and the place that they occupy in settling matters of policy. I will read it to the house because it is the position which, if I were attending a conference of prime ministers later in the year, as I may, I would wish to maintain at that time.

The task of an imperial conference has been well defined as that of considering whether the several governments represented, while preserving their individual rights of decision and action, can coordinate their various policies in

such a way as to assist one another, and help forward the cause of peace. Its function is not to formulate or declare policy. The value of this, as of other imperial conferences, lies mainly in the free exchange of information and opinion; in furnishing the representatives of the several governments with more adequate knowledge of the problems, the difficulties, the aspirations, the attitudes of other members of the British commonwealth of nations; and in giving that direct and immediate understanding of the national and personal factors in the situation which cannot well be obtained by correspondence or indirect communication. With this further knowledge in their possession, the representatives of each government, in consultation with their colleagues and their respective parliaments, are in the best of positions to formulate policies on questions where cooperation is required.

It will be seen that at all the conferences I have mentioned, it was clearly stated that the governments and parliaments of the different countries represented would formulate and decide their own policies, that the conferences were for purposes of consultation to help to make cooperation more effective in the coordinating of policies. It was not for the conferences to formulate policies.

I wonder very much whether those who are speaking about more effective consultation, cooperation and coordination, begin to appreciate how much has been achieved in that direction, how completely there are existing throughout the British commonwealth of nations to-day most effective means of consultation and of cooperation in everything that affects policy, whether it is foreign policy or defence, or communications, or any other particular matter. Let me very quickly mention just what some of those means are.

In the first place there is the communication which takes place between the governments of the different countries. This government receives every day several communications from the Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs bringing to our attention matters that are of concern to the different nations of the commonwealth. Our government communicates every day more or less, I think I can say every day, and sometimes sends several messages in a day, to the Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs giving our views in these matters. There is direct communication between the prime ministers of the different nations of the commonwealth. The Prime Minister of Great Britain communicates direct with the Prime Minister of Canada, as he does with the Prime Minister of Australia and other nations of the commonwealth, and I communicate direct with him or with them when the situation is important enough to have these direct communications in addition to the messages which are sent through the Department of External Affairs to the Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs.

Then there is present in Ottawa a representative of the British government in the person of the high commissioner, formerly a very distinguished member of British cabinets. The high commissioner of the United Kingdom is in a position to communicate direct with the members of the government, with myself personally, as he does very frequently, or with officials of the Department of External Affairs, on matters on which it is desirable to have fuller information than that which is likely to come in formal dispatches. But more than that we have also our high commissioner in Great Britain, and our high commissioner is in a position to bring to the attention of the Prime Minister and other ministers of Britain matters on which we feel we should like to give fuller information than is contained in more formal communications. The practice has grown up during the present war of having the high commissioners of all parts of the British empire resident in London meet daily with the Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs. He has present with him on most occasions a representative of the foreign office, and at these interviews which take place between the Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs, who has been sitting in the cabinet at Downing street, there is communicated to the high commissioners what is important in reference to interimperial relations and matters of common concern with respect to the war.

A complete system of representation by high commissioners in different parts of the empire has grown up since the beginning of this war. Canada has had her high commissioner in Britain for many years, and we received the high commissioner from Great Britain for the first time in 1928. Since the outbreak of war, Canada has appointed high commissioners to all the self-governing dominions. We have our high commissioners in Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Ireland and Newfoundland. These countries (except Newfoundland) have their high commissioners here in Ottawa.

In addition to that we have ministers or ambassadors in a number of the leading capitals. Our ministers are in touch with the ministers or the ambassadors there from other parts of the commonwealth and are in a position to gather a great deal of information which is communicated to the government at Ottawa, matters of common interest and concern; therefore, in all of these particulars there is from day to day the fullest and most complete kind of consultation.

I should add that in addition to all of these communications which take place over the wires there are frequent visits by ministers from different nations of the commonwealth, particularly from Great Britain to Canada and frequent visits by our ministers to Great Britain. Scarcely a month goes by that we have not the honour of meeting either here or in Washington or elsewhere a minister of the British government who is on this continent on some important mission. Take the relations between Mr. Churchill and myself. I have had several meetings with Mr. Churchill since the war began, some of them at Washington, some in England and some here in Canada. All of this is a very much changed condition from what existed prior to the war. Means of travel have been so perfected that a minister can cross from Canada to Britain or vice versa in less than a day, and when any question comes up on which we feel it is necessary to have immediate personal consultation we arrange to see that personal consultation is brought about here or overseas.

I should add in addition to that what I think is most important of all, and it is an answer to those who talk about having some imperial council that is going to decide commonwealth policies. We have to-day a continuing conference of cabinet councils of the commonwealth, a continuing conference of cabinets of the commonwealth dealing with matters of common concern. Let me explain what I mean. When any question comes up that is of common concern to the commonwealth in whole or in part, a communication comes, say from London, if that is the source at which the question arises, to our government. A similar communication is sent to the premiers of other goverments of the commonwealth. Immediately I am in a position, as Prime Minister, to take that particular question before my colleagues in the cabinet; and when I give advice to the British government on any matter I am not giving advice by myself alone, in the atmosphere of London, but I am giving advice based on what judgment I am able to form after consulting with the members of the government from all parts of Canada, each of whom has his immediate responsibility to this parliament of Canada which has its responsibility to the people of Canada. I ask: how can conferences between cabinets be carried out more effectively than that?

The objection I have to going over to London to imperial conferences to try to settle policies, if that should be the object, is that I am at a complete disadvantage in those circumstances; and when I speak of myself it is quite impersonal; I am referring to anyone who holds the office of Prime Minister of Canada. The Prime Minister attending in London meets an entire cabinet. He may be entirely alone. He has not with him all his colleagues; he has with him very few colleagues, unless the business of his own country is to be neglected while he is away. More than that, however, he is without his expert advisers, who are much needed in dealing with great questions of peace or war. On the other hand every minister of the cabinet in London has his expert advisers, when a certain issue is up for discussion, either seated beside him or in an adjoining room, and he is in a position to command their views on any suggestion that may be made. Further, he is in a position to confer with all his colleagues and make his statement to the conference based upon opinions formed in that way. As I say, unless one is prepared to take with him colleagues and experts, and to allow the government of Canada to be carried on minus these responsible ministers and officials while an imperial conference is being conducted, one is not in a position to discuss matters as they should be discussed, and in the light of the responsibilities of the situation, as one would wish to discuss them.

But when, as to-day, we have this system under which every question brought up is discussed fully in the cabinets of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and Great Britain; when views are interchanged within a very short time, what more effective means could possibly be found of obtaining a consensus of view, an approach toward common policy, and a coordination of policies? I am one hundred per cent for close consultation, close cooperation and effective coordination of policy on all matters of common concern between the different nations of the British commonwealth. By all means let us within the British commonwealth be as united as we possibly can in thought and action, but let us seek in regard to other countries also to effect a closer cooperation and coordination of policies, which will make for the sort of world organization we hope to see prevail in future in this world.

This leads me to conclude with just a reference—

Mr. BLACKMORE: Would the right hon. gentleman permit a question? Ever since Lord Halifax delivered his address I have been wondering what further elements of coordination or cooperative machinery he had in mind than those which the Prime Minister has out-

lined. Would it be asking too much to request that the Prime Minister give us some idea of what further might be required?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would not care to attempt in any way to interpret the views of Lord Halifax, but in order to make the position quite clear I think I should say that Lord Halifax was speaking entirely for himself. I have been informed that he was not making any pronouncement on behalf of the British government. He was speaking as an individual who came to Canada to address a large organization in Toronto, and he gave his views on a subject which has been very close to his heart all through his lifetime. I believe a close reading of the address by Lord Halifax will show that in many particulars it has not been understood as he would wish to have it understood. Lord Halifax is a political philosopher as well as a very eminent statesman. He was reviewing the past century and the developments which have taken place during that time, and allowing his mind to travel into the next hundred years as to the possible changes that might be necessary in commonwealth organization. I do not think he meant to do more than put before the particular audience he was addressing, and through it before the public, certain thoughts which he believed it would be well to be considered by all of us who have the future in mind. But I think it was unfortunate, as it has certainly proved, that the speech should have been delivered at this particular time, because it has raised certain issues; and I am speaking here this afternoon very much against my own will in developing this theme at all. I am doing so only because the hon. gentlemen whom I am immediately facing, the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (Mr. Coldwell) and the hon. gentleman who just interrupted me, the leader of the Social Credit party, have given their views on the subject which was brought up, and on that account I feel it necessary to give mine.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I am just wondering if perhaps the hon. gentleman from Britain was not expressing the very idea that has been outlined by the Prime Minister. The right hon. gentleman will remember that my comment was to the effect that the ideas expressed were good but that it was unfortunate he did not tell us how they might be put into effect.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: One concrete issue in external policy has been raised not only by Lord Halifax but also by Field Marshal Smuts on which I feel that I should state my position. In this I am stating the position of the government on what was said in recent speeches by these two eminent public men. I shall read what I have to say on this matter, because I feel the great importance of any utterances on matters of this kind at this time, but I think it well that the position of the government should be stated. I should like to have hon. gentlemen immediately opposite make an equally clear statement, some time during this session, as to their position.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I ask the Prime Minister if he prepared the speech he is about to deliver?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, I prepared this. These are my own views and the views of this government.

A concrete issue in external policy has been raised in recent speeches delivered by Lord Halifax and Field Marshal Smuts. It relates to the domination of certain great powers. Both speeches expressed the view that the future peace of the world depended on the attainment of an equal partnership in strength and influence between the great powers among the united nations. Both took the position that the resources and man-power of the British isles were too small to enable the United Kingdom to compete with the United States and the Soviet Union in power and authority after the war. Both, therefore, argued that it was necessary that the United Kingdom should have the constant support of other countries, in order to preserve a proper balance. Field Marshal Smuts thought that this might be achieved by a close association between the United Kingdom and "the smaller democracies in western Europe"; he had little to say of the place of the British commonwealth as such. Lord Halifax on the other hand declared:

> Not Great Britain only, but the British commonwealth and empire, must be the fourth power in that group upon which, under Providence, the peace of the world will henceforth depend.

With what is implied in the argument employed by both these eminent public men I am unable to agree.

It is indeed true beyond question that the peace of the world depends on preserving on the side of peace a large superiority of power, so that those who wish to disturb the peace can have no chance of success. But I must ask whether the best way of attaining this is to seek a balance of strength between three or four great powers. Should we not, indeed must we not, aim at attaining the necessary superiority of power by creating an effective international system inside which the cooperation of all peace-loving countries is freely sought and given?

It seems to me not to be a matter of matching manpower and resources, or, in other words, military and industrial potential, between three or four dominant states. What we must strive for is close cooperation among those great states themselves, and all other like-minded countries. Behind the conception expressed by Lord Halifax and Field Marshal Smuts there lurks the idea of inevitable rivalry between the great powers. Could Canada, situated as she is geographically between the United States and the Soviet Union, and at the same time a member of the British commonwealth, for one moment give support to such an idea?

The Moscow declaration on general security forecast a system which would involve for its effectiveness, firm commitments by all peace-loving states to do their share in preserving peace. Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union were all represented at the Moscow conference. What would seem now to be suggested is that the prime Canadian commitment should be to pursue in all matters of external relations—"in foreign policy, defence, economic affairs, colonial questions and communications," to cite the words of Lord Halifax—a common policy to be framed and executed by all the governments of the commonwealth. I maintain that apart from all questions as to how that common policy is to be reached, or enforced, such a conception runs counter to the establishment of effective world security, and therefore is opposed to the true interests of the commonwealth itself.

We are certainly determined to see the closest collaboration continue between Canada, the United Kingdom and other commonwealth countries. Nothing that I am saying should be construed as supporting any other view than this. Collaboration inside the British commonwealth has, and will continue to have, a special degree of intimacy. When, however, it comes to dealing with the great issues which determine peace or war, prosperity or depression, it must not, in aim or method, be exclusive. In meeting world issues of security, employment and social standards we must join not only with commonwealth countries but with all likeminded states, if our purposes and ideals are to prevail. Our commitments on these great issues must be part of a general scheme, whether they be on a world basis or regional in nature.

We look forward, therefore, to close collaboration in the interests of peace not only inside the British commonwealth, but also with all friendly nations, small as well as great.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. GRAYDON: I asked the Prime Minister questions respecting the home defence army, General McNaughton and the overseas structure. I take it the Prime Minister is going to wait until the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) provides an answer.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, unless I run wholly counter to the counsel given me by my hon. friend, not to take up too much time in the debate on the address, I cannot begin to run over the various subjects to which he referred in the course of his remarks. I believe the statement with respect to Canadian defence will be best given by the Minister of National Defence.

Mr. GRAYDON: I have no objection to that; I was just asking for information.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Matters respecting aviation will be best dealt with by the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) who, as the house knows, has been giving special attention to those matters. I am not purposely avoiding them, but I simply wish the house to realize that I am not the government. This is not a despotism.

Mr. GRAYDON: Pretty close to it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is not a one-man affair.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I would say so.

Mr. GRAYDON: I am not so sure about that.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It represents collective opinion—a consensus.

Mr. GRAYDON: Collective security.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Mr. Speaker, would you call it six o'clock?

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

EXCESS PROFITS

LIMITATION FROM JANUARY 31 OF TAX ADVANTAGE IN RESPECT OF CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS BY BUSINESS CONCERNS

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) kindly consented to my having two or three minutes in which to make a statement.

Evidence is developing that business concerns which are subject to tax at the 100 per

cent rate on excess profits are being solicited to make unusually large contributions to various non-profit organizations. The activities of these organizations while in many cases not charitable in the ordinary sense of the word are nevertheless classed as such for tax purposes. These contributions up to a point are allowed as deductions from profits for the purpose of computing tax, and under a 100 per cent tax rate on excess profits the main burden of the gift obviously falls on the dominion treasury and ultimately on the tax-paying public generally rather than on the business concern making the contribution.

It is therefore the intention of the government in the forthcoming budget to recommend to the house a safeguarding measure which will ensure that in the case of any contribution by a business concern, whether corporate or otherwise, to an organization classed as a charitable organization which is subscribed after to-day, that is January 31, 1944, the tax advantage in respect of such contribution shall not be greater than that obtainable by a comparable business concern which is not subject to tax at the 100 per cent rate on excess profits.

For example, in the case of the ordinary commercial or industrial corporation the tax advantage in respect of such contribution will be limited to 40 per cent of such contribution, even if the corporation is subject to tax at the 100 per cent rate on its excess profits.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. L. D. Tremblay for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Graydon.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, this may be the last session of parliament before a general election and, if so, it is the duty of all parties to make clear to the electorate where they stand on the fundamental issues of the day. Before declaring the stand of Social Credit and New Democracy I desire to say something about the other major parties in the house. May I turn first to the Liberal party. In the speech from the throne the Liberal government has published what looks very much like an election manifesto. Naturally the government desires to make this manifesto as attractive as possible, and it looks attractive. It is full of vote-getting promises. The only fault with the government's manifesto is that it is illusive and the people should instinctively recognize it as such. It should not be possible to fool the people any more. In the last few years they have gone through too much.

The evidence seems to indicate clearly that the Liberal government will never be permitted to do anything which will hurt international finance and special privilege because international finance manifestly appears to be the boss of the Liberal party. The fact is that if you are going to help the people you must hurt international finance; that is, you must curb its activities. You must put an end to its doctrine of scarcity. You must cut excess profits and wipe out those instruments of scarcity, combines and cartels.

Should anyone doubt that the Liberal party is unable to escape from the control of international finance, let me give him an illustration to support that conclusion. The government now asks the authority of parliament to commit Canada to participate in a plan of international organization which means a supranational government. This is a very natural thing for a servant of international finance to do. I and those I stand for are passionately against any plan which will mean the weakening of Canadian sovereignty and the strengthening of the authority of international finance. Such a plan will render Canada a hopeless victim of its machinations. Such a plan will also prepare the way for a third world war. I am against any proposal which will mean turning the soldiers of Canada into a police force to enforce the policies and programme of international finance. When Europe is set free, Europe must and will work out its own destiny. When Hitler and the Japanese are defeated, I say let us bring the boys home quickly.

Let us take a look at the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. The policy and programme of this party is as illusive in itself as that of the Liberal government. The C.C.F. have two types of bosses. It has the Marxian socialist bosses who would impose socialism on Canada regardless of the consequences. Then it has another kind of boss, the political strategist. His aim is power at any price. He figures things out in this way: Everybody knows that the people are heartily sick of the Liberal government, and the C.C.F. strategists plan to make that party a purely protest movement. When a man is asked, "Are you sick of the Liberal government?" and he answers, "Yes", then the C.C.F. strategist will say, "Vote here".

The trouble with this plan is that the C.C.F. have now been ticketed with socialism. Surely the people of Canada do not want socialism. They must know that socialism means confiscation of savings and private rights and the regimentation of private liberties.

Mr. COLDWELL: How ridiculous! Try to get some new ideas.

Mr. BLACKMORE: We are just unsmearing the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell). When he was out in the Red Deer riding he complained that they were attempting to smear the C.C.F.; we are endeavouring to unsmear them. The people must know that socialism and the socialization of business mean the socialization of everything else. It means a loss of their property; it means the end of private ownership, of farms, banks, pensions and insurance policies. The people of Canada are entitled to maximum security, but they are also entitled to full freedom. The policy of the C.C.F. will destroy the principle of freedom and replace it with bureaucracy. Fundamentally and economically there is no apparent difference between C.C.F. socialism in Canada and national socialism in Germany. Although the C.C.F. will take away a man's freedom it will never bring security. The policy of the C.C.F. means not security but chaos. We do not hear of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation attacking international finance.

Mr. COLDWELL: Who said so?

Mr. BLACKMORE: All we know is that it keeps fooling about with unimportant things, threatening socialization of industry and the banks. The reason for it all is that the doctrine and policy of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, in so far as it has a doctrine and policy, are based upon the outpourings of a gentleman called Karl Marx, who died about sixty years ago. It should be plain that Karl Marx did not know anything about the financial juggernaut of to-day or how to tame it.

But behind the Marxian fanatics and the political strategists are the rank and file of the C.C.F., and nowhere in Canada will you find more earnest people and better patriots than these. The common people of the C,C.F. party are just like the common people of any other party. They want security and freedom. They want an end to scarcity and the beginning of abundance. They do not want needlessly to smash anything. They do not want to change the present system for a new one if the old one when reformed will serve. All they want is results. And it is a fortunate fact that the C.C.F. rank and file are still free enough to upset their irrational leaders and follow along lines of practical reform.

Now what about the Progressive Conservative party? A year ago the Conservative party changed its name; but did it change its attitude to the people? There is no real evidence that it has done so, but we must be patient and give it every chance to prove itself. I am still waiting and wondering. So also are the people of Canada, because the fact is that not only did the Conservative party add "Progressive" to its name, it elected a progressive as its leader. His name is John Bracken. John Bracken was a one-time friend of the common man.

Mr. GRAYDON: He still is.

Mr. BLACKMORE: What we want to know, what the people have a right to know, is this, is John Bracken still a friend of the common people? Have the vested interests or the Tory party broken John Bracken, or has John Bracken broken the vested interests?

Mr. COLDWELL: And the Tory party?

Mr. BLACKMORE: Is the Progressive Conservative party just as it always was, a hireling of the big interests, or is it at last a people's party, free to really serve? John Bracken had a great chance a year ago. Perhaps that chance remains in this hour of national peril, when the claims of country so far outrank the claims of party. I call upon John Bracken to say where he stands.

Mr. KNOWLES: Where does he sit?

Mr. BLACKMORE: I appeal to him to say that he stands against international finance and for the common man. It is to be earnestly hoped that without a day's needless delay John Bracken will declare, "I am a free man. The vested interests have no hold on me. I am against domination by international finance. I stand for abundance. I stand for the total use of the nation's resources. I promise that I will play my part to reform the old economic system so that it will have the power to put at the service of the people the full resources of Canada no matter what may be the reforms required. I stand for maximum production and for distribution upon the level of maximum production. I condemn the doctrine and system of scarcity; I denounce its supporters. I desire the vote and support of no men who put high profits for the few before plenty for the many. I will purge the Progressive Conservative party of such men."

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): He will be lonely.

Mr. BLACKMORE: If John Bracken will pledge himself that way, then the mighty forces of monetary reform will know where he stands with respect to the common enemies of man.

Mr. GRAYDON: What will the hon. member do if he does that?

Mr. BLACKMORE: I will have to see him do it first.

Mr. GRAYDON: All right.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Meanwhile no commitments!

The forces of monetary reform want to know where every Progressive Conservative stands with respect to financial Toryism, which is just fascism in thin disguise.

Now, where does Social Credit—New Democracy stand? It stands for abundance and against scarcity. It stands for maximum production and for distribution on the level of maximum production. It stands for total use of Canada's resources. It stands for the right of the people to that which Providence intends them to have. It stands against the power of finance which would deny that right. That is the issue in Canada and the world to-day. The issue is not communism against democracy, or socialism against capitalism. The issue is total use of the nation's resources for the benefit of the people against restricted use of resources for the benefit of big interests.

New Democracy, when war came, stood and stood alone for total use of resources in war. To-day New Democracy stands for total use of the nation's resources when peace comes. Right now the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) may say that the Liberal government has practised war-time total use. It is a fact that fear of Hitler drove the government reluctantly to require something approximating maximum production. It is equally true that fear of international finance will drive the Liberal government and its policies back to where they were before the war, that is to scarcity and limited production in the service of high profits. It is to be hoped that it will take more promising than the Prime Minister has time for, to make the people of this country forget that for nearly a generation this government has imposed on Canada the unjust and harmful rule of scarcity, at the direction of international finance.

How do we get total use of our resources for the benefit of the people? Let me put the issue in a word. The issue is freedom. Economic freedom means political freedom as well. There cannot be political freedom without economic freedom. There is a tragic lack of both kinds of freedom in the world to-day.

We are fighting the Japs and the Germans in the name of freedom. Let me suggest that in the name of freedom we fight as well our own unjust prejudices; for the lesson of Hitlerism is in vain if it fails to teach us tolerance and generosity. English-speaking democracy under its present leadership has yet to learn that lesson. Here is crowning evidence to support my statement. Many years ago the Jews, responding to a religious and national, as well as a natural impulse, sought for themselves a new home in their old home in Palestine. English-speaking democracy encouraged the Jew to hope; they promised him support. That promise came before the Hitlerian massacres. The Jew, with millions of his countrymen tortured and dead, still hopes and looks to us to make his hopes come true.

Where in democracy are our charity and justice? Where is our Christianity if we let the Jew now hope in vain? I tell this house that the homeless Jew is a challenge to all the decencies that make what we are pleased to call our English-speaking civilization. We dare not refuse that challenge. This house should recognize this truth and this duty by an appropriate resolution and should give leadership to all nations along the path of justice and fair play through the fulfilment of the long cherished dream of the establishment in Palestine of a national homeland for the Jews.

Now let me say a word as to how this nation is to get the total use of its resources. The problem is primarily a political one. You can meet the other problem when this country has elected a parliament pledged to put the interests of the people before the claims of international finance, pledged to make financially possible what is physically possible and desirable.

Reformers of the capitalistic system, when they speak of the reforms in that system necessary to ensure an equitable distribution of maximum production, are asked how they will do it. It is a question designed to confuse the people, because, when a sensible and sufficient answer is given, I have found that the answer is taken by the technicians of reactionary capitalism and bent and twisted out of its original shape. There is no difficulty in building the machinery which will ensure effective distribution, and I tell the house that the time has gone by when the reactionary capitalists should be able to make people believe that there is any difficulty.

Let me put the matter positively. I defy any member of this house to rise to his feet and say that it is not possible to devise means whereby to distribute all that the system is able to produce, and to distribute it, too, without adding to the national burden any further debt or taxation, and without imperilling our freedom with regimentation. That challenge stands. Social Credit-New Democracy is not strong in parliament, but it is very strong in the sense that what it stands for is dear to the hearts of the vast majority of Canadians.

Social Credit-New Democracy is not bigoted. It knows that country comes far ahead of party; it also knows very well that there is but short time left within which Canadians might effect reforms by the democratic way.

Let us members in this house bear in mind the danger that if the parliament of Canada will not give the people justice, then the people will seek justice in another way in spite of parliament. At this time of crisis it is the responsibility of all men of good will to forget their lesser loyalties, to forget the claims of party and of class, and to join together so that they may defeat the common enemy at home, even as our soldiers are now joined together to defeat the common enemy abroad. The common enemy abroad is Germany and Japan. The common enemy at home is international finance, special privileges, the kind of big business that chokes the life out of every other kind of business.

It is in this spirit that I appeal to the really progressive members of the Conservative party, and over the heads of the Marxian fanatics and political strategists, I appeal also to the common people of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. I appeal to those Liberals who have been able to retain their freedom despite a lifetime of despotic political rule. All honour to them! They will be made welcome to the company of free men. So let us get together, forgetful of our minor differences, remembering only that it will take courage and good will on the part of all free men and women to save this country from the chaos which impends.

If my appeal should fall on deaf ears—I trust it will not—then the party of Social Credit-New Democracy will feel in duty bound to go on alone, confident that we shall swiftly grow in strength; for a party which has the honesty and courage to stand against international finance, and for the common man; against socialism, and for reformed private enterprise, in which money will no longer be master; a party which is proud to give its life if needs be in this just cause, is a party which will deserve to have behind it the overwhelming support of a country whose people are still free. Such a party will merit the overwhelming support of the soldiers of Canada; for a party which dared to declare, as this group did, for the total use of the country's resources when this war began, a party which dared to declare for equality of service and equality of sacrifice, should be believed by all of our soldiers when now it declares for the total use of the country's resources when peace shall be restored.

[Mr. Blackmore.]

Why did the Liberal government not declare for total war when war began? Its bosses forbade it to do so. Why will the Liberal government not declare for total use of the country's resources now that peace is drawing near? Because its bosses forbid it. And, Mr. Speaker, they are the self-same bosses.

When our soldiers went overseas they imposed upon those who stayed at home a trust. That trust was to build for them a Canada henceforth free from want and unemployment, free from misery and preventable disease, a Canada of real security and happiness. For my part I accepted that trust and I mean to discharge it.

May I turn for a few moments to a consideration of some of the items in the speech from the throne. There are several things in the speech from the throne which I believe ought to be given special consideration. The government in power has not dealt fairly with agriculture in Canada during the last year. Conditions are gradually improving in agriculture, but it seems to me that the Liberal party has to be forced every step of the way. They do not seem to have a broad, generous, long-range policy; they seem to have a niggardly, cheese-paring policy that concedes a point only grudgingly. I complained of the treatment of the wool producers last spring. The treatment of the lamb producers was a reflection on the intelligence or on the integrity of those who were in charge, and the treatment of the hog situation during this last year has been something to regret; the management of the beef situation casts no honour or credit on the government, while the way in which the beet sugar industry is handled in Canada is a reflection on the government and will be a cause for bitter remorse before this war is over. I do not believe one could persuade any unbiased or dispassionate individual to believe that the men who have had charge of the sugar policy of this country were acting with an eye to the interests of the people of Canada. The labour situation in Canada is far from what it should be. The wartime wages control order, 1943, P.C. 9384, is a most astounding piece of labour legislation bristling with obnoxious features which bear adversely and unfairly upon the workingmen from coast to coast. Our treatment of the returned men is far from reassuring with respect to the future. I find returned men everywhere are dissatisfied. In the first place there has been a removal of the insurance principle from the Pension Act. Very meagre allowances are given to men when they are mustered out of the service, and there is observable indecent haste in the discharge of men from hospital when they are suffering from the results of service.

The reconstruction and rehabilitation programme of the government is causing apprehension, if not consternation throughout this country. We hear of fine and ambitious plans for post-war rehabilitation but never a solitary word as to where the money is coming from to pay for these plans. Yet the plans are being prepared and promulgated by a government that insistently said before the war, we have not the money. And the same mentalities will commence to think after the war, we have not the money. There is a great deal more than political significance to this matter. It seems to me that the average Liberal, if I gauge him aright, thinks of nothing in the world but whether or not he can get back into power. Whenever a matter comes before him he seems to ask himself, will this particular measure bring me votes? He utterly disregards what may be the effect upon the morale of the country, what may be the effect ultimately upon the welfare of the Canadian people.

We hear a great deal about the conversion of war-time industries to peace-time uses. I believe the hon. Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) gave a rather impressive speech somewhere in the east in November, if I remember correctly. In that speech he said there was no reason at all why anyone should be unemployed in Canada after the war. I agree with him. There has been no reason why anyone should be unemployed in Canada since 1930. There certainly was no reason after 1935. But that does not deal with the matter at all. I will grant that we can easily reconvert munition plants in the main and prepare them to produce peace-time goods. The great question is, how in the world are you going to enable the people to buy the goods when they are produced? I am informed we had in Canada in 1939 a production of around three and a half billion dollars, and that during 1943 that production rose to roughly eight billion dollars. We are buying in the neighbourhood of $4,000,000,000 worth of goods with the taxpayers' money and with the money we borrow, and are giving it away. What are we to be doing after the war to correspond with the gifts we are so munificently conferring upon Hitler and the Japanese? I suppose if anyone were to suggest to anyone in this house that we could give $25 a month or something like that he would probably have nightmares for three nights or more. But that does not seem to disturb the mentality of those Canadians who are giving many times that amount to the enemy. The all-important problem after the war will be the selling of the goods. The government steers clear of that problem. I suppose government members will answer me immediately and say, we are planning on export trade markets. Let it be borne in mind, Mr. Speaker, that when the war closes there will be sixty nations in this world all seeking for export markets, each one trying to sell more than it buys. Does the Liberal mentality find it impossible to conceive the absolute grotesqueness of that situation, or does it conceive that Canada, because of her economic strength, is going to be able to crowd the other nations out of the markets and lay the foundation for another war? If everyone of those sixty nations operates under the system in vogue in Canada it will have a shortage of purchasing power within the nation which will be its most painful disability. Canada in this respect will be one of the foremost among them.

Until we learn how to adjust that shortage of purchasing power in the hands of the people, all talk of reorganizing the world on a peaceful basis is utterly idle.

In the speech from the throne we have the proposal to import goods in order to raise our standard of living. May I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the first task of the government is to enable the Canadian people to buy the goods that Canada can produce, buy a sufficient amount of them to raise their standard of living to the point where it should be. We should enable them to buy grains and grain products, vegetables, fruits, animal products and coal, building material and furniture, shoes, clothing and machinery. All these things we produce abundantly in Canada. Why not arrange matters so that our people will be able to buy all they need of these things? Think what it would mean in this country, a land literally flowing with milk and honey, if every Canadian were given by this parliament the assurance that, if he cooperated, never again would he go in need of the food, clothing, shelter, culture, education and recreation that Canada's fields and mines, her waters, forests and workshops stand ready to provide for him abundantly—if only he has the money with which to buy? Supply Canadians with purchasing power with which to buy their own goods and they will buy the imports they need; the government will not have to worry about imports at all.

Now I come to these social security proposals. The whole system offered by the government is merely a plan to tax Canadians into prosperity; no people can tax themselves into prosperity. The whole scheme constitutes an ambitious attempt to redistribute scarcity. There is no evidence of an expanding economy or that such has been contemplated. Such measures offer no possible means for attaining the total use of resources. Expand-

ing economy and total use of resources can be achieved only through the employment of debt-free money. I submit once more to this house that the all-important thing for us to consider at this time is the feasibility of debt-free money with which we can cancel the debt which accumulates in this debt-creating system of ours, debt-free money with which we can distribute the abundance which God has given us the capacity to produce.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL: (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, first allow me to join with those who have already extended congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the address, for their two interesting and able speeches. I want to deal tonight with a few problems which confront the Canadian people, but before doing so I should like to refer to the speech delivered this afternoon by the acting leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon). I want to say at once that I agree with the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) when he suggests that the place for the leader of a political party is in this house. I venture to say that if Mr. John Bracken were to walk down the corridors of this building most of the members of this house would not recognize him, though he has been leader of the Progressive Conservative party for some fourteen months now. It is not that he has not had the opportunity, had he chosen to take it, of seeking a seat here. Sitting beside and behind me to-night are two new members from western Canada, both farmers representing rural seats, one of them almost within a stone's throw of the legislative building where Mr. John Bracken has occupied a seat for twenty years. Had he chosen to avail himself of it the opportunity was there for him to try his luck, if you will, in obtaining a seat in this house, as he should have done; but of course, in spite of the boasting of the Progressive Conservative party, I would remind them that the provincial seat of The Pas, in the Manitoba provincial legislature, which was occupied for so long by Mr. John Bracken, was lost by his followers in that province, and that all the candidates in that by-election lost their deposit to the successful Cooperative Commonwealth Federation candidate.

I do not propose to comment upon what has been said this evening by the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore). As I listened to him I was reminded of a verse which I have read, which runs, something like this: "I thank God I am not as other men."

I should like immediately to express the thankfulness which we share with all the people of Canada for the brightening prospects of a military victory in Europe, and for the preparations that have been made to overcome Japanese aggression. However, events in Italy and in New Guinea during the past few days warn us that we have a long and perhaps bloody road ahead. On our home front I think we ought to pay tribute to the splendid self-sacrifice of our farmers and their families and the efforts of the thousands of workers and office personnel who have produced vast quantities of food and material to back the attack. The achievements of women in many fields in Canada, too, have been no less striking than those to which I have just referred. Overseas the bravery, skill and fighting qualities of our service men and women are bringing results of which this nation may well be proud. Nor must we overlook the contribution of those who organized and trained the forces. Particularly may I mention the services of Lieutenant-General McNaughton, who was among the first in our commonwealth to prepare his army corps for the type of mechanized, scientific warfare which this great conflict has come to be. A fuller explanation of his recent retirement than has yet been given is awaited by both service personnel and large groups of our civilian population.

In spite of our military achievements, however, many Canadians have grave misgivings in regard to the future. The prosecution of the war and the shaping of post-war policy are inseparably bound together. Military and political warfare are inseparable parts of the same struggle for security and freedom. There is a grave danger that while we may be victorious on the field of battle we may lose the no less vital political warfare. There are ominous signs that attempts are being made to appease the fascists and reactionary groups that stand for a return to the pre-war status quo throughout the world. For months Franco has been placated, while he has maintained a division of men fighting our allies on the eastern European front. In Italy we have bolstered a discredited monarch and a former fascist general, while progressive Italians demand the formation of a government in which the Italian people can have confidence, under whose leadership the Italians could fight the common enemy. Throughout Europe, we are told, the courageous underground workers lack confidence in our intentions, as we continue to support discredited governing cliques and former monarchs who are obviously distrusted and disliked by their former subjects. Expediency may be the name but reaction is the substance. Nor can Canada escape some responsibility for this disastrous appeasement. As the fifth among the united nations, or first,

if you will, among the so-called smaller nations, Canada should exercise an influence commensurate with her military and economic power. Her failure to do so invites the judgment that our government is afraid of the social and economic implications of democracy at home and abroad. It is high time that our external relationships were brought under careful review by this parliament. It is time that we stripped some of the unnecessary secrecy that surrounds some of our foreign policy. I earnestly suggest that the standing committee on industrial and international relations—uneasy bedfellows—be split up into two committees, one concerned with labour and the other with international affairs. We need an informed public opinion to support intelligent national policies in these fields.

The speech from the throne states that the well-being of Canada is bound up with the restoration and recovery of world trade. While that is true, we must not allow a government to rely solely upon such trade for our own post-war recovery and well-being. Certainly the speech reveals little understanding of the means by which trade can be expanded in this modern world. As a first principle I suggest that the orderly planning of our internal economy is vital to domestic prosperity and to our ability to trade effectively; for effective trade surely means that we must accept and use the products of other countries in order that we may dispose of our own surpluses abroad.

There is no indication in the speech from the throne that the government appreciates the need of introducing planning into our trade relationships with other countries, as well as into our internal economy. Has our wartime experience of trade through government agencies taught us nothing? How can we plan trade on the basis of national need? Surely through the adaptation of methods of the bulk purchases and sales made now by national agencies. It is clear that bulk buying and selling on a national scale is surely foreshadowed by several nations including our own best customer, Great Britain. If we fail to use such boards as the bacon board and the wheat board, instead of reopening all kinds of private and speculative agencies, our foreign trade will languish. Perchance it will be strangled by a veritable jungle of tariffs, quotas, irresponsible cartels and emergency policies.

The speech from the throne, however, shows that the government has stolen some ideas from the C.C.F. programme. Unfortunately it is only petty larceny of which I can find it guilty. I wish it were of the grander sort; for, after all, its social security programme lacks the necessary basis to sustain it. It suggests the building of a superstructure without laying the foundation of full employment, productivity and the actual means of distribution.

The central problem of our time is that of full employment. Social security measures, essential as they are, must remain inadequate until this central problem of full employment is solved. If we fail to make plans by which alone full employment can be obtained, the burden of new social security measures will fall upon the workers and farmers. The government fails to realize that fundamental economic and social change is the price of social security and of economic freedom. But even the social security measures proposed in the speech from the throne are not firm commitments. A study of the language used filled me, I must confess, with the suspicion that it was merely a pre-election document. If the government means what it seems to imply, let it put its programme on the statute books this session, and into full effect, before going to the country. The people are suspicious of death-bed repentances. They showed that in 1935, as our Conservative friends will remember.

And the Liberal party has, I submit, a bad record of neglected promises. Let me remind the house that in 1919, now a quarter of a century ago the Liberal party promised the people of Canada, among other things—and I shall quote the exact words:

> An adequate system of insurance against unemployment, sickness, dependence in old age, and other disability.

Now, after twenty-five years, with a spectacular loss of support across the country, it repeats its promise of long ago.

In all these years, what have we got?—an inadequate unemployment scheme in 1938, and some pre-death loans, called old age pensions. Therefore, when the speech from the throne says—and again I quote—

> . . . a national minimum of social security and human welfare should be advanced as rapidly as possible—

—we in this house have a duty to demand: How soon? Another twenty-five years, perhaps. Actual legislation this session, before an election, is the only answer the house should tolerate.

But again I say all the social security measures contained in the speech from the throne leave untouched the central problems of our time, the problems of full employment and the proper distribution of goods and services. Furthermore, this scheme of social security cannot be achieved without an imme-

diate attempt to solve the grave constitutional difficulties of which we are all aware. These the present government has shelved and shirked.

A few years ago the dominion, and all but one of the provinces, had Liberal governments. Yet, no solution was found, even when the governments were basically as a party in agreement. How does the government face up to the constitutional problems now? Here is what the speech from the throne says:

> . . . the working out of a comprehensive national scheme, in which federal and provincial activities will be integrated and which will include nation-wide health insurance, will require further consultation and close cooperation with the provinces.

And then, note this:

> My ministers will welcome opportunities for such consultation.

To use a slang expression, surely that is a prize example of passing the buck.

No, that will not do. In the absence of an immediate dominion-provincial agreement, let this parliament enact the measure and invite the provinces to cooperate, much as we did in the case of old age pensions.

Those with good memories will recall a somewhat similar statement to the one I quoted from the speech from the throne a moment ago, one which was made by the present Prime Minister in April, 1930, when the depression was deepening. He said, as recorded in *Hansard* for that year, at page 1226:

> In the absence of any representations indicating that there is an unemployment situation which the provinces cannot cope with, we have no right to say that there is any national unemployment situation in this country.

The time has come surely when the national government must assume the initiative in matters vital to the well-being of Canada. Above all, then, we urge the government to take action now. This social security programme, which the C.C.F. has done so much to popularize across the country during past years, is badly overdue. Other countries have had much of it for several generations. But again I warn that social security measures, desirable and necessary as they are, do not even pretend to solve the central problem of full employment.

Remember, that the present unemployment insurance fund, though nearly $180,000,000, would be a mere drop in the bucket if we failed to provide full employment for the million persons now employed in war industries, and the nearly 800,000 engaged in the armed services. The fund would only provide benefits for all those for less than eight weeks.

To rely upon social security measures to meet the post-war problem of full employment is in our opinion to court disaster. Therefore the proposals in the speech if put into effect, and they must be, can give only limited financial protection against a calamity which the government proposes nothing effective to prevent. On top of that it is questionable how much social security can be financed while the basic economic and monetary issues remain untouched. The truth is, of course, that health is more important that health insurance; work more important than unemployment insurance; rehabilitation more important than disability pensions; decent incomes and good homes more important than family allowances; independence more important than a dole. Health, work, rehabilitation, decent incomes, good homes, economic planning and social independence are the demands of the Canadian people, more particularly the demands of our sons and our daughters fighting the battles overseas. Yet the speech from the throne offers nothing to achieve these ends, so I am going to move, seconded by the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) an amendment to the amendment as follows:

> That all the words of the amendment be struck out and the following substituted therefor:
>
> "We respectfully submit to Your Excellency that in the opinion of this house Your Excellency's advisers have failed to propose the fundamental social changes and economic planning which alone can hasten the winning of the war and make possible the establishment of a post-war Canada capable of providing full employment and complete social security."

The only positive approach to an economic problem to be found in the speech from the throne is the government's promise of aid to certain types of business, presumably in the hope that some crumbs may reach the people. We are told that there is to be an industrial development bank. Instead of bringing the banking, financial and monetary system under social ownership and control, the government proposes to establish a new institution which is apparently to assume the most risky and unprofitable part of the post-war credit operations. Instead of a financial system operating solely for the Canadian people, a new government bank is to be set up whose sole aim apparently is to aid certain types of private business.

For generations some of the leaders of the Liberal party—and I remember specifically the former Minister of Finance, the Hon. C. A. Dunning—urged the creation of an agricultural bank to assist our most neglected industry, but without avail. What agriculture asked for years ago, some businesses are about to get.

The farmer is offered a price floor for staple farm products. What sort of floor and for what staple products? True, the C.C.F. has popularized the demand for a floor under farm prices, but any price floor must be related to the cost of the things the farmer buys and uses. In other words it must be a parity price, not a price which is merely a low minimum and out of relation to other prices. Again I warn that a parity price depends upon the extent to which the country is able to plan its economy. In other words parity prices like full employment depend upon our willingness to make fundamental economic changes. That the government and the official opposition will not do. Evidence of this unwillingness is to be found in various phrases in the speech from the throne.

We learn that there are to be "suitable tax modifications." If this means, as I rather suspect, reduction in the excess profits taxes or corporation taxes or taxes in the higher income brackets, then we shall strenuously oppose such measures. If on the other hand it means the release of purchasing power through the reduction of taxation in the lower brackets we shall be prepared to support it.

The C.C.F. contends that big business has profited too much out of this war, not too little. It may profit more through the activities of the new War Assets Corporation. This body will dispose of hundreds of millions of dollars worth of publicly-owned plant and machines, tools, stores, equipment and material, all at salvage prices. The cry goes up that the government-owned plants will be of little value when the war ends. Private business demands that they be disposed of so that their vested interests shall not be jeopardized. To my mind every effort should be made to utilize these plants to give more employment, more goods and services to the Canadian people. The policy of the government in this regard is the direct opposite to intelligent economic planning and to the needs and I believe the will of the Canadian people.

How improvident this sort of policy is can be illustrated by the announcement made in the house last Friday by the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe). For reasons not disclosed the government has expropriated the properties of the Eldorado Mining Corporation at a price of $1.35 a share, which incidentally is above the price of the stock quoted in Toronto last Friday. In justice to the foresight of our late leader, Mr. J. S. Woodsworth, it should be recalled that in May, 1932, Mr. Woodsworth urged that the valuable radium deposits on Great Bear lake should be brought under public ownership and dedicated to human welfare. He stated that if we were to desire the property in the future we would pay a high price to the promoters whereas at that time the only man with a just claim was the prospector. His words were ignored, and so to-day expropriation will cost the people of Canada some millions of dollars. As I have said already, the price paid by the government is higher than the market value of the stock the day the deal was announced to this house.

The speech from the throne when taken in conjunction with the record of the government gives us little hope for effective measures to cope with the stupendous problems of the future. What the country needs is a definite and specific programme, not vague promises which is almost all the speech from the throne contains. The C.C.F. has committed itself to a full social security programme. What we have also done, and other parties have failed to do, is to provide the economic basis which will make such a programme possible and feasible. What should such a programme contain? First, this parliament should suggest a sum which the country is prepared to spend in the immediate post-war period. Last year, and I repeat the suggestion, I urged that we name five billion dollars as the target of expenditure in the first two years following victory.

First, there must be a concrete, comprehensive and good post-war housing programme instead of the pitiful nibbling at the problem suggested in the throne speech. We should state immediately that we will spend at least $500 million a year to provide adequate houses in town and country for the Canadian people. This vast opportunity to bring decency and comfort to every Canadian and to eliminate overcrowding and squalor is a challenge that we can meet only by the boldest attack. This of course is a means also of providing useful employment for thousands in many branches of industry.

Next must come a plan for rural electrification, to bring modern conveniences to every home in the country. Such a programme would lighten the burdens of rural life, raise standards of living, and—again—provide employment. Next comes the essential task of reestablishment of our service personnel. The reference to this in the speech from the throne is distinctly disturbing. Apparently the government views with satisfaction and complacency the totally inadequate measures already provided. I quote the words of the speech:

> A broad programme has already been developed for the reestablishment of veterans of the present war, and for the care of disabled veterans and the dependents of our fighting men and merchant seamen.

During the period of demobilization the armed service personnel should be kept on full pay and allowances until they are absorbed permanently in remunerative employment. This is one promise that we must make now and carry out for the men and women in the services. Government-owned plants set up for the purpose of war production should be retained under public ownership and converted to peace-time production. Farm implements and supplies, prefabricated houses, commercial aeroplanes and other desirable goods could be produced in these plants. In fact, the farm cooperatives in the west are anxious to go into the production of some of these things. We should immediately make it possible for these cooperatives to acquire the necessary plant and should also make available to them credit for this purpose.

There is still room in Canada for great economic expansion, particularly in the Canadian north. This should be a planned public post-war development. Surveys made in Canada, particularly in regard to oil possibilities, and the experience of the Soviet Union in the development of similar territory, indicate there may be vast natural resources in Canada waiting to be tapped.

Another new field particularly suitable for western Canada is that of chemurgy. Organized research should be undertaken with a view to discovering and developing new uses for agricultural products.

Perhaps one of the most essential things is that we should immediately appropriate a large sum of money for the expansion of the work of the national research council and other public research groups. It is vital to retain for the public benefit the services of the scientists now engaged in research activities. This involves for them adequate remuneration and security. We have watched some of these brilliant young scientists enter the service of the research council, be kept on a pittance doing the scientific work for several years, and then picked up by some industry, given a laboratory, a good salary, and security; their brains, their skills and their inventive genius sometimes lost to the people of Canada and acquired by a private corporation. To my mind the remuneration given to the young scientists who have done so much in this war, under our research council, is nothing short of a public scandal.

All this necessitates, of course, the investment and expenditure of money. Thus since the charters of the banks are due for renewal the government should introduce legislation to bring the chartered banks under public ownership and control. This should be accompanied by a national investment board to direct savings into socially desirable channels; and who is there who will rise in his place and say that a government-owned banking system would not be infinitely safer than the privately-owned chartered banks were in 1931 and 1932 when the finance act of this country had to be amended by order in council to allow some of the banks to deposit securities otherwise not depositable, in order to get the necessary funds to meet their obligations to the public? Or who will say that a national investment board directing the savings of the people would not give more ample security to the people of Canada than the present speculative system under which we live?

Mr. ILSLEY: Is not the hon. gentleman wrong in his statement about the banks?

Mr. COLDWELL: I think not. I think, if the hon. gentleman will look it up, he will find an order in council to that effect.

Mr. ILSLEY: No.

Mr. COLDWELL: Well, we will look it up. I think it will be found that Mr. Bennett's government passed such an order in council in October, 1931.

Mr. ILSLEY: Not in reference to the banks.

Mr. COLDWELL: Well, what was it in reference to? The insurance companies?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. COLDWELL: And the banks?

Mr. ILSLEY: No.

Mr. COLDWELL: Well, the insurance companies in any event.

Mr. ILSLEY: And what was done there is not as is stated by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. COLDWELL: I believe I am right, though.

Mr. ILSLEY: It was a valuation of their securities.

Mr. COLDWELL: I will take the correction meantime.

Under the compulsion of war we have seen how national economic planning, however imperfectly administered, can immensely increase production and end unemployment. Judging from the throne speech this striking lesson has been completely wasted.

In short, what we need now is a concrete programme to maintain full employment, at all costs, and definite legislation for an adequate scheme of social security.

Before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, since this afternoon it was suggested that the parties in this house place on the record their views regarding the controversy which has arisen in this country in the last week—the Prime

Minister did so this afternoon—I wish to place on the record, not the statement which I made last week, but a statement of the executive of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation which perhaps carries more weight than a statement from a single person.

Mr. GRAYDON: I would sooner have yours.

Mr. COLDWELL: Thank you very much. They are substantially alike.

The national executive of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation endorses the statement which our federal leader, Mr. M. J. Coldwell, made public with regard to the recent proposals of Lord Halifax. Those proposals are unacceptable, not only because they are against the interests of Canada, but also because they are against the best interests of Britain, of the commonwealth, and of world peace. The principles underlying these proposals seem to be empire isolationism and power politics. Such assumptions are contrary to the principles of the Atlantic charter. They are the present-day version of pre-war Tory foreign policy.

The Cooperative Commonwealth Federation believes that Britain with the other nations of the commonwealth can and should play a leading part in the establishment of the necessary international order after victory. Further, we believe that Britain herself has now an unprecedented opportunity of assuming a position of leadership in the world's march toward enduring peace based on collective security and international economic cooperation. Canada should at all times give full support to a policy which, based on the principles of the Atlantic charter, will win the cooperation not only of the members of the commonwealth but equally of all other small and great peace-loving nations. The future international order, if it is to endure, must not be based on power groups, and least of all on domination by a few great powers, but on full participation by all states in the processes of peace building and in the machinery of political and economic cooperation.

This is the kind of foreign policy which the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation believes Canada and other members of the British commonwealth should pursue.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would point out to the hon. member that his amendment lacks something which is required in an amendment. The amendment to the amendment proposes, "That all the words of the amendment be struck out and the following substituted therefor". The hon. member will have to correct that to read, "That all the words of the amendment after the word 'that' be struck out".

Mr. COLDWELL: The amendment should have read, "That all the words after 'that' in the amendment be struck out and the following words substituted therefor". I am afraid I did not read that.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member so desires, I will make the correction.

Mr. COLDWELL: Thank you, sir.

Mr. MAXIME RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie (Translation): Mr. Speaker, the few remarks which I intend to make in connection with the speech from the throne will not be lengthy. We shall have at some future moment an opportunity to discuss the various measures announced as soon as they are introduced and better understood.

Let us note first that the speech from the throne does not foreshadow an early end of the hostilities, and that, on the other hand, it gives us to understand that the Canadian people will be called upon to achieve a still greater war effort, especially through the extension to the United Nations of the mutual aid principle, which was at the outset a veiled formula used in describing the gift of billions of dollars to England.

I have already condemned and I still condemn such free gifts to a country that is wealthier than ours and more interested in the present conflict. I have condemned and I still condemn Canada's war effort, which is out of proportion with our resources. I said last year, and I repeat this year, that I cannot understand, in view of our geographical position, far from the scene of the conflict, with no possessions to protect outside America, that the chief aim assigned to Canada by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) should be a war effort proportionately greater than that of any other allied country, regardless of post-war consequences.

On his return from a trip to England, in November last, the honourable the minister of munitions (Mr. Howe) told us again of the amazement with which our war effort was looked upon over there, and he explained how profitable it was for us to supply as an outright gift the goods delivered to Great Britain, in order that we might retain the British market after the war.

Around the same time, unfortunately for our minister, the agricultural advisor of the British Embassy in Washington implied that after the war, England would buy her bacon from Denmark in exchange for her industrial products; Denmark, however, presented England with no gifts whatsoever, nor did she give her, simply as a donation, any of her merchandise.

On the other hand, according to a dispatch from London dated January 18th, Sir John Anderson informed the House of Commons that Great Britain would pay cash for some of her purchases in the United States.

They should stop trying to fool us so as to justify our gifts to a country wealthier than ours. After the war, England will act in her

own interests. That is what we should do also.

In this war we have played and still play the part of a servant who is not consulted but who must take marching orders. London dictates, pledges herself, and we pay the price by going to ruin, and the Prime Minister is happy!

A few days ago, Lord Halifax paid us a visit to tell us what we should do after the war to safeguard the Empire's possessions. He forgets that we are living in America and that we are a neighbour of the United States. May I say that the policy of the Bloc Populaire Canadien takes its inspiration from this formula of Lord Tweedsmuir: "A Canadian owes his first allegiance not to the British Commonwealth, but to Canada". And we will act in our own interests, which happen to be in America.

For the first time since the declaration of war, the government seems to show some concern for the future. It is behind England, however, who gave that subject plenty of thought when the war had barely begun. The speech from the throne, as a matter of fact, is very promising, and in the field of promises, it even goes beyond the social reforms programme proclaimed sensationally by Lord Bennett, just before general elections in 1935. A sure sign that elections are coming.

Several social measures are announced. In the first place, we wish to go on record as opposing any encroachment upon the provincial rights, and we shall demand that in the enforcement of the laws provincial autonomy be fully respected.

In reading the speech from the throne, certain passages are noted which deserve particular attention. Thus, the government informs us that its ministers are determined, insofar as possible, to provide for the future. This is an admission that they had not up to now given any thought to the future of our people. Unfortunately we were too well aware of this.

Further, it is stated:

> The family and the home are the foundation of national life. To aid in ensuring a minimum of well-being to the children of the nation and to help gain for them a closer approach to equality of opportunity in the battle of life, you will be asked to approve a measure making provision for family allowances.

What a discovery on the part of the government! The Bloc Populaire Canadien deserves perhaps a share of credit for the announcement of this reform, inasmuch as since its formation, a year and a half ago, the welfare of the family headed our programme.

[Mr. Raymond.]

Most of the social reforms announced were sorely needed. I have long been advocating in this house, on behalf of the working man, a living wage, a healthy home, means of properly bringing up his family, in a word social welfare legislation.

I shall confine myself to recalling my interventions on behalf of textile workers. The Turgeon investigation ordered by the government had revealed an intolerable situation. As the report was pigeonholed, in 1939, I called the attention of the government to the recommendations of the investigating commissioner in order to remedy the situation and proposed a bill to implement the recommendations. The government managed to prevent it from going through the required readings. This is the concern which the government has shown for the working man.

From 1930 to 1939, the Bennett and King governments meted out direct relief to the people to prevent them from dying of hunger. From 1939 to this day, the war has filled the bill and for the post-war period, a taxation formula is being worked out to pay for the gifts we have handed out to nations wealthier than we are. To-day, it is sought, by new promises, to help forget past promises that went unfulfilled; such a scheme does not work any more.

No matter how worthy the reforms proposed in the speech from the throne, one fact remains; it is that the government does not enjoy public confidence to such a degree that it could put them into effect. A proof of this statement is to be found in the result of the four by-elections held last August, when the candidates of the government were defeated in each of the four constituencies. Our people have had enough of unfulfilled promises. New promises on the eve of an election will not have the effect of restoring confidence in the present government.

Last year, when the Prime Minister blamed me for severing my connections with the Liberal party, he said that I did not do honour to the province of Quebec. I answered that, when the time would come for me to get the approval of the voters of Quebec, I would not dread their verdict.

The test has been taken in Stanstead and Montreal-Cartier, and you know the result. The government candidates were overwhelmed by the standard-bearers of the Bloc Populaire Canadien, in spite of the fraud resorted to by government officials.

In Montreal-Cartier, the Bloc Populaire candidate crushed the government nominee, and if the Labour-Progressive candidate polled 150 votes more than our man, it is only because thousands of fictitious names had been added

to the voters' lists and other thousands of voters had been deprived of their electoral rights. The Labour-Progressive candidate was permitted to name enumerators to revise the lists while the Bloc Populaire representative was denied the same privilege. A royal enquiry should be held, for the parties responsible were in the pay of the government.

In a speech delivered in September last before the National Liberal Federation, the Prime Minister attacked the Bloc Populaire. It happened after the by-elections held in Stanstead and Montreal-Cartier, in the province of Quebec.

He claimed that our group had but a negative and destructive doctrine, that it was attempting to raise Quebec against the other provinces in order to win votes and secure influence by appeals to race prejudice. And he pictured us as a danger to Canadian unity.

His grounds for complaint should be noted. Our doctrine was negative and destructive, he said. Where does he find that? The Bloc Populaire was formed in September 1942. In my first address, delivered in October 1942, I stated as a principle that Canada, being a Christian country, should be governed like a Christian country, that our first concern would be the people. Consequently, we advocated a policy designed to protect and help the Christian family and its numerous children, and to facilitate their education and employment.

I advocated special consideration for public health, the elimination of slums, and a readjustment of salaries, so that our people might live under healthful conditions, and the heads of families might give adequate shelter and food to their children. I also advocated a revision of the taxation system that would take care of large families. Instead of increasing the tax burden which large families have to bear, we would have lightened it. We wanted and we still want, in short, to safeguard the family, which is the foundation of society.

How can the Prime Minister find anything destructive in such a policy? The speech from the throne even seems to have taken a leaf out of it.

In the field of foreign policy, we demand, for Canada, true sovereignty and the attributes of a sovereign state; true provincial autonomy; we demand a national anthem, a national flag, as all other dominions of the commonwealth; we demand that the Governor of Canada be a citizen of the country as in other dominions; we demand the discontinuance of appeals to the Privy Council and of recourse to the Westminster parliament in matters of amendments to the constitution. We wish to make of Canada a truly sovereign nation.

I could keep this nomenclature up indefinitely but I refer you to the Bloc's programme which has been made public.

The Prime Minister added that the Bloc Populaire was attempting to raise Quebec against the other provinces in fomenting racial prejudice. It would be truer to state that it was the Prime Minister who attempted, on this occasion, to raise the other provinces against Quebec.

Is demanding that the constitution be adhered to and that Quebec be represented as it should, equivalent to raising the other provinces against Quebec or fomenting racial prejudice. If so, Mr. Godbout, who, last year, protested against the procedure of the Government in connection with the redistribution of seats, would be as much to blame as we are.

Is protesting against conscription equivalent to raising the other provinces against Quebec? Then the Prime Minister would have been guilty of the same crime in 1917, when he was opposing conscription while all provinces except Quebec were clamoring for it.

Is demanding that the rights of minorities be respected as guaranteed by the constitution, that provincial autonomy be not infringed upon, that we enjoy our legitimate share of government appointments, that the workers of Quebec receive wages commensurate with those paid in Ontario, equivalent to fomenting racial prejudice?

We have become accustomed to hearing the Prime Minister make an appeal for national unity every time he requests concessions on our part.

Our policy is clear and unequivocal. Our movement is national in its principles and it will remain national in its manifestations.

Mr. FREDERIC DORION (Charlevoix-Saguenay): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I wish to follow the tradition of congratulating the mover and the seconder of the address; but they will understand that I cannot agree with all that they said.

During the recess we have witnessed many important happenings, some of them having to do with our national life and others being closely connected with our external policy. One of the most important, beyond doubt, was the Quebec conference in August, 1943. I wish to offer the government my congratulations upon having chosen the city of Quebec, my own city, as the scene of this conference. I do not hesitate to say that the people of Quebec appreciated the choice of

their capital for the holding of this historic meeting. I am sure that our visitors had an opportunity of getting to know our people and of learning that notwithstanding certain misinformation spread by some parts of the press, the people of the province of Quebec are as loyal as anyone else and especially as Canadian as anyone else. This conference also gave the people of Quebec an opportunity to manifest their fullest appreciation of those who, coming from abroad, do not attempt to overawe them or treat them as inferiors, as unfortunately happens much too often, but come as gentlemen. This appreciation extends particularly to the British Prime Minister and his colleagues. It was a great pleasure for our people to hear Mr. Churchill, his distinguished wife and charming daughter, speak to them fluently in their own language. I am sure that no one in Quebec will forget the speech delivered by Miss Churchill over the radio on August 27, when she said:

Je me réjouirai toujours d'être descendue d'abord à Québec. C'est ainsi qu'il faut arriver au Canada.

This may be translated: "I will always be delighted to have come down first to Quebec. It is the way one must come into Canada." But I must say, Mr. Speaker, that if our people were happy to receive such important personages, at the same time they were very sorry to notice the insignificant role played in this conference by our own government. Once more it was evident that our country does not possess the international status which would put it on the same footing as the other nations.

Another very important event I should like to recall is the appointment of Mr. Justice Thibaudeau Rinfret as chief justice of the Supreme Court of Canada. No doubt the government deserves our congratulations on this appointment, because Judge Rinfret was surely the man best qualified to fill such an important post. I am sure the people as a whole, as well as lawyers and others who have anything to do with the Supreme Court of Canada, learned of this appointment with great satisfaction.

Another event occurred which was not so important of itself but which became of some significance because of the declarations made on that occasion. I refer to the Liberal caucus held in Ottawa in September of last year. According to a report published in the Ottawa *Evening Journal* of September 28 the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), addressing his friends of the Liberal party said, as he did this afternoon, that probably no general election would take place before the end of the war; but he added that some circumstances might force the government to appeal to the country sooner. Among those circumstances was the following: any one of the opposition groups, or a combination of them, being able so to impede the progress of business in parliament, or so misrepresenting and distorting government policy, as to make it next to impossible to carry on. I do not know if by this statement the Prime Minister intended to prevent the opposition groups from criticizing the government, but if he did I think he made a mistake. On this point I should like to quote from an address delivered some time ago by the ex-president of the Canadian Bar Association:

Executive control of speech, particularly of speech in criticism of the executive, is fundamentally and completely incompatible with free institutions, whether the criticism be directed against the personnel, policies or acts of that executive or of any board or commission appointed by it. In time of war everyone will recognize the propriety of restricting the dissemination of certain types of information or even of banning the expression of views calculated to injure the country's cause; but to attempt to ban or restrict criticism, however injudicious, of the conduct of the executive or its agencies, is an assault on the very citadel of freedom and the establishment in the seats of power of its deadliest enemy. After all, there are some principles the preservation of which is more important than the fate of any government.

I believe everyone who is interested in the safeguarding of democracy and of our parliamentary system must hold the same views.

The only other event I should like to mention is the result of the by-elections that took place in our province last August. Once more the government has been defeated and has been shown that it has lost the confidence of the people. The result of the elections in Stanstead and Cartier demonstrated that the opinion of the people of Quebec was the same in 1943 as it was in 1942, when I was elected for Charlevoix-Saguenay. These three by-elections in my province give evidence that the Liberal party has lost its grip on that province. This does not mean that any other political group would do much better, because knowing quite well the sentiment of our people I am sure I am right when I repeat what I said last session, that having been tossed for seventy-five years between "reds" and "blues" only to serve as stepping stones to power, without any advantage to themselves, the people of Quebec have become wary; and, though not sure of the political orientation they will ultimately adopt, have decided for the present to support men who, having broken with old ties, can offer them guarantees of sincerity and above all, unselfishness.

I just said, Mr. Speaker, that the by-elections in Quebec in 1943 proved abundantly that this government does not represent the sentiment of the people of Quebec or of the country. To support that statement I should like to recall a declaration made by the Prime Minister himself on January 29, 1934, when he was leader of the opposition, and I quote from page 34 of *Hansard* for that year:

So the evidence from every side goes to prove that not only has the government lost the confidence of the country but it has lost confidence in itself. May I state further that no matter what majority it may have as a result of the number of hon. members returned at the time the government came into office, that majority no longer represents the opinion of the Canadian people. By-elections have expressed in no uncertain voice the opinion of our people. This government has lost the moral authority to govern. . . .

I repeat the statement. I say that having lost by-election after by-election in all parts of Canada during the last two or three years and the people having spoken so positively and so emphatically, it has been made perfectly plain that the gouvernment has lost the moral authority to govern, and if it followed its duty it would resign, go to the people and allow them to speak. The Canadian people as a whole should be given an opportunity at a general election to express their view upon policies which up to the present they have been able to do only in part in by-elections.

I have no doubt that if the Prime Minister was right in 1934 we should not be too long to-day in repeating his own words; and a statement like this weighs more heavily on the eve of the very important journey which the Prime Minister is about to undertake. If we refer to statements made lately by most important statesmen, especially to the address delivered a few days ago in Toronto by Viscount Halifax, it is certain that at the next imperial conference there will be some discussions of very great interest for our country, and there may be some decisions which will bind the future of Canada. Is it logical, is it democratic when all the other prime ministers who will attend this meeting have received fresh mandates from their constituents—is it fair for the people of Canada to have, as their representative, the head of a political party which, according to his own words, does not represent any more the sentiment of the people. It may happen that in such a state of affairs Canadians will not consider themselves bound by the decisions emanating from this conference.

It is true that we have a very fine speech from the throne, a speech which gives contentment to members of the Liberal party. But this is surely not enough to give the government authority to speak for the people of Canada. There will be much to say about the speech from the throne, and no doubt during the session we shall have an opportunity of discussing in detail the legislation which will come out of it. I hope the government will submit to the house the measures announced in the speech, so that we can give them careful study. I hope, also, that all these measures will be discussed on their own merits with the greatest possible broad-mindedness, and that it will not give to anyone the occasion to raise discrimination against one province or another.

As regards our international policy, we heard not long ago that the government had decided to name ambassadors to some countries. There is no doubt that these nominations constitute another push, leading Canada to a greater independence. But there is always this deficiency in our system, namely that of being obliged to go to another country to amend our constitution. I hope, Mr. Speaker, in the course of the present session to have an opportunity to formulate to the house a project which will enable us to amend our own constitution, ourselves, taking good care, however, to preserve the rights of minorities and the spirit of the compact that gave birth to confederation.

If we appreciate the nomination of these ambassadors, we must, however, deplore the fact that the government has not deemed it advisable to name one to the highest moral power on earth, the Vatican. I state that Canada should hurry to take her place among so many other countries with this international authority, the place on earth where problems are discussed and resolved with the greatest justice and equity. Are we aware of the fact that forty countries are represented at the Vatican? I have here the latest available list, and I think it is well known that those with ambassadors are Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Germany, Spain, France, Italy, Peru, Poland. Those with legations are the following: Great Britain, Bolivia, Costa-Rica, Esthonia, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Austria, Hungary, Ireland, Portugal, Roumania, Santo-Domingo, San Marino, Salvador, Czechoslovakia, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Malta, Liberia, Lithuania, Monaco, Nicaragua, Panama, Uruguay and Latvia. Everybody knows the President of the United States has his own personal representative. If so many countries find it to their interest to be represented there, would it not be the same for Canada, and would it not be for her one of the best aids in helping her to play the role she is eager to play in the international field?

Therefore I am sure I would be reflecting the opinion of the great majority of the people in this country, Catholics as well as non-Catholics, in urging the government to decide as soon as possible upon the nomina-

tion of an ambassador to the Holy See. This would surely be the greatest step toward the international status toward which we are heading. Furthermore I should like to tell the Prime Minister, when going to London, that at this imperial conference the finest task he could perform would be to sponsor participation by the Pope in the next peace conference. Since the beginning of the war we have been told we were fighting for democracy and Christian civilization. For us Canadians, we cannot aspire to anything other than the reestablishment of an enduring peace in the world. We cannot expect territorial possessions. We cannot expect much compensation. Therefore, if we wish to reach our end, if we wish to be true to ourselves and to others, we have nothing to do other than to see to it that all the necessary precautions be taken to have this time not twenty years' truce, but a real, everlasting peace. One of the most necessary precautions would most certainly be the attendance at the next peace conference of the most powerful moral authority, the greatest friend of peace, the greatest advocate of the moral brotherhood of mankind. Moreover, this point of view is shared to-day by all those who really care for the welfare of mankind.

I should like to give as an example a quotation from *Time* of August 16, 1943, as follows:

"No matter what critics might say, it is scarcely deniable that the church apostolic, through the encyclicals and other papal pronouncements, has been fighting against totalitarianism more knowingly, devoutly and authoritatively, and for a longer time, than any other organized power. Benedict XV was expressly barred from Versailles by a clause in the secret treaty of London. But whether or not the Pope is present, the influence of the Catholic church's peace policy will be tremendous. Most Catholics and non-Catholics alike would agree that a peace that does not embody at least roughly, the papal position on fundamental social issues will bring not social peace but a sword. For when traditional justice fails, retributive justice supervenes.

(Translation): Mr. Speaker, this opinion of the magazine *Time* on the participation of the Vatican in the future peace conference is shared by a great many people of all creeds, of all races and of all countries.

It is generally agreed that if peace had been better prepared in 1919, if the peace treaty had not been dictated by the international money powers nor based on the hatred of some prominent figures against certain Catholic countries of Europe; in other words if the peace treaty had been drafted with the co-operation of the greatest moral influence in the world, the Holy See, the world would probably have been saved the horrors of the present conflict.

As long as this great international power, the Vatican, is deliberately left aside and excluded from international discussions, the suffering and unhappy peoples of the world will be offered only incomplete and insufficient remedies. The Church is a peacemaker by the very nature of its mission. Suffice it here to recall the many occasions on which the Roman pastors have been successful in putting an end to oppression, in preventing wars, and in securing truces, agreements and peace treaties.

In times gone by, the Pope was requested to act as arbitrator, and history shows that not once had a country any reason to regret having appealed to the Pope for adjusting its differences. One of the first instances where the European nations decided to exclude the Vatican from the discussion of international problems was the Hague convention of 1899. Notwithstanding the express demand of Czar Nicholas II of Russia, notwithstanding the insistence of Queen Wilhelmina, of Holland, notwithstanding the opinions of the experts in international law, the nations decided, on the suggestion of Italy, to exclude the Holy See from the convention. However, less than two years previously, the Seventh World Peace Congress, held in Budapest, under the chairmanship of General Turr, had expressed their gratitude to the Pope for his numerous peace interventions and had humbly and earnestly requested him to remain the champion of the great crusade for the fellowship of all men and to help the civil governments in their efforts toward peaceful mutual understanding.

Neither research congresses, even though independent of all confessional ties, neither the cabinets of reigning sovereigns, although divorced from the Church, could think of an international peace conference from which the Holy See would be excluded.

On August 24, 1898, Count Mouravieff, Minister of Foreign Affairs in Russia, carrying out the instructions of Nicholas II, invited the nations of the world to a disarmament conference. This invitation was conveyed to the Vatican on August 30, 1898, by Mr. Tcharykoff, resident minister of the Emperor of Russia appointed to the Holy See.

To this invitation, the Pope replied that he united wholeheartedly with the nations who wished to agree on terms of international peace. On January 16, 1899, the above-mentioned Mr. Tcharykoff sent a second message to the Holy See; it was a circular announcing the programme of the future conference.

Finally, on April 6, 1899, Queen Wilhelmina forwarded the official invitations to the various powers requesting their attendance at the

meetings that were to take place at The Hague on May 10 following. These invitations, signed by Monsieur de Baufort, Minister of Foreign Affairs for the Kingdom of the Netherlands, did not, however, reach the Pope, in spite of the wish of Queen Wilhelmina and of Czar Nicholas II.

The reason for this is that, during the first fortnight of February, 1899, Admiral Canevaro, Minister of Foreign Affairs for Italy, informed the Czar and The Hague that unless the Pope were excluded, Italy would not take part in the conference. In spite of the steps taken by the Czar, Italy's objection could not be overruled. A short time before the convention Berlin stepped in, warning the promotors that if one of the great powers kept aloof, Germany would do likewise. As the presence of Germany was absolutely necessary, Italy's pressure was heeded.

During that now famous convention, besides the decisions that were taken, resolutions were drafted for future meetings during which the various nations were to continue the work begun at The Hague. Not content with having succeeded in keeping the Vatican away from the convention itself, Italy objected to the insertion in these resolutions of a clause whose sufficiently general scope might later have opened the door to the Holy See's participation.

Having to face, in connection with the drafting of those resolutions which excluded the Pope, most of the other powers assembled at The Hague, Italy endeavoured to obtain the support of some of the greater nations represented at the convention.

Finally, her objection was endorsed by Great Britain's representative, and once more Italy was successful. However, Queen Wilhelmina, ever anxious to have the Vatican ratify the proceedings and the resolutions of the convention, decided, at the final sitting, to quote the letter which Pope Leo III had sent her in reply to the invitation she had extended to him. That letter expounded principles identical to those which Leo XIII had stated some time previously in a consistorial address delivered on February 11, 1899.

A few excerpts from that address deserve to be quoted:

> Accordingly the church has never been and will never be more concerned about the propagation and the defence of the laws of justice and charity. It is for that purpose that the church has worked in the whole world and no one can doubt that it has mollified barbaric nations, in imparting to them the love of justice, and that it has thus turned them from the ferocity of warlike customs to lead them to the arts of peace and civilization; to the lowly as well as to the powerful, to those who obey as well as to those who give commands, it has imposed the obligation of observing justice and refraining from taking up arms for an unjust cause.

And further on:

> It applies itself to requesting from God that, for the salvation and prosperity of nations, He should spare them the dangers of war. Accordingly, every time that the need has arisen and the circumstances have permitted, it has no greater concern than to use its authority with a view to restoring harmony and pacifying kingdoms.

The merit of the Hague protocols, those of 1899 and those of 1908, has been to create a remarkable classification of the rules of public international law; there is no doubt that they contain an accurate and able adaptation of the principles of natural law, in accordance with material conditions and the moral standards of modern societies. It is unfortunate that the legal work achieved at the Hague conferences should have remained as unknown and unappreciated as was the case in almost every country of the world and in almost every social circle.

The fundamental principles of the law of nations would have proved, I believe, less inefficient had they been more widely known, more appreciated and endowed with higher moral prestige. The belligerents could not have, without serious moral prejudice to their cause and their country, violated them as universally and as impudently as our enemies did during the last and the present war.

Had a representative of Leo XIII been present at the first Hague conference in 1899, and a representative of Piux X at the second in 1907, the decisions and resolutions of those conferences would have gained from the moral prestige that would have bestowed upon them the approval and even the cooperation of the Roman pontiff. In all the countries of the world, the principles of morale and justice arising from these decisions and resolutions would have been impressed upon the conscience of millions by the bishops in their pastoral letters and by the priests from the pulpit.

It is indeed not foolhardy to believe that the cooperation of the representatives of Leo XIII and Pius X at the two conferences of The Hague would have helped to make less ineffective this great work of pacification of peoples.

At the outbreak of the war of 1914-18, the Pope, faithful to his mission of peace, attempted to check what he was perhaps in a better position than anyone else to foresee as a catastrophe from which all peoples would suffer without deriving much benefit. After the conflict had broken out, he endeavoured

to relieve as much as possible the sufferings of the devastated countries.

The humanitarian works of the Holy See during the last war were innumerable. Its interventions for the exchange of prisoners, for the care of the sick, for the distribution of relief are undeniable and when, in 1918, victory finally crowned the Allied efforts, why was the Pope once more kept away from the discussions which preceded the signing of the peace treaty? Here again the intervention of Italy is seen.

When in 1915 that country agreed to fight on the side of the Allied Nations, a secret treaty was signed between herself, France, Great Britain and Russia. The Italian ambassador in London, Marquess Imperali, upon instructions from his government, conveyed to the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Sir Edward Grey, to the French ambassador, Monsieur Cambon, and to the Russian ambassador, Count Benckendorff, a memorandum containing clause 15 which read as follows:

> France, Great Britain and Russia shall support Italy's opposition to any proposal tending to introduce a representative of the Holy See in any peace negotiations and in the settlement of matters arising from this war.

This document was signed on the 26th of April, 1915 by the four people I have just mentioned. Therefore, it is not surprising that in 1918 the Pope was not invited to attend the peace conferences of the Allied Nations.

Realizing these facts, is it not true that the instability of the Versailles Treaty appears less amazing? Moreover, why is it that on this page of history, the sacred name of Him from whom proceed all authority, all right and all justice, has not been inscribed? It was "in the name of the most Holy Trinity" that in the past the most solemn treaties were signed, those of 1815 as well as the treaties of Utrecht and Westphalia.

Christian institutions were convinced that God alone could put the finishing touch to human agreements to the extent that His spirit penetrated them. What wonderful success resulted from this policy of excluding the sovereign pontiff and of ignoring the rights of Providence!

The treaty of Versailles has probably lasted for a shorter period of time than any other treaty in history. Is it not very evident that after the present war, when we must start from scratch, it will be absolutely necessary to rectify the mistakes made from 1899 to 1919 and ask the Pope to enlighten by his moral authority the nations which will have the task of drawing up the next peace treaty?

[Mr. Dorion.]

Is there not, at the present time, another secret treaty, another convention designed to keep the Vatican out of international discussions? I hope not, for such a state of things would simply be a repetition of a crime for which we might have to pay very dearly.

It may be said in some circles, even among friends, that it is useless and ill-advised to protest against such an exclusion, for the powers that be have made up their minds to disregard our complaints.

I shall never accept this point of view; a great cause must be defended on the grounds that it is a just cause, and not on the grounds that it pleases everyone.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote a short extract taken from the radio message of His Holiness Pius XII broadcast to the Catholic world on Christmas day 1943:

> Give to thirsting humanity a peace that will restore the human race in its own self-esteem and in that of history; a peace on whose cradle will shine not the vengeful glare of hatred and the instinctive unleashed desires of revenge, but rather the resplendent dawn of a new spirit of universal union; this, strengthened by the supernatural help which is indispensable to the Christian faith, alone can succeed in preserving humanity, after this unfortunate war, from the unspeakable catastrophe of a peace based on false foundations, and consequently no more than an ephemeral illusion.

Monseigneur Deploige, rector of the University of Louvain, speaking at a conference on the Society of Christian nations, said:

> To insure peace, in so far as that is possible in this world of ours, recourse to the church of Christ, the great educator of nations, would have been necessary. Indeed, when the task in hand meets so many obstacles the causes of which are buried deep in the human soul, why should the greatest power in the world, heir to the immortal promises of the God of Peace, why should this greatest power alone remain uninvited?

On motion of Mr. Roebuck the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre) the house adjourned at 10.15 p.m.

Tuesday, February 1, 1944

The house met at three o'clock.

STANDING COMMITTEES

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Pensions and National Health) presented the report of the special committee appointed to prepare and report lists of members to compose the standing committees of the house, as follows:

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

Messieurs

Abbott
Anderson
Claxton
Diefenbaker
Douglas (Weyburn)
Dupuis
Evans
Fair
Factor
Fournier (Hull)
Gershaw
Gibson
Gladstone
Gray
Gregory
Hill
Kirk
Lalonde
MacNicol
McCuaig
McDonald (Pontiac)
Mutch
O'Brien
Pinard
Pouliot
Power
Roy
Slaght
Weir—29.

(Quorum 10)

MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS

Messieurs

Bonnier
Boucher
Bryce
Chambers
Cleaver
Cloutier
Cote
d'Anjou
Donnelly
Douglas (Queens)
Dubois
Durocher
Factor
Fauteux
Fontaine
Gershaw
Gibson
Gingues
Gladstone
Graham
Harris (Grey-Bruce)
Hazen
Healy
Hlynka
Hoblitzell
Howden
Jutras
Knowles
Lacombe
Lockhart
Macdonald (Halifax)
Macdonald (Brantford City)
MacKenzie (Lambton-Kent)
MacLean (Cape Breton North-Victoria)
McGregor
McIlraith
Marier
Matthews
Mayhew
Parent
Poirier
Ross (St. Paul's)
Roy
Senn
Shaw
Stokes
Telford
Tomlinson
Veniot
Wood—50.

(Quorum 15)

BANKING AND COMMERCE

Messieurs

Authier
Black (Cumberland)
Blackmore
Blair
Breithaupt
Claxton
Cleaver
Coldwell
Donnelly
Dubuc
Edwards
Eudes
Fontaine
Fraser (Northumberland)
Fraser (Peterborough West)
Graham
Gray
Hanson (York-Sunbury)
Harris (Danforth)
Hazen
Hill
Jackman
Jaques
Jean
Kinley
Laflamme
Lafontaine
Leclerc
Macdonald (Halifax)
Macdonald (Brantford City)
MacInnis
MacKenzie (Neepawa)
Macmillan
McCann
McGeer
McGibbon
McIlraith
McNevin (Victoria, Ont.)
Marier
Martin
Maybank
Mayhew
Moore
Perley
Picard
Ross (St. Paul's)
Ryan
Slaght
Tucker
Ward—50.

(Quorum 15)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Messieurs

Abbott
Authier
Black (Yukon)
Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)
Boucher
Bourget
Burton
Clark
Cote
Cruickshank
Dechene
Denis
Desmond
Ferland
Fontaine
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Fraser (Northumberland)
Fulford
Gladstone
Golding
Grant
Graydon
Green
Hanson (York-Sunbury)
Henderson
Homuth
Isnor
Johnston (Bow River)
McCubbin
McDonald (Pontiac)
McGeer
McIvor
McNiven (Regina City)
Marshall
Matthews
Mullins
Mulock
Noseworthy
Purdy
Rhéaume
Rickard
Roebuck
Ross (Hamilton East)
Ross (Souris)
Slaght
Tripp
Thauvette
Veniot
Ward
Winkler—50.

(Quorum 15)

RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES

Messieurs

Authier
Bence
Bertrand (Terrebonne)
Black (Cumberland)
Bourget
Breithaupt
Burton
Chevrier
Corman
Cote
Crerar
Douglas (Queens)
Dupuis
Emmerson
Eudes
Factor
Farquhar
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Fulford
Gauthier
Golding
Gregory
Hanson (Skeena)
Harris (Danforth)
Hatfield
Healy
Howden
Howe
Isnor
Jackman
Jean
Johnston (Bow River)
Kirk
LaCroix (Quebec-Montmorency)
Laflamme
Little
Lizotte
Lockhart
MacKinnon (Kootenay East)
McCulloch
McIvor
McKinnon (Kenora-Rainy River)
McNiven (Regina City)
Maybank
Mills
Mullins
Nicholson
Nielsen (Mrs.)
Nixon
O'Brien
O'Neill
Poirier
Pouliot
Roebuck
Ross (Calgary East)
Ross (Souris)
Shaw
Sissons
Turner
White
Whitman—61.

(Quorum 20)

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION

Messieurs

Authier
Aylesworth
Bertrand (Prescott)
Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)
Blair
Bourget
Bryce
Cardiff
Choquette
Clark
Cloutier
Cruickshank
Dechene
Desmond
Diefenbaker
Donnelly
Douglas (Queens)
Dubois
Evans
Fair
Ferron
Fontaine
Furniss
Gardiner
Golding
Gregory
Hatfield
Henderson
Kirk
Laflamme
Lafontaine
Lalonde
Leader
Leclerc
Leger
Lizotte
MacDiarmid
MacKenzie (Lambton-Kent)
McCuaig
McCubbin
McNevin (Victoria, Ont.)
Matthews
Mullins
Nielsen (Mrs.)
Perley
Poirier
Quelch
Rennie
Rhéaume
Rickard
Ross (Souris)
Ross (Middlesex East)
Ross (Moose Jaw)
Rowe
Senn
Soper
Tustin
Ward
Weir
Whitman
Wright—61.

(Quorum 20)

STANDING ORDERS

Messieurs

Bertrand (Prescott)
Brunelle
Cardiff
Denis
Dupuis
Edwards
Eudes
Golding
Graydon
Jaques
Knowles
MacLean (Cape Breton North-Victoria)
Marier
Marshall
McLarty
McLean (Simcoe East)
O'Neill
Rennie
Ross (Moose Jaw)
Stokes—20.

(Quorum 8)

MARINE AND FISHERIES

Messieurs

Bradette
Brooks
Brunelle
Crete
Dechene
Farquhar
Ferron
Green
Hanson (Skeena)
Hazen
Hill
Kinley
Noseworthy
Kuhl
Lafontaine
Lapointe (Matapedia-Matane
Leduc
Macdonald (Kingston City)
MacInnis
MacKenzie (Neepawa)
Macmillan
McLean (Simcoe East)
Neill
Noseworthy
Poirier
Reid
Pottier
Roy
Ryan
Stirling
Telford
Tomlinson
Tripp
Tustin
Veniot
Warren—35.

(Quorum 10)

MINES, FORESTS AND WATERS

Messieurs

Adamson
Authier
Bence
Black (Yukon)
Blanchette
Bourget
Crerar
d'Anjou
Edwards
Esling
Evans
Furniss
Gillis
Grant
Hansell
Hurtubise
Johnston (Bow River)
Lafontaine
Leduc
Little
MacNicol
McCann
McCulloch
McDonald (Pontiac)
McGibbon
McKinnon (Kenora-Rainy River)
Nielsen (Mrs.)
Parent
Sanderson
Sinclair
Tripp
Turner
Ward
Warren
White—35.

(Quorum 10)

DEBATES

Messieurs

Blanchette
Claxton
Esling
Hlynka
Jutras
Pinard
Pouliot
Ross (Middlesex East)
Ross (Moose Jaw)
Rowe
Shaw
Sinclair—12.

(Quorum 7)

INDUSTRIAL AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Messieurs

Abbott
Blackmore
Bruce
Church
Cloutier
Cote
Dubuc
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Gingues
Goulet
Hanson (Skeena)
Homuth
Jean
Lafontaine
Leger
MacKenzie (Neepawa)
Macmillan
MacNicol
McCann
McGarry
McNiven (Regina City)
Massey
Mills
Mutch
Neill
Nixon
Noseworthy
Pottier
Roebuck
Ross (Calgary East)
Ross (Hamilton East)
Rose
Sanderson
Stirling
Turgeon—35.

(Quorum 10)

PRINTING

(Members to act on the part of the Commons)

Messieurs

Bertrand (Terrebonne)
Bonnier
Bourget
Casselman (Grenville-Dundas)
Castleden
Chambers
Chevrier
Corman
Crete
d'Anjou
Denis
Dubois
Dupuis
Durocher
Edwards
Emmerson
Esling
Evans
Fauteux
Ferland
Fraser (Peterborough West)
Furniss
Gillis
Goulet
Grant
Green
Healy
Hlynka
Hoblitzell
Hurtubise
Kuhl
Leader
MacDiarmid
MacKinnon (Kootenay East)
MacLean (Cape Breton North-Victoria)

McGregor
McNevin (Victoria, Ont.)
Mills
Moore
Mulock
Purdy
Rheaume
Ross (St. Paul's)
Sinclair
Sissons
Soper
Tripp
Tucker
Tustin
Weir
White
Whitman
Winkler
Wood—54.

RESTAURANT

(Members to act on the part of the Commons)

Mr. Speaker and Messieurs

Black (Yukon)
Dupuis
Edwards
Farquhar
Furniss
Goulet
Howden
Jaques
Laflamme
Lafontaine
Macdonald (Brantford City)
MacInnis
McGregor
McIvor
Mayhew
Pinard
Purdy
Rheaume
Thauvette
Tucker
Tustin—22.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

(Members to act on the part of the Commons)

Mr. Speaker and Messieurs

Adamson
Aylesworth
Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)
Bruce
Cardiff
Casselman (Grenville-Dundas)
Castleden
Coldwell
Emmerson
Eudes
Factor
Farquhar
Fontaine
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Gershaw
Goulet
Graham
Green
Hansell
Henderson
Howden
Hurtubise
Jaques
Jean
Lizotte
Macdonald (Halifax)
MacKenzie (Neepawa)
MacKenzie (Lambton Kent)
Macmillan
Marier
Martin
Mayhew
Moore
Poirier
Pouliot
Purdy
Raymond
Reid
Rickard
Ross (St. Paul's)
Thauvette
Warren
Winkler
Wood—45.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre) moved that the report be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

POWERS OF COMMITTEES

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That the 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.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAYS AND SHIPPING

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS AND ESTIMATES OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED TRANSPORTATION LINES

Hon. J. E. MICHAUD (Minister of Transport) moved:

That Standing Order 63 of the House of Commons, relating to the appointment of Standing Committees of the House, be amended by adding to the Standing Committees of the House for the present session a Standing Committee on Railways and Shipping owned, operated and controlled by the Government, to which will be referred accounts and estimates and bills relating thereto of the Canadian National Railways, The Canadian National (West Indies) Steamships, and Trans-Canada Air Lines for the present session, for consideration and report to the House; provided however that nothing in the resolution shall be construed to curtail in any way the full right of discussion in Committee of Supply; and that the said Committee consist of: Messrs. Donnelly, Dubuc, Durocher, Emmerson, Ferland, Gray, Hanson (Skeena), Harris (Danforth), Hazen, Howden, Jackman, Lockhart, Michaud, McCulloch, Maybank, Nicholson, Parent, Pouliot, Roebuck, Ross (Middlesex East), Sanderson, Shaw, Sissons.

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS AND PAPERS

TABLING OF REGULATIONS—PENSIONS AND NATIONAL HEALTH AND WAR VETERANS' ALLOWANCES

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Pensions and National Health): I wish to table two orders in council, one amending the regulations made under the Department of Pensions and National Health Act, and the other amending regulations with regard to allowances under the War Veterans' Allowance Act.

Mr. GRAYDON: Has that anything to do with the north west field forces?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): No. One has to do with increases in allowances under the War Veterans' Allowance Act, and the other deals with allowances given to those who have been serving and are still under treatment. It provides in a word that they shall continue to have pay and allowances of the rank, with a ceiling of the rank of lieutenant, until treatment has been completed.

Mr. GRAYDON: I do not know how comprehensive this is, but many complaints have been registered by members generally with regard to the situation and I hope that this clears it up.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON REVISION OF STANDING ORDERS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That a special committee consisting of Messrs. Black (Yukon), Fauteux, Golding, Hanson (York-Sunbury), Isnor, Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre), MacInnis, McIlraith, Maybank, St. Laurent and Quelch, be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in revising the standing orders of the house with a view to simplify, accelerate and expedite its business, and to report to the house during the present session.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask the Prime Minister if it is possible to have this committee sit at an early day in order that we may be able to do something in connection with the rules of procedure before the session ends?—I mean a considerable time before the session ends, because I do not want the committee to bring in its report at the end of the session and have a discussion on it drag on into another session.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say to my hon. friend that the purpose in having the motion introduced at this early stage of the session is that the committee may get to work just as soon as possible. I would hope that it might have some recommendation to make to the house in the course of a few weeks or days. Certainly there is every desire on the part of the government to have the committee report as quickly as possible.

Mr. GRAYDON: The sooner the better.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, that is right.

Mr. J. SASSEVILLE ROY (Gaspé): Mr. Speaker, if I am within the rules I should like to say a few words about the formation of this committee that the government proposes to establish. In his speech yesterday the Prime Minister spoke at some length and offered the suggestion that Wednesday sittings be done away with in order to give members the opportunity to do more work on committees, and also to give more time to the members of the cabinet to look after their very important work. What I want to know is this: how are the members who are not members of the committees to make the contribution they should like to make in order to help the administration of the country? On February 22 of last year I suggested that members from the province of Quebec opposing the government should be given places on those important committees, but my suggestion was turned down. If we are to take it for granted that the opposition should be represented on all committees that have to do with important matters affecting the country, then I suppose, according to the same principle, members from the province of Quebec who in this house are opposing the government should be given the opportunity to make their contribution and bring their views to those committees. Therefore, if my request is in order, I would ask that opposition members from the province of Quebec be nominated to the important committees that the government intends to establish before long.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Hon. R. B. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, I understand this motion is debatable, and I desire to say a word in reference to it. I had the honour of serving on a committee which in 1928 revised the rules of this house under the chairmanship of Mr. Speaker Lemieux, with the help, as a friend of the court, of the present Clerk of the House of Commons. We thought we had done a pretty good job at that time. I regret that the country as a whole, as I understand it, now thinks there were some grave errors and omissions in the work of that committee. I agree that as a result of the demand of public opinion the whole position should be reexamined, and I am glad that the Prime Minister has brought forward this motion.

I sympathize to some extent with the point of view of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Roy), but in connection with a matter of this kind I fear a large committee would not be as effective as a small one. I hope that while there may be some disadvantage—none is apparent to me, at all events—the Prime Minister will adhere to the principle of a small committee. I think it can do more effective and more continuous work than a large committee.

The position taken by the hon. member for Gaspé illustrates what is taking place in this house with a multiplicity of parties. We do not need to tell members of this house what difficult situations arise as a result, but such is democracy and we have to meet it. At the same time a situation of this kind, which has to do with the internal economy of the house, makes it impossible to give representation to every political party that springs up ephemerally, and temporarily I hope, in this House of Commons. Therefore I am going to support the motion as put, in the hope that useful work will be done by this committee, but without any great hope that there will evolve any revolutionary departure from the rules; because after all this is the people's parliament, the high court of Canada, a deliberative assembly wherein the people's representatives meet to express the point of view of those who have sent them here, and I strongly deprecate the curtailment of the right of free speech.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): Mr. Speaker, in rising to say a word or two in respect of the motion before us, may I make an observation or two which I believe will represent the sentiment of a good many of those who sit in this house. I am in support of the motion, but I believe if all the committee does is to readjust a few minor rules, the full importance of the committee's work will not be realized. I fancy it makes very

little difference whether or not a member is permitted to speak half an hour or forty minutes, or whether or not we sit on Wednesdays, or whether or not certain language may or may not be used, and the rules and regulations adjusted accordingly. I should like to see the terms of reference extended in order that a more complete democratic form of parliamentary procedure may be brought about. I appreciate what the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) said when he pointed out that this is the people's parliament. That may be true in theory, Mr. Speaker, but it is not true in practice. We all represent the people, but because of certain party affiliations we can only act as a sort of sounding board, and when votes are taken it does not make very much difference what the people's representatives say.

I believe that the terms of reference to this committee should be extended to look into the matter I have just referred to. The government of this country should be the servants of the people; they should be the servants of parliament. They are not. We cannot vote along certain lines for fear that the vote may be interpreted as a vote of want of confidence, upon which the government would resign. I do not think that should be so in our parliamentary practice. I think we should be free to vote in whatever way we desire, and the government should become the administrative body to put into effect what parliament desires. It does not work that way in practice, as we know; the government seems to be the big boss of the representatives of the people. I wish the work of the committee could be extended in order to place this parliament upon a more practical basis as representing the will of the people, so that the government would become the administrative body to put into operation that which the representatives of the people desire.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the text of the resolution does not go far enough. This committee should consider the whole question of parliamentary, constitutional, cabinet and law reform. After all is said and done we are now in the fifth year of the war, and parliament has to do very little work indeed. We have appointed outside boards and commissions to such an extent that we have abrogated the functions of parliament, and the so-called supremacy of parliament has become a myth. I believe that with all these controls there is very little business for parliament to do except the holding of post mortems; the money is spent before the estimates reach this house. I believe the work to be done by this committee should embrace the subjects I have mentioned. If we had a rule similar to that of the British parliament, under which on the orders of the day supplementary questions might be asked, five-sixths of the debates in this house would be eliminated.

Mr. DANIEL McIVOR (Fort William): I should like this committee to consider the suggestion that when the hour of worship is called here the general public should be welcomed. This is the only place in Canada, so far as I know, where the doors are locked against the general public when we meet together for the worship of God. Surely the general public need it as much as we do.

Motion agreed to.

WAR APPROPRIATION BILL

PROVISION FOR GRANTING TO HIS MAJESTY AID FOR NATIONAL DEFENCE AND SECURITY

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide, *inter alia*,

1. That sums not exceeding $3,650,000,000 be granted to his majesty towards defraying any expenses or making any advances or loans that may be incurred or granted by or under the authority of the governor in council during the year ending March 31, 1945, for—

(a) the security, defence, peace, order and welfare of Canada;

(b) the conduct of naval, military and air 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 in any other manner whatsoever; and

(d) the carrying out of any measures deemed necessary or desirable 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 under the provisions of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, 1931, such sum or sums of money, not exceeding in the whole the sum of $3,650,000,000 as may be required for the purpose of defraying such expenses or making such advances or loans, the principal and interest of any such loan to be a charge upon and payable out of the consolidated revenue fund.

3. That the governor in council be empowered to reexpend, advance or loan moneys that may be received by way of refund or repayment of advances, loans or expenditure under the War Appropriation Acts of 1939 (second session), 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943 and 1944.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the house.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (York-Sunbury): May I ask if this is the standard resolution that has always preceded the introduction of the war appropriation bills?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Does it differ in any particular?

Mr. ILSLEY: No.

Motion agreed to.

DOMINION ELECTIONS

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON TAKING OF VOTE OF ACTIVE SERVICE FORCES

Hon. N. A. McLARTY (Secretary of State) moved:

That a special committee consisting of Messrs. Blanchette, Factor, Fair, Gillis, Green, Hazen, Isnor, Lapointe (Matapedia-Matane), MacKenzie (Neepawa), MacNicol, McCuaig, McLarty, McNiven (Regina City), Reid and Power, be appointed to consider the Dominion Elections Act, 1938, together with any existing regulations relating to the taking of the vote of the members of the active service forces of Canada, with a view to preserving, continuing and safeguarding the full right of franchise of the personnel of the armed services serving at home and abroad and establishing the required procedure for exercising same; to survey all aspects of the problem; to suggest such amendments, modification or regulations as may be deemed necessary to accomplish the above named purposes, with power to send for persons, papers and records, to sit while the house is sitting, and to report from time to time

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): I do not desire to take up any of the time of the house in unnecessary debate on the motion at this stage, for I think the committee should get to work as quickly as possible. However I should like to ask the Secretary of State what arrangements were made for the taking of the votes of the members of the armed services at the time of the 1940 general election. I should like also to suggest to the minister that in dealing with this matter the committee and the government avoid the serious error, amounting practically to a disgrace, which occurred at the time of the last Ontario election; I refer to the proxy system of voting. Perhaps this would be called a post mortem, but I am quite sure that of our people who were overseas at that time, who were perhaps Canada's No. 1 citizens, not more than one in ten actually exercised his franchise under that proxy system. I just point this out to the minister in order that we may not have any disgrace of the kind at the time of the next general election.

Mr. McLARTY: Replying to the first part of the question of the leader of the opposition, I may say that the regulations governing the 1940 general election were passed under the War Measures Act. My hon. friend will remember that there was not a very lengthy session of parliament in that year, and consequently such regulations could not be considered by this house. I am advised and believe, from the fact that no complaints were received at that time, that the procedure then adopted worked satisfactorily and well. However, conditions have greatly changed since then. In the first place the number serving in the armed forces has increased very substantially, and they are widely dispersed all over the world. The government is anxious that the fullest opportunity be given those serving in the armed forces to exercise their franchise in the selection of those whom they wish to represent them in parliament. That is the whole purpose of the motion, and perhaps this statement of government policy will answer the second portion of my hon. friend's question.

Mr. GRAYDON: In other words I take it that there will be no proxy system in the next general election?

Mr. McLARTY: I think it would be a little unfair to tie the hands of the committee. The regulations which have been drafted by the chief electoral officer with the collaboration of Mr. Harry Butcher, a former member of this house who served on the committee which sat in 1937 and 1938, and who I believe enjoys the esteem of all hon. members of this house. will be submitted to the committee for consideration, and I suggest that at this time it would be unwise to endeavour in any way to tie the hands of the committee by making any commitment as to the particular procedure which might be followed.

Hon. C. G. POWER (Minister of National Defence for Air): Perhaps I may say a word, since I was to some extent responsible for drafting the regulations governing service voting in 1940. I should like to point out to the house that these regulations will be somewhat more difficult of application under present circumstances. For instance, referring only to the Royal Canadian Air Force, in 1940 there were something like five hundred of the personnel of the air force overseas. At the present time it runs closer to fifty or sixty thousand, and they are widely dispersed over every part of the globe. So that the machinery which was set up in 1940, which I think all parties agreed was reasonably efficient and which at one time was almost unanimously considered by the house and the country to be fair and reasonable, will have to be considerably modified and altered.

Then other suggestions have been made with respect to the methods and manner of taking the vote. For instance there has been a suggestion made, one which I saw in a fairly widely publicized book by the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) that the members of the forces should be represented in this house by members of parliament at large, a certain number of members elected over and above the 245 for which the constitution provides. Of course that presupposes a constitutional amendment. Also, if I may say so—and I am not prepared at the moment to discuss the question on its merits—it comes perilously close to the fascist system, the corporative form of government, so close, in fact, that I am astonished to find my hon. friend promoting it.

It has some disadvantages, and from the standpoint of draftsmanship great advantages. The drafting of the legislation certainly would be easier if we were simply to say that the members of the armed forces serving overseas would be represented by, let us say, one member for every 20,000, 30,000 or 40,000 as the case may be. As a matter of fact I am informed that in the last war the province of Saskatchewan did have three members at large, one of whom was for Canada, one for Great Britain and one for France. So that the mechanics of that method would be comparatively easy. It would be very easy to make a provision whereby any, we will say, twenty-five members of the forces could nominate any other member of those forces, and after being duly certified as being a member of such unit he would be a candidate. I presume the whole 200,000 or 300,000 soldiers would vote for a certain number of candidates at large, each having the right to vote for ten or twenty members, as the case might be. So that from the point of view of mechanics or draftsmanship, if I had anything to do with the drafting I would welcome it. But I do not know that the country as a whole would support the setting up of a sort of military caste of some twenty or thirty members, in addition to those for whom provision is already made in our constitution. Nor perhaps would the men themselves like to be deprived of their right to vote in the constituency in which they had formerly voted. I suggest this procedure is something which might be studied by the committee. I bring these points forward so that they may be called to the attention of members of the house. The regulations made in 1940 are not in themselves perfect. They will have to be modified and amended, and any other method ought at least to be considered.

There is a further suggestion—and again from the standpoint of mechanics or draftsmanship, it probably presents even greater facilities than any of the others, and it has to do with all due respect to my hon. friend the acting leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon), with a sort of proxy system. The suggestion I received was that the regulations called for the right of every member of the forces to vote by proxy, and automatically that there should be inscribed on the electoral lists of the appropriate riding or electoral constituency wherein the next of kin reside, the name of the service man, with the designated next of kin as proxy. This has been explained to me only vaguely, but it would work out something like this: Tom Jones resides on Metcalfe street, Ottawa. His name would be given to the chief electoral officer by the records office of the Department of National Defence, whichever branch might be applicable, and the details would be inscribed on the list with respect to next of kin. Every member of the forces has next of kin. The next of kin also would be inscribed on the lists as being the persons having the right to vote.

Here a new inconvenience, however, is presented, because a great many of those boys might fear that their mothers or fathers, as the case may be, would be so strongly attached to the old political parties that they might not exercise that right to vote as they would exercise it.

Mr. GRAYDON: The soldier might be afraid his mother and father had gone C.C.F.

Mr. POWER: He might. On the other hand, an arrangement might be made, particularly if any such legislation were brought into effect now, whereby the member of the forces might be given the option or the right to state on some approved form, possibly by cable, that he wished some other man to act for him, or some other person who necessarily, I think, would have to be within certain kindred limitations. Because otherwise John Bracken might go around and get a lot of proxies and get into the House of Commons.

Mr. GRAYDON: He will get in anyway, but he will want their votes, not their proxies.

Mr. POWER: I suggest again, however, that this is a method which is worthy of some study. When I was explaining some of the difficulties to someone who had never been in a political election in his life, he thought it was the common-sense thing to do.

To revert to the 1940 regulations, I fear that with the armed services dispersed as they now are, a delay of some considerable

time in an election would be involved. It would probably make the electoral period longer. Because one of the greatest complaints—I should say one of the very few complaints received at the last election—was that it was impossible to notify troops of the political allegiance or affiliations of the candidates. The troops received a list; and in the next election I presume they will receive a list of anywhere between 750 and 1,000 candidates. In many instances members of the forces have been away from Canada for three or four years, and the new men who have been coming up in the various parties could not possibly be known to those troops. The result would be that the men overseas would not know the political complexions of such candidates and even with the utmost possible use of cables I fear it would be impossible, for instance, to let a lone airman, a man lost in the wilds of the Hebrides, or—

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): Order.

Mr. POWER: I am an oasis entirely surrounded by Scotland, so that I must not talk about the Hebrides. In any case, in an isolated place like the Hebrides, or somewhere in Burma, or the Gold Coast in Africa, it would be an extremely difficult job to let the troops know who the candidates are. So that it may be necessary to have voting by parties. That is, we would allow a man to vote for a party. The candidate would then be designated by the leaders of those parties.

Mr. GRAYDON: Then my hon. friend should explain or should describe who these new parties are.

Mr. POWER: That presents another difficulty. For instance, at the time of the last election the man who voted for my hon. friend in his constituency voted for a national government candidate. This time he will see the name of Gordon Graydon and he will say "Who in—"

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. POWER: "Who is he?" And there will be other difficulties, too. If leaders of parties are allowed at will to designate candidates as being the men to whom will inure the votes of persons who vote for the Progressive Conservative, Liberal or C.C.F. or other parties, as the case may be, we would have the spectacle of my hon. friend from Gaspe (Mr. Roy) nominating as his candidate the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson). When considering that I did suggest to the draftsman that there should be a proviso in the legislation whereby the hon. member for York-Sunbury could repudiate his designation by the hon. member for Gaspe. The leader of the Bloc Populaire or the leader of the Canadian party could nominate the Prime Minister of this country as a candidate in Prince Albert. I do not think that that would help the Prime Minister very much.

These are things that I would draw to the attention of the house in order to indicate that while the 1940 regulation, by the admission of everybody, worked well, they would be difficult of application where the troops are so widespread and where communications are so difficult. I really believe that any method or manner which appears to have some common sense in its make-up should at least be studied by the committee.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I am not clear as to whether the former elections act provided that all members of the armed services are entitled to vote, or must they be twenty-one years of age?

Mr. POWER: All members.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Irrespective of age?

Mr. POWER: Yes.

Mr. SAMUEL FACTOR (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say only a word with reference to the suggestion of the minister as to the consideration of the problem of providing direct representation by the services. If it is the intention of the government that the committee is to consider this wide problem, I submit that the terms of the resolution are not broad enough. It merely instructs the committee to study the elections act.

Mr. GRAYDON: It does not even go that far.

Mr. FACTOR: With a view to preserving the rights of the service personnel. I submit further that it should not be within the province of this committee to study the rather interesting problem suggested by the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis). I suggest that that problem is in itself a modification of a problem which is so wide that it should not be included in the terms of reference of this committee. I would appreciate it if the minister would enlighten the house on that particular phase of the problem

Mr. POWER: I did not draft this resolution, but I was under the impression that it would cover any method which would protect the right of the soldier. It states that the committee is "to consider the Dominion Elections Act, together with any existing regulations relating to the taking of the vote of the members of the active service forces of Canada"—those are the 1940 regulations—"with

a view to preserving, continuing and safeguarding the full rights of franchise of the personnel of the armed services serving at home and abroad and establishing the required procedure for exercising same." The committee is to study the elections act and the regulations and then establish regulations and procedure. It is "to survey all aspects of the problem."

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That has nothing to do with representation; it would involve a constitutional amendment.

Mr. GRAYDON: This does not seem to me to be a question of representation by electoral districts in Canada. The Dominion Elections Act provides the machinery by which the vote is taken, and it is restricted entirely to that. I think the minister will find that he is on pretty broad ground when he talks about changing the method of representation in the House of Commons.

Mr. POWER: I am not advocating that. I am merely suggesting that it should be something for the committee to study. I think the phrase "to survey all aspects of the problem" would give them that power, perhaps with a little good will on the part of the chairman and the members of the committee, and on the part of the house if it were necessary to have the reference widened. Personally I should like to see it studied, although I do not think that I would support it.

Mr. GRAYDON: I agree with what the minister says with respect to that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must point out to hon. members that we are not in committee.

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to say a word, since my name has been brought into the discussion. I have no intention of debating this question now. I am a member of the committee that will be studying the whole problem, and my opinions will be reserved for the discussion of that aspect of the question. I merely wish to say a word with respect to the observation that it smacked of regimentation and so forth.

Mr. GRAYDON: Fascism.

Mr. GILLIS: The corporate state is nothing more or less than totalitarianism in its initial stages. Nothing was further from my mind. On many occasions I have heard hon. members stress the fact that the opinions of those in the services were absolutely essential at this time. Since the outbreak of war we have changed completely the functioning of government in many directions under our war measures acts. If we are honest in our declaration that we want the opinion of the service man in this house, then that is where he should be. I do not think that an amendment of the elections act with respect to the franchise alone is going to give us the real opinion of the man in the services who is now in a theatre of war; it will not bring that opinion into this house. In order to get that, I think the first thing that will have to be done is to give those in the service a full opportunity of discussing the issues involved in the election. I see no other way of doing it except to grant to the men in the services the same democracy with respect to the exercise of their franchise as we have in Canada. My own opinion is—I am not saying that it is the policy of this group—that the man in the services should have the privilege of nominating his own candidate over there. He should have the same right as we have to elect our representatives in Canada. Men from the scene of operations should be sent back to this house to guide us, and to let us know their hopes and aspirations. I am still convinced that that is the correct thing to do. I do not think any man or any woman should be asked to cast a ballot on any question unless he or she is thoroughly familiar with the issues involved.

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to delay the house at this time, but there is one point I should like to bring to the attention of hon. members. When the vote is extended to the members of the armed forces they should be given the right to cast that vote as a secret ballot. I am thinking back to the time when the plebiscite was taken. Under the system adopted at that time it was possible for a vote to be traced, and I think that procedure should be done away with.

Mr. GRAYDON: Mr. Speaker, may I ask your indulgence for a moment? The hon. member for Cape Breton South has raised the question of bringing the opinions of those overseas to bear upon this matter. Will the minister give an undertaking that if we pass this resolution now, and it is found that the terms of reference are not broad enough to cover what the Minister of National Defence for Air thinks it should, the committee will ask for a widening of its powers? Also I should like to know if we will be able to have soldiers from overseas or from Canada appear as witnesses before the committee to give some indication as to what they desire in connection with the point raised. After all, we are only civilians.

Hon. N. A. McLARTY (Secretary of State): I think it would be extremely unwise

for me to give any undertaking as to what the decision of the committee may be, or upon what basis they will operate. The committee has the right at any time to refer back to the house if it is found that the scope of its reference is not wide enough to enable it to perform the duties it feels it should perform. The house can be asked to widen the terms of reference, but that is a matter that should be considered at that time. As to bringing in men from overseas or from the service in Canada, I would point out that the resolution is quite wide. The committee is to be given power to send for persons, papers and records, and to sit while the house is sitting. In other words, there is no limitation on the power of the committee to summon whomever they think could give information that would be of assistance in their deliberations.

Mr. GRAYDON: We ought to know what the troops themselves want.

Motion agreed to.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

REFERENCE TO PRESS REPORT AS TO "LABOUR POOL" FOR WORK IN FORESTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to forward to the Minister of Labour an item in to-day's Toronto *Globe and Mail* entitled "Labour Pool", written by the correspondent of the Boston *Herald* in connection with manpower for our Canadian forests. I was not able to give the minister notice of the question. Perhaps he will not be able to give me an answer to-day, but I wish to serve this notice so that he may be able to give me an answer to-morrow. The item, which seems to give authentic information, says that there is a labour pool available for work in Canadian forests and that United States interests are anxious to get a part of that labour pool—

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): I can answer that question now, without waiting until to-morrow. There is not a labour pool.

Mr. GRAYDON: Then the minister's answer to my question is that there is no available labour pool such as is indicated in this item?

Mr. MITCHELL: No, we have no pool.

[Mr. McLarty.]

INQUIRY AS TO LAY-OFF AT TORONTO SHIPBUILDING YARDS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. HARRIS (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Munitions and Supply. I have not sent him notice of the question, and if he can give an answer to-morrow it will be satisfactory. In the meantime he may be able to straighten out a difficult situation that has arisen in the Toronto Shipbuilding yards on account of the lay-off, last Thursday, on seven days' notice, of carpenters and some other trades. The question I desire to ask is this: Is the principle of seniority rights for these employees in the Toronto Shipbuilding yards being followed and is any consideration being given to the returned soldier preference by contractors for the department in those yards?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): I shall be glad to make inquiries.

HOGS

INQUIRY WITH REFERENCE TO PREMIUM ON GRADE A AND GRADE B-1 CARCASSES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. C. SENN (Haldimand): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture based on a press release of January 22, which recites the intention of the government to pay a premium of $3 on grade A carcasses of hogs and a premium of $2 on carcasses of grade B-1. The next sentence is ambiguous and capable of two or three interpretations. The fact that this premium is already in operation is my reason for asking the question on the orders of the day rather than putting it on the order paper, because I have had many inquiries about it. The sentence to which I refer reads:

> The premium of $1 formerly paid by the packers on grade A carcasses will be paid on the carcass grade value for export bacon.

This has created some confusion. I would ask the minister, first, whether it is intended that this premium of $1 on grade A carcasses should be paid by the packers or by the government? Second, will the premium be paid on all grade A carcasses or only on such carcasses as are exported?

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the present position is that the plan as announced on the 22nd of January is in substitution for one not yet put into effect. The announcement previously made indicated that it would take two or three weeks to get the plan worked out, but we

found within a few days that there was going to be so much difficulty in meeting the situation with regard to individual farmers if something were not done immediately, that on January 22 we asked the packing plants and others who were taking deliveries of hogs to make payment of the premium of $3 on A's and $2 on B-1's when deliveries were made as from the next Monday morning. But at the same time we indicated that the $1 premium which had been previously paid on A's will not be paid after the final set-up is made. In the meantime the $1 premium is being paid by the packing plants and other purchasers of grade A hogs. But after the plan is set up, it is intended that the $1 premium will be spread over the two classifications, A's and B-1's, which are the export grades, in some proportion which will be reasonable in relation to the value of A's as compared with B's. Then there will be an A price and a B price, as well as prices on grades below. The premiums of $3 and $2 will be paid by the government only on A's and B-1's. The present intention is that they will be paid in the form of a warrant which will be attached to the cheque which the farmer receives for his hogs so that he will be able to take it to the bank and cash it along with his cheque.

Mr. SENN: I did not get the minister's idea exactly. May I ask whether this premium of $1 will be paid by the government or by the packer?

Mr. GARDINER: There will be no premium at all after the plan is finally announced, except the premiums paid by the government of $3 and $2. The $1 will be part of the price for A's and B-1's divided between the two in some proportion to be determined on a basis of value.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Monday, January 31, consideration of the motion of Mr. L. D. Tremblay for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Graydon, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. A. W. ROEBUCK (Trinity): Mr. Speaker, may I, notwithstanding the well-chosen words—perhaps I might borrow the adjectives of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and say the amiable words of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Graydon) in reference to the form of this debate—nevertheless conform to the ancient and delightful parliamentary custom of offering felicitations to the mover (Mr. Tremblay) and the seconder (Mr. Tucker) of the address. It was an excellent custom, and they were excellent addresses. But I should like to go further than is dictated by ancient custom and offer a word of commendation and compliment in respect to all the addresses which have preceded mine. They were all good addresses. And why not? Why should they not be good addresses? Every one of them was delivered by the leader of a political party, six or seven of them, and of course, with the status of leadership conferred upon the individual, one would expect that his speech would be broad in scope, well delivered, and so forth.

The hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) has just now referred to the multiplicity of parties, and I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the time will not shortly arrive, in the course of the political development which is now on our hands, when we will all be leaders of a political party. Two hundred and forty-five of us, each leading his own party, would surely improve the quality of the debates and we could adopt as our motto "Every man his own leader".

I have observed in the addresses of all the leaders who have spoken so far—some of them leaders of parties of one, but nevertheless leaders—a certain delightful and inspiring flavour of international politics. I cannot say whether that is the result of the status of leadership, or whether it comes from the divinity that doth hedge a king, or what it is. But I have noticed it with a great deal of interest. Or perhaps it was the evidence that I saw in these addresses of the growing importance of this assembly and the recognition of the fact that we who sit here are representative of a nation—Canada's status within the family of nations. I hope that is so.

Not being myself a leader but just one of the rank and file of the common people, I of course can accept a statement of policy laid down by somebody else; and so I wish to say that I approve very highly the statesmanlike pronouncement which was made in this house yesterday afternoon by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). It is in my judgment a sufficient answer to the question propounded by the noble lord from across the sea as to the future of Canada within the commonwealth of nations and in the world at large.

There was a time in this country when politicians and rank and file were prepared to accept their international thinking from titled gentlemen in Downing Street, and there are still, Mr. Speaker, some colonial-minded people in Canada. We have been slow, very slow, in

shaking off the swaddling thinking of our colonial era, but to-day I believe this house is beginning to recognize that Canada is a nation in her own right—no longer in anyone else's right, but in her own right.

Canada to-day stands in fourth place among the allied nations in both military and economic importance. Canada to-day is a world power and I would remind members of this house that with power is always associated responsibility. We are no longer in a position to shuffle off decisions upon the broad shoulders of imperial statesmen. Canada is playing a part in world affairs and accordingly, in my judgment, Canada must exercise a voice in world problems and questions.

Having said that by way of introduction, I want to utter a word of commendation of some remarks made by the leader of the Social Credit party in this house yesterday afternoon in his reference to that national and international question of refugees. I read from his words just a sentence.

> I tell this house that the homeless Jew is a challenge to all the decencies that make what we are pleased to call our English-speaking civilization.

I agree with that; but the Jewish problem is just one portion of a much broader emigration and refugee problem. The Jewish problem is a portion of the refugee problem and the refugee problem is a portion of the emigration problem. But the Jewish problem is at the present moment the most pressing of all these problems, and that for two reasons. In the first place, it was against the Jewish population of occupied Europe that Hitler and his nazi butchers first directed their diabolical attack upon democracy and decency. They were the primary ones to bear the brunt of nazi brutality. In the second place, the Jewish portion of this big problem has become acute at this moment because of the decision of the British government, made nearly five years ago, to close the door of Palestine on March 31, 1944—that is to say, on the last day of next month—against further Jewish immigration. That makes it a most pressing problem. It creates a crisis in Jewish life and it aggravates the greater question of the refugee. As there are in Canada some 150,000 or perhaps 200,000 Jewish people, Canada is interested in this decision of the British government and in the problem in general; and Canada interested is a Canada with a right to be heard. And so may I trespass on the kindness and courtesy of this very good-natured house to say a word or two upon that great problem to which I have referred.

[M. Roebuck.]

First let me take up the facts of history of a recent date, with which you, sir, are no doubt familiar. A Jewish research committee in the city of New York recently estimated—and its estimate was adopted and published in a notable article by the *New Republic*—that in 1939 the number of Jewish people in continental Europe when the war broke out was 8,324,000. The estimate goes on to show that to-day, after four years of Hitler warfare, butchery and brutality, there remain in Hitler-dominated Europe only 3,300,000 Jewish people. I have no doubt you will ask me what has become of that other 5,000,000 people who, prior to the advent of Hitlerism, were decent, honourable and useful citizens of Europe. Well with the exception of those who have found asylum in neutral and allied countries, all have perished. In a recent statement published by Mr. S. J. Zacks, president of the Zionist Organization of Ontario, the estimate is made—and I look upon him as an authority in these matters, since he is the head of the Zionist movement of the province of Ontario—that since the outbreak of war Hitler has murdered by starvation, torture and violence 3,500,000 people in occupied Europe. Of the 8,000,000 Jewish people in occupied Europe prior to Hitler's advent and the beginning of this war 3,500,000 have been murdered in cold blood and three million only remain. Those in Germany are in deadly peril; in his very last speech Mr. Hitler was still proclaiming that the ruin of Germany was to be attributed to the Jews. The remaining one and a half million of Jewish people are scattered to the four winds, rescued in some cases by the allies and in some cases by neutral countries. Therefore I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, and to this house that the time for turning a deaf ear to the screams of Hitler's victims has gone by.

I have a statement which I extracted from a book called "The Pillars of Society," by Sir William Beveridge. At page 166 he says:

> The refugee problem is a test both of the humanity of all the united nations and of their capacity as a grand alliance to make up their minds upon the problems for whose solution the alliance exists, and in hopes of whose solution it fights.

Since the Balfour declaration of 1917, Palestine has been the bright hope, the haven of refuge for persecuted Jews throughout the whole world. For centuries the Jewish people have held the vision of the return of the children of Israel to their historic home. That idea developed through the years with the growth of learning, and particularly with the development of the learning of Jewish history.

In 1914, when the last war broke out, there was in existence a world-wide Jewish or Zionist

movement. There were some 12,000,000 Jews outside of Germany, or very nearly that many. Jewry, as such had become important from the standpoint of world politics. I have taken an excerpt from the Encyclopædia Britannica volume 23, page 936, which I shall read:

A declaration in favour of Zionism would help to rally Jewish opinion throughout the world to the side of the allies. Further, the settlement in Palestine of a Jewish population attached to Great Britain by ties of interest and sentiment might well be of value in guaranteeing the permanent security of the approaches to the Suez canal. To these practical motives was added a genuine desire to contribute towards the solution of the Jewish problem, in which British statesmen have shown themselves sympathetically interested long before the war.

That was the political situation in the world when in these circumstances, Lord Balfour, then Foreign Secretary of Great Britain, addressed a letter to the Jewish people of the world, through Lord Rothschild, who was the foremost member of that body. I am going to read this letter because it is one of the most important documents of modern times. This is the letter that has become famous as the Balfour declaration of 1917. It is dated November 2, 1917, and is as follows:

Dear Lord Rothschild:

I have much pleasure in conveying to you on behalf of His Majesty's government, the following declaration of sympathy with Zionist aspirations, which has been submitted to and approved by the cabinet: His Majesty's government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country. I would be gratified if you would bring this declaration to the knowledge of the Zionist Federation.

Note the words "approved by the cabinet"; approved "a national home for the Jewish people" and the pledge to "use its best endeavours to facilitate the achieving of this object." Immediately following that declaration France assented and approved; Italy followed. In the United States a resolution was passed by both houses of congress, and I am told that as many as fifty-two of the nations of the world expressed their approval and endorsation.

In my judgment, there could be no more sacred, solemn and binding pledge given by any government to any body of people at any time. The declaration was approved by the Jewish communities of the world, and it secured the cooperation of Jewish people everywhere on the side of the allies, the very purposes for which it was designed.

Five weeks after the publication of the Balfour declaration, General Allenby marched into Jerusalem and took over the control of the government of Palestine. Very shortly after that, Great Britain was given a mandate over Palestine by the league of nations. On July 22, 1922, the council of the league of nations approved the terms of the mandate and it is interesting to note that in the statement of terms the Balfour declaration was recited in the preamble. Not only that, but the terms were drawn a few weeks after a statement had been issued by the British government known as the "Command Paper 1922". I will read an excerpt from that document:

When it is asked what is meant by the development of the Jewish national home in Palestine, it may be answered that it is not the imposition of a Jewish nationality upon the inhabitants of Palestine as a whole, but the further development of the existing Jewish community, with the assistance of Jews in other parts of the world, in order that it may become a centre in which the Jewish people as a whole may take, on grounds of religion and race, an interest and pride. But in order that this community should have the best prospect of free development and provide a full opportunity for the Jewish people to display its capacities, it is essential that it should know that it is in Palestine as of right and not on sufferance. That is the reason why it is necessary that the existence of a Jewish national home in Palestine should be internationally guaranteed, and it should be formally recognized to rest upon ancient historic connection.

When the Balfour declaration of 1917 and the command paper of 1922 which followed spoke of the Jewish people, they meant all the Jewish people; they clearly denoted Jews everywhere. When they spoke of "a national home for the Jewish people," they meant a home for the whole body of these people everywhere. That was the pledge, and that this is what was meant I think is established by what immediately followed. Jewish organizations were permitted to bring immigrants to Palestine, and by 1939 the Jewish population of that country had risen to 450,000 people. It is estimated that by 1936 the Jewish capital brought into Palestine since the first world war amounted to £70,000,000. Every inch of the soil of Palestine which during those years has passed into Jewish possession has been bought by Jewish money collected in Jewish communities throughout the whole world, including Canada, and it has been paid for at the price asked by its original owners. The desert places of Palestine have been made to blossom and bloom. Agriculture and industry have been promoted. The Arab population have greatly

benefited from these activities. Nevertheless, riots, disorder and violence have characterized the conduct of the Arab majority ever since the emigration began. In 1937, due to the violence of the Arabs, a proposal was made to partition Palestine into two states, one Jewish and the other Arab, but it was rejected by both sides as impracticable. Then in 1938, after a conference in London of both Jewish and Arab representatives failed to reach some compromise agreement, the British government brought down what is known as the Chamberlain white paper. Some of the facts set out in that white paper are interesting. It says:

> Since the statement of 1922 was published, more than 300,000 Jews have immigrated to Palestine, and the population of the national home has risen to some 450,000, or approaching a third of the entire population of the country. Nor has the Jewish community failed to take full advantage of the opportunity given to it. The growth of the national home and its achievement in many fields are a remarkably constructive effort which must command the admiration of the world and must be, in particular, a source of pride to Jewish people.

Then a little further:

> **The methods employed by Arab terrorists, against fellow Arabs and Jews alike must** receive unqualified condemnation.

Those are the facts set out in the Chamberlain white paper; yet in the face of those facts and for purely political reasons—I mean "political" in its widest sense—this is the statement of policy which follows:

> Jewish immigration during the next five years will be at a rate which, if economic absorptive capacity admits, will bring the Jewish population up to approximately one-third of the total population of the country.

And the next paragraph:

> After a period of five years no further Jewish immigration will be permitted unless the Arabs of Palestine are prepared to acquiesce in it.

I submit to this house that this is the most perfect example of Chamberlain appeasement one could well imagine. It is appeasement in this, that it submits to the very violence which it condemns. It is appeasement in that it not only submits to the violence of the violent but it does so at the expense of the innocent. That, I take it, is Chamberlain appeasement at its worst.

I am not the only one who holds these views, or who has raised his voice in protest in regard to what is expected to happen at the end of next month. The matter was debated in the British House of Commons shortly after the paper was issued in 1939. At that time, referring to this provision that there shall be no more immigration into Palestine without the acquiescence of the Arabs, Right Hon. Winston Churchill made this statement:

> Now, there is the breach; there is the violation of the pledge; there is the abandonment of the Balfour declaration; there is the end of the vision, of the hope, of the dream.

Mr. Amery, who was a member of the war cabinet at the time the Balfour declaration was issued and was later colonial secretary, made this reference:

> It is a repudiation of the pledge on the strength of which the government of Palestine was entrusted to our hands.

In the House of Lords the Right Reverend Cosmo Gordon Lang, Archbishop of Canterbury, made a denunciation practically as strong. He said:

> If the Arabs are willing to allow an extension over that one-third of the population, another of the wonders of the world will have occurred. The position therefore is that the Jews are reduced to the status of a permanent minority. I venture to think that it was precisely from this permanent minority that they hoped to escape.

You may ask why Canada is especially interested in this problem of Palestine. In part my answer has been given already. In this country there are from 150,000 to 200,000 Jewish people, and the Zionist Organization of Canada has actually invested in Palestine an amount estimated in the neighbourhood of $5,000,000, in addition to the private subscriptions to various industrial and agricultural enterprises. This $5,000,000 was invested by the Zionist Organization on the strength of its members' faith in the Balfour declaration. We in Canada have a right to demand fair play and justice to our own investors.

In addition, of the twelve million Jewish people outside the axis countries, about one and a half million are in the armies of the united nations. Even in Canada, with our smaller population and much smaller army, we have some 14,000 Jewish boys under arms. I submit that this house, this nation and the allied nations as a whole must keep faith with these men.

Furthermore, Canada is a member of the league of nations; and so I hark back to what I have said: with power there goes responsibility. With responsibility there is sometimes call for action. Canada is a member of the organization which gave to Great Britain her mandate over Palestine. Accordingly, Canada has a right to point out, if she so desires, that the white paper is not a proper and just rendering of the Balfour declaration, and that, as a practical matter, the closing of the doors of Palestine against one of these large branches of the refugee group is not in the

best interests of the world at large, is not a Christian act, or a statesmanlike act. Canada is to-day a world power. She can no longer stand aside accepting the immunities of childhood in an adult world.

Our own position in connection with refugee emigration is not such as to provide a salve for an injured conscience. I have already said that some 3,500,000 Jewish people have been murdered by the nazi butchers, within those areas controlled by Hitler and his gang. Of that number 1,500,000 are scattered to the four winds. May I ask this question: How many of this group of refugees have found refuge on the soil of Canada? The last figures available, those for 1942, show a grand total of Hebrew immigration into Canada for the year ending March 31 of that year of 111 persons. That includes men, women and children. I draw attention to this figure of 111 persons out of the 1,500,000 scattered by Hitler.

Of course all the 111 were not refugees. That is the total of Hebrew immigration or, to be more exact, immigrants who professed the Hebrew religion. In the year before the number was 284. Surely in Canada, with our great heritage of 3,500,000 square miles of territory, we have room for more than one or two hundred persecuted people fleeing for their lives from nazi butchers. I should think we could have found a space in this great heritage to extend a helping hand to more than 111 of such people, or rather that portion of the 111 who were actually Jewish refugees.

At the outbreak of war Canada deliberately and purposely closed her immigration offices in Europe and, I believe, in Asia. The one exception was the office in London, England. We also withdrew our immigration officials. I am delighted to note that within the last two or three months we have reopened our immigration office in Lisbon, Portugal, and the immigration officer there has been charged, I believe, with the responsibility of devising methods of carrying out programmes of relief and help. I do not know what the returns are, because I have seen nothing published about his activities. I have been told, however, that Canada has offered to extend a helping hand to some few of those refugees who have found asylum in Portgual, but that so far as the Jewish immigrants are concerned they preferred to go on to Palestine, where the door is still open, and may continue to be open for a short time after March 31.

I say that because in a debate in the British House of Commons in November of 1942, the colonial secretary gave assurance that the full number of 75,000 immigrants would be permitted as had been promised by the Chamberlain white paper, notwithstanding the passing of the exact date. And so the gates of Palestine are not yet closed. I am hopeful that an expression of opinion, even so humble as mine, coupled with many other such expressions, may result in a reconsideration of this subject, and that Canada may make representations along the lines I have suggested. I am encouraged in that thought by the statement by Lord Halifax, speaking in Washington on January 17 of this year, on which occasion he expressed a doubt as to whether Great Britain would actually carry out the formal declaration of the white paper and close the gates of Palestine on March 31. It would seem therefore that the situation is not hopless—indeed, far from it. It is my view that were public opinion aroused in Canada, and that were our government to express, even in the mildest of terms, some of the thoughts I have voiced, as Churchill has put it, the vision, the hope and the dream of a national home in Palestine for the descendants of the writers of the Bible may yet be preserved.

Since in my opinion the opening of an immigration office in Lisbon was in response to an awakening public conscience, so do I hope that a further awakening may lead to Canada's still further liberalizing her immigration policy. I am not advocating that the immigration bars be thrown down, because that is no longer possible in the world as we know it to-day. But aside from the immigration problem, I do believe that Canada should, and I hope will, extend a hand, along with other Christian nations of the world, with a view to saving as many as possible from the fury of the nazi butchers.

Mr. A. R. ADAMSON (York West): Mr. Speaker, while the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Roebuck) opened his address with a condemnation of the Halifax proposals, he proceeded to discuss at length the problem of immigration into Palestine, which, as I understand it, is a subject solely the prerogative of the United Kingdom parliament sitting at Westminster. I do not want to labour this point, but there has been discussed at length to-day in this house an issue which is not one of our prerogatives. I agree with the hon. member for Trinity that this question of Palestine is of importance to those of the Jewish faith in Canada; yet if we are to consider ourselves as a nation, as the hon. member states we should, we cannot wholly disregard or abandon our responsibilities to the commonwealth in connection with a deliberative jurisdictional measure. I shall have more to say on this a little later but the hon. member for Trinity gave me the opportunity of saying a few words now.

When I listened yesterday to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) expound the theme of the supremacy of parliament I thought of some other places where his remarks, instead of being received with the adulation of a mechanical majority, would have brought forth active and violent signs of derision and displeasure. The theory of parliamentary supremacy is all important to the future of the country, because a docile parliament subservient to the rule of the leader has always been the first step to the loss of individual freedom, to dictatorship, and eventually to revolution. That is the danger to-day in Canada, and nowhere is it more evident than in the smoke-screen which is the speech from the throne.

To say that the speech from the throne recognizes the importance of the war is theoretically correct. It recognizes the importance of the war in exactly the same way as the president of a great corporation recognizes the loyalty of the employees in his annual report. In other words, he does it in a stereotyped paragraph, thanking them for their work during the past year and hoping that they will continue to show the same commendable consideration in the future.

Great concern was expressed yesterday by the Prime Minister about the war. I think he was correct in expressing great concern about the war. But a statement was issued some weeks ago by the premier of Quebec to the effect that in conversation with the Prime Minister he had reached the conclusion that we were on the easy road to victory. The main part of the speech was an election manifesto of a unique and in many ways dishonest nature. It did two things. First of all it sets up the vision of a promised land knowing that the attaining of that will require machinery and constitutional changes, the former not being at present available and the latter requiring provincial agreement about which there is very great doubt. In other words, it is like giving a man a cheque for a million dollars and then telling him to go out and get somebody to sign it.

Another point about the speech from the throne is that it endorses the inflationary theme of compensation without contribution. In other words, something for nothing. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) has often and effectively used the words, "work and save", but they have now been changed to the jovial exhortation of "multiply and prosper."

At the very time the government endorses a plan of putting more purchsaing power into the hands of the people instead of providing a high and continuing degree of employment, it brings down an order in council freezing the wages of labour in all its three categories, organized, unorganized and salaried. To aggravate matters, it uses the danger of inflation as an excuse in the very first paragraph of the order in council. Yet it brings down a programme which cannot by any stretch of the imagination be considered as anything but inflationary.

At the beginning of the war labour freely and wholeheartedly gave a pledge that it would not use its final and most powerful weapon, namely the strike, until the war had been won. How has labour lived up to its pledge? I believe the figures will show that during four and a half years of the war the number of man-days lost in Canada through disputes has been less on a per capita basis than those lost in any other part of the world. My own district of West York is one of the greatest industrial and railroad ridings in Canada and as far as I am aware there has not been one man-hour lost through labour disputes. This is a record of which I am extremely proud and jealous.

Now in the fifth year of the war when the problem will soon be not so much getting labour as providing employment there has been issued a highly provocative and contentious order in council known as the wartime wages control order, 1943, the provisions of which go into effect on February 15, two weeks from to-day. I should like to say a word or two about the provisions of this order which I consider to be not only provocative but completely indefensible in the light of labour's freely given pledge. The first objection is to the composition of the national labour board. I shall quote from the order in council so that the house can see what I mean. Besides the chairman and the vice-chairman, who are to be appointed by the governor in council, there are to be two other representatives of the public, then only one representing the employers and one representing the employees. With two members representing the public, who would be government appointees, there would be four members appointed by the government. The operative members, or those representing the employers and employeees, would be outnumbered two to one, while labour would be outnumbered five to one. I think that is an entirely undue weighting of the officials on that board and that labour as well as management should receive a greater proportion of representation.

The regional boards are in a slightly different position, but the same objection applies.

My next objection, and this is one of the most important clauses of these regulations, is that the power of the board is supreme over any court in the land. It takes precedence over any court, no matter where the court is situated and no matter what the circumstances may be. I will read the clause. The directions are final and conclusive in any court.

Any finding, direction or order given or made under the authority of this order by the national board, or by a regional board, until varied or revoked by the national board on review or appeal, shall be final and conclusive for the purpose of any proceedings in any court taken pursuant to this order and shall be accepted by and shall not be subject to review in such court.

That is a habit to which we have been accustomed through order in council. I think it is untenable and an unwise practice in this connection.

The next objectionable feature is the method of appeal from the decisions of the regional boards. This is the appeal clause:

Any person interested in or affected by any decision or direction of a regional board may appeal to the national board if the regional board making such decision or direction grants leave so to appeal.

In other words you are tried by a board and the only appeal you have from that board's decision is dependent upon the board's allowing you to appeal. That, I think, is not good legal practice, nor is it justice.

The next clause which I consider indefensible is the anti-strike clause, clause 35. It is a long clause and I shall read only a portion of it. But first let me say that after the record of labour in this dominion in this war, now in its fifth year, to bring down a clause like this which is like a red rag to a bull and would infuriate anybody is extremely bad policy. The clause sets out the penalties as follows:

Every employee who strikes or takes part in any strike to obtain an increase of wages . . .

I shall not read it all, but it goes on:

. . . or for the purpose of obtaining any direction from or of influencing the decision of a war labour board constituted under this order or in protest against or to obtain any alteration in any such direction . . .

Then these are the penalties:

. . . shall be guilty of an offence and liable upon summary conviction to a fine of not less than twenty-five dollars nor more than one hundred dollars or to imprisonment for a term of not less than one month nor more than three months or to both such fine and such imprisonment in respect of each day or part of a day . . .

that he is on strike.

In other words, the individual is subject to three months imprisonment for going on strike for one day or one hour. That legislation, Mr. Speaker, I contend is as restrictive and as dangerous as anything that Germany has ever had before the reichstag was abolished.

Now I come to the worst clause of all of these regulations, namely clause 36, which deals with the prosecution and the methods to be used in the prosecution. It sets out a principle that is absolutely indefensible and that is so absolutely bad that we might think we were no longer in a British country. I will read the operative part of the clause:

Where, in any prosecution of any person under this section, it is proved that such person incited, encouraged or aided any employee to go on or continue any strike the burden of proof that such strike was not in contravention of this order shall be upon the accused.

Mr. MITCHELL: Finish the clause.

Mr. ADAMSON: Certainly. It goes on:

This provision shall not deprive the accused of the benefit of any reasonable doubt—

Reasonable doubt, mark you.

—which may exist after all the evidence has been put before the magistrate or justice by whom such prosecution is tried.

In other words, the man has to prove he is innocent. Reasonable doubt is on the side of the government. That is absolutely indefensible to have reasonable doubt attaching to the accuser and I protest against it. I am perfectly certain that this country will also protest against it. It is something new in British justice, something new in all our ideas of a court of law. We have taken away the right of a man to appeal. We have said that the ruling of the board takes precedence over any court and we have virtually said that the accused is guilty unless he proves he is innocent. I give the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) warning that if this goes into effect on the fifteenth of the month it will be one of the greatest causes of labour unrest that we have seen in Canada. I sincerely hope that he, in consultation with the leaders of labour, who are reasonable men, will have these provocative, indefensible and dangerous clauses amended.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that an extensive opportunity will be given for discussion of the so-called commonwealth council plan. This question cannot be dismissed after the manner of Doctor Pangloss in *Candide,* by saying that this is the "best of all possible worlds," after the horrible experiences we are now under-

going. It is not perfect by any means, and to reject all suggestions for change as coming from "imperial intriguers" is to continue the petty colonial outlook which has characterized our foreign policy since the last war. As an example of this I am going to quote a paragraph with reference to something that has happened in the very recent past. I quote from a journal known as *Labour*, the journal of the American Federation of Labor and particularly of the Railroad Brotherhoods. It is discussing the world being staked out by a monopoly, the Duponts, the Imperial Chemical Company, and I. G. Farbenindustrie. The words I shall quote are not the words of a labour leader, they are not the words of an isolationist senator or member of congress. They are the words of the assistant attorney general of the United States. He is talking about monopolies and he is reported as saying:

> To illustrate what he meant by dividing the world into "industrial colonies", Berge showed the effect of the cartel on Canada. He said that in order to protect the markets of the British and American companies, Canadian Industries Limited was restrained from doing any exporting or expanding. The effect, he declared, was to throttle Canadian industry and to treat Canada as a colony.

That is the present situation. We have seen in the last few weeks the closing of our greatest explosives plant. Did it have any connection with our being treated as a colony, or did it not? These are questions which we shall have to discuss and to answer in this house.

That is all that my time will allow, but I will say this finally. I disagree with the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party (Mr. Coldwell) in throwing out all discussion without adequate opportunity for this house to debate at an early date the proposals made from time to time that we as Canadians play our full part and have our voice fully heard, not only through the channels of government but through the channels of the people's representatives, first in the councils of the commonwealth and eventually in the new world order which we hope to see.

Mr. G. A. CRUICKSHANK (Fraser Valley): First of all, may I say that I did not understand the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), in his speech, to throw out any discussion. If my memory serves me aright, he invited my good friends of the Conservative party to bring in Mr. Bracken to discuss any matter with him.

It is probably unique for me that I shall agree with a great deal of what the hon. member for York West (Mr. Adamson) has said. I am in accord with the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Roebuck), to this extent, that I entirely disagree with what he said. We have heard a good deal to-day about the criticisms of Lord Halifax in regard to what he said in our country, and yet in the same speech I hear so much criticism regarding Lord Balfour in his own country. I am expecting any day in this house that Lord Helpus will get up and tell us something else.

I am speaking to-day with reference to the labour situation, which the previous speaker also discussed. In this regard I am fulfilling a promise I made to organized labour not only in my own riding but in Vancouver. I will not go into the details of the different sections of this famous order in council, but I do say that, as far as my riding is concerned, I think the government would be well advised to reconsider the order. I have had the pleasure during the last two years of representing Vancouver North in the absence of my colleague, the hon. member for that constituency (Mr. Sinclair). He has been kept out of the house and will not be here for a couple of days, and in case there should be a vote before he returns I may say that I am expressing his opinion as well as my own on this subject. That riding, I may observe, is the most highly organized from the labour standpoint in the province of British Columbia.

During my service in the army in the last war I did not have the privilege of being court-martialed as some of my friends of the Conservative party may have been. But even in the army a man is innocent until he is proved guilty by court-martial, and it is a most ridiculous piece of legislation to make a man prove his innocence. Moreover, it is unfair to labour that it should have only one man on a committee of six on which three can form a quorum. That is not sense. It follows the line of argument that we have seen advanced—rather, not an argument but a line of policy—whereby no man who was an actual producer in agriculture was permitted to serve on the board so that there might be a reasonable representation of that calling there.

Speaking for the Fraser Valley riding and, I may add, for Vancouver North as well, I strongly urge the government to reconsider that legislation. In our opinion, in my opinion at any rate, it does not conform to the true principles of Liberalism as I learned them from my father.

I want to say something now on rehabilitation, and I might as well get my say in now with regard to the revising of the rules of

the house. I wish I had the gift of standing in my place here and, while reading my speech, appearing not to do so. Some hon. members are very adept at reading their speeches from their desks, and I hope that a ruling will be given one way or the other, because I am going to give the house this warning, without intending to tread on the toes of any of my good friends among the members, that I shall use my prerogative under the rules. Every time I see a member reading his speech in the future I am going to draw the fact to the Speaker's attention. I am not referring to leaders or ministers, but to private members. If speeches are read I am going to appeal to the Chair, which I have a right to do as a member of the house.

An hon. MEMBER: Take in the ministers too.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: No. The ministers have to reply to a lot of foolish questions that some of you people ask. I think it is only fair that if one man is allowed to read an excellent speech written either by himself or by a red-headed secretary, or anyone else, I should be allowed to do the same, because I might get Mr. Brockington and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) to write one for me.

My hon. friend the member for Fort William (Mr. McIvor) has suggested that there should be a change in the rules so as to allow the general public into the galleries for the benefit of prayers. I always understood that the prayers were said on behalf of Canada after we had listened to some of these speeches.

And now a word with regard to soldier affairs. As a returned man I am greatly interested in this question, and I do not think the government has done its duty by the returned soldiers. At the same time, I would observe that the government is its own worst critic. It has not made known, either to the soldiers or to the public at large, just what it has done. On the statute books we have some wonderful legislation, but we have failed to bring it to the attention of the veterans of the last war or to the attention of the general public. I am free to admit that I did not know much about the legislation that has been brought down in connection with vocational training. There is one thing that I would point out. It was bad enough to have it under the Conservative government, but under such a fine body of men as we have in the government now, we do not want this condition to continue, where a man receiving the allowance given to burnt-out veterans is docked so much per month to make up for his victory bond purchase. The people of Canada do not want such conditions to exist.

There is another thing I should like to bring to the attention of the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) and that is in regard to the men discharged from the army in the present war. Until they receive their pension or full hospitalization they are left as wards of their municipalities. That has happened in the city of Vancouver, and that is not good enough. It is not good enough for us to rise in our places in parliament and say that our principal obligation is to the veterans who are fighting for us in this war. I think the minister should pay a lot of attention to that and to their rehabilitation. In my opinion there is too much delay in planning. I know the government have had excellent committees working on it under very fine chairmen. I have no doubt they have some splendid ideas, but the public do not know that, the soldiers coming back do not know what these ideas are. I agree with the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation and probably the Social Credit party when they ask, how are we going to finance these plans? No provincial government, municipality or city can plan a proper system of post-war public works until they know where the money is coming from. I believe the government would be well advised to tell us how the financing is to be carried out. I agree with what the leader of the C.C.F. party said yesterday with regard to old age pensions. If I agree with everyone around here I will be very popular in my own riding at least. I do not think this government or any government can afford to delay in bringing about adjustments of old age pensions. There is no excuse for our delaying. We waited until the last day of the session last year before we took any action. Surely we have had time to study the Old Age Pension Act to bring about justice for the old age pensioners, and not wait until the last day of the session.

May I throw out a warning to the government. In my opinion the people of British Columbia will not accept promises of what we are going to do for old age pensioners. In my province at least—and incidentally it is the best province in Canada—it is felt that something must be done.

I give a little word of advice to the government in relation to the Veterans' Land Act. The Canadian Legion, of which I am a member in my riding, are not at all satisfied with the Veterans' Land Act as it stands at present. I urge upon the government that no more amendments be made to the Veterans'

Land Act by order in council. There are approximately fifty soldier members in this house and it seems to me there is no reason why we could not settle these matters in the house or in a committee set up for that purpose. I would urge, as I say, that there be no more amendments made to the Veterans' Land Act by order in council. I think the government has made a good move so far; but I have spoken to soldiers who have come back from this war and to veterans of the last war and they are entirely dissatisfied with the act as it stands at present. I think the soldiers are reasonable enough to realize that no act, when it is first introduced, can be perfect. The government and the people of Canada should bear in mind that from a straight economic point of view it is good business to have a satisfied settler irrespective of the fact that it may cost a little more. I hope the government will take that into consideration when they offer amendments to the Veterans' Land Act.

I should like to say a few words on the subject of family allowances. Probably this is dangerous ground for a member to tread on, especially when he has no children of his own. It may be thought that I am prejudiced; but I think every member, particularly those representing rural ridings, should take into serious consideration the passing of family allowances. I wish to make my point clear in that regard. I am entirely in accord with the principle and I hope the bill will be passed at this session. However, I believe before it is passed—I speak now from the point of view of a representative of a rural riding in British Columbia, and I think it applies to all western Canada—a floor should be placed under agricultural prices. I think that principle holds good for all of Canada. I shall give the house an example of what I mean by that. In the province of Quebec tomato juice can be produced very cheaply. Incidentally, no tomato juice is produced in my riding. Tomato juice can be produced in the province of Quebec at ridiculously low wages in peace time. They run their canneries on slave wages in Quebec, and in Ontario too. We in British Columbia are proud of the fact that during the time the present Minister of Pensions and National Health was a member of the government of that province we passed minimum wage laws. We believe in proper and adequate wages in British Columbia. We cannot compete with child or slave labour as practised in the past in some parts of eastern Canada in producing farm produce. The same thing applies to labour and industry.

In my opinion there should be a floor under agricultural prices and a standard minimum wage across Canada. Why should a particular province in Canada be allowed to pay one dollar a day and board to a logger? We pay reasonable and decent wages. These matters must be taken into consideration. As far as I am concerned naturally I intend to vote for family allowances, but to the best of my ability I am going to see that a proper floor is placed under farm prices. I am not a union man because I cannot qualify. However, I have every sympathy for them and I am going to see to the best of my ability that the wage standard is not set on a basis of family allowances. As I understand it, family allowances are intended to benefit the children and are not to set the standard of wages or farm prices.

My good friend the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) is to follow me and I do not want to take up any more time because I understand he desires to speak at some length. To support my argument in favour of a floor price under agriculture I should like to quote an extract from the minutes of proceedings and evidence of the standing committee on agriculture and colonization of Thursday, June 10, 1943. This should be very interesting to every member in the house and not only members representing agricultural districts. The quotation I shall give is from the evidence of Doctor Barton, deputy minister of agriculture, and is found on page 116:

> Of course, the only justification of any bonus is because of war-time requirements. Under ordinary conditions those areas would take their choice of either staying in the canning business or get out of it on the basis of the cost of production, depending on how the market is available to their various products.

In other words, certain provinces in Canada where there are very large families could go on competing at a very small wage with the rest of Canada where an adequate wage is paid.

I may not get another opportunity to speak in this debate; but I should like to say that I am not always in accord with the leader of the Conservative party, yet I agree with what he said yesterday in regard to the standing army, speaking for my riding at least. We should like to know just why this immense standing army is kept in Canada and is not made available for service elsewhere. I think we are entitled to know that. We have many of them in my riding and in my district from eastern Canada. They are stationed there. Frankly we enjoy having the camp there and I must admit they are well behaved soldiers; but I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the people of my riding can see no earthly reason for these

men being there when there is a tremendous shortage of labour in the mines and elsewhere. They can see no earthly reason why that immense standing army should be kept on apparently after two years service when apparently they have no intention of serving beyond Canada. We are not afraid of the Japs attacking us in British Columbia at the present time. If we have not got them licked by now we shall not be able to help ourselves.

We have heard some discussion on the refugee problem. We have a few refugees. We should like to get rid of them. Probably it would be a good idea to make Toronto the centre for refugees and to send them there from all over Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the government give serious consideration to reconsidering the so-called labour code. After having listened to labour men representing between twenty and twenty-one thousand in the city of Vancouver I came to the conclusion that in most instances they were quite reasonable in their demands. I very much fear that this government will have serious trouble in Canada if the order in council as it stands at present is enforced. We cannot afford to have any trouble in Canada at the present time.

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank) for his cooperation in hurrying through his speech in order to give me an opportunity to say something before the dinner recess. I should like to take this opportunity of congratulating the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne; I think they made very excellent contributions to the debate and laid the basis for a thorough discussion of all the matters referred to in that speech. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) emphasized the necessity of getting through the business of the house as quickly as possible. I quite agree; and in my remarks this afternoon I shall be as explicit as possible in dealing with the points contained in the speech from the throne which I intend to discuss. I have no intention of dealing with all its ramifications, but before I get through I believe the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) and I may be talking to each other. That may give the minister some indication of what I intend to talk about.

In attempting, however, to hurry through the business of the house, we must not be unmindful of the fact that the speech from the throne is a very important part of that business, in that it forecasts the legislation that will be brought down. As I understand it, any measure having to do with the affairs of Canada will be based upon the principles contained in the speech from the throne; and while we may hurry along with minor matters, I believe the measures outlined in the speech from the throne require thorough analysis by this house. The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) has made a broad analysis of that speech and has touched briefly upon practically everything it contains, setting out the views of the members of this group pretty thoroughly.

At this point I should like to say that I listened with a great deal of interest to the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Roebuck), and in my opinion the discussion he carried on was timely; as a matter of fact it is long overdue. Last session the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and I put on record our opinions concerning the matters discussed this afternoon by the hon. member for Trinity, and I am heartily in accord with everything that was said by the hon. member. Without wasting time in elaborating the matter further I merely wish to place myself on record as endorsing the stand he took this afternoon in regard to the Jewish question and the part Canada should play in endeavouring to rescue what is left of these people from Hitler and those associated with him in the occupied countries.

This afternoon the hon. member for Fraser Valley and the hon. member for York West (Mr. Adamson) commented briefly upon the new wage order. I am not going to discuss that order at this time, but I endorse what they said in regard to the restrictions and totalitarian set-up of that legislation. Later on, when it is his turn to speak, at least one member of our group will make a thorough analysis of that order. It is a document the implications of which cannot be thoroughly discussed in the course of a fifteen or twenty minute address; but, as the hon. members pointed out, it has laid the basis for a continuing disruption of labour relations in this country which in my view may have serious repercussions in the future. As I have said, I am not going to go into the matter at this time; I merely want to place myself on record as supporting what these hon. members have said and to advise the house that hon. members of this group will continue that discussion when the opportunity arises.

In his remarks the Prime Minister made the statement that the main emphasis must continue to be on the winning of the war, and I heartily agree. While it is good policy for us to lay our plans for the future, we must not forget that the war is not yet won

and that there is terrific fighting ahead, with terrific sacrifices to be made by the people of this country. During the past six months I have been disturbed to find prominent men warning the people of North America, both in the press and over the air, that the war might come to a sudden end. Such propaganda is, in my opinion, designed for only one purpose, namely, to prepare the people for a negotiated peace. That is not in accordance with the policy enunciated by the united nations, when they declared that only the unconditional surrender of the totalitarian powers will be accepted. Those who carry on the sort of propaganda that I have mentioned are doing a great disservice to the war effort of all the united nations. We must emphasize the fact that we still have to win the war. Let the people of the North American continent make no mistake about it; that is still their major task, because the termination of this war upon any terms other than the unconditional surrender of Germany and its allied powers will mean that we have lost this war and laid the basis for the next one. Nothing else can happen. In the countries of Europe that we are endeavouring to liberate there is no one but Hitler with whom to negotiate a peace, and any negotiations with him mean further appeasement and the acceptance of at least some of the ideas that he intended to foist upon the world. Therefore, in this respect I think the Prime Minister was absolutely correct when he emphasized the fact that certain opinions being expressed tend to take the minds of the people away from the real, main issue, which is the prosecution of the war to the fullest possible extent until we bring about the complete capitulation of Germany and her allies.

In my remarks this afternoon I intend to deal specifically with a most important matter which is closely related to our whole war effort and to the question of what will be the position of Canada when this war is over. In my view the two questions to which we should give the greatest consideration at this time, in an endeavour to see that the least possible disturbance is caused and the greatest possible good is done to those now in our armed services, are the matters of demobilization and reconstruction or rehabilitation. These two questions will require considerable machinery if we are to do a job on them and carry out our duty as we shall be expected to do by those now in the armed services. We must not lose sight of the fact that we in this house are privileged to talk about reconstruction and what will be the future of society on this continent, because the boys and girls in the armed forces, particularly those serving in theatres of war, recognized that the totalitarian military machine must be kept as far as possible from our shores and made their contribution by getting into uniform and crossing the ocean. They are there to-day. They have been successful in their mission, and have stopped the onward march of Hitler and those with whom he is associated. They are on the offensive to-day, and while the struggle may yet be severe, nevertheless they have guaranteed to us on this continent the privilege to do something about the future structure of society in Canada.

Next to the importance of winning the war, I think emphasis must be placed on the care of those who have made it possible for us to say that in the future we intend to reconstruct this country along democratic lines, and those of a Christian civilization. To them we owe the first obligation in the matter of rehabilitating Canada.

That is our first and main task. There is one paragraph in the speech from the throne which sets out the fact that a broad and comprehensive programme with respect to the re-establishment of service personnel returning to Canada has been developed, and that it applies not only to the armed services, but to the merchant navy. This would lead one to conclude that the government is now completely satisfied with the machinery now functioning, and that it believes such machinery is adequate to take care of this matter. I was disappointed, and I believe the government was presumptuous when it included the merchant navy in the present scheme of rehabilitation. I say that because, with the exception of extending the privilege by order in council of coming under pensions regulations for disability they are not included in the present set-up of reconstruction and rehabilitation, and must be considered as a separate unit.

We are led to believe that they are included in the scheme. However, before the house rises I say it should extend to that particular branch of the service every benefit which is now enjoyed by the personnel returning from the fighting services. In my opinion the programme is totally inadequate, and it is not working. I do not say this by way of criticism, or for the purpose of hearing myself talk or of advancing any particular political philosophy. I believe the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie), under whose department this scheme has been functioning, has been working as hard and as conscientiously as any other minister or any other member of the house. I have always found him co-operative, and quite prepared to do anything he could to adjust grievances arising from the

regulations administered by him. I am frank to say that about the minister. But the machinery, as it exists now, leaves much to be desired. It is my view that the machinery in the Department of Pensions and National Health is inadequate, that the department is understaffed, and cannot handle a large-scale demobilization. The personnel of the branch will have to be increased to some considerable extent.

I am not satisfied, either, with the methods employed by army boards who board men out of the services and place them under the jurisdiction of the Department of Pensions and National Health. I refer to those men now returning from overseas with disabilities. I was pleased to hear the minister table this afternoon an order in council which provides that when a man is discharged from the care of the Department of National Defence to that of the Department of Pensions and National Health he will be maintained on full pay and allowances until such time as assessed for disability pension and he is boarded out of the army completely. That is a step in the right direction. It represents the correction of a very sore spot, and one concerning which I had intended to speak. However, since the minister has notified the house that the grievance has been corrected, there is no necessity for any further elaboration.

I should like, however, to call to the attention of the Minister of Pensions and National Health some thoughts in connection with the administration of the Pension Act. I would remind him that in 1940 the pension committee of that year broadened the provisions of the act so that it might embrace the new forces. There was one section which had been carried for twenty-five years and which militated greatly against men who came back from the last war. I refer to the section which dealt with the men who were suffering from nervous disabilities and diseases. On seventy-five per cent of occasions, when men would appear before pension boards with disabilities of that description, the stock decision of such boards was: disability is of congenital origin, and no pension is indicated.

Hundreds of men were thrown to one side on that basis. The minister will recall that the 1940 committee removed that section from the act. I now draw to his attention the fact that while the provision has been removed, those who are to-day administering the regulations are administering them on the old basis. He will find that a large number of men who are returning from this war—and let us remember that this is a shock-war to an even greater extent than was the last one—are suffering from nervous disabilities. When they apply for boarding they find, in practically every instance, as shown by the decisions I have seen, that decisions are made along the same lines, namely that their disabilities are of congenital origin. The wording, of course, is a little different. At the present time the soldier is discharged and examined for pension, and if he has a disability of that description it is classified as pre-enlistment.

These men joined the services in A1 condition. They saw service in England, and have endured bombing. As a result their nerves have suffered. How can any board examining a man who when he enlisted, was classed A1, and who after eighteen months in the service appears before it with a nervous condition, make the decision that the man who at the time of application is in class E, is suffering from a disability of pre-enlistment origin? The point is that this is an accusation against those who examined such men upon entering the services, and an indication that they were totally incompetent for the job they were performing. We must accept either that assumption, or the one that the boards are still administering the old section which we thought we had removed from the act. I mention these facts so that the minister may make a check with those who are boarding service personnel returning from overseas.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Is my hon. friend referring to the medical examiners of the pension board?

Mr. GILLIS: Those who board the service personnel for pension purposes.

There is another sore spot to which I would call the attention of the minister, namely that connected with those men who are being discharged for compassionate reasons. It may be that as a result of some extenuating circumstances at home a man may be discharged from the services. Such man, however, is not given the benefit of any of the present regulations. In fact one instance, affecting a member of the navy, was drawn to my attention. This man was discharged in Halifax and, although his home was in Vancouver, because he was discharged on compassionate grounds he was not given even his transportation expenses to his home. He had to solicit the necessary funds for that purpose. And, vice versa, I have heard of men discharged at Vancouver who have had to travel to the other side of the country.

I believe that is a wrong procedure. Such men are suffering aggravation greater than those who are coming back to normal homes. Who is more in need of assistance than the man who comes back to a normal home?

He volunteered; he endeavoured to do his duty, but circumstances over which he had no control compelled him to leave the service and he is now treated as though he had never been in the service. I think the minister should endeavour to check up on that particular case.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I shall be glad to do so. I will look into all the points my hon. friend has mentioned.

Mr. GILLIS: I bring these to the minister's attention because I know he is interested in these matters. He is the one minister who has his finger on rehabilitation matters and these things come within the jurisdiction of his department. I am quite satisfied to leave this particular grievance with him.

Another grievance is in connection with the decisions that are given when men receive injuries or disabilities while serving in Canada. A man may be discharged as medically unfit; but in every case I have seen, even though the disability is admitted the decision is that the disability was incurred on service but was not attributable to military service. The two statements cannot be reconciled. I know of one case that is perhaps a little outstanding. This boy was ordered on a clothing parade and half a dozen of them got into a jeep. While they were riding along the jeep crashed into a pole. This young lad who was not driving received a fractured skull and lost the sight of one eye. He was hospitalized and discharged, but the decision was that his disability was not attributable to military service. Since that time this man has had a stroke and his case is up for another hearing. I do not think there should be any differentiation between the man who receives a wound overseas and the one who is injured in Canada while actually on parade. There are quite a few cases of this description.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Was that case before me?

Mr. GILLIS: The minister was written to about that.

There is another matter in the field of rehabilitation that requires overhauling. The throne speech would lead us to believe that the machinery for the placement of men discharged from the service was adequate and satisfactory. The minister will remember, as will other hon. members who were on the pension committee back in 1940, that welfare officers were to be appointed. As I understood it, these welfare officers were to look after the employment problem facing the men returning from service; they were to work in conjunction with the officials in the unemployment insurance offices. This machinery has been partly established. There is one placement officer in Nova Scotia; I believe there is one in New Brunswick, and perhaps there are two in Ontario. I notice the minister is smiling. Last session he intimated he was making an appointment to the Sydney office, but that has not been made as yet. I have no doubt it will be made soon.

The number of these welfare officers should be increased. If they are to do a proper job there should be one welfare officer in every unemployment insurance office. This is necessary in order that the preference which has been delegated to those who return from overseas or from the service in Canada is carried out. If we are not to have proper machinery there is no use in doing anything about it. The machinery we have to-day is totally inadequate.

The work of these placement officers was to be supplemented by the appointment of citizen committees in every section. These committees were to supplement the work of the placement officers in probing fields of employment for those men who are coming back. Little was done about this until November of last year when a committee was convened to consist of the mayors of some of the towns and cities across Canada. These volunteer committees are to return to their respective communities and endeavour to take care of the employment needs of the men who return from the services. That machinery is not going to work. These committees are not responsible to anyone. They have no machinery with which to work; they have no offices and they have no authority to do anything for anyone. I think it is a complete waste of time to expect volunteer citizen committees throughout the country to take care of this question of demobilization and rehabilitation. This machinery might have worked a year ago when there were just a few dribbling back, but I visualize the time when there will be total demobilization of all the service personnel. I think the time has arrived when we should have the proper machinery and the proper administrative authority which would be responsible to some department of government.

I think the suggestion in the speech from the throne that three new departments are to be set up is a good one, and these questions of reestablishment and rehabilitation should be centred in one of these departments. In my opinion this idea of citizen committees should be forgotten and immediate steps taken to increase the number of welfare officers in order

to have one in every unemployment insurance office. It would be their duty to find available employment and to see that preference is given to the ex-service men. They should provide advice and guidance in the whole field of rehabilitation. They would have the proper places in which to work and would be responsible to some one. There must be sufficient personnel to handle this problem. Under the present set-up the ex-service man is coming back and is being routed through the regular employment offices. This will continue if the present economic set-up as visualized by the people in power to-day is carried into effect. In addition to the men coming back from the services there will be a million war workers. The present machinery is totally inadequate and does not differentiate between those who have a preference and those to whom no preference has been given.

There is another point in connection with the rehabilitation of veterans to which I should like to refer. Some provision has been made for vocational training and guidance for those coming out of the service who have sufficient elementary education to fit themselves into the present scheme, but there are hundreds or perhaps thousands of boys coming back who have not the degree of education to enable them to take advantage of the present vocational training schemes. I have run into quite a number of them. These men are discharged as medically unfit and they apply to the selective services offices for a job. They write to Halifax to Colonel MacKenzie for a rehabilitation grant or vocational training, but word comes back that nothing can be done about vocational training. Many of these boys have never had jobs and that is the situation they find themselves in to-day. I think there is adequate machinery in the country and it should be used, and used immediately, to do something for this category of ex-service men. I refer to the schools that are now operating. One is in North Bay, and there are three others where illiterate personnel in the service are given an elementary education. The schools are working efficiently and have a very good system. I had the privilege of going through the school at North Bay, and I highly commend it. I think that branch of our educational work should be not only continued but expanded, in order to give this class of boy an opportunity to reestablish himself as a useful member of society. Without such an opportunity he is in the middle of the street; there is no prospect for him, nothing for him to do, and certainly the developing situation with respect to employment leaves much to be desired so far as he is concerned. I leave those thoughts with the minister.

It is not possible for me to tell the whole story, Mr. Speaker, in forty minutes. I have been trying to provoke the minister's thought. I have a lot more to say but my time is limited.

I should like to say a word or two with respect to the machinery of demobilization. That matter will have to be considered. We owe it to the boys who are overseas at the present time and who have been there, some of them, for a long period, to consider what is going to happen on demobilization. There is no doubt that we shall have an army of occupation when the war is over. If that is the case, I think service in such an army should be on a voluntary basis and that reinforcements for that army should be on a voluntary basis. Furthermore, we may have to maintain a large standing army, navy and air force to meet our international obligations in the field of world peace. I think the first choice to serve in such an army, navy and air force, to man and operate it, should go to those who are now serving in an actual theatre of war. Those who are serving at home, while they are making a valuable contribution, have not suffered as have those who have been in actual combat with the enemy. Those who are in service at home are in a position to keep their finger on everything worth-while in the country, and if anything develops which means a future for them they have the opportunity to get there first. But those who are serving overseas have not that opportunity, and so I would like those who have served overseas in an actual theatre of war to be given the first choice to serve in such a force. The Canadian government should insist that our army of occupation retain its Canadian identity and be manned by Canadians, with Canadian officers to look after those of our boys who may desire to serve in that army.

As regards the matter of discharge, undoubtedly considerable machinery will be necessary. We should not do what was done in the last war. Then, when we came back from Europe, we were split up into different camps. Personally I was with a Vancouver unit when the wind-up came. We were taken back to England and shipped to demobilization camps in north Wales. It was not a very nice place to be. But they closed our pay books there, and we were fed very poorly.

I think it should be the policy of the Canadian government as soon as hostilities cease to bring our boys back from Europe as soon as possible; that is, those who want to come back, and the procedure of demobilization should be gone through in Canada. I think the camps we now have all across the

country are adequate for that purpose. Once the men are back in Canada they should be sent to their respective military districts for demobilization.

But before demobilization or discharge there is one thing we should do. Every man in the service on coming back to Canada should be given a month's furlough to allow him to go home and look over employment conditions in his own part of the country. That would enable him to make up his mind where he would like to go. After the last war the men were permitted to take their discharge in any part of Canada or the United States. But we should remember that the employment situation is going to be complicated after this war and we should see to it that every man who comes back has the training necessary to fit him into the employment picture so that he may be able to make his best contribution. In that connection vocational training is very important, and I leave the thought with the minister that we have machinery now functioning in Canada which could be used effectively just by reversing the present process. I mean that we have army personnel or induction boards which consider the aptitudes of a man who is entering the service and route him into the branch where he can make his best contribution. The personnel in charge of this work has been trained for four years and has cost a considerable sum of money. It is doing good service, I am informed, and if it can route men who are entering the service into the branch where they can render the best contribution, then it seems reasonable that, on demobilization, it could route the men who are leaving the service into gainful occupation or into opportunities where their services can best be used. That would merely be a reversing of the present machinery.

The schools now operating, army, navy and air force, should also be fully utilized, as well as the schools set up by industry. All these schools should be expanded, if necessary. The Canadian Legion's war services educational personnel which has been largely absorbed by the defence organizations, should also be fully utilized, because they have a highly trained personnel whose services should be taken advantage of. We should not be political about the thing at all but see that that machinery is used to the best advantage in the period of demobilization and rehabilitation.

It is almost six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, and my time is about up. I have much more to say, but I shall reserve it for another occasion.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

[Mr. Gillis.]

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. J. A. ROSS (Souris): Mr. Speaker, having followed rather closely the remarks of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) yesterday, when he was discussing the speech from the throne, I was surprised at his avoidance of discussion on the topics contained therein. I was also surprised that he did not attempt to answer the important questions put to him by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) with reference to army organization, the resignation of General McNaughton, and many other weighty matters. However, he did say that his ministers would answer those questions, and in view of that statement I would have thought that probably this debate might be greatly curtailed and the progress of the house facilitated had those ministers concerned been prepared to make such statements and to answer the questions that were asked, instead of having the debate adjourned, as it was last evening, by a private supporter of the government.

While I fully realize that our first concern must be, as pointed out in the speech from the throne, the winning of the war, my remarks this evening will have to do chiefly with the matter of agriculture, since the speech from the throne suggests that a floor price should be set up for that industry. That is a principle which we have fostered for some time and I sincerely trust that the floor price will not be too close to the cellar. Many factors must be taken into consideration before that floor price is established.

A year ago, discussing the speech from the throne, I asked for the appointment of a food minister. I am more convinced than ever to-day that had such a minister been appointed, a great deal of the waste that has taken place in connection with foodstuffs during the past year would have been avoided. During the debates of 1940, 1941 and 1942, I pleaded with the government to guarantee the wheat producers of the country, as a basis of parity, a quota basis, at least $1.25 a bushel. This the government did on September 28, 1943—and remember the new year's crop commences on August 1.

This announcement was made on September 28, well into the marketing season. Many people were compelled by force of circumstances to deliver a large portion of their crop in order to pay expenses. This they had done, having delivered on open market owing to the price existing at that time. At the same time that the price was announced on that day, it was announced that the government would pay a bonus of fifteen cents a

bushel on barley and ten cents a bushel on oats, and this was paid to the producers of oats and barley who had delivered this product in that crop year, on open market, on exactly the same basis as the wheat producers had delivered wheat. And remember that those who had delivered wheat were in most instances people who by force of circumstances were compelled to make delivery in order to pay expenses. Those who had the resources to carry on stored their product in most cases on the farm, so that they could take advantage of the $1.25. That was most unfair to those who were least able to bear the loss.

I maintain that the wheat producers should be entitled to settlement on exactly the same basis as the producers of barley and oats who were paid that bonus, because they were the people who really needed it. They needed it more than those who had the means of storing the product on their farms so that they could take advantage of the $1.25.

I have never been able to understand the reasoning of the government in settling for wheat on the basis which they adopted. Some got a fraction of a cent. It depended upon the spread on the day they delivered their wheat. I do not understand it and it is most unfair. I say therefore that the wheat producer is entitled to settlement on exactly the same basis as the producers of oats and barley.

The cost of agricultural production in Canada has greatly increased since the outbreak of the war. There is to-day a great disparity as between United States and Canadian prices in both grain and live stock, and these constitute an important factor in food production for the united nations. May I quote some of these prices. They are the figures at January 27:

	Per bushel
Chicago wheat	$1 71⅜
" barley	1 22½
" oats	78½
" rye	1 30⅝
Winnipeg wheat	1 25
" barley	64¾*
" oats	51¾†
" rye	1 28

* Plus 15 cents bonus.
† Plus 10 cents bonus.

And rye is not controlled in Canada but sold on the open market as in the United States. It will be noticed how closely these prices approximate each other on the Chicago and the Winnipeg open market. Wheat, oats and barley are controlled by the government of Canada. The government, after three or four years, have failed to set a reasonable price for the producers of wheat, but on September 28 they did set a price of $1.25 a bushel in order to prevent a further rise in the price of wheat in comparison with the rising price in Chicago.

Mr. GARDINER: That is the floor. It is not a price.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): It is the floor paid the farmer at this time and he receives the participation certificate.

Mr. GARDINER: Wheat is selling higher than that.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): The object has been to prevent a further rise in prices, but we do not know what is in store in the future. We hope that we shall receive the Chicago price. So much for grain.

Now take live stock. On the same date these were the figures:

	Per hundred pounds
Chicago slaughter steers	$17 00
" hogs choice, 200 to 330 lbs.	13 75*
" sheep	15 85
" lambs	16 00
Winnipeg slaughter steers	12 25
" hogs, 140 to 170 lbs.	16 30†
" sheep	4 00
" lambs	11 00

* Live weight.
† Dressed weight.

The Canadian hog dressed is approximately 75 per cent and is now to be bonused $3 per head for the choice hog. However, the penalty of $3 for a hog dressing out over 185 pounds is extremely unfair, and this should be on a graduating scale of fifty cents for each five pounds in excess of this weight. I have maintained that the penalty is a distinct racket for the packers.

Mr. GARDINER: That is off now.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I am glad to hear that. It is a step in the right direction, and I am pleased to know that the minister contemplates an agreement over a period of years with Great Britain for bacon. That is moving in the right direction. It was on for some years and should have been off long ago.

Mr. GARDINER: It was on by agreement between the producers and the packers. The government have nothing to do with that.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I think the packers certainly dictated the rule; there is no doubt about it. Since 1938 hog prices in Canada have increased fifty-seven per cent, oat prices have increased 241 per cent, barley prices have increased 245 per cent, and farm labour

wages have doubled. Little wonder that last fall, when the government announced a bonus on oats and barley, and said that hog production should be decreased in Canada—I think the Minister of Agriculture had something to say about this, because there was a shortage of help on the farms; every session he has maintained that we had plenty of help on the farms in western Canada—there was a scramble by the farmers all across the prairies to market brood sows after this announcement.

The farmer who grows his own barley and oats and feeds his hogs on his own farm is not entitled to the barley or oat bonus. That is another discrimination. By this policy the government have added to the man-power and transportation difficulties of Canada, which are already numerous. Last October 20, the Winnipeg stockyards and abattoirs were completely swamped with hogs, some 17,000, and at two packing plants alone some 5,000 sows, many of them heavy in pigs, and in some cases they had farrowed in transit. The same situation occurred on several occasions and at several points in western Canada last fall. This is something that should never have been allowed to happen in this country at a time such as this.

During the war years there has been a tremendous increase in hog production on the prairies where the same producers grow the feed and finish the hogs on the same farms. In 1943, Alberta had not only the highest swine population in the history of the province, some 2,337,700 hogs, but the highest ever recorded by any province in the Dominion of Canada. This was quite a record and I think it is something which we had been advised to do over a period of years. We were told that the grain should be marketed through the live stock. These farmers are to be congratulated upon the advance they had made in this respect. Then in the midst of that we had this announcement from the government which completely demoralized all their plans. It was certainly unhealthy and something which I think should have been prevented had we a properly organized food ministry in this country. While they have accomplished that fine record in Alberta the province stood very high in the dominion in the percentage of man-power and woman-power contributed to the armed forces of Canada. It was one of the leading provinces and I think it speaks highly for Alberta and for the other prairie provinces.

Following the government's announcement on Canada's decreased hog production for 1944, the Right Hon. Colonel J. J. Llewellin, Minister of Food for Great Britain, arrived on the scene and somewhat straightened out our muddle, stating that Britain required every pound of Canadian bacon that could be sent across the Atlantic. As I say, the Minister of Food for Great Britain landed here and made that statement, and I am happy to think that our government and our department have since then tried to rectify this muddle, many months too late, after the harm had been done. It is only a guess, but I will venture to say that the people of the prairie provinces had decreased their hog production by twenty-five per cent; it is only a guess, but that is all anyone can say at the present time.

May I refer to the poultry and egg production. The production of poultry and eggs has shown a very great increase in Canada. We are asked for a further production of ten per cent in 1944. At present prices of eggs and poultry feed there will be a decrease rather than an increase in a year's time. On account of very abnormal weather early this winter there was a very large egg production in this country, when the authorities set the present prices of eggs, and as a result many poultry producers have already changed their plans for 1944 production, because the return for eggs is out of line with the cost of feeds and labour. While we have an immense egg production today there will be a decrease rather than an increase a year hence as a result of these prices.

Butter fat with bonus is approximately forty-four cents a pound in Canada. Butter fat with subsidy is approximately 54·9 cents a pound in the United States. Much has been said in past debates in this house about the Canadian farmer's share of the national income. For the period 1926 to 1940, 74·2 per cent of the national income went to the workers and to the farmers of Canada. Labour constituted five-twelfths of the population and received 62·4 per cent of the national income; the farmers constituted four-twelfths of the population and received 11·8 per cent of the national income. That is what they received for their work and their capital investment, which is considerable. There is some disparity there. The average monthly farm wage for the three prairie provinces has increased during the war from $30.13 to $61.17, and the harvest daily wage from $2.86 to $5.56. To be on a par with organized labour it should be further increased, as I pointed out to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell), the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) in the debates on April 2, 1943, which may be found on pages 1808-9, and on May 20, 1943 at pages 2928-9. I believe that farm labour should be guaranteed the same basis of remuneration as organized labour in this country, but there is a great disparity.

However, to do what I suggest there must be a great deal more national planning for agriculture in Canada than there has been hitherto. The farmer must receive a greater return in money for his products in order to pay the wages to which I have referred. Many of the men on these farms operate mechanized machines, and they are just as important as organized labour in this country and should be entitled to the same remuneration. However, as I have said, much greater planning on a national basis in this country is required.

There has not been anything like equity of sacrifice or contribution throughout Canada during these four and a half years of war. Neither is there equity of return to the agricultural producers of food as between the various united nations. In the west we have a man who operates a farm just across the line between the United States of America and Canada. It takes ten steers to buy an automobile in the United States of America. It takes twenty of the same type of steers to purchase the same car in Canada. He thinks he is going to have a difficult time to make good Canadians out of his sons who have assisted him to operate that farm. I think we should be attempting to do something about this discriminatory situation.

The Prime Minister said in his remarks yesterday that the end of the war may yet be a long way off. After the war we must feed the overrun countries, and this will require careful national and international planning. We should have a food ministry for that purpose.

May I for a moment refer to the inequitable distribution of man-power for the armed services of this country and put on the record the percentages for the military districts up to September 30, 1943, because it is remarkable that the provinces with the greatest contribution to the armed forces are the provinces that are making the greatest contribution to the food production of this war:

Military District	Percentage
1. London, Ontario	37·3
2. Toronto	42·7
3. Kingston	38·7
4. Montreal	23·5
5. Quebec	17·7
6. Halifax	41·8
7. Saint John, N.B.	41·3
10. Winnipeg	39·5
11. Victoria	42·4
12. Regina	35·7
13. Calgary	38·1

I think these figures are significant.

There are other matters that I should like to discuss at this time, the chief of which is the Canadian army organization. I have never been satisfied that Canada with its population could maintain an army on the basis which we have attempted and put it into active combat as an army and properly reinforce it. I have had doubts for some years. I have questioned the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) with regard to it. I do not wish to discuss this matter further until we have a statement from the minister. I say there has always been a doubt. The Prime Minister has suggested that he should answer this question and make a fuller statement on the resignation of General McNaughton, who is responsible for the very fine and efficient training of our armed services. However, as I say I prefer to await the statement by the Minister of National Defence on these all-important matters.

There is another point to which I should like to refer, that of the extension of the insurance principle to all members of the armed forces on active service. I have raised this question in this house in other debates, and have pointed out that following the declaration of war in 1939 this principle was applicable in this country, but that for some reason it was deleted by order in council in May of the following year. It seems to me if there is any meaning to this new order we have had placed before us in very vague terms in the speech from the throne, this insurance principle should be made applicable to all members of the armed forces who are on active service anywhere.

I was disappointed this afternoon when a committeee was set up to deal with the election act and the taking of the votes of the soldiers overseas. I do think the terms of the reference should have been made broader, and at a time like this our election act should have been overhauled. Personally I think we should have the transferable vote for single member constituencies. Hon. members may not realize that of the 245 members of this house seventy-four are here by virtue of having received a minority vote in their constituencies. In a democratic nation, which we think is progressive, it is certainly time to correct that situation. I am the more surprised that nothing has been done in this regard because of the fact that in the chart or guide mentioned by the Prime Minister, which he brought forth in 1919, something of this kind was advocated. Surely at this time we should overhaul the election act and make provision for the transferable vote in single member constituencies. In times like these it is not good enough to have so many hon. members sent here as a result of minority votes, and I still hope that something may be done along this line this session.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to sum up what I have been saying. I advocate the appointment of a food ministry, in order to see that everything possbile is done to produce the necessary foodstuffs for the united nations, both for the winning of the war and for the relief of the overrun countries following the victory. I advocate the reinstatement of the insurance principle for all members of the armed forces on active service anywhere. I advocate the adoption of the transferable vote in single member constituencies at this session. I advocate that there should be made available a much larger allotment of agricultural machinery, which is so badly needed for the production of foodstuffs in this country. Finally I advocate that farmers be allowed storage charges for the grain held on their farms within the quota on the same basis that the government allows storage charges to the elevator companies for the grain they hold

Mr. LIGUORI LACOMBE (Laval-Two Mountains): Mr. Speaker, we have in this house an official whose loyal services merit the attention of parliament; a doctor of law, a king's counsel, a member of the Royal Society of Canada, who has been Clerk of the House of Commons for almost twenty years. Doctor Beauchesne recently published the third edition of his "Parliamentary Rules and Forms," the work of a master, covering almost nine hundred pages. This wonderful work was prepared by the author primarily for the use of members of this house, and I wish to extend to him my deep gratitude and satisfaction, and to express the sincere hope that the French translation of this most useful work will be made available without delay. Both languages are official in Canada, and we are only claiming our right when we ask for this translation.

The programme for the present session denotes the anxiety of the government in the face of the serious problems which exist in this country. Never since 1935 has the speech from the throne been of such an election character. Who does not recall the anxiety of the Bennett government, which was in power at that time? The Prime Minister of that time sought, by a supreme effort of social legislation, to remedy what was impossible to remedy. He had gained power by virtue of so many promises. The government which followed, was satisfied with denying its formal commitments while asserting candidly that it could not keep them any more. It even asked its voters to forget about its pledges and heaven knows under what circumstances and through what means. This was done by obtaining the monopoly of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in spite of the most elementary justice. The head of a certain party is now complaining about the C.B.C. Why did he not do so when the plebiscite was held? The leaders of the four main political parties in Canada then tolerated the most shameful dictatorship, which gagged thousands of citizens. Through their action they were responsible for making the fight unjust and unequal in favour of the "yes" and against the "no."

As regards the social legislation introduced by the government, history repeats itself with this difference, that the former government made its calculations in peace time while this government adds, subtracts and divides in war time.

The government says that the first of its ends is to win the war. The second is to face post-war conditions. In order to attain this end, it must do better than move a whole complexity of social legislation. In order to win the peace, it must remedy the social upheavals which it has caused. Four hundred thousand men have abandoned their farms. More than 100,000 women also have abandoned the land in spite of the numerous warnings given by our best economists. The government is doing even worse. It insists upon calling back for a revision of their medical examinations the young farmers, who must fill out the new forms in order to obtain a new postponement. This is a loss of time, and a source of annoyance and bother for the agricultural class which, more than ever, needs all its help and all its time.

The sessional programme refers to a price ceiling on agricultural products. Why not set a price ceiling on foodstuffs which are sold by trusts at prohibitive prices. One can find the proof of this statement in the statistics published about five days ago by the federal department of agriculture. These are the figures:

Wholesale prices of milling by-products per carload and per ton: Barley flour from $38 to $40, and crushed oats from $42 to $44.25 on the Montreal and Quebec markets.

And when the crooked intermediary has drawn his benefits the farmer pays $2.75 to $3 for a hundred pounds of by-products.

Am I not right when I assert that we must set a ceiling on the foodstuffs rather than on the farmer? When the farmer is undergoing considerable sacrifices in order to maintain his production he is being exploited by the trusts of dairies, of milling companies and of flour and foodstuffs dealers.

The mover of the address in reply paid tribute to the proposed expropriation of the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Company by the Quebec government. If this scheme is like the so-called expropriation of Beauharnois, the ratepayers of the province will again be terribly deceived. Furthermore this expropriation will not help the farmer. I do not think it will help the labourer, because state trusts so far have not resulted in anything but deception and exploitation. I am against the expropriation of private enterprise by the state. It is a bad form of socialism, because the governments take advantage of the nationalization of private industries in order to gratify their friends, to the prejudice of the people. Proper laws, and the control of public authorities, will be more effective. The best example is the expropriation of private radio stations by the government. The servile and unworthy Canadian Broadcasting Corporation handled the population of this country with unfairness and arrogance during the plebiscite campaign in 1942.

The liquor trust in Canada is, along with this society, the most detested trust which ever existed in this country. As a result of the guilty complicity of the government this state monopoly sells for excessive prices hard liquors hardly deserving that name. Before Christmas and the New Year one could see in the streets of large cities hundreds of persons of both sexes crowding around the stores of the liquor control boards, in order to obtain for very high prices a little bit of water with a few drops of alcohol added. This is the shameful condition brought about by a hypocritical system of rationing. Many people state that this is the worst swindle of all time. The small and the poor are exploited to the utmost, while the clubs and friends of the regime apparently can sell very dearly old wines and hard liquors which they can accumulate, and still accumulate through a violation of restrictions and rationing established by the federal government. It was not worth while imposing rationing when one knows that families which did not purchase ten cents worth of alcohol a year have obtained their ration books, and now buy all the quantity authorized by the regulations. Can this be called healthy social legislation?

Is it a sane social measure to allow female labour in war-time industry, while infant sons and daughters are dying in nurseries? The family is the very foundation of society, as is stated in the speech from the throne. What has the government done so far to protect families in this country? During more than ten years the last two governments have tolerated in Canada a state of affairs which is very depressing for a father and his sons. More than a billion dollars was spent in direct relief. No money could be found for public works, no salaries for labourers, no work for our sons and daughters. The treasury was empty, for constructive works. But on account of the participation of Canada in this war the government suddenly discovered $10,000,000,000, and more, for destructive work. The unemployment problem was partly solved by the mobilization of our youth in the armed forces. As regards the fathers, compelled by sickness to abandon their jobs in war factories, do hon. members know what fate is theirs? Here is a typical instance: During twenty-seven months a man is employed in a munitions factory. He pays his unemployment dues. He is threatened by tuberculosis. When he becomes sick, he is dismissed. He asks for his unemployment allowance. He is turned down because, owing to his health, this man cannot be recommended for another employment by the selective service. If he were refunded the amount of the dues which he paid, he could support his wife and his three children. But, alas, this man who is a victim of the conditions of labour, where he breathed during eight hours every day the poisonous atmosphere of a munitions factory, will have to beg for his living, or live on public charity. He will be lucky if he is not dead, before a measure of health insurance is adopted. Can hon. members see the injustice this man is suffering because the unemployment insurance which took part of his salary away from him keeps it for healthy labourers who are unemployed? Why is it that in spite of the so-called excellent law more than 100,000 people in Canada were unemployed last December? That is an unbearable situation in a country where approximately ten per cent of the population are in the armed services. The figures given in the January, 1944, issue of *Canada at War* confirm these striking facts.

(Translation): Think of it Mr. Speaker, the advocates of immigration even have the impudence to urge the government to permit refugees or immigrants to enter this country. Not a single immigrant, not a single refugee, from whatever country he may come and of whatever descent he may be, should cross our boundaries. Why, at a time when one must request the government's permission before he can work, and when, in spite of that, unemployment is rife in this country; when the government do not permit any one to transfer from one job to another without their authorization; when the government allow the family to be broken up as a result of the employment of mothers in factories; when the government ration essential goods; when they even ration

farm implements and the maple products; when they begrudge the sugar with which young Canadians sweeten their cereals, and they set up Tuesday as a meatless day, taking no account of the fact that in the province of Quebec and wherever there are Roman Catholics in Canada, Friday is a day of abstinence; when the government have already ordained that one shall wear only one pair of cuffless trousers because that is a practice which is followed elsewhere and must be imitated, since we have ever had and will always have in our midst satisfied colonials; when an army of more than a million men and women will have to be demobilized within two years, perhaps one year, and, who knows, even within a few months; when all those men and women say to the government: you could find money to arm us for war, well, equip us now for peace; when hundreds of thousands of men and women shall have to be demobilized from war industries to rejoin civilian industries that will be unable to absorb them,—a fact of which no intelligent man is unaware,—when the government shall, at last, to keep their solemn promises and their sacred pledges to reappoint in the civil service the employees they have mobilized; when the government shall have to reestablish on the land all the farmers they have kept and are still keeping in the army in spite of our countless protests; when the government shall have to restore the complete land settlement system they had built up at a considerable cost and which they have let go to pieces against the walls of the war plants in our cities; finally, when the government shall have to give back to every one his due, refund war loans, war savings certificates and fill up the abyss into which our yearly billion-dollar gifts have forever disappeared; in view of all that, I do say that there is not and will never be room for a single immigrant in Canada.

It would be criminal to listen to the advocates of immigration, who are all in the pay of international finance and who frequently receive favours from communists and proponents of world revolution.

May I, at this stage of my remarks, place on record in the debates of the house two of the several resolutions which I have received from most of the thirty-three municipalities of my constituency of Laval Two-Mountains. They read as follows:

Resolution in "opposition" to the proposed immigration of European refugees to Canada in violation of the laws of the country.

Whereas according to the *Montreal Gazette*, page one, the Dominion Minister of Immigration, Mr. Crerar, made the following declaration on November 3, 1943:

[M. Lacombe.]

"Canada offers a home to refugees. An immigration agent is being sent to Europe, and the dominion government will consider sympathetically the immigration to Canada of an indefinite number of refugees."

Whereas it is a well-known fact that the United Jewish Refugees & War Relief Agencies, with head office at 1121 St. Catherine St. West, Montreal, has circulated among the public a petition asking that Canada open her doors to all the refugees from the European continent, and that it is endeavouring, under the patronage of Senator Cairine R. Wilson, to obtain in Canada 500,000 signatures for this purpose.

Whereas in so far as such immigration will take place mostly in the province of Quebec, there is cause for alarm.

Whereas on January 7, 1944, the Canadian Press released a news item bearing the following heading:

"Canada has agreed to accept a limited number of immigrants.

Refugees who come to Canada from the Spanish peninsula, according to a decision reached recently, will be given refuge for the duration of the war."

Whereas the fact of thus allowing refugees to enter the country is not only a further encroachment upon the prerogatives of the people, but will be the cause of social disturbances now and after the war.

Whereas this question has not been submitted to the House of Commons and members of parliament should have the opportunity of voicing their views on this matter before such a policy becomes effective. It is unanimously resolved by the council of the municipality of Ste. Monique, Two Mountains county,

1. That the above-mentioned municipal council is opposed to the suggested immigration plan and to any immigration on a different plan than that which has prevailed in recent years.

2. That in any case, no amendment to existing laws and regulations governing immigration should be made unless parliament has had an opportunity of discussing the matter at the next session.

3. That this resolution be given publicity.

4. That copy thereof be forwarded to the Prime Minister of Canada, to the Premier of Quebec, to the Quebec provincial leader of the opposition and to the dominion and provincial members of the constituency.

Dated January 22, 1944.

(signed) Chs. Henri Giroux.
Mayor,

Chs. Ed. Léonard,
Secretary.

Municipality of Ste. Monique, county of Two Mountains.

The other resolution was addressed to me by the municipal council of St. Elzéar de Laval. Moreover, it is drawn up in the same terms as the one which I read a short while ago.

Is that clear enough? Will the government understand where lay the interests most dear to our people, or will it give in to national and international conspiracies hatched in secrecy and all of them detrimental to Canada? That remains to be seen.

Mr. Speaker, it would be quite useless to put into effect family allowances, social insurance, a health insurance scheme and all other measures mentioned in the speech from the throne, if the Government were to render all social legislation ineffective through an immigration which we do not want in the least. All our efforts in the field of social legislation would be wasted if economic upheaval should arise simultaneously with these measures, excellent though they are in themselves.

In closing, I will say a few words about the international body contemplated by the government for the purpose of promoting peace when the war is over. I fear greatly that Canada will count for very little in this body, and once the struggle is over, we ought to attend to our own affairs. We can no longer afford to maintain a whole staff at a new League of Nations where Soviet Russia may be the ruling power because she will then hold sway over all of central Europe. When that time comes, we will be poor enough to stay at home and straighten things up in our own house. Do you think that our sacrifices in men and money will weigh very heavily in the balance at that particular time? Ask Lord Halifax if I am wrong in my forecast. For the last hundred years, there has flourished here a school of colonialism whose professors emeritus hail from London and from our own country as well. For those people, Canada's participation in the war is forgotten as soon as it has become an accomplished fact. The heroism of our soldiers is to them a laughing matter. Their mission is to ignore the sacrifices of a whole nation. When our sole rampart against military and financial imperialism is the Westminster Statute which is and has always been nothing but a hoax, we are indeed to be pitied. Is it not true that for the last century Canada has been steadily going back to the colonial status? Under the Union, the governing body was neither in London nor Washington. Under Cartier and Macdonald, the administration at Ottawa and no one else, was master of our destinies. We have become the incense-bearers of the empire to whom, on our knees, we pay a colonial tribute of a billion dollars a year. This gesture is devoid of all nobility and greatness.

Mr. Speaker, one more word and I am through: let us remain at home after the war, for we may fall to still greater depths, to an abyss from which I wish to guard my country.

Mr. FRED ROSE (Cartier): Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. To me as a newcomer they were symbolic of the growing national unity, a unity between English and French-speaking Canada. They were symbolic of Canada at war; for as soldiers they expressed the sentiments of the armed forces and their relation to the problems of the home front.

I am especially appreciative of the remarks made by the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker) regarding the participation in the war of men hailing from new Canadian stock. It is a better understanding between the national groups of Canada, between peoples of all races and religions who make up the population of our country, that will lead to a strong and democratic Canada.

Likewise, in our international relations it is the conviction of our party that the Teheran, Moscow and Cairo conferences have laid the basis of a great new epoch of human developments. I quote from the declaration of the Teheran conference:

> We express our determination that our nations shall work together in the war and in the peace that will follow. As to the war, our military staffs have joined in our round-table discussions and we have concerted our plans for the destruction of the German forces. And as to the peace, we are sure that our concord will make it an enduring peace. We recognize fully the supreme responsibility resting upon us and all the nations to make a peace which will command good-will from the overwhelming masses of the peoples of the world and banish the scourge and the terror of war for many generations. . . . We shall seek the cooperation and active participation of all nations, large and small, whose peoples in heart and mind are dedicated, as are our own people, to the elimination of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance. We look with confidence to the day when all the peoples of the world may live free lives untouched by tyranny, according to their varying desires and their own consciences.

Here we have a great charter for victory and a better world, not only a charter based on the big powers, as some tend to interpret the Teheran conference declaration, but for all peoples large and small, a charter which shall become the rallying point on a national and international scale.

Before the Moscow, Teheran and Cairo conferences there were danger signs which led many to start speaking about "world war No. 3". There was loose talk about Anglo-Saxon powers running the world. Appeasement raised its head in the form of Darlans, Peyroutons, and similar hirelings in Italy, Yugoslavia, Greece and Austria. An attempt was made to force upon the peoples of Europe the type of leaders who had ruled on behalf of wealthy cliques and had sold their people down the river. The heroic people of China were given all sorts of sympathy and very little else. In fact, in certain of the united

nations circles it was considered indiscreet to attack the emperor of Japan. To-day, following the conferences, there is a vision of free peoples who are fighting to reestablish democratic rule and who, although hesitantly, are getting some help from the leading powers within the united nations. We see the world war becoming one of national liberation. A good example of this we see in Yugoslavia, where, instead of a country run by the Serbs, all of the nationalities on an equal basis and with equal opportunities are fighting heroically and winning world recognition. They have established a national assembly of their own.

This is the new age which we see coming into the world at the present time, although with difficulty. The Italian people are, through the Italian commission, gradually winning some possibility to join with the peoples of the united nations in fighting against the nazi murderers for the establishment of a democratic regime, purged of those elements that have dragged their country down to their present difficult condition. In the far east, a free China will be a powerful force for world peace and will go a long way in influencing and securing freedom for hundreds of millions of Hindus, Burmese and other peoples.

As for Canada, I want to emphasize that our own prosperity, freedom, peace and security depend upon a world living under similar circumstances. If one needed any proof of the truth of this, we saw it in the case of the present war. No amount of isolationism could have left us undisturbed.

We have contributed very substantially towards Hitler's plight at the present time. But, as stated in the speech from the throne, "the German army is still very strong." The hardest battles are still coming; and our job is to have an eye on the ball, the battles against the nazis and the Japanese, rather than to fight for parties and advantage. In the face of this test of strength before which we stand, the measure of national unity which we have had in the past should be continued for the duration of the war and for the immediate post-war period.

Unless we are able to preserve national unity, we shall, in our petty quibbling, let down our boys in the armed forces and bring them back after victory is ours into a state of unrest and chaos. I appeal to all parties to work in this spirit of comradeship. That is the spirit of our heroic men in the services, the men of the merchant marine who deliver the goods, the hundreds of thousands of war workers, men and women, who spare no effort to see that we have the goods to deliver. I appeal to all parties to unite in combatting the forces that would rob us of democratic progress in a free world.

Voices are raised by certain individuals, one of whom the hon. member for Dorchester rightly characterized as "le tapageur". These are voices that I would call the voices of inhumanity. We have just had a very fine example of it in the previous speaker, the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains (Mr. Lacombe). These people, consciously or unconsciously, do the work of the enemy, who in the face of certain defeat, tries to resort to the old worn-out bogey of bolshevism to split the united nations. They take up every argument from the enemy's baggage. Irresponsibly they speak of the impossibility of international unity. They say it will not last; it cannot last; Russia will betray us. And certain scribes of the newspapers use their poison pens to slander the soviet people, whose glorious efforts mean so much to every one of us, to every one of our families. Indeed, many of us would not be here if it were not for their heroic efforts. In the nazi manner they concoct plots and talk about a hundred thousand Jewish refugees who are going to chase the French-Canadian farmers off their land. They discover plots of international Jewry, but Jewry is not the only one who plots. There is freemasonry, and when you say that "free" you want to emphasize it. They resort very openly to Hitler's weapon of anti-Semitism. These elements, although small, are a threat to national and international unity. They are a threat to Canada and Canada's well-being.

Another group are unprincipled enough to resort to any trickery to defeat the desire of our people for a better Canada and a better world. They are the elements who have raised the bogey of socialism and confiscation of savings, and I would not be a bit surprised if in the very near future they said that the socialists were out to nationalize women.

Mr. Speaker, the issue to-day is not what these people call free enterprise versus socialism; the issue is democratic progress versus chaos and insecurity. Our party, the Labour Progressive party, stands for socialism, but we are realistic enough to know and to understand that the vast majority of Canadians are to-day not yet ready for it. We consider that at this time the fight for social progress is a fight in which the people will learn, through their own experience, whether or not they want socialism. The essence of socialism is democracy, and it will not come until the majority of Canadians learn through their experience that socialism is the system they need.

It is in this spirit that I welcome the promises of far-reaching reforms contained in the speech from the throne. Without such reforms, and others which have been omitted, we cannot hope to have national unity. The promise of family allowances is good. I am not surprised to find people who have been talking about family allowances taking the attitude today, not exactly that they oppose such allowances, but that they are not so good. Well, I do not believe that the people in Quebec will fall for any such talk. They will accept family allowances no matter what party introduces the principle. They will be glad to have it. But family allowances must not replace measures for increased wages for labour. Family allowances must not become a bonus to employers, but must be a few extra dollars to people whereby they can buy more milk and more nutrition for their families.

I also believe that family allowances should not be limited to four, five or six children. I do not know how many it is to be, but if it is good for six children, what will the seventh, the eighth and the ninth do? And in our province there are large families. It is unjust to stop at five or six. The issue of family allowances should not be raised as against improving wages. When I speak of wages I think of those paid in our province which are still very low in comparison with those paid in other provinces. I have in mind the thousands of textile workers. For the past year they have been carrying on a just fight to get increased wages. Some of them earn wages as low as 22 cents an hour, and family allowances must not stand in the way of these people getting a just increase in wages. Something has to be done about these textile workers in our province. They have been patient—so much so that one member of the house said to me: "Je pense qu'il y a quelque chose qui ne marche pas dans cette union"; "there is something wrong with the union." There is nothing wrong with the union, if they do not want to bring workers out on strike at the present time. They could have done it. Would that have been just? Would that have been the way for them to get increases? It is the duty of the government to see to it that large concerns like Dominion Textile deal with labour on an equal basis just as a small man does. It is in this regard that I deplore the absence in the speech from the throne of the assurance of a democratic labour code. Promises were made quite a while ago. If the federal government has not the power to deal with this key problem to national unity, what confidence can the people have in the power of the government to apply other measures mentioned in the speech from the throne? I have been told, I may be wrong, that the Premier of Quebec suddenly became what we call provincial autonomy conscious in regard to labour problems and rushed to introduce a bill in Quebec which has won the condemnation of labour forces in the city of Montreal and the province of Quebec. One small group has approved it, the Catholic syndicates, but they stand to lose very little in any circumstances.

I realize that parliament is limited in its power to apply certain measures, but I believe that the time has come when we as a sovereign nation should have the power to amend our own constitution, having full regard for the cultural and religious rights of Quebec. I believe the people of my province will approve measures that will result in improvements in their welfare. Too often have autonomous rights been used by unscrupulous politicians to keep the people of our province in a state of inequality. No doubt the same constitutional objections could be raised in connection with the housing problem. I know that this constitutional problem exists; but again, what are we to do? We have a catastrophic housing problem in the city of Montreal. I am going to quote to the house letters I have received. Some five thousand people may be out of their homes by May 1, 1944. As hon. members know, under order 294 a family can be told to get out of their home if somebody has enough money and makes sufficient profit to buy that home. That home can be taken from them on six months' notice. Where is that family to go? I say it is a criminal act against the war effort. I have received all sorts of letters from people and have had many people come to visit me. Before I cite the cases I should state that there has been an amendment to order 294 whereby only the person who buys the home can force the occupants out of it within six months. In Montreal about five thousand families will be without homes unless we do something about the matter.

Here is a case which I shall call Mrs. A, a French-Canadian woman who is operating a rooming house. Her husband is in the merchant navy and has been torpedoed four times. She has sixteen roomers in her house. They have been ordered to get out. Where are they to go? Here is the case of another woman whom we shall call Mrs. B. There are in her house eleven people and nine children. Her eldest daughter whose husband was recently killed overseas lives with her. They must move. Where are they to go? Here is a man with a family of five; he has one son in the navy and another one in the army overseas. They have nowhere to go. I shall read

a letter from one woman because I believe that letter best describes the condition of these people:

I am a widow, a semi-invalid. I have occupied the residence at . . . for over sixteen years.

I will not read it all.

For fifteen years my son, a dentist—

Mr. LALONDE: The hon. member is supposed to give the name.

Mr. ROSE: I shall start again:

For fifteen years my son, a dentist, Captain J. B., has had his office at this residence. He is now overseas with the Canadian active army in the dental corps. Now here is my problem. After having lived in this house for such a length of time I have received a letter asking us to vacate the premises by May 1, 1944. Now where can I go? When my son left and said "au revoir", with the help of God, he asked me to take good care of his office. Now, I telephoned the company where all his machinery was bought and they told me that his X-ray, dental chairs and other equipment is best in a sunny, dry room, because when left in storage damage can be done to rubber tube in X-ray. Can you please help me in this difficult situation? I have another son in the air force. While these boys are in uniform fighting for their homeland (also for the home of this selfish landlady) the dentist's office and all of the furniture the other son bought is about to be sold for very little.

Mr. LALONDE (Translation): Who wrote that letter?

Mr. ROSE (Translation): I can give you the address, if you wish: Mrs. Boness, 4580 Park avenue.

(Text): There is no limit to the number of examples that I could cite, but I have not the time. However, I will say that we have a very serious situation there. We have in Montreal between 1,200 and 1,400 families living in garages and warehouses. That is a terrible situation when one considers what it means to the health and morale of people who work in war industries. In addition to that, we have, of course, slums galore. In my own constituency we have about thirty families living in a lane that was condemned many years ago. What that does to the health of the people is nobody's business.

I shall now give the house some figures given to me by a doctor dealing with tuberculosis patients. In one small part of my constituency we have over a hundred cases of tuberculosis. Much of that is attributable to bad housing conditions. Let us compare the situation in the neighbouring constituency of Cartier with that of other areas on the island of Montreal. There ninety-three out of a hundred thousand die of tuberculosis as compared with twenty in Notre Dame de Grace and forty in Westmount. The St. James division has an infantile mortality rate of eighty-one per hundred thousand to forty-nine in Notre Dame de Grace and thirty in Westmount. That is quite a difference and lives are dear. We cannot take them too lightly. What are we going to do about this housing problem? First I say the government must see to it that there are no evictions on May 1, and any measures necessary to prevent this should be taken. I can see no justification for any human being, just because he is fortunate enough to have the money with which to buy a house, moving in and throwing out another family from its home.

Mr. BONNIER (Translation): Where will those who have money to buy a house go to live? On the street?

Mr. ROSE (Translation): I shall answer your question later.

(Text): They have tried to take houses and change them into apartments. I have had people tell me that a family of ten would be put out of a home which would be converted into two small apartments, in which I do not see how more than ten people could live, so why should that money be expended? What is solved by this action? This is no solution at all; we need more drastic measures. Under the War Measures Act we have power to build the five thousand homes which I would say are badly needed in the city of Montreal. Where is the money coming from? Well, I am happy to see that the war budget is a quarter of a billion dollars less than last year, so perhaps we could find some money there. Then the government must have the power, though here again there may be a constitutional problem, to undertake a big building scheme, which is very greatly needed. Men are being laid off in factories; materials are available, and such a scheme could be undertaken to-day. In addition to anything done to provide people with houses which they may rent at the rates they are able to pay, we should also make it possible for people to build homes. We have a credit bank for business men, so why not extend credit to people for this purpose. Many aspire to build their homes; this is their dream, so let us help make that dream come true.

I could mention many more matters, but I should like to emphasize these, because I believe they are measures that are needed at once, measures which would bring results. They are vital to our war effort; they are vital to the morale of our people in view of what is to come. What I have outlined, however, is only a small portion of what we must undertake in order to give work to our people. We should draw up a huge public works

plan to include such things as the development of the St. Lawrence waterway, the development of our vast hydro electric power resources, rural electrification, the development of our natural resources, the modernization and reconstruction of our cities, the abolition of slums, the rebuilding of libraries and hospitals, and the development of modern highways to give our people work. Again I may be asked where the money is to be found. Well, during this war we have proved that we can find the money if we look for it and work hard enough to get it.

Then, Mr. Speaker, as a sovereign state we should look to the development of our foreign trade through the more direct handling of mutual aid for the reconstruction of devastated areas. We are an important country from the point of view of production, but what very often happens? We get the orders; we are assigned something; we are just a small contractor, though we have a large production. If we are to have trade; if we are to be a power in the world we must have our own say as to where and when we are to export, as to which countries we are going to help. We cannot be told by others. Look at the United States; through lend-lease they have helped a number of countries, but they have also advertised American goods. Where do we stand? I believe that the aid we grant should be given more directly to the countries involved. We must win their good will to-day for trade to-morrow, for we shall need plenty of trade if we are to give work to everyone. We might increase trade through long term credits to the people of Europe, and let me repeat that we can stake out our share of that trade to-day by dealing with those countries directly rather than indirectly. We are a sovereign nation; let us act as one.

I understand that we are playing quite an important role in the operations of the united nations relief and rehabilitation organization. We are going to supply quite a large amount of material in that connection; in fact if I am not mistaken the head of that commission is a Canadian. We are proud of that, but I understand that all these arrangements are to be handled by the military authorities. I believe they should attend to the war and leave the rehabilitation authorities to handle rehabilitation matters. Then we should let the people know who gives them the goods they receive in their time of need. Yes, we have shown in time of war that we are an important country; we have proved that we can make an important contribution to the world, and we must continue to do so in time of peace, but we must be united and we must be strong.

In this connection I should like to refer to an issue which is being used too often in Canada to divide our people; that is, the issue of anti-Semitism, the issue of racial discrimination, which was used by Hitler to make barbarians out of decent human beings. We have quite a lot of that in Canada. There is no use in adopting a hush-hush policy; I do not believe in it. Recently I have seen some literature which has been distributed in Quebec which is a disgrace to a civilized nation. Jews are painted almost as people with horns, and this literature is being distributed throughout the countryside, where some people have never seen a Jew, so they may actually believe that they are exactly as this literature says. I have had negroes come to me and ask, "Why cannot we get into that dance hall? Why cannot we get jobs? Why do we have it so hard in the air force or the army?" We have the anti-Catholic agitation being carried on by certain people in Ontario. I say that for the sake of unity in Canada the time has come when a royal commission should be set up to investigate all these anti-Canadian activities which are splitting us asunder when we should be strongly united.

I now come to the end of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, which I believe have been made in the spirit in which the Labour-Progressive party wants to work; that is, in the desire to contribute toward a democratic and prosperous Canada. Sometimes I think that certain parties should forget the idea that they have a monopoly on contributions of this kind. We all have a contribution to make for the sake of Canada, for the people of Canada and toward a united effort. So let us go forward to build the type of world that was foreseen by our great leaders when they met in Teheran not so long ago.

Mr. F. W. GERSHAW (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, may I first of all, congratulate the mover and the seconder of the address in reply, upon the eloquent way in which they performed their difficult task. I should like also, if I may, to extend a welcome to the new member for Cartier, Montreal (Mr. Rose), who has just taken his seat. He has expressed himself very clearly, and I hope he will continue to contribute something worth while to the good work of this assembly.

The war has been going on for a long time, and I wish at the outset of my remarks to pay tribute to the record of the government in handling our war effort. This has been mentioned in editorials of many publications, and people from coast to coast are realizing that those who are guiding and directing the efforts of the Canadian people are doing a splendid job, and are deserving

of recognition and credit. Standing close to where you now sit, Mr. Speaker, Madame Chiang Kai-shek said that Canada had contributed more per capita to the war effort than any other of the allied countries. Credit for this is due to the patriotism and the enthusiastic response of thousands of Canadian men and women who have set aside their own affairs, and rallied to the service of their country. All honour to those who have courageously joined the armed forces, or spent long hours labouring in industrial plants! All honour to those who have continued to produce the food supplies of this country! Often they have been poorly paid for so doing. Often they have worked at tasks almost beyond their physical ability. And let us never forget the contribution the women have made in so many different capacities, often working long hours in their homes, providing comforts for the soldiers.

The contribution the people of Canada, working as a united nation, have made to the war effort has amazed the world. Let us look at some of the departments of government. The navy, starting with fifteen ships, and some 1,774 men, has expanded until it now has more than 600 ships and more than 70,000 men and officers. An English magazine, *Shipping*, says that this is an all-time record; it has never been excelled. That navy has patrolled and guarded our shores. Its ships have sailed the seven seas, side by side with the vessels of the British fleet. They have convoyed forty-seven per cent of the material crossing the Atlantic to the united nations.

A United States publication says that if these convoys had not been kept running the allies would have lost the war. A vast Canadian army has been organized. Thousands of airmen have been trained. Those airmen fly four, five or six miles into the thin, cold air. Their efforts are hampered by sleet, clouds and storms. They are harassed by enemy action. They are performing deeds almost beyond human endurance. Indeed, they are making a mighty contribution to the destruction of Hitler.

Then, in connection with the Department of Munitions and Supply, Mr. Churchill when speaking in the United States referred to our output as Canada's massive production. The holding of the price ceiling has been one of the most difficult and, politically, most costly, tasks in so far as the present government is concerned. The New York *Times* recently said that against war-time inflation Canada's defences have been the best of any of the allied nations. These things have required thought and planning, and it is not by accident that the stores in Canada contain nearly all commodities that are required. It is not by accident that the Canadian dollar retains about four-fifths of its pre-war purchasing power.

Mistakes have been made, and before taking my seat I shall enumerate some of them. Legislation which has proven to be good, and will stand as a monument to those who have put it on the statute books, has been passed. I shall refer to some of that legislation. But there are still great problems to be faced, and great dangers and difficulties ahead. This is no time for complacency. This generation must move, not backward but forward, to greater economic and political freedom. All are now agreed that a mistake was made during the ten long years of depression when, in Canada and in other countries, many people were unemployed and were on the breadlines. All are determined that this condition of affairs shall never arise again, and ex-service men, particularly, will never endure or permit the recurrence of such a condition of affairs.

To prevent a return of those days of depression, reconstruction committees under the direction of hon. members have been planning to bring about a condition under which there will be full employment, so far as it is humanly possible to arrange it. There has been planning to revive the coal industry in the little provinces down by the sea, to reclaim land in the central provinces, irrigating the dry prairies wherever it is possible to do so. There is planning for shipbuilding and the development of fisheries of the coastal provinces. Everywhere in Canada roads, schools, hospitals and bridges will be built, and particular attention has been paid to the building of homes in rural and urban districts.

There is one other problem which must be faced—and this I wish to emphasize as my chief object in speaking to-night—namely that agriculture must be put on a paying basis. Anyone going into the homes of average western farmers will realize that the returns in that industry are not as good as those in other industries. People on the farms plan for better buildings and better conditions. They entertain the hope that their children can be educated, so that they may enjoy a better life. But dreams on the farms seldom come true, because of the many hazards which must be faced. If we took man-hours, woman-hours and child-hours required to produce agricultural products we would find that their values are not comparable with values in other industries. It is quite true that at the present time statistics may show that farmers have more money than they have ever had. But they are frustrated, and they have been

exasperated by the many seemingly needless orders which are issued. An order in council will come out which is difficult to understand; it will be long and confusing. Then an amendment will come out and a short time later the order in council may be cancelled. This is all most confusing.

Recently we heard of a bonus on oats and barley. The first announcement was received with consternation in the feeding districts. Later on, the order in council was explained and then a few weeks later a further explanation was issued. But it is still not satisfactory because the man who has oats or barley and who feeds those grains cannot obtain the bonus. We are continually receiving telegrams—I received one to-day—with regard to marketing conditions. There is difficulty in getting a clear understanding of the bonus on hogs. Many of these things are so confusing that the farmers feel discouraged.

In the district whence I come there was a complete crop failure in 1943; even the grass did not grow. In order to meet a condition of this kind I would once more bring to the attention of the house the necessity of irrigating these dry areas. They have a maximum amount of sunshine, the soil is fertile, the only thing required is water. I want to thank the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) for sending out engineers to compile complete records on the engineering phase of one irrigation scheme in southern Alberta. When the war ends it is expected that there will be some measure of employment, and it is to be hoped that these projects will have reached a stage where tenders can be called for and the work started at once. If that is done it will provide homes for those who have been faced with failure or perhaps for those who are returning from the war. It will provide traffic for our railways and provide work for the building trades, for our coal miners and for live stock feeders.

We all want to live as long as we can and we all want to enjoy as much health as we possibly can. Nutritionists tell us that the foods that we generally lack are dairy products and fruits and vegetables. These are the products of irrigated districts. By the development of these districts and the putting in of quick freezing plants these products would be available all year. This would be a great blessing to those who live in parts of the country where such products are difficult to obtain. There are some cooperative processing plants in the district, but there is a danger of their being put out of business. They are not government inspected and thus they do not qualify for the bonus which is being paid for hogs at the present time. This is not fair.

I should like to refer to some of the legislation which I believe is working out well and which will prove to be a credit to the members of this deliberative assembly. In May, 1941, when payrolls were good and when many people were employed the unemployment insurance scheme was placed upon our statute books. The workers now have an equity of $180,000,000 in that fund. Employers, employees and the government all contribute. An employee receiving $20 a week pays thirty cents a week. If he has worked five years and becomes unemployed he can receive $10.20 a week if he is single or $12 a week if he is married for a period of fifty-two weeks. The government is paying the dues of the men in the armed services. If they go into an included occupation when they return they will find themselves in good standing.

As I mentioned when an amendment was being considered last session, it is unfortunate that invalidity and sickness insurance was not included in the Unemployment Insurance Act. The workmen's compensation boards in the provinces look after accident cases, but those who are sick, those who are disabled by any means other than accident find it very difficult when a calamity of this kind overtakes them. Wages, salaries and profits in this country are not sufficient to enable anyone to meet these hazards. I do hope that this problem will be considered under unemployment insurance.

Because of the action of the Alberta government and the dominion government, pioneers in Alberta who are over seventy years of age may now get $30 a month from some source. This problem of old age pensions is mentioned in the speech from the throne and I do hope that something more will be done. I contend that casual earnings should be allowed to reach a higher figure than is allowed at the present time. The years that go by take a toll from the human system and whether we will admit it or not, age creeps up upon us all. When a person reaches the age of sixty-five years he is no longer able to do strenuous work, and so I hope that legislation will be placed upon our statute books to give some relief to those who have reached the age of sixty-five years and are able to qualify otherwise.

A short time ago a dominion inheritance tax was imposed. Wealthy estates are taxed heavily, but the tax is light on the smaller estates. Those below $5,000 are exempt altogether; a widow is exempt up to $20,000, and each child up to $5,000. Near relatives get more out of an estate than do distant relatives. We impose an income tax up to ninety or ninety-two per cent on large incomes, but we have made the burden light on those who are least able to pay. Our income tax is lower

on the lower incomes and higher on the higher incomes than is the tax in either the United States or Great Britain. For example, a man earning $700 in Canada pays $13; in the United States he would have to pay $40, and in Great Britain, $45. But if a man has an income of $30,000, in Canada he would have to pay $18,396; in the United States $13,761 and in Great Britain, $18,217.

Vocational training in this country has been a great success. Thousands of young men have been taught trades and have proved to be very useful during this war. They will be most useful after the termination of the war. Vocational training is being planned for those who return from service overseas. During the last war this type of training was available only for minors and those who were injured during the war, but now it is available for all who can benefit by it, men and women alike. During the time these people are taking training, or when they are convalescent or out of work, they are paid an allowance. A single man can get $10.20 a week, while the married man with children will get a higher rate. The married man with four children can get $24 a week. In Australia and New Zealand these rates are slightly lower and they are paid for only thirteen weeks, whereas in Canada payments may be made for fifty-two weeks, and in cases where education is being continued, for as long as four years.

Thousands of contracts are awarded every week for guns, tanks, ships, planes, motor vehicles, et cetera. There is no preferred or patronage list in connection with these contracts. Anyone, everyone, is allowed to tender; and precautions are taken which show that care is being exercised in the handling of these contracts. For instance, every contract for over $2,000 has to be approved by the head of the branch; every contract or agreement over $5,000 by the deputy minister, and every contract over $15,000 by the cabinet. In addition to that there is a purchase investigating committee. This is a group of business men who go into every contract and every agreement to see that there are no weaknesses and no favouritism. In addition, cost accountants check all agreements and contracts and they are responsible to the auditor general. Also we have a parliamentary committee on war expenditure that may dip into any one of these contracts.

Canada has taken a leading part in international conventions, at Hot Springs and other places, looking to a freer exchange of goods, and with the purpose of feeding the starving people of Europe when they are liberated from the heel of the oppressor. Already half the people of Greece are living on Canadian wheat.

The average Canadian, Mr. Speaker, does not want to embark on vague experiments. He wants victory to come as soon as possible. He wants to be assured of a decent standard of living when victory is won. He wants this war to bring a lasting peace. Toward those objectives we in Canada must keep driving with all the courage and fortitude that we can muster, if we would have that future wherein our children can walk in ways of peace and happiness. Truly a glorious opportunity lies before our people; they can rise to heights to which they have never before attained. As the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) has said, "if we in this country keep our heads and pursue high objectives, we shall achieve results in the post-war world which will amaze civilization."

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, the framers of the speech from the throne which is now being debated have missed their vocation. They should have followed the vocation of window-dressing, because the speech is the most expert piece of window-dressing which I have seen in this parliament.

The main matter before the country to-day is, what is to become of Canada and the British empire after the war Yet there is no cut-and-dried foreign policy, nor is there an announcement of any empire policy at all.

In referring to the speech from the throne the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) referred yesterday to various imperial conferences which have been held, in 1926, 1937 and other years, when Canada took the position that we had no commitments but that parliament would decide. But parliament did not decide anything except to enter the war ten days late.

It seems to me that the issue in this debate is not one of Canada's autonomy, her status, or her sovereignty. There is no intention on the part of the mother of parliament to interfere with any of these things. Some of those who have spoken thus far seem to have searched Old Mother Hubbard's cupboard for skeletons of the past, and dragged into this debate a great many things which should have been forgotten long ago, and should not be resurrected, if we are to win this war, at a time when unity is so badly needed. The war is primary; nothing else matters now. The domestic questions which this country has to deal with, although they are of great importance, can be deferred until we know whether we are going to win this war and whether we are going to have collective security or not. The position

of the Prime Minister is not altogether consistent with the policy in which, I am convinced, all the people of Canada of all parties believe, in what he said was primary, namely the winning of the war. What is the object of going through two world wars like these in a little over twenty years when we shall have the very same condition of affairs again unless the dominions are united with the mother country in the post-war world to come? Britain cannot exist without the dominions. Her very life is at stake; she has to import twenty-five out of twenty-seven raw materials, and she is dependent upon the dominions. Unless they are a unit in their foreign policy and empire policy, the outlook for the empire and for the mother country is very dark. The dominions must hang together or they will hang separately, because none of the dominions is able to "go it" alone. Together they are the greatest in the world. We have seen what has happened to the small states in Europe; they have been overrun by the mechanized hordes of the German and other dictators.

One of the great prime ministers of France said a few years ago that Britain was the hardest country in the world to make a treaty with; she always spoke with so many voices. With Canada's present sovereign status, hardly a day goes by that some ambassador is not sent out to this or that country, all over the seven seas. These people used to be called ministers or envoys extraordinary, and a great many of them were extraordinary. In the twenty years between the two wars we created a number of ministers plenipotentiary. Now as full ambassadors they have brand new uniforms —at the country's expense, if you please—and there are so many of them that the government has a hard time to find anybody left in Canada to take the job. Dear knows who the next one will be or where he will be sent. This is one phase and one consequence of the policy of isolationism and separatism which Canada has pursued.

The right policy for this country was laid down by the Progressive Conservative party, and they have adhered to it since 1844. It is a consistent empire and foreign affairs policy. Some people are talking about "British imperialism." The word "imperialism" is a misnomer. It is used by the same people who in the period between the two wars forgot all about German imperialism, opposed rearmament, and thought we could depend for peace and security on Geneva. It is the humbug of Geneva which was largely responsible for this second war. We in Canada owe everything we have to the mother country. For two years after 1939 she went it all alone with the help of the dominions, standing against the dictators of the world, and we here, the people of Quebec especially, owe her a great deal. Had the enemy sailed up the St. Lawrence with his land, air and sea forces we would have had no defence at all. Yet there are some who wanted to reduce our military estimates to one dollar—some who are now going through the country posing as super-patriots and criticizing "British imperialism." They never said one word about German and Japanese and Italian imperialism, and the menace of it before this war, as they preached pacifism and disarmament.

Sir John A. Macdonald laid down the policy of this party when, speaking to the electors of Kingston on October 5, 1844, he made the following statement:

> It is my firm belief that the prosperity of Canada depends upon its permanent connection with the mother country, and I shall resist to the utmost any attempt from whatever quarter to weaken that union.

Forty-seven years afterwards, speaking in February, 1891, in his last campaign during his last illness, he reaffirmed that doctrine, which has been the policy of every government since. On that occasion he said:

> For a century and a half this country has grown and flourished under the protecting aegis of the British crown. Under the broad folds of the union jack, we enjoy the most ample liberty, we govern ourselves as we please, and at the same time we participate in the advantages which flow with association of the mightiest empire the world has ever seen. As for myself, my course is clear. A British subject I was born and a British subject I will die.

That has been the consistent policy of the Conservative party. Look at the record over the past fifty years and what do you find in regard to Canada's stand in the oceanic empire? In this war, all the dominions came forward unasked to the aid of the mother country, and the colonies, the mandated colonies, and the colonial empire including India, all volunteered their help. They have all done remarkable well, and Canada, as the senior dominion, holds an important key position between the United States and Britain.

In 1899 when the South African war broke out Canada played her part, small though it was. Apart from the war of 1812, that was the first contribution she had made to the mother country in waging a war. Canada raised, together with New Zealand and Australia, several hundred men who went to South Africa, and the British government paid all the costs. In the great war of 1914, the same thing happened; the British fleet ensured the peace of world civilization for over 100 years. From 1815, for 100 years apart from one or two

minor war engagements, no great contribution had been made by Canada so far to the mother country; but with the outbreak of the great war in 1914 over a million men came from the dominions to the side of Britain and 130,000 of them fell in the war. They came forward voluntarily. They fought not for the mother country but at her side, each dominion in her own cause, which was the cause of all. After all, what Canada has done in the past fifty years for the mother country and in the interests of collective security she has done voluntarily, and she will continue to do the same after this war. She would do the same to-morrow, namely, go to the aid of the mother country again, in the hour of peril.

In the South African war in 1899 there were in this country those people who said, "What have we to do with Britain's wars?" They contended that it was contrary to the constitution; it was against the British North America Act to send troops to South Africa. But the loyal people of the country—and fortunately they are not all in one party—brought pressure to bear upon the government of the day to send a contingent to South Africa, and compelled all governments from that day to this to take the stand that when Britain is at war Canada also is at war. They did the same in 1914, and the contribution that has been made to the mother country in this war has gone up by geometrical progression. There were three or four regiments in the South African war and in this war we have 600,000 or 700,000 men. And what we have done we have done voluntarily. What the dominions did in the two world wars has changed the whole history of the civilized world.

On Armistice day, 1918, there was great rejoicing throughout the world. People everywhere thought, with the close of the war, that there would be no more war, that the world had been made safe for democracy. Well, we, by pacifism and folly, lost all the benefits which the military forces had won in France and Flanders. The Germans saw to it that we did. The League of Nations was created and in 1922 was a going concern. During the years 1923, 1924, 1925, Britain completely disarmed; then came Locarno and with it the purchase of German favour, and after that 1936, when our empire ran down the toboggan and the British government allowed Germany to occupy the Rhine. In addition to that, in 1937, Britain and the United States stood aside and allowed Germany to occupy Austria, and in 1938 the frontiers of Czechoslovakia.

Then the deluge came and we found the British empire completely disarmed. That of course led to the war.

I have always supported the principle of a permanent empire council. Speaking in 1923 and again in 1924 and 1925, between the close of the first world war and the outbreak of the second, I urged on the attention of parliament the necessity for such a council. The last time I spoke was in November, 1941, as reported at page 4513 of daily *Hansard*. At that time I said that in my opinion the Prime Minister would have been well advised to support a permanent empire council and a war cabinet. I said it was an absolute necessity and that New Zealand and Australia wanted it. He passed it up. Then came the fall of Singapore and Hong Kong, and I urged the government to call immediately a permanent empire council, because New Zealand and Australia, with Canada, could not any longer afford to have these decisions made against them without their consent and advice. So many hundreds of thousands of our young men could not fight without having something to say about it. This war, Mr. Speaker, will have been fought in vain and we shall have another war before the year 1970 or the close of this century unless we take advantage of the present conflict to carry into the peace some measure of collective security and the unity the dominions had in this war. That means an armed Britain and armed dominions. What does an unarmed Britain lead to? Invasion, insult and nearly in the end, extinction, as in this war.

In 1940 young men by the thousand went up in the air in the battle of London and Britain. By night and by day, twenty-four hours a day, these young airmen, some from the high schools of Toronto, played their part in this war in the air and saved Britain and civilization. Six hundred of them have been lost so far from the high schools in the city of Toronto alone. These young airmen in the battle of Britain have saved civilization. We owe to these young men everything we have in this country, and so do the people of Quebec, those of the maritimes and the people of the United States as well. But for these young men we would long ago have made peace with the axis powers. In view of the Prime Minister's stand, since he refuses to cooperate with New Zealand and Australia in the effort to secure a permanent empire council, it seems to me that Canada is at the parting of the ways. I am very much alarmed. I submit that the time has come for the Prime Minister to tell the house what the foreign policy and empire policy of Canada

is. Where does Canada stand on the declaration of Churchill that he is not going to allow this empire to go into liquidation or go by default, because without the dominions Britain would be a second Denmark, and a second-class power. With the dominions Britain will be the greatest power in the new world to come.

What is the stand of this country on allowing the empire to go by default? I think the Prime Minister should make his stand clear to parliament before the meeting of the prime ministers in June, because none of the component parts of the British empire are strong enough to go it alone, or separately.

Mr. Curtin of Australia, backed by the Prime Minister of New Zealand, outlined the policy of these great dominions for a regional council and permanent empire council and gave the place which Australia will occupy in the Pacific after the war. Mr. Curtin says conditions will never be the same in the Pacific as they were in 1939; therefore we must have the advantage of a concerted empire policy, which will have the power to stand for democracy in the southern Pacific in the post-war years. These will be complex years and Australia cannot afford to let her economic position be unknown and misunderstood. That should be the stand of Canada. Mr. Curtin said in a most notable speech in August, 1942, that Australia is proud of and completely satisfied with her status and rights as a self-governing member of the British commonwealth which is a partnership of equality and fraternity, a partnership whose history has been marked by great contributions to civilization.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the British commonwealth depends to a large extent on the stand which Canada takes. It will be too late when the prime ministers are meeting in England for Canada to declare her policy. We shall be back to where we were in 1937. We shall have no policy. It will be said we have no commitments; parliament will decide. It is a case of now or never; now and forever. Canada is a wonderful North American country of vast resoures and she has a stake in western Europe owing to the invention of the aeroplane. She has a stake also in the Atlantic region. Canada cannot be indifferent to European affairs if she is to be a great nation. Her destiny requires her to be a leader in the commonwealth. Up to the beginning of this century Britain had to fear only naval power. Now she has to fear the aeroplane, and the whole world is changed.

The United States, that great nation which is allied with us in this war and has done so gloriously is the master of its own destiny. That is so, but it cannot interfere with Britain and Canada having the closest ties. Canada's position is vital for the development of air communications, and these should be planned ahead of the prime ministers' meeting between Britain and Canada. It should be an all-empire, red-air policy. I referred at length to civil aviation on July 15 last, and received no reply from the government. Canada is a great country whose resources are vast. She should unite with New Zealand and Australia in a permanent empire council. The destiny of the empire lies largely in Canada's hands. Canada cannot go it alone or separately. We have had a treaty with the West Indies since 1912. Canada with Newfoundland and the West Indies should form a sort of regional council in the Atlantic for the future progress of the world. Canada is of great value to the world of the future as a member of the British commonwealth. After the war Canada should continue the good work she has done in this war and turn out to be an instrumeint for the keeping of peace in the world. If we do that we shall have captured our objective in this war and little more will be heard of war.

The government talks of equality of status and autonomy. It seems to me, with all these ambassadors going around the seven seas representing Britain and the dominions, we shall have nothing but a hidden Tower of Babel of ambassadors that we have at Washington and all the other capitals of the world. We shall come to be a nation of ambassadors. The government is so anxious about equality of status that it will not work with the other dominions in connection with foreign policy and empire policy, and has forgotten all about equality of function without which status is a myth. That is now up in the clouds. What is the use of us talking about Canada being a nation? The British empire, as Lord Balfour's committee said, is not founded on negations. It depends essentially, if not formally, on positive ideals. Free institutions are its lifeblood. Free cooperation is its instrument. Peace, security and progress are among its objectives. Cooperation within the empire for economic development is therefore absolutely necessary for the commonwealth and the colonial empire alike, and international cooperation in economic affairs would be far more difficult if the dominions be treated as separate units in international affairs.

Article 4 of the Atlantic charter safeguards imperial preference. There are many in Canada who do not realize that that principle is absolutely essential to the commonwealth if it is to exist and to the international status, not only to Britain but to the weaker members of the commonwealth. All the dominions will

lose their economic independence if the principle of economic unity within the empire is abrogated.

We have had a lot of talk in this country about this being a class war, a people's revolution and all that kind of thing, but between the two wars we did not hear a word from the pacifists about German imperialism and its menace to the world. What was the cause of this war? It was not for that reason at all. The people who are fighting this war are not fighting for any kind of political nostrum. That is not what the people of the devastated countries are fighting for or have suffered to death for. What caused this war was the determination of Germany to subjugate the continent of Europe so that by her army and military power she would control the people and the industries of Europe and thus have Britain and the British empire at her mercy. It is for that reason that the United States and all the other nations were attacked by Germany, and it is for that reason that Russia came into the war. There are some people who would like to substitute their own economic propaganda for the real German war, and who would like to substitute a political war of their own along certain lines. Imperial unity must be made our first task. We must recognize the fact that the empire can produce almost every article which Britain and her empire need for peace and war. Britain cannot go it alone without the dominions from which she must import twenty-five out of twenty-seven of her raw materials. With the dominions she is to be the greatest power in the world to-day.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been something said about parliamentary institutions and the supremacy of parliament. Criticism in time of war has stirred governments and cabinets to action on a number of matters belatedly and after a lot of urging. The functions of parliament have not changed from those first days when in an historic speech to the sheriffs of Bristol, Burke made the statement that a member when he becomes a member does not become the representative only of the constituency he represents but of the country, as a whole, and that to be a good member was no easy task then or now if one does his duty, especially in a world war like this. One of the most important functions of a member is to criticize, to examine, to cross-question the ministry and to debate not merely the policy of the government of the day, but more important the way the trust of administering the affairs of that country is conducted, and to act also as a check on expenditures and further taxation, and especially of examining legislation.

[Mr. Church.]

But if one consults the record of *Hansard* and the debates one will find that few avail themselves of such privileges. In this war what has happened? Outside boards have usurped the functions of parliament in a haphazard manner over parliament's head; privileges, powers and duties of a democratic parliament and of the ministers of the crown responsible for their actions have been usurped. The minister leaves it all to them with the result that parliament has surrendered and abdicated to those amateurs and overnight they have become experts. As a result legislation is left largely by parliament to the executive and the various control boards, and is carried through by orders in council. So we have these ghosts behind the scenes, these controllers who overnight become experts or bureaucrats and who, with little parliamentary criticism of their actions, pass laws simply because there is a war on. As I see it, to elect or reject governments is not one of the important functions of parliament; the people decide that. Nor is it one of the functions of parliament to propose legislation, since in nearly all cases that is laid down by the government of the day. Yet there never has been a time when it was more important that a useful and efficient private member should function, one who will consider the country's interests and the prosecution of the war as of primary importance, one who will ask questions in season and out of season, since it is in parliament alone that the real truth can be discovered and errors in administration exposed through the questioning and cross-questioning of ministers. In effect and in practice the supremacy of parliament in Canada is a myth. The real debates in this house in which the man on the street is interested rarely get beyond the walls of this building; they might as well be held in secret; yet this is the only place where anyone holding a grievance may have it remedied.

Such, in actual practice, is our new system of government in Canada; yet criticism here could restore the prestige of parliament and perhaps save the government from its friends. Since the beginning of this war, as for twenty years previously, I have urged that constitutional, parliamentary cabinet and law reform were Canada's principal domestic problems, and I have quoted authorities to support that statement; yet nothing has been done. Between the two wars Canada was the chief drifter from the empire. Our main empire interests should be defence, civil aviation, trade, foreign affairs and immigration within the empire, and that should start with British born immigration, and of soldiers first and those who won the battle of Britain, the people of the mother country, with assisted

passages. They should be considered before we bring in any other continental people, though I have no objection to the principle to which one other hon. member referred to-day.

As I have said, Canada was the chief drifter from the empire. At the imperial conferences of 1927 and 1937 we refused to cooperate with our sister dominions of Australia and New Zealand in the matters I have mentioned, on the ground that we had no commitments and that parliament would decide, which, as I have said, was a myth. Canada relied on various peace pacts, agreements, pacifism, the Monroe doctrine and all that kind of thing. We threw away our defences on land, sea and in the air; we lost our friends, and in 1937, when urged by Australia and New Zealand to support an empire air scheme, an empire shipping policy and rearmament for collective security, we refused to do so. The government has conducted a Liberal war in many ways, though many very fine things have been done in connection with munitions and food, and particularly in regard to assistance to Britain, which was a splendid action on our part. However, our man-power policy in my opinion has been carried on by fits and starts, with nothing being continued for very long and no equality of either service or of sacrifice. We have no foreign policy; we never had any policy but drift. We have no empire policy, which is the most important of all. Every year I have urged the creation of an empire council to bring about a wise modern system of empire collaboration, consultation and cooperation between Britain, her dominions and colonies and mandated areas. After the fall of Singapore and Hong Kong in 1941, I urged in this house that a permanent empire tribunal be set up, with a permanent secretariat, to meet frequently and decide all empire matters, since Britain cannot exist without the dominions. Mr. Curtin was right in advocating such a plan, and I am sorry that we have not followed him.

In this war Britain and her dominions, alone, saved the world for two years, and saved civilization from being destroyed. The day of isolation in Canada is gone forever. The great dominions should hang together and have unity in action, while retaining their status and sovereignty and autonomy. They can still combine to aid the mother country and the empire but, unless they are united, each will hang by itself, since none is strong enough to go it alone as a separate nation. Britain and her dominions, while willing to aid in rebuilding a better world and allowing the free use of all raw materials, as far as possible, should retain sovereignty over the empire and not lose any of her territory. In this war the loyalty of all the dominions and colonies, and of India, has been shown to a striking degree, as was the case in the last war. But the various parts of the empire should meet as one unit to discuss matters of defence, collective security, civil aviation and so on. While we are always paying great tribute to our allies and working in unison with them, I believe that since this war began parliament has missed a great opportunity each session to discuss for several days primary empire problems. Each session we have been able to discuss the price of wheat for four or five weeks; yet only for part of a day toward the end of the session are we permitted to discuss the important matters of foreign affairs, empire unity, and so on, which will be the salvation of this country. The mother country should be the axis of the empire, and should give leadership. Empire affairs should be prominent in our parliaments, and frequent meetings should be held between representatives of the parliaments of the empire for consultation, collaboration and cooperation in a forward empire policy of progress leading to a better world after this war.

Christianity is part and parcel of our empire; indeed, the empire is founded on Christianity. This principle was reasserted to the people of India by Queen Victoria in 1858, when the British government took over the Indian empire. The British empire is Christian, not in a sectarian sense but because a Christian people founded and developed it, and it has been Christian in all its institutions ever since. We assert the individual right of the human soul and of all faiths; that all have equal rights as long as they are humane. The kindred nations of our empire have had a record of which they may be proud, for their service to humanity, justice, freedom, civilization and progress. The British empire will continue, after this war, to have a leading place in the service of the world and of mankind.

Mr. DANIEL McIVOR (Fort William): In my opening remarks, Mr. Speaker, I should like to put what I consider the first thing first. When we realize that every member of this house has been spared to come back and serve here I believe it is our duty to express our thanks to the Supreme Being for having allowed us to carry on.

When I think of the speech from the throne I think of the judgment shown by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) when he was casting about for brilliant men to move and

second the address. He came all the way across to this corner of the chamber, and I am sure we in this loyal corner feel greatly honoured that he should wander over here to select two brilliant minds for this task. I doubt if he could have found two hon. members in any part of the house who would have served better. Both hon. gentlemen are soldiers; both are honourable men; both have brilliant minds, and are men who think for themselves under all circumstances.

As I read and re-read the speech from the throne and then went back and re-read the Marsh report and the Beveridge report, together with the findings of Doctor James, I must say that in my judgment the speech from the throne is the cream of them all. It is the best thing I have seen; it holds the greatest promise of a reconstruction plan. It suits me immensely. I am one of those who demanded, as far as I could, a programme for reconstruction, and we have a right to be grateful to those who have given us this programme. Of course I know that we agree with it or disagree with it, according to the group in the house to which we belong. I appreciated the observations of the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Roebuck) who gave us a clear view of our duty as a dominion toward those who have been wronged and driven from their homes. He has told us our duty toward those refugees. I am not a bit particular whether the men, women and children are Jews or Gentiles, whether they are red, black or yellow. They are made in the image of their Creator, and they belong to the type of people for whom Christ died. I am sure we as a nation are not going to play the role of the priest and the Levite who walked by on the other side, and allow those who are in distress to suffer. I agree with the hon. member for Trinity when he says that we should do our best for those people. I say that 111 in one year is not enough. In the words of the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) which he uses frequently; it is not good enough.

There are certain features of the speech from the throne which stand out, and which suit me very well. Family allowances have been subjected to some criticism. In my view this measure has been long overdue. When I think of the Prime Minister, denied the happiness of a family of six or eight or ten to welcome him home at night, and remember that he is helping to put this plan across, and that it is his suggestion for reconstruction, I am convinced that it shows the marks of a great mind. If I were an employer of labour and a man came to me for employment, telling me that he had a wife and nothing else, and if at the same time another man came, telling me that he had a wife and six children, I would think that the man with the children would do a bigger and a better job and would be more entitled to consideration than the one who had no children, and perhaps no home at all.

Another point which stands out in the speech from the throne is the housing plan. I do not know anything that would mean more employment for more people than would be the construction of buildings. Certainly those buildings are needed throughout Canada. We at the head of the lakes, with our abundance of timber which can be cut down and manufactured into lumber, are of the opinion that this housing programme would be a great boon to the Thunder Bay district.

Then, as I look ahead I can see the minister of reconstruction. Of course hon. members may imagine who I think would be the best qualified for that job. I can see him working with an industrial bank close to hand, for his own special use and, in my opinion, such an industrial bank would be a good thing.

Another matter which is of interest to the owner of a farm is the floor price for staple farm products. I have gone to farmers and bought eggs for as little as fifteen cents a dozen. They were glad to get that price. And when we think of farmers raising fowl, and think of all the care required in that operation, and then realize that they have had to sell their eggs for as little as ten cents or fifteen cents a dozen, we must hope that that may never happen again. The farmers are entitled to this new law.

I now come to a subject which is dear to me, namely that of labour. The new labour code has not yet been published, but it is my hope that it will contain a provision for compulsory bargaining. I know it would be better if it were not necessary to have the compulsory provision; but in my opinion such a provision is absolutely necessary for the good of production and of management, and is in the best interests of directors. Certainly it is in the interest of labour.

Then I should hope that under the new code labour would receive holidays with pay. When I see a man toiling twelve months in a year in a machine shop I am bound to conclude that he needs holidays with pay far more than the young man who spends perhaps only eight hours or seven and a half hours in an office. The office worker may work from 9 until 12 o'clock noon, and from 1.30 until 5.30 p.m. Or, let us consider the man who works in a mine. He works deep in the earth, away from the sunlight, and breathes different air. Do hon.

members not think he is more entitled to holidays with pay than even a member of parliament, no matter what position he occupies?

I shall reserve any criticism I may have to make until the new labour code is brought down. However, I should like to bring to the attention of those who are responsible the fact that I have received letters from secretaries of labour unions in which they have dealt with war-time wage control order P.C. 9384. These are the words of H. Rember, secretary for local 132:

> We the members of local 132 feel that war-time wages control order P.C. 9384 when put into effect would destroy the democratic right of workers to bargain collectively.

Also it is pointed out that this order would hurt labour at the present time. I believe the secretary makes a mistake when he says that hon. members should intercede on their behalf in the hope that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) may not permit this order to become effective. I do not think the minister has much to do with the order. He may know about it, but it is not his order—and I shall stand corrected if I am wrong. I do not think the Minister of Labour has fathered everything considered wrong by labour unions.

May I say that I know these unions, and the men in them. They are just as honest as we are. I stand side by side with them in striving to help them get the best possible returns for the energy they put into their work. I have not found them selfish. On the contrary they are straight, honest workers, and I would advise that reconsideration be given this order, and that something better be substituted.

Those who are making reforms might consider the use of the transferable vote. In a single constituency there may be four or five men, and perhaps one lady in a campaign. If there is no transferable vote the result would be that many people would not be represented at all, and for that reason I urge that those who are considering reforms might consider the adoption of the transferable vote.

There is another point I have in mind, one which I might not understand as clearly as I should. I find that the educational facilities in Canada cannot be embraced by certain types of people. There are young men and maidens in outlying districts who do not have the advantage of advanced education. In my view the federal government should put itself on record as being willing to cooperate with departments of education in the provinces to make it possible for these young people, who are keen to acquire education, to secure the degree of education they may desire.

I have a suggestion to offer to the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie). There should be an amendment to the Pension Act, and in this connection I should like to give one or two examples. I know of one man who enlisted in the air force. He was not there very long before he took what is commonly known as polio. He may not have got the attention he should have received, and to-day he finds himself a hopeless cripple for life. Because he was not long enough in the force he is not eligible for a pension. It is true that he received treatment, and I pay tribute to the doctors at the Deer Lodge hospital for the splendid treatment they gave him, but the fact is that he is not able to get further education without going back to school at the expense of his father and mother. The pension he was receiving has been reduced to $25 a month.

Another young man was in the navy when he was taken down with tuberculosis, perhaps partly owing to neglect. They did not think his case was as serious as it proved to be. He probably will be weakened for the rest of his life. These two men have not got what I consider is their due, and I bring their cases to the attention of the minister.

I join with others who have paid a tribute to the young men who have gone overseas, particularly to those who played hockey, rugby and basketball. I have always taken a keen interest in these games and some of these boys played under me. I receive letters from these boys in which they say, "We are just giving the enemy the same thing we tried to give the opposing team when you were in the sub box." Some of these young fellows will not come back, and others are having a terrific time, especially those on the corvettes on the high seas. But I do not think they are having a harder time than the fathers and mothers who receive word of loved ones who are missing and then the final news that they must be considered dead. I have been in many homes, and I consider it most courageous on the part of mothers and fathers who have lost loved ones when they go out and carry on and help others in the same difficult position.

I have my own way of looking at things just as other men have according to their occupations. I think this country is reaching a position for which it will pay dearly in the future. Sunday work is prevalent all over Canada. Some of us have struggled for the preservation of one day in seven, and I have no patience with any man, whether he be a member of parliament or otherwise, who will use the Sabbath for anything but rest and worship. One time I saw a picture depicting the theme that if you break the ten com-

mandments, the ten commandments will break you. I think it was Gladstone who said, and I like to quote the grand-old man, that righteousness exalteth a nation but sin is a reproach to any people. He said that it was a sad day when we neglected our Sabbath day.

We hear a good deal to-day about juvenile delinquency. It is said that it is on the increase everywhere because there is so much money to spend. I have not my facts before me, but I am convinced by reports that juvenile delinquency in Fort William is not nearly as bad as it was during the depression. In those days I have seen as many as twenty boys in the police court at one time. During this last year there has been very little juvenile delinquency.

I do not know who is responsible for the king's honours, but I do commend the Prime Minister for being very sparing in recommending these honours. I think they should be given to our soldiers, and in this connection I should like to refer to one of the finest armies we have in Canada—the Salvation Army. They are always on the attack, not on the defence. They are on the attack against wrong, and those who are responsible for recommending the king's honours should consider some of these outstanding soldiers because they are doing a great job.

Those soldiers who come back from the front should take care to report to the representative of the department of pensions, the pensions advocate. Right here I should like to pay a tribute to the employment officials in the Canadian Car. I recall one case of a young fellow who had been dismissed from this company for bad conduct. He served with a tank corps in north Africa for some time and when he came back he wanted to get work with the Canadian Car. However, the superintendent of employment said that he did not want him. We then said to him, "Do you not think that a boy who has served in the tanks and has fought for your protection should be given some consideration; should you not be willing to forgive him a good deal?" He said, "We will forgive him and take him back." That is the sort of treatment the management of the Canadian Car in Fort William are giving to the returned men.

There are certain things that we need in Fort William, and there are certain suggestions I should like to make to the committee on reconstruction. The first is the necessity for the building up of the home. The home is the most important institution in the community. If you have a poor home, you have a poor community. Many of us have had the blessing of a good home; we have been trained to do the things that we should do—oftentimes we have wandered far—but we think a family altar should be built in every home. The committee on reconstruction should consider that.

I realize that men and women are needed for war work, but I do say that the place of a mother with children is not in the workshop where she is earning money; she should be at home building up character, making her boys and girls fit to go out and take their places as honourable Christian citizens.

As I say, there are certain things we need in Fort William. I am going to hurry up with my remarks because, if I do not finish now, I shall have to complete my speech when the budget is before us. The minister of pensions knows that at the present time the outstanding need of Fort William is an up-to-date hospital, not only for the old folks and the returned soldiers but for the city at large. The Department of National Defence took away our skating and hockey rink. We need an ice rink now. We need a new home for the army and navy veterans, and there are other public buildings that should be erected. I am going to present these claims to the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) and ask for money at a low rate of interest.

The shell factory in Fort William was closed down. The workers were greatly disappointed because they had been happy in their work. There had been a particularly fine type of management there. However, all those who wanted to go to work were offered positions with the Canadian Car and many of them took them. The work being carried out by the Canadian Car is very good. There are 6,052 people working there, 3,285 men and 1,875 women with a considerable office staff. The production of the Curtis dive bomber is now one a day which speaks well for Canadian Car and Foundry company, because they had many setbacks.

When we think of what we have in the district of Thunder Bay, which includes Port Arthur and Fort William, when we remember that one of the outstanding things with which we are confronted is that the haematite ore from Steep Rock will be coming down and will have to be shipped some place else, we believe that we should have a plant where that ore can be smelted and the product, after it has been refined, shipped out. It is all right to ship our pulp across the line; our United States friends can make use of it. But I do not agree that our iron ore should be shipped across the line; I think it should be handled at the head of the lakes where we have any amount of power and water and timber, as well as the workers who will be needed.

Regarding the needs of labour at the present time, I feel confident that we may leave the cause of the worker in the hands of the government, because it is not a matter for the Minister of Labour alone; it is the responsibility of the whole government.

I had a good deal more to say, but I have decided, in view of requests which have been made, to finish my speech when the budget is brought down. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your consideration.

On motion of Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury) the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre) the house adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

Wednesday, February 2, 1944

The house met at three o'clock.

PARLIAMENTARY RESTAURANT

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their honours that this house has appointed the Honourable the Speaker and Messrs. Black (Yukon), Dupuis, Edwards, Farquhar, Furniss, Goulet, Howden, Jaques, Laflamme, Lafontaine, Macdonald (Brantford City), MacInnis, McGregor, McIvor, Mayhew, Pinard, Purdy, Rhéaume, Thauvette, Tucker and Tustin a committee to assist His Honour the Speaker in the direction of the restaurant so far as the interests of the House of Commons are concerned, and to act as members of a joint committee of both houses on the restaurant.

Motion agreed to.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their honours that this house has appointed the Honourable the Speaker and Messrs. Adamson, Aylesworth, Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon), Bruce, Cardiff, Casselman (Grenville-Dundas), Castleden, Coldwell, Emmerson, Eudes, Factor, Farquhar, Fontaine, Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont), Gershaw, Goulet, Graham, Green, Hansell, Henderson, Howden, Hurtubise, Jaques, Jean, Lizotte, Macdonald (Halifax), Mackenzie (Neepawa), Mackenzie (Lambton-Kent), Macmillan, Marier, Martin, Mayhew, Moore, Poirier, Pouliot, Purdy, Raymond, Reid, Rickard, Ross (St. Paul's), Thauvette, Warren, Winkler and Wood a committee to assist His Honour the Speaker in the direction of the library of parliament so far as the interests of the House of Commons are concerned, and to act on behalf of the House of Commons as members of a joint committee of both houses on the library.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask the Prime Minister whether or not it is within the purview of this committee's reference to inquire into the question of a national library for Canada? I realize that the wording of the reference indicates that it has to do with nothing more than simply the library of parliament. There has been quite an agitation in Canada and considerable pressure has been brought to bear for the establishment of a national library for Canada. I wonder if this committee, which has never been very busy in the past, might take this matter into consideration. It appears to have some importance in the mind of the public at the present time.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not think the question of a national library for Canada would properly come within the purview of this committee. The committee's functions are confined to matters relating immediately to parliament. That does not, however, preclude discussion on the question of a national library on some estimate or some appropriate occasion.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I ask the Prime Minister a supplementary question? Has consideration been given recently to the appointment of a successor to the late Hon. Martin Burrell?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, consideration has been given to the filling of the vacancy mentioned, and I hope to be able to announce an appointment before very long.

Motion agreed to.

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their honours that this house will unite with them in the formation of a joint committee of both houses on the subject of the printing of parliament, and that the members of the standing committee on printing, viz,—Messrs. Bertrand (Terrebonne), Bonnier, Bourget, Casselman (Grenville-Dundas), Castleden, Chambers, Chevrier, Corman, Crète, d'Anjou, Denis, Dubois, Dupuis, Durocher, Edwards, Emmerson, Esling, Evans, Fauteux, Ferland, Fraser (Peterborough West), Furniss, Gillis, Goulet, Grant, Green, Healy, Hlynka, Hoblitzell, Hurtubise, Kuhl, Leader, MacDiarmid, MacKinnon (Kootenay East), MacLean (Cape Breton North-Victoria), McGregor, McNevin (Victoria, Ont.), Mills, Moore, Mulock, Purdy, Rhéaume, Ross (St. Paul's), Sinclair, Sissons, Soper, Tripp, Tucker, Tustin, Weir, White, Whitman, Winkler and Wood will act as members on the part of this house, on the said joint committee on the printing of parliament.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

POWER TO CONDUCT SALE OPERATIONS WITHOUT PAYING COMMISSIONS TO AGENTS

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River) moved for leave to introduce bill No. 3, to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, 1935.

Mr. GRAYDON: Might we have an explanation?

Mr. FAIR: Under the present act the board is compelled to use the services of the selling agencies now established. I believe better work can be done in other ways, and for that reason the bill provides that no commissions shall be paid to these agencies but that the Canadian wheat board shall set up its own selling agencies.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

INQUIRY AS TO INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION AND WORK OF SESSION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to make an observation and, founded upon that observation, to ask the Prime Minister one or two questions with regard to the session, if Your Honour and the house will permit me to do so. It appears likely that this year the debate on the address will be less extended than it has been in previous sessions.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I hope so.

Mr. GRAYDON: I have expressed that hope also. This is not the first time the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) and I have hoped for the same thing, though sometimes we have differed when it came to realizing our hopes. In any event, Mr. Speaker, I believe if that were to happen it would meet the wishes of the public, which I am sure the house desires to do. The country wants us to conduct its business with efficiency and dispatch, and I hope that the example we may set in this debate will be followed throughout the session. The duty of the opposition, as you know, sir, is to scrutinize and criticize legislation and to audit the expenditures. I do not think this house should be made a sounding board for political programmes and party plans, and all that sort of thing.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. GRAYDON: I noticed that most of that response came from the section to my left which is more accustomed to do that very thing. However, I should like to say that so far as the Progressive Conservative party is concerned we are trying to organize to do a job, in connection with our house activities, that will be acceptable to this house and to the country. The tempo of the whole session of course is set largely by the government, and for that reason I am asking the Prime Minister to bring down at an early day the legislation envisaged in the speech from the throne. The rules of the house will permit that to be done, as a result of the reservations contained in the motion adopted on the opening day of the session giving right of way to the address in reply to the speech from the throne. I hope the Prime Minister will see to it that this legislation is brought down, if possible this week. There is no reason why legislation which is envisaged in the speech from the throne should not be ready, and if it is, I would ask the Prime Minister to bring it down. I would ask also that all committees be set up this week, if possible. It does not take very long to introduce bills or set up committees, and that work should be undertaken at once.

I have given the Prime Minister notice of these questions, and I should like to ask something else. I presume that when the debate on the address has been concluded we shall take up the war appropriation resolution. Last year we had the budget first, but this time no doubt the war appropriation resolution will come ahead of the budget. I should like to inquire of the ministry whether, when that resolution is brought down, they intend to pursue the course that was followed last year; that is, if they intend to consider it department by department. I think that worked out well last year, with one exception; and therefore the details of all the items coming under that resolution should be brought down before we attempt to deal with the resolution itself, as was done last year. Then I should like to ask the Prime Minister at what stage of the session the government intends to bring down the budget, and also what legislation the government has in mind other than that mentioned in the speech from the throne. All this has a general bearing upon the whole scheme of our parliamentary system. I should like to know also whether, when the Prime Minister goes to the conference of commonwealth prime ministers, it is his intention to ask for an adjournment of the house while he is away.

I am asking these questions only with the idea of trying to formulate, earlier in the session than we have done before, some plan by which the work may be facilitated and the

session shortened, because there seems to be a tremendous volume of work ahead of us and I believe we should plan carefully in order to take care of it.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I need hardly say that I am in complete accord with my hon. friend in his desire to have the business of the session conducted as rapidly and efficiently as possible. He may be sure that the government will make every effort in that direction. I regret that I have not the vision of a prophet or a seer and therefore am unable to give my hon. friend direct assurances with respect to all that is going to happen in the course of the session. I shall indicate to him in general terms the course which the government intends to follow, though naturally how the session proceeds will depend, among other things, upon circumstances beyond the control of parliment, to begin with, and, within parliament itself, certainly beyond the control of the government. However, it is gratifying to realize that hon. members of all parties appear to share the hope of the government that the debate on the address will not be prolonged unduly. I have no desire in any way to curtail the right or privilege of any hon. member to speak in any debate, but I do believe that in previous years the debate on the address frequently has run on much too long. Last year it continued for a month or more, and I believe the public deprecated the length of time it took the House of Commons to conclude that debate. If there is general agreement in the view that the address should be voted in short order, I can assure my hon. friend that other legislation is ready now to be taken up immediately the debate is concluded.

As to the general business, if hon. members will look at the speech from the throne they will see that it falls naturally into three parts. The first part refers to the war and the importance of war measures receiving consideration ahead of all others. There can be nothing as important as the winning of the war and making every necessary provision toward that end at as early a date as possible. Then follow the measures that relate to the period of transition between the close of the war and the establishment of peace. The fact that the speech from the throne dwells at some length on these measures, and on others, must not be taken as an indication that the government entertains any belief that the war is going to end suddenly, or soon. The contrary, as I said the other day, is the view of the administration. I believe the war will last much longer than most of us have assumed it would.

However, it is part of the government's obligation to anticipate, so far as possible, situations which may arise in any eventuality. And for that reason we have had already to take carefully into consideration, as did committees of the house at the last session, those situations which will arise once the war is at an end. The first of the new situations would be that arising from the conditions in devastated areas in Europe, conditions in countries which have suffered, and which will experience need of assistance from the united nations, in order that their peoples may be enabled to reestablish themselves.

Simultaneously there will also be the most important work of the demobilization of our own forces, and making provision for their reestablishment in orderly fashion. Certain measures will be necessary in that connection. I might describe these measures as illustrative of what is related to the transitional period.

Then, following that, measures by way of reforms will be required, if the new era is to be an improvement on the old one—and we certainly hope and expect it will be. Many measures of social reform will have to be carefully considered. But they cannot be considered by this House of Commons alone because, as hon. members well know, under our constitution certain obligations are assigned to the federal government, and others to the provincial governments. Close cooperation will be required between provincial and dominion authorities if we are to bring into being a nation-wide programme of social security and human well-being.

I do not wish to discuss a matter which might be the subject of debate, but may I point out that in his amendment my hon. friend opposite has stressed the importance of the dominion in its social and fiscal measures not invading the jurisdiction of the provinces. When my hon. friend, the leader of the C.C.F., was speaking in the debate he said the speech from the throne indicated a first-rate example of passing the buck from the dominion to the provinces. I leave hon. members to judge for themselves as to just in what position the government is placed when dealing with these matters. I, myself, cannot find any sure path to follow, other than that laid down in the constitution of our country as a guide, and what in the way of cooperation will, we hope, be the attitude of all governments in Canada at this time in seeking to meet situations which will lie ahead of us all.

So, speaking broadly, we find the legislation for this session divided into those three fields, namely that which relates immediately to the prosecution of the war, that which relates to the transitional period, and that relating to

social problems which will also follow immediately after the war ends, and in larger measure as we enter the period of peace. The government will seek to introduce its legislation, broadly, on those lines.

The measures we wish to take up first of all are those related to the prosecution of the war. Then, as I have said, we will proceed to those matters arising immediately from the war and in the post-war period, and other measures will follow in due course. I am not laying down a hard and fast line. As hon. members know, there are some subjects, the discussion of which will take a longer time than others. There are some we may wish to discuss immediately, and then allow some time to intervene before renewing discussion on them. There are always miscellaneous measures. They will be interspersed. The government will have to judge in respect of those matters what it thinks will best serve to meet the general need. Broadly, however, I have outlined the position.

The leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) asked if we can have all these measures introduced this week. I do not think he is serious when he prefers a request of that kind. No administration has ever brought down its whole programme within the first five days of the session—unless it was intended that the session should last about that length of time.

Mr. GRAYDON: That is not the only reason.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: However, we will keep the house plentifully supplied with legislation, and if hon. members feel they have not had the time necessary to consider certain legislation before debate is opened in the house, they have only to ask that they be given a little time, and it will be afforded. That is what we seek to do. We do not wish to congest the order paper with a large number of measures, but rather it is our desire to bring before the house in an orderly fashion and in accordance with the plans I have indicated first of all the measures which are the most pressing.

Mr. GRAYDON: Of course, the introduction of bills does not congest the order paper.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend has his responsibility with respect to the introduction of bills, and I have mine. I should not wish to see measures brought down at other than what I regard as the most appropriate time. The government must be the judge of that.

The next query raised by the leader of the opposition was as to whether we can have all committees appointed this week. May I say to him that that depends on him much more than on me. It depends on other hon. members and other parties in the house rather than on the government. The complaint has been made that last year a long time elapsed before some of these committees were established. I shall not at this time go over the reasons for that, but I would point out in passing that one of the reasons was that, time and again, when we hoped to be able to proceed with a motion related to the appointment of some committee, we were prevented from so doing by a motion from the other side of the house, occasioning at different times debate which ran on for some days, and the opportunity to get committees appointed was precluded from day to day and often from week to week.

Then there was a further fact—and this is important—namely, that there was a desire on the part of some hon. members to start debates on the several motions to establish committees. On one or two occasions I was asked to please hold over my motion to constitute a committee—the committee on war expenditures was one—because it was the desire of certain hon. members to have a debate upon the motion.

Mr. GRAYDON: Of course the Prime Minister knows why that was.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have forgotten it—if I ever did know.

Mr. GRAYDON: Well, I can tell him, if he wishes to know.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am no longer interested as it belongs to the past; but what I wish to say now is that if hon. members are prepared to allow these committees to be constituted without debate, and that is the position they will take with respect to each committee as its appointment is proposed, I would undertake to say that practically all committees will be established this week. As hon. members will have seen, notice appears in *Votes and Proceedings* of motions for most of committees that remain to be constituted. If it is the wish of the house—and it would be very helpful in every way if such proved to be so—I believe those committees could be established at once. If there could be an understanding that there would be no debate—no lengthy debate—on the establishment of the committees, I am sure we could forward them in such fashion that practically all standing and select committees would be established this week.

My hon. friend asked if it was the plan of the government to go on with the war appropriation measure, immediately after the conclusion of the debate on the address. That is the intention. As soon as the debate on the

address is concluded the war appropriation resolution, now appearing on the order paper, will be the first item for the consideration of the house, with the possible exception of some routine motion or motion respecting the appointment of further committees. The bill based upon the resolution is ready to be introduced, and it is the intention with respect to the discussion on the bill to follow the same order of procedure as was adopted last year. That is to say, the estimates with respect to the war appropriation resolution will be broken down, as before, and the debate will proceed on the different branches of the service, taking one service at a time.

My hon. friend asked me at what stage of the session the budget would be brought down. I cannot answer that question offhand because that will depend upon how much time is taken up with the other war measures which will be brought forward in succession. Following the war appropriation measure, without a very long delay, there will be brought down a measure with respect to mutual aid. This year this measure will relate to aid in the nature of relief to countries in Europe as well as to war supplies. I would hope that both of these important war measures might be disposed of before the budget is brought down.

In referring to these matters I think I ought to stress the tremendous load that necessarily falls upon the shoulders of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley). Most of the measures of defence in a time of war are financial in character and the Minister of Finance will have a heavy load to carry in bringing forward these measures one after another. But he tells me that he feels he is equal to it. If the house will, as it has done before, cooperate with him I think we can have these measures brought along fairly soon.

There are also the estimates. They will be ready and tabled shortly. The government hopes to get on with the estimates a little more rapidly this year than has been the case in previous years. It is an open question as to whether more progress is made in the end by having one particular measure discussed at considerable length until it is completed or to break up the discussion and take on other measures in the interim. I am inclined to believe that perhaps it is better not to stick too closely to any one measure through every day in the week but rather to vary the programme in some particulars, while holding in the main to getting through a particular measure. We should I think introduce other bills, some of which may be of minor importance, and have discussions on different subjects so that the discussion on a particular measure may not become too monotonous. The estimates can be taken up on one or more days in the week and we shall hope to begin with them at an early stage of the session.

The leader of the opposition has asked me what legislation the government intends to introduce other than that mentioned in the speech from the throne. I cannot indicate to him at the moment what further legislation there will be. There is one bill with respect to the disposal of obsolete war materials which will be brought forward and there are other measures I cannot recall at the moment. There may arise a number of measures in the course of the session. At this moment I am not in position to tell my hon. friend what they will be. The speech from the throne does not usually make mention of all intended legislation.

I have been asked whether it is the intention to adjourn parliament while I attend the conference of commonwealth prime ministers. Here again I cannot speak with any degree of certainty because I do not know when this conference will take place. It is likely to be some short time hence, but whether it would be advisable to adjourn will depend, first of all, on the time at which the meeting takes place and, next, on the progress that meanwhile has been made with the different war measures.

I should point out to the house that before very long the government hopes to have a conference between the dominion and the provinces. The government has been ready ever since the last conference with the provinces to have another dominion-provincial conference and we have reason to believe that the provinces now are ready and willing, some of them I understand quite anxious to meet with the federal government in conference to discuss some of the social problems and financial questions that they along with ourselves have had necessarily to consider. It may be that an adjournment would be advisable in connection with a conference of the kind. It might be possible to arrange to have it take place at the time the meeting of prime ministers is taking place in London. However, I cannot say as to that at the moment or whether it will be necessary or advisable to have an adjournment at the time. I do say, however, that the fact that we are faced with the possibility of an adjournment gives an additional reason why this house should in the interval seek to make all the progress it possibly can with the war measures.

The last question my hon. friend asked was whether there were any other general sessional

plans which the Prime Minister would care to disclose to the house. I have not any in in mind at the moment. If any should develop I shall be glad to acquaint my hon. friend with them.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I think all hon. members wish to expedite the business of the house. During the past several sessions, however, there have been no private members' days, and opportunities are few for private members to bring forward the ideas that their constituents often wish them to bring forward. To my mind the debate on the speech from the throne offers an opportunity which is now seized by hon. members for that purpose.

I think the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) could expedite the business of the house if he would say whether it is the intention to move the various committee reports that were tabled on the last day of the last session. If it is not, then I shall object most strenuously to the suggestion that all the committees be set up this week. With regard to radio and war expenditures particularly I am certain that some discussion should be undertaken in this house. If we have the assurance that the reports are to be moved, then perhaps there would not be any need to enter into a debate when we are setting up the committees. But if we have not that assurance, members will naturally seize the opportunity—I know I myself intend to do so—when we are setting up the committees to discuss matters concerning radio and war expenditures. Other members may have other reports in their own minds.

As for this house being a sounding board, I take it that this democratic institution affords the right to every member of parliament to bring forward matters which he considers of interest to his constituents and to the country. Therefore I object strenuously to any suggestion that the house is being used improperly as a sounding board.

Mr. GRAYDON: I was just cautioning my hon. friend against it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If I may answer the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, my impression is that reports made at any session must be dealt with at that particular session. It would require the unanimous consent of the house or the adoption of a special resolution to permit of discussion at this time of reports made at a previous session. I am not therefore in a position to give my hon. friend an assurance.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

WHEAT

QUESTION AS TO PAYMENT OF LOST PARTICIPATION CERTIFICATES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. There has been some reference in the press to the possibility of the early payment of participation certificates which have been issued from 1939 to date. Many thousands of these participation certificates have been mislaid by farmers and I should like to have a statement from the minister as to the position of a farmer who had lost participation certificates.

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the hon. member for Lake Centre for asking this question. This matter has been dealt with by the wheat board. That board has duplicates of all participation certificates, and whether they are lost or not, payments will be made. Those who have lost or mislaid their certificates may have to wait a little longer for payment, but they will be paid eventually.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): How soon are payments likely to be made?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): Payments on the 1940 participation certificates will be started in March. Payments on the 1941 and 1942 crops will be made immediately after completion of the 1940 payments. May I add, in reply to the question just asked, that I am occasionally asked as to the amounts of the payments. It is impossible to say yet what the amount of the payments will be, but they will be announced as soon as possible.

I am also asked as to payments on the 1943 crop. That crop is now only in course of sale and delivery and it is impossible to give any information with respect to it.

The wheat board have had a tremendous accounting problem not only in connection with their ordinary activities but in taking over all the wheat in Canada. They are just as anxious as we are that these payments be made at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. WRIGHT: I should like to ask a supplementary question. The wheat board took over the wheat at the closing price on a set date at $1.23¼. The board has been disposing of the crop at the market price, which, judging by the United States price would be between $1.50 and $1.60. What becomes of the difference in price?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): That will all enter into the participation certificates when the 1943 crop is being closed up.

[*Later*:]

Mr. WRIGHT: The minister indicated that he was prepared to answer my question. He has not given an answer yet; I wonder if we may have it now.

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): I was under the impression that the hon. member was referring to the 1943 crop.

Mr. WRIGHT: I was referring to the 1940, 1941 and 1942 crops, not to 1943.

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): The answer I gave was appropriate to the 1943 crop. I am quite ready to give the answer, and I would have given it had I understood the hon. member properly. When the government decided to pay the wheat grower $1.25 a bushel instead of 90 cents as an advance on the 1943-44 and 1944-45 crops it was understood and announced that all the unsold wheat in the wheat board's hands would be taken over at $1.23¼ a bushel. The 1940-41, 1941-42 and 1942-43 crops were closed out in full on this basis.

ALLOTMENT OF RAILWAY CARS FOR DELIVERIES OF 1943 CROP

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. H. CASTLEDEN (Yorkton): I wish to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce another question. There are areas in Saskatchewan, and particularly in Alberta, where farmers have been unable to deliver practically any part of the 1943 crop because of the control of the allotment of cars. That has caused considerable hardship and injustice. Will the minister give the house the assurance that this inequitable allotment of cars will be rectified, and tell us when we may expect effective action?

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): The hon. member for Yorkton telephoned my office just before three o'clock and said that he intended to ask this question. I do not think the situation is quite as bad as his language would indicate, but undoubtedly transportation difficulties have prevented some producers from delivering as much grain as they wished to sell. The trouble is largely caused by transportation and because of the necessity last fall of getting to eastern Canada and to the head of the lakes for export large quantities of grain. If the hon. member will let me know to what particular points he refers, I shall be glad to have the wheat board check the situation.

I would point out that in the province of Saskatchewan there are 1,128 shipping points. Only four of these are on a three-bushel quota to-day; sixty-four are on a five-bushel quota; 180 are on a seven-bushel quota, and the remaining 880, or 78 per cent, are on a ten- or fourteen-bushel quota.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): It does not matter what the quotas are; they cannot deliver.

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): The deliveries are very close to the quotas except in particular spots, and these are receiving the attention of the wheat board.

VETERANS' ALLOWANCES

PROCEDURE UNDER AMENDED REGULATIONS—PENSIONS AND NATIONAL HEALTH

On the orders of the day:

Mr. S. H. KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): I should like to address a question to the Minister of Pensions and National Health. Yesterday, the minister tabled an order in council providing, under certain circumstances, for increases in amounts paid to veterans under the War Veterans' Allowance Act, and also for certain increases to widows of veterans. I should like to ask the minister this question: Will it be necessary for veterans and widows who are entitled to these increases to make application for them, or will all such cases be reviewed automatically?

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Pensions and National Health): They will be reviewed automatically, and arrangements to that effect went into operation this morning.

LIVE STOCK

NEW ARRANGEMENTS WITH REGARD TO SLAUGHTER OF ANIMALS BY QUEBEC FARMERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. K. FRASER (Peterborough West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance, although I know, as the Prime Minister says, that he is a very busy man. I asked the minister a question on Monday last in regard to the slaughtering of animals by farmers in Quebec, and their being permitted to sell the carcass without a permit. I asked whether Ontario farmers and farmers in other provinces would have the same privilege.

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I will give an answer to that now.

Briefly, the new arrangements may be described as follows. The wartime prices and trade board will issue slaughtering permits to local farmers' organizations in the province of Quebec, giving farmers who have registered with the local organization the right to slaughter their own live stock and to sell the resultant meat. The local farmers' organization will be responsible for the distribution and proper use of meat stamping equipment, for the completion of a monthly report by each registered farmer of slaughterings in relation to coupons collected, and for the preparation of a monthly consolidated report by the secretary of the local organization of total slaughterings by all registered farmers in relation to coupons collected.

These arrangements were recommended by and have the approval of the Quebec Department of Agriculture, whose field officials will cooperate with officials of the wartime prices and trade board.

The wartime prices and trade board is hopeful that the plan, which is not yet fully developed, will facilitate the slaughtering of live stock by individual farmers. As hon. members know, farm slaughtering has been almost universal in the province of Quebec, and it was particularly desirable to work out some method of issuing permits which would not interfere too greatly with established practice, while retaining the degree of control essential to the proper functioning of meat rationing. If the plan proves to be successful in the province of Quebec, the board will be prepared to extend the same arrangements to other areas in other provinces where similar conditions exist.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

STATEMENT AS TO LAY-OFF AT TORONTO SHIPBUILDING YARDS—PROCEDURE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Harris) asked a question regarding a reported lay-off by the Toronto Shipbuilding company. He wished to know what procedure was adopted in such cases, with special reference to returned soldiers.

The determination of lay-off procedure is the responsibility of national selective service, and since the question has been raised I should like to advise the house of the procedure which has been worked out as between national selective service, the Department of Munitions and Supply, and war contractors. With the consent of the house I will do this by placing on *Hansard* the following documents, which are self-explanatory:

1. Circular of the Department of Labour, Employment Service and Unemployment Insurance branch, dealing with lay-offs in war and related industries.

2. Circular issued by the Director of National Service with respect to lay-offs.

3. Letter and circular signed by the deputy minister of the Department of Munitions and Supply which has been sent to all prime contractors to the Department of Munitions and Supply.

4. Circular letter from the Acting Coordinator of Production of the Department of Munitions and Supply to all directors-general of production branches, heads of divisions and presidents of government-owned crown companies, setting out the procedure which is to be followed in any changes involving stopping of production, reducing the rate of production or cancellation of orders.

The contents of these circulars will answer the question of my hon. friend and any other questions of this kind which may be asked during the session.

The procedure outlined affects lay-offs where the number of employees involved is in excess of fifty. The Department of Munitions and Supply does not ordinarily receive advice of any lay-off involving less than fifty persons.

In the case to which my hon. friend refers, I am advised that fifteen carpenters were given notice on Thursday, January 27. These men are no longer required because the specifications of the furniture and fittings on the particular vessel on which they were working have been changed from wood to steel.

I now table the documents:

Department of Labour
Employment Service and Unemployment
Insurance Branch
Ottawa

December 27, 1943.

National Selective Service Circular
No. 317

Subject: Lay-offs:—War and Related Industries

1. This circular supersedes and cancels rulings and procedures Number E 10, dated January 23, 1943, and E 10A, dated March 31, 1943.

2. The procedure outlined below will apply to all lay-offs, involving 50 or more persons, and due to the curtailing, cancelling or completing of orders for war and related materials but will not apply where the lay-off is due to seasonal curtailment of civilian goods or services. Where less than 50 persons are involved the procedure outlined below will apply but notices and reports will not be required.

3. Notifications of lay-offs will come from various sources, and generally head office will notify the regional office, which in turn, will

notify the local office of the lay-off. On occasion, regional offices or local offices will be the first to receive a notice of lay-off; in these cases they will immediately notify the other offices; for instance, a local office hearing of a lay-off will advise its regional office, which, in turn, will notify head office, or if the regional office first hears of a lay-off, it will notify head office and the local office.

4. When a lay-off is notified to a local office by a regional office, the latter office will issue instructions on the handling of the lay-off and advise whether a regional officer will advise on arrangements or whether the lay-off will be the sole responsibility of the local office. If a local office first hears of a lay-off it can assume that the lay-off will be its sole responsibility if the number of persons involved is less than 50 and it will immediately contact the employer and make the necessary arrangements, notifying the regional office by mail. If the lay-off involves 50 or more persons the local office will communicate with the regional office by wire or telephone and the regional office will then decide whether it will be necessary to send a regional representative to advise on the handling of the lay-off, or whether this should be handled by the local office. The regional office will immediately notify the local office of its decision and issue any necessary instructions.

5. It should be borne in mind that practically all lay-offs will be in industries covered by NSS Circular 282—A and B Labour Priority Industry—"Freeze" of employment, and consequently no person can be dismissed without the written permission of a selective service officer. This means that no lay-off can take place without the authorization of a selective service officer and further no lay-off is to be authorized until the procedures outlined below are carried out.

6. The officer detailed to communicate with the employer concerned will arrange for an orderly lay-off in the light of the general manpower situation at the particular time. He must courteously point out to the employer that we are definitely interested in who is, or who is not, to be laid off. It is not our intention that the least desirable or least efficient workers will be those to be laid off, but rather, first, those persons available for the army, and, second, other persons who can be moved to the advantage of, or with the least disturbance to the general labour situation. The demands for the army are continuing demands, and must have a definite priority, unless the persons available have exceptional skills which are greatly in demand by high priority industry, for example, tool makers, journeymen machinists, journeymen electricians, etc., should be transferred rather than be called up. The whole situation should be explained to the employer tactfully.

7. In order to obtain men for the army the following procedures will be used:—

(a) Where an Industrial Mobilization Survey has been completed the regional employment officer will direct an officer (preferably an investigator who has worked on the survey) to contact the employer, supplying him with a copy of the industrial mobilization survey plan, and the necessary subsidiary documents including Form NSS (M) 2—job description—for each man listed in the survey. He will then be in a position to discuss the status of each employee on deferment. He should advise the employer that up to the number involved in the lay-off, all men on deferment according to the survey, will be called by the registrar, unless there are very good reasons for not having particular men called. He should further advise the employer that, due to the reduction in production, there will probably be available some skilled men who were previously deemed to be very essential, but who could now be released. After carefully explaining the whole situation he should then go over the survey marking "A" against each man who can be called by the army (men over 38 years of age should not be included) and "T" against the name of each man available for transfer. Where a man is considered to be a key-man, the reasons for this consideration should be noted on the survey. If the number of available men on deferment is in excess of the number to be laid off, the employer will be advised that those who are shown to be replaceable in the shorter periods will be called first and these men will be indicated on the survey. The employer will then be advised that those men will be called for army service, or for transfers and must be given notices of separation. It should be mentioned that a percentage of the men who are on deferment and who will be called by the military authorities, will not be accepted by them and may later be available for reemployment. If such men return to employment additional men on deferment, if available, must be given notices of separation. This procedure will in many cases look after an entire lay-off, but if the lay-off involves more people than can be taken care of in this manner the procedure outlined in paragraph 10 is to be followed.

(b) Where no industrial mobilization survey has been made the officer on his first contact with the employer will request a list of all persons presently on deferment employed in the establishment, and a further list after the first one has been prepared of all other male persons in the designated age groups. These lists should be made up on form NSS (M) 1—industrial mobilization survey and will be supplied by the officer and should contain all necessary information for the registrar to make calls. A similar procedure to that mentioned in (a) above will be followed for the first list, and an endeavour will be made to get as many men as possible for the army, and for transfer.

8. The surveys and lists mentioned in paragraph 7 above will be sent immediately on completion to the chairman of the mobilization survey committee, in whose military district the lay-off occurs, for approval and submission to the divisional registrar. The registrar will thus be advised of the men available for the army and for transfer to high priority industry and will arrange to call up men and approve transfers. Transfers will be approved provisionally but local offices must mail to the registrar, a completed form 144-A—notice to divisional registrar (section C applies), marked "lay-off" in the upper right hand corner, for each individual who is transferred. The lists of men in the designated age groups but not on deferment will be supplied to the registrar by the chairman of the mobilization survey committee to assist in checking delinquents.

9. When men on deferment are laid off and the registrar so notified, the local office must acquaint all placement officers who will be dealing with these men with this information. Men who have received, or will shortly receive their order—military training should only be referred to jobs of short duration and should not be referred to jobs of a permanent nature. If it is decided by the registrar that certain men will not be called, the local office will be

so notified. Men who fail to pass the final medical examination, will be handled in the usual manner at the army reception centres.

10. Where persons in addition to those on deferment are to be laid off, they should generally be laid off in the following order, subject, of course, to seniority rights where plants are covered by collective bargaining agreements, or subject to the conditions of any other employer-labour contracts:

(a) Workers with previous agricultural experience, particularly dairy farm or stock raising. These persons will be directed, if possible, to year-round farm jobs;

(b) Workers who are needed in other essential industries in the same vicinity;

(c) Workers who are required by outside essential industries, and may be moved;

(d) Younger workers without family obligations (workers in this group are more adaptable, and are generally more easily moved).

(e) Married women, if their husbands are supporting them.

(f) Older men and women, if the foregoing classes have been exhausted.

It should be noted that generally women should not be laid off as long as they can replace men. Local situations may, however, alter this general rule, and discretion must be exercised.

11. Employers should be requested to prepare nominal rolls on forms NSS 240A and 240B lay-off report—nominal roll, in triplicate covering all persons to be laid off. Samples of these forms are attached, and will be supplied by the regional office to local offices as required. When this nominal roll is completed by the employer, one copy will be left with him and the other copies will be used by the local office as the basic record for the lay-off. Complete instructions as to its use are on the back of the form.

12. When persons are interviewed, forms U.I.C. 701 will be given the number shown on the lay-off report, nominal roll, for purposes of identification, and the name of the firm will be noted prominently on the 701. 701's for each separate lay-off will be kept in a separate file until final disposal of the applicant is made. If disposal of any person has not been made during the period of three weeks from the date of separation, the situation at that time will be considered to be final, and will be shown under the appropriate heading, and the 701 placed in the regular files. In other words, final disposition of all persons from lay-offs must be made in three weeks from the date of their separation. Otherwise, for record purposes, they are treated as ordinary applicants.

13. Additional reports form NSS 240D, lay-off summary report, and form NSS 240C, lay-off summary weekly report, as per samples attached, will be prepared from the lay-off report—nominal roll. Form NSS 240D will be completed at the close of the week following the week during which the first separation took place. Form NSS 240C will be completed for each subsequent week and will give the cumulative or to date totals for the lay-off. The final report, marked "final" in red ink, will be the report for the third week after the week of the last separation. This will allow sufficient time to record the disposition of the persons laid off and will not unduly prolong the period for which reports are required. These reports will be made in quadruplicate; two copies for head office, employment service division (one of these will be forwarded to the Department of Munitions and Supply). One copy for the regional office and one copy for local office files.

14. The regional employment officer shall notify the regional insurance officer of any probable lay-off of fifty or more employees, unless the persons to be laid off can be placed immediately in other employment.

15. Wherever possible, arrangements should be made to interview the workers who are to be laid off during the period covered by the notice of separation, and at the plant. Direct referrals to new jobs will be made when possible, and the required permits issued. By interviewing at the plant, it is believed that situations will be handled in a much more orderly manner, that crowding and congestion at our offices will be avoided and that the workers and the companies involved will appreciate our efforts to offer new employment with as little lost time and inconvenience as possible.

16. Lay-offs are difficult situations from every point of view, and all officers are cautioned to use courtesy, tact, and diplomacy in dealing with all parties concerned.

17. This circular is effective January 3, 1944, and all lay-offs on and after that date must be handled as outlined above.

18. Form NSS 240-0, lay-off summary report—must also be completed, insofar as it is possible for all lay-offs which have taken place in the period from November 1, 1943, to December 31, 1943. Where a lay-off is in progress at December 31, 1943, a report will be submitted as above, and then the procedures outlined in this circular will be followed insofar as it is possible.

H. F. Caloren
Allan M. Mitchell
Director of Employment Service
and Unemployment Insurance

(Letter attached to National Selective Service circular No. 317-1, January 19, 1944, Subject: Lay-offs—War Contractors.)

Information for War Contractors
in Connection with "Lay-offs"

You are no doubt already aware that essential changes in Canada's war production programme necessitate certain "lay-offs". National Selective Service is most anxious in such cases to reassign employees promptly and with the least inconvenience to all concerned.

Definite instructions have been given to all offices of National Selective Service to cooperate fully with employers and to follow the procedure which is briefly outlined herein.

As you know, your establishment has been classified as a "designated establishment" under National Selective Service Civilian Regulations and consequently you may not terminate the employment of any male employee without the permission in writing of a selective service officer. Therefore, the closest possible cooperation will be necessary in working out arrangements between yourselves and the local employment and selective service office.

Before giving any general or individual notice you are therefore required to discuss the matter

with the manager of your nearest employment and selective service office. He will be ready to render immediate assistance in working out the details of the "lay-off".

The procedure to be followed in reassigning labour due to "lay-offs" will be as follows:

1. Owing to the needs of the army for a large number of men each month, the first step must be to release those men suitable for the armed forces. If an industrial mobilization survey has been completed for your establishment a representative of selective service will provide you with a copy of the survey plan and discuss with you the status of each employee on deferment with a view to making arrangements with the divisional registrar to call up such men for military training, unless there is very good reason why such men should not be called at this time. If no industrial mobilization survey has been made, you will be asked by the national selective service officer to provide a list of all persons in your employ presently on deferment, also a list showing all other male employees within the age groups and of the marital status designated under mobilization regulations.

2. The next step to be taken should be to reduce working hours to 48 hours per week, or to the normal working hours per week for the industry if less than 48.

3. Where it is necessary to lay off persons in addition to those on deferment, it is the intention that they should be laid off generally in the following order, subject of course to seniority rights where an establishment is covered by a collective bargaining agreement, or subject to the conditions of any other employer-employee contract:

(a) Workers with agricultural experience, particularly in dairy farming or stock raising.

(b) Workers whose services could be utilized in other essential industries in the vicinity of your establishment.

(c) Workers whose services could be utilized by outside essential industries and who could be moved to such.

(d) Younger workers without family obligations.

(e) Married women if their husbands are supporting them.

(f) Older men and women if the foregoing classes have been exhausted.

4. Wherever possible arrangements will be made to have national selective service officers interview at the plant the workers who are to be laid off and direct referrals to new jobs will be made when possible. This will enable national selective service to handle the situation in a more orderly manner and to offer new employment with as little lost time and inconvenience as possible.

Your cooperation in assisting our officers in dealing with this difficult situation will be much appreciated.

A. MacNamara,
Director of National Selective Service

Deputy Minister
of
Munitions and Supply
Ottawa, Canada
February 1, 1944.

To Prime Contractors to the
Department of Munitions and Supply.

Re: Procedure by prime contractors when instructions are received to stop production, to reduce the rate of production of stores or to cancel certain outstanding orders.

The pattern of this war is constantly changing and the demands made on this department and on Canadian contractors will likewise change.

These changed demands will necessitate the issuance, from time to time, of instructions to curtail production on certain stores and to stop production entirely on others. Some lay-offs of labour will doubtless result from such instructions.

If and when such an event occurs, prime contractors are called upon to take certain steps which are outlined in the attached memorandum from the Director of National Selective Service, and in my letter of instruction, also attached.

The careful observance of these instructions will enable the government to make full use of the machinery which it has set up to ensure that Canada makes the best use of all available manpower.

This communication is not to be regarded as an indication that we think the war is over. It is to be looked upon purely as a preparation for changes in war demands. Such changes and the cancellations and adjustments which follow them are a part of the business of waging war—not a sign that the war is over.

Will you please acknowledge receipt of these instructions.

G. K. Sheils,
Deputy Minister.

Deputy Minister
of
Munitions and Supply
Ottawa, Canada
February 1, 1944.

To Prime Contractors to the
Department of Munitions and Supply.

Re: Pre-layoff procedure to be adopted by contractors to this department, immediately definite instructions are received either to stop production or to reduce production rates, or when outstanding orders are reduced—if any of the above acts will result in an immediate or subsequent layoff of labour.

When any one of the above conditions occurs you are requested to take the following action:

(a) Communicate immediately with the local selective service officer as no lay-off may take place without that officer's consent,

(b) Supply the selective service officer with the names and addresses of all sub-contractors affected by the production change,

(c) Advise the above noted sub-contractors and suppliers and request them to communicate with their local selective service officer if lay-offs are to occur,

(d) Consult with your labour-management committee or the plant representatives of your employees before notices of separation are given and advise them, as far as is consistent with security, of the reasons for the production change and ask them to inform the other employees.

Please note that, except in so far as necessary to carry out the above instructions, any and all advices regarding production changes are confidential as between this Department and your company.

No publicity must therefore be given to the said instructions or advices without the specific knowledge and consent of the department. If, in your opinion, some publicity is desirable and would be in the public interest, you will please submit your detailed proposals with respect thereto to the director general of the publicity branch of the department who will discuss the same with all parties concerned, including the censors, and will advise you if and when and to what extent these proposals are approved. If the matter should appear to you to be urgent, the publicity branch may be consulted by telephone or telegraph.

When a contract is about to run out and no renewal appears to be likely and such completion of contract will result in labour being laid off in the near future, it is requested that you give your local selective service officer ample notice of the said lay-off to enable him to make his necessary arrangements, also that you advise the sub-contractors and suppliers concerned and request them to communicate with their local selective service officer as contemplated in paragraph (c) above.

Will you please acknowledge receipt of these instructions.

G. K. Sheils,
Deputy Minister.

Department of Munitions and Supply

To: Directors-General of Production Branches,
Heads of Division,
Presidents of Govt. Owned Companies.

Superseding C.P. 8

From: Acting Co-ordinator of Production.

February 1, 1944.

Re: Labour

Procedure for Production Branches and Producing Crown Companies prior to issuing official instructions involving stopping production, reducing the rate of production or cancelling orders.

The Department of Munitions and Supply is responsible for giving National Selective Service advance notice and accurate information regarding labour to be released by prime contractors as a result of production changes, in order that National Selective Service may be able to:

(a) obtain the maximum number of men eligible for the armed forces,
(b) procure by transfer, workers with particular skills urgently needed for other high priority industry, and
(c) place released employees in other jobs with a minimum of disruption or dislocation.

[Mr. Howe.]

1. When it is decided by the programme head that a change of production is necessary, whether this is to be done by stopping production, reducing the rate of production, cancellation of contracts or reduction of outstanding orders, the programme head will communicate with the contractor concerned advising him that a change in production may be required and requesting the contractor to furnish him immediately, by telegraph, information as to the number of employees, male and female, who will be released from his organization if such action is taken, and the approximate dates when such lay-offs will take place. (These figures are not to include sub-contractors.)

2. Directors-General and heads of crown owned companies are held responsible for seeing to it that this request is closely followed up and that no undue delay is permitted in securing the above information.

3. If the contractor reports, or if the programme head considers it likely, that 50 people or more will be laid off as a result of the projected action, the programme head will advise the appointed officer of the Office of the Co-ordinator of Production, local 3781, room B.166, No. 2 temporary building, forthwith by telephone or telegram. This information is to be confirmed in writing, in duplicate.

4. Upon receipt of the above information, this officer will either,

(a) authorize the programme head to communicate the decision to the contractor, or
(b) request the programme head to defer action pending clearance of the lay-off with the Department of Labour through the labour liaison officer. As soon as this is done, the office of the Co-ordinator of Production will advise the programme head.

5. When cleared with the office of the Co-ordinator of Production, the official instructions are to be issued personally by either the director-general, the assistant director-general, the president or general manager as the case may be. These may be sent by letter or wire, two copies of which will be sent to the appointed officer and such other parties as are required by the deputy minister's instructions.

6. In all such advices to contractors, the communication should refer the contractor to the deputy minister's letter of February 1, 1944, copies of which are attached.

J. H. Berry,
Acting Co-ordinator of Production.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): May I ask the minister if there was any consultation with the officials of labour organizations in this connection. I notice that all other parties interested are communicated with; have there been any contacts with labour organizations?

Mr. HOWE: Yes. The case in point is a union shop, and the president of the union is consulted. I believe that the procedure laid down by selective service is worked out in cooperation with the unions, and within the framework of the instructions the union is consulted in the matter of lay-off.

Mr. J. H. HARRIS (Danforth): I should like again to direct a question to the Minister of Munitions and Supply. Yesterday I asked, quite distinctly, if the principle of seniority rights was recognized in the shop agreements which the contractors for the department have, particularly with this company, and whether that principle is being honoured with regard to this lay-off of fifteen carpenters.

Mr. HOWE: The documents which I asked with the consent of the house to have placed on *Hansard* set out the procedure there followed. I might have read these circulars.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): That is all right.

Mr. HOWE: I do not think it is very helpful to give the procedure for one particular case when there is a procedure for general application; and the circular which will be printed in *Hansard* covers fully the point raised by my hon. friend.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Tuesday, February 1, consideration of the motion of Mr. L. D. Tremblay for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Graydon, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, the preliminaries to the carrying on of this debate have no doubt been most interesting to those who have been participating, but I can say they are very disconcerting to a member who is trying to rise in his place in order to proceed with the discussion. However, I am not complaining about that; I recognize that within certain limitations these privileges and rights are extended to hon. members.

In rising to take part in this, what has sometimes been called a time-honoured debate, sometimes characterized as a useless debate, I desire to make one or two observations. There is no doubt about it that in days gone by this debate on the speech from the throne has been carried on at altogether too great length. On the other hand, I would deprecate the wiping out in their entirety of the facilities that this debate offers. There is a happy medium; and in view of the announcement which the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) made yesterday, that the speech from the throne does not mean an election, I am hopeful that this debate will be concluded within a reasonable time. I suppose it is all very well for me to say that when I am through and let the other fellow think he cannot speak at all. But there is no doubt about it, in my view at all events, that the debate on the speech from the throne serves a very useful purpose, and particularly at this time. Notwithstanding the clamour in certain portions of the press for the abrogation of this debate, I should like to point out that this house has had a recess of at least six months, that during that period of time events of great importance and moment have occurred, that we have had no opportunity to review these events, and that it is difficult to do so when one is dealing with particular proposals by way of legislation. So that I say to you, sir, and to the membership of this house, that the debate on the address affords a very useful occasion to review events which have occurred in the long recess period of six months.

It is said that parliament is the great sounding board of the nation. That I think is true. Many of us have no other sounding board. We do not control the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, like the government does; we are not allowed to go on the air when we should like to do so. We may be able, if we have the money to buy the time and place, to go on the air and talk to our constituents, but we are subject to a strict censorship. I protest against that, and I hope that this position will be reviewed at a very early date and that there will be freedom of the air as to-day there is freedom of speech in this house and a free public press. The situation with regard to the use of the facilities of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is intolerable and it cannot be allowed to stand. The sooner it is reviewed by those in authority, the better.

I come to a consideration of some of the topics which are immediately before this house and the country. I am glad to see that my colleague, the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) to-day invited the government to introduce at once the measures visualized in the speech from the throne so that we may have full opportunity of examination and analysis and express our approval or disapproval. The speech of His Excellency, put in his mouth by my right hon. friend and his colleagues, covers an imposing and extensive field. I should say that stress was laid on the transitional period and on the post-war period and the problems relating thereto rather than upon the immediate objective of the nation, the winning of the war.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Oh, that is not true.

Mr. HANSON: Well, that is my reaction. The public has been justified in assuming from the general tenor of the speech that a general election was in the offing. There is no doubt about that; for without hesitation I say to the Prime Minister that in my judgment—perhaps it is as good as his, I do not say it is better—the major portion of the speech looked like and was intended to be taken by the electorate as the basis of an early election appeal. It was an election speech; there is no doubt about that. I go farther and say that it has all the earmarks of an attempt to raise new issues in the minds of the public and to obliterate all recollection of the errors and omissions of the administration during the last four years in the conduct of the war, errors and omissions, sins of commission on the part of the administration which have turned public opinion against this government. If any proof of that fact is required it will be found in the events of last summer when the by-elections were held, by-elections which, if the administration had the confidence of the country, should in all cases have resulted in the return of government nominees; but which to the surprise and astonishment of myself, at least, resulted, in a series of crushing defeats for hon. gentlemen opposite. These by-elections indicated a lack of confidence in the administration. Some people will gloat over this defeat of the government, but to me it has brought very serious implications. I am not gloating over these defeats. In fact I may say very frankly to Your Honour and to the members of this house that I was rather appalled at the results of the by-elections.

Mr. ROWE: So was the government.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Yes, so was the government. That it indicated a protest against the administration will, I think, be admitted by all. But in my view it indicated very much more than that. As I analyse the result it would appear that an extremely radical and, if I may be permitted to say so, in my view at least a subversive element in this country had what I hope is only a momentary triumph.

I know little about the position in western Canada, but consider the two elections in eastern Canada. After the result in Stanstead and Cartier can anyone say that Canada is a united nation? When you witness in a rock-ribbed Liberal constituency such as Cartier the election of a gentleman who is, according to all the remarks that I have heard, an out-and-out communist then I say that is something to think about. I know the gentleman's name is Rose, but that which we call a rose by any other name would smell as sweet. Can anyone say after that result in Cartier and after that result in Stanstead that this country is united? What happened in Stanstead? There was the triumph over a Liberal candidate of a candidate of the Bloc Populaire, a party with a purely nationalistic appeal. What does that mean? It means, if it means anything, disunity in this country and it is a deplorable state of affairs. In my judgment these results indicate that Canada is more disunited than it has been at any time in our history. The results are quite clear. They are very discernible. They are the natural results which have flowed from the policies of the administration in the prosecution of the war. I do not propose to-day to traverse ground that I have covered on previous occasions. I make that assertion. I desire only to emphasize the fact that, in my view at all events, this administration has lost the confidence of the country and I do not think there is any doubt about it.

On Monday the Prime Minister spoke in what I considered to be a chastened mood. I can understand that. It was in marked contrast with past performances. He had his mechanical majority behind him but he has learned the lesson of humility. That is a fine thing for a prime minister to learn. It is a fine attribute for a prime minister to have. I have tried to cultivate that attitude myself, I do not know with what success; but I think it is a fine attribute for any public man to have. The Prime Minister took occasion to say that he wanted no general election before the expiration of the lifetime of parliament in June, 1945; but he so hedged his position, as he always does, by two qualifications, that it is difficult to be certain of his position. The first qualification was that "situations" might arise which would make it impossible for the government to carry on with the authority it should have in time of war. The second qualification which is rather similar to the first was, that some question might arise which would make it absolutely necessary that an appeal be made to the country to settle the issue. He left the door wide open. Make no mistake about that. He always does. That is part of the political strategy for which he is so famous.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Excuse me for just one moment. There was one statement that the hon. gentleman made which I think ought to be corrected. If I gathered rightly my hon. friend said I had said that I wished

no election until June, 1945. I think I said I wished no election in war-time. In answering a question as to the extension of the term of parliament I said this parliament has until June, 1945 to run.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am interpreting the whole thing, the two statements together. The Prime Minister said he did not want any election before June, 1945 because by law the life of parliament will expire at that time and we must have an election unless there is an extension of the life of this parliament.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I was asked a question as to whether I wished parliament to continue beyond that period. I said, no. I do not want the impression to go abroad I had given an undertaking that there will be no election before June, 1945.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The Prime Minister left the door wide open, and I suggest to him that he could always find an excuse. Therefore do not take this promise of no election this year too seriously. I am going to give my opinion about the matter a little later, and I am very serious about what I think ought to be done. If I wanted to be cynical I would say that the Prime Minister was from one point of view well advised in making that declaration. I am thoroughly convinced his party would be defeated at the polls if an appeal were made now or in the immediate future. That is the political angle of this question.

There is another angle to it. Personally I do not wish to be swayed by the political angle. Mere party advantage or place or the prospect of power in the immediate future certainly make no appeal to me as an individual member of this house when there is a war on. I am much more concerned about another great principle and it is this: I believe that the holding of a general election at this time or in the immediate future would be a distinct detriment to the successful prosecution of the war. I am very honest in that conviction. From the very beginning of this gigantic struggle—and I am sure hon. members will bear me out in this—I have taken the position and I have rigidly adhered to it that the supreme objective of the Canadian people, the supreme objective of the membership of this house, irrespective of party, the supreme duty of each and every one of us no matter what our political proclivities, or our point of view may be, is the winning of this war, and all other considerations, party and otherwise, are subordinated to that supreme consideration.

I was very glad indeed to hear the Prime Minister in his speech on Monday last utter a grave note of warning, and again to-day that not only is this war not won, but it is far from being won. In fact, may I emphasize what the Prime Minister has alluded to, that war on the European front is now entering upon its most critical stage. The allied nations have invaded Europe through Italy. Further invasions are contemplated. The most exacting and dangerous no doubt will be on the western front. If we are at all realistic we must know that in attacking frontally the fortress of Europe as now dominated by the German forces the allied nations are undertaking the most courageous and herculean task in all history. Look at the map of Europe; visualize it with me, if you will. Germany dominates over half the whole continent of Europe. She is in absolute possession of Norway, Denmark, the low countries of Holland and Belgium, the whole of France, the major part of Italy and the Balkan states, while her own territory remains inviolate save and except for the destruction of her cities and her production programme wrought by the magnificent work of the Royal Air Force, the gallant Royal Canadian Air Force, and the great and wonderful contribution of the air forces of our mighty ally the United States of America.

There is the position. To say that the war is nearly over is folly and a fallacy. Nothing could be further from the truth; nothing could be more dangerous than to believe anything of the sort. To hold that belief; to relax our efforts in any degree is to invite disaster. And to hold a general election in three or six months, with the prospect of blood and carnage almost unthought of, perhaps beyond the scope and measure of our imagination, I honestly believe would be a letting down of our determination, our morale and our will to support the men at the front, and we must never do that. That is my considered view. Others may differ, but I desire to maintain that position in this house, and I think the Prime Minister might well have taken that position in the speech from the throne. However, he has repaired that omission; and speaking for myself I am satisfied, much as I have deplored the fact that at a time of such great national and international undertakings we in Canada have conducted this war on a party rather than on a national basis.

May I pause here, Mr. Speaker, to express my regret, yea, my astonishment, at the position taken by my hon. friend the leader of the Bloc Populaire (Mr. Raymond) in his recent speech in this house in which, if I understood

him aright, he took the ground that we were doing altogether too much, much more than our proportion having regard to our size, our wealth and our resources, and if I follow him to a logical conclusion he would perhaps have Canada get out of this war altogether now that the danger of invasion is over. I read the translation of that speech, and as I pondered it I could not but reflect that some people in Canada have very short memories. Has the hon. gentleman forgotten those hectic days of May and June, 1940, after Dunkirk, when nothing stood between the enemy and this Canada of ours—which I agree we both love—but the might, the power, the courage and I would almost say the majesty of the British navy, together with the magnificent will and determination of the British people under the matchless, indomitable leadership of Churchill, who, along with the British people, the royal navy, the merchant navy and the workers of Britain offered only blood, sweat and tears, and who not only saved this continent from invasion but saved civilization itself? For, make no mistake about it, the resolution, the fortitude and the bravery of Churchill and the British people did just that. Have we no gratitude in our hearts and minds for that magnificent achievement? From that has grown, with the help first of Canada and the other major sister dominions and then with the heartening aid of the United States and the wonderful contribution of the Russian people, the promising position of to-day, when, if victory is not in sight, it is at least within striking distance. In those days Britain attained the moral leadership of the whole civilized world. Standing alone she earned that position, and at great cost and sacrifice; and we as Canadians, irrespective of our racial descent, should recognize that fact and be eternally thankful. And with all kindliness and in all sincerity I say to my hon. friend that no part of Canada was more vulnerable than his beloved part. No part of Canada should be more thankful than that part of our citizenry which my hon. friend claims to represent, the people of his own province.

In the short space of time allotted to one, Mr. Speaker—and I suppose in days to come even that time may be cut down—it is extremely difficult to cover any wide range of subjects, and I am not going to attempt to do so.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: It is when you read it.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am not reading it. I desire to turn now to a peacetime subject which I consider to be of very great importance, to give some views with regard to it and to ask the administration some questions. I refer to the question of civil aviation. We have made great strides since the beginning of the war. There is no doubt that the empire air training plan has been a great success; started too late, it is true, but nevertheless a great success. It will be recalled that last year the Prime Minister made a declaration of policy with respect to this question of civil aviation, and that the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) did likewise. We also had some observations on the subject in the committee on railways and shipping by the president of Trans-Canada Air Lines. I am not going to repeat what those declarations were; they are well known to all our membership and to the country generally. I do think, however, that at a very early date this whole position should be debated and reviewed. In the speech from the throne there was an omission, a very significant omission, of any reference to this great problem; it contained not a syllable about post-war civil aviation. My colleague the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) referred to this omission in his address on Monday, at page 20 of *Hansard*, in these terms:

> There is no single economic subject fraught with such important effects and ramifications of a world-wide character which is so vital to Canada as commercial aviation.

I agree with that statement. We have the Trans-Canada Air Lines. I am not here to-day to criticize the operations of that enterprise, which started from scratch and has done very good work. No one will deny, however, that the government has been a "sugar daddy" to Trans-Canada Air Lines. Somebody had to father it, and the government did so. Perhaps I may be excused for using the term "sugar daddy"; it is a pretty comprehensive term, and everyone knows what is meant. This was used in another connection; it is a bit of slang we have borrowed from across the boundary line. We find that Trans-Canada Air Lines is just a government monopoly. It is operated for the government under the form of a private undertaking. It is not subject to the control of this parliament. It is not subject—or at least only to a very limited extent—to the control of the board of transport commissioners. Control, in the first instance, is vested in the board of directors, who are the creatures of the government, and the real control of Trans-Canada Air Lines is vested in the Minister of Munitions and Supply. He is behind it. He kept his hand on that when he left the Department of Transport to go to the department which he now heads. I am not blaming him; having

regard to the circumstances existing in the department, I think he did the right thing. But it is a monopoly. The board of transport commissioners has practically nothing to say about its operation. Judging by results, the policy at the moment would appear to be against internal expansion. There may be a reason for that; I do not know. But their policy certainly is to prevent any competition from development by private enterprise. I do not think there is any gainsaying that. And as I am a supporter of private enterprise I ask for a complete overhauling of both the policy and the actual practice.

We are supposed to have a free economy in this country, outside of war time. That may be a fallacy. We are subject to tremendous control at the present time, under the guise of war—some of which control is wholly unnecessary. Under a Liberal government one would have supposed that a free economy in transportation would be axiomatic. That should be the practice. But what have we? The initiative, the freedom to operate privately sponsored air transport is cabined, cribbed, confined and put in a strait-jacket. Even in the air a limited field has been left open to private enterprise, and allotted by government policy. If any proof is required of that statement, I can give it now. Recently application was made on behalf of a private enterprise to establish an airways route between the cities of Saint John and Halifax in the maritime provinces. The application was refused, and in my judgment the refusal was without justifiable or reasonable cause. The field is not occupied, and present facilities on the main line of Trans-Canada Air Lines do not fill the need.

Mr. HOWE: What method was taken to refuse it? Has the hon. member seen the refusal, or anything of that kind?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I understand it is a matter of record that it has been refused. I am coming to what I understand to be the reason.

Mr. HOWE: The situation is, if I am not mistaken, that a number of other applications are not being dealt with by the board of transport commissioners at the present time.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): My understanding is just this—and may I say that that is no reason—that they did not choose to deal with the application. Who told them not to do so?

Mr. HOWE: I did.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Yes. The cold hand of the Minister of Munitions and Supply is against this application. Why? The application was turned down, as I understand, on the ground of military necessity.

Mr. HOWE: It was turned down because we believed that valuable air franchises should be held until the return of the people who are fighting our battles overseas.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Does the minister propose to give the franchise to another company, or is he speaking of employment? Because, if he is, I would point out to him that there will be lots of boys coming back who will be capable of handling the airways. I am dealing with a situation in my own province, one with which I am familiar. The minister will find there is a good deal of irritation there, because we cannot get an air communication service in New Brunswick that is worth while.

Military necessity was, I understand, the reason given for the refusal of the application. To me that sounds most unconvincing. There is no such necessity. This procedure of restricting private enterprise is dwarfing the progress of Canadian air transportation. Instead of permitting it to function and expand in a normal fashion, it is quite plain to me that the government policy is one which visualizes expansion only on the part of Trans-Canada Air Lines—and they are not expanding. It is a dog-in-the-manger policy, and one which should be reviewed and liberalized.

This government-controlled line has been allotted an absolute monopoly of transcontinental routes. That is an accomplished fact, although I believe in future there will be—and should be—room for competing services. But there is more than that here. This government-controlled company has an absolute monopoly to operate all Canadian services on international routes. But it does not operate any international routes, with one exception. That field is being taken up, not by Canadian enterprise but by United States enterprise. They have invaded this country, and they are waiting to invade it further. And, listen to this: I am informed—and I wish to be corrected if I am wrong—that this government will not allow any Canadian enterprise to approach the United States government for licensing facilities, so that they can enter the United States. They cannot even reach the United States government, because the Canadian government refuses to facilitate their application.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: You will elect us again.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Do not worry about me; look after yourself. That is as much as most of us can do.

Trans-Canada Air Lines has a transcontinental monopoly, and has reserved to itself the sole right to develop and acquire any ancillary routes of a main-line character which it may decide to operate. That is government policy. Private operators which have pioneered routes may be arbitrarily ousted and excluded. That is the position to-day.

I suggest to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Munitions and Supply that the government should not bar private enterprise from secondary, feeder or purely local routes in the domestic field, such as that between Saint John and Halifax.

Then we have before us the question of transocean routes. Services for these, also, are reserved for government monopoly after the war, or when they get around to it—whenever that may be. I point out to the house that that is not the attitude of the United States of America, as far as their post-war policy is concerned. If I understand their position correctly the government in that country is encouraging private enterprise to enter this field. I doubt, too, if it will be the attitude of the government of the United Kingdom, or any other of the free sovereign states in Europe after the war.

There appeared in the January isue of the *Atlantic Monthly,* which I have on my desk, an article entitled "The Future of Air Transport, A British View," written by Peter Masefield, who is described by the editor as the personal adviser to Lord Beaverbrook on civil aviation as it affects Great Britain. This article is in no sense official. But because of our knowledge of the author and his position, any views he may express must command respect and attention. I commend a thorough study of the article to the minister and his advisers, and to every thoughtful student of the subject of aviation. His opening sentence is fascinating, and I would ask permission to read it. These are his words:

> Air transport, a child of peace reared in war, approaches maturity. Under the spur of war, flying has found its technical independence. It is free to start anew in the peaceful skies of to-morrow, bound only by such artificial restrictions as the nations choose to apply.

He visualizes three great problems. First, there is the problem of policy and diplomacy, and he tells us that it is important that these should be resolved only by international discussion conducted in a spirit of good will and cooperation. The second is the question of operational problems, matters of subsidy, monopoly, national air routes, traffic, frequency of services and of control. The third covers the technical problems of construction and equipment, which are the least important.

Under the caption "operating policy" he states that general opinion in Britain favours regulated rivalry rather than uncontrolled competition in national and international air line operation. Mark these words, "Monopolies are not favoured or considered efficient." I suggest to the house that these words bear the impress of truth and logic as we know them. Nowhere does he suggest either government operation or monopoly.

Participation by shipping and railroad concerns will be welcomed so long as it promotes efficient commercial operation for the good of air transport in general. I have not the time to analyse his position further, but it is quite clear that he does not visualize government monopoly in Britain. Rather does he approach the solution from the point of view of regulated private enterprise. I think that is the position in the United States.

Recently the Minister of Munitions and Supply visited London with Mr. Symington, the president of Trans-Canada. I believe they sat in on the meetings of a special committee which was set up under Lord Beaverbrook to consider empire air relations and policy. I consider that it is his duty to this house and to this country to give us a report at an early day of the deliberations of that committee and the conclusions, if any, arrived at.

I now ask these important and relevant questions. Where does Canada stand in relation to the promotion of domestic air routes by private enterprise? Next, is private enterprise in the post-war period to be relegated to the limbo of the past in this sphere of national activity? If so, I protest. We want no monopoly in air transportation in Canada any more than we want it in railway transportation.

Mr. HOWE: You wanted it in railway transportation.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I did not want it in railway transportation.

Mr. HOWE: Your party did.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I challenge the minster to substantiate that.

Mr. HOWE: Your party certainly did.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): My party did not advocate it. I deny it. Recently I have heard that another party has advocated it in effect when they advocate taking over by this government of the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway held in Britain. When you

visualize the position where the government of this country will own the Canadian National Railways and control the Canadian Pacific Railway, the amalgamation of those two roads will be just as inevitable as that the sun will set to-night and rise to-morrow morning. I wonder what the railway workers of this country think of that Cooperative Commonwealth Federation policy? Let them put that in their pipes and smoke it.

Mr. REID: I believe it would suit the Canadian Pacific.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I do not think it would. So far as I know all the Canadian Pacific wants is to be left alone to work out its own salvation. It is quite capable of doing so if left alone and if it is not taxed to death. We have the spectacle of the Canadian Pacific last year paying into the treasury of this country in income and excess profits taxes a total of $23,100,000 and the Canadian National not paying a cent.

Mr. HOWE: Oh.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): In income tax or excess profits tax.

Mr. HOWE: It has paid about the same thing.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am going to deal with that. I asked Mr. Vaughan that question and he admitted it. Another question I desire to ask the minister is: Where does this country stand in regard to air transport in the field of empire? Are we for or against cooperation in this field? Where do we stand in relation to the United States? In both Britain and the United States this question of post-war civil aviation has aroused the greatest interest. In Britain the big shipping companies are eager to enter the field of international air transport. Are they to be shut out in so far as Canada is concerned because of our monopolistic policy? I say that the whole position should be clarified and liberalized. If not, we are just one step nearer to the socialist state, and the next step is fascism. I do not know how much time I have.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go ahead.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Thank you very much. I am obliged to the house for its indulgence. I do not want any special privilege to be granted to me that would not be granted to somebody else, but I did desire to say one word with regard to empire relations. I would not do this had the Prime Minister not gone as far as he did on Monday last. I regret exceedingly that at this time, and for reasons which I shall indicate in a moment, the Prime Minister has seen fit to reject practically out of hand the proposals of Lord Halifax as enunciated recently at Toronto, especially so at this time when he has announced his intention of attending in the near future an empire conference in London. I pause here to say that in our view he should attend this conference when it is called and as soon as it is called and that we on this side will facilitate his attendance and wish him Godspeed and a safe return. But since the proposals of Lord Halifax will without doubt be before that conference, it is more than passing strange that those proposals should be rejected out of hand in advance of the conference. I cannot understand that attitude.

I have not had an opportunity of studying the Halifax proposals in detail and therefore I am not going to discuss them either in detail or on their merits. But they were made by a responsible man; whether he made them in his official capacity or not is another matter. I suggest to the Prime Minister that they merit cool and careful study. It may well be that after examination it will be found that Canada cannot accept these proposals either in toto or in part; I do not know because I have not come to any conclusion, but have we given the matter cool and careful study? I do not think we have. There would appear to be a good deal of heat over the matter, and when there is heat there cannot be very much calm consideration.

The attitude of the Prime Minister reminds me of a situation in which I found myself as a young lawyer. With the temerity that characterizes a young and courageous counsel I once went before an old judge. He had been reading my factum and he said to me, "Mr. Hanson, have you a case?" I said, "Yes, My Lord." I thought so, and I still think so. He said to me, "I do not think you have." What an approach to a case! It took the heart right out of me, but I battered away at the old chap as long as I could. He overruled me, but I had the supreme satisfaction of reversing him on appeal.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Then you were still in the same position?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): If the hon. member will just take a chair behind the curtain I think it would be better for us all. I think that is where he belongs. This is all I am going to say about the Halifax proposals until a later date.

In one particular sphere of empire cooperation I hold the opinion that at the peace con-

ference which is to be held, we hope within a measurably short time this country will cooperate with Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and all the other dominions and with the United Kingdom so that in unity there may be strength. If we do not, and it is unthinkable that we should go into that peace conference a divided commonwealth, then I say to the house and to this country that the influence of the British empire will be greatly nullified. I would deplore that, that a country which has saved civilization would be wiped out by disunity among our peoples.

I hope it will not be found necessary to have a division of opinion especially with reference to our friends in the United States. But if we find ourselves in that unfortunate position my views in that regard have not changed since last session; when speaking in this house on foreign relations, as reported at page 4639 of *Hansard,* 1943, I expressed these views, which I reaffirm now:

> Canada has become a nation by reason of the contribution which she has made. Britain has the moral leadership of the world, and she won it as a result of standing almost alone, yea, in fact alone, at and after Dunkirk. They are our blood brothers over there. On the other hand there is the geographical propinquity of Canada and the United States. Canada, it has been said, has been the intermediary between the United States and the United Kingdom, and the interpreter of one to the other. I am not sure that that has worked out in practice, though I think to a degree it is true. But if the testing time comes, and we have to choose between the one and the other—and I pray God for the sake of the general good of the world, of peace among nations, and of the great world which we would like to see afterwards, we shall not have to do that—I say, if the testing time comes, then I tell my right hon. friend that so far as I am concerned—and I would not pretend, like the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George, to speak for the nation—my vote and my voice, my advice to the Canadian people in so far as it may be asked or heeded, will be, "Let us stand by the empire."

I have but a word to add. The Prime Minister has indicated that in empire affairs his government has followed a policy of consultation, cooperation, and coordination. I say to him that if that be true now, it was not always true. If we have arrived at a stage of consultation, cooperation and coordination, we have gone a long way, and let us pursue that path to its logical conclusion, which is unity in action.

Mr. PIERRE GAUTHIER (Portneuf) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak at any great length, or to show any acrimony. In the first place, I do not want to repeat what has been said, or be included among the grumblers mentioned by the mover of the address (Mr. Tremblay) and also referred to by the new member for Cartier (Mr. Rose).

The speech from the throne is a complete political programme, and in spite of the statement made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), I still believe that the foremost concern of the present Government is their reelection. It seldom happens that four by-elections held within one year mean the entrance of four opposition members in the house. In the present case, the standard-bearer of the Bloc Populaire was elected in Stanstead, two socialists in Humboldt and Selkirk and a communist in Cartier. I shall not delve further into that, although I may at some future time discuss the complaints of those who talk about grumblers.

I note with satisfaction that the Liberal members seem to have fully recuperated from the fatigue of their pilgrimage to Stanstead. However, the fact remains that among them were some who had voted against conscription in the house, who had delivered impassioned speeches and yet gave the help of their eloquence to a candidate who was all out for conscription, a circumstance which will surely compel them to explain to their constituents such a change of front.

The leader of the Bloc Populaire Canadien, in addresses broadcast on the 16th and 23rd October, 1943, has clearly defined the stand of that party as regards family allowances. On page 8 of the provincial programme he made the following statement:

> Where private enterprise remains powerless, the family must resort to cooperation, to that truly democratic formula that is within the reach of, and provides such a boon for, people who, like us, lack abundant capital. Especially since 1930, as was noted by Mr. Beaulieu, the cooperative movement has had in this province an encouraging development. We now have credit cooperative societies—the Desjardins caisses populaires which have been so helpful to us—we have farmers', fishermen's, consumers' and builders' cooperative societies, and so forth.

Then, here is what I find on page 9:

> (a) The great agricultural problem is connected with the settlement of young people. It is a question of helping the heads of large families to ensure their children's future. For that purpose we are now studying the methods of an institution which will ensure to farmers advantages similar to those which workers will derive from family allowances.
>
> (b) Farmer families must be helped to secure the comforts of modern living: electricity, running water, telephone, radio, transportation. We shall help financially the organization of cooperative societies for the supply of electricity, telephone service and water.

The hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Edouard Lacroix) had already implemented, in his constituency, this policy concerning telephone co-

operative societies. In order to prevent certain companies from exploiting the rural population, he supplied capital to the tax payers who organized cooperative societies and even bought some lines outright. Only recently, one of these cooperative societies was in such a financial position as to be able to repay the money borrowed at a small interest and become sole owner of the entire telephone system.

The present government—supposing some of its members read this programme, and some must have done so since the speech from the throne mentions family allowances for the first time—have omitted cooperation from their policy. Indeed, a newspaper reports the following, taken from an article by André Roy and published in *l'Action Catholique* of January 29:

Are they attempting to destroy cooperative societies?

Everyone realizes the efforts of the cooperative societies to improve the economic situation of French Canadians. Among those that have best succeeded in overcoming all the inherent difficulties of a new enterprise stands the Coopérative des Pêcheurs unis de la Gaspésie (Gaspe United Fishermen's Cooperative Society).

Trusts and cartels enviously watch the growth and development of these concerns. They fear that French Canadians will some day throw off the yoke, triumph over adverse circumstances, and rid themselves of the "inferiority complex" which implies that they are not fit to engage in industrial and commercial enterprises. Indeed, they never miss an opportunity to hamper our institutions. The United Fishermen were the latest victim of these powers. The remarkable success achieved by this concern during the past two or three years has not gone by unnoticed; it netted an appreciable benefit for the fishermen of the Gaspe area, and we know the stage of technical perfection to which it has raised the fishing trade and industry in our province. The fisheries trust, however, in league with the wartime prices and trade board, has dealt them another blow: Mr. A. N. McLean, administrator of fish products, has ordered it to sacrifice goods on the simple pretext that the F. T. James Company, of Toronto, and the O'Connor Fish Company, of Montreal, can no longer obtain fillet of cod.

How did they go about it? Very simply: they only had to place the United Fishermen in a different category; they were reclassified from wholesale dealers to "processors"; this forces them to sell their product 10 per cent less, and to sell it to middlemen who will net the 10 per cent profit which belongs to the United Fishermen.

Everything becomes quite clear when it is known that the man who assists Mr. McLean in controlling the price of fish is on the board of directors of a chain company having interests in the fishing industry.

This United Fishermen Cooperative had wrested from the clutches of a trust human beings who had been kept in shameful bondage for almost a century. They were forced to sell their fish for the prices which they could get. Kept in poverty, they had to meet the demands of their masters, lest their boats or their fishing tackle be seized. They were not properly clothed for their hard work, and they were not fed adequately; as a result, tuberculosis was rampant among them.

Charitable men had urged them to unite, and the cooperative had brought a ray of sunshine in their lives; the prices of fish had risen, and they were looking to the future with renewed hope. Now, the trust, ever on the alert, has just turned everything upside down and their cooperative will lose 10 per cent on the selling price to enable the trust to grab this profit.

I ask the government to remedy the situation if they have not already done so. They must certainly have received protests from someone or from certain quarters.

The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Bertrand, Laurier) should put an end to such exploitation by the trust. It is rank injustice and an unbearable situation; these people have suffered enough in the past. Like every citizen, they are entitled to a fair remuneration for their labour.

The mover of the address, the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Tremblay) has expressed his opposition to immigration, and he deserves to be congratulated. I shall go farther than he, however, and I shall add that so long as settlers have to endure hardship on uncleared lots—I do not mean all the settlers—on rocky land, so long as they have not been given the opportunity of securing lots which may be cultivated or old abandoned farms—and there are several—so long as workers in war plants have not obtained employment elsewhere—and there are some who are already out of work—so long as there is a single unemployed person, immigration cannot be considered and refugees, irrespective of their race, cannot be accepted.

I have heard the hon. member for Toronto Trinity (Mr. Roebuck) make an appeal in favour of Jewish refugees, the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Gillis) and finally the hon. member for Cartier (Mr. Rose) take a similar stand. I shall be brief but to the point. Our cities are already overcrowded and their population is out of proportion with that of country areas. Therefore, only farmers could be accepted.

In 1932-33, I believe, Right Hon. R. B. Bennett had an amendment to the Immigration Act passed by this house, under which the government could accept farmers only or, at least, a large proportion of farmers.

There are no farmers among these refugees; if there are, the number is negligible, as it is a well-known fact that Jews are not farmers. This is obvious and true. There are two hundred of them to-day, but there will be two thousand to-morrow.

We have been bled white in order to send gifts to much wealthier nations than we, and as intimated in the speech from the throne we have not reached the end, as evidenced by the following excerpt:

A measure to extend the principle of mutual aid so as to provide for relief, as well as for materials of war, will be submitted for your approval.

The house is being prepared. Nevertheless, it must be borne in mind that Canada is not inexhaustible. The arrival of refugees will not add to her wealth. If other nations—and I do not make any exception—wish to be charitable, let them indulge their whim at their own expense, as we do in respect of the war, but not at the expense of our country.

And if some day we should accept immigrants, we want to select them ourselves and not accept all those who are sent.

But I am inclined to believe that this immigration plan is part of the general policy which includes defence, foreign policy, England's trade policy, and I should now like to discuss the declaration made by Lord Halifax.

In 1937, during the first discussions on increased military appropriations, this imperial defence policy was brought to the attention of the Government.

In order to prove that Lord Hamilton's policy was a policy of imperial defence and not an isolated or colonial policy, I quoted a statement by Sir Samuel Hoare, which was also quoted by *Le Droit* in its issue of February 11, 1937. Sir Samuel Hoare said:

All the costs, all the risks, all the expense entailed by the defence of the empire are at present borne by England, which is a grave injustice, for she must not be alone to arm against the enemy who will be a common enemy to the empire, that is to all the dominions, in the event of war. The dominions should outline their projects for the defence of the empire at the imperial conference. They must help Great Britain, and the sooner they do so the better we shall be protected.

Further, I quoted in the same speech the statement made by the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier when speaking on the Guthrie amendment to bill 21 of the 1912-13 session, page 7232 of the *Hansard:*

(Text)

I now come to a consideration of the fact, made manifest by one of the last speeches of Mr. Churchill, that the admiralty favours contribution and not autonomous organization. This is not a new thing: the British admiralty has always preferred a system of imperial contribution to the idea of autonomous organization. At the imperial conference in 1902, Lord Selborne, the predecessor of Mr. Churchill, made a proposal that we should have imperial contributions.

(Translation): Lord Halifax was rather tactless, he spoke too soon. He should have waited a little while longer, until elections in Canada were at hand, and the government would have used his statements as a rallying cry, the call of the autonomist which taught such a bitter lesson to Lord Byng of Vimy who had made the mistake of expressing his views in peacetime. This same cry we ourselves have uttered so often, believing that all who advocated Canadian autonomy would stand firm when war threatened. It is quite probable that the Government will resume its policy of autonomy, that its partisans will oppose, as they did for twenty-two years, participation and conscription, but only a simpleton will believe that the people can be taken in a second time.

In the past, the Conservative party came to grief for having imposed conscription in 1917; the Liberal party is now beginning to feel the ill effects of the wound, for that party also is tainted; the difference lay in the fact that the Conservatives put it into effect openly while the Liberals proceed by way of small doses at a time. Theirs will be the same punishment.

The C.C.F. made a good start, but it has given ground and fallen in step with the two imperialist parties in the house; all have voted what was needed to pursue a total and extravagant war effort. I say to its members, as to those of the other two parties, that imperialist parties will get no support in the Province of Quebec, whether they are openly imperialists or otherwise.

Indeed, the speech made by Lord Halifax was not of our taste, but it is none the less true that it reflects an imperialist policy which has always been in existence and will not cease to operate. We all recall feelings of indignation evidenced on different occasions when tactless imperialists spoke too soon or too loudly.

England without the Empire could not radiate or preserve her European influence, not to speak of her world prestige. One even wonders if she could survive without the Empire. To think that some hon. members have asserted in this very house that the imperialism is on the way out!

During the post-war period, we can expect various imperialist crises to come to a head. It is unquestionable and inevitable; the facts are there to prove it. The present situation is obvious. Canada cannot run the risk of becoming a new Belgium. Whether we like it or not, our country is part of America.

Can we hope that the men who so strongly advocated autonomy, and even nationalism in time of peace, and yet showed their true imperialistic colours in wartime, can we hope that they will stand firm this time?

How many opposed any resistance? How many maintained the views they had held for so long? Count them and see.

The hon. member for Cartier spoke of slums; that is the best part of his speech. To the building of houses he should have added, however, the destroying of slums so that those infected areas might not be used once again. Because, for countless reasons, such as unemployment and the resultant lack of money, as well as the greater facilities for reaching the work-shops, they will again be filled if they are left standing. They must immediately be levelled down. They have contaminated too many citizens, mothers and children; they deserve to be destroyed.

That is where governments are remiss in their duty, tolerating as they do such a situation in the larger cities. Within every great urban centre which is left to itself, through negligence, ignorance or carelessness, there are inevitably wretched and unruly people as well as radicals. Some one has said—I think it was a Spanish prelate—: "Give a pretext to hotheads and an illusion to the wretched and you shall have a revolution".

Having said that, I shall now discuss socialism.

In the first place, it is recognized and history shows that socialism has never transformed any country into a land of milk and honey. Socialism has risen, in all countries and especially in France,—it did its work underground long before that,—as an aftermath of revolution. Socialism was at that time converging from England, where Karl Marx was living, and from Central Europe, then included within Germany; it has fully blossomed forth in Russia with the Mensheviks and the Bolsheviks, the latter, more radical and daring than the former, have achieved the success which we all know.

They always resort to revolutions in order to usurp power. They have preached everywhere the equality of wealth, of the social classes while raising the latter against one another. Do not believe that these socialist leaders have remained poor. Jaurès was a millionaire when he died. It was he who was going down into the coal mines, with a Bible under his arm, saying to the workers: "We must share our wealth. The rich must share with the poor." This is what prompted a French writer who had followed the evolution of socialism to write: "Once upon a time, there was a socialist who did not own a castle."

Lenin was by no means a poor man, and history tells us of the shady methods he resorted to in order to obtain funds for his propaganda. The socialists of Russia have for leader Stalin, the most crafty politician ever. It cannot be gainsaid that he has had the tact necessary to rouse the Russian people and to mould them into a warlike and well organized nation.

Those who believe that his decree abolishing the communist party in the world frees the nations from the menace of a world revolution must be very credulous indeed: the communist party has a new name, that is all there is to it. The cells have increased their activity due to relaxation of watchfulness on the part of statesmen and democracies. In our country, communism was declared illegal, but it has changed its name. Its old leaders head the Labour-Progressive party, however the name is different. This nefarious joke has lasted altogether too long and we shall fall victims to our credulity before long.

I read a small pamphlet written by the hon. member for Cartier, "La cinquième colonne d'Hitler dans Québec" (Hitler's Fifth Column in Quebec). It has a green cover and is fairly well printed. Some hon. members of this house are mentioned in it. I am not a socialist and, on the other side of this house, I see other members who are not either. It may be that a few historical facts will refresh my hon. friend's (Mr. Rose) memory and prove to him that Hitler's fifth column is not recruited in the league for the defence of Canada nor in the Bloc Populaire Canadien, but elsewhere.

Barthou had, one day, succeeded in negotiating commercial agreements to the advantage of France. He was a Republican. He was assassinated as soon as he set foot on French soil. The man who defeated these treaties to Hitler's profit, a socialist named Bonnet, was convicted of espionage, with his wife, and was accused of this crime by all French writers. He was not a member of the Bloc Populaire Canadien. He was a member of Hitler's fifth column in France.

Enough said. I might be called a grumbler. Now, I come, at the end of my remarks, to the slogan coined by the Prime Minister, to the anathema uttered against the Bloc Populaire Canadien: the bloc, that is the enemy! It must be defeated in Quebec, or the party is lost. Not that way, though, not by stating that the Bloc Populaire is appealing to race prejudice. That was not swallowed in Stanstead, neither will be swallowed elsewhere in Quebec or in the other provinces where we shall have a certain number of candidates in the next federal election. In Stanstead—and

this was stated by the Prime Minister himself at the Liberal convention last summer—we were accused of appealing to race prejudice and expounding a destructive policy. Some members showed more cleverness and they delivered finer speeches. I notice some of them on the other side of the house and I offer them my congratulations.

How can it be said, Mr. Speaker, that the bloc populaire appeals to race prejudice, when 38 per cent of the English-speaking population joined the conscriptionist candidate Davidson against our people. They did not make their bid openly and frankly as we did ourselves, but they did it just the same. Because we asked the French Canadians to give their support to the genial member for Standstead (Mr. Choquette) we are accused of appealing to race prejudice. Did the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. Wilfrid LaCroix) appeal to race prejudice when he requested the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Gibson) to appoint a French-speaking official in the overwhelming French Canadian city of Montreal? I suppose that was an appeal to race prejudice. We are not permitted to ask our fellow-citizens of French descent to join forces, but other nationalities are permitted to do so.

When Paul Massé advocated in the constituency of Cartier the union of French Canadians who form 55 per cent of the population, not according to the spurious lists prepared by the Liberal enumerator, but according to a true census of the population, was he appealing to race prejudice? For twenty-five years the constituency of Cartier has been represented by a Jewish member, Conservative, Union Nationale, or Liberal. The majority in that constituency is not Jewish but French Canadian, why, then, should it be a crime and an appeal to race prejudice to ask for the election of a French Canadian? Was Lazarus Phillips more entitled than we were to ask his fellow Jews in the *Jewish Eagle,* to unite and vote for a Jew because otherwise twenty-five years would elapse before the constituency of Cartier could be won back? They have the right to ask their people to unite, but we, French Canadians, have no such right; we appeal to race prejudice, we hinder Canadian unity. The former leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) has said a few moments ago that the leader of the Bloc Populaire had not a very good memory. He has told us about Dunkirk where the British army fought so successfully to cover the evacuation and added that we French Canadians should thank England for having stopped Hitler's march at that time. Have we blamed England for protecting that evacuation? No.

[Mr. Gauthier.]

But reverting to a subject dealt with by the former leader of the opposition, I would say that, had not the French Canadians been here, in 1775 and 1812, to hold the country for the British crown he would not have been in this house to make his utterances, this afternoon.

We do not forget easily, our memory is good, faithful and well exercised. We are little impressed by the anathema uttered against us. We have a programme, we intend to realize the union of French Canadians; we shall seek this end; we have the right to do so and whenever we have the opportunity to do so and we shall continue to work with that object in view. This is clear, very clear indeed. Attempts are made to spread all kinds of rumours on the Bloc Populaire. Some say that we are secessionists, that we aim to ostracize all races in Quebec first, and later in Canada as a whole and then to hound everybody out of Quebec and Canada. This is nothing but political intrigue of the first water and we are used to it. But, I repeat, we shall go ahead in spite of all. There will be other elections in which we shall have candidates who will fight for unity among our fellow-citizens even if we are accused of appealing to race prejudice, every time we demand that the rights and privileges justly belonging to us on account of our numbers and our ethnical importance, be respected. Such accusations leave us unimpressed; that is our right and we intend to use it.

Mr. W. F. KUHL (Jasper-Edson): Mr. Speaker, the speech from the throne indicates certain objectives which the government intends to pursue both for the present and for the future. As to the statement contained in that speech, that the winning of the war clearly remains the first of all objectives, there can be no difference of opinion. So far as the armed forces are concerned and the war machinery which has been set up, we are satisfied that the war will be brought to a successful conclusion. We can rely, as we have relied in the past, on all members of the armed forces to acquit themselves nobly. In regard to the war machinery at home, it is true that there are still many squeaks in it, some of them louder than others; nevertheless we are fairly well satisfied that it will carry us through successfully. So that the question which concerns not only the members of the armed forces but also those still at home is whether, when this awful tragedy has been concluded, parliament will have made provision for a way of life in this country which will be worthy of a nation of heroes.

I believe it was the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) who said on one occasion that if no preparation was made for the new

order before peace came, we should look in vain for that new order. That being so, it is the primary duty of those of us charged with the responsibility of making the laws of the nation to see that adequate preparations are made for the peace when it comes. This leads me, then, to a consideration of some of the objectives for the time of peace, as indicated in the speech from the throne.

If there was any one problem which more than another caused headaches and heartaches between this war and the last one, it was the employment and unemployment situation, and all matters relating thereto. The speech from the throne makes several references to the attitude of the government on the question of employment in the post-war era. I shall point to a few of these statements, one of which is as follows:

> The maintenance of full employment will require, in the period of transition from war to peace, a rapid and efficient conversion of war industries.

Another paragraph which refers to the three broad fields of post-war planning contains this expression—

> —the reconversion of the economic life of the nation from a war-time to a peace-time basis, and its reconstruction in a manner which will provide opportunities for useful employment for all who are willing and able to work.

Still another reference is made to employment, when the matter of world trade is dealt with. The reference is worded thus:

> During the period of transition, the provision of international relief will help to maintain full employment of Canadian man-power and resources.

In another paragraph, which refers to social security measures, we find this statement:

> Such a national minimum contemplates useful employment for all who are willing to work.

These numerous references to the question of employment indicate the importance attached to the subject. Consequently I feel impelled to express a few views on matters relating to employment, particularly the objectives which the government and others have in mind.

These extracts from the speech from the throne, statements which have been made by almost all hon. members thus far, and many speeches made outside the house, indicate that one of the outstanding and most important objectives in the post-war world is what is called full employment. I cannot agree or disagree with those who indicate that full employment should be our objective, until I understand what those who enunciate such an objective have in mind. I should like to know what they believed would constitute full employment. What has the government in mind when it uses the term "full employment"? What has the Progressive Conservative party in mind when its spokesman refers to full employment as an objective in the post-war world? What has anyone either in or outside the house in mind when he refers to full employment as an objective? Does he mean that all people from sixteen to sixty must put in eight, ten, twelve, fourteen or sixteen hours a day before they are entitled to live? Do they mean by full employment that it is not possible for the people in Canada in the post-war world to enjoy the standard of living they desire unless they put in eight or ten or more hours of work a day? Or do they mean that the amount of work which all people, everywhere, will be obliged to do will be only that which the power machines are unable to do?

Before hon. members in the house, or any group of individuals charged with the responsibility of formulating policy, can make any progress in respect of this subject connected with employment in the post-war world, we must have a clear definition of our terms. One great thinker has said that all intelligent discussion begins with a definition of terms. I have yet to hear any individual, either on the government side or on the opposition benches, indicate what he understands by full employment. In my view it is imperative that those who advocate full employment as an objective indicate what they have in mind.

Even before defining the term to which I have referred, I think there is another matter we must settle in our minds and must first determine, namely, the purpose of an economic system. Why do we have an economic system? What is an economic system for? Judging from most speeches I hear both in and out of the house, the complete purpose of an economic system is to keep people at work, to keep their noses to the grindstone. As one who subscribes to what I believe is a new philosophy, I wish to dissent completely from that point of view. I have a different attitude in respect of work. I assert that the purpose of an economic system never was, is not now and never will be that of providing jobs. My contention is that the only sound, sane, sensible, logical and legitimate purpose of an economic system is to provide the maximum amount of goods and services for the minimum amount of work and trouble. I consider that a major premise upon which to base proposals for the post-war period, and I challenge anyone, either in the house or out of it, to refute the soundness of that premise.

I wish now to consider for a few moments what constitutes full employment. What

should determine the number of hours of work any worker in industry, any farmer, any office worker, or any worker anywhere should be obliged to perform? I would say the number of hours of work are entirely dependent upon the standard of living which the people of Canada collectively desire, and the extent to which power machinery displaces human effort. I believe most hon. members, as well as many economists and others who speak as economists outside the house, have not reconciled themselves to the fact that we are living in 1944 A.D., and not 1944 B.C. My criticism of many orthodox economists and the people who hold an orthodox point of view is that most of them were born a hundred years too late. They should have been born back in the eighteenth century. In spite of the facts which stare almost every one of them in the face every day of his life, many fail to recognize that the discovery of electricity, steam power, the diesel engine, radio, electronics and many other things, has increased man's productive capacity by about forty to fifty times what it was a century or more ago. This being so, it should follow that our standard of living to-day—I mean in the post-war period—should be forty to fifty times greater than it was a century ago. Or, on the other hand, if a man does not desire a standard of living any higher than what it was a hundred years ago, he should be required to put forth forty to fifty times less effort in order to enjoy such a standard of living.

This war, as did the last war, has precipitated a technological displacement of human labour much more than would have occurred in a time of peace. I believe we shall all have to reconcile ourselves to the fact that because of this technological displacement of labour we should be able to look forward in the post-war world to a work day much smaller than eight hours. All persons capable of working probably could be kept employed in the post-war period for quite a number of years. We have extensive public work programmes to carry out, but surely we are not going to complete the public works programmes for the next three, four or five generations. Surely we are going to leave something for them to do.

We need public works projects, irrigation schemes and many other things, but in considering these in the light of employment we should decide to build roads for the sake of roads and not for the sake of the jobs which will result. We ought to build roads because we want roads. We ought to provide more irrigation because we want irrigation and the resulting produce from the lands which will be irrigated.

[Mr. Kuhl.]

If in the post-war world all our farmers and workers of every kind are permitted to enjoy the fruits of the machinery available, in leisure as well as in the form of commodities, I believe that the hours of work will be reduced to six, five or even four per day. If the farmer is able to obtain the prices for his commodities which will permit him to buy all the farm machinery, tractors, power, electricity and so on that he needs, the same circumstances will apply to him. We must recognize, as I believe very few in Canada recognize, that the power machine has come not only to remove the drudgery of our everyday tasks but to provide us with more hours of leisure and fewer hours of work. I believe that is the state of things which everyone in this chamber desires to see brought about. I believe that is a set of economic circumstances which everyone desires to see created.

If the truth were known I think it could be said of every one of us that we are constantly trying to get out of all the work humanly possible in order that we may have more leisure. Leisure is not a loafer's paradise; it is an opportunity for self-imposed and self-initiated activity. When people are freed from the necessity of having to spend most of their time in order to keep body and soul together, they indulge in voluntary activities. In most instances they will expend more energy in those voluntary activities than they do in their hours of work. It is not work that anyone objects to so much; it is being compelled to work, whether that compulsion is by the government or by nature. No one wishes to be compelled to do anything. What the people want and desire is to choose their own activities.

When a government, whether it be this government or any other, seeks to compel the people of the nation to work, whether it be on public works or on work of other kinds, then that government is imposing a condition of slavery upon the people. That is the condition we had before war broke out. In many instances roads were being built with picks and shovels and wheel-barrows while the machinery capable of doing the work was rusting. I consider that a condition of slavery. To arrange our national economy so that the people may choose their own forms of activities and put themselves to work is a different situation.

I believe that the extent to which the people of Canada will be free after this war is over will be the extent to which they are freed from compulsory work, whether that is imposed by a government or by natural circumstances. The work state is nothing less

than a slave state. From my conversations with members of the armed forces as well as with other people it is my belief that what they desire most of all when they return—those who will be fortunate enough to return—after this awful calamity is brought to a conclusion is the greatest possible freedom from compulsory labour, and the greatest possible opportunity to indulge in voluntary activities. One reason we are fighting this war is to drive from the earth the philosophy of compulsion of any kind. If our heroes come back to a work state, then much of the sacrifice they have made during the war will have been in vain. Man was made in the image of his creator, and as such he has been blessed with creative instincts. Man will never really be free until he has had the greatest possible opportunity to express those God-given instincts. The power of the machine and all the accumulations of inventive science have made it possible for man to-day to have a greater opportunity for self-chosen activity than ever before in the history of the world.

The real question, as I see it, in connection with employment or unemployment is not so much the question of employment as it is the question of empayment. Naturally, when one talks about a six-hour day, a five-hour day or a four-hour day, the worker's reaction is: Well, if the number of hours of work is cut down to that extent, what is going to happen to my income? If the number of man-hours necessary to produce the standard of living which the average Canadian desires is reduced to six or five or four, what will be the consequence so far as the income of the individual worker is concerned? Will it be cut accordingly? That is a question which naturally arises in the mind of any worker. What happens when a machine is placed in a factory and displaces one hundred or five hundred or one thousand men is that not only does the man's job disappear but his pay cheque too. Private enterprise has been condemned for this. There are those who say that private enterprise failed before the war broke out because it did not provide jobs. There are those who are saying now that if, after the war, private enterprise does not provide jobs it must be eliminated.

I wish to say with respect to private enterprise that I do not consider it the duty or obligation of private enterprise anywhere to provide jobs. That never was the duty or responsibility of private enterprise. The only legitimate function of private enterprise is to provide goods; that is all. I say to those who are so speaking on behalf of private enterprise that they assume that the provision of employment is an obligation of private enterprise. They are assuming a situation which is simply impossible, and furthermore it is undesirable; for, after all, the only legitimate and sound function of the economic system is to provide goods, whether that requires jobs or not. If we can produce most of our essentials of life and the common luxuries as well through the use of a lot of mechanical robots, then I think we should do it.

There is a lot of criticism being made of private enterprise to-day. I do not believe that the thing which is at fault is the principle of private enterprise. The only thing which I can see wrong with private enterprise is the abuse of that privilege, as well as the deficiencies which are inherent in the system, and which are nobody's fault, but which must be corrected.

The low wages to which the hon. member for Cartier (Mr. Rose) referred when he spoke last night of the Dominion Textile company paying twenty-two cents an hour, is an abuse of the privilege of private enterprise. It is not because of the use of the principle. Likewise improper working conditions, abuses of one kind or another which are resorted to, monopolies and so forth—all these are abuses of the system, and the criticism which I make of our friends, the socialists, and those who criticize private enterprise is that they are constantly confusing the use of the system with the abuse of the system. I believe it was last session that the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Douglas) on one occasion spent almost the whole of his forty minutes in making a speech in attributing all the evils of society to private enterprise. I do not consider that that is fair or just, for after all, if the truth were known, I believe that every last individual in this country, whether he calls himself a socialist, a communist or anything else, really believes in private enterprise for himself. If the abuses of the private enterprise system are corrected and its deficiencies taken care of, I believe that it is the best system that we can ever have. When the socialists and those who advocate government ownership contend that the way to deal with the abuses of the private enterprise system is for the nation to take it over, I say that is equivalent to saying that we ought to abolish freedom for fear of its being abused. My personal belief is that it is only under a system of genuine private enterprise that we can ever have genuine freedom. Substituting state monopoly for private monopoly is no remedy for the abuses, because one monopoly is just as bad as another.

Just a word with regard to the deficiencies inherent in the private enterprise system. This brings me to a point which we Social Credit people have made ever since we have been in the House of Commons. It is the original premise upon which Major Douglas based his proposals. It is a point which we contend is still true and will be still more so when the war is over. It lies at the basis of the deficiency of purchasing power which exists all the way through our system. The one fact in industry to which most economists and members of this house as well have to reconcile themselves is that industry is not self-liquidating. There has never been as much distributed in wages and salaries and in payment for raw materials in the process of the production of any article to equal the prices of the commodities which are offered for sale. I believe that the majority of the people of this country who think and speak upon economics still assume that when a thousand dollars worth of any commodity is produced, automatically there is one thousand dollars worth of purchasing power with which to purchase the commodity. They assume that when a shoe manufacturer produces ten thousand dollars worth of shoes, automatically there are ten thousand dollars worth of purchasing power in the system to buy those shoes. It is assumed by most economists that the ability to consume is always equal to production. That, I consider, is one of the major fallacies of economic thinkers. Major Douglas was one of the first to point this out, in saying that there is inherent in the system a chronic shortage of purchasing power which is never overcome.

I have here one statement which members of our group have placed on record before. I do not like to repeat facts and figures, but this is so fundamental that I think it must be repeated until it is acknowledged. The national bureau of economic research reports on the income of the United States—No. 2, pages 242 to 248—state that American industry in 1918—this is quite a way back, but we have no more recent figures, and the principle was just as true before the war as it will be after the war—paid out $45,548,000,000 in wages, salaries, dividends, bonuses, pensions, compensations, and all consumer purchasing power, and at the same time consumer goods were produced of the value of $60,366,000,000. In other words, there is a difference of practically twenty billion dollars between total income and total prices. Of that forty-five billions, about five and one-half billion dollars was reinvested in new production, so that cannot be considered as purchasing power in that cycle, and as a consequence the deficiency of purchasing power that existed at that time in the United States of America was approximately twenty billion dollars. That is not money which was in someone's savings somewhere; it was nothing other than the prices of commodities which were not monetized. It was not represented by money anywhere. The only way in which the people of the United States were enabled to make up that twenty billion dollars was through issuance of debt money on the part of the American government for public works, bonuses, pensions and so on. The cost of that was the increase of the national debt.

The point I wish to make is that in so far as Canada is concerned in the post-war period we shall have a very similar condition here, since it applies to all countries which operate on the private enterprise system. In that connection I wish to emphasize that the people who have the first claim on the production of any country are the people of that country. The only way in which the people of the United States could avail themselves of the sixty billion dollars worth of goods was to have sixty billion dollars in purchasing power, but they had only forty billions. Supporters of social credit say that this twenty billion dollar difference represents the cultural heritage of the people of the nation; it is that which belongs to them by reason of being citizens in this modern generation. The difference between total income and prices is there by reason of the substitution of power machinery for human effort. The wages of men were displaced by machines, but the prices of the goods continue piling up, and therefore the difference between total income and total prices is something which belongs inherently to the people as a whole, and they cannot acquire it until it is monetized. It is the duty of the state to monetize the difference between total income and total prices and distribute it to the consumers.

I do not think it requires much stretch of the imagination to see Canada, after the war has concluded, producing annually about twelve billion dollars worth of consumable goods. If we compare that production with the deficiency which existed in the United States, according to the figure I have just given, that would mean that Canadians would be short of about four to six billion dollars in purchasing power. If the Canadian economy is to be balanced, the consumers in Canada must have four to six billion dollars of extra buying power, which should not be issued either through increased taxation or increased borrowings. I notice that the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) on the

occasion that he spoke indicated that there should be five billion dollars spent in Canada, I believe for public works.

Mr. COLDWELL: Post-war reconstruction.

Mr. KUHL: Post-war reconstruction. I noticed that he did not indicate where this money was to come from, whether it will be borrowed or raised by taxation or issued by the central bank of Canada debt-free. I wish to indicate that the only manner in which the Canadian economy can be balanced will be through the issue of five or six billion dollars, whatever is required to balance consumption and production, as a debt-free, tax-free issue of national money.

Mr. COLDWELL: Through a government-owned bank.

Mr. KUHL: Well, we have a government-owned bank at the present time.

Mr. COLDWELL: But not a government-owned banking system.

Mr. KUHL: Well, that raises the matter of chartered banks, which I have not time to discuss at the present time, much as I should like to do so. The essence of the whole thing is that there must be an addition of buying power to the extent of four to six billion dollars to balance our economy.

Mr. GRAYDON: Never mind the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. They just want a political bank.

Mr. KUHL: Well, we shall discuss that matter when the subject of banking is under discussion.

I should like to have concluded with a little elaboration of the ways and means whereby this four to six billion dollars could be expended in Canada, but my time is up, and I shall have an opportunity to deal with the subject at a later day. It is the principle of the thing about which I think we must be concerned. When that is done, it is my contention that our economy will balance without expropriating anybody's property. Personally I want to see a system in which the people have the greatest possible freedom, and I do not think that is possible unless private enterprise is permitted really to be private enterprise.

On motion of Mr. Bryce the debate was adjourned.

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

Thursday, February 3, 1944

The house met at three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

DEPUTY SERGEANT-AT-ARMS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That the report of the civil service commission respecting the appointment of Mr. John Laundy, as Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, laid on the table of the house on Thursday, January 27, 1944, be now approved.

Motion agreed to.

PARLIAMENTARY REPORTER (FRENCH)

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That the recommendation of the Honourable the Speaker with respect to the resignation of Hector Benoit, Esquire, Parliamentary Reporter, French, House of Commons, laid on the table of the house on Monday, January 31, 1944, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVILEGE—Mr. LACOMBE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. LIGUORI LACOMBE (Laval-Two-Mountains): (Translation) Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. *L'Action Catholique*, of Quebec, in its issue of February 2, 1944, makes the following statement:

Mr. Lacombe's Surprising Remarks

The member of parliament complained of the fact that the liquor commissions cheat the public by selling watered liquor.

That newspaper's correspondent does not select from *Hansard* even one sentence of the speech I made in the house on February 1. In short he distorts my words. By using such a procedure, which is disloyal, to put it mildly, he also distorts the meaning of my remarks. Therefore, I ask that the correspondent publish a textual report of my speech and of this sentence in particular, which is found in the House of Commons debates, on page 91:

It was not worth while imposing rationing when one knows that families which did not purchase ten ounces of alcohol a year have obtained their ration books, and now buy all the quantity authorized by the regulations. Can this be called healthy social legislation?

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INQUIRY AS TO DISCUSSIONS BETWEEN OFFICIALS OF CANADA AND OTHER COUNTRIES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (Parkdale): Press reports would appear to indicate that Mr. Norman Robertson, Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs, has recently been in Washington discussing current matters with

United States authorities. Will the Prime Minister indicate to the house the nature and extent of these discussions, and also whether or not similar discussions are taking place between Canada and the United Kingdom and other parts of the British commonwealth?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I would say to my hon. friend that officials of the government of Canada and the government of the United States frequently exchange visits and discuss matters of general interest, among them some of the questions which will come up in relation to post-war policy. A few months ago I tabled in the house an exchange of notes between the United States and Canada with regard to an agreed point of view which the two countries entertain as to the trend of developments in the post-war period. There have been informal discussions between officials from time to time in relation to these matters.

I might say in answer to the second part of my hon. friend's question that similar exploratory discussions or talks have taken place between officials of the Canadian government and of the British government. They are part of a general plan of seeking to ascertain in advance of the moment when it comes to settle them, how far different governments may be in agreement on some of the all-important matters connected with post-war settlement.

WHEAT

AMENDMENT OF REGULATIONS RESPECTING DELIVERY QUOTAS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. E. PERLEY (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Trade and Commerce based on a report appearing in the Winnipeg *Tribune* of recent date, to the effect that the wheat delivery quota, which at present stands at fourteen bushels to the acre, is likely to be increased to a maximum of twenty bushels in that section of western Canada. This would be a great help to the farm storage situation. Will the minister tell the house if that procedure is likely to take place?

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended making this statement to-day—it was my intention, rather, to make it to-morrow; nor had I any knowledge of the hon. member's intention to ask the question. Since it has been asked, however, I believe I can make a statement now.

The Canadian wheat board regulations are being amended to permit the delivery of eighteen bushels of wheat per authorized acre during the present crop year. This will represent an increase of four bushels over the fourteen bushel limit in effect to date, but will not become effective until established in the regular way by Canadian wheat board instruction.

The raising of quotas at country points already at the fourteen bushel limit will be deferred until the wheat board has been able to raise all country points to at least a ten-bushel quota, and steps have been taken to supply cars to the points which have been below that level. Before the end of the crop year it is intended to raise all stations to the eighteen-bushel quota, as a result of the heavier export movement than was envisaged a year ago when the 1943-44 delivery policy was first announced.

POSTAL SERVICE

AIR MAIL TO TROOPS IN THE MEDITERRANEAN AREA

On the orders of the day:

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Postmaster General. In view of an announcement made by him a few weeks ago that direct aeroplane service had been established to carry mail to our troops serving in the Mediterranean area will the minister say whether letters bearing surface mail stamps are carried both ways by this service?

Hon. W. P. MULOCK (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, as to the first part of the hon. member's question, in which he intimates that I made a statement a few weeks ago, I may say that he is in error; I did not make a statement. In fact I gave instructions to the officials of the department not to make any statement, or to hand any statement to the press, because I did not wish one made by the Post Office Department until such time as a regularly established service was in operation.

In regard to the second part of the hon. member's question, my reply would be that when the service is in full effect, and established, airgraph and armed forces air letters will be carried first; secondly, surface mail on which are affixed air stamps and, thirdly—if there is additional space—we will carry as large an amount as possible of the surface mail.

In regard to mail coming from our troops I would point out there is no charge on such mail, if posted in an army post office. I believe I have covered all the points about which the hon. member asked.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I ask the Postmaster General a supplementary question? Is there any possibility of improving the mail service from overseas in the near future? From

my own experience I know that letters bearing air mail stamps sometimes require a month for delivery, and arrive at the same time as letters posted at the same points with ordinary surface mail stamps on them.

Mr. MULOCK: My reply to the hon. member would be that of course it is a matter of securing the necessary space in aircraft coming in this direction. The situation is improving. Naturally the Post Office Department has to rely on such aeroplane service as it can arrange for. For instance, there is an arrangement with Trans-Canada Air Lines, and the facilities are being increased. That of course is a matter for the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe). Then, additional arrangements are being made with the Royal Canadian Air Force, which of course comes under the supervision of the Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Power). I can assure the hon. member, however, that the Post Office Department through its officials is doing everything possible to obtain all the space it can get. As the hon. member will understand, there is difficulty in obtaining aircraft of the size and cruising range necessary for the carrying of mail across the Atlantic.

Mr. COLDWELL: The point is that the men overseas are paying sixpence for the sending of air mail which apparently is coming by ordinary surface mail service.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

BUTTER

QUESTION OF SUPPLY TO BRITAIN THROUGH EXPORT FROM CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, in view of Britain's anxiety to maintain and perhaps increase her small ration of two ounces of butter per week, I should like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if he has received any request from Britain to increase our exports of butter. If so, will he state what steps he has taken to bring this about?

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Very early in the war Great Britain placed a ration of two ounces per week upon butter. About the time that was being done she entered into an arrangement with different countries to supply different dairy products. The intimation to us was that we should put forth every effort to supply all possible quantities of cheese. We have been doing that since the beginning of the war, and our supplying any butter has been only a matter of accident. It has not happened intentionally on our part.

Last year we shipped the first butter which had been shipped from this country to Great Britain since the beginning of the war. In that year we shipped about 7,000,000 pounds. But the shipment was not made as a result of any intention on our part, or any desire expressed previously by the British government. Our present position is that Great Britain desires all the cheese she can get from Canada, and has expressed no desire that we should take any milk from cheese production in order to produce a supply of butter for her. Our present intention is to follow her wishes in that regard, and to produce as much cheese as possible.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Wednesday, February 2, consideration of the motion of Mr. L. D. Tremblay for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Graydon, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. WILLIAM BRYCE (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, rising to speak for the first time in the house I should like to take this opportunity of extending my thanks to hon. members on each side of the house who have been so courteous, and have shown me so many kindnesses.

I come from the constituency of Selkirk, one of the largest in Canada, and represent the many classes of people there. In that constituency, adjacent to Winnipeg, we find industrial workers, office workers, and people in the professional classes. Then, going a little farther north, we have market gardeners and dairy farmers; and still farther north we come to those great inland lakes, with their fishermen. In the inter-lake country a large number of men are engaged in mixed farming, and also there are extensive Indian reserves. Our industrial workers are dissatisfied with labour conditions. They hope that in the near future the government will establish a code that will be satisfactory to the working classes.

For a moment I should like to deal with our market gardeners and dairy farmers. Prior to the war these farmers were forced to exploit their own families to the greatest extent; their wives and sons and daughters were forced to work for nothing in order to produce the necessities of life. Some of these boys have volunteered, and some have been called up. I appeal to the government to make every possible arrangement at seeding time so that these boys may be allowed to come back to carry on the necessary farm work. No doubt

national selective service has done what it can, but ten men of the type that national selective service will send to these dairy farmers and market gardeners will not take the place of one man who is skilled in these occupations.

When prices are being discussed I should like the government to take into consideration the livelihood of our fishermen who fish from a boat in the summer and through the ice in the winter time. They face all kinds of hardship, and they represent another class, along with our farmers, which has been victimized to the utmost through low prices.

I should like to touch upon some of the injustices which our mixed farmers have been up against. Take wool, for instance. In 1942 the dominion government called a conference at which all nine provinces were represented, and explained what they were up against in connection with wool. They stated that they needed another 8,000,000 pounds of wool. To get that amount of wool would mean clipping another million sheep. With representatives of different farm organizations I went through my province and pleaded with the farmers to produce the increased supply of wool necessary to provide our boys with uniforms. It was most unfortunate that the federal Department of Agriculture made an agreement with the provincial governments and then left it to the discretion of the provinces whether or not they would live up to that agreement. I appeal to the government to make right that wrong.

A bonus on wool has been paid in Ontario and in Saskatchewan, our sister provinces, but Manitoba sheep men have not received any bonus because that province does not think she should subsidize the production of wool or anything else. This decision reacted not only on the production of wool but also on the production of lambs. We kept back lambs which we could have sold for twelve to fifteen cents a pound. When they were yearlings and we had a clip of wool we could get only five cents a pound for them on the Winnipeg market. To make the best of a bad bargain we disposed of the ewes and kept the yearlings, and we had to take seventy cents a sheep on the Winnipeg market. Mutton sold under the same ceiling as it did when the packing companies were paying four or five cents a pound for ewes. That is one injustice the farmer of Manitoba has had to suffer, and I should like the government to correct it.

A floor under prices is mentioned in the speech from the throne. I view with suspicion the establishment of a floor unless it is based on the cost of production. A floor has been placed under the price of butter; that product requires a subsidy of ten cents in order to make it profitable for the farmer to produce. We have a floor and a ceiling in connection with beef, but there is no ceiling on live cattle. The farmer does not sell beef; he sells live cattle, and that is where the ceiling and the floor should be.

To-day on the Winnipeg market 11¾ cent steers go into 19¼ cent beef. If you send in a carload of two-way cattle, which are not only fit to go into the feed lots—something that the Ontario feeder wants—but are fit to kill, what happens? If the Ontario feeder wants to feed those cattle he bids 9¾ cents, because he requires a spread. The processor or packer comes along and bids 10 cents, and the highest bidder gets them. The result is that the farmer loses from $25 to $27 on each one of those animals. You would expect 10 cent cattle to go into 17½ cent beef, but they do not. Those cattle go into commercial grades; they become 19¼ cent beef and, as I say, the farmer loses from $25 to $27 on each animal in the carload. The packer benefits and is able to earn excess profits. These things will have to be stopped.

Next I should like to refer to hogs. I have always been against the compulsory rail grading of hogs. When the government gave us compulsory rail grading, the same system that they had in Denmark, it looked good, but we got only half the system. We were not given the benefits of the cooperative abattoirs whereby the deductions and cuts, et cetera, would come back to the man who produced the bacon. I am against the compulsory rail grading of hogs unless the farmer is able to control the sales of his bacon. He might be better off if the government set the price of the grades, but now the packer does this.

The dominion government has brought in new rail grading regulations. They are not yet in operation at Winnipeg, but they will be in a few days. It is the 186-pound hog that is causing so much dissatisfaction among the farmers. That weight of hog is just between the select and heavy grades, being just over 185 pounds, and this difference represents a loss of $3.50. The farmer is apt to lose $3.50 over one pound of bacon. If the farmer had had the good fortune to have his hog weighed the next day it would have shrunk a pound, because there is that much difference between hot weight and cold weight. When one is standing on the floor of a room and wishes to reach a higher point he asks for a step-ladder, and by this means he can get up and down, step by step. That is what the farmer is asking for to-day, a step-ladder, a graduated scale. It is not fair that the farmer should lose $3.50 because his hog is one pound over

the weight. I know that there has to be a jumping off point somewhere, but why make the farmer jump over a precipice? Let us do the thing more gradually.

The grading of these hogs is not satisfactory. The hog is graded on its way from the producer to the packing company. That is the grade set by the government. Then the hog is graded from the processor to the bacon board, and again from the bacon board to the British food ministry. There are eight grades under the new regulations, and five of them are for the bacon hog from which you get export bacon. Between the processor and the bacon board there are twelve grades; there are four sizes and there are grades A-1, A-2, and A-3 in each of those sizes. From the bacon board to the British food ministry there are two grades, A and B. The thing seems screwy to me. Why does not the first grading carry right through? I think that is what should be done; if the grading is good enough for the farmer, that grade should apply right through. Look up and see how many select A's the farmer gets. In October, ninety-two per cent of A's went to Britain. I hope that the government will do something this session to rectify the situation for the benefit of the farmer who is producing a heavy hog, because in every litter there is a heavy hog.

Some hon. members may ask me, how are you going to rectify the present situation? I would rectify it by establishing a board of live stock commissioners, with producer representation—and by producer I do not mean the man who spends his holidays on a farm; I mean the man who is a bona fide live stock producer, and he should be chosen by the people who produce the goods.

I know that the next objection raised will be, where is the money coming from? I am going to tell you where the money can come from, too. In 1906 the packing industry in this country was granted power to collect half of one per cent as T.B. condemnation insurance on every animal they bought. Since that time the government has been very active in establishing T.B. free areas all over this country. Our cooperative organizations which carry their own T.B. condemnation insurance to-day are carrying it for less than one-quarter of one per cent. If you allow the packers to retain one-quarter of one per cent, with the other quarter of one per cent you could establish a board of live stock commissioners to administer this board.

I wish to draw the attention of the government to the deplorable conditions among the destitute Indians in the northern part of my constituency. I visited that district some time ago, and I found terrible conditions in the hospital at Norway House. It is a sixteen-bed hospital, and I found there forty-three patients, in the corridors and everywhere else. The Indian band there comprises approximately one thousand people. There will be many fewer now because they were dying like flies from tuberculosis while I was there. Nine had died in the seven weeks previous to my visit, and they were between two and sixteen years of age. Those destitute Indians receive every fifteen days ten pounds of flour, two pounds of bacon of the sow belly type, two ounces of tea and one bar of soap. I found one man who was totally blind receiving that allowance. This is a deplorable state of affairs, and I urge the government to correct it.

These, Mr. Speaker, are a few of the conditions which mark the failure of our economy. There must be a planned agriculture in a planned cooperative economy. Then the fruits of the labours of all the farmers will be returned to the farmers, and not to a few industrialists as excessive profits.

Mr. THOMAS REID (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, the speech from the throne delivered a few days ago contained some of the most pronounced advances in social legislation measures that have been proposed by any government in Canada. It was interesting to hear the different reactions from the various opposition groups, after they had recovered their breath. Some chided the government for stealing its measures from their platform of rights. Others stated that the government's proposed social legislation was due to the activities of their own particular group. On the other hand, these measures have been referred to as the beginning of a new era. In this connection I wish to quote from a speech from our own Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) in London, England, on September 4, 1941, in which he said:

> Much is being said about a new world order to take the place of the old world order when the war is at an end. If that new order is not already on its way before the war is over, we may look for it in vain.

That was said, Mr. Speaker, in 1941, before some of the parties in this house got the idea that perhaps they might next be called upon to assume the reins of government.

As was to be expected, the speech from the throne dealt first of all with the war effort and the favourable position in which the allies find themselves to-day. The timely warning that the war is not yet at an end was justified, and I believe was made at the proper time. We have this sobering fact before us, that this year will be the last year on earth for many of Canada's splendid citizens; it is a sobering thought indeed.

The government's foreign policy, that its first objective is to continue with the principle announced in 1939, namely, the winning of the war, will be commended by all citizens of Canada.

Regarding the recent speech which was made by Lord Halifax, and which has excited considerable comment and criticism, the reply of the Prime Minister has been very well received, and, what is more significant, it has been well received in Great Britain. To my mind the remarks were premature. It is premature, especially, when one views the state of affairs in the world, for us to make any definite commitments regarding our foreign policy. One remark I would make, however, in passing, is that it is high time that the people of Great Britain knew as much of Canada and of the Canadian people as we know about the people of Great Britain. It might help to a better understanding if Canada's position and its people were more generally understood in that country. We must face facts to-day; we are not dealing with idealism. True it is that in holy writ it is prophesied that there will come a time when the nations shall beat their war weapons into agricultural implements; but as I look upon the world I recognize that I for one shall not live long enough to see that day; to my mind it is still a long way off. Therefore we must look at the world as it is to-day and so face the actual realities. Nations are not considered strong simply because they have great numbers of people within their borders; they are considered strong through the strength of their military equipment. As an illustration I cite the great country of China. In 1935 the nations of the world were pitying poor China because she had been attacked and ravaged by Japan, although China has between four and five hundred million people. To-day she is regarded as one of the great powers which will help to decide the peace following the conclusion of hostilities.

I think we are all agreed now that Russia will have quite a say in settling the affairs of Europe. I take some exception to the suggestion made the other day by Lord Robert Cecil that British judges should sit upon tribunals to prevent injustices to the Germans. My own opinion in that regard is that such a suggestion is both premature and mischievous—premature, because the winning of the war should be our first consideration; mischievous, because one could interpret it as being aimed directly at some of the powers in Europe that might want justice following the conclusion of hostilities. No wonder that Lord Vansittart, who by the way had quite a lengthy experience as Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, in his book "The Promise", makes the statement that there is little doubt that the English have been idiots in their handling of foreigners. Whilst I would not care to go as far as that, Mr. Speaker, I would say this, however, that the handling of foreigners by the British people and by the people of this country has often been interpreted by many foreigners in this land and in Great Britain as a sign of weakness on our part, and by certain groups has not been appreciated; certainly we have not been given credit for it.

Coming for a moment or two to Russia, I wish briefly to outline to the house a little of the history of that nation. I have one particular reason in mind, namely there is an opinion prevailing throughout this country that the great sacrifices and the great fighting qualities of the Russians have come suddenly upon the Russian people, especially since the new regime under communism, or since the inception of the Stalin administration. Such is not the case. Russia has had seven centuries of fighting. As far back as the year 1380 they were the first to beat the invincible Tartars, the first to throw off the Tartar yoke. Coming to 1702, the scorched-earth policy was first put into effect at the time when Peter the Great defeated Charles XII of Sweden; and then in the war with Prussia, 1756-63, when Great Britain was on the side of Prussia. I wonder how many hon. members realize that in the year 1760 Russian troops marched into the city of Berlin. Again in the year 1779 Russian troops entered Rome, and the line of General Suvorov's march across the Alps is still marked on the Swiss maps. In 1805 Russia, in alliance with Austria and Britain, fought against France; and she fought her again in 1812, when Napoleon invaded Russia—because he felt, as Hitler did afterward, that he should first of all put Russia under his heel. The great fighting qualities of Russians have come down through all the ages, and they have one characteristic which to my mind we could well take to heart in this country, and that is their love of their land.

There must be a better understanding with Russia, based on good will, if we really desire a lasting peace following the end of the war.

There are some matters I wish to discuss before dealing with the proposed social legislation. The first one I have in mind emanates from a remark I interjected when the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) was speaking yesterday, when he was dealing with a statement made by the leader of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation advocating the taking over of certain shares owned

by the Canadian Pacific Railway company. I disagree with part of the remarks of the hon. member for York-Sunbury, my interjection being that the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation might well be playing into the hands of certain Canadian Pacific interests. Those large interests are not concerned entirely with the railroad; their ramifications to-day are many; and whilst we see a great freight and passenger traffic to-day, there was a time not so long ago when the railroads might have been taken over for a mere song, so to speak. But I agree with the hon. member for York-Sunbury in his statement that taking over those shares can have but one end, and that is the amalgamation of the two railroads, and I think there should be no mistaking that fact. The leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation has soft-pedalled a little, as he does at times. He first makes a statement about taking over certain railway shares, and then when criticism arises he tries to tell the public, "Oh, but if we take that road over as a government-owned concern, the two railroads will be made to compete one with the other." Did anyone ever hear a more absurd or impractical suggestion than that? I have not. We might as well call a spade a spade and be done with it. I take exception to that—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Give him rope enough and he will hang himself.

Mr. REID: And I will probably take more exceptions to the remarks of the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation later on in the session. In my opinion, and I am reaffirming it, it will mean the amalgamation of the two roads. Make no mistake about it.

Some members have already commented on P.C. 9384, and while I have no doubt full opportunity will be given the house to discuss this, I want to place myself on record now as being absolutely opposed to that order and the ramifications contained therein. I speak not only as a member of the house but as one who has held practically all his life and still holds a very honourable union card. I am not going to go into the various ramifications of the act, but I am at a loss to understand why at this late date such an order should have been passed, and I would advise the Minister of Labour and the government to reconsider this order before it becomes effective. We have been giving labour just praise for the splendid things they have done since the war began. If we mean this, then why this order, and one I would term iniquitous, after we have been four years at war? However, I expect to have more to say when the matter itself comes before the house.

I have one or two words to say to hon. members, through you, Mr. Speaker, with reference to the proposed changes in the rules of the House of Commons. No doubt the rules of the house have to be changed as time goes on in order to meet changing conditions, but I hope I am making myself clear when I say that I for one am going to protest against the curtailment of, or any attempt to curtail, free speech within this House of Commons. I fear if it starts here the process of curtailment may well be carried on outside this house. There was a time in the House of Commons when a member could speak as long as he liked, and the same arguments were used then against the length of speeches. Oh, it was said, too much time is taken up with speeches. And so a limitation was set at forty minutes. Now again we have reached the stage where it is said that there is too great a waste of time. Well, there may seem to be a waste of time, there may seem to be a repetition of speeches, but after all we must be careful in this matter. Let us take thought where we are going, because this is the only place where the people's voice can be heard.

Do members of this house realize how complex our life has become these days with a multiplicity of boards? The men at the heads of these boards in many instances care not for the public, and they care much less for the people's representatives. Since the war began, my complaint has been, not that there has been too much speaking but that there has not been enough speaking on the part of many members on the government side against some of the injustices which have been growing up. I therefore want to place myself on record in this matter, even though I know there may be endless repetition of speeches. My fear is that the move to curtail free speech here, if encouraged in this house, will lead some time in the future to the curtailment of speeches outside the house.

With regard to the proposed social legislation, I would say first of all a word touching the announcement made the other day by the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) concerning certain beneficial changes dealing with war veterans and their allowances. I believe the proposed changes will be well received, and I want to pay my meed of commendation and praise for what the minister has done. I would say this with regard to the Minister of Pensions and National Health, and I say it fearlessly. When I look over the proposed social legislation I think I can see some of his handiwork, and I know something of the fight he has had to carry on in order to bring about some of the proposed changes.

My first comment on the proposed social legislation is with reference to family allowances. I was surprised to see, the moment that announcement was made, the different points of view that were expressed in various parts of the country. For instance, there was the view advanced by a very reliable paper in the province of Quebec, *L'Action Catholique*—I hope I am pronouncing it correctly. I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that my French is not as good as yours, much as I would like it to be. I have had enough trouble speaking the English language without learning another. However, this paper attacks the allowance plan as "pagan", and it goes on to say that it may well result in curtailing families in the province of Quebec. This to me is a novel idea. It is the first time I have heard the view advanced that the granting of money to families would have any effect on large families in the province of Quebec. I have heard the opposite advocated in other provinces, that the lack of money has resulted in curtailing families. As I say, this is something new. No decision has been made by the government, however, as to the limitation in the number of the family; therefore the attack is perhaps somewhat premature.

It may interest the house to know that more than thirty countries in the world have already established family allowances. Included in this number are Australia and New Zealand. In 1942 Mr. Curtin, the head of the Australian labour government, stated that the reaffirmation of that legislation in Australia had been universally applauded because it was a real and permanent benefit to children.

In some respects labour has taken exception to family allowances. I differ entirely from those among the ranks of labour who say that it may keep down wages. Be that as it may, there is no doubt that it would be a great help to the farming community, and I draw these figures to the attention of farmer members. The farming community in the country have one-half of the nation's children; yet they receive only one-tenth of the national income. That is very significant. I bring that seriously to the attention of every hon. member.

I was very much pleased, as must have been all members representing farming communities, to hear the announcement that a floor would be placed under agricultural prices. I am glad that this matter will be handled by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), for whom I have had a great deal of sympathy since the war started, because I am one of those who have said that agriculture was in some respects bedeviled by having three ministers of agriculture in the cabinet. I have said fearlessly, and I will keep on saying, that agriculture might have been a great deal better off had agricultural policy and prices been left entirely to the present Minister of Agriculture, who has been one of the most outstanding ministers holding that portfolio that Canada has ever had.

The war record of the government has been an excellent one, and so far we have heard little adverse comment either in this house or anywhere throughout the country on the great effort the nation has put forth under the present administration. However, I trust that as soon as possible, following the end of hostilities all regimentation will be removed.

I mentioned something a short while ago with regard to the multiplicity of boards that had been set up, and this is what I find in my travels around the country. I find that the multiplicity of boards, each acting independently, have sent many people almost crazy. I am going to mention one or two instances, just to show what I mean by that. In the city of Vancouver one firm which handles the renting of apartments had a complaint sent in by one of the tenants, a woman who kept all the windows of the apartment open day and night but who complained to the rental control authorities that the apartment was not properly heated. An officer was sent down and, failing to notice the open windows, he saw that the temperature was low and reported accordingly, so those renting the apartment were told they would have to put on more heat. They did so, and then what do you think happened? Someone in the building complained to the coal controller that the building was kept too warm, and two days later he sent down a man, who ordered part of the coal supply of that building cut off. The manager said to me, "Mr. Reid, it is these rulings that are just driving us frantic."

I am very sorry the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) is not in his place, because I have one or two complaints to make in regard to matters which come under his department and as to which he should be kept posted. Various comments have been made with regard to selective service, and you will remember, Mr. Speaker, that last year I pointed out that practical men should be in charge of the selective service offices instead of men who had simply done office work, but the salaries offered are not sufficient to attract highly qualified men to these jobs. Among others there was one complaint which was very unusual. Men were required for the Oakalla prison, and you know that in order to look after prisoners you must be able-bodied. Selective service sent up, not at the same time but on following days,

two men, each of whom had only one arm. Then before coming east, as part of my duties I visited the penitentiary where I found being introduced a system which on examination seems most ridiculous and which has greatly upset the personnel of that institution. It appears that there is what is known as a labour relations bureau being built up under the Department of Labour, and many heads of departments are being asked to take a course in this particular instruction. The entire course I believe lasts ten hours, after which a certificate of competency is granted. In Vancouver a man by the name of Jones—I do not know whether or not he had a certificate or whether he had ever been inside a penitentiary—came to the penitentiary one day with some authority and told the warden, deputy warden and guards that they would have to parade before him because he was going to give them a lecture on how to handle convicts. The warden said to me, "I have been handling convicts successfully for thirty years. Do you think we are going to parade out there and have him tell us in a half hour lecture how to handle these men?" I do not know what experience Mr. Jones had; for all I know he should have been in there with the men.

I want these criticisms to be taken seriously by the minister, because it is this sort of thing that is just driving our people crazy. We have enough to do in connection with the war effort without having these other things inflicted upon us. Then again, while no doubt it was a splendid move when we took steps to keep down inflationary prices, in my opinion prices have been raised by many manufacturers as a result of the system now in effect of offering for sale at the ceiling price goods which are of very inferior quality. I believe that whatever department is responsible for this sort of thing ought to carry on some further investigation with regard to the distribution of goods, because certainly the shelves of many stores in Vancouver and New Westminster are bare of certain articles though we find that many of those things are easily obtainable in stores in Ottawa, Montreal and Toronto. I make that statement seriously. All we ask is our fair share. We are quite willing to make sacrifices, but it causes a great deal of unrest among our people when it becomes known that articles which are not procurable in the province of British Columbia are easily obtainable in the other provinces. As one man said to me, British Columbia is looked upon in the east as away in Timbuktu, and not as part of the Dominion of Canada.

I see that my time has almost expired. I conclude my remarks by saying that later in the session I shall deal more fully with many of the matters I have touched upon to-day, unless of course in the meantime the rules are amended so that no hon. member may speak more than once.

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, the speech from the throne divides itself into two principal parts. The first has to do, and very rightly, with advising this house that it is our immediate duty to prosecute the war as vigorously as possible. I am one hundred per cent behind that, but at this moment I am not going to discuss the war or its prosecution; I prefer to wait until I have heard the several ministers of defence tell the house what is being done to prosecute the war to a successful conclusion. I am going to deal with the second part of the speech from the throne, which calls for vigorous preparation for post-war reconstruction and rehabilitation. I am heartily in favour of vigorous preparation for the period of reconstruction and rehabilitation which will follow the war, and I am glad to see from the order paper of to-day that a rehabilitation committee is once more to be set up. In that connection may I express the hope that the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Turgeon), who was chairman last year, who was an indefatigable worker and always on the job, may be reappointed as chairman this year.

For quite a few years now, with other hon. members of this house, I have listened to western members tell us of their difficulties. I am sorry to have to confess that several years ago I did not give the attention to either the origin or solution of those difficulties that I have given during the last four years. I always felt that there must be a cause, but since no major remedy was brought forward I did not see at the time what could be done. Some few years ago I began to inquire into the matter personally, to see if I could find any major cause of the difficulties and, if so, whether I might discover a remedy. I was greatly depressed a few years ago when I made a trip from Regina to Estevan; in that particular year everything was dried out. I said to myself, there should be some way to overcome dried-out areas in the west. There have been droughts throughout the history of the world, and I began to examine into the causes of those droughts in other countries, and to see how the difficulties were remedied.

I learned that prior to the advent of the "golden hordes" of Genghis Khan into the Turkestanian plains in the fourteenth century, those plains were a smiling area of prosperity, with marvellous crops. But when those hordes went through and destroyed the reservoirs of the two great rivers on the plains, namely the

Amu and the Syr, for the following five hundred years much of those plains was barren. Only within the life of modern man have the Turkestanian plains come back to full fertility. The Russians have done what Canada has not done, and they have done it in a major fashion by building vast reservoirs on those rivers. To-day there is no part of Asia more prolific of crops than are the Turkestanian plains, which otherwise would have been barren. The improvement is brought about by irrigation, in the same fashion as it was done by their ancestors five hundred years ago.

The same applies to a large portion of the Punjab. Before the hordes of Akbar marched through that part of India, it, too, was an area of prolific crops. Now that dear old Britain has erected and recently opened a huge dam across the Indus, that country will all come back.

And who is there who does not know that before the British went into Egypt great famines were frequently experienced, until the population of that country was reduced by millions? But the British have restored the productivity of Egypt by building vast dams. I have in mind particularly the one at the first cataract. The Assuan dam is 132 feet high, and approximately a mile wide. It backs that great river up for 140 miles, and provides irrigation facilities for 3,000,000 to 6,000,000 acres, depending on the season. The result is that never in its history has Egypt had such productivity as it has to-day.

The same applies to North Africa. Before the hordes of Mohammed marched across Libya, Cyrenaica and Tripolitania, all the northern fringe of those states was thoroughly settled by millions of people. Crops were grown by means of irrigation from the small rivers flowing down to the Mediterranean sea from the hills of North Africa. But after the troops of Mohammed marched through, from that day until recently those plains have been a barren desert. Our soldiers have fought in that country, and they know something about it. It is true that the Italians had begun, in recent years, to restore productivity through irrigation. But these are examples of what can be derived from irrigation, and the condition which follows when there is no water to accelerate growth.

Our cousins to the south of us have shown us the way, here in America, where they have made millions upon millions of acres of dry land fit for the growth of good crops. Let us consider Arizona—a state which derives its name from the word "arid". To-day Arizona is one of the finest states in the American union, because they have harnessed their rivers from the mountains and diverted the waters of those rivers to the plains of Arizona. Let us consider what they have done recently at Grand Coulee and Boulder dams. When Boulder dam is in full operation, 2,000,000 acres of arid land adjacent thereto, either in Arizona, California or Nevada, will come into productivity. That, Mr. Speaker, is an example of what Canada should do. The same applies to Grand Coulee where shortly another million and a quarter acres will be in productivity in the state of Washington.

Canada must do more in her western country, and I am going to advocate this both in the house and out of it until I see something done in a major way to restore the west. I say that because I am convinced if it is not restored and if farms from which thousands upon thousands of good honest farmers in Saskatchewan, southwestern Manitoba and southern Alberta have been forced to flee, because of a lack of water, are not restored, we shall have reason to regret not taking action.

The failure of those farmers has meant the ruination of much business in Canada, and I shall continue to advocate development of the west until it has received a square deal. We hear some talk about what it would cost. Well, it may cost up to $100,000,000 but what does that matter? That is no more than it cost to build Shipshaw—it is even less. Two or three of the programmes I shall present would not cost more than $20,000,000 each. That is not much more than the cost of the Montreal bridge—and I should like it to be understood that I am in favour of both the building of the Montreal bridge and the Shipshaw development.

It is up to the members from the east to rally to the support of the west. This is the industrial part of Canada. Having been in big business myself for many years, during which time I watched a plant grow from a small to a very large business concern, I believe I know my subject. That plant grew most when the west started to grow. It receded in the past few years, because the west receded. We have got to restore it.

This is only one of the things I am going to talk about to-day. I shall confine my remarks to irrigation. Last summer I travelled some 8,000 miles by boat, motor, horse and otherwise, making a survey of this problem. I am convinced that the west has not had a square deal, and as an eastern member it is my duty to raise my voice in an attempt to see that it does get a square deal.

What is the situation to-day? A few nights ago I read the tenth verse of the second chapter of Genesis, "And a river went out

of Eden to water the garden." That is a verse upon which I can base my remarks, because the foothills of the Rocky mountains and the eastern slopes of those glorious mountains make me think of what Eden might have been—a beautiful, beautiful land. We have many such beautiful pictures in Canada. I think particularly of standing at Cardston and looking to the Rocky mountains in the west. One of the most beautiful pictures I have ever seen was in that part of Alberta west of Cardston. Stand at Morleyville, west of Calgary, and look at the Rocky mountains. We Canadians have not been fair to that country, and I refer to eastern Canadians especially. I, too, have not taken the interest in the west I should have taken. I charge myself perhaps more than others because from travelling and reading I believe I should have considered the matter earlier.

The country roundabout is wonderful country. The soil has all the chemical ingredients required for complete production. I discussed the matter with professors. Many of those men took me out on the prairies; but one in particular said, "Mr. MacNicol, this bald-headed prairie, covered with sage, wild grass and wild rose, will grow prolific crops, if it obtains water in season." But the water has to be harnessed. We have been asleep at the switch so far as harnessing the water of western Canada is concerned, the water which will give life to those prairies. We must divert water on to the land, as our cousins to the south of us have done, and as has been done in other places throughout the world.

There are four rivers which flow from Montana into Alberta. One of them, the Milk river, I shall not discuss. But there are three others west of the Milk river, known as the Waterton, Belly and St. Mary rivers. They flow with beautiful clear water, having their source in the Montana Rocky mountains. Their water is full of all the chemicals, in solution, which are required for the growing of crops. What are we doing with it? In 1921 we entered into a treaty with the United States by which each country was given permission to erect reservoirs. Why? The state of Montana was the first to use the waters, and they could have taken all these waters and developed their country to an even greater extent than it is developed to-day. Mr. Charles Magrath, I believe at that time the chairman for Canada of the International Joint Commission, protested and as a result a treaty was entered into by which Canada was given a fair share of the waters from these three rivers.

The hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) perhaps has a better knowledge of these matters. The treaty stated that each country should build reservoirs to conserve the portion of the water allowed it, and implied that if either country did not attempt to conserve the waters, then the other could have the waters. Our American cousins have built magnificent reservoirs south of the international boundary, but we have not built any on our side. Hon. members will find in their boxes copies of a sheet I have been using in talking about this subject. I hope those who are interested in trying to do something for Canada will read it, in conjunction with *Hansard*.

I am talking for all of Canada, not merely for the west. I am convinced that Canada cannot progress if the east alone progresses or if the west alone progresses. We must progress together. If we have a depression in the west, we are bound to have it in the east. As I say, we have not built reservoirs on our side of the line. I examined the sites where reservoirs could be built. We could obtain water from the St. Mary river, alone, had we reservoir capacity, capable of covering 362,000 acres one foot deep. An acre contains 43,560 square feet, so that if you multiply 362,000 by 43,560, you have a volume of water which could be conserved from the St. Mary river alone amounting to about 35 billion cubic feet.

On our side of the line this surplus water is running away. We have not equipped ourselves in southern Alberta to use this surplus water. Our American cousins have, but we have not. If we do not do this, we may lose this water. This should be one of the first programmes for post-war rehabilitation. It was presented by Mr. George Spence when he appeared before the reconstruction committee. We should build these reservoirs so that Canada can conserve this surplus water for more irrigation.

South of the general line of the South Saskatchewan river—I am referring to the Oldman river and other tributaries which form the South Saskatchewan—we are now irrigating something like 200,000 acres, and we are irrigating approximately another 200,000 acres immediately north of that general line. I believe the total acreage now actually taking water in this area is something between 350,000 and 400,000. But we could irrigate much more than this. With the present equipment we could irrigate 500,000 acres if we only had the water, and with adequate reservoirs and canals we could irrigate 600,000 more. We have not the reservoirs and we should have them.

What have been the results of irrigation in Alberta? They have been incredible. I have never seen anything like it. On one side of

the road—I am speaking figuratively—you have the bald prairie, while on the other side you have the cultivation of sugar beets and all sorts of crops. There are 27,000 acres in southern Alberta in sugar beets, producing an average crop of twelve tons to the acre, with a top production of eighteen tons per acre. There are two sugar beet factories, one at Raymond and the other at Picture Butte. Those are fine factories, but there should be at least five sugar beet factories in Alberta to provide employment after the war. Employment should be provided for the fine boys from Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba when they come back from overseas by and by. Those two sugar beet factories in 1942 produced 900,000 bags of sugar. I do not know just how many pounds are in a bag, but that is a lot of sugar. But the production should be four or five times that amount, and that would be possible if these reservoirs were built and the water were made available to the farmers for greater irrigation.

The first picture on the front of this sheet shows the St. Mary river with the first irrigation dam across it. This is a small dam, and an irrigation canal flows off to the right. The second picture shows the water dropping down from the first to the second level. The day I photographed it the flow was 445 cubic feet per second, but in the growing season they require at least 1,000 cubic feet. That amount would be available all through the growing season if these reservoirs were built.

Why should not southern Alberta be given a chance to shine in the sun? In reality it is always shining in the sun, but it should be given this opportunity economically just the same as eastern Canada is able to shine in the sun. The third picture shows the first artery leading off from the general canal. That flows out to the farms, and then small capillary canals run off that artery into the different farms.

In addition to growing sugar beets, vast quantities of marvellous corn are grown. I visited two canning factories, one at Taber and the other at Lethbridge. They are able to produce 750,000 cases of corn of 24 cans each, and perhaps as much peas. I understand that each acre produces 150 cases of corn, or about 300 cases of peas. There is much non-irrigated prairie land capable of similar production; why should it not be put into production? Other vegetables are produced in comparable quantity. No relief has been necessary in that part of Alberta. If they could not sell what they produced, they would have plenty to eat. There are some wonderful towns in that part of the province, like Raymond, Cardston, Magrath, and so on. Lethbridge was the most prosperous city I saw during my travels last summer. These irrigation canals should be extended to the limit. I notice the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Gershaw) is in the chamber. He represents a fine city; I spent more than a day there last summer. There are great irrigation possibilities north and south of the Saskatchewan river, west of Medicine Hat. On the north side of the river an unfinished, unwatered irrigation canal now extends towards Medicine Hat, and if completed they could have irrigation right up to the city. From the end of the canal I could see the chimneys of Medicine Hat, or perhaps it was the chimneys of Redcliff, a suburb. There was not a drop of water in that canal for seventy miles because they had not the money to finish it. That is not fair to Medicine Hat or to the people on those plains where you see abandoned farms in every direction. People who had settled there with their families had to get out because they could not produce on dried-out land. I am going to advocate as strongly as I can that that irrigation canal, with the necessary reservoirs on the north side of the Saskatchewan river, be completed up to the suburbs of Medicine Hat; and the same on the south side of the river, east from Taber. There would be plenty of water available, if conserved, which could be used for irrigation purposes, and it belongs to us. All we have to do is to build the reservoirs and irrigation canals to make this fertile land produce. It would not in the end cost this country a single dollar, because the project would be self-liquidating. Why it has not already been done I do not know. If I had had charge of any department with control of irrigation, that work would have been done long ago, even if it had been necessary for me to tour the country and ask the people to subscribe $100,000,000 to complete the project. I have spoken to many boards of trade in the east on this subject and they were one hundred per cent behind putting that part of Canada in a position where it can live, and it is not in that position now. Farmers on irrigated land go into mixed farming. They raise many cattle, horses, hogs and sheep. Only the other day I read about the vast number of cattle shipped out of Alberta last year.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) is not in his seat, but I hope he will come forward with an irrigation project as part of an after-the-war rehabilitation and reconstruction programme. It would do several things. It would provide a lot of employment locally, it would give the farmers a better opportunity to produce, and it would help our eastern manufacturers to provide jobs. Of course, I have to say a word for my own workers.

There are other areas in Saskatchewan and Alberta where thousands of acres could be put into production. West of Saskatoon and directly north of Cabri and on to Tramping lake, there are 2,000,000 acres which could be put under irrigation. I believe that the engineers who have been searching for a safe site have now found one near Saskatchewan Landing, where they can build a dam 150 feet high and back the river up for 100 miles. Talk about foundations on the Saskatchewan river! Last summer I went east twenty-six miles from the fine city of Prince Albert, where in 1913 the people of Prince Albert commenced to build a dam across the Saskatchewan river at La Colle rapids, the first one on the Saskatchewan. The city of Prince Albert itself undertook the project, I think, although I am not quite sure about that. But it matters not who undertook it. They built the dam half way across the river, and then for very good reasons went no further. I believe they had made no provision for the reservoirs which would be necessary up the river. That dam which was built in 1913 is of the Ambursen type, which is a very good type, I believe, with a broad base and of reinforced concrete. That dam has been standing for thirty years and has withstood all the buffeting of floods and ice and is still in very good shape. I am going to suggest to the Minister of Agriculture that that dam be finished, as a start on a North Saskatchewan river rehabilitation project, which would include the building of other dams, including one at Fort à la Corne and elsewhere. The government would be justified in taking over that dam and completing it and returning to Prince Albert a million dollars or more which the people of that city sank into it thirty years ago.

There are two million more acres which could be irrigated in the area to which I have referred, directly north of Cabri and on up to Tramping lake and west of Saskatoon. I also examined the area east of the river, between Regina, Moose Jaw and the river, carefully with engineers. I took someone with me who knows engineering and he stated that at least another 500,000 acres in Saskatchewan could be irrigated in that area. We passed by many abandoned farms. People had settled there years ago. I took a picture of one of these farms. It is shown on the last page of this circular near the bottom, picture No. 6. It was unfair to allow these fine settlers of early days to go in and settle there, whether they came from the old country, from the maritimes or from grand old Ontario—unfair just to let them settle there and say to them; root, hog, or die. I do not say that any government took that attitude, because I do not want to mention politics in discussing a problem of this kind. This irrigation plan is a gargantuan programme, a nation-building programme which, if carried into operation and completed, would bring wonderful returns all across Canada.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): How about reclaiming the marsh lands in the bay of Fundy?

Mr. MacNICOL: As I said at the beginning, I am confining my remarks to one programme. I shall be glad to make a speech on behalf of the east at another time.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): You are not against that?

Mr. MacNICOL: No; I am for it, and in due course I will give a speech on behalf of the maritimes. Just now I am speaking of an area in the west covering altogether three million acres which can be irrigated. What would that mean for the west? It would mean thirty thousand more farmers producing, with an average of 100 acres to a farm. It would also mean another thirty thousand people working in the cities to take care of the farmers' wants. It would mean employment for many thousands of people. For instance, when I was out west, on many occasions I saw products made by the Amherst boiler company, in my hon. friend's riding. I saw shoes that had been made in Quebec city, brushes made in Saint John, fine large equipment made in Sherbrooke, sewing machines that had been made in St. Hyacinthe, paper from Cornwall, vast equipment made in Montreal, builders' hardware from Belleville, refrigerators from Renfrew, filing cabinets from Pembroke, motor cars from Oshawa, and a great deal of equipment from that fine old city of Peterborough, one of our very finest cities in the east, and of course a great quantity of material made in Toronto, much of it made in the riding I represent, such as boilers, radiators, tools, electric equipment and many other articles. I also saw products from London, Windsor, Stratford, Winnipeg and many other cities. Just fancy what the opening up of another thirty thousand farms would mean to the east as well as to the west! It would mean a lot to the west directly, of course, and I hope it would also mean the introduction of many industries in the west; for there is no reason why they should not manufacture in the west many of the things they require. There is no reason why they should not have manufacturing in the west, but they first have to have power. They have it in Alberta. They have little in Saskatchewan. With the project I advocate there will be a provision at Fort a la Corne

of approximately 125,000 horsepower; a dam at Riverhurst would supply 86,000 horsepower, and one near Saskatchewan Landing, about 75,000 horsepower. At Riverhurst the average flow every day of the year is 11,500 cubic feet per second. It goes lower and it goes much higher. At the La Colle site located east of Prince Albert the average flow is 9,500 cubic feet per second every day in the year. Of course sometimes it is higher and sometimes lower.

That river has never been used to help this country as it should be. God made it for a purpose—to save the prairies. These prairies have a purpose. We have not been fair to the west. We have done a good deal in the east; I am in favour of that, and more; but we have not sufficiently looked to the west. As an eastern member I am going to do what I can to help the west; not, of course, forgetting, in my remarks on the west, the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Black) and his part of the country.

What would 30,000 new irrigated farms mean to the west? They would mean a vast increase in the population. Years ago I hoped for the day when Saskatchewan would have, not twenty-one members, but fifty members of parliament, and Alberta, not seventeen, but fifty. Why should these provinces not have that representation? Why should not these great smiling prairies grow in population? Another thirty thousand honest-to-goodness sure-return farms like they have in the riding of the hon. member for Lethbridge, where there are no failures for lack of water, would mean business for the east.

That is a programme, Mr. Speaker. It is an after-the-war programme. It is far too big for one province or even for the three provinces; it is not too large for Canada in association with the three provinces. I am told that the Alberta programme to put 600,000 acres under irrigation works would cost approximately $20,000,000. Every irrigated acre provides, I am told, an average profit return of fifty dollars a year, once it is in operation and paid for.

It is not fair to ask those two fine cities, Regina and Moose Jaw, to suffer under their present adverse water conditions. Regina derives her supply from wells. In Moose Jaw they draw it through sand points in sand fields west of the city. They can have any amount of water if the South Saskatchewan river is dammed near Riverhurst and I would dam it, no matter what it cost. We have got to do it, or that whole area may be like a desert. That cannot be allowed; it would be ruinous not only to western Canada but to eastern Canada as well. The time has come when this whole country should look at the country as a whole, and should in particular consider the present condition of the west, with its dried-out areas, and do what can be done to provide water for those dried-out areas and for the fine cities I have mentioned. The dam will operate itself. That is like what is going on in Egypt, where north from the Assuan dam the water flows in irrigation canals, but where they can pump it out and deliver it south if required. Pumps at a Saskatchewan river dam could pump the water over the height of land.

As regards the picture on the last page of this circular which you will receive, I will not say anything about it more than that it demonstrates that, once the water is pumped over the river bank at or near Riverhurst, where the bank is over 320 feet high, it then can flow down to Moose Jaw and Regina. In the case of the two cities I would follow an engineering plan which I have looked into, of building a pressure stave or steel conduit of sufficient capacity to conduct ample water, safely and without being exposed to loss by evaporation or sinking into the sands, as far as Moose Jaw and Regina, and to also irrigate on the way.

There is a rehabilitation programme, and there is not any reason why this country should not undertake it. It would rebuild the country west of Regina. I cannot speak of the district around Swift Current, because I have not examined that area, but I am told they are doing something there in a small way. There is no reason why that area should not be put under irrigation too.

There, then, is a nation-building programme. I hope I have said enough about it to impress the house, and if they will do me the honour to-morrow of examining this sheet in conjunction with what I have said to-day, I believe they will support that programme.

Mr. VICTOR QUELCH (Acadia): I was very much interested, Mr. Speaker, in the remarks of the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol). He is speaking on a subject with which he is very familiar. I agree with him that irrigation in the west will benefit not merely western Canada but the whole of Canada. The constituency I represent is very much interested in a project known as the William Pearce project. If it were put into operation it would be one of the largest of its kind on the north American continent. I trust that when the committee on reconstruction meets this year it will be in a position to recommend a number of concrete projects of this kind.

I should like to congratulate the mover (Mr. Tremblay) and the seconder (Mr. Tucker) of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. I think their task this year was a little less embarrassing than in the past, because undoubtedly there was somewhat more ammunition in the speech.

I was amused by the headlines in the press on the day the speech was delivered. It reminded me of what one sees on a bottle of patent medicine, advertising it as a general cure for all our evils; and probably one is just about as effective as the other. On the front page which carried this headline I also noticed a statement by Mr. Mitch Hepburn to the effect that before the end of the war we shall probably be eating horse meat, and I could not help thinking at the time that if we have a general election before the end of the war a very large percentage of the Liberal members will not only be eating horse meat, but crow as well, and that crow will be rationed to them, not by the wartime prices and trade board, but by the general public of this country.

I say that for this reason: it is just another example of "too little and too late." The people are always suspicious of deathbed repentances, and the government's record in the past ten years has not been altogether an enviable one. The depression is still fresh in the minds of the people. They remember that the government proved itself absolutely incompetent to deal with the problem of unemployment before the war, and therefore they naturally doubt whether it will be competent to deal with the problems, magnified many times, that will face us at the close of hostilities, when we shall have the tremendous job of rehabilitating and reestablishing about two million people.

The programme outlined in the speech from the throne savours altogether too much of the era of scarcity. It would have appeared perhaps quite progressive in the days of depression, but to-day it stresses altogether too much the awarding of a minimum for this and a minimum for that, instead of laying the emphasis, as it should, on the very high standard of living that will be available to the people of this country at the close of the war or shortly thereafter. Of course, a great deal depends upon the standard at which these minimums are set, and therefore we shall have to wait until the legislation is brought down before we can pass judgment. In the meantime we can only hope for the best. I suggest that the government should keep in mind at all times the fact that the national income to-day is at the very high figure of $8,000,000,000. Indeed, the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) has put that figure as high as $9,000,000,000. That means an average of about $3,000 per family of four. I do not think therefore that penny-pinching measures will be tolerated by the people in the future.

There can be no possible justification for the paltry incomes that are awarded the old age pensioners, and those receiving benefits under the War Veterans' Allowance Act. No family after the war should have to live on an income of less than $1,000 a year. I hope the government will bear that in mind when they bring down the legislation later on.

I would have been far more enthusiastic about the speech from the throne if it had stressed to a greater degree the very high income we have to-day and the government's determination not only to maintain that income at that high level but to take steps to ensure its fair distribution after the war. Our income at the present time is at a high level largely because the government is spending $5,500,000,000 annually. Any attempt to reduce these expenditures at a greater rate than private industry is prepared to take up the slack can only result in reduced income, loss of confidence, and increased unemployment.

The speech from the throne refers at some length to the importance of foreign trade; but foreign trade should be kept in its proper place. It is nonsense to suggest that the people of Canada should not be able to have as much of the production of the country as they require unless a certain proportion of that production is shipped overseas. That is to say, the proper function of foreign trade should be to exchange goods which we cannot consume for the goods which we cannot produce. That, however, has not been the function of foreign trade in the past.

The hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker) blames our troubles upon tariffs. I think the hon. member knows better than that in reality. He knows that tariffs are an effect and not a cause, but unfortunately the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has shown no recognition of that fundamental fact. Why do nations raise tariff walls? Why have they done so in the past? Because they have not been able to sell their total production and therefore they tried to solve their problem by maintaining a large favourable balance of trade, that is, by exporting more wealth abroad than they imported back. Tariffs are maintained in order to discourage imports. Of course, in the past all nations have been trying to do this and as a result tariff wars have ensued. Nations try to scale tariff walls by depreciating their currency, and international friction ensues,

leading up to international wars. Instead of trying to blame tariffs for our troubles, we should first of all remove the cause of tariffs. In other words, we should endeavour to raise the purchasing power of the people up to the level where they would be able to buy the total production of the nation or the production of other nations for which their own can be exchanged.

To sum up briefly, if we want to sell abroad we must be prepared to buy from abroad, and if we want to buy from abroad we must be prepared to place money in the hands of the people so that they may be in a position to buy the goods that are brought into the country; otherwise, naturally, the importers will stop bringing in goods. For that reason I deplore the attitude of certain officials in this country in issuing a pamphlet called "International Exchange Union". If these proposals were put into operation the result would be that a great deal of our production would be exchanged for foreign securities instead of for goods. It might not be so in the immediate period after the war; but after a few months, as soon as certain foreign nations have exhausted their quota of international currency, they will be placed in the position of having to pay us in gold or exchange foreign securities for the goods we ship to them. And of course that situation is bound to be resented by all the nations that do not produce gold, and is bound to cause international friction.

I want to touch briefly upon a number of proposals in the speech from the throne which apparently are aimed at raising the purchasing power of the people. First of all, take the question of housing. This statement appears in the speech:

> A measure to amend and supplement existing housing legislation will be introduced.

It is often suggested that the reason why we have been able to have the type of war effort we have had is that we have had an incentive, the incentive to win the war. In my opinion, after the war a very good incentive to encourage the people to work for an all-out peace effort would be the objective of a decent home for every family in the country, especially having regard to the returned man. Such a programme would provide a great deal of employment, and the money paid out in the building of houses would help to stimulate the demand for consumer goods.

In the past the type of housing legislation we have had has helped people only in what might be called the middle income brackets. In the future we must have legislation that will make it possible for those in the low income brackets to acquire houses. That has not been possible heretofore. If we had legislation of that kind it would mean that money would have to be made available at an extremely low rate of interest. These loans will have to extend over a long period of time and be repaid at a rate not faster than the depreciation of the houses which those people have bought. National housing should be made a national scheme, financed by national money, at a rate of interest at cost of handling accounts, which might be one or two per cent. To talk of a housing scheme for people in the low income brackets and then to charge 5 or 6½ per cent interest is idle; it means that the scheme cannot be carried out effectively.

I welcome the proposal for a floor under agricultural prices, but whether or not that measure will be effective depends entirely upon the level at which the floor is placed. It should be placed closely under what we might call parity prices for agriculture; and when I say parity prices I do not mean the prices based on levels of 1914, or the prices of 1926 or 1929. I mean the level that will assure to farmers their fair share of the national income. And what is that level? According to figures placed before the reconstruction committee by Mr. D. G. MacKenzie, we find that from 1915 to 1919 farmers representing one-third of the population received one-third of the national income. Undoubtedly that was a time when the farmers were receiving parity prices. From 1926 to 1929, however, the farmers received only one-sixth of the national income and from 1930 to 1940 only one-tenth. So, when we advocate parity prices, I think we should have in mind prices which will guarantee the farmers their fair share of the national income; and the only period when that has ever happened was the period from 1915 to 1919.

I am not impressed with the reference to a national scheme of contributory old age pensions on a more generous basis than that at present in operation. What we need to-day is more generous provision for non-contributory pensioners. The people who are in a position to contribute to an old age pension plan are, generally speaking, in a position to buy government annuities. What we want is to take care of those aged individuals who are not in the fortunate position of being able to contribute to any scheme. Certainly there can be no justification for the old age pensioners of to-day or of the future having to accept the very low income that they receive at the present time. We have been told, of course, that if we tried to increase the amount of the old age pension there would be difficulty with some

of the provinces. That difficulty will exist only as long as we make the provinces contribute to the cost of old age pensions. I should like to see old age pensions paid purely on a national basis, financed by the national government. I do not think any province would object to the old age pension being increased provided the federal government paid the total cost, and in that case there would be no reason why the old age pension could not be increased to $40 per person or $80 for a man and wife, which would give them an income of approximately $1,000 a year.

I very much welcome the government's proposal to pay family allowances. This is a step in the direction we have been advocating for a number of years. We first began to advocate something of this kind in this house in 1936; and I think most hon. members will recall how the suggestion that money should be paid directly to individuals outside the industrial system was scoffed at in this house. We were continually told that we were advocating something for nothing. However, apparently the government now see the light and are proposing to issue money directly to consumers instead of having it paid out through industry.

Since the declaration of war the government have had to travel quite a long way in the direction we have been advocating here since 1936. For instance, in the years when we had many unemployed we urged upon the government the necessity of expanding the amount of money in circulation in order to provide employment. Hon. members who were here at that time will remember how the Minister of Finance of that day would become almost hysterical every time that suggestion was made, and would accuse us of advocating inflation. Well, what has happened since the war? When it became necessary to expand production in this country we did not hesitate to increase the amount of money in circulation, so that to-day we find there is over a billion and a quarter dollars more in circulation than was the case at the beginning of the war, in currency and deposits. Another proposal we made back in 1935 was that a discount should be paid on prices, subsidized by the federal government, to make it possible for industry to sell at less than the cost of production, thereby increasing the purchasing power of the people without any danger of inflation. In those days the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) did not hesitate to ridicule that suggestion. I remember how he claimed that this would cause inflation; yet what have we to-day? We are paying millions of dollars in subsidies to industry to make it possible for them to sell at less than the cost of production, thereby maintaining the price ceiling; and the minister himself in this house called it a form of insurance against inflation. Back in 1937 it was called inflation; to-day it is insurance against inflation.

Those are a few of the measures we advocated back in 1936 that the government have had to adopt, though at the time we were ridiculed for having suggested them. Unfortunately, however, the most essential step which must be taken, and which has not been taken up to the present time, is the issue of national money so that national projects can be financed without increasing the interest-bearing debt of this country. Until such time as this measure has been taken the government will always be in the difficult position of having either to curtail its expenditures or steadily to expand the national debt.

I should like to make a few brief observations with regard to the amendments now before the house. The amendment offered by the Conservatives contains nothing at which one could take offence, that is anyone sitting on this side of the house. It just refers to the fact that the government has failed to do this and that, and I think we all agree that the government has failed to do these things. Therefore we will support the amendment. The amendment offered by the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation reads:

> We respectfully submit to Your Excellency that in the opinion of this house Your Excellency's advisers have failed to propose the fundamental social changes and economic planning which alone can hasten the winning of the war and make possible the establishment of a post-war Canada capable of providing full employment and complete social security.

I think most people, if they are frank, will admit the truth of that statement. If I had been drafting that motion I would have added the words, "with the greatest possible degree of individual freedom", because none of us likes to have regimentation of the individual, and if those words were added it would be made clear that this is not intended by the motion. In drawing up plans for the future we should do everything in our power to avoid bureaucratic controls and regimentation of the people. During this war planning has been absolutely essential; we never could have had a total war effort without planning, and I am satisfied that we shall never have a total peace effort without planning, particularly in the transition period between war and peace and especially in regard to finance. Therefore our group will also support the amendment offered by the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation.

I wish now to deal with one of our major responsibilities of to-day; that is, the question of rehabilitating the men of the armed forces. I recall the promises which were made during the last war; I think all hon. members who served in the armed forces at that time will recall that the men were promised that after they were demobilized they would be guaranteed jobs and their dependents would be looked after. I think most hon. members will agree that we failed miserably to fulfil those promises, and I think we also agree that this must never be allowed to happen again. I was very much interested in an article which appeared in the February issue of the *American* magazine entitled "Canada Cares for its Heroes" written by the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie). The hon. member for Rosthern referred to this article, which is an exceedingly glowing account not only of what Canada is doing but of what Canada will do for her soldiers in the future. This, however, is what puzzles me. If that is a correct statement, why should there be such widespread discontent throughout the country among the returned men and the various returned men's organizations? I think when the minister wrote that article he painted a picture of what he would like to see rather than a picture of what actually exists, though I am not for one moment suggesting that the minister was not sincere when he wrote the article. I do not believe there is an hon. member more anxious to see the returned men get a square deal than is the Minister of Pensions and National Health, but of course he has great obstacles to overcome and his word does not necessarily prevail in the cabinet or wherever these things are finally decided.

I shall deal with some of the main causes for the discontent which exists to-day. Just before coming to Ottawa I stayed in Edmonton for a few days and had communication with the Edmonton branch of the Canadian Legion. I found there a tremendous amount of indignation owing to the fact that the men being returned from overseas in a wounded condition were being discharged while still in hospital receiving treatment. One of the cases which received a great deal of publicity was that of Captain Gilchrist. He was seriously wounded overseas and was returned to Canada, but while still in hospital with his leg in a cast he was discharged from the army. His pay was reduced from that of a captain to $44 a month. There was a deduction of $30 a month for hospitalization, so that he received a net income of $14 a month. This man was contributing to the keep of his mother and father, and his case received a great amount of publicity. It made returned men in that city simply wild to realize that that is the way men who had been wounded overseas are being treated.

I was pleased when the order in council was brought down in the house to correct this situation, and I trust its operation will be made retroactive. But I cannot understand why a situation like that was permitted to exist for such a long time. The fact is that it existed for many months, and caused a tremendous amount of indignation in the ranks of the armed forces. Even though we have now changed the situation, that resentment will continue, because the men will have lost confidence in the department and the government and, I think, rightly so.

There appears to be a great deal of carelessness in the way in which men are handled after they are discharged from hospital. While I was in Edmonton I was asked to go out with members of the legion to inspect a certain case. This man had been discharged from the hospital about five days before I made my visit. He was living with his mother at the edge of the city, in one room. There was no furniture in that room, with the exception of a bed. He had not received any clothing allowance or any demobilization pay. The Red Cross later provided him with some clothes. This man had seen service in Sicily and had been severely wounded. He had lost his speech, to the point where he could only say, "Yah". He was not able to use the fingers of his right hand. His right arm and leg were partly paralyzed. In short, he just did not know what it was all about.

The legion had approached certain officials with the idea of having the man transferred to a convalescent home or a reconditioning centre. They were informed there was no such establishment in Edmonton. But this is what angered the legion representatives: It is a fact that the provincial government of Alberta had offered to the federal government the use of Government House as a convalescent home for soldiers. In the past the provincial government had been receiving from the United States authorities $2,000 a month for the use of that building. The time arrived when the United States tenants stopped using the building, and when that time arrived the use of it was offered to the federal government free of charge, as a convalescent home for the duration of the war and for six months thereafter. That offer was turned down.

But when these men are discharged and the legion asks that they be put into a convalescent home they are told that no such accommodation is available. I understand, however, that reconditioning centres are being

built for future use at certain points in the Dominion. Action is now being taken, I understand, to send the man in question to Christie street hospital, Toronto, for treatment. But the mere fact that that situation was allowed to exist, a condition which permitted the sending of a man to a house in such poverty-stricken circumstances, arouses the ire of our people. I believe if the man in question had been left there for any length of time he would have become a mental case.

In his article in the *American* magazine the Minister of Pensions and National Health states, in effect, that the officials of his department will lean over backwards to do justice to the returned men. I believe that is true of the minister, and I do not doubt it is true of the deputy minister. Unfortunately, however, there are many officials across Canada who are either careless or callous, and I think disciplinary action should be taken where the men in charge allow conditions such as I have described to exist. We must assure ourselves that such things will not occur again.

Then, ever since the beginning of the war there has been a great deal of dissatisfaction over the fact that soldiers boarded A1 upon enlistment are refused pension on the ground that their disabilities are of pre-enlistment origin. We have been told in the house that upon enlistment recruits are given a very thorough medical examination. It seems to me therefore that when these men are discharged on account of a disability they should be awarded a pension until their disability is cured, and pension should not be denied them upon the ground of pre-enlistment origin.

Further, I do not like the manner in which some of the men are treated when the medical authorities are trying to find out whether or not the disability was of pre-enlistment origin. It amounts almost to a third degree, and is no credit to the department which allows that kind of thing to take place. I shall not take the time of the house to describe the procedure by which some of these admissions are obtained. I know, however, that very often a medical officer will get into conversation with a soldier, the soldier having no idea that his evidence is being taken down. Then, probably some time later, he may be confronted with the statement he is supposed to have made, in which he has admitted that at some time or another he suffered some slight accident, and that therefore his pension must be refused on the grounds of a disability of pre-enlistment origin.

The other day I discussed this general situation with a naval officer. He said to me, "The government is like a lawyer with a bad case, because it tries to settle for the smallest possible amount." That certainly does seem to me to be the general impression throughout Canada. There are many cases where the applicants would appear to be eligible for certain payments, and yet because of some technical point such payments are refused.

In 1940 I sat on a subcommittee of the pensions committee, dealing with mental cases. That committee recommended that the section debarring a soldier from pension, when disability was of congenital origin, should be deleted. It was my understanding that the clause had been deleted, but I am not now certain whether that is so. Judging from the actions of various medical boards throughout the country one would think that the section is still operative.

Another injustice—and in my opinion a glaring one—is that men who have served overseas for a number of years and who are then returned to Canada and allowed a discharge on compassionate grounds, are refused any rehabilitation grants. Only this morning I received a letter from the Canadian Legion at Edmonton referring to several such cases. Two of the men to which reference was made in the letter had been enlisted, one for three years and the other for four. Upon returning to Canada they had little or nothing to do, so they asked for their discharge. They were refused any rehabilitation grant, including that of clothing and one month's pay. This is what the legion has to say in the matter:

> I think this is one of the grievances that certainly should be rectified, as men who have been overseas and are returned to this country certainly get fed up hanging around not doing anything, and they naturally, after a time, make application for discharge which is inevitably granted.

In my opinion any man who has served overseas, no matter for how short a time, and is discharged on compassionate grounds, should be eligible for rehabilitation grants. In so far as those men who have served only in Canada are concerned, it is my opinion that each case would have to be dealt with on its merits. But a man who has had long service, even though he has not been outside Canada, should be eligible for grants On the other hand, if his service has been short, or if he has been in some building where he expects to sit for the duration, such as the Jackson building, it might be a different state of affairs.

I might add that the postscript to the letter is in these words:

> I am very pleased to let you know that I have been successful in having Jossul's rehabilitation granted so maybe the others will come through.

I am glad to hear that because that may mean that a new policy has been put into effect

with regard to the granting of rehabilitation rights to these men who get discharged on compassionate grounds.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I thought that was always the policy.

Mr. QUELCH: If it is, how is it that there are so many cases where they have not been getting it? Many of these cases have been placed before the department and grants have been refused, cases where men were discharged on compassionate grounds.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Which ones?

Mr. QUELCH: One is Corporal Wallace number R-93837, and I quote:

> The above named N.C.O. joined the air force on the 25th of April, 1940. He was then 45 years of age. He has now made application for discharge so that he can go back on his farm but has been informed that if he accepts his discharge on these grounds he will not be entitled to his rehabilitation grant, i.e., his month's pay and also his dependents would not get the month's allowance.

He then goes on to deal with Private Jossul who had four years overseas.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): The month's pay is not a pension; that would come under national defence.

Mr. QUELCH: I am not blaming the minister of pensions by any means for all these injustices. As I have pointed out already, I do not believe that there is any man in this house who is more sincere in his desire to see that these men get a square deal. However, the minister does not have the final say in these matters; he can only recommend, and apparently in the past his recommendations have not received the kind of treatment they should have received.

Another matter which has caused a great deal of dissatisfaction is the fact that men receive only one month's pay and allowance upon discharge. I notice from the speech from the throne that gratuities are to be given. We cannot criticize or commend this proposal until we know at just what level these gratuities are to be set. In my opinion when a man returns from overseas he should immediately be given one month's leave with full pay. During that time he could get into touch with his relatives and make plans for the future. Then, when he is discharged he should receive a substantial gratuity based upon his length of service. The Edmonton Legion passed a resolution asking that a man coming back from overseas receive one day's pay for each day's service. I do not think that is asking too much.

The clothing allowance which was given in the past was totally inadequate. This has been increased to $65, but I wonder how many members of parliament would like to buy a complete outfit of clothing for $65. By the time you bought a suit and overcoat you would have exhausted your funds, and you would still need a hat, boots, underwear, et cetera.

An hon. MEMBER: And braces.

Mr. QUELCH: Somebody says "braces". They probably would before they got a job. Many soldiers' dependents are suffering injustices. I know this does not come under the minister of pensions, but I have taken up a number of these cases with the dependents' allowance board. I am frank to admit that I have not had much success. There is a practice of stopping a dependents' allowance when a man is absent without leave for a certain length of time. He may be absent without leave for twenty-one days before the dependents' allowance is stopped—if he is overseas the time limit is three months—but after that time the government jumps to the conclusion that the man is a deserter. We know there are many cases where such men have been blown to pieces in air raids, and instead of the wife continuing to get compensation, she is told that her husband is a deserter and her allowance is cut off. I do not think the dependents' allowance should be cut off until there is positive proof that a man has deserted. Just as long as there is any possibility that he may have been killed, the dependents' allowance should be paid in full.

When a man is finally apprehended and sentenced, we will say, to two years in the army prison his dependents' allowance is paid for six months, after which time it is stopped. I contend that as long as the army has the man's body they should continue to pay an allowance to his wife and dependents. Why should they take it out of the dependents? We have in this country many wives and children on relief because soldiers are serving sentences in army prison camps. Just as long as the army has the bodies of those men under control they can get a certain amount of work out of them and the dependents' allowances should be paid. They could be charged up against the man who would work it out. I think most people will agree with the justice of this claim. Why should the wife and children be penalized just because a man, perhaps as a result of war service, has developed some kind of mental quirk and refuses to assume his responsibilities. The man cannot always be blamed. Sometimes desertion is a result of mental trouble resulting from the strain of service.

Another grievance is that deductions from dependents' allowances are made when the dependent receives hospitalization. There are a number of wives of soldiers in Alberta who are obtaining treatment in the sanitarium for tuberculosis. This treatment is absolutely free in Alberta. Anyone in the province may obtain free treatment. Yet the dependents' allowance board deducts $20 a month from the allowance of these women and then pays it to the provincial institution as a maintenance cost. Since this treatment is free in Alberta the province does not want to charge for the maintenance of these women, the provincial government has offered to pay this money over to the dependents, but the dependents' allowance board has ruled that if the provincial government pays this $20 to the dependents, the board will have to make a further deduction. I have taken this matter up with the dependents' allowance board and they tell me that they cannot do anything because they are governed by the departmental regulations. Those regulations are man-made and there is nothing to prevent their being changed. It is high time they were changed. Here we have a most undesirable situation where a civilian can obtain free hospitalization and yet the dependent of a soldier is charged.

In closing, I should like to make a recommendation to the minister. He knows, as we all do, that there is a great deal of criticism of certain of the measures which come under his department and under the dependents' allowance board. I urge that a committee be set up to deal with soldiers' affairs and that the terms of reference should be sufficiently wide to permit it to deal with pensions, dependents' allowances and the reestablishment of the returned soldier.

Mr. G. K. FRASER (Peterborough West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch) for referring to the wives and families of soldiers who may be A.W.O.L. overseas. I know of a number of cases where wives and children have suffered all kinds of distress because the government just like the cut of a knife has taken away their living. The children's aid society have had to take over in many cases.

I should like also to congratulate the hon. member for referring to old age pensions. He has suggested that the old age pension should be $40 a month. If you look in *Hansard* for 1940 I believe you will find that I suggested, not only that it be $40 but that the age limit be reduced to sixty years. The old age pension should be given to those people who are in need, not as a charity but as their rightful due.

The speech from the throne this year was a speech that left the people of Canada speechless. When the people read that speech and found out what was promised—I say promised—by this government they said, I have had them say to me, why, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has promised everything except the kitchen sink. I believe that is right; he has promised everything. I know that the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker), in seconding the motion for the address, certainly hit the nail on the head when he said, as reported at page 16 of *Hansard* of January 28:

> In his book, "Industry and Humanity", written twenty-five years ago, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) set out certain ideals which we shall seek to attain in regard to better social security. It is not often that a young man who dreams of a programme for the betterment of his country is given a chance twenty-five years later, as prime minister of his country, to begin to carry out in such large measure as is proposed in the speech from the throne that programme.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): He is still dreaming.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): I think every person in Canada will agree with me that the Prime Minister is still dreaming, as the hon. member has just said. Why should the Prime Minister have waited twenty-five years to do these things? He has been in and out of office for practically that length of time—

An hon. MEMBER: And he is coming back.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): He is still dreaming and that is what the people believe. The Prime Minister said that we would not have an election this year, but the speech from the throne certainly looks as though the Prime Minister were preparing for an election very soon. It looks as though he had been holding this dream in reserve for twenty-five years, so that he would have something up his sleeve, an ace in the hole, as it is often called, to save him at some future time, because it is only by a miracle that the present government can be saved from defeat at the polls at the next election.

I do not believe that the present government could possibly carry out the programme set forth in the speech from the throne, because a programme of that kind needs to be carried out on sound business principles in order to make it stay with us—not for a year or two, because if we are to have social security of the kind that is set forth in the speech from the throne we do not want it for just a short time but until such a time as a better programme can be found. That is

why I say that the present government cannot give us the utopia that is set forth in the speech from the throne.

I have often urged in this house and on platforms throughout the country that we should have a better social security set-up in regard to health, particularly, in Canada. But so far as I can see, the speech from the throne does not mention hospitalization at all, and hospitalization is one of the greatest needs, if not the greatest need of the country to-day. Not only the working man and the farmer but you and I, Mr. Speaker, are in fear of having to go to the hospital or have some member of our families requiring hospitalization, and we all know that hospitalization drains one's resources almost to the limit. In the case of the working man and the farmer it would certainly do that. But we have another fear, namely that if by chance we or some member of our family had to go to hospital there would not be a room in any hospital to accommodate the patient. That is the case to-day. Hospitalization should have been one of the subjects dealt with in the speech from the throne. I believe that in any post-war programme hospitalization should have priority. I believe that this government should at once announce to the different municipalities throughout the country what it proposes to do to help them build new hospitals or remodel their old hospitals. We know that there is not a proper place to-day even for our returned soldiers, those who have fought in the armed forces, in the army, the navy or the air force and have returned to Canada to receive hospitalization and be taken care of, and we know that very little is being done to remedy the situation. Hospitalization and education are two of the things that should be on the priority list in our post-war reconstruction. I include education because we need new schools in many sections. Many of our schools are out-dated. We should also have up-to-date laboratories where our boys and girls can carry on research work.

In regard to hospitalization I should like to mention a case that was brought to my attention, in which the Department of Mines and Resources refused to pay one municipality the prevailing hospital rate in that city. The prevailing rate in that city was $3 a day. The Indian Affairs branch, which comes under the Department of Mines and Resources, would pay only $2.50 a day to that hospital, which is in the red all the time since the cost is over $3 a day.

The hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) mentioned the harnessing of power in the west, and I was pleased to hear him mention the city of Peterborough in that connection because our industries in Peterborough, Ontario, can supply whatever power machinery and equipment are required. We have also in the city of Peterborough an industry which wakes up every morning the workers not only in Canada but throughout the empire, for the alarm clocks made in Peterborough wake up the whole British empire.

In the speech from the throne mention is made of the fact that three new departments are being created. I would suggest that another minister be added to the cabinet, a minister of education. I believe that the people of Canada to-day would welcome a dominion educational set-up. At the present time each province has its own educational system, under which a teacher in Ontario cannot teach in Manitoba or British Columbia or a teacher in any of the other provinces teach in a different province on account of the qualifications prescribed. I would not want to see the dominion encroach upon provincial rights, but I should like to see the dominion government cooperate with the provinces in order to bring about a better educational set-up for the people of Canada as a whole. We shall never have unity in Canada unless we have proper education.

Health insurance is mentioned in the speech from the throne. Health insurance really means the minimizing of the hazards that cause sickness. When the item for industrial hygiene was brought up last year and in 1942 I suggested that every worker be examined annually, or if possible twice a year, checked for tuberculosis, and X-rayed; and I feel that if that were done we would have happier workers in our plants. Prevention of disease is essential also to any workable social security or health insurance set-up. We have to start at the bottom. At the present time tuberculosis is on the increase, and if that state of affairs is allowed to develop nobody knows what will happen in a few years. In Canada the problem of sickness is not only physical but mental. Unless preventive measures are taken, in a few decades this country, instead of being the home of sound, physically fit people, will be a country of degenerates. The remedy is to start with health insurance at once, to start checking up without any more delay. I notice in the press that the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) has at last got off his hush-hush horse with regard to venereal disease. I am very glad that at last the government has come out in the open with regard to that.

I should like to know what the government is doing toward checking tuberculosis among the children of this country. I include those

of pre-school age. These pre-school age children should be thoroughly checked, not once or twice but a dozen times a year, in order to prevent the child from developing, when it grows a little older, rheumatic fever, which has been the cause of so many men and boys being found unfit for service in the Canadian army.

I noticed in the Ottawa *Journal* of January 31 an editorial which certainly is a dandy. With the permission of the house I am going to read it:

> The C.C.F., with all the courage in the world, makes no bones about what are its aims. Young Mr. Jolliffe, Ontario leader of the party, is quoted in an official document as saying: "What the C.C.F. is aiming at is a system of socialized medicine as a part of a general scheme of socialization." With no worry about provincial rights, Mr. Jolliffe says: "When a C.C.F. government comes into power in the dominion (reformed health services) will be transformed with the least possible confusion and delay into a thoroughly socialized medical system which is a natural part of a socialized society." All the doctors young and old under the C.C.F. scheme are to be regimented and salaries and areas of work fixed, and Mr. Jolliffe says frankly that if there are any doctors who don't like it they can be left to stew in their own juice or starve.
>
> About the C.C.F. proposals there is to be said that they are open and above board and not camouflaged by "approval in principle". Mr. Jolliffe said to a meeting of doctors in London: "The public will have to stop demanding 24-hour service; that is all there is to it." One of the doctors present asked: "Can your party arrange for all babies to be delivered between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m.?" Mr. Jolliffe didn't answer that one.

Does that mean that Mr. Jolliffe spoke for the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party of Canada? If so, I say there is not one of them that is human. And the doctors of Canada, who have done everything in the world to look after humanity here, working night and day, twenty-four hours a day, covering miles and miles and miles of rough roads, winter and summer, are invited to stew in their own juice if they do not like what the C.C.F. do! Just imagine if some hon. member happened to have an accident in his family, and when he phoned the doctor and said, "Doctor, my wife has fallen downstairs, broken her arm and, I believe, cut an artery in her head," the doctor answered "Well, I am very sorry but it is two minutes to five; I will call on you to-morrow morning after eight o'clock or after I have made out my reports in the morning."

Mr. GILLIS: Why not put them back on relief?

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): I am making the speech. And suppose the doctor went on to advise the hon. member to give his wife some sleeping tablets and maybe stick his finger in the cut to stop the artery from bleeding! That is a lovely kind of doctrine or platform for any party to have; and God help Canada and the people of Canada if people of that kind ever get control here. But I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Canada to-day are awake and "wise to" these sayings of the C.C.F. party, the persons who will say something in London, Ontario, and contradict it in Vancouver; who say something in Vancouver and it is contradicted in Nova Scotia. God help the country if it should be controlled by people of that kind.

As regards health insurance, in a little booklet issued by the Canadian Pharmaceutical Manufacturers' association, entitled "Health Insurance," page 24, paragraphs 67 and 68, it has this to say:

> One of the root causes of much of our ordinary sickness is bad housing, with its poor ventilation, its inadequate protection against winter cold, and its lack of sanitary conveniences. Bad housing occurs in its worst form in our city slums, where overcrowding adds one more to the factors that breed and spread disease. Should not better housing be recognized as the joint responsibility of federal, provincial and municipal governments, and be adequately provided for in any plan of national health insurance?

That is what I said before, Mr. Speaker. We have to start at the bottom in order to build a sound basis of health insurance. We must start right in the sub-basement, so to speak, if we are to have a healthy nation.

The booklet goes on:

> An important cause contributing to physical unfitness and the frequent spells of sickness from which many people suffer, is the inadequate income on which they have to live.

That is perfectly true. There are many people in Canada who are not receiving a proper income, and there are others who receive an adequate income but are not educated in the proper spending of that income so as to ensure good health for themselves and their families.

> Poverty can be one of the worst of all disease-breeders. Its attendant evils of undernourishment and malnutrition are not only sicknesses in themselves, but they predispose their victims to every kind of infection to which they happen to be exposed. To people in that class, medical care with hospitalization can at best provide only a temporary escape from sickness, for when they are forced to go back to the old way of living, the improvement they made under medical care is quickly lost.

That again is absolutely true. I know of a young child who was taken out of a very poor home because her mother was expecting another baby. The child was taken to a certain home and looked after and given proper clothing and care, and what happened?

She put on extra weight and at the end of a month was a really strong and healthy child. Then the mother wanted her back and the child returned to her old surroundings. At the end of the next month the mother came to this lady and said, "Mrs. N."—I will not mention her name—"will you please take my daughter back? She has been unwell during the past week. She has failed in health". The whole trouble was that the child did not have the proper surroundings. To continue:

> The form of social security such people need most and given which they would soon have much less need for sickness insurance, is the security obtainable through steady employment at good wages. The responsibility for providing that kind of security, based as it would have to be on national fiscal and economic policies, lies squarely at the door of the dominion government.

That does not apply merely to the workers of Canada; it applies to the farmers as well.

Now I am going to say something and I say it absolutely on my own and not for the party to which I belong. Throughout Canada during the last four or five months organizations have been issuing circulars, booklets and what-have-you, and speaking on the radio—I do not blame them for doing it—asking the people of Canada to take in all the refugees possible from Europe and to bring them to Canada. I have no objection to refugees coming to Canada, but I do say, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, you will agree with me, that not one refugee should come in until every man and woman, and child too—because there are some children of only fourteen or fifteen in our army—now serving in the forces are returned to civilian life and have secured jobs. I do not think these people should come in now and be given the advantage of jobs over our men who are overseas fighting for you and me, and I will fight to the last ditch the entrance of these people into Canada. I say also that immigration should be stopped until our boys and girls return from overseas and until the workers at present in our factories and war-time work return to jobs in normal civilian life. Not until then should these refugees and immigrants be allowed into the country. I shall be criticized throughout Canada for saying this, but it is my belief, and I know there are thousands of others who feel exactly as I do. I suggest further that not one immigrant and not one refugee should be allowed in until they have had the strictest and most rigid medical examination including X-ray. And they should be examined not by one doctor but at least two, and at different examining points. We do not want these people to come into the country unless they are healthy. I would go further and say that those who come in should be morally and mentally well. We do not want little Hitlers in the country; we do not want screwballs—pardon the language.

In the period 1939-43, 11,510 children from babyhood to the age of seventeen were admitted to Canada.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Mr. Speaker, at the time of the dinner recess I had only a few more words to say, and I believe I shall take only about five minutes to conclude my remarks. The speech from the throne contains these words:

> A broad programme has already been developed for the reestablishment of veterans of the present war, and for the care of disabled veterans and the dependents of our fighting men and merchant seamen.

I know that a great many returned men, reading that statement in the newspapers, would say it was absolutely wrong, because they feel that nothing has been done in many instances. The hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch) also mentioned this matter this afternoon. There have been a great many men discharged from the army. In many instances they have been given a few dollars, or perhaps a small pension, but they do not want just a hand-out. These men are anxious to be given something to do, some kind of job at which they can earn a living. They do not want to be handed a pension and told to go sit down on the curbstone and watch the parade go by. They want to be part of that parade themselves; they want to be part of this Canada; they want to help make it a great nation. The Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) has been very kind to me in most of the matters I have brought before him, but I feel that he should survey all the cases he has on his files, to see that these men are given not just pensions but real jobs, no matter how small. Show these men what to do, how they can make a living and become useful citizens once more. They fought for us; surely they deserve every possible consideration. I have some of these men in my own riding, and I think they are entitled to jobs after having fought for their country.

There is another matter I should like to discuss for a moment; that is, the matter of underwear for children. At the present time many men and women are being discharged

from our munition plants, and very little is being done to place these people in other work which will give them a decent living wage. I believe many of these men and women could be placed in the textile industry, where they might help make underwear for our children and adults. There is an absolute shortage of underwear of all kinds in this country to-day; and if God had not been very kind last fall and this winter in giving us springlike weather instead of the sub-zero weather we had last year, I feel quite sure that many children and adults would have perished from the cold. This springlike weather has also been a Godsend in that it has allowed the men in the woods to cut cordwood for next year. To return, however, to the matter of children's underwear, I know of one hospital auxiliary that has had to take sizes six, seven and eight and cut them down for babies only a year old. They have also taken worn underwear and tried to make it over for babies and young children.

I do not think the government really appreciates the need for proper underwear in this country. The men and women who work in our factories find it necessary to change their clothing very often. In Britain the women who work in the munitions plants handling explosives and powder are compelled to change their underwear at least every other day; and to make sure they do change it the government has compelled them to wear one colour on Monday and Tuesday, another colour on Wednesday and Thursday and a different colour on Friday and Saturday. I suppose what they wear on Sunday is their own business, but the government in Britain has seen that there is enough underwear to go round, and I think it is up to this government to do the same. I believe the workers who are being let out of our munitions plants should be permitted to go into the textile industry, which I think is classed as B1.

Of course another reason for the shortage is the definite increase in the birthrate. The number of births from 1939 to 1942 was 1,001,082, of whom there are 936,590 now living To this number must be added the immigrant children allowed into Canada, totalling 11,510. In a letter to me under date of January 29 the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) stated that in 1943-44 there would be 886,000 dozen garments made, as compared with 749,475 dozen in 1942-43; but many of those garments have not been made as yet, and even if they were available the increase would only give the additional children one and a half garments each.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer to the amendment, which states that the government has failed to lessen bureaucratic controls. The Toronto *Globe and Mail* of October 8, 1943, carried the following dispatch:

> People who have been salvaging foodstuffs destined for destruction at the city incinerator had their knuckles rapped by the prices board here to-night.
>
> In a statement issued on authority of the regional prices and supply representative, Stanley Lee, the board pointed out that acquisition of rationed food without surrendering valid ration coupons was illegal. A general warning was issued that unless all such articles of food were surrendered to the board, the holders would be liable to prosecution for contravening prices board regulations.
>
> Large quantities of food, including sugar in sealed containers, tinned bacon, evaporated milk, canned fruits and jams, have been dumped at the incinerator for disposal, and some had been salvaged by nearby residents.

Well, Mr. Speaker, none of those people has died as yet, so that the food must have been good. But why should the prices board demand coupons for food that was to be destroyed? It seems to me that is carrying things a little too far. If people need the food I say, give it to them.

A short time ago I asked the Minister of Finance a question with regard to the slaughtering of cattle and other animals, and he has confirmed my understanding that the farmers of Quebec are allowed to do so, while the farmers of the other provinces are not. He went on to state that if the scheme proved successful in Quebec the other provinces would be allowed the same privilege. I feel that if the wartime prices and trade board is to function properly every province must be treated exactly the same. If it extends a privilege to Ontario then Quebec and the other provinces should have it also. If the prices board gives a privilege to British Columbia then Quebec, Ontario and all the other provinces should enjoy it also. I know of one man who has slaughtered animals for over thirty years in Ontario. He is a law-abiding citizen; yet they took away his licence and would not give it back to him, while other people are allowed to slaughter without licences. There is something wrong with the wartime prices and trade board when they play favourites like that. I believe there should be a great deal of lessening of the controls.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I have used my full time.

Mrs. DORISE W. NIELSEN (North Battleford): Mr. Speaker, I am taking part in the debate because I believe it is very necessary that the reactions of our people toward the

speech from the throne should be made known in the house, so far as any hon. member is able to do so. I wish to join with other hon. members in congratulating the mover (Mr. Tremblay) and the seconder (Mr. Tucker) of the address in reply to the speech from the throne.

Before I proceed further there is one matter I should like to touch upon briefly. I am sorry the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) is not in his seat because I think he should know that I consider the very thinly veiled insult which he offered in his speech yesterday to the new member from Cartier, Montreal (Mr. Rose), coming as it did from an older member of the house—or shall we say a senior member—to say the least of it was unbecoming. What did he say? Oh, he was alarmed! He was dismayed! He was horrified, in fact, that the people of Montreal, the constituency of Cartier, should have sent this new member to the house!

It seems to me that these remarks of the hon. member for York-Sunbury, meant as an insult, will be more of a boomerang. I was not at all sorry he made them, because I think members of the house and the public generally will realize what a thin coating this "progressive" is on the Conservative party. When he said definitely that he was horrified at the election of this new member, what did he really intimate? What did he give out to the country at large? His own real feelings, that he was against democracy in action, when it elected as a representative to the House of Commons a member whose views he did not happen to share. He hated to see democracy in practice. It revealed, in fact, the very core of reaction which lies within the Conservative party. In fact, he made me think he stood there like a very ineffective old King Canute trying to hold back the waves of progress—

An hon. MEMBER: There he comes.

Mrs. NIELSEN: —standing there, hating to see the expression of new thought that springs up from within the heart of the people. And he will be just as ineffective. We do not have to worry about him.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): And I am not worrying about you.

Mrs. NIELSEN: The people of Montreal elected their member to the House of Commons because he was an honest man, because he was a man of the people, and they believe that he will represent them truly. Many of them possibly were not socialists, but they elected him for his honesty, and because they felt they could trust him. For my own part may I say this, Mr. Speaker, that I feel very happy to think that we shall have in this house a member who will help to do something to relieve the somewhat stuffy atmosphere of this chamber, and I am very happy to have with us a little red Rose.

After its long recess, parliament has met again in momentous times. We know that to-day the whole world stage is set for the last great act of what we hope will be the annihilation of fascism in the world, at least its heart. People the world over are ready in their places for the final conflict. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that everything which can be done by the government to add to the determination of the people, to give them courage so that they may go forward and hasten the day of unconditional surrender of the enemy, must be undertaken.

I find myself to-night more pleased to take part in this debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne than has been the case in previous sessions. In the speech at this session, and in the remarks of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), without doubt it is easy to see the government does have a desire to participate with the other great democratic forces in the world, first, by winning the war, through a close military collaboration with the other great powers, and second, by working in the international field for sane collective measures afterwards, to try to ensure peace at least for some generations. There is the further fact that the speech from the throne did bring up, in some measure, the fact that we in Canada intend to do this in our own name; in other words, that we have achieved a degree of nationhood, something which is welcomed, I believe, both by French- and English-speaking peoples in this country.

In the months which have intervened since the house last sat vast plans have been laid for the collaboration of the democratic forces. These were made at the three important conferences of Cairo, Moscow and Teheran. The plans outlined at those conferences have given to humanity a new outlook, a new perspective, which previously we did not have. Of course we have known all along that the forces of reaction, those which have feared the progress of democracy in the world, have done everything in the past to try to divide democratic forces, both internationally and here at home. But the declarations which were made by the leaders of the three great nations at Teheran were definitely a triumph for the democratic forces, and I believe to some degree have caused dismay among the forces of reaction. The agreements and the plans made at Teheran, while not going into intricate details which, at that time, were of course impossible, did offer a very broad scope for collaboration

among the nations of the world who believe in and mean to maintain democracy. They do offer to very wide sections of the Canadian people the hope of achieving not only victory over the enemy but a peace which will give the world an opportunity deliberately to plan its future without the necessity for further war. The fact that the one great socialist nation of the world, and the leaders of the two great capitalist nations were in agreement upon these matters, gives cause for satisfaction to all of us, and does not give any of us reason to disbelieve the sincerity of those who do not happen to think just exactly the same way we do upon economic problems. I would say that, to whichever group we may belong, whether we be socialist in our thinking, or whether we still believe in the power of capitalism, very definitely we can give our support to the plans made at Teheran. The only other alternative for us at a time like this is that when the war is over we shall find, particularly in Europe, civil wars and further devastation. We shall find confusion, lack of opportunity for world trade upon which the security of our own Canadian people depends.

Therefore it seems natural and right that we should favour and do everything in our power to make concrete and to substantiate these plans, so that they may become a reality. If by any chance the plans made at Teheran cannot be carried into effect, with the world itself reverting to chaos, there is no doubt whatsoever but that the most predatory and the fiercest of the reactionary forces of the world will take the opportunity to plunge the people back into an age of servitude, another dark age, comparable with that of mediaevalism.

Although some of us do hope and believe that socialism will be the ultimate solution to give the fullest democracy, to give the finest well-being to our people, yet to fail to see the great step which is outlined for the whole world in these historic conferences, and not to support it would be to fail to give leadership to the people in their struggles for freedom and security and the gaining of the reforms which are definitely one step forward in the progress of humanity.

Speaking on behalf of the people in my own particular part of Saskatchewan irrespective of their party affiliations, I think I can say to you, sir, that they regard this speech from the throne as definitely an advance. The suggestion embodied in the speech that the winning of the war is our first task undoubtedly will have their support. They would urge also —and this I say to you most emphatically— that this government accept its responsibility, as one of the most important if perhaps not the most important of the smaller nations of the world, in making its own definite and independent contribution to the peace plans and in establishing its own trade relationships on the basis of its own contribution in materials and men to the war effort.

Personally and on behalf of my people at home I think I can say definitely that we regret the reduction of twenty-five per cent which is contemplated in our mutual aid. I feel that we should increase rather than decrease this contribution of money and goods.

If the long needed reforms which are promised, perhaps not very definitely, in the speech from the throne are fully implemented they will be most welcome to my people. In order to be able to make their full contribution to the winning of the war, the farmers and small town people of northwest Saskatchewan need definite assurances from this government. As the work of the house progresses I hope that legislation will be placed before us which will give satisfaction and certainty to them.

The great majority of those living in that part of Saskatchewan which I represent in this house are concerned with agriculture. Therefore their main and primary consideration is that agriculture in Canada shall rest upon a sure foundation. I think most hon. members who represent agricultural ridings will agree with me when I say that the security of agriculture depends upon the degree of world trade we are able to develop and secure for ourselves. I think rather than decreasing credits at the present time, we should be increasing them. Such action would help greatly to establish among the nations of the world which need foodstuffs a feeling of friendship which would make them willing to accept our products at a later date. I noticed the other day that one of the representatives in the United States said this:

> It is impossible for us to continue to be an island of prosperity in an ocean of adversity. We cannot be a healthy nation surrounded by a sick world.

Those words apply equally well to Canada. Upon the degree of international cooperation and trade that exist depends the security of the world in general and ourselves also. I feel that we should do more than we are doing to advertise the products we are giving to other nations on long term credits. We should definitely develop our own policies for mutual aid to Europe and Asia to a greater extent. There was a time when we had considerable exports of grain, wheat and flour to China. In 1929 our exports of wheat and flour to China and Hong Kong amounted to

$21,565,000. That was a considerable export, but unfortunately after 1933 it dwindled down until in 1939 we were exporting only $698,000 worth of grain and flour products to that country. There is no reason in the world why we could not regain these markets by rendering more help to China during a time of extreme need, which is right now.

I think we are in a position to tell the people of the world that we are the producers of the finest foodstuffs to be found anywhere. We should let them know that after the war we can supply them with agricultural machinery and all kinds of raw materials and minerals. We should advertise these things in order to make our position for export later on known to the countries of the world which are likely to take advantage of it. The well-being of agriculture in Canada depends upon our export market, but, of course, it will never be secure without the guaranteeing by parliament of a definite parity price, with guarantees to extend for a period of at least two years. That would give our farmers an opportunity to plan and regulate their production.

We welcome the suggestion of placing a floor under agricultural products, but when the actual legislation comes before the house I reserve the right to criticize it, if necessary. I hope it will not be necessary, for I definitely hope that these floors will not be basements. We do not want basements; we want the same treatment for agriculture that industry has demanded, that is cost-plus. For too long our farmers have been producing at less than cost and the time has come when this situation should be changed. The farming people of Canada need protection. They need a stabilization of prices by the elimination of grain gambling, and the elimination of the excess profits of those monopolies which are so closely connected with agriculture, such as the milling industry and packing plants.

I am pleased to see that the government intends to set up an industrial development bank, but in this connection I have a suggestion to make. I would propose that in the legislation to be brought down during this session provision should be made not only for an industrial bank but for a bank for agricultural development. I appreciate that small business interests need such a bank, but I insist that even to a greater extent the smaller farmers, particularly those in the west, need a similar bank. First of all, they need a scaling down of their present debts. They need access to funds on long terms and at low rates of interest. They need the opportunity to establish themselves after the many years of drought and depression through which they have persevered and tried to keep their farms in operation. I hope the government will do what is possible to see that such a bank is instituted.

During the last recess I talked with many farming people in my province and I found that they considered it a disgrace that the province—undoubtedly because of pressure exerted by this government—is insisting upon the collection of old seed, feed and relief debts. During 1937 and 1938 there was a drought, and many of our farmers were forced to take the seed and feed which was given to them through the relief agencies maintained by this government and operated through the provinces and the municipalities. Why does this government feel that those farmers should pay back that relief? It may be said that the farmers got the relief. Certainly they got seed and feed, but when they got it they were actually producing wheat at less than cost. I do not think the Minister of Agriculture will contradict me.

Mr. GARDINER: Since the hon. member has referred to me, I will contradict her. The feed and relief which were given by this government at the period of time referred to by my hon. friend were given as a free gift.

Mrs. NIELSEN: I am very glad to hear the minister say that. But when I was speaking to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) in August he assured me that he had to see to the collection of the seed, feed and relief debts still outstanding in Saskatchewan.

Mr. GARDINER: It will be noted that I did not include seed. I said that feed and relief were given practically as a gift.

Mrs. NIELSEN: It is particularly the relief that was given in the matter of seed that I would mention. I ask hon. gentlemen, did not that relief benefit, not so much the farmers of Saskatchewan when they were producing wheat at low prices, as the railways, the grain exchange, and the small businessmen who benefited from the fact that the farmers were able to put in a crop? That relief helped to keep alive the whole economy of western Canada, and therefore I say that in justice to the farmers it should not be only the farmers who should be asked to pay back that relief but rather the country at large. Let the country at large accept the responsibility for the relief which the farmers were forced to accept.

Mr. GARDINER: I repeat, the farmers were not asked to pay back the relief that was given by this government.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): It is charged against their farms.

Mr. GARDINER: No, it is not.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): It is.

Mr. GARDINER: It is not.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): They have been notified by the municipalities to that effect.

Mr. GARDINER: Not as regards the relief given by this government. That was given as a free gift and not charged against the farmers. The provincial government did borrow and give relief, but that was not relief given by this government.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The relief was given by the country, not by the government.

Mrs. NIELSEN: At some later time I shall be glad to bring before the minister definite statements from my people to substantiate what I have said.

We are very happy to think that the government will consider setting up research laboratories in western Canada, and if we have an industrial bank which will help to finance small industry, we hope that we may have set up in Saskatchewan certain industries which will improve the economy of our province and benefit our people.

No doubt many members will be speaking on the question of housing, particularly with regard to cities. But I want to assure the House that housing is not a matter of concern only to city people. Overcrowding in slum areas in the cities is a ghastly thing, but in the rural areas we also have slum conditions. There, however, it is not overcrowding but the terrible isolation which makes conditions so bad for the settlers who have to endure them. In one of the publications of the Department of Agriculture, the *Economic Annalist* for November, 1943, there is an article about housing conditions in Saskatchewan. It says in part:

> It is readily agreed that improvements in the condition of farm homes in Saskatchewan are badly needed, and that some thought should be given towards rural housing in a broad reconstruction programme.

It goes on:

> Farm houses in the pioneer fringe region are generally in poor condition. The majority of settlers' houses in this region are built of logs and are of rough construction. This situation is in direct contrast with that in the prairie and park regions where the usual house is of frame construction with a small proportion of brick and stone construction. The poorest condition of houses for the pioneer region was shown by the Goodsoil-Pierceland area.

That happens to be in the northwest corner of my riding, and in that particular area the percentage of homes definitely acknowledged to be in poor condition was 70·2; the percentage of homes acknowledged to be in fair condition was 27·4, and those homes acknowledged to be in good condition were only 2·4 per cent of the total. So that in our part of the country, especially if we have a development bank set-up to grant agricultural credits, we hope to see a definite and constructive programme of rural housing undertaken by the government. Not only should the government do that, but I feel that there should be some supervision over the material and equipment used and over the construction companies which undertake such a housing scheme. Unless the government exercises some supervision there will be great variations in quality and price. We need to have prices minimized and standards of material and equipment set, before a housing project of this kind can really be efficient.

We would also suggest that plans for the electrification of Saskatchewan be made at the earliest opportunity. Some of our areas on the eastern side of Saskatchewan might be linked up with the electrification which is being undertaken by the province of Manitoba. We should also do something in the development of our northern water powers. In the northern areas of my riding there are some people who live thirty miles away from the nearest telephone, and in any programme of reconstruction and rehabilitation better telephone communication should be provided for these areas. In times of sickness or accident, with people as far away from a telephone as thirty miles, it will be seen how difficult communication is, particularly at certain times of the year when the roads are impassable.

With regard to health measures, there is unanimous agreement that these are not only necessary but extremely urgent. We need these things. As far as I can gather, the great majority of Saskatchewan people are supporting the Saskatchewan state medical league. They feel that to create conditions of positive health it would not be wise or prudent to take from the incomes of those who are farming in a small way or from the low salaried workers contributions toward a national health insurance scheme. They want the best of health insurance, not a makeshift policy.

We welcome all these things, but I want it definitely known that these measures will not be an alternative to providing for the basic needs of agriculture, which are world trade and guaranteed prices. These other social security measures will just add to the security and well-being of our farming people.

In the far north there are regions in my constituency where in isolated settlements only Indians and half-breeds live. I would suggest that in the period of rehabilitation, in order to give these people a little better opportunity, we might see what can be done in the matter of flooding certain areas, to give these people who live by hunting and trapping a better opportunity of catching muskrats and of selling furs. We might also consider the development of handicrafts in certain districts because that is work which Indians can very well do.

I mentioned this before but it is worth mentioning again. We would like to see an extension of the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act to include the northern areas of Saskatchewan. In some submarginal areas people have been settled on land which will never be able to provide them with a decent standard of living. Some of these families might be moved, under the act, to land more suitable which would give them a better return for their labour, and the lands which they vacate could be reforested and used as game and forest reserves.

My constituency is of tremendous size, and up in the extreme northerly corner of settled territory there is an area of roughly 6,000 square miles without a railway. It is a country which is well settled. There was the beginning of a railway built there ten or twelve years ago. It was a spur line sent in from Alberta to link up with Meadow Lake and St. Walburg. That line was not completed. The roadbed ends in the wilderness. If it were completed it would give the people in that district a chance to ship their cream, eggs and other farm products. I think the building of that railway should be undertaken immediately on the cessation of the war.

I do not think the small farmers, even if we have the measures which I have advocated, will feel that they are quite secure. Therefore, on behalf of those farmers who are farming on a small scale, I think that definitely this government must guarantee to them that they have security of tenure of their land, that we make evictions and foreclosures of these small farmers impossible, because how else are these people to try to develop their farms with any degree of hope for the future? Not only that, but we should prohibit the seizure of farm machinery. Government-owned machine stations should be established, so that these people are not left to antiquated methods of old farm machinery when they can have the chance of something new and better at low rentals. Furthermore, I believe that in these areas of pioneer and homesteading the government should definitely decide to do something to improve the nutritional standards of the people, and by that I mean not after the war, but now. I suggest that something along the lines of the United States stamp plan should be inaugurated to enable these people whose nutrition is low and whose income is poor to have some of the grains, fruits and other surplus foods which will from time to time be available. I think the provision of school lunches for children in these pioneer areas should also be undertaken.

These are things which should not be left until after the war, but should be organized to-day, to aid and increase the ability of our farm people to put their hearts and souls into the winning of the war and to look forward with hope toward the future.

I would again recall the statement made by one of the representatives in the United States house, that it was impossible for us to continue to be an island of prosperity in an ocean of adversity. On behalf of my own people in northern Saskatchewan may I express the hope and the belief that we should never again have islands of adversity, as the northwestern corner of Saskatchewan has been in the past—islands of adversity in an otherwise prosperous world.

Mr. WILFRID LaCROIX (Quebec-Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to participate in this debate, but in view of the controversy raised by the address which Lord Halifax, British ambassador to the United States, delivered before the Toronto board of trade, on which occasion Mr. John Bracken, leader of the Progressive Conservative party of Canada was in attendance, I deem it my duty to submit to this house a few considerations which I regard as necessary.

As a matter of fact, what was stated by Lord Halifax is that, since the imperial federation exists in fact, he could not see why it could not also exist by right. I am convinced that the ambassador himself was the first to derive some amusement out of the rumpus which some people have, for electioneering purposes, raised about his address.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, from the time of the Transvaal affair to this day, have not the successive governments taken an active share in bringing about, in point of fact, the imperial federation referred to by Lord Halifax?

The Canadian government stepped in first through participation in a war whose object was to deprive of its freedom a small defenceless country which only wanted to live, Transvaal. In 1914 at the request of the British government, they once again sided with England in what was then called a "struggle for the salvation of democracy." Now, dictator-

ships have never been so numerous in Europe and everywhere else than after that war of 1914: there have been dictatorships in Germany, in Italy, in Spain, in Russia, et cetera. All of them resulted from the Versailles treaty in the drafting of which the former prime minister of Britain Lloyd George, took an outstanding part. Finally, in 1939, we declared war to guarantee the Polish boundaries, which latter, if I may say so in passing, will shrink noticeably as a result of the present conflict. Besides, here is what Lord Halifax stated on that point in the course of his address:

> We can imagine the bewilderment of an intelligent visitor from another planet on being confronted with its manifest contradictions. . . . The visitor, baffled by this extraordinary confusion of functions, would suffer a further shock if he went on to study what actually happened in September, 1939. He would find that on September 3 Great Britain declared war on Germany; that Australia and New Zealand declared war on the same day, and that South Africa and Canada followed a few days later.
>
> He might well wonder why. He would naturally be puzzled to determine what possible interest the Polish corridor could have for a Canadian, or Danzig for an Australian, or the western frontier of Poland for a South African.
>
> The dominions had not been parties to the Treaty of Guarantee to Poland which was the immediate cause of Great Britain's action. . . . They had influenced, but had not been responsible for, the foreign policy of Great Britain.

Lord Halifax was justified in saying, from his own standpoint: "Since you are members de facto of an imperial commonwealth, why would you not be members de jure?"

Speaking with the authority which he derived from his threefold title of Minister of Justice, right-hand man of Mr. Mackenzie King and dean of the House of Commons, when he maintained that Canada was compelled to take part in the war, Mr. Lapointe, on September 9, 1939, and February 22, 1940, uttered these words: "Neutrality is impossible." On September 9, 1939, he quoted neutrality as defined by Oppenheim "a recognized authority in international law": "Neutrality may be defined as the attitude of impartiality adopted by a third state towards belligerents and recognized by belligerents, such attitude creating rights and duties between the impartial state and the belligerents." On the strength of this rigid definition, the former minister of justice painted a dark picture of Canada remaining neutral in a war which involved Great Britain. Not only did he claim that neutrality was impossible, but he went so far as to assert that there was no such thing as mitigated, partial or sympathetic neutrality. To those who were advocating a policy of mitigated or sympathetic neutrality towards Great Britain, Mr. Ernest Lapointe replied, on September 9, 1939, I quote:

> Well, Mr. Speaker, as a constitutional student —as I think I am—as a public man and a Minister of Justice of Canada I state, with all my responsibility, that there is no such thing as mitigated or partial neutrality.

In his recent address, Lord Halifax stated:

> As opposed to that policy, which Ireland showed could be followed, the world had watched the amazing spectacle of free nations flying into common action as a result of policies in which they had had little share, but in defence of common ideals.

Ireland adds her testimony to that of Lord Halifax. On January 26, 1943, the *Canadian Press* released from Ottawa the following dispatch—I quote:

> Mr. John D. Kearney, High Commissioner of Canada to Dublin, stated that the official attitude of the government of Eire in the present war, as defined by Prime Minister de Valera, is an attitude of benevolent and friendly neutrality. All that Ireland can do in the circumstances is to show goodwill and friendship toward the united nations. Mr. Kearney made this statement to the newspapermen to-day, on the occasion of his first visit to Ottawa, since he has assumed his post in Ireland, two years ago.

In a report on this subject, a daily French paper of Montreal stated: "Ireland's neutrality in this war is a benevolent neutrality."

Mr. Speaker, after all these gestures worthy of colonials, made by the governments which have successively held power since the Transvaal war and which the King administration has amplified during the present conflict, Lord Halifax has considered that it was only logical for him benevolently to stoop down towards Canada and charitably offer our country a seat in the imperial council that will be called, after the war, to pass on matters pertaining to the foreign policy of England.

Was it not a former prime minister of Canada, Mr. R. B. Bennett, who made the following statement, as reported by radio station CFCF, a few days ago:

> I do not believe the British empire is an accident. I believe that the miracles of this war are indeed miracles, and that we have survived and will continue to do so because we have a divine mission to rule the world.

More than that, Mr. Speaker, did not the parliamentary secretary to the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King, who is supposed to express the latter's views, state and define, in the course of an address recently delivered in the United States, the future policy of the Canadian government in the following terms:

> Cooperation with the United States in the protection of the North American continent and

of Great Britain, a country which must be considered, in these times of fast transportation, as the outpost and bastion of our continent.

Therefore, if Mr. Claxton wishes Canada, in cooperation with the United States, to contribute to the defence of Great Britain, it is because the latter is considered to be a bastion and outpost of our continent.

In a few words, Mr. Speaker, our whole war policy leans towards the views held by Lord Halifax. Is not Canada the only British commonwealth dominion without a national flag, and where the union jack is still the emblem unfurled over all public buildings? Is not our country, with its small population of some eleven million, the nation that has done most to hold that bastion, England, by a per capita war effort greater than that of any other country in the world?

Our total income, as compared with our total expenditures, have diminished from 82 per cent in 1939 to the pitifully low figure of 46 per cent in 1943. The total deficit in our budget increased from $119,000,000 in 1939 to the fantastic sum of $3,018,000,000 in 1943. The financial help granted the United Kingdom, which was not anticipated in the budget, climbed from $104,000,000 in 1939 to $1,053,000,000 in 1941, and since then, it has sky-rocketed to tremendous heights.

At the conference which took place in Toronto, Mr. John Bracken, by his presence and applause, gave full support to the words spoken by Lord Halifax. Moreover, all those who heard the speech made by the temporary leader of the Progressive-Conservative party in the house noticed that he considered the proposal of Lord Halifax, simply as a matter of controversy, when both he and Mr. Bracken should have protested and insisted that Lord Halifax leave the country never to set foot here again; for no other country in the world would have tolerated for one moment that foreign ambassador, even though a lord, ask that country to sacrifice its independence in order to please a caste of tories and imperialists who have but one thought in mind, that being to go on milking Canada indefinitely.

In the face of the unspeakable claim suggesting that we be associated to an empire with which we have nothing in common from the geographical and economic standpoints, our present-day Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) felt a sudden throb of Canadianism; this reawakening was evidenced by protests against this proposal, protests which I heartily endorse; the proposal, however, is but the corollary to an imperialistic policy for the shaping of which he must assume a large share of responsibility. We must not forget, Mr. Speaker, that the audacity of the British government which, in spite of what might be said, inspired Lord Halifax, is but the natural consequence of our own weakness. Lord Halifax thought, quite simply: "If they have set the stage for this request, why should I not take advantage of it?" That is one of the reasons why, in September, 1939, I voted against Canada's participation in the war.

As far as I am concerned, I protest vigorously against the proposal of Lord Halifax, just as I have always protested, ever since I have held a seat in the house, against any tightening of the bonds which unite us to England.

I would much rather have my country take a course leading to complete independence than follow blindly in the winding wake of England's foreign policy, a policy which will fatally lead us again into war every twenty or twenty-five years. The sooner we realize that, the better.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to state that if I disapprove of the mad effort which we are putting forth in our participation and which is out of proportion with our financial possibilities, I nevertheless wish to congratulate the government for having announced, in the speech from the throne that they intend to introduce legislation designed to afford farmers the necessary economic stability in the post-war period, through the establishment of minimum prices on the chief farm products. That is a measure which I have advocated every year since I have been a member. I am glad to note that the government has at last adopted it.

Moreover, I wish to congratulate the government for having recognized the principle of family allowances. I hope that the bill which will be introduced in this house will include no restriction as regards the number of children to whom the measure may apply. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, out of 2,486,920 families in Canada, 617,990 or 24.84 per cent live in the province of Quebec. If there are grounds for the rumour that no allowance would be granted to the seventh and subsequent children, this would deprive the province of Quebec from an advantage to which she is rightfully entitled, for it is in our province that the primary notion of patriotism which consists in giving children to the Canadian nation is best understood. Out of 84,920 Canadian families with seven, eight or nine children, Quebec accounts for 43,170, and out of the 20,890 Canadian families with ten or more children, Quebec has 13,220.

The other day I heard certain persons say that this measure would help extend French

influence in Canada. May I, Mr. Speaker, reply to this argument as follows: This legislation will tend rather to give recognition to the unsung heroism of the Canadian mother who daily in her home ignores the urge of selfishness, denies herself in order to do her humble share for a greater and finer Canada where life is worth living. In regard to the development which this legislation may give to the French tongue and influence, I assert that Canada can but benefit from two cultures developing along parallel lines without, however merging entirely. To those who out of racial fanaticism oppose the principle laid down by this legislation may I say also that no matter what may be done in regard to the use of the French language, I state positively that it will endure for, as the poet said:

> Trying to stop its impetus is just like trying to prevent rosebuds from bursting into full blossom. Trying to annihilate its charm and power is like dreaming to dim the radiance of dawn.

No matter what campaigns are launched to suppress the traditions which we inherited from our ancestors, the French pioneers who settled the country, those traditions will remain alive always, for Providence willed, and rightly so, that we should stand guard faithfully, on the shores of the St. Lawrence, in this north American continent, over the genius of French thought.

Mr. D. G. ROSS (St. Paul's): Mr. Speaker, I agree with the words in the speech from the throne in regard to our armed forces; I think they have done a magnificent job. The air force lived up to the best traditions of Canada when it took part in the battle of Britain and helped to defend that citadel of freedom in the dark days of 1940. The men of the navy have been responsible to no small degree for the winning of the battle of the Atlantic and for holding open the life-line to Great Britain and other countries. The men of the army had a tedious wait for several years, and it was remarkable that their morale held up as well as it did. However, they were ambassadors of good will in Great Britain and helped to further the splendid relationship that exists between Canada and the motherland. The women of the armed forces have done very well also. Our men are now conducting themselves wonderfully in Italy, I think far better than the general public really know. They are going through a terrible time over there, and I sometimes think the exploits of our men are taken too much for granted by the people of Canada. I believe it would be better if we knew a little more about the grim conditions under which our forces have to carry on.

That being so, let us see that when the men and women of the armed forces return to Canada they are not disillusioned by the treatment they receive. Every effort must be put forth to see that the ideals for which they fight are realized. Perhaps the majority of the workers—and I include everyone—on the home front have some realization and appreciation of the efforts put forth by our armed forces, but the more closely the hardships and sufferings of our men are brought home to the people in Canada, the more they realize the difficulties that are being encountered, the greater will be their understanding of what must be done in future for those men and women who have saved the world from nazi terrorism and brutality.

After our successes in North Africa we heard it said in many quarters that the war would probably be over by June. I never held that view, which to my mind was greatly to be deplored. Even the speech from the throne, I thought, gave that impression in the first few paragraphs; perhaps that impression was given because what was actually said was so overshadowed by window-dressing. Certainly it looked like a pre-election speech, and I think has been so taken by a great many people. Therefore I thought it was very timely that in his address on January 31, after reviewing the favourable position that the allies are in to-day and the position of the axis powers, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) should say, as reported at page 33 of *Hansard*:

> But I do say at once to the House of Commons and to the people of Canada that I am far from believing there is going to be an early conclusion to this war.

Something along the same line was said to the British House of Commons by Mr. Churchill. Perhaps people were beginning to think too much about the post-war period and too little about the winning of the war itself. The Prime Minister also disillusioned those who thought there would be an early general election, when he said, as reported at the same page of *Hansard*:

> The people of Canada do not want a general election at this time of war. Our men fighting overseas do not want an election, if it can be avoided, until after victory is achieved, and we are in a position to welcome them and all our armed forces home as a victorious army.

However, the Prime Minister left the door open pretty wide, so that I think it is obvious that in the speech from the throne he was dressing his windows and showing his wares to the people of Canada in preparation for a general election, and I imagine that if the right time should present itself the window-dressing will not count for much, though there

will have to be some issue on which he will go to the country. I for one think a general election at this time would be deplorable. Look at what lies ahead of our fighting men. Perhaps we may gain some idea of the difficulties they will encounter if we look at the illustration which appeared in the Toronto *Daily Star* not long ago showing some of the fortifications which will have to be overcome on the western front. Think of the terrible blood-bath that will have to be endured; think of the loss of life, the loss of property that must take place before victory is won. When we consider the care with which the campaign in Italy is being conducted it seems obvious that it will be some time before the war is over; and the war will be over only when we are in complete control of the nazi countries. Another point is that as far as I can see there is no need for a general election just now, because the government have an overwhelming majority and can do anything they like.

I have one or two suggestions to offer in connection with the reform of the procedure of the House of Commons, though perhaps some hon. members who come from a distance will not agree with them. Reform is very badly needed because of the tremendous growth of the business which must be done and the multiplicity of subjects which must be debated. I think everyone in the country deprecates the fact that to a large extent the nation is being run by order in council. I believe most of these measures should be debated on the floor of the house. For instance, order in council P.C. 9384, the wartime wages control order, was passed on December 9 only a short time before the house met. Perhaps the decision in that connection had to be made promptly; I do not know. But it seems to me that a measure of that kind might well have waited until the house was in session. Had that been the situation, some of the unrest among working men might have been eliminated. However, so far as that measure is concerned, I know several hon. members have spoken with respect to it, and I do not wish to repeat what has been said. I simply raise my voice in vigorous protest against the measure as being un-British and undemocratic. I say it should be repealed, and we should have discussion on the floor of the house with respect to it.

It seems to me that when the committee is considering amendments to the rules of procedure some thought might be given to the length of session. We come to Ottawa in the early part of the year, remain here five or six months, and then return to our homes for the remainder of the year. Of necessity, orders in council have to be passed while we are not here, and without debate. Why could the session not be divided into three parts, the members coming here for two or three months, and then returning home? In the first part of the session we might discuss the speech from the throne, vote moneys, pass the necessary appropriation measures, and the required supply. Then we could go away for a couple of months, and return for a further two or three months of discussion, or whatever may be necessary. We might then go away again and, if necessary, come back a little later on.

So far as I know, all orders in council of major importance dealt with by the British government are placed before parliament, and opportunity is given for their discussion when the house is in session. Under our present system I believe the government have taken advantage of the powers given under the War Measures Act to govern by orders in council to too great an extent. Also, they are unnecessarily infringing upon provincial rights. They have taken powers to which they are not entitled. As I have said before in other sessions, a great deal of discussion and many long speeches might be obviated by the introduction of a question hour. Question hours might be allowed two or three times a week during which questions could be asked, replies given and supplementary questions asked. If that were permitted I am sure much of the lengthy discussion and debate would be obviated. There is no doubt of the success of that principle in the British House of Commons.

I am in agreement with much of the proposed legislation in the speech from the throne, but I urge that the government introduce its legislation and bring it down on the floor of the house. The people of Canada do not want window-dressing to-day. Rather, they want something concrete; promises are not enough. They want legislation.

There is a further matter I should like, on account of its urgency, to bring to the attention of the house, rather than wait until a later date. I refer to a revision of the remuneration paid to letter carriers in Toronto, a revision which is long overdue. When one compares the wages or salaries paid to other public servants, such as policemen, firemen, motormen and the like, he realizes at once that the remuneration of postmen or letter carriers which, at present, ranges from $1,020 to $1,500 a year, is inadequate. To these sums, of course, must be added the cost of living bonus.

The intelligence required to perform the arduous duties of these men is often overlooked. I have not now the time to make a comparison with other services, in figures,

but the importance of letter carriers, as far as the performance of their duties is concerned, has been underestimated. The letter carrier is the last link in the system of communications. He corrects all mistakes previously made, he manipulates mail, and attends to incorrect or insufficient addressing by the public. He offers the only means of effecting delivery. He records businesses and householders, and also keeps a record of guests, home-owners, and those people who are in hospitals and hotels. All information in connection with these men is set out in a circular forwarded by the letter carriers branch No. 1—F.A.L.C. committee, which circular I have no doubt has been put into the hands of Toronto and district members. This is an urgent matter and one which should receive immediate attention. That is my reason for bringing it up at the present time.

I was pleased to see in the speech from the throne that at last the government has decided to do something in connection with low-cost housing. I have discussed this matter on many occasions, and I have always been told it was one within the control of the provincial government, the cities or the municipalities directly concerned, and that it was not a matter of federal responsibility. Last year, when it was so difficult to get housing accommodation for workers in Toronto I described some of the conditions under which people were living in my own riding. In some instances I have found families with as many as five or six children living in one or two rooms. Often the house was old, in bad condition and infested with vermin, a condition which was bad for the health of the children. However, city officials did not enforce the by-laws because those people, if ejected, had no place to go. It is about time some consideration were given to conditions of that kind.

I do not wish to discuss the questions arising from the speech delivered by Lord Halifax, or from that of General Smuts. These are matters requiring careful thought ,and I do not believe we should have preliminary discussions on the floor of the House of Commons. The proper place for such discussion by the Prime Minister of Canada would be in round-table conference with the other prime ministers of other dominions. There are many intricate and complex problems involved. The Prime Minister has spoken to us about the means of communication at his hand, with which he may communicate with various members of the commonwealth, or premiers of the provinces. However, all hon. members who are in business know that in their own daily lives, despite the advanced methods of communication, nothing will take the place of a round-table conference. Good and all as communications are, I think we might conclude that the Prime Minister is not going to communicate by telephone with the premiers of the different provinces. I understand that they are to come to Ottawa for a conference in the near future.

It is my hope that the Prime Minister will attend the round-table conference of which mention has been made recently. I hope it will be called at as early a date as possible. Above all, I hope the Prime Minister will go over there with an open mind.

This brings me to another matter which I should like to discuss a little more fully, the question of radio. When we first set up radio in Canada an effort was made to make it a government monopoly, but times and conditions have changed. In Canada we have both free enterprise and public ownership working in cooperation with each other and the state. We have free enterprise under government control and we have public ownership under government control, both surrounded by safeguards to prevent abuse of their powers.

For instance, we have the Bell Telephone company, a free enterprise, operating in conjunction with rural telephone systems, many of which are publicly owned. We have the Canadian Pacific Railway operating in conjunction with the Canadian National Railways. We have privately owned power companies operating in conjunction with publicly owned systems; although in different territories. All these different enterprises compete one against the other. That is a good thing because they act as checks. But they are all operating under the control of the state. We have publicly owned water systems and some privately owned systems. At times privately owned systems have been changed to public ownership and it has been found that they did not work as successfully. We have both publicly owned and privately owned transportation systems in our cities, but they are all under control.

It is important that we should have this dual system because our whole economy has been built up on that principle. Our whole system was evolved on that principle. People talk about our democracy as being a government of the people, for the people, by the people, and let it go at that. But it is more than that. Our system of democracy is built up on one important principle, the diversification of powers of influence. Government of the people means our parliament. For the people means for all classes. By the people means that the people elect parliament. Parlia-

ment is not elected by one class; it is elected by all classes. Perhaps this is done differently in other countries, but that is how it is done here. Parliament is the servant of all, of the power of capital, of labour, of the civil service, of science and so forth, and last but not least, of the power of the freedom of the individual.

Our system has been built up having in view the danger of absolute power. We have always been trying to safeguard against uncontrolled monopolistic power. This is especially bad when such power is controlled by the government or by the state. I see this as an approaching danger in connection with radio in Canada. A British statesman said, "Give me the complete use of the radio and I will elect any party to power." I think he was about right when he said that. The absolutism of the radio corporation in Canada is becoming more intolerable all the time and is becoming more dangerous to the country. I see great danger in the future if it is allowed to continue.

Radio in Canada is nominally controlled by the board of governors, but in fact it is not controlled by the board of governors, it is controlled by the government. At the present time it is controlled by the Liberal party. The board of governors sits every once in a while, but there are at present two vacancies on the board. In addition, there is no general manager, only an acting general manager, and there is no assistant general manager. The bylaws call for certain duties to be performed by the assistant general manager, and I do not know who is performing those duties. However, enough of that. The government runs it; so that is that. With all the excuses in the world, with all the camouflage that can be offered that it is an absolutely independent enterprise, the fact is that it just is not so.

For some time we have had the acting general manager of the radio corporation acting as a referee as to who shall or shall not speak over the radio, whether an address is or is not controversial, or whether it is or is not political. He decides what prominent citizens are to be given the right to speak. If the subject matter of the speech is considered to be political, then the speaker is not allowed on the radio. There have been some slight adjustments in these rules because certain parties are now allowed some time on the air.

On the other hand we hear forum discussions of the most controversial subjects and at times the discussions are inaccurate and misleading. These forums last for half an hour, and they take up subjects which could be debated for at least two or three hours before a proper conclusion could be arrived at. The inaccurate results of these things are left in the minds of the public. Just the other day I listened to a radio broadcast over the new network coming from Philadelphia. This was a speech by a gentleman in the United States whose name I have forgotten. He was referring to Mr. Nehru of India and his persecution by the British government. I do not know anything about that, nor do I know much about Mr. Gandhi or the political significance of all this. But I do know that at the meeting of the empire parliamentary committee held here in the House of Commons the facts were given to us by members of the British government. We listened to a most instructive talk on the matter. I am not defending Gandhi or Nehru; I am simply referring to the discussion about them as an example of the controversial matters that are heard over the radio. If such things are allowed over the radio, is there any reason why other speakers should not be allowed to speak? I only make that comparsion.

Mr. Bracken was refused the use of the Radio Broadcasting Corporation facilities and there was a great deal of controversy over that decision. His speech was rejected by the referee for the corporation on the ground that it was political and that something must first be deleted from it. Who was the judge? Was it the acting general manager of the corporation? Was it the board of governors? Was it some other body that decided that Mr. Bracken should not be allowed to speak because he was too popular? But Mr. Bracken is a prominent citizen of this country and his speech was broadcast over a private radio station and also received wide publicity in the press. I defy anybody within sound of my voice to tell me that that speech was political or controversial. It was a good speech, made by a sane man on conditions in Canada and giving the speaker's suggestions as to what ought to be done. It was not a political speech in any sense, and I might add that it was very well received by the public of Canada.

Last year the committee of this house on radio broadcasting made this recommendation, at page 260 of this report:

> Outstanding speakers of national importance should continue to express their views.

In view of that recommendation of a committee of this house, why was Mr. Bracken not allowed to use the national hook-up to express his views, simply because he was the leader of the Progressive Conservative party? This is not the first time that a speaker of national importance has been refused the air simply because he was the leader of a political party. But all the ministers of the cabinet can use the air all they like and their speeches are not censored.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Oh, yes.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): All right. I think it is quite proper that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) should give a message to this country. But it is a different matter entirely to have political broadcasts by ministers of the crown, as has happened in the past.

Mr. HOMUTH: They were not very effectual though.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): If ministers of the crown are to be allowed to make political broadcasts, then prominent citizens, no matter what their political stripe, should also be allowed to give their views over the air because the public want to hear them.

The committee on radio broadcasting last year reaffirmed the principle of 1932, namely:

> The paramount importance of a single national authority to control all broadcasting in the public interest.

In view of the situation as we find it and the evolution which has taken place in broadcasting, it becomes a matter of public importance that there must be set up some independent body, such as the board of transport commissioners, free entirely from the control of government, publicly owned enterprise and privately owned enterprise, which will have the authority to control radio and act impartially. This body would formulate the general principles upon which broadcasting shall be carried on in Canada so that both private and public enterprise will carry on their business according to their own policies, subject only to the control of the board. The position today is that decisions are given by an official who is under control and his decisions therefore cannot possibly be impartial. He has to make decisions, for instance, with respect to private stations and decide how much power they shall have. Imagine all that being decided by a man who is running a radio system in competition with the private stations!

A commission or board such as I have described would also coordinate all broadcasting in Canada. Another necessity for this is shown in the contradiction which appears in the recommendation of the 1943 committee on radio broadcasting. It reaffirmed the principle of the 1932 report, as follows:

> The public ownership of all high-powered stations under a national system of broadcasting, with low-power stations individually operated or coordinated in relation to the dominant system.

In other words, the publicly-owned stations were to be the high-powered stations, and the privately-owned stations were to be allowed only low power.

Yet the 1943 committee recommended:

> . . . that the independent stations be encouraged to improve their facilities and that they be permitted to increase their power and to arrange for multiple station hook-ups, and generally do anything that makes for better broadcasting in the public interest.

It is true that a new network has been set up utilizing the private stations, but it is under the iron fist of government control. The 1943 committee also stated:

> Evidence was presented to the effect that there may be danger of losing full use of the channels now assigned to Canada by the Havana agreement.

That is so. Yesterday in the house we heard an answer given to a question put by the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) in respect to aviation, which is a public monopoly in this country at the present time, pointing out the strangling of civil aviation. We do not want to have our radio channels lost to us in this country because of government radio monopoly here, but it is becoming abundantly clear that the monopoly control by the broadcasting corporation and the obstructions placed in the way of private stations has placed Canada in a very serious position with respect to channels. We cannot be a dog in the manger. The Havana agreement definitely states that unless these channels are taken up by a certain date by Canada they may be lost to us. We have to the south of us a country of 140,000,000 people, who want to be served by radio. We already have encroachment upon our channels by the United States, and unless we do something about it we shall not be left with the channels we now have and be subject to the control of radio by the United States. There is plenty of room for competing radio chains in this country, and for the reasons which I have stated we must not allow in Canada one all-powerful radio system.

The recommendations of the radio committee have been followed to a certain extent. Another network has been established. I do not know what the full implications of that are, but I imagine I shall find out later on.

Consider for a moment the implications in regard to other media of advertising. It is well known that paper rationing in regard to newspapers is in effect. There are other war-time restrictions on the publishing industry which of necessity have curtailed advertising in newspapers and magazines. Direct mail and similar forms of advertising have been seriously reduced by war-time restrictions, that is by the wartime prices and trade board. These restrictions have been imposed by the government for reasons known to these industries. One of the main reasons, of course, is to curtail the demand for consumer goods and

thus set up another barrier to inflation. Yet we have the spectacle of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation going into the advertising business to an increasing extent, setting up new facilities for advertising, and thereby stimulating, in this most unfair way, the demand for consumer goods, notwithstanding the edict of the wartime prices and trade board.

Here is a statement made by the chairman of the board of governors in 1938:

> Beyond the figure of $500,000 per year of commercial revenue from network and local stations, it is not desirable nor the intention of the corporation to go, and that only until we are self-supporting from other sources.

The then Minister of Transport confirmed that idea.

The latest statements of the broadcasting in 1943, given to the committee, showed that the commercial revenue was $1,204,600. Also, the write-off from real estate, buildings, equipment, et cetera, was $411,000 on fixed assets of $800,000, or fifty per cent. Also there was a total surplus of $230,000.

Surely under present conditions there should be some reduction of the licence fee, or else the corporation does not need this commercial advertising, and it ought to be able to devote its whole time to giving good service to the public.

It is very necessary to-day, in view of the absolute powers of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, that another commission be appointed.

Mr. EMMANUEL d'ANJOU (Rimouski): (Translation): Mr. Speaker, the speech from the throne is interesting not so much for what it contains as to what it hints at. We are engaged in a total war and the government, in the speech from the throne, state that they intend increasing our effort if possible. However, it is the same government who told the Canadian people in the election campaign of March 1940 that our participation in the present conflict would be moderate. They have repudiated this promise together with all the others connected with our share in the bloody conflict now in progress. To ruin the country, shamelessly to sacrifice our man-power and capital, are their foremost and sole concern. All that we have is offered to the god of war, leaving nothing but ruin and bankruptcy for the Canadian people. The speech from the throne again hints at the government's intention to authorize, in the course of the present session, the payment of another tribute of a billion dollars to Great Britain. I state right now, Mr. Speaker, that I shall oppose this measure with all my strength, as I have done on two previous occasions.

Instead of paying an annual tribute to England, the government would be far better inspired in endeavouring to relieve the distress which is to be met all over the country.

The adoption of refugees is now to the fore, as well as immigration. Ever since it has been my privilege to sit in this house I have most strenuously opposed immigration to this country. I strongly condemned the admission to Canada of immigrants picked up on the docks of London and Liverpool, and I have not changed my mind. This means, Mr. Speaker, that I am a relentless opponent of immigration of whatever kind it may be and from whichever country it may come. Let the government encourage rather than discourage large families, thus, our population will increase normally and the immigration problem will no longer exist. As regards the admission of refugees to Canada, I oppose it just as strongly as I have condemned mass immigration. We did not want war and we have done nothing to foment it. Let those countries which have a share of responsibility in this war take care of the refugees whom it is proposed to pour into Canada. Let us first take care of our Canadian people, and above all let us mind our own business before meddling with the problems of others.

Mr. Speaker, I have received a large number of petitions from municipal councils in my constituency, protesting against immigration and, if one may say so, the adoption of refugees. I shall read one of these resolutions to this house:

> Resolution in "opposition" to the proposed immigration of European refugees to Canada in violation of the laws of the country.
>
> Whereas according to the Montreal *Gazette*, page one, the Dominion Minister of Immigration, Mr. Crerar, made the following declaration on November 3, 1943:
>
> "Canada offers a home to refugees. An immigration agent is being sent to Europe, and the dominion government will consider sympathetically the immigration to Canada of an unspecified number of refugees."
>
> Whereas it is a well-known fact that the United Jewish Refugees & War Relief Agencies, with head office at 1121 St. Catherine St. West, Montreal, has circulated among the public a petition asking that Canada open her doors to all the refugees from the European continent, and that it is endeavouring, under the patronage of Senator Cairine R. Wilson, to obtain in Canada 500,000 signatures for this purpose.
>
> Whereas in so far as such immigration will take place mostly in the province of Quebec, there is cause for alarm.
>
> Whereas on January 7, 1944, the Canadian Press released a news item bearing the following heading:
>
> "Canada has agreed to accept a limited number of immigrants. Refugees who come to Canada from the Spanish peninsula, according to a decision reached recently, will be given refuge for the duration of the war."

Whereas the fact of thus allowing refugees to enter the country is not only a further encroachment upon the prerogatives of the people, but will be the cause of social disturbances now and after the war.

Whereas this question has not been submitted to the House of Commons and members of parliament should have the opportunity of voicing their views on this matter before such a policy becomes effective. It is unanimously resolved by the council of the municipality of St. Valérien of Rimouski county,

1. That the above-mentioned municipal council is opposed to the suggested immigration plan and to any immigration on a different plan than that which has prevailed in recent years.

2. That in any case, no amendment to existing laws and regulations governing immigration should be made unless parliament has had an opportunity of discussing the matter at the next session.

3. That this resolution be given publicity.

4. That copy thereof be forwarded to the Prime Minister of Canada, to the Premier of Quebec, to the Quebec provincial leader of the opposition and to the dominion and provincial members of the constituency.

Dated January 24, 1944.

(signed) Zénon St. Pierre,
mayor,
Henri Cimon,
secretary.

Seal of the municipality.

Municipality of St. Valérien.

per H. C. . . . Sec.-Treas.

Municipality of St. Valérien, Rimouski county.

I give my strongest support to resolutions passed by municipalities of my constituency opposing the admittance of refugees and immigration in general.

The speech from the throne contains the announcement concerning the adoption of family allowances by the government. I hope that this is not simply an election campaign promise but that, on the contrary, a bill will be brought down in this connection, in the course of this session. Allowances should not be granted exclusively to families of five or six children, but should apply to all families irrespective of their size.

Families of ten or twelve children are not a scarcity in the province of Quebec. Some are even larger. Personally, I am one of fifteen children, twelve boys and three girls, and I am convinced other families just as large can still be found in the constituency of Rimouski. The government, who had always refused to help large families has now an unique occasion to do so through family allowances. This is not the first time I take the opportunity of pleading this cause in the House and I shall continue to do so until the government decides to be fair to large families.

For us French Canadians, large families are our means of survival, and, as long as, in the province of Quebec, large numbers of children are brought into the world, we shall not need refugees or immigrants from whatever country they might come; that is the way to bring happiness and prosperity to the province of Quebec and to Canada. It is all very well to say that our territory could support 200 million inhabitants, but the numeric strength of our population is less important than its quality. Even if, in ten or fifteen years from now, Canada should support only 20,000,000 inhabitants, this number of Canadian-born citizens would be preferable to 50,000,000 people drawn from every European country or, as I said before, picked up on the wharves of London or Liverpool. Personally, I am for a Canadian population composed of our offspring, especially in the province of Quebec, of real Canadian citizens rather than of people brought from overseas and with whom attempts would be made, after the war, to merge the rest of the population of the province of Quebec. As I said before, Mr. Speaker, I gladly support the petitions sent by the great majority of the municipalities of my constituency and I hope that, at least, the government will understand that helping large families—the best guarantee of prosperity for the country—is promoting their own interests.

Mr. JOSEPH-ARMAND CHOQUETTE (Stanstead) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I may say that I do not intend to trespass on the time of the house. Looking over the speech from the throne I notice that the government intends to introduce several measures of general interest. I do know, however, that if those measures were promised by a government still enjoying the confidence of the Canadian people, by a party that had shown more sympathy toward the people of this country during the last depression, I should be more hopeful of seeing those measures implemented.

That the people no longer trust the government is evidenced by the fact that in the four by-elections held in August 1943, the government candidates were defeated. The government supporters in this house were loud in their applauding the right honourable the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) when he spoke on January 31. They had been much less enthusiastic during the introduction of new members on January 26, the day on which parliament was prorogued, because each and every one of the new members were in the opposition.

The government now wish to redeem themselves in the public esteem, by including in the speech from the throne measures taken from the political programmes of rival parties. In September, 1943, in a speech delivered before the National Liberal Federation, a short time after the elections, the Prime Minister stated that the Bloc Populaire Cana-

dien had but a destructive policy which raised the province of Quebec against the remainder of the country. Yet the Bloc Populaire's programme included family allowances, but the government have nevertheless discovered that the family and the home constitute the foundations of national life. They had to be reminded of that by the Bloc Populaire. With the family allowances that our political movement will ensure us, we shall have the true Christian ideal, based on fraternity and charity. Needless to say, the family is going to derive much benefit from such allowances. We all know that from 1929 to 1939 large families were those which suffered most and had to make the greater sacrifices at that time, and the governments of the time had no thought for family allowances.

Even to-day, on account of the present salary structure, the worker who has a large family, can hardly supply his children with the bare necessaries. The members of the family lack food, clothing and decent housing. The consumption of milk in the working class families is much lower than it should be, and it is the same with meat, vegetables and fruits. Too many workers live in slums. The salaries now being paid do not allow the heads of large families to give their children the bare necessaries.

In the case of the farmer, the situation is different. A farmer who has many children is unable to provide for their education and establishment. In the cities educational facilities are numerous and varied. In rural areas, when children grow up and become old enough to work, they scatter here and there. It is humanly impossible for a farmer who has many children to provide for their establishment, and frequently he must resign himself to letting them take their chance as soon as they are able to earn their living.

Such are, in brief, the difficulties which our families must face. That is why we, the supporters of the Bloc Populaire, have included family allowances in our programme. But let there be no infringement on the rights of the provinces because we hold autonomy as a sacred right. We are against centralization.

Mr. Speaker, the speech from the throne refers to war. We are told that the German army is still quite powerful, that future operations will entail desperate fighting and heavy casualties. But are not those who plunged us into this disastrous conflict the very people who for twenty-five years have been advocating a pacifist policy? On May 24, 1938, in a remarkable speech filled with Canadian inspiration, the right honourable the present Prime Minister stated:

[Mr. Choquette.]

Our foreign and external policy is a policy of peace and friendliness, a policy of trying to look after our own interests and to understand the position of other governments with which we have dealings. It is a policy which takes account of our political connections and traditions, our geographical position, the limited members and the racial composition of our people, our stage in economic development, our own internal preoccupations and necessities—in short, a policy based on the Canadian situation.

And he added:

We have neither the power nor the will to attack any other land for our own ends. Nor are we inclined to organize or join in crusades in other continents. We have neither the power nor the knowledge to settle the destinies of countries thousands of miles away. We are no more likely of our own motion to intervene in Europe than Sweden or Bulgaria or Switzerland is to intervene in America.

Mr. Speaker, these are the very words uttered in this house barely sixteen months before our country was thrown into this war. And what have we done with this moderate, voluntary effort which had been promised? It will suffice to glance through a small pamphlet entitled *Canada at War*, of December 1943, to realize what the pledges of our public men are worth. Present strength of our armed forces, over 725,000 men; women in the armed forces, 37,800; in the navy, present strength 70,000 men; in the army, present strength, over 470,000 men; at present overseas, approximately a quarter of a million men; in the air force, over 200,000 men and women; maximum number of persons identified directly or indirectly with the war effort, over 1,100,000 men.

And what has this war cost us? The estimate up to March, 1944 is $10,824,000,000. And the Liberal party, and its most prominent leaders, have for the last twenty-five years promised to the Canadian people that Canada would never take part in foreign wars. The mistake made by the Conservatives has been conclusively shown, for they are responsible for the fact that 60,000 Canadians have died on foreign battlefields. And what has the first world war cost us? For the six fiscal years beginning in April, 1914 and ending in March, 1920, $1,670,406,213, including the cost of demobilization. Are we better off with the Liberals than with the Conservatives? No, it is the same policy. For that matter, since the outbreak of the war the Conservatives in this house have supported all the important measures introduced by the government. We are sometimes told: "We must help the empire because the empire protects us." What help have we received from the empire? And we derive very little encouragement from the statement which appears on page 24 of the same pamphlet:

Canada at War

In 1918, after four years of war, Canada had suffered heavy losses on battlefields. So far the present conflict has not cost so many lives, but it must be borne in mind that Mr. Churchill has declared that the 1944 campaign in Europe will be harder and more costly in human lives than all the operations carried out to date by the western powers.

And these are the consequences of an imperialistic policy, of a policy which is contrary to our interests. We are quite justified in raising a cry of alarm and in attempting a National Awakening, in order to promote the interests of Canada instead of visiting ruination upon her and jeopardizing her future. The policy of the Bloc Populaire Canadien is opposed to any effort so out of proportion to our means, and the victory in Stanstead and the success in Montreal-Cartier have shown to what extent our party meets the aspirations of the province of Quebec; however, they have given the representatives of the old parties a salutary fear.

Mr. Speaker, there is no reference in the speech from the throne to a question which cannot leave us unperturbed, the question of immigration. I have received numerous resolutions passed by the municipal councils of Stanstead county, opposing any immigration and asking

That in any case, no amendment to existing laws and regulations governing immigration should be made unless parliament has had an opportunity of discussing the matter at the next session.

We are opposed to any immigration until the war is over, until our armies have been demobilized and reestablished in civil life; we shall oppose any immigration until all our workers have a job enabling them to support their families decently; we shall oppose any immigration until all our workers have a healthy home; we shall oppose any immigration until our farmers are in a position to give their sons a start in life. The Government have found billions to give to England for the prosecution of the war; they will have to find money also to overcome the numerous difficulties with which we shall be faced after the war.

Mr. Speaker, has the economic crisis ended? What legislative measures this house has passed to settle that question, I should like to know. Is it not true that the present artificial prosperity is brought about by the war and that soon, poverty will be widespread in the country, perhaps to a greater extent than even in 1939, because we are poorer and saddled with a greater debt than at that time? That is what we are attempting to avoid, Mr. Speaker.

The speech from the throne has little to say about agriculture and, at any rate, nothing very precise. It is true that for the last five years the main concern of the government has been the prosecution of the war, but has not a British minister of agriculture said that "the first line of defence of a country is agriculture"? In this country farming is the foundation, the cornerstone of the whole economic setup. What has the government done to induce farmers to produce more? Among other things, the greater part of the farm labourers have been taken for the army or sent to munition plants and the farmers are left without help after having made such tremendous sacrifices to stick to the land during the ten hard pre-war years. They are in urgent need of farm machinery, but the government request them to produce more while it is impossible for them to buy the implements and even the spare parts necessary for the operations of their farms. They have to wait long months before their orders are filled and, in spite of all that, they are requested to increase their production.

A permit is required to butcher hogs on the farm and very few farmers hold such permits. They are therefore forced to ship their hogs on the hoof on the Montreal market or others to powerful concerns who shall not be impoverished on account of the war. At these points, the hogs are kept for a number of days and their keep is charged to the producers, because the abattoirs are short of help. Last fall, the price of pork had fallen, when the price of feed was rising. In spite of all that they are told: "You farmers are used to that kind of thing, maintain your production at the present level anyway."

This brings me to say a few words about the assistance given by the government to cooperative societies. A cooperative butter factory was refused a permit to collect the cream produced by its shareholders under the pretext that gasoline and tires were rationed. The farmers have to attend themselves to the delivery of their dairy products, which is a waste of time when the help is scarce. It is ridiculous. My hon. friend from Portneuf (Mr. Gauthier), on the other hand, has pointed out the schemes worked against the Quebec United Fishermen in order to promote the interests of two large fish-dealing firms, one from Montreal and the other from Toronto. Well may we wonder whether these schemes were not intended to put the small industries, the private trader and the cooperative societies out of business.

In the economic field, the Bloc Populaire Canadien will first of all promote the maintenance and, in some cases, the reestablishment

of private enterprise. Take good note of this: to-day anything may be done under the easy pretext that we are at war. However, even in peace time, economic dictatorship tended to eliminate private businesses. Large trusts, powerful organizations, were crowding out the small or medium operators as well as the small and medium-sized industries and endeavouring to centralize all economic activities in the large cities. That is what we wish to avoid, Mr. Speaker. We are in favour of a new political economy to promote progress in agriculture.

Here is another article of our programme: the diversification of markets. The political value of this proposition is not so pronounced in war time; however, we expound it nevertheless as an essential element of national sovereignty. For many years past, eighty per cent of Canada's actual trade was done with two countries, Great Britain and the United States. It is easy to realize how far such a dangerous policy binds our destinies to those of the great imperialistic nations. If we ask that new markets be investigated it is not that we are opposed to those we already have, but simply that we are determined to insure that Canada will more effectively attain full autonomy.

Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, the honourable member for Gaspé (Mr. Roy) suggested to the government that the representatives of the province of Quebec who are opposed to the government should be appointed to the committees charged with studying important national matters, to which the honourable member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) replied—I quote from *Hansard*:

> The position taken by the hon. member for Gaspé illustrates what is taking place in this house with a multiplicity of parties. We do not need to tell members of this house what difficult situations arise as a result, but such is democracy and we have to meet it. At the same time a situation of this kind, which has to do with the internal economy of the house, makes it impossible to give representation to every political party that springs up ephemerally, and temporarily I hope, in this House of Commons.

Mr. Speaker, who is responsible for this situation? Why have the people lost confidence in the Conservative party? Why has that party failed to name candidates in the counties of Stanstead and Cartier in August, 1943? Why is the leader of the honourable member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) outside this house? Why has the honourable member for Gaspé (Mr. Roy), who was elected as a Conservative in 1940, abandoned that party sometime later, declaring that there was no room for French-Canadians in the ranks of the Conservative party? The Canadian people, and especially the electors from Quebec have lost confidence in the old parties who too frequently have misled or betrayed them; their policies are no longer popular, and the policy of the Bloc Populaire alone is essentially Canadian.

If I have risen in this house to take part in the debate, it was to defend the rights of the electors of my constituency who have entrusted me with a very definite mandate last summer, to demand justice for the French-Canadians of my province and to urge the adoption of a real Canadian policy. I am not here to look after the interests of Russia or England or any other country, but of Canada, my only mother country. What does it matter if mud is flung at me; for my part, I feel that my country is worth fighting for and I am quite prepared to put up with such slight inconveniences.

Mr. EUGENE DUROCHER (St. James): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to make a lengthy speech, but merely to pass a few remarks. At the very outset I should like to join with the other hon. members in offering congratulations to the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Tremblay) and the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker) upon the magnificent way in which they moved and seconded the address in reply to the speech from the throne, the contents of which I am sure must have been acceptable to the great majority in this house. Never in the history of this parliament has such an elaborate programme been presented to the House of Commons for its appreciation and acceptance.

In addition to the assurance of a continued war effort, the government presents a series of social reforms which should satisfy even the most exacting, under present conditions. First, we find a plan for social security and human welfare; second, a plan for the housing and the health of the whole population; third, social insurance against unemployment, accident, death of the breadwinner from ill health or from old age; fourth, a measure to amend and supplement housing legislation; fifth, family allowances, and sixth, a revision of the Bank Act.

These are the main points which are being brought to our attention. It is gratifying for us to note that such reforms are the work of a Liberal administration. It would be premature to try to discuss these various items at length at the present time, because the details are not known to any of us, and they will not be known until such time as the bills are placed before the house.

For that reason I shall touch upon only one point now, namely that of family allowances.

This measure is surely worthy of our highest praise, and comes at a time when it is most needed by the Canadian people. It will help families balance their budgets, and bring up their children in a more satisfactory and appropriate manner, and at the same time it will to a certain extent relieve the wage problem in Canada. In spite of the criticism which has already appeared in some newspapers, and the remarks of hon. members, among whom were the hon. member for Cartier (Mr. Rose), the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. d'Anjou) and the newly elected member for Stanstead (Mr. Choquette), I feel certain the government will see to it that this measure for family allowances covers not only so many children in a family, but all the children under a specified age. Our critics, who do not know all the facts, should wait and see what the government has to offer in this direction. We all want an increased population in this vast dominion of ours. Before we allow foreign immigration we should attempt to encourage large families and help them the best we can.

This government, I feel certain, does not wish to tell parents that if they have so many children the state will help only so many, for this would mean the establishment of a new policy of birth control in Canada, but I suggest that that has never entered the mind of any minister of the crown in the present cabinet. Birth control would be the worst thing that could happen to our society at the moment. We need more and more good Canadians. It is better to encourage large Canadian families and provide assistance from the state than to bring in foreign immigration. The latter does not always prove profitable either from the standpoint of the nation or from the assimilation with true Canadians. I have before me a clipping from *La Patrie* of Montreal concerning a family of seventeen children. That is the kind of family we want in Quebec. Ten of these children are below the age of fourteen. If we had more families like that our immigration problem would be solved and we would not have to touch it.

It is sometimes hard to get reforms, but a reform is needed in connection with old age pensions. Last year the hon. member for Edmonton East (Mrs. Casselman) took up this matter and drew the attention of the government to the need of raising the allowance. We were all pleased when during the last days of the session the government announced that the allowance would be raised from $20 to $25 a month. We feel that at this session the government should make an effort to increase this allowance to $30 a month and reduce the age limit from seventy to sixty-five years. When a man or woman has reached the age of sixty-five—this applies to men more than to women—it is hard to find a new position should he or she be out of a job. No employer wants to take on anyone that old because he considers they cannot turn out the production. We should be more generous to these people. I feel certain that the government is going to look into this matter and that before the end of the session we shall have the assurance that the old age pension will be raised to $30 and the age limit lowered to sixty-five years.

I should like to refer now to the housing problem. I know there is a housing problem in every large centre in Canada, but I am better acquainted with the problem in my own city which I suppose is the same as that facing Toronto. Along with some of my colleagues this matter was taken up with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) last May, and we received the assurance that a survey would be made in Montreal and some other Canadian cities and a report submitted at the earliest possible date. Mr. Fripp of the housing administration was delegated to Montreal. I met him and went over the whole question. He spent some time in the city and then went somewhere else, and in the late fall he presented a report to the Minister of Finance. Nothing definite has come out of that, but just a few days ago I received a letter from the minister stating that the matter was receiving his earnest attention and that he hoped something definite would come out of it within the next few days. I appreciate that he has taken such an interest in this matter.

But the first of May will soon be here and, if something is not done, many people in Montreal, and I suppose also in Toronto, will be out on the street. We are looking after the older people, and we should be ready to do something for those tenants who will be without homes on the first of May. I am told that this is more a municipal problem. That may have been true before the war, but since the government can do anything under the War Measures Act I think it has now become a federal problem. Huge plants have been established in some of our cities and, while much of the population that has come in might be considered as floating population, large numbers of these people will remain. We are now faced with a position that will not improve after the war. If this is a federal problem, let us get after it without further delay. I suggested to the minister that loans bearing an interest rate of one and a half to two per cent should be made to the muni-

cipalities. Whoever builds a home to-day must spend more money than it is really worth and, if it is built for the benefit of the state, the state should see that the man who invests his capital in a building should not be the loser in the end. There are other matters I should like to take up, but I shall wait until the appropriations are before the house. I reserve the right to discuss them at that time.

Before I close I should like to say a word about our soldiers overseas. Like many others, I have been receiving letters not only from my own but from friends and from boys of my friends. I am glad to say that each and every letter I have received seems to show that our boys are being well treated in England. They are satisfied and hope to see action at the earliest possible moment. That is the spirit we want to see in our boys. But when they come back they will expect something of us and we must have the goods to deliver. We have many social problems in hand and I realize that they represent a lot of hard work. We may not be able to do everything at once, but let us not forget that bricks and mortar are not enough to build new homes in the world of to-morrow.

Mr. LIONEL BERTRAND (Terrebonne): (Translation): Mr. Speaker, this fifth session, like the preceding sessions, will deal with the war. Victory being apparently certain and nearer, the government announces, in the speech from the throne, measures which they feel adequate to maintain the country's equilibrium during the period of readjustment, and to insure the people in the future against the hazards of life, as well as to provide social safeguards appropriate to modern times.

Canada will emerge out of the war crushed under a burden of debt and weakened by the loss of thousands of her sons; she will have to rebuild her commerce and her industry, as well as to straighten her general economy which has become out of balance, to say the least. Will it be possible to make this post-war readjustment without running counter to the traditions, without breaking old covenants, and the conventions which ensure autonomy to the central authority and to the provinces in certain spheres. Some claim that we should forget about traditions and even that we should run ahead of evolution. Is it possible to break away from the past of a nation? Others advocate the most arbitrary measures, but that view is to be condemned just as the doctrines of those who would sabotage the present structure of the nation and replace it by the fragile columns of an exaggerated socialism. Would Canada be at peace if on the morrow of the hostilities, she were torn by internal dissensions, and tossed about by doctrines foreign to her national soul.

Here as elsewhere, the most fantastic theories made their way. In peacetime they ceaselessly ran against repeated failures but war gave them strength and boldness. They are now coming out, undisguised and self-confident. Born from discontent, they thrive by it; every cause of complaint means to them an easy opportunity to achieve new triumphs and to strengthen their hold.

For discontent exists. What is it attributable to? Less to democracy itself than to abuses to which it gave rise. Less to wealth than to bad uses to which it was put. Less to the existing laws than to their enforcement, often ill-advised. War, an easy pretext for abuse, has added to existing evils, the abuse of laws. The nation, owing to the necessities of war, proudly accepted most of them; unfortunately, a multitude of orders and decrees which look too much like brilliant discoveries or outstanding inventions, hence their unpopularity, have been grafted to these laws. These hundreds of orders and decrees have been, I believe, the cause of discontent, the effects of which our democratic system has started to feel. The pyramiding of petty causes inevitably leads to great consequences. Small facts, harmless by themselves, one day or the other will tend to the same end. Consciously or unconsciously, they give rise to movements of opinion, unimportant at first, but which grow in magnitude and become irresistible. Such movements are in existence at the present time in Canadian life. Shall we wait until the dam bursts?

Every Canadian is willing to do his share to win the war. But how many times has national spirit been cooled down or even upset by an uninterrupted series of disappointments; how deeply, at times, has the Canadian nation, so gladly performing its duties, felt that war was a pretext for repeated injustices in the army, and particularly in the price boards, in the intricate machinery of national selective service, as well as a pretext for so many steps taken by a bureaucracy whose policies were bordering on autocracy, or even dictatorship.

It may be said that these are but details in the vastness of a huge organization. Are not rivers made up of drops of water? I agree that they are mere details, but they have enough power when added together, to rout the most powerful organization, to shake the very foundations of a regime and to offer to any party, be it socialist or even communist, easy chances of success. It is said that socialism and communism are dispensers of happiness. I know it; and it is the reason why I fear them. Can we

blame the people, panic-stricken by the abuse of laws, the restrictions of all sorts, the excesses of capitalism, to believe in happiness, when happiness is the fond delusion of every human being. In these four years of war, the world conflict has imposed on every citizen of this country a crushing burden of sacrifices; why then have these hundreds of petty measures, too often drafted on the spur of the moment by controllers not responsible to the people, been added to the burden which weighs already so heavily on our shoulders.

Problems which get more difficult each day and which were in the past reserved to a group prepared to weigh them in all their details are confronting the masses rendered uneasy and even impatient by the course of events. The spirit of emancipation has made its way nearly everywhere. Too often maybe it has confused excessive privileges with necessary inequalities, power with right. But this spirit of emancipation springs only from compulsion. It was caused by the innumerable details which ceaselessly have offended human liberty, violated the most elementary sense of justice, affected even the brotherhood which belongs to democracy. What will come from all that? The people are looking towards new horizons.

I am against communism; it is the worst of all systems and I do not need to comment on it. If I am against socialism, I am for the measures of real social solidarity. The two terms are vastly different. Can socialism, which wants to do away with natural inequalities and establish equal status for all, attain its objective without abolishing private riches which are the most direct incentive to work and private property which is the outcome of work and without entrusting to the state the management of all private enterprises? That means: the state takes over private property, the state manages and controls everything; that is state socialism. State socialism involves a host of officials, feudal coalitions, little states within the state. The least important civil servant, under the banal pretext that he is part of the state, has then the opportunity of believing himself a little dictator and of treating the people as if he were one. Such is the picture.

I am against socialism because first of all it runs counter to the principles of the faith to which I belong, the Catholic religion, because it is meaningless and utopian. History—the best book of human experiments—is there to prove it. The Greeks lost their independence when they adopted socialism; the Romans saw their republic collapse when they embraced it. The French revolution accepted it at the start, but soon deserted it and proclaimed that private property was sacred. Socialism, wherever it was tried, has caused disappointment when it was not the prelude to the decline of the state. For socialism hates all forms of superiority, whether it comes from talent, fortune, intelligence, initiative or work. That explains its obscure programme set forth in vague words to hide its real aims and made to fit opportunities as they change from day to day. Now as then, it is characterized by the same soothing words that seem to make realities out of illusions, the same prejudices hidden under the bright flowers that are its promises of happiness, the same fanaticism hypocritically toned down if need be by tears shed on the misery of the people, or increased if necessary by terrible provocations against capital. Examine the system and you will find that its leaders own nothing; they have no business, no industry. What have they got to lose? Most of them were not even born here. Could they have a true love for the country they live in? What are their ambitions? They want to rule. They must get into power first so as to enforce measures that have nothing in common with the laws of human liberty.

I am in favour of private enterprise. I contend that a government may at times resort to certain measures of expropriation in order to settle a matter of national scope or to defend the rights of the people against the unrestrained ambition of finance. I believe, however, that private enterprise can, in a sort of magical way, obtain from labour the most powerful and productive energies, provided it is backed by sound capital, enterprising patrons and the indispensable cooperation of the working class. Private enterprise that abuses its power becomes a monopoly or a financial octopus whose tentacles draw from their victims the people, fabulous fortunes, swiftly made. If capitalism is vitiated, let us apply the branding-iron. If it has secrets, let us unmask it. If it commits abuses, let us check it and subject it to strict and impartial laws capable of preventing further exploitation of the public. Let us regulate it so that the worker will be the master rather than the slave of machinery. To abolish private industry would reduce its workers to poverty. At this important turning-point of our history, private enterprise shows signs of unrest and discouragement. It dreads socialism. Are not the champions of socialism guilty? A French economist, whose country was ruined by the guilty negligence of the bad governments it had chosen—addressed these pregnant words to the socialists:

You hope that before long there will be no more rich people. When there are no more rich people, everybody will be poor. The poor will be poorer still, and poverty will be general.

Social solidarity is a different thing. It is the duty of governments to grant to the poor the advantages of material and moral progress: insurance against the hazards of life, hygiene, education, rural credit, housing, public health measures, family allowances, et cetera. That is nothing but a social duty. Pope Pius XI, in his encyclical *Divini Redemptoris*, calls for and recommends as a measure of social justice "a system of public insurance for the workers against old age, sickness and unemployment". We can never do too much to alleviate poverty in all its aspects. It could even be extirpated, because poverty is a disease of the social body. If billions and billions could be found for the prosecution of war, there is no reason why money could not also be found for the abolition of poverty, and the elevation of work to a nobler plane. Why could funds not be found to establish within the whole nation a great system of social insurance, so as to eliminate forever the dole which demoralizes, to enact legislation designed to hearten the social outcasts, the old men and women, as well as the orphans, to comfort those who suffer, to extend to destitute children the boon of education, to put within the reach of labouring classes social, welfare and health services, and enable them to own their own homes, in a word to enact legislation based on the great Christian principles of justice and charity. I am in favour of measures of that kind, but if such legislation is to fulfil its ultimate object, it must take into account a multitude of details relating to provincial jurisdiction, to large families and to individuals, according as those families or individuals live in well developed centres or in remote settlements. Those various social measures—and I shall deal only with them for the time being—will be judged on their merits when they are introduced. I must state quite frankly, however, that social solidarity is essential at a time when war saddens all hearts, and I believe, on the other hand, that socialism would be a sore affecting not unlike a tumor the still healthy body of the nation.

The people in other provinces are no doubt wondering about the views of Quebec on socialism. Without any fear of being mistaken, I can assert that Quebec may, in an election, vote for the liberal, the conservative, the independent, or the Bloc Populaire or the Parti Canadien standard-bearers but that it will never vote for socialists. The French Canadians cannot be counted among those who give blind support to subversive doctrines, to theories which aim at disruption. They have for three centuries clung to the Canadian soil, where are to be found, even beyond the Rocky mountains, the imprints left by their first missionaries and settlers When they were ceded to England, my forbears clung to the native land, not like parasites but like true citizens in the knowledge that it was their home and that they had rights to claim and that they were entitled to keep those which they had won. Inspired by the love of freedom, they fought for responsible government. Anxious as they were to preserve their freedom, they refused to become assimilated, and any attempt at assimilation would remain unsuccessful whether it was based on force or persecution. Confederation must have the support of Quebec. It cannot do without it. My province was blamed for having answered "No" in the plebiscite. Quebec has never asserted more emphatically than it did on that occasion its undying love for the native land, and the sincerity of its essentially and primarily Canadian patriotism. Therefore, if a socialist government ever comes into power in Ottawa, it will not be Quebec's fault. My province is urged to save the country from the socialist menace. Quebec is ready, but let the other provinces cease to criticize and blame her about everything imaginable, let them cease to treat her as the waif of the family, since for many reasons she should have been pampered and complimented. Let the other provinces have the kindness and condescension—if they do not want to do it out of mere justice—to give her a fair share in the administration of this country. Let them be broad-minded enough to refrain from raising against her stupid prejudices often resulting from fanaticism and also from the ignorance of facts as well as from a lack of understanding of her characteristic spirit. Quebec is just as loyal as any other Canadian province. Quebec has more than any other province identified herself with our Canadian land. Imperialism is rejected in the province of Quebec; the only imperialism she knows or accepts is the appeal of the Canadian soil to which she is attached by her history. Quebec likes order and harmony; her tolerance is traditional. Deeply steeped in our religious and national principles, we do not want the disruption of our heritage. Transitions that are too sudden cannot but lead to cruel deceptions. We are in favour of evolution, but in the economic or in the spiritual field, we are against revolution. We enjoy certain rights under the constitution, and we are anxious to preserve them. We have no fear for the future, for the very

reason that we find our inspiration in the courage of those who were the builders of the nation.

The future belongs to nobody. The trend of events is in the hands of God, while passions nest in the heart of men. Governments must not forget that spiritual values are highly essential; they must not forget either that no one can be a good citizen without a certain degree of comfort. If socialism is a paradise of dreams and illusion, social solidarity may become a blessing for the whole nation when controlled and ably directed by the state and proudly upheld by capitalists imbued with a deep sense of humanity. The misfortunes of war must not be followed by the misfortunes of peace. In a well-balanced readjustment the people should have a clear and definite understanding that social well-being is within their reach and that they are not excluded from happiness. They must be treated with fairness and equity by governments and employers. They must be protected against abuse from the powerful; that is essential. And I repeat with Victor Hugo: "Humble folk must be sacred to the great, and it is the rights of the weak that go to make the duty of the strong."

On motion of Mr. Diefenbaker the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre) the house adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

Friday, February 4, 1944

The house met at three o'clock.

RADIO BROADCASTING

APPOINTMENT TO BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Hon. L. R. LaFLECHE (Minister of National War Services): Mr. Speaker, I should like to lay on the table of the house a copy of order in council P.C. 530, dated February 3, 1944, appointing William James Parker, Esquire, of the city of Winnipeg, a governor of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

May I say a word as to who and what this distinguished gentleman is. Mr. Parker is a practical farmer, a graduate of the Manitoba Agricultural college and a member of the board of governors of the university of Manitoba. A comparatively young man, he has won a name for himself throughout the west as an authority on general agricultural problems, and is recognized as one of the foremost scientific agriculturists of the dominion. He farms on an extensive scale in Manitoba. Mr. Parker served in the last war as a member of the Royal Flying Corps. He is married and has two sons. He is president of the Manitoba Pool Elevators, and a vice-president of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture.

Mr. GRAYDON: Is the other vacancy to be filled as well?

Mr. LaFLECHE: The matter is under consideration, and I trust to be able to make an announcement before very long.

SOCIAL SECURITY

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SOCIAL INSURANCE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I understand that we are not likely at this stage to encounter a desire for debate on the constitution of the committee on social insurance. If the house is agreeable to having this committee constituted at once, I shall move:

That a select committee of this house be appointed to examine and report on a national plan of social insurance which will constitute a charter of social security for the whole of Canada, and, to that end,

To examine and study the existing social insurance legislation of the parliament of Canada and of the several provincial legislatures; social insurance policies of other countries; the most practicable measures of social insurance for Canada, including health insurance, and the steps which will be required to effect their inclusion in a national plan; the constitutional and financial adjustments which will be required for the achievement of a nation-wide plan of social security; and other related matters.

That the said committee have power to appoint, from among its members, such subcommittees as may be deemed advisable or necessary to deal with specific phases of the problems aforesaid, with power to call for persons, papers, and records, to examine witnesses under oath, to print such papers and evidence from day to day as may be ordered by the committee for the use of the committee and members of the house; that the said committee shall report to the house from time to time; and that the said committee shall consist of the following members: Messrs. Adamson, Blanchette, Bourget, Breithaupt, Bruce, Casselman (Mrs.) (Edmonton East), Claxton, Cleaver, Cote, Diefenbaker, Donnelly, Fauteux, Fulford, Gershaw, Gregory, Hatfield, Howden, Hurtubise, Johnston (Bow River), Kinley, Lalonde, Leclerc, Lockhart, MacInnis, Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre), MacKinnon (Kootenay East), Macmillan, McCann, McGarry, McGregor, McIvor, Maybank, Mayhew, Mitchell, Picard, Shaw, Slaght, Veniot, Warren, Wood, Wright.

Hon. members will observe that the wording of this resolution follows the wording of a similar resolution under which the committee on social insurance was appointed at the last session. The members of the committee are, I understand, for the most part the same; there may be one or two changes.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the speech from the throne is indefinite with respect to the introduction of a health insurance bill in Canada, and this motion would seem to indicate that the whole matter is receiving further study. I take it that the conference with the provinces to which the Prime Minister referred the other day, will discuss health insurance along with other matters. Can the Prime Minister enlighten the house as to whether or not it is expected that the legislation with respect to health insurance will be brought down this session? It has been awaited by the people for a long time now.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Everything depends upon the progress of the work of the session and of the committee. I cannot say more than that.

Mr. GRAYDON: I take it from that, that the government is anxious to get the measure in as soon as possible.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: One of the purposes of reestablishing the committee at once is to begin as speedily as possible the consideration of the matters referred to.

Mr. P. E. WRIGHT (Melfort): Mr. Speaker, it is not my desire to start a lengthy discussion on the setting up of this committee, of which I was a member last year, but there are one or two remarks I wish to make.

It seems to be the general opinion throughout the country that the social security committee was in favour of the medical health bill which was before it. Some two months ago I was listening to a nation-wide broadcast over a national hook-up of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and I was astonished to hear Doctor Routley, the secretary of the Canadian Medical association, make the statement that this must be a good bill because the only body that had studied it was in favour of it, and that was the social security committee of the House of Commons. That statement was not justified, because the committee did not make any study of the draft bill during the last session. All we did was to hear briefs presented by various people who would either render or receive services under the bill. About eighty-five per cent of the submissions were by those who hoped to render services under the bill. I believe there were only two briefs from those who hoped to receive services, one from the Canadian federation of agriculture and the other from the trades and labour council.

It is not my intention to enter into any discussion of the details of that bill; I believe that can be done better in the committee. But I do wish to make it clear that so far as this group is concerned we believe there are certain principles which should be incorporated in a medical health bill. First, we believe that such a bill should be all-inclusive, both as to personnel and as to the services rendered. Any medical health bill should cover everybody, rich and poor. It should not be left to the provinces to say whether certain income groups shall be excluded from the provisions of the bill. Next, the services rendered under the bill should be the same in all provinces. These should include preventive medicine, hospitalization, nursing, and the necessary drugs and medicines. No province should have the right to say that it will accept only some of the provisions of the bill; that it will give hospitalization without providing medicine, for instance, or any other combination. The cost should be a charge not against the individual but against the total ability of this country to provide the necessary health services.

Next we contend that the administration of the bill should be left in equal proportion to those who are receiving services and those who are rendering services. The Canadian Medical Association should not be the sole body in charge of the administration of the bill. The government should have the right to decide when there is any division of opinion between these two groups. With these three principles inporporated in the bill—they are not covered fully in the draft bill as it is at the present time—we will be in favour of complete medical health coverage for the Dominion of Canada.

While I am on my feet I should like to say just a word with respect to the statement made yesterday by the hon. member for Peterborough West (Mr. Fraser) along the same lines. Apparently he is suffering from a disease—

Mr. GRAYDON: May I interrupt at this time? I do not know how this happens to come into the debate. I do not want the hon. member to drag in some extraneous matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is referring to a debate on some other matter which is not a matter suitable for discussion at this time.

Mr. HOMUTH: The hon. member ought to find out what disease he is suffering from.

Mr. WRIGHT: The hon. member was referring to medical services, and he mentioned our group in particular.

Mr. SPEAKER: That was a discussion on another matter. The hon. gentleman would not be entitled to discuss another matter which is already under discussion.

Motion agreed to.

POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON RECONSTRUCTION AND REESTABLISHMENT

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That a select committee of the house be appointed to study and report upon the general problems of reconstruction and reestablishment which may arise at the termination of the present war, and all questions pertaining thereto; with power to such select committee to appoint, from among the members of the committee, such subcommittees as may be deemed advisable or necessary; to deal with specific phases of the problems aforementioned, with power to said select committee and to such subcommittees as may be formed therefrom, to call for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses under oath, and for such select committee to report from time to time to the house; and that the said committee shall consist of the following members: Messrs. Authier, Bence, Bertrand (Prescott), Black (Cumberland), Brunelle, Castleden, Dupuis, Eudes, Ferron, Fraser (Northumberland), Gillis, Gray, Harris (Danforth), Hill, Jean, MacKenzie (Neepawa), Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre), MacNicol, McDonald (Pontiac), McKinnon (Kenora-Rainy River), McNiven, Marshall, Martin, Matthews, Mitchell, Mrs. Nielsen, Poirier, Purdy, Quelch, Ross (Calgary East), Ross (Middlesex East), Sanderson, Turgeon, Tustin, White, and that the provisions of standing order 65 limiting the number of members on special committees, be suspended in relation thereto.

The wording of this resolution is similar to that under which the committees were appointed last year and the year before.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to delay the setting up of this committee. When these committees were set up last year the debates took some considerable time, a good deal of ground being covered. In his remarks the other day the Prime Minister referred to the time which had been taken at the last session in discussing the setting up of these committees. I proffered an explanation, and perhaps I now have the right to give it. The reason why so much time was taken up in discussing the motion to appoint these committees was that the social security committee was being set up for the first time, and some hon. members were anxious to discuss the general problems relating thereto. Another reason, of course, why in the setting up of committees time is consumed in debate is the failure of the government so to arrange the reports of the various committees that they can be debated some time before the session closes. One of the difficulties experienced last session was in connection with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. The report of that committee was brought down, not merely in the dying days of the session, but almost on the last day. No motion for concurrence was moved. I doubt whether it would have been of much use to move concurrence, because the session was practically on its way out. So that when a motion to appoint the committee is made, no one can wonder that some time is taken up in discussing matters which normally would have been discussed had concurrence in the report been asked. I wish to make that clear.

In consenting to the setting up of the reconstruction committee I am hopeful that the government and those who are members of the committee will see to it that the report of this very important committee is brought down within a reasonable time before the end of the session, so that the house may be able to have some general debate with respect to its recommendations. I rather regretted that the Prime Minister the other day, speaking of the report of the war expenditures committee, which was brought down on the very last day of the last session, said that it would not be revived for discussion. At least that was my understanding of what he said. I think his words were that the report would die with the session which had just closed. I hope that is not so, because after all there should be an opportunity to discuss it. I think it is within the power of the government and the house to provide an opportunity of debating reports of committees which may deal with contentious matters on which hon. members may desire to express their opinions.

I point that out to the Prime Minister now, so that when committees are being formed he must not expect debate to be avoided when we have not had an opportunity of considering and discussing the previous committee's reports. The present motion of course does not come within that category, because this is a committee which, as I understand, is continuing, and will report some time during the session; and I am hopeful that when the report is brought down there will be full opportunity for debate.

Motion agreed to.

GENERAL McNAUGHTON

INQUIRY AS TO REASONS FOR RESIGNATION FROM CANADIAN OVERSEAS ARMY COMMAND

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): I wish to direct an inquiry to the Prime Minister, notice of which I gave him earlier to-day. In the course of the debate on Monday last I indicated that many rumours were in circulation regarding the resignation of General McNaughton, and that public interest demanded that the Prime Minister should at once give a full and frank explanation of the

facts in this regard, let the chips fall where they may. In view of the comments reported to have been made to the press by General McNaughton yesterday, I am asking the Prime Minister to-day to make a statement for the purpose of clarifying the whole situation.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition has referred to the debate on Monday last. It is true that at the conclusion of the debate my hon. friend drew my attention to the fact that I had not, in replying to him, touched on the questions of the home defence army, General McNaughton, and the overseas structure. I replied to my hon. friend by saying that I was leaving some matters to my colleagues and that I thought that such was the proper procedure to follow unless time was to be taken up indefinitely with the debate on the address. My hon. friend then said that he assumed that I was leaving the reply with respect to army matters to my colleague the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston), and I indicated to him that in that he was quite correct, and he said that that would be satisfactory to him.

Mr. GRAYDON: When I said that it would be satisfactory to me I had no idea that we would wait so long for some statement from the Minister of National Defence.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That may be. However, hon. members will I think agree that one has to view the business of the session as a whole and plan accordingly. There is a proper time and an adequate time for taking up different questions, and I have felt that the time at which it would be most appropriate for the Minister of National Defence to make a statement on matters pertaining to the Canadian army and on all other aspects of matters relating to defence would be when the house would be considering either the resolution or the bill on the war appropriaton. I have intimated to the house that just as soon as the debate on the address is concluded the first item to be called will be the one relating to the resolution on the war appropriation which is now on the order paper. I had hoped that the debate on the address might conclude this evening, but I understand that it is pretty certain to run over until next week. Were it to conclude this evening, we would of course ask the house on Monday to consider the resolution on war appropriation and the Minister of National Defence would then make a very full statement. I hope the debate will not run on far into next week. Just as soon as it is concluded the Minister of National Defence will deal generally with matters pertaining to the army. Certainly I must say to my hon. friend, and I think he will agree, that any statement I might make at the present time would not be regarded as sufficiently comprehensive to avoid further questioning and the opening up of a discussion —one discussion in the middle of another. Under these circumstances it is I think best that the government should adhere to what I have outlined as the procedure, namely, to discuss army matters, not one incident or one particular matter, but matters generally, when all hon. members will have their opportunity to question and the ministry its opportunity of answering in adequate fashion.

Mr. GRAYDON: Frankly I am amazed at the position just taken by the Prime Minister. It never occurred to me for a moment, in view of the uncertainty and the doubt which seemed to exist throughout the country in connection with this McNaughton matter, that either the Prime Minister or the Minister of National Defence would assume such an attitude. By virtue of General McNaughton's comment yesterday in the papers, the whole question has been thrown into bold relief—the question of the original statement officially given by the government, and then the statement which was given by General McNaughton yesterday. It is not very often that I take such a positive and emphatic stand on matters of this kind, but I call upon the Prime Minister and the Minister of National Defence to clear this matter up now. Let us not wait until next week or whenever it may be. That is not good enough. The people of Canada are agitated over this thing. I would not be pressing my case as I am if I did not conscientiously believe that it is in the public interest that the Prime Minister make a statement with respect to the reason why General McNaughton resigned. Everybody knows that in the statement previously made by the government it was declared that he had resigned because of ill health. General McNaughton now comes to this country and says that he is all right. That, in effect, is the situation. How can anyone expect the morale of the Canadian people not to be affected by the silence of the Prime Minister and of the Minister of National Defence this afternoon? I call upon them with all the emphasis at my command to disclose the exact situation with respect to General McNaughton. Let us not be kept waiting another minute. I shall not be satisfied with the Prime Minister or the Minister of National Defence saying that the matter will come up in the ordinary course of events. This is something which has come up outside the ordinary course of events, and for that reason I call upon them to make the statement I have asked for.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the minister replies, I would like to point out that we are on orders of the day and there is nothing before the house. A question has been asked by the leader of the opposition, to which the Prime Minister has replied. If any part of the answer requires elucidation or explanation for clarification, a further question would be in order, but a general debate cannot take place on the orders of the day.

Mr. COLDWELL: I should like to support the leader of the opposition in asking for an immediate statement from the leader of the government on General McNaughton's resignation.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, nothing could better illustrate the wisdom of the course which the government intends to pursue in this matter than the speech just made by the leader of the opposition, and by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar, supporting him in his request. In the course of his remarks the leader of the opposition made two or three statements which I do not think are wholly correct. I do not wish at this stage to go into the right or wrong of the statements he has made, but in the short time he has spoken he has made it perfectly clear that in discussing matters which relate to the army and to the relinquishment by General McNaughton of his command of the Canadian army there are many matters of which the house will wish to be informed in order to have a clear view of the entire situation. It is not the custom, so far as I am aware, in this parliament, and certainly it is not the custom at Westminster, to begin a debate on a matter as important as that which pertains to the affairs of the army in a time of war on a question asked on the orders of the day. I would expect my hon. friends opposite to be the first to wish the government to set apart, if need be, a special time when the whole matter could be discussed. That would be the correct way to proceed, and as far as I am concerned, if the debate on the address continues to run on for any length of time and hon. gentlemen wish to have a day set apart for the discussion of war measures, the government will be prepared to consider such a request. But I do submit that we shall make far better headway with the business of parliament and get on more expeditiously with our war measures and matters pertaining to the war if we conclude the debate on the address speedily and then take up at once the resolution dealing with the war appropriation.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I say to the Prime Minister that a very heavy responsibility rests upon him in this decision.

Mr. COLDWELL: The Prime Minister has said that he will set apart a day. Would he set aside Monday for debating this question and let the Minister of National Defence speak on the address?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I cannot agree at the present time to setting aside Monday. I said that I would be prepared to consider setting aside a day, but in considering that I shall have to take into account the length of time that it is probable the debate on the address will continue, and what may be most advisable. I do not know why my hon. friend should be so keen about this particular matter.

Mr. GRAYDON: The public is keen about it; that is why.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Just a moment. After all, the great question that is before the country and before the world at the present time is the prosecution of the war, and the prosecution of the war is not being impeded in the least by General McNaughton being at the Seigniory club at the present time or by the government's seeking to conclude this debate before we begin a fresh debate on war measures. I say to my hon. friends that if the matter were urgent in any way the government would be the first to consider the urgency of it, but I am sure that everyone throughout the country who is interested in knowing the whole situation as it exists and as it not only affects hon. members of this house in the course of their discussions here, but affects the whole Canadian army and affects the war, would wish this question to be discussed when there is ample opportunity for a full discussion.

GLYCERINE

REMOVAL OF CHEMICAL CONTROL RESTRICTIONS AFFECTING SALE OF ANTI-FREEZE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. K. FRASER (Peterborough West): I should like to ask the Minister of Munitions and Supply a question with reference to a press release from his department dated February 1, 1944, stating that all chemical control restrictions on the use of glycerine have been removed. Does that mean that anti-freeze, with glycerine base, will be released to the public without the necessity for a permit from the wartime prices and trade board?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): That is the purpose in removing the restriction, so that glycerine may be sold for any purpose.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Thursday, February 3, consideration of the motion of Mr. L. D. Tremblay for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Graydon, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to the amendment moved by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon), seconded by myself, first may I, even at this late period, extend my congratulations to the mover (Mr. Tremblay) and the seconder (Mr. Tucker) of the address. These two hon. and gallant members served during the last war and are in this war contributing their part. May I also, and in this I think I speak for all hon. members of the house, extend a welcome to another hon. member who to-day is in the house for the first time after serving overseas in this war, the hon. member for Vancouver North (Mr. Sinclair), who in seconding the address in the dark days of 1940 did more than he can realize to arouse the people of Canada from the complacency of that time.

To-day I intend to follow the course I have endeavoured to follow throughout as a member of this house, and take the attitude that I believe should characterize an opposition in time of war, and that is to commend where I believe commendation is fitting, and yet fearlessly face the issues that are before us and reveal weaknesses which in the opinion of the opposition require to be rectified. I am not going to deal to-day to any extent with the tremendous programme that is outlined in the speech from the throne. Having regard to the serious conditions referred to a moment ago by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), arising from the war, I wish that he had spoken with greater certainty on the question whether or not an election is to be called in the midst of war. In September last he made a statement that might very well be paraphrased in the words he used in connection with the plebiscite—not necessarily an election, but an election if necessary. On Monday last, in view of the serious position in which we now find ourselves in relation to the war, he warned the country of the crucial period which we are approaching, and indicated that an election was not in prospect; and on Wednesday, in answer to questions put by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon), the Prime Minister made the issue more baffling than it had ever been before.

[Mr. Howe.]

When I look over the speech from the throne, promising, as it does, allowances for all, and when I realize that the only allowances referred to in the Beveridge report which are not covered by the speech are funeral allowances and death payments, and that dead men do not vote, my suspicion of the purposes of this speech from the throne becomes stronger. As I read it over it is the most tantalizing bill of fare ever offered to the Canadian people; but I fear, having regard to the appointment of committees such as those set up to-day on social security and the like, it will be far removed from translation into the feast it promises.

I wish to deal to-day not with social security but with certain matters which for some reason or other are not dealt with at any length in the speech from the throne. First let me say that I find it difficult to understand the attitude of the Prime Minister to-day in refusing to answer statements made by General McNaughton yesterday which indicate that the explanation given last November by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) for General McNaughton's resignation is far removed from the facts as they were revealed yesterday by the general.

Six months have gone by since the last session of parliament, and yet we know nothing of the man-power situation of the dominion. We do not know whether adequate reinforcements have been provided or are being provided for the army overseas, for the army which is now in Great Britain and which will sooner or later take its place in the offensive. General McNaughton is in our midst, the architect of Canadian army efficiency, the man who was held up as the general who meant so much to the Canadian army in its efficient operation, the general who was going to lead that army as the spearhead of attack, the dagger at the heart of Berlin. While there may be security reasons denying us the privilege of having him speak frankly, the government owes it to the people of Canada to say to General McNaughton, "King's regulations and orders to the contrary, your lips are not sealed." If things are not right in the Canadian army overseas, they should be revealed to the people of Canada, and if for reasons of national security they cannot be revealed, I for one, who have opposed the secrecy that too often has characterized this government, suggest that we, the representatives of the people, have the right to have General McNaughton come before this house in secret session and let us know the facts.

I suggest that the Prime Minister, in the stand he takes to-day in denying to the

membership of this house an opportunity to know the facts, has taken steps which are not in accordance with the principles of good parliamentary government or in keeping with considerations of the welfare of the army overseas. I ask the Prime Minister, in the interests of the morale of the people—and the people of the nation are aroused—to place before the house, even later on this evening, the full situation, so far as it can be placed before us without danger to the national safety.

I wish to refer to one other matter dealt with by the Prime Minister in his speech and it is one upon which I do not believe there should be any partisan or biased discussion—namely, the attitude to be taken by the Prime Minister when he attends the next conference of prime ministers. He began by indicating that he did not wish the subject discussed, and then he proceeded to discuss it at considerable length. Personally I believe that, bound as we are to the empire by tradition, by history, by interest, in the years to come there must be closer cooperation with the empire, and closer cooperation with the United States of America having regard to our North American situation. Speaking personally and expressing my own views, I have been a consistent advocate of the setting up of an empire council—not with executive but with consultative powers, continuing from week to week deliberations of the kind that will take place when the Prime Minister goes to Britain some time later this year. In reference to the war effort of the empire and to the constitutional relations between the empire countries, I ask the Prime Minister to consider whether recognition of the principle of continuing participation by a representative of the Canadian ministry in an empire council with deliberative powers only would assure a closer relationship than there is to-day through the instrumentalities he mentioned. This is a subject that does not require nor should it be permitted to enter the realm of, partisan discussion. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, Canada cannot afford the luxury of a fence-sitting policy in reference to her relations with the empire or with other countries of the world. I believe that nothing should be done that would interfere with the free discussion on the part of the Prime Minister at this conference in Great Britain. On the other hand, as a member of this house, I believe each of us has the right, yes, and the duty and the responsibility, to place before the Prime Minister and the government his individual views. It is in this spirit that I place before the Prime Minister my own personal view in regard to the matter.

I now come to the man-power situation. Six months have gone by and not a member of this house has any idea of the man-power situation in Canada. We hear from time to time statements made by the director of national selective service indicating that there is a shortage of man-power—yes, during the last few months a shortage of man-power on the farms. Farmers are still being called up and enrolled in an army for service in Canada. That to me is not understandable. In the period October 31, 1942 to September 30, 1943, the total number of men who served in the army in Canada under conscription for service in Canada has been increased by 31,491. The total number of men that have been enrolled in this army for service in Canada is 125,640, in spite of the fact that they are required to serve in Canada, except to the extent that the boundaries of Canada were extended by order in council to include Kiska. Yet they are still being called up at an annual cost to the country of from $150,000,000 to $175,000,000. I think that is a fair estimate.

What is the man-power situation? Nothing effective has been done since the last session of parliament directly to guide men into occupations which will enable them to make a maximum contribution to the war effort. Oh, yes; bureaux have been set up. Orders in council have been passed. Immediately after the session ended a tremendous reorganization took place; an administrative board of full-time members was set up in addition to an advisory board, a deputy director of the civilian branch and the military branch, five regional or provisional directors, directors for logging priorities, fishing, canning, war industries and other departments. Associate directors' staffs were established in all parts of Canada. Setting up organizations does not solve any problem. On September 9 Mr. MacNamara said there was an over-all shortage of a hundred thousand workmen on the farms and in wood production. These men are needed, according to Mr. MacNamara, for farm and wood production, yet the government goes on conscripting them and increasing the army for service in Canada.

Let me refer to another aspect of the problem. This statement is subject to correction by the Minister of National Defence. During recent months voluntary recruitment has fallen away very considerably. Voluntary recruitment in the armed forces is at a level the like of which has not been seen before since the beginning of the war. Yet we continue to call up men, take them from their useful occupations, place them in an army, and give them training—an army that is all dressed up with no place to go. We do not know, nobody in this dominion knows, outside of the cabinet and the officers concerned, whether or not there are reinforcements available for the army overseas.

Australia in September last found it necessary to consider whether, with the danger of invasion removed, the question of reallocation of service men to production would not enhance their war effort. On the one hand you see advertisements asking men to go back to the farm, farmers to go to the woods, and on the other hand competition with the farms continues. You see advertisements saying to men in the industrial services engaged in wartime production that their place is in the air force, their place is overseas in the armed forces of this country. Surely the time has come when the whole system of man-power administration in this dominion must be rationalized. There are man-power shortages in the key industries, and yet the garrison army remains. Can it be said any longer that the policy in effect makes for efficiency in the utilization of man-power resources?

I should like to say a few words on selective service. General Marshall says, as reported in the press of to-day, that it is necessary to bring in national selective service on an even greater scale in the United States than ever before. What is our position? We have a tremendous selective service organization operating in various parts of the dominion, and yet in spite of the criticism of last year the government apparently has a policy that still is not equalizing the call-up in the various military districts. What is the reason? I can well visualize that in one military district so many men have volunteered in the service of their country that it would be impossible to call up more than a very low percentage if those who are left endeavour to enlist and are turned down. Only a few days ago there was turned out a booklet "Canada At War", January, 1944. I ask hon. members to compare that "Canada At War" with the issue of January, 1943. What it reveals is this: In the first place, in January, 1943, the male population of Canada from 19 to 45 was set out. Since that time the male population from 18 to 45 has been estimated. In every military district of Canada, except No. 5, there has been an increase of from 18 to 20 per cent in the male population available for service. In other words, by reason of the inclusion of the 18 year olds, including the 18-year-old class, adds about twenty per cent to the numbers that were available when the call-up limitation was 19 years of age. And yet, with every other military district showing an increase, in No. 5 military district there are 300 men less of the 18- to 45-year-old class than there were last year in the 19- to 45-year-old class. Based on those figures, the record of enlistment, while shown as 17·7 per cent, in point of fact is 9·8 per cent.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Here is the record of the call-up all the way across the dominion, which shows that there is no equalization, no even distribution of the load. The government, as a policy, apparently deliberately takes the stand of not equalizing the call, and the people of Canada have a right to ask the reason.

Taking the military districts one by one, the following is a record of the call-up during the period from October 31, 1942, to September 30, 1943:

Military district—Location	Percentage
No. 1—London, Ont.	7·8
No. 2—Toronto, Ont.	7
No. 3—Kingston, Ont.	5·7
No. 4—Montreal, P.Q.	7
No. 5—Quebec, P.Q.	5
No. 6—Halifax, N.S.	7·9
No. 7—Saint John, N.B.	8
No. 10—Winnipeg, Man.	7·8
No. 11—Victoria, B.C.	8·1
No. 12—Regina, Sask.	8
No. 13—Calgary, Alta.	7·5

What does this reveal? It reveals—and I take the figures for my own province—that in Saskatchewan, with an enlistment record of 35·7 per cent, sixty per cent more are being called up than in the military district where voluntary enlistments are the least. I believe in the principle of Canadian unity. In adopting a policy under which men in all parts of Canada are not given an equality of opportunity to serve—because it is denied them under the call-up—the government is doing more to cause disunion and friction across Canada than could be occasioned by any other act in the administration of the war effort.

Earlier I made reference to selective service. It is top heavy with employees. A return several inches thick was brought down the other day, setting out the record of employees in that branch of the service. As I see men moved about, I ask myself this question: Does that department, or some of its officials, believe that their work in life is simply that of pushing people around? An example comes to my mind, one of many others, respecting a young French Canadian from Montreal, an electrician by trade, who last November was out of work. He was ordered to go to Drumheller, Alberta, to work as an electrician in the mines. He paid his way out to Drumheller, and upon arriving there he was advised that there was no work for him as he was not the kind of electrician required. He was 2,500 miles from home without a job. The selective service officer in Drumheller advised him that the proper thing for him to do was to go to Flin Flon, Manitoba. to stop off at Prince Albert for instructions. This was a trained man, and he is still at Prince Albert. He has been there for two and a half months

trying to get action from selective service, but none of the officials will accept any further responsibility for him.

I know of two or three men who were farming several hundred acres of land, and who, although they had work to do at home, have been ordered to leave home during the winter months as a condition of postponement. Those men have been directed to travel two or three hundred miles to other farms. The time has come when the whole system of selective service should be reorganized. Changes should be made in its personnel to the end that conditions such as I have mentioned shall not be permitted to exist in this, the fifth year of the war.

I could go on and record many other examples, equally direct and equally revealing. It all comes back to this, that such conditions have arisen because of the fact that, in the midst of war, realizing that the selective service can be made operative only in one way, the government has failed to carry into effect the principles necessary to that end. We have been in session now for more than a week. The man-power situation is serious. The question of reinforcements for our troops overseas is one about which we want to be reassured. The Prime Minister indicated on Monday last, as I understood him, that some time in the course of this debate the ministers concerned would place before the house and the country the position of affairs. Again to-day we face the same attitude that has characterized the administration of the manpower problem, namely, a postponement of action, a postponement of revealing the situation as it exists.

In the time remaining at my disposal I have a few suggestions to make in connection with the men who are being discharged. This is not a partisan matter. All of us want to make sure that the service men and women shall be assured of a fair opportunity when they return to civilian life. There is not a little resentment among the more than 100,000 service men who have been discharged, owing to the fact that only 5,950 of them are in receipt of pension.

Another matter of complaint is the inadequacy of clothing allowances. The allowance on discharge was increased recently from $35 to $65. I say that $65 is insufficient with which to clothe the men who are discharged from the armed services after serving one or two years overseas.

Another matter I wish to discuss is in connection with soldier settlement. I ask the minister why it is that the soldiers who served in the war of 1914-18 and who still hold land are still in debt must pay five per cent interest, which is a rate of interest forty-three per cent higher than is being charged the men who return from this war and who have taken up land under the Veterans' Land Act? That is something that should be remedied. It is discrimination against the man who served in the last war, and it is causing no end of ill feeling among them.

I think the time has come when mothers dependents' allowances should equal those of wives. In many cases dependent mothers are unable to carry on with the present allowances. There is no reason at all why a mother who gives her son should not receive an allowance equal to that paid to the wife of a soldier to enable her to escape destitution.

The hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank) and other members have dealt on more than one occasion with the necessity of the readoption of the insurance principle in connection with pensions. Why it was taken away in 1940 has never been satisfactorily explained. Why it has not been restored in 1944 and made retroactive to the beginning of the war is something that I ask the minister to explain when he speaks on this matter. I know of the kindly attitude of the minister and his desire to see that these anomalies are rectified. Where is there any opposition to the bringing into effect of this principle, to the equalizing of mothers' allowances and to the granting of a cost-of-living bonus along with dependents' allowances equal to that paid to civilians?

Many of our men have been overseas for more than four years, some of them having spent their fifth Christmas there, removed from their loved ones and friends. If the government now takes the stand that there are sufficient reinforcements available, that the manpower situation in so far as the armed forces are concerned is reasonably good and the shipping situation has improved in recent months, I suggest that the time has come for the government to grant a furlough to men in the armed forces who have been overseas from the beginning of the war. A similar scheme is receiving close attention in the United States. The men in the air force are brought home after a certain period of service, and the same treatment is given men in the navy. A similar system should be put into effect for those serving in the army. I realize the difficulty, but an effort should be made to establish a system of rotating leaves or furloughs. It would do much to improve enlistment in the army and enhance the morale of those who serve overseas, as well as of their dependents at home in Canada. I have heard men in the army say, "I am going overseas, and I will have to stay to the end; if I went in one of

the other services I would come home sooner or later, whether or not I were a casualty; I would be given an opportunity to return to my loved ones." The adoption of my suggestion would, I submit, improve the morale of the soldier.

I appreciate the opportunity offered by the speech to bring these matters to the attention of the house and the country. I ask the government to place before the people of Canada the true man-power position, both in the domestic sphere and in the armed forces.

Reference has been made in the speech from the throne to agriculture but time does not permit my discussing that to-day, except to say that I believe in the principle of floor prices, but like hon. members who have already spoken I ask the government what level is to be set. Is it to be a price level in accordance with present prices and subsidies? Is it to be a level that will ensure the cost of production and a reasonable profit? If it is not, it will be a denial of the farmers' due.

The promise to bring in price levels for agricultural products cannot be made effective beyond the period of the war, unless there is an amendment to the British North America Act or the provinces and the dominion agree on concurrent legislation. The farmer should realize that in that promise there may be little or much. There may be new hope for agriculture if the government is prepared to attack the matter from the constitutional angle. On the other hand, if the government does not do that, whatever floor price is set will cease to exist with the termination of the operation of the War Measures Act. That is something I should like to hear explained by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) and those associated with him. What has been done in that connection? What course is being followed to secure the cooperation by the provinces? What amendment will be asked to the constitution to permit of minimum price fixing once the war is over?

There are other matters with which I cannot deal at the moment. I conclude by saying that the man-power problem is of transcendant importance to the future of the war effort of this nation, one that must be faced now, and cannot be faced by merely setting up new board or by the passing of orders in council. What action will the government take now to solve this problem?

Mr. M. E. McGARRY (Inverness-Richmond): Until very recently it was my resolve that I would not take up very much of the time or the attention of this house by participating in this debate; but on reflection, having the honour and of course the responsibility of representing one of the best, if not the very best, constituencies in this vast dominion, I felt that the voice of that constituency should be sounded in this chamber, even though it would be through the rather non-resonant medium of my humble self. Another reason why I thought I should rise, for a very short time anyway, was to offer my hearty felicitations to the mover (Mr. Tremblay) and the seconder (Mr. Tucker) of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. The matter contained in their addresses was sound; it was consistent with what was revealed in the speech from the throne, and it was rendered with an eloquence and impressiveness which reflect credit not only upon the hon. gentlemen themselves but on the constituencies which have the honour of sending them to this house.

Possibly I should make a few remarks with regard to the matters contained in the speech from the throne. Before doing that I wish to refer to a few matters which were commented upon by the last speaker, the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker). Anyone, even though a stranger to the house, would recognize that the hon. member is a lawyer, because with very little material he can make a very strong case; but a stranger would never suspect him to be of a mechanical turn of mind, because he deals so much with man-power; it is his hobby. I know that the hon. member is just as anxious as I am to have the forecasts of legislation in the speech from the throne brought to effectiveness, but I think that when he urges too hasty legislation, particularly in a matter such as the health insurance plan, without first the removal of the constitutional hurdles which are in the way, and before the prelude of a programme of education, he is not taking the most effective way to bring this legislation into administrative usefulness.

I notice he also referred to the matter with regard to General McNaughton which took up so much time in the house this afternoon. Last night I read in the Ottawa *Journal* that General McNaughton was interviewed by reporters—I imagine, of the *Journal*—and it was expressed there that General McNaughton unqualifiedly stated that there was nothing wrong with him. In that very same newspaper, in the same column of the next edition, I read an interview which he had with press representatives last night at the Seigniory club, and what he said there was an altogether different statement; it was qualified; he said that organically there was nothing wrong with

him but he was advised to take a rest as a precautionary measure so that he might avoid what was possibly a threatening organic condition. I do not understand this. Surely there is nobody in the house who cannot wait for a day or two to find out which is the truthful statement.

I am not going to take up any of the time of this house by entering into a detailed discussion of the history of this great global war, and particularly of Canada's record in the war effort. Suffice it to say that Canada's war record is a splendid one, and if there be those who feel that this sentiment is incited by regional prejudice or by ultra-egoism, all they have to do to dispel that view is to refer to the laudations by Churchill, Roosevelt, Stalin, the press, and every worth-while magazine on the north American continent. To bring about this military achievement in Canada is not an easy matter. It cannot be dealt with at random; it must take some planning and require some executive qualities; it must take some cooperation. We in Canada are fortunate to have at the head of our war ministries men who had distinguished military service in the last war. Not only are they qualified in that way, but they have had the wisdom to make a selective draft on good men, men competent to initiate, to organize and to develop programmes and to bring them to a successful termination. But even this could not have been done through these instrumentalities without the hearty cooperation of the industrialists. We had the cooperation of the industrial worker, the producer, the transportation utilities, the merchant marine, last, but not least, we had the patriotism, the generosity and the tolerance of the civil population of Canada itself. If we doubt that, all we have to do is to look at the record of the civilian population. Ever since the war began, young men by the thousands have flocked to the forces, voluntarily offering their services in any theatre of war. We find young ladies holding lucrative and responsible clerical positions leaving these positions and entering industrial plants, thus releasing able-bodied men for the forces. We find to-day comparatively old men, men beyond middle age, who endured the hardships and the horrors of the last war, standing in arms and protecting our shores. Men and women are giving not only from their savings but from their current earnings vast sums of money in order that Canada can carry on her gigantic war effort. Uncomplainingly our people accept the taxation imposts which by necessity are growing greater and greater. Tolerantly they accept our rationing, our regimentations and our restrictions. We find in the country to-day business men affected by these regulations and regimentations to the extent of doing only about one-half the volume of business which they did in peace time. Yet we find no general complaint about that. What does that show? It shows the patriotism and the intelligence of our people. It shows they are aware that this is a total war effort and that the price of victory is common; it is not only a common price but a common sacrifice. They know that this is an all-out war and that these little restrictions and inconveniences which we suffer to-day are but trifling as compared with the tyranny and the serfdom and butchery, I might say, to which they would be subjected if these homicidal would-be world dominators were to gain possession of our country and our institutions. They know that their money would be no good to them at all in that event. I think the manner in which the people of this country have cooperated shows not only their patriotism but their wisdom.

When a nation is at war the government has a double obligation. First of all it has to provide the war materials required; second, it has to preserve the economy of the nation. If the economy of the nation is not preserved, the war supplies cannot be provided. At the very beginning of this war—three hours, in fact, after Canada had declared war on Germany—this government established the wartime prices and trade board. I maintain that the institution of that board was the greatest possible step that could have been taken to preserve the economy of Canada and to throw up barriers and hurdles on the road that would lead to the ignominy of inflation, from which we suffered sufficiently after the last war. Because of the establishment of that board we have escaped hoarding and profiteering, and we have not had to witness the disgraceful spectacle of watching some men and some corporations waxing wealthy on the blood and sacrifice of the nation.

In the speech from the throne it was very well stated that the promises of impressive victories were being fulfilled. But the war is not over. This war may be over in 1944. When that day comes we shall be confronted with the terrible cost of this war, and it is up to us to search our hearts now, because I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the youths who are fighting for liberty and freedom on the other side are searching their hearts to-day. They are praying for life, they are praying for comradeship, they are praying for devotion, and it is up to us to see that we cooperate with them even in their prayers, because without our cooperation, even with their devotion and their prayers, victory will not be achieved.

One would think, listening to some speakers in this house, that this government has not done anything during the period of the war, and even now intends to do little, to improve our democratic condition after the war. I believe that this government has had in mind the right major attitude, and that was the prosecution of the war. But mark you, while they felt that the main intent and purpose of the nation as well as of the individual should be the prosecution of the war, they realized that some consideration should be given to the time when our soldiers will be returning home and when the thousands of people who to-day are engaged in the manufacture of implements of destruction will revert to their peace-time pursuits. As early in this war as 1940 this government put on the statute books three very important measures, all of which tended to help that situation.

There was the amendment to the Soldier Settlement Act. We all know how ineffectually the old act worked, and I think all agree that the reason why it did not work was that, through laxity, the wrong men were put on the wrong farms. The amendment redeemed the old act from some of its weaknesses, so that a settler will no longer be allowed to go on a farm that is not up to a certain standard of productivity, and further he will not be allowed to go on a farm that is up to the standard of productivity required unless he has had some experience in farming. But not only was the old act improved; it was extended so that a fisherman or a man engaged in industry who wished to spend part of his time as a farmer was afforded the same concessions as a soldier.

Then there was the act dealing with compulsory employment after the war of those who left their employment to join the armed forces. Under that act a man will have the legal right to ask for and get, if possible, his old position when he returns.

Then there was the Unemployment Insurance Act. It was instituted at a time when there was very little unemployment. The result is that to-day we have a large repository of funds under the Unemployment Insurance Act which will at least look after the acute stages of unemployment.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I say that while this government has always had in mind as its main purpose the prosecution of the war, it has attended to these other matters in order to be prepared to deal with the crisis which will be upon us in what I might call the conflict of peace. When it is considered what the government has done in these matters, and then when one turns to the speech from the throne and sees what is proposed to be done to improve the social and economic conditions of our people, who will deny that what is embodied in the speech from the throne is intended to bring about betterment in our social and economic conditions? Take, for instance, the plans for the establishment of a national minimum of social security and human welfare, which are to be advanced as rapidly as possible. That is a matter which the hon. member for Lake Centre mentioned. I sat on the committee referred to by my hon. friend, and I know something of its work; I also make inquiries as I go about the country, and I want to say—and here I am not interfering at all with the plans of our chief and of the cabinet—that before we introduce a scheme of national health insurance we should be assured that the people are well educated in the matter and that they are in a position to absorb it.

The speech from the throne says:

> A broad programme has already been developed for the reestablishment of veterans of the present war, and for the care of disabled veterans.

We know that, and I am sure everyone appreciates it.

One thing that I would like to see go further is the floor that has been placed under farm staple products. I cannot see why a floor is not provided for fishermen. They also are producers. They are honest working folk, and as a matter of fact their life is more hazardous than that of the farmer. In fact, we may say they are more or less taking a chance every day in the pursuit of their calling. I do hope therefore that it is only by an oversight that this provision is not also made for them, and that before this particular item reaches the stage of legislation it will have been made elastic enough to extend to the fishermen.

All these things should merit our approval. I fail to see why hon. members, speaking in this house, can say that this government has made no provision for our people. They ignore the statements contained in the speech from the throne, and suggest that when the time of demobilization comes everything will be in chaos because no preparation has been made to take care of our boys.

There are different conceptions of the kind of world that we shall have after the war. There are two definite schools of thought. There are those who believe that we shall have a utopia, and there are others who say that we are going to have a terrible depression and mass unemployment. I do not belong to either school. I do not believe that we shall

have a utopia in Canada, any more than there is likely to be one anywhere else in the world. I do believe however, and I am sure that those who have been at all observant must certainly have seen it, that there has been providential guidance in this war. We have seen it in the almost impossible escapes of our men from conditions that were seemingly inescapable. We have seen it in the blunders of the enemy, for which no explanation could be given—because they have made major blunders where they could have taken advantage of conditions which might have turned defeat into victory for them. I believe that that great providential guide is still at the helm, and He is just as much interested in peace as He is in war.

I believe that what will happen in the peace conflict, as it might be called, will be this. There will arise able executives, competent men capable of initiating, developing and extending programmes for peace such as we have had in the war. But as I have said, just as in the war programme, we must have cooperation. We must have the same cooperation we had in the war. We must have industries. We must have the industrial worker and the producer, and we must have all the necessary transportation facilities. In fact, we must have everything that came to our assistance in time of war. We are not going to do this by thinking that we are going to have a utopia. We shall have to work and to manage the same as before.

I do not believe that the economic condition of Canada will remain static. It will never remain static so long as we have men and women who are free to act and to back up their ideas, men and women who are willing to work and to make sacrifices if necessary. If you make sacrifices for the conduct of war, surely you should be willing to make sacrifices for peace. In a complex society such as we have, governments are certainly bound to introduce some restrictions. Let them beware, however. If we want a democracy we must allow to enterprise at least as much freedom as is consistent with our modern civilization.

In conclusion, let me say this. God forbid that in Canada after this war there should remain a condition where enterprise will have no reward and where thrift will be of no avail. We do not want to see that kind of government. But there is one thing I would mention before resuming my seat. In the constituency I have the honour to represent, we were unfortunately given little in the way of industrial or military projects in connection with the war. Experts were sent to look over the situation, and they came back with the report that for military purposes there was no site that had the strategic importance that was called for in the establishment of such projects at this time. I hope that when the time of rehabilitation comes the government will remember that we were left without projects of this kind while other sections in Canada were absolutely cluttered up with war projects. I hope they will not leave it to the last to do something for us in the way of rehabilitation, but will give us some of the many things that we certainly need; because, after all, we have been very patient during the war, recognizing that the winning of the war is the all-important thing. I trust that when the period of rehabilitation comes we shall not be the forgotten men.

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon we were treated to a liberal helping of Scotch; this afternoon we have been treated to a liberal helping of law; and now we have had a liberal helping of medicine, so I see that I have to watch my step in the few moments at my disposal.

I was pleased to hear the Minister of National War Services (Mr. LaFleche), announce the appointment of Mr. Parker of Winnipeg as governor of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. I think it is about time that agriculture was recognized on these boards, and I hope that other ministers will continue along that path.

In the speech from the throne I have noted quite a number of things which are possibly to the good provided they are brought along and finished up along the right line. If they are not finished up in the right direction then I am afraid the Canadian people will be sadly disillusioned.

Before dealing with that I wish to make a few comments on the speech delivered by the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol). I am sorry he is not in his seat, but I want him to know that I am in accord with the speech he made for different reasons. He told us that it would be a benefit to the west. With that I agree. He also told us it would be a benefit to Canada. With that I also agree. But there is one thing that he did not tell us, and that is, when we have all this production where are the markets to come from? He did not tell us that. At the present time with the few farmers we have at work to-day we have produced far more in some lines than the country can take care of. I was thinking over the project suggested by the hon. member for Davenport and I came to the conclusion that there is still a lot of good cream on the milk in the prairies. Perhaps

some hon. members wonder what I mean by this. If you wake up with me at five o'clock in the morning you will find that the farmer is awakened by the ringing of an alarm clock which has been manufactured in Ontario. He grabs his milk pails, which are also manufactured in Ontario, and goes out to the barn. Then before proceeding to milk his cows he takes hold of a fork—you know for what purpose—which is also manufactured in Ontario. Then he milks his cows and takes the milk to the milkhouse and there proceeds to separate it in a separator manufactured in Ontario. He then comes in for his breakfast and nine times out of ten the breakfast food is manufactured in Ontario. After that he goes out and cranks up an American-made tractor and fills it up with American fuel in a lot of cases. He then goes out and hitches on to his machinery for the day's work, and you usually find with a very few exceptions that that machinery has been manufactured in Ontario. We could go on with this process right through the day until bedtime arrives and we find that the poor farmer goes to bed, which bed was manufactured in Ontario, and sleeps under blankets made in exactly the same province. Notwithstanding that I am in favour of the irrigation project mentioned by the hon. member for Davenport.

We are told that in some cases the west is not doing its share. But perhaps if the west were turned away, then some other parts of Canada would find they would be in a rather peculiar position. I am mentioning these matters not for the purpose of creating disunity, but I do want to show that when Canada's agriculture is prosperous other parts of the country and other industries of the country are prosperous. Let us go back to 1928. In ordinary times the west purchases from the east not less than $387,000,000 worth of goods. At that time wheat was selling at $1.05 a bushel, on the average. Then we come to the depression period of 1933 and we find that the west's purchases from the east amounted to only $80,000,000. At that time the average price of wheat was sixty-eight cents. That indicates a decrease in the purchases of the west in the east of approximately eighty per cent. In 1928 the purchases of farm machinery in eastern Canada by western farmers amounted to $89,306,000. At that time wheat was selling at $1.05 a bushel. Now let us come to 1933, one of the depression years. We find that those purchases had decreased to $8,196,000, or to approximately ten per cent. What about the sales of implements manufactured in eastern Canada? We find in the case of the International Harvester the western sales amounted to 77·60 per cent; eastern sales, 22·40 per cent. In the case of Massey-Harris it would appear that their products are not as favourably accepted in western Canada. The figures were 66·69 per cent in western Canada against 33·31 per cent in eastern Canada. Slightly over forty per cent of the farmers of Canada are in the west. Even though we have only slightly over forty per cent of the farmers in the west it costs us between $50,000,000 and $60,000,000 annually because of the tariff.

We were told in the speech from the throne that we must have export markets. In that connection I think one of our first duties is to supply the home market. That is one of the best potential markets provided we have the money with which to buy the produce. If we have a surplus of goods, then it would seem good business to export it and bring back in return goods which we cannot easily manufacture here.

As a farmer I believe I am expected to say something about hogs. That is one of the vexed questions of the time, and was particularly so a few months ago. In the past four or five months we have had several statements which did not seem to be in the interests of Canada or of the Canadian producers. Just a couple of months ago we had quite a glut of hogs on the market, and about that time the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) was trying to get the western farmers and farmers all over Canada to continue to produce more hogs. About this time also we had an increase in the price of oats and barley, an increase of ten cents a bushel in oats and fifteen cents a bushel in barley. Because people did not feel at that time that hogs were a paying propostion with grain at the prices indicated, a number of farmers decided that they would ship out a number of their brood stock, and while thousands of those brood sows were on their way to market or on the market an order was put through prohibiting the slaughtering of sows or other off-grade hogs, with the result the farmers of Canada lost millions and millions of dollars. The packers took advantage of this glut market. To my knowledge and in my own locality of Paradise Valley one farmer shipped out some hogs averaging $23 to $24.50. During this glut he also shipped out some of the same lot and had grades "B", "C" and "D", which averaged him for the same weight of hogs $18 per head. A few weeks later when the situation had cleared up to some extent the remainder of that bunch of hogs was shipped out and netted $25, and fifty per cent

graded "A" and fifty per cent graded "B". I think that is sufficient to prove that the packers took advantage of a situation over which the farmers had no control whatever, and as a result millions of dollars that rightfully belonged to the farmers poured into the pockets of the packers. In that connection I believe that because hogs had to be shipped from western Canada to eastern Canada for the purpose of slaughtering, the government should stand the heavy shrinkage, and in cases where hogs could not be marketed, the government should stand the cut which had to be taken by farmers on these heavy hogs.

In connection with the cattle markets, we have many complaints. We were told in the committee on agriculture last spring that the government was watching this matter very closely, and that plans had been made, if necessary, to go on the market and buy live cattle. Up to the present time I have not heard of this being done, although I have here a dozen complaints from farmers stating that they have not been at all satisfied with the prices they have received. I understand that at the present time the packers are guaranteed a floor price for any beef which has been placed in storage, and which can be turned over to the government. I am suggesting that the same privilege should be extended to farmers, because if the packer is entitled to a floor price, surely the farmer who produces the cattle should be entitled to exactly the same privilege.

In connection with sheep and lambs we have heard many complaints. Some of those complaints were described yesterday, and they are common throughout Canada. We had a lengthy discussion on the price of wool last year, and several comparisons were made by the Minister of Agriculture. But when we look at the wool prices listed this year we see that the farmers are still being robbed, as compared with farmers in other parts of the world, particularly those across the boundary line. As a result of low sheep and wool prices we find that children in this country have been deprived of woollen underwear during the winter months, a condition which should not be permitted.

In the belief that credit should be given where credit is due may I say the farmers are encouraged by the increases in grain prices recently announced. At present the top price for wheat is $1.25; for oats, 61½ cents, and for barley, 79¾ cents. Those prices, it must be understood, are not net to the farmer, but rather prices, top grades f.o.b. Fort William. In respect of wheat something like eighteen cents a bushel is deducted for handling and freight charges, and there are comparative amounts for oats and barley.

Some people believe that the farmers who grow these grains are becoming millionaires. I do not feel that way about it, because I am in that line of business myself. If the farmers were receiving the same treatment as organized labour we should be receiving $1.60 for wheat, 69 cents for oats, and 90 cents for barley. I am not complaining about the wages received by organized labour, but I am still complaining about the prices received by farmers for their products. I am afraid farmers individually and in organized groups have developed the habit of asking for a dime when they are entitled to a dollar. That applies to most of our organized groups, as far as agriculture is concerned. The sooner we get away from that, and see that we get that to which we are entitled, the sooner will agriculture be on a sound basis.

For the moment I am going to deal with wheat. Taking the period 1926 to 1929 we were told last year the parity price was $1.41. That is sixteen cents a bushel higher than we are now receiving. It might be of interest to know that in 1926 the farmers of Canada comprised approximately one-third of the population, but at that time that third received only one-sixth of the national income. For that reason I do not feel that the 1926-29 period was a fair basis upon which to figure our parity price. If a third of the population of Canada are on the farms, then I believe the period 1915-19 would be much more suitable, when the farmers received a third of the national income. I have before me a table which sets out the farm income during the period 1926 to 1940. During that time the high percentage was received in 1926, in which year we received 17·8 per cent of the national income. In 1932, while a third of the population lived on the farm we received only five per cent of the national income. This table gives other figures in connection with annual wages and salaries in manufacturing industries and, with the consent of the house, I should like to place the table on *Hansard*. It gives the average income during the period 1926-40 as 9·4 per cent, for one-third of the population. And, just in case there may be any question as to the sources from which this information comes I would point out that it is derived from a study prepared for the royal commission on dominion-provincial relations by Messrs. MacGregor, Rutherford, Britnell and Deutsch,

and a supplementary volume bringing the figures up to date by the staff of the commission. The figures relating to manufacturing are based on the census of industry figures supplied by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. The figures for the number of farms are from the "Canada Year Book".

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member leave to place the table on *Hansard?*

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Very well; it may be placed on *Hansard.*

Mr. FAIR: It is as follows:

AGRICULTURE'S SHARE OF THE NATIONAL INCOME

Year	Total Income Canada	Agriculture		Average Income per Farm	Average Cash Income per Farm	Manufacturing	
		Net Income	% Nat. Income			Annual Wages	Annual Salary
	Millions of $			$	$	$	$
1926	4,080·7	728·2	17·8	998	788	1,003	1,867
1927	4,246·2	698·6	16·4	957	746	997	1,899
1928	4,641·1	820·3	17·6	1,125	900	1,024	1,915
1929	4,718·6	691·4	14·6	947	729	1,045	1,954
1930	4,167·6	399·3	9·6	546	348	1,001	1,982
1931	3,525·0	222·6	6·3	304	172	957	1,872
1932	2,861·7	144·5	5·0	198	111	852	1,732
1933	2,632·3	173·7	6·6	238	155	785	1,607
1934	2,879·3	262·2	9·1	359	254	837	1,614
1935	3,116·5	290·0	9·3	398	274	870	1,638
1936	3,416·5	390·4	11·4	534	390	896	1,659
1937	3,829·4	439·4	11·5	602	447	965	1,692
1938	3,837·0	421·8	10·9	577	415	956	1,719
1939	4,039·6	505·7	12·5	695	525	975	1,746
1940	4,594·2	508·7	11·0	698	527	.....	.....
Average—							
1926-29	4,401·6	734·6	16·6	1,007	791	1,017	1,909
1930-40	3,536·3	341·7	9·4	468	329	*902	*1,724
Drop	20%	53%	43%	53%	58%	12%	10%

* Years 1930-1938.

In order to take care of some of the wrongs I have mentioned in connection with hogs, cattle and sheep I say we should have more strict supervision of packing plants. Some of the instances I have given will show that the grading is not as it should be and, because farmers are being robbed of millions of dollars every year, something drastic should be done. We well remember that some years ago an investigation of packing plants was made, one in which the Hon. H. H. Stevens was interested, but not very much was done along that line. Why action was not taken may be realized and understood by some who sit in the house to-day.

As was mentioned in the speech from the throne, we should have in connection with our grain and all other farm produce a floor price. But like other hon. members who have spoken in the debate, I am deeply interested

in where that floor will be placed, whether it will be on a proper level or down in the basement. Before the government begins to set those prices, or the levels at which the floor should be maintained, I suggest that the proper period of 1915-1919 should be accepted as the basis upon which the floors should be fixed.

Then, in order to help out our basic industry I believe we should have research laboratories such as have been described on other occasions. Having them in one section of Canada is not sufficient. In my opinion they should be extended throughout the dominion. Again in that connection I believe research for the benefit of Canada should be the purpose, rather than some of the things done in the past.

I have before me a brief item from the *Rural Cooperator* dated October 12, 1943, which will possibly give some idea of my meaning. This article is headed "Wallace exposes monopolies forming super-government" and states:

Long before Pearl Harbor many of us in government had done our best to build up a rubber stockpile, to encourage the growing of natural rubber in this hemisphere and to get synthetic rubber production started. As Secretary of Agriculture I personally took the initiative in some of this work. Later as a member of WPB I continued to push for prompt butyl rubber expansion.

What I didn't know and what 130,000,000 Americans did not know was that the private rulers of world industry had their own private approach to synthetic rubber. Synthetic rubber was the subject of a private treaty between a great American oil company and I.G. Farben, the German chemical colossus. These two great concerns made a deal. The Germans were given a world monopoly on synthetic rubber. The Americans were given a monopoly on synthetic gasoline. This monopoly was good over the entire world, with the exception of Germany. The Germans knew what they were after. They would not yield their own development in their own country to foreign interests.

This secret agreement between an American monopoly and a German cartel was submitted to no public authority in this country. It was far more important than most treaties but it was never acted upon by the United States senate. The peoples and the governments of the world had unwittingly let the cartels and the monopolies form a super-government by means of which they could monopolize and divide whole fields of science and carve up the markets of the world at their own sweet pleasure.

The people must get back their power to deal with this super-government. This super-government has misused the people of the United States not only with regard to rubber but in a host of other critical industries as well.

That is signed by Henry Wallace, vice-president of the United States.

Looking back to the last session I am reminded that at that time we had two different statements in connection with synthetic rubber, one by the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) and the other I believe by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner). When we set up our research laboratory I hope we do so with the intention and for the purpose of benefiting the people of this country rather than those who would abuse the privilege of free enterprise.

It will also be necessary to have an equitable adjustment of debts. The act which was passed at the last session is not good enough. It should be amended or something worth while passed in its stead. Something else that should have been taken care of long ago is the question of interest on farm debts. This interest should not be payable until the farmer is able to sell his wheat or other products which are now under quota. The farmer should also be allowed storage for the undelivered portion of the quota left on the farm. He is now compelled to accept certain losses over which he has no control.

Education has been sadly neglected in Canada. We can provide millions of dollars for other things not nearly as worthy—I have mentioned some of them—but education seems to be neglected. Some of the provinces are doing the best they can, but under present financial and economic conditions they are not able to provide the necessary money to take care of educational needs. The dominion government should assist the provinces by means of grants which would be administered by the provinces. They would then be able to pay their teachers higher salaries and provide a better set-up for education all round.

The hon. member who preceded me stated that the health programme is being taken care of very ably. I trust his hopes will be realized. I hope that instead of collecting pay for these services from people who can ill afford to pay it, national money will be issued and in this way we can take care of our health programme. I want to refer to one of the scourges of this country—cancer. A short time ago I met a doctor who had retired some years ago, but after the outbreak of the present war he got back into harness. He suggested that there should be a tabulation made of all cancer cases which would be kept at one place. All these cases could be studied with a view to finding out something definite about this dreaded disease. Tuberculosis and other diseases should be taken care of and I hope that our health programme will do these things.

I come now to some of the other items mentioned in the speech from the throne. It is stated that a department of veterans'

affairs will be set up to take care of pensions and all that kind of thing. When speaking on the soldier settlement estimates on July 24 I suggested that this matter should be taken from the Department of Mines and Resources and placed under the Department of Pensions and National Health. I hope my suggestion will be put into effect when the new department is set up. It is also rumoured that the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) is to be in charge of the new department. I know he is sympathetic and wants to do the best he can, but from cases that have been brought to my attention I feel certain that the minister is not getting all the assistance he should from many of his colleagues. For this reason I believe the members of this house should impress upon the government the need of doing everything possible for the men and women who will return from the present war.

I listened with a great deal of interest last night to the speech of the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch), and I heartily associate myself with his remarks. He served with distinction in the last war and he knows exactly what he is talking about. I have been in touch with the officials of the Edmonton branch of the Canadian Legion and I feel satisfied that they want something better for our returned men than is being given them at the present time.

I come now to the question of our soldier settlers. I have referred to this matter on several occasions, but without result. Before the new department is set up the government should discharge its responsibility to the soldier settlers of the last war and give them clear title to their lands. Some one will ask where the money is to come from, but my reply is that it will cost much less to give six or seven thousand clear titles than it will to continue to pay the staff needed in Ottawa and all across Canada to carry on the affairs of the old soldier settlement board. There is no doubt in my mind that it would prove to be a money-saving proposition for the government and it would give these veterans of world war one a chance to breathe for their remaining days. I understand the average age of these men is somewhere around fifty-five or fifty-six years and many of them are up around the seventy mark. They are being asked to sign a new contract for another twenty years in order to fulfil their obligations to the soldier settlement board. It is not necessary for me to give figures; I wish merely to state that I feel the government should not keep these men in bondage and deprive their wives and families of the necessities of life so that a contract which was poorly devised may be lived up to. This has been admitted by the government on different occasions. I should like to refer to the statement made by the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Crerar) when we discussed this matter on July 24, the last day of the session. Speaking about myself he said:

> The hon. member identifies himself with the request made by a small group of soldier settlers who met in Saskatoon some time during the past year. They have put forward the demand that they should receive titles to their property and should not be asked to make any further payments, either of arrears or of amounts owing in the future. That point of view has been very strongly pressed by this little group, but I say to my hon. friend that to consider anything of the kind would be a gross injustice to the thousands of soldier settlers who have met their obligations and who are meeting them to-day and are not asking for treatment of this kind.

A little further on he said:

> In the light of those facts, for my hon. friend to rise and endeavour to give the committee and the country the impression that this government is dealing harshly and hardly with these soldier settlers is wholly misleading. On reflection I think my hon. friend would agree that such criticism is not very wide of the mark.

Commenting on that, may I ask the Minister of Mines and Resources to tell this house how many of these settlers during the past three or four years or since the war broke out have signed quit claim deeds or were served with thirty days notice. A thirty days notice means: Make your payments or a certain portion of them within thirty days or get off the farm and go out on the roads—we don't want you any longer. When the minister gives us that information we shall be able to judge whether or not the government has dealt hardly and harshly with the soldier settlers.

Concluding his remarks the minister had this to say, which I think is no credit to any government:

> I repeat that to meet the hon. member's request and wipe off the outstanding indebtedness of soldier settlers would be unjust to those settlers who paid off their debts and to-day have title to their land. Why, during the last year several hundred of these soldier settlers have paid off what they owed on their land and acquired title to it. I can assure hon. members that the government has no desire to deal harshly with any of these men. We recognize what they did from 1914 to 1918 but, after all, governments have to shape their policies in line with the general good. If to-day we took the action urged by my hon. friend and wiped off the existing indebtedness of soldier settlers, it would be a gross injustice to those who have met and are meeting their obligations.

I take it that the minister means by that, that injustice has been done to some of these settlers and that we have to continue that injustice to those who are still on the land

because to give them a square deal might make the other fellows sore and perhaps they would not vote for the government.

But let us take a hint from the statements that have been made not only by that little group that met in Saskatchewan but by soldier settlers all across this dominion. If these injustices are not corrected I tell the minister and the government that before this session is over he may expect to hear not only from the little group that met at Saskatoon but from thousands and thousands of Canadians who will seek to place their views on this subject before this house, and the minister will find then that I am not a lone voice crying out for justice for these soldier settlers of the last war. At another time we shall press for a chance to discuss this further.

There is one more group about which I wish to speak before I sit down, namely the old age pensioners. In the speech from the throne it is intimated that we are to have a contributory system of old age pensions. With that I do not agree. I agree that we should have a more liberal system of payments for these old age pensioners and that the age should be reduced to sixty. After the war there will be a cry of unemployment. I think we should take the older people off the work list so that after the war our younger people will have the chance to work, and for those who have served their country faithfully but have been robbed of the products of their labours during past years we should provide an old age pension that is worthy of Canada. I am quite satisfied that this can be done. I am quite satisfied that millions of dollars are being paid out to-day to interests who are not entitled to it, and I am suggesting that by adopting a scientific monetary system we can not merely make these payments to our old people but make Canada the best country in the world so far as our standard of living is concerned.

Mr. J. W. NOSEWORTHY (York South): Mr. Speaker, several members of this house have already indicated that this session of parliament has a special significance. Some have intimated that that significance arises out of the fact that we may have a general election before another session is called. But the real significance of this session lies in the fact that we are now in the fifth year of a war that has not yet been won, a war that has come to have a very special significance for the common people of this country. Consequently the Canadian people are rightly expecting a great deal of this parliament at this session. They expect us to enact whatever legislation or measures are necessary to secure a speedy victory over our enemy. They expect us to enact such measures as are necessary to ensure full employment for our men returning from overseas and full employment for those at home. They expect us, in the third place, to enact legislation which will provide adequate social security for all our people, both now and when the war ends.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), in speaking on the address, called the attention of the house to the fact that many members of the forces have already spent their fifth Christmas overseas. Our people were conditioned at the beginning of the war to expect a long war, but they have been led by expressions made by allied leaders to believe that the war in Europe would end in 1944; and while they are prepared to make whatever sacrifices are necessary for as long a period of time as is necessary, they are insistent that we take every possible measure to bring the war to as speedy a conclusion as possible. I have no hesitation in telling the government that the people of this country are not satisfied that we have been up to this time taking all possible steps to secure that speedy victory.

The leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) called attention, as did the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker), to the large army being maintained for home defence. That is a matter of very grave concern to vast numbers of people in this country. It is a matter that is becoming of increasing concern and one concerning which the misgivings of the people are increasing rather than diminishing. We should know in this session whether in the opinion of the government there is such an imminent danger to Canada as warrants the maintenance of that army for home defence or whether it is the intention of the government to use that army overseas should the necessity arise. The policy of the government, whatever it may be, in that matter should be clarified and made known. It will be a grave injustice to the men serving overseas, to the allied nations, as well as to our own people, should we withdraw, as we have done, all these men from productive enterprises and train and maintain them at public expense, unless we are to use them as soldiers either at home or overseas.

There is much misgiving in the public mind regarding the production of war materials both in the field of agriculture and in the field of industry. A few months ago I read in the morning paper that the people of Britain were faced with the necessity of reducing their meagre bacon ration: at the same time I learned from farmers in New Brunswick

that they were obliged to kill young pigs, to kill these litters as they were born, because they were unable to secure feed on which to raise them. I have seen stacks of flour stored in farmers' garages, more than they can consume for the rest of their lives, flour that they were forced to buy in order to secure a few bags of feed for their stock. I saw only a month or six weeks ago pens of cattle ready to be marketed for which there was no market. The Swift Canadian company, the only company to which these farmers were allowed to sell their stock, had, I am told, refused to send their buyers forty or fifty miles from town because there was an abundance of stock nearer at hand. The whole nation has been put on a sugar ration. Only two weeks ago citizens of Chatham, Ontario, called my attention to a refinery for the production of sugar from sugar beet which was closed in that town.

Instances such as these are causing our people to question whether we are seriously trying to provide a maximum supply of war essentials for the allied cause or a maximum of profits for those who control our manufacturing and processing enterprises.

The same question arises in the matter of production in the industrial field. I am constantly meeting men who are paying taxes from their wages who complain of evidences of waste and extravagance on every hand—examples of gross waste of time and material in many plants in which they are working. I have heard no single criticism of our war effort more frequently than that as I have moved about the country. I am satisfied that much of this could be prevented if employers were more willing and ready to grant their employees a voice and some responsibility, as is being done in England, in the matter of management in those plants; if the government were more willing and ready to grant representatives of labour a voice on those committees and councils which set forth the conditions under which workers do work, as, for example, are set forth in order in council No. 9384.

I have as yet been unable to find that the government has any adequate means of determining whether the prices charged on initial contracts, granted on a cost basis, are fair or equitable or whether the people of Canada are getting a fair return for the money spent. I raised this question in the house two sessions ago. I have raised it since. I am still satisfied, when I take the statements by the Bank of Canada and find that, in 1942, 620 companies had accumulated $379,000,000 for distribution as income to stockholders in comparison with $269,000,000 in 1938, that somebody is still profiteering in this war. My information, gathered from reliable sources, is that the government is up until this day dependent for its information, and for its check on these initial war cost contracts, on government accountants, government accountants who have no engineering knowledge, no means of telling what machines or tools are required to do a specific job, no means of telling what material is needed, no means of telling how many man-hours are needed, but are forced to rely entirely on figures which the producers supply. I am told that there is no auditing of many of the oil companies' books in connection with government orders. In England, war contracts are paid for on the basis of a fixed profit, usually seven and one-half per cent, and the profit is based on the original investment of the company and not on the turnover of goods that are produced in the plant.

We were told a year ago that the excess profits tax takes care of or prevents the accumulation of profits. The British government has issued a statement in which it contends that, were there no other controls than that of the excess profits tax, there would be no deterrent to the accumulation of profits on goods sold to the government. It is impossible to secure a statement showing the reserves that are being built up by many of these companies. The London *Economist* a few months ago estimated that Canadian companies had built at the end of 1942 reserves of 700 compared with 100 as the index figure in 1939, whereas 2,000 British companies had been forced to reduce their reserves over the same period to 80 from an index of 100 in 1939.

In other words, there has been more than seven times the accumulation of reserve by Canadian companies than by British between 1939 and 1942. Very little light has been thrown on this whole subject of profits in Canada in war time. Numerous investigations by government officials in the United States have revealed some very startling facts. It is not surprising that Canadians should have misgivings regarding the profits of some of these firms whose parent companies in the United States have been profiteering on a grand scale.

Sessional paper 139, tabled in this house on January 26, shows that the Department of Munitions and Supply has employed 257 dollar-a-year men and that more than one hundred firms represented by these men have received contracts from the government ranging from a few hundred dollars to $270,000,000 in one case, and amounting in toto for the one hundred companies to more than $800,000,000.

The wartime prices and trade board has employed another 216, the majority from large commercial and industrial firms, concerning whose dealing with the government, the return tells us, no information is available.

This situation affords so many opportunities for profiting out of the war that, in my opinion, some more adequate means is required to safeguard the public interest than that afforded by a war expenditures committee overloaded with government supporters and sitting behind closed doors. I think we should be told, for instance, why a certain advertising company with a dollar-a-year man in the Department of Fisheries gets two contracts for $50,000 each to advertise the sale of canned lobster when within a short time after his appointment and the granting of the contract that commodity disappeared almost entirely from the shelves of the stores in this country.

Has it become the policy of the government to let this house occupy itself with insignificant matters of legislation while all matters of most vital importance to the people of the country become subjects of order in council? Wage control, price control, rent control, rationing, all subjects that are of vital importance to every citizen, are removed completely from the control of this house as far as discussion and debate are concerned, and have become subjects of orders in council.

This is amazing from a government led by the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). Has the Prime Minister forgotten a resolution which he himself moved before the Liberal convention twenty-five years ago, which provided for:

> The restoration of the control of the executive by parliament and of parliament by the people through a just franchise and its exercise under free conditions and—

This is important.

> —the discontinuance of government by order in council.

There are a few more passages in that speech of twenty-five years ago which I would quote, not by way of criticism, but in order to urge the present government and the party which the Prime Minister leads to seize the present opportunity that this session affords of placing on our statute books legislation which will make his dreams of twenty-five years ago a reality. They may never again have so great an opportunity as they have to-day. The country is waiting for legislation of that kind. It would make a grand finale for the Liberal party, for, regardless of what party is returned to power after the next election, no party would rescind such measures for the alleviation of society's ills as this government can now, if it chooses, place on the statute books during this session.

On the occasion, twenty-five years ago, on which the present Prime Minister introduced a resolution which was incorporated as part of the Liberal platform on the methods and principles for regulating labour conditions, which had been adopted by the international labour convention, he called special attention to the fact that the Liberal party would be the first political party in any country in the world to accept this programme. The verdict of history is that Canada has to-day the most backward labour legislation of any important country that was represented in that international labour convention, and that notwithstanding the fact that the party which was the first to adopt its principles has been in office eighteen years since that time.

Let me read again from the same document. The Prime Minister made this statement: This resolution—

> . . . is an expression of the belief that industry exists for the sake of humanity, not humanity for the sake of industry.

Again I quote:

> Is it not true of most of the large industries of the country, as organized at the present time, that the capital investors choose the board of directors, that the board of directors select the management, and that the management determines the terms and conditions of employment, without necessarily inviting the cooperation of labour in matters which affect its own well-being?

Most interesting of all, on page 134 of the report of the national liberal convention of 1919, he is reported as having said:

> I think the time has come in the history of Canada when the people of this country are determined to have a government that is not ruled by any railway, by any financial interests, or by any business or other corporations. We want a government that is going to be free from the control of the interests, from the control of specially privileged groups; a government that is representative of the principle of government by the people and for the people, and which will be carried on at the instance of the people's own representatives.

If any change has taken place it is that after eighteen years of Liberal rule those interests now get the ear of the cabinet and the cabinet determines the terms and conditions of employment by order in council.

The country expects this parliament this session to enact legislation that will ensure full employment when the war ends; full employment, not merely for the purpose of keeping people busy, but employment that is socially useful and that would provide all our

people with all the necessities of life. That must be our first aim. To do this we must take steps to see that the necessities of life, in food, clothing and housing, are produced in sufficient quantities to feed, clothe and house our people. In days prior to the war thousands of our people lacked food, clothing and housing accommodation, yet at the same time we spent millions of dollars attempting to bribe people to buy goods that they did not want to buy. We permitted the price and profit mechanism to determine our economy and based our production solely on that which could be provided with the greatest profit for the producer. The war came and we made two radical changes. First we planned production on a priority basis and recognized basic needs. We gave priority in our production programme to those things that were needed by a nation at war. We curtailed the production of non-essentials until those other needs were met.

To achieve prosperity for our people after the war we must apply the same principles to peace-time production, and the government must accept the responsibility of seeing that first of all there is an available supply of food, clothing and housing for all our people.

In the second place we made available to our allies and to our own people, without undue regard for price or profit, those things that they needed. When our allies needed war materials we did not let either price or profit prevent us from supplying them. To enable our own people to be fed and clothed, and to some extent housed, the government made some effort to see that the prices were kept within reach of their purchasing power. When we recognize in peace time, as in war, that basic needs are of vital importance we shall then place welfare before wealth. In the words of the Prime Minister that I quoted some moments ago, we shall recognize that "industry exists for humanity, not humanity for industry", or I may add, the profits of industry. Price and profit will cease to be the sole determining factor of production.

In the third place the government has, in part, financed the increased production of things essential for war out of savings accumulated by voluntary or restricted consumption of non-essentials. Before the war we talked of spending for prosperity. Since the war began we talk of saving for victory. What is true of an armament programme is true also of social reconstruction. Such a programme must be financed largely out of savings, and I think we have to accept the fact that if we are to spend money on social reconstruction we must save it on non-essentials.

[Mr. Noseworthy.]

In addition, of course, to our savings effected as I have outlined the government has used the nation's credit for the production of essential goods. That credit must likewise be made available to meet the peace-time needs of our people. It is in order that the nation's credit may be made available and used for the production of socially useful and essential goods that we in the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation believe that the government should have the sole right of expanding or contracting or issuing credit. Because we believe that this control cannot be exercised while private interests own our banks we advocate the public ownership of these institutions.

On motion of Mr. Noseworthy the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Crerar the house adjourned at 6 p.m.

Monday, February 7, 1944

The house met at three o'clock.

INCOME WAR TAX ACT

AMENDMENT OF PROVISION RESPECTING SECRECY

Mr. S. H. KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre) moved for leave to introduce bill No. 4, to amend the Income War Tax Act (communicating information).

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. KNOWLES: This bill would add to the proper section of the Income War Tax Act these words:

> Provided that nothing in this subsection shall operate to prevent a minister of the crown from communicating to the Senate or to the House of Commons any information obtained under the provisions of this act.

In my view the restrictions as to secrecy imposed by subsection 1 of section 81 as it now stands have the effect at times of preventing a minister of the crown from giving the Senate or the House of Commons information which might be legitimately asked for and given. This amendment would also affect the Excess Profits Tax Act, 1940, since sections 40 to 87 of the Income War Tax Act are by section 14 of the Excess Profits Tax Act made to apply thereto.

Mr. HOMUTH: Has the Minister of Finance nothing to say on this bill?

Mr. ILSLEY: Any hon. member has the right to introduce a bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. This matter is not debatable.

Mr. HOMUTH: It is ridiculous, though.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WAR APPROPRIATION—REQUEST FOR BREAK-DOWN OF ESTIMATES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): I have a question to direct to the Minister of Finance in connection with the procedure relating to the war appropriation resolution. I should like to ask the minister if, following the procedure adopted last year in connection with the war appropriation resolution and the bill founded upon it, he will give, not only the total estimated expenditures of each department of government, but also a complete detailed break-down of the estimates of each such department, in order to enable us to scrutinize more closely and in greater detail the various governmental expenditures which enter into the war appropriations. In view of the fact that the government intends to proceed with this resolution almost immediately after the conclusion of the present debate, it is essential that the break-down be furnished at once; otherwise we shall be severely handicapped in debating both the resolution and the bill. I might add that a similar request was made and acceded to by the government last session.

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I had in mind going even farther this year than we did last year.

Mr. GRAYDON: Then I hope my request will not stop you.

Mr. ILSLEY: My recollection is that last year when I moved the resolution I gave a break-down of the expenditures of the various departments, but that the ministers supplemented the information which I gave by giving a more detailed break-down when presenting their respective estimates. I intend this year to give as far as possible all the information when I introduce the resolution, and to give also comparative expenditures for the present fiscal year, which I think will facilitate the discussion of the resolution. I intend to give that information in the speech with which I introduce the resolution.

MOBILIZATION ACT

QUESTION AS TO PROCEDURE IN ISSUING CALL-UP NOTICES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask the Minister of Labour what steps he has taken to ensure that call-up notices under the mobilization regulations are not sent to those who are already in the armed forces? This question has been before the house in previous sessions, and I thought by now the whole matter had been cleared up. However, a young soldier, who had been in the army since March 30, 1942, came into the parliament buildings yesterday and saw me quite by accident. He said that although he had been in the army since March 30, 1942, the day before yesterday he received his notice of call-up, order for medical examination, transportation warrant, and a single ticket from his home town to Ottawa, which he left with me. I want to ask the minister why such things are still occurring in connection with the call-up notices for our armed forces.

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, since the mobilization work was taken over by the Department of Labour one of the matters which has been giving us constant concern is the question raised by the hon. leader of the opposition, and a great deal has been done to prevent the sending of notices to men who are already in the armed forces. During the latter part of 1943 regrettable occurrences of this kind were, I am glad to say, few and far between.

The whole mobilization plan is worked out on the basis of the 1940 national registration; that is, the basis on which the notices are sent out is the record as indicated by the national registration. The plan is that the registration as to addresses, movements, and so forth will be kept up to date through the method of the person concerned notifying the registrar at Ottawa and the registrar of the mobilization division, in the place of residence, as to change of address and other relevant matters. Hon. members will realize that it is not too easy to keep these records up to date, nor is the importance of notifying the registrars fully realized by all our citizens. In the earlier days of the war the importance of having a prompt report go from recruiting officers to registrars, I am afraid, was not fully appreciated, and in many cases we found that men were in the armed forces and a report had never reached the registrars. I think, too, it is only fair that I should say that in the earlier days of mobilization registrars were not fully organized to take care of the work of keeping their records up to date.

With reference to the young man referred to by the hon. leader of the opposition, who, he said, joined the armed forces in 1942 and was called for service in February, 1944, I cannot without investigation give factual information but I suspect that this young man

had joined the armed forces and that through some neglect on the part of the recruiting officers, or indeed it may be of our registrars themselves, this fact was not recorded. If the hon. gentleman will give me the particulars of the case we shall be glad to get the exact facts.

My hon. friend in his question mentioned that the man was young. We have found quite a number of cases where young men have joined the armed forces when they were considerably under the age of eighteen years and six months. In their anxiety to get into the army they would not state their correct age. At the time the age was attained, a file would be made and a notice sent out. It is just possible that something of the kind occurred in this case.

As to what we have done to prevent this kind of thing occurring, I would say that we have strengthened our organization and arranged for cross-checking with the records of the three armed forces, and generally developed many plans which have the effect of perfecting our records. While I have not the exact figures, I think a good guess would be that over one million men have passed through the armed forces, and I think it is to the credit of the recruiting officers and of the men and women throughout the country engaged in the registration that we have not had more cases of this kind. On the law of averages, human nature being what it is, some people are bound to make mistakes; I am frank to admit that I do myself sometimes, and I hope that we shall never live to see the day in this country when all the people in this chamber are as perfect as some members of the opposition think they should be.

Mr. GRAYDON: I sent over to the minister an envelope containing the information in this case, and I should be glad if he would return it to me when this matter is closed.

Mr. MITCHELL: I shall be glad to do so.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

STATEMENT ON PRESS REPORT AS TO "LABOUR POOL" FOR WORK IN FORESTS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday last the hon. leader of the opposition referred to a press report as to a labour pool for work in the Maine forests, as reported at page 70 of *Hansard*. I replied at the time, "There is not a labour pool." That was with reference to certain Quebec counties along the border of the New England states. Since then a survey has been conducted by the local agronomes under the supervision of Mr. Theriault, agricultural director of the Quebec regional office, and Mr. Rioux, the director of the dominion-provincial farm labour programme. It may take me a few minutes to read this report but in view of the publicity given to the matter in certain directions I think it is just as well that the whole matter should be placed on the record.

In the ten border counties of Quebec, after the intensive campaign carried on in the autumn, 2,235 men left farms for winter woods operations, of whom several hundred have since returned to the farms to do necessary work before spring.

Mr. HOMUTH: Seven hundred and six have returned?

Mr. MITCHELL: I did not say that; I said "several hundred".

Mr. HOMUTH: Will the minister say what he means by "several hundred"?

Mr. MITCHELL: If the hon. member waits until I have finished he will probably find that I have covered that.

Mr. HOMUTH: I am doubtful.

Mr. MITCHELL: I quite appreciate that my hon. friend would doubt it.

In the opinion of the agronomes, 1,575 more men could be used at present on farms in these counties to maintain agricultural production. There are, however, a few men on individual farms who could be spared until spring, men who refuse to move to other farms where they are more urgently needed, but the agronomes would not place the total of these at more than 185.

In this same area of ten counties the employment offices have 500 or 600 outstanding orders for woods workers needed by Canadian companies.

A check was made by the agronomes of 100 representative farms in the area under survey. Out of 201 men on these farms normally, 108 are now in the woods, 7 in other industry, and 86 remaining on the farms. The proportion of men away from the farms is much higher in counties like L'Islet, where out of 23 men only two remain on the farms, and Beauce, where out of 24 only four remain on the farms. Further, those who remain on the farms are usually the old men and the boys.

A good example is the farm of Mr. Xavier Belanger, at St. Marcel in L'Islet county. This farm has 200 acres, of which 110 acres are under cultivation. There are 19 milch cows, 10 other cattle, 4 horses, 4 pigs, and 25 poultry. The three men who are regularly employed on

this farm are now in the woods, leaving a wife and a young boy to look after milking and the other farm work.

In Quebec as a whole there are almost 60,000 men employed in woods operations at present.

Mr. HOMUTH: How many of military age?

Mr. MITCHELL: This is eighty-five per cent of requirements, but at least 7,700 more are still needed.

Since receipt of the report covering the survey, I arranged with Mr. Paul Goulet, associate director of national selective service, to telephone the mayors of several communities in the border area to obtain definite statements as to their views. Charges have been made that the general opinion in the communities was that hundreds of men were available and should be allowed to go to the state of Maine for work. Mr. Goulet reports that the mayors responded as follows:

Mayor Thibaudeau, of Aubert Gallion (Beauce), stated that he himself had difficulty in securing help when he needed any, which proves that there are not many without work in this village. As to farmers in the vicinity, he indicated that it was very hard for him to give any kind of definite statement on the number available.

Mayor Larochelle, of St. Prosper, stated that there may be five or six men in his village unemployed. As to the farmers in his vicinity, he stated that all who could leave the farm had already done so for the reason that they are anxious to work during the winter and earn some money.

Mayor E. B. Groleau, of St. Zacharie, stated that there were possibly fifty men on farms not of military age and thirty-five of military age around this village who might be available. Most of these farmers, however, cannot leave their farms for more than two weeks and have to come back every five or six days to do essential work. For this reason they will not accept work for Canadian operators because they would have had to go 125 miles north.

Mayor Elie Boulanger, of St. Come, claims that in his village it is very difficult to obtain help when needed. At times, transients from distant parishes remain in the village for a few days hoping to get an exit permit. He said that there might be about 100 farmers in the district who have come back from the camps of Canadian operators because their cutting is about terminated, and who, due to the lateness of the season, cannot leave for other camps in the north because of the heavy railroad fares involved. Logically, these same men should remain on the farms for the reason that they are needed there, since when they are away the women and children have to look after the work. The only reason actually for their willingness to accept work in Maine is the alluring high wages to the south of the line.

Mr. Gregoire, manager of the employment and selective service office at Thetford Mines, states that his quota was filled up to 98 per cent, and he understands that the quota of the Levis office was filled 100 per cent. In his opinion, out of the 3,500 men authorized, there are about 3,420 who are actually working in Maine. He claims that quite a few men of military age were anxious to go and work in Maine on account of the high wages and that this might have impressed the companies' agents. These men could not be allowed to go, however, and are now busy on the farms looking after the cattle, cutting the fuel wood, repairing machinery, etc., and otherwise preparing for the spring work.

In review the following would appear to be significant facts:

1. That there are many farms on which the work is being done by women and children. Those in a position to know, namely, the agronomes, say that too many men have been taken off the farms. It seems evident that the task of national selective service in a very few weeks will be to move men back or productivity of the farms will suffer.

2. All told, in this very large area the agronomes estimate that there are not more than 185 men still on the farms who could be taken off. It should be noted that during the time this survey was being made we were recruiting men to fill out the 3,500 total, and no doubt all or mostly all these 185 men will have been recruited for this purpose.

3. Emphasis should be placed on the fact that our Canadian woods operators are still urging the need for more men.

4. It seems evident that this district has been thoroughly and efficiently checked over for man-power and all the men that can safely be taken from farms have been taken, apart from a few individuals in whose case there may be some doubt.

In view of the situation revealed by this survey, the labour department reaffirms the necessity of maintaining the limit of 3,500 men allowed to cross the border for employment in the forests of the northeastern United States this winter.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I ask the minister one supplementary question after his long statement? If national selective service is functioning in that district, why is it necessary, first of all, to have a survey, and second, why

is it necessary for the minister to give the opinions, which are only opinions, of mayors and other heads of municipalities in connection with the labour situation in that part of Canada? That is what selective service is for —to know through its local offices the exact position of the labour market in the dominion. I think the minister owes the house an explanation as to why he has taken secondary evidence when first-hand evidence should be available.

Mr. MITCHELL: The question is a fair one, and I think when my hon. friend reads this statement in *Hansard* he will find that his question is answered. In view of the statements carried by some newspapers in this country, made by a certain newspaper writer in another country, he felt it necessary, even prior to my hon. friend's bringing the matter up in this house, that thorough check should be made so that we might be assured of the true state of affairs. I have quoted the evidence of the selective service officer in charge of the district, but it is only natural that we should get the opinions of the mayors of the communities where this individual is supposed to have had interviews. I think the statement shows conclusively that there is no surplus of labour in that district as claimed in a certain newspaper article published in this country.

WESTERN STOCK FEEDERS

INQUIRY AS TO DISPOSAL OF BEEF CATTLE AVAILABLE FOR MARKET

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): Has the Minister of Agriculture received representations from western Canada to the effect that feeders of beef cattle finishing for market there cannot market this beef? If so, what is the minister doing about the situation?

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Representations have been coming in for about a month to the effect that some fat cows that are ready for butchering cannot be disposed of. The reason is that very early in the season, last November and December to be exact, the packing plants across Canada found it impossible to handle all the hogs and beef coming on the market. The farmers were asked to hold their unfinished cattle and cows and sows off the market as long as possible. The result of that has been that in some areas, mostly in Alberta —all the representations have been from that province—there are some fat cows that have not found a market. The department therefore has been attempting to find facilities whereby these cows can be handled, and some have been taken in; but we have not been able to take care of all of them. The meat board is in touch with the situation at all times and is doing the best it can to see that cows are marketed.

HOGS

EFFECT OF REGULATIONS UPON SMALL SLAUGHTERERS OF HOGS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. KARL K. HOMUTH (Waterloo South): May I ask the Minister of Agriculture what is being done to enable small slaughterers to carry on their business, which has been interfered with by the new regulations? Not having the right to get the subsidy on hogs, the small slaughterers are going out of business, and everything is being shifted into the hands of the big packers of the country.

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): The hon. member, as the representative of a constituency in which a packing house is located, probably knows the answer fairly well—

Mr. HOMUTH: I don't know the answer and I want it.

Mr. GARDINER: —but I may say that a very much larger number of the hogs that are being slaughtered in Canada at the present time is going through the small butchers than was going through them six or twelve months ago. That is due not to the change in regulations referred to by the hon. member but to the change in the regulations made last fall which permitted those slaughtering for home consumption to slaughter any number of hogs for which they can find a market.

Mr. HOMUTH: That does not answer the question at all.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Speaker, the fact that the hon. member makes a statement does not say that it is true either.

Mr. HOMUTH: Of course, I never believed the Minister of Agriculture in my life, because no one else in Canada does. No one ever did believe him. The Minister of Agriculture has been swinging on—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. HOMUTH: He doesn't know where he is.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. HOMUTH: I am asking—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must place the question on the order paper.

Mr. HOMUTH: All right, but I am asking—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): The Speaker is on his feet.

Mr. HOMUTH: Well, when he sits down I will stand up. I am asking the Minister of Agriculture what he is going to do about the small slaughterers who to-day are not put on a par with the big packing houses of the country. What is he going to do for them?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. HOMUTH: They are not being treated fairly and they want to know what he is going to do.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has asked his question—

Mr. HOMUTH: And the minister cannot answer it.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): You cannot ask it properly.

Mr. SPEAKER: —and if the hon. member is not satisfied—

Mr. HOMUTH: I certainly am not.

Mr. SPEAKER: —he has the right to place the question on the order paper and get a reply.

Mr. HOMUTH: You cannot get a reply.

Mr. GARDINER: I have listened to the hon. gentleman asking questions for some years—

Mr. HOMUTH: Order.

Mr. GARDINER: —and I would say to him that when he comes into the house to ask questions—

Mr. HOMUTH: Order.

Mr. GARDINER: —he should ask them in accordance with the rules of the house.

Mr. HOMUTH: The minister has no right—

Mr. GARDINER: The rules require that members shall place their questions on the order paper. When the question is put on the order paper I will answer it.

Mr. HOMUTH: You cannot answer it.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): You cannot ask it.

MEAT SUPPLY

AVAILABILITY OF SURPLUS — RATIONING — MEAT CONDEMNED AT QUEBEC

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. C. SENN (Haldimand): May I ask a question of the appropriate minister, perhaps the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Munitions and Supply. It is based on a press report appearing in the Ottawa *Journal* of February 5. The caption of the article is: "Surplus of Meat, Period of Scarcity Over for Duration." I should like to read one or two sentences that explain the question:

> J. S. McLean, president of Canada Packers Limited, said to-day that within the past few weeks the meat supply situation in Canada has swung from a position of acute scarcity to surplus and "we can all make up our minds that the period of scarcity is over" for the duration of the war.

The article states that every foot of freezer space in Canada is full. In view of these facts, is it the intention of the appropriate department of government to discontinue, or at least to make some change in, the rationing regulations in regard to meat? I would ask another question with reference to the same subject.

Mr. HOMUTH: Ask a lot of them.

Mr. SENN: The next question is based on another press report, appearing in the Montreal *Gazette* of February 5, under the caption: "500,000 Pounds of Meat Condemned at Quebec." Is it the intention of the appropriate authorities to investigate this great loss and assign the responsibility? If so, will appropriate action be taken, if it is found that responsibility has been improperly assumed, to ensure that these men are prosecuted?

Mr. SPEAKER: These are certainly questions that should be placed on the order paper.

Mr. HOMUTH: The minister cannot answer them anyway.

GRAIN

EFFECT OF WHEAT DELIVERY QUOTA ON DELIVERIES OF OATS AND BARLEY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. A. ROSS (Souris): I wish to direct to the Minister of Agriculture a question arising from an article appearing in the Winnipeg *Free Press* of February 3, which states that, by arrangement of the railroads and the Canadian wheat board and the Department of Agriculture, feed grain shipments were held up to provide cars for wheat shipments. The

government asked producers in 1943 to maintain decreased wheat acreage and increase oats and barley acreage, stating emphatically that wheat producers could deliver only fourteen bushels per acre on the basic acreage of 1940. The Minister of Trade and Commerce having stated that the wheat delivery quota will be increased to eighteen bushels per acre, may I ask whether this will be done before the producers of oats and barley, who find it very difficult to finance, are allowed to deliver an equitable quota.

Mr. HOMUTH: Leave it to the minister of pensions. He will tell you whether it should be answered.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): That question is entirely out of order under the rules.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have at various times pointed out that on the orders of the day questions involving policy, and the procedure which the government intends to adopt, should be put on the order paper. These questions must be put on the order paper.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, with your consent, I would point out that it is a distinct rule that questions on the orders of the day may not be based on extracts from journals outside. That is a distinct violation of the rules of the house.

Mr. HOMUTH: The point is not well taken.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I have had similar questions on the order paper since the opening of the house and other members have risen and asked the same questions on the orders of the day. We have not come to those questions yet.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Friday, February 4, consideration of the motion of Mr. L. D. Tremblay for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Graydon, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. J. W. NOSEWORTHY (York South): I have been particularly pleased this session with the number of members who have called attention to the omission from the speech from the throne of any reference to the subject of education. Apparently all the members of this house are becoming education-conscious. I want to emphasize, as I have emphasized before, that no national plan for social reconstruction after the war can be considered complete that does not give education the proper place to which its importance entitles it.

There was an excellent report presented to the James committee last summer. The substance of that report was that where Canadians are now spending one dollar on education they require two, not for something fantastically idealistic, but for the moderate practical advances in education in keeping with the aspirations and the temperament of the Canadian people. It is not a question of interfering with provincial rights; it is a question whether this government is prepared to assist the provinces in assuming and carrying out the responsibility which the British North America Act left on their doorstep. Until this government realizes the importance of education to the point where it is prepared to assist the provinces on an equitable basis of need in financing education, young Canadians will remain deprived of the equality of educational opportunity which is their heritage and their right in a democratic society. I would urge upon this government that they give consideration in their reconstruction programme to the need of assisting the provinces to carry out their responsibility as outlined in the British North America Act. There is no necessity that financial assistance should in any way interfere with the rights and autonomy of the provinces in that regard. As I have already stated, until we are prepared to give assistance to some of the provinces, which cannot under any circumstances provide an adequate educational programme for the use of these young people, we shall not be giving the youth of Canada, their right.

There are one or two points, Mr. Speaker, that I should like to suggest. There are certain needs the satisfaction of which will contribute to unity in Canada, and no institutions of this country can do more to build Canadian unity than the public and secondary schools of the nation. We need an anthology of Canadian poetry by French and English authors, in both languages. We need an anthology of Canadian prose. We need a book of Canadian songs. We need reprints of those pictures that were done by Canadian artists for distribution overseas. We need a book that will give the young people of Quebec "an insight into" life in English speaking Canada; we need a similar book for the English speaking students of this country that will give a picture of French Canadian life. These cannot be sold at a price that will make them available to the schools unless they are subsidized. No province can subsidize a book for the entire country. May I suggest to the minister responsible for education, the

Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) that some consideration be given to subsidizing these books, if the government is unwilling to do anything else in the field of education. That, I am confident, will render a great service and cost the people of this country very little.

Mr. JAMES SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): Mr. Speaker, it is more than three years since I last had the opportunity to stand in my place and address this house. I have no apology to offer for my absence; for my constituents knew when they elected me that I had enlisted in the R.C.A.F. I am very glad to say, however, that they have not suffered by my absence, because my colleague and very good friend the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank) has taken care of my riding in the interval, and for that I thank him. I have, however, one complaint. He has set so high a standard of service to my riding that it is going to be very awkward for me to measure up to it.

When I last spoke in this house I believe I was regarded as a rather impatient and critical supporter of this government. I may tell this house I was consoled when I was in the British House of Commons in 1942 to hear Mr. Churchill tell his followers not to be mealy-mouthed in debate and chicken-hearted in the lobbies. May I now tell this house that while I may still be critical of some points, my service overseas has given me increasing pride and confidence in this government's conduct of Canada's war effort. I know it is increasingly the custom in this country to complain and rant about every minor restriction and regulation that the government has of necessity to impose in this country because of the war. People also point, of course, to other countries and compare our actions in the most unfavourable light. That seems to be the line taken in Canada. Those of us who have served in Britain and the middle east and the far east have a much better appreciation of what Canada has done. We have lived in countries where there has been a very marked increase in the cost of living, where there is no wage ceiling. Because of government control of wages soldiers realize that there is no great gap between their earnings and the wages of war workers in industry.

It is not, however, only the members of this house who feel an increasing pride in Canada's war effort. I need not recount to this house our efforts on the war front; I need not recount to this house our efforts on the production front. That has been very well said by Mr. Churchill himself. I can, however, tell this house of my own personal pride in that last great advance across Libya in seeing that the greater part of the vast fleet of trucks which moved the supplies of the 8th army and desert air force across the desert came from Windsor and Oshawa. A very great portion of the supplies in those trucks, of food, guns and ammunition, were also of Canadian origin —even a little beer; very little beer. I shall speak of that on a later occasion.

On the home front I believe the government is worthy of much more praise than has come its way. What has impressed me, and I know what has impressed most returning soldiers, is the abundance of everything in Canada, an abundance of food, of clothing, of cars on the streets. After the war-worn clothing of England, needfully strict rationing, and the total absence of pleasure driving, we find Canada practically a country at peace. The second thing which impresses a returned soldier is how little the cost of living has changed in this country in his absence—a signal tribute to the government's lone and brave fight against the perils of inflation. I say "lone" advisedly; for I believe the government has received little praise in this country for its magnificent effort.

The imposition of ceilings on wages has I believe aroused labour. The imposition of a ceiling on prices has aroused the farmers and business men; yet these steps are unavoidable if there is to be a real control of inflation. Everyone in this country seems to agree with the principle but objects very bitterly to the practice if it affects them personally. No mention of wage control can be made at this time, however, without reference to P.C. 9384. I am not one who is going to rant and rail against government by order in council. Anyone who has been at war knows the necessity of instant executive action, and that power should be given to a government which has the confidence of this parliament. But I do believe that any such order in council should be capable of justification to parliament by the minister concerned. I do not believe that a Liberal minister of labour can so justify certain clauses in this order.

May I turn first to the actual constitution of this war labour board. There is a common complaint in this country from coast to coast that labour has not been given adequate representation on the many government war boards. If there is one board on which labour should have decent representation it is this national war labour board; yet we find that on a board of six they have one nominee. It is true that the government nominates four members and that one of these may be a labour man, but labour does not want government appointees; labour wants its own nominees.

To my mind there are three groups involved in wage control, the employer, the employee and the public as represented by the government; and I would say that it would be fair to set up a board of six consisting of two nominees from each of these groups.

My next objection is to the third stated object of the order, which is:

> . . . to provide machinery for an orderly rectification of any gross inequalities and injustices in wage rates so established. . . .

Up to this point I agree, but in the mention of the words "gross inequalities and injustices in wage rates" I take it to be tacitly admitted that such conditions still obtain in some parts of this country. The wage ceiling should be elastic. There is no intention of freezing sweatshop wages for the duration of the war. However, the joker is in the last clause, which reads:

> . . . in so far as it is possible consistently with the paramount principle of the maintenance of stability in prices. . . .

In other words an increase can be given in sweat-shop wages provided it does not affect the price of the product of that sweat-shop, which is manifestly impossible. The people of Canada do not believe in sweat-shop wages; they are willing to pay prices which will give the labourer a decent wage.

I think all hon. members will agree that strikes caused by disputes between unions over jurisdiction and other such illegal strikes should be outlawed in time of peace as in time of war. Hon. members may debate whether the right to strike after due arbitration and conciliation should be given to labour in war time; but I do not think many hon. members of this house will agree to the terms contained in sections 33 to 36 of this order. These have to do with prosecutions for offences, the first with the case of an employer who contravenes the order by paying illegal wages or causing a lockout. Section 33 (2) provides that the burden of proof shall be on the accused. Section 35 deals with the employee who is alleged to have taken part in an illegal strike; it provides that the burden of proof that the strike was not illegal shall rest on the accused. Section 36 deals with the man who is alleged to have aided or abetted an illegal strike; it provides also that the burden of proof that the strike was not illegal shall rest on the accused. To my scanty legal knowledge this means just one thing: that the man is taken to be guilty until he proves his innocence, and this in the year 1944, in the fifth year of this war for freedom. I cannot conceive why the Minister of Labour should introduce these things; I cannot conceive why the Minister of Justice should permit it. It cannot be said to be due to the exigencies of war, because I have taken part in summary trials and in courts martial in Libya within the sound of battle, and even there the airman was considered innocent in every particular until he was proved to be guilty.

These bad causes have had one good effect; they have united Canadian labour from coast to coast as never before. A.F. of L. unions, C.I.O. unions, independent unions, and in fact all but the lackey company unions, are unanimous in their opposition to these features. I therefore urge the government to rescind this order, and to replace it with an order which will treat labour, to use the phrase of the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis), not as a commodity but rather as a deserving partner in Canada's war effort, because the record of Canadian labour in this war is good. We who have been overseas know that it is better than the British and American records. Our wonderful war production record has been made possible by the efforts of the Canadian working man. In so urging I speak not only for the labour unions in my riding but also for the Liberals of my constituency, who at their annual convention last month condemned these clauses in the strongest terms as being contrary to their conception of Liberalism.

Next I should like to touch very briefly upon the speech from the throne, which I believe to be one of the most heartening and progressive programmes ever offered to the people of Canada. I believe that national health insurance, adequate old age pensions as a right and not as a charity, and a national housing plan, when carried to fruition will be the very brightest jewels in my honoured leader's long career of public service. As far as health insurance is concerned, fortunately in this country there is a very large body of men who are completely sold on the idea; I refer to the 750,000 men in the services who are now receiving the benefits of state medicine. So, too, with family allowances; here again we in the services have had actual experience. I have never heard a single unmarried airman complain because a married man of the same rank, doing the same job, actually was getting more money because of his dependents' allowance; they all agree that it is a first-class thing. I understand that there is considerable opposition from some groups because they feel that this is going to give undue advantage to the large families of French Canada. I say this is a reproach not to the large families of French Canada but to the small families or lack of families in the rest of Canada. If family allowances increase

the size of the families in the rest of Canada it will be a very fine thing, far better than any system of unrestricted or selected immigration.

The part of the speech from the throne which most interests me, naturally, is that part dealing with reconstruction, rehabilitation, demobilization and reestablishment. I do not intend to speak of reconstruction or demobilization now, but I should like to speak on the rehabilitation of the soldier who returns from overseas. I do not pretend to be the spokesman of the man overseas; however, I do say that I have a fair knowledge of what the airman overseas is thinking. Life with the 8th army in the desert and with the Canadian army in Sicily has given me a little knowledge of the soldier. The sixty-five days I spent at sea in convoy and my trip home on a Canadian destroyer at least gave me contact with our sailors and our merchant mariners. Discussions with these groups have convinced me that they have a common outlook on rehabilitation, so that when I say "soldier" or "sailor" or "airman", these words are interchangeable. In one way the service man of this war is very different from the service man of the last war. Those who fought so bravely in Flanders fields really believed they were fighting to create a world worth living in, because they had not known the aftermath of a world war. Those who are fighting in this war have no such illusions. They know the bitter disillusionment of the soldiers of the last war. They remember the years of the hungry thirties, and they are determined that this is not going to happen to them. Unlike the soldiers of the last war, when they return they are going to have two very powerful organizations to give them guidance, the Canadian Legion and the Army and Navy Veterans.

The soldiers know what they want; what they want must be established in concrete legislation long before the end of the war, and they must know of it. That the government realize this is shown by the fact that legislation has been brought down, that blue cards were issued to soldiers telling them about it, and that later on little blue booklets were issued. I feel, however, that the present programme falls far short of what the soldiers expect in one respect. Since the speech from the throne has announced that certain amendments are to be made I hope that my comments will be taken not as critical of the past but as constructive for the future. To introduce this subject to the house I can do no better than quote the collective opinion of the members of the squadron which I have just left, the City of Windsor squadron. This squadron could well be taken as being representative of the Canadian fighting man overseas. They have had greater and more varied combat experience than any other unit in the Canadian army or air force during this war. They have served in Great Britain, in Egypt, in Cyprus, in Libya, in Tunisia, in Malta, in Sicily, and now they are the crack fighter squadron with the desert air force in Italy.

Mr. MARTIN: Will the hon. member permit me to observe that my city will be most grateful for his observations?

Mr. SINCLAIR: Shortly after the government issued these little blue cards, one of which I have here, the squadron had an open forum of both aircrew and ground crew to discuss these problems. That little meeting on a forward landing ground at dusk was to me the most educative and interesting experience I had overseas. Out of it emerged one bald, bare fact. These men do not want charity or pity in the way of being given a hand-out. All they want is the same fighting chance in peace time as they are now taking for their country in war time. I think I can summarize briefly as follows the collective opinion of their meeting that night:

When the war broke out and our country needed us, the government accepted our services. They took us and trained us in the best manner in the very best of training institutes. During that period of training they clothed and fed us and provided full medical and dental treatment. They paid us a basic rate of at least $1.30 per day and full service dependents' allowance to our dependents, amounting in all to $75 per month for a single man, $110 per month for a married man and $134 a month for a married man with two children. When we have served our country and returned to train for peace we want, first of all, jobs. If we cannot fill those jobs, we want the necessary training. We want jobs not of death and destruction but of peace and construction, under similar conditions of pay and allowances.

With this simple demand no one can find fault. I believe the people of Canada themselves are willing to give these boys that much.

Let me trace what happens to a soldier when he is honourably discharged under existing regulations. Here I must compliment my friend the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) upon his recent action which has cut my feet from under me in my criticism of the old regulations. Under the old regulations a man needing medical treatment was discharged and then given a pension on a much lower scale. Under the exist-

ing regulations he is retained in uniform while undergoing treatment. Officers are paid at the rate of flying officers or the equivalent, and airmen at their existing pay. The retention of the uniform is a fine thing, because a disabled man in uniform is an object of respect; in civilian clothes he is quite often the recipient of unwanted pity. If he is partly disabled, on completion of the treatment he comes under the Pension Act. I do not propose to speak of that matter at this time, although here again I should like to compliment the minister on the recently announced extension of the burnt-out pension scheme.

We now have a man in good health ready for discharge. First he gets his clothing allowance so that he may return to civilian life. Previously this was the ridiculous sum of $35, but it has lately been increased to $65. This sum may be sufficient for a man who has been less than a year in the service, because it would permit him to supplement his civilian clothing, but it certainly is not sufficient for a man who has been overseas for three or four years. Quite often when he returns he has outgrown his clothing; it may be moth-eaten, or his loving relatives may have given it away to the Salvation Army or the Red Cross. I would say that the clothing allowance should be based on a sliding scale according to length and character of service.

There is another important point about the clothing allowance which I want to bring out. Before a man gets his clothing allowance he must turn in his uniform. He is allowed to keep his shirts, underwear, socks and shoes, but he must turn in his gun, tools, uniform, blankets and things like that. Since I returned home I have been stationed at a west coast station. One wet day a man paraded in the squadron dressed only in a sweater and a pair of white cook's trousers and wanted a pass to go to town. He was reproved for parading in such clothing, let alone for asking to go to town, but he explained that he had just turned in his uniform, had got his $65 and now wanted to go to town to get his civilian clothes. When I told that to my colleague, the hon. member for Fraser Valley, that old soldier, with his customary vigour, said that if he had been in that man's place he would have paraded to town in the shirt, underwear, socks and shoes which his grateful country had allowed him to keep.

The very least this country could do for an honourably discharged soldier is to allow him to keep his uniform. The cost of a No. 1 blue is $13.70. When it is turned in it becomes a No. 2 blue worth just $7. A No. 2 blue when turned in is either made into salvage or given to the Indian department. It would not cost the government over $7. Giving the uniform to the air man—I am confining my remarks to the air force—would permit him to return to his home town in uniform. More than that, he would be able to spend his $65 wisely. He could use that money to supplement his civilian clothing when he is at home by purchasing from the home town stores. Let me tell this house that every sailor, soldier or airman is just as proud of his uniform as any officer, and will want to keep it so that in the years to come he can show his children and his grandchildren the uniform in which he served his king.

Next, our man is given a discharge button. This is a most excellent thing, as is the provision of a button to those who have volunteered but have been found unfit, who have tried to join but have been rejected for medical reasons. My one suggestion here is that these buttons are not well enough known in Canada and do not get the honour they deserve. I suggest that the government should omit one of these civilian morale advertisements that clutter up our newspapers and devote the same space to returned soldier morale by featuring, first of all, the red maple leaf of the man who tried to join, who tried to do his bit, and the discharge button given to the man who has been honourably discharged, who has done his bit. In that way the people of Canada would come to know these badges and honour them.

Now our man is ready for his gratuity. I dislike the term "gratuity" because it implies charity. What he actually gets is a grant in aid to enable him to tide himself over the very difficult period of demobilization. At present this is one month's pay of rank and allowances for those with more than six months' service. With both the method of payment and the payment I disagree. There is a great difference between the need of, say, a Seaforth private in Italy who has been serving for $1.50 a day and who is returned to civilian life, and a major-general whose service has been confined to the rigours of Ottawa at $20 a day. Theoretically the higher the rank, the easier it is for a man to return to civilian life. The Seaforth private will go back to civilian life with $45, whereas the major-general will be given $600. This is a case of to them that have had, more shall be given, and to them that have had very little, very little shall be given.

I would take the minister's own yardstick in the case of medical treatment. The basic pay of a flying officer, an army lieutenant or a navy sub-lieutenant should be the basis for paying gratuities to all service men on discharge, and for each year of overseas service

or eighteen months of voluntary service in Canada the man should be given one month's pay at this rate.

Our man is now fit, discharged with his clothing allowance, button, and grant in aid. Now comes rehabilitation. Men in this war differ from men in the last in another way. There has been a high degree of mechanization in this war, and there is a great proportion of skilled tradesmen in the service. Three-quarters of the ground men in the air force are highly skilled technicians, fitters, riggers, wireless operators, welders, and so on. The same is true to a lesser extent of the men in the army and navy. These men are going to have very little trouble in getting jobs when they return, if the jobs are there. That, of course, is the problem of reconstruction.

There is a second group who will have little trouble, those who will return to their civilian occupations because of the government's very good soldier reinstatement act.

There remains another group, estimated by the Canadian Legion to be between 150,000 and 200,000, who will have no civilian trade or who will want to complete their training which was interrupted by the war. In this group will be the very greatest number of the men who deserve best by this country, the actual combatants, the soldier in the line, the aircrew in the air, the sailors on our fighting ships whose only trade right now is to kill or be killed. I have had the opportunity of carefully studying the educational programme drawn up by Doctor Weir and his staff under the Minister of Pensions and National Health, and I find it a wonderful scheme. No returned soldier can say that a suitable training syllabus to train him on his return to civilian life was not prepared. My objection is a simple one. The soldier, sailor or airman will not be able to take this programme because of financial inadequacy. Let me read from this little soldier blue book on the subject of grants-in-aid:

> Grants may be provided to service men while taking refresher courses, vocational training, university education, awaiting return from crops or private enterprise, temporarily incapacitated or out of work, if fit and capable of working.

All very admirable and completely comprehensive. These grants cover (a) tuition fees, student fees, athletic fees or other charges and costs of courses given; (c) allowances for dependents. These are on the service scale as regards children, and I find no complaint with either of these clauses (a) and (c). It is clause (b) that I find fault with. Clause (b) provides for living allowances of $44.20 a month for a single man and $62.40 a month for a married man. This living allowance can be regarded as a basic $44.20, plus $18.20 for wife. Against this I protest.

To begin with, as a mathematician I am fascinated by the $44.20. I would certainly like to know the mathematical basis on which the need and reward of a service man can be figured right down to twenty cents. I am told it is based on unemployment insurance benefits. I scorn that comparison. There is no conceivable relation between reestablishing a veteran who has served his king and country and unemployment insurance benefits.

Some will say it is a wonderful benefit. How they wished they had had it when they attended college! I am sure that the minister, when he recalls his own grim struggle on meagre bursaries through Scottish universities, might regard it as munificent. I worked my way through university by working in the mines, and would have been highly pleased with such assistance. But here again the comparison fails. These are not boys struggling ahead for themselves, but men who have earned men's wages, who have hazarded their lives and sacrificed the best and most formative years of their lives for their country, on meagre pay, and who deserve well by their country. Now when they return they are to be trained for peace. Even from the point of view of the narrowest and most selfish of national interests it is our duty to see them properly reestablished; for they represent our greatest single national asset. the fittest, the bravest, the most self-sacrificing of our youth, those who will create the Canada to come.

I am going to give you actual examples of what is happening to-day. At the beginning of the war, when air force standards were high, junior matriculation or better was required. As the drain on man-power began, standards relaxed, but still a certain minimum equivalent to second year high school mathematics was necessary. To enable candidates lacking this to qualify for the air force, the dominion-provincial youth training plan began giving this training to otherwise qualified candidates. They got only $1.25 a day subsistence. As the need grew greater, the air force took over those lads who where deficient in elementary education and sent them to public schools. In Vancouver, for example, to-day there are about 400 attending two public schools and a technical school. Now these lads get $1.25 a day for board as they lodge near the schools, and $1.30 a day basic airman's pay, a total of $76.50 a month in cash, plus airmen's clothing, full medical and dental care, all costs of tuition, and all the opportunities for free or cheap entertainment and recreation available for men in uniform. Their one complaint is that $37.50 a month is not adequate for board and lodging in Vancouver.

Also in Vancouver we have returned men starting rehabilitation training. Take the case

of a pilot with three years' overseas service who is resuming his interrupted course in engineering at the university of British Columbia. He gets his tuition fees, as the trainee does, and $44.20 in cash—nothing else. No clothing, no medical care except for war injuries, no dental treatment, no opportunities for free or cheap entertainment or recreation. Deduct the $37.50 which the government deems adequate for board for the trainee and we get this comparison:

To the man who is getting elementary education to enable him to begin real air force training to serve his country, $39 a month in cash, tuition fees, board and lodging, clothing, full medical and dental treatment, free or cheap recreation and entertainment. To the man who has served his country on the field of battle and is now training for peace, $6.70 in cash, tuition fees, board and lodging, no clothing, medical treatment only for war injuries, no dental treatment, no chance for free or cheap entertainment or recreation.

I mentioned before that in this group are going to be a large proportion of the most deserving, the actual combatants, the soldiers in the line, the aircrew and the fighting sailors.

In a sympathetic and understanding speech some sessions ago, the Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Power) pointed out that this group would present the greatest problems on return; for not only had jobs to be found, but the men would have to be conditioned to accept the quiet routine of civilian life after years of great hardships, intense excitement and the most incredible nervous strain in the line of battle. What hope is there for conditioning these men to a normal civilian life on a net cash grant of $6.70 a month, out of which they must pay for replacement of clothing, laundry, car fare, medical and dental treatment, recreation, and then find money for leading a normal civilian life? I tell this house that if these men return to such conditions their song will not be "Land of Hope and Glory"; it may well be the red flag. They will remember Kipling's bitter little song, "Tommy Atkins":

> But it's "Thin red line of 'eroes", when the drums begin to roll.

That is what it was when they were called up. But when they find themselves getting $6.70 a month it will be "We serve no redcoats here". These men will know the score, just like Kipling's Tommy did.

> An' Tommy ain't a bloomin' fool—you bet that Tommy sees!

No Canadian at home should accept the excuse that what we are doing is more than any other country is doing. There is only one standard: to our ownselves be true. Give these men the one thing they are asking for, the same fighting chance in training for peace that we gave them when we were training them for war. I therefore propose that a basic sum of $75 a month be paid, plus standard service allowance to wife and children, plus medical and dental care at the nearest military establishment, for the duration of the period of rehabilitation. This is still less than the trainee taking elementary training gets, but it will give the returned soldier a fighting chance. That is all he wants.

While on the subject there are one or two other things in this booklet that I would like to mention. First, soldier land settlement. I do not know very many airmen who are proposing to go on the land after this war. That may be because farm life is unsuitable after service in the air force. It may be because they remember too well soldier settlement after the last war. It may be because they remember too well the plight of experienced farmers before the present war.

Those who are going on the land expect three conditions to be fulfilled. First, that the land be suitable. They are not going to try to raise crops on barren acres. Second, that it be cleared. No British Columbia boy is going to spend the rest of his life trying to tear up British Columbia stumps by hand. Third, that the land be accessible to market.

I have two observations on finance. Every soldier, sailor or airman who reads page 13, and continues to read until he finds that the ex-service man must make a down payment to the government of ten per cent of the cost of the land, or $480, and that this down payment must be made prior to the receipt of any financial assistance, is going to say, "Where the blank am I going to get a down payment of $480?" Out of their savings or their war pay of one dollar and one-half a day? No. Out of this gratuity of $45 in all that the government is proposing to pay? No. From our chartered banks or money lenders? No. Where? I ask the government. It may well bother them. It is bothering, I know, many soldiers, sailors and airmen.

I had thought that in view of the experience in soldier settlement after the last war, the government's approach would be a little different. I do not like making statements without figures, but I am quite sure that if all the cost of land settlement boards and administration and legal costs and surveys and royal commissions were added up, the total would vastly overshadow the actual returns. I therefore propose that any soldier who is still

farming his land after five years be given his farm outright. This would save the government money; it would give the soldier a real incentive to farm, and it would mean the end of at least one war board after the war, because five years after the end of the war the work of the land board would automatically end, not drearily drag on for twenty-five years as has the present land board.

There is one conspicuous omission from this little booklet. The soldier will read it through and say, "Where am I going to live after the war?" We all know what an appalling shortage of houses there is all over Canada. A national housing scheme must come, but ahead of this must be a provision of some decent place for the returned soldier to live in. I am proud of the industrial war workers' housing project in my riding. Similar provision can be made for the soldiers—not mansions fit for heroes to live in, but decent homes fit for good Canadians.

One thing more, in conclusion. In my maiden speech I am supposed to have suggested that there was too much complacency in Ottawa. I heard a lot about that. As a returned soldier I would like to say again that there is far too much complacency and self-satisfaction. Not in Ottawa, however, but in the country at large. I believe that the government are far ahead of the people in realizing that 1944 is no year for complacency or self-satisfaction. Our early days in this war were nothing but one long tale of defeats and reverses. Now that the tide has just begun to turn, and we are having occasional victories, too many people in this country are relaxing and thinking that the war is practically won. The days of great advances over the deserts of Libya or the plains of Russia are past. The fighting becomes more dogged, more bitter, day by day. The bloodiest battle that British troops have ever attempted is just over the horizon.

When we come back we hear a lot about sacrifices in Canada, restrictions, regulations, loss of earning power, and things like that. These are not sacrifices; they are minor hardships incidental to war. It is those who have given their lives, those who offered strong young bodies to their country and who have returned with those bodies shattered, those who have lost sons, husbands, fathers—these are the ones who can talk of sacrifice. Our women folk too: the mothers who are sick with apprehension when they read of our nightly loss of bombers for fear their boys have gone flaming down in the night; the wives who pale at the approach of a telegraph boy for fear he brings the dreaded message; the quiet anguish of all women who can but watch and pray at home while separated from their men overseas—these know the terror and horror of war.

A little earlier I spoke rather strongly of this wage control order. When I read, however, in yesterday's press that certain labour leaders in Canada are proposing an illegal one-day strike as a protest, I am filled with nausea and disgust. Such an action will not help labour with the people of Canada, and I should be ashamed of this government if it paid any heed to such a protest. Such a strike will hurt just one group—the fighting men overseas. A one-day strike will mean that when that bloody morning dawns and our Canadians wade ashore on the beaches of France under a hell of fire and bombing, they will have been weakened by the lack of one day's output of war material, in the most terrible battle in which Canadian troops ever engaged. Let me tell you that those who survive will remember it.

This is no time for self-satisfaction and self-complacency in Canada about our war record, our industrial record, our home front record. This is the year of decision, the year which will decide a rapid victory or a long and protracted war ending probably in a stalemate; a year of blood, sweat and tears for every one of the united nations; a year when our fighting men must be given every conceivable aid and support and encouragement by every man, woman and child in Canada, no matter what the personal cost may be.

Mr. W. K. ESLING (Kootenay West): May I join with all members of this house in a generous welcome to the hon. member for Vancouver North (Mr. Sinclair), who has just returned to his parliamentary duties. He has given the people of this country a clear and accurate presentation of the indebtedness of the government and the people to the fighting forces overseas, and it is to be hoped that full note will be taken of his submission.

As the speech from the throne presents an extensive programme of new and revised legislation, my reference to it at this early stage of the session is with the hope that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) will include in that programme better provision and better opportunities for handicapped people in the dominion, no matter what that handicap may be. The speech contains one point about employment and another on pensions, each of which is closely associated with a third, social security, and on that social security is to be based the new post-war order which is the topic of discussion in every community across Canada. If the government is really in earnest in bringing

this new order into effect, there is no better time than the present to establish a foundation for it.

At the meeting of the social security committee, perhaps the most interesting and informative submission was that presented by Colonel E. A. Baker, of the Canadian National Institute for the Blind. If I could persuade the members of this house to visit the workshops of the blind in the larger cities across Canada they would get a first-hand view of the effort and the energy of blind persons to become self-supporting. They are doing splendid work and their one endeavour is to be free and divorced from all government support.

Colonel Baker's submission was unique in the fact that, instead of asking the government for something, it proposed to relieve the government and the taxpayers from a contribution by way of old age pensions. As hon. members know, a blind person is pensioned at forty. He is permitted to earn, in addition to the pension, the sum of $200 if he is single. That makes $440. A married man is permitted to have $805 including pension. Because he is blind it must not be thought that he is not just as keen to have the comforts and joys of family life and to bring up his children as the children of sighted persons are brought up. And so I ask hon. members this question: Would any man in this House of Commons like to be in the position of having to rear a family on $805 a year, which is the limit set for married men?

It is to that end that Colonel Baker suggests the new method whereby, instead of deducting dollar for dollar in excess of the amount a blind person is permitted to earn, the government will deduct only fifty cents from the pension, so that the blind person may continue to earn until he has reached $680, at which time the pension is wiped out entirely and he no longer receives benefits from the government. That looks like a reasonable proposal. Further, the proposal is that a blind boy who is taking his limited vocational training be pensioned at the age of twenty-one. He too will be better fitted to earn his living. As his earnings increased there would return to the government that proportion of his pension, so that the government would be free. It would be an incentive to all blind persons to earn as much as possible and be released from the receipt of a pension from the authorities. Regardless of what a man's earnings might be in one year, he would still be eligible for pension the next, but he would be most earnest in his endeavour to free himself from the necessity of receiving a pension.

The submission further suggests that legislation for the welfare of the blind, including pension, be placed under a separate act.

[Mr. Esling.]

I should like to refer to a matter that came up at the last session. It has to do with those people who are hard of hearing. That is in the nature of a handicap and it is something to which people give little thought. Many times a child in school is backward, perhaps depressed, and is often spoken of as indifferent or as being, in more direct terms, "dumb", Quite often that is due entirely to the fact that the child's hearing is impaired. That is borne out by a national health survey made in 1935 and 1936, which showed that there were in Canada 155,000 adults who were hard of hearing. The survey showed also that two per cent of the children of school age had defective hearing. As a result there has been incorporated in Canada the national society for the hard of hearing and for the deaf. It has a splendid membership across the dominion. The purpose of the society is to assist people who are hard of hearing or deaf, by way of welfare work and particularly by placing them in positions so that they may be able to maintain themselves.

At the last session, in referring to certain people, I used a word which I know some distributors and manufacturers take exception to—the word "racket." The fact is however that there are people who are making immense sums of money out of the afflicted. The hearing device is beyond the reach of so many people who are hard of hearing. In the first place, these people are not able to earn a normal standard of living and they are deprived of the benefits of this device because it sells from $150 to $200, though the instrument is a very simple one and the material in it represents just about one-eighth of the cost of this hearing aid.

I asked the Minister of Finance during my remarks last year if he would not appeal to the wartime prices and trade board and ask what was a reasonable price at which this instrument should be sold, and the minister kindly did so. I think he was disappointed in the reply, as I was, because the board seemed to assume that it had no concern about hearing devices except as the price applied to the base period of September to October, 1941. The minister must have thought that he was right or he would not have asked his question of the board, but the board replied that they had called in half a dozen distributors from the Montreal district and had been informed that the prices at which these distributors were selling the instrument were the prices that prevailed in the basic period of 1941. Suppose that by some combination of circumstances or war conditions just before that basic period the distributors had jumped the price $100, the reply of the wartime prices and trade board

would have justified the asking today of $300 or $250 instead of current prices. What I particularly asked last year was that the wartime prices and trade board refer this matter to the national research council and to have the national research council determine a fair and reasonable price at which the people of Canada could be supplied with this device. Apparently nobody seemed to be responsible. As I say, the wartime prices and trade board was not concerned. The Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) said that his department was having an expert body look into the matter, but in so far as it went beyond the department he did not think he had any authority to deal with it. Well, it does seem to me that the minister, as minister of health, should take particular steps to see that the Department of Pensions and National Health does take up this matter and does see that the national research council determine a reasonable price.

There are other complications that arise, because the picture has changed entirely since the last session, and the change indicates exactly what the national research council could have done. One of the largest radio manufacturers in the United States has placed a cheaper instrument upon the market. It sells at $40 in the United States as against $150 and $200 in this country. The Department of Pensions has accepted that instrument. It is being dealt with through the orthopaedic branch. It has secured the approval of the American medical society; it has secured the approval of our own national research council. What should be kept in mind is this: that United States concern has practically broken the combination which sells the hearing device on the Canadian market at a price of $150 to $200; and it is for that reason we may expect chaos in the distribution or in the marketing of cheaper grades of instruments to the deaf and hard of hearing people. There are other difficulties. There are high pressure salesmen who are able to convince a buyer that he should have this instrument or that. After he has paid his money, however, he finds that it does not answer the purpose. My suggestion to the government is that they have the national research council go into this matter and establish a specific code for the standardization of material and construction; for achievement and performance; for the permit and for the nature of advertising, and arrive at a graded cost of such instruments in accordance with the cost of the material, the cost of construction, distribution and research that should apply. I know that the government does not want to go into this business, but it should go into the business of protecting the general public against these high pressure salesmen; it should go into the business of seeing that no instruments are sold in Canada unless they pass the approval of the national research council.

I make an appeal to the Minister of Finance. I ask him to have a thought for these people who with great difficulty have saved sufficient money to purchase one of these instruments. It is true that there is no customs duty on them, but there is a war exchange tax of ten per cent and a sales tax of eight per cent. There is also an upkeep cost of about $25 a year. I ask the minister if he will not, in thinking this matter over, endeavour to have these three items deducted from a person's income tax, just as is a reasonable portion of one's doctors' and hospital bills.

The other day the Prime Minister spoke about the various committees and the work which was ahead of them. Every member of this house knows that the members of these committees were worked to the limit at the last session. They were worked to the extent that they had to sit between sessions. May I offer the suggestion that some of this work be turned over to the members of the red chamber. Senators are capable men. They are able to deal with this committee work perhaps as well as the members of the House of Commons. Any committee appointed in the red chamber has a majority of government members; therefore there is no danger of a report being presented contrary to the wishes of the government. If you go through the "Parliamentary Guide" you will find that of the eighty-one members of the red chamber one-third of them have been either members of a government occupying ministerial positions or leaders of parties in their respective provinces. Surely we all know that when they were called to the red chamber, due thought was given to their responsibility and to their qualifications for carrying out the duties of their office, and it is merely with a view to hurrying the session and placing a lot of the work where it could be well done that I offer this suggestion. There is another reason, and it is this: for practically one-quarter of the time of the last session the Senate was without anything to do.

Mr. HARRY LEADER (Portage La Prairie): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I have undertaken a task that is beyond my ability because I am going to venture into the professional realm this afternoon. I am not professionally minded by any means, nor have I had any training whatsoever along that line. I pride

myself on being a practical man though, and I believe even in the professions—and the medical profession especially—one can be practical.

The speech from the throne declares that provision should be made to expand research activities, and that will be the basis of my remarks this afternoon. I am going to speak on only one phase of it, and that is the phase of cancer research. Coupled with that I wish to give the story of Doctor J. R. Davidson, 232 Somerset block, Winnipeg, and some of the results of his investigations of over thirty years in searching for a cure, or as he puts it, a preventive and a possible cure for cancer.

This matter was introduced in this chamber last year by two hon. members. It is true I suggested that these hon. members might mention the case of Doctor J. R. Davidson, because they had both known him well, and at least one hon. gentleman had been associated with him for thirty or thirty-five years. The hon. member for Fort William (Mr. McIvor) was the first to bring the matter before the house. He was kind enough to mention my name and to say that I certainly appeared to be improved in health as compared with previous years. Following that mention of my name I received literally hundreds of letters from all over Canada. I did not know that the newspapers had got hold of it, but evidently some of the newspapers in the east did, because I received some of the most pathetic letters I have ever read. One woman wrote to ask me what she would have to do in order to bring her husband, who was afflicted with cancer, to Winnipeg to undergo the treatment prescribed by Doctor Davidson. I asked Doctor Davidson if I should tell her to bring her husband to Winnipeg for treatment, but he replied, "Harry, don't; I have far more than I can attend to now." Two months later I received a letter in which this lady told me that her husband had passed on.

I mention that instance to indicate the ravages of this, the world's greatest scourge. The other hon. member who mentioned this subject was the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Howden). He is a medical man, and I was particularly anxious that he, with his knowledge of the situation, should bring up this matter in parliament. It was not that I wanted to shirk my responsibility, but I told him that in a few days I was going home to continue my treatments with Doctor Davidson, and that in my opinion he could deal with the matter much better than any hon. member, because he had the advantage of having known Doctor Davidson for so long.

[Mr. Leader.]

Mr. MacNICOL: And he is sincere.

Mr. LEADER: There is no question about that; he is one hundred per cent sincere.

I do not intend to tell the story of Doctor Davidson's work or to outline his treatment, though we have discussed it many times. I am a patient of his, and from my place in this house I say that he has done me a lot of good. I am not going to say that he has cured me, because I have had cancer for twelve years. I am sure he would be the last man in the world to say he could cure me; but he did say, "I think I can help you," and that is just what he has done. I should like, however, to recall the gist of what was said by the hon. member for St. Boniface, who, as I have said, has been associated with Doctor Davidson for thirty-five years. He pointed out that medical associations, even as far away as Rochester, have been kept informed of Doctor Davidson's work, and he told us that Doctor Davidson has carried on his work on his own premises and at his own expense. Finally he paid tribute to Doctor Davidson as a doctor and as a good citizen.

Hon. members who are interested, as I am sure all hon. members are, may find the story of Doctor Davidson's professional investigations in *Hansard* for Wednesday, July 14, 1943, in the speeches of the two hon. members I have mentioned. I should like, however, to quote from the discussion that took place at that time, in order to show the interest that was taken in what these hon. members had to say. The hon. member for Fort William asked, as reported at page 4800 of *Hansard* for last session:

> Will anything be done in regard to this matter? I do not wish to press the minister too hard, but the people who have been cured are most anxious that all the scientific research which has been carried on by Doctor Davidson shall not be lost.

The minister, who has been entirely sympathetic to every effort to have the work of Doctor Davidson investigated, replied:

> There is a committee functioning now in conjunction with the national research council which investigates cases of this kind, and I am sure it is important that this be done in connection with this matter. Certainly I shall bring this discussion to the attention of that committee.

If the records are consulted it will be found that within a very few days the minister did bring the matter to the attention of this committee, which is a branch of the research council. Then the leader of the Progressive Conservative party (Mr. Graydon) had a word to say which showed his kindly interest:

> Has this work by Doctor Davidson been under consideration by the national research council?

To this question the minister replied: "Not to my knowledge." Then the hon. member for Camrose (Mr. Marshall), continuing the debate, said:

I think we were all very glad to hear the statement made by the hon. member for St. Boniface; the members of the medical profession can make valuable contributions to the debates of this house.

This leads me to remark that we can all make valuable contributions to the debates of this house, but it will take more than debate to settle many of the difficulties which confront Canada, and particularly the matter with which I am dealing to-day.

Dyson Carter, a scientist, had an article in *Saturday Night* of October 23 in which he quotes the authoritative Journal of the American Medical Association as saying editorially:

The only hope of solving fundamental problems of cancer lies in research.

Then in the draft national health bill the first explanatory note reads:

To place within the grasp of the people of Canada the benefits of a comprehensive scheme of health insurance, designed and organized for the prevention and cure of disease and the conservation of health.

In the proposed bill the statement is made that deaths from cancer number 12,000 annually, but I believe that in 1942 that number had increased to 14,000, and since cancer is on the increase it is only reasonable to suppose that in this year upon which we have just entered the number will be even greater, perhaps 16,000. Dyson Carter concludes his article, which is based on Doctor Davidson's work and the speeches made in this house last session, by saying:

One savage fact to strike home the truth: so rapidly is cancer increasing that to-day, on our continent, twenty-four veterans of the great war are entering hospital with this disease every twenty-four hours.

As a rule, Mr. Speaker, it is not nice to deal with one's personal affairs in a public way. Sometimes the less said about one's own personal affairs, the better it is for everybody, but it is necessary for my purpose to bring my own particular case to the attention of the house. I told you a few moments ago that I have suffered from cancer for many years. Of course I did not know this at the start. I finally went to Rochester and my trouble was diagnosed as cancer. This was arrived at not by a physical examination but by the exploration of my abdomen. They told me—I shall deal more fully with this in a few moments—that nothing could be done for me, but if I would be good I might live a long while. Then comes a joke which perhaps should never be told in parliament. However, it is so good that I want to tell it to-day. They told me not to do any hard work or to have any mental worry and I immediately said, "Will I be able to attend to my duties at Ottawa?" and a doctor said, "Oh, yes."

I was persuaded to go and see Doctor Davidson. I found him a very modest man, reluctant to speak of his achievements. He would not claim that he could cure cancer, but he was enthusiastic in his belief that cancer could be prevented by the proper diet. He said that all of his experiments led to that conclusion. May I repeat in this house that Doctor Davidson has helped me. If I am allowed I should like to tell you how simple and easy it has been to effect a better condition of life. For ten years I had been constipated and in constant danger of bowel stoppage. He said, "The first thing we must do for you, Mr. Leader, is to get nature functioning properly; we will prescribe a certain diet for you and see if we can get you back to normal." I followed that diet religiously. It consisted of vitamin pills, wheat germ on my porridge and radio-malt twice a day. I am able to eat anything that agrees with me. I have followed this diet religiously and for nearly a year after starting Doctor Davidson's treatment I have not had a laxative. He has helped me to regain my health. As Doctor Davidson says, it is all so simple that most people will not believe it. However, many people are now following his advice.

I started this dietary treatment and then commenced with his cure. It must be remembered that he did not say he could cure me; he never told me he could cure cancer, but he feels he is on the right track and I believe that he is. He has a preparation which he has developed—I will call it a serum but that may not be the proper term—which the hon. member for St. Boniface referred to last year. I could go into this at greater detail to-day but I have not the time. I started to take his treatments and they have done me a lot of good.

I was taking these three times a week, and one day when I was in Winnipeg I went to the office of Doctor J. R. Davidson and his secretary told me that he was sick in the hospital with a heart attack.

I had feared that something like this would happen, because he had been working entirely too hard with the very limited staff which he had at that time. I asked at which hospital and then I went out to see him and found he was feeling a little better. But he had suffered a heart attack even though he was able to come back to his office in a few

days. Then I realized that it was time for me to move. At that time it was perhaps three or four months since the matter had been mentioned in the House of Commons and still no action had been taken. I wanted to keep in the background until I was able to rise in my place before you and offer myself as a living example of this man's work. I wanted to be sure; I did not want to try to put anything over. However, I thought it was time for me to get busy. I called up my friend, the hon. member for St. Boniface, and asked him whom I should approach in the medical profession in Winnipeg in order to direct attention to the condition of Doctor J. R. Davidson. He told me to call up Doctor Cadham, the pathologist in the Manitoba medical college. I talked to him over the telephone. He said he knew Doctor Davidson and had great respect for him. I asked if he knew he was in the hospital and he said that he did not, that he was sorry to hear that. I told him that there was a danger of this man passing, and that with his passing would perish the secret of his years of investigation. He then told me that I would find Doctor Davidson a very difficult man to deal with, that he had worked with him during the first years of his experiments but that he always played a lone game, that he would not play ball with the rest of the profession. He told me that they had investigated his early work but that there was nothing there. I told him that I had been to Rochester; I explained my experience there, and I offered to go to Doctor Cadham that afternoon to have a physical examination. I received no encouragement. I told him that if the medical association of Winnipeg would appoint a committee I would come down any day since I was in Winnipeg three times a week. I did not receive any invitation. When I suggested that the research council should take this up he did say that that was the proper body to deal with the matter.

Right here I might just as well say that the research council has a representative in Winnipeg. You may wonder why I mention names, but I do so because I believe in telling the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Doctor Thorlakson is the representative in Winnipeg of the research council, and I have been told that he is absolutely opposed to any investigation being made into the work of Doctor J. R. Davidson. He represents a body that is going to investigate, or should at the present time be investigating the work of Doctor Davidson. I then wrote to the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie), and I should like to read this letter because it outlines in a concise manner the situation as it existed at that time. The letter reads:

Dear Mr. Mackenzie:

I am again drawing to your attention the case of Doctor J. R. Davidson of Winnipeg, Manitoba. You will remember the reference to the doctor's work when the matter was mentioned in the house last session by Daniel McIvor, M.P., and Doctor Howden, M.P. I also mentioned the matter to you during the recent national Liberal convention in Ottawa.

Apparently nothing is being done to check officially, the work of Doctor Davidson in his search for prevention and a possible cure for cancer notwithstanding the publicity given in several magazines and first-class newspapers.

As a patient of Doctor Davidson and as a public man, I can assure you that I am deeply interested in Doctor Davidson's cancer experiments, and believe that he has long passed the experimental stage and that his work should be given the proper official recognition. Therefore I would respectfully ask you, the responsible minister in such cases, what procedure I should follow that would hasten an official investigation.

Within the last month Doctor Davidson was sent to the hospital with a heart attack. He is again attending his patients, but the danger of collapse is ever present. Can we afford to sit idly by and see this Canadian doctor's work in cancer research perish with his passing?

Will you please designate the procedure that I should follow in getting some immediate definite action in this supremely important matter.

The minister answered promptly. I am not going to quote his letter. In fact, I wrote him again soon after that, and again the minister answered promptly. But I wish to quote a paragraph from his letter just to confirm the argument which I made a moment ago in regard to the attitude of some of the medical men at Winnipeg and some of those who are higher up. This paragraph says:

Two items of information have come to the department recently by way of gossip:—(1) that the medical men in Winnipeg, many of whom were quite outspoken in regard to the hopefulness of something genuinely good coming out of Doctor Davidson's studies, have in recent months apparently been less hopeful. The second point is that we have been informed, that the Doctor, who is 73 years of age, has suffered a stroke or some other serious disability.

I perhaps was responsible for the latter rumour.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Would the hon. member say from which letter he is quoting?

Mr. LEADER: I have just quoted a paragraph from the minister's reply to me. I have other replies from the minister here which I shall not quote. I have another letter here from which I should like to quote a paragraph, but I dare not.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Go ahead.

Mr. LEADER: No, not that it is very serious at all, but it just makes me a little dubious of the outcome of the investigation which is now taking place in Winnipeg.

I learned in correspondence with the minister that the research council had never received any request from Doctor J. R. Davidson for any aid in his experiments. When I heard that I got busy and advised Doctor Davidson that that was what he would have to do. The research council went on to say that they were prepared to deal with the matter in a judicial manner after a request had been received. I told Doctor Davidson that he would have to have his findings put in concrete form, substantiated and certified by medical men who had dealt with his particular cases. He told me that he had done that just the night before. "I sent it away last night," he said. Then I found out that others were working besides myself, many others, in fact, but the man I speak of in particular lives in Regina, and he says that his wife was cured by Doctor Davidson. This man had found out that an application for aid was necessary; I think he supplied the information to Doctor Davidson, and the request for aid from the research council was sent down, I believe, on December 14. Acknowledgment was made on January 5. A questionnaire was sent at that time to Doctor Davidson by Doctor Ettinger, of Kingston, secretary of the research council, I understand, asking the doctor to fill out the questionnaire so that the council would have a basis on which to make an investigation. That questionnaire was sent back January 25. I have here the questionnaire, filled out by Doctor Davidson himself, which I shall not read.

Mr. MacNICOL: If the hon. member will permit me, I called to see Doctor Davidson twice with reference to someone I knew, and he showed me a long list of people whom his serum or treatment had evidently cured. Has the hon. member seen that list?

Mr. LEADER: Yes, and I have also with me the addresses of some of the patients. I will give them a little later. I have them here.

I want to give the house a little personal experience that I had with Doctor Davidson and his work. Doctor Davidson emphasizes the prevention of cancer rather than its cure. His original theory that a nutritional deficiency in diet causes cancer has been abundantly proved by his experiments with mice, and the serum treatment he has developed is a direct result of his research work in discovering the cause of cancer. He has told me many times that his deep concern centred in finding preventive measures to control the incidence of cancer rather than in finding a cure, where a cure so often is impossible. The old adage that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure applies with terriffic force in matters of public health.

May I now give some concrete examples of Doctor Davidson's work. I have before me cases certified by medical practitioners and by representatives of clinics which have made investigations of cases treated by Doctor Davidson where the cancer had cleared up and the people were now evidently in good health and showed no symptoms of cancer. Let me refer to my own condition.

Here is the report from Doctor Waugh of the Mayo clinic, Rochester. I asked Doctor Waugh if I had his permission to use this letter and I told him about Doctor Davidson in Winnipeg. Doctor Waugh sent a copy of this letter to Doctor Davidson and he closes by saying that if he could render help he would be glad to do so. The doctor found a condition in my abdomen which had been there for many years and which had become so extensive that it was not even wise to try to find the primary site. He said my case was hopeless.

Mr. MacNICOL: Your case?

Mr. LEADER: Yes; he said my case was hopeless. He went on to say that he had thought of doing some short-circuiting because of potential bowel obstruction, of which so many people die, but he said even that was impossible. Doctor Waugh told me when I left Rochester that he has known of cases like my own, carcinoid tumour, where people have lived for twelve or fifteen years after the condition was surveyed. If you will recall, sir, what I told you about this vitamin diet which the doctor prescribed for me, and remember what he did to take care of that potential obstruction, you will realize what Dr. Davidson has done for me and is doing for hundreds of people in Manitoba at the present time. It is no exaggeration to say that Dr. Davidson's fame is becoming known all over the world. He is getting letters from Australia. The other day I read a letter in his office inviting him to California, telling him that there are a number of institutions in that state which would be glad to have him continue his experience in those institutions. I said "Doctor, you would not want to leave Canada?"—remember he is seventy-four years old—and he replied, "No; this is my home, I want to stay here." But this goes to show that unless some effective action is taken immediately, either this man will leave Canada and go to

another country, or, on account of his age, pass on and we shall lose the value of his experiments.

I should like to say something about the case of Mrs. J. N. de Stein, of Regina. An abdominal operation on November 22, 1941, was performed by Doctor J. A. Brown. At that time an extensive cancer condition was found. The pathological report confirmed the diagnosis as cancer. The patient also received radiation treatment, but no hope was held for her recovery. Since November, 1942, the patient has been under the care of Doctor J. R. Davidson. On examination by Doctor John H. Gunn on December 15, 1942, she was found to be in excellent health. Mr. de Stein is using all the persuasive powers at his command to see if something cannot be done in the way of investigation. A statement was published in the papers in which he said that owing to Doctor Davidson his wife was completely cured of cancer and has been living at her home, happy, and in good health. This is the type of record with which the research council will have to deal.

I come now to the case of Irwin Cowan, 202 Brooklyn street, Winnipeg. I give addresses in case some hon. members may wish to write to these people and get their own personal story. This boy was admitted to St. Boniface hospital on July 24, 1936, under the care of Doctor Edwin Corrigan. He had a mass of glands removed from the neck, but no pathological report was made at that time. He returned to hospital in January, 1937, and had more glands removed. A pathological report determined the case as cancer. The patient returned again in December, 1938, and another gland was removed. Since that time he has been under the care of Doctor J. R. Davidson. An X-ray examination on December 2, 1943, conducted by Dr. Wheeler, revealed the boy as absolutely free from cancer. This boy was a patient of Doctor Davidson and is still under his supervision.

Here is another case, that of S. S. Coulter, 212 Maryland street, Winnipeg. This man was referred to the Abbott clinic on October 26, 1939, by Doctor J. R. Davidson. In 1937 the man had an operation for cancer of the lower lip. Another operation was performed in October, 1939, and a third operation on May 22, 1940, when more portions of the cancer were removed. On May 29 the patient was sent home. On December 3, 1943, he returned for examination. There is no evidence of any recurrence either in the lips or in the glands of the neck. The patient is enjoying the best of health and is apparently free from cancer. He has been under Doctor Davidson's care for some years and is still under his supervision.

Here is the case of Mrs. A. MacDougall, of Pembina, North Dakota. She had a tumour removed in 1933. It returned in 1938, and she was again operated on, on October 23, 1939. The pathological report pronounced cancer of the breast. This patient has been undergoing treatment by Doctor Davidson, and an examination by Doctor Wheeler found her free from cancer and in excellent health. I met this woman in Doctor Davidson's office one day, and she told me that she was in perfect health, but that when she came to Winnipeg she always wanted to look up the doctor who had made her well.

Another case is that of Mrs. J. Catton, of 1308 Portage avenue, Winnipeg. She was sent to hospital for operation re cancer in breast. The pathological report was "cancer," and the cancer was removed in July, 1942. Examination in November showed no sign of recurrence and the patient appeared in good health. This is a report by Doctor Neil H. Blakie.

One of my hon. friends advises me I have only two minutes left, and I shall conclude in a moment. I do not wish to take advantage of the good nature of the house.

Mr. COLDWELL: Go ahead and finish.

Mr. LEADER I thank hon. members very much for the attention they have given me. It shows deep interest in this subject.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Go on and finish.

Mr. LEADER: Remember that there are thousands upon thousands of people in Canada who are just as concerned about the treatment and cure of cancer as is any hon. member.

What I have had to say is for the purpose of getting definite action and no side-stepping, and let the chips fall where they may. If, after a thorough investigation by a competent tribunal, it is determined that Doctor Davidson has discovered nothing of value, the people should know. We want no false hopes: that is the danger: if there is nothing to Doctor Davidson's experiments, false hopes are being built up in the breasts of many people, and the reaction will be very serious. If, on the other hand, a great discovery has been made, the world should share in its blessing. This is the whole purpose of my remarks.

Mr. McIVOR: Will the hon. member for Portage la Prairie say what is the attitude of the Kiwanis service club toward an investigation and towards support of the work of Doctor Davidson?

Mr. LEADER: The answer to my hon. friend, and it is something I should not have overlooked, is that the Kiwanis club of Winnipeg have set aside a sum of money to help Doctor Davidson in his work over a period of six months. I believe the amount donated was $2,500.

Mr. MacNICOL: Are the governments not doing anything?

Mr. HOMUTH: What is the attitude of the government with regard to Doctor Davidson?

Mr. LEADER: The attitude of the government, as far as I can understand, is that this is a proper function of the research council; that they have within the research council a medical council whose duties are to go into these matters. But I am fearful, and I am basing my concern on remarks which I have made this afternoon, that that investigation will not be final. I take this opportunity to ask the government—and I think it is their duty—to undertake a thorough investigation of their own and give the matter all the support which any government can extend to one of the most worthy of causes.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): I am sure that all hon. members were glad to hear the opening remarks in the speech from the throne, that war conditions had improved. I was glad to hear the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the leaders of other groups, and also the member for Vancouver North (Mr. Sinclair), when he spoke to-day, warn the house that while the situation has improved, the war is not ended. Indeed, far from its being won, there is much fighting and much suffering and there will be many casualties before peace comes.

Like other members of this group who have already spoken in this debate, I welcome the modest programme of social betterment mentioned in the speech. I wish it were as comprehensive and as important as friends to my right fear it is. Possibly they are thinking of it in terms of vote-catching while I am thinking of it in terms of social improvement, which makes all the difference in the world. Some objections have been made in various places to this modest programme of social reform, to the effect that it would detract from the country's war effort. Personally I do not agree with that. In my opinion, not only will it not detract from our war effort but it will do much to improve it.

Defeating Hitler is not the only objective in this war. While that is very important we must also have as an objective the elimination of those conditions that create Hitlers. If we do not remove the cause, other Hitlers will arise. I do not believe that there can be a better time than the present, when the minds of our people are attuned to change, for making social improvements that are long overdue.

I was astonished that there was nothing in the speech from the throne in regard to labour. If it were not realized before, I think it is realized now that industrial relations in this war constitute one of the spots in our whole war effort where we have fallen down. In previous sessions, since the war began I have done my humble best to try to get this government to realize the direction in which we have been moving. No heed was taken of the dangers I was trying to point out. The result is that never has discontent been so rampant as it is at the present time.

Just before coming to Ottawa, along with other members of parliament from the greater Vancouver district, I attended a meeting of the Vancouver, New Westminster and district trades and labour council, affiliated to the American Federation of Labor. In the language of the street, we heard an earful from the three hundred delegates present who represented some 22,000 workers. Since that time I have received resolutions from labour organizations all across Canada denouncing the government's latest wage control order. To put on record what I believe to be the universal attitude of organized labour, I cannot do better than read a resolution passed by the Trades and Labour Council of my own city:

Whereas the new wage control order, P.C. 9384, announced by the government on December 10 following a broadcast on the subject by the Prime Minister, reflects the further intensification of an anti-labour attitude in official government circles that has long stood in the way of implementation of a constructive labour policy in Canada;

And, whereas we are alarmed at the increasing influence over government of big financial interests and large industrialists so clearly demonstrated by many of the orders in council adversely affecting the workers of Canada;

And, whereas said wage control order is in opposition to all the basic principles of the trade union movement and against the recognized principles of freedom and justice;

And, whereas there is a growing tendency of ruling the country by order in council instead of by acts of parliament:

Therefore be it resolved that we urge upon our elected representatives in the dominion parliament the immediate need of them performing the duties for which they were elected and to insist on the reestablishment of the rights of parliament.

Be it further resolved that we most emphatically protest the refusal of the government to heed the expressed wish of labour for a more constructive policy.

And be it further resolved that we hereby demand the immediate withdrawal of the new wartime wage control order, 1943, P.C. 9384, and we hereby authorize President Bengough to

make any representations on our behalf, and promise to support him in any action he may recommend us to follow.

That, I believe, is a fair expression of the feeling of organized labour throughout Canada, and I think members of parliament who sit here year in and year out and see these things being done without a word of protest have something to account for to the labour people in the constituencies which those members represent. I believe that members of parliament are beginning to realize this.

I have in my hand this morning's *Globe and Mail* in which is reported a meeting held yesterday at Hamilton. I am not going to read all that is here reported. I will give two paragraphs that indicate that organized labour is at last receiving some support from their representatives. This report states:

A surprise feature of the rally was the admission by two local Liberal M.P.'s . . .

I will not give their names.

. . . that the members of parliament have not been consulted on such matters.

Mr. MacNICOL: The paper does give their names.

Mr. MacINNIS: Yes.

Mr. MacNICOL: The hon. member for Hamilton East and the hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. MacINNIS:

. . . that the members of parliament have not been consulted on such matters.

It goes on to quote what these men said, and it is as follows:

The government is run by a bureaucracy; the members are nothing, and I frankly admit it. If the order had gone through the house it would have been better prepared.

Then the other hon. member spoke along somewhat similar lines. He had a good word to say for the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell). If it was not a good word it was at least not a bad word. He said:

The Minister of Labour is not as bad as you think he is, but his hands are tied by these men who supposedly guide the destinies of this country.

I have tried to help the Minister of Labour. I am afraid, however, that he thought when I was trying to help him that I was really criticizing him. I wish to say that I was not. I tried to help him privately by advice, but it appears that my advice was not taken. I am not as much surprised as are those members of parliament, or as the representatives of labour at this new order. It is a legitimate successor to all the wage control orders that preceded it, P.C. 7440 of December, 1940, 8253 of October, 1941, and 5963 of July, 1942. Each of these orders took a little bit away from labour and the government got away with it. The government seeing that labour stood for it took a little bit more next time. I have not the time, and it is really not necessary to analyse this new order in detail. Its various points have been touched on by other hon. members, by the hon. member for York West (Mr. Adamson) and by the hon. member for Vancouver North (Mr. Sinclair) as well as by other members.

This group has been advocating adequate labour representation on war boards. When the national war labour board was first organized under P.C. 8253, it had nine members—a chairman, four members representing employers and four members representing employees. A year ago that was changed and we had a board made up of three—a chairman, one member representing employers and one member representing the workers. Under the new order the board is composed of six members—a chairman, a vice-chairman, two members representing the public, one member representing the employers and one member representing the workers. Organized labour believes, and I agree, that under this new set-up they have one representative out of six. It may be said that the chairman, the vice-chairman, and the two members representing the public may be taken as representing labour as well as the employers, but from my experience I would say that any person the present government appoints to a board of this kind, if he is not appointed with the approval of organized labour, will have the employer's point of view. I submit that is not the way to give labour equal representation on war boards.

The order is bad in many ways. The machinery for appeals is inadequate. Regional boards have really no power at all in the present set-up. They are merely agents or the puppets of the national war labour board. The regional boards must submit every decision and every finding made to the national board; the national war labour board of itself, without these findings being submitted to it at all, is authorized to review and vary in any way it sees fit the findings of a regional board, and the decisions of the national board become the decision in that particular case.

The hon. member for Vancouver North pointed out for the first time in this house the worst section of this order, namely section 14, which outlines the purposes of the order. I shall read it:

14. It is the purpose of this order

(a) to provide for the establishment of wage rates incorporating therein cost of living bonuses, payable in respect of the rise in the cost of living.

I submit that is not correct. The order does not provide for the establishment of wage rates. They have frozen the present wage rates and incorporated in those wage rates the cost of living bonus. Therefore the first paragraph gives an altogether wrong impression of the purposes of the board.

(b) to stabilize the wage structure in Canada established in this manner in order to maintain stability in prices and prevent increases in the general cost of living; and

(c) to provide machinery for an orderly rectification of any gross inequalities and injustices in wage rates so established, in so far as this is possible consistently with the paramount principle of the maintenance of stability in prices, and this order shall be administered and enforced to give effect to these purposes.

As was pointed out this afternoon, it can be clearly seen that the national war labour board or the regional boards have authority only to deal with cases where gross inequalities and injustices are apparent, but if in the opinion of the board the removal of those gross inequalities and injustices should interfere with the maintenance of the price structure they are to leave them there, they are to freeze inequalities and injustices. It is no wonder that organized labour resents a policy of that kind.

I should like to make this quite clear. As I have said in this house on many occasions, I am not opposed to wage control and price stabilization. I am convinced they are absolutely essential at the present time. I will go farther than that and say that this government is to be commended for its achievements in that regard; but I submit it is not fair and it is not just to put the burden of price stabilization on the shoulders of those least able to bear it—the underpaid workers. That is what this order in council does.

I should like to read a short paragraph from the majority report of the national war labour board in regard to the matter to which I have just referred. The report states that a wage of fifty cents an hour, $24 a week, could not provide a decent or a healthy standard of living for the heads of families. I agree. But this order in council freezes wages not at fifty cents an hour but at thirty-five cents an hour. I should like to point out that it has long been an axiom of the capitalists that in the carrying on of their business they should not have to draw on capital assets. This applies equally to workers. The capital of the worker is his health and energy; and if he is compelled to live, as he will be compelled to live under this order in council, on a wage rate which does not give him a standard of living sufficient to maintain his health and strength, then he is using up the only assets he has. This is the view of the national war labour board, and I suggest to hon. members that they read the majority and minority reports of that board, for they make good reading. I derived a great deal of comfort from reading the majority report, because it bears out almost every contention in regard to labour that I have raised in this house since 1940. At page 17 the report says:

Even in a war economy a policy which consigns human beings to economic serfdom when a large portion of the community escapes it is incompatible with the ideals on behalf of which we are waging war.

I agree with the national war labour board, and I believe the government must agree also. If they do agree, then they will have to do something about it; at least they will have to leave persons working for a wage of less than fifty cents an hour free to negotiate for increases in wages without being tied down by the condition mentioned in this order, of maintaining prices.

I would and could and do take exception to various other sections of the order in council under review. There is the provision forbidding strikes and providing penalties for striking. Personally I do not believe in the strike as a weapon. Sometimes, however, the workers have no other recourse, but I believe that it is a rather unintelligent weapon and that it should be used only under the greatest provocation. But a time comes when workers reach the stage where it makes no difference to them whether they remain at work or go on strike. When that time comes they will strike, I do not care how many laws are on the statute books saying they shall not; and there is nothing you can do about it. It would be just as effective to pass a law saying mules must not balk as to pass a law against strikes, because when the burden becomes intolerable both men and mules will balk.

The order is totalitarian in its conception and, as I pointed out in regard to strikes, it is foolish and cannot be enforced. The sections that place the onus of proof in connection with violations of the order upon employers or employees in my opinion is wrong; I believe it is something new in British jurisprudence, and we should not tolerate it at this time. I believe we should more and more compare our actions with the ideals for which we are fighting; and if we do so we shall find that this practice of placing the onus of proof upon the accused and many of our other practices are altogether out of harmony with our contention that in this war we are fighting for freedom. There is also the provision in the order which gives the national board the right to change agreements, to reduce wages, to change hourly rates to piece work rates,

and so on. This takes away the whole function of organized labour to negotiate wage agreements.

In concluding what I have to say on this matter, I suggest to the government that as an indication of its good intentions toward labour it refrain from putting this order into effect on the date mentioned, which I believe is February 15. Further I would suggest to the government and in particular to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) that the whole question of the stabilization of wages and industrial relations be referred to the standing committee on industrial and international relations. Let that committee, composed of members of this house, hear what representatives of labour and of employers have to say. There is no reason why that could not be done. Officials of the government could appear before the committee, if they wished, and in the presence of representatives of labour outline the difficulties they have to meet. I am sure that if we had a full discussion of these questions some satisfactory means of dealing with them would be found. I also associate myself with the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) and with the leader of this group that this committee should be divided, that there is sufficient material under those two headings for two committees. I see no reason why a person who is conversant with labour matters would of necessity be conversant with international affairs or vice versa.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MacINNIS: Mr. Speaker, when the house rose at six o'clock I was referring to the government's labour policies and their inadequacy in the situation in which we now find ourselves. When one looks back on our labour policy and our labour difficulties since the war began; when one realizes the resistance of employers to collective bargaining, the failure of the government to give labour representation on war boards, the resistance, I believe, of both employers and the government to the inauguration of labour-management production boards, one really feels that we are not progressing very fast. I should like to quote once more from the report of the national war labour board inquiry. I quote from the majority award because it is signed by the chairman and the representative of the employers, although I believe the minority report is just as worthy of consideration. The majority report has this to say:

[Mr. MacInnis.]

To any one with an eye to see and an ear to hear, it must be clear that labour, more particularly organized labour, is suffering from a sense of frustration as far as the war effort is concerned. It wants to take a responsible part in production, the planning of production and the revising of planning when the same becomes necessary.

We expect the cooperation of labour and we do nothing to give labour an opportunity to show that it can cooperate. The failure of the government's labour policy, the failure of the government to understand labour's place in modern production and indeed the government's hostility to organized labour are aptly demonstrated by two orders in council. One of these, recognizing collective bargaining in crown companies, was passed in 1942, in the third year of the war. The other was tabled a few days ago by the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Martin). This order in council sets up an industrial production cooperation board. In the fifth year of the war we have come to the stage where we recognize, at least on paper, the value of labour's cooperation in industry.

I should like to say something about the proposal in the speech from the throne to pay family allowances. There is not much I can say because I do not know exactly what is implied in the reference in the speech. It is extremely vague and we cannot offer an opinion in regard to the particular legislation until we know what it is going to be. But I should like to know if this is part of the government's social security legislation, or is it proposed as a substitute for low wages? From the way it has come up it appears to me that it is a substitute for low wages. In the majority report of the national war labour board two alternatives are set out. Labour must be permitted to bargain up to a certain wage or provision must be made for paying family allowances. If it is the purpose of these family allowances to supplement low wages I am opposed to family allowances.

Mr. MITCHELL: I think I can put my hon. friend right; that is not the purpose.

Mr. MacINNIS: I am glad to hear that. That being the case, there is no reason why I should say anything more on the subject at this time. Real family allowances will be supported by the group with which I am associated.

I should like to make a brief reference to a matter which was referred to on Thursday last by several speakers. I refer to the question of refugees and immigration. I think it is disgraceful that such statements should be made in this house. I can understand people who are opposed to Canada's participation in

the war making such statements, but I cannot understand people who favour participation in the war rising in their places and saying that we are not going to allow any refugees into this country unless they are examined, not by one doctor or by one board but by a series of boards and doctors. That is not understandable to me. However, I am glad to say that there is another view in this house. I am happy to associate myself with what was said by the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Roebuck). I should like to read his closing reference to this matter in his speech, and I commend it to those who would put immigrants and refugees in the same position. The one has no relation to the other. The hon. member for Trinity said:

> But aside from the immigration problem, I do believe that Canada should, and I hope will, extend a hand, along with other Christian nations of the world, with a view to saving as many as possible from the fury of the nazi butchers.

That is the kind of attitude that will make this country a nation. We cannot build a wall around ourselves and say that we are going to enjoy all the good things of life; that other people must stay outside. We cannot say to people, "No matter how you are persecuted, no matter how cruel your rulers may be, we will not help you until we look after every last man, woman and child in the country." That is not the way to help the refugees meet their problems. That is selfishness of the very narrowest kind.

In the few minutes I have at my disposal I should like to make some comments on the statements made by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) when he spoke. I am glad to see he is just taking his seat.

Mr. GRAYDON: I have been here all the time.

Mr. MacINNIS: He said that the Progressive Conservative party was the spearhead in the fight against socialism. All I can say to that is that both the spear and the head were conspicuous by their absence in the place where socialism could have been most effectively fought, that is in the by-elections which took place in August last. If that is an indication of the effectiveness of the spearhead, then we feel quite easy about it. He goes on to refer to the policies of his party:

> Our party stands for a programme of rational reform, as opposed to a policy, on the one hand, of rigid reaction, and a policy, on the other hand, of reckless revolution. Our party stands pledged to remove the abuses and reform the present system.

I ask hon. members to take note of these words:

> We will go right up to the precipice on the pathway of rational reform with the C.C.F. or any other party, but at the edge of the precipice we must part company with those who would lose their balance and plunge headlong over the cliff into the unfathomable depths of chaos and revolution below.

I do not know whether the leader of the opposition gave much thought to the figure of speech he used, but it is unfortunate and most peculiar. This is the first time I have heard of reforms leading us to the precipice; I always thought that reforms took us away from the precipice. Reforms were conceded when it was realized that if they were not conceded there would be trouble. The use of the word "precipice" in this connection is very revealing because it indicates a fear of reforms by my hon. friend and his party. They associate reform with danger, and they are willing to go only a certain distance.

Mr. GRAYDON: You taught us that lesson.

Mr. MacINNIS: Yes, and we will teach you a whole lot more if you will listen. My hon. friend also said:

> Our party stands for a policy of expanding production as the basis of prosperity.

That is fine! We all agree with that. But the fact remains that capitalism can no longer expand. I wonder if it has escaped the observation of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition that the only two occasions on which capitalism has been able to give full employment within the last forty years have been in periods of war, and unless my hon. friend proposes a policy of permanent war, capitalism can no longer give full employment.

Mr. GRAYDON: Was there a war in 1919?

Mr. MacINNIS: No, we had just finished one; in fact we had not quite finished it. But there was no war in 1930, and no war from 1930 to 1935 and no war from 1935 to 1939. Yet did my hon. friend or his friends use their opportunities to expand production? As a matter of fact we have reached the fantastic position where a war is necessary for capitalism to give full employment.

Mr. JACKMAN: How about New Zealand?

Mr. MacINNIS: New Zealand has done very well. I see my time is up, Mr. Speaker, and I shall conclude with two or three words. Capitalism is not able and has not been able for years to make full use of the potential productive capacity of the nation. This is only now being realized and admitted by the capitalists themselves. Full employment under the present system is impossible, and so now they insist that private enterprise must have

its way, but that the government must meet the problems that private enterprise cannot solve.

Mr. G. S. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I should like to congratulate the mover (Mr. Tremblay) and the seconder (Mr. Tucker) of the address. These two members made a notable contribution in the first war and are to-day serving again.

I should also like to offer to the hon. member for Vancouver North (Mr. Sinclair) my most sincere congratulations upon the very fine address that he made to the house this afternoon. He gave to the members an insight of what our fighting boys overseas are thinking about and the kind of Canada they wish to come back to. This young member is typical of the young Canada of to-day who are serving in the army, the navy, or the air force and writing the name of Canada high up on the scroll of history. This young member is attached to the air force, and I think all hon. members will agree that Canada is especially proud of the boys who serve in the air force. Only a short time ago these were the boys who filled our schools and playing fields. Yet to-day they are flying with silver wings to blast the enemy wherever he may be found, and in their flights they bring hope and comfort to millions of people, now slaves, that the day of victory and peace is coming nearer. It is to that type of young man who represents young Canada to-day that we who stay at home owe so much, and our first duty must be to see that these young men will be fully reestablished and rehabilitated in the peacetime life of this country.

As was well pointed out by the hon. member for Vancouver North this afternoon several times during his speech, our boys who are fighting to-day do not want charity; they do not expect charity. All they want is the opportunity to have a stake in Canada, the chance to reestablish themselves in the peacetime economy of this great country. It is quite fitting, therefore, that the speech from the throne should indicate that there is to be a full-time minister charged with the administration of soldiers' affairs.

Another very interesting announcement in the speech from the throne was that at last some further attention is to be paid to mustering-out pay for the men in the armed forces. There have been many debates in this house on the welfare of soldiers returning to civilian life, and members of all parties have indicated their earnest desire that the very best that Canada can do for these young men should be done. Many of the measures passed by this house and many of the measures described in the press indicate in glowing terms the things we are proposing to do, but unfortunately when we see how some of these things work out, we find they are not so satisfactory. An indication of this was given only a week ago to-morrow when the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) tabled in the house two new orders in council whereby the grave injustice in the matter of pay to soldiers in hospital has been corrected. I for one find it very difficult to understand why such a condition was allowed to exist until the first day of February, 1944. The minister must have full knowledge of the many sore spots of which the returned boys complain. But it seems as though the government will never act until they are forced to do so by public opinion through the press. One illustration of that is what happened in regard to Christie street hospital. Hon. members will remember the debate which took place in this house last year. It was not until after that debate and the clamour that arose in the press that any change was made in the most unsatisfactory and disgraceful conditions which existed at that hospital. Canada expects that we shall provide well for our returned soldiers, and I am quite sure that the minister found out through the clamour which arose that the general public was not satisfied with the treatment our boys were receiving at Christie street hospital.

I have learned from my experience in talking to discharged soldiers—and there are many from my section of Ontario who have been in action overseas and who have now returned home—that there are many things of which they complain. As I mentioned before, these men do not want charity; they do not expect any benefit that is handed out in a grudging spirit by the pensions department or any other department of government. These men have a first claim upon the country, and they are legally entitled to full compensation for any injury to their health through either sickness or war wounds. What must any soldier who has served overseas and gone through experiences there far worse than any described in Dante's "Inferno" think when he comes before the pension board and is brushed aside by some hard-hearted official or when he is confronted with a form letter with his name typed on the top and that newly-coined phrase that is now being used on the form letters "pre-enlistment—not aggravated by military service," or when he is told that he has no apparent disability? Our soldiers are entitled to the most sympathetic consideration by the officials of the pensions department. It was

not for the kind of treatment that I have described that these young men gave up everything and went overseas to defend freedom. In many cases the long and unreasonable delay in dealing with pension cases is most embarrassing to the soldier. It is quite true that he receives certain benefits under the Unemployment Insurance Act, but in many cases these benefits are exhausted before his pension claim is adjusted. It is many, many years since the scale of pensions has been revised in any way. Various other benefits, such as pay, clothing, and dependents' allowance, have been increased. Labour has a cost of living bonus; it is enjoying much higher wages than it received before the war. But in the matter of pensions payable to soldiers there have been no changes for years, and I think it is only reasonable and fair to expect that a soldier drawing a full disability pension should have some reasonable increase to cover the increased cost of living.

Many hon. members have spoken about the clothing allowance. I was very glad to hear the announcement of the minister that it had been increased to $65; but, along with other members, I wish to say that in my opinion that is not sufficient. I for one would be much interested in having one of the defence ministers place on *Hansard* a table showing how the sum of $65 is broken up to enable a soldier to refit himself for civilian life. A soldier while he is in the army is very proud of the uniform he wears. I think the very least we can do is fit him up properly so that when he steps out into civilian life he will still be proud of his appearance, and I do not think he can do so on a grant of $65.

Then there is the question of the amount of pensions payable to officers and men. I have always felt that a soldier, whether an officer or a private, if he should lose an eye or a limb, should receive the same amount of pension. Rank should not affect the award in any way, because both officer and private have to compete in civilian life.

I should like to draw to the attention of the minister of pensions the case of soldiers who have a pensionable disability of less than fifty per cent. On the death of the soldier with a disability of less than fifty per cent his widow does not continue to receive a pension; yet it has always seemed to me that during the lifetime of the husband the pension department recognized the right of the wife. It seems to me that after the death of the husband the wife is more than ever in need of that help.

The hon. member for Vancouver North dealt this afternoon with the matter of the very small rehabilitation grant, which at the present time is only one month's pay and allowances. I was very glad to see the statement in the speech from the throne that this matter is to be investigated, and I sincerely hope that the amount granted will not be small, but liberal, and that when the amount is decided upon the provisions will be made retroactive to cover all soldiers discharged to date.

Each session many hon. members speak of the insurance principle, and I think the minister of pensions will agree that this provision should be reinserted in the Pension Act. I for one have never heard in this house any explanations of why this provision was taken out. Surely a man who served in the army in Canada is entitled, whether on duty or on leave, to the benefit of the Pension Act. It is quite true that under certain amendments—I believe it is section 11—there are compassionate provisions, but I do not think that is enough. They are of a charitable nature, and at the best they are only temporary. There have been many cases where soldiers discharged in "E" category received no pension. To date the number of men discharged from the armed forces exceeds 100,000, yet the number receiving pensions is somewhat between five and six thousand. This seems rather hard to justify, where a man enlists and is placed in "A" category. Hon. members who know anything about the method of the medical examination of a soldier will agree that it is a thorough, rigid and complete examination, including X-ray. If that man is accepted for service and placed in "A" category, and after service in Canada or overseas is discharged in "E" category, it is only reasonable that any disability should be attributed to war service. This is not now the case. Every hon. member must know of many cases where soldiers have been discharged in "E" category and have received no pension. How can any medical doctor, examining a soldier upon his discharge, say, two or three years after his enlistment, that his present disability is not due to war service, when on the medical history sheet there is no record of a disability? Unfortunately, however, the onus is always on the soldier to prove his case. Surely in any case where there is doubt the soldier should receive the benefit of that doubt, and private soldiers should not have continually to fight the pensions department to get their rights.

I have said before in this house, and I repeat, that in my opinion it should never be necessary for any soldier to have to consult his reeve, his mayor, a lawyer, or his member of parliament, in order to prove his case before the pension board and obtain the benefits to which he is entitled. The people of Canada most earnestly desire and expect, I am sure,

that every member of the armed forces will receive the most careful and most considerate attention in the matter of pension allowances.

I would like to concur in the proposal made last week by the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank), that any changes in legislation, or any new regulations affecting the welfare of soldiers or their dependents, should not be instituted by order in council but should be brought before this house for discussion and debate. The new regulations announced a week ago by the minister illustrate the importance of this suggestion, because they will affect the welfare of many thousands of soldiers. Surely this change is of enough importance to be brought before the house.

While some changes for the better have been made, there are still many points to which soldiers object. I would draw the attention of the house to two letters which have appeared in the press throughout Canada, one written by Everett Bristol, district commander of the Canadian Legion, the other by Mr. Williamson, dominion secretary of the Canadian Corps Association, and I wish to quote very briefly from them. In Mr. Bristol's letter he states:

> In addition to unfair discrimination against officers, there are other unsatisfactory features in the new regulations. For example, only those who qualify for the increased hospital allowances whose treatment is "continued without interruption from the date of discharge from the armed forces."
>
> This may mean that if an officer or man discharged from hospital as fit or on pension has a relapse within a few weeks and has to go back for prolonged further treatment, he will get only hospital allowances instead of and lower than his service pay.
>
> Further, the new hospital allowances may be continued only for a period equalling that of the man's service or for twelve months following discharge from the forces, whichever is lesser. What has length of service to do with a disability incurred on service? A man may get badly injured early in his training and require months of hospitalization. Surely he is not to be discriminated against unless there has been misconduct on his part.

I quote from the letter by Mr. Williamson:

> In its opinion, no officer or man should be discharged from the service until he has been released from hospital to return to civilian life. Less than this is unworthy of this country and detrimental in the extreme to morale in all the services. Any person disabled by reason of military service should be retained on the strength until his period of treatment is concluded. If, as will be the case with a small minority, men are confined to a hospital bed for the balance of their lives, these men should be encouraged to feel that Canada is mindful of their welfare as long as they shall live. The cheese-paring implication that, after one year, they are to be forgotten will not do.

The minister will be the first one to admit that these provisions, while they correct and improve many of the conditions, are still far from what they should be, and I think he will agree that any soldier suffering any injury is entitled to hospital treatment until he is fully restored to health.

When the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) speaks I should like him to explain to the house the present and future role of the reserve army in Canada. There is no doubt the reserve army has played a very important part in obtaining recruits for the armed forces. The cost of the reserve army must run into many hundreds of thousands a year and the minister should explain how this very large expenditure is justified. He should explain also the present and future role of the home defence army in Canada. This army, whose numbers are between 80,000 and 100,000, is maintained solely for the defence of Canada, and I think everyone is most anxious to know whether or not these men are to be made available for service anywhere in the world. Other hon. members have raised the same point, and the time is long past when the people of Canada are entitled to a public declaration by the government as to the future role of the home defence army; for if these men are to remain in Canada, what is the advantage of continuing to call men for service? To-day men are being called from the farms; schoolboys are being called, as well as men from industry and from the small businesses. Why put these young men into the army if they are to serve only in Canada? The cost of the home defence army must run into hundreds of millions a year, and I hope that the minister will justify this large expenditure if it is the intention of the government to keep these men in Canada. If they are to remain in this country, what was the object of the plebiscite vote? Is the government still afraid of the "no" majority given in the province of Quebec? What about the matter of reinforcements for troops in England? The Minister of National Defence should give the house a very frank and complete statement on the question of reinforcements for the troops in England. To-day, with the invasion hour drawing nigh, there will be great need of many reinforcements, and if the minister feels that the matter cannot be discussed in public, let him tell the members in secret session. What an opportunity to have General McNaughton present—the man who knows more about the matter of reinforcements than anyone else! All members of the house, as well as the citizens of Canada, are entitled to this information.

Let me mention briefly the two tables that appear in "Canada at War," January, 1944, and January, 1943. These tables set out the per-

centage of enlistments in the three branches of the armed services and also show the number called up under the National Resources Mobilization Act. It is the same old story of eight provinces making more than a fair and equal contribution of men to the armed forces and the ninth province lagging behind. An examination of the tables will show the truth of this statement. I would ask the government if this is what it considers equality of service. In fact, I think there is grave doubt about the matter, if the figures in this table are correct, as pointed out by the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) when he spoke on Friday last.

I would ask the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell), with reference to military district No. 5, whether young men are not called until they reach the age of nineteen. If this is not correct, then I think the Minister of Labour should explain to the house how the difference in figures is accounted for, because in January, 1943, the male population was shown as 214,300 between the ages of nineteen and forty-five, and yet one year later, when the eighteen year olds are included, it is shown as 214,000. If they are called when they are eighteen the minister should so inform us—or are they not called until they are nineteen? Would the Minister of Labour also amplify the statement he read to the house this afternoon in which he said that some 3,500 men from the province of Quebec had been given permits to cross the border and work in the New England states. This is the first time, to my knowledge, that we have had such a great surplus of manpower in Canada that 3,500 men from one province could cross the line to work in the New England states. It might be interesting to know how many of the 3,500 are of military age and also how many work permits have been granted to men in the other provinces permitting them to cross the line in order to work in the United States.

I concur in what has been said by the hon. member for York West (Mr. Adamson), the hon. member for Vancouver North (Mr. Sinclair) and the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) with regard to the new wage order, P.C. 9384, which has given rise to so much controversy. This new wage order was well analysed by the hon. member for York West, who indicated the grave injustices that are being done to labour in particular from the point of view of appeals and the onus of proof. I am amazed that the cabinet should pass such an order. Where is their sense of fair play or British justice when an order is passed which takes away rights which have existed for every British citizen from the time that magna charta was signed at Runnymede? Surely it is well established in British jurisprudence that every citizen has the right of appeal to the highest court in the land. When has the new doctrine come into being in this country that a man must prove himself innocent? Why is it necessary to write into any statute or any order in Canada that the benefit of the doubt is not to be given to the accused? I think every hon. member has a duty to rise and protest against this infringement of rights which has existed for so many years. I, for one, should like the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) to explain to hon. members why it was necessary in the fifth year of the war to insert any such clause in any order in Canada. Surely the day is never going to come in this country when the right to appeal to the court or the right of a citizen to be presumed innocent until proven guilty is to be taken away. The inclusion of any such restrictive regulation as that smacks of the gestapo of Germany.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to emphasize the following points for the attention of the government:

1. A long furlough for all soldiers on discharge with full pay and allowances.

2. No member of the armed forces to be discharged without being provided with a suitable job.

3. A speeding up in the handling of pension applications.

4. Clothing allowance to be increased from $65 on a sliding scale and made retroactive.

5. The insurance principle to be reinserted in the Pension Act.

6. The provisions of the Pension Act to apply to all soldiers injured on leave in Canada, and a review made of all such cases.

7. Soldiers to have all necessary hospital treatment irrespective of the length of service.

8. Rehabilitation grant to be increased and made retroactive to cover all soldiers discharged to date.

9. That the widow of a soldier who had a pension disability of less than fifty per cent be granted a pension after the death of her husband.

10. Dependent's allowance to a mother to be on the same scale as now payable to a wife.

11. That a review be made by the pension commission of all soldiers suffering from shell shock, mental or nervous cases where no pension has been granted.

12. That the onus of proving that the disability was incurred or due to war service be on the pension commission.

13. That a committee of this house be appointed to review scale of pensions to members of the armed forces, pensions to widows, dependents' allowances, clothing allowances, mustering-out pay and all other matters affecting the welfare of the soldier or his dependents.

14. That the Minister of National Defence tell this house whether or not the members of the home defence army are to be made available for service anywhere in the world.

15. The introduction of a system of calling men for military service whereby all parts of Canada will make an equal and fair contribution.

16. That no policy of immigration be undertaken until such time as proper provision has been made for full-time jobs and the complete reestablishment and rehabilitation of all members of the armed forces and all other Canadian workers.

Mr. F. D. SHAW (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, prior to the commencement of the present session of parliament and upon several occasions during the debate which is now taking place reference has been made to the fact that the members are engaging too extensively in debate. It would appear to me that there is a definite tendency, or probably I should say a definite effort from some quarters, further to deprive the private members of this house of the opportunity of giving full expression to their thoughts relative to the many matters that come before the house. How could it be otherwise when the members of this house find it so necessary to occupy so much of their time in debate? Why is it that members of the house should be accused of devoting too much time to matters of little consequence? I have given a good deal of thought to this matter and I find that it is wrapped up largely in the following facts. First, we find throughout this country boards actually legislating, such legislation having the effect of law. These boards deal with the most important matters, matters which, in my opinion, should be dealt with by parliament. In the second place, the government have perfected a scheme of mass production of orders in council. These orders in council are being passed not only between sessions of parliament but also during the actual time that parliament is in session. I find therefore that we have to devote so much time to dealing with matters regarded by some as of little consequence because the major issues are decided outside this House of Commons.

I am becoming extremely suspicious of any attempt to curtail the rights of the private members of the House of Commons, whether in connection with debate or in connection with any other matter which may in effect deprive the individual of performing his duties as an elected member of this House of Commons. We find that this dissatisfaction with respect to the actions of the government is not confined to any small group in this house, nor is it confined to any particular cross-section of opinion in this house, because this afternoon an hon. member asserted that two members of the Liberal party during the past two days expressed what I would call almost absolute disgust regarding the attitude of the government in failing to consult members of the house with respect to major matters affecting the country.

In referring to the speech from the throne, I find that emphasis is laid upon the fact that the winning of the war clearly remains the first of all our objectives. With that statement there is no possibility of disagreement. We are as one, I am sure, in that objective. Canadians who still have their feet on the ground and their heads out of the clouds will recognize that we must continue to exert our utmost energy toward an early and successful termination of hostilities. During the past year much has taken place to give us renewed hope and renewed confidence; yet we are certain as we gaze about into the various theatres of war that the road ahead is bound to be long and bound to be rutted. However, we have confidence in the calibre of the men of our fighting forces. That is reflected from the heroic achievements in the various theatres of war, in Italy, over Europe and elsewhere where they are engaged in conflict. If one reflects upon the decorations that have been awarded during the war he will find that every province in Canada has been represented; he will find that those of the various racial origins within the country are represented, as are also the various creeds. The army on the home front and the civilian population have acquitted themselves most magnificently. I refer to the farmers and to the industrial workers, in fact, to all of those engaged in work associated with the prosecution of the war.

The future, though, will depend largely upon the policies instituted by this government and the action the government may or may not take in connection with the prosecution of the war and the preparation now for the post-war period. As to both of these matters I shall have something more to say shortly, but at this point I should like to make reference to a matter which is of extreme concern to me. When fascist Italy was presumed to have capitulated demonstrations took place in many parts of Canada, par-

ticularly in that part in which I happen to reside. I do not know under whose direction this was done; I do not know who were responsible for making the people in certain quarters think that in effect the war was over, but that was the feeling. Shortly after, however, when our forces were engaged in such mortal conflict on the soil of Italy, the reaction set in. It was a feeling of distress and discouragement. If I recall correctly some of the demonstrations were called off, but others were carried through. Those responsible for causing the people to believe that in effect the war was over should guard against a recurrence of any such error.

The speech from the throne refers to the various social security measures which the government propose to introduce during this session of parliament. It mentions "a national minimum of social security and human welfare," and later, "such a programme contemplates social insurance against privation resulting from old age." Presumably this refers to contributory old age pensions. One encounters extreme difficulty in restraining himself when speaking on this matter of old age pensions, in dealing with the consideration or lack of it which is given to thousands of our older people, the pioneer citizens of Canada. As all hon. members are aware, within the boundaries of the dominion we have thousands of worthy citizens in the lower income brackets, many of whom are in receipt of meagre incomes insufficient to provide the necessities of life. They are utterly unable to secure employment, and thus must depend upon one of two things: the hopelessly inadequate pension which they may obtain to-day, provided they can prove themselves paupers or provided they have the ability to conceal the truth; or the charity of friends, relatives or others who may take pity upon them. In my view the present Old Age Pensions Act, which was passed by this parliament, and the regulations related thereto, have stained the statute books of this land long enough. I contend that if we are sincere in our promise with respect to social security measures we can prove our good faith by setting out to-day to erase from our statute books the act which now exists, replacing it with one which might be regarded as a Christian act, or by so amending it as to make adequate provision for those people who, all hon. members of this house will agree, at least in private, are deserving of more consideration than they are receiving at the present time. The rates of pension established in 1928 bore no relation at all to the cost-of-living index of that day, nor have they borne such relation at any time since. As I indicated a moment ago, a person who has reached seventy years of age and is able to prove himself a pauper or who has the ability to conceal the truth, may qualify for the pittance we now offer. It is then charged against property owned at five per cent compound interest.

Personally, Mr. Speaker, I can have no faith in the intentions of any government until such time as the conditions now prevailing are rectified. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) is very well aware of these conditions. On one occasion he said that the war had not banished suffering from this land. On another occasion he said that we could not put forth our utmost strength if we neglected the elementary human needs of the unfortunate and the suffering in our midst. On another occasion he said that the people of this country were committed to the utmost of our strength to the cause of humanity in its hour of greatest peril, and then he declared that we could not afford to forget claims equally pressing upon our generosity and upon our social and individual consciousness. In the light of that; in the light of what we all know is absolutely true, I say we should immediately take the steps necessary in connection with this matter.

Then the speech from the throne says:

> While giving to the needs of the war precedence over all else, my ministers are resolved that, so far as the future can be foreseen, Canada will be in a position to meet the difficult situations which will have to be faced when victory is won.

I assume this refers specifically to our post-war relationships with both allied and non-allied nations of to-day. In my humble judgment Canada stands destined to play a most important role in shaping post-war world relationships. Moreover, I think our success or failure in the role that we shall be certainly called upon to play will depend entirely upon the calibre and motives of the men who speak and act for Canada. The task will not be an easy one; we all know that. But the experiences of the past few decades do cast a most ominous shadow over the future; one need not be a pessimist to realize this. We have fought wars in the past, and each has been more costly and more devastating than the one which preceded it. Between major military wars, minor military wars have been fought; and while those military wars were being fought, and in between them, economic warfare was carried on. I charge that the effects of the economic warfare have been just as devastating as those of military warfare, and in no small way responsible for such warfare. These boys of ours who are fighting on the blood-soaked soil of Italy or who are facing danger over

Europe to-day and every day are fighting, it is said, to preserve our democratic institutions and the integrity of the British commonwealth. Others say they are fighting in the hope that after the war will come an opportunity for reestablishment in a land free from war. Third, it is said that they are fighting in the expectation that their sons will not have to pay the supreme sacrifice twenty years hence. I am inclined to believe that we should bear all three of these in mind when considering post-war matters. In referring to the returned soldiers, the speech from the throne states:

> A broad programme has already been developed for the reestablishment of veterans of the present war, and for the care of disabled veterans and the dependents of our fighting men and merchant seamen.

Then it goes on to state that gratuities will be paid to these men of the service. I think all the people of Canada are of one mind as to the men of our fighting forces and the debt of gratitude, transcending any other debt claim which may arise from this war, that we owe to them. We know that the men of our fighting forces are looking to the people at home to see that we make this country worthy of their magnificent courage and unstinting sacrifice and of the ideals for which they are fighting. The carrying out of this obligation rests squarely upon and is the responsibility of all the people of Canada. It is a vital aspect of Canada's war effort, and therefore I find it utterly impossible to agree with those who assert that during the actual prosecution of the war we should be devoting no time to the consideration of and preparation for the post-war period.

In referring to the treatment that we are now according the soldiers who have returned from overseas, may I say that I have been filled with alarm over the fact that many of those soldiers who have come home from the theatres of war have not been given their just desserts. I know that as far as my home district is concerned, too many of these men are having to go to their member of parliament in order to secure what most of them refer to as simple justice. Hon. members who have preceded me have referred to the matter of physical examinations. The speaker who just preceded me indicated that the examinations preceding enlistment are thorough. I am not going to challenge his statement; I am simply going to say that many of the cases which have come to my attention in western Canada have proven the contrary to be the case.

For instance, a lad proceeds to a recruiting depot and is directed to those whose duty it is to give him a physical examination. In a number of cases that have come to my attention the lads have referred to disabilities which were incurred as youngsters, and yet they were categorized as "A1". Later on, following discharge, a lad would be told that his disability is not attributable to or aggravated by war service, that his trouble was due to the disability he had had before. Therefore he cannot secure pension. I contend in all sincerity that if a man is examined as thoroughly as it is indicated he is and is placed in "A1" category and comes out an "E" category man, it is only fair to conclude that his disability was attributable to or aggravated by his war service.

I wonder too about the examinations given to men who are moved from one depot to another, one examination being given before they leave the one place and the other after they arrive at their destination. Being from the west, I find it difficult to use language that would convey to the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) what the boys in uniform call that type of examination. Some time I hope to be able to give a description of it to him in person.

Mr. HOMUTH: We have the same language in the east.

Mr. SHAW: It is not parliamentary.

Mr. HOMUTH: It is not parliamentary, but it is nice language.

Mr. SHAW: I should like to refer to some of the cases where men have been injured, let us say while in the performance of duty in the British isles. I will refer to one case which I believe illustrates the point I am trying to make. A man was injured during commando practice. His injuries to his lower abdomen were so severe that it was necessary for his comrades to carry him back from where they were carrying on manoeuvres. He was hospitalized for a lengthy period of time; he was shifted from one hospital to another and was examined by one medical board after another. His disability was diagnosed as being three or four different things. In one instance they called it ulcers of the stomach, but they neglected to add that his stomach had fallen because his disability was low in the abdomen. They had him ready for operation, but shortly before the operation was to be performed they moved him out of the hospital in anticipation of Dieppe casualties arriving, it being just at that time. After he had been moved about for approximately three months he was sent home to Canada to be discharged. Before discharge they confined him in the neurological ward of a certain hospital in Quebec and then discharged him with depressive psychosis, not

pensionable. I have no doubt that if any hon. member of this house received treatment of that kind following an injury he would have a disability far more serious than depressive psychosis. If this man has that, the government is responsible.

An hon. MEMBER: Maybe the government has it.

Mr. SHAW: My hon. friend says, "Maybe the government has it." That's possible. There are too many such cases. I refer to one other case. This man went through the Dieppe raid and received a bullet in his spine. He was decorated because even with that bullet in his spine he carried an officer out of the field of battle. He was sent back to Canada to be discharged. He was kept in military district 13, Calgary, for almost a month, until they could find out what they were going to do with him. One day he was paraded before the medical officer who was seated behind a desk. The medical officer asked him how he felt. Most of us in the west say that we feel fine whether we do or not. After a few moments of conversation he was handed a paper. When he walked out of the office and looked at it he found that he was recategorized as "A 1" to be sent back overseas. He got as far as Debert before a friend of his, a captain in the medical corp, discovered him and asked what he was doing there. He told him he was on his way back to England. That young captain prevented his being moved on. He was held there a month, discharged on the spot and told to discover some method by which he could get home.

I am not blaming the minister for these things, but I sometimes wonder what check there is upon some of these individuals who are responsible for cases like these. Why is it that the bulk of the cases I take to the Minister of Pensions and National health are reopened and either higher pensions granted or a pension granted where none was given before? Does that not indicate to the minister that there must be something wrong with the whole system?

Mr. HOMUTH: You must have some pull with the minister.

Mr. SHAW: I would hardly say that. I must say in all fairness that he has been very fair as far as I am concerned. It should not be necessary to bring up such matters as these in this house, but as far as I am concerned these cases are coming much too frequently. Out of those who have come home to my community, too many have had to come to me to have their cases taken up. I presume there are others who did not come to me but endeavoured to secure justice from other quarters.

I wish now to refer to the Progressive Conservative amendment. The first clause (a) refers to the failure of the government "to make adequate provision and to implement promises already made for the immediate needs and employment of the men and women of the armed forces on demobilization." I find myself in a position where I must agree with that. I feel that the government has not done more than enact a measure here and a measure there; it has not laid down any concrete over-all policy to meet the over-all problem which will confront the country upon demobilization. Many existing measures are inadequate. The amendment goes on in paragraph (b) to say:

(b) Failed to provide adequate measures whereby agriculture can make its maximum war and peace-time contribution through a stable and effective long-term programme.

There can be absolutely no disagreement with that. I wonder why it has not been possible for this government to do more than adopt a very short-range policy in connection with agriculture. For instance, in my part of Alberta last fall a serious situation developed with respect to hogs. Due to hail and frost feed shortages existed. It was extremely difficult for them to purchase feed at the prices prevailing. Hog prices fell. Farmers immediately set about to dispose of their breeding stocks. Liquidation took place which has impaired the potential hog production, and I contend that it will be years before the hog producers of areas in the Red Deer constituency will be able to recover the loss which was sustained when they found it essential to dispose of their sows.

Then paragraph (c) of the Progressive Conservative amendment states:

(c) Failed to establish such a national code for labour as will ensure maximum production and give to labour its rightful place in our national partnership; and failed to provide for the correction of the unfairly coercive and restrictive clauses in the 1943 wartime wages control order;

I doubt if there is a private member of the house who will disagree with the sentiment there expressed. That wage order has been discussed in this house by many hon. members since the debate began, and I agree with what the amendment states. I vehemently disagree with the order that was passed.

Then (d):

(d) Failed to lessen bureaucratic controls and regimentation and to recognize and restore the supremacy of parliament; and failed to halt the continuing infringement of provincial rights and the centralization of authority.

I wonder if Mr. John Bracken has changed his ideas with respect to the Sirois recommendations. Nothing within my memory has been presented in Canada that so seriously threatened the autonomy of the provinces of Canada as did the recommendations of the Sirois report.

Mr. HOMUTH: No.

Mr. SHAW: I answer my Progressive Conservative friend by again expressing wonder: Has Mr. John Bracken changed his attitude with respect to the Sirois recommendations?

Mr. HOMUTH: Not at all.

Mr. SHAW: If he has not, you may as well strike out that clause of your amendment. If Mr. Bracken still holds the same views he did in that regard, this is the strangest proposal ever presented in any Progressive Conservative amendment.

Mr. HOMUTH: No, you do not understand it.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Neither do you.

Mr. SHAW: I now come to the amendment to the amendment. I would hardly care to try to convey the impression that by moving to strike out the whole Progressive Conservative amendment the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party are in disagreement with it all, and I am not going so to charge. The C.C.F. party say in their amendment:

> We respectfully submit to Your Excellency that in the opinion of this house Your Excellency's advisers have failed to propose the fundamental social changes and economic planning which alone can hasten the winning of the war and make possible the establishment of a post-war Canada capable of providing full employment and complete social security.

I am confounded by that wording; I wonder what it means. The expression "fundamental social changes" may mean anything. It refers to planning. What type of planning? I wonder that the C.C.F. party did not strike out both those expressions and put in "socialism". Why did they not do so? The issue would then have been clear. I have reason to believe that there may have been a good reason for not doing so. When it comes to determining the value of that amendment I must make a decision in the light of what has gone before and in the light of the interpretations that may be put upon a vote one way or the other after the subamendment has been voted on. During the past three months I have become more suspicious, particularly in view of the assertions made by the leader of the C.C.F. party during the byelection in Red Deer, in Alberta.

Mr. DUPUIS: What did he say?

Mr. SHAW: I was so incensed, Mr. Speaker, by what he said that I might have to refer to two or three of his statements. In fact, my people would consider it strange if I did not do so, because, after all, here was the leader of a national party who came into a provincial by-election in Alberta and made the most startling assertions, so startling that I could hardly credit them to him. One of them was that the C.C.F. party was the only party in the House of Commons which had protested against the shipment of scrap iron to Japan. He also said that his was the only party which had opposed the present financial monopoly. His was the only party, he also said, which had consistently opposed fascism. He also said that his was the only party which had a programme which comes out of the people. Then, to cap the whole thing, he asserted that the government of Alberta had given away the resources of the province to private monopoly and corporations; but when he was asked to name one he said, "I am not in a position to know what the government of Alberta has or has not done." I would not accept those statements, if they were merely hearsay, but I drove into the city of Red Deer one night during the campaign and parked my car across from the Crescent theatre and heard the hon. gentleman's voice coming over the loud speaker. As I sat there I took notes. I heard these statements. Others sat with me in the car and heard. So it is not hearsay; it is facts. I say to the members of the C.C.F. party that I deplore that sort of thing. I have always tried to be perfectly fair, and I have not made assertions unless I am reasonably certain that they are correct and that I can support them.

Mr. HANSELL: Well, who won the election?

Mr. SHAW: Of course their candidate was crushed in the election. The Social Credit candidate won.

Mr. HOMUTH: There will be a lot more of them squashed before this thing is over.

Mr. SHAW: My point is this, that had the people of Red Deer constituency not been informed, it is quite possible that they would have accepted these statements as true. I repeat that I deplore the fact that the statements were made, especially by the leader of a national party; one who, I believe, knew better. I might have expected it from certain lesser satellites of the party.

Mr. HOMUTH: There are no satellites. They are just duller stars.

Mr. SHAW: It all depends on the interpretation you put on the word "satellites".

Mr. CASTLEDEN: They are not always lit up either.

Mr. HOMUTH: Some of them can stand a lot of it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. SHAW: In supporting the C.C.F. amendment I am not supporting socialism, that is bureaucratic planning.

In the speech from the throne reference is made to the question of foreign trade. That is, to exports and imports. I have given considerable thought to this particular aspect of our national life because, after all, foreign trade has occupied in the past a dominant position in the life of this country. Exports, tariffs and exchanges have caused governments headaches or have been the major worry of governments for decades. Thus far, difficulties have developed with respect to foreign trade because governments have endeavoured to carry on a foreign trade policy by stimulating production within the country, increasing exports from the country, and at the same time erecting tariff barriers to keep the produce of other countries out of Canada. All the while the vain hope existed that unemployment would in some miraculous way cease to exist. Most nations were engaged in an almost identical policy, that of endeavouring to stimulate production by exporting and at the same time erecting tariff barriers to keep out the produce of other countries. We all know that the result has been the most bitter type of economic warfare which the world has ever witnessed, and one which has played no small part in the developments of military warfare, in one of which wars we are at present engaged. While these governments were so endeavouring to export and refuse to import, we witnessed the international discount houses rendering the situation far more difficult by the manipulation of exchanges. We must pray that when this war is over, and even before it is over, as the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch) has so often suggested, our first major concern will be the creating of an effective demand against our own production, exporting surplus production in exchange for the goods of other countries, goods which we may require and can buy and the elimination of the policy which we have been following in the past will do much toward preventing a recurrence of the conditions of war which confront us at the present time.

I had hoped to expand this topic, but I understand that my time has elapsed.

Mr. G. T. PURDY (Colchester-Hants): Mr. Speaker, I should like my first word to be one of congratulation to the mover (Mr. Tremblay) and the seconder (Mr. Tucker) of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. Of the hon. member who moved the address, I can say that he lived up to the high traditions of his race; of the hon. member who seconded it, that he upheld the splendid reputation which he has built up for himself during the past few years.

I know that the last speaker will pardon me if in my few remarks I do not follow his arguments. He seemed to pick out a few individual cases in an attempt to build up a case against the government, without giving the government credit for the many good works it has done. But probably he was on sounder ground even there than he would have been had he attempted to expound the theories of his group. Hon. members in that section of the house are very sincere types, preachers and teachers, rather critical, but lacking practical experience, and for that reason we from the maritimes cannot follow their strange philosophies.

The speech from the throne, as is right and proper, puts first things first. It refers first to the war, which after all is our main concern, because if we do not win the war there is little good in our planning for the future.

Taking an over-all picture of the war effort of this government, I cannot but feel that each and every Canadian, no matter what his race, creed or political affiliations, must recognize that it has in every possible way done credit to Canada. It is true that some of our people are not taking too kindly to many of the regulations which are of necessity imposed on them. However, as I say, taking a broad view of the matter, I believe that to-day, for the most part, these things are necessary.

In the part of the country from which I come one problem which is staring us in the face is the man-power situation. This situation is such, on account of voluntary enlistments, and of men leaving our province to work in other provinces, or joining the merchant navy, that our pool from which we can draw men for practically any work is now at a very low ebb. I propose to quote one paragraph from a letter from a person who is very close to the national resources mobilization board in our province. He says:

There is no new reservoir to call from now in this province except as they come of age. This is going to mean that from now on to quite a considerable extent men taken into the forces have got to be culled who previously have had postponements.

You have only to be engaged in industry in our province to realize how true that statement is. Men are being called up every day and we have no one to take their places. I cannot quite understand why, in our little province, which has been in the lead in voluntary enlistments, we are still called upon to furnish the same percentage of men under the National Resources Mobilization Act as those provinces which have not furnished the same percentage of volunteers. This is a matter that should be given very careful study by the Minister of Labour and the Minister of National Defence, and I respectfully suggest that the time must have arrived when there should be put into force a system that uses the same yardstick across Canada to bring men into the services. In other words, I feel that after more than three years of applying the provisions of the National Resources Mobilization Act there should be a more general levelling off in the number of men in the services as between one province and another.

I now come to my own constituency. In that constituency we have a population of roughly 52,000; and while I may be a little generous in my calculations, yet, on the basis of several yardsticks which I will mention later on, it seems to me that roughly ten per cent of our total population have joined the forces in one way or another. This is only an estimate, not based on any information from the various departments, since they do not keep records in this manner, but I take three yardsticks from which I shapp attempt to prove my point to some extent. First, in the county of Hants, with a population of 22,000 one of the newspapers, the Hants *Journal,* has kept a record of the men and women in the service. That list is in excess of 2,000, and it does not take into account the men in the merchant navy. Let me take another method of measurement. A few Sundays ago, in the church which it is my privilege to attend, St. Andrews United church, Truro, an honour roll was unvieled disclosing 120 names out of 600 adherents. Let me take still another point. The coloured population in Truro numbers 503, and out of that population more than fifty young men have joined the forces. I feel we can find the same situation in any community in the constituency. My point is that our young men and women, irrespective of colour, creed or race, have joined the services in very large numbers, and I am glad to say that practically all are ready and willing to serve anywhere. These young men and women are serving wherever Canadians are in action, and casualties are mounting. Their graves are found in many lands, and there they will rest until the great day when they will be joined by their loved ones and their fellow-warriors, whose last resting place is known only to our Creator. Our duty to the loved ones of those who die is clear, as it is to those who are wounded and to their dependents.

The present government has gone a long way in this direction, and I feel that under the wise guidance of our Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) it will continue the good work and improve our pensions and veterans' allowance legislation.

To those who return in health we also owe a deep debt of gratitude and we must see that the Canada to which they return is a Canada worthy of the high ideals for which they are fighting. They do not want charity. They do not want to be wards of the state. They do not want to be regimented pawns in a socialistic state. They want an opportunity to work and live in a country of free enterprise where initiative will bring its rewards. We must see that they have this opportunity, and as long as I am a member I pledge my efforts along these lines and trust that the government will lose no time in bringing in the necessary legislation.

You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that in the days of ancient Rome when Horatius kept the bridge he was rewarded, together with his fellow-warriors, and Macaulay has commemorated it in the following lines:

> They gave him of the corn-land,
> That was of public right,
> As much as two strong oxen
> Could plow from morn till night;
> And they made a molten image,
> And set it up on high,
> And there it stands unto this day
> To witness if I lie.

In this enlightened age we cannot do less; indeed, we must do more for our enlisted forces.

I will now deal for a few minutes with the peace-time programme outlined in the speech. Coming from the maritime provinces, I shall no doubt be expected to raise the cry of maritime rights. You have not heard much of this in the last few years, but I will say that while that cry has been allowed to rest during the war it is not dead. Perhaps you will expect me, coming as I do from the little province of Nova Scotia, to speak of ships and sailormen, of the present-day equivalent of the wooden ships and iron men of confederation days, or of fish and fishermen. The land of which I am now speaking is referred to by another poet, Bliss Carman, in these lines:

The tides go out, the tides come in,
With the breath of the living sea.
And what will they take in trade again
From the ports of Acadie?

The freshening wind and the saving salt
They bring from the outer vast,
To mould and quicken the men they need
To serve their Lord at last.

Then get you down to the sea, my lads,
And go you forth, my dears,
You have reaped the tide, you must sow the tide,
As it was these thousand years.

Certainly in this crisis our young men have gone down to the sea wherever the opportunity has presented itself. However, I will not speak of these activities of our province. I will leave it to members who are better qualified to speak on ships and shipping. I do wish, however, to take as my text this evening—perhaps you think I am going into the poets—a few lines from Longfellow's "Evangeline":

Giving the village its name, and pasture to flocks without number.
Dikes, that the hands of the farmers had raised with labour incessant,
Shut out the turbulent tides; but at stated seasons the flood-gates
Opened, and welcomed the sea to wander at will o'er the meadows.
West and south there were fields of flax, and orchards and cornfields
Spreading afar and unfenced o'er the plain; and away to the northward
Blomidon rose, and the forests old, and aloft on the mountains—

And then along a little further:

Late, with the rising moon, returned the wains from the marshes,
Laden with briny hay that filled the air with its odour.

I quoted that, Mr. Speaker, because I wish to refer to the marsh-lands of Nova Scotia, and this is my introduction. My constituency has over a hundred and fifty miles of shore along the Cobequid bay and Minas basin. This country was settled by the Acadians and is very close to the village of Grand Pré made famous by Longfellow's poem. We have splendid farming lands in the valleys of the rivers running into this bay and into Minas basin and also into Northumberland strait. I make this explanation because it is often thought we have in Nova Scotia very poor agricultural land. However, we must remember that the lands I have referred to were settled back in 1655 and have been producing crops for more than three hundred years. Where the dykes have been kept up and the ground properly looked after there is no sign of the crops lessening. I give that explanation because we often hear of areas in the west subject to soil drifting where there have been crop failures following a few years of cultivation.

What I should like to propose to-night is a five-year plan for the rehabilitation of agriculture in Nova Scotia. It is true it is an ambitious programme; however, I think it is a programme that would produce excellent results. I break this programme into six parts. Much has been said in this house with respect to our marsh-lands. My proposal would be to expend $200,000 a year for five years to bring our marsh-lands back into a productive state. I would propose a further expenditure of $150,000 a year for five years to build up a system of small abattoirs and cold storage plants situated at various points throughout the province. At the present time we have no abattoir and very few cold storage plants. Any slaughterings that are to be marketed under government inspection must be done outside the province.

I come now to another item of $100,000 for five years to control flood conditions on our streams. The rush of waters in the past years, brought about to some extent by heavy timber cuttings on our mountains, has destroyed hundreds and hundreds of acres of splendid land. I would propose the expenditure of $50,000 a year for five years to encourage the raising of sheep in our little province. Textile experts in the town of Truro tell me that Nova Scotia wool is the best they can get anywhere for the work they have to carry on. They tell me that the fleece is heavier than the fleeces of sheep produced in other sections, and that the wool is stronger. Nova Scotia lamb requires no words of mine to advertise it because it has a market in the United States, in Ontario and in Quebec; in fact there is a great demand for it. I would propose $50,000 a year for five years be spent to bring our people into the growing of flax. I was talking to two experts from the federal Department of Agriculture and they say they have in their possession wonderful linen made from flax grown in Nova Scotia. May I refer again to experts from the textile mills in my constituency. They tell me that the soil and the climate of Nova Scotia are excellent for this class of agriculture. I have one more suggestion to offer and it is in regard to our farm woodlots. Many of our farmers have woodlots adjoining their farms. In the old days they would sell their timber en bloc; an operator would come in; he would cut what was on the woodlot, and it was fifty or sixty years before the farmers got another crop. My idea is that we should spend $50,000 a year for five years to teach our farmers how to crop their woodlots. That would give them

a steady income each year instead of a few thousand dollars one year and nothing in the next fifty years.

This programme is, as I said, rather ambitious. I suggest the expenditure of $3,000,000 in Nova Scotia extending over a period of five years. However, that is very, very small when we compare it with the expenditure made on agriculture in western Canada. We have no objections to that in Nova Scotia, but we think our farmers should be given the same treatment. Under the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act there has been over $16,000,000 spent in the past eight years, an average of something over $2,000,000 a year. If that was the only claim I had in asking for this $3,000,000 for my province, perhaps I would not feel satisfied that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley), who comes from down our way and keeps of course very close watch upon the purse-strings, would give it to us; but I propose to try to show to the minister that under our present system of taxation we would only be getting back what we are paying in. Under the dominion-provincial agreements, income tax and certain corporation taxes have been taken away from the provinces in an effort to level out the tax structure in the various provinces.

I will attempt to show that under our present system we in Nova Scotia are contributing a greater proportion of the taxes than are some of the other provinces. In other words, if we could obtain $600,000 a year for five years we would, under the present differential in taxation, be getting back only what we are paying into the federal treasury in excess of some of the other provinces. That seems like a big statement. To prove my point I shall mention first the sales tax on electrical enegry. That tax is only eight per cent, it is true, but it is based on the dollar amount of the bill; and with electrical energy in Nova Scotia costing twice as much as it does in most Ontario towns it means that the ordinary individual in my province pays some twenty cents a month or $2.40 a year more than he would pay for the same amount of electrical energy in Ontario. Assuming that we have sixty or seventy thousand outlets, that would mean somehting like $150,000 a year to begin with. Then I have something else to add. Under the dominion-provincial agreements the gasoline tax was guaranteed to the various provinces at a fixed rate. In Nova Scotia we imposed a very high gasoline tax as well as a very high licence fee for motor vehicles in lieu of income tax. Our good friends in Ontario and the other provinces were very fortunate. It is true that they had a personal income tax, but they did not have as high a gasoline tax, nor did they have to pay as much for their automobile licences. Here are just two examples. In Nova Scotia the annual licence fee for a Chevrolet coupe is $20.09. In Ontario I could licence that car for $7. For a two-ton truck, licensed for 16,000 pounds, the fee in Nova Scotia is $152, and in Ontario, $17.50. In Nova Scotia the gasoline tax is ten cents a gallon; in Ontario it is eight cents. That differential may be all right in the case of companies which are allowed to deduct these taxes before they file their income tax return, but think of the position of an ordinary person like a member of parliament or a salaried individual. He must pay a greater tax on electrical energy; he must pay a greater licence fee for his car and more for his gasoline. At a rough estimate I would say that in filing our income tax returns we are probably at a disadvantage of some $40 or $50 a year in non-deductible items, as compared with Ontario.

There is another item in connection with which I believe the federal government has guaranteed provincial revenues; that is, in revenue from liquor sales. In Nova Scotia, again in order to avoid personal income tax, we had a higher rate of provincial profit on liquor sales. To-day I am told that for a twenty-six ounce bottle of a fair brand of Scotch an individual in Nova Scotia must pay eighty-five cents more than he would in Ontario. If he buys two bottles a month he would be worse off to the extent of $1.70 a month or approximately $20 a year than his opposite number in Ontario; and again that is an item which is not deductible from the income tax. So I say that if we should figure out these various items we would find that the little province of Nova Scotia, under these differentials as compared with the big province of Ontario, is contributing enough to the federal treasury to permit the Minister of Finance to refund that $600,000 a year for five years, and I hope he will take that suggestion under advisement.

I am only a very ordinary individual, Mr. Speaker. I do not claim to represent the people of Canada as a whole, but from time to time I try to present the views and rights of my constituents to the house and the various members of the cabinet. If in so doing I sometimes run contrary to the ideas of the government, that is my misfortune. Nevertheless I act on conviction, which in my opinion is the only basis upon which a true democracy can exist.

Mr. P. E. WRIGHT (Melfort): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate

I should like first to compliment the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. I hope that in their caucuses and their councils they will endeavour to see that the government bring down measures which are adequate with respect to the matters mentioned in that speech. Too often the speech from the throne has been like the advance billing for the circus which used to come to my town every year when I was a boy. That billing promised great things, but the performance seldom lived up to the advance notices. I hope the legislation brought down by the government to implement the speech from the throne will be adequate. If it is, the government may rest assured that they will receive the support not only of their own party but of all parties in this house. However, if it brings in only palliatives or half-way measures, then it will receive the criticism which it deserves.

In the speech from the throne the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) indicated that this might be the most serious year of the war as far as our effort is concerned, that we might expect more casualties this year than in the preceding four years of this conflict. I believe that to be so; I think the fighting in Italy would indicate that this is a probability. I do not propose to-night to deal with our war effort; I believe that can be dealt with better after we have heard the ministers of the various war departments and have their programme before us. However, I should like to deal with one matter mentioned in the speech from the throne; that is, the setting up of a department of veterans' affairs. I believe this is a measure which will receive support from all sides of the house. Up to the present time there appears to have been a great deal of confusion among the men discharged from the army. Unless they were sent direct to the Department of Pensions and National Health apparently they had no idea of the various measures which had been provided for their rehabilitation, and as a consequence we as members of this house had them coming to us for information which they should have been given before discharge. When this new department is set up I would hope that the files of all men discharged will be transferred to it, and that the department will see that this information is available to the men in order that proper use may be made of it.

One matter to which I believe the department should give attention is the setting up of convalescent homes for our soldiers whose injuries are not such that they require hospitalization. Our hospitals are going to be crowded, and many cases could be dealt with in convalescent homes. Just recently I had a case brought to my attention. This man served three years in the last war, enlisted during the first months of this war and served two years, one of which was overseas. While over there he had a hemorrhage as a result of stomach ulcers and was sent back to Canada. He was sent to the pension board and his disability was indicated as thirty per cent, six per cent due to war service, and he was given a pension of $3.70 a month. He returned home and began working in the local creamery, but after two months work he had another hemorrhage. The local doctor told him it would be necessary to have six months complete rest on a special diet before he would be fit to work again. This man has a wife and two children and he is expected to take six months rest with no worry on $3.70 a month.

There should be convalescent homes to take care of cases like this where men could be sent on full pay and allowance until they were ready to again take their places in civilian life. There will be a number of nervous cases from this war. The strain on men in the air force and in the other mechanized units of our army is much greater than it was during the last war, and there should be some place where these men could be sent to have a real rest among congenial surroundings until they are able to take their place in civilian life. I suggest that the department of veterans' affairs make an effort to establish convalescent homes in Canada immediately.

Another matter with respect to our army to which I should like to refer is that of the home defence army. Many hon. members have referred to this and I must say that I agree with them. We have some 80,000 men in this army who are not available for overseas service, and this at a time when the war has changed from a defensive to an offensive war. This condition does not make common sense. These men should either be available for overseas service or be given their discharge and made available for useful service in civilian life. I suggest that if they are given their discharge they should automatically go into the reserve army so that they would continue to receive part-time training and the authorities would know exactly where they are should they be needed again. There are several industries in Canada where man-power is needed. Agriculture certainly needs more men, so does lumbering and our pulpwood industry. Unless these men are to be available for overseas service I contend they could contribute more to our war effort in civilian life than they are doing to-day.

To-night I propose to deal mainly with agricultural subjects. There is very little with respect to agriculture contained in the speech from the throne, the only mention being the intention to establish floor prices for agricultural products. I think most of us will agree with that; I only hope that the floor is not so full of trap-doors that most farmers in this country will find themselves in the cellar before two or three years have passed. That is the kind of policy this government has had in connection with agriculture ever since the beginning of the war. It has been a minimum policy.

The only advance there has been in prices of agricultural products has occurred after organized agriculture has made a definite fight. That is what happened with respect to butter prices. It was only after the organized agriculturists of this country had put up a tremendous fight that we got any advance in butter prices. The same with beef prices and again with grain prices. Hon. members from all sides of the house have endeavoured to direct the attention of the government to the prices being paid for grain in western Canada and to the fact that they were entirely inadequate. Large delegations came here from western Canada to place these matters before the government, but no action was taken until this fall. Apparently two by-elections in western Canada had more influence on the government than all the rest of the members. I want to congratulate the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bryce) and the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Burton) upon having done more for the farmers of western Canada than we had been able to do in the four years previous.

I do not like the phrase "floor prices"; I would rather call them "basic prices". Any price that is established for agricultural products must take certain essential things into consideration. First, such price must be sufficient to enable the farmer to pay a fair wage to his help and to his wife and family if they have to be used to produce the products which we need during this war. For ten years before the war and for the first three years of this war agricultural prices were at such a level that the farmer in all parts of Canada was able to produce only because he was using the unpaid labour of his wife and family or paying wages to his help which were a disgrace. I hope that in establishing a basic price for agricultural products this matter will be taken into consideration.

Any basic price for agricultural products should be sufficient to enable the farmer to have a decent home and home surroundings. I have seen sections in many of our cities where better homes were needed, but I have seen nothing quite as poor as some of the homes in some of our agricultural districts, especially in northern New Brunswick, northern Ontario and northern Saskatchewan. If a thousand of those homes could be placed adjacent to one of our cities there would be such a howl of public opinion raised against them that something would have to be done. However, because they are scattered and very few people see them we have allowed them to exist as a disgrace to this country for the last twenty years. This basic price should be sufficient to permit the farmer to have the necessary electrical equipment and other amenities of life now available to many of his brothers in the city.

This basic price for agricultural products should be sufficient to permit the farmer to have decent educational facilities. Here again I know that if I could bring a thousand of the schools I have seen in agricultural districts and place them adjacent to one of our cities there would be such a howl of public opinion that something would have to be done. But again, simply because they are scattered throughout the country and few people see them we allow them to exist.

Any basic price established for agricultural products should be such as would provide decent medical attention for the farmer and his family. For the past number of years there has been only a very poor type of medical attention available to the farmer. While it may be partly due to the war, the fact is that there are many districts in Canada where proper medical attention is not available. Many of our medical men are now serving in the navy, army and air force. Our country doctors have been the most abused group of people in our dominion. They have travelled for miles over bad roads in all kinds of weather, giving what service they could to our people and very often receiving only from forty to fifty per cent of the worth of their services because of the prices being received for agricultural products. Again I say that in the establishment of a basic price for agricultural products the matter of medical attention should be taken into consideration.

I feel that basic price for agricultural products should be a price that will fluctuate with the cost of production. If it is established as a floor that cannot be varied, then if the cost of production rises it is no longer a floor but a cellar. So I say that the price should fluctuate with the cost of production.

I feel certain of this, that if we are to have anything like full employment in Canada after the war, we must give to the people of this country the ability to purchase the goods they

need, and I know of no greater market for goods than our agricultural areas. We talk about export markets. Export markets are very fine, and we need them. But our home market, after all, is our greatest market. With twenty-five per cent of our people engaged in agriculture, there you have a tremendous market in satisfying their needs for goods. We need better homes; we need electrification. What would it mean to Canada if instead of ten per cent of our farms having electricity, ninety per cent of them had that boon? What a demand there would be for electrical equipment in Canada! It would put thousands of people to work in our factories producing the goods we need on the farm.

Our farm equipment in Canada has also become depleted during the war. To-day it is not modern by any means. If we receive a basic price for agricultural products we shall be able to modernize our farm equipment, and that will mean employment for thousands more of our people in Canada.

Another matter with which I wish to deal is referred to in the speech from the throne, which states that it is the intention of the government to establish an industrial bank. Apparently the government is going into the banking business. We in this group have stated that we believe in the nationalization of the banking system. But we do not believe in doing it piecemeal as the government proposes to do it. The government proposes in the speech from the throne to establish an industrial bank. If it is going to establish an industrial bank, why not an agricultural bank too? Agriculture needs credit even more than industry does. Agriculture has always paid more for its credit than industry has, from 50 to 100 per cent more, and it will continue to pay more for its credit unless something is done about it. We in this group believe that credit should be made available to agriculture at approximately 2½ per cent. This government is borrowing millions for war purposes at 1½ per cent, and surely one per cent would be a sufficient charge for the distribution and collection of agricultural credit. So I say that if we are to have an industrial bank, we should also have an agricultural bank, and see that credit is made available to agriculture at a price that agriculture can afford to pay. That bank would extend long-term loans. We in this group believe that, so far as short-term credit is concerned, probably the encouragement of the credit union movement in this country would serve the purpose. Credit unions are growing by leaps and bounds, and we believe that with proper encouragement they might be able to take care of a large part of the short-term credit needed by agriculture.

If we fail to establish a basic price for agricultural products and to provide credit for our farm industry I am afraid that the ownership of our farms and homes in Canada will pass out of the hands of those who own them and are farming to-day. Very few people realize just how quickly ownership has been passing from the people in Canada during the last forty years.

I have some statistics here taken from the 1941 census and from the *Economic Annalist* for October, 1937, with regard to farm tenancy in Canada. They indicate that in Manitoba the drop in farm ownership has been about 25 per cent; in Saskatchewan 45 per cent, in Alberta 34 per cent, in Ontario the percentage is now almost 48 per cent lower than in 1901.

In the matter of urban home ownership we find that over 48 per cent of the homes in Canada are rented; ownership has passed out of the hands of the occupants of these homes. These statistics also indicate that for the rural areas, farm and non-farm, the percentage occupied by tenants in 1941, when the last census was taken, was 24·4; for farm homes alone, 18·8 per cent; and for rural non-farm homes 33 per cent. In urban centres, which includes even villages with less than 1,000 people, 58·8 per cent of the homes were occupied by tenants. In cities of 30,000 and over, two-thirds of the homes were in this category; in cities of 15,000 to 30,000, and smaller centres of 5,000 to 15,000, about 53 per cent. Taking all urban centres of 15,000 and over combined, almost 65 per cent of the homes were occupied by tenants.

I shall not take time to read the figures for all the provinces but I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that with the consent of the house I might be allowed to place these two tables on *Hansard* because they give a complete picture of home and farm ownership in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the house that the hon. gentleman shall have leave to place these tables on *Hansard*.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Mr. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The tables follow:

Table 1

Percentage of Fully Owned Farms, 1901-1941

	Can.	P.E.I.	N.S.	N.B.	Que.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.
1901	87·0	94·1	96·3	94·2	89·8	79·8	88·9	96·1	95·8	80·2
1911	88·5	95·5	95·3	94·6	92·2	82·1	83·4	90·6	92·0	85·6
1921	86·5	95·6	96·1	96·1	94·9	85·2	82·0	77·6	90·3	86·4
1931	80·4	94·0	94·2	93·9	93·0	81·9	69·9	66·3	72·9	81·9
1941	75·1	92·2	92·3	92·4	92·7	78·6	66·1	53·0	62·8	79·6

(Sources: Census of 1941; S. C. Hudson, in *The Economic Annalist*, dominion Department of Agriculture, October, 1937.)

Table 2

Percentage of Tenant Farms, 1901-1941

	Can.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.
1901	8·6	14·3	5·0	1·6	2·2
1911	7·9	13·7	10·4	3·7	3·8
1921	7·9	10·2	11·3	10·8	9·7
1931	10·2	11·2	18·3	15·3	12·1
1941	12·7	11·9	18·8	24·3	16·9

(Sources: Census of 1941; S. C. Hudson, in *The Economic Annalist*, dominion Department of Agriculture, October, 1937.)

Percentage of Owned and Rented Homes, 1931 and 1941

	Owned		Rented	
	1931	1941	1931	1941
Canada	60·5	56·7	39·5	43·3
Rural	78·8	75·6	21·2	24·4
Farm	....	81·1	....	18·9
Non-farm	....	67·0	....	33·0
Urban	45·5	41·2	54·5	58·8
P.E.I.	84·7	81·0	15·3	19·0
Rural	93·1	90·9	6·9	9·1
Farm	....	91·9	....	8·1
Non-farm	....	82·0	....	18·0
Urban	56·3	50·6	43·7	49·4
Nova Scotia	69·2	69·3	30·8	30·7
Rural	86·5	83·9	13·5	16·1
Farm	....	87·2	....	12·8
Non-farm	....	81·2	....	18·8
Urban	48·1	51·0	51·9	49·0
New Brunswick	67·4	66·8	32·6	33·2
Rural	82·2	81·5	17·8	18·5
Farm	....	88·0	....	12·0
Non-farm	....	75·8	....	24·2
Urban	39·0	38·0	61·0	62·0
Maritimes	69·9	69·3	30·1	30·7
Rural	85·2	83·6	14·8	16·4
Farm	....	88·4	....	11·6
Non-farm	....	78·8	....	21·2
Urban	45·4	46·6	54·6	53·4
Quebec	47·9	44·6	52·1	55·4
Rural	84·4	83·4	15·6	16·6
Farm	....	88·8	....	11·2
Non-farm	....	70·3	....	29·7
Urban	29·7	25·5	70·3	74·5
Ontario	61·4	56·6	38·6	43·4
Rural	75·6	71·0	24·4	29·0
Farm	....	79·6	....	20·4
Non-farm	....	62·3	....	37·7
Urban	52·6	47·4	47·4	52·6
Manitoba	63·9	62·2	36·1	37·8
Rural	75·7	73·2	24·3	26·8
Farm	....	76·1	....	23·9
Non-farm	....	68·4	....	31·6
Urban	50·6	48·3	49·4	51;6
Saskatchewan	71·9	65·0	28·1	35·0
Rural	80·6	73·8	19·4	26·2
Farm	....	74·4	....	25·6
Non-farm	....	67·7	....	32·3
Urban	54·7	48·3	45·3	51·7
Alberta	70·0	65·8	30·0	34·2
Rural	80·8	76·8	19·2	23·2
Farm	....	79·5	....	20·5
Non-farm	....	64·3	....	35·7
Urban	53·2	49·2	46·8	50·8
Prairies	69·0	64·4	31·0	35·6
Rural	79·4	74·6	20·6	25·4
Farm	....	76·5	....	23·5
Non-farm	....	67·0	....	33·0
Urban	52·8	48·6	47·2	51·4
British Columbia	58·5	58·9	41·5	41·1
Rural	66·4	66·8	33·6	33·2
Farm	....	74·7	....	25·3
Non-farm	....	64·2	....	35·8
Urban	52·1	52·0	47·9	48·0

We in this group have been accused of intending to take home ownership away from the people and of intending to take away the ownership of farms from the present occupants of farms. Some people have gone so far as to say that while we may not do it now, immediately the present owner of the farm dies the farm will not be allowed to pass on to his son or to whomever else he wills it. That has never been the policy of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party, nor is it to-day. The policy of the C.C.F. party is one which is designed to give home ownership back to the people, homes which have been stolen from them through the capitalistic and monopolistic system during the

past fifty years. As indicated by the tables which I have just placed on *Hansard*, that ownership has been gradually declining, and if we allow the present trend to continue for another twenty-five or thirty years we shall find that from seventy-five to eighty per cent of our people will become tenants, and as a result we would have drifters in our agricultural areas.

Mr. GRAYDON: Do the tables which the hon. gentleman has just placed on *Hansard* show the number of tenants as compared with the number of home owners in eastern Canada?

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes, the figures are given by provinces. As a matter of fact it will be found from the tables that there are only two provinces in Canada in which ownership is as great as it was in the year 1901, and those two provinces, if I remember aright, are British Columbia and Prince Edward Island.

Mr. GRAYDON: Since these tables are being put on *Hansard* I think we ought at least to be told what is the proportion of tenants to owners in Ontario.

Mr. WRIGHT: That is shown in the table. I would not give it off-hand, not having the table in front of me just now, but it is indicated in the return which has just been tabled. I may say that the increase in tenantry in Ontario, if I remember correctly, in the last ten years has been eight per cent.

Mr. WEIR: As a matter of information—if the hon. member will excuse me—in the figures he has placed on record is there any weighted consideration given to the trend to living in large apartment blocks and moving into central places in cities and towns?

Mr. WRIGHT: There are figures given with regard to the various cities. I do not think they are broken down to the extent that the hon. member is inquiring about, but only with respect to the size of the various cities. But they are comprehensive, and well worth studying as an indication of a trend which is going on in Canada to-day, a trend which we in the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation believe should be stopped, and which, if our programme is put into effect, definitely will be stopped.

There is one other matter with which I wish to deal, namely the cooperative movement in Canada. We of the C.C.F. believe not only in private ownership of your home, your farm, and your small business, but we believe that another type of ownership which is to be commended in this country is cooperative ownership.

Mr. GRAYDON: You fellows must be capitalists.

Mr. WRIGHT: No, we are not. I will explain to my hon. friend in a moment the difference between capitalism and cooperation.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): What about the viewpoint of your colleague in the Ontario house?

Mr. WRIGHT: If the hon. gentlemen will wait to make their speeches until I am through, I shall be delighted.

As I have stated, we believe in the cooperative movement. In Canada that movement has grown by leaps and bounds during the last number of years. I have here statistics which show that in the year 1942 the reported membership of the cooperatives in Canada exceeded half a million, and the aggregate business was over $250,000,000. Reserves and surpluses reached the high point of $46,000,000 and the working capital position showed general improvement. This is according to A. E. Richards, who is head of the extension department. The cooperative movement is, I believe, the only thing we have in Canada to-day which is a real block to the growth of monopoly capitalism, and as such it should be encouraged by any government in this country. The people who are opposed to the cooperative movement to-day are joining forces to try to stop the growth of that movement. I have in my hand a copy of the *Maritime Co-operator* for February 1 of this year. In it, Professor MacDonald, speaking before the Nova Scotia Credit Union league on January 12 and 13, makes this statement:

> In the United States big business had already formed an anti-cooperative league, pooling thousands of dollars in an attempt to smash cooperative enterprise. Similar efforts, he declared, were already gathering strength in Canada advocating a return to unregulated free enterprise, which he called "a system of free exploitation, favouring the ousting of government control."

It is beyond me how any person can in the same breath say that he believes in competition and capitalism and that be believes in cooperation and cooperatives. Such people are either ignorant of the true meaning of cooperation or they are deliberately trying to mislead.

The leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) wished to know the difference between cooperation and capitalism. The cooperative way of doing business is the direct opposite to the competitive way. Cooperation emphasizes service and equality; competition emphasizes profits and special privileges. We need in Canada to-day a dominion cooperative act which will coordinate the cooperative

movements throughout the dominion. We have in many of our provinces fairly good cooperative acts; and I hope that this government will see fit to bring down a cooperative act which will clarify the position of the cooperatives in Canada in many respects, especially in the matter of taxation. At the present time the pools in western Canada are in a position where they do not know whether they are to be taxed on their earnings during the past number of years, and it places them in a serious position, and one which should be clarified at the earliest possible moment. We have in western Canada also the first co-operative oil refinery established anywhere in the world. It has been doing a fine piece of work as far as western Canada is concerned. It was established some eight years ago with a capital of approximately $32,000; and to-day, after eight years of operation, it has assets of a million and a half dollars, and last year did a business worth two and one-quarter million dollars. Not only has that cooperative been able to build up that capital during this past eight years, but it has reduced the price of petroleum products to the farmer in western Canada to the extent that the savings in one year on one section of land farmed with mechanized equipment are over three hundred dollars, that is compared with what it would have cost the farmer had that refinery not been established. That is a remarkable showing, and our cooperatives should be encouraged in every way possible.

The fourth point which I wish to bring to the attention of the house is the matter of establishing marketing boards in Canada. I believe we should have a dominion marketing act under which we can establish boards for the marketing of various farm products in the dominion, and the act should make it possible that, where sixty to sixty-five per cent of the growers engaged in the production of any particular farm product agree that they should have orderly marketing through the marketing board, it would be compulsory for all that product to be marketed through that board. I believe that is the only way in which we shall be able to obtain orderly marketing in the dominion. As long as small groups of people are left free to disturb the orderly marketing of a particular product because they do not agree to go into that marketing board, I do not think we can have orderly marketing. The greatest factor which is operating against the orderly marketing of farm products in Canada to-day is the surpluses which we may have from year to year on account of weather conditions. We often find that, with very small surpluses existing, products are dumped on the market by a few people and the market for those products destroyed. I believe that there should be marketing boards controlled by the growers themselves, in conjunction with an export marketing board which would take care of the surpluses which may occur from year to year, and which, after all, we need. We should not draw the line too close in Canada so as not to have a surplus, because we do not know what the weather man has in store for us. This surplus should be taken off the market by the government board and processed and kept as a reserve against years of crop failure, or it should be made available for export to countries where there are deficiencies. In Hot Springs, Virginia, about two months ago, there was a conference with regard to the supply of food to countries in which there are deficiencies, and the surpluses which we may have in Canada from year to year, now that we have dehydrating plans and we know more about quick-freezing, could be processed and made available to these other countries instead of becoming a drug on the market in our own country, thus destroying the price system which may obtain at the time.

I believe also that we should have in Canada a programme whereby we might have a reserve of non-perishable products such as grains against any year of drought or a series of years of drought, and the best place in which such products can be stored is right on the farms where they are grown. Under the present system we are taking these grains and storing them in large terminals hundreds of miles away from where they are grown, and if we should have a drought in Western Canada again, or two or three years of drought, we might find ourselves in a position where we would be hauling grain again for seed and feed for the farmers. In the United States they have established such a system as I have suggested. They store grain right on the farm. There is no reason why the same thing cannot be done in Canada. If it were done it would be the best insurance we could have against crop failure and it would give a sense of security to the people living on our farms.

We have a modified form of crop insurance in Canada under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act. That act has served a very useful purpose; but unfortunately, like practically everything else the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) has had anything to do with, we find that the operation of this scheme has become riddled with political patronage, thereby destroying in part at least its usefulness. I believe that not only should we have crop insurance for western Canada but that this

crop insurance should be made available to any group of growers of any particular agricultural product who want their crops insured. It might very well be made available to our tobacco growers, or our potato or apple growers, and the cost of that insurance should be taken into consideration in the establishing of basic prices for agricultural products in Canada. There is no other line of industry where the cost of insurance is not written into the price of the goods it produces, and that should apply to the insurance of agricultural products. Any basic price established for agricultural products should be a price which has taken into consideration the cost of insurance of that crop. If we had that type of scheme in Canada it would give more permanency to agriculture.

Another scheme which has been developed by this government and which has been a very good one is the prairie farm rehabilitation scheme in the west. This has been the first attempt by any government on any large scale to rehabilitate land in Canada. No one who has followed the course of land settlement in Canada during the past one hundred years can fail to be saddened by what has taken place.

Mr. GARDINER: Any politics in that?

Mr. WRIGHT: I am afraid there is considerable politics in prairie farm assistance.

Mr. GARDINER: It is a pretty good outfit.

Mr. WRIGHT: I will say this, however. They have done good work, and the scheme inaugurated is something that should be encouraged and extended not only to the area in which it is operating in western Canada but to the whole of the west.

Mr. GARDINER: What is wrong with politics anyhow?

Mr. WRIGHT: Politics as some people play it is not so hot. That scheme should be extended to cover all the western provinces, and there should be set up in conjunction with it another scheme in the east to cover Ontario and Quebec, and one for the maritime provinces, because there is absolute need of the rehabilitation of farm lands in this country. One hundred years ago our people came to this country and settled in the maritime provinces and Ontario. No direction whatsoever was given them. They took up land wherever the land companies could secure it and sell it to them. Land was cleared that should never have been used for agricultural purposes. The result was that those people were able to live for a few years on those farms where they established homes, but because the land should never have been used for agricultural purposes they had to abandon those homes.

Travel throughout Ontario and the maritimes and see these places. Every one represents not only an abandoned farm but lost hopes and ambitions on the part of those who settled on them. We allowed people to go to western Canada and there the same process was gone through They settled on land and after a few years found it was worthless as far as agriculture was concerned, and people left the south of the province and came to the north. This is my criticism of the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act, that people were allowed to come from the south and settle on the same kind of land in the north. I know of thousands of people who have been brought from the south of the province and established in the north and in twenty years from now they will find themselves in exactly the same position as they were in before. The land is not fit for agricultural purposes. We have had land surveys in Saskatchewan and they have served a useful purpose, but the information has not been disseminated with regard to the land and we have allowed lands to be settled which should never have been settled.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. WRIGHT: I do not wish to trespass any longer on the time of the house and therefore I will leave for another occasion what I intended to say now. At that time I may be able to deal more fully with the matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go ahead.

Mr. WRIGHT: No. What I have to discuss will take a good deal of time.

Mr. L. P. LIZOTTE (Kamouraska) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of this session the view seems to prevail that speeches could very well be shortened as much as possible so that contemplated measures might all the sooner be put into execution. I am heartily in accord with that idea, and, as usual, I shall be quite brief in the remarks I wish to make.

At this stage of the proceedings, we must ask ourselves whether it is convenient, in the interest of the Canadian people as a whole and of our constituents, to support generally the policy outlined by the government in the speech from the throne, which we are now considering. For the present, we must confine ourselves to the principles set forth, reserving

the right to discuss each measure and to consider each proposition on its merits as soon as the details are communicated to us.

Ever since I have the honour to be a member of this parliament, I have endeavoured to consider in a spirit of honesty and independence all problems in their true light, and to approve or disapprove of them conscientiously, outside of all personal or party considerations.

Of course, that is not the best method for avoiding difficulties, but it is the safest way of being at peace with oneself and keeping the confidence of those who have entrusted their interests to us.

Without any further preliminaries, I do not hesitate to state that we should be unfair if we did not congratulate the government, as warmly as we have sometimes opposed certain measures, for the splendid programme they have outlined for the present session of parliament. The proposals which are being laid before us are so timely that they can seemingly gain the almost unanimous support of this house. As was to be expected, the government's opponents, who are here for the furtherance of opposite political interests, have referred to that programme as an election manifesto, made out on the eve of an election. Although my experience in politics is by no means lengthy, I quite understand their embarrassment, but I think it is an indication that the programme is good, and such as to meet the wishes of the people. If there is no election before the session ends or before those measures are implemented, no one will be able to claim that this manifesto is nothing but an election promise.

I believe I may say, therefore, that the fate of the government is in its hands and that its future will depend upon the fairness with which it will carry out the proposed measures.

I do not wish, for the time being, to discuss the war programme of the government. I have had numerous occasions of expressing my views in this connection and I still hold to the same views. We are all agreed that it is absolutely necessary to win the war and to hasten victory, but the fact must be borne in mind that after all Canada is a young nation and that she must act in her own interests and according to her own means, leaving older and wealthier nations more directly concerned to follow the same policy.

I shall therefore confine myself to the plans respecting the period of transition and of peace, outlined in the speech from the throne. How shall we assess these plans?

How could we, on principle, object to the government's plan of increasing our exports by facilitating the exchange of our products with those of other nations after the war? We have forests, mines, water-power and other natural resources of untold value, which may be used in international trade. The interests of our people demand that we should be prepared to take advantage of these resources in order to anticipate prosperity.

How could we, on principle, object to our country's individual participation in an international organization which will strive to avert future wars, further catastrophes, and promote universal security? Would not such a policy tend to give recognition to the sovereignty of Canada, a dream which we have so long cherished?

How could we denounce the putting into effect of certain plans to establish, during the post-war period, a minimum standard of welfare—better food and shelter, social insurance against the hazards of life, setting-up of a national contributory old age pensions scheme on a more generous basis? If we did, it would be tantamount to opposing the new order which has been held out before our eyes and which can only be attained by properly directed social measures.

Who would say that they oppose the setting up of a body intended to supply the credit necessary for the launching of new industrial enterprises, small and medium in size, and to help those already in existence? That will be our greatest need, both in rural and urban centres, if we are to put all our manpower to work after the war.

I should be amazed beyond words if even one member in the house opposed the principle behind a measure which would carry out family allowances. The idea has been under consideration for the past fifty years in this country, and the time has come for a government to have the courage to identify itself with such a plan and implement it. It must be well understood, however, that these allowances shall be apportioned so as to reward and encourage a high birth-rate and help particularly the many Canadian mothers who did not shrink from filling the cradle over and over again, in accordance with the precept laid down by the Creator: "Be fruitful and multiply". A government which would apply this one measure of family allowances with Christian fairness would find that it has done enough to secure the support of the people and their forgiveness of its past mistakes in the management of public affairs.

I am pleased to see that the government has expressed its intention of setting a minimum price on farm products. For too long has the farmer, king of the universe, been treated as a poor relation. I have never understood why, if the workingman is unde-

niably entitled to a fair salary, the farmer should not also have the right to be paid prices just as fair and reasonable for his products. Because the farmer, who is a peaceful and orderly man, has never cared to resort to force in order to press his claims, he has had to muddle through as best he could until now, and it seemed as if he would remain in a class where the income could not budge. If the government carries out its purpose in this respect, it will be entitled to the gratitude of the most interesting class of people.

For all these reasons, I shall support the address in reply to the speech from the throne.

If the contents of the speech from the throne are reassuring and give us good reason to hope for the future, we cannot, however, overlook the dark clouds which still threaten on the horizon. Too often do we hear birds of ill-omen croaking every type of propaganda intended to fray our nerves and fill us with anxiety for the future of our country and the social security of our people.

I wish to denounce the proponents of extreme imperialism and of a policy of immigration on a vast scale. There are also the proponents of state controls whom I intend to denounce when opportunity offers. It is certain that, once the war is over, our people will balk at all the vexatious restrictions imposed by a new bureaucracy, which must be done away with as soon as possible.

The Canadian people believe that they are at home in Canada. They are ceaselessly reminded that they are a sovereign state and that the Westminster statute is a step in the road to independence. If so, be they allowed to keep their delusions and let there be a stop to the procession of salesmen of imperialism who come with statements hurtful to Canadian sentiments.

I congratulate the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) for having disapproved of the terms of Lord Halifax's last proposal. Let the latter attend to his mission in the United States and abstain from offering us suggestions of an imperial federation. If the former leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) and the present leader (Mr. Graydon) have refused to take a positive stand on these matters, it is probably because his views expressed follow very closely those of the Tory party, as formerly expressed by Lord Bennett, of whom we have such an unpleasant recollection. One may be convinced that this policy of imperialization is not accepted any more by the proud people of Canada.

While still shouting that nothing matters except the winning of the war, an attempt is made, in certain quarters, to take advantage of the willingness of our country to go the limit on the road to sacrifice to ask that further sacrifices be made to promote the interests of foreign nations, when peace has been won. An incidious propaganda is spreading the idea that Canada, with its 3,500,000 square miles of territory, should accommodate all the refugees from other countries who wish to take their chances in our midst. In my humble view, this proposition is for the least premature. In spite of their traditionally charitable dispositions, our people will oppose the entry of outsiders, from whatever country they may come, until our returned men and our unemployed have secured jobs bringing them enough money to ensure their welfare and the stabilization of our commerce and industry. Personally, I would resent it if strangers were to take the places, on this hemisphere, that rightly belong to Canadians.

A lot is said about devastation and ruin in countries that have fallen victims to aggression. Our help and sympathy have so far gone to those countries, but do you not believe, Mr. Speaker, that their reconstruction will call for the efforts of all their sons? Should Canada send her people abroad for reconstruction work, while refugees who should logically be at work in their own countries, would take the place of our people in Canada and enjoy here a more comfortable life? That would be absurd.

The complaint is heard that some European countries have a too low birth-rate. Would not their problem become more acute if they were deprived of the elements necessary for the restoration of their population? After the war, each country will have to set its own house in order.

I have received many protest petitions from my constituency and I fully intend to support them. May I suggest that all those advocates of mass immigration should be strongly advised to stop their agitation and wait until our country's economic and industrial structure recovers from the injuries it has sustained before they put forward any immigration plan. We must show forbearance, but I still believe in the old motto, which the British have taught us by word and deed: Charity begins at home. To sacrifice the interests of our people to those of outsiders, would be ill directed charity while being detrimental, at the same time, to the countries of those who would benefit by our excessive generosity.

I have made these few remarks in the house in order to call the attention of the hon. members to the serious disturbance that might be engendered in our country by the implementation of a policy advocated by utopians prompted by momentary enthusiasm, without a thought for the real interests of our people.

These thoughts have been inspired by one single hope, that of seeing Canada, after the war, once again a unified, happy and prosperous country.

On motion of Mr. Tustin the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Crerar the house adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

Tuesday, February 8, 1944

The house met at three o'clock.

DOMINION ELECTIONS

CONCURRENCE IN FIRST REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE (ARMED SERVICES)

Mr. SAMUEL FACTOR (Spadina) presented the first report of the special committee on the Dominion Elections Act, 1938, (armed services), and moved that the report be concurred in.

Mr. SPEAKER: By leave of the house.

Motion agreed to.

WESTERN STOCK FEEDERS

INQUIRY AS TO DISPOSAL OF BEEF CATTLE AVAILABLE FOR MARKET

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): I should like to address two questions to the Minister of Agriculture. The first is in respect of the western stock feeders who find themselves at present unable to market their finished beef. Have representations been made to the minister to the effect that in some cases feed is scarce, that the prices for the finished beef are too low, and that the feeders therefore face heavy losses and even possible ruin? My second question is, has the minister considered the advisability of suspending the meatless Tuesday and the rationing regulations as they apply to beef until such time as the regrettable congestion in beef marketing can be cleared away?

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): As to the first question, there is a delegation here from Alberta this afternoon, a delegation I think of one, who has been telephoning to me since this morning to make an appointment. I have not yet met that delegate, and until I do I would not wish to say anything further about the matter. The other question is one to be dealt with, of course, by the wartime prices and trade board.

[Mr. Lizotte.]

SOVIET RUSSIA

CONSTITUTION OF SIXTEEN REPUBLICS—QUESTION OF DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. Newspaper dispatches would appear to indicate that each of the sixteen republics comprising the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics are now to be free to carry on their own relationships with other powers. Is the Prime Minister in a position to inform the house whether or not this will necessitate any change in connection with our present diplomatic arrangements with Russia?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): In reply to my hon. friend, I do not anticipate that the change which has been made in the constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will necessitate any change in the existing diplomatic relations between Canada and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

MEAT

CONDEMNATION OF 500,000 POUNDS IN GOVERNMENT WAREHOUSE IN QUEBEC CITY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. C. SENN (Haldimand): I should like to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture or the appropriate minister. Will the minister make a statement to the house concerning the recent condemnation by government and municipal inspectors of some 500,000 pounds of meat stored in a government warehouse in Quebec city?

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Just as soon as I have a complete report on the matter I shall make a statement to the house. I have not yet received a complete report.

WHEAT

PROCEDURE IN REALIZATION OF PARTICIPATION CERTIFICATES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. VICTOR QUELCH (Acadia): I should like to address a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Will he make a statement in regard to the disposal of wheat board certificates by the farmers? Should they be sent to the wheat board, and if so, when?

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): The wheat board will make an announcement this month as to the proper method to be followed by the producers in realizing on their participation certificates. Forms will be sent to all elevator agents and to banks for the use of producers, who will use the forms in registering their certificates and will then forward their certificates with the form to the board in Winnipeg. It is very important that the certificate be not forwarded without being listed on the form. The certificates will be checked by the wheat board with the duplicates at head office, and then cheques will issue. Payment on the 1940 certificates will commence in March, and immediately following that, the certificates for 1941 and 1942 will issue.

To anticipate another question, it is impossible at this stage to give any estimate of what the payments on these certificates will be.

EXPROPRIATION OF PROPERTIES

BEAR EXPLORATION AND RADIUM, LIMITED

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. R. ADAMSON (York West): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Munitions and Supply, a copy of which I have already sent to him. The question arises out of a communication made in New York this morning. Has the government taken any steps to expropriate the properties of the company known as Bear Exploration and Radium, Limited? If not, has the government any intention of so doing, or is it in any way interested in this company?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): The answer to the first question is no. The answer to the second question is that the government has no intention of taking action.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Monday, February 7, consideration of the motion of Mr. L. D. Tremblay for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Graydon, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker it was very refreshing to have the hon. member for Vancouver North (Mr. Sinclair), just back from the front, where he did such valiant service, tell the house and the country something about the thoughts and aspirations of the men at the front. May I congratulate and commend him for the contribution he has made and the courage he has shown in not being afraid to point out the defects in the rehabilitation plans at present operating, and express the hope that the government will take early remedial action in regard thereto.

Intimately connected with this subject is the question of housing. I am going to refer to that for a moment because it was mentioned in the speech from the throne.

Of the various acts respecting this subject, one was passed in 1935 called the Dominion Housing Act; in 1937 there was another act, called the Home Improvement Loans Guarantee Act, and in 1938, the National Housing Act. I will deal only with the latter.

I would like to quote first from sessional paper 122T, laid on the table on July 6 last. On page 9 it is stated that:

> Part II of the National Housing Act was designed to assist local housing authorities, including limited dividend corporations, to provide decent, safe and sanitary housing to be rented to families of low income which could not afford the "economic rental" for such accommodation. Under section 18, subsection 2, a provision was included that no loans might be made and no contracts entered into after March 31, 1940.

It is claimed that certain objectives, however, were achieved; in particular, progress was made in promoting a better understanding and appreciation of the nature and purpose of low rental housing and in working out some of the problems and details involved in this type of undertaking. I am sorry that the act was allowed to lapse in 1940, because I think it might very well have been continued until the present. I am well aware, of course, that the argument will be adduced that the war was on and we had other things to attend to.

May I for a moment recapitulate the events in connection with this low-cost housing programme. The present government, by order in council on May 13, 1936 appointed the national employment commission with Mr. Arthur B. Purvis as its chairman. Amongst other duties it was asked to "formulate regulations regarding practical measures for increasing employment." I cannot pass without paying a word of tribute to Mr. Arthur

B. Purvis for the tremendous energy he displayed during the two years he was engaged in this work, giving freely of his great ability and business acumen to a labour of love. Although all his recommendations have not been implemented, his work will stand as a great contribution to our national life. From the interim report of the commission of which he was chairman, I quote as follows, under "Housing Construction," page 11:

> The commission recognized the desirability of a rounding out of governmental housing policy, particularly as regards accommodation for those unable themselves to afford an economic rent —often associated with slum clearance. Action in this field was considered necessary both from the viewpoint of eliminating a social sore all too prevalent, especially in the larger cities, and because of its effect in stimulating employment in the construction field.

The commission recommended that the dominion and to a certain extent the provincial contributions should be in the form of direct subsidies, or, alternately, loans at a rate below the commercial rate, leaving to the municipalities contributions largely in the form of direct monetary payments equivalent to but not in the form of tax exemptions.

On September 9, 1936, the dominion government based certain principles upon recommendations made by the national employment commission. These will be found on page 101 of the commission's report issued on January 26, 1938. It was then announced that the principles which should govern that section of this broad housing plan to be devised to meet the requirements of those unable to pay an economic rent often associated with slum clearance, should be as follows: (a) participation by the dominion, by provinces or municipalities in any aid that may be given, whether by subsidy, loan, guarantee, or omission of taxes; (b) encouragement of the participation of private capital.

Then the commission, on February 9, 1937, presented its detailed plan to the minister, feeling that dominion government action was justified at the time for the following reasons:

> (i) As a measure of public health and social advancement, low rental housing projects will have a direct influence in imporving conditions of life for the low wage earner in urban areas and will be a factor in increasing the employability of our workers after a period in which their employability has been greatly reduced;
>
> (ii) The field of low rental housing is the only one in which a direct and decisive stimulus can be given to home building without the risk of subsidizing competition to private builders and thus discouraging more building than is stimulated;
>
> (iii) The employment created by such housing projects will be greater and more widely spread than that afforded by large scale public works.

I have referred to the fact that to encourage building corporations to undertake this form of building under this part II of the National Housing Act, the dominion government was being asked to lend money to limited dividend companies at a lower rate than that prevailing in ordinary commercial loans. Such corporations might very well decide to limit their dividends to a smaller amount, especially if they received such long-term loans at a low interest rate.

To give in a few words the need for slum clearance in low rental houses, I cannot do better than quote from the report which was made in 1934 by a committee of which I was chairman. In that report we said:

> Bad houses are not only a menace: they are active agents of destruction. The committee is satisfied, from its investigations and inquiries, that they destroy happiness, health and life. They destroy morality and family ties. They destroy the basis of society itself by their destruction of self-respect and their promotion of delinquency and crime.

Until slum clearance and rehousing of slum tenants is undertaken as a national duty and responsibility, to be discharged by national policies put into effect on a national basis, we shall quite unnecessarily be condemned to pass through all those very costly experiences which other nations have already passed through before being confronted by the ultimate inescapable truth that without government assistance there can be no effective slum clearance and rehousing of the lowest wage earners.

I find towards the end of the report that we urged on the dominion government that no public grants are so urgently needed as those for the rehousing of the poorest members of the community, and that, in order to make such grants most effective, a national housing commission should be appointed to assist the provincial and municipal housing authorities in the formulation of plans, in the choice of materials, and possibly, if a nation-wide housing scheme can be initiated, in securing economies by the large-scale purchase of such materials.

I hope the government will revive this portion of the National Housing Act by amendment or otherwise; for I believe the time has arrived when municipalities and limited-dividend housing corporations will be anxious to provide this form of housing by taking advantage of the opportunity to secure dominion loans at less than commercial rates for a period of thirty or forty years.

I wish now to turn for a few minutes to another subject which was dealt with yesterday very effectively by the hon. member for Hastings-Peterborough (Mr. White), the subject of the rehabilitation of returned men. The national council of veterans' associations of Canada, after making a thorough investigation of the subject, made certain recommendations to the government. Let me refer for a moment to these.

Formerly the clothing allowance of soldiers on discharge was as low as $17 if granted in the summer, but afterwards it was increased to $35. The council of the veterans' associations recommended that an allowance of $100 be given to men with overseas service; secondly that $75 be given to men with more than six months' service in Canada; thirdly that a wardrobe reconditioning allowance of $35 be given those with less than six months' service in Canada; and that the personnel of women's services should be given equal allowances.

The recommendations of the national veterans' councils are a minimum and do not provide for working clothing. Immediately following the presentation of these recommendations the clothing allowance was increased to $65, but I still think that this is inadequate and that the sum of $100, as recommended by the veterans' associations, should be the minimum, because it is quite obvious that $65 would not do more than purchase a suit of clothes and an overcoat.

The present regulations provide for a grant on discharge of one month's pay and allowances. The national council of the veterans' associations in Canada has recommended to the government that rehabilitation grants of one month's pay and allowances be given for each six months of completed service. This seems to be more equitable. It is fair to assume that the longer the service the more time will be required for readjustment into civilian life. The present scale of dependents' allowances does not permit the accumulation of any surplus by dependents of men on active service, nor has it been generous enough to more than take care of essential living expenses.

Under these circumstances it will be found that on discharge or demobilization money will be required to reestablish families on a pre-war basis. Length of service will have a direct relationship to reestablishment cost.

Now a word in regard to the hospital allowances during treatment. Formerly service personnel were discharged during the period of active treatment when they became wards of the Department of Pensions and National Health, with consequent serious impairment of their financial situation. Now the regulations in part correct this injustice, but they do not go far enough. The national council of veterans' associations in Canada has recommended to the government that in no case should pay and advowances of a former member of the forces in this war, in hospital, be less than those of his rank during active service for the whole of his period of initial continuous treatment. This will ensure equal treatment for all ranks if adopted, and it would seem to be just without being overgenerous. It is advocated that no officer or man be discharged from the services until he is discharged from hospital; in other words that he should be given the moral stimulus of considering himself on the strength as long as he is suffering in hospital from war-time disability.

The present regulations are unfair for the following reasons: First, they discriminate against officers of higher rank than a lieutenant; secondly, they limit the benefit of full pay and allowances to a period of one year, or the length of service of the recipient, whichever is the lesser; third, they do not take into account the cases of men who may be discharged from hospital prematurely and have to return later for further treatment. A point should be made of the necessity of establishing proper regulations with respect to all matters of rehabilitation now, when there is general public sympathy with men on active service. When the war is over they will again be faced with public apathy, and I am afraid indifference, so that it will prove difficult to have regulations revised to correct any half-way measures which may be adopted at the present time.

I should like to say a word in regard to the promise made by the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) in respect of the Sunnybrook hospital which is to replace Christie street hospital. I understand that progress is being made in the preparation of plans. Early construction of this hospital however will depend upon the energy shown by the minister and his department. If the plans have to be completed to the last detail before tenders are called there will be a long delay in actual construction. May I say to the minister it will be possible to start construction within a month or six weeks if the government is anxious to do so and will allow tenders to be let on a fixed fee basis for profit, established on a reasonable estimate of the ultimate cost. The government should assume responsibility for any fluctuations of price of material or increase in wages of labour during

the period of construction. Priorities for all types of material and equipment should be secured immediately and orders placed as soon as quantities of specific requirements are determined.

Increasing numbers of seriously wounded men resulting from the operations in Italy and elsewhere will soon be coming back to Canada. Present accommodation is quite inadequate, so that Sunnybrook hospital will be absolutely essential at an early day. May I therefore urge upon the Minister of Pensions and National Health that he do his utmost to expedite the construction of this building at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. C. E. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I had hoped on reviewing the speech from the throne to find in it some concrete proposals, but I am inclined to be of the opinion of a great many other members in this house that the speech contains just a lot of propaganda material which can be used to great advantage in an election. The more I read it, the more carefully I examine it, the more I am forced to that conclusion. One thing, however, which is outlined in the speech from the throne, and it appears in the first part of the speech, is I think, very commendable. It is that we are to continue to have an all-out war effort; or probably I should more correctly say it is hoped we shall have an all-out war effort. I do not think anyone can honestly say that we have had an all-out war effort up to date; certainly not from the time the war started, because I can well remember speaking in this house of an all-out war effort when the war started. We of the Social Credit New Democracy party were the only ones in this house who took a stand for an all-out war effort. We are still proud of that record, and we are grateful that we have made at least a dent in some of the thick skulls which opposed us at that time when we were talking about an all-out war effort.

Mr. ADAMSON: An all-worn-out effort.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): It is an all-worn-out effort; but I am speaking of an all-out war effort. I think that one of the grandest factors which must be considered in an all-out war effort is public morale. I listened with a great deal of interest to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) when he spoke at the beginning of this session in regard to the war effort. He condemned those who went about the country preaching that the war was almost over. I think that was the proper stand for the Prime Minister to take. I am not one of those who believe that this war is nearly won. I recall reading the other day in one of our Canadian papers an article reprinted from a United States publication, to the effect that one of the United States generals had said that the German army was stronger to-day in man-power and equipment of all types than it ever was. I think it would be better for us to take that mental attitude than the attitude which might lead us to believe that the war is about over and we should relax our efforts. You can scarcely pick up a newspaper in Canada, even since the Prime Minister spoke, without seeing that some official has said the war is likely to be over this year. I remember reading a statement issued by General Montgomery just a day or two ago to his troops in England saying that he hoped and expected that this war would be over this year. That is in direct opposition to what the Prime Minister is trying to establish. We should begin to censor some of the statements that are made at home, in order to encourage an all-out war effort.

One of the other matters mentioned in the speech from the throne in regard to an all-out war effort is the total use of our resources. I do not think we have begun to use all of our resources in that regard. I recall oil, for instance. In my opinion we have not begun to develop the oil resources that could have been developed in western Canada, and which would have been of great asistance to us in our all-out war effort. Another important point in regard to an all-out war effort is to see to it that public morale is kept up to the maximum and that we are using every available man in this country to the best advantage. The department which can perform that function to the greatest extent is the department which has control of the selective service boards. In my opinion the selective service boards are in some instances a disgrace to this country. I do not particularly blame the minister in charge, but I do blame the officials who are administering these boards. I had occasion to visit one of the selective service boards of this country—and I will name it, the one in Calgary—in an endeavour to get a farm boy, who could be spared from the farm for the winter months, a place in an essential war industry. As I entered that selective service office I was not very well impressed with the set-up. It seemed to me that the officials behind the counter were endeavouring to frighten the men who came in to make application. That seemed to be the atmosphere of the whole place.

I want to give the history of this case in order to show how this works out. This boy was given an indefinite postponement for work

in agriculture; and after he had been partly hailed out last year and had taken off the remainder of his crop, he made arrangements with his father, who lives not far away, to take care of his stock in order that he might accept employment in other essential industry. The government was continually asking farmers to do that very thing. This boy came to see me, and I said I thought that was a very commendable step to take. He had been offered a position in the Kimberley mines of British Columbia, he told me, at a salary of $175 a month, and he asked what he should do. I said, "The first thing you must do is go in and consult the selective service board, who will make the proper arrangements for you." He went in to consult this board and came home and told me the result. Then I went in personally to interview the officials of that board, and I must say that the attitude of those officials was anything but conducive to getting boys on the farms to take employment in essential industries. One official told me that he had informed this young man that he should go to the lumber camps if he wanted to work. The boy told him he did not have any experience in lumber camps and did not want to go there, that he had been offered this other job already. Then this official told me, "These boys must remember that they are in the army, and if they do not go where we tell them to go we will push them back into the army." Such threats should not be permitted. I pointed out that this boy was not in the army in any sense of the word, and that no official of the selective service board had authority to put him into the army. This boy came to me again to see what he should do, and I replied that I did not know. His answer was, "Well, if he thinks I am going up there to work in the woods when I already have a job offered to me, he is wrong." I said I did not blame him, and then he said, "I will go home and sit down, then; I will not do anything." I said I did not think we had quite reached that point, and I sent a wire to the deputy minister, Mr. MacNamara, asking if this was the policy of the government, and stating that I did not think it was. I received a wire in reply saying that they would investigate the case and let me know. That was over three months ago, and I have heard nothing since. I got in touch with one of the district agriculturists of my province, and we talked this matter over. As a result this boy went to British Columbia, regardless of our selective service board; he went to the mine and had his position confirmed, then went to the selective service board, who immediately put him on the job, and he started to work. Why should people be required to get out of the province altogether in order to assist our war effort? I am not particularly blaming the minister, but he must take the responsibility because he is in charge of the department.

Mr. MITCHELL: Frankly I think that young fellow should be in the army.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Why?

Mr. MITCHELL: Because I do.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): This young man has two hundred acres in crop; he has fifty or sixty head of cattle and forty or fifty hogs. Now the minister says he should be taken out of that essential industry and put into the army, though the government and the minister have said time and again that if these boys can possibly get away from the farm for a few months they should get out and assist in essential industry.

Mr. MITCHELL: Yes, but they have to go on the basis of priority; they cannot just go where they like. If that young fellow was in the army he would have to do what he was told; and if he wants to go into some other industry it is not asking too much to let us decide on the priority of that industry.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Well, here was a boy who was willing to do that. He went to the selective service board and they threatened to put him into the army if he did not go where he was told. Yet he had a job offered to him at good pay. Well, it is just as I said to the selective service official; this set-up is not a selective service, it is a gestapo. From what the minister tells me now I am more than ever convinced that this is so, and I can tell the Minister of Labour that there are thousands of young fellows who are anxious to get off the farm during the winter months and assist in essential war industries, and who would do so but for the bureaucratic dictatorship administered by the selective service board. If you want an all-out war effort you will have to change your attitude. I have run across some funny things this last year, especially in connection with selective service, but the minister thinks it is fine.

Mr. MITCHELL: I think it is the best organization in the united nations; what do you think about that?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): You just go ahead and stick up for it; you are the only one who does so, as far as I know. I do not mean that the whole selective service organization is carried on like the branch at Calgary, but I do suggest that the Calgary office needs a little housecleaning.

When I was down at Drumheller I was speaking to the manager of one of the mines there who asked, "What kind of outfit is this selective service board"? I tried to outline what I thought of some of them—

Mr. HOMUTH: Could you say it here?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Hardly.

Mr. MITCHELL: Go ahead.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Somebody says it is the "neglected service," and I think that is a better description. The manager of this mine told me that last year, when they were short of miners, they applied to Ottawa to have some miners sent out, and as a result five men were sent from the east, with their fare paid all the way. Three of them were old men, and after working three shifts they were declared physically unfit to do further mine work. Then they were given transportation all the way back to Ottawa. Why could not these men have been properly categorized and given a proper physical examination before sending them three thousand miles across Canada, when our railway trains are supposed to be so overcrowded? At least that would have obviated the necessity of bringing them all the way back east at government expense.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): At the taxpayers' expense, you mean.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Well, the government are supposed to represent the people.

If we are to have an all-out war effort I think there will have to be some changes in the attitude of the government toward some of the returned men, veterans not only of this war but of the last war and their dependents. The hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch) and the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Fair) went more fully into this question than I intend to go, but I would like to draw one particular case to the attention of hon. members of this house. I know that some men who are fighting overseas to save democracy have dependents in this country who are barely eking out an existence. I had one particular instance brought to my attention, and concerning which I have communicated with the department. But it is only typical of others I have received. According to the regulations, if a boy happens to be overseas, or in the forces at some other point, and his father or mother are dependent upon him, the mother cannot receive any dependent's allowance unless the father is totally incapacitated from earning a living. When one realizes that the dependents' allowance board has to function under those regulations, he realizes that it is placed in a bad spot, no matter how desirous it may be of correcting an evil. These old people may be receiving a very small allowance, possibly only $5 a month. The father may be working as janitor in a school, and as such he may be earning $5, $10 or even up to as much as $50 or $60 a month. In any case it is an amount insufficient to provide them with a decent standard of living. Under the regulations, however, the mother is prevented from receiving any dependent's allowance unless her husband is totally incapacitated from earning a living This means he must be an absolute pauper. If he is earning as little as $5 a month they cannot receive the allowance. Surely that is a condition the department should consider and change.

Provision is made in the speech from the throne for the setting up as a subsidiary of the Bank of Canada, of an industrial development bank to provide credit facilities for both fixed and working capital, so that industries may be converted from war-time to peace-time operations. I believe the government is to be commended upon endeavouring to take some action to facilitate the transfer of industry from a war-time to a peace-time basis. My experience in the war expenditures committee gave me some insight into the tremendous productive capacity of Canada. All the factories we visited had the very best of equipment, and were doing good work. I shall not say anything about the quality of work being turned out, or the extent of production, but the point I make is that we have facilities right at hand, now to put out after the war a production unequalled in our history. It can be done, if we make the proper use of our facilities.

We note that the industrial development bank is to be set up as a subsidiary to the Bank of Canada. This morning I happened to see the Ottawa *Citizen* of Tuesday, February 8, and I noted particularly a misleading statement. This is what I read: "Bank of Canada cuts rediscount rate; debt-free money and ending fight for markets urged by Lord Sempill." I showed this heading to three men and asked them what it meant. Their reply was, "Oh, the Bank of Canada is cutting the rediscount rate, and they are going to issue debt-free money." Ninety per cent of the people are headline readers and I believe many persons across Canada after reading that headline are going to say, "Well, we are beginning to have some sense. The Bank of Canada is issuing debt-free money." But when one looks through the article he finds that it states something entirely different, and that no great change is intended at all. It states that the rate of discount will be lowered from 2½ to 1½ per cent, on advances to

chartered or savings banks. This is no great reform. Once the chartered banks get the advance from the Bank of Canada, they can expand their credit from ten to twenty times, and the rate works out to only a fraction of one per cent. It does not in any sense indicate that either the chartered banks or the industrial development banks will be in a position to make loans to industries or agriculture at a lower rate. Unless we have some means of issuing national money for a national cause we are going to fall into the same error as that into which we have fallen many times before. The government seems to take a great deal of pleasure in passing the buck to industry, if I may use that expression.

There is a widespread belief that the onus of taking up the slack in respect of unemployment should fall upon industry. Industry cannot and never will absorb all the unemployed in Canada. We had better understand that right now, because such is not the function of industry, nor was it ever intended to be. As I pointed out a while ago, the industries of Canada are well organized, and they are turning out the necessary production. The war has proven their ability to produce goods. I am not saying anything about the profits they are making, nor am I expressing any opinion as to whether they are making too much or too little. That is a matter entirely for control. The function of industry is to produce goods, and it is doing that. But to expect industry to give back jobs to all the men who have gone overseas, and who before enlistment were employed with those industries, is just pure nonsense. They cannot and they will not do it.

The hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) delivered a good speech the other day, in which he encouraged the development of industries in western Canada. With his views in that respect we from the west entirely agree. He pointed out the potentialities accruing from such a programme. But one must always have in mind the markets to be supplied. There is no use in having industries, and a greater production of goods, unless we have markets in which to sell those goods. Why, even in the years of depression there was no scarcity of goods in the stores. Industry was producing as much as it could sell.

I recall visiting a plant in Canada just before the war, and upon returning to the manager's office I said to him, "Why do you not keep those fellows employed for the full twelve months of the year? Surely your mental make-up is not such that you would deliberately dismiss a man and place him on relief for six months in the year, with the possibility that he and his family might starve." "Well," he said, "no industrialist would take that attitude; he would be inhuman if he did." He showed me the great pile of stores in their warehouses, and said to me, "If you will get these goods out of here, I will put the men back to work very quickly—and for twelve months of the year." He was perfectly right.

It is the government's obligation to see that we have markets for these goods. Once we have the markets we shall have no difficulty in securing their production by industry. The assumption that foreign markets are going to solve our problems is, to my mind, quite wrong. True, foreign markets are necessary to a certain extent. We must have them so that we may exchange our surpluses, the goods which cannot possibly be consumed within our own country. The greatest and probably the most important of all our markets is the one at home. But in order to have a home market sufficient to take care of our population, we must have the purchasing power in the hands of the people so that they may buy back the consumer goods produced for them by industry. Unless we do that, we shall find difficulty ahead.

That purchasing power can be made up in several ways. A large portion of it can be supplied through industry, which pays the wages and salaries, but there is never enough paid out by industry in wages and salaries to begin to buy back the products of industry, and so there is always a lag. We have advocated the issue of national dividends to make up that lag. Every other party in the house has criticized and ridiculed this principle of national dividends. In view of that, it is amazing now to see in the speech from the throne mention made of family allowances. I have not heard anybody criticize them. Family allowances are in part a national dividend, but only to a very selected portion of our citizens. I am waiting with a great deal of interest to hear what the rank and file of the Liberals supporting the party which proposed these family allowances have to say about that. The principle of the family allowance is sound. But when you issue a family allowance to only a portion of our citizens, that is discrimination.

Mr. GIBSON: Who says that it is being issued to only a portion?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): It is being issued only to the children. Here is what the speech from the throne says, and I am glad to hear the minister take exception to it because evidently he thinks that is wrong. The proposal as contained in the speech from the throne is this:

> The family and the home are the foundation of national life. To aid in ensuring a minimum

of well-being to the children of the nation and to help gain for them a closer approach to equality of opportunity in the battle of life, you will be asked to approve a measure making provision for family allowances.

I take it that "children" means what it says. It does not mean adults.

Mr. DUPUIS: Why adults?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): You answer that.

Mr. DUPUIS: You are there to say.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): We have been eight years or more trying to educate some of the people here to the fact that the family is the foundation of our national life and should be taken care of, that you cannot have a prosperous nation without a prosperous family, that without the family you can have no nation at all. Of course the statement in the speech from the throne that the family and the home are the foundation of national life is only part of the truth, because they are the nation itself. What are we going to do about it? Further on the speech from the throne says that we are going to assist the family in the battle of life. So that the Prime Minister recognizes there that the family is the nation, the most important thing of all, and that the family is to be aided in the battle of life. Why "battle" unless it is a very serious affair?

Then what is it proposed to do for them? Listen to this statement of the meagre infinitesimal action we are to be asked to take! We are to be asked to aid "in ensuring a minimum" of well-being to the children of the nation. We recognize them as the foundation of the nation. We recognize that the battle of life is ahead of them, and yet we as a parliament are not going to be asked to supply them with a minimum of aid but simply "to aid in ensuring a minimum". What kind of legislation is that? Can anyone expect the people of Canada to be serious about a proposal of that kind? All we are to be asked to do is to aid in ensuring a minimum. I have not a great deal of hope from this, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased to know that labour agrees with us on the principle of a national dividend. I want to read an extract from the McTague report, from the minority report written by labour's representative, Mr. J. L. Cohen, a former member of the national war labour board. I quote from page 47:

> The proposal to substitute some family allowance relief measure instead of correcting substandard wages ignores the true character of wages.

With that I agree entirely. It goes on:

> The principle of family allowance in a general programme of social security is commendable, if it is available for all sections of society, rural as well as urban, but to put it forward as a substitute for the correction of substandard wages means to force all families, now in the substandard wage area, to become permanent wards of the state for the whole period during which the order in council would remain operative.

I agree with that one hundred per cent. The principle of a national dividend is acceptable apparently to the then representative of labour on that board, but labour does not want it to be used as a means of driving down wages. That is what they are fearful of, and that is what I too am fearful of. No wonder we are having a great deal of discontent all over this country in regard to P.C. 9384, the new war-time wages control order. No wonder labour is concerned about it. Let us look at the representatives that labour is to have on the new war labour board. I think it is a disgrace. The national war labour board, which is appointed by the governor general in council is to have only one representative of labour out of six representatives. Unquestionably the chairman and the vice-chairman of the board will not represent labour. Provision is made for two representatives of the public; they may not represent labour at all. Then there is one representative of the employers and one representative of the employees. On the old war labour board, labour had at least one out of three representatives, while on the new board labour is to have only one representative out of six; consequently they have not the ghost of a show, in my opinion, in getting justice when they bring their grievances before the board and try to convince the five other members of the board.

There also is provision for a national war labour committee, which is to be set up to consult with and assist the war labour board. They have no power at all; they act only in an advisory capacity. Look at the wording of the order in council setting up that committee. I was amazed when I read the wording, and every one of these words must have been carefully weighed before being used. There are eight or more members, four or more "having regard to the interests" of the employers, and four or more "having regard to the interests" of labour. "Having regard to the interests of" is certainly not the same as being representative of. So that on this war labour committee, labour may not have one solitary representative. Is it any wonder that labour is concerned over this thing?

When it comes to the question of wages—and the whole purpose of this order is to control wages, which might be all right in itself—see how they are to go about it under the order. The employer is forbidden to give an increase in wages unless the employee, that is the labourer, the worker, can prove that this increase in wages will not cause a rise in price. I say that is an impossible position for labour to be put in, because the labourer as such has no possible way of accurately determining the cost of production. That data is contained in the company's books, and the labourer as such has no access to the books of the company. How is he to discover what the cost of production is?

Furthermore, if the labourer goes contrary to the order, he is immediately prosecuted. He cannot even go on a strike unless he proves that that strike is not in contravention of the order, or he is liable to a fine of anywhere from one thousand dollars to one year's imprisonment. I agree with what an hon. member said the other day, that this order is just nonsense. It is going to create much difficulty and hardship, and labour is not going to pay any attention to it. Neither this nor any other government can stop the workers of this country from going on strike. It was tried in the United States, and it did not work. You cannot use a big club over such organizations as this, and if you could it would be an injustice. Why not substitute some provision which will work, which will be fair to both parties? You should not take away from anybody, especially from labour, the right to strike. It is the only defence they have; they have fought hundreds of years to get it, and now they have got it, do you think they are going to give it up? Of course not; they would be fools if they did.

There are many other subjects upon which I would like to speak. Old age pensions, health insurance, and pensions for the blind are most important subjects and should be examined in this house with the greatest care. To my mind the way the blind and the old-age pensioners have been treated is a disgrace, but I have not time to enlarge on the subject on this occasion; I shall deal more fully with these matters later on. I wish, however, to say a few words about agriculture.

In the speech from the throne it is stated:

> To ensure economic stability for agriculture, you will be asked to make provision for a price floor for staple farm products.

Of course the important question is, what will this floor be? A great many people seem to pride themselves on the fact that a floor is to be set for agriculture. A floor in agricultural prices is merely a protection against a sudden fall in prices, and to that extent it is good. It is not justice, but only a protection against manifest injustice; it will not remedy the cause and it will not effect a cure. I think that agriculture should be placed on an entirely different basis. During the years 1915 to 1919 farmers received about one-third of the national income. That was the only time wherein they received anything near parity. From 1926 to 1929 their share of the national income was about 16·6 per cent; in 1930 to 1940 it fell to about 9·4 per cent. We have come to the time when we must change our attitude towards agriculture and put the prices of its products on a different basis. I have before me *Votes and Proceedings* No. 8, Monday, 7th February, 1944, where the following proposed resolution appears in my name:

> Whereas agriculture has seldom received its fair share of the national income of Canada;
>
> And whereas the cost of producing all agricultural products varies considerably from year to year;
>
> Therefore be it resolved,—That, in the opinion of this house and in the interest of the nation as a whole, the government be requested to set the prices of agricultural products at such a level that it will guarantee to the farmers of Canada such a yearly percentage of the national income as will have the same relation to the national income as the agricultural population bears to the national population of Canada.

The values of field crops in the prairie provinces in 1943 and 1942, as given by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, are as follow:

	1943	1942
Saskatchewan ...	$343,233,000	$378,210,000
Alberta	201,426,000	239,121,000
Manitoba	141,490,000	117,593,000

It will be seen that despite the fact that in 1943 the price of wheat was set at $1.25 a bushel, the national revenue from field crops in the prairie provinces has fallen definitely below what it was in 1942. That is really my basis for putting forward this resolution, that no matter at what you set the price of agricultural products, it may not be parity and it may not give the farmer the share of the nation's income which it is his absolute right to have.

My time is up. I will continue the subject at another time.

Mr. R. W. GLADSTONE (Wellington South): My first word to-day will be to the men and women of our armed forces; of the navy, the army, and the air force; those who are serving us in all parts of the world, fighting to preserve our freedom; and not overlooking, too, the doctors and the nurses who are rendering such wonderful service. Our casualty lists are heavy, and we fear will continue so. Our

thoughts go out in deepest sympathy to those at home who have been bereaved of loved ones. They are examples of the great fortitude which must be the strength of the nation in these serious times. Our sailors have endured the rigours of the ocean in all kinds of weather and under extreme difficulties, never knowing when they might face the submarine or the enemy from the air. We cannot but pay the highest tribute to those heroic men who night after night go out and fight our battles over Germany. Our tribute goes too to the men of the army in these trying days, in the difficult situation they face in Italy.

These men and women, who have been training now over several years, are acquiring an entirely new outlook on life. Men from the maritimes have visited as never before our Pacific coast. Men of the Pacific coast have visited, in training, our eastern provinces. Many of them also have found that their training has taken them to distant parts in the neighbouring republic of the United States.

The course of training during this war has been entirely different from that in the previous war. This is a war of science and mechanization. Consequently our men, when they return from this war, will come back with a knowledge of mechanics and, in many respects, of science which they never had before. We must remember that; we must keep pace with them, realizing that their point of view will not be that of the men and women who left us to go into training and into battle. When they come back to Canada they will find different conditions also. They will find a prosperous country. Men and women have been working for good pay and under good conditions. They have had money to spend and have enjoyed a measure of prosperity despite the difficulties of the time. Our war effort has been huge. There may be things we can criticize, but the word that comes from other countries, from great leaders elsewhere, is always that of praise for the magnificent effort that Canada has put forth in this war. The men will find when they return that conditions are not as they were after the last war. They will find that prices have been controlled and that the country will not be facing a period of reduction in prices and losses of inventories, as was experienced in 1919.

Prosperity makes prosperity, and in the prosperity that has been created in this war we can see the great value of creating, in the world that is to be, conditions under which our men and women will have continuous employment. We will welcome them back to better conditions, and it will be our problem and responsibility to see that those better conditions are maintained.

[Mr. Gladstone.]

Many of the men will come back to join their brides of the early days of the war, or perhaps to bring brides with them from the old land. There is a great responsibility for us in the way of assistance in setting up new homes; for, as has been said here so frequently, the home is the foundation of the nation.

I say therefore that in all our arrangements for the future, and for these men and women as they return, we must take into account the fact that they have a changed point of view, and that they will be determined that in future there shall be no repetition of the disappointments that followed the last war. We owe a great deal to these men. Our men were at Dunkirk, at the fall of France, and they took part in the battle to save the British isles, which no doubt prevented the enemy from reaching our shores.

What I have said, Mr. Speaker, with regard to consideration for these men as they return, and the efforts to rehabilitate them, goes also for our most generous consideration, as the days go by, for the veterans of 1914-18 who even yet may be experiencing difficult conditions. I am not one who is learned in the law but I have had considerable business experience, and so it has been natural, during the eight years or so that I have been in this parliament, that I should think along the lines of business and business procedure. That trend of thought has led me as an observer to be irritated at times perhaps with the methods of parliament and the business approach to the consideration of the expenditure of money, and so on. And so, with this attitude, I was prompted, back I believe in 1937, to introduce into this house a resolution calling for a revision of the rules of the house. I mention this to-day because already a committee has been set up to consider means whereby the procedure of parliament may be improved.

It has always seemed strange to me, and I suppose it is the way in politics, that all of one party should vote one way and all of another party should vote another way. That apparently is necessary under our system of government, whereby the defeat of any measure means the defeat of the government. We may not agree with some particular measure, but according to practice it seems that if we oppose that measure in sufficient numbers the government which we support on the sum-total of its efforts may be defeated.

My attitude has been to take an independent view of the questions that come before us, and that will always be my attitude. I feel that I am here to represent all my constituents and not only those who voted for me. It has been my desire therefore to see an improvement in the rules governing procedure in this house

which will leave me freedom to vote for the measures I approve and to oppose the measures I cannot approve. In order to make my attitude clearer on many of the questions that are before us to-day I have had it in mind, following the practice of political parties, to set down a number of points that represent my way of thinking on the questions of the day.

My theme in general is this, that with an improvement in procedure, so that members of parliament may consider legislation on its merits, and with provision to make corrections where there may be weaknesses in our methods and weaknesses in legislation, we can draw upon the past to build for a better future. I do not see the necessity of uprooting the past in order to have a prosperous Canada in the future. I think we can rely on the past, with adjustments and corrections, so that there will be opportunity for every man and every woman to make a decent living in this Canada of great resources. Therefore I desire to enumerate briefly a number of points to indicate my way of thinking and the course I would wish to pursue as the member for the riding of Wellington South.

1. Christianity is our accepted conformity to the divine purpose. Encouragement, in government, to things Christian, and discouragement of things unchristian, is the sure foundation of national worth.

2. National individuality develops with the lapse of centuries. To-day Canada is a growing force in the British commonwealth of nations. In that sphere we can exert a powerful influence, in association with the United States of America, for peace and good will amongst all peoples.

3. Unity of purpose of our peoples of many origins can be attained best by a policy that will encourage a blending of the races in an atmosphere of understanding of civil and religious freedom.

4. Parliament should aim to promote these ideals in our development as a nation. There is need for recovering the confidence of Canadians in their parliament as an institution for safeguarding and promoting equality of rights and equality of opportunity for all.

5. To this end members of parliament, especially in this time of world crisis, ought to exercise their right to advocate and consider legislation with less regard to party affiliation. Members now have freedom, in theory but not in general practice, of voting according to their judgment. Consequently I advocate that the defeat of a government measure shall not constitute defeat of the government.

[Mr. Gladstone.]

6. Confidence or want of confidence in the government, after non-acceptance of proposed legislation, should be determined by a separate vote. An adverse majority on a confidence vote would then constitute defeat of the government.

7. Speeches frequently are ill-prepared, irrelevant and wasteful of time. Reduction in the time allotted for speeches, with certain exceptions, should be made.

8. Procedure in parliament should be revised to minimize general debate. Procedure in committee should be revised to broaden members' opportunity of scrutinizing departmental administration and to give parliament a greater measure of advance control over expenditures. Calling departmental officials before committees would stimulate efficiency and sometimes, perhaps, unearth situations unknown to the ministry.

9. The civil service system should be revised for better recognition of merit and vice versa as to incompetence. There should be flexibility whereby persons with essential qualifications can be sought for special work.

10. Senate reform is being called for in many quarters. Members of that body might very well take the initiative in organizing, in a non-partisan way, for an enlarged programme of national service during the entire session. Unless the public is assured of greater usefulness the demand will grow for change to an elected senate.

11. Agriculture is becoming more and more a scientific and mechanized vocation. Our colleges must be financed more generously for the best obtainable facilities and equipment and to attract specialist personnel for skilled service and leadership. Prices to the farmer must be scaled upwards. His profits will flow back into purchases of machinery, better houses and barns, electrification and modern conveniences. These needs will contribute to employment in industry.

12. Forest reserves in Canada are being depleted by fire, insects and destructive logging methods. Steps must be taken to institute scientific methods and sound business policy to maintain and increase our forests.

13. Mineral production in Canada has expanded enormously for war purposes due to the diligence and skill of the prospector and the scientist. Canada's northland is a vast prospect largely untouched. We must give all possible encouragement and support to those who seek out and develop its hidden treasures. Active mining production means increased factory operations.

14. Merchant shipping is a war-created industry of Canada capable of much expansion. Our trained seamen will respond to this new opportunity of sailing Canada's products to the ports of the world and back with much needed cargo. Our fisheries resources, both salt water and fresh water, are unsurpassed anywhere. Our rivers await harnessing to turn the wheels of industry.

15. Air transport is another war-created industry of Canada. We are the link between the world areas of most dense population. Just as our brave airmen have conquered in war, so will they serve in peace for all manner of transport via our Atlantic to Pacific resources of the air.

16. The tourist trade in our playgrounds of the north is a potential resource of Canada capable of enormous expansion. I suggest that thousands of the temporary war-time houses be reerected along our lakes and rivers in colonies as tourist homes. Under direction we can have these as attractive summer homes for visiting Americans and as comfortable stopping places for our own citizens on vacation. Colonies of tourist homes could be made to give all-year employment to an ex-service man as supervisor, storekeeper, postmaster, et cetera.

17. Boys and girls, especially in our cities and larger towns, should be given the advantage of physical training for health, deportment, and discipline. For confirmation of the value of such training, see members of any branch of the armed forces. They have a glow in their cheeks. Their shoulders are squared. They walk with evidence of purpose. They know the importance of team work.

18. Our prisons are becoming comfortable hiding places for those who would escape military service. These and many delinquent youths should be set to work under guard in lumber camps and mines. Besides board and lodging they should receive modest wages, the same to accrue for assistance to dependents or for themselves by instalments on release to assist them to a new start along better lines.

19. Warning is given that the public is becoming critical of overstaffing of army and other officers in Canada; likewise at headquarters overseas.

20. Warning is given that many men who have been in the reserve army for two or three years consider it futile now to spend time at a summer training camp.

21. Warning is given that after the war our continuing organization for reasonable defence precautions should not be permitted to grow into a costly military aristocracy.

[Mr. Gladstone.]

22. Canada occupies a strong position for industrial development of the aforementioned resources through abundant power, an advantageous world location and a virile people. Persons or corporations must not be permitted to gain monopolistic control. The remedy lies within the power of parliament. Maximum industrial progress can be assured best by encouragement to vision and to the pioneering spirit of our people in association with modern science in a system of due recognition of individual initiative and enterprise.

23. Finance is a service for exchange of values and should be made to serve that purpose at fair cost to all. Persons or corporations associated with finance must not be permitted, through interlocking directorates and in other ways, to adopt policies detrimental to the maintenance of employment on a balanced keel as opposed to cycles of prosperity and depression. Again the remedy lies within the powers of parliament. Canada should aim to be financially independent of other countries.

24. Labour, both men and women, merits the praise of the nation for its contribution to the war effort. Canada will be richer with better paid working men supporting more comfortable homes, better clothed and better fed children and an assurance of security if sickness comes or when they can work no longer. I shall support every fair means possible that our workers may have assurance of the four freedoms.

25. Government proposals for security are on a huge and unprecedented scale. Before the present war the total annual expenditures of the federal government for all purposes, including pensions and veterans' allowances, was around $550,000,000. The estimated cost to-day of the far-reaching programme of social security and veterans' rehabilitation as outlined in the speech from the throne approaches $600,000,000. This amount includes, according to forecasts, $300,000,000 for veterans' gratuities, allowances, rehabilitation, et cetera; $150,000,000 for family allowances and $75,000,000 for national health insurance. Additional amounts in various fields will be provided by the provinces. This surely is an answer for those who are wondering if money can be found for needs in peace time as it has been found for war.

26. There is need for establishing better the supremacy of parliament. Why the methods of careful business administration cannot be employed in parliament is more than I can understand. This criticism is directed towards all governments, past and

present, federal and provincial. Perhaps it is that regimentation of members best serves political ends. I call for commitee scrutiny that will reach into places and situations probably unknown to ministers.

27. It must be apparent that I support democracy freed of hidden selfish direction, either from individuals or groups. I take the past, make corrections and build for the future. I stand for fair and equal opportunity for all men to exercise their initiative and their qualities twice beneficially, to themselves and to the nation.

Mr. J. W. BURTON (Humboldt): Mr Speaker, on this, my first opportunity of speaking in this house, I wish to express my appreciation to you and all other hon. members on both sides for the very kind welcome that has been extended to me as a new member.

At the very beginning let me frankly state that one of the main reasons I am here is that last year in Saskatchewan a group of men took it upon themselves to deny to the citizens of that province the democratic right of passing judgment upon the stewardship of their elected representatives, by extending their own term of office without the consent of those whom they govern. Why did not this government exercise its powers of disallowance, when the democratic rights of the citizens of the province of Saskatchewan were interfered with, as promptly as it did when the special privileges of certain financial institutions in the province of Alberta were threatened? Speaking on behalf of the people of the constituency of Humboldt—yes, and on behalf of the majority of the people of Saskatchewan—through you, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the government to disallow that act extending the life of the Saskatchewan legislature, which is one of the darkest blots on the annals of any democratic country. It is the very negation of democracy. Even though it is somewhat late for such action, I contend that the disallowance of this legislation is the least that can be done to remove that blot and to avoid the establishment of a dangerous precedent that might make a farce of our democratic system of government. On Monday, January 31, I was pleased to hear the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) state that he did not approve the idea of parliament extending its own life. I now appeal to him and to his ministers to take the necessary action to restore to the people of Saskatchewan their democratic rights. Some may argue that this government should not interfere in the domestic affairs of any province. In reply I say that the democratic rights of any part of this dominion should be of greater concern to us than the special privileges enjoyed by financial institutions.

There are other reasons why the electors of Humboldt constituency decided that they could no longer support this government. In the past they were prepared to march down the aisle to the altar of political union with the Liberal party to the strains of "Oh Promise Me", but that day is gone The people of Saskatchewan realize that the Liberal record has been a series of broken promises. While any fair-minded person realizes that in these trying times it is most difficult for any group of men to conduct the affairs of government, yet such fairness ceases to be a virtue if the people would continue to tolerate the inefficiency of this administration. When political expediency takes precedence over the safety of our country; when political patronage supersedes justice, then the people demand a change.

The great majority of the people of Humboldt constituency are farmers, and even most of the residents of the towns and villages depend for their livelihood on the purchasing power of the farmers. The greater part of this territory was settled some forty years ago by people of many races and creeds working together in a neighbourly way to carve out of the wilderness homes for themselves and their children. Scarcely had the sod shacks and log houses been constructed in a community before the neighbourhood got together and built a place of divine worship. They had faith in God; they loved their neighbours, and their desire was to have the opportunity to establish homes and raise their families in peace and security. With visions of comfort and security in the years to come, these pioneers cleared and broke large fields and raised enormous crops. Situated on the edge of the park belt, part prairie and part bush land, and dotted with many small lakes, the greater part of this territory never had a complete crop failure. Hundreds of millions of dollars worth of new wealth were produced in grain and live stock. These provident, hard-working people did not squander their money. Their homes are very modest; in fact many are quite inadequate to their needs. Very few made trips to California, and fewer still back to the land of their birth. But after all these years of hard toil, do you find these people enjoying the well-earned comfort and security that they are entitled to? Many are still struggling along, doing work far too heavy for their advancing years. Others have been forced to give up the struggle and eke out a drab existence under the so-called old

age pension, while the great majority of them have only a load of debt to pass on to their children.

When an industrious people cooperate with a bountiful Providence with no better results than these, then there is something wrong somewhere. This may give hon. members some idea of what I mean. From the book "Down North" written by the British High Commissioner for Canada, Right Hon. Malcolm MacDonald, I quote:

> Such people have made Canada. They love the open spaces and their passion is to produce the fruits of the soil. But they sow the seeds also of greater things. Other people come after them and gather that harvest.

Though the right hon. gentleman wrote those lines in describing one small group of people with whom he had come in contact, they are equally descriptive of practically every farming community in western Canada.

Ever since the west has been settled the policies of the two old political parties have made it impossible for the farmer in the west to obtain a just return from the fruits of his labour. In spite of glowing promises, Liberals and Conservatives allowed their friends from other parts—yes, from other lands—to reap the harvest. These pioneers and their descendants still have faith in God. To produce the fruits of the earth is still their passion, but they have lost confidence in this administration.

For the information of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) I can assure him that his Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), with all the resources and help at his command, left no stone unturned in trying to convince the electors of Humboldt constituency that the agricultural policy foisted on the west by this government was in their best interests. But for once the Minister of Agriculture found himself without a band wagon; so that finally in desperation he climbed on to the water wagon. For years the citizens of the town of Humboldt have been in need of an adequate water supply. Water for domestic use is being hauled to the town by tank wagons. For a number of years both the Canadian National Railways and the town council have made extensive but unsuccessful searches for the source of an adequate water supply. Just two days prior to the by-election last August, supporters of the Liberal party, carrying in honey tins samples of water which were alleged to have come in from some test holes several miles out of town, canvassed the town. Their stock-in-trade argument was that they were prepared to admit that the C.C.F. was going to win the constituency, but that the Minister of Agriculture had promised that if only the town of Humboldt would give the Liberal party a majority the necessary funds and the priority for pipes would be made available. The town of Humboldt did give my Liberal opponent a majority, although it is quite true that their former majority of 400 or 500 was cut down to around 30 votes. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the town did give the Liberal party a majority. What I wish to know is this: When is the Minister of Agriculture going to fulfil that promise?

While the citizens of the town of Humboldt were being given the water treatment by the Liberal board of strategy, the Minister of Agriculture's henchmen covered the constituency, promising each community according to its local desires. For example, in some sections they tried to lead the people to believe that an all-out war effort could be entrusted only to a Liberal administration and its supporters, while in other places the argument used was that the Liberal candidate was the one who could get their boys out of the army. However the electors refused to be sidetracked from the real issues, and voted want of confidence in the government, on the following grounds:

1. The failure of the government to protect the democratic rights of our citizens;

2. The hampering of our war effort by allowing the profit motive to dominate the war industries;

3. The refusal of the government to place agriculture on an equitable basis with other essential industries;

4. Failure to solve the man-power problem, and

5. The hampering of our farmers and small business men by unnecessary and bureaucratic restrictions and control.

On this occasion it is not my intention to deal with all these matters, because other hon. members have already dealt with some of them. But, as a farmer, and as the representative of an agricultural constituency, I wish to speak on behalf of the farmers. For a great number of years the farmers, with justification, asked for better grain prices. This was denied them, for one excuse or another. In later years we have been told that we could not have those higher prices because it would break the price ceiling. What the farmers would like to know is why their prices were frozen at less than the cost of production. On the other hand, spokesmen for the Liberal party urged the people that if they wanted a better deal for the west they should send more Liberal members to parliament.

I have been rather busy in the few days I have been in Ottawa, and have not had

time to count the Liberal members from the prairie provinces. However there seems to be quite a number of them, and I have come to the conclusion that my colleague the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bryce) and myself have more influence with the ministers than all these back-bench Liberals put together. The ninth of August had a startling effect upon the administration. It suddenly became aware of the fact that the farmers in the west meant business. Practically over night, ninety-cent wheat became dollar-and-a-quarter wheat. Roughly estimating this year's crop at a little less than 300,000,000 bushels, the farmers are about $100,000,000 better off in this one year alone because the electors of Humboldt and Selkirk refused to be kidded any longer.

There is no reason why that increase in price could not have been made five years ago. During that time the farmers producing grain have been penalized to the extent of at least $500,000,000—and, Mr. Speaker, out in my part of the country that is a lot of money. It would have helped to pay off quite a few mortgages. However I wish to warn the Minister of Agriculture that he and his government have not yet redeemed themselves in the eyes of western farmers. The maximum production of bacon has been seriously jeopardized by the hesitating and inadequate action of the government. The bonus for top-grade bacon hogs recently announced by the minister is just another example of too little and too late. We have heard quite a bit about hogs during the course of this debate. It is not my intention to elaborate on that. On the one hand, my colleague, the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bryce) showed that the producers of hogs were just about being rail-graded out of business supplying the export market. On the other hand, I should like to know about the pork products consumed in this country. Why is the producer of heavy hogs being penalized to the extent that he is? At least, why do not the consumers get the benefit? Do the consumers have the opportunity to buy any of this pork cheaper because it comes from heavy hogs?

Another matter of vital interest to western farmers with which I wish to deal is the unfair allotment of railroad cars for shipping grain. We all realized the urgent necessity during past years of making full use of all available storage space, and we were prepared to co-operate to fill up that space even to the extent of hauling some of our grain to elevators with which we did not want to do business. But having filled that space once, we object most strenuously to being compelled to refill that space time after time and to being denied the opportunity of delivering our grain to our own elevators. For example, at some points in the west, before this quota and car allotment system came into effect, our elevator handled from seventy-five to eighty per cent of the business, where now, through this unfair car allotment system, our volume has been forced down to forty per cent, and in some cases as low as thirty-five per cent. Someone somewhere, with the blessing of this government, has been playing sugar-daddy at our expense to the very interests that are opposed to our cooperatively owned elevators.

The other day I was pleased to hear the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) announce that we were to have more cars allotted to where we needed them. Following that announcement I received a telegram from a man at Humboldt who had made it his business to find out just what the situation was in two municipalities in which there are ten shipping points, and he reports that of these ten shipping points seven are still without sufficient cars to enable them to handle their quota. He sent me a covering letter giving all the details, and after I am through with it I shall be pleased to give the details to the minister.

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): I shall be glad to have them.

Mr. BURTON: Those two municipalities constitute only a small part of my constituency, and Humboldt constituency is only a very small part of the west. When we have seven out of ten shipping points short of cars to handle the quota in only two municipalities, and we have fifty shipping points in Humboldt constituency, what about all the rest? I have not had an opportunity to make inquiries, but I am going to make it my business to do so, and I am going to take the minister at his word and inform him as to every shipping point that is short of cars.

Another thing that alarms me is that the agricultural policies of this government are forcing the family farm out of our national economy. More and more are we being forced on to a mass production basis. The only way the farm family can compete with modern mass production is by the use of the unpaid slave labour of the women and children on the farms. If it were only that the family farm was in danger I would not be so much concerned, but the very existence of the farm family is being severely threatened. Remember, the family unit is the very foundation of our nation, and statistics prove that the farm family is the keystone of our national life.

The family allowance forecast in the speech from the throne, if properly put into effect,

will be of some assistance, but in itself, it cannot preserve the farm family. In addition, with the rest of the people of this country, we are entitled to know if this and the other legislation forecast in the speech from the throne is just another dream by the dreamer of twenty-five years ago.

I should like to say something about the man-power problem, but to deal properly with the man-power muddle we are in would take much more time than I have on this occasion, and I shall have to leave most of my remarks on that subject for some future occasion. I want to say this now, that if the government in their wisdom consider it necessary for the safety of our country to have fewer men on the farms and more men in the army, then let them say so, and then the farmers will know what is expected of them. But the government cannot expect us farmers to continue to produce the amount of foodstuffs which we are asked to produce unless provision is made to retain at least our experienced help.

In addition to that there are many farm boys who have already, I believe, spent sufficient time in the training camps, and who could now be allowed to return home on extended leave, subject to immediate recall in case of emergency. They would be of greater service to their country helping their folks at home than they are at present, kicking their heels around in these camps, with no place to go.

We have stepped up our production to the very limit of our present farm population, and to do that, the farm families are being driven beyond their endurance. Already there are signs of decreased production. This statement is confirmed in a pamphlet "Canada at War", No. 32, of January, 1944, issued by the wartime information board, on page 51 of which a table is shown giving the agricultural output per male farm worker. The table takes 1939 at 100, as a base, and shows that in 1940 and 1941 we had only eighty-nine per cent of our male workers left on the farms; in 1942 and 1943 we were down to seventy-five per cent. On the production side, again taking 1939 at 100, the table shows than in 1940 we produced 105 per cent; in 1941, 112 per cent, and in 1942, 186 per cent. That is a wonderful achievement. But at what a cost! I venture to say that the last three years have taken more than an extra ten years off the life of the average man and woman on the farm.

Now we come to the 1943 estimated production. With only seventy-five per cent of our workers left on the farms, we still produced 160 per cent of the 1939 basis. But we had an alarming drop of twenty-six per cent in our production from that of the previous year. Speaking in the Saskatchewan provincial legislature a year ago, I told the provincial minister of agriculture, who also acted on various boards for this government, that if they continued to drain our boys from the farms we could not meet the production goals set for us. A deaf ear was turned to my warning. But, Mr. Speaker, this table proves that I was right.

The question is, what are we going to do this year? In my opinion we are facing a still greater drop in production, especially in those lines most needed. I want to give just two examples of many which I could furnish right from my own constituency.

I have in mind one couple, a man and woman seventy years of age. They had no children of their own. They raised a nephew. When the war started that lad wanted to enlist. His uncle told him, "O.K.". The lad enlisted, but before he did so he made arrangements with a younger brother to take his place on his uncle's farm. The younger lad and the man proceeded to operate that farm. Right in the middle of harvest and threshing time that boy got his notice, his call, and he had to go—no ifs or buts about it. The old man told me, "Joe, if God continues to give me good health I shall be able to keep the weeds from running away with the farm, but I certainly cannot do the field work and at the same time do the necessary chores, with all this live stock, all these hogs that I have around. The result is," he said, "that they will have to go." That man carried on. I was seriously afraid that he would break down. Finally, this fall, he realized that he had to do what he said a year ago he would have to do; he had to dispose of his live stock. He used to have a considerable amount of live stock on his place, and now he has no more than he needs for himself and his wife. He is keeping the weeds from running away with the cultivated land; that is all, and more than all, he can do.

Another case: a man, who is now seventy-five years of age, for the past two years has stood on a tractor and operated the tractor and a 15-foot combine alone while his boy took the grain away from the combine. On that farm—again—they used to have live stock, hogs whose value ran into hundreds of dollars value every year. But these people could not carry on the other work which had to be done and at the same time do the necessary chores which live stock entails in our part of the country. What these people needed were, not

high school boys and university students some of whom would not know a tractor from a combine, not that kind of help, but boys right from their own neighbourhood who would know how to operate and handle machinery, and which end of a cow to sit down to if they wanted a pail of milk.

Mr. PERLEY: And which side.

Mr. BURTON: I could give you dozens of examples of the same kind. We are going to run shorter and shorter of the very things we need to produce on the farms, because experienced help has been and is continuing to be drained away from us.

People of the Humboldt constituency have always been willing to do their part as citizens of this country. Enlistment records show that descendants of all racial groups in that constituency are serving in the various branches of the armed service while their elders are working and sacrificing to the limit of their ability to help bring about a victorious peace.

Within a short time we shall again be entering that season of the year when we commemorate the sufferings, death and resurrection of the Founder of Christianity. We also think of the sword of sorrow that pierced the heart of the Mother Mary as she stood at the foot of the cross and beheld her Son, the victim of man's wrongdoing, selfishness and greed. To-day for the second time within a quarter of a century the flower of our manhood, the youth of our nation, is being crucified on the cross of world selfishness and greed. What is yet in store for us no one can foretell, but this much is certain, the hardest part is yet to come. Before many months pass, many a mother will stand with her hands clasped to her breast, with a sorrow in her heart that only the mother Mary can understand. In view of this, the least we can do is so to fulfil our duties that these sacrifices and sufferings will not have been in vain.

Mr. H. R. JACKMAN (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, may I first present my compliments to the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne; and may I particularly compliment the hon. member from Rosthern (Mr. Tucker) whose few remarks in French seemed to my untrained ear to be more understandable French than that of those who learned that language at their mother's knee.

Not a word was said in the speech from the throne, however, about the restoration of the supremacy of parliament over the executive. When the War Measures Act became operative by proclamation at the outbreak of war, it was necessary that the executive be given the power to legislate on the most vital matters affecting the life and security of our people. But after nearly five years, what a reflection on this government if it has not so organized the fighting forces and the production front at home that legislation by executive order should still be necessary! In the opinion of our people the executive is now an overholding tenant, tenacious and avaricious of dictatorial power. The exigency and need for haste in executive action without discussion among the people's representatives has long since passed. Surely the time has come when there should be some revision of the War Measures Act whereby the sovereignty of the people's representatives should be restored to them and exercised by them and not delegated to a handful of dictators who, in cabinet council, sit behind closed doors and order our people about as if they were no longer free men.

Typifying the methods of dictatorship of this government, which does not even consult its own mechanical Liberal majority, are the confessions of two Liberal members, one of whom said, in regard to order in council P.C. 9384 regulating wartime wages, "The government is run by a bureaucracy. The members are nothing, and I frankly admit it. If the order had gone through this house it would have been better prepared." And again, in answer to the remark that labour was being used as a guinea-pig for bureaucrats to experiment upon, a Liberal member said, "The members of parliament are dead guinea-pigs. I have never been consulted or called in on these measures. I admit there are powers behind the government and I know who they are." Assuming that the executive may still need emergency powers of dictatorship, does that excuse it for such flagrant abuses of such power? What an affront to the people's representatives! What a mockery of parliament! What a throwing of democracy into the discard!

The house leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) graphically pictured this bureaucracy by pointing out that since September 1, 1939, statutes passed by parliament have covered 838 pages, while proclamations, orders in council, war orders and regulations have required 5,791 pages—seven times as much legislation by executive order as by parliament. The people no longer run their own country. We are no longer a sovereign parliament. The government is a sovereign executive.

Mr. Speaker, very little has been said about that section of the speech from the throne which was undoubtedly inserted as a result of the speech by Lord Halifax. May I, however, correct an observation made by the hon. mem-

ber for Dorchester (Mr. Tremblay) in moving the address. From his knowledge of Lord Halifax's speech—which from his deductions I doubt if he has read, but has on the other hand rather relied on press clippings and editorial comments from his local newspapers—he appears to labour under a misconception of the purpose and content of the speech. Wherein would he find justification for his statement that: "The latest edition of these mysterious travellers is attempting, it seems, to refloat the foundered ship of the imperial federation"; and, again, "to shower upon us instructions which we shall term indiscreet to say the least"?

The people of Canada as well as the people of the whole British empire, indeed the people of the whole world, are acutely concerned with the achieving of an enduring peace. If a distinguished representative from another country accepts our invitation to visit us, surely he is entitled to fulfil the purpose for which he was asked to come, namely, to present worth-while thoughts for our consideration in respect of one of the gravest questions facing mankind.

As to the remarks of the member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker), he seems not to have crept out of his colonial shell, which the rest of Canada has long since left behind. He said:

> So far as I am personally concerned, I feel that we should continue on our course of moving toward complete sovereignty within the British commonwealth of nations.

Does the hon. member think Canada is anything less than a sovereign power and has been anything less for many years, with power to save its national life or to lose it? Rather let me agree with the speech made by the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Gibson) in Hamilton recently, in which he is reported as having said:

> Canada is as much the master of her own foreign policy as is any sovereign state in the world of its same size; but neither Canada nor any state in the world can of course stand alone.

I think we shall admit that there are many small states in the world which have full sovereignty; but there are few if any who, for their own protection, do not find it necessary to move within the orbit of some larger constellation, if not within the orbit of the whole universe itself. I hope no one in Canada will be so ignorant of our true constitutional position as not to know that Canada is a free and independent country. If membership in that great British commonwealth of nations was thought to be any bar to this view, I have only to point to the peculiar and invidious position of the free state of Eire, whose constitution is so closely modeled on our own. While the future lies ahead, our present autonomous position should be plain to all our people. The decision taken at the forthcoming meeting of British commonwealth prime ministers will be far-reaching in its effect, affecting not only the destiny of the British empire but the destiny of the whole world. That decision may result in the strengthening of the forces for peace, or it may result in the beginning of the liquidation of the British empire, the greatest force for peace the world has ever known.

The people of Canada look forward with great interest to the amplification of the following statement in the speech from the throne:

> You will accordingly be invited to approve of Canadian participation in the establishment of an international organization to further national security through international cooperation.

There is little on the international horizon, with the exception of the declaration of principle contained in the Moscow agreement, to indicate what that international organization is likely to be. The failure of the last effort, a failure due in part to the uncooperative and blind policy of our Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), who was adamant in his refusal to apply sanctions to Italy, just as was the United States at an earlier date to support coercive measures with force when Japan invaded Manchuria, leaves little to inspire one with confidence in a new but similar organization. Do we find our own Prime Minister at the present time taking the lead in building up any international organization such as President Masaryk of Czechoslovakia took after the last war? The end we all seek is plain—peace, prosperity and the right to live our own way of life. But I for one have no intention of grasping at the shadow and losing the substance. Our security and trade lie primarily within the British empire, and old friends are best friends. Our propinquity and close relationship to our cousins in the United States can be strengthened, as can the whole world position, through our membership, first, in the British empire, and secondly, in an international organization.

In that brilliant editorial appearing in the Ottawa *Journal* this morning the theme was built around the following quotation: "No sight is more pathetic than to watch the perfect impede the good." Are we to be placed in the position of refusing to give up some aspect of our sovereignty within the British family of nations for our mutual protection and then to be asked to give up that same aspect of sovereignty to some international organization of strangers? If we cannot live as brothers within the British family it is unlikely that we can live happily as an international club. Let us not bask in the idle undertakings of the President of the

United States, who in his Ivy Lea speech before the war undertook to protect Canada from attack when he was unable to protect even his own country. Are we to rely on a big cousin who every time our common liberty is at stake finds himself shot through with the cancer of isolationism? The Royal Navy has always been the protector of the American Atlantic seaboard; and only the constant readiness of that navy—ready, aye, ready—and the unconquerable courage of the Royal Air Force in the battle of Britain have given civilization the chance to preserve itself while the North American continent armed itself for the conflict. Yes, and in those pre lend-lease and pre-mutual aid days we and our United States cousins sent Britain a bill, to the extent of her ability to pay, for keeping the hun from the shores of North America. What a conception of international morality!

Turning to the domestic sphere we find that family allowances have been proposed in order to ensure a minimum of well-being and a closer approach to equality of opportunity to the children of this country. But one wonders why the government proposes this measure at the present time and if it is the intention of the government to implement that proposal immediately. It appears that in the mind of the government it is money that creates this closer approach to equality and this minimum of well-being; but unless the treasury of this country is inexhaustible it may well be that there are more necessary reforms which should be given a priority over family allowances. In estimating the cost of those family allowances, Doctor Charlotte Whitton, one of the foremost sociologists in North America, placed the figure at $400,000,000. We do not find, however, in President Roosevelt's bill of rights any mention of family allowances. He gives other matters concerning social legislation first place. Doctor Whitton has made ten suggestions which should be given consideration before we embark on any scheme of family allowances costing $400,000,000 a year. Doctor Whitton recommends:

1. More adequate protection for children without decent parental guardianship.

2. Custodial care for feeble-minded children, especially girls and young women.

3. Strengthening of family welfare and adult education services.

4. Better housing for rural and urban homes.

5. Electrical power and appliances for rural homes.

6. Better nursing care in all homes.

7. Enlargement of Canadian hospital resources.

8. Improvement of elementary schools in other than urban centres. This, Mr. Speaker, is one of the crying needs of our great country.

9. More free diagnostic clinics.

10. Food subsidies.

Where is the $400,000,000 to pay for family allowances coming from? The people are going to pay for these allowances; for that is the only place where it can come from. The total share of the national income now going to investment income, to those who own government and other bonds, stocks and mortgages, et cetera, is less than ten per cent. If that ten per cent of the national income is where the hon. gentlemen of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation say it is, in great concentrations, then it is obvious to all that with a personal income tax rate which runs up to well over ninety per cent there is practically nothing left after the state gets its take. Since nearly every family holds a government bond or an insurance policy—there are over three million holders of victory bonds in this country—we know that investment income is very widely distributed and it is perhaps not unreasonable to assume that not more than half of it is taken by taxation. Thus, of the ten per cent of the national income going to pay interest or dividends on the capital savings of the people, only half or five per cent would be left after the tax-gatherer has taken his as net income capable of being spent or reinvested. That does not leave very much for the government still to take. Even if capital were drained to the last drop it would not provide funds for more than a fraction of the social security programme outlined by this government.

If it is not obvious to all that the main burden will rest on the great mass of the people of Canada, then they should be told in no uncertain terms; for it is one thing to be delighted with gifts which other people pay for, but quite another thing to have gifts forced on one and then be sent a bill for the same at the end of the month, if the amount is not deducted from the weekly payroll. Is it any wonder, sir, that the president of the trades and labour congress, as well as the congress itself, inveighs against family allowances. Mr. Percy Bengough, president of the trades and labour congress, said:

> The Trades and Labour Congress of Canada has consistently opposed family allowance legislation. We are astounded that the suggestion is being made that workers' income be based on bare living standards to be increased by subsidies from the government according to the number of children.

They know who is going to pay for these allowances, and their fear is that the money

will be collected at the source through some tax on industry, which, in the competitive struggle for world markets, will mean that their wage returns will not be as high as they otherwise would. Money, which is a claim on the goods and services of our fellowmen, does not grow on trees but is created by the sweat of the brain and the brow of the workers of this country, and the workers of this country not only are concerned with getting their fair share of the national income but in most cases prefer to spend that share as they best see fit, rather than to have a paternal government, no matter how well-intentioned, spend their own money for them.

At school one used to hear about the iron law of wages—an outworn economic theory—whereby labour was believed never to receive more than sufficient to maintain itself and to reproduce its kind. Is this government suggesting that that is the best standard of life which it can promise our workers? Labour is entitled to a fair wage, and when I say "fair" I mean that labour is entitled to most of the benefits arising through new ideas and more efficient methods of production. It is sufficient to leave the owners and managers just enough to keep them saving and working their heads off and their hearts out improving the general standard of living. But never let us kill the goose that lays the golden egg; for it is leadership, whether in statecraft, industry or elsewhere, which gives life to the mass. Without leadership we are lost. With fair wages and adequate unemployment insurance to cover any temporary period of unemployment, surely a worker can be paid enough to maintain himself and his family.

Family allowances undoubtedly have their uses, but unquestionably they have their abuses. Where the balance lies I am not prepared to judge at this moment; but if the people who are going to pay for it do not want this piece of paternalism I see no reason why it should be forced upon them.

The Prime Minister suggested that the speech from the throne divides itself naturally into three sections: first, the winning of the war; second, the transitional period from war to peace, and third, the resolutions for social security, presumably in the post-war period. It is important that we should know when the government plans to make operative a scheme such as family allowances, which at a time like the present is wholly inflationary in all its aspects. If one of the chief purposes of our victory loans is to drain off the surplus spending power which cannot be utilized because civilian goods are not available on which to spend it, then surely the pumping back of some hundreds of millions of dollars annually into the hands of the people at this time, through family allowances, will put a pressure on the price ceiling which will blow the lid to kingdom come. Is it any wonder that when the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker), in seconding the address in reply to the speech from the throne, mentioned that the government had found a way of effecting a much needed adjustment in farm income, through various measures for the financial benefit of our farmers, without increasing the danger of inflation, the colour in the face of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) mounted visibly? Perhaps the rosy effusion was for other seasons, but the coincidence was most marked, for no one knows better than the minister the danger of every hand-out to our people, no matter how well justified, is to the price ceiling. Greater than the wrongs which are sought to be remedied is the danger of inflation which may well be brought about by the very means used as a cure for the lesser evil.

When speaking on the need for social security measures I have always expressed the hope that the Christian spirit of brotherhood among our people would be sufficient for them to be willing to introduce such measures as are necessary not only for the protection of those who are less strong but also for the protection of those who may be strong but who, because of the impingement of world events upon our economy, from time to time may suffer hardship. Some forms of social security measures undoubtedly are necessary because of our dependence upon world trade, as the fourth or fifth trading country in the world, and because we cannot be entirely masters of our own economy, whether that economy be capitalism, socialism, fascism or communism.

Let us look first at our whole social security programme. It must be based upon our post-war plans and outlook, just as the Beveridge plan for social security is based on not more than ten per cent unemployment. Instead of enacting social security measures piecemeal, let us sketch the whole canvas before filling in the detail and throwing the whole picture out of balance. Let the people of this country have a look at the total financial commitments they will have undertaken in regard to social security and other measures before they are asked to rush headlong along any one particular field. Health insurance I should consider an exception to this general rule, because the good health of the people not only reflects adherence to a humanitarian principle but is a sound investment.

In the consideration of the over-all financial obligations we are about to undertake, let us have an eye to the means whereby they will be paid for. I have already declared that the great mass of our people are the only source left to bear the major part of the burden; but our people are also concerned with the rate of taxation, not only on themselves as individuals but on themselves as employees of business organizations which must be allowed to live if they are to give leadership in supplying the goods which will raise the standard of living and at the same time create jobs. If the government wishes to consider post-war planning it must consider first what kind of economy we are going to have. If enterprise is stifled through taxation burdens which kill incentive, then it is perhaps better that we should at once lose our freedom and become a totalitarian state rather than suffer a slow, lingering and blood-letting death through a policy which stifles all development and all new employment. In a recent speech Wendell Willkie said:

> When peace comes taxes must be minimized rather than maximized in order to stimulate the flow of goods, the taking of risks and the creation of millions of jobs. We must solve the post-war tax problem, not by imposing the biggest possible rates on our income, but by creating the biggest possible income on which to impose relatively modest rates.

Let the government declare itself so that both small and large business men may know where they stand, so that they may plan for job creation. During the war there has been no need for new industries for the production of civilian requirements which would give our people a more abundant life. Indeed the demands of war production made it desirable that the dead hand of heavy taxation and priorities should be laid upon new business ventures for civilian consumption. With victory that position will change, and the business man must know where he stands if he is to create employment, a field in which he is particularly qualified to give leadership if he is not interfered with by political agencies whether they be of the national or international variety.

Time will not permit me to discuss socialism, but I point out that while this government makes no profession of state ownership of private industry, through its taxation measures not only has it captured one hundred per cent of all war profits of industry, which is perhaps as it should be, but it has cut itself in, through the minimum taxation on any business, to the extent of forty per cent of the average amount which that business earned in the four pre-war years 1936 to 1939. Thus the government takes not only all new profits, but forty per cent of all pre-war profits even if the company is earning less than it did in peace time. And this, Mr. Speaker, goes one better than socialism; for the government bears no risk whatsoever of loss, and at the same time has never put up one cent of the capital which goes into the ownership and creation of those industries. Can business be expected to survive and develop under such conditions as those, under a "heads I win, tails you lose" policy, where there is no reward for the assumption of risk and there is thus no offsetting recovery for the losses which business sustains when the dreams and hard work of businessmen, whether in the field of industry or commerce or in the development of natural resources, go awry and the only dividends are losses?

The reference to the creation of an industrial development bank as a subsidiary to the Bank of Canada in order to provide both fixed and working capital for the conversion of industrial plants has not so far been mentioned in this debate, and I desire to make a few observations before the resolution is brought down or the bill debated. Indeed, while the government often borrows good ideas which are developed by the opposition in the debate on the resolution, it is even better to have suggestions accepted before the administration allows its preconceived notions to crystallize and thus obstruct the acceptance of a major change in principle or organization.

In the post-war period there will undoubtedly be many cases where an intermediate credit bank is both desirable and needed. The reconversion of war industry to peace industry —from production to kill to production to live—will entail many problems and many risks.

Despite the recommendation of the British Macmillan commission of 1931 and the need for such intermediate credit facilities in peace time, no great development ever took place. Being interested in the possibilities of such business in Canada, I called on the managing director of such a company in the city of London in 1937 and came away with the impression that while the idea was theoretically sound, it was practically of little value because of the great amount of time that had to be given to the oversight and operation of the small borrowing companies. In ordinary times it is not likely that the application of more than one borrower in twenty could be accepted. The post-war problem of Canadian industry may well be different and the bank's usefulness to the country in the transitional period from war production to peace production need not be determined solely by the profit motive. The benefit of job

creation may more than offset any losses of such a bank to the public treasury if reasonable business judgment is used.

It was indicated that such a bank will be a subsidiary of the Bank of Canada. May I suggest that there is no possible connection between the kind of credit granted by a central bank and the financing of industrial development. The two types of mind necessary for success of each would seem incompatible. The industrial development bank takes on many of the lesser aspects of an investment planning board. The training of commercial bankers is not such as would normally fit them for the operation of an industrial development bank.

The British Macmillan report said in regard to such banks:

> The best course might be if the leading private institutions and the big banks were to cooperate in creating one or more such concerns. We understand that the creation of the Bankers' Industrial Development Company was due originally to the belief that help in these directions might be given to industry by the City, which was not being given. We have been told, however, that the authorities of the Bank of England consider, as we do, that these are not proper permanent functions for a subsidiary of a central bank. It would seem desirable, therefore, that the Bankers' Industrial Development Company should at a convenient stage be definitely separated from the Bank of England, have an independent existence, and rely upon its profit-making capacity as a private institution. It is possible that it might form a nucleus for that closer cooperation between finance and industry which we think is required.

The judgment required for the extension of credit for machinery and fixed assets requires an entirely different background from that required for either central or commercial banking. There is a much closer affinity with the judgment required of some of the leading personnel of the Department of Munitions and Supply. The proper procedure is to set up an industrial development bank entirely separate and distinct from any existing bank or government department.

Better still, if the government would announce its post-war business tax intentions and restore the life impulse to industry, it might well find that there was no necessity for the establishment of the bank under government auspices with the taxpayers standing the brunt of any losses. If the credits are economically justified they will be self-supporting and will be financed by private capital if the government does not continue its "heads I win, tails you lose" taxation policy in regard to new ventures.

The reconversion of industry must be planned for now, if we are successfully to reestablish 1,500,000 of our best young men and women out of the armed services and war industry. Under proper legislation as to social services, as to supplemental public works when necessary, as to business regulation and as to private incentive, we may look forward to the useful employment of 1,500,000 additional people. With the product of their services added to our present civilian production we may confidently look forward to a better way of life than we have yet known.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MAURICE BOURGET (Lévis): (Translation) Mr. Speaker, before the conclusion of the debate on the address, I should like to make a few brief remarks on some features of the speech from the throne which, in my opinion, are particularly interesting.

I was glad to read that the government recognizes the family and the home as "the foundation of national life" and that "in order to aid in ensuring a minimum of well-being to the children of the nation and to help gain for them a closer approach to equality of opportunity in the battle of life, the members of this house would be asked to approve a measure making provision for family allowances".

That matter was broached long ago and I do hope that the implementing of such a plan will not be indefinitely postponed. For some time, many rumours (which fortunately had no official character) were abroad to the effect that such allowances would be limited to a certain number of children in each family. I have every reason to believe that those rumours are groundless, and that the government will introduce into such a generous, humanitarian and necessary legislation no feature that might bring about a lowering of the birth-rate in this country.

I, for one, will heartily support that measure and I have no doubt that it will apply to all children. Does not that legislation aim at helping the heads of families, and especially those who have many children? At first sight, it is hard to understand any restriction in its application, because the heads of large families are generally those who are most frequently in need of government help.

In some European countries, and especially in England, the authorities having noticed, not so long ago, a steady lowering of the birth-rate and viewing with the greatest concern its direful consequences for the nation, have appointed a commission empowered to

investigate the causes of such a situation and suggest possible remedies. I have no accurate recollection of the recommendations made by that investigating commission set up in England, but I am sure that a measure like the one providing for family allowances was suggested with a view to improving the situation and increasing the birth-rate. I do believe that were the principle of granting allowances—subject to no restriction, of course—adopted in Canada, we would soon notice the advantages of such a measure.

Another feature of the speech from the throne has particularly impressed me. I refer to "the measure to amend and supplement existing housing legislation".

With the hon. members who have already dealt with that matter—and I wish to single out my colleague and friend the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Durocher)—I wish to emphasize the serious problem that exists especially in centres where war industries are to be found. Such towns are now facing a serious housing problem which becomes more acute as the month of May draws nearer.

I know that many of our towns where dockyards are established have experienced a population increase. The housing problem has reached a point where it has become urgent that the government step in to help these municipalities whose financial resources render it impossible for them to solve this problem brought about by the war.

I have already, on many occasions, in the course of a year or so, discussed this deporable condition with some ministers, especially those from the vicinity of the city of Quebec. They are showing some interest in this matter and I hope my efforts will have practical results. Because of the urgency and importance of the conditions obtaining, I wish to call this matter to the attention of the house.

It seems to me that the government should help these municipalities by granting subsidies that would allow persons who will be without a home next May to start building houses immediately. It may be said that the war will soon be over and that the towns will then have a number of unoccupied houses. I do not hold that view for, in my opinion, many of the people who have moved from rural districts during the last four or five years, to work in our cities, will stay in urban centres after the war and it will naturally be necessary to find hygienic and comfortable houses for them.

Another plan that might be considered by the government would be that of granting loans at a small interest, 1½ or 2 per cent, for example, in order to make it easier for those of small means to get the funds necessary for the construction of dwelling houses. It might be advisable to set up an organization that would work and cooperate with the municipalities and individuals concerned.

In view of the urgent need of solving this problem, the government should see that such an organization is set up immediately to ensure that we shall not have to face a serious condition at some future date. Besides fulfilling an urgent need, such a measure would be very commendable from the social point of view, and, what is more, would help to increase the number of small property owners which unfortunately is at too low a figure. I hope the government will soon introduce a bill to remedy this evil or submit to the municipalities concerned some project in this connection.

Another matter on which I wish to dwell particularly, is the labour question, since I have the honour of representing in this house a constituency, peopled mostly by workers, in fact, it is probably the best labour constituency.

Since the beginning of the war, we have unfortunately witnessed strikes and disputes of all kinds between employer and employee. I do not wish to be unfair to anybody, but, during the last few years, in the course of which I have been more closely associated with both employers and employees, I have been led to believe that the cause of all these misunderstandings do not originate exclusively from faulty legislative measures, but, above all from the lack of cooperation between industrial leaders and workers and mutual mistrust.

I am sorry to have noticed so often that some industrial leaders, trying at all cost to keep the workers in the virtual state of slavery—if I may so express myself—which existed before the war, do not seem ready to abandon this method and will neither trust the leaders of trade unions nor cooperate with them for the purpose of improving their relations and thereby increasing production in their industries.

I should now like to point out that I do not claim the workers are always right, but I simply wish to mention what struck me during my interviews with company officials and workingmen, ever since I have had the honour of representing the constituency of Lévis in this house.

It is quite logical to say that good legislation naturally helps to promote better relations between capital and labour, but I can state confidently that it remains ineffective until these two classes have developed good understanding and mutual trust.

To my mind, the worker should be reasonable in his claims, and should work to the extent that his employers expect of him; on the other hand, the employers should show greater fairness in dealing with the workers and treat them not as hirelings but rather as collaborators and devoted servants.

I wish to state here that I am in favour of private enterprise. On the other hand, I warn those who are most vitally concerned in the maintenance of this system after the war to change some of the methods which they are using at the present time; otherwise, they will compel our leaders to exercise a more rigid control over these industries so that better understanding may prevail in our industrial undertakings.

I take this opportunity to call the attention of the government, and especially of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) upon the administration of the various laws under his department. I have found that there was a lack of supervision in the administration of these laws. Commercial firms appear to have too much latitude, and they interpret in their own way, and frequently to their advantage, of course, the various measures passed by the government.

Such methods naturally breed discontent within the labouring classes. Sometimes blatant injustices are committed and the government has no opportunity to intervene. I understand that the Industrial Relations Branch, which comes under the Department of Labour, is doing excellent work in this field. Unfortunately, it is inadequately staffed, and the adjustment of the grievances which are too frequently reported is unduly delayed. I have personally found that certain grievances have remained unsettled for two or three months due to the fact that this particular branch of the Department of Labour was short of inspectors.

I would therefore ask the Minister of Labour to see to it that his staff is increased so that any misunderstandings which may arise may be adjusted with as little delay as possible.

In "Facts and Figures" published by the wartime information board, I read recently that:

> On January 21, 1944, the honourable Minister of Munitions and Supply and the honourable Minister of Labour released a joint statement announcing the recent establishment by order in council of an industrial cooperation board, entrusted with the duty of assisting and promoting the appointment of labour-employer joint committees in war industries.

Personally I am in favour of the setting-up of such a board. Production committees have already been organized in some industries. Representatives of both employers and employees sit on these committees. Unfortunately—and here again, due to the lack of confidence and good will between employers and employees—these organizations have proven ineffective. The employees, realizing that the suggestions which they were making in order to increase production and reduce costs, were not put into practice, simply discontinued, in some cases, to sit on such production committees.

Under the circumstances, the government's purpose in appointing such a commission is praiseworthy, but I hope that the new body will be able to function properly. Otherwise that new commission will not achieve results such as we might expect from it.

I wanted to make those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, not for the mere purpose of criticizing private companies, but rather to help in the improvement of the relations between capital and labour.

I should like to say a few words on another matter; I know that we shall have an opportunity to discuss it when the budget is brought down, but, in passing, I request again the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) to remove the tax on the salary paid for overtime.

I sincerely believe that the amount collected by the government in the form of such a tax is not very large and that the removal of the tax would greatly enhance production. As a matter of fact, everyone realizes that such a tax has the effect of discouraging workers from doing any overtime.

Last year the Minister of Finance had promised that he would look into that matter. I hope that, when the next budget is brought down we shall have the pleasure of learning that such a tax will no longer hinder war production.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I say a word about immigration? In my opinion that subject should be dismissed, at least for the time being, because its discussion proves useless.

We have noticed for some time past that some war plants were laying off thousands of employees on account of the lack of work. Therefore, nothing should be done that might increase the unrest and bring us back to the pre-war depression years. Before any immigration plan is considered, all our people who are physically fit should be given an opportunity to obtain work. Once the employment problem is solved, the immigration question can be considered, a wise selection being made as regards those accepted as new citizens of this country.

In that particular, we shall not be influenced by those pilgrims who come here

every year to deliver speeches and teach us lessons. We are old enough to take care of ourselves, and I hope that authoritative advice along those lines will be imparted to such people.

Such, Mr. Speaker, are the few observations I wanted to make in this debate. Before resuming my seat, I should like to express the opinion that, when this war is over, the new world which will emerge will not be entirely free from poverty, hardship and anxiety. Nevertheless, with the help of the new beneficial legislation which is imperative and which will be administered with equal fairness to all classes of society, I hope we will be able to bring about and maintain a better understanding, which will be all to the good of the country. May this disastrous war soon come to an end, and may the good days of a beautiful and intense family life be restored to all homes which at present stand empty.

Mr. S. H. KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the speech from the throne has been hailed by the section of the press that supports the government as a remarkable document, full of promise for a better day. We of this group welcome its few good points, but we are in duty bound to point out its serious shortcomings. Our criticisms of the speech are in the main two. First of all we are skeptical lest the government fail to reduce the proposals contained in the speech to actual legislation to be enacted before this session ends. Our second criticism is one that we feel is shared by the entire country, namely, that the suggestions in the speech do not begin to go far enough. They do not even scratch the surface of the tremendous problems facing us at the present time.

To turn for a moment to our first criticism, our scepticism as to whether anything will be done following the giving of this speech, let me call attention first of all to the kind of language in which the speech abounds. One paragraph starts something like this, that "in the opinion of my ministers," and so on, "plans . . . . should be advanced as rapidly as possible." Plans should be advanced! Further, certain things "are contemplated." We suggest, Mr. Speaker, that language of that kind, in the face of the tremendous problems which we had hoped would be dealt with in the speech from the throne, is adequate ground for our scepticism as to whether anything will come of this speech. Surely the phrase, that "a broad programme has already been developed for the reestablishment of veterans," sounds hollow after the remarks of other members, particularly the speech yesterday by the hon. member for Vancouver North (Mr. Sinclair). I find that another paragraph states that "the maintenance of full employment will require"—and a long list of things is given—but no suggestion is made as to how these requirements are to be met. There is another paragraph, to which attention has already been called from this corner, that states: "When suitable agreements are reached with the provinces, my ministers will be prepared to recommend" measures for social advancement.

Not only are we led to be sceptical by this language in the speech from the throne, but we take that position because of what has happened during the course of this debate. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), who usually speaks at considerable length in this debate and deals in detail with the items in the speech from the throne, surprised us this year by delivering a rather brief speech, by dealing hardly at all with the speech from the throne, and by failing completely to touch upon the paragraphs that suggest social security and other measures of post-war advancement. Not only has the Prime Minister failed to give us any dissertation concerning this glorious document, but not another member of the cabinet has risen in his place to outline for us the glories of the speech or to sell to us the proposals and the promises that are suggested in it.

We are told to-day that it is the desire of the government that the vote be taken on the address to-night. I assume it will be taken to-night or not later than to-morrow, and yet up to this point neither the Prime Minister nor any other member of the government has dealt with the suggestions in the speech from the throne which have excited the interest of the Liberal press throughout the country.

We are quite convinced that the speech, even if its suggestions were to be enacted, does not go far enough, and it is really a bitter disappointment to the people of Canada at this time. Canadians everywhere realize, whether the government does or not, that once victory has been won, there will be required on that day for Canadians almost two million jobs. We suggest therefore, whether that day is soon or even not so soon, that it is high time that some proposals were set forth to deal with that basic requirement of almost two million jobs for Canadians when victory in the field has been won. It is on the background of that basic need that we feel that the speech is a bitter disappointment.

The times call for a really broad plan that will provide jobs, certainly not just for the sake of jobs, but that will also provide for meeting the post-war needs of our people, for seeing to it that our workers and farmers are given a chance to provide the things that are needed and also a chance to enjoy them when

they are provided. We suggest that in the fields that are basic, housing, clothing and food, there should be enunciated at this stage plans that will provide for the employment of our people and in turn for the distribution of these things among our people for their enjoyment.

This war has taught us among other things the importance of the market here at home, and the needs and requirements of our own people. We have learned that particularly in the matter of food. We have discovered that whereas before the war we had huge surpluses, while some of us were pointing out that thousands of our people were underfed, now even with our productive resources in food being strained to the limit we are able to make use of all that we are producing because our people, in city and country alike, have better incomes and are able to translate their needs into an actual economic market for food. We suggest that, important as international trade is, valuable as it can be to the economic welfare of our country and to the countries with which we trade, the important thing is to see to it that we pay attention to the market to be found in the needs of our own people. It is on that basis that we are highly critical of the speech from the throne brought down in this critical year, at this critical stage of our history, with these tremendous problems facing us, with the experience of the war, in which we have learned what can be done by national organization, yet with no suggestion that the government is prepared to institute economic planning in such a way as to provide jobs for our people and the things that our people need.

I should like to say a few words, Mr. Speaker, in connection with social security, to which there are references in the speech from the throne, but no promises of any measure except the measure relating to family allowances. This measure has been brought in along with a restrictive labour policy, P.C. 9384. This government's labour policies have made organized labour wonder whether this otherwise desirable social service is being brought in simply as a substitute for an adequate wage policy. Apart from that one measure, the other references to social security which are found in the speech from the throne are so many pious promises and suggestions as to what should be done, what is contemplated and so on. The fact is that social security can only be provided adequately if we have an economy that is functioning to its maximum capacity. I do not wonder that the ministers have not risen in their places to discuss the speech from the throne. There is nothing definite there to discuss along the line of social security and post-war social progress. When they do start to discuss these plans and suggestions for social security they will have to give us some hint or at least answer questions as to how such schemes are to be provided and maintained. The fact of the matter is, if we are prepared to establish economic planning and social ownership of the basic means of production so that we can put our economy on a full-fledged basis, then literally there is nothing in the field of social security that we cannot provide if we have a mind to. The question of how it is to be paid for largely disappears. We of this group have pointed out again and again that social security is not something that is to be had for nothing. It has to be paid for; but the real cost of social security, like anything else that a community has and enjoys, is to be found in the labour that people expend and in the raw materials we use. We have these things in this country, vast labour power, tremendous resources of raw materials. We are asking in the name of the better world for which this war is being fought that there now be given us a plan to put these things together so that we may have a full-fledged economy, jobs, homes, food, clothing, and on top of that a social security programme adequately maintained and guaranteed because of a proper basis in that kind of economy. That is the reason for the amendment moved by the leader of this group, which we are supporting, an amendment which points out that the government has failed to propose the fundamental social changes and economic planning which are necessary if we are to have full employment and if we are to provide and maintain adequate social security.

I should like to turn to something else that is along the line of social security. Apart from the fact that the speech from the throne makes only pious references to social security; apart from the fact that no basis has been provided for sustaining an adequate programme of social security, I should like to say to the government that if it wishes the country to think that it means business in the field of social security and care of our people in time of need, there are certain steps that the government can take without any further delay. I mention first of all old age pensions. It has already been demonstrated that the government can take action to make changes with respect to old age pensions, even changes with respect to the amount that is paid, by order in council, without seeking amendments to the old age pensions legislation. It has done so by raising the maximum amount payable

to $25 a month. I urge again that members of the government realize that it is ridiculous, if not criminal, to ask our old people in this day and age, under living conditions as they are to-day, to try to exist on $25 a month. If I were to suggest that the Prime Minister, who will reach the age of seventy this year, should try it, I would be told that that is a ridiculous suggestion. I would be reminded that the Prime Minister has made a tremendous contribution to the well-being of Canada. Granted, but that is exactly the point we are making. When our old people from coast to coast have reached the age of seventy they, too, have made a contribution to the welfare and to the well-being of this country, a contribution on the basis of which they deserve something better than $25 a month. Not only should the amount be raised to $30 or $40 a month, but the age limit most certainly ought to be lowered. If the government wants to argue that it should not do some of these things without bringing the matter before parliament, my first reply is, bring it before parliament and it will receive support without any question, I am sure, from all sides of this house.

But apart from that there are certain other things that the government could do without delay. Let me give a few details. According to the old age pensions legislation as it now stands a pensioner qualifies for his pension either on the day that he becomes seventy years of age or on the day that the old age pension authority in the province has received all of the necessary documents, whichever of those dates is the later. This means that in many a case an old age pensioner who was entitled to draw his pension from the day he was seventy years of age, must wait two or three months because of that technicality. I happen to know that some of the provincial governments have appealed to this government to change that regulation. I suggest that this should be done without delay.

Another point is that the act and the regulations as they now stand say that if a person becomes seventy—let us assume in this case the other qualification about getting all the papers in is in order—on the 1st day of March, he will draw his pension as from the 1st day of March; but if seventy years ago the stork was two or three minutes late, so that a person becomes seventy on the 2nd day of March he does not draw his pension until as from the 1st day of April. There is no proportioning of the amount at all. I know that many a pensioner becomes utterly disillusioned when he comes up against this fact, that he loses twenty-seven, twenty-eight or twenty-nine days of his pension, merely because he was not born on the first day of the month.

There is another thing that bothers these people—and I stress these things, Mr. Speaker, because it seems to me that this is the point of contact of many people with the government, and it is on the basis of this contact that people form their opinions about political democracy and government. I think it is highly important that we refrain from disillusioning and discouraging people in this way. Here is the case of a man who turned seventy in the month of December and became eligible for his pension as from January 1 of this year. Last year, when he was not on pension, despite his years and ill health he picked up $80 by doing odd jobs. This year there is no chance of his earning any money whatever, because of the condition of his health, but because he earned $80 last year the old age pension authority has to rule that he may earn $80 this year, which is $15 more than he is allowed to earn in addition to his pension in the province of Manitoba, so that the $15 or $1.25 a month is subtracted from his pension. Actually this man is not making any money this year, and will not make any; but when the year is over he will have no chance as long as he lives to pick up that meagre $15 that was deducted from his pension.

I might go on with other cases. I stress the point that this sort of thing is disillusioning to many people, and it is on this basis that many people form their opinion of democracy. It is high time that changes were made in the regulations respecting old age pensions.

Other matters that should be dealt with are the regulations concerning the transfer of property, liens on property, and all that sort of thing, which have made old age pensions only pre-death loans. I shall take only a sentence to refer to the blind, the deaf and other handicapped people. I support most heartily the appeal which has been made in this house on several occasions by the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Esling) that Canada do something more for these people.

I wish to say a word also on behalf of the veterans of the last war and their widows. I agree with the appeals that have been made during this debate on behalf of those being discharged from the services at the present time and those who will have to be demobilized when the war is over, but at the same time we must not forget the veterans of the last war and their widows. To my way of thinking the pension legislation, as well as the War Veterans' Allowance Act, needs to be overhauled. I know the story that is told of how generous this legislation is in many cases; but those I run up against appear to have attached to them strings of one kind or another by reason of which the veteran who has

offered his life for his country finds that, though his later days are ruined as far as health is concerned, he can get nothing but a cold refusal on the ground of some technicality. Therefore I appeal for an overhauling of the Pension Act and the War Veterans' Allowance Act.

Similarly I want to make a further appeal on behalf of the widows of veterans of the last war. These do not form a very large group; politically they are not of special consequence in any particular constituency, but they deserve better treatment than we are giving them. The other day we welcomed the announcement by the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) of a possible increase in the amount paid to these women. I call attention to the fact, however, that as yet this increase to $30 and a few cents a month has not been made basic for all these widows; the order in Council merely says that they may be paid up to that amount. I hope that order in council will be amended shortly by another that will make this amount, if not more, the basic payment to these widows. When this matter was before the house last year the minister promised or at least told us that while at that time we were only voting an item of money, this year he hoped to bring down legislation to care for these people on a permanent basis. I had hoped there might be some reference to such legislation in the speech from the throne, or by the minister if he took part in this debate, but as yet there has been no reference to it. Another point in connection with widows of veterans of the last war is that when the amount payable to them was increased the other day the ceiling on the total income they might have was not increased, except in the case of those who might have up to $25 a year of unearned income. The widow who in the past may have supplemented her allowance with a little money that she earned by going out and doing odd jobs may do so no longer, because the new regulation provides that she may receive up to $365 a year from the war veterans' allowance board provided she has no other income. In other words, the ceiling, apart from unearned income, is exactly where it was before this increase was made. I appeal as strongly as I can to the Minister of Pensions and National Health and to the government to take these matters under serious advisement.

While on the subject of the widows I would stress also the difficulties we have been running into in connection with the provision that nothing can be given to the widow of a veteran unless that veteran saw service in an actual theatre of war. Does the minister not know that there are scores if not hundreds of widows whose husbands got to England in the last war, some of whom were injured while on active service in England, but to whom nothing is available because of the definitions contained in the order in council? I appeal for the withdrawing of that line of distinction, which is working out as an unjust discrimination against a large number of these women.

I should like to turn for a moment or two now, Mr. Speaker, to the new wartime wages control order, order in council P.C. 9384. There is no reference to this order in council in the speech from the throne except the oblique reference to the necessity of maintaining wage stabilization. On the second day of this session, when I asked the Prime Minister if he would set aside a period for discussion of this order, he expressed doubt as to my inference that there was wide and active protest against it. I am sure he now knows that there is wide and active protest, for it has been expressed frequently on the floor of this house and the matter has been drawn to his attention in statements by members supporting the government not only in the house but even more bluntly outside the house, within the past few days. The reasons for labour's opposition to this order are well known. First of all there is the failure on the part of the government to consult labour before this order in council was brought down. There is also the fact that labour's representation on the national war labour board has been reduced from one in three to one in six Then there is the fact that the order makes possible the freezing of gross injustices, practically in so many words; for it is provided that nothing can be done about changing wage rates unless there are gross injustices or inequalities, and even then nothing can be done by way of raising those rates if that would increase the price of the product the manufacturer has to sell. The order also gives power to the national war labour board to reduce wages, to order a change from a time rate to a piece rate or, in that very lovely phrase of the order, an incentive rate. Then there are the provisions which are so drastic against labour's last resort, the strike weapon, and the other provisions which run so counter to British justice and which already have been brought to the attention of this house. I refer to the clauses which place the onus of proof of innocence upon the accused employee.

There is just one good thing about this order. It has united labour; it has shown labour the utter inability of a capitalist government to treat labour as a partner even in time of war. One hears rumours of

various kinds around the halls of these buildings. I have been interested in the rumours that are circulating to the effect that the government may yet rescind this order and replace it with one not quite so drastic. Whether there is anything to these rumours or not, I do not know; but I certainly hope the government will do something in response to the appeals and protests, and that they will do it early, certainly before February 15 which, according to the terms of the order, is the date upon which it comes into full effect.

I should like now to turn to another matter to which reference was not made in the speech from the throne, but which was introduced into the debate by the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson). I refer to the question of post-war civil aviation. The other day the hon. member roundly condemned the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) for refusing a licence to certain private interests which wanted to operate a service between Halifax and Saint John. I take the opposite view from the hon. member for York-Sunbury, and in this instance I am going to commend the Minister of Munitions and Supply for his action. I say quite frankly that my reason for offering my commendation is that I learned from an editorial in the Montreal *Gazette* that the private enterprise which sought the licence was none other than the Canadian Pacific Air Lines.

But while I commend the minister for his action in that instance, I am afraid I have no option but to follow my commendation with condemnation of the government for its action, particularly in the north and northwest, by means of which it is literally giving away to this privately-owned concern, Canadian Pacific Air Lines, something that is of great value to us—our northern country. Speaking in terms of aviation, the value of our great north country is obvious, as far as international flying is concerned. I should like, too, to stress the fact that there is also in that area great value domestically. There is a tremendous amount of mineral wealth in that great north country, and possibilities for settlement beyond our dreams. Yet at the present time, the air being practically the only means of communication with that country, we are literally giving it over to this privately-owned enterprise which, incidentally, has a very interesting tie-up with the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, in the matter of aviation there is no such thing as private enterprise. Private enterprise in flying would mean that every individual concern would build its own airports, would establish its own meteorological services, would set up its own radio beams. What a hodge-podge we would have! Under such a set-up where would there be safety for the travelling public in this new means of transport?

Hon. members know what has been done. The people of Canada through their government, and rightly so, have invested huge sums of money—I believe our investment is now at least $200,000,000, if not more—in the building of airports, lighting facilities, radio, meteorological services and the like. Actually, flying is a public service which the public, through government funds, has to make possible. I call as my witness for this view none other than one of the former leaders of the Conservative party in this house, the Right Hon. R. B., now Viscount, Bennett. Hon. members who were in the house in those days or who have studied the debates for 1937 will recall that when the Trans-Canada Air Lines bill was before the house the then Right Hon. Mr. Bennett appealed to the government not to give away something then held by the people of this country. As a matter of fact it appears that he was able to exert some influence upon the government at that time. I call not only Viscount Bennett as witness, but also the Winnipeg *Free Press,* which has been quite definite on this point. Although I have not time to quote from it, I have before me an article which appeared in that newspaper on May 12, 1943, entitled "TCA versus CPA". The *Free Press* points out that so far as flying on main line and international lines is concerned, there is simply no such thing as private enterprise. The people have a basic interest and concern in this matter, which must not be given away.

We should realize that aviation can add tremendously to the wealth of Canada. It is not just a matter of having planes available for the use of a few individuals who need to make a quick trip. Planes, like trains, can add to the wealth of our country and the people in it, even though many of those people may never travel by plane. We must see to it that the wealth which can be added to the life of this country by this new means of transportation and communication is not given away to private enterprise, and I appeal to the Minister of Munitions and Supply, whom I have already commended for his action in one respect, to take this matter under serious advisement, lest we find that we have given away something which should be held for the people of Canada.

If I may add just one further word in this connection, I would mention the international

field, concerning which I feel the government of the day should take certain steps. This is a matter of great importance to Canada. Frankly, if private monopolies in various countries are able to put over the idea of what is miscalled freedom of the air, so that private companies are free to fly anywhere and everywhere, Canada stands to lose. If we go to the other extreme and build a fence around each country, so that the national lines of various countries can fly only within their own borders, again Canada stands to lose. There is one basis upon which Canada stands to gain. The one basis upon which our geographical position, valuable as it is, will not be circumvented, is in international control of the international air routes of the world.

In that connection I wish to refer to an announcement made by the Australian High Commisisoner to Canada on January 24, in which he drew the attention of this country to an agreement signed on January 21 of this year by representatives of the governments of New Zealand and Australia. Let me quote one or two of the more important paragraphs of this New Zealand-Australian agreement:

(17) The two governments agree that the regulation of all air transport services should be subject to the terms of a convention which will supersede the convention relating to the regulation of aerial navigation.

(18) The two governments declare that the air services using the international air trunk routes should be operated by an international air transport authority.

There are in the agreement other sections of equal importance. I have not time to read them, but I am earnestly hoping that at an early date the government will take a stand similar to that which these two governments have taken, lest Canada find herself, despite our present favoured geographical position, out in the cold.

In closing, I understand the vote may be taken to-night or to-morrow. Our subamendment, coming first, will naturally have the support of this group, to a man, because we believe that it expresses what is basically missing from the speech from the throne. We believe it expresses the view of the people of Canada that the time has come for fundamental social and economic change.

If, perchance, our amendment is defeated, we come then to the Progressive Conservative amendment. We are not satisfied with it; that is why the leader of this group moved a subamendment. However, it states some things which are very obvious. Boiled down, the substance of the Progressive Conservative amendment states that the government has failed. Well, that is fairly obvious, so that we shall support that amendment as well.

If, perchance, that amendment is likewise defeated, and we are left with the address itself, then we have no option but to accept it, not because we are satisfied with the speech from the throne, by any means, but because we feel that at this stage of the game, surely anything less would be unthinkable. If the proposals which the government has made in the speech from the throne are endorsed by a vote in this house to-night or to-morrow, and if it does not want them to backfire, I suggest that the government not merely be content with pious promises but consider seriously reducing these proposals into legislation to be enacted before this session ends.

I suggest also that the government without any delay rescind the obnoxious order in council, P.C. 9384, and replace it with a democratic labour policy.

I suggest also that the government do something without further delay on behalf of the groups I have mentioned, the aged, the blind pensioners, the widows of veterans of the last war, the veterans themselves of the last war, those who are being discharged from the services now, and others who would be covered by a social security programme. Even then it would only be scratching the surface. Even then a great deal would be left for succeeding governments to do, and we shall leave it to the people to say what government shall succeed the present one. But if we are to win not only the war but the peace, surely the present government should do nothing less than to meet the requests that we of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation have set forth in this debate.

Mr. ANTHONY HLYNKA (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, the speech from the throne rightly emphasizes the fact that the winning of the war remains the first objective of the Canadian people. No government and no Canadian can hold any other view so long as we are engaged in this struggle; for despite the fact that we are now in the fifth year of the war no one seems to be any too certain that the war's end is anywhere in sight. For that reason I heartily concur in the statement made in the speech from the throne concerning the prosecution of the war.

Post-war reconstruction can be divided into three distinct phases. The immediate phase will be the gradual demobilization of the armed forces; the intermediate phase will be the period of reconstruction and rehabilitation, and the third phase will be the long-range planning of our economic development.

Before dealing with these three phases I assert, after listening to the numerous speeches which have been delivered in this house during the last few days, that neither will a reactionary philosophy satisfy the needs of the Canadian people in the post-war period nor will the philosophy of the extreme left satisfy those needs. No one would argue that the people of Canada would stand for the reactionary philosophy of pre-war days or that it would be fair and just to our people. On the other hand, no one will tell us that everything that has been built up over centuries of progress must be thrown overboard and something else substituted in its stead, although, of course, the advocates of that philosophy seem to be certain that it would work like a charm.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: Social credit?

Mr. HLYNKA: Social credit is one philosophy that can solve the problems of this nation, yes.

Mr. HOMUTH: And it is not as vicious as some philosophies.

Mr. HLYNKA: I repeat, reaction will not satisfy the needs of the Canadian people in the post-war world, nor will the other extreme do it. But we of the Social Credit group believe that there are many good things which must be preserved, things which have been handed down to us over the ages. On the other hand, we believe that some change is absolutely necessary. We believe that reform is essential. We believe that our proposals with respect to the supply of purchasing power for our people will solve the problems before us.

But, as I said, the immediate post-war problem will be that of demobilization and the transition from war-time to peace-time production. Undoubtedly this will be a period of confusion. Our industries will have to be readjusted and our factory workers and war-time civil servants will have to be assisted in finding profitable occupations. Our returned soldiers must be reestablished in our national life and be guaranteed allowances as well as gratuities. What is more, they must be guaranteed security.

Canadian agriculture must be placed upon such a basis as to guarantee to the farmer a fair standard of living. It must be remembered that one-third of our total population is engaged in agriculture.

Our aged people must also be provided for. No longer must the Canadian people tolerate the conditions which existed in the past and which still exist with respect to our old age pensions. Reference has been made by a number of hon. members to the fact that the amount of the old age pension is inadequate. A great number of people with whom I come in contact and who have asked my assistance in this matter are in their late sixties, and some of them are in such a state of health that they cannot possibly make their own living. Yet these Canadian pioneers, as the law stands today, are not entitled to receive the old age pension just because they do not happen to be seventy years of age. I feel that that is an extreme injustice to our pioneers. I consider that anyone at the age of sixty or over who is physically incapable of making a living should be granted an old age pension.

Then let me mention our youth. On numerous occasions I have read statements in the newspapers that young people between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one should not be granted the right to vote because they are immature, their judgments are immature, and it is best in a democracy to let them grow up to the age of twenty-one before they are given an opportunity to vote. But I would point out that it is these young men who were called upon first to serve this country in time of war. I know that some individuals in certain quarters are afraid that these young men will be too impulsive, that they may not accept the same old promises in the same spirit as those who carry heavier responsibilities, or something of the like. But I maintain that after this war our young people of the age of eighteen and over should be allowed to vote.

Mention has been made of the condition of the blind and other individuals who through physical incapacity cannot look after themselves. If we are a civilized nation we should so amend the existing legislation as to provide pensions for these unfortunate people, regardless of their age. This is something which we should do immediately.

In my opinion the period of post-war reconstruction will find us unprepared. I believe that the promises which are being made almost daily, and so liberally, will amount to very little and will bring results which will greatly disappoint our people.

I do not intend to deal to-night with the subject of rehabilitation of our fighting men; I hope to have an opportunity to discuss that particular subject on another occasion. But I wish to say something with regard to agriculture.

We have come to a point where every political group in Canada should state its policy clearly to the people. No longer must political parties aim at catching votes in confusion. Every group should take its stand on all important problems, giving the people

the opportunity democratically to choose that philosophy which they believe will give them the results they desire.

I have touched so far on the first phase of post-war reconstruction. The second phase is the intermediate period of reconstruction and rehabilitation. I know that in the speech from the throne industry is promised considerable assistance. Personally I have nothing against that; I believe that it is a proper stand to take. This is what the speech says:

> Suitable peace-time uses for war plants are being sought, and plans are being made for their speedy conversion. To assist in the conversion of war plants and in the development of small and medium-scale industrial enterprises, the provision of additional credit facilities, for both fixed and working capital, will be required. To meet this need, your approval will be sought for the establishment of an industrial development bank as a subsidiary of the Bank of Canada. Expenditures on developmental work, in preparation for the transition of industry from war to peace, will be encouraged by suitable tax modifications.

Now let me read the promise which is given to our farmers. This is all I can find in the entire length of the throne speech:

> To ensure economic stability for agriculture, you will be asked to make provision for a price floor for staple farm products.

Nothing else is said about agriculture. Let me emphasize that I have no doubt that the present government will assist industry when it comes to the period of adjustment, the period when concerns will have to change and tune up for peace-time production. With this policy I agree. But why not give the same consideration to our farmers? Why should the farmers be penalized to the extent that they are actually ignored? The only thing that is promised to them is a floor under agricultural prices—a floor! What that floor will be, no one knows; it may be fair, it may be poor. No mention is made of other problems which face agriculture. Let us see to it that the government offers the farmer something which will make farming a profitable occupation.

If one were to analyse the attitude throughout the years of our federal governments toward agriculture, it would be found that they have failed agriculture in every respect. In my opinion at least five things should be guaranteed to agriculture. I mentioned that one-third of our total population is engaged in this calling; surely they deserve a more sympathetic consideration than is being given them by the government.

The forecast which is made in the speech from the throne is only a straw in the wind. The farmer should be guaranteed parity prices which will ensure to him the income he needs to buy the things that are necessary for the maintenance of a decent standard of living. Unless agriculture receives an adequate income, no one can possibly expect the farmer to be able to pay his debts, to educate his children, to carry on efficiently and, in addition to that, to put by the odd cent for a rainy day. Under those conditions that is an utter impossibility. The farmer must have an adequate share of the national income.

In the second place, a definite long-range policy in regard to grain and live stock production should be introduced. As it is to-day —and many hon. members have referred to it—the farmer gets by day in and day out, but he does not know what order he may expect from the government.

In the third place, a comprehensive scheme of non-contributory crop insurance is necessary. I say that many farmers in the west have suffered greatly because of the odd bad year, because of frost, hail and other hazards of nature, and it takes the farmer years to get back on his feet again. Surely the government is in a position to give the farmers a non-contributory insurance.

In the fourth place, there should be adequate low cost credit facilities for agriculture. We know that agriculture needs assistance at all times. Every business man who wants to carry on his business effectively needs credit, and the same is true of the farmer. What has happened? We find that in the province of Quebec credit has been supplied to the farmers over a long period of years at six and seven per cent; in Ontario it has been supplied at five per cent. In the prairie provinces, on the other hand, the farmer has had to pay from five to twelve per cent.

I suggest that governments which were in office at the time and permitted financial institutions to bleed the farmer at these rates of interest permitted a racket. It was nothing but a racket! They skinned the farmers alive! In the future we must not permit this sort of exploitation in any part of Canada.

Let me give a few figures on agriculture as I find them in the 1941 census. The figures of that census show that there were 732,715 farms operated in Canada. Of this number, 549,972 are operated by owners and others are operated either in part by owners and part by tenants or simply by tenants. In the province of Quebec tenants occupy one farm out of every thirty; in Ontario, one out of every nine; in Manitoba, one out of every five; in Saskatchewan, one out of every four; in Alberta, one out of every six. The census shows further that from 1931 to 1941 the

ownership of farms dropped 5·8 per cent and there was an increase of 25·3 per cent in rented farms during the ten-year period. I may explain that the average size of farms in Canada increased from 198 acres in 1921 to 238 acres in 1941. Again, according to the 1941 census, Canadian farmers owed $629,000,000, which amounts to an average of $2,372 per farm, and that does not include debt written off and smaller private debts. Further, forty-eight per cent of all owned farms in Canada are mortgaged.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what future is there ahead for these people when almost every second farmer is in the hands of a mortgage or trust company? Here are the percentages of farms operated by owners and carrying mortgage indebtedness in 1941:

Province	Per cent
Nova Scotia	13·1
New Brunswick	19·0
British Columbia	31·5
Quebec	39·9
Prince Edward Island	46·4
Ontario	50·7
Manitoba	53·3
Alberta	61·0
Saskatchewan	77·6

Let me emphasize this point. In Ontario half of our farmers are mortgaged. In that province only half the farmers have title to their lands and homes, and Ontario is one of the oldest provinces in Canada. Surely the farmers in this province should be better off than that.

Just a few more points before I conclude. May I just refer to credit facilities as they are provided in the United States. In the United States a farmer can be supplied with the necessary amount of credit at 3¼ to four per cent. In Canada the farmers have had to pay from five to twelve per cent, and if they can obtain credit from the Canadian farm loan board they are advanced money at five per cent interest. What we must do in Canada is to set up an agricultural bank so that the Canadian farmer may be provided with the necessary credit to carry on his farming operations. If industry is to be given assistance, why not give the same assistance to the farmers? We know that industries have been assisted during the war, industries that were in a better position to carry on than were the farmers. We shall see after the war that industries which have made considerable money will be given assistance, while the farmers on the other hand who have not been able to obtain farm help and who have had to pay almost double for everything they bought will receive nothing. There is nothing in the speech from the throne to indicate that the government is anxious to help agriculture or to place agriculture on a better basis than it has been so far.

I say again that the farmer must get the same treatment that the manufacturer is getting. If he received that, no one from western Canada would have any criticism to offer, because it is only fair that agriculture should get the same treatment. It is only fair, too, that the government should assist industry, agriculture or individuals to enable them to make a living.

Mention has been made of family allowances. I have referred to old age pensions. Several members of the Social Credit group have pointed out that it was not so very long ago that hon. members jested at any idea of someone receiving "something for nothing", as they called it then. Now that very idea has been adopted or assimilated by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and we may now expect family allowances of a sort. Well, it remains to be seen what the government will be able to do along that line. In some instances the government may have some good ideas, but I am going to ask one question. It is all very well to say that we are going to take care of our soldiers when they come back. Oh, yes, we certainly should. After the last war the government of the day did make loans to our soldiers at five per cent extending over a period of twenty years. After this war the present government intends to be more liberal; it will not deal as severely with the soldiers; it is going to tie a debt around the soldier's neck which will hang there for twenty-five years and at three and one-half per cent interest. Just because they were not bled to death on the battlefield, when they come back the government of this country and the financial interests are going to see to it that they finish them at three and one-half per cent interest, because anyone labouring for years and paying three and one-half per cent on loans which should or could be given to these men free, cannot last.

I should like to emphasize as emphatically as I can one final point, namely, that unless the government declares its policy as to where the money is to come from, all the promises about social legislation, assistance to industries, old age pensions and all the other talk, do not amount to anything at all. I felt that at least one minister would have risen in his place in the course of this debate and explained

how the government proposes to finance all these projects. So far, apart from the Prime Minister, no one has said anything.

On another occasion I intend to deal with soldier rehabilitation and the scheme which the government proposes to inaugurate. On this occasion I have made a rough review of some of the things which are staring us in the face. I wish to plead for agriculture that it be given a fair chance to exist.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. LOCKHART: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Macleod has the floor.

Mr. HANSELL: —I know the house is very anxious to take the vote to-night.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. HANSELL: Thank you for the applause. I will try not to keep the house too long; but as the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) sometimes says, something ought to be said. I do not know why he uses that term so often, because it does not seem to make any difference what the opposition says at any time, the government goes ahead and does just exactly what it wants to do anyway. However, I think I have something that ought to be said.

As I look over the motion and the two amendments I have to make up my mind as to which I am going to support and how I am going to vote. I am particularly concerned with the wording of the amendment to the amendment that strikes out the Conservative amendment and puts in its place:

> We respectfully submit . . . that Your Excellency's advisers have failed to propose the fundamental social changes and economic planning which alone can hasten the winning of the war and make possible the establishment of a post-war Canada capable of providing full employment and complete social security.

As a Social Credit member my interpretation of the wording of this is, I am sure, entirely different from the interpretation that would be placed upon it by the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation group of this house. I often have to ask myself why some people cannot say exactly what they mean. This subamendment needs to be clarified. The position it places our group in is that if we vote against it the country will say: "Oh, you are against any fundamental social changes. If we vote for it, part of the country will be able to say that we want the same social changes as the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation wants. Well, that is not so either. I ask myself, why could not the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar, who is the national leader of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, have stated plainly an amendment to this effect so that there would be no misunderstanding whatsoever:

> We respectfully submit to Your Excellency that in the opinion of this house Your Excellency's advisers have failed to propose a fundamental change in the present system to one of a socialistic state.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is not what we meant.

Mr. HANSELL: Well, you see what is happening now; there is confusion as to what the thing means.

Mr. COLDWELL: No confusion.

Mr. HANSELL: There is not in my hon. friend's mind, but there is in my mind.

Mr. COLDWELL: Get a mind that is not confused.

Mr. HANSELL: My hon. friend says for me to get a mind that is not confused. If he is not careful he is going to prompt me to say something else; and I will say it. The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar comes into Alberta; he has a convention of his party, and he gets up and says that this group to which I belong is the weakest group in the House of Commons.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. HANSELL: Maybe you all agree with that, I do not know.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. HANSELL: Well, that is better; that makes me smile. I say it does not become the leader of any national party to go into other provinces and make remarks of that kind. I do not know how great a leader the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) may be, but I am certain he would not do that. I do not know how great a man Mr. Bracken is, but certainly he would not say that. Furthermore, I can promise my hon. friends that we will not go into their constituencies and make remarks of that kind about them. As far as I am concerned the strength or weakness of a group in this house is not to be judged by how they may say a thing. For my part I judge the weakness or strength of any man or any group on how often he is right in what he says, and how often he is wrong. When I view the record of the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar, who is now responsible for the stands taken by our C.C.F. friends, what do I find? Has he been right in everything he has said? Well, when it comes to financial

matters I recall that only a few months before the war the then Minister of Finance asked this house to vote the sum of $750,000,000. We moved an amendment to the effect that $200,000,000 of that amount should be created by the Bank of Canada. What did the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar do? He submitted an amendment to our amendment suggesting that the amount issued by the Bank of Canada should be $100,000,000 instead of $200,000,000. I do not know why that was done; I cannot make any sense out of it, because now the hon. member is asking this country to make available five billion dollars for post-war expenditures. That does not add up. If it was wrong to issue $200,000,000, then surely it would be wrong to issue five billion dollars after the war.

Mr. COLDWELL: Who suggested it?

Mr. HANSELL: You have suggested that five billion dollars be—

Mr. COLDWELL: —appropriated.

Mr. HANSELL: All right. I know what my hon. friend is getting at; he is saying that this five billion dollars would not necessarily be issued by the Bank of Canada. Let me tell him that in the past year nearly a billion dollars of new money has come out of the banking institutions of this country for the war; and the one or two hundred million that my hon. friend was afraid of was supposed to be new money. How can you reconcile those two facts?

Mr. COLDWELL: Quite easily.

Mr. HANSELL: All right; my hon. friend can do it some time. The fact of the matter is that a few short years ago my hon. friend did not know that you could issue that much money. That is the truth. I simply say that he was wrong there. Then again, did my hon. friend not support the motion to reduce the defence estimates just a few years before the war? I am not going to cast any reflection on his ability to speak; as a matter of fact I think he has a good deal of ability, but that was another case in which the hon. gentleman was wrong. And of course when the war broke out his policy was that not one man should be sent overseas. Suppose we had listened to the hon. member's oratory in those days; what would have happened? The fact is that he was wrong again.

I could go on and tell the house quite a few stories. Later the Prime Minister asked this nation to vote on a plebiscite, and according to propaganda it seemed that the Prime Minister wanted a "yes" vote in order that he might conscript men for service in any part of the world. Well, my hon. friends galloped up and down this country asking the people to vote "yes". What happened? When they voted "yes" and the Prime Minister brought down his mobilization bill, my hon. friends voted against it.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): And we told you why.

Mr. HANSELL: Yes, they told us why.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): But you could not understand.

Mr. HANSELL: The reason why they voted against the mobilization bill was that it did not contain any provision for the conscription of wealth and industry.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is right.

Mr. HANSELL: Well, why did you not go up and down this country telling the people not to vote "yes" until the government had conscripted wealth and industry? Once again your judgment was wrong. Then what happened just the other day? Great publicity was given to the fact that General McNaughton had returned to this country and that he was a perfectly well man. The leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) rose and questioned the Prime Minister on the matter. Of course the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar had to jump up and support the leader of the opposition. If I had been in his place, and could have reviewed my stand on the war, I would not have dared to rise; for let me say that if this country had listened to my hon. friend there would have been no General McNaughton over in England in the first place.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I might make a further comment—and I am not blaming my hon. friend for this; perhaps he wanted to get a little publicity, and believe me he got it. I happened to listen in on the radio to two programmes that night. The leader of the opposition was mentioned once in connection with the McNaughton question, and my friend the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar was mentioned twice. Of course, that may not be a very big thing, but I do interject here that much has been said about the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation being controlled by the government, and having to do what the government said. Well, my opinion is this, that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation during the past year has given more publicity to the C.C.F. group than to any other. It has given more publicity to them than to the Liberals, Conservatives, and Social Crediters, all rolled into one.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Quite right.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): We have news value.

Mr. HANSELL: Yes? I wish the sub-amendment had been defined, because I like to know what I am voting for. The country wants to know where it is going.

I will tell the house something else—and I am taking the responsibility, myself, for what I say—that there is no danger in publicizing a man who does not know where he is going; because the fact of the matter is that if he ever got into power, not knowing where he was going he would have to ask somebody. Whom is the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar going to ask? He certainly would not ask this group; he would not ask Social Crediters, that is certain. I do not know whether he would ask the Liberals or the Conservatives. I am quite sure he would not. He would have to ask advisers. Who are their advisers going to be?

Mr. DUPUIS: Tim Buck.

Mr. HANSELL: Well, I do not know; perhaps eventually Tim Buck will be their adviser. Furthermore, I will say this, that I feel incensed a little bit about this, because our group have tried to work with our C.C.F. friends in the house.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. HANSELL: There is no "oh, oh" about it at all. We have nothing against these men. We are their friends. Their offices are on the same corridor as ours, and we like to get along with them. But when they gallop into our province and do things like this, it does not tend toward the best possible cooperation and friendship.

Someone has said that maybe Tim Buck will be their adviser. Maybe he will, eventually; I do not know. But I will say this: I am not a socialist; I am not a communist; but if ever I were one I would rather follow Tim Buck than the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar.

Mr. ROWE: You would at least know where you were going.

Mr. HANSELL: I was about to say that. Tim Buck makes no bones about it. He tells you what he means. He tells what socialism means, and he says, "Vote for me and you will get it; that is all there is to it." On the other hand, we do not know where the C.C.F. are going. They may be on their way, I do not know.

Perhaps I should give some consideration to some of the more weighty matters in the speech from the throne. I feel very much concerned in respect of any plans which might be made for post-war reconstruction. In my view, if something is not done soon, the whole matter will be hopeless. I cannot say I have any confidence that the present administration will bring about the changes that the post-war reconstruction period of this country would demand, and I shall give my reasons for saying that. I realize of course that the government will have to take the final responsibility. The fact remains, however, that the advisers the government used in pre-war days are the same advisers it uses to-day. If those advisers could not show us a way out during the depression, how can they show us the way out after the war is over? If the system is the same, if it has not changed, can they advise any differently from what they did in prewar days?

I trust I shall not sound too harsh when I say that the advisers to the government should be asked to appear before the committee on post-war reconstruction, and should be asked this question: "Why were you not able to advise the government what to do in pre-war days? Why could you not find employment for the people?" We hear a good deal about a programme for full employment. Much as I disagree with some of the principles embodied in that phrase I would ask why it was they could not provide full employment before the war. They should be asked, distinctly, how they hope to do so after the war if they could not do so before. And if they reply, "Oh, well, we hope our national income will be bigger", or "We hope our foreign trade will be larger and that foreign markets will be open to us"—if they say, we hope, we hope, we hope, then the committee should tell them that that is not satisfactory. Let them put their cards on the table and tell us how they are going to advise. If they cannot give a satisfactory answer, then I say they should be dismissed as not being required as advisers for the post-war period.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), I think in all sincerity, stated on one occasion, according to press reports, that agricultural production had increased by some forty-eight per cent, while actual consumption in Canada of agricultural products had increased by only six per cent. What was his answer for the post-war period? "We hope that by quality production and by good merchandizing Canada will sell in other lands." He should know it is a little too late to be talking about matters of that kind. Why could that not have been done in pre-war days? Furthermore, he must know that all nations will be clamouring for foreign markets. That kind of musing in respect of the post-war period is not good

enough at this time. We should know where we are going; we should have plans, and we should know from where the money is coming, and how our plans can be financed. That is one criticism I have with respect to the post-war reconstruction committee. I cannot discuss that matter now, but I believe that committee must discover how it will finance these projects, and do so without going into debt. It must show how it is going to pay the way, and to raise the standard of living so that we can consume to the very ultimate of our productive capacity; that will give us a high standard of living and give us real social security.

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

YEAS

Messrs:

Blackmore	Johnston (Bow River)
Bryce	Knowles
Burton	Kuhl
Castleden	MacInnis
Coldwell	Marshall
Douglas (Weyburn)	Nicholson
Fair	Noseworthy
Gillis	Quelch
Hansell	Shaw
Hlynka	Wright—20.

NAYS

Messrs:

Abbott	Dorion
Adamson	Douglas (Queens)
Anderson	Dubois
Authier	Dupuis
Bence	Durocher
Bertrand (Laurier)	Edwards
Bertrand (Prescott)	Emmerson
Bertrand (Terrebonne)	Esling
Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)	Eudes
Black (Cumberland)	Evans
Black (Yukon)	Factor
Blair	Fauteux
Blanchette	Ferron
Bonnier	Fontaine
Boucher	Fournier (Hull)
Bourget	Fraser (Peterborough West)
Bradette	Fulford
Casselman, Mrs. (Edmonton East)	Furniss
Casselman (Grenville-Dundas)	Gardiner
Chevrier	Gershaw
Choquette	Gibson
Church	Gingues
Clark	Gladstone
Cleaver	Golding
Corman	Goulet
Coté	Graham
Crerar	Grant
Crète	Graydon
Cruickshank	Green
d'Anjou	Gregory
Dechene	Hanson (Skeena)
Denis	Harris (Danforth)
Diefenbaker	Hatfield
Donnelly	Healy
Hoblitzell	Henderson
Homuth	Hill
Howden	Matthews
Howe	Maybank
Hurtubise	Mayhew
Ilsley	Michaud
Isnor	Mitchell
Jackman	Mullins
King, Mackenzie	Mulock
Kinley	Mutch
LaCroix (Quebec-Montmorency)	Neill
Laflamme	Nielsen, Mrs.
LaFlèche	O'Neill
Lafontaine	Parent
Lalonde	Perley
Leclerc	Picard
Leduc	Pinard
Leger	Power
Little	Purdy
Lizotte	Ralston
Lockhart	Raymond
McCann	Reid
McCuaig	Rennie
McCubbin	Rhéaume
McCulloch	Rickard
MacDiarmid	Roebuck
Macdonald (Brantford City)	Rose
Macdonald (Halifax)	Ross (Calgary East)
Macdonald (Kingston City)	Ross (Hamilton East)
McDonald (Pontiac)	Ross (Middlesex East)
McGarry	Ross (Moose Jaw)
McGibbon	Ross (St. Paul's)
McGregor	Ross (Souris)
McIlraith	Rowe
McIvor	Roy
MacKenzie (Lambton-Kent)	Ryan
Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre)	Senn
MacKinnon (Edmonton West)	Sinclair
MacKinnon (Kootenay East)	Sissons
McLarty	Soper
MacLean (Cape Breton North-Victoria)	Stirling
McLean (Simcoe East)	Stokes
Macmillan	Taylor
McNevin (Victoria, Ont.)	Thauvette
McNiven (Regina City)	Tremblay
MacNicol	Tripp
Martin	Tucker
	Turgeon
	Turner
	Tustin
	Veniot
	Ward
	Warren
	Weir
	White
	Whitman
	Winkler
	Wood—173.

Mr. J. S. ROY (Gaspé): The mover and the seconder of the address having received a great deal of well-deserved praise, I will reserve my thanks for the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Gauthier), who spoke the other day in favour of the fishermen of the Gaspé peninsula.

Ever since I have had the honour of representing the county of Gaspé, I have been diligent in representing the interests of my constituents and on every occasion I have discharged my duty to them. I have sponsored all their needs and all that I thought was worth while on their behalf in this house. If I have not previously brought up the question dealt with in the order in council regard-

ing the fish trade that was passed by the wartime prices and trade board, it is because I was aware of what was going on in view of a settlement of the matter. I knew that the fish board or the officials of the board had been for some weeks trying to come to an agreement with the united fishermen of Gaspé and were having conferences in Quebec and Montreal with the representatives of the united fishermen and with the deputy minister of the department of fisheries of Quebec, Mr. Labrie, as well as with some other independent fish dealers or processors on the Gaspé coast. I think there should come out of these conferences an agreement that will be acceptable to all those who are interested. It should be reached in a few days' time if it has not already been decided upon. I know that the motives which have inspired the hon. member for Portneuf were motives of sympathy for our fishermen, and I therefore offer him my thanks.

Before making any comments on the sub-amendment which I intend to move, I should like to say a few words with reference to the speech from the throne.

Although there are quite a few measures, proposed by the government, which I approve in principle, I will not support the address in reply to the speech from the throne, and I withhold that support because of the government's war policy. I am going to support the Conservative amendment because I am in perfect agreement with the reproach which it makes against the government for its policy. At the same time—and I want to emphasize this—my support to the Conservative amendment does not mean that I support the war policy of that group. It is only what is contained in that amendment that I approve.

At the conclusion of my remarks I shall move an amendment to the amendment, and the first paragraph will read as follows, under the letter (e):

Failed to limit Canada's war contribution to the promise of moderate participation made by the leaders of the government in 1939 and to the means of our country.

A great deal has been said by many members on the international policy of the government, and I will not go over all these questions again. I would say this, however. The policy of the Liberal party is one that has brought about so much discontent throughout Canada that the present administration has lost the confidence of all Canadians, evidence of which has been given by the results of the by-elections which were held last summer.

Of course, there are many causes. In one part of the country it may be one cause, in another part it may be another cause. But the government's war policy is no doubt the principal reason for the general discontent that prevails to-day among the labouring classes throughout Canada, among our farmers, and among other sections of the population. What is going to happen as a result of that policy? When we emerge from this war Canada will be nothing but a ruin and will be thrown into the arms of the extremists. That is what will happen.

Another paragraph of my proposed amendment will read:

Failed to demand Canada's partnership in our allies' conferences on account of her independent status and her important share in the war.

We are told on the one hand that Canada should continue after the war is over—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I cannot hear the hon. gentleman because of the conversations that are going on. I would ask hon. members to moderate their voices.

Mr. ROY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We hear on the one hand that after the war Canada should continue to share in this imperial federation which we have been in for so long a time, and on the other hand we are told, as an encouragement to support the struggle, that after the war there will be a sort of international body composed of the allied nations, and in which the small nations will be on an equal footing with the larger ones. That would be a very fine thing for Canada as a peace policy and in so far as her international trade and commerce are concerned. That is all very well; but when one considers the opportunities that the government has had up to now to prove its sincerity, and has not taken advantage of any of them, how can we now believe in such statements? Why should a certain class of people start moves to bring Canada within an imperial federation to which most of the Canadian people are opposed?

Since the beginning of the war we have had quite a few interallied conferences. We were told that Canada entered this war as an independent nation under the signature of her own king, and that we were fighting the axis as such. After the war began there was concerted action to impose the conscription of men for overseas service. There was an effort made to get everything possible from Canada in the way of blood, money, or other sacrifices. Let us see now what was going on in the meantime. There was a conference which took place on the Atlantic ocean. At that conference there was drawn up what was called the Atlantic charter which is supposed to be the basis of governing all the democratic countries when the war is over. Was Canada asked to take part in that conference as an independent country? Was the Canadian Prime Minister

invited to that conference? No. As I say, we were told that it was a charter for all the allied countries after the war is over. We had another conference at Washington and yet Canada was not there. We had a conference at Casablanca and we find that it was just like the others. There was no place there for Canada. No attention was paid to Canada at all. We were just a negligible quantity. Since then we have had another conference at Teheran. At this conference China, Russia, the United States and Great Britain were represented. Canada, being the fourth largest power in the war, was not represented by its Prime Minister. There was no place for Canada at all, although she is in the war with all her resources. What had then become of our independence? And who was speaking for Canada at those conferences? The British Prime Minister? Before the Teheran conference was called we had a conference which was advertised in the newspapers as a tripartite conference. It was held in Quebec city. We were very well satisfied with the choice of Quebec city as the site of that conference. We were pleased to receive such distinguished visitors. As I say, this was advertised as a tripartite conference, but, although it was held in Quebec city and although our Prime Minister was there, the resulting decisions of that conference were signed only by the Prime Minister of Great Britain and the President of the United States. Canada was again excluded. Although Canada was excluded, did we hear any protests, or criticism such as we heard for the establishment of conscription and for an all-out war effort? We have not heard any complaint at all from anyone. It is amazing. We have not enough pride to demand our place at these conferences.

The next paragraph will read as follows:

Failed to undertake public works to prevent the already existing unemployment.

I should like to comment on this subject to a certain extent. According to the figures which were published recently in some official publication of the government, and according to a statement which was made not very long ago by the deputy controller of the national selective service commission, we shall have before the month of June some 100,000 workers dismissed from the war industrial plants; therefore, unemployment will prevail again. We have a proof of that in Quebec city, where, according to what I have been told by responsible authorities, nearly 2,000 men are unemployed to-day and there will be about 6,000 or 7,000 unemployed in two months' time. This supports well my point that unemployment has already reappeared in Canada.

For two years we have been told an awful lot about reconstruction works, about post-war plans to give work to everybody in Canada; we have been told that unemployment would not come back, that the government was to prevent the return to a state of things such as existed in the depression years we lived through before the war. As I said a while ago, the government has had many opportunities to show its sincerity but we are already facing unemployment. I say that the government should have undertaken public works to prevent unemployment and to serve other purposes.

This brings me to a project which was investigated last summer by a French writer whose name is well-known throughout Canada, Mr. Robert Rumilly. Mr. Rumilly was asked by some concern to undertake a complete investigation and to inquire as to all the possibilities that could be offered by Gaspe peninsula in view of the post-war reconstruction, and the report of his investigation was published by *Le Soleil,* a newspaper of Quebec, supporting the government and by *La Nouvelliste,* a newspaper of Three Rivers, also supporting the government. All his findings were published, and to make a long story short his report suggested the construction of a railroad running through the interior of the Gaspe peninsula, in order to shorten the distance to Gaspe harbour, which should be properly organized as a winter seaport. If these works were undertaken to-day, in the first place they would take care of the unemployment situation perhaps for the whole province of Quebec. In the second place the construction of this railroad would permit the development of the mineral deposits in the interior of Gaspesia, and I believe the exploitation of the resources of the Gaspe peninsula alone would be enough to justify the construction of this line. That is not all however. It would also offer a shorter road to the Atlantic than the one actually existing between Winnipeg and Halifax, and facilitate the export of our Canadian wheat to the European market.

I have some figures, Mr. Speaker, which I am sure will interest you and especially hon. members from western Canada. I have said that the construction of a railroad and the opening of Gaspe harbour as a winter seaport would solve the question of the export of wheat which has not found its solution yet. Let me prove that statement. The distance from Winnipeg to Halifax is approximately 2,200 miles, while the distance from Winnipeg to Gaspe, if this railroad were built, would be about 1,930 miles. According to the Canadian National Railways the freight rate on wheat

from Winnipeg to Halifax is forty-three cents per hundred pounds, or within a small fraction of twenty-six cents a bushel. If you take off 270 miles from the distance between Winnipeg and Halifax, this would amount to one-eighth of the total distance, and if you carry that into the cost per bushel it would mean a saving of almost exactly three cents. If our total exports of wheat after the war should amount to about 300,000,000 bushels annually, and if half that quantity should be shipped by way of Gaspe, it would mean a saving of some $4,500,000 annually for the western farmers; this would represent interest on a capital investment of $150,000,000, or much more than would be required for the construction of that railroad, which would be 160 miles in length, and the work at the seaport.

I have given the distance and rates from Winnipeg to Halifax over the Canadian National Railways. Perhaps hon. members would be interested in knowing the freight rates on other routes we sometimes use for the shipment of wheat. The rate from Winnipeg to New York via the Canadian National Railways is fifty-three cents per hundred pounds, as compared with forty-three cents to Halifax and thirty-eight cents to Gaspe. The rate from Winnipeg to Albany is fifty-two cents, via the Canadian National, while the rate via the Canadian Pacific from Winnipeg to New York is 50½ cents per hundred pounds and to Albany fifty-three cents. So that it is more expensive to ship wheat via New York and Albany in the winter than by Halifax. Then I might give the distance between New York, Halifax, Gaspe and Liverpool. The distance from Halifax to Liverpool is 2,475 miles, and from New York to Liverpool, 3,119 miles, while from Gaspe to Liverpool it is 2,450 miles via St. John's, Newfoundland, and 2,300 miles via the strait of Belle Isle. These figures would show that Gaspe offers Canada a great opportunity to solve the difficulties of export, and to help the solution of our railroad problem in peace time; they confirm the wisdom of the advice which was given for more than one hundred years by engineers and even by the British admiralty, that the Gaspe seaport is the commercial and military key of Canada. If we would recognize this truth we would be able to organize our transportation system in such a way that the wheat of the west would compete in the international market. Of course the advantages I have mentioned would apply not only to wheat, or to outward traffic, but to all our traffic, inward as well as outward.

The last paragraph of the amendment I intend to move reads as follows:

[Mr. Roy.]

Failed to grant farmers and fishermen exemption from military service, in order to remove from them the vexatious proceedings resulting from the narrow application of the national selective service regulations.

The hon. member who preceded me rightly said that everyone would know where he stood after having heard what he had to say. I think my stand on this question is also well known. In 1942 I moved amendments asking for the exemption of farmers, but I received very little support. At the following session there were loud cries heard from all corners of the house about the shortage of man-power for the cutting of fuel wood and also on our farms. I have in my hand sessional paper 135. This contains only a few of the letters sent to the Department of Labour and the Department of Agriculture by municipal councils, county councils and agricultural organizations in Ontario and the western provinces. When the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Dorion) asked for the production of these documents he was requested to go to the department and choose what he wanted, because there were cabinets containing thousands of these requests from all over Canada, and they were too numerous to be all produced. So we have here requests from Ontario and the western provinces, with only two from Quebec in this lot. These ask for the exemption of farmers, or for a regulation by national selective service with respect to the calling up of draftees, so that the man-power on farms might not be disturbed. Taking into account this general and huge protest, I believe I was quite right in asking for the exemption of farmers. In fact, I am now more convinced when, in the last few days, I have heard from different parts of the house hon. members reproaching the government for keeping more than 60,000 men under arms in Canada, when they are not needed. The government is being asked to dismiss these men. Well, if we do not need them, why do we keep them? Why does national selective service keep calling men every day, if we do not need them. Why do we call them if we have already too many, and if their being called is useless and a bad thing for the country?

In order that I may have time to move my amendment, I shall not speak at greater length this evening but shall complete on another occasion what I had intended to say. I now move, seconded by the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Dorion):

That the following words be added to the amendment:

"(e) Failed to limit Canada's war contribution to the promises of a moderate participation made by the leaders of the government in 1939, and, to the means of our country;

(f) Failed to demand Canada's partnership in allies conferences on account of her independent status and of her important share in the war;

(g) Failed to undertake public works to prevent the already existing unemployment;

(h) Failed to grant farmers and fishermen the exemption from military service, in order to remove from them the vexatious proceedings resulting from the narrow application of the national selective service's regulations."

Mr. MAURICE LALONDE (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend this evening to discuss the merits of the amendment, but in my humble view it is out of order. I understand that in our parliamentary code there are no precise and definite rules respecting the form of such an amendment, but I have always felt that, to be legal, it cannot be worded as is this one. We find in it these words:

I have the honour to move, seconded by the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Dorion) that the following words be added to the amendment.

I draw particular attention to the words "that the following words be added to the amendment", and humbly submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member is out of order in asking that something be added to the amendment of the Tory party. Had the amendment now before the Chair asked that something be stricken out, and that such part be replaced by something else, then we would have before us a proper amendment. But now we have before us only a completion of the amendment offered by the Tory party.

Mr. GRAYDON: Out of courtesy, if nothing else, would the hon. member refer to us properly as the Progressive Conservative party?

Mr. LALONDE: That is another question which will be debated later.

Mr. GRAYDON: On a point of order, surely there should be at least courtesy in the House of Commons. The name of the official opposition is the Progressive Conservative party, and I would ask my hon. friend to have the courtesy to call this party by its proper name.

Mr. LALONDE: It has changed its name so many times we sometimes do not remember it correctly. However, I accept the correction.

May I in this connection quote from May, page 173:

In both Lords and Commons, since the commencement of session 1890-91, the answer to the royal speech has been moved in the form of a single resolution, expressing their thanks to the sovereign for the most gracious speech addressed to both houses of parliament and amendments to the address are moved by way of addition thereto.

In my humble opinion the phraseology of the amendment means that it is out of order

Some hon. MEMBERS: Eleven o'clock.

On motion of Mr. Lalonde the debate was adjourned.

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

Wednesday, February 9, 1944

The house met at three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON REVISION OF STANDING ORDERS—CHANGE IN PERSONNEL

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That the name of Mr. McGarry be substituted for that of Mr. Isnor on the special committee appointed to revise the standing orders of the house.

Motion agreed to.

WESTERN STOCK FEEDERS

INQUIRY AS TO DISPOSAL OF BEEF CATTLE AVAILABLE FOR MARKET

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): I desire to direct two questions to the government through the Minister of Agriculture. Has the government carefully considered the seriousness of the possibility that undesirable prices and marketing conditions at present facing beef producers in western Canada may so discourage them as to cause an embarrassing beef shortage next year? Inasmuch as the present lack of markets confronting western Canadian producers might indicate that Canada does not need their beef, would the government consider permitting producers to sell their beef for a time in the United States market?

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): The question which has been raised by the hon. member for Lethbridge, on each of the last three sittings, I think, of the house, is answered in the following words:

During the first month of the present year, hog slaughterings have been at unprecedented levels and slaughterings of other classes of

live stock have been substantially greater than during the same period a year ago. Cattle slaughtered in Canada during the first four weeks of 1944 totalled 86,991 as compared with 52,279 during the same period of 1943, an increase of 34,712 head, or 66 per cent. Sheep and lamb slaughterings totalled 65,169 as compared with 44,318 in 1943, an increase of 20,851, or 47 per cent. Calf slaughterings were 24,795 as compared with 19,066, an increase of 5,629, or 30 per cent. Hog slaughterings totalled 901,767 as compared with 501,334 a year ago, an increase of 400,435, or 80 per cent.

I give these figures in order to call attention to the suggestion which is made in the question of the hon. member, namely that unless we do something now we are going to have a shortage a year hence, and to remind the house that I have heard that same story every year since the war began; and now this year, when we are entering upon the session, we are reporting an eighty per cent increase in deliveries of, let us say, hogs, and comparable increases of other live stock coming in from the farms in different parts of Canada. The figures which I have given are only for the month of January, but comparable figures exist with regard to the three months preceding the month of January, all of which should suggest to the house that there has been very little in all this talk with regard to any possibility of there being a decrease in meat supplies in Canada, at least in the immediate future. That, I would say, possibly would have some bearing even on the suggestion that there will be a decrease a year hence. Handling and movement of this record volume of live stock has taxed the capacity of the packing plants, storage warehouses and shipping facilities.

Purchases of bacon for the United Kingdom account have averaged over 20,000,000 pounds for several weeks, and an average of 20,000,000 pounds for fifty weeks out of the year would be 1,000,000,000. I give these figures to emphasize the great quantities of live stock which are coming on the market at the present time.

All available storage space was used for storage, but all product over and above what could be stored was placed in cure for current shipment, and the record volume that had to be moved placed a great strain on the shipping space available. I may say, with regard to this matter too, that recently three boats which were intended to be made available for the shipment of meat have met with mishaps, and that has made it impossible for them to take meat out until repairs are made. That too is a difficulty that governments cannot avoid during a war period.

[Mr. Gardiner.]

The following statement shows the storage stocks at January 1, 1944 as compared with January 1, 1943, the figures being in thousands of pounds:

	1943	1944
	Thousand pounds	
Frozen beef (bone in)..	15,498	13,065
Frozen beef (boneless)..	4,498	8,735
Veal	2,308	5,445
Mutton and lamb.....	5,038	9,345
Fresh frozen pork.....	22,142	27,582

This last figure includes approximately 18,000,000 pounds of export bacon stored for later shipment.

While at the moment, owing to heavy slaughterings of all classes of live stock during recent weeks, there is what might be considered a surplus of meat, the fact is that the United Kingdom desires all the surplus meat that Canada can provide. What happens to be a surplus at the moment is due to lack of shipping facilities to move the surplus product immediately. The reasons, in part, for that I have already given.

Steps are being taken to divert additional shipping space to Canadian ports not only for the purpose of handling additional bacon but also to lift surplus quantities of beef and mutton. That is a diversion of ships from some ports further south, to Canadian ports, in order to take out Canadian meat. That would emphasize the fact that there is just as great a difficulty in handling meat on the American side of the boundary line as there is on this side. As a matter of fact, there have been controls even more stringent with regard to getting hogs into packing plants on the American side of the boundary line than there have been on this side. All one needs to do at present is to examine the price levels in the two countries to realize that difficulties are as great on the other side as they are on this side.

Our pork to-day, in the markets in Canada, is bringing a higher price, with the premiums that are being paid, than the prices quoted on the American side of the line at the present time. This is particularly true of the Buffalo market as compared with the Toronto market. I have before me the figures on most live stock products. One would find it difficult to ship many live stock products into the United States under present conditions, pay the freight and any duty which there might be upon these meat products, and land the products in the markets there at higher prices than can be obtained here, or at prices as high as can be obtained in Canada, or at any rate as high returns as are here obtainable, including subsidies in some cases.

The immediate problem is (a) to secure additional shipping space and (b) to relieve the

congestion in cold storages by exporting products now in storage so as to permit the packing plants to handle and store the surplus live stock that is offered. The meat board stands prepared to purchase and export to the United Kingdom all surplus quantities of pork and beef, and arrangements are being made to export some quantities of mutton as soon as shipping space is available. Notwithstanding the heavy volume of live stock being offered—and this is important as an answer to a part of the question—prices for hogs and finished cattle have not been depressed, and all good butcher cattle has remained well above floor prices. With ample meat supplies available, the packers have found it difficult to move lower quality cattle and cows in the domestic market. The meat board found it difficult to handle the quantities being offered owing to the shortage of storage and shipping space, and in that connection I think I should say that there is no diffierence in the present conditions, so far as the marketing of live stock is concerned, as compared with conditions that always prevail. A man who is bound that he will ship live stock just when he thinks it ought to be shipped is always in the position, whether the government has control or has no control, of having to accept a price lower than the market would have provided for him had he waited another week or two to deliver. In the present situation, under more or less government control, he can move his live stock, more particularly cows, and have those cows processed in packing plants, frozen if necessary in the form of beef, and shipped to Britain. That is the market which is available under the arrangements now made, and when the government says to people with cows, "You had better hold them off for another two or three weeks, or another month, if you want to get a fair price for them," I submit the hardship is no greater in doing that than it was when on other occasions one was obliged to do it in order to meet the laws of supply and demand. That is the situation which does exist at present and it is creating some difficulty.

There is one other thing I hesitate to say, but I ought to say it in view of some of the representations that have been made in the resolutions which are coming to us from the section most affected, and that is that cows that run on the range have to be marketed somewhat earlier in the season than many cows that do not run on the range. The reason for that is obvious to men who are accustomed to handling cattle in the range country. It is that the cattle have to be got to the butcher before calving time comes. I am not so sure that getting them to the butcher before that time will affect the quantity of meat in the manner suggested a few moments ago. It might even increase the quantity to have the cattle kept off the market. That may not meet the wishes of those desirious of selling cattle at present, though it does affect somewhat the price that can be secured for the quality of beef obtainable from a cow that is heavily in calf. While an ample meat supply is available, the packers have found it difficult to handle the lower quality cattle and cows in the domestic market. The meat board found it difficult to handle the quantities offered owing to the shortage of storage and shipping space. During the past few days, however, the board has been able to accept immediate shipment of some seven million pounds of beef, and this movement has had an immediate effect on cow prices, which moved sharply upwards in all markets. There is every reason to believe that in future all surplus beef available will be handled and lifted as offered for export. There has been a decline in sheep and lamb prices as a result of the temporary over-all meat position. While there is no floor price established for mutton and lamb, steps have been taken to export some of the surplus accumulation now in storage with a view to creating a better market for this class of live stock.

That, I think, covers the position pretty well with regard to the matter of beef, particularly the lower qualities which are not required on our home market. There does not appear to be any difficulty in connection with the quality of beef which is required on the home market.

Mr. M. C. SENN (Haldimand): In view of the statement of the minister with regard to the surplus of meats throughout Canada, will the government consider the discontinuance of the meatless Tuesday and of the rationing of meats in Canada?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Consideration can be given to that.

Mr. GRAYDON: The minister says "consideration can be given." Consideration can be given to anything. Is consideration being given to it?

Mr. ILSLEY: Perhaps I should have said "will be given".

MEAT

CONDEMNATION OF 500,000 POUNDS IN GOVERNMENT WAREHOUSES IN QUEBEC CITY

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): I should like to give an answer to the question asked yesterday by the hon.

member for Haldimand (Mr. Senn) with regard to the beef which had been found spoiling in Quebec. I may say this beef was in the storage of the national harbours board at Quebec. As I understand it, the inspector, Mr. C. A. Rose, assistant chief veterinary inspector, was called in to make a report, and has made a report, which I now table.

WHEAT

INQUIRY AS TO EXPORTS TO THE UNITED STATES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. E. PERLEY (Qu'Appelle): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce based on a report appearing in the western papers to this effect, that the United States are after all the wheat they can get from Canada. The report goes on to say that the United States government have purchased forty million bushels of wheat from Canada and have sent twenty-seven hundred cars to Canada to transport it. It also says that this is necessary to prevent the rationing of flour and bread in the United States. When similar sales have been made by the Canadian Wheat Board the minister has always made a statement to the house. Would he care to make a statement as to the conditions under which this wheat is being sold, the price and the conditions in respect of duties, freight, et cetera, and what Canadian export agencies are handling the transaction?

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I think, Mr. Speaker, that I can give the house at a very early date a statement on the point raised by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

QUESTION OF PROVISION FOR DEPENDENTS OF THOSE IN WORK CAMPS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): May I direct a question to the Minister of Labour, or in his absence to his parliamentary assistant. It has come to my attention that in many cases the wives and children of conscientious objectors who are being sent to work camps in Ontario are being left without any means of support. Is it the policy of the government merely to pay these men fifty cents a day and to make no additional provision for their dependents?

Mr. PAUL MARTIN (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Labour): The question that the hon. member has just asked came to my attention a few moments before I came into the house. If he will allow the question to stand I shall be able to give a complete answer to-morrow.

FUEL

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT AS TO COAL, OIL AND NATURAL GAS SUPPLY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. KARL K. HOMUTH (Waterloo South): May I ask the Minister of Munitions and Supply if he will give the house a statement some time soon with respect to coal, oil and natural gas, and what the situation is likely to be in the future?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): I shall be glad to discuss that subject when I speak on the war appropriation bill.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Tuesday, February 8, consideration of the motion of Mr. L. D. Tremblay for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Graydon, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Roy.

Mr. MAURICE LALONDE (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, last night I raised a point of order with respect to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Roy), on the ground that it was not in order because it suggested additions to the amendment of the Progressive Conservative party. In my remarks last night I quoted May to support my contention. I had not concluded my argument last night. I respectfully submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the subamendment is not in order on the ground that it is not relevant to the amendment and raises new issues. I refer to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, third edition, 1943, citations 367 and 368, at page 142:

367. A subamendment on the address in reply to the speech from the throne may be moved subject to the same rules as any other amendment. It must be relevant to the amendment and cannot raise a new issue. Great latitude is allowed in this debate. If the amendment and the subamendment both take exception to the government's financial policy and the former refers to customs duties, the latter is in order if it refers to income tax or any other mode of collecting revenue; but if the amendment deals with conscription a subamendment dealing with tariff is irregular.

368. A subamendment on the motion for the adoption of the address in reply to the speech from the throne must be relevant to the amendment. . . .

One can readily see that the subamendment moved by the hon. member for Gaspé is not relevant to the amendment moved by the leader of the Progressive Conservative party. To support that contention, referring to page 29 of *Hansard* of January 31, 1944, I find that the amendment deals, first, with employment of the men and women of the armed forces on demobilization; second, failure to provide adequate measures whereby agriculture can make its maximum war- and peace-time contribution through a stable and effective long-term programme; third, labour questions, and fourth, bureaucratic controls. As I read the subamendment moved by the hon. member for Gaspé I find that it deals with Canada's war effort, Canada's partnership in allied conferences, public works to prevent already existing unemployment, and the exemption of farmers and fishermen from military service. I humbly submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that according to citation 364 of Beauchesne, third edition, the amendment is out of order. Citation 364 reads as follows:

> Since the purpose of a subamendment is to alter the amendment, it should not enlarge upon the scope of the amendment but it should deal with matters that are not covered by the amendment if it is intended to bring up matters foreign to the amendment, the member should wait until the amendment is disposed of and move a new amendment.

I should like to speak to the merit of certain questions that have been dealt with by the hon. member for Gaspé, particularly the question of the exemption of farmers from military service, but I believe I should be out of order in doing so at this stage of the debate. I reserve my right to speak on these matters later. For the reasons I have given, I humbly submit to you, sir, that the subamendment is out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does any other hon. member wish to speak to the point of order?

The hon. gentleman has quoted May, at page 173, and that dictum of May has been adopted by Doctor Beauchesne in his latest book, of which all hon. members have copies; it appears in citation 336 at page 135. I would draw to the attention of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken citation 335 on the same page:

> A motion may be amended: (a) by leaving out certain words; (b) by leaving out certain words in order to insert other words; (c) by inserting or adding other words.

The subamendment now before the house seeks to add other words to the original amendment. Then citation 338, at page 136 of Beauchesne, reads:

> The object of an amendment may be to effect such an alteration in a question as will obtain the support of those who, without such alteration, must either vote against it or abstain from voting thereon, or to present to the house an alternative proposition either wholly or partially opposed to the original question. This may be effected by moving to omit all the words of the question after the first word "that", and to substitute in their place other words of a different import. In that case the debate that follows is not restricted to the amendment, but includes the motives of the amendment and of the motion, both matters being under the consideration of the house as alternative propositions.

As the hon. member has pointed out, under citation 367 at page 142, great latitude is allowed in the debate on the address, and exceptions taken of a highly technical nature as a rule are not considered when amendments are made in that debate. The effect of the amendments is as follows. The motion is made; the amendment is moved, and the subamendment follows. In our practice the procedure is to deal first with the subamendment; then having disposed of that either by adoption or rejection, we deal with the amendment. If the subamendment is approved, then the amendment is put before the house as amended by the subamendment; and in like form when dealing with the motion, if the amendment has been adopted, then the motion is placed before the house as amended by the amendment or the subamendment as the case may be. The consequence is that in the debate which is taking place hon. members are addressing themselves to the motives contained in the original motion, the amendment and the subamendment, and additions to an amendment, when adopted, are really additions to the main motion.

For the reasons I have stated I think this subamendment is in order. The hon. member who raised the point of order referred to the question of relevancy. If one is dealing with all the motives contained in either the motion, the amendment or the subamendment, then the question of relevancy has some bearing, not as directly affecting the amendment or subamendment but as affecting the subject matters of the three motions before the house. In this case we are dealing with the speech from the throne, which embodies many principles; and the principles which have been set forth in the subamendment of the hon. member for Gaspe (Mr. Roy) are I think relevant to the subject under discussion. For that reason I am of opinion that the subamendment moved by the hon. member is in order.

Mr. T. C. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Mr. Speaker, with one statement that was made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) in the course of his remarks the other day I am in complete accord; that was when he said, as reported at page 34 of *Hansard*:

. . . I am opposed to parliaments extending their own terms of office. I think one of the greatest mistakes made in this country was the extension by one parliament of its own term of office.

With this point of view I am in complete agreement, as I think most people will be who are desirous of retaining our free institutions and maintaining our democratic form of government. It is a great pity, however, that the Prime Minister was not able to impress his point of view upon the Liberal government of Saskatchewan, which last April supported a bill to extend its own term of office. This was done in spite of the protests of the official opposition. What has amazed most people has been the complete acquiescence of the federal government in this very apparent violation of established constitutional procedure. I have made a careful search of the records, and I cannot find a single case in the history of the parliament at Westminster, or of any of the self-governing dominions, or of any of the legislatures of the Dominion of Canada, in which a parliament or a legislature extended its own term of office without the consent of the official opposition.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is my hon. friend suggesting that the federal government should have interfered in any way in a matter which was the exclusive concern of the provincial government?

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): If the Prime Minister will have patience with me I shall come to that very point, as to what I think the government ought to have done. In 1916 Sir Robert Borden introduced a humble petition asking the parliament of Westminster to amend the British North America Act to extend the life of the Canadian parliament. On February 8 of that year, as reported at page 622 of *Hansard,* he said:

It is hardly necessary to say that it is a motion which we should not press if hon. gentlemen on the other side of the house should oppose it as a party. In that case I should feel it to be my duty to withdraw the motion, and then it would naturally be for the government to consider its course.

He was followed in that debate by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who at page 634 of *Hansard* is reported as having said:

If this resolution was not adopted unanimously, even though carried by a majority of this house, and even if my right hon. friend himself were to carry it to the foot of the throne, I have no doubt whatever that in the face of such a minority as would be arrayed against it, the British parliament would never grant the power sought.

A similar petition was introduced in the following year by Sir Robert Borden, but when some of the official opposition expressed their disapproval the Prime Minister immediately withdrew the resolution on the ground that unless the opposition gave virtually unanimous consent the British parliament would be unwilling to permit the Canadian parliament to extend its own life. It has remained for a Liberal government in Saskatchewan to defy the parliamentary traditions of several centuries and use its majority in the legislature in order to cling to office without giving the electorate an opportunity to express their wish in the matter.

The Prime Minister asks what we think the federal government should have done about it. May I point out that the federal government, and particularly the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent), have a responsibility to discharge to the people of Canada, and especially to the people of Saskatchewan. Under the British North America Act the power of disallowance was given to the federal government not merely to prevent the passage of legislation which might be considered ultra vires; as a matter of fact legislation of that kind can be taken care of very well in the courts. The power of disallowance was granted to the governor in council, in order that, as George Brown put it very succinctly:

. . . no injustice shall be done without appeal in local legislation.

The Minister of Justice is charged with the responsibility of seeing that provincial legislatures cannot pass legislation which deprives Canadian citizens of their democratic rights. The Minister of Justice and the government have been quick to use this power of disallowance when property rights were at stake, or when Canadian bankers felt that they were being discriminated against. But when the people of Saskatchewan were being denied the right to decide who would constitute the government of that province the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister failed to take any action. It is not enough for the Prime Minister to say that he is opposed to parliaments extending their own terms of office. He must do more than that. He must act. He is the custodian of the rights and privileges of the Canadian people, and in failing to disallow legislation by which the Saskatchewan government extended its own life the Prime Minister and his government, it seems to me, were derelict and negligent in the discharge of their duty.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask the hon. member a question? I think he was in the house when the Ontario government, on perhaps more than one occasion, extended its tenure of office by extending the term of the legislature. Did the hon. member or any-

one else raise the question he is now raising as to the dominion's interfering with the province in that matter?

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): May I reply to the Prime Minister by saying that in respect of the action of the Ontario legislature, that government had the consent of the official opposition. It is true there were eight votes cast against it by Liberal members, but the official opposition in the Ontario legislature voted in support of the resolution to extend the term of office.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My point goes beyond the opposition and the government; it goes to the rights of the people themselves as they are protected by the constitution. It is not for members of parliament, through agreement among themselves, to extend the term of parliament and the time for which they were elected.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Why did the Prime Minister of Canada not recommend to the governor in council that some action should have been taken in that regard?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I feel very strongly that it is not for the federal government to interfere with provinces in matters which by the constitution have been assigned to them.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): The Prime Minister certainly believed in interfering where Alberta was concerned, when he thought the bankers and some of the property owners of this country were being discriminated against.

In my view the government still has until April of this year to take some steps in the matter. I think the Prime Minister has a responsibility to inform the premier of Saskatchewan that any further attempt to extend the life of his government, without a mandate from the people, will compel the federal government to use the power of disallowance, in order to protect the democratic rights of the people of that province. If the Saskatchewan government should once more attempt to extend its own life, let me tell this government here and now that we in this group will take appropriate measures to bring the matter before parliament and the country, in order to ask the federal government to use its power of disallowance to preserve that democracy for which brave men daily are laying down their lives.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Would my hon. friend, when he suggests that we should tell the Saskatchewan government what they should do, also say that I should raise at the same time a question about absentee leadership, and if they approve absentee leadership, whether it be in the leadership of the opposition in the provincial or in the federal field?

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): May I say to the Prime Minister that the only reason why I am at the present time an absentee leader in Saskatchewan is that the Liberal government of Saskatchewan has not dared to call any of the four by-elections that are due, or a general election in that province.

May I now turn to the speech from the throne—and I hope I shall be given some extra time, because of the interruptions made during my speech. This is the ninth debate on speeches from the throne I have witnessed in the house, and I must say it is the most astounding of them all. A speech from the throne debate is not generally considered something to be got rid of. It has generally been considered a debate during which several ministers of the crown would give an account of their stewardship, and during which they could outline the legislation they intend to present to the house. It has been considered that during the debate on the speech from the throne ministers would enunciate the principles and directives underlying that legislation. This debate would probably have closed last night, had it not been for the subamendment, and yet not a single minister on the treasury benches has taken part in it, with the exception of the Prime Minister—and he did not discuss the speech from the throne, but rather discussed Mr. John Bracken, and the speeches made by Lord Halifax and General Smuts.

Why this veil of silence? The ministers of the government make me think that the government programme is something like a little boy who has been given a lovely Christmas box wrapped in silver paper and bound with red ribbon, and that they are now standing aside in apprehensive timidity lest the little boy should ask permission to open it in order to see what is inside. I do not think they care to discuss this very promising programme they have placed before the Canadian people. After all, it is not sufficient to say that the war appropriation resolution will serve as a substitute. The people of Canada would like to know what plans the government have to deal with that period of transition from a war-time to a peace-time economy. That will not be covered by the war appropriation measure. Has the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) no plans concerning the period of transition to place before the house? Has the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) nothing to say about the tremendous problems

which will face agriculture when some of these subsidies are withdrawn, and when agriculture is faced with peace-time problems? Yet none of these ministers has had a word to say in the course of the debate.

In some quarters this speech from the throne has been held out as an epic-making document, while in others, the people are suspicious of it, and it is not hard to understand why they are suspicious. I hold in my hand two documents, the first of which is a copy of a paper dated August 13, 1919, containing the programme passed at a Liberal convention at which the present Prime Minister was elected as leader of the Liberal party. It certainly is a promising document. I see here that the principal articles of food are to be placed on the free list. Farm implements, farm machinery, flour mill and saw mill machinery and repair parts are to be placed on the free list, and wearing apparel and footwear are to have a reduction of at least fifty per cent in duty. I see further that there is to be an increase in the British preference to fifty per cent. I see further a resolution moved by W. L. Mackenzie King and seconded by Arthur Roebuck—a most interesting resolution. I cannot read it all, but I notice that they were to give us the federal incorporation of cooperative associations. I notice further that there was to be an acceptance of the principle of proportional representation. Then I find here a long resolution moved, I believe, by Colonel Ralston, who is now Minister of National Defence; and it is just as rosy as some of the promises which now, twenty-five years later, appear in the speech from the throne. Soldiers were to have cash grants, such grants to be in addition to the present gratuity and pay for disability resulting from service. It states:

> That such pensions or allowances be granted as shall enable soldiers or their dependents, as the case may be, to maintain a liberal standard of living sufficient to guarantee health, education and all the necessities, comforts and amenities which go to make up a standard of living worthy of Canadian citizenship.

After twenty-five years each of those promises has been more honoured in the breach than in the observance. I have another document here which helps to make me more sceptical about the speech from the throne. This is a reprint of the statement handed to the press by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) the night of the general election, October 14, 1935. It is an interesting document. It states:

> The election is an endorsation of the Liberal view that credit is a public matter, not of interest to bankers only, but of direct concern to every citizen.

And again:

> The electorate has declared that a responsible ministry, not organized finance and international money power, is to control in all matters of state.

It says:

> It is a verdict for the democratization of industry, in the rights of labour and consumers to have their voice heard and influence felt in the control of industrial policy. It is a warning and rebuke to arrogant employers of labour who have sought to intimidate their employees to prevent them from enjoying the free exercise of the franchise which is the birthright of every Canadian citizen.

I ask hon. members to put that statement alongside P.C. 9384 and see how they compare. Further on in the same statement:

> It is a verdict in favour of personal liberty, electoral reform, and of measures which will, among other things, prevent the national radio being surreptitiously used by any political party for the defamation of character.

And again:

> It is a verdict in favour of a more equitable distribution of wealth, with increasing regard to human need, to the furtherance of social justice, and to the promotion of the common good.

Then one more statement:

> In the new era which dawns to-day, the struggle for the rights of the people will, in the realm of economic liberty and security, be carried on as never before. Poverty and adversity, want and misery, are the enemies which Liberalism will seek to banish from the land.

And again:

> We take up at once, as our supreme task, the endeavour to end poverty in the midst of plenty, starvation and unnecessary suffering in a land of abundance, discontent and distress in a country more blessed by Providence than any other on the face of the globe.

This effusion of eloquence was followed by four years of young men riding the rods, with 400,000 unemployed and in the neighbourhood of a million people on relief. Is it any wonder that we are rather sceptical of the speech from the throne and the fine promises that are now held out to the Canadian people? As a matter of fact, when one comes to examine the promises they are not so specific. After a cursory mention of the fact that the first objective must be the winning of the war, the speech from the throne proceeds to say that there are three main tasks which must be accomplished after the war: first, demobilization; second, conversion of our machinery of production from a war-time to a peace-time economy, and, third, social security measures.

With regard to demobilization it says that a broad programme has already been developed. Are we to take from this that the

machinery now set up for the demobilization and care of our discharged men is the ultimate? Has the government nothing new to add except establishing a veterans' welfare department? Is there no new machinery to be added? If there is not, then heaven help the thousands of young men who will be coming back after this war. Heaven help them if something more adequate is not provided by the government.

With regard to the transfer from war-time to peace-time economy the speech from the throne states that the maintenance of full employment will "require" certain things. There is no statement as to how it is proposed to accomplish them. Two things are mentioned, an industrial bank and a sop which is thrown out to industrialists in the form of certain tax modifications.

Then we come to number three, social security. Some newspapers have set out fourteen points covering what the government is going to do, but the speech from the throne does not say what the government is going to do. The social security measures that have been set up already are very meagre, and the speech states that the working out of a comprehensive national scheme will require further consultation. Then follows the only promise:

> My ministers will welcome opportunities for such consultation.

That can mean very little, "will welcome opportunities for further consultation." It states further that they are prepared to provide for federal assistance in a nation-wide system of health insurance. There is no guarantee there that they are going to set up a nation-wide system of insurance. It states only that they are prepared to provide assistance. Anyone who has examined the findings of the Sirois report knows perfectly well that the provincial governments with their present limited sources of revenue will require more than assistance; they will require that the federal government either accept almost full responsibility or give to the provincial governments much larger sources of revenue than are now available to them.

In the light of what has happened in the past; in the light of these very vague statements, we in this group are not greatly encouraged by the speech from the throne. We shall welcome any social security measures which the government may bring down during this session, but we have no confidence as yet that these measures will be adequate or that the government is prepared to deal with the fundamental economic base which must be set up in order to provide full employment and make possible adequate social security.

May I deal now with what the speech from the throne says about agriculture? In all of the long speech—this is one of the longest for many years—only three lines are devoted to agriculture. It states:

> To ensure economic stability for agriculture, you will be asked to make provision for a price floor for staple farm products.

That will all depend upon what the floor is. If it is a basement floor it will be of no value. If it is to be the floor we now have it will be of little worth the moment subsidies now paid under the War Measures Act are taken away. I may say to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) that the farmers of this country are concerned as to what will happen when the subsidies now being paid—subsidies which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) has suggested are being paid for the benefit of the consumer and not for the benefit of the producer—are removed. The floors which are now set will be totally inadequate.

It is true that the farmer has been receiving better prices for some of his products during the past few months. This may be partly due to the fact that two by-elections in western Canada did not deal very kindly with the Liberal candidates and it may be due partly to the fact that we are coming close to a federal election. As a matter of fact, I have always suspected that if you X-rayed a Canadian farmer you would find that he was pretty well streaked. There would be four streaks of lean for the four hard years and then one streak of fat for the election year. Every four or five years something has to be done for the farmer, and then he goes back to the lean years again after the election year.

The case of wheat is a good example. For years, hon. members on this side of the house have asked the government to suspend trading on the Winnipeg grain exchange and to establish a parity price for wheat. A delegation of four hundred farmers came here from Saskatchewan nearly two years ago and placed their case before the cabinet. No action was taken. The hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright) and I both moved motions last year in this house calling upon the government to take steps along the lines I have already mentioned. No action was taken. But this past year, when the world surplus of wheat was shrinking visibly and the demand for wheat was causing the price on the open market to rise, on the 28th of September the government stepped in, suspended trading in wheat, and fixed the price at $1.25; and fourteen days later, on the 12th October, passed an order in council giving them authority to do what they had done fourteen days before. Why? Because as a matter of fact the government, which had

pinned its faith up until then on an open market, found that if the open market were to continue the farmer would probably be getting $1.50 a bushel for wheat. Therefore they stepped in, at long last, not to help the farmer, but because they realized that the open market was now going to work to the advantage of the farmer, whereas before it had worked to his disadvantage.

I want to remind the Minister of Trade and Commerce that about fifty-four per cent of the 1942 crop was sold by the farmers on the open market, and that they will get no benefit out of the participation certificates, or any increased price, for that wheat.

What is true of wheat was equally true of hogs. During the last two sessions hon. members on this side of the house tried to impress upon the Minister of Agriculture that, unless we got a price for hogs which was commensurate with the price of other commodities, and unless the farmers could have some help retained on their farms, they would be forced out of hog production. What happened? To bring the situation to a head, this fall a subsidy of ten cents a bushel on oats and fifteen cents a bushel on barley was paid. The farmers, short of help, now realized it was better to sell coarse grains than to use them for feed. Last fall the farmers began to go out of hogs; and what was most alarming to me, watching the figures, was that twenty to twenty-three per cent of the hogs being shipped were breeding hogs.

Mr. GARDINER: The hon. member did not follow the figures.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I did, and I followed them very closely.

Mr. GARDINER: Those are not the figures.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Well, the minister can give the figures when we reach the war appropriation debate. That will give him plenty of time to get the figures.

Mr. GARDINER: The hon. member will get them as soon as he is through.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I am glad if I have succeeded in getting the minister on his feet. If I have got him to break the veil of silence I shall be more than satisfied.

When the farmers began to put their live stock on the market in such quantities that it was glutted, the minister had to find a scapegoat, and the scapegoat he found was the C.I.O. workers in the packing plants whom he blamed for holding up the slaughtering of the farmers' hogs. I do not mind a man making a mistake, and I do not mind, indeed I rather admire him if he accepts responsibility for it; but when he tries to lay the blame on a group of workers in the packing plants who are working long hours, often with inexperienced help, I think he is taking advantage of people who cannot answer back.

The objection which we have to the programme outlined by the government is that, while they may mention a social security measure here or a social security measure there, without any definite commitments, there is nothing to indicate that they propose to deal with the fundamental changes which must take place in our economy if we are to maintain full employment, provide a maximum market here in Canada, and provide for the exchange of our surplus commodities with other countries.

In the time allotted to me I cannot discuss the changes which must take place in other fields of our economy. I should like to say a few words about the changes which must take place in agriculture in order to enable it to pass from war-time economy into our peacetime economy with the minimum of dislocation for the country and for the farmers. After all, we are on the threshold of a new era as far as agriculture is concerned. As regards the decisions of the conference at Hot Springs, the united nations agreed to set up certain minimum nutritional standards whereby we shall guarantee to every man, woman and child in the united nations all the food they require, and guarantee to the farmers who produce that food an adequate living for doing so. If that policy is followed, then, as the vice-president of the United States has said, "the breath of the future is upon us," and we are now coming into a new era as far as agriculture is concerned.

I should like to outline here, briefly, twelve points, some of which we of this group have brought to the attention of the house before, and will continue to bring to the attention of the house throughout the session in asking the government to give these matters consideration. I enumerate them because I have no time to discuss them at length.

1. The establishment of basic parity prices for all farm products; this price to bear a direct relationship to the cost of production. That is not a floor price, but a price which will vary with changing costs of production.

2. The establishment of marketing boards for the purpose of carrying on orderly marketing of farm products.

We believe that, wherever two-thirds of the producers of any farm commodity agree, there should be set up a marketing board on which

there shall be adequate producer representation for the purpose of taking delivery of that particular product.

3. A comprehensive system of crop insurance to apply to all Canadian farmers producing crops in which there is an element of risk.

The premiums for such crop insurance to be included when computing the basic parity price.

4. The setting up of a board of live stock commissioners with power to license, regulate and control the facilities for assembling, transporting, yarding, slaughtering, processing and packing, together with the facilities for grading and selling all live stock and carcass products designed for human consumption, and in addition all live and dressed poultry and eggs should be subject to the jurisdiction of this board.

5. The establishment of an agricultural bank for the refinancing of farm mortgages at a maximum rate of two and one-half per cent interest.

6. The passing of a dominion cooperative act to enable farmers to establish cooperatives and to permit the coordination of present provincial cooperatives under a national charter.

7. The setting up of a farm implement board for the purpose of working with the cooperatives in order to manufacture and distribute farm implements at the lowest possible cost.

8. Federal and provincial legislation to provide that every farmer who is honestly endeavouring to pay his way shall be able to retain his farm and to pass it on unencumbered to his children or to make such other disposition of it as he may see fit.

9. The establishment of an ever-normal granary to store surpluses of non-perishable goods, and the building of storage facilities in order to carry a reserve of prepared and processed goods which are of a perishable nature.

10. The setting up of export and import boards in order to dispose of surplus products in conformity with the principle laid down by the united nations conference on food and agriculture held at Hot Springs, Virginia, last May, at which it was agreed that freedom from want of food suitable and adequate for the health and strength of our people can be achieved and that in supplying this food the producers can and should be adequately rewarded.

11. The provision of large sums for soil and water conservation and for irrigation projects in order to preserve Canada's farm lands and to provide employment in the post-war period.

12. Immediate research into the field of chemurgy. The erection of factories in western Canada after the war for the purpose of utilizing agricultural products for industrial purposes.

We believe, Mr. Speaker, that this would constitute a bold and imaginative programme for agriculture. We believe that unless we are prepared to adopt such a programme we shall not lay the economic base without which it is impossible to have in this country either full employment or adequate social security.

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): I had not intended to speak in this debate, but in view of the challenge which the last speaker (Mr. Douglas, Weyburn) has given I shall say a few things with reference to what he has stated to the house.

In the first place he has suggested that no minister during this debate, excepting the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), has spoken up to the present time, and he has been more or less critical of that fact. Well, at the beginning of the debate I had understood that it was the consensus of the house generally that we should do everything possible to shorten the debate. Members of the government have a number of opportunities upon which to deal with the questions with which their departments are particularly concerned. When estimates are brought before the house it is our opportunity to place upon *Hansard* a record of all the activities of the different departments, and we have the opportunities which are presented when we are bringing down legislation. We have also the opportunities which are presented when members from different parts of the house ask questions on the orders of the day, and I took advantage to-day of one such question in order to place certain information before the house.

The debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne has never been regarded as the special opportunity for ministers of the crown. Rather it has been looked upon as the special opportunity of private members to voice their views, a time when they have the privilege of speaking on any question concerning matters of government. I think therefore that ministers are to be commended rather than condemned if, on an occasion of this kind when it has been considered essential by all that the debate should be shortened as much as possible, they allow private members to take up the greater part if not the whole of the time devoted to debate.

When the hon. member for Weyburn rose he said he would agree with a statement made by

the leader of the house, the Prime Minister, and on this occasion I would like to agree with the statement made by his leader the other night, when, as I noticed, the hon. member for Weyburn was not as much in agreement with what that hon. gentleman said as I was, judging from the expression on his face. When the Prime Minister was discussing these matters the other day he referred to a number of things, one of which was the advisability of appealing to the people at the end of a term of office; and that has been referred to by the hon. member for Weyburn. Another matter touched upon was the advisability of leaders of parties, who intend to represent the people, finding a seat in the house where it is meant that they should attend to lead their group. I was surprised to hear my hon. friend, referring to that matter a few moments ago, say that the present government in Saskatchewan has not called an election, in constituencies which have been vacated within the last few months, in order to make it possible for him to enter the house in that province.

It has been, I believe, the almost invariable custom for members of a party who already have seats in the house to resign a seat and challenge the government to put up a candidate against their leader when he has been chosen to lead them in the house. But in the province of Saskatchewan, where by the way the real leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party is serving his country overseas with the armies of the empire, a convention was called during that gentleman's absence and a new leader was chosen. That new leader holds a seat in this house, and I am not surprised that no follower of the real leader of the C.C.F. party, who is at present serving overseas, has seen fit to resign his seat in the house in Saskatchewan in order to make it possible for the hon. member to contest that constituency.

What gave me considerable pleasure, when listening to the hon. member for Weyburn say that he agreed with statements made by my leader, was the privilege which I have of agreeing with statements made by his leader,—

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I agree too.

Mr. GARDINER:—when he said the other night that he agreed with the leader of this party and of this house that it was essential that a leader of opposition should find a seat in the house in which he aspires to leadership. Well, my friend claims that he is leader of the C.C.F. in Saskatchewan, and he uses this house as a sounding board and as a platform to make a speech which to all intents and purposes would be a campaign speech in an election in the province of Saskatchewan. I agree again with the leader of his own group, that the proper thing for my hon. friend to do, if he desires to discuss provincial questions in the manner in which he has discussed them this afternoon, is to seek a seat in the Saskatchewan legislature and discuss those questions there where they can be properly debated and answered.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): One cannot enter the house unless the government calls an election.

Mr. GARDINER: The next point that occurs to me is one that was brought up by his leader the other day. It seems to be a favorite topic of discussion when C.C.F. speakers make speeches, either in this house or outside, to refer to the Liberal platform of 1919. He brings into the house a copy of an old paper and recites that platform. He reads it to the house and makes no explanations with regard to it and then he proceeds to be critical. I had the privilege of being on the resolutions committee of the convention of 1919 as representative of the Liberal group who were sitting in the legislature of Saskatchewan at that time, and I would like to tell members of this house, including the leader of the C.C.F. party and his chief supporter, the leader of the C.C.F. party in the province of Saskatchewan, that that convention was made up of representation from the Liberal parties from every province in the dominion and from the different sections of the different provinces which had more than one Liberal organization represented. The information submitted to the resolutions committee and to the convention as a whole was a document about three-quarters of an inch thick and it contained the plaftorms of all the Liberal parties in all the provinces of Canada. Those platforms were studied, and out of them, with the assistance of men representing every provincial Liberal group in Canada, there was worked the platform from which my hon. friend was reading.

What has happened since that time? The Liberals went back to the provinces. They did not do what my hon. friend has done here to-day—suggest that the government of Canada should start to direct the activities of the provinces. They went back to the provinces and in their own legislatures they placed upon the statute books of those provinces the legislation that was embodied in the principles of Liberalism as drawn by the 1919 convention in so far as they related to provincial affairs. My hon. friend comes here this afternoon and instead of reciting these facts he starts to read twelve points drafted in Regina a short time ago—at a meeting behind closed doors, by the way—that ought

to be applied to agriculture in Canada. In doing that he recites that his party is in favour of cooperation. If he will go back to the province from which he comes and examine the statutes of that province he will find that it has the most advanced legislation with regard to cooperation that can be found anywhere in Canada, and just as advanced as can be found anywhere in the world. As a matter of fact, much of that legislation has been copied by others. Then he relates the same kind of argument to the importance of public health and social security. I would call his attention to the fact that there is not a single thing in all the recommendations of the Beveridge report that is not already covered in principle in legislation of the province from which he comes, with the one exception of family allowances, and this government has taken care of that in this session. That being so—

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): In principle, not in legislation.

Mr. GARDINER: It has been announced that it is going to be done.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): It is always announced; that has been the cry for years.

Mr. GARDINER: Then my hon. friend says we are going to ask the provinces to consider with us some of the suggested social legislation. Why, of course we are. The province of Saskatchewan has municipal doctors paid for out of the tax rates of the municipalities in which they serve. It has municipal hospitals. It has free treatment of tuberculosis. It has clinics which have been operating for many years. It has maternity grants, mothers' allowances, et cetera. I could go on and recite one social service after another. Does anyone suggest we are going to bring legislation into this house without consulting the provinces that have these services established, in order to determine what the relationship is to be in the future between the set-up of this government to administer such legislation and the set-up that already exists in the provinces? Of course the thing is unthinkable. But the point I wish to make is this, that the platform of 1919 recommended that all these things enunciated as policies of the Liberal party be brought into effect by any institution of government that we might have in the dominion, from the municipalities up to the parliament which meets in Ottawa, and much of it has been brought into effect.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Much has not.

Mr. GARDINER: My hon. friend took occasion to speak of farming, and in speaking of farming he demonstrates about the same amount of information as he does with regard to political platforms drafted by other political parties. Apparently he does not know that every farm product grown in Canada is being sold to-day at prices which are at parity or above parity, and I do not exclude the recent sales of wheat.

Mr. WRIGHT: What parity are you taking?

Mr. GARDINER: The prices asked by the farm federation based on 1926 and 1929, which the farm federation takes as parity, and I would much rather take their figures than those of my friends on the other side of the house.

Mr. WRIGHT: They did not take those.

Mr. GARDINER: The parity prices asked for by the farm federation are the parity prices I refer to when I make that statement. In dealing with that matter my hon. friend takes his usual course. He states it in such a manner as not to give all the facts—therefore, to give a wrong impression. He left the impression in this house, Mr. Speaker, that when wheat was rising in price the government stepped in and said: We are not going to let it go any higher. Of course he knows the government did not do any such thing. He knows as well as I do that during the period between the time when our American friends and others came on the Canadian market to buy wheat and September 28 there was no way of hedging the purchases which had been made, and thus securing anyone who purchased the grain against possible losses, with the result that the farmers in western Canada during that period of time were being asked to take a spread as high as seventeen cents a bushel between Fort William and street prices; whereas the usual spread would be somewhere around six or seven cents a bushel, and if we had continued with the market open at Winnipeg over any considerable length of time there would have been no possibility of farmers being able to regain that amount of money which had been denied to them in order to carry any risks which there were. Therefore the government undertook to carry the risks, and in undertaking to carry the risks we took over all the wheat that had been marketed. That wheat was purchased at $1.23¼ a bushel. After we had purchased that wheat we said to the world and to the farmers of Canada: That wheat belongs to the government. It is going to be used to make up any gifts which we

make to any country in the world by way of relief, and it is going to be utilized in connection with mutual aid.

Those wheat purchases by the government made possible participation payments on 1940 wheat, 1941 wheat and 1942 wheat. Again my hon. friend does not give all the facts when he comes to deal with participation certificates. He picks his own year. He picks 1942, and he says that in that year fifty-four per cent of the wheat was delivered to the open market. That would leave only forty-six per cent of it to be delivered to the board. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that in the year 1940 nearly all the wheat was delivered to the board. In the year 1941 nearly all the wheat was delivered to the board.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): No.

Mr. GARDINER: Well, a very large percentage of it. Why was it not delivered to the board in 1942?

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): The market price was above the board price.

Mr. GARDINER: The market price was above the board price; that is exactly right. Then my hon. friend says the farmers of western Canada came down here in the spring of 1942 and asked for a number of things, none of which was done. Well, if he will come to my office I will show him quite a number of communications from farm organizations in western Canada thanking us for what was done as a result of that mission of farmers to Ottawa. And even in connection with this very question some things which were very material were done. In the time at my disposal I cannot go into details with regard to the matter, other than to say that the advance on wheat—not the price—was set at ninety cents a bushel, and finally, late in the season, as has been said, the price of wheat was higher and wheat went to the trade in considerable quantities. What I wish to say about that is this. Every member of this government that I have heard discussing the question—and certainly I as Minister of Agriculture—went through the length and breadth of western Canada and warned the farmers not to pay any attention to my hon. friends across the way who were saying that because there had been no participation on wheat in the past there would be no participation in the future.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I rise to a point of order. The minister cannot make a statement like that unless he is prepared to corroborate it. No member of this group to my knowledge ever made such a statement. We told them to sell to the wheat board, not on the open market. The minister ought to know that.

Mr. GARDINER: My hon. friend admits this, that I at least advised them to deliver to the wheat board irrespective of the price. He will admit, too, that men who are supporters of his group and opponents of the party to which I belong went around the province of Saskatchewan making exactly the statement I have just made.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Not to my knowledge.

Mr. GARDINER: Well, to my knowledge, and I could quote extracts from newspapers and other publications. What is the present position in regard to this matter? My hon. friend leaves the impression that a price of $1.25 a bushel has been established for wheat, and that this price cannot go up. No such thing has been done. What this government did last September was to place a floor under the price of wheat for two years, until July 31, 1945, on wheat taken in after September 28, 1943. We guaranteed that for every bushel of wheat delivered to the elevators we would pay on the basis of $1.25, No. 1 northern Fort William; and then what do we say with regard to that wheat? We say that this wheat, differing from the wheat which is to go under mutual aid or to countries to which we are giving relief, is to be sold for what it will bring. I am not in a position at the moment to state what the price is, but I submit that this wheat is being sold at considerably more than the floor price which has been referred to, so that the statement I made a few moments ago with regard to parity is correct as far as recent sales are concerned.

That being the case, why does an hon. member of this house rise in his place and say that this government fixed a price of $1.25 a bushel for wheat, and thus stopped wheat from going to $1.50 a bushel? Wheat is being taken in by the government on a guaranteed floor of $1.25 a bushel and is being sold in the markets of the world for prices up toward $1.50. Every farmer who delivers a bushel of wheat under that programme is given a participation certificate which entitles him to the earnings of the wheat which is being delivered to the markets of the world at the present time or which will be delivered in future. My hon. friend says he did not go around the province of Saskatchewan advising farmers against the plan which was in effect prior to last year, but as I listened to him this afternoon he gave me the impres-

sion that we were having wheat delivered at $1.25 a bushel and that the farmer would have no further interest in that wheat, that he would not obtain the benefit of any increase in the selling price. That is exactly what his group said previously with regard to wheat delivered to the board or to the trade.

In the few moments he was on his feet my hon. friend also dealt with another matter, in connection with the delivery of hogs, and at the time I said I would place the figures on record as soon as he was through. I have these figures before me, by the way; the reason for having them is that I have had them on my desk ready to hand in the first time questions are called. The question, in reply to which these figures were prepared, was asked a few days ago by the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross), and I have been awaiting an opportunity to lay them on the table. His first question was:

How many sows were marketed in Canada each month, (a) from July 1 to December 31, 1942; (b) from July 1 to December 31, 1943?

Now listen to the answer:

	(a) 1942	(b) 1943
July	45,384	69,465
August	34,533	69,484
September	27,050	71,320
October	19,034	61,381
November	24,768	39,868
December	25,421	24,489

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Has the minister those figures by provinces?

Mr. GARDINER: I can get them by provinces, but they are not so given in this return.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): If he takes the western provinces he will find that the percentage of sows delivered was much higher.

Mr. GARDINER: I shall deal with those figures in a moment. As I have stated, this information was obtained in response to a question placed upon the order paper, and it will appear in *Hansard* within a few days. What do they show? We made an announcement of policy on October 22, as my hon. friend said a few moments ago. The heaviest deliveries of sows in 1943 were in July, August, September and October. Then we made our announcement. The next month deliveries amounted to 39,868, and the next month to 24,489. There is no indication in these figures that any announcement made by this government on October 22 had anything whatever to do with the marketing of sows in great numbers in western or eastern Canada or anywhere else.

Mr. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. GARDINER: If my hon. friend will just contain himself, I have the rest of the information here and he will not need to ask the question. The next part of the question asked by the hon. member for Souris reads:

How many barrows and gilts were marketed each month between the above dates under (a) selects; (b) B1's; (c) heavies; (d) all other grades?

If I have permission I should like to place this table on *Hansard* and not take time to read all the figures.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Mr. GARDINER: The table is as follows:

	Grade A (a)	Grade B1 (b)	Heavies (c)	All other grades (d)	Total
1942—					
July	123,170	201,220	14,223	122,958	461,571
August	92,029	144,691	8,001	86,529	331,250
September	138,490	211,762	11,895	98,688	460,835
October	147,450	221,979	20,185	103,565	493,179
November	172,495	273,404	29,032	139,846	614,777
December	201,537	325,592	36,234	158,960	722,323
1943—					
July	146,573	204,956	18,171	180,662	550,362
August	104,701	143,570	14,019	137,963	400,253
September	151,432	210,855	18,313	162,300	542,900
October	172,890	246,338	24,504	170,260	613,992
November	227,709	352,054	32,038	203,574	815,375
December	291,139	476,859	35,961	239,441	1,043,400

Let us look at the figures for July. In 1942 there were 123,170 grade A's delivered and in 1943 there were 146,573, or an increase of 23,403. In the B1's, 201,220 were delivered in 1942 and 204,956 in 1943. In the heavies, 14,223 were delivered in 1942 and 18,171 in 1943. Of all other classes or grades, 122,958 were delivered in 1942 and 180,662 in 1943. The totals show that in July, 1942, there were 461,571 deliveries while in July, 1943, there were 550,362 and there is a constant rise in deliveries from July to December, which is the last month given. Let us look at the figures for that month. In 1942 there were 201,537

grade A's delivered, while in December, 1943, there were 291,139. In December, 1942 there were 325,592 B1's and in 1943 there were 176,859. In December, 1942 there were 36,234 heavies delivered, and in 1943 there were 35,961, or fewer heavies in December, 1943, than in December, 1942. Of all other grades, in December, 1942 deliveries amounted to 158,960, and in 1943 to 239,441. What do the total figures show? In December, 1942 there were 722,323 hogs of all kinds marketed, while in December, 1943, there were 1,043,400 hogs marketed, or an increase of more than 33 1/3 per cent. My hon. friend gets up this afternoon, waves his arms, spreads them out to take in all Canada, and goes on to say that it is evident to everybody, that what they have been saying, that some day calamity was going to overtake agriculture, has materialized, and that we are down in the production of hogs in 1943.

Mr. WRIGHT: Would the minister give the date at which the embargo against the delivery of sows was put on in western Canada?

Mr. GARDINER: Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Also why did you reduce the amount of bacon to be delivered to Great Britain?

Mr. GARDINER: I am coming to that, too, in a moment. My hon. friend (Mr. Wright) has asked about sows, and because he is a farmer, and differs in that respect from the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Douglas), he will understand what I am going to say. My hon. friend knows that when you are marketing 33 1/3 per cent more hogs on the market you are going to market more sows on the market, too.

When did these farmers decide to market their sows? It was not after changes were made in the Canadian prices of feed grain in September. It was not after an announcement of policy on October 22. They had started to do it away back in June, and, so far as these figures are concerned, they carried it right through July, August and September, into October, and right down to the time we put the embargo on, about which the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright) has been talking. And then the marketing of sows went down, naturally.

Why were they up before? The hon. member for Melfort knows that many other farmers did what I did. Those of us in western Canada who raise hogs know this, that unless you have a superior kind of equipment you cannot raise successfully and market more than one litter of hogs, especially in Saskatchewan, from any one sow in any one year. What we do when we undertake to increase our production is this, if we are doing the thing we ought to do: We take a gilt that was littered, let us say in April or March, and we breed that sow in December of that year or January of the following year. Thus we have pigs from her when she is a year old. We wean the pigs in May or June. Then we sell the sow. Naturally anyone who is carrying on business on his farm economically in the western provinces marketed his sows as early as he could. And those of us who did not get them marketed before the embargo was put on found ourselves with sows on our hands. Yes, we found ourselves with those sows on our hands. That is no indication there was or was not to be a reduction in hog production. It is an indication that we just missed. We should have sold our sows, and would have been better off if we had done it. These high sales of sows in Canada during that period were natural to greatly increased production. It was good business for the farmers to sell their sows during that time.

My hon. friend says we have come to the time when the production of hogs in Canada is down. I gave figures earlier this afternoon indicating that if we market the number of pigs that we have been marketing for the last three months we shall have close to a billion pounds of bacon to send to Great Britain this year, even with increased marketings of hogs in Canada at the present time. I notice my hon. friend shakes his head. Well, he shook his head a year ago when I said that. He shook his head two years ago when I said it. They have been shaking their heads for four years. In other words, I agree with the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell) when he says that the people of Canada are not going to believe in people who make mistakes so often. The production of hogs has been going up every year, and it is still going up. Our problem to-day is not the problem of getting greater production in order to supply the market that we have. Our problem is to get shipping in order to take the hogs from where they have been produced, to the British market, or from where they are to some other part of the Canadian market. That is our problem to-day. And that is so with nearly all the farm products we have been discussing in the house.

May I say that no member of the British government since this war started has ever suggested to the government of Canada that we are not measuring up to our obligations in connection with the production of hogs. As a matter of fact, my colleague who sits in front of me went to Great Britain in the fall of

1939; and with the best efforts and support he could get from the officials of my department he was able to make a contract in Great Britain for only 291,000,000 pounds of bacon and ham. It was not until well on in that season that they consented to take 330,000,000 pounds, the amount we had for sale.

I myself went to Great Britain in October of 1940, and I worked on a contract. I tried to persuade the British that they needed the 425,000,000 pounds of bacon we had in sight at that time. After I had been there a month I came back to this house. What was the criticism I heard? The criticism was that I had been dickering with the British government and refusing to accept the price they were able to pay, in spite of the fact that we had these great quantities of bacon products to sell. But inside of two or three months, when my friends got out into the country, what did we hear? The story then was that we had not foreseen what did happen, and that we should have taken proper action to serve a greater market. When the time came we had the quantity available. Then my friends said, "You will not have enough." In 1942 we had 600,000,000 pounds; in 1943 we had 675,000,000, and this year they are coming in faster than they have ever come in in any preceding years. Our concern to-day is this: What are we going to do with them? That concern requires us to make some changes, and to evolve policies to take care of the matter. In working out these policies we must of necessity communicate with our friends to the south. Why? Before our American friends came into the war we stopped shipment of our food from this country, to the extent that was required, in order that we might send more to Great Britain. Since the Americans came into the war they have been lease-lending food to Great Britain, and much of that food is the same kind of food we produce in Canada. Through an understanding which we have with them we attempt to lend-lease our own food to Great Britain, and they lend-lease theirs. Producing all the food we possibly can for our own consumption and for British consumption, we have found the desire to produce to the limit on both sides of the line to have resulted in our packing plants being filled to capacity with hogs, with cattle, and with meat products of all kinds. The shipping from both countries is not sufficient to take care of our meat supplies, for all concerned. Some adjustments have to be made. But these adjustments are made by the shipping board, which has a very strong representation on it from the British government. As they require these greater quantities of food, from time to time, they will see to it that the ships get here to take it away, and in that way we will find a market for it.

But in the meantime there are certain things which have to be considered in connection with that matter. We shall have to be a little bit patient about some matters, and not simply say that because yesterday we did not have the market open into the United States and something has happened here that creates difficulty for us, at a time when there are just as great difficulties on the other side of the line, we should take off our restrictions and throw the food to them so that they will have trouble with it. That cannot be done in war time, when we have problems which concern us both.

Our intention is to get as much as possible of this meat over to the British front, where it is required, and to the fronts where our soldiers are fighting in different parts of the world. But what I wish to emphasize is the fact that our friends are still doing what they have been doing ever since this war started: They are praying for a calamity to come, and it has never come in so far as agricultural production is concerned. They are not quite big enough—I am not a big man myself—to stand up in their places and say that in spite of their prophecies last year, in spite of their prophecies of the year before, and in spite of their prophecies of the year before that, agriculture in Canada has gone on to greater and greater heights in production, and has done that in spite of the fact—this is their next statement on most occasions—that our opponents claim we have had a muddling of man-power in this country. When my hon. friend gets up and says, "You have not enough labour in agriculture, you have not enough labour in industry, you have not enough labour in shipping, you have not enough labour in our transportation organizations, you have not enough labour in our schools to teach our children, you have not enough labour in our armed forces," what does that mean? That means that all the available man-power of this country is engaged in prosecuting this war. That is all it means.

With reduced man-power upon the farm we have produced forty-eight per cent more farm products than we produced in the last year before the war. That does not indicate any muddling in man-power; it indicates that the man-power of this country is working more effectively and to better purpose than ever before. Why? An hon. member, I think it was the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell), said last night that I said something the other day about the necessity of having markets for our products. He made light of that statement. He lost the point entirely of

what I said. In the speech from which he was quoting I stated that in spite of the fact that we have reduced the man-power and woman-power on our farms by almost half a million we were producing over forty per cent more tonnage of food than we produced in the last year before the war. I went on to say that in spite of the fact that we have purchasing power in Canada greater in proportion to our population than we have ever had before, we are able to eat only six per cent more food in tonnage than we ate before the war. When those two facts are considered, I am afraid that those who criticize the statement that we must export some of it from this country, in other words find a market elsewhere for it, are advocates of the policy they sometimes accuse us of advocating, namely, a policy of scarcity, producing less so that you can sell each unit at a higher price. That would be the only policy which would be an alternative to the one I suggested in the remarks I have just made. That would be applicable to all primary production as well as other products produced from the natural resources of this country with the labour of Canadian people.

If my hon. friend really wants to know what the Liberal policy is, let me tell him that the whole intent of Liberal policy has been the same since it was first laid down in principle by economists and political leaders in the British isles. I said the same thing before the war; I said it again during the war, and I think it ought to be taken as proof that I should say it again after the war is over. If a man is right once, he ought to repeat the thing; if he is right the second time, he ought to say it again and not do as my hon. friends do, express one statement in the fall of 1939 with regard to the war and possible production, and then change that statement in 1942, make a new guess, and then change it in 1943 and make another guess. Then when we are in the fifth year of the war we find that they are still going right on guessing.

We on this side of the house are convinced that there is only one thing for the people of Canada to do in order to provide the amount of employment we talk about, and that is to produce everything that we are constituted to produce in the greatest possible quantity and then look about the world for places which produce the things we would like to have and without which we cannot live at the standard at which we desire to live, and endeavour to trade our surpluses with them. Someone said the other day that we had been twenty-five years in bringing that policy into effect. May I say to the hon. member who said that that in 1932 we got down to the lowest level of trade in relation to production in this country. There was a slight come-back down to 1934. What did we say to the people in 1935? We said that if we were put in power we would go out through the world where people are disunited and discontented and endeavour to make trade agreements. We made something over twenty and in spite of the threat of war we increased our trade with the outside world by fifty per cent. While increasing that trade by fifty per cent we decreased unemployment by fifty per cent. That is an indication of what the policy will do under the most difficult possible conditions in peace time.

What do my hon. friends say? They say, "No; give us socialism." Where did they go to find it. They went to the only countries where there was national socialism.

An hon. MEMBER: England?

An hon. MEMBER: New Zealand?

Mr. GARDINER: No, they did not go to New Zealand.

An hon. MEMBER: Sweden?

Mr. GARDINER: They went to central Europe. All one needs to do in order to be convinced of that is to read the recent books they have had published on the subject. They went to those countries which they said had learned the value of control in the last war—there were three of them—and they contended that we should apply it in this country. They are trying now to get away from the label of national socialism that was placed on them after they had—

Mr. COLDWELL: I rise to a point of order.

Mr. GARDINER: There is no point of order.

Mr. COLDWELL: We are at war with the national socialist states, and to call any group in this house "national socialist" is in my opinion, and I think in the opinion of this house, something that is unwarranted, particularly when we in this group derive our hopes, our aims and our aspirations from the democratic socialism which is carried on under the labour party in Great Britain and throughout the British empire.

Mr. GARDINER: I may not understand the English language, but when my hon. friends talk about the national socialization of everything in this country I should like to know what their right name is. Last night my hon. friends opposite were saying that we ought to call them Progressive Conservatives. Any one who reads history knows that no political party necessarily bears the name it has given itself. Political parties in the countries of the empire, the Tories, the Whigs,

the Grits, and so on, have been so named by their opponents. Names given by political opponents usually stick, and there is no name that describes them as well as national socialism. That being so, may I say to them that in the very books they have had written in order to convince the people of this country that they ought to vote for them, they talk about our young boys riding the rods before the war.

Mr. COLDWELL: To which you condemned them.

Mr. GARDINER: We did not condemn them; we were not in power. I shall deal with that in a minute. Why were they riding the rods?

An hon. MEMBER: Because of Liberal policy.

Mr. GARDINER: We will deal with that. They were riding the rods because we could not market the products of Canada in other countries. We were denied the right to market them in Germany; we were denied the right to market them in Italy; we were denied the right at certain stages to market them even in France. Apparently my hon. friend cannot solve a plain mathematical problem, one so simple that it would not be given to a grade eight class. The statement is that if you increase your production by forty-eight per cent and increase your consumption by only six per cent, if you were exporting a large percentage of your products before the increase, then you must trade your surplus to someone else.

Mr. COLDWELL: And people were starving in this country.

Mr. GARDINER: This was exactly the condition—

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Three cents a meal for those on relief in Saskatchewan.

Mr. GARDINER: The reason your wheat was twenty-six cents a bushel when my hon. friends opposite were in power was that Germany and France would not take it. There was no other legitimate reason. The reason why it was only seventy cents at the beginning of this war, or shortly before, was that we could not find people to take it. The reason why we are getting over $1.25 for it to-day is that we have demands for it, all over the world, and shipping is our shortage. There is not any other solution of this problem. My hon. friends have sent their emissaries over to these countries to examine into their institutions, and they came back here and said, "Apply them here".

Mr. COLDWELL: Who said that?

Mr. GARDINER: It is in your book. I have a copy up in my room and I can bring it down to-morrow and read it to you.

Mr. COLDWELL: Name one of the emissaries.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Name one.

Mr. GARDINER: I will get down to it in a moment.

Mr. COLDWELL: Name one.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Name one. We are not in Saskatchewan now.

Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Speaker, I will name one. That will end it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The minister's time has expired.

Mr. GARDINER: Wait until I answer this question.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. GARDINER: My hon. friend asked me to name one. I will name him, the most prominent one I know of, the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party in Saskatchewan, who is over in Europe to-day fighting for us, Mr. George H. Williams.

Mr. COLDWELL: Is he a national socialist?

Mr. GARDINER: He went to Russia.

Mr. COLDWELL: I say, is he a national socialist?

Mr. GARDINER: Oh, well, now, you asked the question. He belongs to the C.C.F.

Mr. COLDWELL: Certainly.

Mr. GARDINER: He went over to Russia and to other European countries, and came back and wrote a book. That book is still in print, and anybody can buy it and read it.

Mr. WRIGHT: Did he advocate national socialism?

Mr. GARDINER: And some of the people who write books whose principles are still being followed by my hon. friends also went over and examined these institutions, and came back and stated, "There are not any young men riding the rods over there." On the very next page they told us the reason. What was it? They said that the only three countries in the world which have taken a lesson from the last war and have adopted controls as against our free way of living are the only countries where young men are not riding the rods; and therefore, they said, we ought to adopt something similar over here.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Will the minister give the source, Mr. Speaker?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. In the first place the minister has exceeded his time; and in the second place, he cannot make quotations in this house without stating what he is quoting from. I do not know what he is using, unless it is his fictitious imagination; is he quoting from that?

An hon. MEMBER: Sit down.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I will not sit down, and nobody over there can make me.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

An hon. MEMBER: Sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no objection to the minister speaking over his time, and I do not hear any, he may continue.

Mr. COLDWELL: There were no objections as long as the minister was sticking to facts. But he has departed wholly from the facts and is drawing on his imagination, and I object to his time being extended further.

Mr. GARDINER: May I speak to this point of order? I am not sure that any hon. member has the right to restrict me to forty minutes. My hon. friend said a few moments ago that no minister has spoken in this house on this amendment; it was moved only last night; I am the first minister to speak on it; and I am not so sure that anybody can stop me if I wish to go on.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go ahead.

Mr. REID: I told you the minister had an answer.

Mr. GARDINER: My hon. friend says "Quote the book". I will quote that book exceedingly often before the session is over, and satisfy everybody. I have it upstairs. I did not know I was going to speak or I should have had it with me.

An hon. MEMBER: You should carry it around.

Mr. GARDINER: I will carry it around.

Mr. GRAYDON: Which one?

Mr. GARDINER: The reason why they have no young men riding the rods over there—

Mr. COLDWELL: May we have the point of order settled?

Mr. GARDINER: We shall have it in a few minutes.

[Mr. Gardiner.]

Mr. COLDWELL: No. I rose to a point of order, and Mr. Speaker is on his feet to give a ruling.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): The minister cannot run the show as he could in Saskatchewan.

Mr. SPEAKER: Standing order 37 reads:

> No member, except the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition, or a minister moving a government order and the member speaking in reply immediately after such minister, or a member making a motion of "no confidence" in the government and a minister replying thereto, shall speak for more than forty minutes at a time in any debate.

I take it that the subamendment, taken in conjunction with the motion and amendment, comes under the category of a motion of "no confidence" in the government. The minister may therefore continue his reply.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I just get a clarification? Do I understand you, Mr. Speaker, to say that the moving of a subamendment is a want of confidence motion? If so, I want to point out that last year I was prevented from speaking for more than forty minutes.

Mr. DUPUIS: The hon. member is not a minister of the crown.

Mr. SPEAKER: As the house knows, an address of humble thanks to His Excellency the Governor General having been moved, an amendment was moved by Mr. Graydon, seconded by Mr. Diefenbaker, regretting that His Majesty's advisers have failed in certain respects, to which Mr. Roy moved a further amendment, that the government has further failed in other respects. Amendments of this kind from any quarter of the house, if approved, would mean a vote of "no confidence" in the government. The government has not yet replied to the subamendment. Therefore hon. members making such amendments and a minister replying thereto have the right to speak without being limited in time, under the provisions of standing order 37.

Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Speaker, what I was stating when I was interrupted was that there was a reason why young men in those countries were not riding the rods. Those of us who belong to the Liberal party, and perhaps some others, gave that as a reason at the time. One of the reasons why I myself gave it in the years following 1936 was that I had the privilege of sitting in the gallery of the House of Commons in London in 1936, and I listened to the man who was sitting on the right-hand corner, as I faced him, in the front bench just across from the government. He

was asking the government of Great Britain of that time, which I have heard my friends condemn on quite a number of occasions, for the privilege of forming a small committee, a committee of four or five members of the house, and of meeting the government in council in order to discuss the conditions existing over on the continent of Europe which made unemployment not a possibility there at that time. After he had stated his case, a member of the government rose and denied him that right, and said that no member of the house knew better than he did that any hon. member could go to the government at any time and discuss any subject as important as that with the government, but they did not consider that any small group in the house knew so much more than the government itself knew with regard to that situation to lend sufficient importance to it to have a meeting of that kind. Well, now, that was during a debate on defence, and what he was trying to point out was that they were building on the continent of Europe at that time the greatest war machine the world has ever seen. At that time the man who was giving that warning got a very indifferent hearing, both in the house and outside. War came, and during the period before the war there was unemployment for reasons I have been indicating, namely, that we could not sell our products in the countries that were preparing for war against us. The war came in 1939, and it had been in progress only a few months when that same man was called to the premiership of Great Britain, and he has led us through the war. And what have we found out during that period? We have found that we could end unemployment by building a war machine. The United States has found the same thing; Britain has found the same thing; every country in the world has found the same thing; and in building a war machine at least as great as that of our opponents we have for the time being brought about lack of unemployment in the country. But, like my hon. friend who spoke last night, I am not going to follow the socialists into the next election or into the future and maintain that, in order to end unemployment, we must have the same kind of regimentation and control throughout peace time as was required in those various countries for war whether in preparation for or during war.

What is needed in the world is the new spirit spoken of by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and ridiculed a few moments ago by the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Douglas). My hon. friend apparently does not understand what the brotherhood of man leads to. The brotherhood of man does not lead to nationalism, with consumption in your own country of everything you are going to produce, and only the production of those things which you can consume in your own country. The spirit of the brotherhood of man leads to the production of all that can be produced in this country of those things which are needed in other parts of the world, and the distribution of them to all parts of the world. That is the ideal of Liberalism and it has been the ideal of Liberalism ever since the Liberal party has been known in Canada.

One thing that pleases me is that most other parties in this country are coming to think the same thing, and when they do come to think the same and meet behind closed doors in Winnipeg or Regina to draft a new platform, what do they do? A new platform in these days toward the end or in the middle of the war, days during which we are fighting for the freedoms that Liberalism has established in different countries throughout the world, under whatever name the principle may have operated, means simply this, that these people take up all the things done by the Liberal party, provincially and federally, and recite them as their own.

My hon. friends opposite say that floor prices came from John Bracken. They forget that we had a floor price under butter in 1938. They forget that we had a floor price under hogs and cheese in 1939-40. They forget that we had a floor price—their own party put a floor price, if you like to go back—of 87½ cents under wheat when Mr. Bennett was in power, but they have dropped the name of his party. We have put floor prices all the way from 70 cents to $1.25 under wheat at different times, and if anyone cares to search the records he will find that the week before Mr. Bracken made the announcement of his policies in Lethbridge I announced this particular policy, in connection with floor prices, in London on October 15 last, and the Prime Minister himself read it over the radio into the platform of this party very shortly after. The Prime Minister tells me that it was in the platform of the Federation before Mr. Bracken spoke.

In any event, a floor under farm products has been the policy of this government ever since the war started, and all we have said in any policy announced lately is that we shall bring down legislation to make it possible for us to apply that policy when the war ends to those products to which at present we can apply it, under the War Measures Act. The War Measures Act, as it now stands, applies only for six months after the war. We are to bring down legislation which will make it

possible for us to have floors under farm prices put into effect by this government and maintained beyond the war.

The hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) raised the constitutional question the other night, and someone else said that floors may be in the basement, while still another person said something else about it. Well, I should say this. My hon. friends opposite ask, where will you find markets? I have been saying something about that in the last few moments; but the market that has always been supplied, where floor prices have been involved, is the market supplied by the government of this country when it says that when products reach a certain price we shall take control of them and then try to find a market for them, after having taken them over at that price. There is nothing constitutionally wrong with that. There may be some other things that are difficult about it, but constitutionally there is nothing wrong with it.

And so finally, with regard to the attack made this afternoon, I say that we have in Canada an agricultural policy of which we are proud. We have the satisfaction of being able to stand anywhere in the dominion and say that the returns from agricultural products are better than they ever were previously in the whole history of the country, war time or any other time. We have the further satisfaction of being able to say that men are getting out of the debts they incurred during times when some others were administering the affairs of this country, that men are paying their debts and getting into the position where they can go on at the end of the war and operate more successfully than ever before.

My hon. friend makes an appeal to us to help those who are coming back from overseas. I agree with the hon. member who spoke from over in the corner the other day, after returning from overseas, that to be able to say that you are doing more than any other country has done is not enough. I do say, however, that we are doing so much and attempting to do so much more that I am quite sure that what another returned man said the other night over the radio is true, namely, that if the young men over there knew all the things he knows, after listening to certain things he has heard since coming here, they would be fairly well satisfied with what the Canadian government is doing to prepare for their home-coming. And those things which we have not done and which probably have not occurred to us, those things which others are suggesting ought to be done, are always given full consideration, and if they are helpful they are adopted from time to time as, I have no doubt, they will be adopted in the future.

[Mr. Gardiner.]

This government is in every sense a liberal government and we do not intend to apply state socialism either to agriculture or to any other line of industry in order to bring about prosperity in Canada, because we know that in a free world such as we shall have after the war, where there will not be national socialist states in Europe, where people will be prepared to trade with one another, and to treat one another as brother men, conditions will be very much better under a spirit of Liberalism than under any other spirit which can be established in this country.

Mr. A. M. NICHOLSON (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I must thank hon. members for the very long and loud ovation that I have just received.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Wrong again; try again.

Mr. A. M. NICHOLSON: I refrained from participating in this debate in the hope that a division might be reached last night, but to allow the minister's speech to go unanswered would indicate that he has spoken the truth. He does a great disservice to democracy when he fails to distinguish between the national socialism of Germany and the socialism that is practised in Sweden, in Australia, in New Zealand, or that is advocated in Great Britain where there are members of the cabinet who have called themselves socialists. We have refrained from saying "yes" when people have asked us if we are socialists, because it has been quite clear that many of our questioners have refused to clarify their own ideas as to socialism.

The minister does a great disservice to a former colleague of his in the Saskatchewan legislature, Major George H. Williams, M.L.A., who is the only leader in any legislature in Canada on active service. Major Williams did visit Russia a number of years ago and on his return wrote a book entitled "The Land of the Soviets". I should like to remind this house that the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Mackenzie King) visited Germany in 1936 and interviewed the fuehrer himself. Is there anyone in this house or in this country who would suggest that the Prime Minister of Canada is a national socialist because he visited Hitler?

Mr. ADAMSON: And gave him a buffalo.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I am informed that he presented some buffalo as a gift. I think the wartime information board should do some educational work on the cabinet ministers of this country so that they might understand more about the fundamental differences that are found in the different countries participat-

ing in this war. The Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) had as his guest upstairs to-day Doctor Henry Sigerist, professor of the history of medicine at Johns Hopkins university, who is here in Ottawa as a guest of the health league. I think the minister is to be commended for trying to find out what has been done in Russia, so that we might benefit by some of their achievements.

In connection with some of the concluding remarks of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), I say to him that the country which has done such a remarkable job in the 1940's is the same country that could do so little for its young people, for its unemployed, in the 1930's. The Minister of Agriculture must take responsibility for the conditions which prevailed in different parts of this country from 1935 to 1939 when five dollars a month was offered to many of our young people, when heroes of to-day were riding the boxcars of yesterday.

Mr. GARDINER: If the hon. member will permit me, what I was referring to in the general statement was references to Germany and Italy, which are referred to in "Social Planning in Canada".

Mr. NICHOLSON: At the moment we are referring to Canada. Major Williams' book was written after his visit to Russia. I gathered from what the minister said that he was making some reference to what Major Williams had written on his return.

Mr. GARDINER: My hon. friend asked me to name any member from his party who had been over there, and I named Mr. Williams.

Mr. COLDWELL: The reference was to national socialist countries and the Prime Minister is about the only one who has been officially in those countries.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Mr. Speaker, in support of my argument I should like to refer to the January issue of "Canada at War". I find on examining this booklet that thirty-five per cent of the man-power of Canada between the ages of eighteen and forty-five has joined the armed services. The sixty-five per cent at home includes cripples and many who have tried unsuccessfully to join the services. They, with women, children and the old people, have done a remarkable job for which the government of this country should not take too much credit. This job has been done in spite of the feeling in agriculture that the farmers are the forgotten people, in spite of the feeling amongst labour that the workers of this country are not accorded the consideration that the employers are receiving. Notwithstanding that, I find on page 39 of this publication that the production of miscellaneous military stores in 1943 was nearly six times as much as in 1939 and 1940, mechanical transport four times as much, cargo and naval vessels twenty times as much, aircraft eight times as much, armoured vessels ten times as much, guns and small arms 196 times as much, guns and ammunition fourteen times as much, instruments and signalling apparatus sixty-one times as much, chemicals seventy-six times as much, small arms thirty-seven times as much. In the field of agriculture our farmers have a wonderful record. In 1943 we had on the farms only three farmers for every four we had in 1939, but per farmer in Canada as a whole twice as much was produced. In connection with our shipments of pork products to the United Kingdom in 1943, this booklet shows that they were about three hundred per cent of what we sent in 1939, about fifty per cent more of wheat, about two hundred per cent more canned fish, about fifty per cent more cheese and about forty times as many eggs.

I should like to correct the impression that the minister gave that we were consuming only six per cent more food in 1943 than in 1935-39. In this publication I find that we were consuming 18 per cent more dairy products than we consumed in the 1935-39 period, 12 per cent more meats. We were up to 29 per cent in beef; poultry, 2 per cent; eggs, 24 per cent; potatoes, 7 per cent; tomatoes and citrus fruits, 20 per cent; coffee, 11 per cent, and cocoa, 19 per cent. In a few items we were down: tea, refined sugar and butter.

Mr. GARDINER: These are in dozens and quarts; I was speaking of tons.

Mr. NICHOLSON: This booklet says "Consumption in Canada in percentages." We were down in butter and tea. With thirty-five per cent of our man-power in uniform we have established this remarkable record. The point we have been making again and again is that it should not require a war every generation to speed up our production, to give our people more beef, pork, butter and eggs than they had in peace time. The figures I have given show what we have been able to do under the stress of war. We have made these very, very large gifts to Great Britain—and we are all for it—and at home we have had more and better food. Why? Because for the first time in twenty years many of our people are able to go into a store and buy adequate supplies of food.

The minister intimated that he is well satisfied with the social security legislation that is in effect in many parts of the dominion and he thinks the Liberal party should deserve a good deal of credit for it. I should like to turn now to what has been done in the field of health in Canada. The reports that have been submitted to the advisory committee on health insurance contain some material that is well worth further study. We should consider how Canada stands in regard to the health of her people as compared with other countries. Look at maternal mortality rates, for example. The figures per thousand live births for 1936 were as follows:

Canada	5·6
United States	5·7
New Zealand	3·7
Australia	6·0
England and Wales	3·8
France	2·1
Netherlands	3·0
Norway	2·6
Sweden	3·1
Denmark	3·9

Infant mortality rates per thousand live births for the same year and the same countries were as follows:

Canada	66
United States	57
New Zealand	31
Australia	41
England and Wales	59
France	67
Netherlands	39
Norway	42
Sweden	43
Denmark	67

Canada has a very bad record; it is right at the foot of the list in regard to maternal mortality rates, and our infant mortality rates bring shame to most people who are concerned about the health of our country. Doctor Heagerty, director of public health services for the Department of Pensions and National Health, points out quite correctly that when a mother dies at childbirth a child usually dies also. He informs us that on an average we have been losing a thousand mothers a year, and that during the past ten years we have lost yearly an average of 15,000 children under one year of age. He asks:

> Would you tell me why a child should die of measles? Is there any reason for it?

The only reason is poverty on the part of the parents, who just cannot afford to call a doctor or nurse, or who call them when it is too late. Then in connection with the tuberculosis deathrate and our treatment of that disease in Canada, Doctor Heagerty comments:

> And now, it is obvious that Ontario and Saskatchewan having succeeded in reducing the tuberculosis deathrate, and that it could be done in other provinces; and we know that given an opportunity we can eliminate tuberculosis altogether in one generation; and it does not take very much money to do it.

What is the story as far as tuberculosis is concerned? The deathrate per 100,000 population, excluding Indians, was 47 for the dominion, which was a reduction of 46 per cent during the last twenty years. Our Indian deathrate from tuberculosis, however, was 631 per hundred thousand. The figures by provinces are as follows:

Tuberculosis Deathrate per 100,000 Population

	Deathrate 1941 census	Percentage decrease 1921-1941	Indian deathrate 1936-37
Prince Edward Island	74	48	429
Nova Scotia	72	46	319
New Brunswick	67	37	534
Quebec	80	34	319
Ontario	26	63	362
Manitoba	30	58	1,040
Saskatchewan	21	51	485
Alberta	24	54	1,036
British Columbia	46	40	752

Hon. members will notice that in Saskatchewan we have a record of which our citizens are proud, the best record in Canada in 1941. The reason, of course, is that many years ago we provided in a socialist manner for people suffering from tuberculosis. I was interested in observing a graph showing the deathrate from tuberculosis in Saskatchewan over a period of years. A decided drop appeared when the first sanatorium was built. There was another drop a few years later, when rates were reduced from $2.50 to $1 a day per patient. A few years later there was another break, occasioned by the introduction of free treatment for every tubercular patient in the province. According to the evidence which has been compiled, Ontario and Saskatchewan are the only provinces which have services as

complete as should be provided. It is interesting to note the deathrates in two provinces very close together. In Quebec it was eighty per 100,000, while in Ontario it was twenty-six, though climatic and other conditions are very similar in both provinces. If adequate provision could be made for the treatment of those suffering from tuberculosis in Quebec, over a period of time that province could have a similar rate to Ontario.

When we consider the tuberculosis deathrate among our Indians I believe the people of this country who have concerned themselves with the health of people in China, India, Africa and other places should blush with shame. In the province where the minister in charge of Indians lives—1,040 Indians per 100,000 died from tuberculosis, while the deathrate among white people was only thirty.

Mr. GRAYDON: Would the hon. member repeat those figures?

Mr. NICHOLSON: The tuberculosis deathrate among Indians in Manitoba was 1,040 per 100,000 as compared with thirty among the white people.

Mr. HOWDEN: We have more Indians in Manitoba, and the climatic conditions are not as good.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Climatic conditions there are not very much different from those of Saskatchewan, and at that we are ashamed of our record, though in our province the Indian deathrate was only 485 per 100,000.

Mr. HOWDEN: But we have more Indians.

Mr. NICHOLSON: These are figures per 100,000, not the number of deaths.

Mr. GRAYDON: Are Indians more susceptible to tuberculosis than we are?

Mr. NICHOLSON: Yes, and the white men must take responsibility for bringing this plague to the first citizens of Canada. Having brought it to them, we must see to it that these fine citizens have the sort of treatment they deserve.

I should like now to discuss the question of health services in connection with those in our mental institutions. The deputy minister of health of Ontario gave evidence before the committee last year to the effect that 17,000 more beds were required to meet the situation in Canada. Doctor Heagerty said we had 47,000 patients in our mental institutions and that we were short about 10,000 beds to accommodate them. He also said there were not enough doctors or nurses or orderlies to care for the patients properly; and he pointed out that we have been told by experts that a great deal of mental illness is preventable. Specialists tell us that if they could get hold of children who have either the hereditary factor or an inclination toward mental illness they could do away with a great deal of it.

Coming to the question of our general health services, I have obtained a great deal of information from the bureau of statistics in regard to our provision for the health of the people of this country. I find that according to the 1941 census we had a doctor for every 1,098 people in the dominion. The figures for 1941 by provinces for doctors and dentists, not including those in the armed forces, are as follows:

	Persons per doctor	Persons per dentist
Canada	1,098	3,121
Prince Edward Island	1,419	4,320
Nova Scotia	1,350	3,959
New Brunswick	1,694	4,529
Quebec	1,107	3,883
Ontario	927	2,318
Manitoba	1,107	3,475
Saskatchewan	1,700	4,766
Alberta	1,320	3,961
British Columbia	1,010	2,548

These statistics prove clearly that people in all parts of Canada are not given the advantage of adequate medical service. In my own riding we have eleven doctors practising now, each looking after an average of 5,217 people. Our three practising dentists look after an average of 19,131 each. I am informed that in the Canadian army we have a doctor to care for every 245 soldiers, a dentist to look after every 535, and a nurse for every 294. In the army, of course, provision must be made to look after the wounded, after they have joined in battle. But I cannot see any reason why it is necessary to have a dentist for every 535 in the Canadian army, and why the people in the Mackenzie riding should have to get along with a dentist for every 19,131 people.

Before the war we were not in quite such a serious situation. We had a dentist for every 11,000 people. I wonder if hon. members realize what it means to people in different parts of the country who have to live year after year without being able to go to a hospital or a doctor? In 1930 I found my abode at Hudson Bay Junction, in the north country. We had left Edinburgh, Scotland, where the very best of medical services were available for every man, woman and child. The Scottish people are much maligned, but it should be said for them—

Mr. GRAYDON: Who maligns the Scots?

Mr. NICHOLSON: Too many. In the city of Edinburgh is found one of the finest hospitals in the old country, the Royal infirmary. There

one receives the very best of treatment, and a bill is never submitted. The Hudson Bay Junction district was served by one medical doctor who cared for farmers, townsfolk and about 800 men working in the bush. But when the depression came, and the sawmill operators could not sell their lumber, many of the mills closed down.

At the same time, large numbers of people in the drought area came north, and brought with them very little money. I happen to have with me the pictures of three of the heroes of the last war, who came north from the city of Regina. In one case the man is fighting for democracy for the second time. The two others have sons fighting in this war. The arrangement was made whereby they would receive $10 a month for food, for the first year, and that they would have other expenses which would not make a total expenditure of more than $300 for the year. It does not require much imagination to appreciate that the $10 a month to city dwellers going to the north would not allow much for medical services. It would be used for the purchase of foodstuffs.

Accordingly the board of trade and the citizens in the community thought something should be done by the government of the day to provide medical service for these settlers. They were being given food, and it was argued that medical service was also important. What I am about to say is for the benefit of my hon. friends to the right, the Progressive Conservatives. While many of them would rather not take responsibility for the administration of the Right Hon. R. B. Bennett, as he was then known—now Viscount Bennett—and for the Conservative administration in the province, I must remind the house that many of those who are now supporting the Progressive Conservative party were active in the Conservative party at that time.

What did the government of the province say? It said, "This is a matter the people must look after themselves." No help was provided. Conservatives said, "Our doctor is a Liberal; if he were not such an active Liberal the administration might do something about it." Liberals said, "If we had a Liberal government a different policy would be carried out."

Mr. GRAYDON: Is my hon. friend referring to specific cases?

Mr. NICHOLSON: Yes, at the place where I lived for ten years.

Mr. GRAYDON: What is the name of the doctor?

Mr. NICHOLSON: Doctor Collins, who practised in Hudson Bay Junction at that time. By and by we did have a change of government. Under that Liberal administration we did get much better treatment. We were without a doctor for some considerable time, as no doctor could provide medical service for this large area under such conditions. There was not a doctor within seventy miles when he left for another location. His going was a great loss to our community.

How would hon. members like to live in a community where there was no doctor within seventy miles to look after people who became sick. But when the Liberal government did decide to do something about those people, they made provision for $50 a month to pay the doctor. The doctor had to agree that every person who was on relief could come to him and receive treatment. He was not prevented from making additional collections. But people who were getting $10 a month for relief, and were selling cordwood at a dollar a cord were not likely to be able to pay much to a medical doctor. However, the doctor was concerned about the health of the people, and he did accept $50 a month from the provincial government, and did give medical service to the people in a very large area.

I submit that $50 a month to give comprehensive service to such a large number of people in an area where the nearest hospital and doctor is seventy miles away is not sufficient. Many of the people in that area were men who had fought for their king and country at the time of the last war. That was one of the areas which was available for settlement when they came back from overseas. They settled on these bush homesteads, up in the north country.

After criticizing ourselves for our failure to care for people in times of sickness, we might ask ourselves if people in other countries have done better. If we examine the evidence placed before us in this large volume by the advisory committee I think we shall find that there are two countries which have outstanding records, as far as providing health for their citizens is concerned. I refer to New Zealand and Russia. And, in passing, I urge hon. members to take advantage of the opportunity to hear Doctor Sigerist this evening in the Glebe collegiate, or to-morrow before he leaves the city. Hear what this outstanding professor of the history of medicine has to say about what has been done in Russia.

In his book, which I have before me, I find some significant statements. He says this:

> It seems to me that the following four points represent the most characteristic features of the soviet health system:
>
> 1. Medical service is free and therefore available to all;

2. The prevention of disease is in the foreground of all health activities;

3. All health activities are directed by central bodies, the people's commissariats of health, with the result that—

4. Health can be planned on a large scale.

Then he says:

There can be no doubt that the soviet system of social insurance is infinitely superior to any insurance system in capitalist countries. The costs are what they should be, part of the cost of production. The benefits are infinitely greater than under any other insurance scheme. The worker is guaranteed complete medical service, he is given social security. He is entitled to it, because after all, he is creating the values that make such a scheme possible.

Most people are agreed that changes will have to be made in our health programme in Canada. Some doubts exist as to what type of changes should be made. I have here a copy of "You Knew What You Were Voting For", written by William S. Gibson, President of National Cellulose of Canada, Limited.

On page eight he says:

All the planners start with the premise—"We must not have another depression." I could bring many arguments to show that nations and individuals profit more in adversity than in good times. I know that I would rather start a new enterprise during a depression than in good times.

Of course Mr. Gibson would rather start an enterprise in poor times. In January I talked to a man working in one of the sawmills in my riding. He is receiving forty cents an hour and his board, but he told me that the first time he met me, in 1932 or 1933, he was working for four cents an hour for a ten-hour day. They could not even make it five cents an hour. Naturally Mr. Gibson would rather start an industry when he could have his materials produced by men working in the bush for four cents an hour, when there are fifty men looking for every job available.

I think this war has proven one thing conclusively. It has proven that if we want it we can have a high standard of living in Canada in the world of to-morrow. We should understand that a nation can plan its production and consumption on a low plane, with mass unemployment and low standards, or on a high plane with full employment and high standards for its people. I should like to point out that it was stated by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston), when he was Minister of Finance, that whatever is physically possible must be made financially possible. His successor, the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley), has emphasized that. We must always keep that in mind. If that is true in war time, then it is equally true in peace time. Whatever is physically possible in peace time must be financially possible.

I have not the time to go into all the details that must be considered, but finance is not now and should not be a limiting factor in our effort in any direction. The only limiting factors should be: first, raw materials; second, labour; third, the machinery of production and, fourth, our power to coordinate these things. I submit that if the war should end to-morrow—we know that victory will be achieved some day—Canada would be a richer nation than ever before. By that I mean that we would have more new factories, more trained workers and more new resources to develop.

In order to plan a health programme for the post-war period there are certain physical necessities which must be kept in mind. We must have: first, nutritious food; second, adequate supplies of heat, light, potable water, sewage disposal facilities and fresh air; third, preventive and restrictive health services; fourth, adequate clothing and proper housing for all our citizens. I shall have something to say about most of these at some future time.

Mention was made a few days ago by the hon. member for Peterborough West (Mr. Fraser) of an editorial which appeared in the Ottawa *Journal* and which had been prompted by the report of a speech by Mr. Jolliffe, leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation in Ontario. During a discussion before a group of eminent medical men Mr. Jolliffe outlined in some detail the plans of the C.C.F. for improved medical services. This was during a meeting of the London academy of medicine on September 23, 1943. In his remarks Mr. Jolliffe made it quite clear that on the whole the doctors of this country had done a good job. We do not want to place the doctors of Canada in a position where they are not going to have a great deal of freedom. The president of the Canadian medical association made some reference to the fact that the C.C.F. would limit the salaries of general practitioners to $3,000, and of specialists to $6,000. I have made a careful survey and I can find no record anywhere where any C.C.F. speaker made any statement of that kind.

I would remind the house that in Russia they have provided the highest standard of living available for their doctors. The C.C.F. in any province in Canada would recognize that our doctors are highly trained and must be given as high a standard of living as we can provide collectively.

Then the hon. member for Peterborough West asked if the C.C.F. could arrange for babies to be delivered between eight a.m. and five p.m., but no answer was given. Both the editorial in the *Journal* and the hon. member for Peterborough West assume that

no answer could be given. Again I would remind the house that arrangements have been made to look after the medical and dental needs of our troops without any one doctor having to work for twenty-four hours a day.

Some of my best friends are of the medical profession and I have the greatest respect for them, but there is one thing I must say about them. While they are ready to look after their friends, most of them seem to be unable to look after themselves. Many of them are burnt out by the time they reach fifty or fifty-five years. We must provide machinery so that the medical services of this country can be carried on without any one doctor having to work for sixteen or twenty hours a day.

On motion of Mr. Marshall the debate was adjourned.

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

Thursday, February 10, 1944

The house met at three o'clock.

POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

FIRST REFORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE—MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE STANDS

Mr. J. G. TURGEON (Caribou) presented the first report of the special committee on reconstruction and reestablishment, as follows:

February 10, 1944.

The special committee on reconstruction and reestablishment begs leave to present the following as a first report:

Your committee recommends,

1. That it be granted leave to print from day to day 1,500 copies in English and 400 copies in French of its minutes of proceedings and evidence, and such other documents as it may authorize.

2. That on account of the demand evinced for copies of the fourth report of the 1943 special committee of the house, presented on January 26, 1944, an additional 500 copies in English of the said fourth report be printed.

3. That standing order 64 be suspended in relation to the above.

4. That ten members shall constitute a quorum.

5. That your committee be granted leave to sit while the house is sitting.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Mr. TURGEON moved that the report be concurred in.

[Mr. Nicholson.]

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): Before the house gives leave, can the hon. member tell us whether this is just the ordinary formal report of the committee's proceedings or whether there is something special in it? We have not seen it.

Mr. TURGEON. This is a formal report asking, as we do every session, that the quorum be reduced and that we be authorized to have certain printing done. It is a report of the organization meeting of the committee.

Mr. GRAYDON: When the house is asked for leave in this way, I think that if the report is so very short we might have the terms of it.

Mr. TURGEON: The report was read to the house by the acting Clerk Assistant.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would point out to the mover of the report that paragraph 2 recommends that, on account of the demand evinced for copies of the fourth report of the 1943 special committee of the house, presented on January 26, 1944, an additional five hundred copies in English of that report be printed. There was nothing in the terms of reference to the committee to enable them to make such a report. So far as this report is concerned, therefore, it is irregular, but that does not prevent the house, if it so desires, from complying with the wish embodied in that paragraph. The hon. member, however, must have regard to the circumstance I have pointed out.

Mr. TURGEON: What would you suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we eliminate that portion?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, I think so. I take it, then, that paragraph 2 will be omitted from the report as presented.

Mr. TURGEON: Thank you.

Mr. NEILL: May I ask how long it would delay the adoption of the report if it followed the regular course? Is it so urgent that we cannot wait one day to get the real details of the report? There is no occasion for this rush.

Mr. TURGEON: I do not wish to rush it, but it would permit the committee to get to work so many days earlier.

Mr. NEILL: One day.

Mr. TURGEON: It can stand.

Motion stands.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

WAR-TIME WAGES CONTROL ORDER—LABOUR RELATIONS CODE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I should like to say a word with respect to the war-time wages control order.

Mr. GRAYDON: The Prime Minister just got in ahead of me.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I hope my hon. friend will not hold that against me.

May I read to the house a paragraph which appears in the speech from the throne at the closing of the last session. The paragraph is as follows; *Hansard*, page 5575:

> During the course of the year, the price ceiling has been splendidly maintained. My ministers have reaffirmed their determination to do all in their power to prevent inflation and to safeguard a basic standard of living. To this end the war-time wages control order has been simplified and strengthened. It will continue to be administered by the national war labour board. Consultation is proceeding with the several provinces regarding the enactment of a comprehensive code of labour relations which will be administered by a war-time labour relations board, and which will include the principle of compulsory collective bargaining.

May I speak first on the second of these matters, the one related to a code of labour relations. I am happy to be able to say to the house that the consultations which were proceeding between the provinces and the dominion have been concluded, and there have also been concluded consultations between representatives of labour organizations and the government with respect to the code. I am advised that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell), expects to be in a position to table early next week the enactment respecting the code of labour relations.

As to the war-time wages control order, many representations have been made to the government, some by hon. members of the house, some from labour organizations and others from other sources. These the government has already had under consideration. To-morrow the government will be meeting a delegation of representatives of the Canadian Congress of Labour. As hon. members know, there are four outstanding labour organizations representative of the different labour unions throughout the country: the one which I have just mentioned, the Canadian Congress of Labour; another organization, also large in numbers, older in years, the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada; there is the Canadian Catholic Confederation of Labour; and there are the organizations representing the railway brotherhoods. On January 27 of this year the government met the joint legislative committee of the railway running trade organizations as a delegation from that body. At that time certain representations were made to the government with respect to the war-time wages control order. To-morrow, as I have said, the government will be meeting the delegates of the Canadian Congress of Labour, and we expect that representations will be made by that body to the government with respect to this order. At any rate I now extend an invitation to the delegates of the Canadian Congress of Labour to make such representations as they feel they may wish to make to the government with respect to the order.

Very shortly the government will be meeting a delegation of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada and also a delegation from the Canadian Catholic Confederation of Labour. These are the customary annual meetings with the government. We will expect, and I now invite, the delegates of these other large organizations to make to the government such representations as they deem advisable with respect to the war-time wages control order.

When the government has these various representations before it, the government will then be in a position further to consider what amendments should be made to the order. It is the intention of the government to make certain amendments, but we wish to have these representations from the leading labour organizations before us when we are considering these further amendments; and after that opportunity has been given to labour, and the government has had the opportunity of considering all representations which have been made, amendments will be made by the government to the war-time wages control order.

I would hope that these various labour organizations could meet with the government within the next two weeks. One meeting as I have said has been arranged for to-morrow. I do not know that there has been a definite date fixed for the other two; but I would say now that we would seek to meet their convenience at as early a date as may be possible.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, when the Prime Minister rose to make a statement with respect to the war-time wages control order of 1943, I rather expected that he would make a much more comprehensive and perhaps much more satisfactory statement than he did, and having that in mind, I suggested that he was "getting there first", before I had asked my question. But I want to say this to the Prime

Minister: as he rose, I was about to make an inquiry, and it was on this basis. What the Prime Minister has now said in connection with calling in the other representatives is, of course, a very good thing. I hope he will do that. I hope he will give some real consideration to what they say. But in the meantime February 15 is the deadline for the operation of the war-time wages control order of 1943, and that is where the emergency and urgency of the matter arise. May I ask the Prime Minister, as I intended to before this statement was made, that the government give consideration to the postponement of the application of war-time wages control order of 1943; otherwise it will go into effect and then all the representations that are afterwards made cannot be regarded in perhaps the same light as those which are made before the order goes into effect. At the same time, and following up what the Prime Minister has said, and doing what the Prime Minister now suggests be done in another way, I suggest that he refer this whole order to the industrial and international relations committee of the house, so that those interested in and affected by the provisions of the order may have an opportunity to appear before that committee.

These two suggestions, I think, are most important, and I impress them upon the Prime Minister: first of all, the postponement of the application of the wages control order—because it is going to be too late by the time he sees all these people—and second, that the parliamentary committee have a chance to hear the representations of these people in a proper way. I ask the Prime Minister to give consideration to these suggestions.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am always pleased to give consideration to any suggestions which my hon. friend may wish to make.

He has referred to the 15th of this month being the date on which the order itself takes effect in some particulars. In that connection, there is one very important consideration, it is that there are certain benefits which accrue to labour, under the order, on the 15th. They relate to the basic wage in which the cost of living bonus is embedded; and I understand that already steps have been taken by employers to see that the benefits to be derived from that section in particular will be accorded. It would I think be inadvisable to postpone anything of the nature of a benefit. I cannot see that there would be any possibility of anything inimical happening from effect being given the order in other particulars as, in fact, is now the case, before the further representations of labour have been heard. I assure my hon. friend that the government is most anxious in this matter, above all others, to have the cooperation of labour. We believe that labour, as well as all other classes in the community, is interested in preventing inflation in this country, and that labour realizes that a measure of wage stabilization is essential if we are to preserve the price ceiling. We all recognize that it will require close and helpful cooperation on the part of government, labour, employers and the community, to maintain the price ceiling and prevent inflation. We have no desire to be in any way coercive in this matter, but rather we wish to make the measure as effective as it can be made through good will on the part of all parties concerned. At a later stage it might be advisable to have the committee which my hon. friend has mentioned, the committee on industrial and international relations, consider some of these matters. If so, I should be prepared to advise my hon. friend accordingly; but at the moment I think the step proposed by the government will expedite the revision of the order in a manner which will help to meet at least some of the objections, and I should hope all fundamental objections.

Mr. GRAYDON: If I may ask one supplementary question, the Prime Minister mentioned that the national labour code would be brought into being by order in council, as the war-time wages control order was brought into being. May I ask the right hon. gentleman if, in view of the dissatisfaction that has been expressed at the way this order was put through, by order in council, the government will not bring in legislation dealing with the national labour code, so that this house may properly consider all the aspects relating to labour relations in Canada, instead of doing it by order in council as was done in connection with the wages control order.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The government has carefully considered the matter to which my hon. friend has just referred. One thing we must keep before us at the present time is the fact that these are temporary measures. We are not enacting permanent legislation. These measures are being enacted for the purpose of meeting conditions relating to the war. How long the war will last none of us can say, but it is certain that as conditions in the world change some of these orders will have to be changed considerably. To bring into parliament legislation which would be as comprehensive as these measures are; to have that legislation considered by this house, in addition to the heavy legislative programme already before the house, I fear would not be helpful in enabling us to keep our minds con-

centrated above all else on the prosecution of the war itself. There are important war measures that must be taken up ahead of all other legislation, they have been mentioned to the house already. I submit that parliament itself enacted the War Measures Act to enable the government to meet by order in council situations arising out of the war, and this is the kind of enactment it was intended should be dealt with under that act.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): When parliament is in session? That is just rendering us impotent.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No. I think my hon. friend is overlooking the very important consideration I just mentioned, namely that parliament should be giving its attention to the most important war measures and not be devoting its time to discussing at considerable length measures that are solely in the nature of temporary measures, which can be dealt with effectively under the provisions of an act of parliament passed for the very purpose of meeting such conditions.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That means we are to abdicate our functions.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think I am expressing the position in a way that will be regarded as sensible and will be readily understood by all. I should add this further word. The enactment, presented in this form, is a flexible measure the provisions of which may be altered by order in council, just as the enactment itself is by order in council. That is very different from the procedure required to amend a statute. One could not say whether parliament would be in session at the moment at which a statute might have to be amended. On all counts, taking these various points into consideration, the government believes that the supremacy of parliament will be fully maintained by the power which is being exercised under its authority in this way. Certainly by this procedure the time of parliament will be preserved for the discussion of the most important of all measures.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: In the light of the Prime Minister's statement as to the advantages to labour contained in order in council P.C. 9384, I should like to ask if any organized body of labour has suggested that they would like to have this order applied on February 15 because of those advantages.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I cannot answer my hon. friend categorically, but I do know that some of the labour organizations feel that there will be substantial benefits to them under this order and would welcome those benefits coming into effect on the 15th of this month.

EXTRADITION TREATY

CANADA-UNITED STATES—INQUIRY AS TO PRESENT POSITION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I desire to direct a question to the Prime Minister on an entirely different matter, and perhaps he will be obliged for the interruption. Last year the government signed or arranged—I do not know exactly the correct position—a new extradition treaty with the United States which if ratified and put into effect would, in my judgment at all events, have a devastating effect on Canadian citizens. I desire to know from the Prime Minister, if not to-day then perhaps to-morrow, what is the present position of the proposed extradition treaty with the United States, and whether it is the intention to have parliament ratify that treaty.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I shall give my hon. friend an answer to-morrow.

ROYAL CANADIAN AIR FORCE

CONFERENCES WITH R.A.F. ON ADJUSTMENTS IN AIR TRAINING PLAN, ETC.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. R. MACDONALD (Brantford City): Are conferences now being held in Ottawa between the Minister of National Defence for Air and representatives of the British air ministry with respect to adjustments between the R.C.A.F. the R.A.F. and the joint air training plan? Is the minister prepared to make a statement now with respect to the conferences, or will he make a statement to the house when the conferences are concluded on the agreement reached and the decisions made?

Hon. C. G. POWER (Minister of National Defence for Air): Mr. Speaker, conferences are now being held between a member of the United Kingdom cabinet, Captain the Right Hon. Harold Balfour, Under-Secretary of State for Air, Air Marshal Sir Peter Drummond, air member for training of the R.A.F. and members of his staff, on the one hand, and officers of the Department of National Defence for Air and myself on the other hand, with a view to making adjustments in the air training plan and to bring about better conditions of service for our R.C.A.F. personnel overseas, as well as other matters. The conferences are continuing; as a matter of fact they are being held every day. They will not conclude until some time next week, and I shall be only too glad to inform the house as to the results thereof.

ALLOWANCES FOR TRAVELLING TIME TO PERSONNEL ON LEAVE

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask the Minister of National Defence for Air a supplementary question. He speaks about making certain adjustments which will be to the benefit of Royal Canadian Air Force men overseas. Has any consideration been given to making adjustments in Canada to the end that travelling time may be allowed to the men of the R.C.A.F. when they are on leave, as it is allowed for the navy and the army? I understand there is discrimination in this regard, and I should like to ask the minister if he will rectify it.

Mr. POWER: That being purely a domestic question, it would hardly have anything to do with the discussions between ourselves and the British government representatives. However, I shall be only too glad to take my hon. friend's question into consideration, and look into it.

Mr. GRAYDON: But will the minister do something about it?

POLICY WITH RESPECT TO RETIREMENT OF OFFICERS

Mr. JAMES SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a further question of the minister. In view of the recently reported retirement of a large number of high ranking officers of the Royal Canadian Air Force, has he any statement to make to the house in the matter?

Mr. POWER: My hon. friend was good enough to give me notice of the question. In reply I may say that there is a definite retirement policy in the Royal Canadian Air Force.

When the war broke out the R.C.A.F. was a small organization. It comprised a number of excellent officers who had done magnificent service in the last war. These men were the backbone of the R.C.A.F. development and expansion. The principal job of the R.C.A.F. during the first years of the war was the organization, development, expansion and administration of the air training plan. The plan has produced results and dividends far surpassing our own expectations and frustrating those of our enemies.

These officers, who gave of their time and experience to bring about those results, though comparatively young in years, were mainly too old to take an active operational part in this war. Besides, their experience, their prestige, their authority, made it necessary to retain them here or elsewhere in non-operational duties.

[Mr. Power.]

The rapid expansion of the joint air training plan, the western hemisphere operations and the overseas air force brought increased responsibilities and with these accelerated promotion. There are now many officers of comparatively high rank in our forces who have not seen operational service. They could not. But rapid promotion brings the penalty of early retirement, otherwise there would be stagnation at the top. The air war and the air force must be dynamic, not static.

The air training plan has reached its peak of development. From now on there will be contraction rather than expansion. The favourable war situation has brought about a shifting and contraction of our defensive home war establishments.

If all these men were retained in their positions or promoted right up to their full retiring age we might be faced with a thick ceiling, a bottle-neck at the top, comprised entirely of men who, through no fault of their own, have seen no active flying service overseas in this war. Now, after five years of war, we have at our disposal, overseas especially some younger men who have had actual fighting experience against the enemy in this war. More and more we are calling on overseas headquarters to send these men back to us.

If we are to encourage the initiative, the ambition of these young men, we must show them that there is room at the top, that the ceiling is not closing in, but that the upward path will be made clear for them.

This is the policy. There is no stigma, no reproach in retirement, but there is ruthless necessity if the R.C.A.F. is to continue during the war and after to be the young, virile, dynamic force which I am sure all Canada wishes it to be and has a right to expect from it in return for the sacrifices made on its behalf.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I wish to commend the minister for that answer.

TREATMENT OF CANADIAN PERSONNEL ATTACHED TO ROYAL AIR FORCE

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): I was interested in the minister's statement respecting promotions, and I agree with it. I should like to ask him a further question with regard to men who are serving overseas and who have seen operational work. Are Canadian personnel who are serving in the Royal Air Force, and who enlisted in England, to receive the same consideration as Canadian personnel who are merely attached to the Royal Air Force?

Mr. POWER: If my hon. friend will put that question on the order paper I will answer it at that time. I understand he is speaking of Canadian nationals who were residing in England either during the war or prior to it, and who joined the Royal Air Force. He is not referring to R.C.A.F. men who are now attached to the R.A.F. I would have to look into that.

BEER

REQUEST THAT FURTHER SUPPLIES BE MADE AVAILABLE FOR THE ARMED SERVICES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JAMES SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of National Revenue. When liquor rationing was introduced I understood it was on the grounds of temperance and man-power. In view of yesterday's report that 2,300,000 gallons of beer have been shipped to the United States, I should like to ask, first of all, whether the man-power situation in Canada now justifies that, and, second, whether this course is one to aid temperance in the United States. If the minister's answers to those two questions are in the affirmative, will he now divert some of that beer to British Columbia, to relieve the very great shortage of the supply offered to the soldiers, airmen, sailors and war workers who are out there.

Hon. C. W. G. GIBSON (Minister of National Revenue): I think that is a question which should be on the order paper. My hon. friend sent me a copy of a question he intended to ask, and I have the answer to it. But he did not ask that question.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am merely enlarging on my question. I think it is of more and more importance, as it would seem that beer is going to the United States and it is not going to the Canadian army.

Mr. GIBSON: I have the hon. member's question which he sent me, in which he asked: "In view of the very marked shortage of beer in the soldiers', sailors', airmen's and veterans' canteens of British Columbia, will the minister divert more of this traffic to British Columbia." I would point out that there is a difference in the method of supplying beer to the active service forces, and to veterans' clubs. Active service units secure a quota on the basis of a gallon per man per month, and that amount is considered sufficient by the military authorities. In regard to veterans' clubs, the allocation within the province of the provincial quota to hotels, veterans' clubs, other clubs and individuals is a matter which comes under the jurisdiction of provincial authorities and is subject to provincial control.

Mr. GRAYDON: The minister cannot pass the buck to the province on that.

CONFERENCE WITH PROVINCES

PROPOSED MEETING TO CONSIDER SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH AND OTHER MATTERS

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (Parkdale): I should like to ask a question of the Prime Minister. Earlier in the session he expressed the intention of calling a dominion-provincial conference with respect to social security and health measures. Will he tell us what steps he has taken in that regard, and if the conference is to be convened at an early day?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Before the session opened a communication was sent by the Clerk of the Council to the several provinces, seeking to ascertain what date would be most convenient to the different provinces to meet at Ottawa with the dominion government. I should have said that, first of all, they were asked as to whether they would wish to have such a meeting. All the provinces, I believe, have signified their readiness to meet with the dominion government in conference on matters of mutual interest and concern in connection with social security, health, and other matters—financial matters being among that number.

It is difficult at the moment to say just when the conference can be held, as it is almost impossible, simultaneously to suit the convenience of all the provinces. At the present time some of the legislatures are meeting, or will be meeting within another few weeks. It looks, however, as though it might be possible to suit the convenience of all some time about the Easter season. That is as near as I can come to giving a date which is considered most acceptable to all.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

PROVISION FOR DEPENDENTS OF THOSE IN WORK CAMPS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. PAUL MARTIN (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Labour I should like to reply to a question asked yesterday by the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Douglas).

Conscientious objectors who have dependents are in camps as a result of a magistrate's

decision due to refusal to comply with the regulations. Men of this class when declared to be conscientious objectors are given the opportunity of performing alternative service by assigning a part of their wages to the Canadian Red Cross and adjustments are made in the amount of the assignment so that the man will be able to maintain his dependents.

There are certain cases, however, where individuals will not accept any direction at all, and in these cases it has been necessary to have them committed to service camps. Unfortunately their dependents have to rely upon their own resources, these cases being parallel to the cases of men committed to a prison. These men are encouraged to reconsider their decision, and when this happens the arrangements originally proposed to them are put into effect.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Wednesday, February 9, consideration of the motion of Mr. L. D. Tremblay for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Graydon, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Roy.

Mr. J. A. MARSHALL (Camrose): Mr. Speaker, if I were allowed only sixty seconds in which to express an opinion upon the proposals to be found in the throne speech, I would say two things. First, these proposals serve only to relieve and not to cure. They are merely palliatives. My second thought is that all reforms depend upon monetary reform.

Canada in the matter of production ranks high among the nations of the world. Human effort, combined with material resources and unfettered by financial limitations, has raised Canada to a position where she is admired, where she is the envy of the whole world. There flow from Canada's shores to-day vast quantities of war materials and foodstuffs, not only to our own fighting men and women but to every one of the allied nations. Such an achievement is highly creditable and reflects upon the wonderful work which is being done by our men and women in industry, in mining, in fishing, in forestry and on the farm. I should like too to pay a tribute to the men and women of our fighting forces, who are to be found not only in our own country but in Great Britain and in almost every theatre of war. They are doing a magnificent job; they are writing history which future generations will read with pride and satisfaction.

I was deeply impressed by the speech made several days ago by the hon. member for Vancouver North (Mr. Sinclair). Here is a man who has spent three years in close association with Canadian men and women in Africa, in Sicily, and in Italy. He has come to know their thoughts, their dreams, their aspirations, their plans, and their difficulties. He has returned to this country, and at the first opportunity has presented these difficulties to us as members of the House of Commons. I believe he deserves the support of every hon. member in his endeavour to get these wrongs righted. I for one shall be glad to give him every support in this work

But there is one thing I should like to say at this time. Just as long as Canada is fettered with an outworn financial system, just so long will it be difficult for us to bring about necessary reforms. As the editor of the Ottawa *Citizen* aptly expressed it the other day: Reform our monetary system and ninety per cent of the ills of society will be cured. There must be no financial restrictions to Canada's post-war programme, but I fear that as long as the governor of the Bank of Canada, the chairman of the wartime prices and trade board and the deputy minister of finance are the chief advisers to this or any other government, there is little hope of much change in our financial policy.

On February 11 of last year, within a day of one year ago, I spoke during the debate on the throne speech. On that occasion I said I believed that forces were at work which had as their object the accomplishment of three things: (1) the return of Canada to the gold standard; (2) the establishment of a supranational government, backed up by an international police force; and (3) the complete destruction of British idealism, individualism and initiative and the substitution therefor of state autocracy. Any right-thinking individual who has been following the course of events through the newspapers can readily see that these objectives will eventually be attained unless some action is taken to thwart the move.

I turn now to the speech from the throne itself. We find in it, as someone aptly expressed it to me the other day, a strange mixture of pious platitudes and ponderous piffle. In support of my first assertion I read

the third paragraph of the speech from the throne:

The winning of the war clearly remains the first of all objectives. My ministers believe it is their duty to see that Canada's war effort is firmly maintained until the enemy is defeated in Europe and in Asia. They believe the government's primary task, and the primary duty of the Canadian people, is to concentrate on the prosecution of the war. Our fighting men must be assured that there will be no diversion from this vital task and no relaxation of Canada's war effort. Till the war is won, the policies of my government will continue to be shaped to that end.

Our armed forces at sea, on land and in the air have added lustre to the name of Canada.

Those are wonderful words, and I agree heartily with the sentiments there expressed. But in the mind of the common man in this country, confusion and doubt and anxiety exist with respect to the trend of events at the present time. It is difficult for the common man to understand when he picks up his newspaper and reads that General McNaughton has given up the command of the Canadian forces, the reason given being ill health, to find a few days later that that statement is contradicted and the government take no action to clear up the puzzle. It is difficult, too, for the common man to understand why it is that when Russia and the United States are fighting as allies, Russia is attacking Finland while the United States is still on friendly relations with that country. It is difficult, too, for the common man to understand why it is that when Britain and the United States are locked in deadly combat with Japan, Russia, which is our ally, gives to the Japanese valuable fishing concessions in Russian waters. It is little wonder that doubt and confusion and anxiety exist in the minds of the people of Canada. It is little wonder that our people do not understand what Lord Vansittart meant when he said just a short time ago, in an article appearing in an English periodical, that this is a phoney war and we may get a phoney peace.

Now I turn to the second assertion which I made. In the seventh paragraph of the speech from the throne I read this:

Canada's prosperity and the well-being of her people are bound up with the restoration and expansion of world trade. Export markets are essential to the efficient employment of vast numbers of Canadians. Larger imports are needed to raise the standard of living.

That is a strange statement. It leads me to believe that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) is still living in the ox-cart age of economics. This whole question of foreign trade, export markets, imports, and so forth, was I think very satisfactorily dealt with by the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch) when he spoke the other day, but because the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) showed the same deplorable lack of knowledge of economics yesterday, I think it is necessary for me to bring a little more evidence to bear on the matter.

I have here a copy of a report of the London Chamber of Commerce on "General Principles of a Post-War Economy". This was published on the 12th of May, 1942, and is the outcome of a study by a special committee appointed by the council of the London Chamber of Commerce on March 10, 1942. In order that hon. members may get a picture of the background of the London Chamber of Commerce, may I read the first paragraph of the report:

The London Chamber of Commerce has a direct membership of 9,000 firms and companies. Thirty-nine industrial and commercial associations, with an approximate membership of 50,000, are affiliated to it and are represented on its council. The chamber is therefore vitally concerned in the nature of the framework within which industry and commerce will be called upon to function after the war.

The special committee appointed by the council studied this whole question of markets, imports and exports, favourable and unfavourable balances, and tariffs. I quote from pages 8 and 9:

It is an obvious absurdity that nations should regard it as necessary to export their real wealth, not for the purpose of paying for imports, but in order to solve their domestic unemployment problem by passing it on to other countries. Exports with this end in view are nothing more nor less than an excuse for distributing wages to people who otherwise would be unemployed. This purpose would be equally well served if the goods were to be thrown into the sea or if the people were to be employed to dig holes and to fill them up again.

When, however, it is remembered that even wealthy nations have a large percentage of their population under-fed, ill-clothed and ill-housed, it is clear that these would be the best recipients of this alleged surplus wealth. What is necessary is to improve the technique for the internal provision of money, so as to convert this human demand into effective demand.

The chamber considers that it is a perversion of export trade to employ it for the purpose of exporting domestic unemployment and dumping it on other nations which already have their own problem to solve. These surplus exports might confer a benefit on some countries if they were sent as a gift; and the recipient country had an interal financial mechanism capable of distributing enough purchasing power to its people to enable them to buy excess imports of consumers' goods in addition to, instead of in competition with, the goods already there. They are, on the contrary, used for the purpose of getting other nations into unpayable debt; and moreover, the recipient nations have not the

mechanism for distributing additional purchasing power to buy them so that they do, in fact, displace goods already in the market, and cause distress selling and a slump in prices.

The chamber submits that international trade must now be raised to its true function, that is, nothing more nor less than an exchange of goods and services of a mutually advantageous character.

I would like hon. members to compare this with the unrealistic attitude of the government on this question as given in the speech from the throne. In the language of the air force the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture are off the beam and lost in fog.

The question in my mind which I have to answer to my own satisfaction as I study the proposals is simply this: To what extent will they solve present and future national problems? The amendment of the Progressive Conservative party and the amendment of the Bloc Populaire are of little concern to me; they are designed to put people on the spot. They are nothing more or less than political by-plays.

What are some of the things which we propose to do in this session of parliament? We are told that the government proposes to set up three departments—a department of veterans' affairs, a department of reconstruction and a department of social welfare. We are asked to approve of Canadian participation in the establishment of an international organization to further national security through international cooperation. We are asked to give approval to an industrial bank. We are asked also to approve of housing legislation, a nation-wide health insurance plan, contributory old age pensions, provision for family allowances, and a price floor for staple farm products. In a word, all this legislation means bureaucracy, regimentation, and cruel taxation, if carried out under the present economic set-up.

I believe that members of parliament, in discussion, are constantly confusing two things, methods and objectives. These proposals in the throne speech are methods whereby we can attain a certain objective. So far as I can learn, very few members have discussed paragraph 10, which deals with the objective this government has set for the Canadian people.

Let me say at the outset that objectives are not the concern of members of parliament or of cabinets; objectives must come from the people themselves, and if they do not come from the people themselves they are of little value. Paragraph 10 of the speech from the throne sets out the post-war objective:

> While the post-war objective of our external policy is world security and general prosperity, the post-war objective of our domestic policy is social security and human welfare.

It is strange that we should place our foreign policy ahead of our domestic policy. We have given it precedence in the speech from the throne. The reason for this is not clear. It is not my intention at the moment to discuss the question of foreign policy, but I wish to say one or two words with reference to the post-war objective of our domestic policy. We are told that that objective is social security and human welfare. The inmates of a gaol or penitentiary or an asylum enjoy those things; they have social security and welfare. The slaves in the early days enjoyed the same condition. The people of Germany, the people of Italy and the people of Japan enjoyed a high standard of social security and human welfare, but two things they did not enjoy were individual freedom and personal initiative. It is strange that these things are not to be found in the domestic objectives as outlined in the speech from the throne. I say that the people will reject this objective when they come to realize what it all means. I think I am safe in saying that what the people of my constituency, one hundred per cent of them, want is economic security with individual freedom; and I cannot support that part of the throne speech unless the Prime Minister and his advisers are prepared to make those necessary changes.

In order to obtain these objectives, methods are suggested. To me, methods are clearly the responsibility of experts. Neither the mass of the people of Canada nor the members of parliament are experts, so that I do not think that we are in much of a position to judge the merits and demerits of these various proposals. My opinion is that it is the business of members of parliament to frame and place upon the statute books of Canada laws which will make these proposals effective. Therefore, we must first settle upon the objective. Having settled upon our objective, we should retain the services of competent experts to get us those things which the people desire. Having had these submitted to us, we should pass the necessary legislation. That is the only place where a member of parliament should come into the picture.

For instance, I should like to know the names of the people who have suggested to the government that the ills of industry can be cured by the setting up or establishment of an industrial development bank. If industry want another bank, of course they must have it, if they feel that that will solve their problems. But I want to know which section of industry have petitioned for it. I want to know who have recommended this bank to the government, so that, say four or five years hence, we can highly commend them for their

action if it has proven a success and has benefited industry, or, on the other hand, wreak our vengeance upon them if it has bound industry more strongly to finance. Personally I do not think it is a bank that they want; I think what they need are plenty of customers with plenty of buying power. Industry after this war will be capable of turning out goods in tremendous quantities; yet if the consuming public have no buying power, what purpose will be served by turning out so much goods?

Lord Melchett said, just a short time ago:

> The problem of the modern world is to provide the population with mass purchasing power to absorb the output of mass production. This lies within the field of finance.

So much for the industrial development bank.

We are to be asked to give our approval to a national health insurance scheme. If it means the sort of thing which the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Leader) complained about a few days ago, I want none of it. If it means the denial of the right of a citizen to engage the services of a chiropractor, an osteopath, or any individual who can relieve suffering and pain, I do not want to have anything to do with it. If it means the denial of the right of the citizen to embrace the philosophical teachings of Christian Science, then, again, I do not want anything to do with it. In other words, if it in any way curtails the freedom of the individual and substitutes an enslavement to bureaucratic regimentation, we shall be better without it.

A few words on family allowances. Here we have a direct admission on the part of the dominion government that industry does not distribute through wages, salary and dividends, sufficient buying power to the consuming public to purchase total production.

Here we have a government endorsing Major Douglas's theory without giving credit where credit is due. If we admit that there is a deficiency of purchasing power inherent in the system, in my judgment we should extend this plan to give to every Canadian citizen sufficient buying power to provide for him and for his family the bare necessities of life. Stuart Chase said recently:

> Steadily, reluctantly, even kicking and screaming, western civilization is being driven to the hitherto abhorrent notion that the consumer must be furnished with purchasing power whether he works or not.

That is a very important admission on the part of a man who has held orthodox views for so many years.

In conclusion, I want to say a word to the post-war international planners who are springing up like mushrooms all over the country. One of the most picturesque figures in all biblical history was that wise old patriarch Solomon, king of Israel. In his day he was pestered with planners, until in a fit of anger he turned to them and said, "The eyes of a fool are in the ends of the earth". I think that might be fittingly applied to the international planners of our day. We should wish our friends of the Soviet Union, China, France, Norway, Belgium, Holland and all other countries, success in reconstruction and reestablishment, of their countries, but we ourselves should get on with the immediate task of solving our own problems at home. Haakon Lie, secretary of the Norwegian Federation of Labour, speaking recently to the Wellesley Institute for Social Progress, said:

> We do not want any army of occupation. We can administer our own affairs. We can buy what we need from Britain and America. All we want is our freedom. You can educate your administrators and send them over with the best will in the world, but in a short time they will be as much disliked as the German administrators.

That is something for our meddlesome planners to ponder. I feel quite sure in my own mind that there is a very rude awakening coming to those individuals when the "cease fire" sounds and our young men return from overseas.

I see my time has gone, Mr. Speaker, and there still remain such important questions as agriculture, old age pensions, housing, and so on. They are all big questions, and when they are under discussion in this house I shall have something to say in respect to them. I do want to say, however, that each of these questions is capable of a simple solution. The old axiom "there are none so blind as those who will not see" applies most fittingly to our present administrators. Will it take a revolution to shake them from their complacency?

Mr. E. E. PERLEY (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended taking part in this discussion. I was prepared to accept the suggestion of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) who, in moving his amendment, spoke briefly and said that in his opinion there should be few speeches on the address, that we should wait until the legislation was brought down and we knew what it was all about. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) accepted that suggestion and also spoke briefly, taking only about twenty minutes to deal with general matters before going on to read his statement in regard to the speech by Lord Halifax. It seemed to me that, since the speech from the throne was not very definite, we should wait until we had the actual legislation and then get on with the business

of the country. After listening to the political speech delivered yesterday by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), however, in which he referred to Liberal policies and to the floor prices on agricultural products, I came to the conclusion that I should say a few words at this stage.

May I say quite frankly at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that my first concern is the winning of the war. To my mind that is our most important problem, and the only thing that matters now. Having said that, however, I want to repeat what I said last session, that I have no apology to offer for having supported certain measures brought down by this government since the beginning of the war, when I thought those measures were in the interest of Canada's war effort. Neither have I an apology to offer for having on occasion criticized this government, I hope constructively, when I thought such criticism would also help the war effort.

When I looked over the speech from the throne point by point, as was suggested by the leader of the opposition, I had to agree with him that most of the legislation there suggested was taken from the platform drawn up by the Progressive Conservative party at Winnipeg in December, 1942. But even at that the Progressive Conservative party is by no means stranded, for there is much remaining in that platform which the government could well adopt and much that the people of Canada will approve when they have a chance to express themselves at the next general election.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Poor old Tory party!

Mr. PERLEY: If the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) will just keep quiet for a little while I may have a few suggestions to offer him. I do not think I have said anything as yet that would call for any interruption by him, but when I do so, as always I shall be glad to hear from him. I hesitate even at this stage to offer any constructive suggestions to the government with respect to marketing problems or similar questions, because during the last eight years I have had many such suggestions refused by the government at the time they were offered, only to see them put into operation a year or two later.

Mr. SENN: Too late.

Mr. PERLEY: Yes, too late; but I think the government will agree that I made the suggestions before they thought of them.

Yesterday we listened to two able speeches, delivered with great energy and force, by the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Douglas) and the Minister of Agriculture. It developed into a real bout. I am not going to get mixed up in any of their little differences; I am not even going to suggest that I might act as referee, because each scored so many points that it might be a little difficult to say who won. I noticed, however, that each took many of his points from the Progressive Conservative party. The minister took credit, in a forceful way, for the policy of floor prices. In doing that he referred to the fact that the first person to establish floor prices in Canada with respect to the marketing of grain was Right Hon. R. B. Bennett in 1935. This is what the minister said:

> My hon. friends opposite say that floor prices came from John Bracken.

Hear, hear; they did.

> They forget that we had a floor price under butter in 1938. They forget that we had a floor price under hogs and cheese in 1939-40. They forget that we had a floor price—their own party put a floor price, if you like to go back—of 87½ cents under wheat when Mr. Bennett was in power, but they have dropped the name of his party. We have put floor prices all the way from 70 cents to $1.25.

Then he goes on to say that on October 15 the Prime Minister made a statement with respect to floor prices. The minister's memory is not good. The statement made in October was made about a year after the Winnipeg convention, where the principle of an initial floor price was established and put into our policy. Then the minister mentioned the different prices—the initial price, the parity price, and the floor price—and said they were all practically the same, namely, floor prices. When the minister made reference to all these prices I was surprised that his memory was so short. He did not mention all the names pertaining to prices, because he and his party were responsible in the fall of 1935 and the beginning of 1936 for establishing what was termed a fire sale price. It will be recalled that following the election, Mr. McFarland was thrown out and Mr. McIvor took office. It was at that time that a fire sale price was established in an effort to dispose of surplus wheat, which later proved to be a blessing in disguise. They tried to sell that wheat at fire sale prices, offering it in large quantities which the market could not absorb. The minister forgot to mention that yesterday.

The minister then reviewed the situation with respect to prices in 1937, 1938 and 1939, down to the present time. I am not going to go into detail on that matter. I shall say only that it was not very long before the Canadian Wheat Board Act, passed by Mr. Bennett's government in 1935, was set aside by what was

described by the late Hon. Mr. Motherwell as an illegal order in council. Hon. members know what happened. After the fire sale price had been established, in an effort to dispose of the wheat, the price changed; it went up until in 1937 it reached $1.47. Then the act was brought into operation again, and hon. members know the record from that time. As the minister said yesterday, we had a floor price of 70 cents, and then floor prices of 80 cents and 90 cents, down the line. The minister yesterday tried to take credit for the price at $1.25, but we shall have something to say about that later on.

It is hardly necessary for me to say anything respecting my own stand in these matters. I think every hon. member knows where I stand in regard to prices, and particularly grain prices, which were under discussion yesterday. In 1938, after the fiasco of the fire sale price, I proposed in the house a policy which amounted to a floor price, to be effective not only from year to year, but over a ten-year period. After setting out the circumstances and conditions in connection with marketing I suggested, in 1938, that the government should authorize the board to fix a minimum price of a dollar per bushel for a period of not less than ten years. I mentioned further on that occasion that coarse grains should be brought under the operation of the board, and that a fixed minimum, or, if you like, a floor price, should be placed on coarse grains of export grades. So, who was practically the first to suggest floor prices in the house? On the occasion on which I made the suggestion in the house we had discussion in our caucus, and I had the support of every hon. member there present for the policy I advanced. We discussed it, and in the main that was the policy of our party.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): The Conservative party, or the Progressive Conservative party?

Mr. PERLEY: I was at the Progressive Conservative convention at Winnipeg when we adopted that policy in a plank providing for floor prices. The policy was adopted by the party as a whole on that occasion. The orders of the day in each session from 1940 will show a resolution in my name, asking for a parity price and a minimum price with participation certificates. I say therefore that my record in that respect has been consistent.

Last fall, when the price of $1.25 was announced, in my effort to be fair, as I try to be in all cases, I wrote to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) and complimented him upon his action in setting that price. In my letter I expressed regret that it had not been done sooner. I pointed out that the minister could have taken similar action in March, at the latest in July. It will be recalled that in March he had announced the policy that the 1943 price was to remain at 90 cents. Then in July, having in mind the circumstances surrounding marketing in western Canada, the United States and Europe, I asked the minister to reconsider his policy and to advance the price by at least twenty cents. He replied that he could not do so.

It is of interest to note that when the price was set at $1.25 I had made a motion in the committee on agriculture, in addition to my resolution on the order paper which, because it was private members' business, could not be reached. But on July 16 in the committee on agriculture I made practically the same motion which had stood in my name on the order paper. My motion in committee asked the government to consider increasing the price by twenty cents to $1.10. The committee's report states:

> This committee recommends that in view of the changed market conditions the wheat committee of the cabinet should authorize the initial payment of wheat being increased to $1.10 a bushel basis No. 1 Northern at Fort William, instead of the present 90 cents paid by the Canadian Wheat Board, and the Wheat Board Act should be amended to permit this higher payment, at the present session.

The motion was made on the 16th, and it was ruled out of order on the 19th. When the committee met on the 19th the chairman announced that he had consulted with you, sir, and I believe also with the Clerk of the House, and he then ruled my motion out of order on the ground that it would involve the expenditure of public money. It is interesting to note that having ruled that out on July 19, they proceeded in September to adopt the principle. They even went a little further, for which I am glad.

There is another thing about which I am quite pleased. On that same day I moved, as will be seen from the records of the agriculture committee, as follows:

> This committee recommends that the government should authorize the Canadian Wheat Board to handle all oats and barley on a pooling basis according to grade, with initial price not less than the established ceiling price.

They struck out the words "with initial price not less than the established ceiling price" and then adopted the motion. It is interesting to note that within two weeks they passed an order in council which was my original motion almost word for word. When that motion was put to a vote in the committee only the Conservative members and the C.C.F. members voted for it. It is interesting to note, too, that they have adopted some of my suggestions in that respect.

The farmers have done their part, and all they want is a square deal. They have done everything that has been asked of them in the way of producing products of all kinds. They have helped as much as any other class of our people to finance this war. I am proud to say that the agricultural districts in my constituency have gone over the top early in every victory loan campaign. They have done their duty in many respects and, as I say, all they want is a square deal and an adequate return for their labour.

They also want some controls with respect to our marketing system. The government proposes to establish floor prices, I trust that these prices will not be lower than the ceiling prices now prevailing. There should be participation certificates and the wheat board should be given the necessary control in order to carry out orderly marketing. As has been suggested already, I am firmly of the opinion that the Minister of Agriculture should set up a board of live stock commissioners. If that board had the proper agricultural representation—no one knows better what should be done for the farmer than the man who is actually in the business—it would prove of great help to the minister.

Within the last two or three days questions have been asked by the leader of the Social Credit party and others in this house with respect to the marketing of beef, live stock and so on. This goes to show that conditions are not satisfactory. I shall not take the time now to go into this in detail, but I think the minister would be well advised to consider some of the suggestions that have been made. The western beef producers are dissatisfied, as are the hog producers. I should like to quote from the Regina *Leader-Post* of January 26, 1944. This is the mouthpiece of the Liberal government and the Minister of Agriculture in Saskatchewan. It says:

> Returns for hogs are the lowest since 1938 and the bonus will only put the net return to where it was in 1942.

That shows that his own organ is not very well satisfied. The government should give more attention to what agricultural and co-operative organizations have to say. These organizations are playing a most important part in the affairs of this country. The federation of agriculture is well organized, and it represents every branch of the agricultural industry.

I said a moment ago that I hoped the floor prices would be set at a level comparable to what the farmer has to pay for the things he consumes, comparable to the prices now being received in the United States, and they should be set for a term of not less than five to ten years.

There are other suggestions I could make with regard to marketing and agricultural questions with which I am familiar, but I shall not take the time now. There will be an occasion later on. The chief whip of the Liberal party laughs. We shall have something to say on these matters. All the government has to do is to bring down its measures and we will dissect them. I am generally on the job, and I think I shall be able to give him something to laugh about later on.

There are many matters forecast in the speech from the throne, most of which have been discussed during this debate. I refer to rehabilitation, social security, man-power on the farm, and other labour problems. With respect to social security I shall say just one word. If you want to solve that problem, if you want to provide security for all the people of Canada on a proper basis, all you need to do is to enact measures that will provide employment for all.

I am going to make one or two suggestions. The government should adopt measures to put the four basic industries of Canada on a proper footing. First, there is agriculture with its subsidiary industries of milling, baking and so on. Then there is the lumber industry, with the different forest products. Then there is the mining of minerals, with which would be associated the production of hydro-electric power. And there is the fishing industry. If these four industries are put on a proper basis, every secondary industry will fall in line. They are our four chief industries, and if proper consideration is given to them our difficulties with respect to labour and other problems will be taken care of. I do not intend to go into the details of what should be done with each industry; there will be another time to discuss these matters.

I regret that the Minister of Agriculture is not in his seat at the moment. I noticed he was here yesterday; it may be that it takes a speaker like the hon. member of Weyburn (Mr. Douglas) to bring him into the chamber. I listened with close attention, as I always do, to what he said yesterday. He made a speech with some punch in it. He tried to convince the members of this house that the present government of which he is a member had implemented the policies laid down from time to time in the different platforms of the Liberal party, and I was surprised to hear the minister take credit to the government for the fact that the employment situation to-day is more or less satisfactory. He sought to leave the impression on the house and, through *Hansard*,

with the people of this country, that the alleged policies of the Liberal party were responsible for the present lack of unemployment. I use the word "alleged" advisedly, because I doubt if there are many people in Canada who have the remotest idea of what the Liberal policies are; they have been changing with such frequency that no one can keep track of them.

An hon. MEMBER: That is progress.

Mr. PERLEY: It is progress to change your policy? Surely, Mr. Speaker, thinking Canadians know full well the price we are paying in blood, sweat and tears for the synthetic prosperity of which the minister spoke yesterday.

The minister also suggested that trade treaties alleged to have been negotiated by his government with twenty different countries were in line with Liberal policy and at least a contributory factor to the prosperity that he mentioned. Here again I think the people of Canada know that the present shortage of goods and services and any measure of prosperity we may now enjoy are not attributable to the government's policies at all but to the curse of this war.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): The minister was speaking of the period up to 1939.

Mr. PERLEY: And since 1939, because there was no prosperity under the Liberal government prior to 1939. I know that the minister referred to the low prices of 1932. But who in Canada who knows anything about agriculture is not familiar with the conditions that prevailed in 1932? What about Mr. Dunning and the manifesto of 1930, when the Liberals admitted that they were responsible for the drop in prices and the depression that came upon us?

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): In 1935 the people showed by their votes who they thought were responsible.

Mr. GRAYDON: You had better stick to fish.

Mr. PERLEY: The credit for our larger domestic and foreign trade, to which the Minister of Agriculture referred, cannot be given to this government. Every man in Canada knows that our expanded foreign trade and our enlarged domestic trade is due to the producers in Canada, who are the ones, and the only ones, who should get the credit.

The Minister of Agriculture yesterday, in his little bout with the hon. member for Weyburn, devoted a lot of time to socialists and socialism. I said at the outset that I am not going to assume the role of referee between them. I will content myself by saying that I do not think the people of Canada are ready for complete socialism. The failure of the Liberal government to solve the economic problems of Canada before the war, despite the ample opportunity they had to do so, and the feeling in the minds of the people that they would not be able to solve the problems of the after-the-war period, was responsible, I think, for the adverse vote which the government received in the by-elections that have taken place in recent months throughout Canada. This was the only opportunity that the people of Canada have had since war broke out of expressing themselves; and how did they do it? Evidently they had concluded that the government was not responsible for the prosperity of which the Minister of Agriculture spoke yesterday.

I have one complaint to make in conclusion, and it is this, that the government, which boast now of setting a floor price of $1.25 for wheat, did not do it earlier. They announced their wheat policy in March of last year, when they said there would be no change in price for the 1943 crop. I asked the Minister of Trade and Commerce in July of last year whether he would not reconsider the government's wheat policy, but to no effect. The government did not take action until September 21, when a great deal of our wheat had been marketed under the first quota —because with the present system of harvesting in western Canada, where combines are used, a lot of wheat is marketed in August and September. The open market price at that time was considerably over 90 cents, and many farmers, taking the government at their word that there would be no change in policy, sold their wheat at the open market price. I myself took the minister at his word and sold a considerable amount of wheat on the 1st of September. If I had held it a few days I would have got a better price, but I took the minister at his word and sold a considerable portion of my wheat at the open market price. I think the farmer should receive a proper settlement for the wheat he sold during that period from August 1 to September 21. The settlement on the basis of the spread is not good enough, and the farmers will not forget it. I got three-quarters of a cent in the spread between the price on the day I sold my wheat and the price on the day the government set a floor of $1.25. I think something should be done even now about that. I ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce when we may expect a statement from him with reference to the amount of wheat taken over by the board, the price paid for it, and the profit made. I think we should have that statement before long.

Much has been said in this debate about the price of hogs and other products, and I listened to the Minister of Agriculture yesterday trying to square himself or get himself out of the mess in which he apparently finds himself because undoubtedly there is a lot of dissatisfaction with the government's agricultural policy. It reminds me of the pictures of a boy riding a donkey. In one picture you see him riding facing one way, and in the next picture you see him facing in the opposite direction, so that you cannot tell where he is going. The minister has been riding the hog both ways and has got into trouble. We shall have something to say later on this question, but I trust that this debate will close soon and that we shall get down to the business of the session.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): I had not intended to participate further in this debate, but yesterday's remarks of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) have prompted me to do so. First, however, let me say that I agree with very much of what the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Perley) has said, though I would remind him that if we are entering into a competition to see who first suggested parity prices or floor prices we should look to many of the farm organizations in the west. I believe that as a matter of fact the movement for which I speak to-day was the first movement to incorporate such a plank in a political platform. I have before me our Regina manifesto of 1933 and I find in it clause 4 under agriculture:

> The encouragement of producers' and consumers' cooperatives; the restoration and maintenance of an equitable relationship between prices of agricultural products and those of other commodities and farm services.

As long ago as 1933 we were urging and advocating that form of price level guarantee.

Yesterday the Minister of Agriculture made a political speech in the course of which he saw fit to make a number of statements that were inaccurate and that misrepresented the viewpoint and the basis of the movement which the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation group represents in this house. He attacked particularly my hon. friend the member for Weyburn (Mr. Douglas) and chided him because he had not yet found a seat in the provincial house at Regina. Well, we must remind the minister, as we did yesterday, that for almost two years one provincial seat has been vacant in the province of Saskatchewan and that since July last three others have been vacant, one of them a seat formerly occupied by the present hon. member for Humboldt in this house (Mr. Burton), a seat occupied by a C.C.F. member. At any time the government of Saskatchewan could have opened one of these seats, and I am quite sure the hon. member for Weyburn would have been glad to seize the opportunity and attempt to enter the Saskatchewan house at Regina.

I presume the minister is alarmed because the political machine in Saskatchewan, upon which he has relied so long, has shown signs of breaking down. In the Humboldt by-election we had that machine in full force in the constituency. The minister was there himself, having left parliament before this house rose in July, to supervise that campaign, and he gathered round him the old cohorts of the Saskatchewan Liberal machine. And let me say that there has been no more devastating machine in the democratic world than that organized by the Minister of Agriculture in the province of Saskatchewan. Let me tell the house that employees of the federal government were there in force with cars belonging to the Dominion of Canada. We made a check of them. I have before me only a partial list of some of the cars that were present during the time I myself was in that constituency. I saw some of them parked outside the hotel where I was staying, which also happened to be the headquarters of the Liberal party. We took a number of car numbers; all the following are Saskatchewan licence numbers of the dominion Department of Agriculture, P.F.R.A. Regina.

No. 20475	No. 20444
No. 20471	No. 20452
No. 20474	No. 20458
No. 20456	

Mr. GRAYDON: They must have been a fleet of jeeps.

Mr. COLDWELL: No. They were not jeeps. Some were fine modern cars, including one fine maroon car which I am told the minister himself drove on one occasion to attend a political appointment. Who paid for the gas and upkeep of the cars? The people of Canada. But the political machine is so brazen in the province of Saskatchewan that it dared to do this sort of thing in the midst of a by-election. And so, when the minister talks about regimentation, let me remind the house that no other province in this dominion, at any time, has been regimented in poverty by a political machine to the extent that Saskatchewan was regimented during the depression years. Unless you were a member of the Liberal party or had a recommendation from that party you found it difficult to get relief work.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): That is untrue.

Mr. COLDWELL: You found it difficult to get anything at all. I know the facts.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): That statement is not correct.

Mr. COLDWELL: This statement is just as correct as the statement about the cars, the basis of which statement I witnessed with my own eyes. No other province has been controlled to the extent that Saskatchewan has been under the regime of the present Minister of Agriculture. And so I say that when the time comes we shall want to know what the expense accounts were of those gentlemen who were in the town of Humboldt during the by-election between the middle of July and the 9th of August when the minister himself was there.

The minister took particular credit yesterday for the fact, as he claimed, that the province of Saskatchewan had on the statute books, in principle at least, everything that was to be found in the Beveridge report. Well, they may be there in principle, but there are thousands of square miles of territory in Saskatchewan without adequate social services upon which a community must depend at this time, particularly medical services, as the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie well knows. And as for taking credit for the municipal doctors and other cooperative medical facilities in that province, those of us who know their history know that health organizations arose out of the needs of the people and were organized first by the people themselves and then the government came along with its legislation.

As for social services like education, there were schools without teachers, teachers working in the province for $350 a year and not getting paid during long years of Liberal administration in that province, so that when the minister rises in this house and gives us the province of Saskatchewan as an example of what the Liberal government would do, I say heaven save us from a Liberal government in the dominion who would follow that example.

We learned yesterday too that the government took credit for the improved conditions when the war broke out or prior to the breaking out of the war. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle, who has just taken his seat, gave the house the reason for the improved trade conditions immediately prior to the war. Canada was assisting in the rearming of the aggressor nations. Session after session we and others in this house rose and pointed out the exports of nickel, exports of aluminum, exports of copper, exports of scrapiron that were going in an ever-increasing stream to the present enemy nations, particularly to Japan. We know that one large mine, the Granby mine, in the province of British Columbia, was permitted for several years to send to Japan all its output of copper concentrates. We know that well into 1940, long after we were at war with the German reich, this government was permitting the export of nickel, copper, aluminum and scrapiron to Japan, in order that she might rearm herself.

Mr. DUPUIS: Part of which went to Russia.

Mr. COLDWELL: That, let me add, was the cause, to some extent at least, of the increased trade figures which were presented to this house at that time. So I say that the government can find very little comfort in the statements made in that regard.

Then, of course, he twitted us with socialism. I am going to say something about that in a moment. But let me point out here that no government could have regimented our young men and women more thoroughly than the Liberal government regimented them in those years before the war. They regimented them in poverty and want. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Perley) made a statement regarding the condition in 1939 which was disputed by the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Ross). If he will look up the relief figures for 1939 he will find that at one time in that year there were nearly one million people in this country on relief, and four hundred thousand registered unemployed. I say that no government in any country could have regimented in poverty and want the people to a greater extent than the present government which sits opposite.

Mr. MARTIN: Those were world conditions.

Mr. COLDWELL: Five dollars a month on a farm and three cents for a meal. The minister yesterday denied that men were riding the rods during the regime of this government. True, they were riding the rods in 1933, 1934 and 1935, when Mr. Bennett was in power, but they were also riding the rods in 1939, 1938, 1937, 1936. I remember vividly one incident which occurred under this roof in 1939. About this time of the year, early in February, there came into the office of my friend, Grant MacNeil, half a dozen young men, who were the vanguard of a number who had ridden the rods into this city, having been sent first of all from Vancouver to the province of Ontario. They came in homeless, foodless and cold. We got in touch with the then Minister of Labour, one of the kindliest men who have ever sat in this house, the late Hon. Norman Rogers. Mr. Rogers said: "My department can do nothing for them. We make grants to the provinces." Grant MacNeil got in touch with the province of Ontario: "We can do nothing

for them; they have not been in Ontario a year." Mr. MacNeil phoned the civic authorities: "We can do nothing for them; they have not been in the city three months." And a Liberal member in this house at that time rose in his place and described those two or three hundred men who were here the following week as—what? "Bums, toughs, yaps, ne'er-do-wells." And they drifted away. After the war broke out, in September, 1939, I happened to be walking down O'Connor street, away from this house. As I passed a recruiting station, or what I supposed was a recruiting station, for there were a lot of young men around there, I heard someone say, "There is Mr. Coldwell." I turned to him and asked, "What part of Saskatchewan are you from?" He said, "I am not from Saskatchewan; I am one of the boys who were in Mr. MacNeil's office in February. I have joined up." I shook hands with him and I wished him good luck. That boy, who could not get a fifteen-cent meal from the Dominion of Canada in February, who was a "bum," "spineless," and all the rest of it, according to a Liberal member of this house, in February, joined up. What did he get? He got a good suit of clothes, a good warm overcoat, good underwear, socks and shoes, three good meals a day, a ticket to the Y.M.C.A.—and socialized medicine thrown in with it, as my hon. friends remind me. These boys were "no good" in peace, but when war came they became necessary for our defence. But the government, which is yet in power, sat unmoved and did nothing to relieve their distress. They left them to ride the rods.

Mr. MacINNIS: They waited on world trade!

Mr. COLDWELL: Yes; as my hon. friend says, they waited on world trade. Yesterday the minister spoke to us of world trade. I believe in world trade; you export in order to import the goods which you need. But my hon. friends dare to tell me that world trade was the solution in this country when there were a million people on relief and four hundred thousand unemployed? In the city in which I live, and which is probably one of the best in the dominion in respect of relief so far as amounts go, three meals a day at three cents a meal was the average family allowance. And my hon. friends tell me that we ought to have exported more food? We say we ought to have fed some of the people. And we have reaped the nemesis since. I remember a former minister, the Hon. Mr. Thorson, rising in this house and telling us that forty-four per cent of the young men who had volunteered and been examined were turned down on account of physical unfitness. That was the result of the years when this government was in power. And then they say, "Put the C.C.F. in power and they will regiment you." We want to free men from that kind of regimentation, and if we ever get the opportunity, as we shall, we shall do it.

The minister said that we sent emissaries to national socialist countries to see what they were doing there. Where did he get his information from? We sent no emissaries. When we asked him whom he had in mind he named Major George H. Williams—a man who to-day is serving in the Canadian army overseas—as having been an emissary to a national socialist country to come back to teach this country national socialism, the thing we are fighting against. Major Williams is not only serving in this war but took part and was wounded in the war of 1914-18. Where did he go? He went to Russia. Did we send him there? No, we did not send him there. He was sent there by the farmers of Saskatchewan to study the agricultural problems of that country and how they were going to meet them, and what effect they might have in the future on the agricultural economy of our own country, and particularly of our prairie provinces. That is why Mr. Williams went to Russia. A few years ago, of course, even three or four years ago, hon. members would rise in their places and call us communists. "Russia" was thrown at us. Now, of course, Russia is our ally, communism is a bit more popular, and so they turn around and call us national socialists.

Mr. MacINNIS: They have to have something.

Mr. COLDWELL: Yes, they have to have something. But let me tell them that calling names will not meet argument, and calling names of that description will do them more harm than it will do us. As far as we are concerned we are the most democratically based political party in this country, indeed probably anywhere in the world; and our democratic associations are recognized in other countries.

May I interject this personal experience. I know I am the only member of this house ever to be invited to sit in at a labour party caucus in Great Britain, as I did on November 10, 1941, with Clement Attlee, Ernest Bevin, Herbert Morrison, A. V. Alexander and the other men who to-day are giving leadership in this struggle against national socialism but who hold to exactly the same kind of democratic socialist principles that we in this group hold to in this country; and that is recognized. So that I do not think that such stupidity

is going to carry any weight in this country; and to vilify a man who is serving his country overseas at this time is almost beneath contempt.

The minister said he was quoting from a book. What book? Well, at the conclusion of his remarks he held up this book, "Make This Your Canada." I would recommend that all hon. members read it; then perhaps they may know something more about the C.C.F. and be prepared to discuss it intelligently. But later on, when the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Nicholson) was speaking, I noticed that the minister interjected that the book was "Social Planning for Canada." We did not write or produce that book. It was written by a group of men associated with the League for Social Reconstruction of which, if I am not misinformed, some hon. gentlemen sitting on the other side of the house were members in the early nineteen-thirties.

Mr. GRAYDON: Who would they be?

Mr. COLDWELL: Well, I am not going to say, but I will ask this. Who were the authors of that book? It was written by a group of brilliant young men, one of whom, Doctor Leonard Marsh, is in an advisory capacity to one of the most important committees this government has set up, the social security committee. Indeed, he drafted their plan for them. Another one, Graham Spry, is now the personal assistant to Right Hon. Stafford Cripps in Britain. Some national socialists, aren't they, people of that description? Page the Minister of Agriculture, somebody says. I should say so.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Where is he?

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Probably busy.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Probably scared.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Of what?

Mr. COLDWELL: Yesterday I think this house took the measure of the minister in the kind of speech he made, when he tried to suggest that people like those I have mentioned were national socialists. If he had called anyone in this house a national socialist then he should have gone further and laid a charge with the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) and had that person interned, because we are at war with national socialism. Therefore when we examine a speech like the one made yesterday, so full of misrepresentations, it makes us wonder just what idea the minister has of the quality of thinking of our Canadian people.

A few moments ago I said that ours was the most truly democratic movement in Canada, and it is. We are the only political party organized in this manner. Back in our constituencies and throughout the country there are literally hundreds of clubs of ordinary, plain people meeting together regularly, studying the economic and social conditions of the country in which we live, formulating their ideas, putting them into resolution form, sending them to our constituency conventions, then up to the provincial conventions, held every year, and finally to the national convention, held every two years, to which the delegates are elected by the people. That is not like a Liberal convention held once every twenty-five years. The minister said yesterday, "Oh, yes; they held a meeting in Regina behind closed doors." Every political party holds its caucuses behind closed doors. The meeting referred to was a meeting of elected representatives, in the main, federal and provincial, in order to sort out some of the problems that confront both parliament and legislature. We thought that was a real contribution to the welfare of Canada at this time. What about the Liberal party? It has not had a national convention for twenty-five years. Oh, yes, they had a meeting last September. I happened to come into the House of Commons at the time a meeting was being held; and the meeting place, the railway committee room, was very carefully guarded by police. We did not have any police at our meeting in Regina; we did not need them.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): That was not a meeting at all.

Mr. COLDWELL: It was a caucus, and ours was a caucus, too. Then a meeting of the Liberal federation was held at the Chateau Laurier. Was the press admitted?

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Part of the time.

Mr. COLDWELL: Does anybody know what was adopted at that Liberal federation meeting?

Mr. MARTIN: Yes; it was given to the press.

Mr. COLDWELL: No, it was not. We were told that we would hear what the Liberal federation had decided when the programme of the government was brought down.

Mr. MARTIN: No.

Mr. COLDWELL: Oh, yes, we were; I can produce the press clippings to that effect. So that I say to the minister, let him beware when he hurls stones at some of the other people in this house, that he does not live in a very thin glass-house himself, for some stones may be hurled back at him.

I say we are a democratic political movement based on the people themselves. I have

no preemption of the position I hold to-day. I am elected or reelected every time there is a national convention, unless they wish to replace me by someone else. That is mass control; that is control by the people; that is democratic control, if you will, and we intend to keep it that way. I noticed, too, that the minister said he wanted to agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell) the other evening. I am prepared to place the record of this movement in pre-war international affairs beside the record of any other party in this house. We are not provincial isolationists, like my hon. friends to the left; nor do we dodge every issue that comes along, like my hon. friends to the immediate right; nor do we delay issues, like the government.

Mr. GRAYDON: You were getting along pretty well until now.

Mr. COLDWELL: Well, I should like Mr. Bracken to make a statement on some important matters. During pre-war years we demanded collective security, and the carrying out of league obligations. From 1931 right up to the outbreak of war we condemned the support that was being given by powerful interests throughout the world to Germany, Italy and Japan. We demanded that that cease. We denounced Mussolini when others were praising him, when they were coming back from Italy, as Colonel George Drew did, telling us that Mussolini was a wonderful man, that he had drained the marshes, made the trains run on time, and so on, and so on. We were denouncing the same Mussolini.

Mr. GRAYDON: It is great to be perfect.

Mr. COLDWELL: And we were denouncing Hitler all through those years, even when we were told that if Hitler had only stopped at a certain point he would have been a pretty good man. I remember that being said by the late Doctor Manion, the then leader of the Conservative party in the house. And we denounced Hitler, too, when some of our Liberal friends in Saskatchewan were addressing meetings in swastika-decorated halls—yes, in swastika-decorated halls.

True, we did demand disarmament as had been agreed to in the league covenant. We did denounce wars which were fought for economic interests, imperialist interests, and purely for trade and for commerce. And during those years we drew attention again and again to the preponderance of league power, if we cared to use it, for the preservation of peace.

With respect to Munich I am prepared to put the record of this movement opposite that of any other group in Canada. When Munich came in September 1938, I telegraphed the League of Nations Society in Canada, a member of whose executive I was at the time, and stated this:

Chemainus, B.C., Sept. 30, 1938.

European situation direct result of desertion of league covenant and collective security by great powers. Believe shameful partition of Czechoslovakia could have been prevented and war averted if league nations had resisted unitedly.

Result of fascist aggression demonstrates peril of small nations which rely on pledges of great powers and the honour of their reactionary politicians.

Urge world-wide campaign to revitalize league to prevent further aggression so clearly foreshadowed by success of Hitler's threat to world peace and human brotherhood.

That was my view at the time of Munich.

What was the view of the leader of the Liberal party? I shall read it, and place it on the record. This communication is dated at Ottawa, September 29, 1938, and states:

The Right Honourable Neville Chamberlain, P.C., M.P., Prime Minister of Great Britain, 10 Downing street, London, England.

The heart of Canada is rejoicing to-night at the success which has crowned your unremitting efforts for peace. May I convey to you the warm congratulations of the Canadian people, and with them, an expression of their gratitude, which is felt from one end of the dominion to the other. My colleagues in the government join with me in unbounded admiration at the service you have rendered mankind. Your achievements in the past month alone will ensure you an abiding and illustrious place among the great conciliators whom the United Kingdom the British commonwealth of nations and the whole world will continue to honour. On the very brink of chaos, with passions flaming, and armies marching, the voice of reason has found a way out of the conflict which no people in their heart desired, but none seemed able to avert. A turning point in the world's history will be reached if, as we hope, to-night's agreement means a halt to the mad race of arms, and a new start in building the partnership of all peoples. May you have health and strength to carry your great work to its completion.

W. L. Mackenzie King.

That was signed by the present Prime Minister.

I did not rejoice in the autumn of 1938 when the gallant little nation of Czechoslovakia was sacrificed. Now we know that the sacrifice of that nation had tremendous and serious effects on the future of the world. Doctor Riptka, under-secretary of state for foreign affairs in the Czechoslovakian government now in London has published in his book, "Munich and After", the whole story of the Munich agreement, together with the Czech documents. Among them one will find, if he reads the book, that they had a firm commitment from Russia that if France marched, and Britain marched with her for the protection of Czechoslovakia, Russia would march, too. And because of the deep distrust placed in the

hearts of the rulers of Russia at that time, a year later we have the Stalin-Hitler pact, and the way cleared for the outbreak of war in which, for a time, the British Commonwealth and Empire stood alone.

And so I say to-day I am not ashamed of the part we played before the war. In that connection, Mr. Speaker, I might refer to a speech I made on September 26, 1938, in the city of Victoria. I have the report of that speech as it appears in the Regina *Leader-Post* on September 27 of that year. This is a Canadian Press dispatch from Victoria, British Columbia.

Mr. GRAYDON: What year was that?

Mr. COLDWELL: 1938.

Mr. GRAYDON: It is important to have the right date.

Mr. COLDWELL: It states:

"Believing that Prime Minister Chamberlain has been forced into the present situation, if war comes we must give whatever assistance we can," he said.

"As a fundamental of participation, Canada must be organized economically to render maximum assistance. All essential industries must be placed under national control and profiteering of all kinds eliminated completely."

You see, at that time I thought perhaps the great powers might honour their obligations. The report continues:

"Canada must decide what her best contribution can be. To my mind this is economic. There probably is insufficient national unity to organize a large expeditionary force."

Practically everybody agreed with that. Speaking in this house in March, 1939, six months later, the Prime Minister made the statement that in his opinion we would never again send a force overseas, and that it was unthinkable that every twenty-five years or so we should send our youth across the seas. That was pretty much the general opinion at that time—that it would be difficult to organize and dispatch an expeditionary force.

Then the report goes on to say:

"The present situation arose from conditions that prevailed, prior to the great war," the C.C.F. member said.

"We desire not national rearmament but collective security," continued Mr. Coldwell.

"In other words, we hold that peace cannot be maintained by armed alliances. The League of Nations has not failed, but the statesmanship of the great powers has failed.

"To-day humanity seems to reap the whirlwind, whereas collective security properly applied could have prevented this situation.

"We tolerated the Japanese seizure of Manchuria in 1931.

"Having failed to disarm themselves the league powers allowed Hitler to commence arming. In 1936 his remilitarization of the Rhineland was permitted.

"Toward fascist Italy we have pursued a similar policy. Non-intervention policies in Spain in the face of German and Italian aggression strengthened the fascists."

That was my view in September, 1938. And I say quite freely that in September, 1939, with the people who had made the Munich agreement still in power I was afraid —yes, afraid, that we might once again find our boys sacrificed to the people who were in office, and had made the Munich agreement. But when Dunkirk came, when that government was overthrown and was replaced by one which represented the people of Great Britain, one in which we could have more confidence, the situation was different. To-day my own late leader, Mr. J. S. Woodsworth, who is sometimes vilified, has two sons in the armed forces, and my own son is serving in the air force overseas. So let us stop this kind of foolish name-calling and bandying of words. That was all the minister indulged in yesterday. If we stop that sort of thing we should get along with the business of the house and the war. But I am going to add this, that the kind of argument we heard yesterday will be met whenever it is made in this chamber. We are not on the defensive; we are on the offensive. It is the government that has to answer for many things. It is the government that kept the people regimented in starvation during the depression. It is the government that has no plan for the future. We will cooperate to make plans for the future, but when there is misrepresentation or vilification we shall not let that misrepresentation or vilification go unchallenged.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, until the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) rose in the house I had not the slightest intention of taking part in this debate. With what my hon. friend had to say concerning my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), I am not going to deal in my remarks. The Minister of Agriculture has demonstrated on more than one occasion that he can look after himself, and I have no doubt whatever that he will look after himself so far as the remarks of the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar are concerned. But it is in connection with the latter part of the speech made by the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation that I wish to make a few observations to the house.

If my hon. friend seeks to give the impression to this country that his record and the record of the C.C.F. so far as the war is concerned, so far as the conditions leading up to the war are concerned, are as rosy and fine

and wholesome as he indicates, then he has a big job on his hands. My hon. friend states the position he took at the time of Munich. If Great Britain and France at the time of Munich had gone to war with Germany in support of Czechoslovakia, I put this question to my hon. friend and to those who sit behind him: Would they have favoured Canada's participating in that fight to crush the tyranny of Germany?

Mr. COLDWELL: I said so in the very speech to which I referred.

An hon. MEMBER: 1939?

Mr. COLDWELL: 1938.

Mr. CRERAR: If that was the view of my hon. friend, then the position he took when war broke out was an extraordinary position.

Mr. COLDWELL: I did not trust the governments.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend gives a very lame reason for not standing unanimously with parliament in support of the war when it was declared by Canada in September, 1939.

Mr. COLDWELL: I did. I voted for it, as did every hon. member of this party except Mr. Woodsworth.

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend did not stand for effective participation by Canada in the war.

Mr. COLDWELL: Yes, I did.

Mr. CRERAR: I shall read the record in a moment. He gives us as a reason for his vacillating attitude at that time the fact that he did not trust this government or the Prime Minister of Great Britain. Is a great national question like that to be decided by the hon. gentleman by his not liking some one who is in a government or at the head of a government?

Mr. COLDWELL: I have to decide according to my own conscience.

Mr. CRERAR: All I have to say is that my hon. friend has quite an extraordinary conscience.

Mr. COLDWELL: If we are going to talk about consciences, I am not going to take anything of that from my hon. friend.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CRERAR: I did not interrupt my hon. friend when he was making his speech. I want to go back a little prior to the declaration of war by this parliament, September 9, 1939. What was the attitude of my hon. friend and those who sit behind him when we were dealing with the defence estimates presented by the present Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) when he was Minister of Defence in 1936, 1937 and 1938? I have the record here. I shall refer the house to the pages of *Hansard*.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): "Facts are chiels that winna ding."

Mr. CRERAR: It was clear to any one who knew anything about the international situation that the storm clouds throughout the world were rising. When the Minister of Pensions and National Health as Minister of National Defence sought to get a modest increase in the estimates for national defence for Canada, what was the attitude of my hon. friend? I happened to have some notes in my desk which I sent for after my hon. friend rose in his place. The hon. member who leads the C.C.F. party in the House of Commons is reported on page 3203 of *Hansard* of May 28, 1936—my hon. friend can mark down the page number and check it up—as follows:

> . . . in my opinion a country the size of Canada, with its diverse peoples and small population, is best defended if we rely upon our weakness physically and our good will as a good world neighbour, rather than attempt to ape the military powers of the European countries.

If my hon. friend's policy had been adopted when war broke out and the Japanese nation had attacked the shores of Canada, as was quite possible, where would we have been in the defence of Canada?

Mr. COLDWELL: Oil sanctions.

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend refers to the shipping of materials to Japan, Germany, Russia and other countries. I am not going to debate that matter at the moment more than to say that it is a difficult and dangerous thing in peace time for a government of one country to throw down a challenge to the government of another country in the way suggested by my hon. friend. There is another delightful gem of the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Douglas) who took part in this debate yesterday. This was delivered when we were endeavouring to get a modest increase—let me repeat that—in the defence estimates in 1937.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Far too modest.

Mr. CRERAR: Far too modest, the Minister of Pensions and National Health suggests, in the light of events that later occurred.

When on February 19, 1937, we were endeavouring to get this modest increase in the defence estimates the hon. member for Weyburn delivered himself of this gem, and I invite the attention of the house while I read it:

Against whom are we arming? What potential aggressor is more aggressive to-day? Oh, I know that bogeymen have been trotted out in this chamber. It has been suggested that it might be Italy, it might be Germany, it might be Japan!

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Finish the paragraph.

Mr. CRERAR: I do not need to.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): You dare not finish it and give the context.

Mr. CRERAR: I did not interrupt my hon. friend yesterday when he was speaking, and I ask him to refrain from interrupting me.

An hon. MEMBER: That is typical.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The minister, without a *Hansard* before him rises and quotes a sentence from my speech without giving the context. He is quoting from page 1063, and I know the rest of that paragraph. I will give it to the minister if he wishes. But I ask him to quote the rest of that paragraph or to withdraw what he has already said.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Otherwise it is tantamount to a complete misrepresentation of my remarks.

Mr. CRERAR: May I say to my hon. friend that I have had a little too much experience in this house—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member for Weyburn has raised a point of order with regard to the quotation made by the minister. If the quotation made by the minister is not correct, of course the hon. gentleman will have an opportunity of correcting it. But the minister is making his speech and he is entitled to make it as he sees fit.

Mr. CRERAR: The quotation I have made is a correct quotation from *Hansard*.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): But an incomplete one.

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend will find nothing in his speech at that time that will water down or qualify the definite statements which he made and which I have quoted.

But there is more than that. In 1937 the hon. gentleman who now leads the C.C.F. took part in the debate on the defence estimates of that year and made this statement on November 15, at page 888:

Are we in Canada going to join in this mad race without knowing precisely the policy that underlies the increased estimates upon which we shall shortly have to vote? Our answer in this little group is, of course, no, because we believe that such defence preparations only breed fear, and that hate, which, in turn, is the child of fear.

That was the lofty sentiment expressed by my hon. friend on that occasion. That would have been of very little avail against an armed Germany and an armed Japan, and I say to my hon. friends of the C.C.F. and to this house that if their point of view had been accepted by parliament at that time, not only would there have been no increase in the defence estimates, not only should we have had not even a modest preparation against the dangers that everyone could see were rising, but we would have dropped our defence estimates altogether and would have retired or, as my hon. friend suggested the year before, to defencelessness as our best defence.

Mr. COLDWELL: We would have had an international policy.

Mr. CRERAR: Well, I leave that to my hon. friend.

There was a by-election in Selkirk last August. It did not turn out very well for the government; my hon. friends' candidate won. I have here that candidate's circular and some of his campaign literature in which he said: "If you want to win the war, vote for the C.C.F." My hon. friend nods his head in approval. But what was the position taken by my hon. friend himself when war broke out? The might of Germany then was known. Russia was not then a member of the allied nations fighting Germany because she had a truce, temporary it is true, with Germany, a truce that was uncertain in character. But at that supreme moment, when Britain was threatened as she never had been threatened before in a thousand years of her history, what was the position of my hon. friend and those who sit behind him?

Mr. COLDWELL: The same as the government's.

Mr. CRERAR: When this government decided to declare war on Germany, my hon. friend made a declaration in this house. I do not wish to deal unkindly with him at all, but it is well known that in his group there were strong differences of opinion. The leader of the party at that time was the late Mr. Woodsworth, for whom I had a very great

respect, and Mr. Woodsworth took a line in this house different from that taken by my hon. friend because Mr. Woodsworth said that we should not take any part in the war whatever. But my hon. friend made the declaration that our effort should be wholly economic in character and that no forces should be sent overseas. What would have happened to the commonwealth air training plan under that policy? What would have happened to the assistance we have given on the ocean in carrying and convoying supplies to Britain, without which she could not win the war? I say to my hon. friend and to this house and to the country that if my hon. friend's policy had been accepted and adopted by this country at that time Canada would have done nothing toward helping to win this terrible war. So when my hon. friend endeavours to give the impression that his party were the only real patriots at that time—

Mr. COLDWELL: I never said that—

Mr. CRERAR: No, but my hon. friend has criticized everyone else, so what else can we think? I have not the slightest doubt, Mr. Speaker, that when the people of this country get all these facts before them, as they will, they will deal and deal effectively with my hon. friend the leader of the Commonwealth Cooperative Federation and those who sit behind him in this house.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. This afternoon the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Crerar) was permitted to place on the record a statement which he read from a piece of paper and which purported to be an extract from *Hansard* of a quotation from a speech which I had made. I objected at the time, and I now claim the right, first of all, to point out that the quotation made by the minister was incomplete and therefore incorrect—

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): No. I was not incorrect.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): —and I claim the right to read to the house and to place on the record the statement from *Hansard*, not from a piece of paper which I hold in my hand but from volume 2 of the session of 1937, February 19, page 1063. The quotation follows—

[Mr. Crerar.]

Mr. SPEAKER: Do I understand that the hon. member claims the right to reply to the Minister of Mines and Resources with regard to a statement which the hon. member declares is incorrect? Do I understand that to be his point of order? The Minister of Mines and Resources is of course the judge of his own speech, and if he makes a quotation from any speech or any document which has a bearing, as in this instance, on what the hon. member said on a former occasion, if the quotation he makes is in the exact terms of the record, he is entitled to make it. If the hon. member thinks and states that he has been incorrectly reported and therefore that what has been said is untrue, he has the right to make a correction. In this instance, however, I understand the hon. member to say, not that he has been incorrectly quoted, but that the whole quotation has not been given and that therefore the meaning which the hon. member intended to convey in the speech in question has been distorted. There is nothing incorrect, nothing untrue, in what the Minister of Mines and Resources has said, and the opportunity may arise when the hon. member for Weyburn will have the right to place on the record his interpretation of the statement made by the minister. On the basis of what the hon. member has now said, however, I cannot hold that he is in order.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): May I point out that it is not a matter of interpretation—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I am pointing out—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I have a right to rise to a question of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am of course willing to give as much latitude as possible, but the point of order as stated by the hon. member is not well taken. It is a question as to the correctness or incorrectness of a statement made by the minister and is therefore not a point of order.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): My point of order is this: I am not calling in question any statement; the question I am discussing is whether or not the minister was quoting correctly from my statement. He had on his desk not a copy of *Hansard* but a piece of paper, and I contend that no member in this house has a right to quote from *Hansard* unless he quotes correctly.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): On a point of order, I have before me a

copy of what the minister said this afternoon and I have also before me a copy of *Hansard,* and on my honour as a member of the house I say that what the minister said is absolutely correct in every detail.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must rule against the point raised by the hon. member for Weyburn. In the first place, I do not think it is a point of order. If an hon. member wishes to quote in his address any part of a speech he is entitled to do so. Here, however, no point of order is involved, and the hon. member will have to take any opportunity afforded him to place before the house what he intended to convey.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): An opportunity to refute political dishonesty.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): The dishonesty is over there.

Mr. SPEAKER: That of course must necessarily be a matter of opinion.

Mr. L. PHILIPPE PICARD (Bellechasse): Anybody rising at this stage of the debate on the address usually starts by saying that he had no intention of speaking but is forced to do so through some intervention in the debate by some other member. I will follow the tradition and say that I did not intend to speak but that the sub-amendment proposed by the hon. member for Gaspe (Mr. Roy) and now before us is the reason for my addressing the house to-night.

I do not feel that I should deal with the first three paragraphs of the subamendent because my position on such questions is well known. I have dealt with them on previous occasions and I shall have an opportunity to do so again in the future. But, Mr. Speaker, I represent an entirely rural constituency in the province of Quebec, and as the fourth paragraph in this subamendment reads that the government—

> Failed to grant to farmers and fishermen exemption from military service in order to remove from them the vexatious proceedings resulting from the narrow application of the national selective service regulations.

I feel I should explain my position.

Even with these words in the subamendment I declare at once that I cannot vote for it because I am convinced that the farmers of my province as well as the farmers of all Canada have been treated fairly.

The farmers are not asking for any special law for themselves. The regulations existing at the moment give them all due opportunity to get deferments and to be left to till the soil if they properly present their applications to the different boards organized by the Department of Labour. The farmers want to be treated as all other good citizens of this country are treated, and they are just as patriotic as other classes in the community. They know that the policy of this government has been to keep in their present occupations all men whose labour is considered essential to the prosecution of the war. In this regard they know that all important industries dealing with the war effort, munition plants, shipbuilding plants, and most of the war industries, have been given the privilege of declaring who, among their men, when they are called, are essential to production. And these men upon the declaration of these industries are given deferment.

The farmers occupy an even better position from the point of view of preferment. In the first year of the application of the mobilization act a farmer had to prove that he was essential on the land in order to obtain deferment. Soon after the plans for agricultural expansion in Canada were brought down the Department of Agriculture realized that, in order to send to Britain and to the other united nations the quota they had agreed to supply, all men occupied in agriculture, farmer-owners, sons of farmers or others engaged in agriculture, were necessary and had to be left to till the soil.

As I stated in this house on two previous occasions, the government realized "that the land is the first element that enters into the question of production and that farming is the primary industry and most essential in carrying on the war, because the best trained men, with the best and most modern equipment, cannot fight on an empty stomach."

From then on the farmers throughout Canada had only to establish their status to get deferment from military service either to work on their own farms or to work on the farms of their fathers, or, if those farms were well enough supplied with labour, to be sent to work as farm hands on farms where there were no sons of an age to work, or where there was lack of man-power.

My experience—and I say again that I represent a constituency 98 per cent rural—is that the farmers are satisfied, and I have ample evidence from letters from my own constituents showing that they recognize that they have been well treated and recognize what has been done by this government, not as a favour to one class of the population, but to ensure adequate production of food for Canada, to be sent to Britain and to be supplied to the United Nations. As I say that they have been well treated I intend, for the sake of the record and although we all know about this, to outline in a few words the

procedure which was followed, and which, when followed, permitted these farmers to remain on the farms if they were bona fide farmers.

The moment these men were called, as every other Canadian citizen coming of age was called, if they were notified that their medical examination classed them in a category where they were callable for service, they had to file a form stating the size of the farm, the quantity of cattle or hogs or other animals that they had; in short, to explain what sort of farm they had and how many people there were on the farm. Immediately that procedure had been followed, the registrar of their district would, if the evidence was sufficient, immediately issue to them a certificate stating that they were deferred until further notice, which meant that unless the enemy landed on Canadian soil they would be left to till the soil and produce the food necessary for our armies.

Those who may not have supplied all the documents necessary to prove to the registrar their good faith, or the necessity of their remaining on their parents' farm, were, if there was enough evidence to show that they had been the larger part of their life on a farm and knew about farming and desired to carry on that kind of work, given deferments of from three to six months; and that limit was not to cause them any trouble, as this amendment might lead us to believe, but to make sure, as the government had to do, that these men would remain and work on the farm for the production of food, and were not trying to get deferment in order to go into industry, as was done under regulations which were in force during the last war.

Our people in good faith produced that evidence, showed it to the registrars or to the courts of inquiry that had authority to revise the decisions of the registrars and, once they showed their good faith, were immediately given deferments. Those who were given three to six months deferments, received further extension from six months to six months, after evidence was produced that they were really on the farms.

Some will say that there were men in the first months of the application of the mobilization act who were called at the time for four months and did not ask for any deferment, as they were willing to go for four months, that they entered the army, and that afterwards the procedure to get them out to go back and till the soil was a little difficult. Well, such cases have happened. I have had some myself in my constituency. I have some that are not yet solved. But most of them have been carefully scrutinized by the army authorities, and I must say that, especially in the last year, there has been a great improvement. When the Department of Agriculture impressed upon national selective service authorities that all the men needed for agricultural production had to be returned to the land whenever the man was not in an operational unit and it could be proved that his father needed him on the farm, and when we presented the case to the military authorities, men who were in the different camps throughout Canada were released for periods of from three to six months for duty on the farms, and some of them had their leave extended for other periods of six months. Furthermore, these agriculturists have even been begged by the government to go into the forests during the months they were not absolutely necessary on the farms and work for lumber companies. This was not done to give preferences to special classes of the population, but in order that they could produce the lumber so much needed for the war effort. As regards most of these cases which at first gave trouble to some hon. members because the men had not applied for deferment and were inducted in the army because they were willing to serve, and whose fathers seeing the production on their land lagging, asked to get them back for a certain period of the year — they have been for the most part redressed. I myself have some cases which have not yet been solved, of men who are already over one year in the army on the Pacific coast or the Atlantic coast. There may be difficulties in connection with their farms. I say there may be some such cases, but would this house be justified in passing such an amendment merely because in certain cases the circumstances have not been understood by some officers of the Department of National Defence as we expected they would? I do not think the situation justifies any hon. member voting for the subamendment. The farmers of Canada are satisfied to comply with the regulations as at present applied, and under which, if they choose to ask for deferment of their service when called, they are sent back to till the soil, to work and fight as soldiers of production.

I should not like to conclude this first part of my remarks without a word of praise for the sons of the soil who volunteered for service, or who, when called under the present regulations, reported for service. What would Jean-Baptiste Montminy, from St. Just de Montmagny, think of such an amendment? Jean-Baptiste Montminy volunteered in the first days of the war and has seen service in Italy, and a month ago this man was awarded the Military Cross, with the following citation:

During the attack against hill 246 at Santa Maria he led his platoon to assault. After the machine-gunner was killed he took hold of the

machine-gun and ammunition and advanced in the direction of two nests of enemy machine-guns and by skilful manoeuvring of his arm succeeded in reducing them to silence.

Climbing the hill with his platoon, despite heavy enemy fire he operated on his own initiative an encircling move, and utilizing resourcefully geographic accidents he succeeded in dislodging the enemy who was then impeding the advance of the Canadian unit.

Here was a man who had tilled the soil. Here was a farmer from Quebec, who had enlisted and is keeping alive by his exploits the tradition of the old 22nd battalion of the last war.

As to those who are yet on the farm, they are by their labour and their energy serving on the home front to help feed the country, to help feed Britain and our allies.

One thing I should like to say just now. I am sure that French Canada will realize when this war is over that it owes more to men like Jean-Baptiste Montminy of St. Just, who was decorated in Italy; that it owes more to men like Flight Sergeant Marc Chabot, who was reported missing after an air raid in North Africa in 1941 and who since then has been presumed dead in action and whose father and grandparents are from St. Francois in my constituency; that it owes more to all its sons who have served in this war and who have vindicated its reputation, than it owes to the hon. member for Gaspe (Mr. Roy) and those who surround him and who share his views, or to the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. LaCroix), who seconded this subamendment.

It might be opportune at this moment to see what the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency had to say in this debate, to examine his attitude during the past two years, and to form a conclusion as to the use it has been to his own province and to his own people. Speaking in this debate, the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency criticized all Liberal administrations since 1900. He criticized the late Mr. Lapointe's statement in this house in September, 1939, as to Canada's participation, and called it a gesture of colonialism. If the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency was so much against what Mr. Lapointe said in 1939, why did he support him; why did he run in Montmorency as a straight Liberal in support of King and Lapointe in 1940? I remember a meeting in the good constituency of Quebec East, with which I have many links because for a long time I was secretary to the then hon. member for that constituency, Mr. Lapointe. Everyone wondered what would be said by the brave member for Quebec-Montmorency, who only a few months before had spoken against Canada's participation in the war. Everyone wondered how he would act when the election came along. In Limoilou, in the large hall where most political campaigns in Quebec East are begun, we had our honourable colleague sitting in the front row. When his time came to speak he rose very pompously, bowed very nicely in the direction of the then Minister of Justice, Mr. Lapointe, and said, "My respected leader, Mr. Lapointe." Then he bowed a little more mildly in the direction of the then minister of pensions, now Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Power) and said, "My good friend, Mr. Power," and proceeded to support the Liberal party which was appealing to the people at that time.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that what the hon. member calls gestures of colonialism had been made before 1940, before that campaign opened. Why, then, did the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency, who now criticizes every move made by the government, support the government at that time? I will tell you it was because he felt that the province of Quebec, and indeed the whole of Canada, were behind King and Lapointe. Why does he not cross the floor now and sit in the far corner? Again, because he has his nose in the wind; he wants to make sure whether the people of Quebec will follow King again in the next election, he senses that the people of my province, with those of the rest of Canada, at the next election will be behind Mackenzie King again, and he wants to play safe if he can. The hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency tells everyone privately, "Well, I am just following the advice of Mr. Lapointe. I am staying within the party and trying to bring about reforms." That was what Mr. Lapointe said one day when he saw a few Liberals in Quebec form a group called L'Action Liberale Nationale; men who differed with the provincial government on no real question of principle but who did not agree with certain actions taken by that government. One of these men was a friend of Mr. Lapointe who, without trying to bring about any change within the party, had left to help form this other group. Mr. Lapointe said. "The Liberal party is broad enough to tolerate discussion within its ranks. Could they not have aired their views and differences within the party, instead of forming another party?" There is a great difference between that attitude and the one taken by the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency in this house during the last few years. Mr. Lapointe meant that any reforms or alterations to be brought about in a party policy, or any differences of view, should be aired within the party councils rather than in public. Any member of the party whose views differ from those of the majority should endeavour in party caucus, by private conversations and in

group meetings to influence the views of the party and have the policy changed. Of course liberty of action should exist within any political organization. At one time or another any member of this house may vote against his party if his principles or ideals force him to do so. That may show the strength of mind of the individual member, and it also demonstrates the true democratic value of our parliamentary system. However, Mr. Lapointe's words, so often quoted by the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency, never meant that a man whose views differed radically and constantly with those of his party, on matters of national importance, should remain apparently within the party in order the better to stab it in the back.

When an hon. member differs with his party on a vital question, or with the views generally accepted by his friends, he should do as the hon. member for Gaspe did when he left the Conservative benches. We know he is still a Conservative, though of a different species—a different brand of the same make, only temporarily isolated from the flock for the duration of the war—yet he did the proper thing when he stepped down into the realm of pseudo-independence. The same might be said of the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Dorion), who I understand has been called in to reply to my remarks. He entered this house not as a Conservative but as an independent, but it might be interesting to see what he was in the past. During the election of 1940, when the present Conservative party was called the National Government party, if that is the right thing to say—I want to be precise and correct—the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay was the chief organizer in Quebec for that party. We must believe, however, that later on he saw the light and became converted to a spirit of independence, so that he now sits in this house as an independent. He has done the right thing; he is against the government, and we know it, so he sits in that corner. When the hon. member for Beauharnois-Laprairie (Mr. Raymond), the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Lacroix) and the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Gauthier) felt that their views could not be reconciled with those of the Liberal party, they crossed the floor; they moved, shall I say, to another "block." I do not approve their views; but if they considered that their views and those of the Liberal party were irreconcilable, they did the right thing. I have more respect for those who, having views opposed to those of the government, cross the floor and fight from the opposition benches, than for those opportunists who try to get whatever prestige they may from being considered Liberals but who are always lurking in the dark, a dagger in hand, ready to stab in the back those with whom they still pretend at times to be associated.

While our late leader, Mr. Lapointe, was in this house the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency, like many others who now invoke Lapointe's memory to try to justify certain attitudes, had not a word of friendship for him privately; yet in 1940 the hon. member rallied to the cause of the Liberal party and ran in Quebec-Montmorency as a Liberal. In his remarks a few days ago he criticized the policies of Laurier, which are a part of Canadian history. He criticized the stand taken by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) at the beginning of this war, which is a matter of record. He criticized the action taken in 1940, not many months before he ran as a Liberal; yet at the time he proclaimed himself as a Liberal and acknowledged King and Lapointe as his leaders.

Mr. GRAYDON: Are these matters at issue in your part of the country?

Mr. PICARD: The issues in all parts of the country are really the same; they mean the winning of the war. My hon. friend should realize that what I am doing now is trying to convince the house that the people of my own province are all really united against the isolationists, so that the hon. gentleman has no reason to interrupt what I am saying. I am trying to prove that in Quebec sentiment is as good as in any other part of the country, and that my compatriots should not be classed with some few members in this house, the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency and others, who have taken the same attitude and spread the same doctrine at large in the province, believing that they can get more popularity by stating that they are against participation, and by criticizing every phase of the war effort. Let me tell them that they are mistaken. With the help of their near-seditious paper in Montreal, on the radio and on the platform they try to poison the minds of our population. And as we failed to counteract immediately, they may have influenced temporarily those of the less well informed elements and may have pleased a very small minority of people who accept their views. But the people of my province are intelligent enough that when we went and explained the situation in its true light they reacted with their usual good and sound judgment, and soon realized that their true friends were not those who tried to ring the bell of narrow provincialism, or to awaken racial prejudices, as some of them do in

Quebec, and as the hon. member for Hastings-Peterborough (Mr. White) never fails to do each time he rises to speak in the house.

In the early days of the war, soon after the declaration, it might have been possible that some who were not well informed in Quebec might have thought that some elements of the Anglo-Canadian population had been influenced more by their love for Great Britain than by Canada's interests, when they had pushed Canada into the war. I do not believe it was a fact. I was convinced we were going into the war because of our own interests. Ill-informed people might have been led to believe otherwise at that time. But after every country in Europe was involved, after the fall of France, after Pearl Harbor, was it still justifiable for any one in this country to be isolationist? I think everybody in my province, when the situation was properly explained, understood that Canada was joining with all liberty-loving nations in preventing the enslaving of the world by the axis nations. Canada was acting to protect her sacred heritage of the past, and to ensure our liberty in the world of to-morrow.

I can assure the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency, and all others who take the same attitude, that the people of Quebec, just as the people in the other provinces, have greater confidence than ever in the present administration. They are just as proud as other people throughout the country in the government's war record. They cannot overlook the fact that, due to wise administration by this government, Canada has accomplished a magnificent war effort, undreamed of by many, while at the same time disturbing as little as possible the life of the country.

They cannot overlook the fact so eloquently outlined yesterday by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), that Canadian farmers are more prosperous to-day than they were before the war, that industry has been mobilized, and that the working class is better off to-day than at any time before the war—and all that while Canada has mobilized vast armies, has enlarged its navy tenfold, and has equipped and trained the most magnificent air force and managed so efficiently the empire training scheme—and all that while Canada has helped so magnanimously to feed and equip Britain and the united nations.

And I say here that these extraordinary accomplishments have done more to make of Canada a great nation, an important sovereign state, than can or will the wailing of the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency, and those who adopt the same attitude.

I am not more of an imperialist than the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency. I have just as much at heart the interests of Canada, and I want to point out to that hon. member that Canada evolved from colonial status to that of a great dominion, under Laurier, whose policies were criticized only a short time ago by the hon. member. Canada evolved under the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) from the status of a dominion, as the word meant in 1911, to that of an autonomous nation within the empire, as meant by the declaration of the imperial conference of 1926. Canada has continued to evolve from that condition to that of a sovereign state, again, under the present Prime Minister.

I attach more importance to the broad policies of the government than to the eradication of a few symbols of the past, to which the hon. member ties his policy, and that can and will be corrected by one simple gesture at the proper time.

I am as much of a nationalist as is the hon. member, not in the narrow sense of provincial nationalism, as the hon. member advocates, but in a true, great, Canadian, nationalist sentiment, viewing Canada as a great united nation where the descendants of two great races and those who later associated with them, will develop in harmony with one common objective—not the narrow view of their own province, nor with the antiquated mentality of colonials, thinking always in terms of imperial interests, but with one common objective, making their Canada one great sovereign state, claiming its due part in the concert of nations, and helping to shape a better world for to-morrow.

That is what the present government is aiming at. It is, I believe, the reason of their actions, a reason which the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency and the hon. member for Gaspe and others of the same type fail to see, in their lack of perspective of the future. That is my reason for supporting the government, and that is why I am ready, as I have done in the past, to go to my people, and why I am confident they will understand me and give me their support.

Mr. WILFRID LaCROIX (Quebec-Montmorency) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, in reply to my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Picard), I shall merely say—

Mr. SPEAKER: I saw the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green).

Mr. HOWARD C. GREEN (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, this evening I would ask hon. members for a few minutes to turn their thoughts to the west, not to the near west, the prairies, but far across Canada, over the Rocky Mountains, to the Pacific Coast, where they would find snowdrops and crocuses blooming —and, I must admit, might also find a little fog; and then to direct their thoughts farther out, across that vast ocean, the Pacific.

It is my purpose to-night to deal primarily with Canada's position in the war on the Pacific. Then I shall discuss the new Australian-New Zealand agreement signed less than three weeks ago. Following that, I shall touch upon British commonwealth defence and foreign policy.

But before doing so I wish to say a few words with respect to two points in the amendment to the address offered by my party, the Progressive Conservative party. Those two points are the failure of the government to provide adequately for the men and women in our forces and the protest contained in the amendment against the recent wages control order.

First, with respect to the men and women of the forces: The young fighting men of Canada have set a standard for the nation which has never been surpassed. I was very much pleased to read a statement by that great elder statesman Field-Marshal Smuts, where he said on December 8, referring to our present younger generation, that this war has proved that our generation is not degenerate, and accordingly that he looked forward with confidence and faith to the future.

Canada can expect great things from her young men and women on their return from this war. They will bring bold and forward-looking leadership. They will bring a new and broader vision to this, their nation. In the meantime, however, what about those of us who are on the home front and, in particular, what about those of us who are members of the House of Commons of Canada? Our young men are going into heavier battles; there will be greater casualties as the year progresses. Canadians at home, particularly during this year, must never forget the personal aspect of waging war, that our fighting men are placing their lives between us and our enemies. They are making the greatest sacrifice possible; let there be no mistake about that. The very least we can do is to make certain that they and their dependents are cared for adequately, are treated in a spirit of gratitude rather than grudgingly. I regret to say that that is not being done by the government of Canada and I propose to give several examples.

[Mr. Speaker.]

My first reference is to the medical examination given to recruits. This has been far more thorough than was given to those of us who enlisted in the last war and there has been far less chance for mistakes. Yet we find that only a small number of men who have been taken on the strength as being in category "A" and then discharged as being in category "E" have been able to qualify for a pension. That is something I cannot understand. Last year I asked for a return, and the information received was that less than fifty per cent of the men who had enlisted in category "A" served overseas, come back and been discharged in category "E" were able to get pensions. Of the men who served in Canada, only one in thirty-three could obtain a pension and yet, when they enlisted, they were placed in the top category and, when discharged, in the lowest.

The Pension Act is wrong, and it should be changed to provide that there shall be a definite presumption that a man's condition as recorded on his admission to service was in fact his condition and that any subsequent deterioration is due to service. It should be the responsibility of the government to overcome that presumption or else award the man a pension. Further, the insurance principle should be extended to men serving in Canada. It applied to them in the last war and it did in this war until some time in May, 1940. The present position is that a man must prove that his disability arose out of or was directly connected with service. A direct result of that provision in the law is, as I have mentioned, that only one in thirty-three of the men discharged in Canada under the conditions outlined has been able to qualify for a pension.

In another regard the government has not treated these men fairly. I refer to their pay and allowances on discharge. A man is given one month's pay and a clothing allowance which has recently been raised to $65. That is not sufficient to clothe a man coming out of the forces, and one month's pay is not sufficient to enable him to readjust himself and get settled in civilian life. I have had men come to my office who have served with our own Seaforth battalion which has given such gallant service in Sicily and Italy. They find that this allowance is not sufficient to purchase a proper outfit and it has proved a shock to their morale. They cannot understand why they should be treated in this way. This condition cannot be remedied too quickly.

As a third example, the government has failed to enact a Sparkman act for Canada. Members will recall that last year we had a debate lasting a whole afternoon on the advisability of setting up legislation of this kind

in Canada. The Sparkman act is the United States act which protects the fighting man's home, protects him with regard to debt, mortgages, insurance, leases, loan interest and so on. Members of every party in the house spoke in favour of such an act, and so did the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston). As reported at page 3055 of *Hansard* of May 26, 1943, he stated that a committee had been appointed to consider this legislation and had reported. He then went on to say:

> I anticipate that action will be taken along lines which I feel ought to meet the situation.

And further on:

> I can only assure the committee that every study will be made of the matter, and active consideration will be given to it.

Almost a year has gone by, but as far as I know no such provision has been made.

To sum up, I repeat that the government has failed to provide adequately for the men and women of the forces. The ministry seem to have little realization of the sacrifices that are being made, they go just far enough to save face and only that far after there has been a great deal of coaxing and prodding and long delay. So much for the men and women of the forces.

Then a word with regard to our protest against the recent wages control order, P.C. 9384. I was pleased to hear the Prime Minister (Mr.Mackenzie King) state to-day that there would probably be an amendment to that order in council. I think he would be well advised to go further and scrap the whole thing and start over again. When I read that order in council I was amazed at the government dealing in such a cavalier fashion with any group of law-abiding Canadian citizens, large or small. The whole tone of the order is punitive rather than friendly, and this at a time when labour generally has shown a keen desire to cooperate, has shown by and large a high sense of responsibility to Canada, as great a sense of responsibility as any other body of men or women in this country.

For example, the order in council provides for the setting up of a national board upon which the employees are to have only one representative out of six. This board must review the decisions or the directions of the regional boards which are on the spot and have a far greater knowledge of local conditions. The national board may of its own initiative, without a hearing of any kind, vary or revoke an order of a regional board. Then an iron-clad ceiling is clamped down on wage rates, and there are drastic terms outlawing strikes. The burden of proof is thrown on the accused, contrary to all our ideas of British justice. There is set up a dictatorship with regard to prosecutions, which is placed in the hands of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell). Finally, there is an intimation in the recital of the order in council that the order is necessary not only in war—goodness knows it is bad enough in war time—but also during the post-war period. That period will be difficult enough even with friendliness and cooperation between all groups of Canadians, but with orders in council of this type there will be nothing but chaos. I urge that the order be cancelled and something at least approaching Canadianism substituted in its place.

I come now to Canada's position in the war on the Pacific. Our position in that theatre of war is most unsatisfactory. Although we are a nation on the Pacific and vitally interested in what goes on around the shores of that ocean, we are failing and have failed to accept our share of the responsibilities. Before Japan struck in December, 1941, we sent out our ill-fated and ill-equipped force to Hong Kong. I was saddened just last week to see a press dispatch covering the experience of a Chinese who had escaped from Hong Kong and returned to Canada. He reported the bayoneting of nine Canadian officers and men. He then went on to say that he had been in a prison camp with men of the Royal Rifles and the Winnipeg Grenadiers and that they had very little mechanical transport and were disappointed and angry over the delay in the arrival of their equipment. Some day, Mr. Speaker, there will be much more said about the failure to equip properly that force which was sent to Hong Kong. After Japan had struck; after great pressure from every sort of people in the Pacific province, and after, I believe, pressure from the United States of America, the government finally established defence forces on the Pacific coast. Eventually some airmen were sent to Alaska, most of whom I believe have since gone to other parts, and then last summer a small task force was sent to Kiska with the United States forces which attacked that island. The Canadian troops did good work there; they made a good name for themselves and upheld the reputation of Canadian fighting men. Now they have returned to Canada, and once again Australians, New Zealanders and the Americans are left to do the fighting in the Pacific war zone. If Canada continues in this way she will have very little voice in Pacific affairs, and she will deserve very little voice.

Why does the government adopt this policy in Pacific affairs? The answer is simple. It is because the troops on the coast, including the troops who went to Kiska, are home defence troops, and under the government's policy, not under the Canadian law, they cannot be

sent to fight away from the American continent. That is the position despite the plebiscite vote, which was overwhelmingly yes. The result is, of course, that the government is in effect defying the expressed wish of the great majority of the Canadian people. These home defence troops on the Pacific coast cannot go abroad under the government's policy despite the fact that they are fully trained and equipped, and that those at least who went to Kiska are experienced, have a high morale and are eager to fight the Japanese. They are not so keen about going to Europe. I believe that questions have been asked throughout the force and there is a desire among them of their own free will to go and fight the Japanese. The government still maintains its policy despite the further fact that behind these Pacific coast troops there are in Canada thousands and thousands of other home defence troops piling up who can never be used in fighting unless that fighting takes place on Canadian soil. Finally, these troops are held in Canada despite the fact that Canada's duty is to do her full share in the war on the Pacific. And so I appeal to the Prime Minister of this country to stop this farce at once and send these troops to fight either beside the Australians and New Zealanders in the South Pacific or beside the Americans in the Central Pacific.

Canadians facing on the Pacific ocean are always greatly interested in what is done by our sister nations, Australia and New Zealand, because our outlook and our interests are much the same. We were therefore greatly interested in the agreement recently negotiated between Australia and New Zealand known as the Australian-New Zealand agreement, 1944. I think that agreement is of great importance not only to those of us who live on Canda's Pacific coast, but to all Canadians, in fact, to the whole British empire and to the different members of the united nations because it points the way to world peace. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that consideration should be given to printing this agreement and the accompanying press releases of the ministers of Australia and New Zealand in the *Votes and Proceedings* of this house so that the members may be able to give them more careful consideration. The agreement contains no secret clauses; everything is open and aboveboard. It begins with these words:

> . . . having met in conference at Canberra from the 17th to the 21st of January, 1944, and desiring to maintain and strengthen the close and cordial relations between the two governments, do hereby enter into this agreement.

Then it goes on to define the objectives of Australian-New Zealand cooperation. It deals with such things as the prosecution of the war, and with the armistice and the subsequent arrangements, and I would remind hon. members that the armistice period after this war is apt to be a long period, perhaps running into some years.

It also deals with the question of security and defence, and with civil aviation, outlining a new policy which Canadians should very carefully consider, a policy which among other things advocates international air trunk routes and the setting up of an international air transport authority.

Then it deals with dependencies and territories and with the welfare and advancement of the native peoples of the Pacific. It also provides for the calling of an international conference relating to the southwest and the south Pacific and for permanent machinery for collaboration and cooperation between Australia and New Zealand. That part of the agreement sets out measures whereby these two nations may cooperate for defence, and may collaborate in external policy; also for the development of commerce between them, for the full employment of Australians and New Zealanders, the highest standards of social security and the encouragement of missionary work and other activities directed toward the improvement of the welfare of native peoples. It goes on to invite other nations interested in the Pacific, of which Canada is one, to join Australia and New Zealand in promoting these objectives. That particular paragraph reads:

> The two governments declare their desire to have the adherence to the objectives set out in the last preceding clause of any other government having or controlling territories in the Pacific.

I suggest that the government of Canada should give thought to collaborating with the Australians and New Zealanders under the terms of this agreement.

Then it provides for setting up a permanent secretariat with one branch in Australia and another in New Zealand. In explaining the agreement the minister of external affairs of Australia, Doctor Evatt, makes this statement which I think is of great importance to Canadians:

> The war with its extension to the Pacific and its long sustained threat of utter disaster—

And these are words which Canadians would do well to mark, "its long sustained threat of utter disaster".

> —has brought the two peoples closer together than ever before; it has made us realize that we can help each other only by pulling together in the struggles that still lie ahead; in winning, not only the war but the great struggle for improved standards in the years of post-war reconstruction.

Doctor Evatt concluded with these words:

> This agreement is in effect a permanent understanding between two nations which are completely autonomous and are at the same time united by a common allegiance to the King and also trustees for British interests and British civilization in the Pacific.

The prime minister of New Zealand, Mr. Fraser, used these words:

> It is an agreement of positive value in the sense that it is directed against no other people; on the contrary, other powers are invited to adhere to the principles enunciated . . . . I should like to make it perfectly clear that neither the holding of this conference, nor the agreement resulting from it, is in any sense a departure from the principles of the British commonwealth of nations, membership of which is in the very forefront of the policy of both Australia and New Zealand.

The agreement therefore is a very practical step not only in the direction of security but also toward cooperation among all nations, in short, toward world peace. Obviously it would be absurd to say that it endangers world peace and equally absurd to say that any similar British commonwealth pact would do so; Doctor Evatt has suggested in his release that:

> In the successful outcome of the present Australian-New Zealand consultations, there may well be a precedent of considerable value to other members of the British commonwealth.

That brings me to my final topic, namely, British commonwealth defence policy and foreign policy. Recently there has been considerable discussion concerning the advisability of working out a British commonwealth defence policy and foreign policy rather than each nation of the commonwealth having its own policy on these matters. It is a question which will require calm and careful consideration by the Canadian people, of whatever party. Personally, I believe that the condition of the world is such that a commonwealth policy on defence and on foreign affairs is advisable. Apparently the Canadian Prime Minister does not. He believes otherwise. He differs from such men of the empire as Field Marshal Smuts, Prime Minister of South Africa, and from the Prime Ministers of Australia and New Zealand, and Lord Halifax, a member of the British war cabinet; and he has rather summarily rejected the suggestions made by these men.

Now it can be agreed that all persons participating in this discussion have one common aim, namely, security and world peace. Prime Minister Smuts made that perfectly clear in his speech on the subject when he stressed as an objective human welfare, peace and security. Personally, therefore, I am hopeful that having this one end in view, it will eventually be possible for all those who are involved to reach common ground.

Another fact upon which there is agreement is that all Canadians participating in this discussion are conscientiously thinking first of Canada's own interest. That must always be the basis for the foreign policy of Canada. What is the interest of our own nation? No one is questioning for a moment Canada's autonomy. That was settled long ago, not by a lot of politicans either, but by the men who fought in the last war, and it is being established further by young Canadians who are fighting in the present war.

So what about this question of a defence policy and a foreign policy? Before the war there was a very sketchy British commonwealth defence policy. There was no foreign policy; really, no part of the commonwealth had any foreign policy. Canada's foreign policy, as enunciated by the present government, was to have no commitments. We had no commitments to anyone; we buried our governmental head in the sand and let the rest of the world go by. That was one reason why the British peoples in the world were nearly wiped off the face of the earth in 1940 and 1941. During the war the reverse has been the case. The British commonwealth has had but one policy on defence, one foreign policy. We had to have such a policy; otherwise we would have perished, and with us civilization.

And so to-day, this very night, there are young Canadians fighting and dying beside young men from all other parts of the British commonwealth. We have in war time a commonwealth defence policy and a commonwealth foreign policy. What about after the war? Are we to continue in the same sensible way, or are we to have five or six defence policies and five or six foreign policies? Why not continue with the commonwealth policy and at the same time try to modernize and improve it?

Our Prime Minister says that Canada should aim at creating an effective international system. That is all very nice, all very general, and probably all very harmless. As reported at page 41 of the present debate he advocates creating an effective international system inside which the cooperation of all peace-loving countries is freely sought and given. No one can quarrel with that proposal, but it would not be affected or defeated by a commonwealth policy in addition. The Prime Minister thinks otherwise, because at page 42 he is reported to have said:

> I maintain that apart from all questions as to how that common policy is to be reached, or enforced, such a conception runs counter to the establishment of effective world security.

There, Mr. Speaker, he is dead wrong, and if Canada follows his lead she, too, will be dead wrong. He bolsters his argument by attacking statements made by Field-Marshal Smuts and Lord Halifax on the ground that behind their conception of three great powers in the world, the United States, Russia and the British commonwealth, there lurks the idea of inevitable rivalry. He is wrong to stress rivalry. It is unfair to shout power politics on this question. It is not only unfair but misleading to the Canadian people. Field-Marshal Smuts, in the course of his speech, stresses partnership. There is no question of rivalry. He stresses the word partnership—the partnership of this trinity, the United States, Russia and Great Britain. For example, he said:

> In that trinity you will have two partners of immense power and resources—Russia and America. And you will have this island, the heart of the empire and of the commonwealth, weak in her European resources in comparison with the vast resources of the other two. An unequal partnership, I am afraid.

Then, referring again to an "equal partner", he used these words:

> . . . an equal partner with the other colossi in the leadership of the nations.

He then pointed out that he would like to have the trinity, a trinity of equals:

> I should like to see all three of them equal in power and influence and in every respect. I should not like to see an unequal partnership.

Field-Marshal Smuts is afraid that Great Britain alone, as distinct from the British commonwealth, will be unable to do her share in the trinity; so he advocates that, rather than Great Britain alone being a partner, the British commonwealth should be a partner, and he says that this trinity is a protecting wall behind which the other nations of the world can organize. He uses these words:

> I think this trinity will be the stabilizing factor, the wall of power behind which the freedoms and the democracies of the world can be built up again. It will be the protecting wall.

He appeals not only to the other members of the British commonwealth to join that partnership, but also to the small nations of western Europe. He says.

> To my mind, it is a question whether those who think alike and feel alike, whose interests and whose safety rest on the same broad human political basis should not be together in building up that splendid trinity to which we look forward for the future leadership.

There spoke a realist. The Canadian people are realists, and if this issue is put fairly before them they will see the point. What Field-Marshal Smuts proposes in effect is a very practical step; it is that this trinity will have to maintain peace until an effective world organization can be set up, and that may take years.

Therefore I appeal to the Prime Minister and to the government to give the whole question further consideration, and not to put Canadians in the position of arbitrarily opposing this plan for the commonwealth, not to put us in the position of refusing to take our part; and I warn him and I warn the government that if they do put the Canadian people in that position they may wreck the whole plan. Canada might be responsible for the wrecking of the partnership of these three great peoples, and Canada might be responsible for preventing the world peace which we all so much desire.

The record of the governments led by the present Prime Minister of Canada in international affairs is not as good as it might be. It does not cause one to have very much hope of the proper stand being taken. I have here a book entitled "The Lost Peace," by Harold Butler, who at one time was director of the international labour office of the League of Nations. He points out in this book that in 1924 Great Britain and France brought in a protocol the effect of which would have been to put teeth into the League of Nations, to give the league some force to back up its decisions. Then he goes on to say that that protocol was opposed by the dominions, and he adds:

> The objections of the dominions were summed up by Senator Dandurand as delegate for Canada: "In this association of mutual insurance against fire, the risks assumed by the different states are not equal. We live in a fireproof house, far from inflammable material."

That was referring to Canada, and subsequent events have shown how foolish the statement was. Mr. Butler adds:

> That was the prevalent feeling not only of the dominions, but of other non-European countries. They thought they were living in a big world. Europe was thousands of miles away; therefore nothing that happened there was likely to affect them vitally. They did not have this attitude on emerging from the world war; then they had subscribed willingly enough to the covenant. But when, only five years later, the protocol was framed to implement it, the drift back to isolationism was already so strong that they repudiated it.
>
> This was without doubt the first turning point at which the league turned downhill instead of up.

In conclusion, may I say I am convinced that the destiny of Canada, of our Canada, is not to be a small nation, one of many small nations including now, I suppose, the new fifteen or sixteen small Russian nations: the

destiny of this nation is to be a world power standing beside Great Britain and the other dominions in a British commonwealth, a commonwealth that will be the leader in preserving peace and justice among the nations of the world.

Mr. WILFRID LaCROIX (Quebec-Montmorency) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Picard), may I quote the words spoken by Disraeli to Lord Peel, then Prime Minister of Great Britain:

I was elected to this seat and here I remain. It is, indeed, not I, but the government who have effected a change of policy.

Lord Peel reproached Disraeli for sitting on the side of the government. Disraeli then reminded the government of the promises they had made.

Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Bellechasse, may I say that I was elected by the voters of Quebec-Montmorency to the seat which I now hold, and that their decision only, and not his, can remove me therefrom. As regards the upholding of my views on the war and on imperialism, I should like to assure him that he need lose no sleep over them, as I shall keep on defending them in this house or elsewhere without asking for his opinion, and shall, above all, disregard the party spirit which, until now, has obscured the clear-sightedness of our ethnical group under the narrow red or blue angle. I feel convinced, moreover, that the hon. member for Bellechasse will long since have relieved this house of the poisonous gas he distills and of the servile attitude he displays, while I shall still have the honour of representing the ideas and interests of the voters of Quebec-Montmorency.

Mr. Speaker, may I say further, that I extend to him a cordial invitation to discuss this issue in my constituency, if he so desires.

I also wish to give some explanations in regard to my attitude on the sub-amendment proposed by the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Roy) and on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) acting leader of the opposition. In so far as the amendment of the hon. member for Peel is concerned, I wish to say that, notwithstanding my great reluctance to support an amendment proposed by the Progressive Conservative party, with whose imperialistic policy I disagree because it is utterly opposed to Canada's interests in regard to the war effort, I must admit, however, that an amendment must be considered according to what it purports and not according to the party which sponsors the motion.

Well, in the text of which I approve there is a passage which has given me particular pleasure, it is paragraph (*d*) which reads as follows:

We respectfully submit to Your Excellency that this house regrets that Your Excellency's advisers have:

(d) Failed to lessen bureaucratic controls and regimentation and to recognize and restore the supremacy of parliament and failed to halt the continuing infringement of provincial rights and the centralization of authority.

There does not exist a shadow of a doubt that the province of Quebec has the greatest number of small commercial concerns and industries and that the vexatious measures enacted by the federal bureaucracy work the most havoc there, with the result that eventually the large trusts will gobble up all industries and small enterprises and that the rights of the province of Quebec will gradually be infringed upon, thereby depriving the French-Canadian minority of the influence necessary to maintain its prestige and separate entity.

Besides, these controls and enactments of the federal bureaucracy do not take into account the peculiar conditions affecting the Quebec farmers.

For these reasons, although opposed to the type of war effort advocated by the Progressive Conservative party, I shall support the amendment as it now stands.

I wish to add that I have not supported the amendment moved by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), because I am averse to any kind of socialization tending to a greater centralization in Ottawa.

Mr. FREDERIC DORION (Charlevoix-Saguenay (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I would not have participated in this debate, had not the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Picard) made a personal reference to me. I think the hon. member, in speaking as he did, has brought little credit on himself and still less on his party.

In connection with the first part of his speech, I have not much to say because he discussed politics. He voiced his opinion. To that part of his speech I know that the electors of Bellechasse will answer for me. But in the second part of his remarks, he claimed that I still had ties—if it were true I would not be ashamed to acknowledge it—with the party of which I have been an organizer. Neither am I ashamed to admit that, because I am not ashamed of my past record. If, in 1940, I was the National party's organizer for the Quebec district it was because I trusted the then leader of that party. I am not ashamed of having trusted the Hon. Mr. Manion. When after the 1940 election, I noticed that the party of

which I had been a member was reverting to the imperialistic policy which we had already condemned, there was only one course open to me because I wanted to be consistent with myself and honest toward those with whom I had worked in the province of Quebec. Accordingly, in 1941, after the first session that followed the 1940 election and in view of the stand taken by the leaders of the then Conservative party, I severed my connection with the latter. In September, 1941, I called, in cooperation with the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Roy), a meeting at the Palais Montcalm, in Quebec city, which was attended by more than four hundred former active members of the Conservative party in the province of Quebec. At that meeting which took place on September 6, 1941, we defined what we deemed to be a true Canadian policy, consistent with the best interests of Canada. Let me quote the resolution adopted at that meeting:

This meeting expresses the wish that success may attend the Canadian people's efforts in the present war; it prays the divine Providence to help our armies and those of our allies achieve complete victory. Our country will then be in a position to enjoy an enduring peace, which will enable the various racial groups to achieve their full development and to cooperate in a spirit of constitutional freedom and social justice, so as to form at last a truly and wholly Canadian nation.

On that occasion I did not hesitate to tell all my friends that it was necessary for us to leave the party to which we had belonged. Since then the people of my province have shown that they know I have not betrayed them. Indeed, in November, 1942, in the Charlevoix-Saguenay by-election, after a campaign that lasted for a month, although the friends of the hon. member for Bellechasse claimed that "A vote for Dorion is a vote for Borden, for Meighen, for the war, and so forth," the electors of that constituency elected me because they trusted me, and I do not think I am remiss in my duty to them.

Mr. Speaker, a while ago the hon. member for Bellechasse, following an interruption by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon), claimed that his speech was made as part of his war effort and to help win the war; he also said that such an attitude was preferable to the speeches made by the isolationists, and so saying, he pointed to us. It is on account of that declaration that I rise from my seat believing that the House of Commons should know, once and for all, where are the isolationists, and why such people are to be found in the province of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a number of *Le Soleil*, which is known to everyone and styles itself the organ of the Liberal party in the province of Quebec. On July 25, 1930, on the eve of a federal election, this paper ran the following headline in five-inch type on its front page:

London, the Tories, and the War.

And please note the sub-title, on the eve of election day in 1930:

In Great Britain, it is hoped that the conservatives shall triumph in Canada so that war may be waged in Egypt and India.

In 1930, attempts were still being made to stir the population of Quebec against conscription, just as they had been made in 1917, also in 1921, then again in 1925; such attempts were repeated in 1926 and renewed in 1935. Then, Mr. Speaker, people wonder why it is that there are isolationists in the province of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I heard the hon. Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Crerar) maintain that the leader of another group in the house had not been as loyal as he claimed to be since he had opposed certain estimates for national defence in 1936, 1937 and 1938. Well, on December 17, 1937, the former chief of the hon. member for Bellechasse, the right hon. Mr. Lapointe, speaking at St. Flavien de Lotbinière, stated the following, and his words, reported in the December 20th edition of *Le Soleil*, of Quebec city, are found in the fifth column of page 10. I quote:

Our opponents say, he adds, that we incur these expenditures because we want war. But we want to preserve you from war, we advocate sending no one to war. I shall repeat this afternoon what I have already said from my seat in the Canadian parliament: every single one of these disbursements have been made solely and exclusively for the defence of Canada. Is there a single Canadian who could oppose that? You remember 1916 and 1917, the darkest period of the great war; at that time we opposed certain measures forced on Canada. We are all for the defence of Canada and its territory, but we shall never go beyond that. I have told parliament that I would not support anything more, and that if we went any farther Lapointe would not be a minister any more.

And, during the same election campaign in the Lotbinière constituency, the hon. Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Power), who was then and who is still sitting in this house, made a statement which *Le Soleil*, of Quebec, again reported, as follows:

I have been to the war and I have returned; I shall not go back nor send anybody there.

That is what the hon. Minister of National Defence for Air stated in the Lotbinière constituency. Further on, Mr. Speaker, *Le Soleil* of Tuesday, December 13, 1938, page 12, reported the Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe as having stated, at a meeting held in his own constituency:

Instead of going to war in foreign lands, we shall stay at home to defend the Canada we love.

There is more, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. Prime Minister of Canada has also made statements reported by *Le Soleil*, of Quebec city. He spoke at a meeting held in St. Roch market, on September 8, 1935, and, on September 9, in a report concerning this meeting held the previous day, we find the following utterances of the Prime Minister:

The people of Canada are against war and a conflict raging in these far countries hold no interest whatever for Canada. No one has the right to engage our country in a war as remote as the present one without going before the people through a plebiscite.

And here is a statement of the hon. Prime Minister, on May 24, 1938, as reported at page 3178, vol. 3 of *Hansard* for 1938:

Our foreign and external policy is a policy of peace and friendliness, a policy of trying to look after our own interests. We have neither the power to attack other countries to promote our own interests nor do we wish to do it. Nor are we inclined to join in crusades in other continents.

Those are the words spoken by the Prime Minister of our country, in this house, on May 24, 1938.

And here is what he declared at the session of 1939, page 2419, vol. 3 of *Hansard*:

We have tremendous tasks to do at home, in housing the people, in caring for the aged and helpless, in relieving drought and unemployment, in building roads, in meeting our heavy burden of debt, in making provision for Canada's defence, and in bringing our standards of living and civilization to the levels our knowledge now makes possible.

This quotation seems to be a repetition from this year's speech from the throne.

There is no great margin of realizable wealth for this purpose; we must, to a greater or less extent, choose between keeping our own house in order, and trying to save Europe and Asia.

And here is a further statement made by Mr. Lapointe in Quebec city, on December 13, 1938, as reported by *Le Soleil*:

Instead of going to war in foreign lands, we shall stay at home to defend the Canada we love.

But there is something else, Mr. Speaker. In 1925, Dominion elections were held in this country, and you will recall that following those elections the Liberal party was returned to this house with 105 members including 65 from the province of Quebec. How had it succeeded in obtaining these 65 members from the province of Quebec? Mr. Speaker, I shall tell you. It is with such literature as I have here and with cartoons which I invite hon. members to examine, as they are very interesting. I have one here which depicts the honourable Mr. Meighen confronted by two grasping hands on which is written the word: "Imperialism". These hands drip with blood and the hon. Mr. Meighen is shown offering Canada to these blood-stained hands which are labelled "Imperialism". After this, can we be surprised that there are isolationists in the province of Quebec?

And on the following page, there is another cartoon; this one depicts Mr. King uttering these words:

Not a cent will be expended, not a man will be mobilized for the empire without the people's approval.

This is the kind of political campaign which was waged in the province of Quebec. This is the kind of political campaign which was carried out in the province of Quebec for twenty-five years, and to-day we find a member who has benefited therefrom, who, to say the least, has thrived upon such campaigns, and who now questions the Canadianism of those people, and twits them with being isolationists. Let him come to the province of Quebec, let him come, I shall not say to my constituency, as the member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. LaCroix) stated, but to his own constituency of Bellechasse, anytime, anywhere, and we shall discuss the speech which he has delivered to-night.

And, Mr. Speaker, there is more than that. In the same newspaper *Le Soleil* of May 12, 1942, an editorial reads as follows:

Notwithstanding the direct pledges to the province of Quebec, the political heir of Wilfrid Laurier is exposing the French-Canadian youth to an imperial servitude which has always been distasteful to him.

And this, Mr. Speaker, took place during the war, on May 12, 1942. Now, who is trying to arouse passions in the province of Quebec? Who indulges in isolationism, if it is not the friends of the Liberal party who, as I have stated a moment ago, have far too long thrived upon such policy? Fortunately, the people of the province of Quebec are beginning to see through that little game. This is the reason why there is not a single constituency where the government can have one of its supporters elected. Let them open any constituency in the province of Quebec and let them try to have a member of the government elected.

I shall conclude these brief remarks by saying how proud I am sometimes to note that certain English-speaking quarters realize the position in which the Liberal party has placed the province of Quebec in the last twenty-five years. And in concluding I wish to quote

the last part of an article which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* of Toronto, on January 26, 1944. The situation as depicted by this article is so true, so realistic that I wish to read it to this house. Referring to the separation of the province of Quebec, the newspaper says:

(Text)

The separation was deliberate. It has been continued deliberately as a political stratagem since the last war. There is no mystery about where the real blame rests. And it does not rest wholly on the racial spokesmen of Quebec. It rests even more heavily on the Prime Minister and the Liberal party in Canada. They have fanned the prejudices of Quebec to maintain political security, and in doing so they have worked a cruel injustice on the people of that province and on the nation which only time and deeds can remove.

Mr. H. E. BRUNELLE (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, the speech from the throne contains a complete programme of social legislation, and is self-explanatory. I would have been content to vote for it without saying a word, had not so many other subjects been discussed during the debate. It is far from my mind, however, to undertake to cover all of them; on the contrary I shall limit my few remarks to the one subject which formed the theme or basis of the speech delivered recently by the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. LaCroix), who also seconded the amendment of the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Roy). The subject matter of his speech was Lord Halifax and the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Mackenzie King). I do not wish to give too much importance to the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency, but since his voice is quite loud in volume I thought it might take both the voice of the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Picard) and mine to equal his.

At the outset may I say in all sincerity that it is a pity that such a speech should be made on the floor of this house, especially since the suggestion made by Lord Halifax had then been turned down and rejected by the Prime Minister. When that had been done at the beginning of this session it should have settled or closed the case. Most of the utterances of the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency referring to the Prime Minister are contrary to the facts. I shall deal with just one of the hon. member's statements, that which referred to the Prime Minister as an imperialist. By what process of thinking the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency comes to this conclusion, I do not know. In this house more than anywhere else statements should be based upon facts and truth rather than upon suspicion, intuition or simple suppositions. The hon. member made the following statement, which I quote from the translation of his speech:

We must not forget, Mr. Speaker, that the audacity of the British government which, in spite of what might be said, inspired Lord Halifax, is but the natural consequence of our own weakness.

In making such a statement he bases his opinion upon suspicion, upon unfair suspicion, because the Prime Minister had already given it as his opinion that Lord Halifax was only expressing his personal views. Mr. Churchill had also stated that Lord Halifax had not spoken on behalf of the British government, but only for himself. The hon. member said that the British govenment had inspired Lord Halifax. Surely the opinion of our Prime Minister, whom the hon. member calls his leader, and that of Mr. Churchill, who is usually not afraid of the truth and who is certainly no weakling, should have made upon the mind of the hon. member in question some impression different from that which he expressed in this house.

Then he says that the speech of Lord Halifax is but the natural consequence of our own weakness. The hon. member should speak for himself and not associate too many of us with him in his own weakness. Speaking of weakness and strength and courage, I would say to the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency that the most elementary act of bravery is for a man to face his opponent and not stand to one side or behind him. The whole public life of the Prime Minister bears witness to the fact that he has never been an imperialist. He has not the time nor is it worth his while to rise in his place every time someone makes an untrue or unfair statement about him. I crave the honour in a humble way to do this little job of correction.

There may be some explanation, if there is no excuse, for an opposition member making a statement which is not in conformity with the facts; but when such a false statement emanates from one sitting to your right, Mr. Speaker, I claim that the case is much different, that the case is deplorable, and a correction is then necessary. First, let us ascertain just what imperialism is. I find the following simple definition in Webster's dictionary:

Imperialism. The policy or practice of seeking to extend the control or empire of a nation.

The Americana encyclopedia defines "imperialism" as follows:

The national policy which tends toward the expansion of national domination and national ideas over a geographical area other than that of national boundary.

According to the opinion of the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency the Prime Min-

ister of Canada follows the doctrine of imperialism which I have just quoted. That is a ridiculous opinion. Anyone who is serious, anyone who cares anything about the truth, anyone who knows the Prime Minister and his life will know that the opinion of the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency is contrary to the truth. I do not hesitate to say that our Prime Minister has always stood for the autonomy and independence of our country within the commonwealth of nations. Let me give only one of the utterances of the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency. He said:

> In the face of the unspeakable claim suggesting that we be associated to an empire with which we have nothing in common from the geographical and economic standpoints, our present-day Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) felt a sudden throb of Canadianism; this reawakening was evidenced by protests against this proposal—
>
> The proposal of Lord Halifax.
>
> —protests which I heartily endorse; the proposal, however, is but the corollary to an imperialistic policy for the shaping of which he must assume a large share of responsibility.

I assert that this statement is not borne out by the facts, and I should like to give some proof of my assertion. Following out the principle that a wise man says nothing that he cannot prove, I shall quote to the house the opinion expressed by the Prime Minister in 1923 when there was a crisis in the near east. England had had some difficulty with Turkey and had asked the dominion to send a contingent. The Prime Minister of Canada then made this statement in answering a question put to him by the Right Hon. Mr. Meighen, who was then leader of the opposition:

> As regards the part which our government has taken in this matter, I would say to my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) that we have felt and feel very strongly that, if the relations between the different parts of the British empire are to be made of an enduring character, this will only be through a full recognition of the supremacy of parliament, and this particularly with regard to matters which may involve participation in war. It is for parliament to decide whether or not we should participate in wars in different parts of the world, and it is neither right nor proper for any individual or for any group of individuals to take any step which in any way might limit the rights of parliament in a matter which is of such great concern to all the people of our country.

Now let me give the opinion of our Prime Minister as expressed in London during the conference which took place in 1937 on the occasion of the coronation. The Prime Minister then applied himself to keeping Canada out of any general imperial scheme. This is what he said as to imperial conferences and their purpose:

> The task of an imperial conference has been well defined as that of considering whether the several governments represented, while preserving their individual rights of decision and action, can coordinate their various policies in such a way as to assist one another, and help forward the cause of peace. Its function is not to formulate or declare policy. The value of this, as of other imperial conferences, lies mainly in the free exchange of information and opinion.

Let me now quote a statement made by the Prime Minister in London, England, at the Mansion House, on September 4, 1941, at a luncheon tendered to him by the Lord Mayor. The Prime Minister said:

> Canada is proud of her position in the sisterhood of the British commonwealth. But that position and association, had other reasons been lacking, would not have sufficed to bring Canada into a European war. Ours was not an automatic response to some mechanical organization of empire. Canada's entry into the war was the deliberate decision of free people, by their own representatives in a free parliament.
>
> Canada is a nation of the new world. As a nation of the new world, we placed ourselves freely at Britain's side because Britain's cause was the cause of freedom, not in this island alone, not in the British empire alone, not in the old world alone, but everywhere in the world. Lincoln, in his day, saw that the United States could not survive half-slave and half-free. . . . We saw that if Hitler was successful in his immediate aims, the whole world would soon be threatened by the unlimited ambition of evil men, and by the might of the greatest military machine the world has ever known.

Now let me quote the words of the Prime Minister expressed on June 17, 1941, in a speech which he made in New York at a dinner tendered in his honour by the Associated Canadian Organizations of New York city. I quote:

> The Canadian people entered this war of their own free will. As one people, we made the momentous decision by the free vote of a free parliament. Our declaration of war was signed by the king upon the recommendation of His Majesty's Canadian ministers. The king's proclamation was in the name of Canada. We, in Canada, are as free to make war or to abstain from making war, as the people of the United States are free to make war or to abstain from making war.
>
> The decision of the Canadian parliament was given as soon after the outbreak of war as parliament could be called together. It was a prompt and united decision. There was no hesitation. There was no compulsion.

Let me interject at this point that when Canada through this parliament decided to participate in the present war there was no opposition from any one of the members who now compose the Bloc Populaire in this house. The Prime Minister continued:

> We knew humanity's crisis was upon us all. We took our stand as a free and independent

people who wished to do our utmost to thwart aggression, to maintain freedom, to crush the cursed creed of nazism, to preclude world domination by any power, and to end forever, if that were possible, the substitution of force for reason as an instrument of national policy.

Our people went to war for the sake of Canada, but not for Canada alone. We went to war as well for the sake of Britain, for North American civilization which we are proud to defend, and for the sake of that humanity which is above all nations. We saw clearly that Canadian freedom, that North American freedom, was one with British freedom.

We went to war at Britain's side because we believed hers to be the right side. We committed ourselves to her cause because it was our cause—the righteous cause of the liberty of nations, great and small, and of all men, great and humble, rich and poor. If Britain had not been on what we believed to be the side of righteousness, the cause for which she had taken up arms would not have been our cause. I do not hesitate to say that Britain, or no Britain, Canada would never have entered the war if, at the outset, our country had not seen the issue clearly for itself, and believed it to be what all free peoples know it to be to-day.

Having so refreshed the mind and memory of the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency as to the stand taken publicly and officially on all occasions by our Prime Minister both in the past and recently, as to the declaration made by Lord Halifax, I wish to ask you, Mr. Speaker, and the members of this house whether it was not a pity, to say the least, to hear the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency denounce the Prime Minister as an imperialist.

In resuming my seat, I wish to say that I did not rise to flatter the Prime Minister. I rejoice very much, however, in the fact that his actions pay him the highest of compliments. In rising, I was really moved by a sense of gratefulness and fairness to the right hon. gentleman, in whose veins runs the purest of Canadian blood. In brief, I only wished to do justice to him.

Mr. A. R. ADAMSON (York West): Mr. Speaker, there have been so much passion and heat to-day in this house, that, I think, we have performed the patriotic duty of saving one ton of coal in five. Before you put the question there is one item discussed in this debate that should be brought up in the house to-day. It is of immediate and vital interest to the country, the house and the government. I refer to the public statements made by a number of members of this house, outside the chamber, to the effect that they protested against the new wartime wages control order P.C. 9384. They will now have an opportunity to show their consistency and carry out, by their actions in this house, their promises and protests made outside these stone walls. I refer to the petition to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) by hon. members supporting the government from the province of British Columbia and by hon. members from Hamilton and Wentworth, expressed at an open labour meeting, to the effect that they protested against the wholly indefensible and coercive clauses in this damnable order in council.

We in this party have officially stood against this order in council by a clause in our amendment which I wish to quote—clause (c): That the government has:

> Failed to establish such a national code for labour as will ensure maximum production and give to labour its rightful place in our national partnership; and failed to provide for the correction of the unfairly coercive and restrictive clauses in the 1943 wartime wages control order.

If these hon. members and all others who think likewise wish to give action to their words, action which the government cannot overlook, they can do so by supporting this amendment.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the supreme test of democracy and free parliamentary representation. If the power of the party whip is to be greater than the freely expressed opinion of individual members, then we have truly gone far on the road to dictatorship. The next few minutes will tell the story, they will be historic. I challenge hon. members who have taken this stand outside the house to support by their action the words they have uttered, and support this amendment.

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

YEAS

Messrs:

Choquette	LaCroix (Quebec-Montmorency)
d'Anjou	Raymond
Dorion	Roy—7.
Gauthier	

NAYS

Messrs:

Abbott	Black (Cumberland)
Adamson	Black (Yukon)
Anderson	Blackmore
Authier	Blair
Aylesworth	Blanchette
Bence	Bonnier
Bertrand (Laurier)	Boucher
Bertrand (Prescott)	Bradette
Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)	Brunelle
	Bryce

Burton
Cardiff
Casselman, Mrs. (Edmonton East)
Casselman (Grenville-Dundas)
Castleden
Chevrier
Church
Clark
Claxton
Cleaver
Cloutier
Coldwell
Coté
Crerar
Cruickshank
Dechene
Denis
Diefenbaker
Donnelly
Douglas (Queens)
Douglas (Weyburn)
Dupuis
Durocher
Edwards
Emmerson
Esling
Eudes
Evans
Factor
Fair
Farquhar
Fauteux
Ferron
Fontaine
Fournier (Hull)
Fraser (Northumberland, Ont.)
Fraser (Peterborough West)
Fulford
Furniss
Gardiner
Gershaw
Gibson
Gillis
Gingues
Gladstone
Golding
Graham
Grant
Graydon
Green
Hansell
Hanson (Skeena)
Harris (Danforth)
Hatfield
Henderson
Hill
Hlynka
Howden
Hurtubise
Ilsley
Isnor
Jackman
Johnston (Bow River)
King, Mackenzie
Kinley
Knowles
Kuhl
LaFlèche
Lafontaine
Lalonde
Leader
Leclerc
Leger
Little
McCann
McCuaig
McCubbin
McCulloch
MacDiarmid
Macdonald (Brantford City)
Macdonald (Halifax)
McDonald (Pontiac)
McGibbon
McGregor
McIlraith
MacInnis
McIvor
MacKenzie (Lambton-Kent)
MacKenzie (Neepawa)
Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre)
MacKinnon (Edmonton West)
MacKinnon (Kottenay East)
McLarty
MacLean (Cape Breton North-Victoria)
McLean (Simcoe East)
Macmillan
McNevin (Victoria, Ont.)
McNiven (Regina City)
MacNicol
Marshall
Martin
Matthews
Michaud
Mills
Mitchell
Mullins
Mulock
Mutch
Neill
Nicholson
Nielsen, Mrs.
Noseworthy
O'Neill
Perley
Picard
Pinard
Poirier
Pottier
Power
Purdy
Quelch
Ralston
Reid
Rennie
Rhéaume
Rickard
Rose
Ross (Calgary East)
Ross (Hamilton East)
Ross (Middlesex East)
Ross (Moose Jaw)
Ross (St. Paul's)
Ross (Souris)
Rowe
Ryan
St. Laurent
Sanderson
Shaw
Sinclair
Sissons
Soper
Stirling
Stokes
Taylor
Thauvette
Tremblay
Tripp
Tucker
Turgeon
Turner
Tustin
Ward
Warren
Weir
White
Whitman
Winkler
Wood
Wright—178.

Mr. PIERRE GAUTHIER (Portneuf) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, the speech from the throne outlines some measures which we have long recognized as necessary. In an address broadcast on October 16, 1943, the leader of the Bloc Populaire Canadien made the following statements which are to be found on page 12 of his provincial programme:

Salaries

1. The salaries now paid to Quebec workers are generally lower than in Ontario, even within the same industry, notwithstanding the fact that large families are much more numerous in our province. We shall put an end to such an unfair and absurd situation and we will see to it that the salary level is the same here as in the neighbouring province.

2. We denounced last week the individualistic salary system which disregards the family. Accordingly, we advocate a generalized and compulsory system of family allowances. Single men should have no fear of such a system, which will enable them, incomparably better than does the present system, to fulfil their legitimate desire to settle down for life.

This is a preelection session, as evidenced by the spirited debates. The government did not wish, at least in words, to lag behind and through the governor general they have announced a series of reforms taken haphazard from the programmes of other political parties, in an attempt to regain the prestige which, after four years of war and expenditures beyond our means, and twenty years of antimilitarism they have lost in the minds of the Canadian ratepayers.

Family allowances are among the measures that had been advocated even before they ever thought of them. On the other hand, the speech from the throne announces measures which we cannot support, which we have denounced and against which we will continue to fight. They include the help out of all proportion with our resources, which the government is going to ask for the United Nations. Outstanding public men recognize—as evidenced by what Mr. Churchill, Mr. Eden, and Madame Chiang Kai-shek have stated in this house—and statistics show that on the basis of population, our effort is greater than that of any other of the united nations.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come for Parliament to remember that besides the empire, there is a country called Canada which is now being bled white, with the result that its economy will have to be built up anew

and her citizens will suffer both from the moral and the physical standpoint. That will be a consequence of the hardships, the vexations of all kinds, and the various controls forced on the labouring classes, the farmers and workers.

It is a far cry from the days of 1940 when the Prime Minister and the late Minister of Justice, the Right Honourable Ernest Lapointe, were giving us the assurance that conscription would be for service in this country and not outside our boundaries. It is a far cry from the free, voluntary and moderate war effort.

Yet the statute of Westminster made us independent, and free to take whatever decision we liked. We know to what extent our decisions are free.

I have here a book by Mr. Emile Vaillancourt, entitled "Le Canada est-il une plantation?" (Is Canada a plantation?) which amply shows, to what extent Canada is mistress of her fate and of her decisions. According to Lord Tweedsmuir's interpretation of the Statute of Westminster, Canada is independent and can govern herself from the standpoint of international relations. This is true of Australia, of New Zealand, of the Union of South Africa, but these countries, even though they are members of the British Commonwealth of Nations, have their own flag. Here, the Union Jack waves over the Parliament buildings, the army headquarters, the customs buildings and the post office building. Canada has no national anthem of her own; the only official national anthem is God Save the King. When passports or passes are issued to Canadian citizens, they bear the description: British subjects by birth or by naturalization. These passports are not issued by the Governor General in the name of the King of Canada but in the name of His Britannic Majesty. Mr. Speaker, according to the statute of Westminster, Australia, New Zealand and the Union of South Africa may amend their own constitution, whereas Canada is required to ask the Parliament of Great Britain for leave to amend her constitution. Australia is a commonwealth, South Africa is a union, Ireland is a republic and Canada is a dominion. Now, according to the definition given by certain legal authorities, the word dominion is synonymous with colony, possession or plantation.

This evening's newspapers—I have one here—contain a statement by the Minister of National Defence, entitled:

Reduction of reserve army.

I quote from *Le Droit*.

A man-power pool will be set up for the active army.

[Mr Gauthier.]

And the statement goes on:

While the reserve army is still necessary, it is possible, due to the improved military situation—

And mark these words, Mr. Speaker, mark them well.

—and the efficient results obtained, to curtail its training programme during the forthcoming year.

And further, it is stated:

Function of the reserve.

(a) form a man-power pool for the active army in the event of future mobilization;

Not present, but future,

(b) take part in the territorial defence of Canada in case of necessity;

(c) supply a continuous flow of reinforcements to the active army;

(d) assist civil authorities in the event of disturbances.

Therefore, according to the statement of the Minister of National Defence, Canada is no longer in danger, and we do not need conscription for the country.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a speech of the hon. member for Beauharnois-Laprairie (Mr. Raymond), leader of the Bloc Populaire Canadien, delivered on September 9, 1939, in regard to Canada's participation in the present war. The hon. member said the following:

Politically, in the first place, it would mean a formal recognition of the formula resorted to by the Prime Minister, with all its consequences, namely, "When Britain is at war, Canada is at war."

The hon. member for Beauharnois-Laprairie spoke of the consequences of our participation.

Consider the enormous investments which Great Britain must protect everywhere; reflect that she must undertake to defend on land, on sea and in the air a world-wide empire covering one-fourth of the earth's surface, that she occupies strategic and commercial posts located on every sea, that she must protect her markets against foreign competition everywhere, that the most important interests of her whole empire lie in Asia along routes which lead there, and that for their protection her policy must extend over the entire east, including the Black sea.

At that time the leader of the Bloc Populaire Canadien spoke against participation. In so doing, he was only following the arguments and teachings against participation and conscription which we had heard in the province of Quebec and to which the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay referred a while ago.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I have the honour of moving, seconded by the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Choquette), that all the words following "that" be deleted, and the following substituted:

We respectfully submit to Your Excellency that this house regrets that Your Excellency's advisers have failed:

(a) to take appropriate measures to suspend conscription of men for military service and to put an end to mutual aid to the united nations;

(b) to recommend the suppression of recourse to the Westminster parliament in matters of amendments to the Canadian constitution and the adoption of a distinct national flag for Canada;

(c) to take such steps as to establish in the limits of the federal constitution, for labour and agriculture, a general plan capable of supporting the workers of both categories, during and after the war, in each of the Canadian provinces.

Mr. T. C. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to detain the house, but wish merely to avail myself of the opportunity of placing on *Hansard* the remainder of a paragraph, part of which the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Crerar) quoted this afternoon. I asked for that privilege earlier to-day, but it was not possible to have it at that time. Therefore I wish to give the quotation now, and my reason for doing so is that this is not the first time that these few sentences have been wrested from their context, in radio broadcasts in Saskatchewan and other parts of Canada. These sentences have been quoted over the air, without any statement as to the circumstances under which they were made, and without giving their context. In an advertisement which appeared in the Brandon *Sun* during the recent by-election this is the sort of thing which appeared:

Rev. T. C. Douglas, M.P., chief military critic of the C.C.F., in a pre-war public debate on defence estimates asked this question:

"Against whom is this country preparing to defend itself? Is it against Germany? Is it against Japan? Or is it against an invasion of Canada by the Eskimos?

They did not even take the trouble to keep close to the text, let alone keeping it within the context. This afternoon the Minister of Mines and Resources came into the house with a sheet of mimeographed paper on which were some extracts purportedly from *Hansard*. He quoted one statement by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) and gave the date November 15, 1937. The House of Commons was not sitting on November 15, 1937. I found out later that the proper date was February 15, 1937. The Minister of Mines and Resources is too old a parliamentarian not to know better than to come in here with a piece of paper from which to quote extracts without having *Hansard* on his desk and being prepared to give the proper date and proper quotation.

Mr. GARDINER: The hon. member is out of order. He is referring to a previous debate.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): The debate is not finished.

Mr. GARDINER: The debate was finished when the vote was taken.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I should like to quote from page 1063 of *Hansard* of February 19, 1937. At that time I had placed on *Hansard* a table from the dominion bureau of statistics giving the exports of nickel from 1929 to 1936, after which I made this statement:

Against whom are we arming? What potential aggressor is more aggressive to-day? Oh, I know that bogeymen have been trotted out in this chamber. It has been suggested that it might be Italy, it might be Germany, it might be Japan.

That is where the Minister of Mines and Resources stopped, but *Hansard* does not stop there. It goes on:

I cannot suppose that the government has any real fear of the intentions of these nations, for I noticed in the figures I have just read that Canada is shipping nickel to them. Knowing that we control the major part of the world's nickel supplies, I cannot believe that we would ship to them material which we feared would be returned to us in the form of high explosives. Surely those who talked about the Italians bombing this House of Commons did not imagine that the government of the day would allow us to send them the nickel with which they made those bombs, or did they?

That is the rest of the paragraph which the Minister of Mines and Resources so conveniently omitted to quote.

Mr. J. GORDON ROSS (Moose Jaw): I should like to quote from the same speech of the hon. member. On page 1059 of *Hansard* of February 19, 1937, a few pages prior to that from which he quoted, I find the following:

I speak for my colleagues and myself when I say most categorically that we are opposed to the increases in the defence estimates.

Then in the same quotation which my hon. friend just gave there is a first part which he left out. This reads:

May I now state the three reasons why I cannot vote for the increase in armaments. First, I do not feel that the government has shown that we are in any way more menaced this year than we were last year. This group has not said that it is not in favour of defence, but we are opposed to an increase in the defence estimates because it has not yet been demonstrated that the danger has become any greater now than it was twelve months or twenty-four months ago.

Then he continues with what he said in regard to nickel. He knows quite well that Canada could not have stopped exporting nickel unless she stopped the export of that commodity to every country in the world.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Not at all.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Further on in the same speech as reported on page 1064 of *Hansard,* there is a full sentence, as follows:

I object to increased armaments.

No matter how much the hon. member wants to read *Hansard,* if he goes back to the debates of 1937, 1938 and 1939 he will find that his party was against increasing any estimates for defence when we were badly in need of them.

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

YEAS

Messrs:

Choquette
d'Anjou
Dorion
Gauthier
LaCroix (Quebec-Montmorency)
Raymond
Roy—7.

NAYS

Messrs:

Abbott
Anderson
Authier
Aylesworth
Bertrand (Laurier)
Bertrand (Prescott)
Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)
Black (Cumberland)
Black (Yukon)
Blackmore
Blanchette
Bonnier
Boucher
Bradette
Brunelle
Bryce
Burton
Cardiff
Casselman, Mrs. (Edmonton East)
Casselman (Grenville-Dundas)
Castleden
Chevrier
Clark
Claxton
Cleaver
Cloutier
Coldwell
Coté
Crerar
Cruickshank
Dechene
Denis
Diefenbaker
Donnelly
Douglas (Queens)
Douglas (Weyburn)
Dupuis
Durocher
Edwards
Emmerson
Esling
Eudes
Evans
Factor
Fair
Farquhar
Fauteux
Ferron
Fontaine
Fournier (Hull)
Fraser (Northumberland, Ont.)
Fraser (Peterborough West)
Fulford
Furniss
Gardiner
Gershaw
Gibson
Gillis
Gingues
Gladstone
Golding
Graham
Grant
Graydon
Green
Hansell
Hanson (Skeena)
Harris (Danforth)
Hatfield
Henderson
Hill
Hlynka
Howden
Hurtubise
Ilsley
Isnor
Jackman
Johnston (Bow River)
King, Mackenzie
Kinley
Knowles
Kuhl
LaFlèche
Lafontaine
Lalonde
Leader
Leclerc
Leger
Little
McCann
McCuaig
McCulloch
MacDiarmid
Macdonald (Brantford City)
Macdonald (Halifax)
Macdonald (Kingston City)
McDonald (Pontiac)
McGarry
McGibbon
McGregor
McIlraith
MacInnis
McIvor
MacKenzie (Lambton-Kent)
MacKenzie (Neepawa)
Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre)
MacKinnon (Edmonton West)
MacKinnon (Kootenay East)
McLarty
MacLean (Cape Breton North-Victoria)
McLean (Simcoe East)
Macmillan
McNevin (Victoria, Ont.)
McNiven (Regina City)
MacNicol
Marshall
Martin
Matthews
Michaud
Mills
Mitchell
Mullins
Mulock
Mutch
Neill
Nicholson
Nielsen, Mrs.
Noseworthy
O'Neill
Perley
Picard
Pinard
Poirier
Pottier
Power
Purdy
Quelch
Ralston
Reid
Rennie
Rhéaume
Rickard
Rose
Ross (Calgary East)
Ross (Middlesex East)
Ross (Moose Jaw)
Ross (St. Paul's)
Ross (Souris)
Ryan
St. Laurent
Sanderson
Shaw
Sinclair
Sissons
Soper
Stirling
Stokes
Taylor
Thauvette
Tremblay
Tripp
Tucker
Turgeon
Turner
Tustin
Ward
Warren
Weir
Whitman
Winkler
Wright—171.

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

YEAS

Messrs:

Anderson
Aylesworth
Black (Cumberland)
Black (Yukon)
Blackmore
Boucher
Bryce
Burton
Cardiff
Casselman (Grenville-Dundas)
Castleden
Choquette
Coldwell
d'Anjou
Diefenbaker
Dorion
Douglas (Weyburn)
Esling
Fair
Fraser (Peterborough West)
Gauthier
Gillis
Graydon
Green
Hansell
Harris (Danforth)
Hatfield
Hlynka
Jackman
Johnston (Bow River)
Knowles
Kuhl
LaCroix (Quebec-Montmorency)
McGregor
MacInnis
MacKinnon (Kootenay East)
MacNicol
Marshall
Nicholson
Noseworthy

Perley
Quelch
Raymond
Ross (St. Paul's)
Ross (Souris)
Shaw
Stirling
Stokes
Tustin
Wright—50.

NAYS

Messrs:

Abbott
Authier
Bertrand (Laurier)
Bertrand (Prescott)
Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)
Blanchette
Bonnier
Bradette
Brunelle
Casselman, Mrs. (Edmonton-East)
Chevrier
Clark
Claxton
Cleaver
Cloutier
Coté
Crerar
Cruickshank
Dechene
Denis
Donnelly
Douglas (Queens)
Dupuis
Durocher
Edwards
Emmerson
Eudes
Evans
Factor
Farquhar
Fauteux
Ferron
Fontaine
Fournier (Hull)
Fraser (Northumberland, Ont.)
Fulford
Furniss
Gardiner
Gershaw
Gibson
Gingues
Gladstone
Golding
Graham
Grant
Hanson (Skeena)
Henderson
Hill
Howden
Hurtubise
Ilsley
Isnor
King, Mackenzie
Kinley
LaFleche
Lafontaine
Lalonde
Leader
Leclerc
Leger
Little
McCann
McCuaig
McCulloch
MacDiarmid
Macdonald (Brantford City)
Macdonald (Halifax)
Macdonald (Kingston City)
McDonald (Pontiac)
McGarry
McGibbon
McIlraith
McIvor
MacKenzie (Lambton-Kent)
MacKenzie (Neepawa)
Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre)
MacKinnon (Edmonton West)
McLarty
MacLean (Cape Breton North-Victoria)
McLean (Simcoe East)
Macmillan
McNevin (Victoria, Ont.)
McNiven (Regina City)
Martin
Matthews
Michaud
Mills
Mitchell
Mullins
Mulock
Mutch
Neill
Nielsen, Mrs.
O'Neill
Picard
Pinard
Poirier
Pottier
Power
Purdy
Ralston
Reid
Rennie
Rhéaume
Rickard
Rose
Ross (Calgary East)
Ross (Middlesex East)
Ross (Moose Jaw)
Ryan
Sanderson
Sinclair
Sissons
Soper
Taylor
Thauvette
Tremblay
Tripp
Tucker
Turgeon
Turner
Ward
Warren
Weir
Whitman
Winkler—126.

100—24½

Mr. ROY: I was paired with the hon. member for Mercier (Mr. Jean). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I was paired with the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

The house divided on the main motion (Mr. Tremblay) which was agreed to on the following division):

YEAS

Messrs:

Abbott
Anderson
Authier
Bertrand (Laurier)
Bertrand (Prescott)
Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)
Black (Cumberland)
Black (Yukon)
Blanchette
Bonnier
Boucher
Bradette
Brunelle
Casselman, Mrs. (Edmonton East)
Casselman (Grenville-Dundas)
Chevrier
Clark
Claxton
Cleaver
Cloutier
Coté
Crerar
Cruickshank
Dechene
Denis
Diefenbaker
Donnelly
Douglas (Queens)
Dupuis
Durocher
Edwards
Emmerson
Esling
Eudes
Evans
Factor
Farquhar
Fauteux
Ferron
Fontaine
Fournier (Hull)
Fraser (Northumberland, Ont.)
Fraser (Peterborough West)
Fulford
Furniss
Gardiner
Gershaw
Gibson
Gingues
Gladstone
Golding
Graham
Grant
Graydon
Green
Hanson (Skeena)
Harris (Danforth)
Hatfield
Henderson
Hill
Howden
Hurtubise
Ilsley
Isnor
Jackman
King, Mackenzie
Kinley
LaFleche
Lafontaine
Lalonde
Leader
Leclerc
Leger
Little
McCann
McCuaig
McCulloch
MacDiarmid
Macdonald (Halifax)
Macdonald (Kingston City)
McDonald (Pontiac)
McGarry
McGibbon
McGregor
McIlraith
McIvor
MacKenzie (Lambton-Kent)
MacKenzie (Neepawa)
Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre)
MacKinnon (Edmonton West)
MacKinnon (Kootenay East)
McLarty
MacLean (Cape Breton North-Victoria)
McLean (Simcoe East)
Macmillan
McNevin (Victoria, Ont.)
McNiven (Regina City)
MacNicol
Martin
Matthews
Michaud
Mills
Mitchell
Mullins
Mulock
Mutch
Neill
Nielsen, Mrs.
O'Neill
Perley

Picard	Sanderson
Pinard	Sinclair
Poirier	Sissons
Pottier	Soper
Power	Stirling
Purdy	Taylor
Ralston	Thauvette
Reid	Tremblay
Rennie	Tripp
Rhéaume	Tucker
Rickard	Turgeon
Rose	Turner
Ross (Calgary East)	Tustin
Ross (Middlesex East)	Ward
Ross (Moose Jaw)	Warren
Ross (St. Paul's)	Weir
Ryan	Whitman
St. Laurent	Winkler—146.

NAYS

Messrs:

Blackmore	Johnston (Bow River)
Bryce	Knowles
Burton	Kuhl
Castleden	MacInnis
Coldwell	Marshall
Dorion	Nicholson
Douglas (Weyburn)	Noseworthy
Fair	Quelch
Gillis	Shaw
Hansell	Wright—21.
Hlynka	

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the chief whips.)

Rowe	Howe
Senn	Ross (Hamilton East)
Bruce	Moore
Church	Slaght
Lockhart	Roebuck
O'Brien	Veniot
Homuth	McCubbin
Desmond	Gray
Hazen	Kirk
Bence	Maybank

Mr. ROY: I was paired with the hon. member for Mercier (Mr. Jean). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. PICARD: Is there not a rule, Mr. Speaker, that any hon. member in the house at the time of a division must vote?

Mr. SPEAKER: I should prefer not to give an opinion on that point at the moment.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That the said address be engrossed and presented to His Excellency the Governor General by such members of this house as are of the honourable the privy council.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): It is a rule of the house that immediately the address has been agreed to the house then appoints the two committees of the whole house, the committee of supply and the committee of ways and means. I therefore move:

That this house will, on Friday next, resolve itself into a committee to consider of a supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That on Friday next this house resolve itself into a committee to consider of the ways and means for raising the supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

It being twenty-five minutes after eleven o'clock, the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Friday February 11, 1944

The house met at three o'clock.

MAIN ESTIMATES 1944-45

A message from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting estimates for the financial year ending March 31, 1945, was presented by Hon. J. L. Ilsley (Minister of Finance), read by Mr. Speaker to the house, and referred to the committee of supply.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

PRECEDENCE OF GOVERNMENT NOTICES OF MOTION AND GOVERNMENT ORDERS AFTER FEBRUARY 14

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That on and after Monday the 14th February, 1944, to the end of the present session, government notices of motions and government orders shall have precedence at every sitting over all other business except introduction of bills, questions by members and notices of motions for the production of papers.

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a word in regard to this motion. I realize it follows the practice that prevails at Westminster, and that in time of war, in the interests of the safety of the state, it is necessary to abrogate the rights of private members. Nevertheless, having regard to the fact that during the entire period of the last war, with the exception of the last four or five months, private

members' days were left untouched. I again bring to the attention of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the house the necessity of protecting the rights of private members. It is all very well to say that in Great Britain those rights have been taken away; but in Great Britain private members enjoy rights which are not granted to members of this house. Each day they have an opportunity of questioning the ministers of the crown, and if the ministers give unsatisfactory answers, supplementary questions are allowed. In any event the rights of the private members are protected in that at adjournment time they may again bring the question before the house.

I realize that the all-absorbing and exclusive business and responsibility of members of parliament is the mobilization of the nation for war and the making of plans for peace. As private members we have a great responsibility here. During the last few days statements have been made by members on the government side indicating an attitude in reference to parliament that is far from encouraging. Our responsibility as members of parliament in connection with the war is to strengthen the resolution of the people to carry on to the end; to energize our people against the apathy that too often follows military successes; to assure our men and women of the forces that other men, with the necessary equipment, will be available as reinforcements and to see that our manpower is fully mobilized and put to the greatest possible use. For peace the challenge that comes to us as members is to make sure that the fullest possible plans and preparations be made now. I think I speak for the ordinary member of the house, Mr. Speaker, when I say that these aims and ideals for war and peace cannot be achieved if the membership of the house devotes itself, as it has to some extent during the past few days, to partisan discussions, and to turning this house into a cockpit of contending factions, each desirous of preparing for the hustings. Our responsibilities are too serious for that.

I ask the Prime Minister not to take away entirely the rights of private members. I realize that in time of war there must be a diminution in ordinary rights; that matters concerning the war must be given precedence; but we are living in times when parliament is losing its place in the opinion of the country. We are being criticized for wasting time; we are being criticized for abdicating two of our great functions, the deliberative and legislative functions. During this period of war we have given up many of our privileges; we have put these things in pawn for victory. Private members are just as desirous as the government that we should get on with the business of the country, but we find our rights being whittled down, it is true with the consent of the house, until to-day we are almost in the position of being bound by the answers of the government. We cannot challenge the answers we get to questions asked on the orders of the day; we must accept what we are told. That is why ordinary members of parliament such as myself have reached the point where we feel that our rights should not be further curtailed.

Let me point out that this is not a partisan view I am expressing. The hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Gladstone) dealt with this matter the other day, and two other hon. members are reported to have made speeches in the city of Hamilton last Saturday in connection with the same matter. I am not expressing a conception peculiar to the opposition. The hon. member for Hamilton East (Mr. Ross), referring to the labour order, is reported to have said:

> The government is run by a bureaucracy; the members are nothing and I frankly admit it. If the order had gone through the house, it would have been better prepared.

Then the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Corman) is reported to have said:

> The members of parliament are dead guinea pigs. I have never been consulted or called in on these matters. I admit there are powers behind the government. . . . I think most of them are necessary, but I cannot see why the members should not be consulted. The Minister of Labour is not as bad as you think he is, but his hands are tied by these men who supposedly guide the destinies of this country.

Those are serious allegations against the power and prestige of the House of Commons. We find too that as time goes on the legislative authority of this parliament is being gradually diminished. No one can deny that. Orders in council of all kinds are necessary between sessions of parliament, but I submit that when parliament is sitting no orders in council should be passed at the instance of boards and commissions responsible only indirectly to parliament, carrying on uncontrolled by the representatives of the people, except those necessary for administrative purposes. We have only to look at the labour order to see what bureaucrats can do when they bring into effect legislation concerning the substantive rights of the individual, when there has been no discussion in parliament by the representatives of the people.

I realize the need to get on with the business of the war. On the other hand, Mr.

Speaker, I say that private members should not be unnecessarily denied the privileges that are theirs. I appreciate the fact that for the first two or three months of the session the rights of private members must be abrogated; but I make the appeal that toward the end of the session at least one day a month be set aside as private members day. It may be argued that private members have that opportunity in other ways, but I point out that the same argument would apply in peace time. I am not one of those who believe that the importance of parliament is actually lessening. We have stood here together through dark days, but throughout the country the man on the street feels that we do not discharge our responsibilities. That is why I am offering this suggestion to-day, asking the Prime Minister, who has always stood as a proponent of the principles of parliamentary government, to protect the rights of the private members who, occupying no positions of power, nevertheless collectively have in our custody and care the rights of the people.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I whole-heartedly support what has been said by the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker). Year after year since the war began we have agreed to dispense with private members' days, but few opportunities are given hon. members to bring before this house ideas which they think would be beneficial to the country. If I remember correctly, last year we made a similar appeal to the Prime Minister, suggesting that while the government should get along with the business related to the war in the early part of the session, later on some opportunity should be given to private members to express their views, and I concur in the suggestion made by the hon. member for Lake Centre in that regard. I am particularly anxious that this should be emphasized this year because we are now approaching, we hope—I say, "we hope"—the time when we shall have to be giving closer consideration to the matters which will relate to the end of the war. If that is so, then it seems to me all the more important that private members, apart altogether from the legislation the government has foreshadowed, should be able from their places in the house to bring before parliament suggestions which they think might be beneficial to the country in the period which will follow.

I thoroughly agree with the hon. member for Lake Centre that if we were to study the opportunity given in the British parliament to private members, we would realize that we are more greatly restricted than are the members in what we sometimes call the mother of parliaments. As has already been said, they have their question hour, at which time supplementary questions may be asked and ministers interrogated. They have also a custom which to my mind is an invaluable one, that of bringing matters to the attention of the house on the adjournment. A half hour is allotted to that daily. We have not that procedure here. As a consequence, sometimes hon. members have to take advantage of the motion to go into supply to bring some matter to the attention of the house, a procedure which often leads to long debate. Opportunities of that sort are few and far between, particularly in connection with appropriations made for war purposes, which in reality are a budget in themselves. I would urge the Prime Minister that he endeavour so to arrange the business of the house that, later in the session, when the pressure of war business has been eased somewhat, private members' days may be restored.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, the resolution which I moved this afternoon is similar to those which have been approved by the house at each session of this parliament. The arguments made in support of it are, if anything, stronger to-day than they were at any preceding session. I am glad to see, therefore, that the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) and the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (Mr. Coldwell) both agree that there are reasons why, at least for the beginning of the session, the government should have an opportunity to get on with government measures, and that, if private members are to have an opportunity of bringing forward resolutions of their own, such opportunity should be postponed until later in the session. I think we are agreed on that.

So far as an opportunity being presented later in the session is concerned, I would say the government will be only too pleased to consider granting that opportunity in the light of conditions as they may develop. I did say in the last session that we would be prepared to consider giving private members an opportunity to bring forward resolutions when we got through the main part of our business. But I think all hon. members felt that by the time we reached the month of July they much preferred to have an adjournment of the house than to stay on for the purpose of debating the different motions placed on the order paper by private members.

Reference has been made to the position at Westminster. I believe a comparison will show that in this house private members have an even greater opportunity of bringing forward

matters of interest to themselves, and of questioning the government, than is afforded at Westminster.

For instance, let us first consider the matter of questions, which has been mentioned by the hon. member for Lake Centre. He said that at Westminster the government can be questioned at considerable length. My understanding of procedure there is that all questions to be answered by the government must be placed upon the order paper, and that the only questions which may be asked of the administration during the question hour are supplementary questions, growing out of those already asked. We adopt quite a different procedure here, one which gives hon. members a much greater opportunity to ask questions of the government. Almost every day the government is questioned in regard to some matter of which it has had no notice at all, and of which nothing whatsoever has appeared upon the order paper. On some days an hour's time is taken up in questions asked of the ministers. That would not be permitted under the procedure at Westminster. In this way, an opportunity does exist here for private members which does not exist in London. More than that, there is here no restriction upon the introduction of public bills by private members. In London during this time of war that right has been taken away from private members. They have not the right even to introduce a public bill.

Mr. GRAYDON: Of course our public bills do not get any further than the introduction stage.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, they do provide an opportunity to place before the public certain views which private members may wish to put forward. However, the point I am emphasizing is this, that the government in taking its stand in this matter, and in making a request of the house, is not seeking to deprive private members of their rights. It is seeking to gain a high degree of co-operation on the part of hon. members in getting on with the all-important business, the business pertaining to the war. I am sure the leader of the opposition would recognize that fact if, on Monday next, the house were to begin a debate on some of the private members' motions; he would be the very first to say that the house had put itself in a false light before the public. The people of Canada would ask: Why is our parliament at this stage interesting itself in a number of motions which have been introduced by private members, instead of considering the war appropriation bill and other important war matters?

After all, what is the extent of the privation? In the first four weeks of the ordinary session hon. members have certain rights on Wednesdays and, I believe, Mondays. But after that government business has precedence. In this session two weeks have already gone by, and hon. members have been perfectly free to discuss anything they liked, and have been under no restrictions whatsoever. The fact is that they have been discussing what they liked. We have had half a dozen amendments, apart from everything else, to the speech from the throne, and on them almost every subject of immediate concern has been discussed by one member or another. In those discussions there have been no restrictions whatsoever.

I do not like to have the impression develop in the public mind that private members have not full opportunity to discuss subjects in which they may be interested. The speech from the throne, we have been told, is lengthy. It contains a number of subjects, each of which will come before the house in the course of the session. Hon. members may then address themselves to any of these questions.

Let us consider what would happen if we were to proceed now to a discussion of the private members' motions as they appear upon the order paper. The first of these motions is one which relates to measures for the better protection of all soldiers who serve in His Majesty's forces. There will be ample opportunity to discuss those matters on the war appropriation measure now to be proceeded with.

The next one has to do with the giving of clear titles to all soldier settlers who still hold land under contract with the soldier settlement board. That subject will come up under the estimates connected with soldier settlement, and in other connections.

The next resolution is one relating to reconstruction and rehabilitation; developments ensuring employment and opportunities in connection with transportation, and other matters. We shall be dealing at length with the whole question of reconstruction, and any member who wishes to discuss any particular phase of the subject will have his opportunity at such time.

The next resolution relates to the marketing of western Canada's wheat. My recollection is that in every session parliament has taken a couple of weeks to discuss wheat, and opportunities will come at such a time.

Next we find a resolution supporting feasible irrigation schemes in connection with post-war

reconstruction. Such irrigation schemes can be discussed when we are dealing with the reconstruction measure.

Another has to do with the development of mineral resources under government control and operation. That, surely, would come up when we are discussing questions related to the resources of our country, and their development.

Finally there is a resolution relating to the prices of agricultural products. At other sessions we have discussed these matters, and ample opportunity will be given at this session for like discussion. And I suggest further that they will be much more effectively discussed when dealing with government measures on these subjects than they would be if discussed under private members' resolutions.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I ask a question? I hope the Prime Minister is not building up an argument for use after the war is over because actually what he is saying now about this resolution covering something that may be dealt with in the course of ordinary debate would apply equally to peace time. I hope the Prime Minister is not going to deny to private members in time of peace the opportunity of placing resolutions on the order paper.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I thank my hon. friend for assuming that I will be directing the affairs of government at that time.

Mr. GRAYDON: I hope the war will be over very soon.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am not at all surprised that my hon. friend should assume what he has, but let me say that the purpose of this resolution relates to war time only. There has been no attempt at any time that I am aware of to restrict private members' rights and privileges during a time of peace, by action similar to that being taken at this particular time because of the war.

Mr. GRAYDON: The same argument would apply to both peace and war.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The whole thought behind this resolution is that we are at war and that the country is interested in seeing that this parliament concentrates on the prosecution of the war, and regards everything else as secondary until victory has been achieved.

I might say more on this, but the house has passed a similar resolution in previous sessions and hon. members understand its purpose. The hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) has repeatedly made remarks, about parliament losing caste with the people, private members being reduced to ciphers and comments of that kind. I cannot understand why he should go on trying to belittle parliament in the eyes of the public.

Mr. GRAYDON: Why deliver him a lecture at this time?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Because he delivered a lecture to me.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: There was no question of any lecture. When the Prime Minister talks about—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:—our prime purpose I would say to him that what I was talking about was the past two days when the Prime Minister's own supporters were doing anything but trying to win the war in the discussion that took place.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Seventy-five members have spoken during this debate, and I think if my hon. friend looks over the list he will find that there were comparatively few on this side who have participated. I do not want to go into any small discussion, but I have regard for the larger question, namely, the impression that the public may get with respect to parliament. I say that that impression may be created in two ways. First, it can be done by taking note of what actually has taken place in parliament and, second, by the iteration and reiteration of criticisms of its action by members of parliament themselves. I say that the latter kind of thing does no good either to parliament or to the public. My hon. friend has referred to the present session but I do not know of any session of any parliament in Canada's history where more has been accomplished in the first two weeks after the opening of a session than has been accomplished in this session up to this time. Committees have been appointed, the speech from the throne has been agreed to, the estimates have been tabled, and there has been a full debate. If hon. members would direct the attention of the country to what has been accomplished in this way they would be serving a much better purpose than they are by criticizing adversely.

Motion agreed to.

EXTRADITION TREATY

CANADA-UNITED STATES—INQUIRY AS TO PRESENT POSITION

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Yesterday the hon. mem-

ber for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) asked a question with respect to the present position of the extradition treaty with the United States, and I promised that I would have a statement to-day. If hon. members are agreeable, it might appear on *Hansard*, but I shall read it if it is desired.

Mr. GRAYDON: Is it very long?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No. Would the hon. gentleman like to have it read?

Mr. GRAYDON: Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: On January 29 of last year I informed the house that the government had received representations from many organizations in Canada which are interested in the marketing of securities and which feared possible adverse effects from the treaty upon legitimate Canadian business. I informed the house that these representations were being given careful study.

Since making the statement to which I have referred, a hearing was held on May 18 last before a special committee of the cabinet consisting of the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Crerar), the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley), the Secretary of State (Mr. McLarty), and the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent), at which all organizations and individuals interested in the possible effects of the treaty were given an opportunity to make any representations they wished concerning the treaty. Following that hearing, the whole matter was discussed informally with the security commissioners of all the provinces in the course of meetings held in Winnipeg at the end of May. Following these discussions, representatives of the Department of External Affairs and the Department of Justice proceeded to Washington to have further consideration of the position with the United States authorities.

The position at present is that discussions are going on between the Canadian and United States governments as to the nature and extent of any modification which it might be desirable to make in the effect of the treaty in order to ensure that no legitimate business operations are affected by its terms. It is hoped that it will be possible to conclude these discussions very shortly and to have the matter placed before parliament for approval. Such approval will be sought before ratification of the treaty is proceeded with. The treaty was tabled in the house by the Minister of Justice on August 1, 1942.

SUGAR

PRODUCTION OF BEET SUGAR IN CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): There are three questions I should like to ask the government through the Minister of Finance. First, in view of the danger of a sugar shortage during 1944 and 1945 which is indicated by a recent statement by S. R. Noble, the sugar controller, has the government taken any measures to facilitate the production of beet sugar in Canada during 1944? Second, if so, what measures? Third, if not, why not?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is the type of question that should be placed upon the order paper.

ROYAL CANADIAN AIR FORCE

TRANSFER OF CANADIAN PERSONNEL FROM ROYAL AIR FORCE TO R.C.A.F.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JAMES SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence for Air or his parliamentary assistant. Yesterday the minister informed the house that he is now holding discussions with representatives of the British air ministry on matters affecting the R.A.F. and the R.C.A.F. There is one matter which is of great interest to all Canadian airmen serving overseas, that is, the transfer to the R.C.A.F. of Canadian airmen who enlisted in the R.A.F. either prior to or subsequent to the declaration of war. These men have given heroic service and have added great lustre to Canada's name. I ask the minister or his parliamentary assistant if consideration is being given in these discussions to the transfer of Canadians in the R.A.F. to the R.C.A.F.

Hon. CYRUS MACMILLAN (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of National Defence for Air): While it is hoped that the minister will not be pressed for piecemeal reports of the conference, since he has undertaken to give a report when it terminates, I can say, now that the matter has been raised in the house many times, that the question of transfer from the R.A.F. to the R.C.A.F. of Canadian nationals is one of the problems being considered. It has been under negotiation for some time. In August last, concrete and detailed proposals were made to the air ministry and the minister hopes that out of the conferences at present being held there will be a final and mutually satisfactory solution.

INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS

AUSTRALIA-NEW ZEALAND—REQUEST FOR PRINTING IN "VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS"

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. C. GREEN (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, in the course of yesterday's debate I suggested that the agreement between Australia and New Zealand which was signed about three weeks ago is of sufficient importance to warrant its being printed in *Votes and Proceedings,* together with the press releases issued by the Minister for External Affairs for Australia and the Prime Minister of New Zealand. Will the Prime Minister tell us to-day whether it will be possible to have that suggestion carried out; and if not in the form suggested, perhaps in some other way so that members of the house may be able to study the agreement and the press releases?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there will be no difficulty in having the agreement printed in a form which will make it available for hon. members. As to whether it would be advisable to print it as an appendix to *Votes and Proceedings,* I would have no hesitation about that if my hon. friend would be satisfied with the agreement itself; but if he wishes to have the press releases made by Prime Minister Fraser and Prime Minister Curtin at the time the agreement was signed also printed, I think it would be better to have them printed with the agreement in a separate document, and not to appear in *Votes and Proceedings.* I say that because I do not think it would be a wise precedent to begin printing press releases in the *Votes and Proceedings* of this house. I shall undertake to see, if the house is agreeable, that the agreement is printed together with the press releases referred to by my hon. friend, and they will be available as soon as the printing bureau has the work done.

Mr. GREEN: Thank you very much.

GASOLINE RATIONING

REQUEST FOR AMENDMENT OF ORDER WITH RESPECT TO THE USE OF TRUCKS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Finance in regard to a recent order of the wartime prices and trade board forbidding the use of trucks for so-called "wasteful or unnecessary purposes". During the last month or so there have been a number of prosecutions against farmers for attending social or church gatherings in their trucks, even though they have no other means of transport. My question is this: Will consideration be given by the government to having that order altered so as to permit farmers and others who have no other means of conveyance than the truck to attend social or church gatherings without rendering themselves subject to prosecution and conviction?

Mr. D. C. ABBOTT (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend was good enough to give me notice of his question. We have had similar inquiries from a number of other hon. members. As my hon. friend knows, the substance of the order forbids the wasteful and unnecessary use of gasoline used in going to and from social gatherings, recreation meetings and so on. The underlying purpose is to conserve trucks, gasoline, and rubber, which is still in very short supply. When the amending order No. 318 was passed last September, careful consideration was given to whether or not an exception could be made for the owners of trucks who were not the owners of pleasure vehicles. However, the gasoline ration for trucks is more than double, I think, the ration for the ordinary pleasure vehicle, and in addition gasoline and new tires can be obtained, if necessary, for trucks. So that after consideration it was felt that to make such an exception would contravene the fundamental purpose of the order. I shall be glad to bring my hon. friend's question to the attention of the officers of the board, but the information I now have is that it is unlikely that any change will be made in the order at the present time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk)

IMMIGRATION, 1940-43

Mr. DORION:

How many immigrants entered Canada in each of the years, 1940, 1941, 1942 and 1943?

Mr. CRERAR: Immigration to Canada during the years 1940, 1941, 1942 and 1943 was as follows:

Calendar Year	Number
1940	11,324
1941	9,329
1942	7,576
1943	8,504

CANADIAN REPRESENTATION IN PORTUGAL

Mr. DORION:

1. Has the Canadian government any representative in Portugal at the present time, whose duty it is to look after refugees?

2. If so, (a) since when; (b) what is his name; (c) what was his former residence; (d) what are his duties?

3. Is he authorized to issue permits for the entry of refugees into Canada?

4. If so, how many such permits has he issued since his appointment?

5. Are these refugees subject to the provisions of the Immigration Act?

6. What are the conditions of admission of these refugees?

Mr. CRERAR:

1. There is a Canadian immigration officer located at Lisbon, Portugal.

2. (a) October 24, 1943. (b) Odilon Cormier. (c) Quebec, P.Q. (d) (i) to examine refugees applying for sanctuary in Canada. (ii) to examine applicants for admission to Canada as immigrants. To grant appropriate immigration visas to those in both classes who pass civil and medical examination.

3. No, the officer grants immigration visas —see answer to No. 2 above.

4. Full information on visas issued not available. No refugees have yet come forward from Portugal, but arrangements are nearing completion for the departure of the first group.

5. Yes.

6. Those admissible are family units in good health, of good character entering Canada for the duration of the war, destined to Canadian organizations that have guaranteed reception, maintenance and placement.

CANADIAN TRADE COMMISSIONERS

Mr. DORION:

1. In what countries does Canada maintain trade commissioners?

2. What are the names of such commissioners?

3. Are they Canadian nationals?

4. What were their former occupations, and where did they reside?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West):

1. and 2.	3.	4.
United Kingdom:		
London—Hudd, Frederic	Yes	Editorial staff, Evening *Telegram*, Toronto; Director, Canadian Bureau of Information, New York.
Langley, Jas. A.	Yes	Engineering Dept. Canadian Pacific Rly.; Purchasing Dept., Nat. Transcontinental Rly., Ottawa; Canadian Representative of National Meter Co., New York.
Gornall, W. B. (Fruit Trade Commissioner)	Yes	Chief, Markets Extension Division, Dept. of Agriculture, Ottawa.
Liverpool—Bryan, Arthur E.	Yes	Imperial Munitions Board, Ottawa.
Glasgow—Johnson, Gordon B.	Yes	Assistant Engineer with Construction Co., China; Assistant on Construction, Ontario Hydro-Electric; Canada Cement Co., Montreal.
Dublin—McColl, Ernest L.	Yes	McColl Bros., Toronto.
United States:		
New York—Cole, Douglas S.	Yes	Canadian Explosives Ltd., Montreal; Imperial Munitions Board, Ottawa.
Ausman, Leland H. (Assistant Trade Commissioner)	Yes	Canadian General Electric, Toronto; T. Eaton Company, Toronto.
West, Christopher H. (Assistant Trade Commissioner)	Yes	Attached to law office in Saskatoon and Vancouver; practised law in Kimberley and Cranbrook, B.C.
Washington—Scott, Harry A.	Yes	Export division, Ford Motor Co.; Secretary to Medical Director, Soldiers' Civil Reestablishment, Ottawa.
Allen, Stanley V. (Assistant Commercial Attache)	Yes	Public Library, Calgary; Brewster Transport Co., Banff; H. H. Cooper (wholesale grocers), Edmonton.
Bull, William F.	Yes	General Motors Corporation, Oshawa.

1. and 2.	3.	4.
United States—*Concluded*		
Los Angeles—Monty, Theodore J. (Acting Trade Commissioner)	Yes	Ford Motor Co. of Canada, Montreal; Dept. Mines, Fisheries and Colonization, Quebec. Advisory Board on Tariff and Taxation, Ottawa.
Chicago—In charge of chief Clerk of staff, during absence of trade commissioner on special duties in Ottawa.		
South Africa:		
Johannesburg—Brown, H. Leslie	Yes	Canning Company, Vancouver; High School Staff Alberta and British Columbia.
Cape Town—Macgillivray, John A.	Yes	Reporter, Kingston *Standard;* Editor, Queen's University Journal; Canadian Pacific Rly, Montreal; Telephone Co. Mtl.
Australia:		
Melbourne—Palmer, Frederick	Yes	Toronto Structural Steel Co., Toronto; Freeman Bros. Halifax; Asst. Editor "Contract Record" & "Electrical News" (Maclean Publications) Toronto.
Sydney—Noble, Frederick F. (Acting Trade Commissioner)	Yes	Teacher, University of California; Clerk with Financial Brokers, Vancouver; Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Ottawa.
New Zealand:		
Auckland—Birkett, C. Blair (Acting Trade Commissioner)	Yes	Asst. Engineer, Bell Telephone Co., Montreal; Asst. Engineer, Canada Paper Co., Windsor Mills; B. H. Porteous & Co. (Brokers) Montreal.
British West Indies:		
Port of Spain, Trinidad—Newman, Gerald A.	Yes	Advertising and publicity experience in Winnipeg.
Kingston, Jamaica—Fraser, Frank W.	Yes	Forest Products Laboratories, Montreal; Office Manager, Publishers Paper Co., New York City; Ironsides Board Corpn., Norwich, Conn., Clarke Bros. Paper Mills, Coldbrook, N.B.
India:		
Bombay—Sykes, Paul	Yes	Asst. to Editor, "Canada Year Book," Ottawa. (Dominion Bureau of Statistics.)
Newfoundland:		
St. John's—Bower, Richard P. (Acting Trade Commissioner)	Yes	Manitoba Paper Co., Pine Falls; Hudson's Bay Co., Winnipeg; Northern Office Equipment Co., Winnipeg.
Argentina:		
Buenos Aires—Strong, James A.	Yes	Foreign Exchange Dept., Bank of Montreal.
Depocas, Jean Charles (Asst. Com. Attache)	Yes	Highways Dept., Quebec city; Price Bros., Isle Maligne; Anglo-Canadian Pulp & Paper, Quebec.
McCullough, Wilfred B. (Asst. Commercial Attache)	Yes	Department of Agriculture, Fredericton.
Brazil:		
Rio de Janeiro—Glass, Lester S.	Yes	Secretary-Treasurer, Municipal District, Edmonton; Assistant Geologist on Survey.
Belanger, Maurice	Yes	Hugh Carson Company, Ottawa; Technical Translator, Privy Council office, Ottawa.
Chile:		
Santiago—Vechsler, M. Jack	Yes	Customs Examining Officer, Montreal; Department of National Revenue, Ottawa.
Colombia:		
Bogota—Stewart, Max T. (Acting Trade Commissioner)	Yes	Imperial Varnish & Colour Co., Toronto; Harris Abattoir Co., Toronto; General Motors Corporation, Walkerville, Ont.

1. and 2.	3.	4.
Cuba:		
Havana—Mutter, J. Lindsay	Yes	Employed with the Corporation of Wentworth county.
Egypt:		
Cairo—Grew, Richard	Yes	Empire Cotton Mills, Welland, Ont.
Mexico:		
Mexico City—Bissett, Clifford S	Yes	Business, legal and export sales experience, Edmonton, Alberta.
Peru:		
Lima—Stark, William G.	Yes	With brokerage firm in Toronto; Ontario Department of Education; Bank of Nova Scotia; brokerage firm in London, England; industrial research work with university of Toronto.

REFUGEES

Mr. DORION:

1. How many refugees have entered Canada since September 3, 1939?
2. What were their countries of origin?
3. Have all such refugees remained here?
4. Did any of them return to Europe?
5. If so, how many?
6. How many permits have been issued by the Minister of Mines and Resources, or by any person authorized by him, under order in council P.C. 9440, December 10, 1943?

Mr. CRERAR:

1. Information not available; the classification "refugee" is not included in immigration statistics.

2, 3, 4 and 5. See No. 1 above.

6. 932.

ALIENS IN INTERNMENT CAMPS

Mr. LACOMBE:

1. Have any aliens been released from internment camps?
2. If so, how many?
3. Who are these aliens?
4. Has Mr. Camillien Houde, former mayor of Montreal, been released from an internment camp?
5. If so, when?
6. If not, will he be released?

Mr. ST. LAURENT:

1. Yes.

2. 1,577.

3. Not in the public interest.

4. No.

5. Answered by No. 4.

6. Mr. Camillien Houde had a hearing before an advisory committee on the 28th of May, 1943. The committee recommended continued detention which was approved by the Minister of Justice on June 1, 1943.

In January, 1944, Mr. Camillien Houde was given an opportunity to have a further hearing before the advisory committee, but he refused to have such hearing.

SELECTIVE SERVICE AND UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE OFFICES IN QUEBEC

Mr. BERTRAND (Terrebonne):

1. How many local selective service and unemployment insurance offices are there in the province of Quebec?
2. Where are they located?
3. What is the grade of each of these offices?
4. Who are the managers of these offices and what is the salary of each?

Mr. MITCHELL:

1. Sixty.

2. 3 and 4:

Location of local office—grade—manager—salary

Montreal, grade 7—Guay, Marcel, $4,000.
Lachine, sub. of Montreal—Meloche, J. A., $2,100.
Longueuil, sub. of Montreal—Leonard, R. E., $1,500.
Pointe-aux-Trembles, sub of Montreal—Gagne, J. P. (acting), $2,100.
St. Paul L'Ermite, sub. of Montreal—Drasse, R., $1,500.
Verdun, sub. of Montreal—Latendresse, J. A. (acting), $1,800.
Actonvale, ungraded—Lussier, P., $1,500.
Asbestos, ungraded—Bruneau, L., $1,500.
Baie St. Paul, ungraded—Tremblay, J. A., $1,500.
Beauharnois, ungraded—Boyer, L., $1,500.
Buckingham, ungraded—Daoust, J. A., $1,500.
Campbell's Bay, ungraded—Davis, J. E., $1,500.
Causapscal, ungraded—Frenette, E., $1,500.
Chandler, ungraded—Duguay, L. (acting), $1,200.
Chicoutimi, grade 3—P. Grenier, $2,700.
Coaticook, ungraded—Boivin, J. A., $1,500.
Cowansville, ungraded—Boisvert, J. E., $1,500.
Dolbeau, ungraded—Garant, L. P., $1,800.
Drummondville, grade 1—Gagner, G., $2,100.
East Angus, ungraded—Roy, J. L., $1,500.
Farnham, ungraded—Deveault, H. L., $1,500.
Granby, grade 1—Marion, J. R., $2,100.
Hull, grade 3—Boucher, O., $2,700.
Joliette, grade 1—Coderre, R., $2,100.
Jonquiere, ungraded—Lavallee, T., $1,800.
Lachute, ungraded—Charron, J. R., $1,800.
La Malbaie, ungraded—Bergeron, R., $1,500.
La Tuque, ungraded—Fusey, J. L., $1,500.
Levis, grade 1—Lambert, T., $2,100.

Location of local office—grade—manager—salary—*Concluded*

Louiseville, ungraded—Giguere, G. A., $1,500.
Magog, ungraded—Gosselin, L. F., $1,500.
Matane, ungraded—Leblanc, J. W., $1,500.
Megantic, ungraded—Lemelin, G., $1,500.
Mont Laurier, ungraded—Blouin, R. H., $1,500.
Montmagny, ungraded—Pare, J., $1,500.
Nicolet, ungraded—Savoie, J. R., 1,500.
Plessisville, ungraded—Hubert M., $1,500.
Port Alfred, ungraded—Reid, J. H., $1,800.
Quebec city, grade 6—Picard, S., $3,700
Montmorency, Sub of Quebec—Cote, J. P., $1,500.
Richmond, ungraded—Fowler, E. E., $1,500.
Rimouski, ungraded—Morissette, G. O., $1,500.
Riviere du Loup, grade 1—Gendron, J. A., $2,100.
Roberval, ungraded—Lefebvre, A., $1,800.
Rouyn, grade 1A—Vacant, $1,200.
Ste. Agathe, ungraded—Larche, J. A. B., $1,800.
Ste. Anne de Bellevue, ungraded—Legault, J. A., $1,200.
St. Hyacinthe, grade 1—Forbes, R., $2,100.
St. Jean, grade 1—Lomme, G. R., $2,100.
St. Jerome, grade 1—Sanderson, W. H., $2,100.
St. Joseph d'Alma, ungraded—Tremblay, $1,800.
St. Therese, ungraded—Charbonneau, J. A. $1,500.
Shawinigan Falls, grade 1—Bellefeuille, M. C., $2,100.
Sherbrooke, grade 3—Fortier, E. H., $2,700.
Sorel, grade 1—Cournoyer, E. F., $2,100.
Thetford Mines, grade 1—Gregoire, H. M., $2,100.
Three Rivers, grade 3—Prefontaine, J. A., $2,700.
Val d'Or, grade 1A—Sevigny, J. P., $1,800.
Valleyfield, grade 1—Ladouceur, L., $2,100.
Victoriaville, grade 1A—Levreault, J. C., $1,800.

ECONOMIC STABILIZATION INFORMATION COMMITTEE

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West):

1. Has the government set up an organization called "Economic Stabilization Information Committee"?

2. If so, when was such committee constituted?

3. What are the duties of such committee?

4. What are the names of the members of the committee?

5. What past experience and qualifications has each member of the committee for the position to which he or she has been appointed?

6. What salary, fee and/or remuneration is being paid to each member of the committee?

7. What amount has been expended for travelling expenses and/or living allowances for each member of the committee?

8. What amount has been expended by the committee on all accounts other than those in questions 6 and 7?

Mr. CLAXTON:

1. Yes, an interdepartmental committee under that name has been established.

[Mr. Mitchell.]

2. On December 21, 1943.

3. To "institute a programme of public information designed to increase the understanding of economic stabilization measures, of the need for these measures in the interests of the nation as a whole, of the benefits of these measures to all groups and individuals, and of the responsibility of all groups and individuals to do their part in assuring their success." And otherwise as set out in the order in council P.C. 9746 constituting the committee.

4. A. D. Dunton, Chairman: G. C. Andrew, R. B. Bryce, S. R. N. Hodgins, V. C. Phelan, W. F. Prendergast.

5. Mr. Dunton at the time of his appointment to the committee was assistant general manager of the wartime information board and has since been appointed general manager. Previously he was editor of the Montreal *Standard:* Mr. Andrew is a senior officer of the wartime information board; Mr. Bryce is an official of the Department of Finance who has been particularly concerned with the problems of economic stabilization; Mr. Hodgins is general executive assistant to the deputy minister of agriculture and is concerned with matters of publicity; Mr. Phelan is director of the information and publicity branch of the Department of Labour; Mr. Prendergast is director of information of the wartime prices and trade board.

6. No salary, fee or other remuneration is being paid to any member of the committee in connection with his work on the committee.

7. None.

8. None.

*SALES TAX, FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL

Mr. ROY:

Can the federal sales tax collected by way of stamps affixed on goods and merchandise be taxed over by a provincial sales tax?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: May I deal with this question orally? It calls for an opinion on a matter of law not connected with any of the business of the house at this time. I think it would be quite inappropriate and certainly contrary to the practice of the Department of Justice to give opinions on such matters. But I can give the hon. member some factual information. Something that comes pretty near his question was dealt with in a judgment of the privy council which was rendered on July 30 last in the case of the Atlantic Smoke Shops Limited, v. Conlon and the Attorney-General of Canada and others, which is reported in the English Report, Appeal Cases for 1943 at page 550.

Mr. GRAYDON: Any charge for that?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: That is not an opinion. That is just a statement as to a fact.

SELECTIVE SERVICE AND UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE OFFICES IN MONTREAL

Mr. BERTRAND (Terrebonne):

1. How many are employed by the central office of the selective service and unemployment insurance in Montreal?

2. What are their names, grades, titles and salaries?

3. By whom was each of them recommended?

Mr. MITCHELL:

1. 322.

2.

Unemployment Insurance Commission

Name—Grade—Title—Salary:

L. V. Prefontaine, 2, Regional Sup., $5,400.
H. T. Dauth, 2, Regional ins. off., $3,000.
R. M. Bergevin, Travelling super., $2,640.
E. E. Smith, Travelling super., $2,640.
J. A. P. Gaudette, Travelling super., $2,640.
A. Gagne, Travelling super., $2,640.
G. M. Downing, Travelling super., $2,640.
J. A. Trudelle, 2, Super. of staff train., $3,000.
O. Deschamps, 2, Super. of insp. and train. Br., $3,000.
D. Christie, Super. of office services, $2,700.
A. H. Gregoire, 5, Employment and claims off., $2,400.
J. A. L. Girouard, 4, Employment and claims offi., $2,100.
A. Asselin, 3, Employment and claims off., $1,800.
C. Laurence, 3, Employment and claims off., $1,800.
J. H. Stewart, 3, Employment and claims off., $1,800.
G. L. Primeau, 3, Employment and claims off., $1,800.
J. M. DeSlubicki, 2, Employment and claims off., $1,500.
M. St. Martin, 2, Employment and claims off., $1,500.
J. F. Lasalle, 2, Employment and claims off., $1,500.
J. B. E. Senecal, 2, Employment and claims off., $1,500.
J. Rolland, 2, Employment and claims off., $1,500.
G. H. Ste. Marie, 2, Employment and claims off., $1,500.
G. Genereux, 1, Employment and claims off., $1,200.
C. Labrecque, 1, Employment and claims off., $1,200.
F. R. Bergeron, 1, Employment and claims off., $1,200.
R. H. Bissonnette, 1, Employment and claims off., $1,200.
H. Guyon, 4, Clerk, $1,800.
J. Cornez, Head clerk, $2,520.
E. E. duMont, Principal clerk, $2,040.
C. S. Mayer, Principal clerk, $1,920.
P. E. Aube, 4, Clerk, $1,620.
J. M. Desnoyers, 2, Clerk, $1,140.
J. M. Boileau, 3, Clerk, $1,440.
S. Lacasse, 3, Clerk, $1,380.
J. W. N. McDuff, 3, Clerk, $1,380.
F. Dupuy, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
G. Gauthier, 2, Clerk, $1,080.

Name—Grade—Title—Salary:

J. C. Tremblay, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
G. Breton, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
C. Michaud, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
J. Lambert, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
J. Prudhomme, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
R. Potvin, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
J. H. M. Picard, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
M. Moisan, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
L. Bourgoyne, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
A. Paiement, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
E. Debroin, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
J. P. A. Sauve, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
J. Gervais, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
C. M. Loiselle, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
G. Latendresse, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
R. Provost, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
J. R. Pepin, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
J. A. M. Labrie, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
R. E. Longtin, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
J. E. R. Desmarais, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
J. R. Daviault, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
A. Lussier, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
A. M. Rochon, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
H. Breton, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
M. Laplante, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
A. Allard, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
J. G. Leroux, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
G. Dugal, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
E. A. Clark, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
S. Scheffers, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
L. Guevremont, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
I. Bigue, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
Y. R. Poirier, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
L. Globensky, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
H. Dupuis, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
M. Legare, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
J. A. Guenette, 2, Clerk, $1,080.
M. A. Lussier, 1, Clerk, $780.
G. Chatelaine, 1, Clerk, $780.
J. Huard, 1, Clerk, $720.
M. A. Laframboise, 1, Clerk, $720.
M. Butterworth, 1, Clerk, $780.
C. Bigonesse, 1, Clerk, $780.
R. Rondeau, 1, Clerk, $720.
J. L. Labeau, 1, Clerk, $720.
P. Lauzon, 1, Clerk, $720.
I. A. Pitre, 1, Clerk, $720.
M. A. C. Gregoire, 1, Clerk, $720.
P. Guertin, 1, Clerk, $720.
F. Bissonnette, 1, Clerk, $720.
L. Chausse, 1, Clerk, $720.
M. R. A. Bernard, 1, Clerk, $720.
R. Hebert, 1, Clerk, $780.
Y. Paquette, 1, Clerk, $720.
T. Renaud, 1, Clerk, $780.
S. Poirier, 1, Clerk, $720.
R. Vinet, 1, Clerk, $720.
L. Houle, 1, Clerk, $780.
M. M. J. Hebert, 1, Clerk, $720.
E. Grenier, 1, Clerk, $780.
T. Gallipeau, 1, Clerk, $780.
A. Lalonde, 1, Clerk, $720.
H. LaRose, 1, Clerk, $720.
G. Boyer, 1, Clerk, $780.
T. Duchesne, 1, Clerk, $780.
C. Caron, 1, Clerk, $720.
C. F. Fortin, 1, Clerk, $720.
M. B. M. Vezina, 1, Clerk, $720.
R. Bolduc, 1, Clerk, $780.
A. Dostie de Bellot, 1, Clerk, $780.
C. Bush, 1, Clerk, $780.
H. Labarre, 1, Clerk, $780.
G. Thibault, 1, Clerk, $780.
D. Normandeau, 1, Clerk, $780.
G. Trudeau, 1, Clerk, $780.
A. Marsolais, 1, Clerk, $720.
F. Robin, 1, Clerk, $720.

Name—Grade—Title—Salary:

L. Carrier, 1, Clerk, $720.
M. R. Pauze, 1, Clerk, $780.
A. Maurice, 1, Clerk, $780.
M. Laplante, 1, Clerk, $780.
E. Lamontagne, 1, Clerk, $720.
A. M. B. Rivest, 1, Clerk, $720
J. Gauvreau, 1, Clerk, $720.
J. M. Jodoin, 1, Clerk, $780.
R. Rocheleau, 1, Clerk, $720.
J. R. Leger, 1, Clerk, $780.
A. Lolande, 1, Clerk, $720.
A. Gingras, 1, Clerk, $720.
C. Ouellette, 1, Clerk, $720.
M. Vernier, 1, Clerk, $720.
C. Dupuis, 1, Clerk, $720.
P. Noiseaux, 1, Clerk, $780.
T. Gosselin, 1, Clerk, $780.
S. Beriault, 1, Clerk, $780.
S. Cardinal, 1, Clerk, $780.
J. Cartier, 1, Clerk, $780.
D. Dubuc, 1, Clerk, $780.
M. A. Durivage, 1, Clerk, $780.
L. Harvey, 1, Clerk, $720.
M. Lalonde, 1, Clerk, $780.
J. Major, 1, Clerk, $780.
M. Melancon, 1, Clerk, $780.
J. Bruneau, 1, Clerk, $780.
E. Memary, 1, Clerk, $720.
R. Hudon, 1, Clerk, $780.
H. Rancourt, 1, Clerk, $780.
B. Thibault, 1, Clerk, $780.
C. Tisseur, 1, Clerk, $780.
B. Turcotte, 1, Clerk, $720.
L. Chaput, 1, Clerk, $720.
S. Denis, 1, Clerk, $780.
M. Vezina, 1, Clerk, $720.
A. Levesque, 1, Clerk, $720.
M. L. Y. St. Amour, 3, Stenographer, $1,380.
B. Bartolini, 2, Stenographer, $1,320.
J. Theriault, 2, Stenographer, $1,080.
B. Thibault, 2, Stenographer, $1,080.
L. R. Guilbault, 2, Stenographer, $1,080.
A. Gagne, 2, Stenographer, $1,080.
M. B. G. Laramee, 2, Stenographer, $1,080.
L. Lapointe, 2, Stenographer, $1,080.
J. Lefebvre, 2, Stenographer, $1,080.
M. M. E. Y. Gagnon, 2, Stenographer, $1,080.
H. Garnier, 2, Stenographer, $1,080.
C. Forest, 2, Stenographer, $1,080.
R. Boucher, 2, Stenographer, $1,080.
C. Mongeau, 2, Stenographer, $1,080.
P. Vinet, 2, Stenographer, $1,080.
F. Rodier, 2, Stenographer, $1,080.
T. Denoncourt, 2, Stenographer, $1,080.
E. Pepin, 2, Stenographer, $1,080.
R. Roy, 2, Stenographer, $1,080.
F. Bouchard, 2, Stenographer, $1,080.
C. Leclerc, 2, Stenographer, $1,080.
N. Leblanc, 2, Stenographer, $1,080.
G. Gaudet, 2, Stenographer, $1,080.
F. Dumais, 1, Stenographer, $780.
M. St. Andre, 1, Stenographer, $780.
F. Rivest, 1, Stenographer, $720.
J. E. Boucley, 1, Stenographer, $720.
J. Arsenault, 1, Stenographer, $720.
G. Savoie, 1, Stenographer, $720.
S. Biron, 1, Stenographer, $780.
Y. Larouche, 1, Stenographer, $780.
A. Martinolli, 1, Stenographer, $720.
L. Sabourin, 1, Stenographer, $720.
B. Richard, 1, Stenographer, $780.
C. Leduc, 1, Stenographer, $720.
R. Chaurette, 1, Stenographer, $720.
J. Belair, 2, Typist, $1,080.
L. Labrecque, 2, Typist, $1,080.
E. Bouthillier, 2, Typist, $1,080.
M. F. Denis, 2, Typist, $1,080.
T. Prudhomme, 2, Typist, $1,080.

[Mr. Mitchell.]

Name—Grade—Title—Salary:

M. Forget, 1, Typist, $720.
M. A. Laporte, 1, Typist, $720.
C. Demers, 1, Typist, $780.
M. A. Breton, 1, Typist, $780.
C. Mellish, 1, Teletypist, $1,080.
B. M. Gilbert, 1, Teletypist, $1,080.
J. Dupuis, Office boy, $600.
A. Loyer, Office boy, $600.
M. Gincherean, Office girl, $600.
C. Choquette, Office girl, $600.
A. Cote, Enforcement officer, $3,600.
R. Savignac, Enforcement officer, $2,400.
B. Eudes, Enforcement officer, $2,100.
G. A. F. Robillard, Enforcement officer, $1,800.
P. A. Masson, Special representative, $3,600.
J. G. Vandry, Special representative, $3,600.
E. A. Dionne, 1, Employment adviser, $3,300.
E. R. Cornell, 1, Employment adviser, $3,000.
J. P. Cote, 1, Employment adviser, $3,000.
J. G. Heffernan, 1, Employment adviser, $3,000.
L. V. Hurtubise, 1, Employment adviser, $3,000.
H. T. Ortiz, 5, Investigator N.S.S., $3,600.
H. L. Perry, 5, Investigator N.S.S., $3,600.
N. Desnoyers, 4, Investigator N.S.S., $3,300.
J. D. McCallum, 4, Investigator N.S.S., $3,300.
E. Lavoie, 4, Investigator N.S.S., $3,300.
S. Neal, 4, Investigator N.S.S., $3,300.
S. G. Davis, 4, Investigator N.S.S., $3,300.
A. M. Duncan, 4, Investigator N.S.S., $3,300.
H. E. MacDonald, 3, Investigator N.S.S., $3,000.
E. M. Sirkett, 3, Investigator N.S.S., $3,000.
R. Guevremont, 3, Investigator N.S.S., $3,000.
F. L. Willard, 3, Investigator N.S.S., $3,000.
E. N. Emery, 3, Investigator N.S.S., $3,000.
G. Laurion, 3, Investigator N.S.S., $3,000.
L. Rousseau, 3, Investigator N.S.S., $3,000.
W. C. O'Malley, 3, Investigator N.S.S., $3,000.
H. E. St. Onge, 3, Investigator N.S.S., $3,000.
E. A. Cartier, 3, Investigator N.S.S., $3,000.
R. H. Groulx, 3, Investigator N.S.S., $3,000.
L. Dugas, 3, Investigator N.S.S., $3,000.
G. A. MacDonald, 3, Investigator N.S.S., $3,000.
H. C. Carson, 3, Investigator N.S.S., $3,000.
J. Katz, 3, Investigator N.S.S., $3,000.
D. Urquhart, 3, Investigator N.S.S., $3,000.
E. C. Lariviere, 3, Investigator N.S.S., $3,000.
R. A. Cote, 3, Investigator N.S.S., $3,000.
A. Theriault, 3, Investigator N.S.S., $3,000.
A. Chartier, 3, Investigator N.S.S., $3,000.
J. Tremblay, 3, Investigator N.S.S., $3,000.
A. J. Gelardie, 3, Investigator N.S.S., $3,000.
E. H. Auger, 2, Investigator N.S.S., $2,700.
A. Peers, 2, Investigator N.S.S., $2,700.
L. J. Beauchemin, 2, Investigator N.S.S., $2,700.
E. Rousseau, 2, Investigator N.S.S., $2,700.
M. E. S. Parker, 2, Investigator N.S.S., $2,700.
J. O. Baillargeon, 2, Investigator N.S.S., $2,700.
L. A. R. Bertie, 2, Investigator N.S.S., $2,700.
R. Ross, 2, Investigator N.S.S., $2,700.
S. V. Larkin, 2, Investigator N.S.S., $2,700.
P. M. Sproule, 2, Investigator N.S.S., $2,700.
J. A. Laflamme, 2, Investigator N.S.S., $2,700.
W. D. Wilson, 2, Investigator N.S.S., $2,700.
G. E. Paradis, 2, Investigator N.S.S., $2,700.
J. P. A. Toupin, 2, Investigator N.S.S., $2,700.
A. W. Cote, 2, Investigator, N.S.S., $2,700.
P. A. Galarneau, 2, Investigator, N.S.S., $2,700.
A. J. Carle, 2, Investigator, N.S.S., $2,700.
H. Ball, 2, Investigator, N.S.S., $2,700.

Name—Grade—Title—Salary:

V. Gamache, 1, Investigator, N.S.S., $2,400.
K. G. Walters 1, Investigator, N.S.S., $2,400.
W. W. Beckingham, 1, Investigator, N.S.S., $2,400.
R. J. Hopper, 1, Investigator, N.S.S., $2,400.
J. A. Morin, 1, Investigator, N.S.S., $2,400.
J. C. Lacroix, 1, Investigator, N.S.S., $2,400.
E. Joubert 1, Investigator, N.S.S., $2,400.
J. I. Delisle, 1, Investigator, N.S.S., $2,400.
A. W. Bolduc, 1, Investigator, N.S.S., $2,400.
J. G. Vallerand, 1, Investigator, N.S.S., $2,400.
L. Bolduc, 1, Investigator, N.S.S., $2,400.
O. Beaudoin, 1, Investigator, N.S.S., $2,400.
L. C. Hayward, 1, Investigator, N.S.S., $2,400.
M. Faulkner, 1, Investigator, N.S.S., $2,400.
J. L. Lefebvre, 1, Investigator, N.S.S., $2,400.
M. Decaire, 1, Investigator, N.S.S., $2,400.
M. Guay, 4, Insurance inspector, $4,000.
W. H. Barker, 3, Insurance inspector, $2,520.
M. O. J. Dion, 3, Insurance inspector, $2,520.
R. H. Sims, 3, Insurance inspector, $2,520.
N. G. Lamarre, 3, Insurance inspector, $2,520.
T. M. Holly, 2, Insurance inspector, $1,920.
S. Sheppard, 2, Insurance inspector, $1,920.
J. I. Langevin, 2, Insurance inspector, $1,920.
M. Guertin, 2, Insurance inspector, $1,920.
G. Tellier, 2, Insurance inspector, $1,920.
J. V. T. Lacasse, 2, Insurance inspector, $1,920.
C. Bellemare, 2, Insurance inspector, $1,920.
A. A. Parke, 2, Insurance inspector, $1,920.
P. G. Duckett, 2, Insurance inspector, $1,920.
A. P. C. Mills, 2, Insurance inspector, $1,920.
F. O'Reilly, 2, Insurance inspector, $1,920.
A. Boivin, 2, Insurance inspector, $1,920.
H. Daoust, 2, Insurance inspector, $1,920.
J. B. Walker, 2, Insurance inspector, $1,920.
A. R. Y. Foisy, 2, Insurance inspector, $1,920.
A. A. Guilbault, 2, Insurance inspector, $1,920.
R. Boisvert, 2, Insurance inspector, $1,920.
J. N. Blouin, 2, Insurance inspector, $1,920.
J. Brunette, 2, Insurance inspector, $1,920.
L. E. Poitras, 2, Insurance inspector, $1,920.
L. Viau, 2, Insurance inspector, $1,920.
J. E. L. Comolli, 2, Insurance inspector, $1,920.
P. E. Dufresne, 2, Insurance inspector, $1,920.
E. E. Bridgen, 1, Insurance inspector, $1,620.
H. L. Grenier, 1, Insurance inspector, $1,620.
R. Cote, 1, Insurance inspector, $1,620.
H. L. Lewis, 1, Insurance inspector, $1,620.
R. Poirier, 1, Insurance inspector, $1,620.
J. E. Chouinard, 1, Insurance inspector, $1,620.
J. W. Pringle, 1, Insurance inspector, $1,620.
J. L. Desilets, 1, Insurance inspector, $1,620.
G. Provost, 1, Insurance inspector, $1,620.
J. P. Smith, 1, Insurance inspector, $1,620.
L. C. Vallee, 1, Insurance inspector, $1,620.
B. LaHaie, 1, Insurance inspector, $1,620.
J. N. Mandeville, 1, Insurance inspector, $1,620.
J. R. Trudeau, 1, Insurance inspector, $1,620.
M. D. Dicaire, 1, Insurance inspector, $1,620.
L. P. Savage, 1, Insurance inspector, $1,620.
J. E. Charron, 1, Insurance inspector, $1,620.

3. No one. All appointments made by the Civil Service Commission.

SUGAR

Mr. ISNOR:

1. What quantity of raw sugar was imported into Canada during (a) the fiscal year ending March 31, 1942; (b) during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1943?

2. From what countries was such sugar imported in each of these years?

3. What quantity of raw sugar was imported into Canada during the month of December, 1943?

4. Was there a quantity of raw sugar landed at the port of Halifax during the month of January, 1944?

5. If so, from what country, and to whom was it consigned?

6. Have representations been made to the government regarding the reopening of the Acadia Sugar Refinery, Woodside, Nova Scotia?

7. If so, what are the names of those making such representations?

8. Will the refinery be reopened in the near future?

Mr. ABBOTT:

1. (a) 488,485 long tons, (b) 303,922 long tons.

2. B.W.I.—Australia—Fiji—Santo Domingo—Cuba—for each of the two years.

3. 17,679 long tons.

4. 5,450 long tons.

5. 4,850 tons from Barbadoes and 600 tons from Santo Domingo—both consigned to the sugar administrator.

6, 7 and 8. No information.

PARTICIPATION CERTIFICATES, 1940-41 AND 1942 CROP DELIVERY

Mr. ROSS (Souris):

1. When will payment be made to farmers holding participation certificates for wheat crop delivery in the years 1940-41 and 1942?

2. What will the payment be per bushel on participation certificates for each of the years 1940-41 and 1942?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West):

1. Payments on the 1940 participation certificates will be started in March. Payments on the 1941 and 1942 crops will be made immediately after completion of the 1940 payments.

2. Information not yet available, but an announcement will be made as soon as possible.

VICTORY AIRCRAFT LIMITED

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. Has the production of Victory Aircraft Limited been satisfactory since Mr. J. P. Bickell became president?

2. What salary and/or expenses did he receive for acting as president?

3. What salary and expenses, if any, is to be paid to his successor, Mr. V. W. Scully?

4. What salary and expenses did each of the retiring directors receive?

5. Who are the new directors to be associated with Mr. Scully, and what salary and expenses is each to receive?

Mr. HOWE:

1. Yes.

2. No salary; no expenses.

3. Mr. V. W. Scully is president and general manager of War Supplies Limited and as such receives $700 per month, U. S. funds, and an additional allowance of $5 per day to compensate him for additional expenses incurred

while in Washington. When Mr. Scully is released from these duties and his full time is taken up by his positon as president of Victory Aircraft Limited, a salary will then be arranged.

4. No salary; no expenses.

5. (a) The following directors will be associated with Mr. Scully in the management of Victory Aircraft Limited: Harold S. Beddoe, president, United-Carr Fastener Company of Canada; Major J. E. Hahn, director general, Army Technical Development Board; President, John Inglis Company, Limited; Richard Riley, Grand Lodge representative, International Association of Machinists; L. F. Winchell, vice-president and general manager, Hinde and Dauch Paper Company of Canada, Limited; (b) No salary; no expenses.

PENSIONS AND VETERANS' ALLOWANCES

Mr. WINKLER:

How many veterans who have served in actual theatre of war are receiving, (a) pension, or (b) veteran's allowance, in the following forces: (1) Northwest rebellion of 1885, (2) South African war, 1898-1901, (3) great war, 1914-1918?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Return as of 31 December, 1943, (a) (1) 5 veterans are receiving pension. (No definition of theatre of actual war for Northwest Rebellion of 1885). (2) Decisions on entitlement to pension of members of the Canadian contingents which served in the South African war are given by the British Government. However, section 47 of the Pension Act reads as follows:

"47. The pensions which are now being paid by Great Britain for disabilities or deaths which occurred during the South African war to or in respect of members of the Canadian contingents which served in that war shall hereafter be supplemented during the continuance of the residence in Canada of the recipients of such pensions by such additional pensions as will make the total of the two pensions received by them equal to the pension that would have been awarded if they had been disabled or had died in the military service of Canada during the war. (1920, c. 62, s. 27.)"

Veterans benefiting under said section 47 number 37. No information as to theatre of service. (3) 67, 116. (b) (1) Nil. Not qualified under act. (2) 416. (3) 21,835.

WAR VETERANS' ALLOWANCE BOARD—WIDOWS' ALLOWANCES

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. How many widows without dependent children have been awarded special allowances by the widows' allowance division of the war veterans' allowance board?

[Mr. Howe.]

2. Of the above, how many have been awarded, (a) $20 per month or less; (b) between $20 and $25 per month?

3. How many widows with dependent children have been awarded special allowances by the widows' allowance division of the war veterans' allowance board?

4. Of the above, how many have been awarded, (a) $40 per month; (b) less than $40 per month?

5. How many awards by the widows' allowance division of the war veterans' allowance board have been made retroactive to April 1, 1943?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Return as of December 31, 1943:

1. 951.
2. (a) 318, (b) 633.
3. 49.
4. (a) 11, (b) 38.
5. 329.

NEW ZEALAND BUTTER IN COLD STORAGE

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. What quantity of New Zealand butter is in cold storage in Moncton, New Brunswick?
2. What quantity of New Zealand butter is in cold storage in Canada?
3. Is the above butter in bond or is it to be released for domestic consumption?
4. How long has the butter been in cold storage?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. No New Zealand butter, but 28,000 pounds of Australian butter.
2. No New Zealand butter, but 50,400 pounds of Australian butter.
3. In bond and earmarked for export to the Navy, Army and Air Force Institute.
4. Since February, 1943.

MEATS IN COLD STORAGE

Mr. HATFIELD:

What quantities of the following meats were in cold storage in Canada at January 1, 1944, (a) pork; (b) beef; (c) lamb; (d) mutton?

Mr. ABBOTT: (a) 83,231,011 lbs.; (b) 35,639,828 lbs.; (c and d) 9,344,749 lbs. (not shown separately).

WARTIME FOOD CORPORATION—FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. What are the names of the members of the Wartime Food Corporation?
2. What experience has each had in the handling of foodstuff?
3. Where is the head office of the corporation?
4. Has the corporation charge of the handling of fresh fruit and vegetables in Canada?
5. If so, under what system or plan do they intend to handle these fruits and vegetables?

Mr. ABBOTT:

1 and 2. The directors and principal officers of the Wartime Food Corporation Limited are:

President: R. T. Mohan, president of General Foods Ltd., and administrator of Tea, Coffee and Spices.

Vice-pres.: K. W. Taylor, co-ordinator, Foods Administration.

Other directors: Raoul Godbout, president of the Horticultural Society of Canada; A. R. Johnstone, vice-president of the International Union of Hotel and Restaurant Workers in Canada; S. R. Noble, vice-president, Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation Limited and Sugar Administrator; Carl Sanders, president of Gamble-Robinson Ltd.; E. W. Smart, administrator of Wholesale Trade.

General manager: J. B. Lander, manager of Canadian Fruit Distributors Ltd., Regina,

Secretary-treasurer: A. N. H. James of Barclays Bank.

3. Head Office is in Ottawa; principal operating office is in Toronto.

4 and 5. Wartime Food Corporation Limited is a subsidiary of Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation Limited. It is an administrative organization created for the purpose of carrying out instructions given by the Wartime Prices and Trade Board. It has been instructed by the board to take such action as may be necessary from time to time to ensure that supplies of fresh fruits and vegetables are available in Canada at reasonable prices and are equitably distributed. To this end it has been empowered (a) to divert supplies from surplus areas to deficiency areas and where necessary to pay the extra transportation costs involved in such diversions, (b) to bulk purchase directly or through agents, either domestic or foreign fruits and vegetables and to allocate or dispose of them in accordance with board policy or instructions, (c) to pay subsidies as the board may from time to time direct.

It is the policy of the board to make full use of existing organizations and channels of distribution.

REJECTION OF BACON SHIPMENTS TO BRITAIN

Mr. ROSS (Souris):

1. How many consignments of Canadian bacon to Great Britain have been rejected by officers representing the bacon board during each of the years 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943?

2. How many consignments of bacon, if any, have been returned to the suppliers in Canada by officers of the bacon board and to whom were they returned?

Mr. GARDINER: The following quantities and kinds of bacon consigned for export to the United Kingdom were rejected by officers of the bacon board during each of the years 1940, 1941, 1942 and 1943:

1.

Date—Name of shipper—Quantity—Kind

March 7, 1940—W. Wight & Co. Ltd., Toronto—148 bales, Wiltshires; 19 boxes, Gammons.

June 3, 1940—Gainers Ltd., Edmonton—31 bales, Middles.

June 3, 1940—Burns & Co. Ltd., Edmonton—73 bales, Middles.

June 10, 1940—Gainers Ltd., Edmonton—119 bales, Middles.

June 12, 1940—Burns & Co. Ltd., Edmonton—191 bales, Middles.

July 3, 1940—Quebec Packers Ltd., Quebec—61 bales, Middles.

July 3, 1940—First Co-operative Packers of Ontario Ltd., Barrie—1 box, Middles.

July 6, 1940—First Co-operative Packers of Ontario Ltd., Barrie—68 bales, Wiltshires.

July 16, 1940—Quebec Abattoir Inc., Quebec—41 bales, Middles.

July 22, 1940—Dumarts Ltd., Kitchener—2 bales, Wiltshires.

August 20, 1940—Quebec Abattoir Inc., Quebec.—27 bales, Middles.

August 28, 1940—Quebec Packers Ltd., Quebec.—1 bale, Wiltshires.

Sept. 17, 1940—Burns & Co. Ltd., Edmonton—59 bales, Middles.

Sept. 23, 1940—Intercontinental Pork Packers Ltd., Saskatoon—118 bales, Wiltshires.

Sept. 21, 1940—Burns & Co. Ltd., Calgary—75 bales, Middles.

Sept. 26, 1940—Quebec Packers Ltd., Quebec—4 boxes, Backs.

Sept. 26, 1940—Quebec Packers Ltd., Quebec—3 boxes, Backs.

Oct. 23, 1940—J. M. Schneider Ltd., Kitchener—6 boxes, Fores.

Oct. 24, 1940—J. M. Schneider Ltd., Kitchener—8 boxes, Fores.

Dec. 21, 1940—Intercontinental Pork Packers Ltd., Saskatoon—1 bale, Middles.

March 3, 1941—Union Packing Co., Ltd., Calgary—73 boxes, Backs.

March 28, 1941—Swift Can. Co. Ltd., Winnipeg—78 bales, Wiltshires.

March 18, 1941—Swift Can. Co. Ltd., Winnipeg—10 boxes, Gammons.

March 18, 1941—Union Packing Co. Ltd., Calgary—58 boxes, Backs.

July 23, 1941—First Co-operative Packers of Ontario, Ltd., Barrie—40 boxes, Fores and Backs.

Sept. 20, 1941—First Co-operative Packers of Ontario Ltd., Barrie—139 bales, Wiltshires.

Feb. 11, 1942—Burns & Co., Ltd., Edmonton—49 bales, Middles.

April 18, 1942—First Co-operative Packers of Ontario Ltd., Barrie—485 cases, Pork Offal.

June 18, 1942—W. Wight & Co. Ltd., Toronto—85 bales, Wiltshires.

Sept. 5, 1942—Quebec Packers Ltd., Quebec—1 box, Backs.

Sept. 4, 1942—Swift Can. Co. Ltd., Edmonton—1 box, Gammons.

June 25, 1943—First Co-operative Packers of Ontario Ltd., Barrie—76 cases, Pork Offal.

June 26, 1943—Quebec Packers Ltd., Quebec—298 cases, Pork Offal.

August 30, 1943—Swift Can. Co. Ltd., Edmonton—1 case, Pork Offal.

Date—Name of shipper—Quantity—Kind

August 30, 1943—Swift Can. Co. Ltd., Winnipeg—1 box, Livers.

Sept. 1, 1943—Burns & Co. Ltd., Prince Albert—3 boxes, Kidneys; 2 boxes, Livers.

Sept. 1, 1943—Swift Can. Co. Ltd., Winnipeg—1 box, Livers.

Sept. 9, 1943—Canada Packers Ltd., Winnipeg—1 bale, Wiltshires.

2. All bacon for export to the United Kingdom rejected by officials of the board was turned over to the shipper at seaboard and the board has no information as to final disposition.

CONTRACTS UNDER COLD STORAGE ACT

Mr. ROSS (Souris):

1. How many new contracts have been entered into by the government, under the terms of the Cold Storage Act, 1907, during the years 1940 to 1943 inclusive?

2. What are the names and addresses of the persons or companies to whom subsidies have been granted during this period?

3. What is the total amount involved, (a) in cost of the plants; (b) in the amount of the subsidy contracted for in each case?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. Seven.

2. Municipality of City and County, Saint John, N.B.; Kent Fruit Growers Cooperative, Blenheim, Ont.;Elgin Growers Cooperative, St. Thomas, Ont.; North Star Cold Storage Company, Winnipeg, Man.; Winnipeg Cold Storage Company (2), Winnipeg, Man.; Edmonton Cold Storage Company, Edmonton, Alberta.

3. (a) $101,947.60; $349,834.10; $28,000.00; $49,000.00; $79,144.00; $197,231.00; $63,000.00; (b) $30,584.28; $104,950.26; $8,400.00; $14,700.00; $23,743.20; $59,169.30; $18,900.00.

SALE OF ARMY MOTOR VEHICLES IN MONTREAL

Mr. TUSTIN:

1. Was an auction sale of army motor vehicles held in the city of Montreal during the months of November or December, 1943?

2. If so, on what date or dates?

3. Were any of the said motor vehicles sold at a price in excess of the price ceiling prescribed by the order of the wartime prices and trade board?

4. If so, how many vehicles were so sold?

5. What was the ceiling price on each such vehicle and what was the price at which each such vehicle was actually sold?

6. Has any action been taken to discipline those officials of the government responsible for a breach of the price ceiling by the government itself?

7. If so, what is the nature of such action?

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax):

1. Yes.

2. November 24 and 25, 1943.

3. Yes.

4. Two.

5. Ceiling price (1) $417.00; (2) $417.00; Sale price (1) $440.00; (2) $475.00.

6. No. As the law officers advised that M.V.C. 18-A, M.V.C. 19-A, and M.V.C. 18 did not apply to the Crown. The Motor Vehicles Controller was fully informed of the matter and he did not require that any price adjustment be made. Instructions have been issued that, in regard to further sales of motor vehicles by the department, the orders of the Wartime Prices and Trade board are to be observed.

7. Answered by 6.

VETERANS' LAND ACT—PURCHASES OF LAND

Mr. WRIGHT:

1. What is the total number of purchases of land under the Veterans' Land Act up to January 1, 1944, (a) under the permanent farming scheme; (b) under the small holding scheme?

2. What are the locations, number of acres, price and the names of parties from whom each parcel was purchased?

3. How many veterans have been settled under the scheme up to January 1, 1944?

4. How many applications for settlement have been made up to January 1, 1944?

Mr. CRERAR:

1. (a) 109; (b) 735.

2. It is not considered in the public interest to divulge the individual purchase prices paid.

3. 15.

4. 603.

MARKETING OF SOWS

Mr. WRIGHT:

1. How many sows were marketed in Canada each month, (a) from July 1 to December 31, 1942; (b) from July 1 to December 31, 1943?

2. How many barrows and gilts were marketed each month between the above dates under, (a) selects; (b) B I's; (c) heavies; (d) all other grades?

Mr. GARDINER:

1.

	(a) 1942	(b) 1943
July	45,384	69,465
August	34,533	69,484
September	27,050	71,320
October	19,034	61,381
November	24,768	39,868
December	25,421	24,489

2.

	Grade A (a)	Grade B1 (b)	Heavies (c)	All Other Grades (d)	TOTAL
1942—					
July	123,170	201,220	14,223	122,958	461,571
August	92,029	144,691	8,001	86,529	331,250
September	138,490	211,762	11,895	98,688	460,835
October	147,450	221,979	20,185	103,565	493,179
November	172,495	273,404	29,032	139,846	614,777
December	201,537	325,592	36,234	158,960	722,323
1943—					
July	146,573	204,956	18,171	180,662	550,362
August	104,701	143,570	14,019	137,963	400,253
September	151,432	210,855	18,313	162,300	542,900
October	172,890	246,338	24,504	170,260	613,992
November	227,709	352,054	32,038	203,574	815,375
December	291,139	476,859	35,961	239,441	1,043,400

It is not possible to divide the barrows and gilts.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON COMPLAINTS OF JAPANESE NATIONALS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. TUSTIN:

1. What was the total cost of the royal commission recently appointed to examine into complaints made by Japanese nationals in British Columbia with respect to treatment being received by them?

2. Has the commission made a report of its findings, and if so, to whom?

Mr. MITCHELL:

1. $4,168.14.

2. Yes, to the Honourable the Minister of Labour.

SUBSIDIES TO CANADIAN COLLIERIES— HOUSES FOR MINERS

Mr. O'NEILL:

1. What amount was paid to Canadian collieries by way of subsidy during the year 1943?

2. What amount was spent by the government in building houses for miners in Cumberland, British Columbia, during the year 1943?

Mr. HOWE:

1. During 1943, the following moneys were paid to Canadian Collieries (Dunsmuir) Ltd.:

Production subsidy	$173,063.48
Cost of living bonus assistance	96,992.46
Subventions	32,851,02
Total	$302,906.96

2. Nil.

WHEAT CROPS OF 1940, 1941 AND 1942

Mr. WRIGHT:

1. At what price did the government take over the wheat from the 1940, 1941 and 1942 crops?

2. What will be done with any money that may accrue as a result of the disposing of these crops at a price higher than the one allowed when making the settlements on the wheat participation certificates for these years?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West):

1. The unsold stocks were taken over from the 1940, 1941 and 1942 Canadian wheat board crop accounts at the closing market prices of September 27, 1943, as registered for each grade of wheat, namely, $1.23¼ per bushel basis No. 1 Northern, Fort William-Port Arthur.

2. The unsold stocks carried by the 1940, 1941 and 1942 board years were taken over by the dominion government and are now referred to as "crown" wheat. The cost of carrying these stocks as from September 27, 1943, will be a charge against "Crown wheat account," and any loss arising as a result of the marketing of the wheat will follow the charges and accrue to the same account. Settlement on producers' certificates for these board years will not be affected by any transactions after September 27, 1943. The government are meeting the requirements under the mutual aid plan, and providing for the subsidized domestic purchasers out of government owned wheat, rather than out of the 1943-44 wheat in which the farmers have a participating interest.

DR. LEONARD C. MARSH

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West):

1. When was Dr. Leonard C. Marsh taken on the civil list of Canada, at what remuneration, and what is he now receiving?

2. Has his remuneration been increased?

3. If so, from what date?

4. What aggregate amount has he received by way of salary, fees, travelling expenses or any other form of remuneration since his appointment?

5. Has a Dr. Firestone been retained on certain special studies or assignments in connection with the work of the reconstruction committee or any similar committee of the government?

6. If so, (a) to what department is he attached; (b) to whom does he report; (c) what is his nationality; (d) when did he come to Canada; (e) in what status; (f) what remuneration does he receive; (g) what sums has he been paid?

7. Is there a Mrs. or a Miss Hurst engaged to assist Dr. Leonard Marsh?

8. If so, (a) in what capacity; (b) at what remuneration; (c) what is her citizenship; (d) was she a resident in Europe at any time in the last fifteen years, and if so, where, in what status and what was her citizenship; (e) where was she employed prior to her present appointment?

9. Is there a Miss Weekes engaged to assist Dr. Leonard Marsh?

10. If so, (a) in what capacity; (b) at what remuneration; (c) where was she employed prior to her present employment?

Mr. CLAXTON:

1. (a) July 15, 1931. For three months. Temporary appointment as a principal clerk in the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. Salary $1,920 per annum; (b) February 16, 1934. For 4½ months. Temporary appointment as a head clerk in the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. Salary $2,520 per annum, minus 10 per cent; (c) July 2, 1941. Research adviser to advisory committee on reconstruction. Remuneration $4,000 per annum. Now receiving same.

2. Not since July 2, 1941.

3. See (2) above.

4. Salary: 1931, $480 (3 months); 1934, $850.50 (4½ months); 1941-42, $3,000 (9 months); 1942-43, $4,000; 1943-44, $4,000.

Fees: none.

Travelling expenses: 1941-42, $171.32; 1942-43, $830.39; 1943-44, $769.42.

Any other form of remuneration: none.

5. Yes. Appointed April 15, 1943.

6. (a) Senior research assistant on staff of advisory committee on reconstruction—responsible to Privy Council; (b) to the Research adviser; (c) Austrian; (d) July, 1940; (e) Refugee internee; (f) $3,000 per annum; (g) 1942-43: Special studies, $500-$150; travelling expenses, $71.67; 1943-44: Salary, $3,000, travelling expenses, $47.44.

7. Yes. Appointed 23 April, 1943.

8. (a) Assistant secretary on staff of advisory committee on reconstruction; (b) $2,760 per annum; (c) Canadian citizen—born in Canada; (d) Yes, in the U.S.S.R.

1932-33: Student on special fellowship, through Bryn Mawr graduate school, Bryn Mawr, Penn.

1933-37: Teaching, translation; and executive asistant in Moscow office of The Open Road, Inc., a New York city travel agency.

[Mr. G. K. Fraser.]

A Canadian citizen.

(e) 1937-40: Assistant to executive secretary, The Welfare Council of Toronto and District, 100 Adelaide St. W., Toronto.

1941-43: Convalescing from illness (T.B.).

9. See answer to 10.

10. Miss Weekes was in 1943 employed for a special study on provincial welfare services in relation to social security and was paid a fee of $100.

SELECTIVE SERVICE—MME. FLORENCE MARTEL

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West):

1. Is there a Mme. Florence Martel in the department of selective service?

2. If so, (a) when was she appointed; (b) at what remuneration?

3. Is she also a member of the employment service council?

4. If so, (a) when was she appointed; (b) on whose recommendation?

5. Is she a dominion appointee to the committee on day nurseries for Quebec?

6. If so, (a) when was she appointed; (b) is she associated in any way with the league for women's rights in Quebec; (c) do her duties take her to selective service offices and include interviewing of women workers in industrial plants in Quebec?

Mr. MITCHELL:

1. Yes.

2. (a) Appointed July 11 under authority P.C. 2254 of March 21. Appointment certified under P.C. 27-8346, Sept. 15. (b) $3,000 per annum.

3. She is a member of the National Employment committee.

4. (a) September 23, 1941. (b) Appointed on the recommendation of the Unemployment Insurance commission which commission considered her a person who could express the views of organizations representing women of Quebec.

5. Yes.

6. (a) 27th July, 1942. (b) Member, but inactive during past two years. (c) Her duties take her to selective service offices at certain times when special problems concerning the employment of women are under consideration. Her duties also take her to industrial plants to look into and advise on the general welfare conditions for women workers.

GOLD MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. NICHOLSON:

How many people were engaged exclusively in the gold mining industry at the end of each of the last five years for which statistics are available?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West):

Average number of employees in the years 1938-1942:

	Auriferous quartz mining	Alluvial gold mining	Total
1938....	29,647	1,071	30,718
1939....	30,622	830	31,452
1940....	31,405	840	32,245
1941....	32,551	797	33,348
1942....	26,030	471	26,501

CANADIAN FORCES—INCOME TAX EXEMPTION WHEN BEYOND CANADIAN BORDERS

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. Is Kiska outside of the western hemisphere?

2. Were income tax deductions made from service personnel in the units of the 13th Canadian infantry brigade during the time they were stationed at Kiska? If so, on what basis?

3. Was an order in council passed providing for the sending of the 13th Canadian infantry brigade, (a) beyond the borders of Canada; or (b) beyond the western hemisphere?

4. If service personnel, as noted above, were not given full exemption from taxation while they were in Kiska, why was such exemption not given?

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax):

1. No.

2. Yes. Deductions made at one-half effective rate applicable to each individual.

3. An order in council was passed authorizing the despatch of personnel called out for training, service or duty pursuant to the provisions of the National Resources Mobilization Act, 1940, to the Territory of Alaska (including the Aleutian islands and other United States islands adjacent thereto). By direction of the Minister of National Defence this order in council was made applicable to all such personnel serving with the 13th Canadian Infantry Brigade.

4. Income War Tax Act, Section 4 (t) (i), grants full exemption to personnel on strength of overseas units outside western hemisphere; first schedule section 3 rule 3 grants one-half exemption to personnel serving in western hemisphere other than in Canada.

OLD AGE PENSIONS

Mr. NICHOLSON:

1. How many persons in each of the provinces were receiving old age pensions on December 31, 1943?

2. What was the average monthly payment in each province?

Mr. ABBOTT:

Answers 1 and 2 as at September 30, 1943:

	Number of old age pensioners	Average monthly pension
Alberta	11,099	$ 18 75
British Columbia	14,337	19 37
Manitoba	12,534	18 88
New Brunswick	11,900	15 65
Nova Scotia	14,154	16 48
Ontario	56,776	18 98
Prince Edward Island.	1,884	13 57
Quebec	47,014	17 62
Saskatchewan	13,007	22 68
North West Territories	7	20 00

Note—December 31, 1943, figures not yet available. As at September 30, 1943, the province of Saskatchewan was the only province that had furnished the Department of Finance with pay lists to enable the payment of the additional amount authorized under the War Measures Act, from September 1, 1943.

CANADIAN FORCES—ARMY BOOTS

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. What steps has the government taken to provide for an investigation into the charges made by Mr. James Clark, of Toronto, against the inspection board of the United Kingdom and Canada, in connection with the quality of leather used in army boots supplied to the government by a certain manufacturer?

2. If no steps have been taken to date, will the government order an inquiry?

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax):

1. It is understood that the charges of Mr. James Clark as well as the answers to the charges issued by the Inspection Board of the United Kingdom and Canada will be carefully considered by the agenda committee of the Special Committee on War Expenditures and appropriate action taken.

2. See answer to No. 1.

WARTIME OILS LIMITED

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. What are the names and addresses of the directors of Wartime Oils Limited?

2. How many wells have been drilled to date by the above company?

3. What is the total amount of money expended to date in drilling operations by the above company?

Mr. HOWE:

1. The directors of Wartime Oils Limited are:

President, A. A. Carpenter, K.C. 501 Public Building, Calgary, Alberta.

Secretary-treasurer, K. J. Morrison, Lougheed building, Calgary, Alberta.

Director, Colonel L. D. M. Baxter, c/o Osler, Hammond & Nanton, Nanton Building, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Director, A. H. Mayland, 301 Lancaster Building, Calgary, Alberta.

Director, J. G. Spratt, Anglo-Canadian Oil Co. Ltd., Calgary, Alberta.

2. There have been no wells completed. There are five wells testing, and eight wells drilling.

3. As of January 31, 1944, the amount of money expended was $1,215,332.08.

WINNIPEG GRAIN EXCHANGE

Mr. FAIR:

1. Did the government order the closing of the Winnipeg grain exchange, insofar as it affects the sale of wheat, on or about the 28th day of September, 1943?

2. If so, was this action taken with the knowledge and consent of the British government?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West):

1. The order issued early on September 28th, 1943, effected the discontinuance of wheat trading on the Winnipeg grain exchange. The details of the government's action are contained in order in council P.C. 7942.

2. The imported cereals division of the United Kingdom Ministry of Food were in close touch with the market situation.

FLUID MILK SUBSIDY

Mr. SENN:

1. How many distributors in Canada were granted the fluid milk subsidy for distribution to the producers during the last six months of 1943, by provinces?

2. How much was paid out in each province?

3. Do public or private institutions receive subsidies on milk produced and consumed on their own premises?

4. If so, how many in each province, and in what amount?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. In the last six months of 1943, 1024 distributors in Canada were paid fluid milk subsidies for distribution to producers and 2276 producer distributors were paid fluid milk subsidy. The number of distributors and producer distributors receiving subsidies in each province were as follows: Prince Edward Island 6; 68. Nova Scotia 38; 161. New Brunswick 33; 331. Quebec 243; 872. Ontario 574; 235. Manitoba 22; 65. Saskatchewan 23; 49. Alberta 35; 121. British Columbia 50; 374.

2. Total fluid milk subsidies paid to distributors for distribution to producers in Canada for the last six months of 1943 totalled $3,228,313 of which: Prince Edward Island received $14,531. Nova Scotia received $128,929. New Brunswick received $93,327. Quebec received $796,118. Ontario received $1,484,848. Manitoba received $170,440. Saskatchewan received $94,746. Alberta received $157,239. British Columbia received $288,135.

3. The Agricultural Food Board does not approve the payment of fluid milk subsidy on milk produced and consumed by public or private institutions on their own premises.

4. Answered by No. 3.

GRADING OF HOGS

Mr. ROWE:

1. How many hogs in Canada were inspected by government graders in each year, 1939-1943 inclusive?

2. What are the official grades for hog carcasses?

3. How many carcasses fell into each grade during each year as above?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. 1939, 3,628,369; 1940, 5,454,930; 1941, 6,573,951; 1942, 6,196,850; 1943, 7,173,550.

2 and 3.

	Carcass graded				
	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943
A	600,427	1,153,726	1,959,970	1,863,491	1,997,226
B	1,091,789	2,325,684	3,379,023	3,428,636	3,743,893
C	102,126	273,490	357,945	308,761	342,445
D	8,662	18,135	25,092	18,715	17,760
Lights	42,292	164,800	123,946	17,636	35,589
Heavies	50,568	59,563	100,069	197,722	340,463
Extra heavies	12,915	15,628	33,790	55,957	127,244
E	19,504	48,104	69,371	70,901	82,555
Sows	35,768	64,904	167,001	266,344	462,246
Total	1,964,051	4,131,252	6,225,515	6,232,087	7,149,421

Grand total includes export.

Graded alive

	1940	1939
Select bacon	370,261	518,986
Bacon	648,703	835,532
Butchers	108,451	155,927
Heavies	21,956	37,800
Extra heavies	11,330	14,886
Lts. Feeders	114,887	111,379
No. 1 Sows	21,500	20,075
No. 2 Sows	23,606	36,511
Roughs	2,965	2,812
Stags	1,933	3,102
Total:		
Yards	593,693	746,152
Plants	731,899	990,858
Dir. Exp.	7,218	5,118
Grand Total	1,332,810	1,742,128

VETERANS' LAND ACT—SASKATCHEWAN

Mr. PERLEY:

How many veterans or discharged men have been settled under the present Veterans' Land Act in the province of Saskatchewan?

Mr. CRERAR: 15.

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING OF HOGS

Mr. ROWE:

1. How many hogs were produced in Canada in each year, 1939-1943 inclusive?
2. How many hogs were marketed through stock yards in Canada in each year, 1939-1943 inclusive?
3. How many hogs were delivered directly to packers' yards in each year, 1939-1943 inclusive?
4. How many packing companies in Canada process hogs for export?
5. How many packing companies in Canada process hogs solely for domestic consumption?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics estimate the total number of hogs slaughtered in Canada as follows. These figures include hogs slaughtered on farms and slaughtered by local butchers: 1939, 5,591,600; 1940, 7,116,800; 1941, 8,222,800; 1942, 8,394,000; 1943, 9,174,000*.

2. 1939, 790,422; 1940, 1,083,998; 1941, 1,090,488; 1942, 925,209; 1943, 953,896.

3. 1939, 2,886,602; 1940, 4,499,944; 1941, 5,336,502; 1942, 5,477,407; 1943, 6,336,457.

4. 34.

5. There are 14 abattoirs in Canada operating under federal inspection where hogs are slaughtered for the domestic market only. No information is available as to the number of companies, not under federal inspection, which process hogs for domestic consumption.

MRS. RUBY DOOLITTLE

Mr. WHITE:

1. Is Mrs. Ruby Doolittle in the employ of the Department of Pensions and National Health, or war veterans' allowance board?

2. If so, (a) when was she appointed; (b) in what capacity; (c) at what remuneration; (d) on whose recommendation?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre):

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

HENRY C. MILLER

Mr. WHITE:

1. Is Mr. Henry C. Miller in the employment of the oils and fats administration?
2. If so, (a) when was he appointed; (b) in what capacity; (c) at what remuneration; (d) on whose recommendation?
3. What amount has he received in each year since his appointment for travelling expenses and/or living allowance?
4. Does he devote his full time to this position?

Mr. ABBOTT:

1. Yes.

2. (a) June 8, 1942; (b) Director, Natural Resins; (c) $3,720 per annum; (d) Civil Service Commission.

3. In the fiscal year 1942-43 travelling expenses only, $47.20. In the fiscal year 1943-44 to date, nil.

4. Yes.

BONUS ON FLUID MILK

Mr. HANSELL:

1. Is the bonus of fifty-five cents per hundred pounds of fluid milk still being paid to milk producers?
2. If so, how is this bonus paid?
3. Is the intent of this order to bonus milk producers or the milk distributors?
4. Has the attention of the government been drawn to communities where dairy distributors retain this bonus while in other communities the dairy distributors pass the bonus on to the producer?
5. What is the regulation in this respect?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. The government subsidy of 55 cents per hundred pounds is paid until April 30, 1944 on such milk sold by producer distributors and on such milk purchased by distributors for fluid milk consumption as the Agricultural Food Board may direct, provided that in areas where the subsidy of 25 cents per hundred pounds is considered by the Agricultural Food Board to be adequate the subsidy shall be limited to that amount.

2. The subsidy is paid by the government to distributors or producer distributors who are required to pay the full amount of the subsidy to the producers of the milk.

3. It is the intent of this order that all subsidies be paid to the primary producers.

4. Yes. In certain isolated instances subsidy has been withheld from the primary producers by the distributor and when drawn to the attention of the agricultural food board and an investigation made, the subsidy was withheld from the distributors concerned and paid directly to the primary producers.

* Preliminary.

5. Distributors when making claim for subsidy must attach to their claim form the list of producers to whom the subsidy has been paid and must certify on the claim form that the total amount of subsidy which they receive has been paid to the primary producers. In cases of producer distributors purchasing milk from other producers, the names and the signatures of the producers to whom the producer distributor paid the subsidy must be entered on the subsidy claim form.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

CANADIAN FORCES OUTSIDE OF CANADA—CURRENCIES USED IN PAY TO PERSONNEL

Mr. COLDWELL:

1. In what currency are Canadian service personnel paid, (a) in Great Britain; (b) in Newfoundland?
2. If in sterling, at what rate of exchange?
3. Do Canadian personnel receive any part of their pay in North Africa, Sicily or in Italy, in other currencies than that of the Canadian dollar?
4. If so, what currencies, and at what rates of exchange?

Mr. McLARTY: Return tabled.

SALE OF AIRCRAFT, AND PARTS AND EQUIPMENT

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West):

1. Has the Department of National Defence for Air disposed of any aircraft, aircraft parts or other equipment?
2. If so, who received the aircraft, parts or equipment?
3. Is the general public allowed to purchase aircraft, aircraft parts or equipment from the Department of National Defence for Air?

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): May I say in regard to this question that a member of the staff of the National Defence for Air came to my office and suggested that the form of this question be amended to read:

1. (a) Has the Department of National Defence for Air disposed of any aircraft?
(b) Has the Department of National Defence for Air disposed of any aircraft parts or other equipment in bulk?
2. (a) If so, who received the aircraft? (b) If so, who received the parts or equipment in bulk?

The third question would remain as printed on the order paper.

CIVIL SERVICE—ADDITION SINCE AUGUST 1, 1943

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West):

1. How many civil servants have been added to the government payrolls since August 1, 1943?
2. Of these, how many are permanent and how many are temporary?

FLEET FINCHES AIRCRAFT

Mr. COLDWELL:

1. What price per unit has the government paid for Fleet Finches aircraft?

[Mr. Gardiner.]

2. What is the overhaul price for this aircraft per unit?
3. How many have been disposed of through salvage?
4. At what prices and to what persons?
5. How many have been sold or otherwise disposed of to any of the united nations?

Mr. MACDONALD: Return tabled.

CANADIAN CASUALTIES IN VARIOUS CAMPAIGNS

Mr. ROY:

What is the list (names and addresses) of Canadian army casualties for Hong Kong, Dieppe, Sicily and Italy campaigns?

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax): The casualty lists show the names of the casualties and the names and addresses of the next of kin. They do not show the addresses of the casualties. I have spoken to the member for Gaspé and he is quite willing to have his question amended so that it will ask for the list of casualties and the names and addresses of the next of kin. The question can be passed in that form as an order for return.

R.C.A.F.—FACILITIES FOR RELIGIOUS WORSHIP

Mr. RENNIE:

What facilities have the R.C.A.F. for religious worship in Canada?

Mr. MACMILLAN: Return tabled.

CANADIAN FORCES—PULMONARY TUBERCULOSIS

Mr. ROSS (Souris):

1. How many men in the armed forces, serving in Canada only, have been discharged from the service on account of pulmonary tuberculosis?
2. Were all of the men so discharged granted pensions for this disability?
3. If not, how many are not receiving such pension, and why?
4. To how many of these men are pensions being paid?
5. How many have been granted pensions for aggravation of this condition?
6. Were all of these men submitted to an X-ray examination on enlistment?

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND FERRY

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland):

1. Have tenders been called for the construction of a ferry boat to serve Prince Edward Island?
2. If so, who were asked to tender, stating tender prices of each?
3. If contract has been let, what is the date, name of firm, contract price and time of delivery?
4. What is the tonnage, dimensions and speed?
5. What type of power plant is called for, stating horsepower and names of builders?
6. Is the boat to be completed by one contractor? If not, state names of any other tenderers of component with cost and description of such equipment?

7. What will be total estimated cost of the boat fully equipped and delivered?

8. Who are the architects and designers, and what fees will they receive?

CANNED VEGETABLES IN STORAGE

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. What was the quantity of canned vegetables being held in storage by the Department of Munitions and Supply or by any board of the government at January 1, 1944?

2. Where are the said canned goods being stored, and in what warehouses?

3. What are the quantities of each kind of canned vegetable?

Mr. McLARTY: Return tabled.

EDMONTON-WHITE HORSE AIRWAY SYSTEM

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. What was the total cost to the dominion government, to December 31, 1943, for the construction of the airway system from Edmonton to White Horse, including both of these points, and including aids to navigation, installations for meteorological services, buildings, roads, airports, lighting and other services?

2. How many airports have been constructed on this route, and what are their names?

3. What was the total revenue received by the government from civil operators flying over this route for each of the years 1942 and 1943?

4. What was the cost of maintaining the meteorological, radio, airport and other services on this route for each of the years 1942 and 1943?

5. What operators or companies have been licensed to operate over this route?

CANADIAN PACIFIC AIR LINES

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. Is the company known as Canadian Pacific Air Lines incorporated under the laws of the Dominion of Canada? If so, when was it incorporated?

2. Who are the officers and directors of Canadian Pacific Air Lines, and what are their addresses?

3. What companies are owned by, or are subsidiary to, Canadian Pacific Air Lines?

4. What functions have been assigned to Canadian Pacific Air Lines by its incorporation?

Mr. McLARTY: Return tabled.

RAILWAYS—INCREASED PASSENGER FARES

Mr. NICHOLSON:

1. Have the railway companies been granted permission to increase fares in Canada?

2. If so, what reasons were given when the request was made for the increase?

3. Will wages be increased to the employees?

CLOVER SEEDS

Mr. McGREGOR:

1. What domestic retail ceiling price per pound has been established on alfalfa, red, alsike and alsike-white clover seeds?

2. Did the special products board by regulation take over the exportation of the surplus of all such seeds?

3. Have any discussions been held or arrangements been made between the British food mission and the special products board or any other organization in Canada respecting the exportation of such surplus seeds?

4. If so, what?

5. Was a price fixed by the special products board for these exportable surpluses?

6. If so, at how much per pound for each kind of seed?

7. On what basis were these prices for export determined?

WINDSOR, N.S., TRANSIT OR EMBARKATION DEPOT

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland):

1. To whom were original contracts awarded for buildings, improvements and fittings in the construction of the transit or embarkation depot at or near Windsor, Nova Scotia, stating description of work and materials, amount of each original contract and time for completion?

2. Were any supplementary contracts or extensions of contracts authorized, stating names, kind of work or materials and costs?

3. Were any cost plus, days work or other special contracts entered into and, if so, state particulars?

4. What have been the total amounts paid to each contractor up to January 31, 1944; also the estimated additional amounts payable to complete contracts?

5. What have been the, (a) tendered costs; (b) actual costs to January 31, 1944, and (c) estimated cost to complete the above, under the following headings: (1) land, (2) drainage and sewerage, (3) waterworks and services, (4) grading and filling, (5) gravelling, (6) roadways, (7) electrical services, (8) other construction work, (9) equipment, (10) total costs?

6. What has been the cost of operating and maintaining the depot to January 31, 1944?

DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland):

1. What appointments have there been since January 1, 1935, to the chief executive positions on the staff at Dorchester penitentiary, stating names, salaries and duties?

2. Have such appointments been for replacements or to fill newly created positions?

3. What positions did such persons fill prior to above appointments, stating locations, duties and salaries?

4. Have there been any promotions from the local staff? If so, give names, positions and salaries?

5. Did the royal commission investigating these penal institutions in 1936 recognize the superior capabilities of the staff at Dorchester?

6. Has the amalgamated civil servants of Canada or the local council at Dorchester protested against failure to make promotions from the staff at Dorchester, and if so, what action was taken?

CANADIAN RECRUITING OFFICES IN UNITED STATES

Mr. WHITE:

1. Does the government maintain recruiting offices in the United States for enlistment in the army, navy or air force?

2. If so, what is the address of each recruiting office?

3. Have any such recruiting offices in the United States been closed?
4. If so, which offices have been closed?
5. What was the rank, pay and allowances, living expenses, travelling expenses, etc., of each member of the staff of the closed offices?
6. How many recruits were obtained through the offices now closed?
7. What has been the total expense of each office now closed?
8. Are there any recruiting offices in the United States still operating?
9. If so, what staff is there at each office?
10. What is the rank, pay and allowances, living expenses, travelling expenses, etc., of each member of the staff?
11. What is the total expense of each office to date?
12. How many recruits were obtained through each office?

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

CONTRACTS BETWEEN GRANBY MINING CORPORATION AND JAPANESE INTERESTS

Mr. COLDWELL:

For a copy of all orders in council, correspondence and other documents relating to contracts made between the Granby Mining Corporation, of Princeton, British Columbia, and Japanese interests, together with a copy of such contracts submitted to the government from time to time for its consideration or approval.

PENSIONS—OLD AGE AND THE BLIND

Mr. KNOWLES:

For a copy of all communications, agreements and other documents, from January 1, 1943, to the present, exchanged between the government, including any department or official thereof, and the governments of the several provinces of Canada, relating to old age and blind pensions; also for a copy of all orders in council dated since May 19, 1943, relating to the same subject.

Mr. ILSLEY: There is no objection to this order passing, provided it is understood that it does not cover a lot of routine correspondence such as correspondence relating to individual pensions and pay-lists covering pension payments. I take it that the hon. gentleman does not want that type of correspondence. If that is understood, the motion may pass.

Mr. KNOWLES: The correspondence that I am interested in is that relating to the total amount of the pension, adjustments in the amount, changes in regulations, and that sort of thing.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion subject to the explanation made by the minister?

Motion agreed to.

WAR-TIME WAGES CONTROL ORDER P.C. 9384

Mr. KNOWLES:

For a copy of all communications relating to wartime wages control order, 1943, P.C. 9384, received by the Prime Minister and/or the Minister of Labour, dated since December 9, 1943, from the Winnipeg and district trades and labour council, the Winnipeg labour council of the Canadian Congress of Labour, the Winnipeg central labour council of the One Big Union, and any other trade union or organized labour bodies in Winnipeg; also for a copy of all replies to the said communications by or on behalf of the Prime Minister and/or the Minister of Labour.

SHIPBUILDING COSTS—GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATELY-OWNED YARDS

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West):

For a return showing, (a) cost of material; (b) cost of labour; (c) amount of overhead cost, of each ship of the 10,350-ton class, and of the 4,700-ton class constructed since the beginning of the war in, (i) government-owned yards; and (ii) privately-owned yards.

Mr. HOWE: I must ask that this resolution do not pass, on the ground that it is not in the public interest to give the information. As hon. members know, my department has consistently taken the position since the beginning of the war that it will not give costs of war materials. I think that aside from the policy, which is also the policy adopted in the United Kingdom and the United States, there are reasons of public interest that the production of one yard shall not be compared with the production of another yard without giving the circumstances which might account for variations in price over a period or from time to time.

Mr. GRAYDON: Mr. Speaker, the time-worn reason given by the minister, that it is not in the public interest, has been resurrected again this session. I quite understand that the minister may think there are special reasons why this motion should not pass. But I would point out that we had a committee investigating the question of shipbuilding, a committee which for similar reasons seemed to find it necessary to sit in camera, and I should like to know whether the people of this country have the right and are entitled to have some information with respect to the money that they are spending themselves through this government in connection with our war effort. If I were satisfied that the disclosing of this information would give help and comfort to the enemy, I think the minister himself would be the first to admit that I would not make such a suggestion, nor would any other hon. member. However, there is a feeling across Canada that umbrage is taken by the government and the ministers when the phrase "not in the public interest" is objected to. I think that the minister ought to go farther in assuring this house before he requests the government and the members to turn down this motion.

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): Mr. Speaker, the difficulty is that these are private yards competing against each other in peace-time work. The conditions in the various yards are not the same. One yard may have a run of the same type of ships throughout the entire season. In that case naturally the costs would be low. Another yard may be asked to build three or four different types of ships in the same yard. Another yard may be primarily a repair yard. We may have forced them under pressure into the shipbuilding business, perhaps against their will, and the yard is doing shipbuilding work and at the same time attending to a great deal of repair work. If I could take the time of the house sufficiently to give an analysis of the reasons for the costs in each case it might be fair to bring them down. My hon. friend suggested that my department refused to give the information to the parliamentary committee.

Mr. GRAYDON: I did not say that at all.

Mr. HOWE: We simply told the parliamentary committee the facts that I am giving here. We said to the committee, "If you insist, we will give the information, but we prefer not to disclose the competitive position of one private yard with another yard."

Mr. GRAYDON: Would the minister do us the courtesy of allowing this particular motion to stand?

Mr. HOWE: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that I am within the rules in raising the objection with respect to this motion. I call your attention to citation 439, which is found on page 136 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, second edition, 1927:

> A motion for a return may be opposed on the ground of public policy, such as that the disclosure of the information sought is not for the public interest, or that its supply would involve unreasonable labour or expense.

The last clause of the citation is particularly applicable because we have not the cost of each individual ship. It would take a good deal of time and expense to analyse the costs of the various yards and bring the costs of individual ships into anything like the same proportion.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Mr. Speaker, this bears out exactly what the member for Lake Centre said, that private members have nothing to do in regard to these important matters. The people believe that, too. We do not get the information that we should have. If we cannot get the information publicly we should get it privately.

Motion dropped.

VICTORY AIRCRAFT LIMITED—J. P. BICKELL

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

For a copy of all letters, memoranda and other documents exchanged, etc., between Mr. J. P. Bickell, former president of Victory Aircraft Limited, and the Honourable the Minister of Munitions and Supply, or other official of the said department, touching on the resignation of Mr. Bickell from the presidency of the said company.

Mr. HOWE: Return tabled.

LABOUR CODE—CORRESPONDENCE WITH PROVINCES

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West):

For a copy of all correspondence exchanged between the government of Canada and the government of each of the provinces of Canada having relation to the drafting of legislation for a labour code or the formulation of a joint dominion-provincial policy in regard thereto, together with a copy of any letters or telegrams or other communications between any minister or official of the federal government and any minister or official of any provincial government relating thereto, from January 1, 1943, to date.

Mr. MITCHELL: That will be subject to the approval of the provinces.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): I do not think they should mind, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MITCHELL: It is not as simple as that.

Mr. GRAYDON: Does the minister mean that if one province out of nine decides that the correspondence should not be brought down the government is relieved of the responsibility of tabling it in the house?

Mr. MITCHELL: The government is not asking to be relieved of anything.

Mr. GRAYDON: You have asked to be relieved quite often in the past.

Mr. MITCHELL: We are not asking to be relieved in this case. It has been the policy as long as I can remember to get the consent of the provincial governments before correspondence between provincial governments and the federal government is tabled. That is the only reason for making the reservation at this time.

Mr. GRAYDON: That point has been argued many times in this house, and the minister has been present on those occasions. No very convincing argument has ever been put forward as to why this government should hide behind the provinces in regard to this matter. There is no cogent reason why these papers should not be brought down. There may be some reason in the government's mind why they should not be brought down, but so far as parliament is concerned there is no valid reason why the minister should take the position he now takes.

Mr. COLDWELL: Is this not a departure from the understanding we had in this house several years ago? I was under the impression that when another government of a sovereign state was involved, the permission of that government should be sought. But we are dealing with the provinces of Canada, and this practice seems to be something new that has cropped up within the last two or three years. I think we are going far afield when we allow the government to say they cannot produce correspondence carried on between the dominion and the provinces on the ground that the provinces must first be consulted. By and by I suppose we shall be told we must ask the municipalities as well because they are the governments of their particular localities. I think we should distinguish very clearly between the courtesies that ought to be followed in our dealings with other nations and the methods we should adopt in connection with the various provinces. I think this parliament has a right to all correspondence passed between the dominion and the provinces, provided that it is not of a wartime confidential nature.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Finance was dealing with the second motion for papers, which also asked for correspondence with the provinces, he made no reservations with regard to the provinces; therefore, I do not see why the Minister of Labour should make any reservations in this instance.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say a word to my hon. friend? This question was discussed at some length last session, and I think the understanding was this. The government has no desire not to bring down correspondence with provinces, but I do think it is what my hon. friend has just said, a matter of courtesy to inform the provinces that this information has been asked for, and to say that we propose to table it unless there is some reason they wish to put forward for not tabling it. Parliament ought to be informed of their reasons, but I do think that courtesy is courtesy, whether between nations or provinces, municipalities or individuals, and I for my part would wish to preserve that courtesy.

Mr. COLDWELL: I agree with the Prime Minister in that.

Mr. GRAYDON: That is different from what the Minister of Labour said.

Mr. SPEAKER: Carried, subject to the reservation made by the minister.

[Mr. Graydon.]

WOMEN'S VOLUNTARY SERVICES

Mr. McGREGOR:

For a copy of all correspondence between the Minister of National War Services or any of his officials and the Marchioness of Reading re receiving a delegation of women from the women's voluntary services of Canada; and a copy of all correspondence between any of the women's organizations in Canada and the Minister of National War Services bearing on this subject; and a copy of all correspondence between the Minister of National War Services and any other sources or personages on this subject.

WAR APPROPRIATION BILL

PROVISION FOR GRANTING TO HIS MAJESTY AID FOR NATIONAL DEFENCE AND SECURITY

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide, *inter alia*,

1. That sums not exceeding $3,650,000,000 be granted to His Majesty towards defraying any expenses or making any advances or loans that may be incurred or granted by or under the authority of the governor in council during the year ending March 31, 1945, for—

(a) the security, defence, peace, order and welfare of Canada;

(b) the conduct of naval, military and air 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 in any other manner whatsoever; and

(d) the carrying out of any measures deemed necessary or desirable 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 under the provisions of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, 1931, such sum or sums of money, not exceeding in the whole the sum of $3,650,000,000 as may be required for the purpose of defraying such expenses or making such advances or loans, the principal and interest of any such loan to be a charge upon and payable out of the consolidated revenue fund.

3. That the governor in council be empowered to reexpend, advance or loan moneys that may be received by way of refund or repayment of advances, loans or expenditure under the War Appropriation Acts of 1939 (second session), 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943 and 1944.

He said: You will note, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution asks for authority to introduce a bill which is designed to provide the appropriation we shall require for war expenditures during the new fiscal year which begins on April 1 next. Except in regard to the amount asked for, the resolution is in exactly the same form as on previous occasions; and similarly the house will find that, with the same exception, the bill itself, when introduced, will be in exactly the same form as the main war appropriation bill introduced at the last session of parliament.

This will be the tenth appropriation for direct war expenditures which parliament has been asked to provide during the present war. It may therefore be of some historical interest if I review the previous appropriations. The house will note that I am speaking of appropriations to cover only Canada's direct war expenditures; I am not including the appropriations for indirect war purposes, that is to say, appropriations to provide munitions and other war supplies to our allies.

At the first war session in September, 1939, parliament voted a war appropriation of $100 million. War expenditures during the fiscal year 1939-40 amounted to $118 million, the remainder of the funds being supplied from the ordinary vote of the Department of National Defence which had been included in the ordinary estimates for the fiscal year.

In May, 1940, parliament appropriated $700 million for direct war expenditures during the fiscal year 1940-41, and on April 4, 1941, voted a supplementary appropriation of $135 million. Direct war expenditures during the fiscal year 1940-41 charged to these two votes amounted to $752,045,000.

The main war appropriation for the fiscal year 1941-42 amounted to $1,300 million, and had to be supplemented by a further vote of $135 million in March, 1942. Direct war expenditures during the year totalled $1,339,700,000.

For the fiscal year 1942-43, three war appropriation acts were passed, one for $500 million in March, 1942, one for a further $1,500 million in June, 1942, and the third for $858 million at the end of the year. Total direct war expenditures during the fiscal year amounted to $2,724,200,000.

These eight votes for direct war expenditures total $5,228 million. Total direct war expenditures to the end of the last fiscal year, March 31, 1943, aggregated $4,934 million, to which should be added loans and advances charged to active assets, of $144 million, making a grand total of $5,078 million. This figure excludes indirect war expenditures to provide war supplies to other united nations.

For the present fiscal year, the house will recall that we passed last spring a main war appropriation act for $3,890 million—in addition, of course, to the Mutual Aid Act appropriating $1,000 million for the provision of war supplies to other united nations. We are still too far from the end of the fiscal year for me to forecast with any accuracy to-day the probable total of our direct war expenditures for the present fiscal year. However, I am hoping that when the accounts for the year are closed, we will find that actual expenditures for the year have run very close indeed to the original estimate we made and that no further funds for this purpose will have to be voted by parliament. Parenthetically, I may add that I expect the mutual aid appropriation of $1,000 million to carry expenditures for mutual aid purposes several weeks beyond the end of the fiscal year.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that the appropriation which parliament is being asked to provide for the coming fiscal year, namely $3,650 million, is somewhat smaller than the provision which was made for direct war purposes for the current fiscal year. Actually the decrease is $240 million, or slightly over six per cent. I need not assure the house that this probable reduction in direct war expenditures, like the corresponding decrease forecast by President Roosevelt in connection with United States war expenditures, does not represent any slackening in the war effort but rather merely the result of the stage of the war and of our preparation for war which has now been reached. The speech from the throne clearly indicated that while the war situation has improved from the point of view of the united nations during the past year, nevertheless the duty of the government is to see that Canada's war effort is firmly maintained until the enemy is defeated in Europe and in Asia. The winning of the war clearly remains the first of all our objectives. The primary task of the government and of the Canadian people is to concentrate on the prosecution of the war and assure our men in the armed forces that there will be no diversion from this vital task and no relaxation of Canada's war effort until victory is conclusively won.

Despite the reduction, the vote asked for is still a huge one, judged by any Canadian standard. Its magnitude and the fact that it is to provide for our direct war financial programme for the new year makes the war appropriation bill the most important by far of the many measures with which the house will have to deal during the present session. As in previous years, the resolution and the bill itself will provide ample opportunity for discussing and appraising not only the war programme which we are proposing for next year but also the record of war activities and war expenditures during the fiscal year now drawing to a close. It will be the purpose of my colleagues and myself to afford full opportunity to hon. members to make such inquiries and

comments as they may wish to make, and to give them pertinent information in as complete a form as may be practicable.

To facilitate such inquiries and debate, I will now place on *Hansard* a break-down, by the main categories of expenditure in the form used last year, of the estimated expenditure of $3,650 million for the fiscal year 1943-44. For the convenience of the house, I am also showing in the same table the corresponding estimates for the current fiscal year. Unfortunately, as I have already indicated, I find it impracticable to be responsible for giving, in addition, estimates of probable actual expenditures under each item during the current fiscal year, but I have no doubt that my colleagues will be prepared to report actual expenditures to some recent date and perhaps also will be willing to hazard rough estimates of probable total expenditures for the various items which come within their own jurisdiction.

The table showing the break-down of the estimated war expenditures for 1944-45 to which I have referred is too long to read, and if the house will permit me I will merely place it on *Hansard* and then direct attention to some of its major features and the more important items.

Mr. SPEAKER: With the consent of the house.

Mr. ILSLEY: The table is as follows:

WAR APPROPRIATION, 1944-45

Summary of estimated expenditures by departments for the fiscal year 1944-45 as compared with the estimates originally submitted for 1943-44

	1944-45		1943-44	
NATIONAL DEFENCE	$	$	$	$
Army Services	1,535,000,000		1,764,000,000	
Naval Services	410,000,000		489,144,967	
Air Services	1,090,000,000		1,129,421,414	
Sundry Services	22,315,827		22,500,000	
		3,057,315,827		3,405,066,381
MUNITIONS AND SUPPLY—				
Administration	9,000,000		9,300,000	
Expansion of Industry and Production of War Supplies	174,000,000		157,000,000	
		183,000,000		166,300,000
		3,240,315,827		3,571,366,381
OTHER DEPARTMENTS—				
Agriculture	73,666,070		14,240,309	
Auditor General's Office	290,600		281,500	
Civil Service Commission	576,500		597,443	
External Affairs	337,425		545,000	
Finance	191,581,325		143,852,000	
Fisheries	690,000		578,000	
Justice	245,712		50,700	
Labour	24,000,654		21,558,192	
Mines and Resources	6,831,826		10,288,135	
National Harbours Board	179,500		53,750	
National Research Council	3,945,507		2,114,708	
National Revenue			4,000	
National War Services	16,494,804		11,651,878	
Pensions and National Health	20,467,980		15,622,130	
Post Office	385,360		183,020	
Privy Council Office	1,077,055		727,858	
Public Works	6,168,000		4,490,000	
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	6,557,871		6,091,320	
Secretary of State	11,000		44,950	
Soldier Settlement	15,000		13,000	
Trade and Commerce	9,799,485		7,296,555	
Transport	12,090,675		8,435,215	
		375,412,349		248,719,663
Provision for Contingencies		3,732,364		4,887,292
Total Estimated War Expenditure		3,619,460,540		3,824,973,336
Active Assets		30,539,460		65,026,664
Grand Total chargeable to the War Appropriation		3,650,000,000		3,890,000,000

WAR APPROPRIATION, 1944-45—*Con.*

Details of estimated expenditures by departments and services for the fiscal year 1944-45 as compared with the estimates originally submitted for 1943-44

Department of National Defence	1944-45		1943-44	
	$	$	$	$
ARMY SERVICES—				
1. Civil Salaries and Wages	16,199,853		8,832,687	
2. Pay and Allowances	547,256,061		539,730,211	
3. Travel, Transportation and Freight	92,957,866		74,190,760	
4. Construction, Purchase, Repairs and Operating Expenses of Properties—				
(a) Capital Expenditure	28,987,000		62,780,482	
(b) Repairs, Operating Expenses and Rentals	51,059,856		46,620,690	
5. Personnel Supplies and Services: Food, Medical and Dental Stores, Clothing and Personal Equipment	159,566,238		185,868,300	
6. Signal and Wireless Equipment, Line Construction, etc	23,599,633		27,826,751	
7. Ammunition and Bombs	182,194,664		273,325,890	
8. Armament, including Rifles, Machine Guns, Mortars and Guns of all Descriptions	104,819,202		123,070,907	
9. M.T. Vehicles: Trucks, Tractors, Trailers, Tanks, A.F.Vs., and Repair Parts	274,068,547		371,853,674	
10. Operating Cost of Mechanical Transport: Fuel, Maintenance, etc. (not including Repair Parts)	30,044,487		35,187,833	
11. Sundries, including Printing, Stationery, Telephones, Telegrams and Other Costs not included in Above Items	24,246,593	1,535,000,000	14,711,815	1,764,000,000
NAVAL SERVICES—				
1. Civil Salaries and Wages	6,511,987		6,192,054	
2. Pay and Allowances	114,698,835		89,565,119	
3. Travel, Transportation and Freight	9,794,479		6,978,000	
4. Construction, Purchase, Repairs and Operating Expenses of Properties—				
(a) Capital Expenditure	17,990,462		36,579,608	
(b) Repairs, Operating Expenses and Rentals	6,715,891		6,267,182	
5. Personnel Supplies and Services: Food, Medical and Dental Stores, Clothing and Personal Equipment	27,846,280		22,015,072	
6. Signal and Wireless Equipment, Line Construction, etc	19,759,334		4,592,188	
7. Ammunition and Bombs	23,835,200		14,245,890	
8. Armament, including Rifles, Machine Guns, Naval Guns, etc	26,458,650		42,415,548	
9. Fuel Cost of Ships	27,806,604		25,257,798	
10. Acquisition, Construction, Charter, Repair and Upkeep of Ships	82,282,000		167,571,202	
11. Naval Stores: Small Boats, Minesweeping, Degaussing, Anti-Submarine, Fire-Fighting and Training Equipment, etc	34,678,967		57,651,110	
12. Miscellaneous Stores and Services: Printing, Stationery, Laundry, Office Machinery, Teletype Rental, etc	8,873,210		6,552,959	
13. Sundries: Postage, Pilotage, Prize Funds and Other Costs not included in Above Items	2,748,101	410,000,000	3,261,237	489,144,967

WAR APPROPRIATION, 1944-45—*Con.*

Details of estimated expenditures by departments and services for the fiscal year 1944-45 as compared with the estimates originally submitted for 1943-44—*Con.*

	1944-45		1943-44	
AIR SERVICES	$	$	$	$
1. Civil Salaries and Wages	22,478,709		18,620,637	
2. Pay and Allowances	323,315,774		238,023,232	
3. Travel, Transportation and Freight	27,345,330		20,838,068	
4. Construction, Purchase, Repairs and Operating Expenses of Properties—				
(a) Capital Expenditure	39,750,000		93,421,100	
(b) Repairs, Operating Expenses and Rentals	17,689,838		13,482,925	
5. Personnel, Supplies and Services: Food, Medical and Dental Stores, Clothing and Personal Equipment	38,515,252		50,451,918	
6. Signal and Wireless Equipment, Line Construction, etc	34,654,365		26,838,773	
7. Ammunition and Bombs	18,175,000		23,990,000	
8. M.T. Vehicles and Marine Craft: Capital Cost and Repairs	7,026,713		10,508,405	
9. Fuel Costs for Aircraft, M.T. and Marine Craft	19,892,038		29,368,636	
10. Aircraft Engines and Spares, including Overhaul	188,947,545		231,846,296	
11. Miscellaneous Stores and Equipment, including Machine Guns and Other Armament	15,992,000		26,623,160	
12. Flying Training Contracts	29,345,667		33,805,829	
13. Maintenance of Overseas Squadrons	345,664,964		303,783,729	
14. Sundries, including Printing, Stationery, Telephones, Telegrams, Teletype Rentals and Other Costs not included in Above Items	8,981,443		7,818,706	
	1,137,774,638		1,129,421,414	
Less Estimated Recoverable Items	47,774,638			
		1,090,000,000		1,129,421,414
SUNDRY SERVICES—				
Departmental Administration	1,774,000		1,526,405	
Experimental Station, Suffield	1,916,810			
Internment Operations	3,730,717		8,430,895	
Dependents' Allowance Board	805,300		657,700	
Dependents' Supplementary Grants Fund	3,500,000		1,285,000	
Inspection Board of the United Kingdom and Canada	10,589,000		10,600,000	
		22,315,927		22,500,000
		3,057,315,827		3,405,066,381
DEPARTMENT OF MUNITIONS AND SUPPLY				
Departmental Administration	9,000,000		9,300,000	
Expansion of Industry and Production of War Supplies	174,000,000		157,000,000	
		183,000,000		166,300,000
		3,240,315,827		3,571,366,381

WAR APPROPRIATION, 1944-45—*Con.*

Details of estimated expenditures by departments and services for the fiscal year 1944-45 as compared with the estimates originally submitted for 1943-44—*Con.*

OTHER DEPARTMENTS	1944-45		1943-44	
	$	$	$	$
AGRICULTURE—				
Agricultural Supplies Board—				
Administration	51,300		43,500	
Programmes to encourage the production of essential war supplies	93,560		177,500	
Assistance in disposal of agricultural products rendered surplus by the war	550,000		1,080,000	
Feeds Administrator—				
Administration	47,125		45,000	
Freight Assistance on Western Feed Grains	16,500,000		8,000,000	
Subsidy on Western wheat used exclusively as feed for livestock	8,000,000		2,000,000	
Flax Fibre Administrator—				
Administration	32,300		30,500	
Fertilizers and Pesticides Administrator—				
Administration	31,850		31,600	
Subventions and Freight Allowances	.....		1,000,000	
Seeds Administrator—				
Administration	19,100		16,500	
Seed Programme	500,000		180,000	
		25,825,235		12,604,600
Meat Board—				
Administration		71,300		71,300
Dairy Products Board—				
Administration	21,690		14,950	
Purchase and Storage of Creamery Butter	.....		1,500,000	
		21,690		1,514,950
Special Products Board—				
Administration	50,190		49,459	
Seed Export Office	29,480			
		79,670		49,459
Agricultural Food Board—				
Administration	68,175			
Subsidies to Producers of Food Products	47,600,000			
		47,668,175		
		73,666,070		14,240,309
AUDITOR GENERAL'S OFFICE—				
Audit of War Expenditure		290,600		281,500
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—				
Supply of Personnel for War Services		576,500		597,443
EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—				
Departmental Administration and Passport Office		142,452		270,500
Representation Abroad		87,000		111,500
Sundry Services		108,000		163,000
		337,425		545,000
FINANCE—				
Comptroller of the Treasury		9,105,355		7,950,000
Wartime Prices and Trade Board—				
Administration	15,600,000		14,300,000	
Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation	140,000,000		120,000,000	
Wartime Salvage Limited, Administration and Losses	500,000		1,000,000	
Canadian Wool Board, Administration	500,000		500,000	
		156,600,000		135,800,000
Old Age Pensions and Pensions to the Blind		6,942,250		
Payments to Millers and Other Manufacturers of Wheat Products		15,000,000		
Housing Conversion Programme		3,755,000		
Sundries		178,720		102,000
		191,581,325		143,852,000

WAR APPROPRIATION, 1944-45—*Con.*

Details of estimated expenditures by departments and services for the fiscal year 1944-45 as compared with the estimates originally submitted for 1943-44—*Con.*

	1944-45		1933-44	
	$	$	$	$
FISHERIES—				
Assistance in the construction of vessels of the Packer-Seiner type		250,000		250,000
Assistance in the construction of vessels of the Dragger type and the conversion of fishing schooners to Draggers		250,000		250,000
Sundry Services		190,000		78,000
		690,000		578,000
JUSTICE—				
Administration of the Defence of Canada Regulations		30,000		35,000
Expenses in connection with Prize Courts		10,000		10,000
Penitentiaries Branch—Purchase of materials in connection with manufactures for War Departments (Recoverable)		200,000		
Sundry Services		5,712		5,700
		245,712		50,700
LABOUR—				
War Emergency Training Programme—Administration	40,460		48,000	
Payments to the Provinces *re* training for skilled and semi-skilled occupations connected with war work	4,000,000		5,200,000	
Payments to the Provinces *re* training for Aircraft Manufacturing and Ground Mechanics	1,800,000		1,950,000	
		5,840,460		7,198,000
Vocational training of discharged Members of Canada's Armed Forces		780,000		525,000
Assistance in meeting extra costs of Universities in accelerating certain courses and to provide loans to certain students		300,000		440,000
National War Labour Board		522,960		468,445
General labour transference in War Industries and Agriculture		500,000		500,000
National Selective Service Programme		11,002,429		8,680,225
Removal of Enemy Aliens from protected areas		2,750,000		3,000,000
Payments to the Provinces in connection with organizing and operating day nurseries and like facilities		250,000		120,000
Assistance to the Provinces in recruiting, transporting and placing labourers on farms		800,000		250,000
Wartime Bureau of Technical Personnel		200,000		220,500
Stabilization of Longshore Labour—Halifax		450,000		
Wartime Labour Relations Board		175,000		
Transfer of ex-coal mine workers back to the industry		250,000		
Sundry Services		179,805		156,022
		24,000,654		21,558,192
MINES AND RESOURCES—				
Mines and Geology Branch—Development of Tar-sands of Alberta			150,000	
Remodelling and expansion of Plant of Abasand Oils, Limited	500,000			
Investigations of petroliferous deposits and of potential petroliferous areas in Canada	145,000		500,000	
Special exploration and development work in connection with the supply of strategic minerals	60,000		500,000	
Assistance to Provincial Governments in construction of transportation facilities into strategic mineral, including oil, properties	75,000		200,000	

WAR APPROPRIATION, 1944-45—*Con.*

Details of estimated expenditures by departments and services for the fiscal year 1944-45 as compared with the estimates originally submitted for 1943-44—*Con.*

	1944-45		1943-44	
	$	$	$	$
MINES AND RESOURCES—				
Mines and Geology Branch—Conc.				
Bureau of Mines—				
Construction of new Metallurgical Laboratory	.....		115,000	
Metallic Minerals Division—				
Services to War Departments	330,000		210,000	
Sundry Services	41,500		80,500	
		1,151,500		1,755,500
Lands, Parks and Forests Branch—				
Bureau of Northwest Territories and Yukon Affairs—				
Expenses of Liaison Officers in connection with the Alaska Highway and Canol projects	10,000		10,000	
Dominion Forest Service—				
Internment and Prisoners of War Operations	52,800		42,445	
Forest Products Laboratories	56,400		34,435	
Alternative Service Work Camps	127,000		79,000	
National Parks Bureau—				
Alternative Service Work Camps	250,000		500,000	
		496,200		665,880
Surveys and Engineering Branch—				
Alternative Service Work Camps	.....		140,600	
Prince Rupert-Terrace-Cedarvale Highway	3,000,000		5,000,000	
Employment of persons of the Japanese Race and /or Japanese Nationals	1,000,000		2,200,000	
Post-War Construction Programme—				
Planning	420,000			
Sundry Services	67,490		22,735	
		4,487,490		7,363,335
Immigration Branch—				
For expenditures in connection with looking after Canadian interests Abroad	475,000		275,000	
To provide single minimum cost of transportation of wives and dependents of members of the Canadian Forces Overseas	100,000		100,000	
Assistance to the National Advisory Committee for Children from Overseas	75,000		75,000	
Sundry Services	46,636		53,420	
		696,636		503,420
		6,831,826		10,288,135
NATIONAL HARBOURS BOARD—				
Halifax Harbour—Operation and Maintenance of fire boats and other fire protection		178,800		53,750
Sundry Services		700		
		179,500		53,750
NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL—				
Special War Activities		3,945,507		2,114,708
NATIONAL REVENUE—				
Censorship of Newspapers, etc	.....			4,000
NATIONAL WAR SERVICES—				
Departmental Administration		90,907		91,335
War Charities Division—				
Administration	59,395		46,000	
Auxiliary Services	12,000,000		7,000,000	
		12,059,395		7,046,000
Salvage Division		310,750		396,965
Corps of (Civilian) Canadian Fire-Fighters for United Kingdom		744,905		957,850
Committee on Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship		46,367		

WAR APPROPRIATION, 1944-45—*Con.*

Details of estimated expenditures by departments and services for the fiscal year 1944-45 as compared with the estimates originally submitted for 1943-44—*Con.*

	1944–45		1943–44	
NATIONAL WAR SERVICES—Con.	$	$	$	$
Censorship—				
Administration	18,345		19,000	
Information and Records Branch	171,900		174,900	
Postal Censorship	1,515,260		1,070,800	
Censorship of Publications	135,355		127,400	
Telegraph and Cable, etc., Censorship	337,040		346,970	
		2,177,900		1,739,070
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation—				
Short Wave Station		150,000		640,000
National Film Board—				
Revolving Fund for Purchase of Supplies	.....		100,000	
Special War Film Library	40,000		40,000	
Acquisition of Film Prints for Sale	30,000		30,000	
Wartime Information Film Programme	660,000		550,000	
Still Photograph Production and Distribution	115,500		.....	
		845,500		720,000
Sundry Services		69,080		60,658
		16,494,804		11,651,878
PENSIONS AND NATIONAL HEALTH—				
Pensions Branch—				
Treatment and Pension Examinations—Members and Ex-Members of the Armed Forces (Present War)	9,000,000		4,225,000	
Treatment—Royal Canadian Mounted Police	110,000		110,000	
Pensions—Armed Forces, Fishermen, Seamen, Special Constables—R.C.M.P., Civil Servants, Auxiliary Services and Civil Defence Workers	8,500,000		3,500,000	
Detention Allowances on behalf of Canadian Seamen	100,000		100,000	
Rehabilitation Benefits	5000,00		400,000	
Sundry Services	94,000		95,000	
		18,304,000		8,430,000
Health Branch—				
Civil Defence	1,038,500		6,589,650	
Industrial Hygiene, including Inspection of Industrial Plants	31,000		24,000	
Laboratory Analyses and Services for the Department of National Defence	27,000		37,000	
Public Health Engineering—Inspection of Camp Sites and Airports for the Department of National Defence in connection with Sanitation and Water Supply	34,000		33,000	
Quarantine Medical Service—At the Ports of Halifax, Quebec, Sydney, Montreal and Other Ports	80,000		98,480	
Processing, Storage and Distribution of Blood for Transfusion	565,000		120,000	
Maintenance, medical and other care of incapacitated non-resident seamen pending deportation	50,000		40,000	
Grant to the Canadian Nurses Association to increase the supply of qualified nurses in Canada	250,000		250,000	
Contribution toward Health Services at Halifax	45,000		.....	
Sundry Services	43,480		.....	
		2,163,980		7,192,130
		20,467,980		15,622,130
POST OFFICE—				
Canadian Postal Corps		385,360		183,020
PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE—				
Statutory Orders and Regulations Division		40,665		22,608
Wartime Information Board		995,707		658,000
Advisory Committee on Reconstruction		25,435		47,250
Sundry Services		15,248		.....
		1,077,055		727,858

WAR APPROPRIATION, 1944-45—*Con.*

Details of estimated expenditures by departments and services for the fiscal year 1944-45 as compared with the estimates originally submitted for 1943-44—*Con.*

	1944-45		1943-44	
PUBLIC WORKS—	$	$	$	$
Chief Architect's Branch—				
Repairs, Alterations, Operation and Maintenance of Buildings occupied for War Purposes	2,300,000		1,530,000	
Rental of Premises occupied for War Purposes	1,900,000		1,500,000	
Furniture, etc., for War Employees	500,000		700,000	
Ottawa—Addition to Temporary Building No. 8, Carling Avenue	300,000		.....	
Post-War Construction Programme—Preparation of plans, specifications, etc	95,000		.....	
Sundry Services	.....		15,000	
		5,095,000		3,745,000
Chief Engineer's Branch—				
Esquimalt, B.C.—Additional Operating Cost	.....		20,000	
Saint John Harbour (Courtenay Bay)—Dredging	100,000		100,000	
North Sydney, N.S.—Reconstruction of Wharf and Terminal Facilities	300,000		.....	
Post-War Construction Programme—Surveys, Preparation of Plans and Specifications, etc	146,000		.....	
Seymour Narrows, B.C. — Removal Ripple Rocks	.....		200,000	
Sundry Services	2,000		.....	
		548,000		320,000
Telegraph Branch—				
To provide for 24-hour service on the Pacific Coast	85,000		75,000	
Ottawa—Telephone Service	390,000		300,000	
		475,000		375,000
Contingencies		50,000		50,000
		6,168,000		4,490,000
ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE—				
Increased Activities of the Force due to the War		6,557,871		6,091,320
SECRETARY OF STATE—				
Department Generally		8,000		39,950
Commission *re* Revocation of Naturalization Certificates		3,000		5,000
		11,000		44,950
SOLDIER SETTLEMENT—				
Alaska Highway—Legal and Survey Fees, etc		15,000		13,000
TRADE AND COMMERCE—				
Export Permit Branch—Administration		153,805		144,160
Canadian Shipping Board—				
Administration	98,300		92,435	
Revolving Chartering Fund	500,000		500,000	
		598,300		592,435
Shipping Priorities Committee—Administration		47,380		59,960
Gift of Wheat to Greece		8,500,000		6,000,000
Steamship Subsidies War Stabilization Fund		500,000		500,000
		9,799,485		7,296,555
TRANSPORT—				
Departmental Administration		36,000		26,960
Transport Controller's Office		392,000		211,000
Director of Merchant Seamen—				
Headquarters Administration	72,480		73,190	
Manning Pools and Training Schools in Canada	1,111,620		898,980	
London Office and Proposed Manning Pool in Liverpool	91,140		.....	
Assistance to Seamen's Welfare Institutions and School of Navigation at Vancouver	25,000		26,500	
		1,300,240		998,670

WAR APPROPRIATION, 1944-45—*Con.*

Details of estimated expenditures by departments and services for the fiscal year 1944-45 as compared with the estimates originally submitted for 1943-44—*Con.*

	1944-45		1943-44	
TRANSPORT—Con.	$	$	$	$
Joint U.S.A. and Canada Defence—Purchase, leasing or otherwise acquiring properties		110,000		.....
Air Service—				
Special Radio Services, Weather Observation and Teletype Services—				
Radio Service	2,666,045		1,761,325	
Meteorological Service	1,670,480		1,366,000	
Civil Aviation Services—				
Airway and Airport Traffic Control	736,450		680,000	
Operation and Maintenance of Municipal (Terminal) Airports	398,260		336,600	
Moncton to Newfoundland Airline	130,500		976,700	
Improvements to Airports	500,000		500,000	
Canadian Government Trans-Atlantic Air Service	400,000		.....	
Canals Service—		6,501,735		5,620,625
Canals Generally	.....		15,000	
Welland Canal	.....		32,000	
Marine Service—		.....		47,000
Marine Service Steamers, including Icebreakers	405,000		275,000	
Aids to Navigation	50,000		50,000	
Nautical Services	86,200		63,460	
Compensation to Masters and Crews of Canadian Vessels for loss of Personal Effects	100,000		100,000	
Railway and Steamship Service—		641,200		488,460
Cost of fitting Canadian Ships, as well as foreign flag vessels either seized in prize or requisitioned by the Canadian Government, with special defensive apparatus	395,000		300,000	
Design, construction and operation of additional harbour and transportation facilities to the Port of Halifax, N.S.	275,000		281,000	
Assistance to the Canadian National Railway Company in the development of the iron ore deposit owned by the Steep Rock Mines, Limited, near Atitokan, Ontario	2,360,000		400,000	
		3,030,000		981,000
Government Employees Compensation Act—				
Administration		79,500		61,500
		12,090,675		8,435,215
PROVISION FOR CONTINGENCIES		3,732,364		4,887,292
Total Estimated War Expenditure		3,619,460,540		3,824,973,336
ACTIVE ASSETS—				
Purchase of Railway Equipment—				
Canadian National Railways—				
1941 Orders	.....		4,883,664	
1942 Orders	8,226,460		24,543,000	
1943 Orders	16,500,000		.....	
		24,726,460		29,426,664
Loan to the Canadian National Railways for the development of the Vermilion, Alberta, Oil Field		313,000		600,000
Advance re purchase by Russia of Canadian Wheat and Flour		.....		4,000,000
Canadian Wool Board Limited		5,500,000		19,500,000
Wartime Salvage Limited		.....		6,500,000
Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation		.....		5,000,000
		30,539,460		65,026,664
Grand Total chargeable to the War Appropriation		3,650,000,000		3,890,000,000

Mr. GRAYDON: Is that in the same form as it was last year?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes. When hon. members have an opportunity to examine the table they will note that in round numbers the aggregate expenditures of the three defence services are estimated at $3,057 million as compared with the original estimate of $3,405 million given for the current fiscal year. Breaking down these totals, we find that army services account for $1,535 million in 1944-45 as compared with $1,764 million in 1943-44; air services $1,090 million as compared with $1,129 million; naval services $410 million as compared with $489 million; and sundry services $22·3 million as compared with $22·5 million.

As I have already indicated, these somewhat smaller figures in each case reflect primarily the stage which we have now reached in the war itself and in our preparations for war. In other words, we have at long last reached, or at least nearly reached, the end of the costly period of preparation for total war, the end of the discouragingly long period during which we, like other peace-loving nations, have been trying to "catch up" in trained man-power, in armoured strength, and in the capacity for making the weapons for war with an enemy who had devoted several years to war-like preparations before he finally "struck" and who had therefore caught us largely unprepared. For the united nations, therefore, the initial years of war were primarily years of holding the enemy at bay by rapidly improvised programmes while we reorientated our whole economy, built new plants and extended old ones for war purposes, mobilized our man-power and trained it in the new technique of modern war and war industry, and gradually built up supplies of initial and reserve equipment considered adequate to knock out a powerful and resourceful enemy already armed to the teeth.

Fortunately, as I have said, we have reached or are reaching the point, varying to some extent in varying fields of equipment and activity, when, thanks to the superiority of our industrial resources and the resourcefulness which characterizes the democratic organization of the united nations, we can deliver against the enemy that overpowering weight of armed power which is essential for assuring victory as well as for minimizing the loss of human lives. What I have been saying applies to the united nations as a group as well as to Canada; for this tremendous mobilization for war against the common enemy has been a cooperative process involving mutual help and the integration of resources of the several nations to a very high extent. Had such cooperation and mutual assistance been lacking, the period of preparation to which I have referred would have taken much longer—perhaps indeed the victory we aim at could not otherwise have been achieved.

The huge war appropriation which this parliament voted last year represented in a very real way the harvesting of much of this prolonged work of preparation. The very large increases in the sums then made available to our three defence services, as compared with those provided in preceding years, were to enable them to fill up their quota of initial equipment and build up reserves as far as practicable. The somewhat smaller sums being asked for this year reflect to a substantial degree the fact that this process is nearing completion and that what is now primarily necessary is to provide equipment and supplies to repair the wastage of equipment and supplies that will accrue in a period of more intense and more continuous war activity, and to keep constantly abreast or ahead of the enemy in the development and provision of new and better weapons which the changing phases of the war require. To some extent also it reflects the completion or near-completion of the construction programme of the three services.

The Department of Munitions and Supply, which is the procurement agency for the defence services as well as for other allied governments in respect of Canadian war supplies, estimates its requirements for the coming fiscal year at $183 million. This compares with the estimate of $166,300,000 for the current fiscal year which I gave for this department at the beginning of the year, although I understand that the funds actually required by this department will, because of working capital requirements, be found to have substantially exceeded this estimate.

For the war activities carried on by all other departments or agencies of government, the estimate for 1944-45 is roughly $375 million as compared with the estimate of approximately $249 million for the present fiscal year. Of this total the two largest single items are $156·6 million for administrative expenses of and subsidies to be paid by the commodity prices stabilization corporation, and approximately $74 million for the Department of Agriculture (including almost $47,600,000 for subsidies to food producers paid through the agricultural food board, $16,500,000 freight assistance on western feed grains, and $8,000,000 subsidy on western wheat used exclusively as feed for live stock). The amounts estimated for other departments are of much

smaller magnitude and compare more closely with the corresponding estimates for the current year.

Finally, there is an estimate of $30·5 million as the amount required to cover cash outlays charged to active assets rather than to expenditure, leaving a small amount for contingencies.

Mr. GRAYDON: The minister has not the total of subsidies?

Mr. ILSLEY: The total estimated subsidies will be apparent from the tables I placed on *Hansard*.

I shall not at this time say more about the details of these estimates by departments and functions. As I said last year, to do so would be needlessly confusing to the house, because it has not yet had time to study and digest the salient features of the table which I have placed on *Hansard*.

It also seems to me unnecessary to dwell at length on the general economic and financial significance of the over-all figures and it is too early for me to present to the house an accurate picture of our probable total expenditures for all purposes during the coming fiscal year.

The main estimates, which I have tabled to-day, show an increase, due primarily to increased interest on the public debt, but on the other hand we expect to be able to effect a considerable reduction in the appropriation which it will be necessary to request for mutual aid purposes. The global figure for government expenditures for all purposes during the coming year is therefore expected to be smaller than the total which parliament appropriated for all purposes during the present fiscal year.

In commenting upon the general significance of the sum requested for direct war expenditures, I wish to emphasize again that it is based on the assumption that Canada wishes to maintain a total war effort—wishes to make the maximum contribution of which it is capable during the coming year to the achievement of victory. That, I believe, represents the point of view of this house and of the country generally. The vast majority of hon. members and of the Canadian people do not wish it to be said of this country that we fought a "comfortable" war—that we stopped short of doing the most we could do to assure victory and, moreover, assure it at the earliest possible moment and with the least possible sacrifice of human lives. On the contrary, I think they will wish to look back on their record in this war in the way that Walter Lippmann looked back to the record of the united nations during the past year. Let me quote from what he wrote on the eve of the new year:

> The year which lies behind us will in the perspective of time be remembered proudly and gratefully. . . .
>
> The nations have been put to the test and they have met the test. Facing defeat, they have not despaired. Confronted with impossible tasks, they have accomplished them. In the judgment of history there will stand forth the grand result, and not the trouble and confusion by which we have reached it. . . .
>
> We may say with sober confidence that we shall have the victory and that we shall come through the ordeal into one of the great epochs of human history. We have faced fearful danger and a monstrous evil; let us not be too timid to believe that in the certain triumph of this righteous cause our children will find peace and the good life again.
>
> Our assurance that this is so rests upon the proved fact that for the greatest things in this enormous conflict—for resistance to evil, for the courage to fight, for patience to wait, the resolution to work, the readiness to endure—our people have not been wanting. It is in the incidental and secondary things that we have been least successful.

I do not contend that everything that he says is applicable to Canadian conditions, athough some of it is. He continues:

> The nagging contentions which disgust us and disgrace us have not been about the central and mighty issues of this momentous struggle. The contentions have been about seventeen cents an hour and two cents a quart for milk, and a few dollars of taxes, and a little more or a little less profit on a war contract; the contentions have been about who should stay in a public office or who should replace him, and how to finagle to stay in and how to manoeuvre to get in. These are the small change of the small transactions of small men who live in the little private worlds of their personal grievances and their private ambitions, while the majestic drama of the great world, which alone can give purpose and meaning to any human life to-day, passes them by. . . .
>
> The great things are going well, and they have been made to go well by thought and work and faith, not by accident and good luck.

There are, I am convinced, very few Canadians who wish to live meaninglessly in comfort or luxury while "the majestic drama of the great world" passes them by; few who fail to realize that we as individuals get out of life what we put into it and we as nations will share in "the grand result" of this struggle in proportion to the contribution we have made towards it. It is true that there were one or two voices raised in this house which have condemned Canada's war effort on the alleged ground that it is "out of proportion to our resources" and indeed—believe it or not—that it is "proportionately greater than that of any other allied country." The facts, I think, speak for themselves. The fact is that our war effort cannot be too big, for the simple reason

that we have been been able to accomplish it. It is a travesty of truth to say that it is proportionately greater than that of any other allied country. We have done well for a small and youthful country; we have done more than the world thought we could do and more indeed than we ourselves ever dreamed that we could do, but he makes a mockery of words who says that our effort and our sacrifices are proportionately greater than the achievements and the sacrifices of the heroic people of Britain and of Russia, or the nameless suffering of the peoples of the conquered countries.

What have we in Canada suffered or sacrificed? I speak not of our fighting men or of families who have lost their loved ones. I speak only of those of us who have remained at home and are supposed to support the home front. Well, the fact is that we have suffered a few inconveniences and sacrificed some chance of profit that fattening on the extremities of other nations might otherwise have brought to us. But when you have said that, you have said all. For the nation as a whole the standard of living has risen substantially, and again on the whole it is higher than it has ever been before. Our national income has risen to unprecedented heights and it is distributed far more equitably than ever before. True, our national debt is also far higher than ever before but the significant thing is that when we take into account lower interest rates and other offsetting factors, we find that the annual burden created by that debt, the net interest charge, is smaller in relation to national income and taxable capacity than the burden of the national debt before the war or even twenty years ago. That debt will create its problem of management, no doubt, but that problem will be by no means beyond our capacity to solve. The key to it will be found in the maintenance of a high level of employment, production and national income.

To that objective we are committed. I have no doubt of our ability to achieve it, if we show boldness and intelligence in our planning and do not allow our constructive efforts to be frustrated by bickering and strife. Fortunately, thanks to the fact that we have conceived our war effort in great and noble proportions, we shall go into the post-war period with many new assets. In particular, we shall have a vastly expanded and more highly diversified industrial equipment, a wide range of newly-acquired skills, a larger, better-trained and healthier population, and a new sense of achievement, a new confidence in our capacity to do great and difficult things. Some of these assets are of an intangible character but they are of the first importance for the tasks that will face us.

Neither now in planning our war effort nor later in planning for the new and better world which we hope it will make possible can we afford to be timid or selfish or short-sighted. We cannot afford to take counsel of small minds or selfish hearts. We must seek to do our best, the utmost of which we are capable.

That is the philosophy which has guided us in planning the war programme which requires the appropriation for which we are now asking. That programme is large and varied, but it is one which we believe we can accomplish.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to delay the house resolving itself into committee to deal with the war appropriation resolution. I rise simply to repeat what I said last session when I indicated to the minister and the government our desire to have before us the details of the expenditures proposed for the further prosecution of the war. The Minister of Finance has now tabled the details for this year.

We are anxious this year, as we were last session, to discharge our obligation and our duty as members of His Majesty's Loyal Opposition. We intend to see that the money which has been raised by taxation, by loan and otherwise is spent to the best advantage. At this moment I think I should caution and warn the government that we are taking a definite stand with respect to war expenditures. The government may expect a closer and more effective scrutiny of each item in the war appropriations than was given last year. There are more people who are conscious of the expenditures of our government. More people in Canada are paying taxes than ever before, and when a man pays taxes his consciousness of public expenditures becomes that much greater.

It will be a strange thing if there is not great waste and great extravagance in certain parts of our effort. Perhaps that may have been expected in the hurly-burly and hurry of the early stages of the war, to which the minister has alluded, but now an entirely different set of circumstances exists. The plan and the chart and the course of the war are known to the government. They have their organization in shape to handle the vast enterprises they are now conducting, and there is not the same reason why there should be any evidence of waste or extravagance in connection with the prosecution of Canada's national effort. Again I caution the government, and particularly the Minister of Finance and the other ministers charged with departments directly concerned with the prosecution of the war, that we shall accept nothing less than the fullest information,

freely and willingly given in reply to the inquiries that we shall put from time to time in the committee stage. We are not desirous of continuing this general debate because we feel that the interests of Canada can best be protected and advanced by allowing the resolution to proceed into committee as soon as possible.

There is an additional reason why I think that at this time neither the house nor the country would wish that time be spent unnecessarily in a general discussion. This nation has been awaiting for some considerable time answers to certain questions which have been put more particularly to the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston). He is here in the house and ready, I understand, to go ahead with his estimates under the war appropriation. I think myself that we have already waited too long for the information he is about to give to the committee when we reach that stage. We are desirous of fulfilling our obligations as an opposition by giving the closest possible scrutiny to every dollar of expenditure which the government is making in the prosecution of the war. Our people do not mind raising the money by whatever means may be necessary, but there is at the same time a corresponding demand on the part of every taxpayer in Canada that we see to it that the money that is raised is properly and efficiently and economically spent, even in the hurry and haste of war. That is something that the taxpayer of Canada has the right to expect. That is something which we here, as members of His Majesty's Loyal Opposition, will endeavour to accomplish by scrutiny, audit and investigation of the accounts.

In taking my seat I want it distinctly understood that I do so not for the purpose of hurrying this resolution into committee but rather because we feel that by facilitating the business of the house in this way we shall the sooner be able to deal with the indivdiual items, which after all are the most important part of the discussion which will follow.

May I before I sit down ask the Minister of Finance two questions. I would have done so while he was on his feet but I was intrigued particularly by the latter part of his address and I did not wish to interrupt him. I should like to know, and I think the country would like to know how much this government intends to appropriate for Mutual Aid during the coming year. I do not think the minister gave that although he came very close to it on one occasion.

I should also like to know the government's plans with respect to the procedure that will be followed in committee. Are we going to follow the same procedure as last year? So far there has been no agreement, as I understand it, among the different parties with respect to the procedure to be followed in discussing the war appropriation resolution this year. I think it is a proper inquiry for me to make in order that we may find out in what sequence the departments will be taken up when we get into committee.

Mr. COLDWELL: Mr. Speaker, we are not yet in committee, and I do not want it to be understood that if the minister now replies to the questions just asked he will be closing the debate, because I do not wish to lose the privilege of saying a word or two.

Mr. ILSLEY: Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the house I can answer the questions now, although we are not in committee. The amount of the Mutual Aid appropriation has not yet been agreed upon. If it were I could state the overall estimate for our total expenditures for the coming year, which I am not yet quite prepared to do. I know what I think the Mutual Aid will be but I do not wish to announce it until I am sure. All I can say is that it will be less than last year.

Mr. GRAYDON: Less than a billion dollars?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes, less than a billion. My hon. friend's other question was as to the procedure this year. I propose that the procedure shall be exactly the same as last year, that the departments be taken up in rotation.

Mr. GRAYDON: In the same rotation?

Mr. ILSLEY: We will take the defence departments first. I do not know about the other departments. There might be some variation there; I have not given any thought to that. At present I can see no reason why they should not be taken up in the same rotation, except that, by agreement, some department might be taken up in advance of another that was expected to be taken up at a particular time. The intention is to follow the procedure of last year.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, we have all listened with a great deal of interest to the statement of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley). Whether or not we agree with his views on social and economic matters, we all respect him and realize that he gives close attention to the work of his department and carries his heavy task with a good deal of honour to himself and to this house.

The expenditure this year, he has said, will be smaller than that of last year, but it is still ten million dollars a day—a very large sum of money for Canada when stated in those terms. We of this party are agreed

that whatever is required of us to win the war should be given without stint, and we are prepared to support the government in all that is necessary in order to carry on the great struggle against the forces which are threatening the freedom of the world.

I did not rise at this stage to discuss the resolution but rather to say a word about the procedure to be followed. The war appropriation is, after all, the biggest budget that this house has to consider during the course of the year—many times larger than the civil budget which we shall adopt later in the session. In looking over the records of the last few years I find that this main appropriation is passed in the form of a bill; the bill becomes an act, and it is unlike any other budgetary act because it has not attached to it the schedules of expenditures. This afternoon I sent for a copy of the new edition of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms. At page 168, paragraph 439, dealing with a money resolution, it is stated:

> The object of the resolution recommended by the crown is to give the house a first opportunity to discuss the advisability of making a certain expenditure. The details of the projected measure are not then disclosed and debate is confined to the resolution which should not be lengthy, although care must be taken that the terms used are sufficiently wide to cover the whole of the bill which will be subsequently introduced.

That is the procedure laid down by the rules of this house. I have thought for some time that the procedure we have followed and apparently are to follow again this year is irregular; it does not conform with the rules. I would not object to irregularity where it served a useful purpose, but in regard to these large expenditures, as the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) said a few moments ago, we should exercise care, scrutinize every expenditure, and adequately protect this nation. Consequently it seems to me that what we should be doing this afternoon is saying to the minister: Yes; we approve the principle of the resolution; let us pass it into committee and recommend its adoption as quickly as possible, so that we may examine the bill to be founded upon it. In short, we should discuss in detail the bill, not the resolution. That has been the procedure of this parliament from time immemorial. We should not be discussing the resolution for days or weeks; we should be discussing the bill and the schedules attached thereto. If the present procedure is allowed to remain as a precedent, it will be a very bad one. I raise the question this afternoon in the hope that the various groups in the house will be able to agree with the Minister of Finance that we dispose quickly of the resolution stage and get down to the actual consideration of the war appropriation estimates when the bill is before us. Let us follow the proper parliamentary procedure and ask the government to bring down a bill at the earliest convenience, say on Monday next.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): I believe that every hon. member looked back with a measure of regret on our performance last year with respect to the war appropriation bill. We spent far too long in more or less rambling and aimless discussions of questions upon the various items which were listed for us in the break-down of the appropriations to the various ministers. In my view that waste of time, or shall I say unwise expenditure of time, resulted largely from the way in which we went about the whole thing. I believe that if the suggestion of the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) were adopted, we would save a great deal of time and be much better satisfied after the whole thing was over.

I believe that all hon. members, and I am sure all hon. members of my group, are fully in accord with winning this war and fully prepared to support the minister to any extent that he deems advisable in carrying on the war. If three and one-half billion dollars are sufficient for him, good; if he asked for more we would support him for that higher figure. I do wish therefore that we could get the resolution off our hands and have the bill before us so that we could discuss the whole matter with much more accuracy and effectiveness.

Mr. A. G. SLAGHT (Parry Sound): I agree with what the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party (Mr. Coldwell) said with regard to bringing in a bill at once and not having a double-barrelled or futile discussion of the resolution itself.

Bearing upon the answer which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) gave to the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) with regard to the amount of Mutual Aid to be brought down this year, and apropos of his statement that the matter was still under review, that it would not exceed the allowance of last year, but had yet to be determined, if I am in order in so doing I would offer for the consideration of the Minister of Finance and his colleagues the suggestion that we should entirely eliminate an allowance by way of mutual aid this year. No other of the commonwealth nations makes any such allowance. Our own contribution in maintaining our own armed forces and our other obligations is heavy indeed. We can be proud of that, aside from an additional

mutual aid allowance. There are many reasons, in my view, to support that suggestion, but now is not the proper time to give them to the house.

I desire to be understood as not including in my objection a special allowance which Canada will be asked to make this year to the organization known as UNNRA, or a contribution with our other allies to feed the starving conquered nations. I think that is an obligation, and that we must make an appropriate contribution; but, except for that, I desire with the greatest respect to suggest to the minister the entire elimination of an allowance for mutual aid.

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

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): A year ago, when I spoke in the house on a similar occasion, I talked about preparation of the army. I now can speak of accomplishments. When I spoke last year the clearing of North Africa had just been completed. I said that the year ahead looked like a year of action, and that if it was the Canadians would be in the thick of events for which plans and preparations had been under way. I said that they were on a front which would in all likelihood prove to be the decisive front of the war. I said that they might fight on that front or on some other; that they might fight as an army or in separate formations; that wherever they were they would be a power to be reckoned with just as Canadians were twenty-five years ago.

To-day the army overseas finds itself on two fronts and I want to speak very briefly first of the troops in the Mediterranean area and of the visit which I made there in November and December. I have made no report to anybody with regard to it except to my colleagues in the government; but I think it is due our soldiers themselves and perhaps due the house that I say just a few words regarding what I saw. I spent three weeks there. I think I saw something of everything. I wished I could have seen everybody. It is not possible to take the house on a day-to-day tour, but I want to do a little more than generalize. I am afraid that half-and-half narrative may prove a dull resume of what was a trip with not a dull moment in it.

I saw the troops in three areas: North Africa, Sicily and Italy. I was in North Africa first and then in Italy, then back to Sicily, then back to Italy again, then back to Sicily and then to North Africa. The troops at that time were distributed, with reinforcements in North Africa and a hospital there. The corps troops were in Sicily with another hospital there, and two divisions were in Italy with hospitals there. I have described the terrain to the people of Canada in something said over the radio from Campobasso. I can only repeat that it is terrain such as I never saw before, and I do not think many of us who were in the last war have seen battle conditions such as I saw in Italy. There were hills in ceaseless succession, longitudinal roads few and far between, narrow winding roads up hills toward the towns on top which had to be taken, and a wonderful opportunity of which full advantage was taken by the enemy in the use of mines on the hair-pin turns and for demolition of bridges.

As I say, I saw first the reinforcements in North Africa. I was there just two days. The troops in North Africa felt they were a long distance away from the war and their one idea and eagerness was to get further forward. They have been moved since then. I saw their hospital under field conditions. It is a hospital with over eleven hundred patients under canvas, operating under what were truly battle conditions without any actual fighting. It was on a hillside. The canvas had been blown down repeatedly. Cooking had to be done on the top of the hill and food carried something like a quarter of a mile in containers to the patients who were in marquees. I found that the hospital had been operating at that time for nearly five months with the highest morale, the greatest energy and the finest efficiency that one could imagine.

Then I went to Italy and saw the forward troops first. I saw the armoured troops disposed on each side of the road, some in billets, but many of them sleeping out in pup tents. I talked to these men as I went along. I remember the first headquarters I visited and the first group to which I spoke. At that time a lump came into my throat as I realized what those men had gone through, because I knew that particular formation and how all the way from Pachino up they had shown their worth.

There I learned what we have to learn in this war, that operations are conducted to no small extent by means of task forces. By that I mean forces which are not necessarily homogeneous in the matter of the particular country from which the troops come or homogeneous in the particular arm of the service to which they happen to belong. The forces are put together because of the teamwork which the various arms of the services can do, and which various men from various countries can do in a combined operations to deal with a particular situation, having regard to the disposition of the enemy, the communications, the terrain, and the ultimate objective. They do not use an armoured brigade when

they can use a battalion; they detach the battalion if necessary for that purpose to make up the force which does the job. That, after all, is what counts. That is happening in the Mediterranean area constantly and is happening more in this war than ever before—the combination of troops from various countries and the combination of various arms of the services in task forces rather than in more normal organization of divisions, corps and armies. That armoured formation of ours had been in all sorts of operations as sometimes doing a task with the British and sometimes with our own division.

When I saw the armoured corps one battalion was not there, and I saw it afterwards, a battalion which had made a magnificent reputation for itself. After seeing the armoured corps I saw the forward troops. I was at one battalion headquarters where they had had a pretty tough time a couple of nights before. They had lost some men. They had sent a detachment to capture a strong feature in front of an important town. They had had to retire and to reorganize. They had sent in another detachment and captured and held the position, and were just as proud as if they had taken Rome itself. They were living under conditions which were pretty grim. There were no funkholes, no trenches and no dug-outs such as veterans of the last war know. They were out in the open under the cold Italian stars with nothing but the groundsheet between them and the cold earth.

I was thrilled by my visit with them. There I learned the fluidity of the so-called line and the fluid and constantly moving nature of the operations. No over-the-top attack at dawn by a line of soldiers getting out of a trench, but fighting done by patrols fighting forward, capturing a post, moving in, then another patrol coming up and capturing another post and so on, zigzagging back and forth, finally getting toward the objective until the time comes when the guns put on the intensive bombardment, and then the assault. On that front that was going on constantly. One could not tell really just where the front was, made up as it was by patrols and by posts.

Then I saw the rear division, first the infantry brigade and later the armoured brigade, keen, anxious, alert, wanting very much to get forward, wondering how long it would be before they would be in the battle area. I knew some of the units, and I was impressed more than I can say with the sturdiness, with the appearance of good health, and with their evident determination to do their part and to keep up the fine record which our first division had established.

I visited the reinforcements in Italy, in perhaps the most attractive town I saw there. It was a touch of home to see, up on one of Mussolini's recreation centres, the sign "Maple Leaf Gardens." The streets of that town are given Canadian names. I visited another town where divisional headquarters was located at that time, where they had the Beaver club and where, by the way—and this is not intended to advertise the Canadian Pacific railway—they also had the Royal York hotel. That was a regular Canadian town. On the streets were hundreds of Canadian soldiers from the support brigades billeted in the nearby villages. They came in for a show and a day off after a strenuous tour up front. I visited, in that one day, I think ten units of the two support brigades, and had an opportunity of saying a word to them, bringing them greetings from Canada, and of bringing messages back from them. I want to say to hon. members that I have never had a more inspiring or more exhilarating or more stimulating experience. They were well turned out, clear eyed, earnest, sure of themselves because they had "been there." I saw the corps troops; they were in Sicily. The second morning before I left the word was going round over the "clothes-line" telegraph that Hitler had capitulated. Everybody was sore; they said this was a phoney war, that they had been sent to Italy when we knew there was no action going on there. That was the story, and they did not like it a bit. I am only sorry to say that since then many of those boys have learned the lesson that many of us in Canada have to learn; that is, that the war is not over and that Hitler has not capitulated. Many stern battles have been fought by those men since I saw them.

I saw another hospital in Sicily, excellently located. They had made a name for themselves in the early days of the fighting. They had lost all their equipment, but with captured German hospital equipment they had set up their establishment and, although they only had about 300 beds, they cleared something like 3,300 patients in sixteen days.

I should have said that I saw in Italy other hospitals, one of which had arrived at its location only the day before, had established itself in a practically new Italian hospital, and had already opened one wing with over 50 patients.

The nurses, medical officers, and personnel of another hospital I visited had been through a trying experience. Their ship was torpedoed and, although fortunately there was not a single casualty, they had lost everything in the way of personal belongings. However by a stroke of luck their hospital equipment was on

another ship, and they expected to be in a position to take 200 patients within two days after I was there.

Finally I visited the assembly place of the dead who fell in Sicily, the cemetery near Agira, looking up at that town which one Canadian brigade captured with such marvellous courage and such dauntlessness in an operation that had been delayed a day behind schedule because of the terrific hun resistance, but which was carried through after the divisional commander himself came up to attend conferences to help replan the operation which carried the town. Not far away were Assaro, Leonforte, Castlenuova, Regalbuto and Adrano, all places where the Canadians had made their mark and their name. I went over the ground with one of the officers who had been in the operation at Agira, and he showed me the method of operating and the difficulties which they had encountered and overcome. That assembly place, I can assure the house and the people of Canada, is a dignified and a worthy resting place for those who gave their lives in Sicily. There, in after years, friends can go from Canada and pay tribute to the men who are gathered there, who sleep a warrior's sleep after having truly fought a warrior's fight.

That is the briefest sort of report on my trip. I saw the commanders, General Eisenhower, General Alexander and General Montgomery; I had an opportunity of talking with them, and I want to say that the cordiality, the informative way they received and talked with me, and the receptive attitude which they displayed, were things for which I was gratified and for which I thanked them on behalf of Canada. We talked straight from the shoulder. They held nothing back. They told me their plans and I told them ours. I cannot tell them here, but I mention this to remind the committee that of course there must be some things that we who have the responsibility for these operations would know and would learn, that would influence decisions, which cannot be explained at the present time. So one has to ask the public to withhold conclusions until all the facts are known. I was tremendously thrilled, of course—and perhaps this was the highlight of the trip outside the visit to the troops—to hear the unanimous, enthusiastic and I may say unsolicited testimony which all three of these high-ranking and experienced officers gave with regard to Canadians and their magnificent work as part of their formations. They were unqualified in their welcome to the Canadians and in praise of their work; if I remember correctly, General Montgomery's tribute was that there were no better troops in any army anywhere.

[Mr. Ralston.]

I have not said anything about the discussions at our forward headquarters in Italy. I visited those headquarters twice, where I had many discussions with regard to administrative matters. There they handle matters affecting our troops right on the ground. Matters concerning personnel, casualties, promotions, supplies and the administrative services are dealt with on the spot. It gave me an opportunity of seeing a well functioning, as I thought, and a well organized headquarters, going concern, in the field of operations.

Among the many things I had to deal with there were three affecting the troops that I might mention. One was mail. Generals may be important; ministers may have some little importance sometimes, but generally speaking the most important man in the unit is the corporal with the mail, and that was impressed upon me time and time again. I want to say to the people of Canada, through this house, that nothing can help keep up the morale of our troops like having mail get to them just as frequently and as quickly as possible. The mail service was not good at the time I was there, far from it; and I want to pay tribute to the Royal Canadian Air Force and to Trans-Canada Air Lines for the work they have done in endeavouring to put on a Canadian service to the Mediterranean. I know it has not worked perfectly, but that has not been the fault of either the Royal Canadian Air Force or Trans-Canada Air Lines. The route they have to fly has its difficulties, its accidents and its contingencies of weather which of course interfere with uniform and regular deliveries. Mail is all-important, and I do not mean mail telling of troubles at home; I mean mail which makes the boys realize that we are behind them, which tells the boys the bright side of life here, because believe me they have enough of the drab side in service out there.

Films were another matter—old films. They complained bitterly about their films being out of date. That condition has been very much improved since then.

The next thing was a paper for the troops. The *Maple Leaf* was established on January 14. It is a newspaper published in Naples, and goes to all the troops in that area now. It is edited by the services themselves. I have seen the troops and—as I told the newsmen at Algiers—after having seen them, and after knowing something at least of what they have gone through and what they had accomplished, the ground over which they had fought and the successes they had won, I never was as proud of being a Canadian as I was that night.

Just one more thing—and it has to do with the sombre side of warfare. Speaking of Agira, and the bit of hallowed ground there, the assembling place for our heroic dead, may I humbly put on record the casualties up to January 8. Up to that date casualties in Sicily and Italy totalled: killed in action, 1,079; died of wounds, 272; unclassified deaths, 3, giving a total of 1,354 deaths. Missing were 299; prisoners of war, 86, and wounded, 4,655. Those figures, of course, have grown since January 8.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) has spoken of the enormous sum of around three billions of dollars called for by him in the resolution. I think the hearts of Canadians everywhere go out to those homes of which the minister spoke—the thousands of homes in Canada represented in these casualty lists. It is those homes which know the real cost of the war. It is not in dollars and cents. The contribution they make is not found in an income tax schedule. Their gift is of the priceless lives and war wounds of those who, to them, were the dearest on earth.

That, Mr. Chairman, is a brief report of the visit to the troops in Italy. I came back more determined than ever to do my best to see to it that they are well served. Anything one can do, any opportunity one has to be associated with men of that kind is a privilege, and something for which I, speaking for myself, thank God.

Let me speak now of the troops in Canada and deal, if I may, with the question asked the other day by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon). There has been a good deal of discussion with regard to the number of troops in Canada. I wish to make it clear, to put on the record and tell the committee what the situation is in that respect. As I explained last year, our troops are divided into operational troops, non-operational troops, troops in training—and now we have made a fourth division, namely disposal and selection centres, where for the time being men are at depots for the purpose of being discharged or of being posted to other tasks.

Included in those operational troops were the 6th, 7th and 8th divisions, to which I referred last year. The leader of the opposition has asked this question: Why were the 7th and 8th divisions disbanded? And this question: If they were disbanded, why were they ever formed? May I say to him and to the house that I said last year that I hoped we would have a reduction in the number of troops in Canada. In connection with operational troops, at that time we had about 80,000. We had assessed the situation with respect to possible scales of attack which might be expected, and those scales of attack had been appraised, along with our friends in the United States who had the same problem there.

Having assessed those scales of attack, the Department of National Defence, and I as minister of that department recommended to the government that we could disband the 7th and 8th divisions, and reorganize the 6th division, because the strategic situation had changed things due to the occupation of the Aleutians.

I think there has been more misrepresentation about the disbanding of the 7th and 8th divisions than perhaps in connection with anything else which has taken place concerning the army. The 7th and 8th divisions were disbanded because it was felt they were not needed longer as operational troops. That is the simple reason. And in disbanding them it was not intended to nor did we discharge physically fit men. The divisions, as divisions, were disbanded, but the men who were in the division either went to other units, to fill them up, or went to the training stream to train and to be fitted for overseas service. N.R.M.A. men in these divisions were sent to other units to relieve general service personnel. Some low-category men were discharged from the service in order that they might fill civilian occupations, and supply civilian needs. It seems to me that was a simple and sensible operation, but it certainly has been misrepresented in this country, and at first at least it was misunderstood in the United States.

I wish to emphasize just that one point, that no man physically fit for overseas service, other than in most exceptional cases, has been discharged, unless on compassionate grounds. The result has been to release more men for overseas service and to raise the average standard of physical fitness in the operational units. That is why the 7th and 8th divisions were disbanded.

Why were they formed? Some hon. members have, I think, very short memories. I want to recall this, that when war broke out with Japan, immediate steps were taken to strengthen the Pacific coast defences. We rushed troops there in the form of extra battalions and thickened our coastal artillery defences. As the Japanese success proceeded—with, I may say, pretty disastrous and alarming rapidity—pressure was increased from all sides to add to those defences in the Pacific coast area.

Pearl Harbor was in December, 1941. In April, 1942, the mobilization of the 7th and 8th divisions was authorized, in addition to the 6th division, and money was subsequently

voted in this house. And there was not a single voice raised against the authorization for the formation of those two divisions. Two months later the Japanese attacked in the Aleutians. And then the possibility of a direct attack on Canada reached what might be called its zenith. Japanese forces were everywhere in the ascendancy.

In the Aleutians they had established an advance base. That meant an advance base in North America. Then it was not a question of whether those divisions should be mobilized, but how quickly we could get them out there. The pressure of that summer was something which I shall not soon forget. And it was not only the army which was built up to resist that attack, because there was heavy pressure from all sides on the navy and the air force. I remember very well that increased air protection was urged, and a very large expansion of the air force on the Pacific coast was made.

That is why the 7th and 8th divisions were formed, and I have just told the committee why they were disbanded. I said that the strategic position had changed. By the end of 1942 the pendulum had swung the other way, and with the reoccupation of the Aleutians in August, 1943—remember the date—it was felt that the scale of attack could be changed. We did not lose any time about it. In September we authorized the disbanding of the 7th and 8th divisions. I do not want to make comparisons with other countries, but I do think we as Canadians can feel that we were at least as forward in that as our good neighbours to the south. It was some time after that before the announcement was made by them with regard to a change in their dispositions. Their desire was the same as ours, to release more men for overseas service. That is the situation and that is the answer to my hon. friend.

To-day in Canada we have three brigade groups. One of them consists of the brigade group which was at Kiska. Somebody will say, "What do you want them for?" I can only say that we want them because we are advised that there are certain scales of attack which are still a possibility. It is all very well just to say, "Let us put the guns in grease and close up on the two coasts", but I want to tell this committee that on Christmas day there was an alarm on the east coast and everybody was standing by. Shortly after that there was an alarm on the west coast and everybody was standing by. I can imagine what the condemnation would have been had there been nobody at those posts to stand at the alert.

[Mr. Ralston.]

We have a training brigade in the east and we have a few infantry battalions. We have troops in Labrador, Newfoundland, in the Caribbean and in the West Indies, all of which are included with the strength of troops in Canada. It is not as though those operational troops were there for just one purpose. The endeavour has been to make them as flexible as we possibly could, and that flexibility is demonstrated by the fact that they are trained for the defence of Canada, as I have indicated, as well as to provide reinforcements if they are needed overseas. They are trained also—and this applies particularly to the Kiska force—for special duties in the Pacific should action make that necessary and should the decision be made to send them there. I think we have a rather tidy situation. I think we have made the best of what we have. We are still at war and we do not know what the future may hold. I contend that it is good insurance to have these troops trained for whatever role they may be called upon to fill.

I have mentioned Kiska. Fortunately Kiska was an operation which resulted successfully without the firing of a shot as far as the enemy were concerned. But I want to say this for the Kiska force and for the organization of it. No better found, no better trained, no more alert a force ever left Canada than that force which went to Kiska. I want to pay a tribute to the organization of the Pacific command and to headquarters for the way in which that force was organized in a comparatively short time and made ready to go. I want to repeat here the thanks which I expressed to the Hon. Mr. Stimson, United States secretary of state for war, when I wrote to him and expressed our appreciation for the magnificent cooperation which was received in that operation from the officers and men of the United States navy and army. It was a perfect example of team work. The fact that we were able to disband the 7th and 8th divisions was due to the reoccupation of Kiska. We are proud that it was reoccupied by the joint forces of the United States and Canada.

I want now to say a word with regard to non-operational troops in Canada. These are the troops which serve the different establishments which we have in this country. These are the troops which provide the service with respect to ordnance and supplies going overseas. These are the troops which supply the training staffs for the centres for training reinforcements for overseas. They comprise a good many different groups and a great many different arms of the service. I shall not trouble to put them on record at this time, but I ask the committee to think, for

instance, of ordnance, army service corps, medical corps, provost corps, veterans' guard, staff clerks. There are many places outside of district headquarters and national defence headquarters where these troops are required. They include the depot at Longue Pointe which is operated principally not only for storage but for the concentration and shipment of supplies to the United Kingdom government. Over three thousand men are employed at this depot. Men of these non-operational troops are employed in ordnance and ammunition service for other countries. There are dental units to service the navy and the air force, as well as service corps and postal corps for the air force. That gives the committee some idea of the activities of these non-operational troops.

I wish we could cut them down. No one more than the minister would like to see them reduced. We have put a ceiling on them and we are below that ceiling now, but not a great deal. We were able to make a reduction of something like three thousand troops in these non-operational units. That does not sound like a large reduction, but it must be remembered that it was made notwithstanding the fact that we have provided certain new units which had not been required before. I refer to the training brigade on the east coast which is doing such a splendid job in training reinforcements, and certain other units which have been formed for the purpose of doing civilian rather than military work, such as port companies and wood-cutting detachments. There have been increases in certain units which were serving other governments and the navy and air force.

I want to stress the fact that the non-operational troops in Canada, and the whole army in Canada as far as that goes, perform a vital service as a base for both equipment and the providing and training of troops for overseas, as well as the provision of administrative services for both the United Kingdom and the Mediterranean areas. When we talk about the size of our army we must look at our army as a whole. We must remember that it is one army, one organization, and that a major task for these troops in Canada is to see to it that the men in the line are properly served.

Now I wish to speak of our overseas army in England and perhaps this would be the appropriate time for me to say something regarding the leave of absence which was granted to General McNaughton and which has been the subject of a good deal of comment. On December 27, I issued a statement to the press with regard to General McNaughton as follows:

The Minister of National Defence announced to-day that following the recent illness of Lieutenant-General A. G. L. McNaughton, medical authorities have advised that he has developed a physical condition which will necessitate freedom from all military responsibility for an extended period.

General McNaughton has advised the government of his inability physically to carry on and has asked to be relieved as soon as possible.

In these circumstances and in view also of the requirements of impending operations, the minister stated that the Canadian government, with great regret, had decided to grant General McNaughton several months' leave of absence from service and to relieve him of command of the First Canadian Army. The minister paid tribute to General McNaughton's outstanding service to Canada and hoped that after a period of rest and recuperation his unusual talents would be available to serve his country in some capacity less exacting than in command of an army in the field.

Lieutenant-General K. Stuart, present chief of the general staff, has been appointed chief of staff at Canadian military headquarters, London, and Major-General P. J. Montague will continue as Major-General in charge of administration at Canadian military headquarters, London, taking that title and as judge advocate general, Canadian army overseas. Pending the appointment of a successor to General McNaughton, Lieutenant-General Stuart has been appointed to the acting command of the First Canadian Army.

The minister stated further that Canadian troops in the Mediterranean had been increased to constitute a Canadian corps under Lieutenant-General H. D. G. Crerar.

The important points were that medical authorities had advised that the general had developed a physical condition which would necessitate freedom from all military responsibility for an extended period and that General McNaughton had advised the government of his inability physically to carry on and had asked to be relieved as soon as possible, and that the government had decided to grant General McNaughton several months leave of absence from service and to relieve him of command of the First Canadian Army.

The advice of the medical authorities was contained in two reports which were transmitted to the Prime Minister on General McNaughton's direction and were also given to me.

The first report came to me about November 29 when I was in the Mediterranean area, and the second when I returned to England about December 10. The reports were as follows:

Department of National Defence
Army
26th November, 1943.

To D.M.S., C.M.H.Q.
Re Lieutenant-General A. G. L. McNaughton, D.S.O., M.C.

The above noted officer was first examined by me during the winter 1941-42. At that time he had an area of localized pneumonia at the base of his left lung. He was also in a state of fatigue.

He was again examined by me in the spring of 1943 for an acute respiratory infection. At this time it was also noted that this officer was suffering from fatigue. On both occasions he showed a persistent hypotension.

For the past week he has been under supervision for a recurrence of his respiratory tract infection and has again shown evidence of being definitely below par.

To-day, Lieutenant-Colonel G. C. Ferguson and I have examined General McNaughton. We are both agreed that he is below par and would strongly recommend that he be given leave of absence, and freed from all military responsibility for three months; at which time he should be reexamined.

Provided he is not exposed to undue hardships it is our opinion that General McNaughton could carry on his present duties for a limited period.

L. C. Montgomery.
Col. L. C. Montgomery,
Consulting Physician for DMS.

G. C. Ferguson,
O i/c Medical Division,
No. 12 C.G.H.

The other is dated December 11, 1943, and reads as follows:

Examination of Lieutenant-General A. G. L. McNaughton, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O.

Lt.-Col. Ferguson and I have again examined Lt.-General A. G. L. McNaughton, this date, and agree that he still shows definite signs of exhaustion.

We recommend that he be relieved of all military responsibilities as soon as possible.

We also recommend that this period of rest be for not less than three months.

L. C. Montgomery,
Col. L. C. Montgomery,
Consulting Physician for D.M.S.

G. C. Ferguson,
O i/c Medical Division,
No. 12 C.G.H.

Mr. GRAYDON: At whose request was this last examination made?

Mr. RALSTON: All I know is that this report was transmitted by General McNaughton's direction to the Prime Minister by cable. I was not in London at that time, if I remember correctly. I may have arrived there on the 10th or 11th but I am not too sure about that date. I know nothing of the request. As I say, this was transmitted to the Prime Minister by cable by direction of General McNaughton.

Mr. GRAYDON: Were any of these examinations suggested by the government?

Mr. RALSTON: Not that I know of.

Mr. GRAYDON: Are you sure?

Mr. RALSTON: They were not instigated or suggested by me in any way. All I know is that these were transmitted by General McNaughton's own direction to the Prime Minister.

About the time I received the second report I received a message from General McNaughton through Major-General Montague, Senior Officer at Canadian Military Headquarters, dated December 7, when I was still in the Mediterranean area, or on the way, which was as follows:

Dear Price,

That is Major-General Montague.

Dear Price,

This is just a note to say that the experience of the past few days has shown me conclusively that I have not the strength left to look after the Army properly, and to do, with the required effect, the many things that need to be done from day to day.

Will you please give this message to Mr. Ralston for me, when he arrives, and say that I think the general interest requires that someone else should now take charge, and that I must and will accept the situation with the best grace I can muster.

Ever yours,

A. McNaughton.

Major-General P. J. Montague, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., M.C., V.D.,
The Senior Officer,
Canadian Military Headquarters,
2 Cockspur street,
London, S.W.1.

I immediately set about making arrangements in order that the general might go on leave as early as possible.

The result was that Lieutenant-General Stuart, Chief of the General Staff, who was being appointed Chief of Staff at Canadian Military Headquarters, was also appointed acting in command of the Canadian Army pending the time when a successor to General McNaughton would be appointed.

I saw General McNaughton personally on the 14th and again on the 21st of December.

Mr. GRAYDON: Is that the first time the minister saw him when the minister was over there?

Mr. RALSTON: Oh, no, I had seen him two or three times before I went to Africa.

Mr. GRAYDON: Did you discuss his health with him at that time?

Mr. RALSTON: No.

Mr. GRAYDON: He did not mention his health to you?

Mr. RALSTON: No. I think he spoke of the strain he was under at that time. On the 21st I gave him a copy of the press announcement which, with a slight change not relating to him, was published on December 27 and which had had the approval of my colleagues. I advised him that General Stuart would go to see him almost at once about taking over

and to arrange for the beginning of his leave as of December 27. I wrote him on December 22 confirming this, and enclosing a copy of the press statement which I have quoted.

The Prime Minister in a statement issued on December 27 fittingly expressed the regret of us all and paid the tribute due regarding the outstanding service which the general in his high posts has rendered.

I feel that the house and the country would like to have that statement on *Hansard*. It was as follows:

The word that General McNaughton has found it necessary to relinquish the command of the First Canadian Army will be received throughout Canada with feelings of the deepest regret. Especially will this be the case because of the present condition of his health.

General McNaughton's exceptional abilities as a scientist, coupled with his record as a soldier, marked him out as one particularly suited to plan a modern mechanized military force. With this part of Canada's war effort, he has been most intimately connected from day to day through the whole course of the war.

All Canada will recall the confidence which General McNaughton helped to inspire in the dark days of 1940. After the withdrawal from Dunkirk, the First Canadian Division was one of the few formations available in Britain equipped with weapons to fight. As General McNaughton's division grew to a corps, and then to an army of two corps, he accepted the growing responsibilities and faced the new problems with the utmost skill and devotion.

Weeks and months and years of waiting made heavy demands upon all the Canadian forces in Britain. They made especially heavy the burden of responsibility upon the army commander. Until now few will have realized the great strain under which General McNaughton has worked through years of unremitting tension. It is a strain which has been the greater for him through the loss in action of a gallant son.

During General McNaughton's command, the training and organization of Canada's army overseas has been brought to a very high level. The Canadian units who went into action with the Eighth Army in Sicily last July, and who are to-day fighting with such determination in Italy, have won the highest praise for gallantry in action and for stubborn courage and resolution under fire. Some of this praise belongs to General McNaughton. It reflects the fighting spirit which will always be associated with him as commander of Canada's army overseas.

General McNaughton's health has prevented him from carrying on, as he would have wished, until the end of the war. He has, however, the satisfaction of knowing that his work has been a large factor in contributing to the successes thus far achieved by Canada's army, and that it will have its part in the supreme effort needed to attain ultimate victory.

All Canada will wish for General McNaughton a speedy restoration of his health, and that his exceptional abilities and wide experience may long continue to be at the service of our country.

General McNaughton is now on leave, as recommended by the medical authorities. We are all glad to know that he is making good improvement, and I repeat most sincerely what I said to him in my letter of December 22, that the only thing for him to do now is to devote all his endeavours to getting well.

I am sure that the house and the country will join in wishing for Mrs. McNaughton and for him, as well as for ourselves, that he may have a speedy and complete recovery and many years of usefulness in the service of Canada.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that with the rumours and so-called "inside", "off the record" reports which are current, there might be a desire on the part of members of the house and others to make inquiries here or elsewhere as to the truth or otherwise of these rumours and reports. We could go into all of this as well as any other matters relating to the subject. I would prefer not to do so because such discussions can, to say the least, do no possible good, especially at times like these.

If you ask me whether General McNaughton and the government were always in absolute agreement in everything, I would undoubtedly answer "no." General McNaughton is a man of strong character and strong opinions. He is no "yes-man". The government is the representative of the people of Canada and charged with the responsibility of administering Canada's war effort and the affairs of Canada's army. From what I hear at times, the minister apparently is not a "yes-man" either. That there should be at times divergence of views between the military and the government is inevitable. But I can say that those differences of opinion have not interfered in any way with the loyal carrying out of plans when a decision has been reached. I can say, too, that those differences of opinion have never altered in any way the high regard in which the government holds General McNaughton both as a man and as a soldier.

I can only hope that General McNaughton will be allowed to get the rest and recuperation which he is seeking, free from the worry which a controversy would entail. I hope also that the house and the country will recognize that the important thing at this time is to carry on with the pressing activities of the war and to give wholehearted support to those who are now and who may be charged with the responsibility of leading the Canadian forces in the battle theatres.

Before I deal further with the army overseas—

Mr. GRAYDON: May I ask the minister one question?

Mr. RALSTON: Well, I wonder if my hon. friend would allow me to go on.

Mr. GRAYDON: It is a pretty pertinent one.

Mr. RALSTON: I know, but there will be plenty of time.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): If the minister would rather not have any questions asked about General McNaughton's retirement until he completes his statement—

Mr. RALSTON: I have completed my statement as to General McNaughton.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Then this is the logical time.

Mr. RALSTON: With deference, I do not think it is. I am endeavouring to make a connected statement.

Now with regard to the army overseas—

Mr. GRAYDON: I was just endeavouring to help the minister clear up the whole situation. I was going to ask him one question by which I think we can entirely clear the air.

Mr. RALSTON: If my hon. friend would permit me—

Mr. GRAYDON: It is for the minister to say, but I think it would be preferable if he would permit the question now.

Mr. RALSTON: Now with regard to the army overseas, in England the work and preparation go on. We have there an army headquarters, army troops and a corps. I want the committee to realize, if I can bring it home to them, just what that means—an army headquarters, army troops and a corps. A corps consists normally of two or three divisions. Then there are corps and divisional troops. We have over there reinforcements, the hospitals, the forestry corps, base installations, ordnance workshops and depots, the Canadian Women's Army Corps, and administrative services. They all have their tasks and they are training to fit into the plan of operations. I had an opportunity, both before I went to North Africa and the Mediterranean area and after I came back, particularly the latter to visit quite a number of units and formations which form the Canadian army overseas in England. I cannot tell this committee how keen they are or how hard they are working to put their years of training and preparation to the test. The waiting time for them is past. At last they can see ahead the prospect of striking the blow which will tell to shorten the war and hasten the day of return.

There is a lot written and a lot said about the army, and with all due respect I am not sure that even this committee understands just what is the composition of our forces overseas. I should like to put on record a very brief explanation of what constitutes that army, so that there will not be the apparent misunderstanding and, I submit, sometimes misrepresentation with regard to that organization.

In the first place—I am dealing with an editorial which I saw the other day—the army overseas does not consist of six or seven divisions. Some editor said that just the other day. Second, the army in Italy does not consist of three divisions. The army that is in England and in Italy consists of one army headquarters, that is officers and other ranks, signallers and so on, having to do with the operational and administrative services and the necessary troops in order to carry on those services. In addition to army headquarters, there are army troops—I will explain that in a moment—two corps headquarters, corps troops, and five divisions. That is the army overseas, both in England and in Italy. I want to make it quite clear that while for organizational purposes we divide the troops into groups, and have troops known as divisional and corps and army and line of communication and G.H.Q. troops, it does not necessarily follow that units included in those groups fight with and serve only the units within that particular group.

Whenever formations are organized, and particularly the larger formations of divisions and corps, it is always necessary to provide, with the units of the division or of the divisions forming the corps, a certain proportion of units which are required to support those formations.

What is a corps? A corps consists of a headquarters, certain corps troops, and two or more divisions. The corps headquarters is so organized that it can direct and administer two or more divisions. Corps troops are provided on the basis of a certain proportion for each division allotted to the corps. Quite often the division itself throws off a certain number of troops of certain units and hands them over to the corps commander in order that he may use them to serve either one division or the other, or both perhaps if they happen to be in the line. It may be signals, it may be artillery, it may be line of communication troops, contributed by the two divisions to the corps headquarters to serve the divisions which are in the line, and if one is in a tough spot, extra corps artillery may be put behind them.

As I have said, we have two corps, each with a headquarters. We have allotted two divisions to one of these corps, the one in Italy, and three to the other. One corps with its two divisions and an armoured formation and an appropriate proportion of army troops is in Italy under the command of Lieutenant-

General Crerar. The other corps with its three divisions and another armoured formation is in the United Kingdom.

But we have something more in the United Kingdom. This is what seems to confuse people. We have the First Canadian Army headquarters and the remainder of the army troops which have not been allotted to the corps in Italy.

What is an army? I have said that a corps is an organization which administers, supports and directs two or more divisions. An army is an organization consisting of a headquarters, and army troops supporting, servicing, directing two or more corps. The army headquarters and the army troops in England at the present time—let the committee not forget this—were authorized and organized two years ago when we expected major activities across the channel. And there was not a single objection to it at that time. Then what happened?

Until the middle of 1943 the army stayed as a whole in England, because it was represented to us that that was where the job was. Some people said it was because the government were afraid of having the army do any fighting. Other people suggested that it was because the army commander wanted to keep it together. The truth is that the Canadian army overseas was there to be used, in whole or in part, as would best serve the allied cause. As has been said again and again, the army overseas was kept in England because we were given to understand that that was where it could serve the best in those lean days when Britain had to stand on the defensive. But if we kept these troops in England until the time came to strike across the channel it meant that the whole Canadian contribution in land forces overseas would be thrown into battle without any of them ever having any experience under battle conditions or having heard a shot fired in anger, except the very few who might be attached for short periods to British formations in other theatres. That was the situation which we had to face in the early days because the allies were on the defensive, but it was a situation we could cure when the allies assumed the offensive and we took steps to do it.

In November, 1942, the North African show came along. Canadians were not in it. I was in England at the time and went immediately to inquire why, and was given, as I have already stated in the house, what I considered were good and sufficient reasons for not adding a Canadian component to the British and American forces at that time. Once more I underline the flexibility of our organization, and that our willingness to serve did not mean "all or nothing"; that it meant "in whole or in part."

In the spring the Sicilian operation was planned and the government learned of it in due course. The Canadian government suggested that Canadian troops be employed as part of the force and eventually a request was received for a division. The division went. It joined the redoubtable Eighth Army. The story of thirty-nine days' fighting in Sicily and six months in Italy is a golden page in Canada's war history.

After prospects faded for activity across the channel in 1943, we sought opportunity to give battle experience to more of our officers and men, not only to another division but to a corps headquarters, corps troops and army troops as well. It would be, we thought, a direct contribution to victory in driving out the enemy, but as well, it would give the Canadian army battle-trained officers and men to be available to be drawn on to help season and steady and inspire our troops in England when their job came.

We pressed for the inclusion of another division and of a corps headquarters in Italy. The arrangement was made. Another division was sent. The corps headquarters was sent, corps and army troops were sent, and to-day we have a self-contained formation on that front as part of the Eighth Army. In England we have the other corps headquarters, corps troops, three divisions and the remainder of the army troops.

As I have said, we have in England army troops and an army headquarters. What do we do with them when we have only one corps remaining in England? The answer is that those who are conducting operations are extremely glad indeed to have that army headquarters there with those army troops in order that they may direct and administer and support the Canadian corps along with other formations of British or other allied troops which may be put into the same army organization.

What were the alternatives? Well, there were two. One was to disband the army headquarters and the remainder of the army troops. If we did that it simply meant throwing away the benefit of long training of a highly efficient team at army headquarters and putting our corps in England under some new headquarters completely strange to our personnel and conditions. The disbandment of Canadian army headquarters would simply leave a vacancy in the order of battle of the combined armies, and would require replacement by another headquarters drawn from British or allied sources. It would do no

good to our common cause to disband a headquarters, which through long training with our troops had become a well coordinated and highly efficient team. By the disbandment of the remainder of the army troops we would to that extent be injuring the common cause, by dispersing trained and hardened fighting and administrative troops, and, at the same time, we would be creating a fresh demand upon the already heavily burdened British or allied forces for exactly the same units which must come from some other source, in order to support our forward formations of corps and divisions.

The other alternative—the first, as I have mentioned, would be to disband the army headquarters and troops—would be to hand this headquarters organization and these army troops over to the allies and let them officer it to suit themselves. We have chosen neither of these alternatives. We propose to keep our army headquarters and our army troops to serve our own Canadian corps in the United Kingdom, and whatever formations of our allies are included with ours. It follows that any allied formations placed under the control of our army headquarters would bring with them the appropriate proportion of corps and army troops for their support.

In a word, we have an army headquarters to control and administer, and army troops to support our corps, and we have the reinforcements for them. We are going to use that army headquarters and these army troops as a Canadian organization to add to our contribution to victory and to provide the world with further demonstration that Canada is "all-out" in her war effort.

I believe that Canadians will feel that Canada is hitting on all six cylinders with a self-contained corps in Italy with autonomy and self-dependence equivalent to the Canadian corps in the last war. In England we have another corps with its proportion of army troops, and in addition to that we have an army headquarters which we expect will have the distinction of having under its control, not only our own corps and army troops but such other formations and units of the allied countries as may be allotted to it.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall I report progress?

Mr. GRAYDON: Mr. Chairman, in rising to a point of order I think it is only fair that I should give notice of the question that I intended to ask the minister who did not seem to want to answer it this afternoon. My question is whether or not any factors, other than that which he mentioned of ill-health, entered into the resignation of General McNaughton?

[Mr. Ralston.]

Mr. RALSTON: I shall deal with that.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall I report progress?

Mr. ILSLEY: Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Chairman, I think I should say something about the suggestion made by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar and concurred in by the hon. member for Lethbridge, namely, that we should change our procedure this year and by general consent conclude the discussion on the resolution at an early stage.

The CHAIRMAN: Has the minister the unanimous consent to continue?

Mr. ILSLEY: Do I need unanimous consent to continue?

Mr. GRAYDON: If you do, you have it.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes; I think that we are prepared to agree with the suggestion, but I am just a little doubtful whether the discussion would cease as early as it is hoped that it would. However, I agree with the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar that discussion on the resolution should be short.

Mr. GRAYDON: Are you prepared to bring down the bill?

Mr. ILSLEY: I have not been able to get the house to agree. I have tried to get resolutions out of committee by saying, "Let us talk about this on the bill." Now that someone else proposes it I agree with the proposal, but I have never been able to get the house to agree with me. When we get to the bill we shall do on one section of the bill exactly what for the last three or four years we have done on the resolution; that is, the departments would have to be taken up one by one in order and fully discussed, which, I think, might have the effect of doing away with some duplication, if we can get the resolution reported.

Mr. GRAYDON: Would the minister include the estimates in a schedule to the bill?

Mr. ILSLEY: No; that is the point I want to make clear.

Mr. GRAYDON: There is not much use in making a change unless you do that.

Mr. ILSLEY: That cannot be done because there must be elasticity in the expenditure of these funds. In a war you cannot say how much you need for one purpose rather than another purpose. These are estimates at the present time. There must be transfers from one item to another, from one department to another, in a great many cases.

Mr. GRAYDON: Does that not answer the whole thing? If you are not going to add a schedule, why change the arrangement?

Mr. ILSLEY: To get rid of some duplication. I suggest to the leader of the opposition that he think about the matter between now and Monday. It depends very much on what he says about it. I am just going along the way I did last year and the year before because the house would not vote the money, they would not pass the resolution giving us billions of dollars unless they had an account of our expenditures of the year before. They never would do it. If they will do this year I shall be very happy.

Mr. GRAYDON: You would be the first one to ask the same questions if you were leader of the opposition.

Mr. ILSLEY: I do not know if I would or not.

Mr. GRAYDON: If you did not you would not be a very good leader of the opposition.

Mr. ILSLEY: I am not disagreeing with anybody. I am just saying, if you do agree with the suggestion of the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar, I am agreeable.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. COLDWELL: No. I think it depends upon the addition of the schedule.

Mr. GRAYDON: Everything depends upon that.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is what I had in mind, anyhow.

Mr. GRAYDON: If you are not going to have the schedule let us go on as we were. I think the decision can be made now.

Mr. ILSLEY: All right.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the house adjourned at 6.12 p.m.

Monday, February 14, 1944

The house met at three o'clock.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

WARTIME WAGES CONTROL ORDER P.C. 9384—MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT UNDER STANDING ORDER 31

Mr. P. C. BLACK (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, I ask for leave under standing order 31 to move the adjournment of the house for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely the urgent need for postponement of the application of the wartime wages control order, 1943, P.C. 9384, which order otherwise becomes effective February 15, 1944, which is to-morrow.

Mr. SPEAKER: A copy of this motion was given to me just before I entered the house. The question of the adjournment of the house must depend upon the urgency of the matter involved. I am not in a position to be fully aware of that urgency, so I would ask the hon. member to let me know the degree of urgency upon which he would base such a motion.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): Under the terms of the order in council to which this motion refers, Mr. Speaker, it becomes effective February 15, which is to-morrow. The matter is urgent, because if the application of the order is not postponed it will become effective to-morrow, with its many objectionable features, without members of parliament having an opportunity to discuss it. Therefore I consider it most urgent that the application of the order be postponed.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): May I say to my hon. friend that the order has been in force since December 9, 1943. I have in my hand a copy of the wartime wages control order, 1943, P.C. 9384, dated at Government House, Ottawa, Thursday, December 9, 1943. It was approved at that time. There is one clause in the order which does not become effective until the 15th of this month; that is, a provision giving employees certain advantages through having the cost of living bonus embedded in the wage rate, and having wage scales based on that basic rate. The effect of the postponement of that particular clause, as requested by my hon. friend, would be simply to deprive labour of at least one provision in the order which I think labour would very much wish to have retained. At any rate the order is in force at the present time, and my hon. friend's motion is not a correct statement of fact.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say something with respect to the matter now before the house. When the Prime Minister speaks of the order in council having been effective or in force since December, the date of the order, he must remember that one of the major provisions of the order will become effective to-morrow. So important does labour regard this, that during the last few days there have been protests from one end of the country to the other. And when the Prime Minister talks about taking away something from labour by not having this order applied to-morrow, I suggest that he should not be so far out of tune with labour sentiment. Only yesterday in this city there was a largely-

attended labour meeting which asked not only for the postponement but for the rescinding of this whole order in council. The fact that the hon. member for Cumberland has brought this matter before the house is only a reflection of the views of labour from one end of Canada to the other. I am convinced, despite what the Prime Minister says, that this is the last day before the order in council comes into full force and effect, and therefore urgency is a prime factor in the matter.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, this is not the time to debate the question of the order. It is a matter of stating, with respect to a motion which is before the house, whether what is set forth in the motion is or is not correct. The fact that there have been a number of meetings held—and we all know how these are arranged—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): How are they arranged?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, my hon. friend, I suppose, has as much knowledge of those matters as I have.

Mr. GRAYDON: I do not know what the Prime Minister means by that, but if he is insinuating that there is someone behind the scenes arranging meetings of labour, then I say that is not correct.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not think the point is one which needs to be discussed. What I was going to say about these meetings is that they reveal the extent to which representations have been made with respect to the order, not only in the house but throughout Canada, which are not correct. The people have been led to believe that the order was not to come into force until a certain time, namely, the 15th of this month. As a matter of fact the order has been in force for over two months, since December 5 in fact. And so far as I can see no one has suffered by it. Indeed, we are now being told that it should not be put into force to-morrow, lest once in force somebody might perchance suffer from the consequences of it.

The clause which was not to come into effect until to-morrow is No. 16, as follows:

16. No employer shall, except in accordance with a written direction of the National Board in any payroll period commencing on or after February 15, 1944, pay wages to an employee in an occupational classification for which he is required to establish a single rate or range under section 15 of this order, at a rate other than a single rate or a rate within a range established in the manner therein prescribed for such classification.

The manner prescribed is to see that that basic rate contains not only the former rate, but also an amount calculated by way of bonus, embedded in it as part of the rate. The fact the hon. member and others have been under the impression that the order has not been in force up to the present time shows that there has been a good deal of misleading information and some misleading expressions with regard to it. However, I made clear a day or so ago that the government has under consideration certain amendments. Representations have been made by hon. members and representatives of labour and others, and I have stated that very shortly we expected to have certain amendments made to the order. I therefore cannot see why there is any urgency with respect to the order being discontinued at this time.

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few observations on this matter, and particularly as to the urgency of it. I believe the point raised by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Black) is a good one. As the Prime Minister has pointed out, the order has been operative, with the exception of its financial aspects, since December.

I am always afraid of how legislation of this kind may be administered. As I view it, the postponement of the order now will not cause labour to suffer the loss of any benefits which might accrue to them because of the application of the order with respect to the bonus. They are now being paid the bonus; they are receiving that money now. It is merely a matter of changing it from a bonus arrangement to basic rates. What I am afraid of if the order becomes operative to-morrow is that the minimum of thirty-five cents an hour, which the order sets out as being grossly unjustifiable, will be applied by the national war labour board. There are many organizations now negotiating agreements with employers across Canada who have not that particular angle to contend with. If the board is permitted to apply the financial aspects of the present order, in my opinion it is going to militate against organizations now in the process of wage negotiations. That is what I am afraid of—that the board will take as its only latitude in permitting increases the basis now set out in the order, "gross inequalities" meaning thirty-five cents an hour. Consequently it will interfere with the functioning of regional boards, which are now making examination of the wages in different places and with different organizations. They have some latitude, and can make decisions. Under the new order they are not permitted to make any decisions unless they are ratified by the national board. The only scope the national board will have in making adjustments in wages is in respect of the financial aspect of

the order to be declared operative to-morrow. I cannot agree with the Prime Minister when he says that labour would receive any benefit from the bringing into effect of the provisions of the order which are not at present operative.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I do not wish to prevent my hon. friend from speaking, but there is a time when this matter can be debated. I might point out that it has already been debated in the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne. Then there is a bill on the order paper with respect to the wages control order that would make the discussion of the wages control order at this time out of order. Moreover I have given the house the assurance that the matter of amending the order will be discussed again before very long. What we have before us is a motion which states as a fact something which is not a fact; and, not being a matter of fact, the grounds upon which it is suggested action should be taken fall completely. I submit it is for Your Honour to say whether this is the time to discuss this particular question, and more particularly on a motion which does not set forth the facts.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have listened to the submissions by hon. members with regard to the urgency of the matter. Citation 176 in Beauchesne, third edition, states:

> The "definite matter of urgent public importance" for the discussion of which the adjournment of the house may be moved under standing order No. 31, must be so pressing that public interest will suffer if it is not given immediate attention.
>
> On the 2nd of November, 1932, a member asked leave to make this motion for the purpose of discussing the necessity of immediate action being taken by the house to investigate the financial position of a certain life insurance company and the conduct of its senior officers, as disclosed by a recent police court investigation in Chicago. The Speaker ruled that the motion should not be allowed, because he did not think the matter mentioned in the member's statement was of recent occurrence nor so urgent that the proceedings of the house should be halted so that it may be discussed. There must be a prima facie case of urgency.

On page 741 is to be found a ruling given by the Hon. Mr. Rhodes, then Speaker of the house. It reads:

> (b) "Urgency" within this rule does not apply to the matter itself, but it means "urgency of debate" as the ordinary opportunities provided by the rules of the house do not permit the subject to be brought on early enough and public interest demands that discussion take place immediately.

The right hon. Prime Minister has stated what I had noted, that the motion concerned the urgent need for the postponing of the application of the wartime wages control order, 1943, being P.C. 9384. This order otherwise becomes effective on February 15, 1944. The facts as stated by the right hon. Prime Minister are that the order in council in question is now in effect and therefore it does not come within the last sentence which states that it becomes effective on February 15, 1944. It is very difficult for the Chair not to accede to a request by an hon. member to adjourn the house to discuss a matter which is evidently much in the minds of hon. members, but the Chair must be satisfied that there is that degree of urgency which would make it absolutely necessary that it be discussed in order that no injustice should be done either to hon. members of the house or to the people of Canada. In the circumstances as I now have them I must come to the conclusion that there is not that urgency which would justify me in allowing this motion to be put before the house.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, I have the greatest respect for your position and I have the highest regard for Your Honour—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland). —because of your fairness, dignity and ability to discharge your duties as Speaker, but in view of the urgency of this matter, and in view of the protests that have been made by all parts of Canada, I desire with the greatest courtesy to appeal from your decision.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not deciding a point of order. Standing order 12 reads:

> Mr. Speaker shall preserve order and decorum, and shall decide questions of order, subject to an appeal to the house without debate. In explaining a point of order or practice, he shall state the rule or authority applicable to the case.

I am not dealing with a question of order. I am dealing with a question of the opinion of the Chair, and I take it that my opinion is not appealable by the house.

Mr. NEILL: The Prime Minister raised a point of order and you gave a decision.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The Prime Minister raised a point of order.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I did not raise the question. May I say that in regard to matters of urgency the practice is for the hon. member to confer with the Chair in advance and obtain the agreement of the Chair that it is a matter of urgency.

Mr. GRAYDON: No.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I submit respectfully to Your Honour that you gave a

decision on a point of order and therefore this motion is either in order or out of order. Whatever you may conclude, that is your decision, that is the judgment of this court on a question of order, and certainly it is appealable.

Mr. SPEAKER: Standing order 31, subsection 3, states with reference to the member who desires to make the motion:

He then hands a written statement of the matter proposed to be discussed to the Speaker, who, if he thinks it in order and of urgent public importance, reads it out and asks whether the member has the leave of the house.

I take from that the decision rests entirely with the Chair. The Chair must decide whether it is in order. In this case I was not required to decide a point of order. What I did say to the hon. member for Cumberland was that I wished him to give reasons to support his claim of urgency in the matter. I repeat the standing order:

He then hands a written statement of the matter proposed to be discussed to the Speaker, who, if he thinks it in order and of urgent public importance, reads it out and asks whether the member has the leave of the house.

I did not think it in order; therefore the hon. member has not the leave of the house.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I respectfully point out to Your Honour that the custody of the rights of this parliament rests with the members of parliament themselves. When a question arises as to whether or not the ruling of Your Honour is a proper ruling, surely there does not arise, as Your Honour would suggest in this instance, the right of the Speaker to make a decision quite apart from reference to the house itself. This would be particularly so when a part of the house has asked that the opinion of the house be tested on this point. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Black) now asks that the opinion of the house be tested, and we are prepared to rise in sufficient numbers in order that the opinion of the house shall be tested now.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend has just referred to the custody of the rights and privileges of hon. members of the house. These are in the care of His Honour the Speaker. My hon. friend well knows that at Westminster, from which we take our example in these matters, it is not only the tradition, it is the custom and the practice of the house, to obey the Speaker in his rulings as largely as possible and to have very serious grounds before taking exception. I do submit that if this house is to get on with its business in the way in which it should, it is important that we should not be indifferent to the opinions expressed by the Speaker and begin a practice of appealing from the Speaker's rulings time after time without number. A lot of time of the house has been wasted in that way in previous sessions, and I do submit that the decorum and business of the house will both be furthered by hon. members accepting the rulings of the Speaker unless there are the strongest of reasons to the contrary.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would refer hon. members to page 747 of Beauchesne, third edition, on which is reported a decision by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Black), who was then Speaker of the house. I quote:

The Speaker's refusal to permit an appeal from his decision that it is not urgent to adjourn the house for the purpose of discussing an urgent matter of public importance being appealed from was confirmed by the house.

Leave had been asked under standing order 31 to move the adjournment of the house for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, which was stated to be:

The recent dismissal of between 200 and 300 officers and men of the Royal Canadian Air Force without regard to their families, their overseas service or their period of enlistment or service, and the embarrassing situation which may arise if they were forced by the necessity for employment to accept service with another nation.

Mr. Speaker ruled that the statement was not in order and that the matter was not one of urgent public importance and moreover that there was no appeal from his decision.

Mr. Ralston appealed from the Speaker's refusal to permit an appeal from his decision.

And the question being put by Mr. Speaker: Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained; it was decided in the affirmative.

Mr. GRAYDON: I did not quite hear one part of that quotation. Was it the present Minister of National Defence who made the appeal at that time?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Why not? It killed the air force.

Mr. POWER: Sabotage of the air force by the government of the day.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): You began the sabotage back in 1923.

Mr. SPEAKER: The appeal was made by the present Minister of National Defence.

PRIVILEGE

MR. GARDINER—REFERENCE TO STATEMENT OF MR. COLDWELL IN DEBATE ON FEBRUARY 10 AND EDITORIAL IN OTTAWA "CITIZEN"

On the order for motions:

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege I wish to make a statement with

reference to a charge made when I was out of the house on Thursday last, which was commented on by the Ottawa *Citizen* in an editorial this morning, February 14, and which concerns my actions as a member of this house. The first reference is to my not having been in the house at the time this matter was discussed. At page 337 of *Hansard* of February 10, 1944, the following is recorded:

Mr. Coldwell: Page the Minister of Agriculture, somebody says. I should say so.

Some hon. Members: Where is he?

Mr. Douglas (Weyburn): Probably scared.

My answer is that on Thursday last I entered the house and checked the speaker's list to see if anyone from the C.C.F. group was listed to speak, as I expected a reply to what I had said the day before. There was no member of the C.C.F. listed to speak. I remained in the house until the member for Camrose (Mr. Marshall) took the floor and then went to my office to fulfil other engagements. I am informed that after I left the house the member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) arranged to take the time previously allotted to the leader of the Bloc Populaire and answered in my absence what I had stated the previous day. If his name had been on the list I certainly should not have left the house and would not have needed paging.

While I was absent he made this statement, as reported in *Hansard* at page 334,

And let me say that there has been no more devastating machine in the democratic world than that organized by the Minister of Agriculture in the province of Saskatchewan. Let me say to the house that employees of the federal government were there in force with cars belonging to the Dominion of Canada. We made a check of them. I have before me only a partial list of some of the cars that were present during the time I myself was in that constituency. I saw some of them there parked outside the hotel where I was staying, which also happened to be the headquarters of the Liberal party. We took a number of car numbers; all Saskatchewan licence numbers of the dominion Department of Agriculture, P.F.R.A. Regina.

No. 20475	No. 20444
No. 20471	No. 20452
No. 20474	No. 20458
No. 20456	

Mr. Graydon: They must have been a fleet of jeeps.

Mr. Coldwell: No. They were not jeeps. Some were fine modern cars, including one fine maroon car which I am told the minister himself drove on one occasion to attend a political appointment. Who paid for the gas and upkeep of the cars? The people of Canada. But the political machine is so brazen in the province of Saskatchewan that it dared to do this sort of thing in the midst of a by-election. And so, when the minister talks about regimentation, let me remind the house that no other province in this dominion, at any time, has been regimented in poverty by a political machine to the extent that Saskatchewan was regimented during the depression years. Unless you were a member of the Liberal party or had a recommendation from that party you found it difficult to get relief work.

There are certain statements in the *Hansard* report to which I wish to refer because they reflect upon my activities as a member of this house and of the government.

At page 334 of *Hansard* the minister for Rosetown-Biggar—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Not minister yet.

Mr. GRAYDON: Keep the record straight on that.

Mr. GARDINER: He just missed being a minister by two years—a minister of the church. The member for Rosetown-Biggar stated at page 334:

Let me say to the house that employees of the federal government were there in force with cars belonging to the Dominion of Canada.

Answer: There was not a single federal government employee who had a car belonging to the Dominion of Canada which was being used for political purposes in the constituency of Humboldt during the by-election to my knowledge.

Again at page 334 the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar states:

We made a check of them. I have before me only a partial list of some of the cars that were present during the time I myself was in that constituency. I saw some of them there parked outside the hotel where I was staying, which also happened to be the headquarters of the Liberal party.

An hon. MEMBER: What was he doing there?

Mr. GARDINER: I do not assume my hon. friend is suggesting that the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar was staying at the headquarters of the Liberal party. He happened to be in the same building.

Answer: Mr. Speaker, I have before me the full list that was taken down by the C.C.F., not only the 7 numbers quoted in *Hansard* but the full list of cars, the numbers of which were taken down by the C.C.F. and referred to the licence office at Regina for check, and this will provide a sufficient answer to that statement. The cars are as follows—this list is rather long, containing 29 car numbers and names of owners, and I will put them on *Hansard* unless it is the wish of the house that I read them.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Read them.

Mr. COLDWELL: Read them.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Is this our war effort?

Mr. GARDINER: If it is the wish of the house I will read them. The numbers are as follows:

21025 Department of Natural Resources, Federal Government, Regina.
20458 Dominion Department of Agriculture, P.F.R.A., 910 McCallum Hill Building, Regina.

Mr. GRAYDON: Put them on *Hansard* without reading them. We could not discuss labour matters just now, which is a much more important matter than Saskatchewan elections.

Mr. GARDINER: I am quite sure that if I did not answer the charge that has been made it would take more time to do it in the country than to deal with labour, when my hon. friends opposite get out there. Then, if it is the wish of the house, I will put the remainder of the list on *Hansard*. It is as follows:

20067 Arnold W. Loehr, farmer and provincial civil servant, Muenster.
20533 Saskatchewan Pool Elevators, Limited, Humboldt.
8147 John Deere Plow Company, Saskatoon.
765 Waldemir Yanchinski, farmer, Yellow Creek.
5493 Senhouse D. Noble, farmer, Colonsay.
2202 Lake of the Woods Company, Limited, 34 Cambridge Court, Saskatoon.
25357 William L. Dutton, farmer, Govan.
25983 William S. Nobbs, farmer, Portreeve.
20452 Dominion Department of Agriculture, P.F.R.A., 910 McCallum Hill Building, Regina.
20444 Dominion Department of Agriculture, P.F.R.A., 910 McCallum Hill Building, Regina.
20639 Archibald McCallum, 2910 Angus street, Regina, organizer.
2022 Ryan Brothers, Limited, James street, Winnipeg.
20456 Dominion Department of Agriculture, P.F.R.A., 910 McCallum Hill Building, Regina.
20474 Dominion Department of Agriculture, P.F.R.A., 910 McCallum Hill Building, Regina.
2914 T. M. Ball Lumber Company, Limited, 614-9th Street, Saskatoon.
21843 August J. Kruse, Humboldt, farmer.
20471 Dominion Department of Agriculture, P.F.R.A., 910 McCallum Hill Building, Regina.
21322 John F. Anderson, organizer, 7 Banner Block, Regina.
79938 August Kachur, farmer, Lanigan.
75069 Mrs. Elsie Tallentire, housewife, Whitewood.
58315 William Bernesky, farmer, Connel Creek.
57166 August Delke, farmer, Jansen.
4080 Russel William Ley, Viscount, farmer.
20475 Dominion Department of Agriculture, P.F.R.A., 910 McCallum Hill Building, Regina.
20731 Francis L. Brennan, salesman, 2530-11th avenue, Regina.
2812 The Wadena Nurseries, Canada Building, Saskatoon.
5737 Massey Harris Company, Limited, 1st avenue, Saskatoon.

[Mr. J. A. Ross.]

It will be noted that in that list there is one federal car not mentioned by the member for Rosetown-Biggar, namely the first, and three operated by officials of the provincial governments, who, I presume, cover the territory in their ordinary work. What does this list together with the list placed on *Hansard* by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar, indicate? It indicates first that what the C.C.F. did was to take the number of the cars standing outside the hotel in Humboldt at which the member for Rosetown-Biggar was a guest, send the entire list to Regina to be checked, take from the list cars which were registered as the property of the Department of Agriculture of the federal government; and then, without any further check, the member for Rosetown-Biggar makes a charge against me as a member of this government on the ground that because the Liberal headquarters were in the hotel the cars must have been used by employees of the federal Department of Agriculture for political purposes.

In the first place the member could not have stopped in the room in which he did in that hotel without knowing that the engineers of P.F.R.A. had a drafting room on the second floor of the hotel, which was occupied by them throughout the summer, before, during and after this election campaign, until the construction of the dam was agreed to.

The member for Rosetown-Biggar further states:

We took a number of car numbers; all Saskatchewan licence numbers of the dominion Department of Agriculture, P.F.R.A., Regina.

The list above shows they took a number of car numbers and selected a group of seven which they found to be P.F.R.A. cars registered at Regina. The list and the work being done by those operating these cars is as follows:

20458. This car is operated by M. B. J. Brockman, who has been stationed at Humboldt for several years on small water development. His car is always stationed at Humboldt, but my information is that it was not used in the election.

20474. This car is operated by Mr. Ed. Hogan, who resides just outside the Humboldt seat but who did some inspection work in the constituency during the election while Mr. Brockman was on annual vacation leave.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Mr. Speaker, is this a matter of urgent public importance?

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): I rise to a point of order.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): This is all out of order. There is no question of privilege here.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): I ask for a ruling, Mr. Speaker, as to whether the statement read by the Minister of Agriculture is of urgent public importance.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): It is a question of privilege.

Mr. GARDINER: The statement was made that I as a member of the government ordered and directed the use of cars owned by the government for political purposes during an election campaign; and as a matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I have the right to reply to that statement, made not only in this house but outside.

Car No. 20452. This car is operated by Mr. L. D. McMillan, district engineer in that district, who is in charge of the investigation work on the proposed water supply dam in Wolverine creek. He was also in charge of the drafting room in the hotel. Mr. McMillan is an engineer who comes from the province of Manitoba and about whose politics I know nothing.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. the minister is going through a list of cars. I do not know just what his object is, but in so far as he is identified with any of the cars—

Mr. GARDINER: They all come under my administration.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Engaged to win the Saskatchewan election.

Mr. GARDINER: A statement was made that I was using these cars in an election campaign in the province of Saskatchewan, utilizing public funds to purchase gasoline in order to operate the cars, and I am stating who was using them and for what purpose, to refute the statement just repeated.

Mr. COLDWELL: I think the minister should be allowed to make his statement of privilege.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Let us quit the war and have an election.

Mr. GARDINER: Car No. 20475. This car is operated by R. Peterson, engineer who was making soil tests in connection with the foundations necessary for the construction of the Wolverine water project.

Car No. 20444. This car is operated by Peter Hyndman, agricultural supervisor under P.F.R.A., who made a survey and report on the agricultural benefits of the Wolverine water project.

I am positive that none of these last three men who were working on the project throughout the summer of 1943 took any part whatsoever in the by-election. Any part which the other two might have taken would only be what any citizen resident in the area is free to take under our democratic institutions; but they did not use federal government cars for political purposes during the election.

Car No. 20471. The information I have is that this car was operated in Manitoba early in the season but was turned over to Saskatchewan during the season, but that it at no time during the election was in or near Humboldt.

This leaves the car which is at headquarters in Regina, No. 20456, and which is placed at my disposal when I am in the province. I drove this car to the constituency, used it on certain occasions while there and drove it back to Regina later. I paid for my own gasoline while it was out, as I always do. The government did not pay for any gasoline in any car used for political purposes during that election, and no one of the cars listed above excepting 20456 was used for political purposes to my knowledge. To the extent that I drove the car in and out of the constituency and on a few occasions while I was in there it may be said that car was used for political purposes.

The Ottawa *Citizen* comments in these words on the last paragraph of the quotation from the remarks of the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar, which I have given:

> It is not a pretty picture that Mr. Coldwell draws. No doubt Mr. Gardiner will enter a trenchant rejoinder. But how does Mr. King feel about it? He is perhaps obligated to Mr. Gardiner to some extent for election in Prince Albert.

There are two objections that I raise with regard to that comment as being unbecoming of a newspaper when referring to a member of parliament. The first is that it suggests that Mr. Coldwell's inferences are based upon facts, without any further examination of the records. The records indicate they are not. Second, it suggests that what Mr. Coldwell infers was done in Humboldt—namely that government officials driving government cars operated on government gasoline, were directed by the Liberal organization under Mr. Gardiner—was no doubt done in the past to elect Mr. King in Prince Albert. I only wish to state that Mr. King has been elected five times in Prince Albert, the first time in spite of a campaign put on by an eastern newspaper which sent to Prince Albert the Stevens charges of 1926 just off the press and Mr. J. J. Maloney.

Mr. GRAYDON: I rise to a point of order.

Mr. GARDINER: Mr. King at no time—

Mr. GRAYDON: I rise to a point of order. I want the hon. minister to sit down until I get through with my point of order. After all I think I have the right to rise to a point of order.

Mr. GARDINER: But I have the floor. I have the right to sit down before you get so angry about your rights.

Mr. GRAYDON: I am not going to argue the matter with the minister. I do not mind going a certain distance on this matter of privilege, but when it comes to reading into the record a whole lot of political propaganda, directed, I presume, at some other party now in the house—I have no idea to whom the minister is referring—I object to his bringing in these extraneous matters.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): He is replying to an attack in the press.

Mr. GRAYDON: You sit down, too.

Mr. GARDINER: The Prime Minister has won each election on that record.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Sit down; Mr. Speaker has not ruled.

Mr. SPEAKER: I gathered from the statement made by the minister that he was referring to matters which came within the question of privilege, but he must show that the latter part of his remarks also comes within the confines of a question of privilege so far as he is concerned.

Mr. GARDINER: I could read the *Citizen;* I have it here. It suggests—

Mr. SPEAKER: The question of privilege refers in part to the Prime Minister, not the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): The Prime Minister can speak for himself.

Mr. GARDINER: I have the editorial here. After giving what they call the picture of the organization in Saskatchewan they suggest that I used the same methods in Saskatchewan in order to elect the Prime Minister. I am giving the house the answer to that.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): An attack upon you.

Mr. GARDINER: Mr. King at no time has suggested, nor would he agree, that anyone should conduct a campaign in his interest on anything but his record and policies. He has won each election on that record and those policies. The only person who has ever approached me to manipulate the organization of a Saskatchewan constituency to get a seat without opposition for anyone is Mr. Bowman of the *Citizen*. When I told him I had no such power or authority he refused to believe me. If he wishes to discuss that further I am prepared to discuss it with him, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COLDWELL: On a question of privilege, the minister in the course of his remarks left the inference that I had deliberately avoided making a speech in his presence. May I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that on the afternoon in question I saw the Deputy Speaker as soon as I was able to do so, which was quite early. He told me that Mr. Raymond was ill and that if I saw the chief whip of the Liberal party I might be able to follow Mr. Perley, who was speaking second.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Did you have to get their consent?

Mr. COLDWELL: There was a speakers' list. I want it clearly understood the inference that there was some understanding between Mr. Raymond and myself is utterly without foundation. At no time did I speak to anyone other than the Deputy Speaker and the chief whip of the Liberal party. I want to make that very clear.

BORDER CROSSINGS

SURRENDER BY CANADIAN CITIZENS OF REGISTRATION CERTIFICATES ON ENTERING THE UNITED STATES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege; since we are having a field day, I have one of my own. On the first day of December last, as a law-abiding citizen of Canada I had occasion to go to the United States. I had diligently prepared myself with a passport and a permit from the foreign exchange control board. I carried in my pocket, as I have since August, 1940, my national registration certificate. At the border a very courteous young customs officer, whom I know very well and whom I am glad to call my friend, approached me, asked me for the paper given to me by the foreign exchange control board, and demanded my registration certificate. I asked him under what authority he acted. He said he did not know, but those were his instructions. Not wishing to have an altercation with him I gave it to him. It has never been returned to me. I am now a law-breaker in this country and liable to be taken at any time by the mounted police and run into the calaboose on Nicholas street by reason

of some order of this government over here, which so regiments our lives as to make us lawbreakers willy-nilly. When am I going to get back my national registration certificate?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, on February 9—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I want an answer. I want to know from the responsible officer of this government when I am going to be put in order as a law-abiding citizen. I want to know what right there was to take away from me my national registration certificate and make me willy-nilly a lawbreaker. I have been going around the country in fear and trembling lest some mounted policeman take me by the neck and demand my registration certificate or in default put me in gaol. I want an answer from the government.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Minister of Mines and Resources): I am not certain whether the complaint that the hon. member has made is against an official of the Department of Mines and Resources or against an official of the Department of National Revenue.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): National Revenue.

Mr. GRAYDON: He is not rum-running.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It must be War Services.

Mr. CRERAR: To that extent the department I represent is in the clear, and I suggest to my hon. friend that if he goes to the Minister of National Revenue and gives the date and the name of the polite customs officer who kept his registration certificate, the Minister of National Revenue will endeavour to get it back, and if in the meantime it should have been lost, I am sure there will be some way of getting the necessary authority to issue my hon. friend a new national registration certificate.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Why should I have to do anything?

Mr. CRERAR: I quite agree.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): We are in agreement. Then send it back.

Mr. CRERAR: Has my hon. friend brought it to the notice of the Minister of National Revenue?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I have not. It is not my business to do so. It is their business. Send it back. That is the attitude I take; and I will not ask for it, either.

Mr. CRERAR: Well, the Minister of National Revenue is not a mind-reader, and neither he nor any other member of the government knew about my hon. friend's certificate.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): But you are responsible for the officers of your department.

Mr. CRERAR: We will try to get it cleared up.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Send me back my certificate.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): There was a government notice in the newspapers.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West). —that everyone crossing the border had to give up his registration certificate—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): You can make all the noise you like; it does not bother me. If a member of parliament does not get back his registration certificate, what about the public, who do not know how to get theirs back? The hon. member's certificate has not been returned, and there was this notice in the newspapers that anyone crossing the border had to give up his registration certificate. If the hon. gentleman does not get back his certificate, what about other people? I think it is up to the government to give an answer to this at once.

Mr. GRAYDON: Before this matter is decided, I want to raise a point. We have not received an answer from the government to this very important question. What the hon. member for Peterborough West says is pertinent; it is germane to the whole issue, because there must be thousands of people—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

An hon. MEMBER: Put it on the order paper.

Mr. GRAYDON: I am going to ask the government this question, which is a supplementary one, and I demand an answer.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): How is this in order under "motions"? If the hon. member got up on a question of privilege, he was entitled to do so, but this other discussion is out of order.

Mr. GRAYDON: I rise to a question of privilege myself on behalf of thousands of people, not just one person. Is this policy still in effect?

Hon. C. W. G. GIBSON (Minister of National Revenue): As far as the Department of National Revenue is concerned, the hon.

member has stated that his certificate was taken from him by a customs official. I shall be glad to look into the matter and find out if one of our officials has it. If so, it will be returned to the hon. member.

Mr. GRAYDON: You had better reverse the policy.

Mr. LOCKHART: Also on a question of privilege, will the minister be good enough to inquire about certificates taken away at the Niagara Falls port of entry and get them back?

POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

CONCURRENCE IN FIRST REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. D. A. McNIVEN (Regina City) moved:

That the first report of the special committee on reconstruction and reestablishment, presented to the house on the 10th instant, be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CANADIAN ARMY—TOTAL STRENGTH, DISCHARGES, ETC.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West):

1. What was the total strength of the Canadian army overseas as at December 31, 1943?
2. What was the total strength of the home defence army in Canada as at that date?
3. During the year 1943, how many men called up under the National Resources Mobilization Act have gone active and are now available for service anywhere?
4. During the year 1943, how many men and officers were discharged from the Canadian army overseas, (a) on account of service disabilities; and (b) for other reasons?
5. During the year 1943, how many men called up under the National Resources Mobilization Act serving in Canada have been discharged, and for what reasons were they so discharged?

Mr. McLARTY:

1. Assuming that by "overseas" is meant in the "European zone" the strength of the Canadian Army Overseas at 31st December, 1943, was over 240,000 including over 700 members of the C.W.A.C.

2. Assuming that by "home defence Army" is meant all troops in the North American zone including those in operational units, non-operational units, training stream and district depots, the strength at 31st December, 1943, was over 235,000 including over 12,000 members of the C.W.A.C. In addition, there were over 7,500 men on long term leave granted in order that they might engage in agriculture, logging, mining, etc.

3. Of men actually enrolled in the Canadian Army, the following number have enlisted for general service anywhere during the year 1943 according to documents received at National Defence Headquarters to 31st December, 1943:

General Service Army	5,616
R.C.A.F.	114
R.C.N.	43
Other Military Forces	5
Total	5,778

NOTE:—(a) Above figures are subject to change by reason of documents received in 1944 which are applicable to 1943.

(b) Above figures do not include men who were called up under the N.R.M.A. but who presented themselves for enlistment for General Service anywhere without having been enrolled as N.R.M.A. soldiers.

4. Assuming that by discharged from the Canadian Army Overseas is meant "discharges of personnel who have had service in the European zone", the following were such discharges according to documents received at National Defence Headquarters to 31st December, 1943:—

Medically unfit	
Officers	116
Other ranks	3,800
Total	3,916*
Other reasons	
Officers	137
Other ranks	710
Total	847*

5. Of the men actually enrolled in the Army under the N.R.M.A. the following were discharged in 1943 according to documents received at National Defence Headquarters to 31st December, 1943:—

To R.C.A.F.	114
To R.C.N.	43
To other military forces	5
To civil life—	
Medically unfit (estimated)	6,532
Other reasons (estimated)	841
	7,535
To General Service-Army	5,616
Total	13,151*

* Figures are subject to change by reason of documents received in 1944 which are applicable to 1943.

BUTTER IMPORTS AND EXPORTS

Mr. WHITE:

1. What quantity of butter has been imported into Canada during the years 1942 and 1943?

2. From what country was the butter imported?

3. What quantity of butter has been exported from Canada during the years 1942 and 1943?

4. To what country was the butter exported?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West):

1 and 2.

Imports of Butter into Canada

Country	1942 Lbs.	1943 Lbs.
United Kingdom	511	....
Australia	516,740	....
New Zealand	55,710	464
Argentina	1,808	....
Alaska	270	244
United States	17,777	446
Total	592,816	1,154

3 and 4.

Canadian Exports of Butter

Country	1942 Lbs.	1943 Lbs.
United Kingdom	....	7,089,200
British South Africa	1,400	....
Gambia	4,800	....
Gold Coast	9,000	26,300
Nigeria	700	4,500
Sierra Leone	10,900	18,400
Bermuda	3,500	....
British Guiana	153,000	301,600
Barbados	81,600	38,200
Jamaica	1,400	222,500
Trinidad	91,400	588,700
British West Indies, other	31,600	61,700
Newfoundland	1,064,100	951,000
Greenland	28,900	6,500
Egypt	2,400	....
St. Pierre	88,500	99,800
Peru	20,000	....
United States	7,700	200
Total	1,600,900	9,408,600

ANDREW SHELINE

Mr. STOKES:

1. Was Andrew Sheline in the employment of the national war service salvage division at Calgary, Alberta, during the year 1943?

2. If so, what was his official position?

3. What annual salary was he paid?

4. What, if any, living or travelling allowances was he paid during 1943?

5. Is he still employed in this or any other capacity in the public service?

6. If still employed, what salary is he paid?

7. If not employed, when did his services terminate?

Mr. LaFLECHE:

1. Yes.

2. Provincial salvage supervisor as certified by civil service commission.

3. $3,300.

4. $602.50 travelling allowances.

5. He resigned August 10, 1943.

6. Not applicable.

7. See answer to question No. 5.

SUGAR CONSUMPTION

Mr. NICHOLSON:

1. What are the estimated quantities of sugar used for, (a) soft drinks; (b) wines; (c) candy; (d) preserving, in 1941, 1942, 1943 and 1944?

2. What are the estimated quantities of sugar, (a) produced; (b) imported; (c) consumed in Canada for each of the past five years?

3. What is the estimated consumption of sugar in Canada for 1944?

Mr. ILSLEY:

1. (a) Soft Drinks
1941—92,208,634 lbs.
1942—72,590,397 "
1943—72,608,628 "
1944—73,766,907 "

(b) Wines
1941—12,962,988 lbs.
1942—12,077,275 "
1943—10,659,503 "
1944—10,646,354 "

(c) Candy
1941—64,283,940 lbs.
1942—49,566,518 "
1943—51,081,684 "
1944—51,427,152 "

(d) Preserving

	Industrial	Home Preserving
1941	74,943,867 lbs.	120,000,000 lbs.
1942	64,690,025 "	103,000,000 "
1943	78,375,122 "	99,000,000 "
1944	79,955,093 "	120,000,000 "

2.

	(a) Production Refined Sugar	(b) Importations Raw Sugar	(c) Consumption Refined Sugar
1939	158,400,814 lbs.	1,051,163,978 lbs.	1,209,564,792 lbs.
1940	205,565,824 "	975,284,781 "	1,180,850,605 "
1941	225,502,000 "	1,063,372,000 "	1,251,590,000 "
1942	194,002,000 "	612,066,000 "	974,200,000 "
1943	151,602,000 "	826,276,000 "	969,680,000 "

3. Estimated consumption for 1944—1,000,000,000 lbs.

DOMINION LOANS TO OTHER COUNTRIES

Mr. MARSHALL:

1. What loans, if any, were made by Canada to other countries during the year 1943?
2. Has the government taken any security as guarantee for the repayment of these loans?
3. What security is held by Canada for the repayment of the loan to Roumania?
4. Has the government given any consideration to the question of the cancellation of the loan to Greece?

Mr. ILSLEY:

1 and 2. In the calender year 1943, $9,335,-125.86 was advanced to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to be applied as a credit for the purchase by that country of Canadian wheat and flour, pursuant to an agreement with Canada. This advance bears interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum, and is repayable in four semi-annual instalments commencing six months after the end of three years from the date of the agreement.

3. $23,969,720 4 per cent consolidated loan bonds due April 1, 1968, principal and interest payable in United States dollars. 5,662,792.50 francs ($359,542.40) 4½ per cent consolidation loan bonds due November 1, 1953, principal and interest payable in French francs or gold lire.

4. No.

JAPANESE NATIONALS

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West):

1. How many Japanese have been removed from the province of British Columbia to other provinces?
2. To what provinces have they been removed, and how many to each province?
3. Of those removed to the province of Ontario, how many are naturalized?
4. How many of these are entitled to vote in federal elections?
5. Of these, how many are in each riding (federal) in Ontario?

Mr. MITCHELL: I can answer now the first four questions but it will take some time to get the information regarding the fifth. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will answer the first four and ask that the fifth stand as an order for return.

1. 6,480, including women and children.
2. Alberta 2,880
   Saskatchewan 57
   Manitoba 1,011
   Ontario 2,234
   Quebec 298
3. 136.
4. Such of the above as qualify under the Dominion Elections Act 1938, section 14.

EXPORTS OF SPIRITUOUS LIQUORS

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. How many proof gallons of, (a) gin; (b) whiskey, were exported from Canada during the months of November and December, 1943, and January, 1944?
2. To what countries were these exports made, and what was the quantity exported to each country?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West):

1 and 2. Canadian exports, by countries, of whiskey and gin, during the months of November and December, 1943, and January, 1944:

Country	November, 1943.	December, 1943.	January 1944.
Gin—	Proof Gal.	Proof Gal.	Proof Gal.
United States	963	2,380	109
Br. West Indies, other	194	—	—
Newfoundland	159	1,790	1,084
Colombia	39	4	18
Nicaragua	22	—	—
Peru	10	87	—
American Virgin Islands	590	—	—
Bermuda	—	117	—
Trinidad	—	5	—
French Africa	—	664	—
Iceland	—	56	6
British West Africa	—	—	325
Egypt	—	—	127
French Oceania	—	—	301
Iraq	—	—	424
Totals	1,977	5,103	2,394

Country	November, 1943. Proof Gal.	December, 1943. Proof Gal.	January 1944. Proof Gal.
Whiskey—	164,100	233,862	139,370
United States	639	—	—
British East Africa	583	561	—
Bermuda	229	—	48
Jamaica	844	75	—
Trinidad	60	78	1,219
Br. West Indies, other	1,583	4,410	4,998
Newfoundland	45	—	—
Australia	304	1,249	396
Fiji Islands	1,684	—	—
Chile	1,326	70	20
Colombia	38	—	—
Ecuador	75	3,044	3,253
French Africa	2,349	1,174	462
Guatemala	8	—	—
Hayti	1,027	—	174
Honduras	—	—	150
Bolivia	—	—	283
French Oceania	13	—	—
Iceland	3,044	2,319	—
Iraq	943	—	4,470
Mexico	40	—	39
Nicaragua	309	449	242
Peru	2,989	—	—
American Virgin Islands	1,584	—	761
Puerto Rico	566	—	—
Uruguay	152	—	—
Venezuela	—	1,309	2,346
British West Africa	—	3,028	—
Ceylon	—	317	—
Bolivia	—	351	803
Brazil	—	2,065	—
Cuba	—	1,689	13,628
Egypt	—	—	761
New Zealand	—	—	2,154
Panama			
Totals	184,534	256,050	175,577

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

CANADIAN FORESTRY CORPS

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West):

1. Was the Canadian Forestry Corps dispatched for service in Great Britain? If so, for how long did it remain overseas?

2. How many officers and how many men received orders during September and October, 1943, to return to Canada?

3. Did such officers and men upon their return proceed to Debert camp, Nova Scotia? If so, what information, instructions or advice was given to them regarding their employment in forestry work in Canada?

4. Were these men of the Canadian Forestry Corps interviewed at Debert by selective service officials? If so, to what purpose?

5. Were these men advised and given assurances that during their occupation in forestry work in Canada they would receive the same privileges, protection and salary as they received while on active service overseas?

6. Was one group of these men eventually established at Sussex camp, New Brunswick? If so, were they placed in charge of all fatigue and guard duty at that camp?

7. Was another group of these men sent to Hastings Park, Vancouver?

8. Why were these men returned to Canada from active duty overseas?

9. How many of the Canadian Forestry Corps so returned were category "A", and how many of these men have been remustered and transferred back overseas?

10. Did these men enlist voluntarily for the duration of the war?

11. On whose authority were orders issued for the return of officers and men of the Canadian Forestry Corps in September and October, 1943?

12. How many of the officers of the Canadian Forestry Corps so returned have, (a) reverted to their reserve status; (b) reverted to civilian life, and in either case was this done on instruction from authorities in Ottawa?

JAPANESE NATIONALS—BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. ESLING:

1. Under the jurisdiction of the British Columbia security commission, how many Japanese were moved from the coast to settlements at Sandon, New Denver, Slocan City, Lemon Creek and Kaslo in West Kootenay district of British Columbia?
2. How many have since been moved from each of these Japanese communities to other provinces?

BEET SUGAR PRODUCTION

Mr. BLACKMORE:

1. In view of the danger of a sugar shortage in Canada during 1943 and 1944, has the government adopted any measures to stimulate beet sugar production in Canada during 1944 and 1945?
2. If so, what measures?
3. If not, why not?

CANADIANS IN R.A.F.

Mr. GILLIS:

1. How many Canadians are presently serving in the R.A.F. overseas?
2. How many R.A.F. personnel are presently serving in Canada?
3. What are the rates of pay in the R.A.F., and how do they compare with the Canadian rates?
4. Are the Canadian personnel serving in England subject to income tax? If so, what is the rate?
5. Are Canadian personnel who enlisted in England serving in the R.A.F. entitled to dependents' allowance, (a) for wife and family; (b) for mother or other dependents?
6. Are R.A.F. Canadian personnel on demobilization entitled to Canadian rehabilitation regulations, (a) men who are attached to the R.A.F.; (b) personnel who enlisted in England?

Mr. POWER: Return tabled.

ADVANCES FOR SEED, FEED AND FODDER

Mr. MARSHALL:

1. What were the original amounts advanced by the dominion government for, (a) seed; (b) feed; (c) fodder, in each of the years 1917-1922 inclusive?
2. How much was added in each subsequent year for interest and other charges?
3. What amounts were repaid by way of, (a) interest; (b) principal, in each year from 1922 to December 31, 1943?
4. What balances remained at December 31, 1943?

JAPANESE NATIONALS—BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West):

1. How many persons of Japanese origin are permitted to live and to do business or work in the prohibited area in British Columbia?
2. Have any persons of Japanese origin who were removed from the prohibited area in British Columbia been granted permission to visit the Pacific coast prohibited area? If so, how many permits have been issued, and for what reasons?
3. How many radio receiving sets are in use in each camp where persons of Japanese origin are located in the interior of British Columbia?
4. Which of the said camps have schools; how many; what are the names of the teachers, and what are the qualifications of these teachers?
5. What salary is paid to each school teacher in camps where Japanese are located?
6. What are the names, addresses and business or occupation of persons of Japanese origin who are allowed to remain in prohibited areas?

[Mr. G. K. Fraser.]

PRODUCTION OF FLUORSPAR

Mr. WHITE:

1. Has the government, through the Department of Mines and Resources, advanced moneys to persons or corporations for the production of fluorspar in the county of Hastings?
2. If so, what are the names and addresses of the persons or corporations to whom such moneys were advanced, and what is the amount advanced to each?
3. Did the government advance the total amount necessary to operate the mine in any one or all cases, or was it necessary for the operator to invest any part of his own money?
4. To what persons or corporations, if any, did the government advance the full amount necessary to operate the mines?
5. What is the method of repayment and what amount has been repaid on each loan?
6. What security has the government for the repayment of the moneys loaned?
7. What has been the total tonnage of fluorspar ore produced to date from each mine financed by the government?
8. What has been the profit of each operator?
9. Is the operator permitted to make a profit before repayment has been made in full of all moneys advanced by the government?

CANADIAN FORCES—SERVICE CENTRES IN CANADA

Mr. HANSELL:

1. How many service centres are established throughout Canada for the army, navy and air force?
2. What are the names of these, where is each located, and by what organization is each one administered?
3. Are any of these service centres established and administered entirely by either of the defence departments? If so, which ones?
4. What financial assistance, (a) in establishing; (b) in operating, has been or is being given by the government to each one of these service centres?

ASHOUAPMONCHOUAN RIVER BRIDGE, ROBERVAL COUNTY, QUE.

Mr. CARDIFF:

1. Has the bridge over the Ashouapmonchouan river at St. Felicien, Roberval county, Quebec, been rebuilt or repaired?
2. Has traffic over highway No. 55 been renewed over this bridge?
3. What was the total cost for the repair, restoration or rebuilding of this bridge?
4. What portion of this cost was paid by the dominion government, and out of what appropriation was said grant made?

Mr. MICHAUD: Return tabled.

PETROLITE CORPORATION LIMITED

Mr. CARDIFF:

1. Is the Petrolite Corporation Ltd., of Wilmington, Delaware, registered to do business in Canada?

2. Is the Petrolite Corporation the owner of patented or unpatented processes and inventions known as the Petreco process of electrical dehydration and the electrical purification process for desalting petroleum products?

3. Has the Petrolite Corporation erected or installed plants or equipment in Canada for the use of its processes? If so, where?

4. Has the Petrolite Corporation entered into a contract or contracts, or agreements with any Canadian firms for the installation or use of its processes or equipment? If so, with what firm or firms?

5. Were the Canadian firms to whom the use of the processes granted named or designated by the Minister of Munitions and Supply?

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

SALE OF CLOVER SEEDS IN DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN MARKETS—PRESS RELEASES

Mr. SENN:

For a copy of all press releases dealing with the sale and/or the prices of clover seeds in domestic and foreign markets from August 1, 1943, to date, issued by the special products board, the seed branch of the Department of Agriculture or any other governmental body.

DAMAGING OF TUG "BALLY" BY THE "SANKATY"

Mr. NOSEWORTHY:

For a copy of all correspondence and reports between any officer of the tug *Bally* and naval authorities at Halifax, and between naval authorities at Halifax and any department of the government regarding the damaging of the tug *Bally* by the *Sankaty*, referred to in sessional paper 253, 1942.

For a copy of all correspondence and reports between inspectors or any other government officials and any department of the government regarding any inspection of the *Bally* following its damage by the *Sankaty*.

A copy of reports and correspondence by inspectors to the government or any official of the government concerning the inspection of the *Bally* in June, 1941, mentioned in sessional paper 253, 1942.

A copy of all correspondence between any department or official of the government and the owner of the tug *Bally* informing him of the damage caused to the *Bally* by the *Sankaty*.

CANADIAN FORESTRY CORPS

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West):

For a copy of any memoranda issued in October or November, 1943, to the men of the Canadian Forestry Corps who returned to Canada from overseas; and in particular, a copy of a memorandum entitled "General Information", purporting to be instructions to the men of the Canadian Forestry Corps who returned to Canada.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—AIR TRAINING CENTRES—SPUR LINES AND SIDINGS

Mr. SHAW:

For a copy of each agreement entered into between the government, or any government department, or any official thereof and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company relative to the extension of spur lines into air training centres or the construction of sidings adjacent to such training centres.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WAR EXPENDITURES AND RADIO BROADCASTING COMMITTEES

On the order, Government Notices of Motion:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): At this point may I say a word about the appointment of committees. As hon. members know, the government is anxious to have all these committees constituted at as early a date as possible. I think only two special committees still have to be appointed, the one having to do with radio broadcasting and the other with war expenditures. I am quite prepared to hand to the Clerk of the House a similar motion to that which appeared last year and the year before with respect to the war expenditures committee, just as soon as I can secure the names of hon. gentlemen opposite who are to be members of that committee. I understand that some names will be given to-day or to-morrow; at any rate what I wish to make clear at the moment is that the government would have placed a motion on the order paper before this had it not been that up to the present we have not been able to get all the names of hon. gentlemen opposite who are to be members of the committee.

Earlier in the session it was mentioned from the other side of the house that there was a desire to debate the report which was tabled by the war expenditures committee at the close of last session. I was asked if I would give an undertaking that this might be done when the war expenditures committee was being set up this year. At the time I mentioned that it was the custom to allow the reports of one session to end with that session. However, since I understand hon. gentlemen opposite wish to debate the last report made by the committee on war expenditures, I have handed to the Clerk notice of a resolution which will permit that course to be taken. I am only too happy to have this done if it will expedite the appointment of the war expenditures committee for this session.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): I think I asked the Prime Minister if something of that sort could be done. If it could, I think it would expedite the setting up of the

committee this year. I should be glad to discuss that report either by itself or when the motion appointing the committee this year is before the house. I might also tell the Prime Minister that we gave the name of the proposed member of the committee from this group to the proper authority I think the day the house opened, or the day after. We were all prepared with our nominee.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): The Prime Minister has gone to some pains to indicate that one of the reasons the war expenditures committee has not been set up is that the names of the members of this party who are to serve on it have not been handed in to the whip. I did not intend to raise this question at this time, but since the Prime Minister has been good enough to bring it up I want to tell him that one contributing factor which has made it difficult to hand in those names is the spirit of frustration felt by many of our members because of the fact that government members of the committee, being in the majority, have consistently closed the doors of the committee to the public and have kept the proceedings of the committee secret. It is a difficult position for us to be in. If the Prime Minister will rise in his place now and say that, so far as the government members are concerned, these committee meetings will be open to the public we can hand in the names this afternoon; but it is very difficult for us to get people to serve on a committee where the blinds are pulled down, the shutters closed and the doors locked. That is the story.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Each committee of this house manages its own business, and the government does not interfere.

Mr. GRAYDON: The business is managed by the majority of the committee, who are Liberals.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend seems to think the government has no obligation in the matter of carrying on the business of the country except what is granted to it by the opposition. May I say to my hon. friend, and this is important, that the government has been sent here to carry on the business of the country at a time of war, and it is our duty to adopt the methods that we believe will achieve that end most effectively.

Mr. GRAYDON: Do you think that is the best way to carry on the war effort, to close the sessions of that committee?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Just a moment; I shall answer my hon. friend immediately and effectively. No parliament on earth has more experience in matters having to do with war expenditures than the parliament at Westminster, and I am prepared to say that this government will follow with respect to war expenditures exactly the procedure followed by the parliament at Westminster. My hon. friend knows very well that the reason the parliament at Westminster has not opened the doors, put up the blinds and done the other things suggested by my hon. friend is that it regards the war as far too serious a matter to permit a lot of unnecessary discussion to take place in the nature of political controversy.

Mr. GRAYDON: I do not know whether the Prime Minister is or is not serious in what he says.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: He is not only serious, but he would add that another reason is that the government does not wish to have any information given to the enemy —which, apparently, my hon. friend is quite prepared to risk.

Mr. GRAYDON: On the point raised by the Prime Minister: Imagine his talking about comfort to the enemy over a question of wartime housing!

Mr. THOMAS REID (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, in connection with this matter may I point out that I resent the leader of the opposition saying to the Prime Minister what he should undertake regarding the views, information and the stand taken by members in that committee. I as a member of the committee went there without dictation from anyone—and I refuse to take it from anyone, even from the Prime Minister. I decide myself what stand I shall take.

Mr. GRAYDON: Open the door and we will think more of you.

RECONSTITUTION OF COMMITTEE ON DEFENCE OF CANADA REGULATIONS

Mr. S. H. KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, in connection with the statement the Prime Minister has just made respecting other committees, would he tell the house whether the proposal to reconstitute the committee on the defence of Canada regulations has been forgotten?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Up to the present time no request has been made for the constitution this year of that committee. If, however my hon. friend thinks it desirable to have a committee on the defence of Canada regulations constituted at this session, the government will be prepared to consider the suggestion.

Mr. GRAYDON: Our names for that committee have been in for some considerable time just so that there may be no doubt about the matter.

ROYAL CANADIAN AIR FORCE

BLACK MARKET IN SUPPLIES TO AIRPORT IN NOVA SCOTIA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of National Defence for Air based on an article in the *Gazette* of Glace Bay, of February 8. This article says that there has been a black market in supplies to the airport in that area. Has the minister been advised of the charges appearing in that newspaper article? If so, can he assure the house that the proper machinery of his department will be used to conduct a thorough investigation into the alleged charges?

Hon. C. G. POWER (Minister of National Defence for Air): My hon. friend gave notice of this question. He asked first: "Has the article mentioned been brought to the attention of the minister?" The answer to that is yes. His second question is: "If so, is the matter under investigation?" The answer is yes.

His third question is: "Will the investigation be followed through to its logical conclusion and appropriate action taken to assure the public that the taxes they are paying for military purposes are being protected by those responsible for the administration of military affairs in Canada?" The answer to that is yes. And the article bears on its face the assertion that appropriate action is being taken, in that a number were arrested, and are now in gaol.

Mr. GILLIS: But action was instituted by the civil authorities.

Mr. POWER: Action is being taken. I would say to my hon. friend that the Royal Canadian Mounted Police act in most cases on behalf of the military services.

Mr. GILLIS: The city police were the first to act in this instance.

FLAXSEED

INCREASE IN PRICE TO CANADIAN FARMERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, based on an article from the Canadian Press appearing in the Ottawa *Citizen* under a Winnipeg dateline of February 12. The article reads:

> The Winnipeg *Tribune* said to-day it had learned that the price of flax seed to Canadian farmers would be increased from $2.50 a bushel to probably $3.

Is this true?

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to get to my feet to make a statement on this matter. For the purpose of informing flaxseed growers in order that they may make their seeding plans accordingly, I wish to announce that it is the government's intention to pay a fixed price of $2.75 per bushel for No. 1 Canada western flaxseed, basis in store Fort William-Port Arthur, and for No. 1 Canada eastern flaxseed, basis in store Montreal, during the 1944-45 crop year. The present fixed price of $2.50 per bushel will continue in force until July 31, 1944, and the $2.75 price will take effect on August 1.

WHEAT

STATEMENT WITH RESPECT TO EXPORTS TO THE UNITED STATES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, on February 9 the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Perley) asked me if I would make a statement regarding sales of wheat to the United States.

In reply to the hon. member for Qu'Appelle, I wish to inform the house that the United States war food administration, through the commodity credit corporation, is making tentative plans to import 175,000,000 bushels of wheat from Canada during 1944. Of this total, 40,000,000 bushels are intended to be moved by rail direct in United States cars from western country points, 30,000,000 bushels by vessel from Vancouver and other Pacific ports, and 105,000,000 bushels by lake during the 1944 season of navigation.

I wish to emphasize that this is a tentative programme and subject to change in the light of transportation developments and war food administration needs. Purchases by the commodity credit corporation are being made from time to time in amounts broadly corresponding to the quantities for which firm transportation commitments can be made.

With respect to the rail movement, between the dates December 13, 1943, and February 10, 1944, inclusive, the Canadian Wheat Board has sold 10,269 cars (approximately 18,000,000 bushels) of wheat for shipment all rail from country elevators in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta to destinations in the United States. Of this total, 9,419 cars have been or will be shipped from country elevators in Manitoba and Saskatchewan and 850 cars from country elevators in Alberta.

Since December 13, 1943, United States railways have delivered to Canadian railways a

total of 5,561 freight cars owned by the United States railways for the transportation of this wheat. Additional United States cars are being delivered daily at border points to the Canadian lines by United States railways. The volume of future all rail sales to the United States will be largely governed by the number of additional United States cars delivered.

Prices asked for such wheat by the Canadian Wheat Board from December 13, 1943, to February 10, 1944, have ranged between low points for the grades of one, two and three northern of $1.41, $1.38 and $1.36 per bushel, respectively, and high points of $1.47, $1.44 and $1.42 for the same grades, all basis in store Fort William Port Arthur. These sales have been made from day to day and have been within these prices ranges, net to the Canadian Wheat Board basis in store Fort William.

Sales have been confined almost exclusively to the grades of two and three northern.

Since the importer and buyer of this wheat in the United States is the commodity credit corporation, a United States government agency, the question of duty does not arise.

All freight charges apart from those from the country shipping point to Fort William are absorbed by the buyer.

Here follows a list of exporting firms which have made the sales to the commodity credit corporation:

Alberta Pacific Grain Company Limited.
Bunge North American Grain Corporation, Canadian Agency, Limited.
Cargill Grain Company, Limited.
Continental Grain Company, Limited.
Hallet and Carey, Limited.
Kerr-Gifford and Company
Leval and Company, Incorporated.
McCabe Brothers Grain Company Limited.
National Grain Company Limited.
Norris Grain Company Limited.
Reliance Grain Company Limited.
James Richardson & Sons Limited.
Saskatchewan Pool Elevators Limited.
Searle Grain Company Limited.
K. B. Stoddart & Company Limited.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Is the wheat to be sold to the commodity credit corporation of the United States in this crop year or calendar year, or has a definite period been set?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): I do not think a definite period is stipulated in the negotiations; but it is anticipated that it will be during this crop year.

[Mr. J. A. MacKinnon.]

MAJOR-GENERAL CHISHOLM

REFERENCE TO ADDRESS TO ROTARY CLUB AND TORONTO WELFARE COUNCIL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. G. ROSS (St. Paul's): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the appropriate minister. Did Major-General G. Brook Chisholm, director general of army medical services for Canada, speak with the authority of the government in a public address delivered to the Rotary club and the annual meeting of the welfare council of Toronto last Friday, February 11? Was he reflecting the views of the government when he is reported to have said:

To adjust recruits properly to army life, that "the influence of mothers" has to be weakened. He felt that women "are not oriented toward society, they are oriented toward men." In times of stress, such as war, women become a liability.

Is that a correct statement?

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): I shall inquire into the matter, and take what the hon. member has said as a notice of question.

CHRISTIE STREET HOSPITAL

INQUIRY RESPECTING ALLOWANCES TO MEN ON DISCHARGE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. NORMAN J. M. LOCKHART (Lincoln): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Pensions and National Health, based on information to the effect that amendments are to be made in connection with hospital allowances to men discharged from Christie street hospital. It is my understanding that there is some revision in prospect. Would the minister give, if not to-day perhaps at an early day, a statement indicating the extent to which these provisions will be amended and whether they will be made applicable to men who have been discharged three, four or five months ago?

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Pensions and National Health): I shall be glad to look at my hon. friend's question and answer it later.

SUGAR

PRODUCTION OF BEET SUGAR IN CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, I desire to draw to your attention a situation which I believe requires consideration. On Friday I asked three questions regarding the sugar situation in Canada and

Your Honour advised me to put those questions on the order paper, which I did. They appeared on the order paper to-day and I was told that they will be answered in the form of a return, which means a good deal of delay. I should like to point out two or three factors which bring about a certain degree of urgency in this matter.

Let it be borne in mind that the cost of producing beet sugar has increased considerably of late and that the number of crops which compete with sugar beets on irrigated land have increased, mostly because of the war. May I draw to your attention the fact that Canada is facing a sugar shortage and no one knows just what is going to happen with respect to sugar. There is every reason why we should do everything in our power to stimulate the production of sugar. Not very long ago a committee representing the Canadian beet growers waited upon the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) and asked him if he would give a further rebate of a half cent per pound of the excise on sugar. It seems to me that some statement should be made to let the country know whether the minister is prepared to do anything in this regard or whether this matter of sugar is going to be left to pure chance.

Let us bear in mind that men are signing contracts right now for the production of sugar and if this matter is not attended to within a short time it will be too late.

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): The question on the order paper is one which concerns two if not three departments. Because it concerns two or three departments it will be necessary to have a consultation about it, and for that reason it is passed as an order for return.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Can the minister give us an assurance that we will have a reply within the next two or three days?

Mr. GARDINER: A reply will be given as soon as possible.

Mr. BLACKMORE: There were just three simple questions asked, it should be possible to give the answers in ten minutes.

WAR APPROPRIATION BILL

PROVISION FOR GRANTING TO HIS MAJESTY AID FOR NATIONAL DEFENCE AND SECURITY

The house resumed from Friday, February 11, consideration in committee of a resolution to grant to His Majesty certain sums of money for the carrying out of measures consequent upon the existence of a state of war—Mr. Ilsley—Mr. Bradette in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): I should like to finish my review of the activities of the department and my reference to the army in Canada and the various groups into which that army is divided. On Friday I gave particulars of the operational troops and mentioned that they had been considerably reduced as a result of the changed strategic situation and the disbandment of the seventh and eighth divisions.

I also gave the committee some details of the non-operational troops, which are the servicing units and the servicing personnel, not only for Canada but for overseas. There are two further groups I should speak of. One is the training stream, which is tremendously important, and the other is the reselective and disposal stream, or depots as we call them. In the training stream, as of only a few days ago, we had something over 75,000 personnel, of which a little over 15,000—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): What is meant by training stream?

Mr. RALSTON: That is a stream or group into which men go for training in progressive sequence. They go first to basic training, then to advanced training, then to special arm training, then to the training brigade and then overseas. In personnel, those not actually attached to units, we have something over 75,000.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Not all are in that stream; some do not go overseas?

Mr. RALSTON: A little over 15,000 are N.R.M.A. personnel. Regarding the depots or disposal and reselective stream, I am sorry to have to say that the number in these depots has increased. I do not know of any group which is more difficult to regulate than the group in the depots. To the depots come those who are on their way out for discharge, those who have been in a unit which has been disbanded and who have not yet been posted to some other unit, those who come from a unit or a training centre, posted for the time being to the depots until they go to a new job. Generally speaking these depots perform the function of employment agencies for soldiers who are temporarily not posted, either because of unfitness for the job they have had or for which they have been training, or because their unit has been disbanded.

Another function of the depots is the documenting and medical examination and taking care of soldiers who are being discharged.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Is it fair to say that it is a distribution centre?

Mr. RALSTON: I should think so. It is a distribution centre. I suggested that it was more or less a transient hotel for soldiers, but the department sat down on that title definitely. They said it was no such thing, that it is a place where men are actually posted to different units, where training is done and where every endeavour is made to make the stay at that particular place just as short as possible.

Mr. LOCKHART: Has there been any change in the functioning of the depots since the war started?

Mr. RALSTON: There has been a great deal more in the way of employment activity. More attention is being paid to selecting men for particular jobs, especially in the last year. As a matter of fact, we have at the depots placement officers similar to those of the Department of Labour. These men are there for the purpose of finding out the jobs in the different districts for which men are wanted, and also looking for men who can best fill those jobs.

Mr. LOCKHART: Is that the only reason for the increase in the numbers at the depots?

Mr. RALSTON: No; the increase in numbers is due to no small extent to the disbandment of the seventh and eighth divisions.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): And men returning from overseas, like the forestry corps?

Mr. RALSTON: And men returning from overseas. They have to be discharged and the depots have been under additional pressure this year. I am convinced that generally speaking there has been an extra effort put forward to deal with these cases just as fast as possible. There may be some exceptions, but speaking generally those in charge of the depots are never satisfied with the progress being made. I know they are seeking honestly and sincerely for improvement in administration. We endeavour to terminate as speedily as possible the uncertainty which faces a man when he goes to the depot.

I have referred to the placement officers and stated that they fulfil the same function as the placement officers of the Department of Labour in the employment offices. Arrangements have been made to have representatives of the Department of Pensions and National Health at the depots to look after men for whom rehabilitation treatment is needed. That is to say, in connection with men on the way out an endeavour is being made to integrate the services rendered by the Department of Pensions and National Health with the services rendered by the Department of National Defence. I am sure that hon. members have in their minds cases—there may have been a number of them—in which men seem to get out of the army and not into the Department of Pensions and National Health as promptly as possible. I can only say that both the Minister of Pensions and National Health and I have been constantly at work on that. We have tried to impress our officers with the importance of setting up a system whereby the men will be informed not only by the department of pensions but also by the army of what their rights are; and vice versa. The department of pensions will give to the man who is in the army, even though he has not been discharged, such information as can be given with regard to his rights eventually when he comes to be discharged. That is not merely his right as to pension but as to treatment, vocational allowance, unemployment allowance and all the different benefits provided under the department of pensions. Those depots will become more important as the war goes on and demobilization increases, because the problems of the post-war employment of soldiers will be first encountered and dealt with there. The depots will be the focal point.

Speaking generally with regard to the army in Canada, everybody wants to see it reduced and wonders why it is so large. I wish to speak of two or three features of administration of the army in Canada. We have endeavoured to make some genuine effort to reduce it. In this I point out, if it is any comfort to us, that we are at least as far advanced in this matter as our good neighbours to the south, and in some instances that I know of we took the steps considerably earlier than they did.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): What is the total number as of this date?

Mr. RALSTON: The total number of what?

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): Of the home army.

Mr. RALSTON: I am going to summarize just as soon as I get through with these reductions. Hon. Mr. Stimson, Secretary of State for War in the United States, only a few days ago issued a statement in which he forecast what he called a drastic shake-up in the army in the United States. He spoke of comb-outs that were being made, of discharges and replacements of physically fit men by men less physically fit. I read his statement with a great deal of interest, and I think I can say that the policies which Mr. Stimson announced

are along the line of the policies which have been in force in the Canadian army for some time.

Mr. GRAYDON: The cases are scarcely parallel.

Mr. RALSTON: Yes, they are. Let me give one or two examples. Our neighbours to the south are replacing physically fit men by members of the Women's Army Corps, soldiers unfit for service overseas, new recruits physically handicapped and short-term enlisted men. Canada releases her physically fit men by utilizing general service personnel returned from overseas, general service personnel unfit for operational duties, the Canadian Women's Army Corps and N.R.M.A. personnel who cannot be absorbed in operational units. That was the great objective—to release men for operational service.

Mr. Stimson mentioned also that they were releasing overhead personnel, which I take to be those in the non-operational units, which I spoke of the other day as servicing units. In Canada we have been doing exactly the same thing. We have been combing out general service personnel, physically fit. I stated last year that in Canada over sixty per cent of the general service personnel in the non-operational units were men who were below category "A" or over thirty-five years of age. That meant that a comb-out had already taken place. To-day this figure is close to seventy per cent.

Our drive was also to release general service men from operational units in two ways, by comb-out and by disbandment, with the result that during the present fiscal year, ending March 31, 1944, we shall have released probably 15,000 general service personnel from operational units, a large number of whom will be for overseas service.

Mr. Stimson mentioned another feature of the drastic shake-up in the United States, and that was the reverting to inactive status of thousands of commissioned officers over thirty-eight years of age for whom no suitable assignments were available. In that case also we can say that Canada is, to say the least, not behind the United States. Since last September we have had released numbers of officers who could not be suitably employed. We have not fixed a definite age limit in this respect. We have said that they shall be reverted to reserve status if they cannot be advantageously employed in the service in their present rank, and that is regardless of age, whereas in the United States apparently the general policy is limited to deal with officers who are over thirty-eight years of age.

In addition, the Canadian army some months ago inaugurated the retirement age limit; the retirement of officers who it is found cannot be advantageously employed as well as those who have reached the age ceiling is not a particularly agreeable task. Those who have given good service are naturally anxious to see the war through; but it is obvious, when the peak of expansion is passed, that it is unwise in the interests of both the officer and the service, as well as in the interests of national economy, to continue in active status officers for whom no suitable employment is available or who have reached the age limit fixed. We have thought and still think—and it is working out that way—that it affords to the officer an opportunity to reestablish himself in civil life before the rush of demobilization comes. It also gives the younger officer a chance to make his mark in this war. The Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Power) expressed the same idea in announcing a somewhat similar policy for the air force a few days ago—that it would make the air force more dynamic, vital and virile. That is exactly what it does in the army, under the policies which we inaugurated some time ago.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Is experience no factor?

Mr. RALSTON: I want the committee to follow along with me, if members will permit me to proceed; but I am glad that my hon. friend interrupted with that particular question. I can say to my hon. friend that there is just one exception with regard to the retirement of officers of sixty years and over. The officer must be retired unless the adjutant-general certifies that no other suitable officer is available to take the job he is holding, and in that case there may be an extension for one year.

Mr. GREEN: Has the minister the figures on retirements?

Mr. RALSTON: I am reaching in the air for this figure. They have not been completed but I think we have in prospect something like 700. I am not saying 700 over age, but either over age or not advantageously employable in their present rank.

The third advantage is that it promotes efficiency in the service by increasing interest and enthusiasm by the enlargement of opportunity to the younger officers. The fourth advantage is that it releases for civilian occupation men who have had an established place in civil life and who can contribute much toward reconstruction in the transition period. I want to record here what I have already said publicly, namely the appreciation of the department of the services of those older officers and particularly those who served in the last war, who have relinquished their

civilian occupations without thought of personal sacrifice, and made a fine contribution in this war to help build up the Canadian army of to-day. Those men have done their bit and have now left the army better for their work. Their service is appreciated and they now are giving younger men whom they have helped to train an opportunity to advance.

Mr. Stimson announced also the putting of training camps, stations and other installations on a stand-by basis. We have done the same thing in Canada.

Mr. HANSON (York Sunbury): What do you mean by that?

Mr. RALSTON: Closing training centres, due to the fact that the peak of expansion was past and that the development of the armed forces was on a maintenance rather than on a capital basis. It is just the same as in connection with our munitions production. That was driven to a peak in order to get production and initial equipment for the formations. That equipment is now in very many cases being produced on a maintenance basis; that is, on a replacement or reinforcement basis. It has not to be furnished initially for further capital formations. We in Canada announced the same policy. That policy applied to both officers' training centres and to other ranks' training centres as well. Last spring I announced the closing down of officers' training centres at Gordon Head and Three Rivers, with the concentration of training at the officers' training centre at Brockville. That reduced overhead and output. We had put forth an aggressive effort to build up the officer strength of the army, which during the days of 1942 was considered very necessary, and was demanded to meet the emergency that developed as a result of events following Pearl Harbor. Our officer strength was built up just as fast as it could be. We have now a reserve. There were two major factors which contributed to that; first, the improvement of conditions which warranted the disbandment of the seventh and eighth divisions making those officers available for other duties; second, the fact that operations in 1943 were not of the degree of intensity for which provision was made. The fact that we are in this comfortable position of having a reserve to meet officer requirements does not mean that officer training has ceased, or that those now serving in the ranks will have no opportunity for commissions. But the general policy is that recommendations for commissions will be made after a man has an opportunity of proving himself overseas rather than in Canada.

[Mr. Ralston.]

We have this reserve of officers, and we are utilizing it by making good use of the time and facilities which we have to broaden and to intensify their training; in other words, adding to their qualifications by giving to them refresher and advanced training to make them just that much more fit to undertake the responsibilities which devolve upon commissioned officers. As I say, we have those facilities, and we are taking advantage of them to give these young officers training far in advance of what would have been possible in the last war.

Mr. Stimson did not speak particularly of officer training alone. He spoke of training camps, stations and other facilities, which would be placed on a stand-by basis. We have done the same thing with regard to our basic training centres.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I ask one question? Have you brought instructors back from the fighting fronts, such as Sicily, Italy and North Africa, to the officer training centres?

Mr. RALSTON: From time to time, yes. I cannot recall names at the moment; we are bringing them back from time to time. My hon. friend probably heard an officer by the name of Lieutenant Colonel Garneau on the radio last night. Lieutenant Colonel Garneau had been at Sicily and Dieppe and is in Canada now in connection with training.

So far I have spoken about officer training centres. I shall now speak about training camps and other ranks. This is another policy which we have had in force for a considerable time. I have not the date, but as I remember it, it was sometime last summer that I announced the policy of closing several of the training centres and the inauguration of a plan for linking up the basic training with the advanced so that men in a certain basic training centre would know they would be going to the advanced training centre and would not be distributed all over Canada. This made for liaison between centres. The officers in these linked centres knew what the conditions were in the centres with which they were associated and the proficiency which had been arrived at, and the general scope and quality of the training. That is to say, the advanced training centre would know all about the basic training centre, and therefore would be able to pick the man up in his training from where he had left off. It made for more speed and more efficiency than would be the case if the man had come from some basic training centre which the advanced centre did not know.

Mr. GRAYDON: Why was there such a wide distribution in the early days?

Mr. RALSTON: Simply because they had to be put wherever they could be accommodated. The purpose of reducing the basic training centres and providing the link with the advanced training centre was to reduce overhead and to integrate basic and advanced training.

Since that time thirteen basic training centres have been discontinued and the capacity of eleven more has been reduced. This has permitted a reduction of staff. Some of the closed centres are in use for other purposes and others are on a stand-by basis so that the original capacity can easily be utilized if occasion should arise. In the meantime we have ample basic training capacity for the number of men we assume we estimate we shall require. The closing of the centres where only small numbers were in attendance, and the concentration in fewer establishments has helped the staffs in the training centres to do better work, and the staffs at the districts and at headquarters to give closer and more helpful supervision.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The training centre at Edmundston is very small; has it been closed?

Mr. RALSTON: I do not know; I am not quite sure; I do not think it has.

I should now like to answer the question of the hon. member from Cumberland (Mr. Black), with regard to the army in Canada. Last year I said there would be a definite reduction in the number of troops in Canada. I said that would be largely effected by the dispatch overseas of units already earmarked for overseas service, and of some required for administrative service; that is to say, there would be a reduction by taking units which were in Canada and sending them overseas. The number in Canada earmarked for overseas at that time was about 11,000. As a matter of fact I said that the minimum reduction would be 15,000, I think. I also said that the strength as of March 31st would likely be about 235,000. I am glad to say, on the record we have, that I believe we have done very much better than that. We estimate that the army in Canada will be something over 215,000, as against 235,000 which I predicted last year; that is the active effective strength. We estimate that the reduction, instead of being about 15,000, will be nearer 35,000. Indeed, in the reduction are some 8,000 granted long-term-leave in agriculture, mining and industry who ought not to be charged to the army, since they are only nominally soldiers and have been on leave for months and months. We cannot treat them as soldiers and at the same time have them used in the national economy for something other than military service. It might be said that we had men on leave last year, but we had very few last year as compared with this year.

Mr. GREEN: Are they included in the 215,000?

Mr. RALSTON: I think the 8,000 are included in the 35,000 reduction. I should say also the C.W.A.C.'s were not included last year and were not included this year either, but there has been an increase of between three and four thousand in the Canadian Women's Army Corps this year. That increase is not counted in estimating the reduction. To me, the most satisfactory feature of the reduction is that in the process over 70,000 men will have been sent overseas by March 31 of this year.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): What about those who have come back and are at the dispersal centres? I refer to the 2,000 foresters. Where do you put these; they are in Canada but are not being used.

Mr. RALSTON: I shall give my hon. friend the distribution of the 2,000 foresters. I have not it here. They are being used. Some of them are still at the depots, and if they are there—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It is so small, it is ridiculous.

Mr. RALSTON: No, my hon. friend is wrong. There were something like 2,000.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): A good many of them have been disbanded.

Mr. RALSTON: I will give the distribution.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That was the greatest fiasco of the whole thing.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Will the minister break down those figures?

Mr. RALSTON: Under the uncertainties that have existed and the administrative difficulties involved in reorganization, that record of reduction is one in which the department has a right to take some satisfaction. I would remind the committee that included in these figures for Canada are forces maintained by us on the outposts of the continent, in Newfoundland and Labrador, and in the Caribbean. Included in the figures are the 5,000 sent to Kiska. The break-down as at March 31, 1944, shows that we estimate the operational troops will be over 55,000, the non-operational troops something over 75,000, and those in training and awaiting disposal, something over 75,000. The total will be over 215,000.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Did the minister say that the non-operational troops exceed the operational?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Comb them out; that is all I have to say.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend does not appreciate what the non-operational troops are. They are, for instance, the veterans' guard at internment camps; I have mentioned 3,000 at Longue Pointe depot working for the British government, and there are the men in the units in the dental and service corps, working for the navy and the air force, and the staffs of the training camps. There are the Army Service Corps personnel, the ordnance personnel, the medical units and all these service units, which are not simply for the purpose of servicing the army of Canada in Canada, but for the purpose of providing a base for equipment and reinforcements for overseas.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): Where is the classification with regard to the reserve army for home training, with no intention of going into combat overseas? They are known as the reserve army.

Mr. RALSTON: I was going to deal with the reserve army. In reference to the matter of reinforcements—

Mr. GREEN: Before the minister leaves that point, how many of these men are N.R.M.A. men?

Mr. RALSTON: Some 70,000.

Mr. GREEN: How are they divided?

Mr. RALSTON: Forty-seven per cent of the N.R.M.A. are in operational troops; fifteen per cent are non-operational troops; twenty per cent are in the training stream; eight per cent in the depot reselection and disposal wings and seven per cent are on leave.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): What is the total number?

Mr. RALSTON: I believe it is 70,000.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Does that include those absent without leave, deserters?

Mr. RALSTON: I cannot tell my hon. friend.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): We ought to know about that.

Mr. RALSTON: I cannot make a complete and comprehensive statement now. Perhaps the hon. member will allow me to continue and he can ask questions afterwards.

[Mr. Ralston.]

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): You know and we do not. We will ask questions.

Mr. RALSTON: I will find out for my hon. friend. With regard to reinforcements, I have a very brief statement which will put the matter clearly. I am glad to be able to say that notwithstanding the fact that a part of the army has been fighting since July, the reinforcement pool overseas is well up to the planned original full strength. This pool was that which was estimated to be adequate to meet battle casualties, and the supply can and will continue to be replenished by the dispatch of further reinforcements from Canada as required.

There is one qualification to be made. It is very difficult to match supply with requirements of all the different types of tradesmen. Thirty-five per cent of the army to-day are in the different trades, of which there are over 200, many of which are highly specialized. It is a constant battle to get from the population of this country, or for that matter of any country, so large a percentage of skilled men, particularly bearing in mind the needs of war industry. The adaptability of young men is such, and the presence of tradesmen throughout the army is so general that I think we can be confident we shall always be able in time of emergency to meet the need.

We have ample trade training facilities and we try well ahead to allocate men during training to meet the requirements which we forecast from the demands that come periodically from overseas. That reinforcement pool overseas will be drawn on as casualties occur; but we estimate that by sending 48,000 men overseas during the fiscal year, 1944-45, we would, on the basis of estimated casualties before us, still end the year with a pool sufficient to maintain the army at the height of its fighting efficiency. To provide that 4,000 a month, we estimate that we shall have 60,000 general service personnel suitable for overseas service in training centres and in units in Canada at the end of March of this year. These, less certain wastage which always occurs from training, will be sent overseas as they complete training or as they are made available by orderly withdrawal from units. That will deplete the number in the training stream. Therefore, to safeguard the future, we are budgeting for an intake of 48,000 general service plus 12,000 N.R.M.A. personnel to release general service personnel, or a total of 60,000 from the total Canadian manpower pool for 1944-45. If we achieved this intake of an average of 4,000 general service men per month it would see us at the end of the fiscal year with reinforcement pool overseas

maintained at adequate strength, and it would see us with sufficient men in training centres to fight on during 1945.

In the last three months our intake of general service men averaged a little over 3,700. For January it was almost 4,000. What the future will be I do not know, but certainly efforts will be steadily put forth to maintain this January rate. If recruiting should materially fall off it will begin to affect the numbers dispatched overseas in the later months of the fiscal year 1944-45, and should find us at the end of March, 1945, with the pool maintained overseas, but with the number of general service men in Canada reduced approximately by the amount of deficiency in that intake. As a further backlog we have in Canada well over 60,000 N.R.M.A. personnel, of which number perhaps 50,000 could be made available for overseas service if emergency arose and necessary action were taken.

Mr. GREEN: Has there been any increase in that number since last year?

Mr. RALSTON: I am sorry I have not the exact figure. I gave the percentages a few minutes ago. In answer to somebody I said 70,000. I do not think it can be 70,000. I fancy the explanation is that the 70,000 is the number projected as of March 31 while the 60,000 is the number now.

Mr. GREEN: What has been the intake of N.R.M.A. recruits in the same time?

Mr. RALSTON: There will be plenty of opportunity to give those figures later and I shall have someone furnish them.

Mr. GREEN: You should have them in the general service statement.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend will permit me to make my statement; I cannot have everything at once. I do not think he quite means what he says, when he suggests what I should have and what I should not have. The reinforcement position always depends, of course, on the accuracy of forecast as to casualties and our officers have made a careful study of this factor. I think we have made ample provision in this respect, and therefore, I think I can say to the committee with considerable confidence that our reinforcement position for the fiscal year before us will be well provided for.

Mr. GRAYDON: Will the minister say that he makes that statement with full confidence?

Mr. RALSTON: I cannot say with full confidence; I do not know what the casualties will be.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): On the point of reinforcements, will the minister say, in the event of a second front in Europe, on the western front, whether we have adequate reinforcements.

Mr. RALSTON: I will say exactly what I have said here.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That does not say anything.

Mr. RALSTON: I am saying what anybody would say who had any sense of responsibility.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I have a sense of responsibility, and I resent that.

Mr. RALSTON: I have a sense of my responsibility, too; and I say to my hon. friend and to the committee that the casualties have been estimated on the basis of the best information that can be obtained in conjunction with the war office, having regard to the operations which will be carried on, and that is the situation if those casualties are realized. I have said to the committee already that the casualties we have suffered in Italy were somewhat less than those that had been budgeted for.

Mr. GREEN: Are the divisions overseas—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The minister has expressed the desire to make his statement first, and then he will answer questions.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): We are in committee.

The CHAIRMAN: We are just dealing with the resolution itself; there is no special item before the committee.

Mr. LOCKHART: Can we not interrogate the minister at all as we go along?

Mr. RALSTON: I am sure the hon. member for Vancouver South will recall that last year the practice was to allow the minister to make his statement; then there were at least four or five or six quite lengthy speeches, one of which was made by my hon. friend, before there was any thought of asking questions of anybody or getting down to business. I am glad we are getting down to business earlier this session.

There is another matter to which I wanted to refer; it is just in passing, but at the same time I feel that the armed services should indicate to the committee that they have not lost sight of it. I must say that I have hesitated to talk very much about rehabilitation or demobilization. Sometimes I have been a little concerned at people going overseas to talk to

our men about rehabilitation and demobilization, knowing as I do and as the country knows what is before us this year.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That the war is not won.

Mr. RALSTON: That the war is not won. I felt that it might give the boys an entirely wrong impression, that it might turn their minds from the job they have in hand or perhaps indicate that our minds were being turned from the job which is in hand. At the same time I know enough, from my experience in the Mediterranean area and in England, to realize that naturally the boys are thinking about these things. They are young men who are looking forward to coming back some day, and they want to know what is to be done for them. They do not want charity, but they want to know how they are to be assisted and how they are to be recognized, having regard to the fact that they have been away from employment conditions in this country for a number of years. Of course this is not the particular province of the three armed services; but I wish to say—and in this I am inspired by, and want to give credit to, my colleague the Minister of National Defence for Air—that quite regardless of the fact that pensions and national health, or the veterans' welfare department, or whatever it may be, eventually will take care of the matter, all three services intend to take and are now taking a definite and positive interest in the prospective rehabilitation of soldiers, sailors and airmen. It is not intended that the services should do this by way of providing rehabilitation grants, because those will come after demobilization; it is to be done by looking forward to the time when demobilization may come, endeavouring to plan the relative priorities of the various men who are now in the service, whether it be by length of service, by occupation or what-not. I would not want the committee to take it from anything I say that any policy has been decided upon—but the services want to determine what shall be a fair method of rehabilitation and demobilization; to help the men who remain in the service for a considerable time due to military duties, but duties which may not be as pressing as the duties we see before us this year; to help these men to prepare themselves, looking forward to the time when they will be discharged and return to civilian life.

So each of the three services is setting up a special directorate to deal with demobilization. I do not mean that each directorate is to deal only with the machinery, to decide where the medical examinations shall take place, what forms will be signed, where men should be sent for the purposes of demobilization and discharge, and things of that kind, but it is also to consider and work out what can be done while the men are still in the army, the navy or the air force, to assist in preparing them for their return to civil life. It may be the matter of vocational training, which is being talked about so much; it may be vocational guidance; it may be more education; it may be advice; it may be assistance in some other way to prepare them to return to their rightful place, the place they want in society. These directorates will be headed by men who have had experience in this war, and, I hope, in the last war; men who will understand the problems, the aspirations, the needs and the ambitions of these boys. The directorates will be coordinated by means of an interservice council, so that as nearly as possible we may have the same degree of assistance in the three services by way of vocational training and preparation for civil life, having regard to the facilities provided and the opportunities that present themselves in the service in which the men are engaged now. Further than that, we shall have an interdepartmental council composed of representatives not of the three services alone but of the three services, pensions and national health, labour, and reconstruction, when that department is established. I only mention this to indicate that the services themselves realize their responsibility to those who are still in the service, so that such spare time as these men may have when the active part of the war is over, if they are still retained for military service, shall be utilized in the best possible way, having in mind the desirability of assisting these men in order that they may be prepared to resume the functions of citizens.

Someone asked me about the reserve army. Just a day or two ago a statement was published in this regard, and I should like to give the committee the substance of it. First I want to say that the Canadian army can never acknowledge in too generous terms the work of the reserve army, or the non-permanent active militia as we knew it, and all it has meant in laying the foundation of the Canadian army as it exists to-day. Nearly every unit of our army is founded upon a former militia unit. The names may have been changed, but the personnel, the structure, has remained, and the foundations and traditions are there. If the non-permanent active militia had done nothing more than furnish that

foundation it would have performed not only a creditable but a vastly important service in connection with the great war of 1939.

Mr. STIRLING: That was the original scheme of the non-permanent active militia?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Mr. GRAYDON: They do not always get the credit that is due them, and for that reason I am glad to hear the minister make this statement.

Mr. RALSTON: There is no doubt about that. More than that, the non-permanent active militia not only furnished units and helped to mobilize them; it furnished officers as well to take posts not necessarily in their own units but elsewhere, particularly staff officers in the beginning of the war.

Mr. GRAYDON: And the people in the non-permanent active militia went to a tremendous amount of trouble and expense.

Mr. RALSTON: Not having been a militia man myself, perhaps I can express appreciation more freely than others. I have had occasion to marvel at the time, the energy and the money, as my hon. friend says, that commanding officers particularly, and other officers as well, have put into this work of keeping up the morale of the regiment, making it attractive for men to come in, giving what is perhaps more valuable than money to busy men, namely their time and interest, in order that these young men might have associations with the army, and the benefit of the riper experience of the older ones.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): In that case services have been voluntary.

Mr. RALSTON: The service was voluntary, originally, but that could not be expected to continue forever. I think the country was asking too much.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The greatest asset was leadership.

Mr. RALSTON: Yes, there is no doubt about that. We did, as a matter of fact, provide for what we called small administrative and training staffs, for which we paid.

Mr. GRAYDON: We would have been in a bad fix when war broke out, if we had not had them.

Mr. RALSTON: We would not have had an organization at all. The reserve army carried on and furnished these units for the active army.

There came a time when I had to come to the house—two years ago I believe it was—and make a statement. I was asked to say what defence plans we had for Canada, and how we were going to meet the situation on the west and east coasts. I had to speak at that time about the organization of reserve brigade groups, in which reserve units were brigaded for purposes of preparing for actual defence, if defence should be necessary.

At that time, as everybody knows, there was a tremendous upswing in the reserve army, provided by way of additional training equipment, pay and allowances, and by way of extra facilities provided for these units. I think they tided us over, and saw us through at a time which was indeed a very difficult one, before we were able to get going completely with the active army, in full strength.

I believe I have had the opportunity of meeting the officers commanding in almost all districts in Canada. I have been impressed with the interest, zeal, enthusiasm and self-denial those men have shown in their desire to help, and in their eagerness to have young men join in order that they might train themselves for whatever task they might have to fulfil in the armed forces.

At that time the reserve army had four roles. One role was a basis of expansion for the active army, in the event of further mobilization. Another was the operational role in the defence of Canada. Another was that of continuing reinforcements to the active army, and the fourth was the duty to aid the civil power.

With that activity there has been strenuous and exacting work done by officers and men, including the older men and the boys. Night after night in different armouries they trained in order to see to it that they could do their part, or that they would be ready to do their part in case the need should arise. I know that from different reserve units I have had the request that they might be stationed at some point on the east coast or on the west coast to do their share of duty, as it were. Of course that meant a tremendous amount of dislocation in the work of businessmen and others who were members of the reserve units. It would have meant that for the time being the men in those units would have had to sever their connections with the ordinary enterprises in which they were engaged.

Fortunately the situation was such that we did not actually have to use those units for defence. Now, with their background of two years of intensive training and a general increase in efficiency, they are asking, "What will we do now?" It is possible to reassess the demands which we make on the reserve army during this year. It is of course a bulwark against any possible deterioration in the military situation.

Its role during the coming year is summarized in this way—and I put this first point very high. At the same time it may sound perhaps more psychological than military. The role I mention is that of maintaining throughout the country continued interest in the Canadian Army and its activities, and to set to all citizens an example of preparedness at all times. That is what they have done right through, and I do not think it was needed at any time more than it is now. Many of these men are perhaps working at work benches during the day in munitions factories or in stores or offices or on the farm, but in the evenings they give their time to training, and to fitting themselves for a possible emergency, should the time come. They serve in two ways. I do not know of any better example of "preparedness" than is found in the reserve army.

A second role is that of providing a continuing flow of reinforcements for the forces overseas, by training young men of pre-enlistment age. Another is to back up the civil authority responsible for the enforcement of law and order. Another is that it shall stand as a trained reserve to support the active forces available for the defence of Canada if the military situation should deteriorate, and the last is that it shall be a basis for expansion of the active army, should the necessity arise.

The reserve army is insurance against the uncertainties of war. It represents a substantial investment in time, effort and military knowledge on the part of its members. It is sound common sense to maintain that insurance while the risk continues to exist.

While the necessity for the reserve army remains unchanged, it is possible, in view of the improvement in the military situation and the increased efficiency that has been achieved, to decrease the intensity of its training during the coming year. It is therefore proposed: first, to reduce the period of training from forty to thirty days. This will permit a 15-day summer camp, with the remaining fifteen days training carried out at local headquarters, either as forty-five training evenings, or partly evening training and partly week-end exercises.

In addition, provision will continue to be made for the further training of officers, non-commissioned officers and specialists.

Since the reserve army has been operating with a liberal scale of full-time administrative and training staffs for some eighteen months, it is considered that units have now progressed to a stage where their officers and non-commisioned officers are sufficiently qualified to carry out their training without the same degree of assistance. There will therefore be some reduction in the number employed on full-time training duty.

While no general change in the structure of the reserve army is contemplated, it is proposed that some measure of stream-lining will take place to ensure that all units maintain a satisfactory standard of efficiency. Units unable to maintain a satisfactory strength and efficiency will become dormant for the duration of the war.

In other words, the answer to the reserve army is this: "We want you to carry on, and we believe you are doing a service to Canada in the training which you have undertaken, not only in the record you have made, but because of the interest which you maintain in a community, and through your example of "preparedness." The reserve army assists the young men of sixteen, seventeen or eighteen years who spend their evenings in training with the older men. They are there for the purpose of providing a flow of reinforcements, and that flow has been a most generous one. It will stand back of the civil authority and act with the active force, if necessary. It will be a basis for expansion of the active army, should the necessity arise. We say to them, "You do not need to train quite as intensively as you have done. We have cut the training down by twenty-five per cent from forty to thirty days. We continue to make provision for the training of officers, non-commissioned officers and specialists. We ask you to carry on more of your training yourselves than you have done. And we say, in connection with those units which have become more or less dormant, those which are unable to maintain a satisfactory degree of efficiency, 'we will let them lie dormant for the present time'."

Mr. GRAYDON: Is there a very large percentage which would fall into that class?

Mr. RALSTON: I am told there is not.

Mr. CASSELMAN: Why do they become dormant?

Mr. RALSTON: I presume it is because of their location, more than anything else. They would be in the more scattered communities.

Mr. CASSELMAN: Might it not be that all eligible men have gone from that district?

Mr. RALSTON: Well, as the hon. member knows, the members are men of thirty-five years and over, and boys under age.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): Would the minister give the number in the reserve army?

Mr. RALSTON: Although I have not the exact figure, I think it is around 100,000.

It is felt that these changes will give fresh incentive to all ranks of the reserve army to maintain the efficiency that has resulted from the past two years of intensive training. The continued support of employers in encouraging

their employees to attend annual camps will be of the greatest assistance in carrying out this objective. I wish to say a word of appreciation to employers who have planned so as to allow men to attend these camps.

Mr. GRAYDON: At great inconvenience to both the men and the employers, sometimes.

Mr. RALSTON: A greater measure of responsibility will be placed upon those who have benefited from this training, and the shorter periods of duty will require that all ranks take full advantage of the available training time to maintain the high standard necessary to fulfil the roles allotted to the reserve army. Modern equipment and the latest methods of training will continue to be made available for its use. At the same time appreciable economies will be effected in its cost to the public. Let me emphasize again that the voluntary contribution of time and effort on the part of all ranks in the reserve army is deeply appreciated and recognized, and it is the purpose of the department to ensure that the demands made upon the reserve army are matched to the changing requirements of the military situation. The standard of training already achieved and the improved strategic situation justify a reduction in the training time required during the coming year, provided full advantage is taken of the reduced period to maintain efficiency.

There is just one last item I wish to put on record before I conclude. I am not going to give any figures now, but I should like to say a word with regard to the Canadian Women's Army Corps. There has been an increase of about 3,000 in the corps this year.

Mr. GRAYDON: What is the total now?

Mr. RALSTON: I think it is about 14,000. Of the many endeavours which have been put forward to provide agencies to assist in the war none has been more successful, so far as the Canadian army is concerned, than the C.W.A.C. I want to voice the wholehearted and unreserved appreciation of the department for their work and the pride we have in their accomplishments. These young women are serving not only in Canada but in Washington and in the United Kingdom and they would like to serve in other places overseas as well. Where they replace men they are doing their jobs as well as the men, and sometimes better. I think the men will permit me to say that.

Mr. GRAYDON: There is nothing surprising about that.

Mr. RALSTON: They are more nimble-fingered and perhaps even more nimble-witted than the men. They have proved a credit to themselves, a credit to the army and a credit to Canada. I am sure that the committee must take pride in them, seeing them at their work, and on the street. I am sure that hon. members would have got a tremendous thrill to have seen the parade I did in London when I attended the service at St. Martin's in the Fields, just before I came back from overseas. They are a great corps and they are doing a magnificent work.

In conclusion, I just want to sound one note of warning. I only wish I could make it reverberate across this dominion from Sydney to Vancouver. People are being led to believe or they are leading themselves to believe that we have got on so well in winning the war that the collapse of Hitler's Germany is just around the corner. When I was in England there was some talk of the war being over by Christmas; now there is talk of finishing it this year. I hope we do, because every day by which it can be shortened will mean a saving, not just in dollars, but in precious lives and in distress in the homes of Canada and in every other country allied with us.

It is true that we have taken Italy's colonies in North Africa. It is true that we have captured Sicily and about one-third of Italy. It is true that a small portion of the territory held by the Japanese in the southwest Pacific has been rescued from them. It is a fact that the Russians in their amazing fighting have retaken a lot of the territory which Germany had overrun. But it is also a fact that more than half of the territory taken by the axis forces in their drives of the last three years is still conquered territory. It is a fact that there is not much evidence that German military power has decreased and there is no sign that the Japanese troops have lost any of their willingness to fight and die to hold the outposts which protect their home base.

In both Europe and Asia great forces of well-trained enemy troops, well led and well equipped, are ready to fight—and they do fight. Germany dominates Europe. She controls a population of some 325 million. She draws on practically the whole of Europe's industries and economic resources. She has more than 300 well-trained divisions. She has millions of foreign workers in her war industries. It is true that if all the resources of the united nations were pooled we would have an advantage over Germany in the European theatre. But if it were not for the enormous sacrifices of our Russian ally, who pays the price for magnificent victories, the odds would be roughly four or five to one against us, and these odds would be more unfavourable because of the network of fortifications which the Germans have prepared.

Let us face the facts. The two major reasons for our optimism for the future—there are others of course—are, first, the ability of our Russian ally to keep nearly three-quarters of the German army occupied in the east and, second, the ability of British, Canadian, Australian, New Zealand and United States aviators to keep up their tremendous raids on Germany's European fortress. Germany has shown herself able to stand prodigious losses. At Stalingrad last winter she lost some twenty divisions. Every one of these has been replaced by a new division, well trained and equipped with the latest and best types of weapons. The Germans lost eight divisions in North Africa. Those eight divisions have been replaced with new divisions armed with the most modern equipment. Even last year the Germans reformed, reequipped and raised more than sixty new divisions, each of which had approximately 600 machine-guns and 300 heavier weapons. Included in the armament of these divisions are new models of tanks, self-propelled guns, rocket-guns and other latest type equipment, which in some cases is equal to and in some cases better than anything the allies have.

I am not a pessimist, far from it, but I am a realist. I hope I can make this country realize just what we have ahead of us. It is true that good news has been coming, but remember that if that good news is to continue it can only be by continuous contribution of the matchless price which the men and women of the forces and the homes they come from pay, and only if we are willing to make our contribution in self-discipline and self-denial worthy of theirs.

Let us take a look back and a look ahead. It took three and a half years to clear the enemy out of North Africa. The war has been going on for four and a half years and it is only in the last six months that we have been able to overrun Sicily. The successes we are now having in Italy are just on the fringe of Europe. So far as our land forces there are concerned, we are nearly eight hundred miles from Germany with plenty of formidable opposition and tough ground on our way. The continent of Europe still has to be retaken. The superb fighting in Russia has still to be matched. China must be liberated and Hong Kong avenged. Burma, the Malay peninsula, Singapore and the Philippines must be regained and the southwest Pacific cleared. These enemies of mankind must be forced to unconditional surrender.

Canadians in that tough and heroic fight at Dieppe marked the first turn of the tide toward the land offensive in northwestern Europe. Canadians in Sicily and Italy helped to mark the first turn of the tide toward the land offensive in southern Europe; Agira and Ortona, to mention only two of many, were epic battles in Canada's war story. But some of the greatest battles of the war are still to be fought, and Canada will be in the thick of it, on sea, on land and in the air.

The message from our troops in Italy and from our troops in England is, "Don't get the idea because good news is coming that the war is about won and that we can slacken a bit." If we were with them in either Italy or England we would not have any delusion that the war is nearly over. We would realize that there is a long way to go yet and that the going will be hard and rough. The way Canadians at home can help to shorten that road is, not by slowing up, but by trying to match the resolution and drive of our soldiers who are fighting Canada's battle in Italy at this very moment and who are at this instant preparing in England for the great offensive.

Their message is, "We are going to stick it; we are going to see it through, but we expect the folks at home to keep up the pressure, not to relax, not to let up." Not long ago we heard the story of the long, grim, stubborn, victorious fight for Ortona. Wounded men refused to be evacuated. Troops asked not to be relieved. They fought on. They won. We at home have to match their fighting spirit with our work, with our determination, with our self-denial, and with our endurance, to back these men of ours to the limit.

My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) asked me on Friday, with regard to General McNaughton, at whose instance the medical examinations were made. I told him that I knew the report was transmitted by General McNaughton's direction to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) by cable, and that I was not in London at that time, if I remember correctly what I said. I find that the first report, dated November 26, was procured by General McNaughton at his instance and was sent by him to the Prime Minister.

Mr. GRAYDON: At his instance only?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes. I said with regard to the other one that I did not remember just when I received it. I said that I got it—

Mr. GRAYDON: That is the report of December 11.

Mr. RALSTON: Yes—just after I got back to England on December 10. I find on look-

ing over my letters that the same day, December 10, I wrote to General McNaughton this letter:

My dear General McNaughton:

As soon as I got in, General Montague—

Mr. GRAYDON: This is with reference to the first examination?

Mr. RALSTON:

—gave me your message. As man to man I want to say that I am deeply sorry to find that the situation regarding your health has grown more acute since General Stuart reported to me in Sicily.

That refers to the first medical report. I received that in Italy.

Mr. GRAYDON: That is the November 26 one?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes. The letter went on:

I do hope and believe that relief from work and rest and change will bring recovery and I shall help all possible to ensure prompt action to facilitate this. I take it that you will be sending me a note so that the matter can be dealt with expeditiously. I understand that apart from Mrs. McNaughton and the doctors, General Montague is the only one who is seeing you but whenever the ban is lifted and you can have it I should be glad to come to visit you at your convenience.

With sincere regret and my remembrances to Mrs. McNaughton and with every good wish to both of you.

Yours very truly,
J. L. Ralston.

Mr. GRAYDON: What is meant by "when the ban is removed?"

Mr. RALSTON: I was told by General Montague that no one was allowed to see General McNaughton on business except the medical men.

Mr. GRAYDON: How long did that ban extend?

Mr. RALSTON: I cannot tell you. I had just got back.

Mr. GRAYDON: You had seen General McNaughton in November.

Mr. RALSTON: Oh, in November? General McNaughton was not in bed when I saw him at army headquarters. On the 11th of December I got this letter from General McNaughton, dated December 10:

Dear Colonel Ralston:

General Montague has just given me your note of yesterday's date, and I do most sincerely appreciate your kindly consideration of the difficulties in regard to the exercise of the command of the Canadian army in which I am placed by reason of my health. I have spoken to our medical authorities, and it has been arranged that they will make a further examination this afternoon. I will ask that they furnish you with a copy of their report immediately thereafter; also that the text be cabled to the Prime Minister.

My wife very much appreciates your kind message to her, and she and I will be very happy indeed to see you personally at any time, for I think the doctors are now inclined to let up a bit on the restrictions which they had placed on me.

Very sincerly yours,
A. G. L. McNaughton.

That gives my hon. friend the information with regard to the second medical report which I read to the house the other day.

Mr. COLDWELL: Were there any other examinations besides these made of the general's condition, on his own initiative, by civilian doctors or anything of that sort?

Mr. RALSTON: I do not know.

Mr. GRAYDON: Can the minister recall what was the last date he saw General McNaughton before he went to the North African area?

Mr. RALSTON: It was a Sunday. I have this year's calendar in my pocket, not last year's. I think it was Sunday, November the 14th or the 7th; it was a Sunday in any event.

Mr. GRAYDON: The minister was good enough to volunteer the information on Friday that when he saw General McNaughton at that time no question of the general's ill health was mentioned between the two of them.

Mr. RALSTON: Yes; the only thing at that time was that I recall General McNaughton speaking of the great strain he was under. I think I have mentioned that to the house already. That was the last time I saw him before I went to Italy.

Mr. GRAYDON: The matter of his health was not an acute subject between you at that time?

Mr. RALSTON: I am not going to answer a question of that kind. He spoke of the very great strain which had been on him with regard to some matters—

Mr. STIRLING: When did the minister reach London?

Mr. RALSTON: Coming back?

Mr. STIRLING: The minister said on Friday that he met General McNaughton on several occasions before the minister went to North Africa. He has told us that the last time was Sunday the 7th or the 14th.

Mr. RALSTON: I have not my diary here.

Mr. STIRLING: Had the minister been in London for a week or a fortnight then? He saw the general on several occasions.

Mr. RALSTON: I think I had been there altogether about eight or nine days. I saw him soon after I got there.

Mr. GRAYDON: What the minister says now is that the entire conversation that took place between him and General McNaughton with respect to his health was prior to the minister's having gone to North Africa?

Mr. RALSTON: I do not recall now. I have not attempted to go into detail as to what the general said then. I had a conference with him of an hour or more on that particular Sunday morning. I do not recall speaking of health in the conversations we had prior to that, after I had landed in London and before I went to Africa.

My hon. friend asked another question to which I wish to refer. He said:

> My question is whether or not any factors other than that which he mentioned of ill health entered into the resignation of General McNaughton?

I deliberately confined my statement of Friday to the matter of the general's ill health and his own request for his being given leave of absence and relieved of the command of the army, and I said that I could discuss all other matters connected with the subject but I preferred not to do so because it could do no possible good, particularly at a time like this.

Mr. GRAYDON: But you did not confine yourself to his ill health, and that is the reason why I asked the question.

Mr. RALSTON: I do not know what my hon. friend means.

Mr. GRAYDON: You did not confine yourself entirely to ill health as the reason for General McNaughton's leave of absence. The minister immediately launched into a question which, I think, raised a doubt in the minds of everyone in the house that ill health was the only factor. The minister spoke about the strong wills of himself and General McNaughton.

Mr. RALSTON: Yes. I was dealing with the matter of leave of absence entirely and the contribution that ill health made to it. I do not follow what my hon. friend means at all. I mentioned, of course, strong wills. I said, "if anybody asked me if we always agreed I would say, 'no'".

[Mr. Ralston.]

Mr. GRAYDON: I think the general impression was there was some possibility of disagreement. I just want to know whether or not that was a factor.

Mr. RALSTON: What is that?

Mr. GRAYDON: May I explain what I mean? When the minister spoke he said he had confined himself entirely to the matter of ill health. I then rose in my place to explain that he had not confined himself entirely to the matter of ill health but in making his explanation had gone on to refer to the strong wills of himself and General McNaughton. This left the impression, if I may say so, on most members of the house that there was a possibility of disagreement between the government, the minister and General McNaughton. On the basis of that possibility I asked a question as to whether or not there were factors other than ill health which entered into the leave of absence granted to General McNaughton.

Mr. RALSTON: I think I can say to my hon. friend that if it had not been for General McNaughton's ill health, leave of absence would not have been granted at the time it was. He would not have been relieved of the command of the Canadian army at the time unless he had requested it. In other words, ill health was the proximate cause.

Mr. GRAYDON: Ill health was the proximate cause?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Mr. GRAYDON: The minister has not answered the question.

Mr. RALSTON: I am going to deal with that question if my hon. friend will permit me.

Mr. GRAYDON: I do not want the minister to become angry about it.

Mr. RALSTON: I am not angry.

Mr. GRAYDON: I am trying to get some information. Let us deal with this thing reasonably.

Mr. RALSTON: I intimated that there were all sorts of rumours floating about. I said I could go into all of them but that I did not consider it opportune. I preferred not to do it, because it could, to say the least, do no possible good, particularly at times like these. I suggested to the committee, and I suggest to my hon. friend, that when we have a situation which is clearly set forth in the documents which I have read, there can be no question in the mind of anybody that

leave of absence was necessary and was requested by the general on the ground of ill health. Therefore, is not the supreme question whether General McNaughton was able to carry on at that time, and has anybody any doubt of his inability to do so after reading the documents to which I have referred? I suggest to my hon. friend that makes any other factor simply academic and not applicable to the case. In addition to that practical situation I ask my hon. friend in all sincerity, as I ask myself and the committee, do they think the morale of the Canadian people and the morale of the troops in the field would be promoted by discussions of factors which at the moment and in the circumstances can have no application? Would it not be bound to deserve the rebuke of the men who are in the battle lines at this very instant, or who are preparing to go into battle, if we were to use our time and our energy on a controversy over what might have been, instead of considering how we can train, supply, equip and reinforce these men?

I have already made a statement about our army in Canada and overseas, and the reasons for the dispositions. I ask, is that no more important than the hypothetical question as to whether, although General McNaughton was physically unfit to carry on, there might have been other factors which did not apply? In times like these does the committee think we should spend our time in that way? As I said before, I would prefer not to discuss any other factors. I think the one of health is sufficient. I say to my hon. friend that I am not refusing to do so. I am expressing this view because that is how I feel. I have some personal reasons why it would be far easier for me to go into a discussion of all sorts of things, but I suggest that in the circumstances no good purposes could be served, and I leave it to my hon. friend to decide whether or not he presses that question.

Mr. GRAYDON: Mr. Chairman, the subject that is before the committee at the moment is the minister's statement with respect to the whole problem of the armed forces. At the last session this subject was proceeded with in a certain very definite way. After the minister had given his statement, item number one on the army war appropriations estimate was called and on that a general discussion took place. I take it that the government is prepared at this time to follow the same procedure.

This afternoon I wish to avail myself of the privilege that has been accorded in the past and follow the same procedure. I refer the minister to certain questions which I asked on the address in reply to the speech from the throne. Some of those questions have not been answered. Some of them have been answered to the satisfaction of the minister, but not entirely to the satisfaction, if I may say so, of the committee as a whole. One of the questions asked at that time will be found at page 19 of *Hansard* of January 31, and is as follows: "What is being done with our big home defence army?" As the minister has indicated, that is an army comprising some 70,000 people. The minister now shakes his head. The figures I jotted down are, "70,000 in the home defence army."

Mr. RALSTON: No. If my hon. friend will permit me, the operational troops number something like 55,000. These people are distributed, as I indicated, in the home defence army. They are distributed on different jobs. The home defence army, so called, or the operational troops in Canada number about 55,000. I think I said forty-seven per cent of the N.R.M.A. were in these units.

Mr. GRAYDON: I think that pretty well illustrates another point which I intend to bring up, namely, that in the discussion which occurs from time to time in connection with the armed forces, the average layman is confused by the conflict of terms of a military nature which he does not always understand.

Mr. RALSTON: You invented that term; I did not.

Mr. GRAYDON: Perhaps I did. I may invent some more during the discussion which I hope will be applicable to the situation. What the public wants to know is how many men are in uniform in Canada who are not available for overseas service or, in other words, fall into the category of those called under the National Resources Mobilization Act who have not volunteered for service outside Canada. My understanding is that that number is something like 70,000 men. If that is so, I should like the minister to take note of these supplementary questions. I should like him to answer the question I asked on January 31, which was, has the government given consideration to whether or not these men are going overseas or whether or not the personnel is to be directed back to civilian activities in Canada, or what actually is to be the final disposition of those 70,000 men? I think the minister ought to give us all the information in regard to the cost of these 70,000. I should like to know the yearly cost of maintaining that army of 70,000, because the question becomes very important from another angle.

Since Kiska the whole question of the army of 70,000 has been altered to some extent. In addition to that, the government has seen fit pretty well to withdraw and to abandon in many sections the whole A.R.P. activity, which would indicate clearly that the government is of the opinion that the whole question of the invasion of Canada and, in consequence, the whole question of the defence of Canada has undergone a major change. I wish the minister would give these figures when he speaks again in the debate.

The minister has referred to General McNaughton. I approach the whole question with regard to General McNaughton with as serious a sense of responsibility as anyone in public life could have. I agree with the minister that the name of a great Canadian, the name of one who has achieved great things with Canada's army, should not unnecessarily form the subject of a mere political discussion in this parliament during the war.

I think all members of the committee will feel as I do this afternoon when I say that personally I have not made a sufficient contribution in the war to be able to say very much about those in our armed services who have done so much more. In the early stages of the war many of us did apply for enlistment in the armed services, and some of us have tried, as far as it lay in our power to do so, to serve our country; but I am frank to say that I have always felt that my contribution is rather puny, measured by any yardstick, when contrasted with what has been done by those who are in far more dangerous fields of activity than we are.

From that point of view, I am very conscious of the whole situation with regard to General McNaughton. I think we ought to look at the government's problem, and the problem of those men and women who are in the armed services overseas and in Canada, with a mind bent upon doing the best we can for them and for the country at this time. Whatever may be the responsibility —and the minister assesses some responsibility to the opposition in this regard—I would point out to him that it was not the opposition or members of this house who created the situation upon which the public has been demanding so much enlightenment, particularly in the past few days. I would have felt a rather heavy responsibility if that situation had been created by us; nevertheless, as the Prime Minister very properly pointed out a few days ago, the opposition in parliament has an obligation to the people. Therefore, subject to security reasons and the whole question of the national interest, and subject further, if I may say so, to the desire that the names of those men who have done so much to preserve and maintain this country during this time of war, and who are in our armed services, should not be made a matter of mere political discussion, it seems that the minister also has a heavy responsibility in denying to the country at this time as much information as he is actually withholding at this moment.

Mr. RALSTON: I have not denied it.

Mr. GRAYDON: I asked the minister at the end of the sitting on Friday a question which was not designed to throw this problem into the arena of parliament; rather, I was hoping that he would then, by a simple answer, be able to clear up the whole situation. I tried to interrupt him on one occasion in order that he might have that opportunity in an early part of the debate, and I put the question again at the end, so that he would have notice of it for to-day. The question was a very simple one which the minister could have answered readily, but he has not answered it this afternoon. The question is this: Were there other factors, other than ill health, which entered into the whole problem of the resignation or leave of absence of General McNaughton?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Before the leader of the opposition presses his question further, I desire to say that while I know that the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) is prepared to answer the question immediately, as Prime Minister I have very grave doubts whether it is not against public policy to discuss further at this time the matter which is raised by the question which the hon. gentleman has asked. I believe I am familiar with all the relevant facts and circumstances, and I should be pleased to meet with and to show the correspondence to the leader of the opposition and to the leaders of the C.C.F. and the Social Credit parties. Indeed, I have come to the conclusion that it is my duty to show it to them. Until these leaders have been afforded this opportunity, I hope that no hon. member will press the matter further. Sitting opposite me, in the person of the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Stirling), I see one who has been a former Minister of National Defence in a Conservative administration, and I would extend to him an invitation to accompany the three leaders, when I hope to have an opportunity of placing all the correspondence before them.

Mr. GRAYDON: I gladly accept the Prime Minister's invitation to read the correspondence and discuss the matter with him. I wish to say that it seems rather strange that only at this stage should a question so serious finally be discussed by members of the House

of Commons. Never since parliament rose on July 24 last has the Prime Minister asked me, as leader of the official opposition, for a consultation on the matter of General McNaughton or any other matter; I do not know what he has done in connection with the other parties. I want to point this out to the country and to parliament now. This is a very late invitation, but one which I feel should be accepted in the public interest. Perhaps it will provide some explanation as to why we who are completely in the dark in connection with these matters have asked for the information we have requested during this debate.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If I have not asked my hon. friend to come and discuss this matter with me privately, it has been out of deference to what I thought would be his own feelings, in not wishing to discuss the matter with me privately until there had been some open discussion of the situation in parliament. I preferred to extend my invitation to him in the House of Commons at the time I thought it might become necessary. That is the sole reason I have not conferred with my hon. friend on this point.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee met at eight o'clock.

Mr. GRAYDON: Mr. Chairman, when the committee rose at six o'clock I had not quite concluded the observations I intended to make in connection with this part of the discussion on the war appropriation measure. I should like in my remarks this evening to refer to one or two matters mentioned by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) on Friday and again this afternoon.

I refer first to a matter which perhaps some who are not too familiar with the situation might regard as of minor importance, compared with other matters which were the subject of discussion. Nevertheless it seems to me that the matter to which I am about to refer is one of great significance and one which has assumed great importance. The fact that the Minister of National Defence returning from theatres of war overseas saw fit to use the House of Commons as a venue for the giving of information, to give a lead to the people of Canada, indicates the importance of the matter to which I now refer, namely, the delivery of mail to our men and women in the armed services.

I regard with some pride the fact that I have a heavy overseas correspondence. My experience indicates there is scarcely anything more valuable to our overseas troops than the maintenance of a regular mail service. Whatever we in parliament can do to arouse the people of our country to a point where they will keep closely in contact with those who have left our midst might be regarded as a signal service to Canada, and to those who serve overseas.

I am not sure whether it was the Minister of National Defence or the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) who said that in some instances men have spent their fifth Christmas away from home. I believe it was the Prime Minister who said that.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. GRAYDON: Just think of that! The fact of the matter is that because of the trend of the war our troops have been left for a long period of time without action. That fact has, in my view, made it even more essential for our people to assume the responsibility of seeing to it that our men and women in the armed forces are not disregarded, so far as keeping in close touch with them is concerned.

I said something this afternoon about the contrast between the contribution made by those of us in civilian life and that made by the forces in the armed services. Sometimes we are apt to put too much stress on what is done on the home front. The home front is important; and those connected with it have done a great job. But let us not in the same breath mention the service, the contribution and the sacrifice of those who are on active fronts, protecting us in the theatre of war. That being so, surely those of us in the civilian population can make sure that those boys and girls who have gone from our midst are assured, by communications from time to time, that they are still part and parcel of the Canadian people. I make these observations to-night to emphasize a matter which, to my mind, is of greater importance than it may appear to be at first glance.

I was pleased, too, to hear the minister make reference to the work of the Canadian Women's Army Corps, and I join with him in paying a well-deserved tribute to that branch of the service. I would couple with that observation a similar expression with respect to the women in the other two branches, namely the air force and the navy. No reflection is intended upon other branches of the service when I mention these three services specially. The reputation the womenfolk in the armed services have gained, and

the splendid work they have performed should not go unnoticed by a grateful country and parliament.

Then the minister touched upon, but did not discuss at length, the rehabilitation of the men and women in the services. I would agree with the minister, and I believe most people would agree with him when he says that the main emphasis must be placed upon matters more urgent and more acute than those connected with demobilization. I agree with him when he says that the winning of the war must come before demobilization. The seriousness of the job was impressed upon us this afternoon, when the minister pointed out that the war has not yet been won, and that we may be some considerable distance from that result. So that the whole problem of rehabilitation and demobilization must come in its turn.

However, while that may be, the government must be prepared for the possibility of a speedy ending, and it must not be caught unprepared for the peace. The fact that we were not prepared for the eventualities of war cost us a great deal in life, limb, property and finance. Let us make sure that when peace comes upon us we shall not be unprepared.

This brings up the whole question of the rehabilitation of our men and women in the services. While I take my position with the minister in his statement as to the relative importance of rehabilitation compared with the immediate problems of the war, nevertheless I think he will agree when I say that we must not disregard the problems connected with demobilization. This has been the subject of many conversations. Much has been said about what is to be done for the man who comes back from the war by way of placing him in a peace-time pursuit. I pass on to the minister—and also to the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie), who might lend an ear to this—what has been told to me by men who have returned from overseas. It is all very well to speak about putting our soldiers, sailors and airmen on the land. In itself, however, that is not sufficient. It is all very well to talk about giving them education. But again, that in itself is not enough. Our men and women who will return must not be placed in a position where they will feel that those civilians who have been able to save victory bonds, war savings certificates and the like are placed in a better position, in respect of ready cash and security, than those who have done the fighting. The whole problem of gratuities, the whole problem of providing for the men and women of our armed forces something in the nature of ready cash, if you want to put it that way, when they come back and when they take up their jobs must be considered so that they will not be penalized in favour of those who stay at home for various reasons or were unfit to go, but shall be placed, not only on an equal footing with our civilians but, if I may say so, on a preferred footing. That must be the position of the men and women of our armed forces in any demobilization and rehabilitation scheme. I want to caution the government to see that these plans have been completely worked out by the time they are to be put into use.

I have no intention to-night of taking up any undue time of the committee because when the resolution was originally moved into committee I indicated that it was the intention of our party to make a close scrutiny, investigation and audit of the expenditures of the government when we were in committee. I have simply outlined one or two points which I thought were of salient interest and importance to the public and to parliament. I hope that as the discussion progresses we shall be furnished with as full and complete answers to the questions that have been asked as is possible to give in order that we may have the information to which the public is entitled.

Mr. COLDWELL: I do not propose to speak at any length to-night because last Friday I expressed the opinion that we should be discussing the details of these estimates when the bill was before us. I still feel that the time spent in two debates, one on the resolution and one on the bill, is time that is—I shall not say wasted, but duplicated. I should like to see the house proceed with the bill.

However, there is one thing I wish to say to the Prime Minister. Just before we rose for dinner to-night he suggested that in view of the interest shown in and the questions asked about the retirement of Lieutenant-General McNaughton he would be very glad to have the leader of the opposition, the leader of the Social Credit group and myself meet him in the near future, to-morrow morning I believe, for the purpose of seeing the correspondence. I am glad to accept that invitation, but I have a suggestion to make. It is that we should have this meeting and invite Lieutenant-General McNaughton to be present. Very often official documents and correspondence, because of their nature, need to be supplemented by personal explanations. I think in viewing this correspondence we could gauge the situation much more intelligently if Lieutenant-General McNaughton were present.

I do not know whether it would be possible to have him present to-morrow morning, but I think the meeting should be held at once and I am using the term "at once" to mean as soon as possible. In the interests of the government and of those who have to read this correspondence and come to some decision in order that they may advise their colleagues I urge the Prime Minister to take steps to see that Lieutenant-General McNaughton is present when this correspondence is examined.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think the first meeting should be between the leaders of the different parties of this house and myself. When we come together and discuss the matter we can then consider the point raised by my hon. friend.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I should like to ask the Prime Minister a question since I was not present just before the dinner recess. If there is any correspondence in existence which has not yet been revealed and made public and which it is now proposed to make public to the leaders of the respective parties and I believe to my colleague, the hon. member for Yale, should that correspondence be kept private or are these gentlemen to be at liberty to divulge to their followers the contents of the correspondence? If that be so, is there any good reason why the correspondence should not be tabled? Why the secrecy about the matter? If the Prime Minister will say on his responsibility, not that it is not in the public interest, because that is the stock phrase, but that for reasons of security, having regard to the times in which we are living or for some other reason similar to that, it should not be made public, then I shall be content.

I know nothing about the matter, but the public mind has been raised to the point where they desire to know more about it. If the truth bears heavily upon someone, and I do not know whom, then the truth will not hurt anyone. I invite the Prime Minister to take us into his confidence. If he will say that because of national security or for some other good reason it is not wise that this correspondence should be made public, then I shall not question his decision. I do not rise in my place to make an issue because I do not know anything about this matter.

I have a sincere regard for General McNaughton. I was associated with him for a brief period some years ago. I thought then he was a man's man, and I still think so. The government selected him to lead the Canadian troops overseas in November, 1939, and the whole country applauded that action and supported the government in its selection. May I pause here to express my personal sympathy with General McNaughton if after four years or more of very strenuous life he finds himself in perhaps not as healthy a condition as he ought to be. I think every one of us will be sympathetic, but I am inquiring now if there is any good reason why the public should not know the truth about this matter.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: First of all, may I answer my hon. friend's question with regard to security. I am glad that he has raised the point. As he will be the first to know, telegrams come in cipher code and I have to consider the responsibility, and the government has to consider the responsibility of making public, telegrams or correspondence in the terms in which they come to the government and thus divulge what may lead to the government's code being deciphered and use being made of it by the enemy. That of itself is a clear reason why correspondence which has come in cipher code and which has been deciphered should not be made public, certainly not in the exact terms in which it appears. That is one real embarrassment and handicap the government is under in this matter. It has no desire to keep secret information the public ought to have, but it does desire to safeguard in every possible way great public considerations of which full account has to be taken. There is the further fact to be considered. Whatever is disclosed in connection with this subject cannot be other than of great concern, not only to the people of Canada but to the government of the United Kingdom, the government of the United States, and indeed to the governments of all the united nations. I am perfectly sure that when the hon. leaders of the different parties learn at first hand of the matters on which they wish to be informed, they will find little difficulty in agreeing with the government as to the best course which should then be pursued.

As to placing any obligation on the leaders of the parties who may see the correspondence or be advised of it, I need not say that all three leaders are honourable gentlemen and I place no restrictions on them whatsoever as to what they may wish to say or do as to informing or advising the members of their respective parties. I do not wish to impose any restrictions upon them, beyond those imposed upon each by his own conscience.

The government's action in this matter, as I have already said, is entirely begotten of a desire to protect the war effort not only of this country but of the united nations to the fullest extent possible and to protect all parties concerned therewith.

May I say to my hon. friend who has spoken of his admiration for Lieutenant-General McNaughton that I am one of those who had to do with the appointment of General McNaughton, and I have always held him in the highest possible esteem. I would be the last to wish to have any step of mine in any way embarrass General McNaughton or deprive him of any privilege that he may wish to have. I cannot, however, see that in taking the course which I am now suggesting of having the leaders of the different parties come together and consider all that may be before them, I shall be taking any step that will be prejudicial to anyone, let alone to General McNaughton.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mr. Chairman, one word more. I had intended to make reference to the proposal of the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar that General McNaughton should be invited to meet this committee. May I say that, at first blush at all events, I deprecate that suggestion for this reason: it would simply be an invitation to cross-examine General McNaughton. I do not think the stage has been set for that or anything like that, and I hope that will not happen.

Mr. COLDWELL: The purpose of my suggestion was not to cross-examine General McNaughton but rather because I know from experience extending over some years that public documents do not always contain all that there is to know, and to complete the picture one sometimes needs public documents to be supplemented by those who are involved in matters which public documents discuss. I think every member of this House of Commons knows the nature of official documents. Otherwise it seems to me that what we would be actually doing would be hearing one side of the story if we merely see the correspondence, and I do not think it is quite fair—if I may put it this way— to leave the party leaders to make a decision as to whether their colleagues in the house should be advised of all the circumstances or not. I do not think that is placing us in a proper position with regard to our colleagues or with regard to the house and the country. That is what I had in mind.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say to my hon. friend that he will be at the meeting in the morning and I shall be very happy if he will see that his interest is protected in every particular.

In order that there may be no misunderstanding as to my attitude toward General McNaughton at this time or in regard to the matters we are discussing, may I give to the committee immediately the telegram I sent to General McNaughton at the time he relinquished the command of the Canadian army. This was not in code. It was sent to the high commissioner to transmit to General McNaughton.

Mr. STIRLING: Would the Prime Minister give the date?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is dated Ottawa, December 26, 1943, and reads:

Dear General McNaughton:

As you relinquish your command of the Canadian army I desire, on behalf of the government and people of Canada, to thank you for the great service you have rendered our country and other of the united nations from the beginning of the war. I sincerely trust that, freed from the very heavy responsibilities which have been yours over the past four years, your health and strength may speedily be restored.

The word that you have had to relinquish command of the army will be received throughout Canada with feelings of deepest regret. May it not be long before our country may again have the full benefit of your wide experience and exceptional abilities.

Yours very sincerely,

W. L. Mackenzie King,
Prime Minister.

Mr. GRAYDON: Perhaps I misunderstood the admonition of the Prime Minister at six o'clock, but as I understand him, his desire was that this whole question of General McNaughton and his resignation should be a closed book until such time as the leaders of the different parties had an opportunity to discuss it. But now, first of all, the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar interjects with new suggestions, and then the Prime Minister comes along and reads a telegram. If we are to heed the Prime Minister's admonition I think we had better end further debate on this matter at this time. I am quite surprised that the Prime Minister should have introduced that telegram; and if this keeps up I do not know where we are going to end. I have been trying to carry out the Prime Minister's wishes because I thought it was in the national interest not to prolong this debate now.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If my hon. friend heard what his colleague the hon. member for York-Sunbury suggested, he would see it was a statement that seemed to me to necessitate or render advisable by giving to the committee the telegram I had sent in the open to General McNaughton at the time.

Mr. GRAYDON: It did not strike me in that way.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I hope there is nothing in the message which anyone in the house will take exception to one way or the other at this time. I am only too ready to say nothing further about this matter at all until hon. gentlemen opposite have made their wishes known.

Mr. STIRLING: It seems to me without doubt advisable that nothing more be said at this stage on this matter until the meeting takes place, and I thank the right hon. gentleman for his courtesy in asking me to join with the three leaders. He does so, I know, because for a year or so I occupied the position of Minister of National Defence, and during that time Lieutenant-General McNaughton was Chief of the General Staff. I never can forget the admiration in which I held General McNaughton, the assistance that he was, the ability that he showed and the experience which he had, and it is a matter of no little sorrow to me that General McNaughton's health at the moment is not such as to enable him to carry on the arduous duties for which he was responsible.

I cannot find myself in agreement with the suggestion of the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar, reiterated again to-day, that we should do well to cut short all debate in the committee stage on this resolution and that the debate should take place on the bill. I think he was in error the last time he referred to it when he stated that the bill would have the schedules attached and that they would come before the Chair item by item. That is not the case. War appropriation bills of recent years have had no schedules attached. I have always understood that one of the reasons for making it a different bill from the ordinary money bill was that the government sees fit—perhaps quite rightly so—to keep a certain amount of flexibility within its grasp with regard to these expenditures. The fact remains that on a bill such as this there is no schedule attached, and it appears to me that it does not make very much difference from the point of view of saving time or wasting it whether the discussion takes place at this stage or at that. There is a reason why I prefer that it should take place at this stage. In matters as complicated as this one, subjects frequently arise which have to do with not one minister or two but perhaps three; and when such matter is discussed we may, after hearing the first minister and his views thereon, have an opportunity of hearing a second minister, and it may cover the doings of three departments. It may very well be that after the discussion has taken place questions arise on which clarification is required. When the bill comes up in the committee stage for second reading we have an additional opportunity to obtain more information if we so desire. To my mind that is the reason why it is well to have the discussion take place at this stage; and we are able to go back again to the bill if it is necessary. Last year it was not necessary. Hon. members will remember that the war appropriation bill was completed only two days before prorogation, and appears in a short paragraph in *Hansard*. The introduction of the bill, first reading, second reading, committee stage and third reading all took place in that short space of time. No advantage was taken of the opportunity to discuss the bill at that time. But if I remember rightly, in the year before when the war appropriation bill was brought down such discussion was of great value when the bill came up the second time. Therefore I prefer the method which we have found our way into in this war for dealing with discussion on these estimates. The government shows it is fully inclined to give us all the information in detail. The first sheet is before us. We can open it up for discussion, and I have no doubt there will be no impediment placed in our way in our endeavour to obtain the information we require.

There is a matter that I want the Minister of National Defence to refer to again in clearer terms than he did, because I am in just as much of a fog as I ever was with regard to this army in Canada, which some people call a home army and some call the defence army. I remember the minister said last session that there was no such thing as a defence army. I do not know what it is called to-day, but the description which the minister gave this afternoon has left me as much befogged as I ever was, and lest it be thought it is merely my dullness of mind, may I say that I find a considerable number of my fellow members are also quite befogged as to what this army consists of and what it is doing.

It is not easy, without *Hansard* of this afternoon before us, to follow the minister's description. The picture that I have is that in Canada there is a training stream which amounts to 70,000 men and which is looked upon in the main as the reinforcements which in due course will find their way overseas. These reinforcements, plus such reinforcements as exist in the holding units overseas are, in the minister's opinion, sufficient to meet the estimate of casualties for five divisions overseas at the present time. At the other end of the scale, if I may so describe it, we find the reserve army. The reserve army consists of the units that were known as the non-permanent active militia. I am very glad

the minister took the opportunity to pay tribute to the officers and men of the non-permanent active militia. It was set up twenty or more years ago. It was a skeleton force in my day and amounted to 55,000 men. It was to be the nucleus capable of being expanded into the necessary armed forces when war came. These officers and men stayed loyally with the reserve army, doing the drudgery through the years of depression and years of peace. I do not think too high praise can be given them. I have known them in the units in my particular neighbourhood. I have known them in other units, and I have always felt great appreciation for what these men gave up to keep their unit of the reserve army in something like its proper shape. The minister did not praise them any too highly and I know his words will be appreciated by many who have come in contact with them. That reserve army, he tells us, amounts to about 100,000; and it is in between these two extremes of the military forces that I want clarification.

Excluding the reserve forces, I understand that the remainder of the soldiery here or overseas, compose the active army. Certain of them, for reasons well known, will not under present regulations leave this country. They will be used in defence. Did I understand him to say that in the active army in Canada there were 55,000 operational troops and 75,000 troops rendering service to the operational troops and that it covered the veterans' guard, training establishments and the great number of incidental units? What I do not understand is, will those 55,000 men be available for the training stream if and when need arises? That is one of my difficulties.

Another of my difficulties is to follow him in his description of how the national resources mobilization men compose forty-seven per cent of the operational troops here, and if that is so how can they be considered a part of that stream which may eventually be trained for overseas? To my mind there is considerable confusion with regard to those who are not reserve, those who are not in the training stream, those who are at the present time in Canada preparatory to defence, shall I say? Included in that is the contingent that went to Kiska and came back. What is happening to them? Are those units being broken up now that they are being distributed through the Canadian active army in Canada, or are they finding their way into the training stream?

It is commonly said that in a good many parts of Canada—I shall mention Petawawa for one—there are a very large number of men with their complement of officers, with their necessary supporting supply forces, and there are unattached officers by the dozen. I do not know if that is an accurate statement, but the minister will be able to inform us. It is commonly believed that, scattered across Canada, there are a very considerable number of officers who do not appear to be attached to any unit at the moment and who are marking time or doing something or another or doing nothing at all. It is all these matters which I think the minister will do well to explain to us and through us to the people of Canada.

Mr. RALSTON: First, with regard to troops in Canada, I find it a little difficult to follow my hon. friend. He speaks of the number of N.R.M.A. personnel in Canada and talks about the home defence army. I have endeavoured to make it clear that there is no such thing as a home defence army. There is a Canadian active army, and in units of that army, in detachments of it, there are men who are N.R.M.A. personnel who at the present time are not liable without further action to service overseas. But they are serving in the Canadian active army; they are not hived or segregated. They are filling a place which is necessary at the present time in Canada, doing a job that somebody else would have to do if they were not there. That applies in connection with operational troops of whom 34,950 are N.R.M.A. personnel.

Mr. STIRLING: That is, of the 55,000?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes. In the non-operational troops the proportion is very much lower, about 11,000, and in the training stream there are 15,000 out of approximately 75,000.

Mr. STIRLING: Have they volunteered for overseas?

Mr. RALSTON: No.

Mr. STIRLING: Then how can they be in the training stream heading for overseas?

Mr. RALSTON: The training stream is heading both for overseas and for service in Canada. When you call a man up you have to train him whether he is to serve in Canada or overseas. In the depot, reselection and disposal units there are 6,400, and on extended leave, about 5,300. So that these men are scattered all through the services in Canada, and it is quite true that they are not available for overseas service until further action is taken. But there seems to be an idea that these men are sitting down doing nothing because they are not for overseas service at the present time. If you did not have them, however, you would have to have some other men in their place.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Why does the minister say that? There is no danger of invasion.

Mr. RALSTON: I have heard that so often.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It will bear repetition.

Mr. RALSTON: I heard it from this part of the house when I was minister in 1926-30; "What are you preparing for? There is no war." I maintain that we do not have these operational troops just for fun. They are on the east coast and on the west coast, in coast defence batteries, in close support battalions, searchlight companies and in all the posts which are necessary for the purpose of taking care of the scale of attack which has been agreed to, not simply by our own chiefs of staff but by the United States chiefs of staff as well, and the 55,000 form a comparatively small number. That is what these troops are for.

The hon. member for Yale asks with regard to troops going overseas, and reinforcements. He wants to know what the situation is. I said that the reinforcement pool overseas is well up to the planned strength; that is to say, it is a pool over there to be drawn on as casualties occur, and as that pool goes down it is refilled by men sent from here. If the casualties are heavy at a particular time the pool will go down considerably, but the general dispatch is more or less in regular monthly shipments, with the result that at the end of the year you will have averaged up and the pool will be back to what it was at the beginning, provided the casualties have not exceeded the rate at which the reinforcement pool was at first built up.

Mr. STIRLING: And that pool overseas amounts to the estimate of the casualties that may be anticipated for the five divisions overseas?

Mr. RALSTON: For a certain period, based on a certain number of months intense activity and a certain number of months of operations of varying degrees of intensity, as is figured out, having regard to the operations which are visualized.

There has been some statement about divisions sent to Italy in order to avoid or to lessen the necessity for reinforcements. There has not been a single change of any kind in the scales of casualties for which we have estimated, owing to the fact that we sent divisions to the Mediterranean—no change whatever.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I never heard that, but you have reinforcements there, I hope.

Mr. RALSTON: It has been said. The suggestion was that the corps was sent to Italy because the government had not reinforcements sufficient to keep them up at the rate which was estimated, taking cross-channel operations into account. The estimate of casualties has been based on the most careful computation possible in view of the experience our men have had, and the figures I gave out this afternoon are figures in which my officers believe. They have been overseas themselves consulting with the authorities, and they anticipate that if these estimates are based on sound grounds, which they have every reason to believe is the case, the reinforcement situation will be as I have stated.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The minister did not give the figures on reinforcements.

Mr. RALSTON: Yes; my hon. friend did not hear me.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): What is considered an adequate reinforcement pool in percentage in relation to the active army overseas?

Mr. RALSTON: Of course I cannot give that information. I have been asked for it before. It is regarded as one of the most secret pieces of information from the point of view of security, but I assure my hon. friend that it is based not simply on a Canadian estimate but on a British estimate as well.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): What is the estimate based on—on the history of casualties in this war? If that is so, it is very small for Canada.

Mr. RALSTON: I can only say to my hon. friend that it is based on what competent officers think is a scale which is not likely to be exceeded in connection with the sort of operations they visualize, and that applies not simply to the Canadians but to the British as well. I have already explained that that reinforcement pool is there, and as it is lowered by casualties it is filled by troops sent over. These troops are in the training stream at the present time, being trained, they are also in operational units. We are withdrawing these men from operational units from time to time, retraining them when necessary, and sending them overseas, replacing them with N.R.M.A. personnel. That in short is the situation. I was frank with the committee and pointed out that if recruiting went down perceptibly, if it did not keep up, it would

mean that at the end of the fiscal year, 1944-45, towards the end, the pool in Canada would drop, although the pool overseas would have been kept up.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Has not that contingency arisen now—that recruiting has dropped and dropped materially, and that an effort is being made now, through the draft boards, according to recent instructions, to increase the number of men to be taken in?

Mr. RALSTON: I do not know what my hon. friend is referring to. All I have to say is that I believe the number being requested from the draft board has remained constant for the last six months, at least, and I am sure there has been no effort as far as the Department of National Defence is concerned to have any increased number called.

The CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed further I would suggest, not for my own sake but for the sake of preserving order, that hon. members address their remarks to the chair.

Mr. RALSTON: I have a suggestion to make, if it is agreeable to the committee. We have here the statement and the various headings under which these expenditures are being considered by the committee. Would it not help us all; would it not enable us to formulate our questions better and perhaps let us make better preparation to answer them, if we did as we do with ordinary estimates, that is, proceed with the items as they are set out here, in the order in which they appear? I may say to anyone who is interested in the mobilization act, for instance, that this matter can be taken up very easily under pay and allowances, which includes national resources mobilization personnel. The first item on the list is civil salaries and wages. I am in the hands of the committee, but I think this procedure is generally understood to be the best to follow, and perhaps we might make better progress; I might be more informative, and perhaps be a little more ready to answer, if we proceeded in that way.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): While we are discussing this question of organization and this reinforcement pool, I should like to ask the minister whether these divisions—I think he referred to three in Britain and, I suppose, the two that are in Italy—are up to war strength now. Are all these divisions fully manned and up to war strength at the present time?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Mr. LOCKHART: From what the minister said I gathered that the training stream, or whatever term he applied, included the men who are in the defence army of Canada, so called by the public, the men staying in Canada—

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend is starting his question with an assumption which is not correct. I understood him to say that he gathered that the training stream consisted of the defence army in Canada. The training stream consists of all the men who are in training either for overseas or for Canadian service.

Mr. LOCKHART: I think in the minister's statement he said that training stream numbered about 50,000; I believe that was the figure used.

Mr. RALSTON: It is about 75,000 altogether.

Mr. LOCKHART: That included others as well, but we will use the figures, fifty to seventy-five thousand. Does the minister feel that this is the number that will be maintained as a training stream or whatever he wishes to call it? Does he feel that this will be the approximate number that will be held here in Canada?

Mr. RALSTON: No. As I was saying, the training stream is drawn upon from time to time as dispatches are made overseas; and as recruiting is carried on the training stream is refilled. I said that if recruiting went down in July or August, for instance, it would mean that the output of the training stream perhaps next January or February would be lower, due to the fact that fewer men had gone in.

Mr. LOCKHART: The minister misunderstood me. Do I understand, then, that in practice, according to the minister's ideas, that number of fifty to seventy-five thousand must be maintained in order to carry out the policy which has been adopted by the department; in other words, that this many men will still remain inactive in Canada, in a sense, possibly in preparation for going overseas if they ever go overseas? It keeps fifty to seventy-five thousand men static in Canada; that is what I mean.

Mr. RALSTON: They are not static.

Mr. LOCKHART: Well, that is what it amounts to.

Mr. RALSTON: They are not static; they are being trained.

Mr. LOCKHART: Trained for what purpose?

Mr. RALSTON: Trained for overseas.

Mr. LOCKHART: But fifty thousand or more of them are not going overseas?

Mr. RALSTON: I interrupted my hon. friend to tell him that I thought he was labouring under a misapprehension. In the training stream at the training centres there are about fifteen thousand who are National Resources Mobilization Act personnel. At the present time these men are not going overseas, but they are being trained for the purpose of taking the place of general service personnel in units, to release those men so that they may go overseas. But those units have to be kept up. I have explained some of the functions of the operational units, and I have gone into the functions of the non-operational units as well. These units have to be kept up in order to supply the ordnance and so on, and to supply the personnel to do all the work of a base for the provision of our army overseas.

Mr. LOCKHART: Then are we to have only fifteen thousand men in Canada who are not going overseas?

Mr. RALSTON: No. We have 15,000 in the training centres; we have 34,000 in the operational units, and we have 11,000 in the non-operational units.

Mr. LOCKHART: That is 50,000 or more.

Mr. RALSTON: Altogether it comes to over 70,000 men. Included in that number are 5,300 who are on extended leave, that is to say farm leave, mining leave, forestry leave and so on. They are all included in that number.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Will the minister give the committee a statement of the number of men in Canada, in all capacities, drawn to the colours under the provisions of the National Resources Mobilization Act, at present in the training stream or in units, operational or otherwise? How many of these draftees have we on the payroll in Canada to-day, where are they and what are they doing?

Mr. RALSTON: This is the third time I have given that information, but I will give it half a dozen times if the committee wants it. In operational troops, that is in units, there are roughly 34,000. In non-operational troops there are roughly 11,000.

Mr. TUSTIN: What are the duties of those 11,000 men?

Mr. RALSTON: I have explained that the non-operational troops are in the training centres as administrative staff, and so on. There are something like 22,000 of them there, though not all called up under the National Resources Mobilization Act. Some of those men are in the training centres as clerks, cooks and all that sort of thing. There must be thousands of them in ordnance, in the depots all over the country. I am thinking of—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): What is that?

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend asked for the information; surely he will give me an opportunity to furnish it. These men are in ordnance depots. I think of the central mechanization depot at London; I think of the Longue Point depot; I think of the training centre at Barriefield; I think of hospitals all over the country; I think of district headquarters; I think of camp staffs; I think of army service corps. All these men are non-operational troops. In the training stream there are 15,000 being trained.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is 60,000.

Mr. RALSTON: Then in the depot, the re-selection wing I spoke of, where they are being moved from one place to another, posted to a new place and so on, there are 6,400; and on extended leave there are 5,300.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is approximately 70,000, all told.

Mr. RALSTON: And as I pointed out to the committee, if they were not there somebody else would have to be there, drawing the same money.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): We heard all that. These 70,000 men are all in good military categories, capable of fighting?

Mr. RALSTON: No, they are not.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): What categories are they in, then?

Mr. RALSTON: They are category "A", category "B", and some as low as category "C".

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): How many in category "A"?

Mr. RALSTON: I could not tell my hon. friend; I could only make a rough estimation.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Perhaps my hon. friend can give that later on.

Mr. RALSTON: At a rough guess I would say probably 50,000.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I may as well tell the minister now that the public want to know how many men there are among these zombies, as they are commonly called, who are in category "A", the highest category, and who are not fighting, who are not intended to fight and who do not intend to fight.

Mr. RALSTON: Like the Kiska troops, for example?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I expect they are part of it.

Mr. RALSTON: They were part of it. They seemed to have some intention of fighting.

Mr. WHITE: In the break-down the minister has given he has placed the number of recruits called under the National Resources Mobilization Act at around 70,000. I should like to draw his attention to the table which appears in the January, 1944, issue of *Canada at War,* at page 22. It shows the total number called as 125,640, from which number there is subtracted the number of men who transferred to the other various forces, numbering 37,930. That leaves a remainder of 87,710, as of September 30, 1943. Since that time no doubt many thousands of others have been called, which brings the number up to around 100,000. Would the minister explain where these 30,000 men are, between the 70,000 he has given, and the total to date of 100,000.

Mr. RALSTON: I think my hon. friend has the explanation right in that book. I think the footnote in the book will tell him that. I have not the book in front of me, but I think it is the case that the figures he has given are intake, and they have made no allowance for discharges. The difference lies in those who have been discharged. I think if my hon. friend would read the note he would see if it is not what I say it is.

Mr. WHITE: Which note?

Mr. RALSTON: I have not the book here. Is not the first note one which says that certain figures are not included?

Mr. WHITE: It says:

> Figures of intake do not represent actual strength of the armed services, as they do not take into consideration men discharged for medical or other reasons.

Mr. RALSTON: I am talking about actual strength. My hon. friend is talking about gross intake.

Mr. WHITE: But I would point out to the minister that if these men are called up and enrolled under the National Resources Mobilization Act, it is doubtful that there would be any number up in the thousands discharged.

Mr. RALSTON: I am sorry if my hon. friend is doubtful, but I am giving him what the strength is. And there are discharges. I think if my hon. friend has the figures he will see these enrolments began in 1941.

[Mr. R. B. Hanson.]

Mr. WHITE: It is up to September 30, 1943.

Mr. RALSTON: Those are enrolments since the beginning of the war?

Mr. WHITE: Yes.

Mr. RALSTON: And there have been those discharges.

Mr. WHITE: Well, then, would the minister be good enough to complete this statement, and show us the number of discharges?

Mr. RALSTON: I cannot give it in that way. The only way to do is to give my hon. friend the strength. I have given that to him. My hon. friend is doing what others are doing who take the total enrolments in the last war and treat that as the strength of the army.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The last war?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes, the last war. They are comparing this war and the last war, and saying there were 619,000 in the last war, when it was 619,000 men enlisted and conscripted. It was not 619,000 on the strength of the army.

Mr. WHITE: Is it correct to say that of these 125,000 called up under the National Resources Mobilization Act there have been some 30,000 discharged?

Mr. RALSTON: The hon. member is correct in assuming that the difference between the strength I give him now and the total or net figure that he has there are discharges or are transferred, or have been struck off strength for some other reason.

Mr. WHITE: When it says in the book that men are called up and enrolled, that actually means that those men are enlisted and attested on the army's strength.

Mr. RALSTON: I beg my. hon. friend's pardon.

Mr. WHITE: This list which shows enrolments of men called up under the National Resources Mobilization Act actually means that these men have been called and have passed the medical examination, and later have been discharged for some reason.

Mr. RALSTON: Not all those have been discharged.

Mr. WHITE: The number who are here.

Mr. RALSTON: The numbers have not been discharged. That shows the number who have actually been enrolled.

Mr. GREEN: The minister said this afternoon, if I understood him correctly, that there are about 50,000 men called up under the

National Resources Mobilization Act, commonly known as home defence troops—I understand that they are known as such erroneously—that there are that many men called up under the act who are of a category such that they could be sent overseas, from either coast, to take part in the fighting. In other words, there is an army in Canada of 50,000 of these men who, under the present policy of the government, will never fight unless that fighting takes place on the shores of Canada. This is a question on which there is a very wide difference of opinion between the government and the members of the official opposition. I say that because we believe that these men should be available for fighting wherever they are required. What happened to the Kiska force brings out the point very well. Here we had a force of approximately 5,000 men who were practically all called up under the National Resources Mobilization Act. Those men were sent to Kiska. They went there to fight. Everyone has agreed that they carried on in a splendid fashion, and made a very good name for themselves. Of course, there was no actual fighting.

Now, these men have come back to Canada. Kiska has been occupied and these Canadian troops have come back to Canada. I understand they are still on the Pacific coast. Besides that task force there are one or two other similar task forces on the coast. All of those troops have been trained for jungle fighting, or in other words, to fight the Japanese. They are thoroughly qualified. I believe some inquiries were made among the units as to whether or not the men were willing voluntarily to go to fight the Japanese, as distinguished from fighting in Europe, and that the majority of men agreed to do so, and said they would be perfectly happy to fight the Japanese. The minister can correct me in that if I am wrong.

But there is the position. Why is it that those men cannot be sent to fight the Japanese? Why do they have to remain in Canada, while the Americans, Australians and New Zealanders are doing the fighting in the Pacific area, and Canada is not represented at all? That seems to me a very unwise position for this nation to be put in. Apparently we are in that position because of the policy of the government in refusing to send any of these men abroad to fight.

The minister said on Friday, referring to the Kiska force, that these men were trained not only for home defence, but for special duty in the Pacific, should action make that necessary and should the decision be made to send them there. Will the minister explain the position with respect to forces such as the Kiska force? Why cannot that force be sent to fight the Japanese? Why must it stay at home in Canada?

Mr. RALSTON: I wonder if my hon. friend will permit me to get an understanding of his policy. Supposing the Kiska force were to-day general service personnel; would my hon. friend advocate sending them to fight the Japanese?

Mr. GREEN: Yes.

Mr. RALSTON: You would?

Mr. GREEN: Yes.

Mr. RALSTON: Even with the man-power situation as we have it in Canada, you would advocate that?

Mr. GREEN: Well—

Mr. RALSTON: Just a moment.

Mr. GREEN: You have asked me a question.

Mr. RALSTON: You would advocate fighting a third front—Canada fighting the Japanese, too?

Mr. GREEN: The minister cannot evade the question in that way.

Mr. RALSTON: I am not evading it.

Mr. GREEN: If the policy of this government were a proper one, and all these 50,000 men were available for fighting, there would be men to send to the Pacific and to Europe. The objection is that you have 50,000 men you cannot send anywhere under your foolish policy.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend is generally pretty clear, but I think if I may say so he is not thinking very clearly in this instance. In the first place, at the present time I do not see this parliament authorizing the sending of a force to Japan—

Mr. GREEN: Not to Japan.

Mr. RALSTON: To fight the Japanese. The first person to object to it would be the hon. member for York-Sunbury.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I did not say that.

Mr. RALSTON: Or his leaders, who may be keener than my hon. friend about reinforcements. That is one thing they are always talking about, that if these men are there we should leave them for reinforcements.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The minister does not know what is in my mind, at all.

Mr. RALSTON: All right. My hon. friend may contradict it if he wishes. These men at

the present time are, as I have indicated before, a second line of reinforcements. I do not think my hon. friend would be standing on his feet for a single moment advocating the sending of a force just at the moment from Canada to fight the Japanese.

Mr. GREEN: Why did the minister send them to Kiska, then, if they were not to fight?

Mr. RALSTON: That was simply a brigade, and that was before we sent our second division to Italy. That was at a time when there was no such activity on the western front such as there is to-day. They were sent there because there was an opportunity to send them to do a job and we did it. My hon. friend seems to think that there are strings on the 50,000 men who are in Canada, that they cannot fight outside Canada. They are trained; they are fit for reinforcement purposes, and they can be sent if the action is taken. They are to-day a potential force for reinforcements as well as for the defence of Canada or for operations on the Pacific.

Mr. GREEN: Why cannot the Kiska force be sent to Europe if the minister does not want to send them to fight the Japanese?

Mr. RALSTON: Canada has reached the peak so far as the sending of new capital units overseas is concerned. A year ago we took that stand, and that policy was endorsed by this house. The suggestion has been made to me that I am simply crazy to build up the army, that the army overseas is big enough now. My friend now suggests that we send another brigade in the shape of the Kiska force.

Mr. GREEN: Why cannot they be sent to Europe as reinforcements?

Mr. RALSTON: If there is any necessity of sending them overseas, they can be sent if the proper action is taken. I pointed out that at the present time there are in Canada about 60,000 men who will provide feeders for the reinforcement pool overseas. That pool will be filled up again by recruiting. If recruiting does not go on fast enough, then the pool in Canada will be down and we shall have to consider what to do. There is nothing lost through the fact that at the moment these men do not happen to be subject to overseas service.

Mr. GREEN: The plan is to keep these 50,000 fighting men in Canada who have not volunteered for service anywhere, and if next year more men will be required, others will be sent and these 50,000 will remain here doing nothing.

Mr. RALSTON: We must have some men in Canada. These men are serving in Canada and are doing the jobs I have spoken of. If a man wants to volunteer to go overseas, I would rather have him. If we can get it, I would rather have a volunteer army. If the time comes when it is necessary to do something else, then, as I have said to this house before, as far as I am concerned I shall be ready to make the recommendation. In the meantime these men are trained and they can be used for service in Canada. They are available as a second line if action is taken for reinforcements, should the occasion arise.

Mr. GREEN: If the minister wants volunteers to go to Europe and these Kiska men have volunteered to fight the Japanese, why cannot they go to fight the Japanese?

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend is talking about these men wanting to fight the Japanese, about our sending a certain force to fight the Japanese. I do not know what my hon. friend is talking about, but I am delighted to hear that the Kiska men are prepared to volunteer for general service.

Mr. GREEN: To fight the Japanese.

Mr. RALSTON: I understood that they volunteered if they were sent as a unit. My hon. friend asks why they are not sent overseas as reinforcements. They have an opportunity to volunteer and I am sure that some of them are volunteering. As they volunteer they are sent into training.

Mr. GREEN: What does it cost to keep these 50,000 men?

The CHAIRMAN: I think we should have a certain amount of decorum and all remarks should be addressed to the chair.

Mr. RALSTON: It costs exactly what it would cost for any 50,000 men who were needed for service in Canada. For approximately 70,000 men I think the figure would be $100,000,000 a year. That would have to be spent whether it was national resources mobilization personnel or general service personnel so long as the job had to be done here.

Mr. GREEN: The minister has emphasized the necessity of keeping the units overseas reinforced, and with that I heartily agree. Apparently he is quite satisfied that there are sufficient reinforcements available. Have the

five divisions overseas been kept up to strength? I ask that question because on November 25 the following appeared in the Vancouver press:

Indications are that the following changes are being made in the reorganization—

Referring to the army overseas.

1. Withdrawal of troops from the second division to meet requirements in other divisions, thus eliminating that division as a combat force.

It has been reported that some second division units are now classed as training battalions with the task of supplying reinforcements to units on the fighting fronts.

I hope that report is incorrect. The second division fought the battle of Dieppe, and this report is to the effect that they are not now at full strength as a division and have never been since the battle of Dieppe. Will the minister tell us whether or not that is the situation?

Mr. RALSTON: No, it is not true. I heard of that report when I was in England. The second division has a definite task to do in connection with certain operations, and I have no knowledge whatsoever of the second division not being up to strength or not operating as a division. I am sure they are operating as a division.

Mr. GREEN: Just the same as the other divisions?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Mr. LOCKHART: I do not wish to press the point unduly, but there is something I should like to draw to the minister's attention. He has said that this force of upwards of 70,000 men must be retained to keep the training stream flowing. There has been some criticism of this action in my area and I should like to give the minister an illustration or two. Some young men have bought what have been classed as non-essential businesses such as shoe stores. I know of one case in a town of two thousand where a man bought a business and carried the only up-to-date stock in the community to take care of the farming population. This man was to be forced out of business, and there are other cases I could give the minister. This particular man developed a physical weakness of which no one knew anything, but he received his notice and transportation and had to go to Toronto. He was to be forced to sell his business. The feeling is growing about these cases. People think there could be some reduction in these men who are being retained in the defence army described by the minister. Surely it is not necessary for a married man with three children to have to sell his business which was bought three years before the war started. As I say, there are other cases of which I can give the minister particulars. Apparently if the war goes on one or two more years this force will still be maintained.

Mr. RALSTON: The Department of National Defence does not call up those men; it simply makes a requisition on the Department of Labour, and national selective service decides whether or not a man is eligible for exemption or deferment. The case cited by my hon. friend does sound like an appealing one, but it is something the army cannot do much about.

Mr. LOCKHART: Just so that the minister may have a clear picture, I may say that the young man went to Toronto to the selective service office and explained the circumstances. His whole savings were at stake, but by the time he got back home his notice to report was in the mail and within four days he was to report for service in the army. By a stroke of good luck or otherwise he happened to have some physical defect which he had never known of, and that was all that saved him. He had told the selective service office the position he was in but got nowhere. I give that as one case. You are maintaining a large group, some 70,000 men, in a more or less static state—I know the minister disagrees with that—and when these men plead their case and explain what they are up against to the selective service officers it seems to make no difference. They are called into the army in spite of everything.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Am I to understand from the minister that these men are afraid to go overseas? You can call them by any name you please, but that is what it really amounts to, and they are not from British Columbia. Yet some of these men who are afraid to go overseas are acting as non-commissioned officers instructing active service men who have volunteered to go overseas.

Mr. RALSTON: I do not know of any of them instructing in the training centres.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I do not care where they are instructing. I know that in British Columbia we have men from the province from which the hon. member for York-Sunbury comes, men who have not done an honest day's work in the last six months, who are telling active service men in British Columbia who have volunteered for active service overseas to pick up a cigarette off the sidewalk, or some other order.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The men from my county all went active.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Right in British Columbia we have men from your province.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Name them.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I think it is a disgrace that an active service man who has volunteered to go overseas should have one of these men who have not volunteered for service overseas but have two or three stripes telling him what to do. I know what would have happened in my battalion if anything of that sort had occurred. If the minister wants instances, I can give them.

Mr. RALSTON: I should like to have them.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: The minister says that these men are taken into the stream. If they are in a stream, all I can say is that they are trying to run uphill. These men from eastern Canada are not getting infantry training in British Columbia. There are active service men from British Columbia who are building roads and these other men are doing nothing but lying around camps. Some of them could not dig a post-hole in three days. If that is what he calls a streamlined service, I do not know where the minister gets his advice. The minister cannot keep track of all this, I know, but some steps should be taken to see that these men from eastern Canada who have not volunteered for active service are not put in a position to order a volunteer from British Columbia to pick up a cigarette from the playground. Yet there they are, sitting around the sidewalk in North Vancouver, and it is a disgrace that these men from eastern Canada are not doing a type of work or undergoing a type of training that would be to the good of the country.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I take objection to any suggestion that these men come from my riding.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I think there is a lot to be said about the home defence army. It is most unsatisfactory. I should like to get a broader picture of the general situation. The minister tells us that we have 240,000 troops overseas, and he has said that we are to maintain our army headquarters staff. To most of us this is something new. We do not know what establishment is necessary for an army headquarters staff and all the necessary ancillary troops. Could the minister give us an estimate of the numbers necessary for the present army headquarters staff and ancillary troops? We know how many are required in a division, and I understand that for a corps the numbers are almost double those required for the two divisions contained therein. I should like to know the extra percentage required for army headquarters staff and the necessary ancillary troops. I think that has a distinct bearing all the way through on our reinforcement pool and home defence army.

Mr. RALSTON: I explained on Friday to my hon. friend that it is difficult to say how many troops you need when you have an army headquarters, because the corps does provide a proportion of army troops to go to whatever army headquarters are supervising and directing that particular corps. I have not any figures here to-night, but I remember tabling a return showing the number of officers at army headquarters and the number of other ranks required. I do not recall the number of officers, but if I remember correctly the number of additional ranks was shown as something like 7,000 men. I would have to look up the return to be sure of that, but that is my best recollection. The army troops, generally speaking, are provided in large measure by the corps which the army is supervising. The corps provide the army troops for whatever army they may happen to be directing.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Out of present personnel?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes. The army headquarters has no method of recruiting or organizing a unit. It gets its men from a corps and they become army troops and are always under army command.

Mr. WRIGHT: There are approximately 100,000 men called up under the N.R.M.A., and the present strength is approximately 71,000, which would indicate that about 29,000 have been discharged or transferred or died.

Mr. RALSTON: Or enlisted, or become general service men.

Mr. WRIGHT: What is the present policy with respect to discharging men in low medical category who have been called up under the N.R.M.A.?

Mr. RALSTON: They are discharged when they can be spared. We are endeavouring to have as large a percentage as possible of "A" category men in the army, whether N.R.M.A. or general service.

Mr. WRIGHT: Is any different policy followed with respect to the discharge of those called up under the N.R.M.A. if they are in a low medical category?

Mr. RALSTON: If it is a matter of requesting a discharge, certainly the general service man would get the preference. That is, where a man would like to get out and is in a low medical category and can be spared the general service man would get the opportunity first. But if it is a case of a man wanting to stay in, the N.R.M.A. man of low medical category would be discharged first.

Mr. QUELCH: Can the minister state whether our estimate for necessary reinforcements is at a higher or lower rate than in the last war? In the last war we had a considerable amount of difficulty in maintaining a sufficient flow of reinforcements, and our units were usually below strength. The strength of five battalions would pass as reinforcements through one battalion. Naturally, people are puzzled. They wonder how we are going to maintain a sufficient volume of reinforcements when we have so many men in the armed forces, in the navy, army and air force, and at the same time so many more on the production line.

Mr. RALSTON: I beg your pardon.

Mr. QUELCH: On the production line. Just exactly how many men have we available for reinforcements in Canada, England, Italy and Egypt? What is the total number, or do you not care to give that information?

Mr. RALSTON: I am sorry, I could not give that.

Mr. QUELCH: Can you tell us how the estimates compare with the estimates of the last war? Is it higher or lower? It seems to me it must be very much lower than the estimate we had in the last war.

Mr. RALSTON: I do not think any comparison can be made. I do not know what the basis was in the last war, but obviously the composition and employment of the forces are entirely different in this war. The forces are entirely different. I do not think any useful or intelligent comparison could be made.

Mr. QUELCH: On the other hand, you would not say that the casualties will be lower, surely. You would expect the casualties to be higher, if anything, if we are to have many more Dieppe raids, for instance.

Mr. RALSTON: I hope we shall not have any more Dieppe raids.

Mr. QUELCH: We have to be prepared, nevertheless. Could the minister say what the policy is in regard to the appointment of officers in the filling of vacancies in the field? Have the commanders the right to fill vacancies of officers in the field by appointing men from the ranks, as they did in the last war? At that time men were taken from the ranks and given a commission on the field.

Mr. RALSTON: I can say to my hon. friend that is a matter which is under discussion at the present moment. There is some discussion as to what is best to do; that is to say, whether an officer who has had officer training should be used when there is a surplus of officers, or whether the appointments should be made directly on the field without further training. The matter is under discussion now, as a matter of fact, with Canadian military headquarters. Obviously there are many advantages in having a man who is battle-trained. He has been a non-commissioned officer, he knows conditions; at the same time there are certain qualifications which are required by commissioned officers which can, I think, best be obtained by long-term training which we endeavour to give them. There is something to be said for using officers when you have them rather than making ad hoc appointments on the field. The matter is under consideration.

Mr. QUELCH: The minister knows that a lot of hard feeling was caused in the last war by sending green officers over to take charge of men who had had two, three or four years service. I think it took a lot of pressure on the part of the commander in the field before they were given the right to make these appointments on the field. I think further consideration should be given to that.

Mr. RALSTON: I happened to be a commander myself on the field in the last war. I remember one or two circumstances at that time, but I always did this. I do not think I ever appointed a man on the field; I recommended him to go back to England and take an officers' training course, if he had all the qualifications and all the equipment that a man should have in order to take that position.

Mr. QUELCH: In the early stages of the war there may be men appointed on the field who were not given the chance of officers training.

Mr. RALSTON: I know that.

Mr. MUTCH: May I suggest to the minister that it might be advantageous and help to clear the picture if he explained briefly to the committee the practice of selecting men to be trained as officers. Only those men who have had a very considerable amount of experience in Canada, or in field units overseas are selected as officers. I have had an oppor-

tunity in recent months of seeing a considerable number of those who are passing through the officer training period in England, and I do not know of anyone—I may be open to correction in this—who has come to the officer training centres from the field forces in England in recent months who has not had field experience. They are not building up their reserves any more with inexperienced people from civilian life. They are building them up from men who have been in the service a minimum length of time under the regulations and who have complete training or experience overseas. They are men who have trained in the arm of the unit from which they come.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Go to a barber college and get a commission.

Mr. BRUCE: I have one or two questions to ask the minister with respect to reinforcements. He stated on Friday that although we were maintaining our army headquarters we had only one corps, and that the other corps would be supplied by Britain. My first question is, if our three divisions are in action I presume that the Canadian pool to which he referred would supply the reinforcements for our own divisions.

Mr. RALSTON: Correct.

Mr. BRUCE: Second, in the event of an invasion of the continent, can the minister give us any estimate of the percentage of reinforcements that might be necessary within the first two weeks?

Mr. RALSTON: I would not attempt to give any estimate of that kind. I say to my hon. friend that provision has been made for reinforcements on a scale which is regarded as adequate. We had exactly the same situation in Sicily. This is not the first time, you know. We had an invasion in Sicily and we sent reinforcements which were regarded as adequate for the first two weeks, and much longer than that.

Mr. BRUCE: We have been told that there is a reinforcement pool in Canada and a pool in England, and if the pool runs out in England it will be reinforced from the pool in Canada. It would take a considerable time to move these troops from Canada to England, and if we have very heavy casualties in the first two weeks or month of the invasion, then I think the people of this country would like to be assured that we have sufficient reinforcements available immediately to take care of the situation. I should like to ask the minister if he can give that assurance.

Mr. RALSTON: I think I can.

[Mr. Mutch.]

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: The criticisms that I have heard wherever I have gone regarding the home defence army is that we are sending men overseas with considerably short periods of training, and we shall probably be sending others if the emergency arises, with still shorter periods of training, while we have in the home defence army men who have had much longer years of service and more years of training. That is the chief criticism that I have heard regarding the home defence army in my ramblings around the country. The minister has indicated that the government does not think it advisable at the present time to have Canadians engaged in war with Japan but that our forces should be concentrated in the war in Europe. I think it is generally understood that the war with Japan will continue possibly for some years after we hope the war in Europe will have finished. Has the government formulated any plans regarding the use of Canadians against the Japanese when the war in Europe has been completed. That requires, I am told, a large number of attendants, men who know Japanese, know Japanese customs, men who have worked with the army. I understand the Americans are doing a great deal in the way of training men for that work. Is anything of that kind being contemplated in Canada at the present time?

Mr. RALSTON: In the first place, what I said with regard to Japan or what I wanted to say was, that no commitments have been made at the present time as to the nature or extent of Canada's participation in the war against Japan. At the same time I wish to say, as I said last year, that the army recognizes fully that we are at war with Japan and we are making plans accordingly. I cannot give my hon. friend any statement with regard to policy.

Mr. ROSE: I believe there is a good deal of uneasiness among certain people with regard to the army's role in strikes. I was in Shawinigan Falls at the time of the strike, having been invited by the unions to go and speak, and while there I found quite a number of soldiers who had been sent from Farnham. They were French-Canadian soldiers, it is true, but they were parading the streets intimidating the workers and they did not create the best impression upon the people. I do not think it is the best thing for the morale of the soldiers, who believe there is a greater enemy for them to fight than their fellow Canadians at Shawinigan Falls. Who ordered the soldiers there? In the Montreal strike of policemen and firemen there were, I understand, one thousand men sent from Farnham.

It is true they were not paraded but were kept in barracks, but here again they were men who had been sent for the purpose of dealing with the strike. Many of these men expressed regret at being used for that purpose. The reserve army is another organization that was ready for action in connection with the Montreal strike. A colonel—I cannot say what his name is—said after the strike that he was sorry he did not get the chance to come to grips with the strikers. The reserve army officers, especially some of the older men are through and through reactionary. They still think of the good old days. I would suggest that some of the older officers of perhaps thirty-five or forty released from active service, be placed in the reserve army instead of having men of between fifty and sixty, old men, who as I said before still think of the good old days. They are jingoes; they do not understand the new spirit of Canada and of the world. There have been a number of occasions when men in the reserve army have been told, "It is true the danger of attack is over, but after the war we may have to be used in case of emergency." What emergency is contemplated? We are not planning for trouble. If we mean to plan for a peaceful post-war there is no necessity to arouse people who join the reserve army by telling them that they may be used in case of emergency.

Mr. WHITE: Are all officers liable for overseas service, or is it necessary for an officer to volunteer for overseas service? Are officers still trained for the reserve army?

Mr. RALSTON: All officers are liable for overseas service. Do I understand the hon. member to ask whether officers are still being trained for the overseas army? Does he mean, are reserve army officers being trained at Brockville?

Mr. WHITE: Yes.

Mr. RALSTON: I cannot be sure, but I think that is so. I have not inquired in the last month. There is a very small number.

Mr. GILLIS: The question I have to ask is along the line of that asked by the hon. member for Hastings-Peterborough (Mr. White). What is the policy with respect to non-commissioned officers and commissioned serving in Canada who desire to proceed overseas? Is it necessary, in order to proceed overseas, to revert to the rank of non-commissioned officer or to take a lower rank if one is a commissioned officer? Second, with respect to N.R.M.A. forces, is it not true that whole units of these forces have volunteered their services generally, provided the unit be not split up, and that if it was necessary to send them to any theatre of war, provided they could be sent as a unit, they were prepared to proceed on that basis? I think myself, that, with respect to the N.R.M.A. forces, they are receiving a good deal of abuse which they do not deserve. We must remember that when the war broke out the great majority of these boys were young fellows who were roaming the streets, who had very little to fight for, and with absolutely no knowledge of the military set-up. But they were called up to report for military duty, and in many cases they were sent to camps where, after considerable training received since going into the services, they have had names hurled at them and everything done to discourage them, though they might have tended otherwise to take their place in the legitimate army and proceed overseas. I find no fault with them.

The Minister of National Defence, in summing up the general situation at the time he began his report to the house at this session, made it quite clear that it was necessary to maintain in Canada an army for emergency purposes, that it was necessary to fortify our coasts at both ends of the country, and many of the men of that army who get such a ribbing have been doing duty in outlying sections of the country and have undergone considerable hardship. They have been posted out there and have had to stick to their posts, and they have done a very useful service. There is no doubt about that. At the last session I said, and I say it again, that anyone who takes the position in this house that every man in uniform in Canada during the past three years should have been routed overseas is taking a very unrealistic position.

The main difficulty we have had to contend with in the past two and a half years has been to get something overseas for those who were already there. Shipping has been our difficulty. And what was the soldier in Britain doing during the past two and a half years which the soldier in Canada was not doing? He was kicking his heels waiting for action. One of the main difficulties facing those charged with the responsibility of maintaining the morale of the troops over there was to keep them busy doing nothing until such time as there was somewhere to send them into action. I hate to sit back listening to armchair generals who are quite comfortably seated in Canada, prepared to carry on the war until the last worker is killed. I am not interested in that line of argument. I

think these men are badly abused. They were boys picked up on the street who knew nothing but starvation under the regime of those who now take the position that they should all be prepared to die for a country that disinherited them while those persons were themselves in power. I think these boys have performed a useful service and do not deserve the names that have been hurled at them and the abuse they have received during the time they have been doing a very valuable job in Canada, standing, on guard on all our coasts, while at the same time unit after unit have been volunteering, provided they could go overseas as a unit. The position taken by many in the house is completely unjustified, and I am certain of this, because these boys, by and large, are the brothers or sons of men who to-night are in Sicily doing the fighting. If the time comes when they need reinforcements over there, when our army is in action, there will not be found any difficulty getting most of them to volunteer to go there.

I think national defence has been well advised, although I do not agree with them in every thing, in maintaining that army on that basis until such time as it is needed over there. To suggest that this force should have been sent to Britain during the past two years, to load upon the British government the burden of feeding and looking after them, was a completely unrealistic position to take. I have sufficient confidence in those boys as Canadians to believe that when the time comes they will make their contribution where it is most needed.

I did not intend to speak at any length at this time. There are many things that could be said with respect to the army overseas, but I do not think this is the time to say them. However, I should like the minister to answer the question with respect to officers and non-commissioned officers who desire to proceed overseas, as to whether or not they are compelled to relinquish their rank. I know there are officers in Canada who are anxious to get over, who have volunteered from the army to the air force, from the army to the paratroops and so on, in an attempt to get a shift out of Canada, but they have been held here, I do not know for what reason.

Mr. RALSTON: With regard to the necessity for a non-commissioned officer or an officer to revert in order to go overseas, there is an agreement with Canadian military headquarters and with the army that a certain proportion—it is a small proportion—of reinforcement troops can be particular ranks; I think there are some sergeants and even some as high as warrant officers class 2, but not a great many. To answer my hon. friend's question directly, it is not an absolute rule that every non-commissioned officer has to take off his stripes before he goes overseas; it all depends on the need for non-commissioned officers over there and of course to some extent on the qualifications of the man here. With regard to officers, captains have been taken as such, though not a great many. Generally speaking, we would very much prefer to have subalterns there, in order that they might work up, but occasionally captains are taken.

With regard to N.R.M.A. personnel volunteering as units, that is a very attractive proposition for the recruiting officer; it means that he fills up his month's quota pretty quickly if he can get a whole battalion to volunteer, but I may say it is a headache for the administrative officers because it means arranging to have that unit go overseas as a unit. The formations overseas are already constituted, and in order to keep faith the unit volunteering it might be necessary to break up another unit which has been overseas for a good while. That has never been done, although offers of that kind have been made. Generally speaking, the matter is explained to the men in the unit. We endeavour to keep them together as much as possible, and we have had arrangements under which platoons and even larger subunits of the unit have gone over together. We endeavour to keep them together in the reinforcement centre, but I do not know of any case in which an entire unit composed of N.R.M.A. personnel has ever volunteered and gone over as a unit. As my hon. friend can see, it would mean adding to the capital overseas, which in turn would mean adding to the reinforcement liability here, and putting an extra unit on a formation that is already complete.

Mr. GILLIS: I agree with the minister. I was not arguing the merits or demerits of the scheme; I was trying to correct the impression created by some hon. members and others that the N.R.M.A. men in Canada were slackers, that they wore the uniform but did not want to fight. That impression has been created, and I agree that the mechanics of the situation as outlined by the minister are such that it is not possible to do these things. It is only natural that after serving for two or three years most of these boys should want to go overseas. They are not all slackers.

Mr. ISNOR: I want to support the thought that has been expressed by the hon. member for Cape Breton South. Coming as we do from the Atlantic coast, he and I have had an opportunity of coming in contact with the men who have been serving in the coastal defence units. This question has been raised on more than one occasion, and some criticism

has been offered in regard to the so-called home service men. The same criticism was expressed during the last war when, as now, men were obliged to carry out duties which were considered necessary on both the eastern and western coasts. I am glad to join with the hon. member for Cape Breton South in voicing my objection to the opinion so often expressed by unthinking members of this house as well as by citizens at large, that the man serving in the home forces is not performing a necessary duty. On more than one occasion the minister has expressed his appreciation of these men on the floor of this chamber. Last year he stated that the men on home service were absolutely necessary; and we all know, as the hon. member for Cape Breton South said, that for the past three or four years they have been receiving training. Perhaps it has not been as extensive as the training given those who were proceeding overseas, but very important training has been given our home service men to prepare them to take their place either overseas or in defence of the shores of our country, if that should be necessary. I thought I should like to add my word of commendation for those who are obliged, quite often against their own wish and desire, to serve on our eastern and western shores.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: If the hon. member would permit a question, why are they obliged to serve in Canada?

Mr. ISNOR: That is a question that perhaps neither the hon. member nor I can answer. I leave that to those with more experience in these matters.

Mr. STIRLING: I wonder if the minister would deal with the matter I brought up, concerning the statement which has been made to me not once but many times, that scattered across Canada—I mentioned Petawawa as an instance—there are said to be a very considerable number of officers who apparently are not attached to units or taking courses; perhaps "unattached" is the proper term to use, but they are officers who do not appear to have any definite work to do. They are to be seen not only at Petawawa but at Vancouver and various other places in Canada. To what extent is that an accurate statement?

Mr. RALSTON: I cannot tell my hon. friend to what extent it is an accurate statement. I did say that we had a reserve of officers, so that we are pretty comfortably off. As a matter of fact, at the present moment an arrangement is under consideration for the employment of quite a large number of officers, which will reduce that surplus very considerably. I am surprised to hear my hon. friend suggesting that these officers are simply in camps, unemployed. I had understood that they were taking these advanced courses and refresher courses, not only at Brockville but at the schools of instruction being held at the advanced training centres as well. I can only say to my hon. friend that I shall inquire about the matter at once and shall be glad to give the committee the information. I know what my hon. friend wants is action, not information, but I shall try to give the information and get the action as well.

Mr. STIRLING: Then has the minister any information to give the committee with regard to deserters, how many there are, how many are being pursued, and how many he anticipates will be apprehended?

Mr. RALSTON: Could I make a note of that and give the information to my hon. friend to-morrow? I have in mind that there is pretty nearly a constant number. There are recaptures; then somebody else deserts, and so on. I cannot tell my hon. friend the rate of inflow or output.

Mr. STIRLING: Would the minister deal with it as far as possible, so far as their origins are concerned? That is to say, would he tell us from what part of the Canadian active army they come?

Mr. RALSTON: According to districts?

Mr. STIRLING: Yes.

Mr. MacINNIS: While we are under this heading I would draw to the attention of the minister the case I took up with him some little time ago. I am quite satisfied with the action in that part of it in which the minister interested himself, but I must point out that if this case is typical and if the information I have is correct, then there would appear to be many men in the home defence army—if I am using the correct term—who are receiving very little military training, and most of whose time is taken up in working for private employers.

I have a letter from the parents of a young boy who was inducted into the army on March 8, 1943. He was taken first to Little Mountain barracks, and was there for only a short time when he was sent to Victoria. He then went to Alberni where he worked for three months in the bush. His parents state that while there he was pulling telephone poles through the bush with ropes, for a private contractor. That lasted for three months. The rather peculiar circumstance in this instance is that the parents of the boy say that an army officer had said he was not strong enough for ordinary military training.

Mr. RALSTON: Is this the boy who went to the hospital in Vancouver?

Mr. MacINNIS: Yes, he went to hospital, mentally deranged. Further, after working at Alberni for three months he came back to Victoria, and from there went to Patricia Bay, where he had about a week's training. Then he came home to Vancouver for a week's leave, I believe. From there he was sent to Port Hardy, where he was handed a pick and shovel and started to work at digging ditches. Whether this was for a private contractor or for the army I cannot say, nor could his parents.

He worked there for a while ,and then was sent to Vernon, staying there for a little more than a week. From there he was sent to work for the Canadian National Railways at Blue River. For a person who is not physically strong, track maintenance work is one of the heaviest types of work a person could do, and is particularly hard for a person who is not used to that type of work. He was there for a short time when his parents were notified that he was back again at Little Mountain barracks, mentally deranged.

How many of the men in the home defence army are doing work for private employers such as the Canadian National Railways, the Canadian Pacific Railway, or other employers of that type? During the three months the boy was at Port Alberni was he doing army work, or working for a private employer? These are questions to which the fathers and mothers of young lads in the army would like to receive answers.

Mr. RALSTON: I cannot tell my hon. friend how many are detailed. It is some time since I looked at the order in council. There was an order in council providing that personnel under the National Resources Mobilization Act could be detailed in units or subunits for civilian work. Then there was a provision under which they could be given leave and could go to a private employer. I am sorry I cannot tell my hon. friend as to how many are in each class, but I shall have the information to-morrow.

Although my hon. friend did mention that feature of the matter in his letter, I must say that I do not think I dealt with it, because I was more concerned with the boy's health, and as to whether he was going to get along all right. I do not think I dealt with that matter, did I?

Mr. MacINNIS: No; the minister dealt very quickly with the matter of the boy's health, and the other feature was not mentioned in the correspondence which passed between us. Had it been explained to my satisfaction I would not have bothered mentioning it to-night, because I discuss in the house only those questions which I cannot settle in another way.

Mr. RALSTON: Did the hon. member give me the boy's name?

Mr. MacINNIS: I have given the name to the minister.

Mr. RALSTON: What we wish to do is find out the circumstances under which he did that particular job, and also the number of men in that class.

Mr. MacINNIS: I want to know if this boy was working for a private contractor for three months when he was at Port Alberni, and how this affects other men in the army.

Mr. RALSTON: I believe there was an order in council authorizing the detailing of men to do railway work at a time when the railways were short of help. I believe that would be the class in which he would come, but I shall look into the matter.

Mr. WRIGHT: Under what arrangements do men work for private employers? Are they paid by the army or by the employers?

Mr. RALSTON: I am sorry I have not the order in council with me. However, if it is the same as the regulation with respect to work on farms, it will be recalled that they were paid a flat rate per day, depending on the zone in which the work was done. However, I shall find out about this particular man, because he will be representative of the class.

Mr. GILLIS: The matter is not confined to that order in council. Just a few days ago I received a letter from London, Ontario, protesting—

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend has extended his constituency.

Mr. GILLIS: I think I am elected to represent Canada as a whole, with the exception of the constituency of the Minister of Pensions and National Health. The hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Mackenzie) looks after that.

In this particular case a charge was made that through some arrangement with the authorities in that area carpenters were released and were employed on jobs, thereby displacing regular carpenters.

Mr. RALSTON: Where did this happen?

Mr. GILLIS: London, Ontario. There was considerable controversy with selective service in the matter. No progress was made, and it was suggested I should take it up in the house. I have written the department, but have not yet received a reply. That seems to be a pretty general thing all the way through.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Supplementary to the question raised by the hon. member for Yale with respect to surplus officers throughout the country, I understand the minister's department conducted a survey during the past months to see how many such officers were in Canada who were not now rendering useful service. When the minister brings down his answer, would he give us the number of these officers, and also the number who have been discharged? I know several officers who have been notified of their discharges without any reasons being given. No doubt some of them had passed the age limit, but the newspapers have carried articles about this.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend refers to officers being discharged without any reasons being given. I am very particular about that, and if he knows of any case I wish he would bring it to my attention. There is a most strict procedure laid down. I try to see the files myself. I would be disappointed to know if there were such cases. If there are any I should like to know of them for administrative purposes. An officer who has served and served well is certainly entitled to know the reason why he is being reverted to reserve status.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): One man showed me his papers from the department and they did not give any reason. I know this man personally and I believe he is over age, but I shall let the minister have his name.

Mr. EDWARDS: I appreciate that there are officers who are over age and are being retired, and there are others who cannot be usefully employed, but I wonder whether the department has considered the advisability of an opportunity to resign being given to some officers who are now usefully employed. Perhaps it could be intimated to these men that their resignations would meet with approval. There are three or four cases that come to my mind at this time. These men held good positions or conducted businesses before they entered the army three or four years ago. They have done an excellent and worth-while job in Canada in training men for overseas. In each case the man is a veteran of the last war in which he served with distinction. I believe they would all be glad to return to civilian life and make way for other men less fortunate or for men who are coming back from overseas. They hesitate to take the step because of the reflection that might be cast upon their devotion to duty. I feel sure these men would be glad to tender their resignations if it were indicated to them that that would be agreeable and acceptable to the government and that there would be no question of their patriotism.

There is another matter concerning the treatment given to officers who are retired because they have reached the age limit—I understand the principle is that these men must be retired unless a certificate is made to the adjutant-general that another suitable man is not available—and to officers who are asked to retire for other reasons. In the first case the officer is given a gratuity on retirement of one day's pay for every twelve days of service, or one month's pay for each year of service, whereas the officer who is asked to retire receives only the bare gratuity of one month's pay. I consider that this is an injustice.

An officer may be a veteran of the last war, he may have served Canada for three years, but when he is retired he is given a gratuity of one month's pay. A brother officer may be retired because of age, and if he has served the same time he will receive a gratuity of three months' pay. If I have not a true appreciation of the facts perhaps the minister will correct me, but if I am correct then I think this matter should be reconsidered. Personally I do not think it is fair to have a man serve two or three years and then be told that he is out on thirty days' notice and will receive only one month's gratuity.

Mr. RALSTON: The first point raised by my hon. friend was with regard to permission being given to officers to resign. I have no doubt that the officer in question would prefer to revert to reserve status because, if he resigned, he would have to resign his commission, whereas if he reverts he could go back on the active list again if the occasion arose. I am sure that the boards which discuss these matters would consider that point in those cases where officers cannot be advantageously employed. I shall see that the idea is transmitted to the boards.

The other point raised by my hon. friend was with regard to the apparent discrepancy between the case of the man who had reached sixty years of age and was being retired and the case of the man who had not reached that age and was being retired because he was not advantageously employable. There is a difference between those two cases which may sound technical. The man who has reached sixty years of age has a job and most likely

he is fit to fill that job. The job is there for him but suddenly because of age he is out. That regulation was not in force at the time he entered the service and it was thought that he should have some compensation. The other man had held his position subject to his being retired if he could not be advantageously employed. That situation came about and he was paid a gratuity. As I say, the distinction may be somewhat technical, but there is a real distinction between the two. However, the matter is under active consideration, and I shall take note of what my hon. friend has said with regard to it.

Mr. EDWARDS: The Minister of National Defence for Air made the statement the other day that negotiations were going on between the R.A.F. and the R.C.A.F. with a view to allowing Canadians who had enlisted in the R.A.F. since the beginning of the war to transfer to the R.C.A.F., and I was wondering whether similar discussions might be going on with respect to Canadians who had enlisted in the British army at the outbreak of the war and might want to transfer to the Canadian army. The two men that I have particularly in mind enlisted in the British army in a specialist capacity on the understanding that when the Canadians came over they would be transferred to the Canadian army; but from that day to this, despite their best efforts, they have never been permitted to transfer to Canadian forces, despite the fact that they are Canadians. Are similar negotiations going on with respect to the army such as the minister for air indicated were going on as between the R.A.F. and the R.C.A.F.?

Mr. RALSTON: Very recently there arose a case of one particular officer, and there was a discussion then on general principles. I shall make inquiries and see how far those discussions went. The British pay us a compliment in wanting to keep Canadian officers when they get them, and they do not meet with any great enthusiasm the suggestion that they transfer. I will see how far the discussions have progressed.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): A soldier in the Canadian army on discharge receives $65 as clothing allowance. I understand that in the United States on discharge the soldier receives from $100 to $300. Has this government any intention of increasing our allowance?

Mr. RALSTON: I think my hon. friend is mixing up two things. The $100 to $300 in the United States is what they call mustering-out pay, a sort of war service gratuity.

[Mr. Ralston.]

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): It is the same thing.

Mr. RALSTON: No; the $65 clothing allowance is paid to enable a man on discharge to get a civilian outfit. I presume the United States also have a clothing allowance for their army.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): And the Canadian soldier gets one month's pay as well.

Mr. RALSTON: Yes. The United States army, I presume, has also a clothing allowance, but what it amounts to I do not know.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Can the minister tell us how many recruits have enlisted voluntarily month by month during the past year? There is no doubt that immediately after the passing of the National Resources Mobilization Act, recruiting for the air force and navy speeded up; I do not know how it affected recruiting for the army. But the government have now got a tiger by the tail, and do not know what to do with it.

I have another question to ask while the minister is looking up those figures. I have no doubt that to-morrow he will answer my question on the orders of the day in connection with the speech made by Major-General Chisholm in Toronto from which I quoted. There are one or two other quotations I should like to give now from that same speech. He is reported to have said:

> Too many women are bringing up too many boys on women's values, without relation to their obligation to the community. The result is that the army has to do a lot of unnecessary "growing up" of recruits.

I think that is a terrible castigation of our womenfolk. I do not blame the women for that at all. I do blame one woman who used to be a member of this House of Commons and used to rise in this house and ask for the cadet corps to be wiped out, and who now belongs to the national socialist party, and who was always asking in this house to have the defence estimates reduced to one dollar, and so on. But there were also many other gentlemen now sitting on the opposite side who in years gone by refused to have the defence estimates raised. It was that sort of thing, the education given by such people—and I include some of our friends on the opposite side—that is responsible for what Major-General Chisholm complains of. Then they were for no commitments; there was no danger at all; they were isolationists, and so on. So I say you cannot blame the women of Canada for the consequences.

This national selective service is now a half idea; it is neither fish nor fowl. As I say, the government have a tiger by the tail

and do not know what to do with it. Just imagine trying to put 75,000 of these zombies on a boat going overseas. What good would they do? And would you ever get them there?

Major-General Chisholm makes another pertinent statement. He says:

> The Canadian army has had to reject large numbers of men, and the British, United States and Canadian armies have found it expensive to train men who find it difficult to reorient themselves from a position of thinking of the privilege of the individual to the general security of the group.

Do they discharge them for that reason or just let them sit here at home? Is there any educational process being applied in that situation? What are we going to do with these people? It is all very well to continue to talk about having these people, but something should be done about it.

I see recruiting posters all around the country addressed to the women, and by the way these are the women of whom Major-General Chisholm says:

> In times of stress, such as war, women became a liability.

As I say, these posters are appealing to the women of the country to join up and release men for active service. It is true that we want more women to release men for overseas service. But I ask, why should we appeal to women to release men for overseas service when we have so many men here who are doing nothing at all? The minister said that they are on non-operational duty. The hon. member for Fraser Valley told us what these men are doing in British Columbia. I am glad that there are none from my riding among those he spoke of in British Columbia. But that is a situation that has been brought about by the National Resources Mobilization Act. It is simply ridiculous. The enforcement of the act is all crazy. I know a number of men in the army who would have been far more useful in Canada, and we have people taking their place here who would be far more useful in the army. I know of many instances like that. We have no national mobilization or selective service in Canada at all. We have the National Resources Mobilization Act which is neither one thing nor the other. A little while ago there was a certain amount of pressure brought to bear on these people to have them go active, but you cannot get them to go active any more. What we have to do now is to depend on recruits. Suppose you need these people and you have to bring in an act to make them go active so that they may be sent to any place in the world. That will be all right, but what good are they going to be? That is the situation. I have finished my statement and I hope the minister will answer the other question to-morrow.

Mr. RALSTON: In reference to Major-General Chisholm's speech I have told my hon. friend I would reply to-morrow. I do not think I can add anything to what I have already said other than to correct my hon. friend once more with regard to the employment of these men in Canada. My hon. friend says they are doing nothing. I told him what they are doing as reported to me. I get these reports from the district officers commanding. The hon. member for Fraser Valley seems to have a situation in his part of the country which needs to be corrected. I am going to have somebody on the job and if he will give me some information about it we shall see that it is cleaned up. These men are not loafing by any means. The work is there for them to do and they are doing it. I am glad to have this opportunity to endeavour at least to dispel in the minds of those who will listen and who will accept the fact as it is given to me, the idea that these men are doing nothing, because my information is that as operational troops and as non-operational troops in these two service units they are doing work that has to be done by somebody, and would have to be done by general service personnel if these men were not available.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I should like to ask this question: Have we in Canada men who are being discharged all the time, as Major-General Chisholm says here, because they cannot reorient themselves from the possibility of thinking of the privilege of the individual rather than the general security of the group? He says they are being discharged, and I am perfectly sure that I could give instances.

Mr. RALSTON: They are going back to civil life. My hon. friend says they are needed there. The country is not going to lose them because they are being discharged from the army.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Are they useful, and could they take the place of some of these fellows who are doing service in Canada who might very well do service in other places? That work could very well be done by men in category "E."

Mr. RALSTON: What do you suggest, keep the men—

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): May I finish before the minister replies? We have men being discharged from the army for mental reasons. The minister is laughing. I will take the laugh off his face in a minute. Men are being discharged from the army for mental reasons. They have been taken into the army as category "A." They are then examined by psychiatrists and are then discharged for emotional instability, constitutional inadequacies, as psychopaths and mental defectives. They are placed in category "E" and are not pensionable. They could be doing useful work. Are they to be a charge on the community for the rest of their lives? They have that stigma attached to their names for the rest of their lives. Could they not be kept in the army to take the place of some other men in category "A" who are doing work that these discharged men could do? One does not need very much intelligence or be very bright to do some of these jobs. I think these men could very well be used for that purpose. You are going to have a lot of these men on your hands, and something should be done about the matter. I do not think the thing is very well run at all.

Mr. RALSTON: I can say to my hon. friend that I have seen quite a number of these men that he speaks of and who he says do not have to be very bright. I am thinking of the Longue Point depot, for instance. I think some of these men and women would qualify as members of parliament. I do not think they are devoid of grey matter.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): We have been talking all around item number one. Last year the item amounted to $8,832,000. This year it is $16,000,000. I should like to ask the minister why the item is almost double this year and just what it covers.

Mr. RALSTON: The increase is due to the fact that we have very much increased the number of civilian employees as we have decreased the service personnel. The total increase, as my hon. friend will see, amounts to about $7,000,000. Soldiers were replaced by civilians, and that accounts for about $2,000,000. Included in that also are the hourly paid employees who were included elsewhere in 1943 and 1944. That amounts to $3,000,000. In other words, that $3,000,000 is taken from another place and is cut off another item.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Do the people who are employed wear uniforms?

Mr. RALSTON: No. I inquired about this item. I said, how is it we increased the pay and allowances of the civilian employees, and increased the pay and allowances of the army and still, at the same time, were reducing the army? As a matter of fact, I found the actual decrease in the pay and allowances of other ranks is $17,000,000 as compared with 1943-44, but various increases total $24,000,000 altogether in pay and allowances. Of this, $17,000,000 is accounted for by the decrease in pay of other ranks, while the increase in the pay of civilians is about $7,000,000. Therefore, on this basis, you will see there is a saving of about $10,000,000. There is one more item, reclassification of positions, $552,000, which is another part of the $7,000,000. The growth of army administration shows an increase of $2,000,000, due to increased number of employees.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Is that a reclassification of civilian positions?

Mr. RALSTON: Civil Service reclassification. Reclassifications are taking effect now, a certain number every year.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): They did not get the cost-of-living bonus.

Mr. RALSTON: That is a reclassification of twenty-three hundred positions since the 1943-44 estimates were prepared. The total is $552,000 altogether.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. STIRLING: Can the minister give the committee some information with regard to the organization that is being set up to take over administrative duties in reoccupied countries? I have had several inquiries made by officers who are at the present time in the army in Canada. Some of these men, it would seem to me, are well suited by their experience for such work. Is it an international organization that is being set up, of which Canada supplies so much, or is Canada setting up an organization of her own for that purpose? Can the minister give the committee some information with regard to that organization?

Mr. RALSTON: I have a memorandum here, but I shall not read it all. The situation in North Africa was the first immediate situation which required attention in the way of civil administration. The necessity for some measure of temporary jurisdiction being established by the military over the large number of civilians in territories freed from enemy control was indicated. The commanders in chief first appointed officers for that purpose. These were known as civil administrators or military governors, as the case might be, and the work was carried on by military personnel. The civil affairs officers were employed, first, on staffs of formations and, second, as civil

affairs detachments. I remember, if I may interject the observation, that a member of the tariff board of Canada, Major Hebert, is a member of the civil affairs administration in Italy at the present time. During an advance the formation staffs tackle the problems as they arise, and detachments are established when important towns or centres are taken. The detachment then guards every town or centre under direction from formation headquarters and in cooperation with the local authorities if available.

Following on the opening of civil affairs schools in Britain and the United States it was decided to conduct a two-months' course along similar lines in Canada and we have established a course at the Royal Military college. The first group of twenty-four officers graduated recently. That is a joint undertaking covering the three services, the Department of External Affairs acting in an advisory capacity. A number of Canadian officers overseas have attended the civil affairs school in England and a few have taken the course in the United States. Our people who have established the school at the Royal Military college and are in charge of it have been at the school in England and also at the school in the United States to make themselves familiar with the syllabus provided and to ascertain the different kinds of training given in Britain and America. Canadian officers will be available for the staffs of Canadian formations for work at various times in which there is intermixture of British and American. The civil affairs administration is a temporary measure to be maintained in any locality only so long as it is required.

My hon. friend has inquired with regard to an officer friend, and I may tell him that commanding officers were asked to make recommendations of those who had qualifications, who had some knowledge of municipal affairs, town planning or general administration, or public utilities, water works, light systems and matters of that kind. Linguists are also useful, though not unless they have some training or experience in connection with civil administration. As my hon. friend quite understands, there is very little in the way of military training given, because it is a military officer who is being dealt with. If anyone in whom my hon. friend is interested wishes to do so, anyone who might be qualified for this work, he ought to apply to his D.O.C. and have his name sent in.

Mr. STIRLING: What numbers does the minister expect to obtain—scores or hundreds?

Mr. RALSTON: I do not know how long we shall maintain the school here. There is also a school in England. I expect there will be two or three more courses, and the number may be a hundred or more.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Will the minister give those figures about which I inquired?

Mr. CHURCH: Last session the Minister of National Defence for the army laid before the house a schedule recording pay and allowances for all ranks. It would surprise members to know of the different inequalities that exist, starting with lieutenant-colonel and major right down to private. The return showed a rate per day of $1.30 and in some cases $1.50, and it went straight across the blueprint, giving the total for the year. There were a great many inequalities in that schedule of the lower-paid men, and I should like to find out what is being done to remove them. The minister for the navy and the minister for air followed and gave a similar statement, a blueprint which was published in *Hansard*. It caused a great deal of dissatisfaction among the returned men and those overseas, because some received certain allowances, while others did not get anything. It may not be altogether in the minister's department, but I think some explanation ought to be given while the minister's estimates are before us, because the same thing applies throughout. Young men have joined up from the high schools of the country. The high schools of Toronto alone have given 600 men in casualties to the air force. I suggest, therefore, that the inequalities that appear in the schedule should be removed.

In the matter of allowances, some receive them and others do not. Section 11, subsection 3, of the Pension Act applies to the army, and last week a deputation appeared before the board of control in connection with this matter. One section relates to the necessitous circumstances of soldiers coming home. They do not get a grant at all and some are practically on the street. That section as applied to the army means simply charity. As I say, a deputation appeared before the board of control of Toronto last Thursday, and I will send the information to the minister. As regards clothing allowances, the $65 for a returned man should be marked up. The officers have been marked up and I do not see why the privates and non-commissioned officers should be forgotten. They are largely doing good work in the camps. I receive many letters from the returned men. There are many in my constituency and throughout Toronto. I do not like to bother the minister, but I hope that something will be done to remove the inequalities between the private soldier and the non-commissioned officers as

compared with the men at the top of the ladder. There should be an announcement, and I hope it will come shortly, with regard to this whole matter, which will give to these people who are coming home some additional allowance for clothing and so on. The minister gave an elaborate statement last year about the matters to which I have referred, and I should like to find out if anything additional in allowance is to be done about the large number of men who are coming back from the front.

Mr. RALSTON: What I shall try to do is to get the statement made last year and make a comparison to see how much ironing out there has been of the inconsistencies in the different classes. I believe a substantial change has been effected since that schedule was filed. I should like to see what it looks like this year. We might prepare a new schedule and see how it compares with the old. With regard to the other matter, rehabilitation and the announcement of a policy with respect to what assistance is to be given, that announcement will be made in due course. I will take note of what my hon. friend says and see if we cannot get a new statement to see how it compares with the old, and what suggestion my hon. friend has to make.

Mr. CHURCH: Regarding pay and allowances, there is a good deal of complaint in the camps about leave, and the amount of money the soldier must pay to get home over the week-end. This applies to Camp Borden and many other camps, but little is done about it. The other day in Toronto we had an announcement by Major-General Chisholm which has caused a great deal of dissension and dissatisfaction in the Toronto district among women whose men are at the front or at the camps. Something should be done to find out from the railway companies what they intend to do with regard to a reduction of fares at week-ends for men at the camps. As you know, Mr. Chairman, down to the end of 1940 the railways had made more money than during the entire four and a half years of the last war. Surely something should be done by the government and the minister to see that these men are allowed cheaper fares to get home.

Apparently there is a rule now in force that the men are not allowed to write letters to the newspapers about these matters. If that rule applies to privates and non-commissioned officers it should apply also to Major-General Chisholm, who in his talk has caused a great deal of disunity among the families of our soldiers. If it were not for the women who are doing such magnificent work at home, I doubt if we would have had such success as we have had in connection with recruiting. I hope the rule will apply to Major-General Chisholm and the rest of those at the top who are spreading these rumours about leaves and doing a great deal to hurt recruiting.

Mr. RALSTON: The hon. member for St. Paul's asked for the enlistments in 1943. The figures are as follows:

January	12,366
February	8,890
March	8,231
April	6,650
May	6,609
June	5,485
July	4,805
August	4,884
September	5,029
October	4,306
November	3,565
December (estimated)	3,500

This book is a little old, and I have just obtained an estimate for the month of December from the officer who is before me. This makes an approximate total of 74,000 for the year.

Mr. McNIVEN: Are these voluntary enlistments?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Mr. GILLIS: I do not want to hold up this resolution, but I should like an answer from the minister with respect to the low-category men who are discharged after having been called up under the mobilization act, or who have returned from overseas as casualties. I do not know whether the information is correct, but I have had at least two letters from military district No. 6, written by men who recently returned from overseas. They complain that the camp is literally blocked with category "C2" men, who are performing no useful service in the camp.

Mr. RALSTON: Is this depot at Halifax?

Mr. GILLIS: Yes. I have received complaints from men who feel that perhaps they could make a better contribution outside, since they are not fit for regular military duties. That complaint also has come from other places, but the two specific complaints I have had came from military district No. 6. I should like to find out from the minister just what is the policy of the department when a man is boarded, his catgeory is lowered and he is classified as unfit for regular military service. What is he assigned to do in the military district; what duties is he required to carry out, or what service does he perform when he is kept in the army? Would it not

be better to discharge that man and send him out so that he might be able to make a useful contribution in some civilian capacity? I think it would be good business if men like that were routed back to civilian life and given an opportunity to rehabilitate themselves now, before we have the general demobilization. I think it is a mistake to keep any large number of men of this kind in any camp.

Mr. RALSTON: I must confess that I agree with my hon. friend. Of course there are some jobs, such as orderlies and things of that kind, in which low-category men can be usefully employed, but generally speaking I see no point at all in keeping a man of that kind in the army, unless he is absolutely essential and no one else can be obtained to do the work. I indicated that our depots are very full at the present time, though the number of men in them is going down quite rapidly. However, in talking with my colleague, the Minister of Pensions and National Health, I have inquired into the matter pretty carefully, and I may tell my hon. friend that one reason which is given to me is that the procedure followed this time in connection with the discharge of a man is really terrific, in the number of forms that have to be filled out and the examinations that have to be gone through. You may ask why. Well, it is for the purpose of seeing to it that pensionability or otherwise is established at the start, instead of having a man come in two or three years from now saying, "Such and such a thing happened. I was stripped to the waist and examined; out I went, and nobody looked at me to make any notes of how I was." The examination does take a considerably longer time than formerly; they have specialists and so on, as my hon. friend knows.

In my judgment, however, there is no reason for these men being kept at our depots for any long time, except that of course medical officers are none too plentiful, and they tell me that a board can only handle properly something like fifteen men a day. So that it takes a number of boards if you have to deal with three, four, five or six hundred men, or perhaps a thousand or more as they may have at Halifax. It does take time to get them out, but I really think that is principally due to the necessity of taking time in order to see that the examination is properly carried out. As a matter of fact, we are putting someone in charge of all these depots, having him go around to see if he cannot smarten up the procedure. I know one depot in particular which is extremely efficient. We have had officers in command of other depots visit this one to see how it is run, and they have worked out something in the nature of a belt-line procedure.

There is another thought that has just come to me. We had an investigation made of our examination system, our reception system and our discharge system by officers of the United States army, and I must say that the result put our people very much on their toes. Perhaps they became a bit complacent following the compliments they received from these visiting officers because of the care that was taken in connection with the discharge of personnel. I remember writing a memorandum at the time congratulating them on the record they had made, but adding that I hoped this would not lead to complacency. Coming back to my hon. friend's statement, I say that by all means these men ought to be out of the army. We try to work just as hard as we can, in order to get them out just as quickly as we can, and the procedure is being improved just as much as it possible can, always having in mind the examinations which are required in order that pension cases may not arise in the future, and that men may not be deprived of evidence which they would have had if they had undergone a proper examination.

Mr. QUELCH: Recently I have had brought to my attention several cases similar to those referred to by the hon. member for Cape Breton South. The complaint I hear is that these men get tired of hanging around and apply for their discharge. Invariably the discharge is given, but then these men are barred from receiving the one month's pay and the clothing allowance. For instance, I have before me a letter from the Edmonton branch of the legion—

Mr. RALSTON: Was the man discharged to accept civilian employment?

Mr. QUELCH: Let me read part of the letter:

> I think this is one of the grievances that certainly should be rectified, as men who have been overseas and are returned to this country certainly get fed up hanging around not doing anything, and they naturally after a time make application for discharge, which is inevitably granted.

Then, due to the fact that the discharge was granted at his own request, the man is refused his one month's pay and the clothing allowance. I have referred these cases to the department but so far have received no reply. It does seem to me that when a man has been overseas for two or three years and returns to this country he should be granted a discharge and should be eligible to receive the one month's pay and the clothing allowance.

Mr. RALSTON: Would my hon. friend mind giving me one name?

Mr. QUELCH: I am referring to the case of Corporal J. R. Wallace, and also the case of Private Jossul. I believe in the latter case, however, the allowance has been granted, though at the time the letter was written it had not. Of the four cases referred to in this letter, the allowance was granted in only one.

Mr. RALSTON: What was the second name?

Mr. QUELCH: The first case is that of Corporal J. R. Wallace, No. R-93837. The second case is that of Private Jossul, but in that case I believe the allowance has been granted, because there is a postscript to the letter which reads:

I am very pleased to let you know that I have been successful in having Jossul's rehabilitation granted, so maybe the others will come through.

Apparently Jossul's case was an exception to the rule.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend has sent a copy of the letter to the department?

Mr. QUELCH: Yes, I have written the department.

Progress reported.

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

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

The house met at three o'clock.

WARTIME WAGES CONTROL

PROPOSED REVOCATION OF ORDER IN COUNCIL OF DECEMBER, 1943

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview) moved for leave to introduce bill No. 5, to revoke the wartime wages control order, 1943.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall said bill be read a second time?

Mr. CHURCH: By leave of the house I would ask for second reading now.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That cannot be granted.

Mr. CHURCH: By leave of the house I would ask for second reading.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is opposition to it. Standing order 73 provides that two readings cannot take place on the same day.

[Mr. Ralston.]

Mr. CHURCH: I would ask for leave of the house. When five members rise the question of leave must be put to the house. Five members must rise.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Who invented that rule?

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no motion before the Chair. First reading is passed in the ordinary way, and second reading takes place at the next sitting of the house. When shall the bill be read a second time?

Mr. CHURCH: I would ask for a recorded division.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): A recorded division on what?

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no motion before the house. Second reading at the next sitting of the house.

CHRISTIE STREET HOSPITAL

ANSWER TO QUESTION RESPECTING ALLOWANCES TO MEN ON DISCHARGE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Pensions and National Health): Yesterday the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lockhart) asked a question of me in connection with veterans' treatment allowances. I find I tabled P.C. 1/602 on February 1 of this year, and I have had the pleasure of sending a copy of that order in council to my hon. friend, with an attached memorandum. The order is not retroactive, and is effective from February 1, 1944.

RADIO BROADCASTING

APPOINTMENT TO BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF C.B.C.—GENERAL MANAGER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I was not able to give notice to the Minister of National War Services of the question I am about to ask, but it is the kind of question, as I think will be indicated, of which notice is really not necessary. When may we expect to have an announcement respecting the other appointment to the board of governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation? A vacancy has existed there since last November. At the same time will the minister tell the house when we may expect an announcement in connection with the appointment of a general manager for the corporation? I do not like to raise these questions so often, but this broadcasting corporation is getting into a terrible state because of the delays.

Hon. L. R. LaFLECHE (Minister of National War Services): Mr. Speaker, while I welcome the first question, I do not like what was added at the end of the second one, because what was said was quite unfair.

Mr. HOMUTH: No one thought the minister would.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It is too bad if the minister does not like it.

Mr. LaFLECHE: Each one speaks for himself in the house.

Mr. GRAYDON: That is right.

Mr. LaFLECHE: In regard to the question respecting the vacancy on the board of governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, I cannot say just when an announcement as to the appointment will be made. I assure the house that very careful attention is being given to the matter, and my hope is the same as that entertained by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon). I can answer only that it will be done as soon as possible. With respect to the appointment of a general manager, I have not yet received a recommendation from the board of governors. I know they are giving the matter careful consideration, and I hope very soon to have the recommendation in this respect.

Mr. GRAYDON: Has the failure of the government to appoint a full board of governors held up the appointment of a general manager?

Mr. LaFLECHE: I cannot see that that could possibly be so.

BORDER CROSSINGS

SURRENDER BY CANADIAN CITIZENS OF REGISTRATION CERTIFICATES ON ENTERING THE UNITED STATES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) felt that he was a lawbreaker because he did not have his national registration certificate. I am glad to return to my hon. friend his certificate, thus putting him in good standing in the eyes of the law and allaying any fears that he may have about being picked up by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. I am sure that none of us would want that to be done.

I should like to explain to the house, if I may, that an arrangement was made in June, 1943, whereby customs officers at all boundary points and Royal Canadian Mounted Police security officers at seaports collect the registration certificates of persons who are leaving Canada permanently or for more than thirty days. However, the customs officer or whoever picks up the certificate is supposed to give the person a receipt for the certificate, a sample of which I have in my hand. On the back of this receipt appear the following instructions:

> Upon returning to Canada the registrant should immediately mail this receipt to the chief registrar for Canada, national registration, Department of Labour, Ottawa, and request delivery or his or her certificate. When writing to the chief registrar please state clearly the address to which the certificate is to be sent.

In addition the traveller is given with his passport a notice explaining why the certificate is being lifted, and I hold in my hand a sample of that notice. The same information as appears on the notice given to the traveller appears on this card which is posted in the border offices. I have in my hand a copy of the card.

Mr. REID: What are the reasons for lifting the certificate?

Mr. MITCHELL: I shall come to that in a minute. The notice to each traveller instructs him—I speak now of those leaving the country temporarily—to make application for the return of his certificate to the chief registrar under the national registration regulations, 1940, upon his return to Canada. All certificates are sent to the office of this official in Ottawa, and it was in that official's office that I obtained the hon. gentleman's certificate this morning.

Hon. members will understand that the collection of certificates of persons leaving Canada permanently is done as a safety measure and because such persons naturally would be in possession of better personal identification. The authority for picking up certificates of persons leaving Canada for thirty days or longer is contained in section 28 of the national registration regulations, 1940, which reads as follows:

> For the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of these regulations or supplying any deficiency therein, the minister may issue such directions not inconsistent therewith as may be deemed necessary to give effect to these regulations according to their true intent and purpose and any such direction shall have the same force and effect as if enacted in these regulations.

The main reason for requesting that direction was a growing epidemic of loss of certificates by registrants and theft of certificates from them when outside of Canada, particularly Canadians visiting in the United States and merchant seamen in foreign ports, both of which are definitely dangerous in war

time. Each postmaster in Canada has been notified of this arrangement and instructed to issue a temporary fourteen-day certificate to any returned registrant who applies through his office for the return of his or her certificate. From June, 1943, to date, many thousands of certificates have been picked up and returned under this procedure, with a surprisingly low minimum of complaints or trouble.

Special forms of certificates bearing a full physical description of the registrants are issued to a few officials and others whose duties may require them to leave and return to Canada several times a year. This saves them the necessity of surrendering and obtaining return of their original certificate on each such occasion. I may say that the necessity for this safety measure was thoroughly discussed by my predecessor in office and the legal assistant of the branch with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the foreign exchange control board, the chief passport officer and others before being decided upon and put into effect.

I now table the form of receipt for the certificate, the notice given to the traveller, the card posted in border point offices, and a copy of the national registration regulations of 1940, as amended to December 31, 1943.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (York-Sunbury): First of all, I should like to thank my hon. friend for the celerity with which he moved to get back my certificate. I should like to say alsc that it takes a jab in the back to get this government to move in connection with anything. I should like to make another observation. I would not like the young officer at the border to get into any trouble, but no receipt was given to me for my certificate and none of the formulae which the minister has indicated was gone through with. I doubt if the young man had been supplied with the necessary forms, but of course that is pure conjecture on my part.

This whole thing has served a useful purpose, not only for me personally but in drawing the attention of the public to the situation. I do not share the view that any great national emergency would arise through the loss of my registration certificate should it be taken into the United States. I think this is another case of over-regimentation of the civilian population of Canada by this government.

Mr. LOCKHART: May I direct a brief question to the Minister of Labour to clear up one point in connection with this matter of permits for leaving Canada? I understand the minister to say that the permits to which he refers are for thirty days and more. Will he be good enough to make sure that no officials are taking up permits for those who are leaving, perhaps just for overnight and coming back the next day? Therein lies confusion, because I have been informed that such things have happened.

Mr. MITCHELL: I shall be glad to look into that.

MAJOR-GENERAL CHISHOLM

REFERENCE TO ADDRESS TO ROTARY CLUB AND TORONTO WELFARE COUNCIL

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member for St. Paul's (Mr. Ross) referred to a press report of a statement or an address which had been delivered in Toronto by Major-General Chisholm, director general of medical services. I regret to say that the report would seem to indicate that there was some reflection upon Canadian women in connection with the war. I took the matter up immediately with the director general of medical services and I have his statement which I should like to read to the house. It is as follows:

I regret that the remarks which I made to the Rotary Club in Toronto in a professional address last week—and representing only my own personal views—were misinterpreted as a reflection on the women of Canada.

My theme was the emotional adjustment involved in the transition from civilian to military life and vice versa. I endeavoured to trace these emotional relationships from tribal stages to modern times. It is unfortunate that certain remarks, removed from their context, conveyed impressions which would not have been conveyed had the full text of my address been quoted.

For example, the statement that "in times of stress, such as war, women became a liability" had no reference to the present situation or to the present war, but referred definitely to the women of developing tribes who were unable to fight along with their men when the tribe was threatened. This obviously has no reference to modern times wherein—in warfare as in peace—women generally are an enormous asset to society.

In so far as references to the present day are concerned, my address was an interpretation of professional findings to an intelligent lay audience. In our professional research we make careful studies and statistical records of cases investigated representing a cross section of the population. Among these are found certain abnormalities, some of which I referred to and described.

It is regretted that the specific cases referred to were given general application to all women in the published report of my address.

I was deeply concerned about this matter when it came to my attention, and I hope that this statement by General Chisholm will be accepted with the genuine regret which I know he feels that any words of his should be construed as a reflection upon our women folk.

It almost seems to be emphasizing the obvious to try to stress the value of the contribution which the women of Canada make in war, as well as in peace. But in my department we are so conscious of the devotion and the Spartan courage which the women of this country are showing in this time of stress and anxiety that this incident impels me to add a word of my own. Nobody could administer the affairs of the army without knowing that our war activities would have small chance of success if it were not for the fortitude and consecration with which the mothers and wives and sisters and sweethearts of this country encourage their men in the forces and in other tasks of war. Here is an extract from a letter written by a mother who acknowledges with thanks the Memorial Cross, which, as she says:

—I received on the anniversary of my son's death. The just pride one feels in being a Silver Cross mother does in some small measure ease the feeling of irreparable loss. David, who won the D.F.M. in November 1942, and his commission, was one of three brothers in the air force and one with the navy. One boy has been in Africa since May 1942. A daughter is with No. 15 Hospital in Africa and lately moved on. One boy is in Iceland with a coastal patrol, and one at Victoria. We are the parents of to-day who are looking to a future Canada that will justify the sacrifices being made.

The members of this house know, I am sure, that the spirit of that letter is multiplied in hundreds of thousands of cases across Canada, and I know that they will join me in this simple tribute of grateful appreciation to these noble women of ours whose inspiration challenges every man of us.

DOUKHOBORS

REQUEST FOR DEPORTATION OF SONS OF FREEDOM

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. K. ESLING (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, so that I shall not trespass on the rules of the house I wonder if I may have the consent of hon. members to preface a question to the Prime Minister with a very short statement of facts. On Sunday last, as hon. members may have noticed by the press, more than 400 Doukhobors from my district of West Kootenay staged a nude parade. Last Friday they burned a school. Two months ago they burned over $100,000 worth of government buildings. It is a way they have of emphasizing their defiance of Canadian law. Most of the older people, the men and the women, dominate and inspire and influence the younger generation to follow the traditions of this religious sect. Ever since they came to Canada in 1898, every federal government has been unable, and has had to admit the humiliation of being unable, to cope with these Doukhobors. All under forty-five years of age are Canadian citizens. Those over forty-five years of age, with the exception of a few who have been naturalized, have no claim to Canadian citizenship.

My question is this: Will the Prime Minister, through the hon. Mr. Tounkin, the Soviet ambassador to this country, endeavour to arrange with the Soviet government for participation in the deportation and settlement of these Doukhobors—that is to say, of all members of what is known as the Sons of Freedom, and of all other Doukhobors who violate Canadian laws; and will the government negotiate for the settlement of these people in any portion of the Soviet or in any one of the Soviet republics?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as my hon. friend has just indicated, Doukhobors who are not citizens of Canada are nationals of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. He has suggested that by conference with the Charge d'Affairs of the U.S.S.R. to Canada I might seek to arrange to have these nationals of the U.S.S.R. deported or repatriated to Russia. May I say to my hon. friend that the question is one of what is practicable. To-day it would not be possible to secure the means of transportation or the means of entry into Russia of Russian nationals who are residing in Canada at the present time. Some other means will have to be adopted of controlling them at least until the war is over.

COAL

REFERENCE TO PROSECUTION OF ORANGEVILLE DEALERS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. W. E. ROWE (Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a question of the Minister of Finance based on an article appearing in the Orangeville *Banner* of February 10. The article states that proceedings have been taken by the Guelph branch of the wartime prices and trade board against the

firm of R. D. Bryan & Co., Orangeville fuel dealers, for selling coal above the ceiling price. I quote from the article:

The evidence disclosed that the ceiling price had been broken only when the Toronto suppliers boosted their price 75 cents a ton. When this was done the Bryan Company raised its prices 50 cents a ton, thereby undertaking to absorb one-third of the price increase on its own account, but passing the other 25 cents on to its customers.

The evidence showed that as the Bryans were not importing directly, they were not receiving the dominion coal subsidy of $1.40 a ton, which would have enabled the firm to keep within the ceiling price.

It has been rumoured that the wartime prices and trade board will investigate this case. In the meantime this company, which supply sixty-five per cent of the coal used by the citizens of Orangeville, cannot operate except at a loss, and they have notified their customers and the citizens that they are forced to discontinue business. I would ask the Minister of Finance to investigate this matter immediately and avoid a possible crisis in the fuel supply of Orangeville district.

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I shall look into the matter. I am not just sure what the hon. gentleman wants done. Does he want an increase in price authorized for this company?

Mr. ROWE: The company has already been fined $50 for exceeding the ceiling selling price of coal, and without the permission of the board they cannot raise their prices. If they cannot raise their prices they cannot continue in business, which leaves the citizens of Orangeville faced with a serious fuel situation. The coal comes by truck from Toronto.

Mr. ILSLEY: I will bring the matter to the attention of the board.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I add that this is a matter of great concern to the citizens of Orangeville, and I think an investigation should be made immediately.

DEFENCE OF CANADA REGULATIONS

INQUIRY CONCERNING THE INTERNMENT OF MR. CAMILLIEN HOUDE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. LIGUORI LACOMBE (Laval-Two-Mountains): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent). Has the Department of Justice received a letter, dated January 26, 1944, in which Mr. Camillien Houde requested to be released by order in council from an internment camp, in view of the fact that his internment was carried out by means of an order in council?

[Mr. Rowe.]

Hon. LOUIS S. ST. LAURENT (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the internment of Mr. Camillien Houde was not carried out by means of an order in council. I shall look over the file, in order to see whether we have received from him a letter containing such a statement, and I shall then reply to the hon. member.

WESTERN STOCK FEEDERS

QUESTION OF PRICE OFFERED TO PRODUCERS BY PACKERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. WILLIAM BRYCE (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture relating to the present emergency with respect to fed cattle at Lethbridge which are now ready for market. What steps are being taken to prevent the producer from being compelled to sacrifice these cattle at the "below floor" price at present offered by the packers?

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the provision that is made for the handling of beef cattle was arranged about a year ago. That provision is that there is a floor price under beef and a ceiling price on beef—not on cattle. The ceiling price on beef is set at one level throughout the year. The floor price varies from 2¼ cents below the ceiling price in the fall to one-quarter of a cent below in the summer. I think the variation at the present time is about three-quarters of a cent. When beef gets down to that price, the board representative of the government purchases the beef and puts it in freezers, freezes it for export to Britain. That is the present arrangement to take care of floor prices in connection with beef. Then there are certain prices which bear a proper relationship, for cattle, to that floor price of beef. My understanding is that in Alberta for about a month's time there has been difficulty in marketing one kind of fed cattle, that is cows; and my information is that there has been considerable improvement in that position recently. The immediate action taken was to examine all the cold storages across Canada that are in proper relationship to killing plants—vegetables, fruits and other commodities have been moved out of storages to take care of some millions of pounds of beef which could be put into those storages—in some of them, now, and in others, very shortly. This arrangement is intended to take care of the situation until such time as sufficient shipping can be secured with which to ship out the meat which has been accumulating in Canada. That is the provision made up to date.

SEED GRAIN

PRESS REPORT OF PROVINCIAL ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO INDEBTEDNESS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. E. PERLEY (Qu'Appelle): I desire to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture based on an announcement made in the legislature of Saskatchewan by the premier of that province. By the way, that legislature met a week ago to-day. The premier announced that the seed grain debt of the farmers in Saskatchewan in respect of grain supplied in 1938 would be reduced to the extent of forty cents per bushel, and that the debt for seed oats would be reduced by eighteen cents per bushel. He also made the statement that this was being done with the approval of the dominion government, and that any farmers who had paid for their seed grain would receive rebates on the basis of forty cents for wheat and eighteen cents for oats. I see that the Minister of Agriculture is pointing his finger at the Minister of Finance; will the Minister of Finance state what portion of this amount will be absorbed by the federal government and what part by the provincial government?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): The federal government is not assuming any part of that reduction. I have not seen the statement of the Premier of Saskatchewan, and I do not know, therefore, what he said; but if there is to be a reduction, it is a reduction by the government of Saskatchewan.

Mr. PERLEY: The premier stated definitely that the dominion government was a party to the arrangement and was assuming part of the cost. The report appears in the Regina *Leader Post*, which is in the reading room. I will send it to the minister.

Mr. ILSLEY: He could not have said that.

WAR APPROPRIATION BILL

PROVISION FOR GRANTING TO HIS MAJESTY AID FOR NATIONAL DEFENCE AND SECURITY

The house resumed from Monday, February 14, consideration in committee of a resolution to grant to His Majesty certain sums of money for the carrying out of measures consequent upon the existence of a state of war—Mr. Ilsley—Mr. Bradette in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

The CHAIRMAN: Item 2, pay and allowances.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): We did not pass No. 1.

Mr. GRAYDON: I thought there would be a misunderstanding about this. When the committee rose last night, you, Mr. Chairman, stated that the item would be carried. One of the members of our party made it very clear that we were not allowing that item to carry, and then you called it eleven o'clock. I think we had better have this matter cleared up, because there has been far too much of this "carried" business on the part of the Chair. As soon as anybody sits down, or a moment of silence intervenes, the chairman always calls "carried". It must surely be reasonable to assume that these items require a lot of discussion. My only reason for referring to this is to see if things cannot be made a little easier for the Chair.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The understanding is that No. 1 is not carried.

Mr. GRAYDON: No; No. 1 is not carried.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I believe I was on my feet last night at eleven o'clock when progress was reported. I was seeking an answer to a question which, I assume, I can ask to-day.

The CHAIRMAN: While I have no objection to dealing further with item No. 1, I should point out to the committee that I thought the item was carried and that the committee would agree to avoiding the repetition of the general discussion we have had. I believe even the leader of the opposition will agree with me on that score.

Mr. GRAYDON: It is on the first item that the general discussion must take place, and that general discussion is not yet completed.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I call attention to the fact that only under item 1 can there be general discussion, and it is open to hon. members to ask any questions and make any speeches under this heading. When we leave No. 1 we are pinned down by the rules to concentrated discussion of the particular item. I think it is well to allow latitude on the first item.

Mr. RALSTON: I want my hon. friend to be sure about that. I think he will find that there is a place for everything, and I am sure that "civil salaries and wages" was not intended as a catch-all.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That question was asked yesterday, and I understood the minister's reply was that this would be the proper item under which there would be a general discussion. I think I can find it in *Hansard*.

Mr. RALSTON: No, there was no suggestion of that. I did call the committee's attention to the fact that we were proceeding item by item, but that we were wandering all over the lot, on the matter of the so-called home defence army, on questions of medical treatment, and other irrelevant matters, all under this item "civil salaries and wages," although the discussion did not belong there at all. I suggest to the committee that if possible discussion be confined as much as may be to the item of "civil salaries and wages." "Pay and allowances" is the widest term, or at least as wide as any, under which almost anything can be discussed provided it has to do with the army—I mean the uniformed men.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is what I understood the minister to say yesterday.

Mr. RALSTON: I think "civil salaries and wages" is a limited item. One hon. member, I believe it was the hon. member for Peterborough West (Mr. Fraser), asked why there was an increase in this item of civil salaries and wages, and I was giving an explanation about the time the committee rose.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Just as we rose last evening I think the matter of depots was being discussed and the difficulties which had arisen there. I should like to ask the minister —for although it really comes under selective service it does affect the man-power of the army in the call-up under national mobilization—whether, as I understand it, men below "A" category are still being called. If those regulations are still in existence they are not in the best interests of our war effort. I know of young men who in the last two months have been called from essential occupations in production, under the National Resources Mobilization Act. If those regulations are still in effect and these call-ups are continuing, steps should be taken, if these people are in a useful occupation, to have them left there, provided they are below "A" category and cannot join active service. I would hope the practice has been discontinued, but I know it did prevail during the past few months.

While I am on my feet, I would also ask the minister what is the number of deserters from our army in Canada during the past year; also the number of draft evaders—that is, how many persons have not answered their call under the National Resources Mobilization Act. Rumcur has it that there are many thousands of men in different sections of the country who have not answered the call. I trust the minister can tell us exactly how many men there are in the different districts, or anywhere in Canada, not of "A" category, who are still being called from essential occupations to join the armed services, in which they are not rendering as important a service as they would be back on the farms or in other occupations essential to the war effort.

Mr. RALSTON: With regard to the first question, whether or not men in "A" category as my hon. friend calls it, are being called, I would point out that there is a difference between being called, that is to say, notified for medical examination, and being enrolled in the army. Requisitions on the Department of Labour by the Department of National Defence are for men of what would be called, under the old classification, "A" category. It may be quite possible that registrars are sending notices to men who are below that category, because they cannot of course determine the category until they come in and are medically examined; but in no cases are we accepting anyone below the equivalent of "B-1" category, which, as my hon. friend knows, is a very high physical category.

With regard to deserters, there are at the present time about 11,000 altogether. I have not the record by districts, but we are getting it. However, there seems to be about an even flow out and in in the months. For instance, in May, 1943 there were 8,958. In June there were 619 who deserted and 560 apprehended; July, 769 deserted and 546 apprehended; August, 822 deserted, 475 apprehended; September, 1,008 deserted, 699 apprehended; October, 716 deserted, and 444 apprehended; November, 913 deserted, 800 apprehended; December, 801 deserted, 316 apprehended; January, 635 deserted, 307 apprehended.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): They are getting ahead of you pretty fast.

Mr. RALSTON: From May there is a gain of 2,000.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Were those all in Canada?

Mr. RALSTON: They would include a few overseas. I wish to give a statement on procedure with reference to absentees and deserters:

On the eighth day of absence the officer commanding the unit issues a descriptive report, showing all details of the man, his physical description, information regarding his home address and places he is likely to visit, etc. This is circulated immediately to:

(1) N.D.H.Q.

(2) Provincial and municipal police in the immediate vicinity of the soldier's unit.

(3) Active units, depots, which might be able to assist in locating the man.

(4) Civil police in the area to which the soldier may have proceeded.

(5) In the event of its being thought that he may have gone to the U.S.A., to the Military Attache Washington, D.C., who attends to circulation through the F.B.I.

(6) Provost Marshal, District Headquarters.

The return is also circulated to all district and command headquarters in Canada.

Steps Towards Apprehension

(1) Inquiries are made locally in areas to which it is thought the deserter may have proceeded.

(2) Provost personnel work in close co-operation with provincial and municipal police and the R.C.M.P.

(3) Provost companies have special apprehension squads to apprehend absentees and deserters.

(4) Provost personnel may be granted permission to wear plain clothes for the purpose of pursuing their inquiries.

(5) Where considered desirable the next-of-kin are communicated with and are informed of the consequences of continued absence, and that it will ultimately result in the stoppage of dependents' allowance and assigned pay.

Inquiry sometimes shows that a man has re-enlisted in another force, in which case consideration is given to the question of which force he shall continue to serve in.

It is impossible to detail the steps taken in each individual case, since each case presents to some extent a special problem and the answer to which is dependent on the extent to which the community can be expected to assist. The methods used in one case will not produce results in another case, and methods used in one district will not produce results in another district.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): What about the number of absentees?

Mr. RALSTON: After eight days they are all deserters.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I asked the minister about those who had not answered the draft call. It would not include those.

Mr. RALSTON: That has nothing to do with my department.

Mr. CHURCH: There are one or two matters I want to discuss with the minister; they relate to several questions that were brought up last year. One of them has to do with the first and second items regarding pay and allowances and administration. May I refer the minister to a certain matter that came up in the British House of Commons on December 14 last, when Mr. Anthony Eden, speaking for the government on the Cairo conference, made a statement regarding the commitments of Britain, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and the United States in the Pacific in connection with Japan. He said in that debate that while the Pacific being looked upon somewhat as the territory of the United States, which had been looking after that particular work with some assistance, the Cairo conference had been attended only by Mr. Churchill, Mr. Roosevelt, and the representative of China. He emphasized that the fight with Japan was a fight to the bitter end, whatever the cost might be and however long it might take. I wonder if the people of Canada and of Great Britain and of all America are aware of what that will entail in the future, seeing that Russia is not at war with Japan and was not represented at Cairo. That is one matter which I think we should make clear to the people. We should let them know what our commitments will be as to Japan, because even if the war with Germany came to an end, there is no doubt that this other struggle will continue for a considerable time, and we are committed to it on the principle that when Britain is at war Canada is at war; and also we have separately declared war on Japan. We are therefore a belligerent so far as Japan is concerned.

Another question regarding which I should like to get some information from the minister is the matter of embarkation leave, cheaper fares and cheaper meals and berths on trains, better transportation facilities, week-ends in the camps, and the question of bonus, equality of treatment for all ranks and dependents not as a matter of charity.

With regard to the chaplain service, the Lord Archbishop of Huron, who was elected metropolitan of Ontario yesterday, Doctor Seager, made a sensible suggestion recently. At the exhibition camp in Toronto the different branches of the armed services have separate chaplains, and he suggested, as something that would make for economy, that in the larger cities the soldiers should be allowed time off on Sunday morning to attend the church of their own choice instead of one to which they are compelled to go every Sunday. Not only would it be economical but it would be satisfactory to the men themselves. I think that this suggestion should be taken into consideration in revising the regulations with regard to the chaplain service. So far as civilian status goes, the soldier loses all his rights as a citizen once he enlists in the forces. There is no doubt about that. If a soldier is killed the civil authorities cannot hold an inquest. It is prohibited. The soldier cannot even write a letter now. He has to be a major-general to write a letter or make a speech, as was shown yesterday. There seems to be one law for the private and the non-commissioned officer and another law for the other ranks. I am not criticizing the fine officer to whom I referred last night. I was not able to be here yesterday until very late and did not want to hold up the item. I wish to see the item carry. I do not desire to cast

any reflection on General Chisholm. He has given his view on leave for soldiers, but he also gave his views last Christmas. He said, in the language of the children, "there ain't no Santa Claus." If he had waited two months and heard the speech from the throne he would have found there was a Santa Claus for every day of the year. I do not believe though that there should be one law for the privates and another law for the other ranks.

I believe there should be better and more holiday leaves and week-end leaves, and there should be no deduction for the time taken travelling from the training centre to the homes of the soldiers. Women are charged $2.05 to go up to Camp Borden and if they have two or three children it takes all the money that the soldier makes in a week to pay the fare. There should be some revision. The railways are making fabulous sums out of this war, and for that reason there should be some reduction in the fares charged the men. When one takes into consideration all the money they are making out of the government surely they can do something to help the soldiers in the camps across Canada. In addition to that, hospital services should be improved and better housing provided.

Mr. Morgenthau, the able treasurer of the United States, went over to Italy last month. When he came back he told a committee of congress what he found there. He said that the soldiers asked him if they were to do the fighting over there in Italy and pay for the war when they came back. He struck out a great many items for home defence. I was surprised to read in the December issue of the report of the National City bank about the huge reduction in the United States in the home defence items. Hundreds of millions of dollars were cut out of some items. Millions of dollars that appeared in the past fiscal year have not yet been spent and they have been reduced 50 per cent. I appreciate that a home defence army is sometimes necessary, but the camps are filled all over Canada. They are talking about curtailing leave, but some of them from the city of Toronto cannot get home at all as they are in camps all over Canada. A great many in the home defence army could be better employed in industry under selective service, because they are not going overseas. Most of them are unfit to go overseas. I believe there should be some reduction.

I am surprised something has not been done about the inequalities in pay. It costs a private just as much for rent, board and food as it does a junior commissioned officer or a senior officer getting $15 or $20 a day. I should think there should be some revision in so far as selective service is concerned. Nearly three years ago I sent the ministers a copy of the Sparkman bill which was introduced in Washington. My friend from Vancouver South referred to it several times last session, and has taken a great interest in it. I can find no relief along that line at all. Some of the service men will find themselves turned out of their homes on May 1, and they will not be able to get a house anywhere. I should like to see something done in regard to the housing situation in the city of Toronto. They have been successful to a certain extent in getting some of these large places converted into apartments for the Wrens and others. I see no reason therefore why the soldiers should be living under such awful conditions as those that exist there at the present time. Counsel should be provided in the law courts for those who get into trouble. I read in the press that soldiers are appearing in police courts all over the country. Nobody appears for them. An officer may say he has been a good soldier. Without hearing him at all the accused is sent down. Some of these men are in gaols in the province of Ontario that have been condemned as unfit for civilians. Why should they be used for soldiers.

I have pressed now for four years or more the matter of a national system of insurance for soldiers. If it was successful in the United States in the last war, I am sure it would be successful in Canada. If it were not for the opposition of the insurance companies I believe we would long ago have had a national system of insurance which would take care of unemployment after the war and provide some remuneration for the soldier. I brought this matter up three years ago and it was frowned on by the Minister of Finance. I have also referred to the matter of a records office. I think it is too bad that we cannot obtain from the records office the number of men who have enlisted from the different municipalities in Canada. The municipalities will require that to deal with unemployment after the war. The victory loan people can tell you how much money has been contributed daily by every municipality in Canada. Why can we not cooperate with them and have a similar system of records? I admit the minister has done some good work, but it is almost an impossible task to do it all. I admit he has made some improvement. It is too bad we cannot get this information. Soldiers from all over Canada are enlisting in the city of Toronto. When the war is over they will head for Toronto. Our military district gets no credit for it in the records. The municipal authorities are entitled to know what men have enlisted and their place of

abode. How can they get that if there is no records office? There is no doubt about the contribution of Canada to the war effort, but I should like to point out that last June I asked the minister if he would give some explanation why, when General Montgomery marched across the desert to meet the American forces, there were no Canadians along with him. The minister was going to reply when the Speaker interrupted him on the orders of the day, saying that it should be put on the order paper, and it was never answered. I believe the people of Canada are entitled to have some information about the Cairo conference. This committee does not know one thing about what happened at Cairo; neither does anyone else in Canada.

Mr. Churchill made changes in British generals in the darkest hour of the war in Africa. General Wavell was transferred, General Auchinlech and General Ritchie were removed, and Generals Montgomery and Alexander were put in charge and then marched nearly 3,000 miles across the desert. There were no Canadians with him. I asked the minister where they were. Were they tied up in the old country? I do not wish to criticize the minister; far from it. I know he is a hard-working minister. I do not wish to bring into the debate anything that is not regular. I believe the people of Canada should know something about it. After all, who is paying for the war? It is the people of Canada. Why should this information be kept in the secret office of some minister and some deputy minister and not given to parliament, as in England?

I have read the debates of the British House of Commons. Last year I sent a copy of the British *Hansard* to the minister. Major-General Markland, V.C., had returned from the front. He criticized the government of which he is a supporter. Mr. Churchill replied the next day in the house giving a full statement of the facts. I urge the minister to take note of these matters and make a statement on them before the resolution passes. In these days the rights and privileges of the private members are curtailed, so much so that if, under the political system we have in this country, a member rises and criticizes the government, he has not much chance. He is a marked man, if he criticizes it at all, and in so far as any promotion is concerned, it is easier for a camel to get through the eye of a needle than for him to look for any relief or get any information in the house.

The minister, as I have said, is a hard-working man. I hope he will give some attention to the matters I have raised. I trust that he will give relief such as that prvoided by the Sparkman Act, which I proposed three years ago. I sent a copy of that act to the minister, and my friend from Vancouver South gave an elaborate explanation of it to the house last year.

Mr. RALSTON: I shall take into consideration what my hon. friend has said on a number of subjects. I promised him last night that I would see if I could not get him a new comparative statement with regard to pay and allowances and benefits, similar to the one which was furnished last year. I think when I do that, the matter of inequalities in pay, and some other matters to which he has referred, will perhaps appear in a form which would render discussion of them somewhat easier. We will see if inequalities still exist. I am referring my hon. friend, for the purposes of the record, to a return made to an order of the House of Commons, No. 151, dated March 26, 1942, and I would ask him if that is the form in which he wishes to have a further return and a further comparison and compilation.

My hon. friend, too, has discussed very often the matter of leave. There was one matter I promised last session to take into consideration. I have in mind the suggestion made by the hon. member for Edmonton East (Mrs. Casselman) with regard to reductions in railway fares. A suggestion was made that there should be some sort of ceiling on these fares. What the hon. member probably had in mind was a zone system under which anyone moving in any part of a certain zone would pay a certain flat rate. That did not commend itself to those who were discussing the matter, because it meant that one soldier would really be paying for another soldier's fare. Perhaps I might have misunderstood her suggestion, but arising out of her representation, we have been working with the railway companies—and I cannot say more than that—on a variation of the same idea, to see if there is any possibility of establishing a ceiling for these one-third fare leaves, that is, a maximum above which no soldier would have to pay, regardless of distance. This would mean a contribution by either the railway company or the government toward making up the deficiency created by such underpayment. I say that matter is under discussion, and I may add for the benefit of the hon. member who has just spoken that that is the only thing now under discussion in connection with a reduction in railway fares.

As a matter of fact, as my hon. friend probably knows, in the United States fares are paid by the soldier. There is no contribution made by the government in respect of fares on leave warrants. We are considerably

ahead of that in Canada, and I think generally speaking the system we have has worked well.

If I understood correctly my hon. friend's suggestion in respect of chaplain services, it was to the effect that instead of there being compulsory church parades the men should be allowed to attend the churches of their choice. Speaking for myself, and having regard to my experience in the last war, I am not so sure whether I would have attended church very often if left to my own volition. As a matter of fact I thought church parade was a pretty good sort of moral and disciplinary measure. At the same time I would say to him that in Toronto, and other places where there are many churches, I am sure a man would have the right to go to any church he might select, and that compulsory church parades in depots or establishments where there were large numbers of men might be held at certain stated periods. That is so in Ottawa, and I believe it is so in Toronto. Where there are church parades they are generally just Protestant or Roman Catholic parades. The different Protestant denominations do not divide up and have different parades.

The matter of housing is a bit out of my bailiwick, but I am tremendously interested in housing for soldiers' dependents. My hon. friend pointed out that the navy had such housing accommodation in Toronto. I think he must have meant the barracks on the lake shore front. In that respect the army has exactly the same sort of provision in its establishment at the Exhibition grounds, Toronto. Regarding houses for soldiers' dependents, in every case where it has been brought to the attention of the government I have endeavoured to take an interest, and I have been able to get from the wartime housing commission a certain number of houses for the use of municipalities. I refer, of course, to municipalities where wartime housing is taking place. That is the sort of municipality in which there is likely to be a scarcity of houses. We have been able to get from the commission a certain number of houses for the use of such municipalities in order that they may be put at the disposal of soldiers' dependents.

The matter of legal aid has been mentioned. May I at this point express a word of appreciation to the Canadian Bar Association for a very forward and useful step they have taken in providing legal aid for soldiers. Committees have been appointed in the larger towns, and a routine has been established whereby if a man wishes legal assistance he speaks to his commanding officer, or the officer next in charge, and the matter is looked into. Immediately he is put in touch with some member of the Canadian Bar Association who has volunteered to do that kind of work. It is something the same as legal aid which is provided in the United Kingdom.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): And a very commendable step on the part of the bar association.

Mr. RALSTON: I might say—and perhaps this is an advance announcement; it has just been authorized, although I do not think it is yet in orders—that the Canadian Bar Association have offered to go further and provide legal aid for dependents as well. That offer has been accepted by the department. I would expect it to be ratified and the arrangements completed at a meeting to be held shortly by the Canadian Bar Association representatives.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The minister might also add, for the benefit of the public, that this is a gratuitous service offered by a profession which is often accused of being very mercenary.

Mr. RALSTON: I am glad, on behalf of my hon. friend's profession and mine, to add that word. Of course, if a millionaire were to come along and ask for legal aid, I would imagine that in such circumstances an honorarium, let us say, would be accepted.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is a good term.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend is quite right when he says that this is a gratuitous service furnished for those who are not in a position to provide legal aid for themselves, or who do not have the money necessary for that purpose. This is done by men of standing in the profession, who give exactly the same service in these cases as they would give to their regular clients. As I say, they have been expanding, rather than contracting, in this very worthy and helpful service to men and women of the armed forces.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is correct.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Does the soldier who is brought before a civil court have to request the military authorities for legal assistance, or is that provided under K.R. & O?

Mr. RALSTON: Is my hon. friend referring to a criminal case?

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Yes, where a soldier gets into trouble, and is apprehended by the civil authorities.

Mr. RALSTON: The bar association provision does not deal with criminal cases.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: If the soldier makes a request for legal aid, does he get it?

Mr. RALSTON: Well, I cannot tell my hon. friend there is a system in that respect. I know that in serious cases that is so. If my hon. friend is referring to the ordinary police court case, then I am not in a position to say what the situation is. I can say however that he would be provided with a soldiers' friend in the person of a member of the service who is a barrister. He would not be provided with a civilian lawyer at the expense of the government.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Does he have to request that?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes. In some way information would have to be given to the commanding officer that the assistance is required.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Perhaps I might add a word, because in my own office I have made arrangements for assistance to soldiers in connection with court martials and charges laid in the civil courts. I understand arrangements are being completed whereby a man who needs legal assistance will get it. I refer, of course, to a man who cannot pay. I am glad to add my word of commendation to the legal profession. Many of the members of the bar who are offering their services are veterans of the last war and understand the situation very well. Although they may be busy men, they are glad to assist.

I had intended to take some part in the discussion on this resolution from the general point of view, but I regret to tell the committee that I do not feel physically capable of entering upon any extended remarks. However, there are a few specific subject matters which I wish to call to the attention of the minister and headquarters. They may require some explanation and perhaps some remedial measures or changes in the future.

There is one matter which I should like to deal with at some length if I were capable, but I just cannot do it. I refer to certain courts martial which were held in my city a few weeks ago. The minister was good enough to order that investigation at my request, but I must express surprise at the outcome. I would point out to the minister that some change is necessary in the methods adopted for the examination of men, similar to the one known to us. I am not going to mention the name of the man or of the officers or of anybody else. The fact would appear to be that there were not enough officers to go round, that the panel of doctors operating at the military district depot in question was small in number, and under the system in vogue, I believe it is called the Pulhems system, there were not enough doctors to do the necessary work.

I am afraid that in a desire to get in recruits there was not sufficient attention given to all the medical aspects of this man who had been drafted into the army. The result in the particular case was certainly disastrous. I am not going to attempt to allocate the blame, because I could not possibly read all the evidence. The sad part is that the man left no dependents, and there is no remedy in civil law, because there is no one living who sustained any damage. I suggest that if the authorities have not changed the practice and system, it should be done at once. I understand from a newspaper report that because of the incidence of the case in question the practice has been changed, and I shall look for specific improvement. This man was inducted into the army and he notified the officer he was diabetic. The officer disregarded the warning and this man was dead within thirty hours. The officer was acquitted. I am not going to refer to this again; I am not asking the minister to do anything, I am only hoping that his officers may draw a lesson from what has happened.

There is another matter to which I should like to refer briefly, and that is the withdrawal from the Canadian army overseas of some 2,000 foresters who were volunteers. The alacrity with which the young men of New Brunswick who were experienced woodsmen acceded to the call of the government to join the forestry corps reflects nothing but credit upon them. I assume that the purpose of this corps was a useful one, that they did useful work overseas and that as the war is not yet won there will be necessity still for cutting timber. This would seem to be so because a large number are still being retained on the other side at that work. I do not think we can make any other assumption.

One day last autumn the men in certain camps in Scotland were paraded—I cannot vouch for the truth of the report, but I think there is a large element of truth in it—and 2,000 of them were told they would have to come back to Canada. As I understand it, not one man wished to return to this country. However, the 2,000 men were brought to Canada in the fall of 1943 along with their full complement of officers. I suggest to the minister that no matter how meritorious or good the object of this move may have been, it has failed. There has been a useless expenditure of the taxpayers' money, and there is great dissatisfaction over what happened

among the personnel. They cannot understand why 2,000 of them have been withdrawn from overseas service. They feel that if they were not required in forestry work in Scotland they could have done useful work as auxiliary troops, thus avoiding the necessity of transporting men and women from this side to do that sort of work overseas. That is one of their complaints. However, their main complaint is the manner in which they were used after they came to this country. I want to be frank with the minister and the committee and say that I have not been able to obtain corroborative evidence to support the statements contained in a communication which I received from a non-commissioned officer and from which I intend to quote. This man came back to Canada against his will. I understand he asked for and received his discharge and is now in civilian life. Unfortunately his communication came to me while I was absent from home and I did not see it until the end of January. On December 27 he wrote me, approaching me as the representative of the constituency of York-Sunbury; I received his communication in that capacity and I now present his position to the committee. This is what he said in the opening paragraph:

As the representative for York-Sunbury I would like to draw to your attention some of the salient facts re the return of a part of the Canadian forestry corps to Canada. To my mind, and I have every reason to believe that this is the opinion of a great majority of the men, we have been given a deal since returning to Canada that the citizens of this country should know about, so that in future men returning to Canada will be used as men who volunteered and went overseas to do their humble part have the right to expect, and which we are sure the vast majority of our citizens expect them to have.

I approach the consideration of this matter on the basis of this man's declaration that they had not been used properly on their return to this country. I continue:

We landed in Canada in October after a good trip, with good food, and so forth, aboard ship. We were entrained for Debert camp. We arrived there around six thirty in the evening to find cold huts, no hot water in the huts and no rations drawn. Mind you, sir, this is a body of nearly two thousand men without rations.

Just imagine that situation!

After a time blankets were drawn and men were detailed—

Mind you, this zombie army in Canada was detailed to have this camp ready for these hungry men coming from an eastern Canadian port late in the day, and when the men came in to the camp they found it cold and empty.

After a time blankets were drawn; men detailed to get fires going. About nine o'clock we were told supper was ready. Personally I did not go to the mess hall, as like many more the inner man called long before this and I had gone to the war services canteen and had a good lunch. I might just mention here that officers had to eat there as well as on the first night.

Of course I do not think that hurt the officers a bit.

We had been split up in strange companies overseas and were more or less unacquainted with the personnel of our company.

He just mentions that in passing.

We were there from Tuesday until Saturday night. During Wednesday, Thursday, Friday and Saturday it was as near a mob as one could ever hope to see.

I can visualize the situation of these men, and I call the minister's attention to this:

First you would be called for a parade. No sooner on parade than ordered to return to your huts for further orders. And so it continued the whole time. They were at that time trying to get us broken down from companies to our military district depots. As an example, No. 7 district depot was called to parade at 7 a.m. in the drill hall with our blankets to turn in. We were then very much in the way of the various district depots west of military district No. 7. However, by moving us from one corner to another many times the other districts got formed up and moved out; this was around 12.00 noon. We were told then to break off and return at 1 p.m., which we did. From 1 p.m. till 3.30 p.m. we did get our blankets turned in and formed up in formation. We were to move off that evening.

I suggest that there was very bad management on the part of those administering this dispersal.

I have cited this one instance, which is true and can be verified by any man there, as an example of the start we made in Canada. Also to just let you think how the men were feeling after four days of absolute inefficiency from start to finish.

That is the charge of this non-commissioned officer.

Through it all the men were remarkably well behaved and they had far more than their share of grievances.

And now for a brighter side of the picture. We left Debert on Saturday night between 8 and 9 o'clock after four hungry days. We left, I might add, with no regrets, and with a feeling of being badly let down by the powers that be.

We arrived in Fredericton the next morning, and this was a treat; for we were taken right to the depot, given a good breakfast, and by 8.30 a.m. they had us on first parade. From that until 3.30 p.m. we went through the various branches, medical, pay, quartermaster, etc., were given our fourteen day leave and any that could got to their homes that day. Personally my pride returned a good deal to see at least our own depot handled in such a highly efficient manner.

I pause here to say to the minister that I believe the administration officer at No. 7 depot, Fredericton, is a first-class administration officer. I have heard no complaints about

him. I believe he endeavours to do his level best under circumstances that at times may be very difficult and trying, and I have never heard any complaint against him. I am glad to pay him that tribute.

On our return from leave, we were in Fredericton a week and each day made us forget Debert and appreciate district depot No. 7. We were informed we were going to Sussex, which we did on November 15.

I suppose this is all military routine, but just mark this. In order to get to Fredericton they would have to go through Sussex. Now if they were going to Sussex for dispersal, one would think the business-like thing to do would be to stop at Sussex instead of going on through Sussex to Fredericton and then being brought back to Sussex again. That would have meant a considerable saving of money. He goes on; speaking of the camp at Sussex:

The camp was ready and rations drawn. But imagine our surprise to find not only the maritime and Quebec men there but some from as far west as Winnipeg. Altogether there were between 700 and 800 men.

I call the minister's particular attention to this next statement:

The next morning we were called together and an unsigned document was read to us. I enclose this unsigned document minus paragraphs 6 and 7.

My curiosity is piqued as to what paragraphs 6 and 7 were. I have before me a copy of this unsigned document. It is headed "General Information," and reads:

You have been returned to Canada to assist in increasing the production and export to the United Kingdom of vitally needed lumber.

2. It is the belief of the government departments concerned that you can probably make the best contribution by returning to lumbering operations, with civilian firms.

Very good. If the conditions were right, that was a proper objective, assuming that the men were needed in Canada.

3. You may apply for and receive leave of absence without pay—to be known as "forestry leave." If you do this you will have to proceed to such lumbering operations as national selective service officials may direct. National selective service will explain conditions of pay and employment to you and will give consideration to placing you with your former employer, if you so desire, or in the locality for which you express a preference. You will understand that this will not be possible in every case. They will endeavour to secure the most favourable conditions of employment for you.

4. If you accept forestry leave you remain on the strength of the army but return to work on a temporary civilian basis, taking your own chances in regard to earnings.

Note that, please.

You will be given an initial free outfit of outer clothing and footwear as required by your employment. You will, while on such leave cease to draw any army pay and allowances (including dependents' allowance).

Note that. These men are still in the army, but at the same time they are not in the army. They must take their chances. They are brought back to help the war effort as soldiers. That is my appreciation of the situation, and if I am wrong the minister will correct me. I am simply giving my own interpretation of the position. They are brought back as soldiers, as enlisted volunteers—not draftees, remember—to assist in a vital war effort. But then the army tells them: While you are in the army you will return to work on a temporary civilian basis, taking your own chances in regard to earnings, and you will be given thus and so.

Mr. RALSTON: If you ask for leave.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is what it says in the "General Information."

Mr. RALSTON: I know, but you are not in the army if you ask for leave out of the army and you get civilian pay.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): But they were brought back to produce lumber as part of the war effort. This is one of the things they complain of. They say this was done under false pretences.

Mr. LOCKHART: How does the man's family live until he draws his first civilian pay?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I should like to know. I do not want to get into a row about this thing, and I do not want to be too harsh or rough in my judgment. I am going to leave it to the minister to straighten it out. It goes on:

You will while on such leave cease to draw any army pay and allowances (including dependents' allowance). You will not be eligible for army medical or dental treatment. You will not be eligible for any army pension if killed or incapacitated. You will, however, be subject to the provisions of any provincial compensation act which may apply to your employment.

No thanks to the army for that, because the civilian laws provide for it.

You will have the right to apply for cancellation of your forestry leave to return to army employment.

That, of course, is quite proper.

If you take this you will be placed on such duties as your commanding officer may order.

I ask the minister if that statement which this man says was read to them was put out by the army and under army orders. Then I

ask him to read to the committee, or hand to me to be read, sections 6 and 7, which this unsigned document contained but which my correspondent did not enclose to me. I have no doubt what was in it.

Mr. RALSTON: What was the date of the circular?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): There is no date on it; but it was read to them. What I have is a mimeographed copy of a typewritten document, with no date on it, headed "General Information," read to these men on parade at camp Sussex the morning after they arrived, which, I gathered from this letter would be November 16. This is his observation with regard to paragraphs 6 and 7:

It appears that paragraphs 6 and 7 must have been too unwholesome even for an unsigned document.

Well, that is his observation.

Mr. RALSTON: Your correspondent is saying that?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Yes.

Well, we went to the selective service men. They were only interested in the lumbering industry and of course had no instructions at that time to handle other occupations. Of course, all forestry leave forms and conditions will be procurable for you if you wish to look into the matter.

I have not had an opportunity to do that, and I have not done it.

Things went on like this for several days, with men applying for leave and getting it for lumbering. There were many who wanted to get back to other lines of work—mining, fishing, farming, railroading, etc.

I believe this man is a railroad man.

After a time selective service was allowed to place miners and farmers. Then along came our army examiners for our "M" test and interview—

I believe that is an intelligence test, is it not?

—which many of us had in Scotland. The examiner told us the papers had been lost, so our intelligence was to be tested again. They worked hard and rushed us through, gave us all a very cheerful story and led us to believe we would soon be placed where we wanted to go and were needed the worst. As the returns came back, drafts started moving to their various depots. Hopes were high that we would all be in our depots before Christmas, so as to have Christmas or New Year's at home.

Some of these men have been overseas since the very start of the forestry corps, which, I believe was early in 1940, or perhaps before.

When we were reduced to a mere handful of men—

This is still at camp Sussex.

—we were told some had to remain and furnish a guard for the camp during the holiday season. Two N.C.O.'s and twenty-four other ranks were attached to No. 6 employment company for this purpose.

I call attention to the next paragraph:

We all agree and know that duties must continue at all times. What we cannot understand is why we are chosen on our return—

And I interpolate this—after four years overseas—

—for this, as there is a battalion of trainees here, namely the Edmonton Fusiliers.

These men, I understand, were trainees called up under the National Resources Mobilization Act, and were not going overseas unless they volunteered.

The men think, and not without good reasons, that it is a rank bit of discrimination as between the volunteers returning and the men drafted for home service only.

These men were obliged to perform in the holiday season the camp duty, and there was a battalion of draftees in the same camp.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Had they had a leave home by that time?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Oh, they got their first fourteen days. But this was the Christmas holiday. These men were waiting to be placed by national selective service or to be allowed to withdraw from the army, get their discharges and go to their civilian occupations. I suppose that that was the worst insult of all. I really think that that was the greatest degradation to which these men felt that they could be submitted, that they would have to do fatigue duty—if that is the right term—in that camp, of which these draftees, who were going to do nothing but train, train, train, were relieved. I realize this is a very touchy subject, but it has been hidden all too long and might just as well be cleared up now. It shows the temper of these men who are volunteers with respect to those who are not, and I believe the minister should take note of that. Then I call his attention to the next paragraph:

For as sure as the sun rises, on the ending of this war and the return of our fighters from the various services, it has got to be faced. . . . I realize that some of the complaints may seem trivial to a civilian, but a continuous stream of these small things day after day soon builds up to things which are far from trivial. There are instances, sir, by the score I could cite you. However, I hope to be able to call on you before you go to Ottawa, if you care to have any more details.

I did not get this in time to see the writer. I knew him in civilian life before he enlisted.

He realizes that he may be assuming some responsibility in making the statements contained in this letter. In the latter part of it he says:

> I fully realize I am leaving myself open in writing you this, but if it is necessary to tell your source of information I am perfectly willing that you use my name, if in doing so it will clear up what will soon be a very serious situation.

And he signs his name.

Mr. RALSTON: He is a non-commissioned officer, not an officer?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): He was a non-commissioned officer. I understand he got his discharge subsequently and is now back in civilian service. I hope he is immune to the wrath of the powers that be, because if he is still in the army he might still have cause to fear it.

Mr. RALSTON: Their wrath is not half as great as the wrath of my hon. friend.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): We will say that it is simulated to quite a large extent. I am going to hand this letter to the minister. It will have served a good purpose if I have called his attention to the serious implications underlying it as to the treatment of returned men by his department, and in particular, the treatment of this large group of returned men who did not want to come back at all. I think the minister knows that; if he does not he is hearing it now.

A delegation consisting of a number of officers from this group came to see me. They are still kicking their heels around the district depot. They are all young men. One of them is a civil engineer, and I am in high hopes that he will be transferred to the pioneers, because he is capable and he certainly would be an efficient young officer in the engineers. If there are to be promotions I suggest to headquarters that they could usefully employ him because he has had experience. Other fellows are waiting to be placed and have not been placed. At any rate, the rank and file of these men think they have a grievance and many of them have. The worst thing, I think, was the failure of the administrative authorities in military district No. 6 to provide for their reception at Debert. It seems to me that is inexcusable. There may be an answer; I do not know. You ask men to come home—what a homecoming for 2,000 men. They come ashore looking forward to some days' leave and are put in a cold camp without rations or blankets for four days. They got the blankets and rations, of course, but there was, as he said, the best exhibition of a mob for four days.

Somebody is to blame. I do not say it is the minister; not at all. He is only the spokesman for the department and the person to whom I am making these representations in the hope that the administrative staff in Halifax will be put on the carpet for this. They are the people I am gunning for, if I may put it that way. I do not know who they are and I do not care.

The minister ought to have occasional shake-ups in the administrative staffs, and I would like to be taken as saying that I do not think that applies to our district depot; for I have given myself a certificate of character. And Colonel MacDougall, by the way, is not a supporter of mine.

Mr. BRUCE: In spite of that.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): In spite of that. There are some good ones, you know. He is a very decent man, I think, and has had wide administrative experience both in the last war and in this. I hope I have not been too severe in putting forward this case, but I know this man. I have faith that he is telling the truth. I have not had the privilege of an interview with him since this letter came, and I am going to send the letter to the minister and ask him to do what he has been good enough to do for me on more than one occasion—to have an investigation made into such complaints in the hope that there will be no repetition of this sort of thing, in the hope that those who are responsible for inefficiency are dealt with. I was going to say brass hats, but I will not say that. You know, it is fashionable to throw mud at the general staff, but I do not believe in that. They are doing the duty that is assigned to them and many of them are very efficient. I must pay a tribute to the courtesy with which they have always received me on any occasion I had to go to them, not for my own purposes, but on behalf of anyone who has written to me. I am not throwing mud at the general staff, but I think there are occasions when it would be well for the minister to know that there are charges of inefficiency in the administration of his far-flung department, and in his heart I know he would be glad to have representations made to him if based on proper evidence or allegations, so that he can shake up the administration.

Whatever you may say about the Hong Kong investigation, I notice that the minister did shake up some of these departments, and there were people who took their departure from headquarters. Perhaps there are others who should do likewise in consequence of the same thing. That was one thing that came out of the Hong Kong investigation.

The minister said his department was never static. I hope that has been true at all times, but I notice that they move more quickly when something happens to arouse their attention. That may be a blessing in disguise. I make this submission to the minister, and I do not think he should be called upon to reply now, but I would ask him to investigate the matter. I do not want to give it further publicity but I ought to call attention to it. I think the state of inefficiency that is exhibited there is inexcusable, and the manner in which the men were handled when they got to Sussex is more or less inexcusable.

I would like to know what the attitude of the department was towards bringing these men back to Canada. For, believe me, not one of them wanted to come back to Canada. Whether they were right in that point of view I do not know. They were soldiers and had to obey orders. I believe they were represented as volunteering to come home; I understand they were asked if they would like to come. I tell you that there was nothing voluntary about it. They were paraded and they had to come home even under the guise of volunteering. That is what has been reported to me, and I do not want anyone from headquarters to say that these men all voluntarily came home, because I think that is far from the truth.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend was good enough to say that I could leave the matter until after making further investigation—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Surely.

Mr. RALSTON:—and I shall have to do that in connection with two or three matters, particularly of administration. I do want to tell the committee, however, what the situation was with respect to the return of that corps and its employment here. The return of approximately 2,000 men of the Canadian Forestry Corps in the fall of 1943 was the result of communications between the ministry of supply in Great Britain and the ministry of munitions and supply here and the Department of National Defence. The question was where the most timber could be produced. Up to the early summer of 1943 the situation had been that it was better to produce timber in the United Kingdom even though it could not be produced at the same rate, since the stands were very much smaller there than in Canada, particularly on our west coast. It was felt better to produce the timber there and save the shipping that would be required in taking Canadian timber over. It was realized, however, that the operation was not altogether, shall I say, commercially and economically sound because of the small size of the timber there and the smaller number of superficial feet which were produced per head under those conditions. Munitions and Supply here considered that the timber supply in Canada required a substantially increased output and they asked that the members of the Canadian Forestry Corps be returned for that purpose.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That was Munitions and Supply?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes. The matter was taken up with the appropriate authorities in the United Kingdom, the department of supply there, and it was agreed that this could be done on the condition of fixing a certain number of tons. The timber was counted in tons, as members of the committee know, and it was agreed that a certain number of tons per year should be fixed as the minimum which they hoped Canada could produce. It was under those circumstances that the Department of National Defence expressed willingness to bring back 2,000 men of the Canadian Forestry Corps for the purpose of cutting timber here.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I admit that no complaint could be found with that. I admit that right off.

Mr. RALSTON: We realized from the start that there would be difficulty in connection with employing these men and we tried to give them notice well ahead. I am interested in what my hon. friend says with regard to the men being paraded overseas. I know exactly where they were. Several hon. members have visited them over there, and I must confess that I do not think I would like to leave that particular spot myself, because it is a very attractive place.

Mr. SENN: Will the minister say whether bushmen were picked out?

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend is anticipating me; however, I can answer the question now. As my hon. friend knows, in these forestry companies there is a considerable percentage of tradesmen, mechanics. These men are used for the purpose of handling not only the saws and machinery but the mechanized transport. I have seen them in the lumbering operations in the United Kingdom. They were employing what, in the presence of some hon. members from British Columbia, I would call the high-line system of lumbering. We do not know very much about that in the east. It is used particularly in connection with larger timber. They had the very best equipment possible. There were a certain number of tradesmen among the men who came here; whether they volunteered to come, as my hon. friend points out,

or whether they were ordered, I am not able to say at the moment. A large percentage of the men who came here were general duty personnel.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): General duty men.

Mr. RALSTON: General duty men who were not tradesmen in the sense in which one refers to a motor mechanic or a sawyer, for instance, as a tradesman. There was a larger percentage of general duty men than of tradesmen. I do not know whether these men were asked to volunteer to come or not. There was no reason under the terms of their service to ask them to volunteer to come home any more than there would be a reason for asking the men in England to volunteer to go to Italy; that is to say, an order would be issued stating that this was the place to go. They enlisted in the Canadian army for general service. They were put in the forestry corps because they were especially useful there. I cannot tell the committee at this stage whether or not the order was given that they come or whatever attention was paid to the desire of the particular individual. I have an idea that probably an attempt was made to find out whether the men wanted to go or not, and to let those go who would like to go, but I would not want to take issue with a member of the contingent. I would expect there would be a certain number in the group who would welcome the opportunity to come back to Canada. That was the situation, and that was the purpose for which they came.

With regard to the reception at Debert, all I can say to my hon. friend at this stage is—and I do not want this to be understood as the last word—that what he says sounds to me like bad staff work. There is usually something to be said on the other side. I happen to know the commanding officer of that particular camp, and I would want to reserve judgment until I had an investigation made, which I assure my hon. friend will be made very quickly. I have the documents before me. These men arrived on October 19, and the next morning at least this attention was paid to them. They had not just simply a camp staff there. They had a fairly sizable staff. The director of administration there, also, was Major D. Drummond; Major C. L. Code, of the directorate of organization; Mr. E. K. Marsh, of the Department of Labour; Mr. F. E. Hall, of the Department of Munitions and Supply, with ten trained civilian interviewers assisted by unit officers who interviewed all the men there before they were dispatched to the depots for disembarkation leave. That sounds as if some attention was paid to the welfare of these men and that a businesslike attempt was made to find out where they fitted into Canada's lumbering economy.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is not the point at issue. The point at issue is their physical comfort.

Mr. RALSTON: I say that was the next morning. Whether or not they had blankets as soon as they arrived or whether they had to get them, I do not know; whether rations were drawn or not is another question. I can hardly credit the statement which is made that rations were not drawn for these men because they would be at Halifax and notice would be given by M.D. No. 6, to the army service corps, and rations should have been drawn for them.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): They should have been ready.

Mr. RALSTON: I shall reserve judgment on that. Next morning, as I say, these men were brought in for the purpose of interview. The gentleman who writes the letter speaks of there being a mob. There again I cannot conceive of Brigadier Colquhoun, who was in charge of the camp there, permitting any kind of mob.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): He says it was as near to a mob as one could ever hope to see.

Mr. RALSTON: I cannot conceive Brigadier Colquhoun permitting any sort of mob in the camp. I know Brigadier Colquhoun quite well. He has had service overseas in this war as well as in the last. Brigadier Colquhoun is in charge of the training brigade at the present time and was previously in charge of a brigade out west. I am not going to say that it did not take place. As I say, I reserve judgment. Then the men received disembarkation leave; that is to say, every man from Debert went to his depot, that is, the depot in his home district from which he took leave. That was the reason why the New Brunswick boys would go to Fredericton and go out from the depot there. Their leave would be properly noted on their documents there and the railway warrants would be given them to go to their homes, wherever they may be. They received fourteen days' leave and then they came back. The New Brunswick boys would go to Sussex. The other boys would go to their own particular concentration centres. As I remember it, the arrangement was that there were two concentrations. There was one at Sussex for the men from the east, and one at Camrose, Alberta, for the men from the west. Here is where the trouble arose.

The Canadian army could detail these men for lumbering by companies just as it did in the United Kingdom. They could form any special units they desired. The Canadian army took that authority under an order in council which was passed for that purpose. As a matter of fact, they did not need any order in council at all. What was wanted by the operators in the west, and the eastern operators fell in with them, was that these men would go to them as civilians, work at the same job they had worked at before and be paid civilian pay.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): May I ask the minister a question right there. Was it not first suggested by the lumber operators in eastern Canada that they should take these men as army men and pay all that the army had paid them and all the collateral benefits, and that they refused? They simply would not take them under these circumstances.

Mr. RALSTON: I shall come to that. That was the net result in the east and the west, as a matter of fact. The army was prepared to detail these men to go into these different companies and operate in the woods. The instructions to the district were prepared by the Department of National Defence providing for the detailing of soldiers on forestry duty. The plan was not put into effect because of objections raised by the Department of Labour and the British Columbia operators. Representatives of the British Columbia operators informed the interdepartmental committee, that is a committee consisting of Labour, National Defence and Munitions and Supply and a representative of the timber controller—that union activities in British Columbia logging camps made it impossible for them to accept soldiers detailed as such for duty in British Columbia. The only way they could accept soldiers was by their applying for and being granted leave of absence without pay and allowances, the soldiers to receive the same rate of wages as civilians.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Does the minister interpret that to mean that the unions refused to work with men in uniform?

Mr. RALSTON: I am reading what I have here. As a matter of fact, I was overseas at the time this took place. I understand that it does not mean that the unions refused to work with men in uniform but that the unions were complaining that men in uniform were receiving pay for certain work at a different rate of pay compared with the rates being paid to the civilian operator. The Department of Labour concurred in this view. It was pointed out by the representatives of the Department of Labour that to detail soldiers for duty in eastern Canada on soldiers' pay and allowances would probably cause dissatisfaction among civilian woods workers because the earnings of civilian workers, generally speaking, were, it was said, less than the pay and allowances of a soldier.

The timber controller expressed himself on various occasions as being in favour of employing forestry corps personnel only on a leave without pay and allowances basis, employed as individuals in existing logging camps, and paid by the operators at the same rate as civilians.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): May I ask the minister a question right there. Why were these things not all threshed out before the country went to the expense of bringing these men out?

Mr. RALSTON: Because of the fact—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): They did not give any consideration to that situation at all?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes, consideration was given—there were communications between the departments, and it was expected that this could be arranged so that these men could be detailed.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Not with the operators, anyway.

Mr. RALSTON: I am talking now of the timber controller of the Department of Munitions and Supply. I am not blaming them but we all assumed it could be worked out. The result was, as I say, that it meant that the way to employ these men was by giving them leave.

My hon. friend suggests that these men were hurt. A lot of men wanted to do things other than taking leave for the purpose of working in the woods.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is true, and they did not like the conditions.

Mr. RALSTON: Yes. These were the alternatives for the men:

(a) Forestry leave for all wishing same;
(b) Men of suitable rank, age and Pulhems profile for overseas service in another arm to be given opportunity to transfer;
(c) Veterans of 1914-18 to have the privilege of transferring to veterans' guard of Canada;
(d) Coal-mining leave under existing regulations to those eligible;
(e) Compassionate farm leave under R.O. 3456 to those eligible;
(f) Any other type of leave without pay and allowances to those eligible, under existing regulations.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): What does that include? Does that allow a man to go back to his former civilian occupation?

Mr. RALSTON: No; that refers to compassionate leave. But sometimes there are special types. There was some leave for mining.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): And railways.

Mr. RALSTON: Yes, and for railways. Then it continues:

(g) Opportunity for trades training to those suitable and selected and transfer to appropriate corps;

(h) Authority for discharge of personnel whose Pulhems profile was lower than 2 and who were not specially required in the army by reason of technical military or trades qualifications;

(i) Personnel returning from forestry leave eligible to take advantage of alternatives (a) to (h).

Those were the instructions given.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The instructions from headquarters?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Was that read to the men on parade?

Mr. RALSTON: I am sure that it was told to them, and that the men were given that option.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Well, what about this thing I have here?

Mr. BOUCHER: What is the number of discharges?

Mr. RALSTON: I shall give the disposition of the whole force. The movement of personnel from Camrose to Vancouver commenced. The above alternatives were also extended to permit transfer to vacancies in operational units or home war establishments, provided an equivalent number are thereby released to the reinforcement stream. The total of other ranks returned to Canada was 1,905. Those who took the leave to go into a civilian occupation under the terms set out in the general instruction which my hon. friend read numbered 558.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): About 25 per cent.

Mr. RALSTON: Yes. Those who were granted forestry leave numbered 558, and those granted compassionate farm leave numbered 6. The complete table showing the disposal made is as follows:

Total other ranks returned to Canada...	1,905
Granted forestry leave.....	558
Granted compassionate farm leave.....	6
Granted coal-mining leave.....	1
Transferred to other arms as reinforcements	233
Transferred to veterans' guard of Canada	14
Transferred to district depots—	
Pulhems 1 and 2 for absorption with operational units or H.W.E.'s.....	255
Pulhems 3 and 4 for employment if available; otherwise discharge.....	692
Pulhems 5 for discharge.....	31
Retained at depots following disembarkation leave for medical and other reasons and not dispatched to concentration points	115

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): How many went into the bush?

Mr. RALSTON: There were 558.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Twenty-five per cent out of the total achieved the objective.

Mr. RALSTON: That is correct.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is pretty small.

Mr. RALSTON: They were granted forestry leave. I am saying to my hon. friend only this, that that is not the fault of the army. It is the fault of the civilian situation, whereby these men were not allowed to work in forestry corps units.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): We will say it is a combination of circumstances.

Mr. RALSTON: Yes, it is a combination of circumstances.

Mr. WHITE: How many of these men have since returned to the army and are no longer in the bush?

Mr. RALSTON: I cannot say.

Mr. WHITE: Does the minister not know how many of them have returned to the army?

Mr. RALSTON: No, I do not know that.

Mr. GILLIS: Was not the fact that most of these men did not go into the bush the result of financial considerations?

Mr. RALSTON: What was the hon. member's question?

Mr. GILLIS: I remember reading a press dispatch only a few days ago to the effect that members of the forestry corps returning

to western Canada refused to go into the bush at $5.50 a day, because they considered they were better off financially.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): They might be.

Mr. GILLIS: With their pay and allowances, and so on. I believe most of the friction developed along those lines. However, I would ask the minister to comment on that situation. What actually happened in British Columbia when the forestry corps refused to go into the woods was that they were lowering their income. Is that true, or is it not?

Mr. RALSTON: I do not know what the reason was. I was not here, and I have not heard the reasons. All I can say to my hon. friend is that if they stayed in the army they could not be used as forestry corps in Canada under the labour conditions I have spoken of which existed in the camps in British Columbia and eastern Canada.

Mr. GILLIS: As I understand it, taking their discharge from the army, and going into the woods—

Mr. RALSTON: They did not take their discharge; they got leave.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is correct; they just got leave.

Mr. GILLIS: Coming within the tax structure, and so on, meant that even when receiving $5.50 a day, that amount when compared with their army pay worked out to a point where it was indicated that they were worse off than they would be in the armed service. I understand that was the basis of the friction in British Columbia.

Mr. RALSTON: There was no friction in British Columbia so far as the men in the army were concerned.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is true.

Mr. RALSTON: I am not blaming these men for not going into a civilian occupation. The army was giving them the opportunity, and that was all there was to it. The army expected they would be used as they had been used in England, as a forestry corps. Conditions in the camps on the Pacific coast and the eastern coast prevented that.

Mr. ROWE: They were all working in the bush in the old country?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes. They were all in the forestry corps. Of course when my hon. friend refers to the bush, I must explain that some were in mills and some were in other operations connected with lumbering.

[Mr. Gillis.]

Mr. ROWE: But they were all producing timber in the old country?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Mr. GREEN: Was that situation not investigated before they were brought back?

Mr. RALSTON: I am sure it was investigated by the timber controller, and by the Department of Labour. They had from us the information as to what would be done with them.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): And their objective failed

Mr. NICHOLSON: Was consideration given to having the men work in the bush on army pay, as in the old country? What consideration was given to that?

Mr. RALSTON: Full consideration. As I have said, the Department of National Defence were not only willing, but were really in favour of doing it. However, that was prevented because in the camps in the west and in the east the operators found they could not allow army personnel to take employment side by side with civilian personnel. As a matter of fact, I think the suggestion was made that they should use some of the camps exclusively for army personnel. Apparently that was not practical or possible.

Mr. ROWE: The final result, then, is that we actually lost about seventy-five per cent of the efficiency of that group of men, so far as the main purpose of increasing empire timber production was concerned.

Mr. RALSTON: No; there were 558 on forestry leave, 233 were reinforcements and sixty-nine who may be employed in forestry, if we have a place to employ them.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It would be interesting to know how many of those 558 are still in the bush. I bet more than half of them are out of the bush.

Mr. RALSTON: I am not betting, or taking bets, because I do not know.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Neither am I, but I make a wager once in a while.

Mr. RALSTON: These are the figures given me. Let us understand that these men are not lost to the man-power of Canada because they do not happen to be working in forestry.

Mr. ROWE: But they are lost to forestry production, and that was the main purpose of the change. And we have no assurance that the 558 are still in the bush.

Mr. RALSTON: I have no such assurance. But do not blame me, because it is not my fault.

Mr. ROWE: I am not blaming the minister. But the plan fell down, in the production of empire forest products, products which were so necessary for an all-out war effort. It was so important that the 2,000 had to be brought back from the old country. We now find that only a quarter of them went into the bush, and the rumour that is current in forestry circles is that only about a quarter of that quarter is still in the bush.

Mr. RALSTON: They are there for the operators to take, if they wish to take them.

Mr. ROWE: The operators have refused.

Mr. RALSTON: It is not the army's fault that they were not in the woods, if the operators will not take them. The army will produce them, but the operators will not take them. They will take them only in civilian clothes, but they will not take them as the army details them.

Mr. ROWE: They have been offered?

Mr. RALSTON: The army has offered to detail these men to timbering operations, but the operators have refused them unless they are civilians.

Mr. NICHOLSON: The argument advanced by the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) expresses the opinion of some of the forestry men from my area who have returned. It seems to me that if the shortage of lumber was so serious in Canada to warrant bringing two thousand men back, plans should have been made to see that those two thousand men would go into the production of lumber under army pay and instructions. It seems a pity that only 525 are now engaged in the work for which these men volunteered and that seventy-five per cent of them are not doing the work they wanted to do when they volunteered for service.

Mr. RALSTON: It certainly is a pity, but if they will not let them work it out, that blocks the use of them.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: Is the minister telling us that the lumber operators rather than the government determine where the soldiers shall be used?

Mr. RALSTON: Not at all.

An hon. MEMBER: Labour unions.

Mr. WHITE: Has the minister any knowledge or record of the rates or scale of wages paid to these men, on either the east or west coast? A number went to the Timagami district in Ontario.

Mr. RALSTON: I have not that information.

Mr. WHITE: Can the minister get the information so that the committee may know the approximate pay that these men receive?

Mr. RALSTON: I will get it from the Department of Labour because that is not in my department. These men are on leave and are working for civilian pay. I say with great respect that I do not think I should be asked to go around to all the lumber camps to get these rates of pay.

Mr. WHITE: I understand that a number of these men went to the Timagami district and were given the opportunity to return to the army. A large number have returned. Perhaps the minister can tell us how many of these 558 men have returned to the army.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend asked that some time ago and I made a note of it.

Mr. GREEN: I think the minister would help us a great deal if he would give us more details about the plan by which men can leave the army, apparently on indefinite leave, in order to work in industry. There are not only the men in the lumbering industry, there are men who have gone into mining, and I have also heard of men from the forces who have gone into the shipyards. Apparently men are going from both the Canadian active army and the group of men called up under the National Resources Mobilization Act. Would the minister give us the number from each of these two armies and also in what industries these men are working? What arrangements are made for getting them back, or are they to remain there permanently?

Mr. RALSTON: The order in council is P.C. 8197, which I have not with me. This authorizes personnel to be detailed for duty or granted forestry leave. I shall have to get the other orders in council with regard to coal-mining leave and other leaves. Perhaps I can give my hon. friend the general details with regard to forestry leave.

Provision is made for grant of leave to personnel of the Canadian forestry corps returned from overseas to return to the lumbering industry for the purpose of increasing the production of Canadian lumber for export to the United Kingdom. The officer commanding No. 1 district headquarters, Canadian forestry corps, and the district officers commanding were authorized to grant such leave for a period not exceeding six months. The same officers may renew such leave for further periods of six months. Leave granted is without pay and allowances of any kind or medical treatment at public expense.

With regard to coal-mining leave, leave may be granted to coal miners for the purpose of

resuming employment in the coal-mining industry. Personnel granted leave must be employed in the actual production of coal; that is, from face to pithead. Leave may be granted for a period of six months and is renewable for such periods of three months as may be considered advisable. This leave is granted on the authority of national defence headquarters and is without pay and allowances of any kind or medical treatment at public expense.

Provision is made under another order for the return of men to the lumbering industry. Soldiers who are skilled loggers and have had experience in the province of British Columbia may be given leave of absence to return to the lumbering industry in British Columbia. This leave is without pay and allowances of any kind or medical treatment at public expense and is granted on the authority of the general officer commanding in chief or the district officer commanding. Leave may be granted for a period of six months and may be renewed for such periods not exceeding six months as may be considered advisable.

Then there is another provision with regard to leave for the purpose of returning to industry. Application for return of a soldier to war industry must be originated by the employer, who will submit application to the officer commanding the unit in which the soldier is serving. The officer commanding the unit will forward application, together with his recommendation, to the general officer commanding in chief or the district officer commanding, who will submit same to national selective service mobilization board with such recommendations or representations as they may consider necessary. When the board recommends that leave be granted, the general officer commanding in chief or the district officer commanding may grant leave.

In the event that the general officer commanding in chief or the district officer commanding does not concur in the recommendation of the board, the application will be referred to national defence headquarters for decision. Leave granted is without pay and allowances of any kind or medical treatment at public expense and will in no case exceed six months. Renewal may be granted by the general officer commanding in chief or the district officer commanding after the case has been reviewed by the board.

As my hon. friend knows, the other leaves are compassionate farm leave, compassionate leave without pay, compassionate leave with pay, disembarkation leave, embarkation leave and ordinary leave and furlough. I have not given my hon. friend the number on leave, but I shall endeavour to get that.

[Mr. Ralston.]

Mr. GREEN: Do those rules apply both to men in the active army and men called up under the National Resources Mobilization Act?

Mr. RALSTON: I think there is some provision with regard to detailing men for farm leave that provides that only men under the N.R.M.A. may be so detailed.

Mr. GREEN: Is there any provision whereby a man in eastern Canada who is called up under the N.R.M.A. can be sent to the Pacific coast to work in the shipyards? I believe that has been done.

Mr. RALSTON: I cannot remember because there are so many regulations. I do know that there is a provision for detailing men for railway work and perhaps there is a similar provision for war industry. I shall have that looked up. That is not leave really; it is detailed for duty.

Mr. GREEN: What is the provision in connection with the men who work on the railways?

Mr. RALSTON: They are detailed for duty; it is not leave. I am sorry I have not the order in council if there is one under which provision is made for detailing men to the shipyards. I shall have that looked up to see just what the provision is. The aggregate number of these extended leaves, as I indicated yesterday, is something like 8,000.

Mr. GREEN: How many are N.R.M.A. men?

Mr. RALSTON: About 5,000 out of the 8,000.

Mr. GREEN: Where a man is detailed for work on the railway or work in a shipyard, who pays his wages?

Mr. RALSTON: The employer.

Mr. GRAYDON: Does he work as a soldier or as a civilian.

Mr. RALSTON: He is detailed for that work and is required to stay on that work, as I understand it, under the military regulations, but the actual remuneration is paid by the employer. What I have in mind at the moment is that he gets either the civilian rate or the soldier's rate of pay and allowances, whichever is higher, and the employer reimburses the government. Here is a memorandum on the order in council relating to railway duty:

Under authority of order in council P.C. No. 8217, dated 26th October, 1943, N.R.M.A. soldiers having a medical grading lower than Pulhems profile 2222222 as might be spared from their military duties for limited periods

may be detailed to perform railway duty. Personnel detailed for railway duty shall continue to be credited with their military pay and allowances, including trades pay and dependents' allowances. If the amount payable by the railway companies in respect of the service performed by the soldiers exceeds the amount of the military pay and allowances, the amount of such excess shall be payable to such soldier. This excess will be credited through the paymaster's accounts of the soldier concerned.

The soldiers were detailed as individuals and worked in groups or individually as required by the railway companies.

497 were employed on railway duty as at 22nd December, 1943.

No soldiers are on railway duty at the present time, all personnel having been recalled under instructions.

Mr. GREEN: That really amounts to providing forced labour for the railway companies.

Mr. RALSTON: I am putting no construction on it at all. I say that there is power under the order in council to detail men for railway duty.

Mr. GREEN: These men have to work for the railway. They have no option.

Mr. RALSTON: I am not giving any legal construction to it at all. A soldier having the medical grading may be spared and detailed to perform railway duty.

Mr. MacINNIS: I wish to follow up the questions a little further. I understand that when these men were performing railway duty in British Columbia they were working under the direction of an army officer, and as the hon. member for Vancouver South suggests, it was in effect forced labour because these men are under army discipline and they cannot refuse to take this kind of work. Furthermore, I am told that they were working longer hours than worked by the ordinary railway employee, that they were working 10 hours a day when in British Columbia at least, the ordinary day is 8 hours. I may not be correct in that, but that is the information I have.

Mr. RALSTON: Were they getting higher pay than the railway men?

Mr. MacINNIS: No, I understand they were getting the pay of the railway man or soldier's pay whichever was the higher.

Mr. RALSTON: Was the pay of the soldier including dependents' allowance higher than the pay of the railway man?

Mr. MacINNIS: I gather it would be.

Mr. RALSTON: Then perhaps they could afford to work a little longer.

Mr. MacINNIS: Would the minister give the committee a comparison of the wages paid? Where there was a difference between the pay of the soldier and railway pay, was the difference paid by the employer or by the government? In other words, would the soldier's pay be higher when he was drawing soldier's pay than the railway workers' civilian rate? I think we should have that information.

Mr. RALSTON: It would depend on what soldier you took. A soldier with four children and drawing dependents' allowance would probably be getting a higher rate of pay than the railway man working beside him. You will have to give me a particular case. I cannot give any general rule.

Mr. MacINNIS: The department must have figures on that because a certain amount of bookkeeping would have to be done and the bookkeeping would reveal the facts. I remember that a few years ago in this house—I have not heard so much of it lately since most of the members have taken a great interest in labour—when we spoke of low wages the reply was: What about the soldier drawing $1.30 a day? We pointed out then that the soldier at $1.30 a day was getting more than many men in civilian work, and the statement made by the minister just now bears that out. I think we should be given the rates that were paid to soldiers working on the railways.

Mr. RALSTON: I have nothing here whereby I could give the comparison my hon. friend asks for, but if I can find any case where we have a statement showing the payroll of the soldier, and what he would get if working on the same job at civilian rates, I shall be glad to give it.

Mr. GREEN: Is it a fact that the position is that some men are given indefinite leave from the army in order to get jobs in the woods?

Mr. RALSTON: We were talking about the railways a minute ago. Are we talking about the woods now?

Mr. GREEN: Wait until I finish my question.

Mr. RALSTON: I am interrupting to see if my hon. friend is really referring to woods work.

Mr. GREEN: I am going to refer to both.

Mr. RALSTON: There are two sets of orders in council relating to woods work, one applying to the Canadian Forestry Corps and the other applying to logging.

Mr. GREEN: Some of the loggers are given indefinite leave from the army.

Mr. RALSTON: Not indefinitely.

Mr. GREEN: Six months leave, and it can be renewed for another six months and so on. And they work like the ordinary logger would work, at his rate of pay and under the same conditions. Another group of men were apparently detailed for work on the railways and in shipbuilding yards, and they were not given leave under the same conditions but were told by the army: You have to go there and work for such and such company. I should like to know why such a difference is made between these different classes of work. I must say that I think the government is treading on very dangerous ground and establishing a dangerous precedent when it supplies forced labour for the railways or shipbuilding companies or for any other private employer. It is coming close to slave labour.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend is advocating the conscripting of men to be sent overseas to take part in a war. I suppose he will say that that is forced labour.

Mr. GREEN: That is entirely different.

Mr. RALSTON: I beg my hon. friend's pardon. The government has under the National Resources Mobilization Act the power to direct the employment of every individual in Canada, including my hon. friend. The government finds a situation on the railways where labour is needed. Men have been called up under the N.R.M.A., and the government has power to detail men to take part in that work, which is after all a war job. That is all. The government is not treading on dangerous ground.

Mr. GREEN: Why are they not given leave like the men who go logging.

Mr. RALSTON: Because they would not go on leave perhaps. That may be the reason. One is a privilege and the other is an obligation. That is the difference.

Mr. BOUCHER: Does the minister mean to say that some of these soldiers have been given leave of absence and detailed to do work in industry, forestry work and so on, and that the government has no record of the hours of work and the pay they receive?

Mr. RALSTON: We have been talking about detailing men for railway work. We have not been talking about men working in the woods, as to which there is a special order in council. I have already said to the hon. member for Vancouver East that I shall see if we have in the department any record of comparative wages, showing the pay these men would have received if they were getting civilian pay in that enterprise as compared with the pay and allowances they would receive in the army.

Mr. BOUCHER: The point I am trying to make is that it does not seem to me that it is quite playing ball with the men in the forestry corps if any of them are directed to go to an industry on terms as to wages, hours of labour and so on, of which the government has not full and specific knowledge; and I wonder why we cannot get that information.

Mr. RALSTON: If the government detail them, they detail them to go to work under regulations which the government themselves make, just as they detail them to go and train on a parade ground, or go on manœuvres, or anything of that kind. They go to work as soldiers, and the government, of course, takes care of the situation as regards how many hours they shall work, and that sort of thing, guarantees them at least the pay and allowances of a soldier, and says that if anybody in that enterprise doing equivalent work is getting more than that, it will see that these men get that additional pay.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: Could the minister give the approximate number of soldiers detailed to industry, and the various industries to which they have been detailed?

Mr. RALSTON: The last figures I have show that for farm duty there were detailed, at the end of December, 166, the number having gone down from 1,700 on September 30. Of course the work is seasonal and the number required would diminish as winter approached. There were 487 detailed on railway duty as of December 22, but, as I indicated, all those had been recalled on December 29, so that apparently there is none now. I have no figures as to any being detailed for forestry duty.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: Were there any other industries to which men were detailed?

Mr. RALSTON: No, no others for which they are detailed under order in council.

Mr. GREEN: What about shipbuilding?

Mr. RALSTON: I stated to my hon. friend that I would look up the particulars regarding shipbuilding, that I have no information here about that.

Mr. TUCKER: While the minister is getting a statement as to the various jobs to which soldiers are detailed I would like to say a few words. I would not like it to be supposed

that I am in agreement with the remarks of an hon. member suggesting that only recently have members of the house other than those connected with the C.C.F. party become interested in the problems of labour. I do not think the suggestion is called for. Nor is the suggestion that the average soldier is getting more than the average man engaged in industry. If the hon. member who made that statement was really interested and took the trouble to find out what the average soldier gets he would not be so ready to rise in his place pretend that that is the actual state of facts. He would know that a private soldier in the army without dependents receives $1.50 a day, his clothing and his food. It is true that he may also receive a pension if something happens to him. But I suggest that this is very inadequate compensation for the extra risks he takes as a fighting man as compared with men engaged in industry, and I would like to protest against any suggestion that the average fighting man who goes into the army without wife, family or dependents, is being better paid than a similar man in industry. That has been suggested before by the hon. member for Vancouver East, and I protest against it because it is not correct.

Mr. MacINNIS: The member for Vancouver East did not suggest any of the things which the hon. member for Rosthern has just mentioned. What the member for Vancouver East said, and it is borne out by the statement made in this chamber a moment ago by the Minister of National Defence, is that if these men were detailed to do railway work, they would not do it, because the railways would not pay them enough wages. That is what I said.

Mr. RALSTON: That is not what I said.

Mr. MacINNIS: I think that is what the minister said.

Mr. RALSTON: I beg the hon. member's pardon. I said, perhaps they would not work on the railways, but I did not give any reason, as to whether the railways would pay them more or less; I do not know.

Mr. MacINNIS: That is right. They would work on the railways if the railways would pay them a living wage. Not only that, but to-day, if these railway workers go on strike to get better wages, they find themselves in gaol, and under the order in council they are guilty of an offence unless they can prove their innocence. These are facts, and the facts are proved by the order in council which has just been read by the minister.

Mr. JACKMAN: Would the minister say what disposition has been made of the young men who composed university training course No. 1; also, why university course No. 2 is being continued at the present time?

Mr. RALSTON: I shall have to look that up.

Mr. GILLIS: Evidently many hon. members are very touchy along political lines. The hon. member for Vancouver East, when he made his observation with respect to the item under discussion, was absolutely correct in the assumption that the difficulty experienced by the Department of National Defence with respect to detailing men to certain industries in Canada from the services was connected with financial considerations. That is not anyone's imagination; it follows from an analysis which anyone who is reasonable and fair will have to make after listening to the minister's presentation of that question. The men refused to go on the railroad because they would thereby lower their incomes. On the front page of the Ottawa *Journal* last week it was definitely stated that men detailed from the forestry corps refused to go in the bush at $5.50 a day because it lowered their income in contrast with what they were receiving in the service. Those are not the statements of the hon. member for Vancouver East.

I rise at this time because I note that some hon. members on both sides of this chamber are endeavouring to drive a wedge between the armed services and the industrial workers on the basis of the question we are now discussing, and I believe that action of that kind is a disservice not only to men in the service but to the war effort generally.

At the time the matter was first raised, after listening two or three times to the discussion and having some fair conception of the reasons behind it, members of this group took it upon themselves to make an examination of the question. You cannot examine it by merely picking out the single man who goes in the service or the single man who is employed in industry. Wage rates in this country are computed on the basis of the average income over a given industry, and in many cases this method is not fair, because it includes men in receipt of high salaries as well as those who are drawing $4 a day, and that boosts the average. I believe that anyone who examines the question fairly cannot but arrive at the conclusion that, no matter what industry he investigates, with the present tax structure, what you have left to maintain your family on does not compare very favourably with what those in the service are receiving. No one here has ever intimated that those in the service are getting too much.

Mr. McLARTY: Generally, would the hon. member agree with the suggestion of the hon. member for Rosthern?

Mr. GILLIS: No, I would not because it is not a fair premise.

Mr. McLARTY: You do not think it is correct?

Mr. GILLIS: No. You cannot take the case of a single man and make your analysis on that basis. You have to take an average family. You are getting concrete evidence this afternoon. When you brought the forestry corps back from England you attempted to detail them to do certain work that is now being done by civilians in the country, and when the men in the service stopped to make an analysis of their position after tax deduction at the end of the month they found they would not have as much in cash as they would have in the service without such deduction. The same thing applies to the railways.

Mr. RALSTON: That is not the reason why they are not in the woods.

Mr. GILLIS: That is the reason the Ottawa *Journal* gave a few nights ago as coming from those who were being detailed for that work. The same is true of the mining industry. Hundreds of miners have gone back from the service into that industry because an emergency in fuel was declared. But talk to many of the men who have gone back and they will tell you that after tax deductions they find that they were better off in the service, though they feel they are making the best contribution they can to the country.

I do not approach this question from political reasons. I am concerned about having a fair understanding of the position of the taxpayers of Canada who are footing the bill and also making sacrifices. I suggest that it is a wrong attitude for any member to take, to try to play the public against those who are in the service, on the basis of sacrifices. When a man lays down his life for his country he does something that cannot be computed in financial terms. You cannot compensate a man for that; the only compensation in that case is to take care of his dependents properly if they are unfortunate enough to be left without a bread-winner.

Listening to the discussion I am convinced that there should be a revision of the wage rates in the industries affected, where you are trying to detail men back to work. Either that, or the taxing arrangements should be revised to enable the men to maintain the income they had by virtue of the service they were in.

[Mr. Gillis.]

May I inquire of the minister with regard to another category that is out of the services and into essential industries. I refer to the men who have gone back to the mining industry. Three months' leave was given and that was extended to six months if they applied. The question is this. Some of these men, since going out of the service into the industry, have developed disabilities that render them unfit to work underground. I know of one man who has found it difficult to get back to the service, the reason given being that he is unfit. He is not fit for that occupation and he is also unfit for the service, and a decision has been pending for some time. Is there any understanding in that regard?

Mr. RALSTON: Do I understand my hon. friend to say that the man contracted some disability after leaving the service and going back into industry?

Mr. GILLIS: Yes.

Mr. RALSTON: No; there is no provision.

Mr. GILLIS: He develops a bronchial condition, for example, and he is not fit for the army nor is he fit for that particular occupation. Where does he fit in?

Mr. RALSTON: Pensions and national health would determine whether or not the disability is attributable to service. It may be a service disability, or it may have had its cause there.

Mr. GILLIS: But pensions will not take him until he is back in the service or is discharged.

Mr. RALSTON: That is right.

Mr. TUCKER: I am interested to hear the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) giving me a lecture on splitting up the Canadian people. Let me read what the hon. member said last night:

> I hate to sit back listening to armchair generals who are quite comfortably seated in Canada, prepared to carry on the war until the last worker is killed.

Who is trying to set class against class, and person against person? The hon. member suggests that there are people who are ready to sit back here and carry on the war until the last worker is killed. Is he suggesting that other people are not fighting the war as well as the workers and that certain people are ready to take advantage of the workers? Who is trying to create class hatred?

Mr. GILLIS: I am prepared to repeat that statement. Since coming into the house I have heard men, on this side particularly, whose only desire was to see everyone in

Canada that could be picked up sent overseas with a gun in his hand to do the fighting. Most of these fellows have done little fighting during their lifetime, and when you boil it down, who do the actual fighting, the slugging and shooting, in wars? Ninety-five per cent of them are workers or the sons of workers. I never heard anyone suggest from this side of the house, dealing with the question of conscription, that the bankers and industrialists and people in that category should be conscripted. Certainly I repeat that statement. I am not going to ask someone to go out and commit suicide unless I am prepared to do the same myself, and I am not going to ask the government of this country to go out and requisition boys and girls unless I am prepared to be requisitioned myself. This is an entirely different matter.

Mr. TUCKER: It is raising the question of class—class hatred because of discrimination against a certain class.

Mr. GILLIS: When you take the wage rates of the country and juggle them as between the army and those who are in Canada, and classify as saboteurs the working people of the country, who by and large are creating the machinery necessary to carry on the war—when you classify them as saboteurs and traitors because they try to lift the wage standards of the country against the time when civilians now in uniform will return, what are you doing? After all, they are civilians in uniform. That is what the Canadian army is, a body of sensible men, civilians who are overseas to-day because of the failure of those who had the direction of affairs of the nations in their hands during the last twenty-five years. They are civilians who will come back to Canada as civilians, and the standards of living being advocated and fought for by their civilian brothers at home will be the standards that will be available for them when they come back. That is the point with which I am concerned. The point raised by the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker) is entirely different. Requisitioning men without giving them an opportunity to say whether they are satisfied to follow that road or not is a serious question. Last night I said I agreed with the government in maintaining that army at home in order to perform essential services. Now that the danger of invasion is over, other arrangements will have to be made, and the policy carried out in the past on that question is one with which I am satisfied. I will not ask someone to do something that I do not do myself.

Mr. RALSTON: A question was asked with regard to the personnel of No. 1 Canadian army university course. I have a brief statement as follows:

The course was conducted at university of Toronto from October, 1942, to May, 1943.

(a) 158 candidates were enrolled.

(b) Disposal of candidates was as follows:

Graduates	133
Unsuccessful	25
	158

After appraisals by army examiners, successful candidates were allocated to various arms and carried out training as follows:

Canadian Armoured Corps	18
Canadian Armoured Corps (Reconnaissance)	16
Royal Canadian Artillery (Field)	28
Royal Canadian Artillery (Medium Anti-Aircraft)	4
Royal Canadian Artillery (Medium)	1
Royal Canadian Artillery (Coastal Defence)	1
Royal Canadian Artillery (Survey)	11
Royal Canadian Corps of Signals	25
Royal Canadian Engineers	6
Canadian Infantry Corps	6
Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps	5
Total	121
Transferred to Royal Canadian Air Force	12
Total	133

The instructions have been issued that this personnel will proceed to officer selection and appraisal centre, Brockville, Ontario, under special quota on 11th February, 1944, for appraisal by officer selection and appraisal board, and for disposal as follows:

(a) Personnel selected as officer material will be given the opportunity of proceeding to officers training centre under special quota upon completion of corps training.

By "corps training" I mean training in the particular arm to which he has been allotted.

They will be fully informed at officer selection and appraisal centre of the time element involved in completing officer training and subsequent dispatch overseas.

(b) Selected candidates, who because of the time element involved in the attainment of a commission, might be deterred from going to officers training centre will be allowed the option of proceeding in reinforcement stream as other ranks rather than to officer training, and to proceed overseas as early as possible upon completion of corps training. They will not be held in Canada as assistant instructors. In each case, their documents showing that they had so elected will be clearly marked at officer selection and appraisal centre.

That is to say there will be some credit given to them for the fact that they have elected.

Mr. JACKMAN: How long is the corps training?

Mr. RALSTON: I think probably two months, or something like that.

(c) Personnel not selected as officer material will be considered for technical or specialist training (i.e. survey, radio direction finding, signals, etc.), and be given the opportunity, if selected, of commencing such specialist training forthwith.

(d) Personnel considered to be unsuitable or not electing under any of the foregoing sub-paragraphs will be immediately returned to the reinforcement stream and dispatched overseas on completion of corps training. They will not be held in Canada as assistant instructors during progress of training.

(e) Documents of all personnel who successfully completed the academic portion of No. 1 Canadian army university course will be clearly marked to that effect.

That applies to the No. 1 course. No. 2 course, as my hon. friend knows, is on at the present time. There was a quota of 1,270 established and 1,270 were enrolled. I can give the universities, but perhaps that is not necessary. There were certain casualties in the 1,270, so that the total still on the course as of January 26, 1944, is 1,145.

6. Subject to the exigencies of the service and the requirements for reinforcement officers at the time, all candidates of No. 2 Canadian army university course will be given an opportunity of appearing before the officer selection and appraisal board provided:

(a) that they have successfully completed the academic portion of the course.

(b) that they have completed the required military training, basic and advanced of the corps to which they have been allocated.

7. A directive dated January 25, 1944, has been sent to all districts and commands advising them of this decision and instructing that universities concerned and personnel of No. 2 Canadian army university course be also informed. At the same time it is to be made clear to all concerned that these candidates are not being promised commissions in the army.

Mr. PURDY: I do not think the statement made by the hon. member for Cape Breton South to the effect that young men in our banks and similar institutions are not pulling their full weight in this war should be allowed to go unchallenged. If he followed the statements of our chartered banks he would see that up to fifty per cent of the memberships of their staffs are on active service. The suggestion that these young men are not doing their part in this war is not fair.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I know it is difficult to follow these questions in sequence, but in answer to a question this afternoon the minister said there were some 1,100 deserters from the Canadian army, most of whom are in Canada. While the minister has the facts and information before him, would he give us a break-down, if possible, by military districts?

[Mr. Jackman.]

Mr. RALSTON: Yes, I told my hon. friend we were endeavouring to get that. I said last night I would try to get it. It takes quite a while to get the information, and I thought I would give the committee the information I have here. I will get the information.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): We should be able to get the information by military districts as to how many are N.R.M.A. men.

Mr. RALSTON: We shall do that if we can.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): May I ask the minister a question before he leaves the arena. I should like the minister to tell us how many of the 588 men volunteered for bush duty, how many are still in the bush and how many have been returned.

Mr. RALSTON: All right.

Mr. GILLIS: Mr. Chairman, I dislike rising again, but if the few remarks that I made regarding the question of conscripts did not register with the hon. member for Colchester, that is not my responsibility. I did not say what he said I said.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It sounded like that.

Mr. GILLIS: I have not heard anyone in this house suggest the conscription of the bankers and industrialists of this country. The employees of the banks are workers, and are not in the category to which I refer. They have made their contribution one hundred per cent.

Mr. PURDY: I am glad the hon. member apologizes to them.

Mr. GILLIS: I am not apologizing to them. It is a misunderstanding of terms.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. GREEN: No. The minister said yesterday there were about 5,300 N.R.M.A. men out on extended leave. To-day he has mentioned more N.R.M.A. men who are detailed for duty with different industries. Would he tell us how many there are in the latter class, and how many under each of the headings? Are they operational troops or non-operational troops? Under which heading do they come?

Mr. RALSTON: They are not included in the non-operational troops or in the operational troops. My hon. friend was out when I gave the figures with regard to the troops. I said that the number of soldiers detailed to farm duty on December 1, 1943, was 166. I said that I had no figures of any troops

being detailed on forestry duty and that in connection with railway duty as of December 22, there were 497 employed, but on December 29 all personnel had been recalled; therefore, the number detailed is very small.

Mr. GREEN: There are some in other industries.

Mr. RALSTON: This seems to be exhaustive of those classes in which detailing for duty is provided by order in council—railway, forestry and farming.

Mr. GREEN: Are the N.R.M.A. men on extended leave in the overseas category?

Mr. RALSTON: Some are and some are not.

Mr. GREEN: Has the minister figures to show how many are and how many are not?

Mr. RALSTON: No, I have not.

Mr. BRYCE: I should like to ask the minister if the same opportunity will be given the men to go to the farms this year as was given last year to take part in seeding and harvesting operations.

Mr. RALSTON: All I can say to my hon. friend is I do not know of any more acute subject being under consideration by the department. Fortunately it is only February, and I hope that I shall not have to give consideration to it too soon. Let us get the estimates through first. I assure my hon. friend we always have it in mind and we endeavour to make the best arrangement we can, subject to that old and well-worn phrase which goes something like this, "subject to the exigencies of the service".

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I would not like this item to carry now because it is six o'clock and some hon. members might wish to say something further in connection with it.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BRUCE: Mr. Speaker, as a medical man I should like to say a word on behalf of a distinguished member of my profession, whose statement in a recent speech in Toronto seems to have been misunderstood. I thought I might say this in addition to what the minister said this afternoon. As I have been accustomed to reading and listening to scientific addresses I may say that the speech of the director general of medical services did not perturb me. If he had made this speech before a scientific body, such as a medical society, it would have been regarded as a valuable scientific contribution to our knowledge of the many problems with which medical officers have had to deal when working among our soldiers in this war, into which certain psychological factors have entered. I feel quite sure the director general did not intend to make any reflection upon the mothers who have given their sons, or upon that great body of women who have done and are doing such a splendid and patriotic work.

In view of the many statements which have been made in respect of the maintenance of the morale of our forces overseas, over this long period of battle inactivity, may I say that not a little credit for the favourable situation which obtains was due to our high commissioner for Canada in London, the Right Hon. Vincent Massey, who has just arrived back in Canada. I wish to bid him welcome to his native land, and to pay tribute to the splendid work he has done and is doing as our representative in England. Among his many activities are soldiers' clubs, in London, and an officers' convalescent home which he established at his own expense in Gloucestershire. I am quite sure hon. members would like to associate themselves with me in an expression of appreciation of his and his wife's many and continuing acts of kindness to our forces overseas, which have gone a long way toward relieving them of the nostalgia inevitably felt after years of separation from loved ones at home.

Mr. RALSTON: I thank the hon. member for Parkdale for his reference to Major-General Chisholm, and the speech he made. It is difficult for a layman—and my hon. friend appreciates this better than I—to understand the full significance of what is being discussed in a scientific discussion of that kind. I say to my hon. friend and the committee, as I tried to say this afternoon, that I know the last thing Major-General Chisholm would think of doing would be to cast the slightest reflection, or to do otherwise than give the greatest credit to the women of our country in the great work they are doing during this time of war.

It was most gracious on the part of the hon. member to refer to the advent of the Right Hon. Vincent Massey. As one who has seen at first hand some of the work Mr. and Mrs. Massey are doing, I wish to join with the hon. member in his expression of appreciation to them, and to say to hon. members and the country generally that I do not think Canada can ever fully realize or recognize not only the fine service these two gracious people

are rendering, but the devotion and the genuine consecration they have shown in their heavy task for Canada, which, because of the activities of this war, has increased tenfold.

Mrs. CASSELMAN: I was glad to hear the minister say this afternoon that the matter of the transportation of the armed forces is under consideration, and I hope that the suggestions made may be carried out.

I should like also to thank the minister for the observations and appreciation he has recorded respecting women in uniform. I believe people throughout Canada would subscribe to what he has said. So far as I have talked to members of different units, and to civilians in our different cities, I have gained the impression that the opinion respecting women in uniform is very high indeed.

Has the minister considered the suggestion that women should have representation on the committees being set up for the reestablishment of troops returning from overseas? I suggest that women should be on such committees which would deal with the reestablishment of women who have been in the services. And I do not think it would be a bad idea to have a woman or two on the general reestablishment committee for all troops, men and women combined.

I was pleased to hear the explanation made respecting Major-General Chisholm's address. I knew it was not meant the way a reading of it might indicate, and I was convinced that there must have been some misinterpretation; because everyone knows that, although there are a few who might be emotionally too sensitive and therefore might upset the boys returning home, the fact remains that the great majority of women have added to the morale of our troops, in every respect. The minister himself expressed his realization of that fact when he referred to the letters received by the men overseas. I am sure a great percentage of that mail comes from the women of our land. The minister referred to that mail as a morale builder for our troops overseas. I am sure that the women of Canada are glad to have heard the explanation, and that they will continue to play their part, one which in some respects is very difficult, during this time of war.

Mr. RALSTON: With regard to the membership on the rehabilitation committee, to which the hon. member has referred, possibly she knows that in the Department of Pensions and National Health, over which my colleague presides, there has been set up a special rehabilitation committee to deal with the rehabilitation of women in the services. In addition to that, I am informed by my colleague it is anticipated that there will be appointed, near the fountainhead of the administration, an executive assistant in the person of a woman, who will work with the assistant deputy minister who is also the director of rehabilitation in the Department of Pensions and National Health. So that I am sure women will be fully represented. The hon. member has a right to ask whether the same thing will apply in respect of these committees about which I have spoken. I can say to her that so far as the army is concerned—and I have not consulted my colleagues in the navy and air force—arrangements will be made so that representation will be given on the administrative body we are setting up for that purpose.

Mr. GREEN: The minister said yesterday there was to be some reduction in the paid personnel of the reserve army. I understand there are a certain number of men in each unit who are on a full-time basis. Did that recommendation for a reduction in paid personnel come from the units themselves, or is it just a move by headquarters? I am asking that because, particularly in coastal brigades, which are the most likely to see active service, it would seem to be a mistake to cut down on their paid personnel. Has any consideration been given to having the reserve army take over some of the functions of the other troops—perhaps some operational role, such as anti-aircraft protection. There may be other work which they could do, and in this way they would enable the minister to reduce the number of men in Canada of the active force.

Mr. RALSTON: With regard to the first question, I am sorry I cannot tell my hon. friend whether or not the recommendation came direct from the units. I refer to the change-over whereby more responsibility for training will be put upon officers of the reserve units, and less by way of paid personnel. The recommendation was made in conjunction with the director general of the reserve army. I know that he has travelled from coast to coast, and back again as far as that goes, consulting those who have to do with the reserve army units. That recommendation is the result of that trip and of the consideration which Major-General Phelan, the director general of the reserve army, has given to the matter.

The point is, as I endeavoured to point out on Friday, that with these two years of intensive training—I really think the reserve units will agree with this—it is felt that the officers and non-commissioned officers have become sufficiently trained to take on a greater responsibility for the training of the units. I have not said that the staffs would be cut

out completely, but they certainly will be reduced. I think there is a justification for that, and it will give them a little more in the way of self-dependence, in the way of running their own show, which will be all for the good of the service.

The other question was in connection with having them take over some of the work of the active units. That has been under consideration, and it is simply a case of the difficulty of making practical arrangements. Obviously you cannot send a reserve unit from Toronto or Winnipeg to the coast; you could use only a unit located in the area which is represented by my hon. friend and in which he lives. There have been discussions with regard to this. As a matter of fact, I did say last year that I anticipated there would be some taking over of anti-aircraft work by some of the reserve units. That has not been carried out to any extent because it means you would have personnel in your anti-aircraft unit who were working in the day time. In these days it is sometimes difficult for businessmen to make arrangements to undertake, say a three months' tour of duty in order to serve on special coast defence duty. The men are prepared to do so if the necessity arises, but to have a unit serve as a whole could not be done advantageously without great sacrifice which perhaps is not required.

Mr. GREEN: What are the plans for the Pacific coast militia rangers? Units of this corps have been established mainly in the smaller centres and they have done excellent work. I think they would be of great use even in peace time. A few months ago there was some talk about the number of men and the number of units being reduced, and I should like the minister to tell us what he has in mind.

Mr. RALSTON: I had a memorandum the other day with regard to the Pacific coast rangers. There is no intention of disbanding them. There has been a certain curtailment, not so much in connection with their activities as in connection with their spheres of activities. As my hon. friend knows, they were perhaps one of the most rapidly growing and vigorous military organizations that we have had in Canada. As my hon. friend says, they have done grand work and they are entitled to full credit. At the same time they did overlap to some extent with the reserve army.

Mr. GREEN: Only in a few places.

Mr. RALSTON: I said to some extent. Of course it is desirable to prevent that overlapping and to decrease, at least to that degree. I cannot give my hon. friend any particulars at the moment with regard to localities, units or what reductions there will be, but the force will be maintained as a force.

Mr. GREEN: I believe they have only partial equipment at the present time, and I should like to know if they are to be provided with more equipment.

Mr. RALSTON: I am afraid I cannot speak with any degree of certainty with regard to that. The clothing and equipment provided consists of a steel helmet, waterproof jacket and trousers, arm band, a ·3030 Winchester rifle or a ·303 Ross rifle, Sten guns and pistols for the officers. We are not providing transport or other equipment.

Mr. GREEN: Are they provided with boots?

Mr. RALSTON: No.

Mr. GREEN: Why not?

Mr. RALSTON: We may as well go through all the lists of clothing. They are not supplied with a number of things provided for the regular troops. The jackets and trousers were an extra issue, and the steel helmet was an extra issue. Some arms were not provided, but we have gone a long distance in this respect. I presume that the reason more equipment is not considered essential is due to the fact that they have combined some of the work being done on the Pacific coast with their civilian work. The strength as of December 31, 1943, was over 12,000. The reduction we are planning, which my hon. friend will see is a small one, will bring the strength down to something like 10,000. That reduction will be effective in the same way as the reduction of the reserve army, that is by stream-lining or cutting out the dormant units but not by disbandment.

Mr. GREEN: I think it would be helpful if these men were able to get more gasoline for their transportation. I believe their efficiency would be increased.

Mr. RALSTON: We endeavoured to get more gasoline for the motor-boat squadrons at Vancouver and Victoria, but we were not so successful. I do not want to hold out too much hope.

Mr. STIRLING: I was interested in what the minister said this afternoon about the No. 1 army course. May I take it that it is the intention now to permit those who pass this course successfully to proceed along the lines of the technical training they have received. The minister may remember that in

November of last year I took up the case of two brothers, I believe their name was Saunders, and referred to the representations they had made to me. When they went into this course they understood from the minister himself that they would be potential officers when the course was over. However, when they finished they were told that they could not proceed to O.T.C. training, that they would be retained in the one unit in the east for further consideration. One of these men found himself in a unit for a considerable time and could see no opportunity of getting any further along the lines for which he had trained. He endeavoured to transfer to the air force and was told he could not do that. I am told that an officer commanding a certain unit knew something of some of these lads and applied for their transfer to his unit, but he was told that this could not be done, that it was contrary to the then arrangement that these lads were to be kept together in the east for further consideration.

There has been a good deal of feeling among the successful candidates who were unquestionably disappointed. I realize that into the picture came the decision to curtail the number of officers, but I am now asking the minister whether those who were successful at the end of the No. 1 army course—this was before the No. 2 course was set up—are now being taken care of and given the opportunity for advancement which they had been led to expect at the beginning of the course.

Mr. RALSTON: I admit to my hon. friend that the statement I put on record this afternoon is a little involved. I mean, one must read it quite carefully. The first thing, as I understand it, is that all the successful candidates will be permitted to proceed to the officers' selection and appraisal centre at Brockville, under special quota for appraisal by that board. That board decides who are likely to make potential officers, and the personnel selected as officer material will be given an opportunity of proceeding to O.T.C. upon completion of their corps training. This corps training would take probably two months at least. They will be fully informed at the officer selection and appraisal centre of the time element involved in completing officer training and subsequent dispatch overseas. That perhaps is somewhat of a deterrent to them, the fact that if they take the officer training course it may be some time before they get overseas. Selected candidates who, because of the time element involved in the attainment of a commission, might not want to wait will be allowed the option of entering the reinforcement stream as other ranks and of proceeding overseas as early as possible upon completion of corps training. They will not be retained in Canada as assistant instructors. Their documents showing that they had so elected will be clearly marked at officer selection and appraisal centre. My hon. friend's question I think would come in there, and the answer is not given in that paragraph which I have just summarized. He was asking if they would be retained for specialist work for which they had been particularly trained in the course. The answer to that does not appear plainly in that paragraph. But the next paragraph of this memorandum does indicate that personnel not selected as officer material will be considered for technical or specialist training such as survey, radio direction finding, signals, and so forth, and be given an opportunity, if selected, of commencing such specialist training forthwith.

Personnel considered to be unsuitable will be immediately returned to the reinforcement stream and dispatched overseas upon completion of corps training. They will not be held as assistant instructors during the progress of training. I should like to have a little more information on one point, whether selected candidates who decide not to wait for the Brockville training but want to go overseas have any preemption on technical or specialist units. I shall get that information for my hon. friend.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I wish to make a few observations with reference to the resolution now before the committee. I should like first of all to say how glad I am that the minister made the remarks he did yesterday, addressed to the Canadian people, warning them that the war is not yet finished by a long way and that a difficult and bloody path lies ahead. It seems to me that the whole psychology of the allied governments has to some extent been at fault in this regard. By that I mean such things as the optimistic statements made around the New Year to the effect that 1944 might see the end of the war in Europe. A number of other circumstances arising about the same time all helped to give the feeling not only among civilians but even among service personnel that we are now coasting into the home stretch. There were, for instance, the announcement that the reserve army was going to cut down the number of days training, the announcement that the air force would no longer accept recruits for the women's division, the fact that in some training centres across Canada the number of persons to be trained is to be greatly reduced, the number of officers who are being dismissed from the service—I know men who have come to me during the last

three months, men in the armed services, who are already making plans for going back to civilian life because of the impression that seems to have been created that it is now a matter of months before the war is over—all these things have tended to give that impression. I think that is bad psychology.

I think the speech from the throne—I am not going to discuss it now, Mr. Chairman—after a merely cursory statement that the winning of the war is the first objective, failed to set out a single particular in which we could improve our war effort or step it up. That also helped to give the impression that we are now passed the peak and are coasting to the home base. The result is that we are psychologically unprepared, I think, for the terrific sacrifices and terrific casualties that may suddenly be catapulted on the Canadian people.

I wish to commend the minister for the very frank statement he made yesterday. I think also that anybody who listened to his statement of last Friday regarding his visit to the troops must have been touched not only by his evident sincerity but by the inspiration he gained from visiting the men engaged in actual combat.

I should like to say something about the large body of non-operational troops in Canada. There are in Canada some 75,000 non-operational troops, if I remember the minister's figures; that is, men who are mostly on administrative or training staffs. It seems to me that this is a very high figure. Last year, if I remember correctly we had about 86,000 in A. and T. staffs, while this year it is from 70,000 to 75,000. But 75,000 seems to be a very large percentage of administrative and training personnel to carry. Can the minister in the course of this discussion tell us whether the time has not come to reduce the large administrative and training staffs?

I should also like him to tell the committee how many men are going through these training centres. If I am not incorrectly informed, in some training centres the number of men carrying on administrative work and training actually exceeds the number of men being trained in the camp.

Mr. RALSTON: There are about 23,000 men carrying on administration and training for about 75,000 personnel in the training stream.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I did not mean in toto but was speaking of particular camps. I should like to know how many men are going through each of these camps each month. In the province of Saskatchewan—

Mr. RALSTON: Maple Creek, for instance?

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): At Maple Creek in January the number of men who came in to be trained was so small that I would hesitate to quote it.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend is right about that. I was speaking about the camps as a whole.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I am wondering how many other camps are similar to Maple Creek and whether the large non-operational staff could not be reduced and these men used to better advantage elsewhere.

I wish to say a word about the large operational personnel. I agree with my desk-mate the hon. member for Cape Breton South, in what he said last night, that last year and the year before there was a demand among the members of this house that the government should do something to protect our coasts and that therefore the government is not to be blamed for having a large body of men occupied in doing just that. But it may be that the time has come when we no longer need from 60,000 to 70,000 men in the classification of N.R.M.A. personnel, and that something else may have to be done with them. The minister has stated that they will be available for reinforcements. That is true. In the meantime I think the government has to decide whether there is not some better use that can be made of them until they are required as second-line reinforcements; that is, if the government is not anxious to use them in actual combat. It seems to me that many of these men who have been already trained might be returned to farms; some of them might be returned to coal mining and forestry. All these trained men could very easily be brought back into units if the government decided that they were going to make some use of them. The time has come when the question of the disposal of these sixty thousand or seventy thousand non-operational personnel should be reconsidered by the government with a view to deciding whether they are making the best possible use of these men. I do not feel at all satisfied with the minister's statement this afternoon.

As to seeding leave for the men of the National Resources Mobilization Act personnel, I do not know whether the minister realizes how serious the situation is. On the prairies there are thousands of farms where the only persons operating a farm are an elderly man and his wife. These people are four years older than they were when the war started. Many of them will not be able to put in a crop this spring unless some member of the family now in the armed forces comes home and helps them, or unless they can hire help, which at the present time is virtually

impossible. I think the government will have to give some thought to this matter, and not leave it until April and then make some hastily-concocted scheme. They ought to be giving some consideration now to two things: first, to make it possible for the men who are from farms to return to them in the spring to help put in the crop; and, second, to assist men who are in the National Resources Mobilization Act personnel to be placed on farms so as to assist farmers in putting in a crop this coming spring. I ask the minister to give some thought to that and to be prepared to have a discussion in the house, not at the end of March or April, when the men should already be on the farms, but sometime during the present month of February.

I should like to ask the minister about the order in council which forbids men in the armed forces taking any part in public discussions, which forbids them writing letters to the newspapers, which forbids them speaking at any kind of public meeting. I think we have gone a long way in this country when a member of the provincial legislature who is a member of His Majesty's forces is forbidden to speak on a Sunday afternoon to an open forum, where he was asked to go and speak on post-war reconstruction, a subject in which I think most hon. members, and many men who are in the armed forces, are interested. Here is a man who receives such an invitation, accepts it, and then finds the day before that he cannot go and take part in this discussion because, in order to do so, he must submit the manuscript to a national defence headquarters here in Ottawa.

In this country we have never believed in a professional army. Our armed forces have been civilian armies, and we have tried to make them as democratic as possible; we have tried to encourage the fostering of discussion and the exchange of points of view; and I do not think the Canadian people, and least of all the men in the services, take very kindly to the proposition that because a man is now a member of His Majesty's forces he is not to be allowed to write a letter to the paper, or to go to a public meeting and there express whatever point of view he may have on any subject under discussion. I should like to have the minister in the course of his discussion tell us the terms of that order in council and the exact reason why the government thought it necessary to pass it.

I wish also to say a word about the fact that men who joined the Canadian army from the reserve army and were brought in under general order 139 are not being paid a clothing allowance. There was a reason for that when that regulation was originally passed. If a man came into the army through the reserve under general order 139, it was understood that he would be in for only a short time, probably to do some temporary task, so that when he was let out of the army his clothes would still fit him and still be in a fairly good state of repair, and he would need no clothing allowance. But the men who have gone into the army through general order 139 and who are now being discharged are men who have been in the army in some cases for three or four years, and when these men are discharged without a clothing allowance they are under serious hardship.

When I was in the city of Prince Albert, represented by the Prime Minister, a number of men, thirteen, I believe, came to my hotel room. All of them were being discharged on the following Monday. Most of them, I think, had joined up at Yorkton. They did not know anything about recruiting stations, in the early days of the war. They had gone to reserve army headquarters, and reserve army headquarters made arrangements for them to be taken in and sent them straight to Dundurn, and actually, although they had not been members of the reserve force, they came in through the reserve force under general order 139, I do not know why. That is the *modus operandi*. What is the result? These men have been cooks and batmen and working in training centres. Now, nearly four years later, when they are discharged, they find that there is to be no clothing allowance. They do not know where their clothes are. These men now have to go out and spend sixty, seventy or one hundred dollars to buy clothing so that they can return home. I do not suppose that this incident is typical of the cases of large numbers of men, but it is a serious hardship to the men who are affected.

I should like to make another suggestion to the minister, although I am not sure whether his department or the department of pensions is the more vitally concerned. The department ought to give some thought not only to the question of demobilization of the men coming back, but to the question of the soldiers' wives and the whole matter of the psychological adjustment of men returning after the war. A number of soldiers' wives have spoken to me about it. They point out that when their men come back after being away three, four or five years, many of them come back changed. They have been through a variety of experiences, have come back tired, moody and nervous. Many of these men were married probably only a matter of months prior to going overseas. In cases where the

wives are young they are at a complete loss to understand the change of attitude and the change of personality that have resulted from years of service. I believe great work could be undertaken by one of the departments of government putting out literature, particularly to soldiers' wives, to make them aware of the fact that any man who has spent some time overseas in service will come back a different person to some extent, and that there is need of a period of psychological readjustment if we are not to have matrimonial wrecks all over this country in the post-war period.

There is one other question which I wish to ask the minister. Will he elaborate to the committee some of the reasons for breaking up the Canadian army? I believe there was a strong feeling throughout the country, and certainly there was a strong feeling in some parts of this house, expressed repeatedly during the past two or three years, that the Canadian army should be retained as a unit. Those who have read the memoirs of David Lloyd George or of Sir Robert Borden, who was Prime Minister of Canada during the last war, will remember the tremendous pressure which was brought to bear upon the Canadian government and the Canadian military authorities to break up the Canadian army of 1914-18, a pressure which Sir Arthur Currie resisted so strongly, and which was resisted by Sir Sam Hughes and Sir Robert Borden. Most historians who have studied the history of the last war have generally agreed that these men were right in resisting the pressure of the British government and the British general staff and in refusing to break up the Canadian army during the last war. That does not mean that it is right not to break it up during this war.

Mr. RALSTON: Will my hon. friend elaborate that? There was no Canadian army in the last war, but a Canadian corps.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Yes.

Mr. RALSTON: Does he mean pressure to break up the Canadian corps?

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): In the last war, yes.

Mr. RALSTON: I know the fifth division was broken up.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): The minister will remember that there was terrific pressure, according to the memoirs to which I have referred, in the early stages of the last war to split up the Canadian corps and to use one battalion in one division and another battalion elsewhere throughout the British army as shock troops, and he will remember the fight which Sir Arthur Currie and the Canadian government—

Mr. RALSTON: The Canadian corps was formed when there were two divisions.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Yes; but the fact is that pressure was brought to bear to break it up so that it would not operate as a corps but that the respective battalions would operate as parts of the British army to be used as shock troops under the British command. The Canadian government and the Canadian military authorities at that time strongly resisted that pressure, and we have felt during this war that there was a strong demand in this country, and a strong feeling in the army itself, that the Canadian army be allowed to do the better job it could do if it were possible to retain it as a unit operating under a Canadian commander in the field. The government, for some reason or other, has decided to accede to the request that it be broken up. One corps will be sent to Italy; the other corps will remain in England with an army headquarters, and I imagine a British corps or some other corps will operate with that corps under Canadian army headquarters.

Mr. RALSTON: Whose request was it that the Canadian army be broken up? The hon. member said that the government had decided to accede to the request that the Canadian army be broken up.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I take it for granted that it was the request of the British government.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend can take it for granted it was nothing of the kind. I have said, in my statement to the house, that the government itself of its own initiative asked for a division to go to Italy, and then pressed for another division to go. There was no request of any kind or description by the British that the two divisions should go to Italy. I have said all that. I went into the details of it.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I heard the minister's speech.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend did not listen, I am afraid.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): May I hear the minister again?

Mr. RALSTON: I say I am afraid my hon. friend did not listen, if he makes the statement that we acceded to a request and says that the request was that of the British government.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I hardly take it from the minister that the Canadian government decided to send a division without any prior consultation with the British government.

Mr. RALSTON: Certainly we had prior consultation with the British government, but we had no request from the British government. It was on our initiative and not on theirs.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Then the responsibility lies squarely with the Canadian government?

Mr. RALSTON: Absolutely.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): The Canadian government decided that the Canadian army, instead of operating as a unit, first of all a division and now a corps, would be sent to Italy and that corps would operate under a British army commander and that the other corps would remain in Great Britain under Canadian army headquarters, to which will probably be added a British corps or some other corps to complete that army operating under Canadian army headquarters.

I do not wish to discuss the question of General McNaughton, in view of what the Prime Minister said yesterday, but I think it was a mistake that the announcement regarding the break-up of the Canadian army as a unit coincided closely with the announcement of General McNaughton's resignation. Also it reminded many people of the fact that after Dunkirk, General McNaughton was quoted by some United States papers as saying that after what he had seen in France he would be opposed to having the Canadian army broken up. I do not mean that that is still his point of view; I do not know. But the inference drawn by a great many people, both inside and outside the armed forces, was that there had been here a distinct cleavage of opinion as to whether the Canadian forces should go into action as a unit or should be broken up and operated on several fronts as different army corps. After listening carefully to the minister on Friday last, the only reason I could gather for the advantage of breaking up the Canadian army was to gain battle experience. There is a great deal of merit in that argument. I can see the difficulty in keeping a large body of men in England, the danger of men going stale, and the desire on the part of highly trained men to acquire some battle experience. The minister has not explained why it was not possible to use the entire Canadian army in Italy so as to enable them to remain as a unit. There may be strategic reasons which he cannot give, but I think the minister will have to remember that there are many people in this country who were naturally anxious that the Canadian army should have been kept as a unit and who will want some further explanation as to why it has not been kept together.

Everyone I believe recognizes that in a unified united nations' strategy all the different countries participating will have to fit into a general plan. That is inevitable, and neither Canada nor any other country can have sole control of the military strategy that will dominate the war effort of the united nations. At the same time the Canadian people have placed hundreds of thousands of their sons in the care of the government and particularly of the Minister of National Defence, and they will want to know just to what extent the strategy and the battle operations to be followed are in any way influenced or affected by the Canadian general staff and by the Canadian government.

I know there are limitations; I know the larger picture will have to dominate. But I say frankly to the minister that there is a strong feeling in some quarters, which may be justifiable—in fact it is there—that the control has been going increasingly into the hands of professional soldiers; that the R.M.C. men particularly, and naturally, since they are the trained men, have been given positions of responsibility; that civilian soldiers have been to some extent pushed aside; that the entire control of the strategy is increasingly in the hands of the British general staff and British generals; and that less and less of the say as to what will be done with the Canadian forces is being left in the hands of the Canadian command and the Canadian authorities. I think the minister could do a great deal to alleviate some of that feeling by giving to this committee, if not now, whenever he can, a picture as to just how the Canadian corps will integrate into the picture in Italy, how the Canadian corps and army headquarters will integrate into the picture in Europe and what consultation there will be with Canadian military authorities.

For instance, the Canadian people have not forgotten that on several occasions in the last war, if the histories that have been written are correct, Sir Arthur Currie insisted before certain battle operations took place that certain artillery support and certain conditions must obtain before Canadians would take part in the operations that were proposed. I think the Canadian people in the final analysis would be glad to know that the control and the decisions affecting the lives of the men they have sent overseas will be safeguarded

and protected not only by the Canadian government but by Canadian commanders responsible to the Canadian government.

Mr. RALSTON: I think I might as well deal now with what my hon. friend has said. I have already spoken with regard to some of these matters, and I do not want to indicate that I have any hesitation whatever about discussing the question. My hon. friend has spoken of several comparatively minor matters to which I shall refer only briefly. I have already given the committee a very full statement with regard to the employment of non-operational troops and their different roles. I can give the committee a full schedule of all the different groups of units which are involved, but at the moment I do not think it is necessary to load up *Hansard*. Suffice it to say we have a committee, and it is a hard-boiled committee. It is a committee that those connected with the various units in the non-operational group consider pretty tough. They are travelling back and forth in this country all the time examining into the establishments at the different centres, and at the different headquarters as well, in an endeavour to check and see whether a man can be spared here or there. A great many war establishments have been cut down as a result of the action of that committee—not always; sometimes they have been increased. But I wish to assure this committee that there has been and there is vigilance in connection with the matter of the conservation of man-power and every effort is made to prevent them from getting into the backwater of non-operational troops unless they are doing an actual job.

I have already made reference to operational troops and indicated the cut which was made. Sometimes I feel that perhaps there is nothing which the department can do which is right. Last September I really thought I was doing something which everybody would applaud when the seventh and eighth divisions were disbanded. I heard nothing but criticism from one end of the country to the other. It has been talked about as a muddle; it has been said that the statement which was made was rotten. As a matter of fact, I penned the announcement myself and take full blame for it. I thought that I had made a statement which the public would understand and that we were really doing a job in cutting down operational troops. Nevertheless the storm came just the same. In spite of that, we are still studying the possibility of disbanding other units, and we are going to keep on with it regardless of what people may say and whether people give us credit for it or not.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Will the minister be able to give us now or later comparative figures of A. and T. personnel in these camps as against the number of men being trained in the camps?

Mr. RALSTON: Certainly. With regard to seeding leave I took note of what my hon. friend has said and will endeavour to see to it that early attention is given to the matter in order to ascertain whether any changes can be made which may further the objectives which he has in mind. With regard to the order in council forbidding writing to newspapers, it is not an order in council; it is Canadian army routine order, and as a matter of fact it is under consideration at this minute. With regard to the clothing allowance under general order 139—

Mr. GRAYDON: From the tone of the minister's reply in connection with that one order or regulation may one take it that the government is taking some steps to review and perhaps alter it?

Mr. RALSTON: The three services are taking steps to review it.

Mr. GRAYDON: Does that also refer to their taking part in public activities?

Mr. RALSTON: It was passed when I was away. I did not know the contents of it until I had it looked up here to-night. It does not refer to public activities. As I understand it, this order prohibits men writing any articles at all whether they happen to be military or otherwise. Is that what my hon. friend has reference to?

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Yes.

Mr. RALSTON: That is the one under review by the three services now.

Mr. GRAYDON: I hope the minister makes some change because it is pretty drastic.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Does that routine order also forbid the men writing to members of parliament?

Mr. RALSTON: No; K.R. and O. does that.

Mr. GRAYDON: Does that mean that anybody in the armed forces cannot write to members of parliament?

Mr. RALSTON: On military matters.

Mr. STIRLING: Who is to tell?

Mr. GRAYDON: Surely that should be clarified. I should not like to be a party to breaking some of the K.R. and O., but I get letters from various sources.

Mr. RALSTON: I had the sad experience in my own constituency of a constituent writing to me. I think it is a fact that K.R. and O., as it stands now—

Mr. GRAYDON: Surely that is pretty drastic.

Mr. RALSTON: I am not dealing with that because I want to get on with other matters. My hon. friend referred to general order 139. The clothing allowance provision has been made to apply to those who were discharged under general order 139, and it has been in force since November 1.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): And made retroactive.

Mr. RALSTON: No. With regard to soldiers' wives, my hon. friend simply referred to it as a possible activity of the department. We do want to take in all the scope possible in connection with the men who are considered the wards of the department, but I think probably that is going a little far afield. However, I shall certainly bring what my hon. friend says to the attention of the committee which has this whole matter of rehabilitation in hand. I thought my hon. friend was referring first to soldiers' brides. This is a subject which has had some attention in publications in Canada. I say in that respect that the department feels we have a responsibility there and is joining with the Department of National War Services, the Red Cross and other agencies in order to endeavour as far as possible to see to it that these girls who are coming home, some with children and some with none, are received and looked after as befits the wives of men who are fighting the battles of Canada overseas.

Mr. GRAYDON: Hear, hear.

Mr. RALSTON: The hon. member for Weyburn said something about the breaking up of the Canadian army. I have already dealt with that. It is not a long story and it is not a very complicated one. I am not saying this sarcastically, but I never realized how the policy of having a Canadian army had taken on in Canada until the events of the last six months occurred. When the formation of the army was announced two years ago, I did not hear much applause for it anywhere. As a matter of fact, I heard a good deal of criticism in newspapers about the fact that we were aspiring to have a Canadian army. The suggestion was that we were building a structure of gingerbread, and that it was something that we were putting on to our organization by way of a frill. There was a good deal of newspaper criticism of that kind.

[Mr. Graydon.]

I find now it was regarded as a constructive step, and I am glad of that. But even a year ago I had to take notice of the criticism and to call the attention of the house to the fact that the house had approved of the organization of a Canadian army, and that I did not think it was up to the people generally, or to the house particularly, to criticize that organization which had been approved without a dissenting voice. But there was a good deal of talk—perhaps not so much in *Hansard*—but certainly the suggestion that we had bitten off too much, and that this idea of a Canadian army was just a little bit of frosting which could have been omitted, and that we would have been just as well off without it. The idea suggested was that it was for the purpose of making more generals, and of building up an organization which, although it did not mean much, sounded big.

That was the attitude of a good many people in Canada. But, strangely enough, just now it seems that they had real, genuine, sincere admiration and affection for that particular organization. The situation was that two years ago the Canadian army was formed. We set out to build that Canadian army, and we expected, as everybody knows, that there would have been activity on the continent of Europe at least in 1943. There was no opportunity whatsoever to give to units of the Canadian army battle experience, in view of the job which they had been given, namely the defence of Britain. The first Canadian division, then the Canadian corps and then the Canadian army itself had a key position in the defence of Britain during those years of 1940, 1941 and 1942, when the danger of invasion was imminent. That threat of invasion diminished as 1942 ran on.

The time came, in the fall of 1942, when I hoped that an opportunity might be made for the use of at least part of the Canadian army elsewhere than in Britain. I had heard a great deal of discussion and much criticism of the fact that the Canadian army was standing idle over there. I had had some questions put to me in the House of Commons by hon. members, by members of His Majesty's loyal opposition, asking what the Canadian army was doing, and why it was not in the fighting which was then going on in North Africa.

I found out that an operation was imminent, and I immediately went to the chief of the imperial general staff with regard to the matter of possible participation of some Canadian forces in that operation. I went to the secretary of state for war. I talked the matter over thoroughly with those gentlemen, and they gave me, as I have said to the house, what I considered good and sufficient reasons why at

that time they could not consider the inclusion of a Canadian component with the United States and British components of the forces which were intended to land, and which did later land in North Africa.

Well, the Canadian army still stayed in Britain. We still heard a good deal on this side and a good deal on the other side to the effect that the Canadian army was not doing very much. As a matter of fact, a leading Canadian in Britain at a public function on one occasion even referred to the "Canadian home guard" of the British isles. That was the attitude taken by some people. So far as I was concerned I felt we were right in respect of the attitude we had taken. I felt an opportunity would come, if some operation did not take place on the continent in the spring of 1943. If it did take place in the spring of 1943, it meant, as I said the other day, that Canada's whole investment—by that I mean an investment in lives, not dollars—of ground forces overseas would be put to the hazard in one gigantic operation across the channel, without any of them, practically, having had an opportunity of hearing a shot fired in anger. Of course, that was a situation which would have to be faced, if necessary; because, as I have said, there has to be a baptism of fire; at some time men have to hear the first shot fired. But it did seem to involve at least some responsibility, to see if it were not possible that there might be some battle experience given at least to part of the Canadian forces, if that could be done.

The opportunity came. The operation did not come off in the spring of 1943; at least the plans did not materialize. In lieu thereof there was the operation which was to take place in Sicily. An approach was made immediately to the United Kingdom authorities to suggest that there ought to be a Canadian component in the forces which were going to Sicily. Those representations were accepted, although I shall not go into detail respecting the discussions. The first Canadian division and an armoured formation were sent, and the committee knows the record made by that division and those armoured troops in Sicily and in Italy under Major-General Simmonds.

Those who talk about breaking up the Canadian army ought to think of where Canada would stand at the present time in the eyes of the world and in the eyes of her own soldiers and in the eyes of her own people, if we had not had that opportunity last July to show to the world that, notwithstanding the fact that they had not been permitted to fight for three years, Canadian soldiers were not stale, that they could fight as did their fathers twenty-five years before them, and give a good account of themselves.

When one hears talk about breaking up the Canadian army, one asks himself: What would be the alternative? Just here let me interject that to speak of breaking up the Canadian army is not a correct description of what we are doing. We are, on the contrary, maintaining the army organization and using it as a Canadian contribution along with the corps in the United Kingdom. The alternative was, of course, to keep them all in England, to keep them all for the day when they might all launch one great attack.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I suggest to the minister another alternative: Would it not have been possible to have gone as an army?

Mr. RALSTON: Would my hon. friend please permit me to finish what I am saying. We felt that if we could have an opportunity to give battle training to at least a part of the army, not only the non-commissioned officers and men, but the officers themselves and the staffs, they might be available to come back to the United Kingdom—for that was to be where the main thrust was to take place. And I wish to tell the committee that for a good while nobody knew where the main thrust was going to be. As a matter of fact, it was not decided and announced until the Teheran conference. Our idea was that we would have men who would have acquired experience, and who could come back to help lead the forces who had not then had that training, in the great offensive across the channel.

That was done; the first division and an armoured formation were sent, and, as I say, a proud record for Canada was made in July and August of 1943. That involved, I suppose my hon. friend would say, the breaking up of the Canadian army, in that it involved taking one division from that army and leaving only four.

It appeared in the summer of 1943 that nobody knew what was going to happen next. There was talk, as a matter of fact, about collapse by Christmas, and that the war might be over. There was talk, on the other hand, that nobody knew when an operation might take place on the continent, and we faced the situation again of people saying, "Yes, Canada has one division out of five in the war. The other four are safely tucked away in England, and some day those four divisions will have to be thrown into battle without any battle experience." I talked the matter over with the chief of the general staff and

my officers at national headquarters. I talked it over with General McNaughton and I decided—I take full responsibility—upon the advice of the chief of the general staff, that for the sake of the morale of the troops in England, for the sake of the morale of the people in Canada, but much more for the sake of the training and the experience which would be obtained and which would be for the benefit of the war effort, because of the preparation we would have and the greater pool on which we could draw for the purpose of the invasion or the offensive in which we might later take part, that the thing to do was to see to it not only that non-commissioned officers and men were given an opportunity to become battle trained and battle experienced, but that our staffs, our divisional staffs and our corps staff were given an opportunity for operating in a battle theatre so that they might know at first hand the handling, not simply in manœuvres, but the tactical handling and administration of units and formations and divisions and corps under actual battle conditions. That was decided upon deliberately.

Representations were made again to those who had the strategic direction of the war in charge, and the result is that to-night Canada has a corps in Italy operating as a self-contained corps with just as much autonomy as the Canadian corps had under Sir Arthur Currie in 1914-18. To-night that corps is contributing many officers to the organization which is going on in the United Kingdom in order that Canada may take part in the great offensive, whenever that time may come. I shall have some announcements to make later on which will indicate that, but I cannot make them to-night. Had this action not been taken, men and senior officers would not have had this experience. The people of Canada now may know that many of the men who will lead their boys into battle will be men who have been under fire in Italy, men who have had opportunity to handle formations, men who have acted on divisional staffs under actual war conditions.

That decision was made by the Canadian government. That decision was made in respect of the Canadian army. The decision was to use the Canadian army where and how it could best be used. I say to my hon. friend that I do not for one instance make any apologies. Perhaps I am saying that a little defiantly, but I do not mean it in that way. I make that statement because of the solemn and serious responsibility which has been upon my shoulders and upon the shoulders of the government. I wish to say earnestly and from the bottom of my heart that I believe that was the decision that ought to have been made. That decision was made soundly in the interests of the Canadian army and in the interests of the cause which the Canadian army is supporting.

My hon. friend asks why we did not take the whole army to Italy. The same argument applies. If you had taken them all to Italy at one time; if you had sent them all into battle at one time, you would not have had the benefit of a proportion of experienced battle-trained officers; you would not have been able to get them under war conditions by degrees. And as a matter of practice, under the situation as we found it, I do not believe there would have been any possibility of sending the whole Canadian army to Italy under the conditions which existed when the division and the corps were sent.

I believe the people of Canada would have been very much concerned if we had sent the whole Canadian force to Italy, if they were in Italy to-night, instead of the one corps that is in Italy taking its place on the right flank of the battle that is going on, with another corps in Great Britain under Canadian army headquarters. That Canadian army headquarters is in a position to direct and support and supervise any corps which our allies decide to entrust to that army. I think it is a compliment to Canadians that we are able to feel that we have an organization, that we have an army headquarters which is so organized that, when the time comes, it will be able to take on the direction and support and carry out those functions which must be exercised by an army headquarters. Under this headquarters will be a Canadian corps and whatever corps of allied troops may be associated with them. I think this is a compliment also to General McNaughton, and I say that quite frankly.

That is the story of the breaking up, so-called, of the Canadian army. I hope it will approve itself to the people of Canada. I know there will be great disappointment that all Canadians are not together. I said to this house the other day, and I emphasize and underline it to-night, that the whole course of this war, the whole fashion of formations and of battle lines to-day is in the form of task forces. There is an integration of forces of different countries. We have the special service force which has been spoken of which is made up partly of United States and partly of Canadian troops. One of the things I learned when I was in Italy was that we do not necessarily have a division fighting as a whole. We may be fighting two brigades of a division, and we may have an armoured brigade from somewhere else put along with it in order that a particular task may be done. In this

war Canada will be fighting side by side with the British and United States troops. There are other divisions of active armies that I know about which I cannot disclose and alongside which Canada is fighting at the present time. We cannot manage to have complete homogeneity, but at the same time we can see to it that our men are trained, that our men are fit, that our men get the best experience and are led by officers who have had experience under the actual conditions of war.

I have no doubt there will be many other questions asked in connection with this matter, but I welcome this opportunity to speak, perhaps a little at length, because I believe that when the Canadian people realize just what has happened, and why, when they know that there has been considered and deliberate judgment about this thing, they will accept the decision which has been made, believing that it is for the good of the common cause which, after all, is all that counts.

Mr. DUROCHER: Is the increase in item 1 due solely to additional personnel, or is it due to increases in salaries and wages of men already in the service? I notice that item 2 covers officers and men, but this item 1, apparently covers civil salaries and wages.

Mr. RALSTON: The portion of the increase of $7,000,000 which is due to increases in pay is $552,000. This is due to the reclassification of the positions of something like 2,300 employees. The remainder is due to, first, the growth of army administration; second, the replacement of soldiers by civilians and, third, the inclusion of certain employees who previously were included under another item and who will now be deducted from that item.

Mr. QUELCH: It is not very often that I rise to support the government, but I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate the minister and those who are responsible for the decision to send a Canadian division to Sicily and Italy. I know I was thrilled, and the people with whom I spoke were thrilled when they heard that Canadians were going into action as part of the eighth army, an army that had built up for itself in this war a reputation second to none. It must have been tremendously stimulating to our troops, who were green troops, to know that they were to be under the supreme command of a man who had shown that he would not start an action until he was ready, and then when he did start it, make sure that he was going places. Therefore I think we can feel gratified that our troops were sent forward under that type of leadership, and I hope that when the second corps goes into action it will be under the same kind of leadership. Personally I would have been very uneasy if the Canadian army had gone into action as an army, with the men all green, the commanders all green and no man having proven what he could do. In a war of this kind it has been shown that with a pincers' movement it is quite easy to lose a division and even an army in a short space of time, and I congratulate the minister and his officials upon sending Canadian divisions into Sicily and Italy in the way they did.

Mr. COLDWELL: I wish to refer for a moment to one of the matters which the minister described as one of the minor matters that had been raised.

Mr. RALSTON: Perhaps it was not.

Mr. COLDWELL: I want to refer to the order which the minister said was under reconsideration dealing with the writing of letters to the press by soldiers. I have on my desk beside me at the moment a letter from a member of the veterans' guard in which he tells me that in December he wrote a letter to the Saint John *Telegraph-Journal*. He is not a member of this party, but the letter dealt with some editorials and articles that were appearing in the Saint John newspaper. The letter was not published. But a week or so later, when this man was on duty one night, he was called into the orderly room and given a severe reprimand for having written a letter to this newspaper. As I say, the letter had not been published. The man thought he was entitled to express his views on matters that were of interest to him. He was a veteran of the last war with three and a half years' war service, and was discharged with wounds. He has two sons serving in the Royal Canadian Air Force in this war, one of them operating a Spitfire.

I appeal to the minister to rescind this order. After all, what are we fighting for? We are fighting for democracy, we are told. Are all the people of this country to be allowed to express themselves except the very men who are actually engaged in fighting for our right to express ourselves?

A few days ago I was reading a book written by a prominent man in Great Britain, dealing with public affairs, and in the preface to it he said that very largely the material in the book had been discussed as he was discussing it there because of the numerous political questions that had been asked him when he was addressing meetings in army camps, barracks and aerodromes in Great Britain. Only a short time ago I read an article in which it was said that one thing the British

were achieving in this war that our friends in the United States were not achieving was that, like Cromwell's army, the British army was becoming a thinking army, knowing exactly for what it fought, and why.

Consequently I ask the minister to consider rescinding this order. It is anti-democratic in a war of this kind when we are fighting for the principles of democracy—the right to freedom of thought, freedom of speech and freedom of association. Surely the man who is fighting for these ideals ought to be permitted to exercise some freedom in that regard. I rose to underline one of the points made by the hon. member for Weyburn and to appeal to the minister to consider doing away with this order.

So far as writing to members of parliament is concerned, if that is covered by the king's regulations and orders, I think we should not slavishly follow K.R. and O. of the imperial army. As my hon. friend pointed out, we have a civilian army; we represent the people of Canada in their capacity as civilians, and the men in the armed forces should, I think, have the right to write to their member and bring to his attention, not matters connected with details of military administration or anything of that sort, but matters that fall within their orbit very often, sometimes dealing with their families. May I just say, since I have been critical, that I have appreciated the manner in which the minister has himself dealt with letters of that kind having to do with matters of family need at home, and so on. Invariably the minister has given the kindliest consideration to that kind of approach, made through a member of parliament sometimes, and I wish to thank him for it. But I would suggest that he go beyond that and remove the ban on men in the armed forces writing to the press and writing to their members of parliament.

Mr. RALSTON: I will read the memorandum so that hon. members will understand that the matter is being given serious consideration:

> Objections have been taken to this order on the grounds that it prohibits publication, without permission, of articles or material not of a military character. This order has recently been reconsidered by representatives of the three services.

So that the order has been reconsidered and certain recommendations are being made. I think the words "or otherwise" are the words that were objected to.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Has the Canadian army in Italy any veterinary service? I understand that the United States army has a veterinary service which looks after meat and dairy products for the army, and meat and dairy hygiene generally. It also looks after the water supply, perishable foods and things of that sort. Has the Canadian army a similar service in Italy?

Mr. RALSTON: I did not see anything of the veterinary service. A member of this house, the hon. member for London, is one of the officers in charge of the Canadian Army Service Corps on the supply side. For a considerable time—this is another side of veterinary activities—mule and pack trains had to be used. But if my hon. friend is speaking of the inspection end of the veterinary service, I have not personal knowledge of it. I shall be glad to inquire and find out.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Has Canada any war dogs at the front like other armies have, the United States army, for instance?

Mr. RALSTON: I am not in a position to speak of that. I cannot say yes or no.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): I am in the same position. I was asked the question and was not able to answer it.

Mr. TUCKER: Both yesterday, and time and time again to-day we have heard a lot of members suggest that many of the non-operational troops in Canada were not doing anything. I have served almost from one end of Canada to the other with operational and non-operational troops. I am, for example, at present with 1 training brigade. Some members seem to think that all that an army organization has to do to get a plethora of unnecessary people is to ask for them. Let me say that we started out with an organization in 1 training brigade that was so short of help that training cadre, cooks, clerks, officers and everybody connected with the establishment had to work Saturdays, Sundays and at nights to get the work done. I do not think I ever worked so hard in all my life before as I did on the headquarters of 1 training brigade. We were going night and day, and sometimes in a climate which is not so pleasant—Nova Scotia in the fall. Perhaps if hon. members from Nova Scotia had to be out at night in the pouring rain, they would not appreciate conditions around there so much as when they are inside their own houses. In any event, I can say that the attempts to get an adequate number of people to do the work which is supposed to be done, and the fight with the committee in charge, reminded me very much of the fights which I understand take place to get certain matters

past the treasury board. Indeed, it would seem to me harder to persuade the committee to supply an adequate staff for this work than to get authorizations from the treasury board. I speak only of things which I know. Certainly everybody connected with the so-called non-operational group was working very hard and it was extremely difficult to persuade the committee to provide extra assistance.

That raises the question of whether people of low categories should be employed in this non-operational work. Remember that we were attempting to train young fellows, to prepare them, perhaps, to go right into action. They were young men in category "A" who had already gone through the basic, advanced and special to arms training centres. They were in the pink of condition, and the idea was to give them a last month of training before they might have to go into action. It was found that many of the people over age or of low category could not keep up with these young fellows—they could not train them; they could not lead them; they could not do their job adequately at times. When you suggest that none but low category people be assigned to non-operational work, you are simply proposing to train the finest men in Canada with people who are over age and of low category, and it just cannot be done.

On another matter, I was very glad that the hon. member for Acadia, a returned soldier from the last war, agreed with the government, as I believe every old soldier will agree, that no matter how much you try to train people and prepare them for actual fighting, you learn to fight only by fighting. You can learn more in regard to how to handle yourself under combat conditions by one day's experience under fire that you will probably learn in a month under similar conditions of training. I know that a real attempt has been made to simulate war conditions in the training given our troops. But, like the hon. member for Acadia, I believe that practically everybody who thought of the possibility of the whole Canadian army going into action together, without some prior experience by various units, was very much worried; and conversely, when it was learned that our troops would be sent into action piecemeal, getting their baptism of fire without the risks which would result from the entire force being thrown in at once, with the possibility of something terrible happening to them, everybody was relieved and shared the views of the hon. member for Acadia.

In the last war the Canadian corps was built up gradually to the pitch at which it finally arrived; first a battalion, then a division, and so on; they gradually became accustomed to the work they had to do. I do not move in exalted military circles or have the chance of consulting with the "brass hats". But, like the hon. member for Weyburn, I do read a bit, and I am sure that every person who reflected seriously on the subject felt that the action which had been taken was much the wiser course, and I think the Minister of National Defence should be told that in no uncertain terms by this committee.

A word as to the question of suggesting to the troops that, every time anyone is not satisfied with something which happens to him—such as this afternoon, when we heard of somebody's complaint that he did not get his supper on time or something of that sort—he should be encouraged to write to his member of parliament or to the newspapers. I wonder how many people who have had service in the army would expect much discipline or morale in the forces if that sort of thing were encouraged. Regular channels of communication are provided whereby a soldier is absolutely guaranteed that, if he has a legitimate grievance, it will be looked into. He has the right to appeal, and if he is not listened to he can take his grievance step by step to a higher authority. That means that it goes to the people who can look into it and investigate it. If he goes over the heads of those who know all about it and writes to his member of parliament, what will happen? If one person does it, the whole army is entitled to do it.

The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar just mentioned something of that kind. My attitude regarding complaints made to me as a member of parliament is to say, "The law of the land has laid down full protection for you as a soldier, and you should avail yourself of the regular channels of communication. So that I as a member encourage these people to use those channels of communication. But every once in a while, someone ignores the law and writes to a member like the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar and gets consideration of the complaint, as he says, from the minister; and what does it lead to? The soldiers were told by members who encouraged their correspondents to abide by the laws of the land are bound to feel that they have some grievance. They see that so-and-so wrote to another member, and he went over the heads of everybody else and dealt with the minister, and got things adjusted, and they conclude that if one can do it, all can do it. What would then happen to the discipline of the army?

The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar suggests that we should not pay much attention to what is laid down in K.R. and O. of the

British army. I do not say we should follow it slavishly, but I suggest that the regulations contained in K.R. and O. of the British army are there as the result of generations upon generations of experience in handling a fighting force. I also suggest to the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar two things: one, that no troops are better looked after by their officers or were better looked after in every way in past generations as compared with other fighting troops the world over than British troops; second, that because of, or perhaps the hon. member may say, in spite of these conditions in the past from time to time in various wars there was built up, in the British army, a body of fighting men not excelled by any equivalent force of fighting men anywhere else in the world. The history of what they have done on various battle fields for the last several hundred years is enough to establish that. Nobody can suggest that they, individually or as an army, suffered unduly by virtue of these regulations. In other words, you cannot run an army like you run the houses of parliament or—

Some hon. MEMBERS: The C.C.F.

Mr. TUCKER: —or like you can run—

Some hon. MEMBERS: The C.C.F.

Mr. TUCKER: No: I say that the C.C.F. do not run their party like that, either. I venture to say that there is pretty stringent discipline in their party.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): There is democracy in our party.

Mr. TUCKER: I think, for example, of the hon. member for North Battleford, who did not agree with the leaders of the party, and was thrown out because she persisted in disagreeing with them, and does not sit with them to-day. But I do not know of anybody in the Liberal party who was thrown out of our party because they did not agree with it in all matters—and there have been lots of chances of throwing people out.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Is Mr. Hepburn in or out?

Mr. TUCKER: Mr. Hepburn was not thrown out. He took himself out.

Mr. GRAYDON: And took the Liberal party with him.

Mr. TUCKER: Coming back to the matter I was discussing, I agree it might be possible to consider these regulations in the light of changed conditions and that this should be done; but having had something to do with the army in the last war as a private, and something to do with the army in this war, I would say that the first place that a soldier should be encouraged to go if he has any difficulties at all is to the officer who is in immediate charge of him, who is told over and over again that his duty is to encourage his men to come to him with their most intimate problems; and who should feel that it is his duty to convince his men that they can come to him and confide in him. There should be a feeling of real comradeship. If the man feels he is not getting a square deal from the officer immediately in charge of him, he has the right to go to the officer who is next higher in rank; and if he is still not satisfied that he is receiving fair treatment, it is his right to go higher and higher and higher. But by making it necessary for that soldier to go in the first instance to the officer, the officer will probably be able to clear up the difficulty there and then. There is, however, something more important than that. If the soldier is taught to use, and if he tries to use that means of obtaining redress, he will find nine times out of ten that the difficulty under which he is suffering will be cleared up by his own officer. This would lead to greater mutual confidence and it would enable them to learn to get together and to trust one another. But if you encourage every soldier to believe that if he has some sort of grievance against his officer he can write to his member of parliament, and the member of parliament can go after the officer commanding that battalion and get that officer into trouble, what sort of army will you have very shortly?

There is another matter that I would call to the minister's attention, and I think he will agree that it is most important. I understand that in the beginning applications for farm leave and postponement of service were sent by the district officers commanding to national defence headquarters and were then referred back to the national selective boards. That meant presumably that troops, no matter from what part of Canada they came, received the same consideration. The decision has now been made, embodied in a routine order, that applications for farm leave shall be dealt with by district officers commanding. That may have been necessary at a time when there was, for example, real danger of attack on the Pacific coast, leaving it to the district officer commanding there, or the G.O.C., Pacific command, to say whether the exigencies of the service would permit him to allow anyone to go on farming leave or to have postponement of service by reason of the fact that he was needed at home on the farm. But the effect of that has been this. There were, I understand, somewhere in the neighbourhood of 6,000 people who were granted extended leave.

If so, it would appear to me that there has been a good deal more generosity in the granting of such leave in other places than to men in the troops in the Pacific command. I do not think there is any doubt about it. That may have been justified when the exigencies of the service were different from what they are to-day; but I would urge the minister to see to it that applications for postponement, or for seeding leave, or harvest leave, or leave on compassionate grounds, be dealt with in some uniform manner throughout Canada, so that it would not be possible for one D.O.C. to turn down all applications almost en masse, while another D.O.C., who is more favourably inclined to or more impressed with the needs of the farming industry, grants far more applications than are granted elsewhere.

I do not know the figures; but if there has been granted the number that the minister says, then my experience leads me to say that if other constituencies had the same experience in getting farm leave granted, the number would not be 6,000 but more like 1,000. That is probably due to the fact that such a large proportion of troops called up from my constituency and in Saskatchewan have been serving in the Pacific command.

I do not ask for special consideration. I simply suggest that the same attitude be taken toward the troops everywhere, no matter where they may be in Canada, and that there should be some supervision over the decisions of the district officers commanding. That is possible now because the danger of invasion and the exigencies of the service are such that perhaps conditions are pretty much the same throughout Canada.

Mr. RALSTON: I did not catch the suggestion as to who the supervising authority should be. Did the hon. member mean that it should come back to headquarters?

Mr. TUCKER: I think it is better that it should come back to headquarters in Ottawa and they can see that similar treatment is given to the people in all military districts.

Mr. MUTCH: I rather think that if the members of the house generally are labouring under the impression that a large number of those in the forces are desirous of writing directly to members of parliament, they might be shocked in some instances to know the reaction of large numbers of the forces to that somewhat unique animal the member of parliament-in-general. Individually, I suppose, the average member is as well regarded by those persons whom he knows in the forces as any other member of society; but as a group, it is very revealing and produces a good deal of thought to sit by, and I will not say in disguise but at least unknown, and listen sometimes to the comments which one hears with respect to the activities of those of us who occupy seats in this house.

I should say at once that I welcome the suggestion of the minister to-night that the objectionable words in the regulations quoted, with respect to the publishing of letters sent home and to private individuals by persons in the forces, are likely to be altered, because under the strict conditions of censorship which now exist, it suggests rather too much that the forces themselves are not sufficiently security-minded and not sufficiently patriotically-minded to be able to exercise that type of discretion which would make it possible for the letter which is written to the home town to receive that degree of publicity which the family of the man or the man himself might welcome.

This brings me to another consideration which I think is of importance, and that is the general method or lack of method in keeping the personnel serving in the active forces informed as to what is going on at home, and particularly with respect to Canada's war effort as a whole and in some degree of things political. I am not one of those persons who ever felt, even in times of peace, that there was either sense or justification in the virtual disenfranchisement of those persons who served in the active forces, and if I was not sympathetic with it in times of peace, I am even less sympathetic in time of war.

I am not aware that soldiers of modern nations in this war such as Russia fight any less well because they are active members of a political organization—I said a political organization in that particular case, but I think it would apply where there is more choice. I do not think soldiers fight any better for a society which they hope will come in some nebulous time in the future than they will fight for a state of society which they help to create and in which they have a vital interest.

As I went among the overseas forces in the United Kingdom in the last few months I had an opportunity of sitting in at a considerable number of discussion groups. The discussion groups to which I refer that are held in the Canadian army are known as leaderless-situation groups. Half a dozen men are put in a room and examined by people trained to make such examinations, in order to see which one of these groups under certain circumstances will assert himself as a natural leader, and which of the men will fail to measure up to these tests. One of the tests frequently used, not only in our army but in other armies, is that of the leaderless-discussion group. A half

dozen men would be put in a room for about thirty-five minutes and told that they could talk about anything they liked, but that they must express opinions on the subject chosen. They are told also that they are being observed. If they were not observed they would not be there.

If I can trust my memory I attended twelve or thirteen such groups. Those groups were composed of young chaps who had been overseas anywhere from two and a half to four years. Without exception one of the subjects which was nominated by someone was the question of reestablishment and rehabilitation after the war. That subject was not always discussed. They get very much interested in subjects like whether we can defeat the hun by air power without an attack on the continent. There were a variety of subjects, but I want to point out that that particular one was always mentioned and very often discussed.

If I may say so, I was shocked to hear these men talking about the days after the war in the exact terms of the days before the war which we remember rather sadly. I sometimes had an opportunity to hear some extreme statement from these boys. They would urge that we must attempt to do something which I knew that the people of Canada have already done, perhaps two or three years ago, for example, in connection with the expansion of industry. I would ask the question, "Do you know So-and-so", and they would almost invariably say, "no". I might then give them a word of explanation, perhaps in the discussion period, and they would say, "You have been in Canada recently; what about this and that?" Their curiosity was insatiable. Their interests tended always to the future days rather than to what had gone before. I found very little recrimination among any of the boys against society as a whole, for the experience through which many of them had gone. I found an appalling lack of knowledge of what was going on. And when I drew attention to that they would say, "Why don't they send somebody over to tell us?" Well, you know in a democracy who "they" are. There is only one "they" who can do anything under a democratic governmental system.

When discussions were over somebody would say, "Don't you think there is something in it. Someone should be sent to tell them." I would answer, "Canada has only been able to do what she has done by virtue of the fact that every man and woman in the country has supported the authorities there." It is not the government that has done the job, but the Canadian people; the direction and executive part of it has been done by the government, but if we are going to tell the story of what has been done we must tell the story of what has been accomplished by the executive action of the government. Suppose some one was sent to tell that story. Suppose, even that, some of my hon. friends to the left or I should attempt to write that story to these men. The cry would go up from different sections of this country that the Canadian army was developing a system of political commissars with all its implications. Therefore I do say that it is perhaps impractical to do that. However, I think every possible means should be taken to put the story before these boys. A large percentage of them have no real assurance of coming back. The war has scarcely started for them. In spite of that they are thinking in terms of the future, and to those who come back and to their children it is of vital interest. They should have the information; they should be encouraged to discuss it, to think about it and to talk about it. That is a little different from saying they should be encouraged to write to the newspapers or members of parliament about personal and individual grievances. I know something of the problems of discipline in the army. I have had some opportunities to study some of the disciplinary actions in the army and at a later date I shall probably have something to say about that.

We ought to cultivate the idea of getting to these men, somehow, more of the details of the nation's affairs. These men have a bigger stake in the future of this country than any of us. We cannot get this information out to them by radio because the majority of them who are situated in England have no access to it. We are not getting it to them, unfortunately, to the extent that they desire, in the way of pamphlets or general information. It is important to the morale of the army in much the same way as is the mail which was referred to by the minister and the leader of the opposition. I do not need to stress that because enough has been said about it.

Mr. GRAYDON: Are they getting a good supply of newspapers over there?

Mr. MUTCH: Newspapers do not go across. The trouble with newspapers is that by the time they reach them they are so old and remote from the troop's knowledge and experience that they are scarcely news. I saw this experiment made: papers of Ottawa and Montreal were laid on the table in an officers' mess within thirty hours of the time they came from the presses. They were placed in a conspicuous pile. One young man who had been over there for two or three years came

in and glanced at them. His face lit up. It was something from home. He looked at them, sort of glanced through them casually and then went over and read the British paper which he was accustomed to reading, because there was nothing in his recent experience and understanding that attracted him to the Canadian papers. The headlines did not relate to anything in his daily experience. Four years is a long time, and unfortunately for us in this house and, to a certain degree the people of Canada as a whole, too much of the information that reaches the men about what is going on here is of the sensational type and, I am sorry to say, not always in a reliable form. You cannot be surprised if they write and request news and information, if they wish to be informed on current opinion. We should not be surprised if they feel the responsibility of citizenship in this country. We should be glad. I have come back with it firmly fixed in my mind that everything should be done to make these men and women feel that they are fully enfranchised citizens of Canada. I am firmly of the opinion that they must have a full understanding of what is going on at home.

Before I sit down I should like to mention one more experience I had. Not very long ago I sat in the mess of a bomber command. A visitor in the mess was a chap who had just come back from the near east. I never heard a man get a better hearing than he received when he bragged, frankly, bragged, a Canadian among Canadians, about what it felt like as a Canadian to land in a port in the near east, or at a station somewhere in Africa and walk up from the landing-strip, or from the docks, between crates piled on either side like an avenue on which were letters four or five inches high saying, "made in Canada". That sort of thing got a reaction which would be soul-warming to those people who produced the goods that were there. The discussions with respect to those people who sometimes through mistaken or selfish ideas have stopped for a while producing these goods, would be shocking if heard.

Mr. PERLEY: I wish to say a brief word on this item. I listened carefully to the minister when he made his first statement yesterday and I have also listened to him to-day. The more we listen, the more information we get. I think the minister made a frank and proper statement in reply to the hon. member for Weyburn. It was informative, and I believe it would have been well if he had made it a little earlier rather than have it prompted by the hon. member. I certainly appreciate, and I think we all do, the difficulty the minister and the government have in carrying on the war. The minister has the first responsibility. He has to organize the Canadian army and keep it supplied with reinforcements, the stream-line training he speaks about. That has to be ready and he does not know the minute he will be called on. I think it was very fine that he set out in an instructive way to give us the information which he did. We have heard a good deal with respect to soldiers, or other men in the armed forces writing to members of the House of Commons, or taking their difficulties to district officers commanding. The minister has said that teamwork is necessary, and I think hon. members ought to be patriotic enough to display a desire for teamwork.

May I tell the committee how I have dealt with many of these men who have come to me—and I have no doubt other hon. members are approached in the same way. All of us receive many letters. I have three on my desk which came yesterday. I have not yet received my western mail for to-day because the train is late, but I suppose there will be more when that mail arrives. To be quite frank, I reply to these men or, if they come to my office—and a great many of them have come—I listen to their stories. Some of them think they have grievances. I say to them, "Well, you may have a grievance", if I think they have one. I tell them how to go about obtaining redress, and point out to them that the first thing for them to do is to discuss the matter with their district officer commanding.

That is what I tell them because, as I have said on many occasions, if the Minister of National Defence were to listen to me or to any other member of parliament, would not this whole thing be a farce? There have to be rules and regulations, and the minister is familiar with them. It is the duty of hon. members to tell these men just how to go about obtaining redress for their grievances. While I have had cases brought to my attention where I did not believe they had received a square deal after the matter had been taken up with the district officer commanding, yet on the other hand I believe many of them have received just treatment.

I was pleased to hear the minister say that some action will be taken with respect to having men return on leave to take part in seeding operations. This afternoon we heard a long discussion in connection with the forestry corps, some of whom were turned over to do farming operations. I make an appeal to the minister to have the information sent out in plenty of time so that the farmers will receive a square deal in getting assistance from some of the non-operational troops we now have in Canada.

I could go into detail by pointing out that in my opinion some of the boys overseas, who have been there for three or four years, should be returned to Canada. In some instances fathers may have died, or something of that kind happened, and where fathers have died widows would be left on farms. In those circumstances it is, of course, difficult to carry on.

I make a further appeal to the minister. Yesterday he said he proposed to enlist 60,000 men this year. I trust, when that is done, the call-up will be carried on in a manner which will not bring about the discrimination and unfairness which obtained in respect of the call-up made last year. At page 190 of *Hansard* are to be found figures showing the call-up in the thirteen military districts. My observations apply more particularly to the western provinces. We find according to those figures that in a western district with only one-third of the population of districts in certain parts of eastern Canada the percentage at Regina was 8, whereas in the east it was only 5·7. Those are percentages taken for 100 troops called up.

Possibly the minister will recall the statement made by the hon. member for Lake Centre, and he might follow the suggestions made by that hon. member. When this year's call-up is made I wish to see a fair and equitable call in all military districts. I make that appeal to the minister, and trust he will take into consideration what I have said.

Mr. RALSTON: On the last point, I do not wish to pass the buck, but I must say that those call-ups are made by means of requisitions on the Minister of Labour by the Department of National Defence. It is the Department of Labour and national selective service which actually carry on the call-up in any particular district. So that I am afraid all the army can do is to ask for so many men to report at a certain centre at a certain time—and that might be at Vancouver, or anywhere else. National selective service calls them up from any part of Canada. We do not regulate where they are to come from. We only specify where we went them to report. However, I shall pass on to the Minister of Labour what my hon. friend has said. There is nothing I can do further than that.

I have already made a statement with respect to seeding leave. That will be taken into consideration almost at once, and I think the farmers, who were getting a pretty square deal from the army—and I hope my hon. friend does not think they are not—will be treated fairly—

Mr. PERLEY: I did not say that.

[Mr. Perley.]

Mr. RALSTON: —particularly having regard to the fact that there is very liberal, shall I say—if my hon. friend does not mind that term—

Mr. PERLEY: Progressive, probably.

Mr. RALSTON: —a very liberal exemption or deferment for men who are engaged in farming. However, the point has been raised to-night, and I shall endeavour to look into it and give it the best possible consideration.

I am obliged to the hon. member for Rosthern, the hon. member for Winnipeg South and the hon. member for Qu'Appelle for their remarks respecting representations made to members of parliament. As I said to the leader of the opposition a little while ago, I wish to call to the attention of the committee a paragraph in K. R. and O. to which I believe some hon. members have been referring. I would point out that the provision is not against the writing of letters to members of parliament. I refer to section 423 (b) which states that attempts to obtain favourable consideration of any application by the use of outside influence are forbidden, and, if resorted to, will be regarded as an admission on the part of the applicant that the case is not good on its merits, and that it will be dealt with accordingly. That is the section under which men offend if they write to members of parliament, or others outside the service, if thereby they seek, in the words of the regulation "to obtain favourable consideration", a promotion, a transfer, or something of that kind.

I have had experience in my own constituency; do not let hon. members think I do not understand this matter. I appeal to members of parliament to have these young men realize that this thing called "pull"—and that is what they call it—does not exist. As sure as the world, when you find a young man who goes to a member of parliament, or writes to the minister, and as a result thereof some favourable consideration ensues, just as sure as the world he tells someone else the result, and the story goes that Bill has got something by way of "pull." It does not matter how regular the procedure may have been. The suggestion arises because the action was taken by a member of parliament or someone outside the service.

I have received representations from time to time from members and I do endeavour to deal with them. I do not for a moment question the right of hon. members to write me with respect to these young men, but I do believe the teamwork mentioned by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle could help us all so that these young men might not be encouraged to write to members of parliament

respecting matters having to do with their positions in the army—and particularly those communications dealing with promotions or for special consideration of some sort.

I say in that connection—and this is almost a humiliating confession—that we almost have to apologize to Canadian military headquarters in England when we make an inquiry about any individual, for fear someone will think that influence is being used within the meaning of section 423(b). I know that should not be so; but the less there is of that sort of thing, the easier it will be to run the army. It would mean that everyone would feel they were being dealt with on exactly the same basis.

I had an instance—a very sorry one—in my own experience, in which I was written to by an individual. I did not see the letter. It was passed to the branch concerned. Next thing I found out was that the man had forfeited fourteen days' pay for having written to his member of parliament. That was serious for him, particularly in view of the fact that his member of parliament happened to be the Minister of National Defence. He is still out the fourteen days' pay. He said he thought he was writing to the Minister of National Defence—and so he was; but the letter got into a groove, and reached someone who was pretty tough on the regulations, with the result that a forfeiture of pay was imposed. I think it would do us all good; I think it would do the army good if we endeavoured to teach the provisions of this section 423(b) to the soldiers in our constituencies. We should ask them, not to not write to us, but not to write to ask for favourable consideration in connection with army matters, not to make representations outside.

As the hon. member for Rosthern says, there is a plain line of procedure laid down. It is pretty old, but it is pretty sound. It promotes confidence between the man and his officer, and puts the officer in the position of being a trustee and a guardian for the man. He is his adviser and friend. Generally a man's complaint is considered and he gets satisfaction. I know that sometimes a man must be persistent. He may have a platoon officer who is not very sympathetic and he may have to go to his company officer, but in the end he gets through and the grievance is redressed.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I wish to support what the hon. member for Winnipeg South has said about getting information to the men in our armed forces. I understand there is a department known as the department of public relations. I should like a statement from the minister about what is being done and whether every use possible is being made of this department to get information to the armed forces in the different fields. The longer this war lasts, the more important this will be.

Another matter I wished to take up concerns increases in pay. An increase was announced last year, but this was contingent upon the officer commanding making a recommendation. I understand in some cases the increase was ten cents a day after three months' service, and in other cases after six months' service. I should like to have an assurance from the minister that this increase is now in general effect throughout the service, both in the army and the N.R.M.A. forces.

In connection with writing to members of parliament my experience has been that the men who write to me are ignorant of the machinery which they could use to approach their officers. The hon. member for Rosthern has said that the men are told what to do, but I have found that many of them do not know what to do. They thought they were supposed to go to the sergeant-major or the sergeant, and they got told in sergeant-major language what they can do with their letters. It seems to me that in many of the camps there has not been sufficient instruction given to the men and they are entirely at a loss to know what the procedure is. If the men were given more instructions; if they knew what their rights and privileges were and that there would be redress for a particular situation, then when letters come to members of parliament they could advise the men to take up their case in the proper way. I tell men who write to me that if they cannot get access to the officials in that way I shall be glad to take up the matter. I find that in most cases when they try the proper procedure they get fairly quick action.

I should like to support what has been said this evening with regard to compassionate leave. There seems to be considerable difference in the action taken by various commands in connection with men applying for leave on compassionate grounds, or for spring and harvest leave. I would support any move that might be made to make this procedure more uniform, either by having these applications go through headquarters or by giving definite instructions to the units with regard to the action that should be taken.

Several demands have been made in this house—I made one myself in 1940—for free transportation for our soldiers when on leave or furlough. Surely these men and women who are offering everything should be granted free transportation on our railroads.

Mr. MUTCH: Would you apply that to N.R.M.A.?

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Embarkation leave.

Mr. MUTCH: You referred to the men and women who were offering everything and I was wondering if you would include them both.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: The N.R.M.A. men are to be sent overseas if they are required. Canada is a country of great distances and some of these men are being discriminated against. It seems to me that the least we can do for these people is to grant them free transportation. Thousands of our men have been lost in the last year, and I hate to think that some of them were denied the privilege of seeing their loved ones before they went overseas because the cost of transportation was too great. The minister stated this afternoon that the matter was under consideration, but it has been under consideration for over a year. Nothing has been done about it. Some reduction was made in 1941, but I think we should go a little further. It may be said that we should not encourage increased travel in these days, but I am sure the civilian population would be ready to step aside if necessary so that these men might go home on their last leave or furlough.

The last thing I wish to refer to is something disgraceful that occurred recently in a Montreal court. Last week a discharged soldier was sent to gaol for two months for wearing a uniform illegally. No doubt he was wearing the uniform illegally because he had been discharged two weeks previously. When this particular soldier was demobilized the winter clothing allowance was only $35, but I understand it has been raised to $65. When a man is discharged in Canada in the winter time $35 is not sufficient to buy his civilian outfit. Surely such a thing should not happen in this land of ours. The regulations should be changed so that this thing cannot occur again. I understand that some action is being taken. The Minister of Justice should be notified of this and if the sentence cannot be remitted, I think some other action should be taken so that the men in our fighting forces will know that such a thing cannot happen again.

Mr. RALSTON: Did the hon. member bring that to our attention before?

Mr. CASTLEDEN: No. There was an editorial in the Montreal *Star* of February 5. I have not the name of the soldier.

Mr. DUPUIS: That is only a report by a newspaper. The hon. member should read the judgment and the circumstances.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I read the judgment.

[Mr. Castleden.]

Mr. WRIGHT: A short time ago the minister stated that his department would requisition the number of men required in each district from the selective service. I should like to know upon what the requisition is based. Does it take into consideration the number of voluntary enlistments in the military district, or is it based upon the population in the district? What is the basis of these requisitions? It seems to me that requisitions are made against certain districts where there has been a large voluntary enlistment. They naturally feel that they must fill the requisition. I think there should be a different basis for making the requisitions from the various military districts.

I wish to say something about agricultural leave. Last year, as I understand it, the person who made application for agricultural leave applied to the officer commanding. In many cases the officer commanding flatly refused to consider the application and it never reached the district officer commanding. I agree with the hon. member for Rosthern that a different method should be used this year to bring about more uniform procedure in the granting of agricultural leave. I had several cases brought to my notice last year of men being granted agricultural leave to work on a farm where there were only thirty to forty acres under cultivation, while in other cases applications were refused when the men wanted agricultural leave to work on farms where their fathers had a section or a section and a half under cultivation; yet they received no consideration. I would urge again that a more uniform method be used in the granting of agricultural leave whereby the needs of each particular case might be given consideration.

Mr. RALSTON: With regard to the requisitions, I want the committee to understand that all that the Department of National Defence does in the matter is to say that we want so many men at a certain training centre. The national selective service directorate decide where to get these men. They may not get them from that particular district at all. The Department of National Defence has nothing to do with designating the district from which the men shall be drawn. It simply says: We want so many men at a certain training centre.

With regard to having a more uniform system for considering applications for agricultural leave, I have the point made by the hon. member for Rosthern and the hon. member for Melfort, and I will look into that and have it brought before the officers who will be dealing with the matter very shortly.

The hon. member for Yorkton asked in regard to increased pay, and I might as well put that on the record now. He asked as to

the percentage of men overseas and in Canada who are receiving the increased rates of pay provided under the order of last year. The survey is not complete, but it gives a fair cross-section which enables us to tell pretty well what the whole situation is.

Overseas, the number in receipt of the basic rate of $1.50 is 90·5 per cent; the number in receipt of $1.40 is 4·5 per cent; the number in receipt of $1.30 is 5 per cent. In the C.W.A.C. the number in receipt of $1.25 is 50 per cent; the number in receipt of $1.10 is 7·1 per cent; the number in receipt of $1.05 is 42·9 per cent. To get this C.W.A.C. figure, for the purpose of getting these results they took about half the personnel over there. It may not be quite an accurate cross-section, but it would be pretty nearly so.

Mr. GRAYDON: Why are the women not paid on an equal footing with the men in the army?

Mr. RALSTON: As I have explained before, a quick answer would be that it is not the practice in connection with other women's corps. It is the same with the ATS and the Wrens. The theory was, in plain English, that women were not adaptable to all forms of service. While they did exceedingly well the jobs that they could do, they were not as versatile, if I may put it in that way, as the men, having regard to the different forms of heavy service that the men have to do. That is the only answer I know. I have made the same answer to the hon. member for North Battleford and to the hon. member for Edmonton East.

Mr. GRAYDON: Is there any difference between the pay of the Wrens, the women's division of the air force and the C.W.A.C. for equal ranks?

Mr. RALSTON: No, none; they are on an even basis. My hon. friend will remember that they were all increased last year. They were receiving 66⅔ per cent of the men's pay and that was increased to 80 per cent. Tradeswomen get the same trades pay as the tradesmen.

Mr. GRAYDON: Has the government under consideration raising the pay of the women generally to that of the men?

Mr. RALSTON: No. Their basic pay is 80 per cent of a man's pay.

Mr. GRAYDON: I hope that answer is a little more elastic than it sounds.

Mr. RALSTON: Things are always under consideration, I suppose.

Mr. GRAYDON: There is active and passive consideration, and quite a difference between them.

Mr. RALSTON: In Canada the number in receipt of the basic rate of $1.50 is 65·7 per cent; the number in receipt of $1.40, 9·1 per cent; the number in receipt of $1.30, 25·2 per cent.

In Canada the women's army corps has 60·1 per cent in receipt of $1.20; 11·5 per cent in receipt of $1.10; and 28·4 per cent in receipt of $1.05.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: There seems to be quite a difference in the pay of the C.W.A.C. overseas and those in Canada. There is a larger percentage on the lower rate of pay overseas. Is there any explanation for that?

Mr. RALSTON: Overseas 50 per cent were in receipt of the top rate, as compared with 60 per cent in Canada. Perhaps it was because there were more tradeswomen in Canada. But when I think of it, that, of course, does not apply with regard to the basic rate. I cannot give the explanation of that offhand, but I shall make inquiries.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Do the C.W.A.C. get a clothing allowance?

Mr. RALSTON: They get a cash allowance for clothing.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Have their uniforms to last for the duration of the war?

Mr. RALSTON: No; the uniform lasts as long as it lasts. When the inspecting officer decides that it is no longer serviceable, they get another.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Does the government give them another uniform when that is warranted?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Mr. GRAYDON: You should not ask ladies to put up with a uniform until it is worn out.

Mr. RALSTON: Oh, no, I do not say that.

Mr. COLDWELL: Has any consideration been given to granting an allowance in respect of girls with dependent mothers?

Mr. RALSTON: On July 1, 1943, provision was put into effect bringing dependent mothers within the meaning of dependents under the regulations.

The hon. member for Yorkton asked in regard to the steps taken to get the news to the troops. The Canadian Press bulletin, as the committee knows, is cabled overseas to Canadian troops. It is published twice a

week; I am not sure but that it is oftener than that. It has a very wide circulation among all three services, particularly the army, because they are more concentrated. The air force find it more difficult to get it when they are serving with R.A.F. squadrons. The bulletin is greatly appreciated by the troops and has done a genuine service.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: How many copies are printed?

Mr. RALSTON: I think probably there is one copy for every four or five men.

Mr. COLDWELL: Is it printed overseas?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Mr. COLDWELL: The news is assembled here and sent overseas?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Mr. COLDWELL: Would it be possible to have a copy of the news which is sent overseas circulated to the members of this house, in order that we may see what it contains?

Mr. RALSTON: I will try to do better still. My hon. friend has put the idea in my mind. We can get a few copies of the bulletins sent over in a bomber. I should like hon. members to see the bulletin. I take a little credit for this Canadian Press bulletin. I was over in 1940 and I was shocked and ashamed to be asked in November by some of our boys who were guarding an aerodrome, "Who won the world series?" I decided that if the Canadian troops were that badly informed, we had better get a newspaper and get it quickly.

Mr. COLDWELL: They did not ask who had won the election in 1940?

Mr. MARTIN: Who did win the world series?

Mr. RALSTON: It was in 1940.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Did the minister know who won the world series?

Mr. RALSTON: I could tell them then, yes. Hon. members may be interested in a publication which has been going for some months overseas, "Canadian Affairs", which seems to have been of considerable interest to the troops. It is published under the auspices of the wartime information. Perhaps members of the committee have seen it. The second issue of the home edition is just out. It deals with articles which perhaps are more for study groups, as has been suggested, but it has a good deal of factual information as well.

Mr. MUTCH: Is any arrangement being made for that pamphlet, "Canadian Affairs," to be distributed to the troops overseas in the same fashion as the news sheet is?

[Mr. Ralston.]

Mr. RALSTON: As the Canadian Press bulletin is?

Mr. MUTCH: Yes, in the same generous measure.

Mr. RALSTON: I am assuming that it will be.

Mr. MUTCH: As a matter of fact, at the moment it is not.

Mr. RALSTON: As a matter of fact, the distribution so far has been mostly to officers, has it not?

Mr. MUTCH: Yes, to officers, by whom the reading is casual; but every copy that gets to the troops is "read to pieces", because in it they get some elements of opinion as well as news.

Mr. RALSTON: I am glad to get that testimonial to it, and consideration will be given to sending it out on a larger scale. As a matter of fact, we have only just commenced using it in Canada. The first issue of the home edition, dated January 15, is in my hands now.

In Italy the only really Canadian paper there was the *Red Patch,* a little paper published in Naples. It was gotten out by the first division and was most creditable as a purely house organ. In addition to that they had the *Eighth Army News.* It had a small box section for Canadian news, but that was pretty small. There has now been established the *Maple Leaf,* and the first copy was issued on January 14. It is published at Naples and is serviced by Canadian Press with home news; it will also be a house organ; that is, it will have some news of the units at the same time. It is more along the lines of the United States *Stars and Stripes,* which is published for the American army.

I think that answers the question as to the way in which news is being gotten to the troops. In addition, broadcasts are being made from England from time to time, but often these are not heard by the troops unless they are out of the line, whereas the *Maple Leaf* and the *Red Patch* get up the line to the troops, and are eagerly read. I found in North Africa, when I was in the reinforcement camps, a great shortage of reading matter in the form of magazines like the *Reader's Digest* and other like and light literature. Everything hon. members can do to assist in getting more of that sort of thing to the troops will be, I am sure, of genuine assistance to morale.

My hon. friend mentioned the matter of fares. I have nothing more to say about that, but it has been under consideration. The consideration which was given reduced the cost to the soldier to one-third of a single fare for

a return journey, and that was regarded as a pretty substantial measure of assistance to the troops. Take, for example, Camp Borden to Vancouver; the return coach fare is $87.55; the soldier obtains return accommodation for $15.95. Then from Halifax to Vancouver the ordinary return fare is $131; for the soldier it is $25.10. The same transportation concession as is allowed when proceeding on annual leave and furlough is granted when the individual is given embarkation leave. The only phase of the matter I mentioned this afternoon that we had under further consideration was the possibility that the ceiling of the contribution a soldier makes might be fixed at some definite amount. We have that under consideration now and under discussion with the railway companies.

I have made a note of the case of which my hon. friend spoke, of a man in Montreal who had been wearing a uniform illegally, and will inquire into it at once.

Mr. GRAYDON: Regarding the point which the minister has just brought up, concerning lower fares for soldiers on furlough or otherwise, a good many of us through the years have attempted to persuade the government to grant free transportation under certain circumstances to the troops. The government has, of course, conceded something on this point, and we are always glad to acknowledge any movement in that direction. There may be reasons, although I have never been convinced they are very good, why free transportation should not be given to the troops at all times, but I think the minister might, even at this late date, reconsider the provision of free transportation on the railways on the six months' furlough and the embarkation leave. I reiterate this appeal because there is a feeling abroad that some of the little things which do not cost the country very much, but mean so much to the troops in Canada before they leave, are not being taken care of. Sometimes we are penny-wise and, perhaps, pound-foolish. It would be well to disregard the little extra money it would take and make this gesture, even though it be nothing more than a gesture, to the troops in Canada before they leave. It would show that our government and our people are making a move in recognition of the sacrifices which these young men are prepared to make on behalf of all of us.

Then there is a feeling, to which I have heard expression given, as no doubt the minister has on many occasions, that the armed forces of our friends to the south are being serviced by the government and the people of the United States on what is sometimes regarded as a higher standard than our own. I do not wish to make any comparisons or cast any reflections on the manner in which our own troops are being used, but I suggest that Canada cannot afford to use her troops, while they are here or on the scene of actual operations in accordance with any lower standard than that of any other country. It may be that my information on these points is wrong, but I have heard it voiced by the troops themselves, and that is why I put it before the minister. Last evening I brought up a matter which, though perhaps not of large importance, was sufficiently so for the minister to mention it, and seemed to me sufficiently important to emphasize, namely, that the public should see to it that our people overseas get plenty of mail and are kept in frequent contact with the community in which they lived.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend is quite right; it is not a little thing.

Mr. GRAYDON: To some people it may seem a small thing, but it is of tremendous importance; and so are such matters as transportation. These are things that may not mean in the aggregate a great deal of money, but I think they would pay great dividends in the future from the point of view of our forces. The minister is in a better position than I am to know that the troops look at these little things as an evidence of what the government thinks of their services and of the appreciation of the country. It shows how the country recognizes the sacrifices they are prepared to make, and I feel keenly in the matter. With the expenditure of a little more money a great deal could be done to enhance the prestige of our people at home, and also of the government, with our troops. We should see to it that all these little differences that sometimes naturally crop up in the minds of the troops are eradicated. As you ride on the trains and talk to the troops you get to know what they are thinking. You do not have to raise the question; it is brought up time and again.

Some years ago I raised the question, as I have done on many other occasions, with reference to free transportation. Dozens of soldiers on the trains find out who you are and they say that this is something that should be taken into consideration. It is something that has caught on with the troops. They have never been able to see why, when we are able to spend so much money on so many things, some little conveniences of this sort are not provided for them. I concur in this idea and I should like to see Canada stand high at home with the troops overseas. I am not suggesting that this is not the case, but there are many little things that we could have done and can still do to improve our position at home, and the esteem in which we

are held by our fighting men. I am sure the minister will be sympathetic, but I should like him to give the matter more than passive consideration, because frankly, in view of the fact that the United States has the reputation of doing these things in a big way, I think we in Canada must measure up to the standard set by other countries. In fact, I should like to see this country do a little better than the rest.

Mr. RALSTON: As a matter of fact, in this regard the United States is behind us. They charge full fare.

Mr. GRAYDON: I was not thinking of railway transportation particularly, but of servicing overseas.

Mr. RALSTON: I should have said they charge three-quarters fare. My hon. friend is quite right. There are some things which the United States certainly does in a big way; but without casting any reflection upon them, or preening ourselves on being a little more modest in our appropriations, I would suggest that there are directions in which I do not think I would go as far as the United States—for instance, provision with regard to hostels and things of that kind. They are extremely comfortable, but we have got along with less of that sort of thing, and have got along very well indeed. I do not take second place to anyone, not even to my hon. friend, in the desire to see the best possible done for the troops, consistent with this idea, that we want them to realize that this is a war and this is a war service we are providing, that these things are temporary, and that soldiers as well as civilians do help the country not only by fighting but by saving, provided reasonable comfort is obtained.

In the matter of fares, I feel that we have gone a long distance, having regard to what the United States has done; of course in Britain, there are free fares as in the last war. Our system in Canada is a sort of half-way house that would seem to be reasonable. I have heard what my hon. friend has had to say and have heard similar representations before, and these matters are always under consideration.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): The minister referred to mothers' allowances paid in respect of persons serving overseas. I should like to have a little more information in regard to mothers' allowances paid to mothers of men in the armed forces abroad. As I understand it, a mother whose son is serving overseas cannot receive mother's allowance unless the father is totally incapacitated. That places the family in an extremely bad position. I am thinking of a particular case. The father of this family is a janitor who is receiving a very small amount for his services in a schoolhouse. The mother has applied for mother's allowance. In this case there is a portion of assigned pay, but I am informed that the regulation is such that no mother's allowance can be given unless the father is totally incapacitated from earning a livelihood. If that is true, that is a terrible position for these people to be placed in. Is it understood that assigned pay in a case such as I have indicated is to be used by the mother as a means of livelihood? I understand that the assigned pay is not necessarily used for that purpose. If it is, however, then certainly the government cannot expect that soldier will have saved up for him two or three or four hundred dollars to enable him to take up a farm when he comes home under the arrangements now proposed. Will the minister give some information along that line?

Mr. RALSTON: I believe the hon. member is dealing with the case of a soldier's mother whose husband is alive but is totally incapacitated from earning a living. Is he criticizing the provision with regard to total incapacitation, or has he in mind that it must be shown that the soldier is not her sole support?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Not necessarily her sole support. I believe the regulation reads that before the mother can receive mother's allowance the father must be totally incapacitated from earning a living.

Mr. RALSTON: That is correct. It is section 101. What my hon. friend is asking is that the regulation be changed?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Yes, definitely so, because the father may be earning a small amount, $5 a month, and yet the mother is barred entirely from receiving mother's allowance and that might be her only source of income. I have such a case in mind and that is why I mentioned it.

Mr. RALSTON: The section is a familiar one. The same thing appears in the Pension Act, where there is a requirement to show that the husband is totally incapacitated, but I cannot speak to it with any degree of certainty to-night. I will take it under consideration and consult the dependents' allowance board.

Mr. COLDWELL: What about a deserted mother? I fancy that was altered.

Mr. RALSTON: The mother whose husband has deserted her and who has not been supporting her for a considerable length of

time, where the officer or soldier is her sole or partial support? That is taken care of. Because she is deserted she is not getting any support at all.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Would the minister explain the point I brought up in connection with that. Is it expected that the mother would use the assigned pay of the son who is on active service overseas to maintain herself?

Mr. RALSTON: Did my hon. friend say, is it the intention? The assigned pay which is the basis of the allowance would be available for her to use.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Must she use it?

Mr. RALSTON: If she does not need it, I suppose not.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Take the case of a father receiving only $5 and the son assigning $20 or $25 of his pay. Would it be necessary for the mother to use that $25 for her keep?

Mr. RALSTON: I do not understand what my hon. friend means when he says, "Would it be necessary." If she had no other money, of course it would be necessary.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): That is exactly the point. I imagine the dependents' allowance board would take this view: If the father is earning $5 or $20 a month as janitor and the mother is getting $25 assigned pay, that amounts to $45 a month and she does not need any more. What I want to know is, would they be expected to use that assigned pay in order to maintain them? Would it be counted as income, or should they rightfully be entitled to consideration for mothers' allowances?

Mr. RALSTON: I understand from the chairman of the dependents' board of trustees that she is allowed $40 a month as income excluding assigned pay, without affecting her right to dependents' allowances.

Mr. QUELCH: The ruling I got from the allowance board was this: Where assigned pay is paid with dependents' allowance, the assigned pay is counted as income. When assigned pay is paid without an allowance, then it is not. I had in mind this case. The father is getting old age pension. They have three sons in the army. Each of the sons is assigning $20 a month. One of the sons gets dependents' allowance for his mother. That gives her a total income, assigned pay of one soldier plus dependent's allowance of $540. She is allowed only $365; therefore, the old age pension is reduced by the difference between $365 and $540. That is different from the attitude taken in the War Veterans' Allowance Act. Under that act the board do not take into consideration assigned pay. This woman is investing the total amount of the assigned pay in bonds in the names of her sons, so that they will have that money on their return. I think in that case the assigned pay should not be taken into consideration at all. The dependents' allowance only should be taken into consideration; then there would be no need to reduce the amount of the old age pension. I do not think the assigned pay should be taken into consideration when it is being invested in bonds for the sons on their return.

Mr. RALSTON: I note what my hon. friend has said and we shall deal with it to-morrow. If the committee is agreeable I should like to move that the committee rise and report progress.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Bradette in the chair.

Administration service—

1. Departmental administration, $130,406.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry.

Mr. CRERAR: No; let the item stand. I presume the committee will wish to discuss it somewhat more fully.

Item stands.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

(Other than War Appropriations)

Normal services—

176. Grants to military associations and institutes as detailed in the estimates, $10,575.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CRERAR: To-morrow we shall continue with the discussion of the war appropriations. Before adjournment to-morrow we shall probably ask to be allowed to put in two additional departments.

Mr. COLDWELL: Wait a minute.

Mr. CRERAR: Post Office and Pensions.

Mr. GRAYDON: What do you want two more for now?

Mr. CRERAR: In case some minister may not be present.

Mr. COLDWELL: We have two departments in to-night in the last five minutes. After all, members of the house have few opportunities of raising matters concerning their constituencies, and it seems to me to get the departments in, in this way, as was done last year, and then call the remainder in the last few days of the session, is unfair to the members, and I object to putting too many departments in supply at this stage. We have two in now and that should be sufficient to give us work on Fridays.

Mr. CRERAR: I think the Prime Minister indicated this afternoon that we hope to get the estimates discussed on Fridays.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is right.

Mr. CRERAR: We have only two departments in. It might happen that the ministers of these departments could not be present. I do not think we are infringing on the good nature of the house by asking to be allowed to put in two additional departments to-morrow afternoon.

Mr. COLDWELL: If that is the case these departments should not be brought in during the last two or three minutes at night, but early in the day; otherwise we shall be compelled to raise some matter and block the going into supply of so many of the departments.

Mr. CRERAR: That is a matter which my hon. friend can bring up to-morrow if he wishes. This is the procedure which has been followed in the past, and I draw the attention of my hon. friend to the fact that there is still a very considerable number of departments to be brought in, as my hon. friend knows.

Mr. COLDWELL: We were told that last year, and at the end of the session all of the departments went in at once and we had not an opportunity to do the things we wanted to do. Moreover, we have no private members' days this year.

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

Wednesday, February 16, 1944

The house met at three o'clock.

ROYAL CANADIAN AIR FORCE

BRITISH COMMONWEALTH AIR TRAINING PLAN—GENERAL POLICIES—DEMOBILIZATION PROBLEMS

Hon. C. G. POWER (Minister of National Defence for Air): Mr. Speaker, as promised last week, I have a statement to make regarding the discussions which have taken place in connection with the British commonwealth air training.

Representatives of the Canadian and United Kingdom governments have been discussing matters of common interest to the R.C.A.F. and the R.A.F. in their overseas relations, and in connection with the British commonwealth air training plan.

The United Kingdom was represented by Captain the Right Hon. Harold H. Balfour, Under-Secretary of State for Air, and Air Marshal Sir Peter Drummond. Canada was represented by myself, Air Marshal Robert Leckie and staff officers.

Members of the R.C.A.F. are not only serving in Britain and elsewhere in Canadian squadrons, but also in their thousands are attached temporarily to the R.A.F. squadrons, detachments, units and formations, widely dispersed throughout the world.

It is inevitable that innumerable questions arise concerning the welfare, careers and conditions of service of these Canadians attached to another force and for the time being serving under commanders other than Canadians. The R.C.A.F., which recruited and trained them, is responsible at all times to the people of Canada for their welfare and future prospects.

Such matters as length of service with R.A.F., commissions, promotions, operational and non-operational tours, and leave to Canada, vitally concern not only these boys, but also their parents, dependents and friends in Canada.

From time to time adjustments must be made, and the Department of National Defence for Air, either directly or through the Canadian air officer commanding-in-chief, overseas, in conjunction with the United Kingdom air ministry, discusses and formulates the general policies which are to be followed by both forces in dealing with these important and sometimes difficult problems.

The basic agreements made between the two governments in 1939 and 1942 have been modified and amended where necessary and certain understandings have been reached which confer on us a larger measure of responsibility for our own personnel.

The policies laid down in the agreement of June 1942 have not been materially altered, but there has been clarification on some points, as well as modification of administrative procedure. The amendments to the agreements of June 1942 are tabled herewith.

Long and tough fighting lies ahead before the war is won. But we must be ready with plans for demobilization, repatriation and rehabilitation well in advance. Our problems in this

connection are greatly accentuated because by far the largest numbers of our aircrews are serving with the R.A.F. in distant and varied theatres of war. It must be and is a matter of primary concern to the government to ensure that these men are not placed in an unfavourable position by reason of their service in the R.A.F., or in any way handicapped as compared with men in the other Canadian services, or with their air force comrades at home. All our men must be given the same opportunities with regard to priorities in demobilization, repatriation and rehabilitation, and whilst demobilization procedure and related questions must fundamentally be the problem of each country to be dealt with in the light of the interests of its own economy and its own nationals, it is essential that our plans be closely correlated with those of the United Kingdom in order to give these benefits and advantages to our personnel when their service abroad is no longer required. To this end, it has been agreed that a joint committee of air force representatives of both countries will be established with headquarters in London, to discuss these problems, to exchange views and to advise their ministers. It has already been agreed that arrangements which have been made either by the United Kingdom or Canada for pre-demobilization, educational and vocational training shall be available to the nationals of both countries on a reciprocal basis.

Finally, a matter which, though not connected with the air training plan or its graduates but which is of considerable interest to Canadians, was also considered—that of the transfer from the R.A.F. of certain Canadian nationals who had joined that service prior to and during the early stages of the war. In this connection it has been agreed with the United Kingdom representatives that such officers and men may apply for transfer to the R.C.A.F. Certain Canadian-born women not normally domiciled in the United Kingdom who joined the Women's Auxiliary Air Force of the R.A.F. will also be eligible to apply for transfer.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): May I ask a question at that point? Take the case of young officers in the R.A.F.—

Mr. POWER: I would prefer to complete my statement first.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am sorry that I have to leave the house in a moment. Will these officers be transferred on the same basis as their present status?

Mr. POWER: My hon. friend will have to wait until the regulations with respect to transfer are issued.

Besides these personnel matters, consideration was given to the overall capacity of the training organization in Canada which is administered by Canada on behalf of the partners of the British Commonwealth air training plan. The air training plan will continue as long as the war lasts.

During the three years which followed the signing of the plan agreement in 1939, the principal preoccupation of Canada and the other partners was to create a training organization on which could be built fighting air forces equal in size and superior in quality to those of the enemy. Today, in the beginning of 1944, it can be said that this objective has been reached, and we have increasing air superiority over the enemy in every theatre of war. This superiority is evident in the sky-fronts of the operational theatres over land and sea. Not so evident, but behind the front line squadrons, there are thousands of aircrew being put through operational training units and conversion units, and farther back again there are tens of thousands of young aircrew going through the training schools of the British Commonwealth air training plan in Canada and in similar schools in other parts of the world.

In other words, the personnel necessary to fill squadrons, units and formations planned for the front line are already in the pipeline feeding the air forces of the United Kingdom, the commonwealth and the allies serving under the strategic direction and tactical command of the Royal Air Force. At the present time we have the capital and the necessary immediate replacements.

Our long-term war plans entail certain reductions in the numbers of entrants to aircrew training. The current entrants into training will not in fact engage the enemy for a comparatively long time. This is largely because of the increased complexity of modern aircraft requiring lengthy training over an ever widening range of subjects. The young man who fights in the air in the future will not do so until he has had more flying hours during training than ever before. In a sentence, the standards of skill required and the opportunities for obtaining experience have progressively increased since the beginning of the war.

Consequent upon the reduction in intake of trainees, there will be a gradual and progressive closing of a certain number of training units, and schools in Canada, beginning with the

R.A.F. transferred schools. The process will be deliberate and extended over many months, and the reduction of training facilities will be geared to the requisite flow of pupils through the plan.

One important objective will be to utilize to the greatest possible extent the resources in skilled personnel in our training organization as they become available, for reinforcing and enlarging the operational units. As the R.A.F. schools in Canada close, the personnel will be transferred to the operational theatre in England to increase the number of skilled men available for the continued expansion of the front line of the Royal Air Force.

Numbers of R.C.A.F. air and ground crew personnel, besides the graduates, will be made available for overseas duties owing to the reduction of training capacity in Canada and also to the curtailment of western hemisphere operations due to the more favourable war situation on our coasts.

This concentration of man-power in the United Kingdom will provide close to the front line more backing to the squadrons now actively engaged or required for forthcoming operations and renders more effective the impact of both the R.A.F. and the R.C.A.F. on the enemy during this critical year of the war.

WAR EXPENDITURES

MOTION FOR CONSIDERATION THIS SESSION OF THIRD REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That the third report of the special committee on war expenditures, presented to the house on the 26th of January, 1944, be considered by the house during the present session of parliament.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): Does that include reports of all the subcommittees?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The third report.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

WHEAT ACREAGE REDUCTION—RYE AND GRASS CLAIMS

Mr. ROSS (Souris):

1. What is the total amount paid on 1943 rye and grass claims under W.A.R.A., as at January 1, 1944?
2. How many claims have been paid?
3. What is the amount paid by provinces?
4. How many claims have been paid by provinces, in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta?
5. When will the balance of claims be paid?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. The amount paid on 1943 rye and grass claims is not segregated from the amount paid on other crops or summerfallow. The total amount paid as at January 1, 1944, was $21,160,192.89.

2. 34,163 claims containing grass and rye acreages.

3. Payments on grass and rye not segregated. Total payments by provinces were: Alberta, $6,373,220.87; Saskatchewan, $11,116,650.28; Manitoba, $3,670,321.74.

4. Claims containing grass and rye acreages: Manitoba, 7,514; Saskatchewan, 19,669; Alberta, 6,980.

5. By March 15, 1944.

CANADIAN ARMY—PAY TO THE RANKS

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. Are all troopers, gunners, sappers, privates, etc., in the Canadian army, now receiving $1.50 per diem?
2. If not, on what basis are any of the above receiving less than $1.50 per diem?
3. If all troopers, gunners, sappers, privates, etc., in the Canadian army, are not receiving $1.50 per diem, what percentages are receiving lesser amounts?

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax):

1. No.

2. In order to qualify for the first increase to $1.40 per diem a soldier must have completed four months' continuous service, provided that during the period in question:

Efficiency

(a) (i) He has reached a state of efficiency which might reasonably be expected in conformity with opportunities for training available to him, has performed his duties satisfactorily, and the officer commanding his unit certifies that these conditions have been met.

Conduct

(ii) He has not forfeited pay and allowances under articles 85(2) or 149 of F.R. & I. (Canada) in excess of an amount equal to three days' pay, or

(iii) He has not been awarded fines which in the aggregate exceed an amount equal to three days' pay, or

(iv) The total of forfeitures and fines under (ii) and (iii) above is not in excess of an amount equal to three days' pay.

A soldier will be eligible for the second increase to $1.50 per diem after six months' continuous service provided:

Proficiency

(b) (i) He has attained a degree of proficiency in training applicable to his arm or corps which ought to be reached two months after receipt of the first increase and the officer commanding his unit certifies that this condition has been met.

Conduct

(ii) He fulfils the conditions as defined in sub-para. (a) (ii) (iii) or (iv) above, during the two months' period following the first increase.

3. The following are the percentages of troopers, gunners, privates, etc., who are receiving lesser amount than $1.50 per diem—as of 1st February, 1944:

	Canadian Army in Canada	Overseas
Number in receipt of $1.40 per diem	9·1%	4·5%
Number in receipt of $1.30 per diem	25·2%	5·0%

SUGAR IN STORAGE

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. What is the quantity of refined sugar stored in the city of Saint John, New Brunswick?

2. Of the above, what quantity is stored in the Crosby warehouse; what quantity in the Belgian warehouse?

3. How long has the sugar been in storage?

4. Has any of the sugar been lost or damaged?

5. If so, how much was lost or damaged, and why?

6. What is the quantity of refined sugar stored in other warehouses in Canada?

7. What is the quantity of raw sugar stored in warehouses in Saint John, New Brunswick?

8. What is the quantity of raw sugar stored in warehouses in Canada?

Mr. ABBOTT:

1, 6, 7 and 8. There are no stocks of sugar owned by the government stored in Saint John, New Brunswick, or in any other warehouses in Canada.

2, 3, 4 and 5. The sugar administrator purchases and arranges transportation for all sugar imported and sells it to refiners on arrival. Whereas he does obtain regular reports regarding refiners' holdings of raw and refined sugar, he has no information regarding wholesalers' and retailers' stocks.

For security reasons, it is not considered in the public interest to publish information regarding stocks of an imported commodity like sugar, on the basis of which it might be possible for the enemy to draw inferences regarding the movement of ships on the high seas. Stocks vary considerably from day to day, and release of the figures for any particular date might also lead to unwarranted and undesirable speculation as to changes in consumer rations.

STORAGE OF GRAIN

Mr. PERLEY:

1. What is the total amount paid by the Canadian wheat board for storage on grain, (a) in interior elevators; (b) in terminal elevators, for the crop year 1942-1943 and 1943-1944, to date?

2. How much was paid to each company or firm?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West):

1. Total amount paid and accrued for storage on grain in terminal elevators for season 1942-43—$6,233,418.30. (Figures showing split of this total between interior terminal elevators and other terminals are not available.)

Terminal storage paid to 31st January, 1944, for season 1943-44—$627,480.81. (This figure does not contain any accrued storage and split between interior terminal elevators and other terminals is not available.)

2. The amounts paid to each company or firm are not readily available. No useful purpose would be served, as far as the wheat board is concerned, by keeping this information by companies. To obtain the required data would necessitate an exhaustive reanalysis of the year's operations. The comptroller's department is already overburdened in its endeavour to issue the participation certificates as soon as possible.

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

Mr. PERLEY:

1. How many are at present employed in the Canadian wheat board offices in Winnipeg, Manitoba?

2. How many outside inspectors or field-men are employed?

3. What is the present salary of each of these inspectors or field-men, and what was the former occupation of each?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West):

1. 392.

2. 14.

3. $175 per month plus cost of living bonus. Former occupations—country elevator operators, travellers and accountants, with one exception who was employed in the Manitoba forestry branch, and as farm supervisor.

PERSONNEL RECRUITED IN ONTARIO FOR QUEBEC REGIMENT SENT TO HONG KONG

Mr. WHITE:

How many recruits, if any, were recruited in Ontario for the Quebec Regiment, sent to Quebec, and later sent to Hong Kong?

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax): No recruits were recruited in Ontario for the Quebec Regiment (Royal Rifles of Canada), sent to Quebec and later sent to Hong Kong. However, 50 men from the Midland Regiment, Ontario, and 104 men from Camp Borden, Ontario, were transferred to the Royal Rifles of Canada. These men were not sent to Quebec but joined the Royal Rifles of Canada on its way to Hong Kong at North Bay, Ontario.

KINGSBURY-RICHMOND, QUE., POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. CARDIFF:

1. What is the name of the person who holds the contract for the delivery of mail from Kingsbury post office, Quebec, to Richmond, Quebec?
2. How long has the present holder been in possession of this contract?
3. Were tenders called for before this contract was awarded to its present holder? If not, why were they not called for?
4. Has the price for the contract been increased during the term of office of the present holder?

Mr. MULOCK:

1. Eric Malboeuf.
2. Since the 1st September, 1942.
3. No. Eric Malboeuf secured the contract through a regular transfer from Emile Felix Malboeuf, the latter having obtained the contract, dating from the 1st November, 1940, following the invitation of public tenders.
4. No.

RATIONING—MAPLE SUGAR AND MAPLE SYRUP

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. Is the government giving consideration to allowing a ration free distribution of maple sugar and maple syrup?
2. If not, what provision is being made to keep the farmers in maple sugar and maple syrup production?

Mr. ABBOTT:

1. No.

2. As a result of numerous discussions with representatives of the maple sugar and maple syrup producers, the following arrangements have been made with a view to keeping the farmers in production.

(a) Effective February 3, the coupon value of maple sugar was raised from one-half pound to 2 pounds, this coupon value to be effective throughout the year;

[Mr. J. A. MacKinnon.]

(b) During the period February 3 to May 31, 1944, one preserves coupon will purchase 40 fluid ounces of maple syrup, the coupon value reverting to 24 fluid ounces beginning June 1.

The increased coupon value for maple syrup during the period February to May is designed to result in as little interference as possible with producers' normal marketing methods during the period in which the majority of direct producer-consumer sales takes place. Producers will still be able to sell to consumers in gallon containers (1 gallon will cost only 4 coupons), and this type of sale has been further facilitated by advancing the validity date of "D" coupon 16 from March 30 to March 2, so that three "D" coupons will become valid on March 2. In addition, special arrangements have been made under the ration programme for mail order sales, which account for an important part of the production of many producers

GRANITE BAY, B.C., POSTMASTERSHIP

Mr. STOKES:

1. Who is the present postmaster at Granite Bay, British Columbia?
2. When was he appointed to that position?
3. Who held the position just prior to the present postmaster?
4. Why were his services dispensed with?

Mr. MULOCK:

1. Henry John Bull.
2. 24th March, 1930.
3. Mrs. Florence Bull.
4. Resignation of Mrs. Bull.

VETERANS' LAND ACT—ALBERTA

Mr. SHAW:

1. Have any veterans or discharged men been settled under the Veterans' Land Act in the province of Alberta?
2. Has any land been purchased in Alberta to be used for the settlement of veterans under the Veterans' Land Act?
3. Is it the intention of the government to purchase large farms and place more than one settler on each such farm?
4. Have any purchases for the purpose of the type of settlement referred to in question three been made to date?

Mr. CRERAR:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. No.
4. No.

MEAT BOARD

Mr. SENN:

1. Is the meat board set up under the provisions of order in council P.C. 4187 still in existence?

2. If so, who are its members?

3. Does the board exercise the power conferred upon it by section 4, subsection 1-C of the above mentioned order in council "to determine the prices which shall be paid to packers or other persons for meat delivered for export"?

4. Does the board exercise the power conferred upon it by section 4, subsection 1-E of the above mentioned order in council "to fix the minimum price to be paid by packers or other persons for live stock"?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. Yes.

2. Hon. J. G. Taggart, Minister of Agriculture, Saskatchewan, Chairman; S. E. Todd, Managing Director, Industrial and Development Council of Canadian Meat Packers; A. Morin, Associate Deputy Minister, Department of Agriculture, Quebec; L. C. McOuat, General Agricultural Agent, Canadian Pacific Railway.

3. Yes, for the various classes and grades of meat within the agreements entered into by the governments.

4. The meat board have never yet deemed it advisable to fix minimum prices for live stock. The board has, however, considered it a primary responsibility to ensure that prices paid to farmers for livestock have been at least equivalent to the prices received by the packers for export product.

Mr. BLACKMORE:

1. Who are the members of the meat board?

2. To what minister are they responsible?

3. Is it a responsibility of the meat board to purchase from the beef producers the surpluses of beef which might threaten to depress beef prices to the producers?

4. If so, what classes or grades of beef were purchased by the meat board during the months of December, 1943, and January, 1944, and how much of each grade in each month?

5. What grades of beef were not purchased by the said board during each of those two months, and why?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. Hon. J. G. Taggart, Minister of Agriculture, Saskatchewan, Chairman; S. E. Todd, Managing Director, Industrial and Development Council of Canadian Meat Packers; A. Morin, Associate Deputy Minister, Department of Agriculture, Quebec; L. C. McOuat, General Agricultural Agent, Canadian Pacific Railway.

2. The Minister of Agriculture.

3. The meat board stands ready to buy surplus beef at the equivalent of floor prices when it is processed and shipped in accordance with specifications for export.

4. During December, 1943, 459,466 pounds of cow quality carcass beef were delivered to the meat board. During January, 1944, 2,048,543 pounds of cow quality carcass beef were delivered to the meat board.

5. No qualities other than "cow" were purchased by the board, this being all the beef offered to the board in exportable form for shipment during those months.

PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. ESLING:

1. What was the total amount of the funded debt of Canada and the unmatured treasury bills as at March 31, 1943?

2. What was the net amount added to this by the two victory loans in 1943 and by new treasury bills?

3. What is the total amount of the public debt of the nine provinces of Canada?

4. What is the total amount of the debts owing to the public by Canadian municipalities?

5. What proportion of the public debt of each—federal, provincial and municipal—is owing in Canada and what proportion abroad?

Mr. ABBOTT:

1. Unmatured funded debt and treasury bills of the Dominion of Canada at March 31, 1943—$7,893,478,422.96.

2. Cash subscriptions—

Fourth victory loan	$1,308,716,650
Fifth victory loan (preliminary)	$1,383,300,000
Increase in amount of treasury bills outstanding	$ 30,000,000
Decrease in amount of deposit certificates outstanding	$ 105,000,000

3. The Bank of Canada Statistical Summary estimated that the direct debt (less sinking funds) of the provinces for the fiscal year-ends nearest to December 31, 1942, was $1,892,400,000.

4. The Bank of Canada Statistical Summary estimated that the total outstanding bonded debt and bank loans of Canadian municipalities for the fiscal year-ends nearest to December 31, 1942, was $989,800,000.

5. Due to the fact that a great part of these securities is in bearer form, it is not possible to state acurately what proportion of the public debt is held in Canada and what proportion is held abroad.

CIVIL AVIATION POLICY—EMPIRE CONFERENCE

Mr. ESLING:

In view of the Prime Minister's announcement that the air policy of Canada was government control of international and transcontinental air lines, has the government considered any change of such policy as a result of the empire conference on air policy as participated in by Hon. C. D. Howe, and the president of the T.C.A.?

Mr. HOWE: No.

EMBARGO ON IMPORTATION OF MATERIALS CONTAINING RUBBER

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Did the government place an embargo on the importation from the United Kingdom of all marine packing, jointing and insulations containing rubber used by war industries and ships?

2. Are goods of this kind manufactured in Canada of a sufficiently high standard to meet marine requirements?

3. Have manufacturers in the United Kingdom of these materials stocks available for shipment to Canada?

4. If such embargo was imposed, why was it imposed?

Mr. CHEVRIER:

1. No.

2. Yes.

3. No information.

4. Answered by No. 1.

RADIO STATION CFAR, FLIN FLON

Mr. NICHOLSON:

1. What is the name of the company which owns and operates radio station CFAR at Flin Flon, Manitoba?

2. What are the names and occupations of the directors?

Mr. HOWE:

1. Arctic Radio Corporation, Ltd.

2. President, Geo. W. Bridgman, lumber merchant, Craigflower Auto Court, Victoria, B.C.

Secretary, Joseph R. Cousineau, mechanic, McLeod, Alta.

Directors, Geo. W. Bridgman, Victoria, B.C.; Lily Bridgman (occupation and address not given); J. M. Bridgman, radio engineer, Flin Flon, Man.

SELECTIVE SERVICE AND UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE—TORONTO OFFICES

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's):

1. How many local selective service and unemployment insurance offices are there in the city of Toronto?

2. Where are they located?

3. What is the grade of each of these offices?

4. What are the names, positions and home addresses of each of the employees of each of these offices?

5. What are the salaries and other remuneration of each of these employees?

Mr. MARTIN:

1. One.

2. Three branches of the local office: (a) men's division, 174 Spadina Ave.; (b) women's division, 832 Bay St.; (c) sub-office, 2854 Dundas St. W.

3. Grade 7.

4 and 5.

[Mr. Howe.]

Name—Classification—Home Address—Salary

Temple, J. W., Mgr., E. & C.O., grade 7, 44 Rochester Ave., $3,600 plus $420 WDS.

Buckley, G. A., Asst. Mgr., E. & C.O., grade 7, 64 Eastbourne Crst., Mimico, $3,000 plus $300 WDS.

Stevenson, R., Sup. Staff Tr., grade 1, 147 Highbourne Rd., $2,400.

Ord, G. L., E. & C.O., grade 5, 138 Jackson St. W., $2,640.

Collins, G. S., E. & C.O., grade 6, 22 Rowanwood Ave., $2,700.

Eadie, M., Employment adviser, 6 St. Thomas St., Apt. 42, $3,000.

Brownell, E., E. & C.O., grade 3, 50 Rathnelly Ave., $1,800.

Boyd, J. A., E. & C.O., grade 4, 63 Tilson Rd., $2,100.

Murphy, D. F., E. & C.O., grade 3, 425 Jarvis St., $1,800.

Renwick, J. W., E. & C.O., grade 5, 398 Strathmore Blvd., $2,400.

Butt, F. C., E. & C.O., grade 4, 67 Orchard Park Blvd., $2,100.

Burgess, M., E. & C.O., grade 4, 41 Glenrose Ave., $2,100.

Weir, J. W., E & C.O., grade 3, 38 King St., Weston, $2,100.

McCaul, R. M., E. & C.O., grade 4, 15 Trellis Drive, $1,800.

Trent, R. O., E. & C.O., grade 3, 218 Poplar Plains Rd., $1,800.

Johnston, E., E. & C.O., grade 2, 230 Glenrose Ave., $1,500.

Shaw, S. J., E. & C.O., grade 3, 86 Runnymede Rd., $2,040.

Symon, C. A., E. & C.O., grade 3, 41 Buchan Ave., $1,920.

Conlon, H., E. & C.O., grade 4, 1 Seneca Ave., $2,100.

Fix, M., E. & C.O., grade 4, R.R. No. 1, Port Credit, $2,100.

Burr, A. E., E. & C.O., grade 3, 425 Dufferin St., $1,800.

Marsh, N. F., E. & C.O., grade 3, 53 Hillsview Ave., $1,800.

Ayres, E. M., E. & C.O., grade 4, 15 Belford Ave., $2,100.

Bradley, Y. W. R., E. & C.O., grade 4, 439 Sherbourne St., $1,800.

Blanchard, R. B., E. & C.O., grade 3, 252 Salem Ave., $1,920.

T. H. Nash, E. & C.O., grade 3, 209 Victor Ave., $2,100.

Duncan, W. N., E. & C.O., grade 3, 165 Neville Park Blvd., $1,920.

Atkinson, H., E. & C.O., grade 3, 301 Avenue Rd., $1,800.

Kennedy, L. O. R., E. & C.O., grade 3, 33 Parkside Drive, $1,800.

Keys, M. E., E. & C.O., grade 3, 16 St. Joseph St., $1,800.

Murray, R. C., E. & C.O., grade 3, 538 Brunswick Ave., $1,800.

Paul, H. H. W., E. & C.O., grade 2, 71 Indian Rd. Cres., $1,500.

J. I. Morgan, E. & C.O., grade 3, 8 High Park Ave., Apt. 11, Toronto, $1,800.

B. C. Banks, E. & C.O., grade 3, 1550 Bathurst St., $1,800.

E. Leitch, E. & C.O., grade 1, 200 St. Clair W., $1,200.

M. B. Cameron, E. & C.O., grade 2, 20 Larkin Ave., Swansea, $1,500.

W. Johnstone, E. & C.O., grade 2, 173 Westmoreland Ave., $1,500.

Name—Classification—Home Address—Salary

G. H. Lyons, E. & C.O., grade 2, 320 Roncesvalles Ave., $1,500.

H. C. Brown, E. & C.O., grade 3, 79 Bond St., Lindsay, $1,800.

E. J. Clougher, E. & C.O., grade 3, 597 Huron St., $1,800.

J. W. Kenmore, E. & C.O., grade 2, 14 Alberta Ave., $1,500.

T. Jackson, E. & C.O., grade 3, 9 Mountnoel Ave., $1,920.

H. Spencer, E. & C.O., grade 3, 32 Sorauren Ave., $1,800.

P. S. Wood, E. & C.O., grade 3, 35 Aldridge Ave., $1,800.

B. E. Stubbs, E. & C.O., grade 3, 48 Maxwell Ave., $1,800.

M. L. Murphy, E. & C.O., grade 2, 433 Sherbourne St., $1,500.

W. S. Jackson, E. & C.O., grade 3, Scarborough P.O., $1,800.

L. A. Nicholson, E. & C.O., grade 3, 49 Cheriton Ave., $1,800.

J. E. Beaumont, E. & C.O., grade 2, 87 Dunington Drive, $1,500.

A. J. Kennedy, E. & C.O., grade 3, 93 Kennedy Ave., $1,800.

J. G. Farquharson, E. & C.O., grade 3, 87 Howard St., $1,800.

O. Dill, E. & C.O., grade 3, 137 Heath St. E., $1,800.

E. I. Acton, E. & C.O., grade 3, 164 Heath St. E., $1,800.

R. M. Walker, E. & C.O., grade 3, 2 Fulton St., $1,800.

M. C. Trimble, E. & C.O., grade 3, 26 St. Joseph St., $1,800.

A. F. Lougheed, E. & C.O., grade 3, 566 Spadina Ave., $1,800.

C. B. MacLean, E. & C.O., grade 3, 644 Christie St., $1,800.

B. Sauriol, E. & C.O., grade 3, 435 Sherbourne St., $1,800.

A. G. Galpine, E. & C.O., grade 2, 78 Grosvenor St., $1,500.

W. Pinkus, E. & C.O., grade 3, 544 Crawford St., $1,500.

G. A. Booker, E. & C.O., grade 2, 64 Wellesley St., Apt. 106, $1,500.

W. J. Burrows, E. & C.O., grade 1, 122 Brookdale Ave., $1,200.

P. A. Pink, E. & C.O., grade 2, 1031 Dufferin St., $1,500.

E. G. Gowen, E. & C.O., grade 3, 107 St. George St., $1,800.

H. J. W. Bromley, E. & C.O., grade 2, 219 Dunn Ave., $1,500.

W. R. McArthur, E. & C.O., grade 3, 696 Dufferin St., $1,800.

H. N. Day, E. & C.O., grade 2, 20 Glen Elm Ave., $1,500.

F. E. Bonwick, E. & C.O., grade 3, 20 Kenwood Ave., $1,800.

M. D. Sturgeon, E. & C.O., grade 2, 343 Cedarville Ave., $1,620.

R. S. Casburn, E. & C.O., grade 1, 121 Lamb Ave., $1,200.

D. Monie, E. & C.O., grade 2, 101 Melville Ave., $1,800.

W. R. Pitman, E. & C.O., grade 2, 43 Cambridge Ave., $1,800.

C. G. MacKay, Clerk, grade 3, 132 Blantyre Ave., $1,380.

E. L. McDonald, E. & C.O., grade 2, 34 Parkwood Ave., $1,500.

W. J. Brick, E. & C.O., grade 2, 559 Sherbourne Ave., $1,500.

Name—Classification—Home Address—Salary

J. Scouse, E. & C.O., grade 1, 19 Wheeler Ave., $1,200.

E. J. I. Orchard, E. & C.O., grade 1, 31 Madison Ave., $1,200.

M. O'Brian, E. & C.O., grade 2, 250 Heath St. W., $1,500.

S. G. Jones, E. & C.O., grade 1, 258 Winona Drive, $1,320.

F. White, E. & C.O., grade 2, 130 Glendale Ave., $1,620.

A. M. Ridley, Clerk, grade 3, 2 Bracebridge Ave., $1,440.

F. Campbell, E. & C.O., grade 2, 321 Lonsdale Rd. Apt. D, $1,500.

M. B. Walsh, E. & C.O., grade 2, 415 Walmer Rd., $1,620.

E. R. Gregory, E. & C.O., grade 2, 241 Silverbirch Ave., $1,620.

W. D. Dougherty, E. & C.O., grade 1, 387 Sherbourne St. Apt. 205, $1,200.

J. J. Monahan, E. & C.O., grade 1, 192 Rushton Road, $1,200.

M. G. Chambers, E. & C.O., grade 1, 8 Silverbirch Ave., $1,200.

M. A. Charbonneau, Clerk, grade 3, 57 Howland Ave., $1,380.

A. J. Sloane, E. & C.O., grade 1, 370 Concord Ave., $1,320.

M. E. Roberts, E. & C.O., grade 1, 921 St. Clair Ave. W., $1,320.

F. E. Fenton, E. & C.O., grade 1, 11 Mount Noel Ave., $1,200.

L. J. Jacob, E. & C.O., grade 1, 354 Russell Hill Rd., $1,200.

R. M. Gray, E. & C.O., grade 1, 64 Strathallan Blvd., $1,320.

H. D. Skelton, E. & C.O., grade 1, 261 Vaughan Rd. Apt. 30, $1,500.

L. H. Stinson, E. & C.O., grade 1, 151 Glenholme Ave., $1,320.

E. R. Rooney, E. & C.O., grade 2, 97 Durie St., Toronto, $1,620.

B. E. Marcoux, E. & C.O., grade 1, 88 Coody Ave., $1,200.

W. Van Ark, E. & C.O., grade 2, 241 Albany St., $1,500.

H. W. Cheevers, E. & C.O., grade 2, 18 Freeman St., Toronto, $1,500.

J. E. Burch, E. & C.O., grade 1, 55 Lakeview, Apt. 2, $1,320.

G. W. Wiggins, E. & C.O., grade 2, 91 Oakwood Ave., $1,500.

F. J. Kelly, E. & C.O., grade 1, 61½ Waverley Rd., $1,600.

A. Plenty, E. & C.O., grade 2, 845 College St., $1,500.

D. Stepler, E. & C.O., grade 2, Meadonia Hotel, 252 Bloor St. W., $1,500.

H. Davidson, E. & C.O., grade 2, 124 Erskin Ave., $1,500.

S. R. Sprung, E. & C.O., grade 2, 76 Woolfrey Ave., $1,500.

J. A. Delahay, E. & C.O., grade 2, 238 Maplewood Ave., $1,500.

T. Hannaford, E. & C.O., grade 2, 266 Greenwood Ave., $1,500.

R. M. Brown, E. & C.O., grade 2, 2437 Queen St. E., $1,500.

B. Smith, E. & C.O., grade 2, 599 St. Clair St. W., $1,500.

M. E. Stone, E. & C.O., grade 2, 79 Lippincott St., $1,500.

W. A. Henderson, E. & C.O., grade 2, 71 Sheldrake Blvd., $1,500.

M. F. Rogers, E. & C.O., grade 1, 62 Appleton Ave., $1,320.

Name—Classification—Home Address—Salary

C. I. O'Reilly, E. & C.O., grade 2, 118 Queensbury Ave., $1,500.

R. Fawcett, E. & C.O., grade 2, 52 St. Nicholas St., $1,500.

M. Salyerds, E. & C.O., grade 1, 433 Sherbourne St., $1,200.

M. F. Speers, Steno., grade 2, 849 Bloor St. W., $1,140.

K. M. Waddington, E. & C.O., grade 1, 160 Kingston Rd., $1,200.

E. Henning, E. & C.O., grade 1, 327 Woodfield Rd., $1,200.

A. L. McCutcheon, E. & C.O., grade 1, 95 Kirknewton, $1,200.

S. G. Sharkey, E. & C.O., grade 1, 717 Eglinton Ave. W., $1,200.

P. C. Watson, E. & C.O., grade 1, 247 Manor Road E., $1,200.

M. B. McCausland, E. & C.O., grade 1, 10A Gormley Ave., $1,200.

H. K. Farquharson, E. & C.O., grade 1, 229 Russell Hill Rd., $1,200.

L. Connolly, E. & C.O., grade 1, 148 Bloor St. W., $1,200.

J. E. Clancy, E. & C.O., grade 1, 405A Roncesvalles Ave., $1,200.

J. Sherriff, E. & C.O., grade 1, 166 Millwood Rd., $1,200.

C. Grant, E. & C.O. grade 1, 1 Brookdale Ave., apt. 4, $1.320.

D. C. McLachlan, E. & C.O. grade 1, 115 Fermanagh Ave., $1,200.

E. Carr, E. & C.O. grade 1, 27B Rosehill Ave., $1,200.

R. Boyle, Clerk, grade 1, 307 Castlefield Ave., $780.

J. H. Corbeille, Clerk, grade 2, 72 Hastings Ave., $1.140.

J. M. Stevenson, E. & C.O. grade 1, 50 Briar Hill Ave., $1,200.

E. A. Ferguson, E. & C.O. grade 1, 46 Glen Road, $1,200.

S. Campbell, E. & C.O. grade 1, 23 Pavler Cres., $1,200.

R. J. McCoy, Clerk, grade 2, 116 Lyall Ave., $1,080.

T. Kelly, E. & C.O. grade 1, 573A Vaughan Road, $1,200.

T. B. O'Donnell, E. & C.O. grade 1, 66 Niagara Street, $1,200.

C. Sanford, E. & C.O. grade 1, 55 Massey Street, $1,200.

D. Scantlebury, E. & C.O. grade 1, 589 Markham Street, $1,200.

M. E. Mulholland, E. & C.O. grade 1, 99 Belhaven Road, $1,200.

R. C. Crosdale, Principal clerk, 137 Waverley Road, $1,920.

J. McGregor, Head clerk, 554 Millwood Road, $2,520.

P. Clodman, Clerk, grade 4, 38 Barton St., apt. 18, $1,620.

W. Bagnato, Clerk, grade 4, 1014 Briar Hill Ave., $1,620.

J. J. McCabe, Clerk, grade 3, 142 Northcliffe Blvd., $1,380.

B. Hahl, Clerk, grade 3, 33 Deer Park Crescent, $1,440.

F. Berrin, Stenographer, grade 2, 164 Robert Street. $1,080.

F. W. McGregor, Clerk, grade 3, 959 Broadview Ave., $1,620.

J. H. Willett, Clerk, grade 3, 16 Doris Street, Lansing, Ontario, $1,440.

E. H. Carr, Clerk, grade 3, 18 Ferrier Ave., $1,380.

[Mr. Martin.]

Name—Classification—Home Address—Salary

C. A. L. Mintram, Clerk, grade 3, 154 Pacific Ave., $1,440.

F. M. McGregor, Clerk, grade 3, 897 Avenue Road, $1,380.

H. M. Pitts, Clerk, grade 3, 30 Lansdale Road, $1,380.

D. Elsam, Clerk, grade 2, 95 Heath Street E., $1,080.

E. Dowd, Clerk, grade 2, 561 Jarvis Street, $1,140.

H. H. Graham, E. & C.O. grade 2, 114 Malvern Ave., $1,620.

W. B. Major, E. & C.O. grade 2, 408 Roehampton Ave., $1,500.

W. D. S. Fraser, E. & C.O. grade 2, 84 College Street, $1,620.

W. G. Evans, E. & C.O. grade 2, 202 Oakmount Rd., $1,620.

F. L. Wright, E. & C.O. grade 1, 137 Madison Ave., $1,320.

F. M. Wright, E. & C.O., grade 2, 61 Albany Ave., $1,620.

M. M. Clelland, E. & C.O. grade 2, 103 Glendale Ave., $1,500.

N. E. Graham, E. & C.O. grade 2, 870 Millwood Rd., $1,500.

H. M. Loree, E. & C.O. grade 1, 524 Perth Ave., $1,320.

Geo. Harrington, Clerk, grade 3, 74 Chester Ave., $1,440.

E. E. Bowyer, Stenographer, grade 2, 41 Brunswick Ave., $1,080.

R. C. Hill, E. & C.O. grade 1, 1067 St. Clemens Ave., $1,320.

Alpha Ruffell, Clerk, grade 2, 20 Preston St., Birchcliffe, $1,080.

E. F. Hull, E. & C.O. grade 1, 163 Humbercrest Blvd., $1,200.

L. E. Cawthorpe, E. & C.O. grade 1, 57 Kendal Ave., $1,200.

J. Sorton, E. & C.O. grade 1, 82 Lawlor Ave., $1,800.

M. M. Clark, E. & C.O. grade 1, 44 Foxbar Rd., $1,200.

M. L. Burke, E. & C.O. grade 1, 303 Russell Hill Rd., $1,200.

F. Lunan, Clerk, grade 1, 318 Milverton Blvd., $840.

E. Tompkins, E. & C.O. grade 1, 120 Bloor St. E., $1,500.

G. Morgan, E. & C.O. grade 1, 77 Winchester St., apt. 8, $1,200.

A. Whitten, E. & C.O. grade 1, 32 Queen St. E., $1,200.

H. O. Martin, E. & C.O. grade 1, 77 Wellesley St., $1,200.

M. F. Carey, Clerk, grade 1, 14 Glen Morris, $780.

R. J. David, E. & C.O. grade 1, 227 Quebec Ave., $1,320.

D. Wylie, E. & C.O. grade 1, 11 Kendal Ave., $1,200.

A. Steele, E. & C.O. grade 1, 173 Nairn Ave., $1,200.

B. R. Bromley, E. & C.O. grade 1, 68 Goodwood Ave., $1,200.

M. C. Langford, E. & C.O. grade 1, 48 Maxwell Ave., $1,200.

M. M. Brady, E. & C.O. grade 1, 439 Sherbourne St., $1,200.

G. O. Lodder, Clerk, grade 2, 119 Woodfield Rd., $1,140.

F. Ware, Clerk, grade 1, 302 Windermere Ave., $720.

E. M. McFarland, E. & C.O. grade 1, 24 Beachview Crescent, $1,200.

Name—Classification—Home Address—Salary

B .M. P. Shearer, E. & C.O. grade 1, 126 Yorkville Ave., $1,320.

A. E. Atkinson, E. & C.O. grade 1, 265 Dewhurst Blvd., $1,200.

H. J. Denton, E. & C.O., grade 1, 477 Bayview Ave., $1,320.

E. Prince, Clerk, grade 1, 547 Roxton Rd., $720.

E. D. Farr, E. & C.O., grade 1, 148 Hampton Ave., $1,200.

B. Normandy, E. & C.O., grade 1, 102 Tyndall Ave., $1,200.

J. P. Hagerman, E. & C.O., grade 1, 5 Early St., $1,200.

T. J. Caffrey, E. & C.O., grade 1, 339 Gladstone Ave., $1,200.

E. L. Williamson, Clerk, grade 2, 270 Logan Ave., $1,140.

F. R. Thomson, E. & C.O., grade 1, 273 Runnymede Rd., $1,200.

M. Hobson, Clerk, grade 2, 214 Westwood Ave., $1,080.

S. M. Simonoff, E. & C.O., grade 1, 518 Markham St., $1,320.

V. Moore, E. & C.O., grade 1, 43 Warren Rd., $1,200.

J. A. Villeneuve, Clerk, grade 2, 137 Lee Ave., $1,500.

R. S. Thornton, Clerk, grade 2, 9 Humewood Drive, apt. 6, $1,080.

D. Dalton, Clerk, grade 1A, 255 Keele St., $960.

T. J. Cassidy, Clerk, grade 2, 22 Grosvenor St., $1,200.

G. Scolnick, Clerk, grade 2, 34 Glenholme Ave., $1,080.

R. Davids, Clerk, grade 2, 336 Sheldrake Blvd., $1,500.

D. M. Pidgeon, Clerk, grade 1A, 82 Birchmount Rd., $900.

L. Chapple, Clerk, grade 1, 314 Lonsdale Rd., apt. 8, $780.

S. A. Beresford, Clerk, grade 2, 76 Pembroke St., $1,080.

N. Naysmith, Clerk, grade 2, 108 Rosethorn ave., $1,140

A. Dezenhouse, Clerk, grade 2, 403 Queen St. W., $840.

B. H. MacLaren, Clerk, grade 2, 294 Kennedy Ave., Belfour, $1,080.

A. T. Lawson, Clerk, grade 2, 31 Melrose Ave., $1,080.

J. Godfrey, Clerk, grade 2, 291 St. Clements Ave., $1,080.

A. M. Quinn, Steno., grade 2, 153 Hopedale Ave., $1,080.

J. J. Lynch, Clerk, grade 2, 169 Sackville St., $1,080.

M. H. Clubine, Clerk, grade 2, 81 Belsize Drive, $1,080.

M. E. Williams, Clerk, grade 2, 142 Wellesley Cres., $1,080.

E. Dods, Clerk, grade 1A, 6-38th St., Long Branch, $900.

J. Gleave, Clerk, grade 2, 35 Roslin Ave., $1,140.

E. A. Treble, Clerk, grade 2, 32 Dingwall Ave., $1,080.

P. G. Noble, Clerk, grade 2, 159 Castlefield Ave., $1,080.

W. J. French, Clerk, grade 2, 66 Brookmount Rd., $1,080.

E. Maughan, Clerk, grade 2, 33 Ascot Ave., $1,080.

F. H. Puttenham, Clerk, grade 2, 99 Leuty Ave., $1,080.

N. Corcoran, Clerk, grade 2, 59 Charles St. E. $1,140.

J. N. Cornfield, Clerk, grade 2, 52 Grenadier Rd., $1,140.

G. Ball, Clerk, grade 1, 163 Arlington Ave., $780.

B. Saunders, Clerk, grade 2, 124 Glen Rd., $1,140.

E. A. Ballantyne, Clerk, grade 2, 636 Danforth Ave., apt. 4, $1,080.

R. W. King, Clerk, grade 2, 101 Hocken Ave., $1,080.

V. N. Jimpson, Clerk, grade 1A, 265 Boon Ave., $960.

E. McMahon, Clerk, grade 2, 184 Cottingham St., $1,080.

R. P. Holstock, Clerk, grade 1A, 230 Silver Birch Ave., $900.

I. Ross, Clerk, grade 2, 387 Dundas St. W., $1,080.

W. I. Maisonneuve, Clerk, grade 2, 81 Isabella St., apt. 1, $1,080.

H. Rainnie, Clerk, grade 1, 1143 Davenport Rd., $780.

H. I. Walter, Clerk, grade 2, 1205 Bathurst St., $1,140.

L. Wellwood, Clerk, grade 2, 489 St. Germaine Ave., $1,140.

J. A. Tansley, Clerk, grade 2, 164 Cumberland St., apt. 10, $1,080.

H. Haig, Clerk, grade 2, 34 Roxborough St. E., $1,080.

M. L. Wallace, Clerk, grade 2, 528 Russell Hill Rd., $1,140.

E. Johnston, Clerk, grade 2, 84 Willow Ave., $1,080.

J. Tannack, Clerk, grade 1A, 36 Symington Ave., $900.

C. Burch, Clerk, grade 2, 43 DeForest Rd., $1,080.

I. L. Mackey, Clerk, grade 2, 91 Inglewood Drive, $1,080.

M. Cudmore, Clerk, grade 2, 1585 Dufferin St., $840.

E. M. Fleming, Clerk, grade 2, 2297 Gerrard St. E., $1,140.

I. M. Reid, Clerk, grade 1, 37 Glenview Ave., $780.

L. M. Cain, Clerk, grade 2, 601 Palmerston Ave., $1,080.

C. Bowman, Switchboard operator, grade 2, 755 Markham St., $1,020.

M. E. Wideman, Clerk, grade 2, 135 Warden Ave., $1,080.

E. Turner, Clerk, grade 2, 3015A Dundas St. W., $1,140.

H. Swift, Clerk, grade 2, 24 O'Haro Ave., $1,140.

R. W. Morrison, Clerk, grade 2, 251 Ellis Ave., $1,080.

F. Ross, Clerk, grade 2, 344 King St. W., $1,140.

E. Harrison, Clerk, grade 2, 299 Kenilworth Ave., $1,140.

A. J. Boase, Clerk, grade 1, 205 Booth Ave., $780.

J. Bannerman, Clerk, grade 1, 138 Merton St., $780.

N. Rosenfarb, Clerk, grade 1, 357 Queen St., $780.

E. F. Thompson, Clerk, grade 1, 795 Vaughan Rd., $840.

L. Thomas, Clerk, grade 1, 48 Alcina Ave., R.R. 1, York Mills, $720.

S. Lee, Clerk, grade 1, 29 Ranee Ave., $840.

Name—Classification—Home Address—Salary

V. E. Stubbert, Clerk, grade 1, 174 Sunnyside Ave., $780.

S. R. Greene, Clerk, grade 1, 548A College St., $720.

L. M. Fairbrass, Clerk, grade 1, 906 Greenwood Ave., $780.

S. Campbell, Clerk, grade 1, 238 Balliol St., $720.

M. A. Griffin, Clerk, grade 1, 207 Fern Ave., $720.

E. M. Bond, Clerk, grade 1, 138 Cumberland St., $780.

M. K. Ryan, Clerk, grade 1, 58 Rose Park Drive, $840.

E. E. Heney, Clerk, grade 1, 141 Yorkville Ave., $720.

M. F. Jones, Clerk, grade 1, 250 Oakwood Ave., Apt. 12, $720.

J. M. Sinclair, Clerk, grade 1, 109 Springhurst Ave., $720.

G. M. Williams, Clerk, grade 1, 270 Balliol St., $840.

M. G. Hutty, Clerk, grade 1, 138 Broadway Ave., $840.

E. Klein, Clerk, grade 1, 44 Isabella St., $720.

A. Cowan, Clerk, grade 1, 217 Greenwood Ave., $720.

J. Archer, Clerk, grade 1, 220 Evelyn Ave., $720.

A. Smith, Clerk, grade 1, 125 Benson Ave., $720.

W. Mountjoy, Clerk, grade 1, 7 Belhaven Rd., $780.

M. W. Lawson, Clerk, grade 1, 8 Chambers Ave., $720.

J. Nicklin, Clerk, grade 1, Y.W.C.A., 18 Elm St., $840.

B. Soltz, Clerk, grade 1, 245 Rusholme Rd., $840.

P. Allen, Clerk, grade 1, 854 Ossington Ave., $780.

R. Coburn, Clerk, grade 1, 77 Geoffrey St., $780.

G. Nield, Clerk, grade 1, 241 Dunraven Drive, $720.

E. W. Waltho, Clerk, grade 1, 140 Balliol St., $780.

J. Haynes, Clerk, grade 1, 54 Raglan Ave., $840.

F. Walford, Clerk, grade 1, 132 Caledonia Rd., $720.

J. B. Bardwell, Clerk, grade 1, 76 Hogarth Ave., $780.

F. Latten, Clerk, grade 1, 368 Indian Grove, $720.

L. Morgan, Clerk, grade 1, 28 Silverbirch Ave., $780.

J. Carter, Clerk, grade 1, 305 Dupont St., Apt. 2, $720.

A. Buckley, Clerk, grade 1, 23 Harvard Ave., $780.

O. Kertson, Clerk, grade 1, 1595 Bathurst St., $720.

I. Blue, Clerk, grade 1, 88 Galley Ave., $780.

E. Trunks, Clerk, grade 1, 595 Dovercourt Rd., $720.

P. A. Wilcock, Clerk, grade 1, 89 Salem Ave., $720.

H. E. Wells, Clerk, grade 1, 157 Swanwick Ave., $780.

M. G. Stephens, Clerk, grade 1, 232 Willow Ave., $840.

B. Youell, Clerk, grade 1, 193 Dowling Ave., $840.

I. Perry, Clerk, grade 1, 199 Elm St., $780.

[Mr. Martin.]

M. I. S. Gillies, Clerk, grade 1, 132 Rawleigh Ave., $720.

Y. Jackson, Clerk, grade 1, 480 Victoria Park Ave., $840.

D. M. Duerden, Clerk, grade 1, 78 Grosvenor St., $780.

E. V. Evans, Clerk, grade 1, 46 Avoca Ave., $780.

L. M. Watson, Clerk, grade 1, 153 Briar Hill Ave., $720.

W. Rogosingki, Clerk, grade 1, 758 Adelaide St. W., $840.

K. E. Hayford, Clerk, grade 1, 336 Woodfield Rd., $720.

L. R. McEvoy, Clerk, grade 1, 42 Blandford St., $720.

C. B. Cormack, Clerk, grade 1, 12 Cherrynook Gdns., $780.

A. Will, Clerk, grade 1, 34 Victoria Park Ave., $720.

E. Matthews, Clerk, grade 1, 16 Wallace Ave., $780.

M. Gerard, Clerk, grade 1, 54 Kalmar Ave., $720.

H. D. Laurie, Clerk, grade 1, 159 Rosemount Ave., $780.

M. W. Dixon, Clerk, grade 1, 497 St. Clair Ave., $840.

E. Dunn, Clerk, grade 1, 62 Pleasant Blvd., $840.

C. Leach, Clerk, grade 1, 43 Fairview Ave., $720.

E. C. Robertson, Clerk, grade 1, 23 Surrey Place, $720.

M. Nicoletti, Clerk, grade 1, 35 Bowden Ave., $720.

L. Quin, Clerk, grade 1, 193 Dowling Ave., $780.

H. I. E. Furlong, Clerk, grade 1, 125 Bathurst St., $720.

S. Burack, Clerk, grade 1, 275 Crawford St., $720.

M. J. O'Bryon, Clerk, grade 1, 350 Bartlett Ave., $720.

V. Hamilton, Clerk, grade 1, 72 Pembroke St., $840.

D. Beallor, Clerk, grade 1, 9 Lippincott Ave., $720.

E. L. Baker, Clerk, grade 1, 11 Linsmore Cres., $720.

J. Lavis, Clerk, grade 1, 50 Gloucester St., $720.

L. Adams, Clerk, grade 1, 417 Kingswood Rd., $720.

R. Braithwaite, Clerk, grade 1, 24 Grange Ave., $720.

R. M. Carlisle, Clerk, grade 1, 282 Nairn Ave., $720.

G. M. Dinsmore, Clerk, grade 1, 91 Withrow Ave., $720.

E. Randle, Clerk, grade 1, 218 Keele St., $780.

A. P. Pierce, Clerk, grade 1, 66 Gledhill Ave., $720.

I. Saiger, Clerk, grade 1, 153 Holland Park Ave., $780.

G. Rappaport, Clerk, grade 1, 16 Springhurst Ave., $780.

I. Murphy, Stenographer, grade 1, 425 Jarvis St., $720.

R. H. Veal, Stenographer, grade 1, 782 Logan Ave., $720.

R. Salome, Stenographer, grade 1, 1 Eaton Ave., $840.

P. A. Lock, Switchboard operator, 76 Woodycrest Ave., $1,020.

B. B. Thompson, Switchboard operator, 145 Arlington Ave., apt. 4, $1,020.

Name—Classification—Home Address—Salary

G. E. Greenbury, Switchboard operator, 23 Avonlea Blvd., $1,020.

I. Lind, Switchboard operator, 196 Eglinton Ave. E., $1,020.

F. McKinnon, Switchboard operator, 318 Dovercourt Rd., $720.

A. R. Phillips, Switchboard operator, 957A Bloor St. W., $1,020.

J. J. Garnett, Stenographer, grade 3, 113 Walker Ave., $1,380.

M. M. Allen, Stenographer, grade 2, 1055 Logan Ave., $1,320.

C. J. Myers, Stenographer, grade 2, 316 Kenilworth Ave., $1,200.

M. E. Huntley, Stenographer, grade 2, 181 Pearson Ave., $1,140.

E. Weinbrom, Stenographer, grade 2, 95 Brunswick Ave., $1,080.

E. J. Underwood, Stenographer, grade 2, 43 Peterboro Ave., $1,080.

S. M. Foran, Stenographer, grade 2, 743 Euclid Ave., $1,080.

W. L. Carr, Stenographer, grade 1, 61 Cowan Ave., $780.

R. Zener, Stenographer, grade 2, 106 Baldwin St., $1,080.

V. Patch, Stenographer, grade 2, 141 Monarch Park Ave., $1,080.

Y. M. Weatherup, Stenographer, grade 2, 329 Brock Ave., $1,080.

I. G. Brisley, Stenographer, grade 2, 1 Glen Forest Rd., $1,080.

M. K. Cameron, Stenographer, grade 2, 42 Charles St. E., 1080.

V. N. Barrett, Steno., grade 1, 42 Blantyre Ave., $720.

Ann Miller, Steno., grade 1, 102 Glencairn Ave., $720.

R. C. Graziadei, Steno., grade 1, 193 Beatrice St., $840.

P. Goldberg, Steno., grade 1, 18 Borden St., $720.

L. V. Wilmot, Steno.. grade 1, 85 Gwynne Ave., $720.

G. Pechenick, Steno., grade 1, 38 Lippincolt St., $780.

B. L. Johnson, Steno., grade 1, 170 Clinton St., $720.

D. Wagman, Steno., grade 1, 54 Huron St., $720.

L. Worden, Steno., grade 1, 21 Durie St., $780.

W. Cox, Steno., grade 1, 32 St. Joseph St., $780.

I. G. Edmonds, Steno., grade 1, 107 Glenayr Road, $840.

E. H. Miller, Steno., grade 1, 88 Carlton St., $780.

H. D. Rappaport, Steno., grade 1, 93 Northcliffe Blvd., $780.

F. Cohen, Steno., grade 1, 224 Beatrice St., $720.

C. E. Birrell, Steno., grade 1, 204 Quebec Ave., $780.

E. Corscadden, Steno., grade 1, 45 Dearbourne Ave., $720.

P. McIntosh, Steno., grade 1, 16 Roseneath Gardens, $780.

E. C. Turnquist, Steno., grade 1, 100 Vaughan Road, Apt. 20, $800.

B. H. Austin, Steno., grade 1, 1529 Bathurst St., $780.

B. Goldman, Steno., grade 1, 354 Shaw St., $780.

Name—Classification—Home Address—Salary

M. M. Korol, Steno., grade 1, 730 Richmond St. W., $720.

M. Nicol, Steno., grade 1, 10 Jillson Ave., $780.

S. Nordstrand, Steno., grade 1, 1844 Davenport Road, $780.

G. Message, Steno., grade 1, 153 Dowling Ave., $780.

Mrs. M. Williams, Steno., grade 1, 228 Windermere Ave., $780.

U. D. Lovell, Steno., grade 1, 143 Borden St., $720.

R. Graham, Typist, grade 1, 301 Salem Ave., $720.

R. Lambie, Office boy, 237 Bartlett Ave., $600.

D. Schleiffer, Office boy, 825A College St., $600.

C. Warne, Cleaner & helper, 103 McGill St., $1,080.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

CANADIAN ARMY—OFFICERS

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West):

1. (a) How many members of the Canadian army, permanent force, enlisted prior to August 31, 1939, have been commisisoned as officers;

(b) Of those commissioned, how many now hold the ranks, acting or confirmed, of (1) captain, (2) major, (3) lt.-colonel, and (4) colonel;

(c) How many of these are serving in Canada at National Defence headquarters, district camp commands, training centres, and/or other home war establishments;

(d) How many of these are graded for pay as classified in F.R. & I. as staff or specialist officers?

2. (a) How many members of the permanent force, not holding commissions, prior to August 31, 1939, have been retired on pension as officers;

(b) How many permanent force officers commissioned since August 31, 1939, who are below medical category to proceed overseas, have been retained in the service, and why are they retained;

(c) How many in a medical category qualifying them for overseas service have been retained in Canada, and why?

3. (a) How many such officers, commisisoned as quartermasters or specialists without passing any examinations, have been granted the rank of major or higher, and on what grounds;

(b) Is it compulsory for officers in the permanent force to undergo regular medical examinations if they have less than fifteen years' service;

(c) Have any been kept in the permanent force without regular medical examinations, and if so, what number?

GENERAL ELECTION 1940—RED DEER CONSTITUENCY

Mr. SHAW:

1. Who was the returning officer for the electoral district of Red Deer at the time of the general election of 1940?

2. What firm or individual was given the contract for the printing of the voters' lists, ballots, etc., in connection with the above electoral district in 1940?

3. Did the firm or individual referred to in question two have the facilities necessary for doing all the work in connection with the said printing? If not, what part of the work was done by another firm or individual?

4. Did any firm or individual located outside the electoral district of Red Deer do part of the work in connection with the printing referred to above?

5. If so, what are their names, and what was the reason for part of the printing being done outside of the electoral district of Red Deer?

6. Is it the policy of the government to have all the printing of voters' lists, ballots, etc., done within the electoral district concerned provided facilities are available within the district for the handling of such work?

BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Mr. ESLING:

1. How many boards and commissions have been appointed by each department of the government since Canada entered the war?

2. How many employees are on the payroll of each board and commission?

3. What is the total payroll of each board and commission?

CANADIAN FORCES—UNIFORMS

Mr. CRUICKSHANK:

1. What is the cost of a walking out uniform for other ranks in the army and air force, (a) tunic; (b) trousers; (c) shirt; (d) tie; (e) shoes; (f) cap?

2. How many of each are issued, and at what intervals?

3. What clothing is issued to a soldier on his discharge?

4. What is the cost of clothing per annum for each inmate of the penitentiaries?

5. What clothing items are issued to each convict per year?

6. What clothing is issued per annum to A.R.P. wardens; what is the cost of each article?

CANADIAN FORCES—SENIOR OFFICERS IN CANADA

Mr. CRUICKSHANK:

1. How many members of the armed forces are serving in Canada in the following ranks: brigadier, major-general, lieutenant-general, and what is the rate of pay and allowance in each case?

2. How many members of the armed forces are serving in Canada in the following ranks: air commodore, air vice-marshal, air marshal, air chief marshal, and what is the rate of pay for each?

[Mr. Shaw.]

CANADIAN FORCES—CLOTHING ALLOWANCES

Mr. SINCLAIR:

What clothing allowance, if any, is granted to officers of the armed services ,(a) on retirement; (b) on resignation of their commissions?

EMBARGO ON IMPORTATION OF ASBESTOS PRODUCTS

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Did the government place an embargo on the importation of asbestos cloth and any other asbestos products from the United Kingdom?

2. If so, when was it imposed, and why?

3. Was a survey made to determine what stocks of asbestos cloth and asbestos material were available in Canada for ship repairs and ship construction prior to the embargo being imposed?

4. What quantity of asbestos cloth and other asbestos materials was there on hand in Canada at the time the embargo was imposed?

5. Is such an embargo now in force?

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

DAFOE, SASK., POSTMASTERSHIP

Mr. BURTON:

For a copy of all correspondence, reports, recommendations, applications and other documents in the possession of the Post Office Department in connection with the appointment of a postmaster at Dafoe, Saskatchewan, during the past six months.

Mr. MULOCK: Subject to the usual reservation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I ask the minister what are "the usual reservations"?

Mr. COLDWELL: I was going to ask the same thing.

Mr. MULOCK: So far as this motion is concerned, the reservation is that the reports of officials in the department are confidential and need not be produced unless it is considered in the public interest to do so. That is a matter which has been discussed many times in the house.

Mr. COLDWELL: It is only confidential as between the official and the minister, is it not—not between official and official? We would like to have all these documents brought down.

Mr. MULOCK: No. That would defeat the very object of the reservation.

Mr. HOMUTH: It certainly would.

Mr. MULOCK: An official in a district reports to the district director, who in turn

reports to the assistant deputy minister or the deputy minister in Ottawa, after which these papers are submitted to the minister.

Mr. COLDWELL: This is something new, Mr. Speaker; I never before heard that proviso made to a motion of this kind. The Prime Minister will be able to tell us if it is the practice.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: One of the oldest rules of parliament is that correspondence between a minister and officials of his department, or between officials of departments on departmental matters, are confidential and need not be brought down by the minister unless he feels it is in the public interest to have them brought down. I was going to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we might assume that all orders which are passed are passed subject to that reservation without any specific announcement being made to that effect.

Mr. GRAYDON: I do not know whether I am in entire agreement with the Prime Minister on that last statement. Very often ministers say, in assenting to these motions, "subject to the usual reservation," and this question has to be asked. Is there a regulation or rule which applies as the Prime Minister suggests? If there is, I am quite in agreement with him that there is not much use in wasting words in these various discussions and saying "with the usual reservations". I have heard it so often when anybody asks a question.

Motion agreed to.

ARMY BOOTS

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

For a copy of all letters, communications, reports or other documents dated between October 2, 1939, and August 6, 1943, wherein one James Clark, of Toronto, formerly an inspector of or in the employ of the Department of National Defence, and/or the inspection board of the United Kingdom and Canada, alleged or complained that army boots of inferior quality or manufacture were being manufactured for or supplied to the government by the firms named by him, together with a copy of all letters received by the Minister of National Defence, or the acting minister, from the said James Clark, and/or anyone on his behalf, relative to his complaints with regard thereto or requesting an investigation thereof, and the replies made thereto since August 6, 1943, to date hereof.

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax): Stand.

Mr. HOMUTH: Mr. Speaker, why should a motion like this stand? It is perfectly obvious what it means. There has been publicity in the papers about it. I do not know why it should be asked that a motion like this should stand.

Mr. SPEAKER: Stand.

Mr. HOMUTH: Of course we have no rights.

ORDERS IN COUNCIL AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION OF ALL-WEATHER ROADS IN ONTARIO

Mr. MARSHALL:

For 1. a copy of order in council P.C. 10145, dated November 10, 1942, authorizing the payment to the province of Ontario of a grant for the construction of an all-weather road from, (a) Ramsay, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, to the property of the Jerome Gold Mines Limited; (b) Missanabie, to the property of the Renabie Mines Limited.

2. Copy of P.C. 3197, dated April 19, 1943, authorizing the payment to the province of Ontario for the construction of an all-weather road from Savant Lake Station to the property of the St. Anthony Gold Mines Limited.

POTATOES

DISTRIBUTION IN THE MARITIMES—PROCEDURE IN QUESTIONS ON THE ORDERS OF THE DAY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. P. C. BLACK (Cumberland): I am getting complaints from Nova Scotia that potatoes in the larger centres are in short supply, and I should like to ask the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Agriculture whether steps are being taken to see that the larger centres in Nova Scotia have an adequate supply or a fairer distribution of potatoes. There was a short crop in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island last year, and it is reported that this crop—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): —has been largely controlled and held in storage or diverted to central Canada, with rumours of a black market, with the result that centres in Nova Scotia are not getting an adequate supply.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I am only right in directing the attention of the house to the fact that a practice is growing up which has not prevailed in the past, I will not say, in the very recent past, but which certainly did not prevail in previous parliaments, of hon. members taking advantage of the opportunity there is on the orders of the day to ask a question, to make a speech of considerable length at

the time of so doing. That is not in accordance with the rules of the house and should not be permitted, and if His Honour the Speaker rules that a question should be regarded as a notice of a question to be placed on the order paper or should be asked by itself to the exclusion of all else, His Honour should be supported by the house in asserting the rule; otherwise the business of the house is going to be delayed, and what is worse, a state of confusion arise from day to day in the minds of hon. members before we get on with the real business of the house, later in the afternoon. I would ask of hon. members that any questions they wish to ask should as far as possible be handed in to the Clerk and placed on the order paper. Now and then emergencies may arise where obviously there is necessity for an immediate answer to some question, and with the permission of the house the government would in such cases be only too ready to give an answer if it is possible to do so, but advantage must not be taken of the rules of the house to permit of hon. members raising a discussion even before the minister has had an opportunity of knowing what the question is which is going to be discussed, nor should hon. members take advantage of a rule unduly to prolong the business of the house.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me; I wish to respect the rules of the house, but this is a very important matter from the standpoint of consumers, distributors and suppliers.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): I made a very short explanation of the question which I was asking, and I sent a copy of it to the Minister of Finance as he took his seat.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Let it stand as a notice of the question to be answered at another time.

Mr. SPEAKER: In connection with these oral questions, I would observe that during the past two weeks the rule has been abused to a certain extent. Hon. members asking a question must realize that the question which they are asking should be of immediate importance, to which an answer is required immediately, and is asked orally only because, if it were put on the order paper, the opportunity of applying a remedy in respect of the subject matter might in the meanwhile be gone. In *Beauchesne*, third edition, paragraph 297, it is stated:

A certain number of oral questions are permitted in practice by members, without notice, before the orders of the day are called; but these are merely allowed by courtesy in connection with the business of the house or with very urgent and important matters of public concern. They are always brief, no debate being permitted, and the replies are as concise as possible. The minister interrogated may reply at once or may direct that the usual notice be given. Such questions are governed by the same rules of order as questions of which notice has been given.

And again:

Questions asked orally on the orders of the day being called must not be prefaced by the reading of letters, telegrams, newspaper extracts or preambles of any kind. When a member, on the 18th February, 1936, said: "I should like to ask a question of the Minister of National Revenue based upon a circular letter which was sent out by the . . . company to its dealers in my constituency. This letter is dated at Saskatchewan and reads: x x x." Mr. Speaker said:—"I do not think the hon. gentleman should read the letter; he should put his question directly." The member: "I must read the letter in order to make my question intelligible. This is a very short letter." The Speaker: "I do not think the hon. gentleman has a right to read the letter. He should put his question directly, as to what government intends to do." (The letter was not read.)

If any hon. member regards a particular matter of such importance as to justify an immediate answer, and wishes to put to the government a question based upon a newspaper article, he should not read the article but should simply use it as the basis of his question. Moreover, he should put his question as concisely as possible. The minister then, if he is in a position to answer the question, may do so; if not, he may take it as a notice. This point has been brought to the attention of the house on several occasions by myself, and though I dislike very much interfering with the freedom of hon. members in asking questions that are of some degree of urgency, I must nevertheless insist upon the observance of the rule.

Mr. HOMUTH: Before the orders of the day are called—I trust I shall be in order—may I ask the Minister of Finance whether, in view of the shortage of potatoes in the larger centres of Nova Scotia, the government will see to it that there is a fair distribution?

Mr. ISNOR: If the hon. gentleman who has just spoken can make reference to this subject—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. ISNOR: —I think I should have the same privilege.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. ISNOR: I brought this same matter before the government weeks ago and it received immediate attention so far as Halifax is concerned.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is prefaced by a statement of fact which may or may not be correct. I do not think it is a matter of such urgency as to require an immediate answer and it should be placed on the order paper.

Mr. GILLIS: May I direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Is the wartime prices and trade board contemplating any action to relieve the shortage of potatoes in Nova Scotia? This situation has existed for two years and it is serious right now.

Mr. ILSLEY: This is the same question that was put before.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been repeated in different forms. It should be placed on the order paper.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that order No. 3 had already been called; the Clerk Assistant had begun to read that order. We had commenced a specific order. These questions are therefore completely out of order if we are to abide by the rules of the house.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman rose to ask the question when the Clerk Assistant had read the order. I would not deprive an hon. member of his opportunity on that ground.

Mr. GRAYDON: Let us not be too technical.

WAR APPROPRIATION BILL

PROVISION FOR GRANTING TO HIS MAJESTY AID FOR NATIONAL DEFENCE AND SECURITY

The house resumed from Tuesday, February 15, consideration in committee of a resolution to grant to His Majesty certain sums of money for the carrying out of measures consequent upon the existence of a state of war —Mr. Ilsley—Mr. Bradette in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. GRAYDON: Yesterday at the request of the Prime Minister, I, with three other members of this house, met him and the three defence ministers, as well as the Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs, in a private conference. At this interview the Prime Minister read to us what we understood to be the essential parts of the recent correspondence and other documents bearing upon the McNaughton situation.

As leader of the opposition I have certain responsibilities and obligations to this house and to the nation, and I conceive it to be my duty to make my position perfectly clear at this time. The background relevant to this picture extends over more than four years of war. Obviously a review of the more recent events could not place us in complete possession of the facts. We were told enough, however, for me to form the opinion that the Minister of National Defence in the present debate has not told the whole story. In saying that to the members of this committee and to the people of Canada I feel that I am discharging any obligations which I as leader of the opposition may have in this instance.

The responsibility now passes back to and remains with the government as to whether they will disclose the whole story fully to parliament and to the people. They and they alone are fully possessed of the background and facts. The responsibility is theirs and theirs alone. No one can share it with them. I invite the Prime Minister to make known his government's decision on this matter now.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say to my hon. friend, I am only too happy to reply to his request to make known immediately the government's position on what he has described as the "McNaughton situation" or "this matter". The Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston), speaking on Friday, February 11, read to the house a statement which had been issued to the press on December 27 with regard to General McNaughton. I am going to read this statement in a moment, but first I wish to say that the statement was authorized by the government, by myself and my colleagues. It was known to the government before the minister gave the statement to the press. The statement, as reported at page 411, was in the following words:

> The Minister of National Defence announced to-day that following the recent illness of Lieutenant-General A. G. L. McNaughton, medical authorities have advised that he has developed a physical condition which will necessitate freedom from all military responsibility for an extended period.
>
> General McNaughton has advised the government of his inability physically to carry on and has asked to be relieved as soon as possible.
>
> In these circumstances and in view also of the requirements of impending operations, the minister stated that the Canadian government, with great regret, had decided to grant General McNaughton several months' leave of absence from service and to relieve him of command of the First Canadian Army. The minister paid tribute to General McNaughton's outstanding service to Canada and hoped that after a period of rest and recuperation his unusual talents

would be available to serve his country in some capacity less exacting than in command of an army in the field.

There is another paragraph but it is immaterial. The minister, at the time he read to the house this press release which had been issued on December 27, continuing to speak in the debate on Friday last, said:

The important points were that medical authorities had advised that the general had developed a physical condition which would necessitate freedom from all military responsibility for an extended period and that General McNaughton had advised the government of his inability physically to carry on and had asked to be relieved as soon as possible, and that the government had decided to grant General McNaughton several months leave of absence from service and to relieve him of command of the First Canadian Army.

The minister went on to say:

The advice of the medical authorities was contained in two reports which were transmitted to the Prime Minister on General McNaughton's direction and were also given to me.

There was also included General McNaughton's letter to Major-General Montague. Having these medical reports before the minister and myself and some of our colleagues, knowing that these reports would be presented to the house and made public, the government felt that it would not be advisable to go behind what was stated in the reports, to bring up other matters which might relate themselves to General McNaughton's relinquishment of command of the Canadian army. What was stated in the reports of the medical officers is perfectly clear, and it was not felt by the government, unless it was obvious that by going into other matters some useful public purpose would be served, that any statement should be made other than the one that was made up to that point.

May I say quite frankly that the Minister of National Defence himself would greatly prefer to discuss all phases of this matter to the satisfaction of every hon. member in the house. Personally, so far as he is concerned he would welcome it, and as I stated the other day he was ready at that time to give an immediate answer. My hon. friend had his immediate answer in his hand, and it was known to me what he had in mind to say. Knowing what might come to be discussed at that time, or what might arise out of the discussion, I felt it was necessary for me to say that I did not believe public policy made it advisable to say anything further at this time with respect to what has been since referred to as the McNaughton situation. And I gave my reasons for that. May I quote them from *Hansard*. So that I may make the statement as comprehensive and as completely non-evasive as possible, I shall begin with the question which was put by the hon. leader of the opposition and which appears at page 450 of *Hansard* of Monday, February 14:

The question is this: Were there other factors, other than ill health, which entered into the whole problem of the resignation or leave of absence of General McNaughton?

Mr. Mackenzie King: Before the leader of the opposition presses his question further, I desire to say that while I know that the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) is prepared to answer the question immediately, as Prime Minister I have very grave doubts whether it is not against public policy to discuss further at this time the matter which is raised by the question which the hon. gentleman has asked.

I gave my reasons for that, and they were set out in the course of the discussion. I shall quote one paragraph which appears on page 453 of *Hansard*. I said:

The government's action in this matter, as I have already said, is entirely begotten of a desire to protect the war effort not only of this country but of the united nations to the fullest extent possible and to protect all parties concerned therewith.

I felt it was owing to this house and to the country that so far as the correspondence was concerned the leader of the opposition and the leaders of the other two parties whom I invited should come and see the correspondence and read it with me. I also invited a former minister of national defence in a previous administration, the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Stirling) to accompany them. I placed the correspondence, or rather read, as the leader of the opposition has just said, the essential parts of the correspondence to them. I have left it to these hon. gentlemen to act in this matter as their own consciences may dictate. I have placed no restriction upon them with respect to the information they gained at that interview, which lasted for three hours, and in which all that is really essential in what has been described as the McNaughton situation was gone into very fully.

I want to repeat at this moment what I said the other day in replying to the leader of the opposition:

Before the leader of the opposition presses his question further, I desire to say that while I know that the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) is prepared to answer the question immediately, as Prime Minister I have very grave doubts whether it is not against public policy to discuss further at this time the matter which is raised by the question which the hon. gentleman has asked.

Hon. members of this house know that at the present time preparations are being made on a vast scale for the invasion of Europe. The question that I have to ask myself is

this: Is any further discussion of what has been referred to as the McNaughton situation likely to have a good or an adverse effect on the war effort of Canada, of Great Britain, of the United States and of other of the united nations. I believe that the morale, not only of the people in the countries I have mentioned but more particularly of the armies not of Canada alone but of the other countries might be very seriously affected were there to be at this time a discussion which went into a number of matters that have taken place in the past. Such a discussion might provoke a very serious condition of affairs if begun at this time.

I want to make it perfectly clear the government has nothing to hide or conceal in this matter. The minister wishes to conceal nothing. Indeed he would prefer, for his own feelings and for personal reasons, to have without reservation matters disclosed which were disclosed to the leaders yesterday; but as Prime Minister I have a great responsibility to safeguard the war effort of all the united nations; and I repeat, I doubt very, very much if it would not be against public policy to discuss the matter further at this time. So far as the government is concerned I intend not to discuss it or have it discussed unless some hon. gentlemen opposite or others outside should, by statements that may be made, render it necessary for the government to make disclosures which up to the present time have not been made.

Mr. COLDWELL: As one of those present at yesterday morning's meeting I should like to say that I came away with the impression that it would not be in the public interest at this time to discuss this matter more fully than it has been discussed. I must say this, however, that the discussion this afternoon by the leader of the opposition and the Prime Minister is bound to arouse in the public mind a good many questions. If those questions arise it seems to me there are two things to be considered. First there is the matter of the public interest, and in that I am in agreement with the Prime Minister. Then there is the viewpoint of the other party concerned, namely Lieutenant General McNaughton himself, a man who has served this country well, whose great talents in organizing the Canadian army I think are recognized by everyone in the house. In view of the fact that General McNaughton has submitted a letter in which he gave as the reason for his request the fact that his health was poor, as apparently it was, it seems to me that we should take into consideration General McNaughton's great service to this country; and if we wish to pursue this matter further, in my opinion a committee of the house should meet General McNaughton and discuss matters with him.

Mr. RALSTON: Mr. Chairman, I want to say just one word. I do not know of anyone who is more sensitive, and perhaps wrongly so, to any suggestion of lack of frankness or candour than I am. I have spoken to this committee twice concerning this matter, and in the statements I made I think I endeavoured to state clearly that I was not saying everything there was to be said in connection with this regrettable episode but that I was dealing with the particular matter which counted, namely the question of the granting of leave of absence to General McNaughton and the reasons for it.

It does cut just a little for my hon. friend to proclaim this afternoon, in one short sentence, that he has come to the conclusion that the Minister of National Defence has not told the whole story. I can see that in headlines across Canada. The Minister of National Defence has made it clear to this committee that he has not told the whole story of the McNaughton situation.

The question is whether or not the Minister of National Defence has anything to hide. That is the important thing. My hon. friend has not suggested that there is anything of that kind, and he has had the opportunity to become acquainted with the communications in connection with this matter. Perhaps my hon. friend did not mean anything by it, but to have that statement made as it was does not help, when at page 413 of *Hansard* of February 11 I said we could go into all these matters, mentioning the rumours, the press reports, the off the record statements, and so on, and then said:

> We could go into all of this as well as any other matters relating to the subject. I would prefer not to do so because such discussions can, to say the least, do no possible good, especially at times like these.

Again at page 449 of *Hansard* I said I did not think the morale of the Canadian people or the morale of the troops in the field would be promoted by the discussion of factors which at the moment and in the circumstances can have no application. A little later I repeated that I would prefer not to discuss any other factors. I only want to say to the committee that if my hon. friend has any suggestion to make that the portion of the story I have not told, and which I indicated I had not told, contains anything which he thinks I desire to hide, I want him to say so now. I would have preferred, as the Prime Minister has said, to go into this matter from

stem to gudgeon, for the simple reason that it would have prevented any possible suspicion or suggestion that I or the government had anything to hide. I assented to the course which the Prime Minister has indicated this afternoon for the reasons he gave, namely in the public interest, which was concurred in by the leader of the C.C.F. party. The leader of the opposition has made no expression on that point.

I am gratified by the fact that although there has not been a disclosure to the house of the whole situation, the government has indicated that it has no desire whatever to keep the communications within the confines of governmental privacy but has made them available to three hon. members of this house, with no strings of any kind attached except the dictates of their own conscience. Under those circumstances I do submit that it was hardly fair—I do not generally criticize him for this, and I repeat that he may not have intended it in this way—for my hon. friend to say that he had come to the conclusion, as if it were something he had only discovered after seeing these communications, that the Minister of National Defence had not told the whole story. I have said I have not told the whole story; I said that to the committee on two occasions. The purpose of the conference with these hon. gentlemen was to let them know the whole story. I do ask my hon. friend, if he thinks there is anything I have to hide in connection with this matter, to indicate that fact; or if he did not intend the reflection which I feel he cast upon my statement, I ask him to say so.

Mr. GRAYDON: I had no idea that the minister was reading into my remarks something which I think upon reflection he will see is not there.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I say to hon. gentlemen to my right that I heard several remarks from that corner imputing motives of one kind or another to the leader of the opposition. I think most hon. members of this house know of my desire to be fair to the government and everyone else. No one understands that better than the minister, I am sure; otherwise perhaps I should be in some state of heated anger over this matter. Instead of that I am trying to discuss it reasonably, and I hope the minister and the committee will understand that. If the minister will accept my statement in the reasonable way in which it was made, I simply said that we were told enough for me to come to the conclusion that in the present debate the Minister of National Defence has not told the whole story. It may be that the minister and I are looking at these words and their context in entirely different ways, but I want to tell the minister that what I wanted to convey, and what I think is conveyed as clearly as that could be done, is that after having gone over certain of the correspondence and other documents which were shown to us I came to the conclusion that the whole story had not been told.

Mr. RALSTON: That was already clear.

Mr. GRAYDON: I quite understand that, but I do not understand why the minister makes an issue of this. Both my hon. friend and the Prime Minister made the point clear, when the debate was halted last Monday evening, that there were some facts which the government felt should not be disclosed to the house and the country because of the public interest. All right. Surely it is not wrong for me, after having seen the documents, to come to a conclusion, as I did; and if that conclusion was the same as that reached by the minister, so much the better.

Mr. RALSTON: There is just one point between us; that is, that my hon. friend's statement suggested that he had to see the documents before coming to the conclusion that the minister had not told the whole story. My point is that the minister himself indicated to the committee on at least two occasions that he was not disclosing all the circumstances, and that it did not require the conference, which is the suggestion contained in my hon. friend's statement, in order to give him the information from which he could conclude that the minister had not disclosed everything.

Mr. GRAYDON: My statement was simply an attempt to tell the committee what were my conclusions after having the correspondence read to me. The minister had told us that the full story was not being disclosed, but after all it seemed necessary, the evidence having been presented to me, to form my own conclusions, and that is exactly what I did. I do not want the minister to take umbrage. Perhaps he is a little bit touchy, and perhaps I would be if I were in his position. I do not want him to go away with the idea, and I do not want any one in the house to think that I had some ulterior motive in formulating that sentence. I tried to make it just as fair as I could.

The CHAIRMAN: I believe the committee wants to see this matter thoroughly discussed, although it may not be properly before the committee. Therefore it would be in order for hon. members to rise now and speak on what we are discussing at the present time before taking another subject.

Mr. RAYMOND: A moment ago the Prime Minister referred to the discussion which took place last Monday in connection with the resignation of or leave of absence granted to General McNaughton. That discussion had taken place because of the following question put to the Minister of National Defence by the leader of the opposition:

> My question is whether or not any factors, other than that which he mentioned of ill-health, entered into the resignation of General McNaughton.

The Prime Minister intervened in the debate in order to put an end to the discussion, and he said:

> I should be pleased to meet with and to show the correspondence to the leader of the opposition and to the leaders of the C.C.F. and the Social Credit parties.

He also added the hon. member for Yale to that group. The Prime Minister completely ignored another group in this house, the Bloc Populaire of Canada. He knows of the existence of this group at least since the by-elections at Stanstead and Cartier. If any group in this house is entitled to information, then all groups should be entitled to the same information. If any member is entitled to any information, then all members should be entitled to the same information. What right has one group to get information which another group cannot get? What right has the hon. member for Yale to get information which other hon. members of this house cannot get? Have we any rights in this parliament? Is this a democratic parliament? Are we not entitled as members of parliament to all information?

If there is some secret about the matter, then close the doors like we have done in the past. I do not want any secrets to be revealed to the enemy, but I think it is unfair when the Prime Minister takes it upon himself to call in the leaders of certain groups and another member who is not a leader of any group in order to give out information and ignore the others. That is my view, and because that is my view I put this question to the Minister of National Defence. Were there other factors other than ill health which entered into the whole problem of the resignation or leave of absence of General McNaughton?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am not sorry my hon. friend has raised the point as to why hon. gentlemen besides those whom I named the other day were not included in a meeting to discuss a confidential matter with myself as the leader of the government. That brings me back to procedure under the British parliamentary system. That system recognizes the government, recognizes it as the body which has been entrusted by the people to carry on the business of the country, and it recognizes the opposition. The position of the opposition has been recognized by our House of Commons in the enactment, of a statute which gives an official position to the leader of the opposition. The government and the opposition are the two elements of parliament which under the British system are presumed to be the ones to be considered, in the main may I put it, in carrying on the business of the country.

At the time I extended the invitation I did, I asked myself whether I should not confine to the leader of the opposition the invitation I was extending to discuss privately a matter of great public importance. I would have been taking a proper position if I had so confined my invitation. The leader of the opposition himself took exception to the fact that I had not conferred with him earlier. He recognized that he had certain rights as the leader of the opposition to know some matters which were of great public importance but which necessarily had to be kept secret. I gave him the reason why I had not asked him earlier to confer with me. I knew very well that if he had been given certain information in a private way before there was any discussion in parliament he might have felt himself precluded from debating as freely as he otherwise might have wished to do and from giving information to the members of his party.

The reason I extended an invitation to the leaders of the C.C.F. and the Social Credit party is that throughout this entire parliament there has been a recognition that at the time of the last general election those parties were returned in the numbers in which they were. Their leaders in this house have been granted, not as a matter of right but as a matter of courtesy, a certain recognition by the government. It seemed to me that the present was an occasion where it was desirable to invite those hon. gentlemen to a conference. The reason for inviting the hon. member for Yale must be obvious to all members of the house. The hon. member for Yale is a member of the privy council of Canada and has served in the position of minister of national defence under a Conservative administration. I felt that it

would help to give confidence to hon. members of the house and to the public if the hon. member for Yale were present at that interview.

But for my hon. friend to say that because a new party has come into existence since a by-election, the leader of that party should have the same courtesy extended to him, is I think to take a position that is perfectly ridiculous. If that procedure is to be followed we may expect that any number of hon. gentlemen may suddenly become leaders of parties, whether small in number or not, and claim special rights and privileges in this house. I would have felt that I was making a very great departure from the proper procedure in parliament if I had gone any further in recognizing groups as a part of the opposition than I did.

May I say that I intend as far as it lies within my power to see that the business of this House of Commons is discussed as between the government and the opposition. If the opposition wish to be divided into groups, that of course is their own affair. I would draw attention to this fact. They are rapidly heading toward the system which developed in France where there was a large number of parties and where the business of the country got into such a state that there was no stability. I think quite sincerely that that condition had a good deal to do with the fate of the world as it is to-day. I do not believe the people of Canada wish to see a lot of parties in this country and I as Prime Minister am not going to do anything to further that trend.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Before proceeding to say what I had intended to say, I should like to say just one word to the Prime Minister with respect to the formation of parties. The fundamental reason why new parties form is that the men in power signally fail, and the people, feeling absolute frustration because of their inability to get what they want from those in power, form new parties. I tell the Prime Minister that just as long as he fails to give the people of Canada what they want in the way of distribution of goods so that they can enjoy a standard of living commensurate with what their productive power justifies, he must expect to see new parties form ad infinitum in this country, and the one who will be to blame will be the Prime Minister himself. He cannot escape responsibility by rising and giving eloquent discourses and reading lectures to us every once in a while.

The Prime Minister speaks as though Canada were the only country in which more than two parties were recognized in parliament. If I am correctly informed, in England at the present time the Liberal party forms the third party and receives recognition. Also, if I am correctly informed, for a time in the mother of parliaments the Irish party formed the third party and was freely granted recognition. Consequently the Prime Minister is not breaking altogether new ground, although we recognize that he has endeavoured to be fair and just in his treatment of the minorities in parliament since he has been leading the government.

With respect to the McNaughton case, I had the impression before it was ever discussed in parliament that it was one which it would be altogether in the public interest for us to leave pretty much alone, leaving it to the government in power which is in a position to know all the details; and my experience yesterday in the meeting to which the Prime Minister referred confirmed me in that belief. I would say now that if we would discharge our responsibility as members of this house we would discontinue the discussion of this McNaughton affair and allow it to work its own way out in time.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, I have just a few words to say. As a private member I cannot understand the distinction that is made with respect to matters which can be told to the leader of the opposition and the leaders of certain groups in this house but which cannot be told to private members. The Prime Minister was right when he said that in England there is only one leader of the opposition officially recognized by the government. Then he added that he had extended the courtesy to the leaders of two other groups, the C.C.F. group and the New Democracy group, of calling them into his confidence. But if the practice in England is to be followed, the government shall consider only the leader of the official opposition; but if similar courtesies are extended to the leaders of two other groups, that same courtesy should be extended to all members. I do not see why the leaders of the C.C.F. and New Democracy groups should receive better treatment than my hon. friend the member for Laval-Two Mountains, the leader of the Canadian party, or the leader of the Bloc Populaire, or the member for North Battleford, or the new member for Cartier. They should all be extended the same courtesy as is already extended to two leaders of political groups.

What are the matters that can be told only to the leaders and not to the rank and file? How is it that the rank and file cannot get

certain information and that they are not trusted? Last year or the year before I suggested that we should have secret sittings of the house regularly once a week, when the government should take the members into their confidence and tell them matters that would not be discussed in public. There is news appearing in the press which has a much more disturbing effect on the morale of the Canadian people than the McNaughton case, especially the bombing of those seventeen allied ships at Bari in Italy by German aeroplanes, with no counter-attack from the allies. Those ships were not protected. That story appeared in the press, in every paper. Is not a thing of that kind disturbing to the morale of the Canadian people? Does it not give them the impression that there is something wrong? Those shiploads of ammunition and supplies were for the 8th Army and the 5th Army. Who was punished for allowing the ships to be sunk? Nobody was. Eisenhower was sent to England, and Montgomery had his picture taken with the Minister of National Defence. Nobody was punished. Seventeen allied ships loaded with ammunition bombed at an Italian port by the Germans without retaliation, it must have a disturbing effect on the morale of the Canadian people and of all the allied nations.

When there is something wrong in the Department of National Defence it is often said that the facts cannot be told because it is a military secret. Last year when I fought for the health of those in the Canadian army and wanted to see that the boys who were unfit were discharged because they were a burden to the army as well as to the taxpayers of this country, I was jeered by some members who said they were bored in listening to the dialogue carried on about it between the Minister of National Defence and myself. Here I must mention that one of our colleagues who deserves special praise is the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of National Defence, the hon. member for Halifax, who has seen that many grievances were redressed.

Another case that is very sad is that of a boy who was unfit for the army. He suffered from angina pectoris. He was first classified "C-2" by his doctor. Then he went to the army and was classified "B." He was called up again and was classified "A." He drilled for a day, fell sick and called for a doctor. That was refused. They found the boy dead the morning after and later on he was buried in my constituency, where he was born. When a man dies under such circumstances the case deserves consideration, and deserves what else? It deserves reform. It is time for reform. We are here to talk about public business, and this is public business.

There is also a man in the camp at Barriefield who has to follow a special diet of veal liver and things like that, a regimen recommended by a specialist who knows his case, and he has to go to the restaurant to buy this special food out of his meagre pay. He has fallen off in weight from 142 to 108 pounds, and he is very sick. But he is kept there. He cannot follow the regimen prescribed in camp, but he is kept there just the same. There are many cases like that, and I feel that it is time to consider the health of the men in the army. We should see that the boys in every branch of the army are kept in good health. These are matters that should be discussed.

Why did not the leader of the opposition, the leader of the C.C.F., the leader of the New Democracy group, the leader of the Bloc Populaire and the leaders of all other groups ask the government to explain what happened at Bari and who was responsible there? Was it Montgomery? Was it Eisenhower? Who was responsible for not protecting those seventeen ships loaded with ammunition and food for the 8th Army along the Adriatic coast? Perhaps the reason why the allied advance is so slow in Italy is that those boys did not have the ammunition. It is time to ask the government about it. Is it not much more important than McNaughton's resignation?

Mr. LACOMBE: (Translation) Mr. Speaker, the first part of the resolution at present under consideration reads as follows:

1. That sums not exceeding $3,650,000,000 be granted to His Majesty towards defraying any expenses or making any advances or loans that may be incurred or granted by or under the authority of the governor in council during the year ending March 31, 1945, for

(a) the security, defence, peace, order and welfare of Canada;

I shall confine my remarks mainly to paragraph (a) of the resolution at present under consideration: "the security, defence, peace, order and welfare of Canada". Here are words which are frequently misused. The government is asking this house to vote $3,650,000,000 to ensure the realization of security, defence, peace, order and welfare, but is it taking the necessary action to achieve this purpose? We shall see. Strikes are breaking out everywhere. Dissatisfaction is rife. Unemployment is increasing, and trouble makers are taking advantage of this deplorable situation which borders upon disorder. Since the mobilization of all our resources for the prosecution of an exaggerated war effort, similar appropriations have been requested each year from parliament for a similar purpose. But, are we not standing still? Nay, we are going backwards. Never has the national debt reached such a high level. Never have taxes weighed so heavily

upon the taxpayer. The public must put up with restrictions of all kinds. The Canadian family is dealt a heavy blow by the absence of the mother working in war plants. Add to this the insidious propaganda broadcast over the radio in such terms as these: "The woman of the day is the woman in uniform." In spite of the feeling of admiration I have for our women soldiers, I believe, as many others do, that the woman of the day is still the mother, who is especially revered because of the lives she has given and still gives to the nation. Notwithstanding all the sacrifices and the nobleness of the woman in uniform, I prefer to see the woman in her splendid role of guardian of the home, or preparing herself to fulfil such an admirable task.

Where did the popularity of feminine enlistments originate? If I am not mistaken, it started in totalitarian countries, in Soviet Russia, especially. Although such a statement may seem paradoxical, I am not a supporter of order within disorder nor of disorder within order. And what is the worst disorder, if not the breaking up of the family, which is the very foundation of society? I will not support this measure, not only for the reasons I have just indicated, but also because a revolution is in process of preparation in Canada. The government seems to do nothing to prevent its blazing out sooner or later, even before the end of this conflict. Is any evidence required? Only yesterday a party which has assumed a new name held a congress. That party has always been considered as banned in this country.

Mr. GAUTHIER: They changed their name.

Mr. LACOMBE: I agree with my hon. friend from Portneuf. Because that party has assumed a new name while holding the same doctrine, the government adopts toward it a laisser faire policy. Only a few days ago, prominent members of the clergy gave to the authorities of the city of Montreal a solemn warning about playgrounds where communistic propaganda is at work among our young people. They have furnished so much evidence in support of their claims that aldermen of the city of Montreal have asked for an inquiry into the matter. The pursuit of a policy of laisser-faire has brought us to such a pass. Moreover, after this frightful war, which is engulfing the economy of the nation has come to an end, who will be the cat's-paw? Who will hold sway over all of central Europe? And what will Canada have to offer her sons and daughters whose careers, shattered or in such a state that they must be built up again from scratch, will be to them an even heavier burden that the wounds they suffered on the battle-fields? Let us first look after our own. Our freedom and our rights as Canadian citizens come first. Away with agitators, with propaganda agents of subversive ideas.

Since the government asks for this sum of $3,650,000,000 to ensure the security, defence, peace, order and welfare of Canada, it is my right and duty to ask that it safeguard without delay our threatened peace, security and social order. Since the government intends to bleed white the Canadian taxpayer in order to defend Christianity, freedom, justice and right, I would ask, in the name of every sacred principle, that it put a stop before it is too late to the insults and mud hurled every day at Christianity and His Holiness the Pope by the advocates of communism and by the sheet called "The Gospel Witness". On page fifteen of its issue dated February 10, this paper ran the following monstrosity:

(Text)

More About Russia and the Vatican

Last week we quoted an article from *Izvestia*, Soviet newspaper, which asserted that "servility of the Vatican towards fascism has not been confined to Italy," etc. *Izvestia*'s article is criticized by the New York *Times* as being "unjust and intemperate." The press dispatch was as follows:

"New York, Feb. 4.—The attack on the Vatican by the Soviet government newspaper *Izvestia* is denounced to-day by the New York *Times* as 'unjust and intemperate.'

" 'Of all the incendiary literary bombs manufactured in Moscow since the Teheran conference and thrown with such light-hearted recklessness into the unity of the allied nations, none is likely to do greater damage,' the *Times* says. It adds that the 'palpable insincerity' of *Izvestia*'s charges may be judged by the character of one of them.

"The *Times* asserts that Russia's allies, Britain and the United States, 'have no doubt where the real sympathy of the Vatican lies in this struggle.'

" 'They recognize the inescapable neutrality of the Pope's position,' it says, 'but they have had no difficulty in finding in his eloquent declarations clear evidence of his detestation for those who have violated the rights of little nations, who have committed bestial acts from one end of Europe to the other and who have attempted to elevate the dogma of totalitarianism to the dignity of a new religion.'

"The *Times*' defence of the Roman Catholic church should not be taken seriously, as it has long been evident that on many matters it takes its orders from the Roman hierarchy in the United States. Like other daily papers, it probably has one or more Romanist editorial writers, and one of them in all probability is responsible for this. Nothing escapes the eye of the propaganda department of the Roman Catholic church. It makes use of the radio and the public press for the dissemination of its views. The Roman serpent is a hydra-headed monster; and every head has a thousand tongues speaking lies and blasphemy.

(Translation) Neither communism nor this nameless sheet take into account the fact that millions of Roman Catholics and Christians of various denominations fight in the ranks of the united nations. Unless the government stop this propaganda at its very origin, Canada is in for a dismal future. These people will avail themselves of the deep post-war reactions to overwhelm established authorities both religious and civil. Demobilization in the army and the industries will afford them a fertile field for the dissemination of the most subversive doctrines. On the heels of destitution and unemployment the conflagration will spread to every part of the country. That is why I urge the government to take every necessary step to safeguard security, peace and order in Canada.

After the filthy extract written by a coward, I wish to read a touching description from the pen of a soldier-priest who, among thousands, has fallen a victim to German bullets on the blessed soil of Belgium. This extract is taken from *Nouvelles catholiques,* issued by the Wartime Information Board, on February 1, 1944:

While Awaiting the Firing Squad

While awaiting to be shot by a German firing squad, Father Joseph Peters, rector of Comblain-au-Pont, Liege diocese, wrote the following letter to his parishioners—a last message from "Your pastor who loves you and will continue to do so in heaven."

Father Peters recalls that every day he has offered the following prayer to Almighty God: "From this day, I accept with all my heart and with perfect joy, any kind of death that it might please Thee to choose for me, with all its difficulties, anguish and sufferings." The letter adds: "The time has come to realize this promise. When you receive this letter, I shall have fallen a victim to German bullets for having served my country as a priest and a soldier.

"I have no time to relate to you how and why I have acted but I shall say that I have no regret for what I have done and would do it again if I could.

"I face death without fear or blame, relying on Almighty God's infinite mercifulness and convinced that He will welcome me to heaven, where I hope to meet my dear parents, my brothers and sisters who have preceded me in the eternal world to come.

"Is it not true that you must know how much I loved you without distinction of age, rank or party, and I have felt, especially from the time of my incarceration, that you loved me as a father. . . .

"Before being called to face my supreme judge, I wish to beg forgiveness from anyone whom I may have offended in any way or toward whom I may have neglected to do any good deed which it was in my power to do. . . .

"My dear brethren, I must leave you in the act of blessing you for the last time . . . and, for the last time, I shout: 'All for Almighty God and the Blessed Virgin Mary! Long live the Catholic Church! Long live Belgium! Long live Comblain-au-Pont'."

(*The Universe,* December 17.)

How many times have I urged the government to ban the newspaper *The Gospel Witness,* sower of hatred and national disunity. This accursed sheet spreads falsehood, calumny and abuse even against the united nations and slings mud at their noblest characters. And the Post Office department welcomes its anti-national undertakings by accepting its infamous propaganda for distribution all through the country. That is the pass to which things have come. We are fighting for the triumph of christianity, freedom, justice and human rights, while in Canada there are two kinds of justice, one for the reviler of Christianity and the heroes of this war, and the other for the man who for a period of nearly four years has languished in an internment camp and was denied a trial. If it is for such a justice that we are sacrificing all our resources and that we are asked to vote again $3,650,000,000, I say that it is indeed not worth while. Therefore, we call upon the government to stop persecuting that outstanding citizen who has been and still is, whatever anyone may think, the former mayor of Montreal and member for St. Mary in the Quebec legislature.

I shall make one further remark before I conclude. The statement made by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) gives little encouragement, as regards our reserve army and the men who have been mobilized. I am very much afraid that conscription for service anywhere and on any war theatre, although now an accomplished fact, will be enforced even more sternly. No one has opposed more than I such a policy. Therefore, I bring once again to the attention of the government the difficulties they will face in the dangerous course they have long since taken. I repeat that I have never approved of that policy, that I condemn it more than ever as forcibly as I can.

Mr. CHURCH: I am not a leader of a group like the last speaker, therefore I have no speech to read; but I wish to point out to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the government, certain facts about the question which, fortunately or unfortunately, has been raised in this house this afternoon. After all is said and done, we are in the fifth year of the war. I think this country has done splendidly on the land and sea and in the air, starting as it did from scratch. I wish to say to the noble seven who sit down in the left-hand corner

that their province was one of the most exposed of all. In all our eastern provinces as well we were very fortunate that we did not have an invasion with the gestapo, the trampling feet, the loud speaker, the whip, the concentration camps and the deportation of large numbers of the civiliain population to Germany and other places. We were spared all these cruelties and dangers which might have happened to this country.

I believe it is the opinion of the private members and of people outside the house that the country has responded nobly in this emergency. I am not here to criticize anybody, but I wish to say that the public are paying for the war, and they are entitled to know the facts. I am speaking only as a private member. I do not know anything about it. I was not told anything, and I do not want to be told anything, because I have already heard a great deal of the story from those who have come home from the front. I repeat that when the war broke out the government were confronted, as in the last war, with an emergency because we had thrown away our land, sea and air forces and our friends as well. We had simply disbanded our army, navy and air force. The permanent force was laughed at. Look at the men who are leading the armies on the front to-day. Many of them were then in the permanent force. I remember many of them. When they walked down the streets of the cities they were looked upon by pacifists with derision and it was said that they should be out of the profession altogether. These men saved us and have done nobly.

I desire to say a word about what was done by the British government in a case like this. As you all know, away back in January last year the war was not going very well in Africa. Mr. Churchill, the Prime Minister, went over to Africa. General Wavell, General Auchinlech and General Ritchie were transferred, and the march across the desert was placed in charge of General Alexander and General Montgomery. They marched right across the desert, and after Casablanca they met the army coming from America. In the British House of Commons private members rose—some of them just back from the front—and criticized. At the time I gave a copy of the British *Hansard* to the Minister of National Defence (Army) and it showed that private members in the British House of Commons, many of them generals, many of them from the army, the navy and other places, had criticized the conduct of the war. Mistakes will always be made in war; but the mistakes which the British have made are as nothing compared with the mistakes which Germany made and the mistake she made by forcing Japan to attack Pearl Harbor, forcing the United States into the war.

It is all very well for our friends down in the left-hand corner to talk about small nations. We have seen what happened to small nations in Europe. We would have had the same thing happen here if it were not for the mother country and the stand taken by the people of Canada and the government in raising such a noble army, navy and air force. The people want to know the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth about this matter. It was discussed after Africa in the British House of Commons and Mr. Churchill told the house the truth. I should like to point out also what they did in Germany and in Russia regarding a similar situation. At Stalingrad the Germans and the Russians brought in numbers of new generals. They removed a great many generals. Both the Russians and the Germans brought in managers of departmental stores and others who were civilians. They had learned to drill in two years or less. The new generals did a magnificent job. The Russians under new generals started their march at Stalingrad and they have defeated the Germans all along the line. I point these things out to the committee because it is not an involved question at all. I pointed out yesterday that the commitments which are being made are so vast and the world war is so widespread that it is hard for the average citizen, unless he follows the thing and has been following military matters many years, to know very much about it.

We are a nation and there is no intention on the part of the British government to interfere with our status, our sovereignty or our autonomy. We entered this war voluntarily by a resolution of the house which, with one or two exceptions, had the full support of the members. That resolution told the government to give the full strength and the full power of the nation to the conduct of the war. It was well that Canada decided to do so because she had to start from scratch, and as I say, our forces have done splendid work on the land and sea and in the air.

It do not believe it is the duty of the opposition, as their leader has said, to decide this matter of policy. The onus is on the government of the day as long as they are the government of the day to conduct a total war in a manner that will satisfy the people who are paying the taxes. This war was forced upon the British empire. Nobody wanted it. The empire went to the limit to have peace. It disarmed, threw away all its defences in 1922, 1923 and 1924. It had nothing left when

the war broke out. In the period of twenty years between the two wars, the most fatal in the history of civilization, we thought we could do without armies, navies and air forces and depend on notes and the result was the British empire was left by the pacifists in a helpless condition. If the people are not allowed to know the facts, if they are allowed to know just what their rulers decide, then we are embarking on a very dangerous course.

Yesterday I referred to what Mr. Eden said in the British House of Commons on December 7, and on December 14, Mr. Churchill having taken sick, he referred to the commitments which had been made at Cairo between Great Britain, United States and China. These nations were represented by Mr. Churchill, Mr. Roosevelt and Chiang Kai-shek. They came to certain conclusions which bound Canada. These conclusions were that in the Pacific so far as the war against Japan was concerned everything that Japan gained at Pearl Harbor in December 1941 would be taken from her; that Japan would also have to give back everything she had acquired in the Pacific in the last two generations. Nobody knows when the war with Germany is going to end. I believe the full facts should be given this afternoon to the people of Canada. We should know the ins and outs of this case. I read in the house last year a statement of Major Markland, V.C., who is serving in this war. He is a member of the British House of Commons. There are forty-six members of the British House of Commons who have lost their lives in this war and all but one or two are Conservatives. Major Markland, V.C., rose and criticized the conduct of the war in North Africa, whereupon Mr. Churchill gave a full statement to the house, and to the public later on the radio, with regard to the transfer of generals and all that kind of thing. The conduct of the war for Canada is the responsibility of the government and the officers on the field and no one else. I do not want to say anything to interfere with the progress of the war or in any way to impede the work of the government or the minister in that connection; because I think the opposition as a whole has so far given the government splendid support. To ask us to throw out the life-line as to what should be done on government policy now is another matter, when we have nothing to do with it. I am not speaking for any party in this house. I have been nothing but a consistent follower of one party all my life. I have never claimed to be anything else. I have been a supporter of rearmament all along the line, in season and out of season. I was a voice crying in the wilderness in the period between the two wars, when I said we should not leave the defence of civilization to notes, pacifist doctrines, the Monroe doctrine, and all that kind of thing. I supported, to the best of my ability, the expenditure of money on our defences, and in 1935, when I was sitting on the other side of the house, I opposed the reduction in the defence estimates that was made by my own government before the election of that year.

I regret the stand that the government has taken regarding a great "soldier, statesman and patriot" whom I have known since he was a student at McGill university. I do not know anything about the conduct of the war in Italy except what I have heard, though I believe there is one matter which might well be mentioned here. In this world war there has been too much dependence upon those who have graduated from staff colleges. I understand some of the best men in the field in this war are men who have been connected with the militia all their lives, men who have gone up the ladder from the bottom to the top, and in connection with our army, navy and air force I think it might have been better if that principle had been followed in this war a little more liberally than has been the case so far.

That is about all I have to say. I believe this is a matter for the government to decide, and I am sorry it has gone as far as it has because I believe the people are entitled to know the truth. Mistakes will always be made during a war. Mistakes have been made in connection with the Germans all down through history, and mistakes will be made in the future. Many more mistakes will be made before the end of this war unless this House of Commons reasserts itself. Talk about parliamentary control over the war! The private members of this house might just as well pack up and go home if we are just to take somebody's say-so in connection with the conduct of the war. I am strongly opposed to the stand taken by the Prime Minister and the government in this matter. I believe the people are entitled to all the facts. All the cards should be laid on the table; if that is done we will strengthen the morale of the people of Canada and of the troops at the front, who cannot say anything because they have lost their civilian status. They can say nothing at all; their civilian rights have been taken away, and it is up to us to protect our men in the field and the people at home. After all, wars are won by soldiers, sailors and airmen at the front, and not by home defence. I suggest to the noble seven down at the far end of the chamber that there is no such thing

as home defence, as the small nations of Europe found out to their sorrow. The mechanized hordes rolled right over the small nations. Canada has to stand with the mother country in this fight; we have to hang together or we shall hang separately, because none of the dominions is able to go it alone.

Mr. MacNICOL: I should like to ask the minister a question on the first item in his estimates, if am in order now. If my question is not in order I shall not expect the minister to answer it now. Yesterday in Toronto I found a good deal of excitement being caused by the calling up for service of eighteen year old lads going to high schools and collegiates. A man whom I know very well, who has one son nineteen years of age now in the air force and another lad nearly seventeen, called me up in reference to his neighbour's son. This boy is just past eighteen, and a day or two ago he received a call to report to military headquarters. My question is this. Has it come to that stage, that lads in Toronto and perhaps elsewhere, eighteen years of age, are being called to report to military headquarters, to be taken into the service?

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend has me at the moment; I did not know they were being called up at that age. I am afraid I have not the informations here just now, but I will have it within twenty minutes and will tell my hon. friend.

Mr. MacNICOL: If the Minister of National War Services had been in when the house opened I would have asked him the question on the orders of the day.

Mr. RALSTON: The case my hon. friend refers to was a call for military service?

Mr. MacNICOL: Yes, for army service.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: I should like to bring two matters to the attention of the minister. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has drawn attention to the calling up of eighteen year old boys. Could the minister tell us just what the policy of the government is with regard to the calling of conscientious objectors. I know these people are not very popular in the country and one does not court popularity by speaking in their behalf, but it appears that the government is intent upon calling every conscientious objector of military age, regardless of his occupation or of how essential he may be in agriculture or some other industry.

I was surprised yesterday when the minister informed us that men have been detailed from the army back to agriculture and other industries, while at the same time these conscientious objectors, who because of their religious scruples simply will not fight, are constantly being taken out of agriculture and industry, where they are doing a good job of production; and when they refuse to go to labour camps they are even sent to gaol, where they produce nothing but are an expense and liability to the country.

Mr. MacNICOL: And their wives and children are the sufferers.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: That is correct. I have two instances that came to my attention last week, both of which I have brought to the attention of the Minister of Labour, under whom the selective service operates. Apparently nothing can be done, however, to prevent these people from being sent to gaol.

Mr. RALSTON: To prevent what?

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: Apparently nothing can be done to prevent their being sent to gaol. In the first instance this man tells me he is employed in a shoe factory. His employer asked for his postponement, stating that it would be impossible to replace him and that production would suffer if he were called. Notwithstanding that, the man was instructed to go either into the army or into a labour camp. He refused to do either, and apparently he must go to gaol. The second case is that of a man who farms 150 acres of land, with 23 head of cattle, 35 hogs and 6 horses. I have verified these facts. He also has a tractor, which he uses in work for other farmers as well. His father is sixty years of age, and will be unable to carry on the farm if his son is taken away. Yet that man was haled into the army and, since he was a conscientious objector, was offered the opportunity of going into a labour camp, which he refused. I am told that his case was adjourned for a week to give him a chance to change his mind, but when he still refused to do so he was sent to gaol.

The point is that these people object to paying for the war under compulsion. One of these men tells me that if he had consented to pay $2 a week to the Red Cross he could have avoided going to gaol or going into the army. I have his statement here to the effect that he was offered the choice of paying $2 into the Red Cross or going into the army. I should like to know the government's position on that matter. On the surface it looks as though there is a prejudice against these men because of their religion. That religion may seem peculiar to some of us, but there would seem to be that prejudice.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): There is no reflection upon the Red Cross?

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: No, not in the slightest. It was simply that the officers were trying to offer this man an easy way out.

Mr. WOOD: In what district was it that this man who had 150 acres and 23 cows was refused postponement?

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: Around Brampton.

Mr. WOOD: That would be the Toronto district?

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: No. I am doubtful if this man would have been called from the farm had he not been a conscientious objector. I have been given the particulars of many farmers who were granted leave to remain on their farms and who to all intents and purposes were no more needed than this man. The second matter I wish to bring to the attention of the minister is the one we were discussing when the committee rose last night at eleven o'clock, the matter of dependent mothers.

Mr. RALSTON: I should like to appeal to the committee in connection with this discussion. I have pointed out to the committee that we have been over two days on item 1 and I do not think ten per cent of the discussion has related to that item. However, I felt that this was the time to permit hon. members to deal with the special things they had in mind or with general topics in connection with the department. My hon. friend has dealt with conscientious objectors. May I say to him with all respect that that matter does not come under the army at all. It has to do with the Department of Labour and national selective service. The next matter he proposes to take up is dependents' allowances which comes under item 2. I wonder if the committee would be prepared to pass item 1, or else confine the discussion to that item so that we may make at least that much progress. The next item will call for a long discussion since it covers pay and allowances which take in a good deal.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: I brought this up because it was under discussion last night, but I am quite prepared to wait.

Mr. RALSTON: I am trying to get the procedure in the groove, as it were. Does the hon. member for Yale, who is representing the leader of the opposition, think there should be any more discussion on this item?

Mr. STIRLING: I think the difficulty arises from the fact that we have adapted ourselves to a course of action which is not strictly in accordance with the rules. We have chosen to adopt this method of clarifying the situation and permitting a great latitude of discussion, but the fact remains that these items have not been committed to the committee. We are scarcely within the rules as we would be if it were a matter of the estimates.

Mr. RALSTON: I believe the Minister of Finance put them on *Hansard* when he made his speech.

Mr. STIRLING: But they have not been committed to the committee in the same way as the items of a money bill would be. We have had to devise our own methods of handling this matter, and I am sure the opposition will be ready to accommodate itself to whatever method of conduct may be adopted with the consent of the committee. Considerable discussion has taken place on item 1, but I think a certain amount of latitude was agreed to. I should imagine that most of the questions hon. members would want to ask would fall within the succeeding items.

Mr. LOCKHART: May I be permitted to bring a matter to the attention of the minister?

Mr. RALSTON: Is it under 1?

Mr. LOCKHART: I have given consideration to what the minister said about item 1 and perhaps item 2. I am referring to a situation which has developed within the last few days. It has to do with the housing of the wives of soldiers and their dependents. I cannot find any item in the list which would cover this except item 4, which covers construction, and that certainly is not the matter with which I wish to deal. I shall not hold up the committee any longer than possible, but what I have to say is supported by a strong resolution, copies of which I believe have reached the hands of the Minister of Munitions and Supply and will probably work back into the Department of National Defence.

I intend to deal with the matter of housing as it affects the families and dependents of soldiers who have gone overseas, as well as soldiers who have returned and their dependents. Many of these are unable to work and they require housing. I ask the minister or his assistant to take note of one or two things. When the wartime housing scheme was first started the Minister of Munitions and Supply did his best to provide housing for soldiers and their dependents by making available in some centres a small number of

houses which had been built by Wartime Housing Limited. However, when the pressure of production increased, the minister had some difficulty in meeting the demands made upon him.

I think the situation has changed to some extent, if not in all areas at least in my own constituency. I know of one plant the production of which has been reduced to the minimum. Hundreds of men have been laid off in other plants. As the minister has described it, it is now a case of maintenance rather than production. Soldiers and their dependents in this highly industrialized area have suffered considerably. Now that the pendulum is swinging back, the council of my city has taken the matter definitely in hand. As I say, I wish to bring two points to the minister's attention.

I ask him to be good enough to confer with the Minister of Munitions and Supply in an endeavour to have more latitude given to these dependents, and more particularly to those men who are coming back bruised and battered, both mentally and physically, by the war. In order to make my position clear I intend to refer to a resolution passed on Monday night by the council of my city. I shall not attempt to spread the whole text of this resolution upon the record, but I shall read just enough to give the minister the position. Will he just give me his attention? It was moved and seconded:

Whereas this council is definitely of the opinion that members of the armed forces, who have returned from overseas service or from active service in Canada and who have received their discharge papers, should have the opportunity of securing housing accommodation for themselves and their families, by means of rental of wartime housing dwellings.

I repeat, the peak of production in that area has been reached; the pendulum seems to be swinging back so that it is now more or less of a maintenance proposition. The council in its resolution goes on to point out that the dwellings erected by Wartime Housing Limited were put up originally to take care of an emergency situation and that they are not available for members of the armed forces who have been discharged from military service. The resolution goes on to say:

Now therefore this council hereby resolves that the dominion government be petitioned to amend the present regulations governing Wartime Housing Limited dwellings and to provide that members of the armed forces who have returned from duty overseas, or who have been honourably discharged from military service, should be eligible to secure Wartime Housing dwellings for themselves and their families; and that those whose families have been residing in Wartime Housing Limited dwellings during the period of their absence on military service be permitted to continue their occupation of these dwellings.

[Mr. Lockhart.]

There is also a reference to unpaid rent accounts. I have searched the records in vain to find anything covering that point; accordingly, I telegraphed to the corporation for instructions, and I received in reply this telegram:

St. Catharines, Ont.

N. J. M. Lockhart, M.P.

St. Catharines paid to Wartime Housing Limited three accounts for rentals unpaid by occupants amounting to a total of $118.12, and has also paid water rates $8.65 and electric light account $6.29.

Herbert H. Smith,
City Clerk.

I can find nothing in the law or regulations that gives Wartime Housing Limited the right to demand a guarantee from a municipality for the payment of rent for a soldier and his dependents. I think it is an unfair imposition to kick that back on to the municipality, because this housing accommodation is being used in some cases for the protection of the wives and families of soldiers who have gone overseas and returned. I suggest that in this matter the minister ask the cooperation of his colleague the Minister of Munitions and Supply to see if something cannot be done to rectify the present situation. In that area there are some 800 houses put up by Wartime Housing and there are many soldier families who have not been able to get decent housing accommodation. Some of them are living in hovels. Surely we can do something for the wives and dependents of soldiers who have returned to that area.

Mr. RALSTON: I think the quickest way for me to deal with the matter would be to get the letter which was written by the Minister of Finance to the mayors of Windsor and Hamilton, I think it was, setting out the whole arrangement. I shall then give the particulars to my hon. friend. At the moment I would say that what is done is to call to the attention of the municipalities that the matter of housing is not a federal responsibility but a municipal and community responsibility. Notwithstanding that, Wartime Housing Limited has given to the municipalities the use of a certain number of houses which they may want particularly for soldiers' dependents, to be used until other housing is obtainable, and the municipalities looking after the collecting of the rents. The soldier and his dependents are receiving pay and allowances for the purpose of paying rent. This is just a temporary arrangement which was made at the request of the municipalities in order to assist them in carrying out the usual obligations of municipalities in helping to provide housing for their citizens. In Windsor and Hamilton, particularly, the community associations are

very active in looking up housing accommodation for soldiers' dependents and in indicating or requesting, if necessary, housing of this kind from Wartime Housing Limited. Wartime Housing Limited has put at the disposal of different municipalities a certain number of houses. I have given this information to my hon. friend in advance. I will give him to-morrow the letter written by the Minister of Finance to the municipalities.

Mr. LOCKHART: May I add in all fairness to the Minister of Munitions and Supply that there is an acute housing situation in that area, which is probably the most highly industrialized in Ontario.

Mr. RALSTON: That is St. Catharines?

Mr. LOCKHART: Yes, including Merritton.

Mr. RALSTON: Hamilton too.

Mr. LOCKHART: Hamilton is also highly industrialized. There was a time when I felt extremely sympathetic toward the Minister of Munitions and Supply. I know that he simply could not give houses that just were not there, and the demand for munitions at that time was so great that munitions had to come first. But now the peak of production has passed in that area. I was in the national selective service office last Saturday morning and I saw at least seventy-five persons arranging for their transportation out of the city. Hundreds have already gone, and I know of several married couples who are planning on moving out because they see production tapering off.

Mr. RALSTON: Moving out of Wartime Housing?

Mr. LOCKHART: Yes, I know of three or four cases personally. The resolution passed by the city council of St. Catharines does not give specific cases. It deals with the problem generally. I could give the minister specific cases of men who have come back from overseas broken down in health who are now on hospital leave from Christie Street hospital and who just cannot get accommodation for themselves and their families in the St. Catharines area. There is a number of such cases. I am asking the minister to cooperate with the Minister of Munitions and Supply in relieving the housing shortage in that area for members of the armed forces who have returned from overseas and their dependents. I draw to the attention of the minister the situation of the returned men in that area. The city council has been doing its best to search all over for housing for a returned soldier who is mentally unbalanced on account of his war service. Here is an opportunity for Wartime Housing Limited to give returned men and their dependents some little preference in its housing accommodation.

Mr. GREEN: Yesterday the minister promised to give certain information. He said he would tell us, for example, how many men had been detailed for work in shipbuilding yards and other industries. When he is giving us that information, he could perhaps give us further details of the plans with regard to the men called up under N.R.M.A. Just two days ago the minister said that there were about 70,000 men in Canada who had been called into the army under the N.R.M.A. and that of that number 50,000 could be sent abroad to fight; in other words, there were 50,000 fighting men. That same figure of 50,000 fighting men was given also about a year ago by the minister, on May 14, to be exact. At that time he said that there were 50,000 men called up under the N.R.M.A. who could, if the government chose, be sent abroad to fight. A year has passed; 25,000 more men have been called up under the N.R.M.A., and yet to-day we have only 50,000 men, the minister says, fit to fight. I would ask the minister why it is that with this additional 25,000 called up there has been no increase in the number of those who can be sent abroad to fight. The plans for the coming year are that another 12,000 shall be called up. I should like to know whether it is the intention to have any larger number available for fighting, or whether these 12,000 who are to be called this year are simply to be replacements, so that a year from now we shall find, again, that we have only 50,000 N.R.M.A. men who are in a category such that they can do any fighting.

Mr. RALSTON: First, with regard to the matter of the men for the shipyards, no soldiers have been detailed for duty with the shipyards. At the request of the Department of Munitions and Supply, in November, commands and military districts were authorized to grant six months' leave without pay and allowances to sixty soldiers who were qualified electricians and who volunteered for employment with the Burrard Dry Dock Company, Limited, Vancouver, on electrical work in connection with the conversion of certain vessels into aircraft carriers. Is that what my hon. friend is referring to?

Mr. GREEN: Yes. Where did these men come from?

Mr. RALSTON: Soldiers granted this leave were issued with a free transportation warrant to Vancouver, British Columbia. This expenditure is recoverable by the Department of

National Defence from the Department of Munitions and Supply, who in turn will recover it from the Burrard Dry Dock company. Transportation on termination of employment is issued under the same conditions. Sixty soldiers volunteered and were released for this employment, reporting to Austin C. Taylor, Wartime Merchant Shipping, Limited, Vancouver, for interview and placement with Burrard. The report shows that recently fifty-seven of these men are still employed, three having terminated their employment due to ill health or other reasons.

I have not information here as to the districts they come from. My hon. friend will notice that commands and districts were authorized to grant six months' leave. They were specially trained electricians, and probably would come from quite a number of districts. I will find out.

Mr. GREEN: Were these men N.R.M.A. men?

Mr. RALSTON: I cannot tell. I will find out.

Mr. GREEN: Will the minister find out where they were sent from?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Mr. GREEN: I understand that some, at least, were sent from eastern Canada.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend understands they were volunteers for the work and were given leave.

Mr. GREEN: Is it possible, then, for a soldier, if he wishes to go into a shipyard, to get leave and go away from the army for an indefinite time?

Mr. RALSTON: This was a special case, a special request from the Department of Munitions and Supply to see if we could find them sixty electricians for special work, and we made an order authorizing the districts and commands to give leave to not more than sixty men in the aggregate for the purpose of taking on this work. And they got sixty men.

Mr. GREEN: Is there any similar provision to allow men to go away on leave to work in other industries, war industries or otherwise?

Mr. RALSTON: No. Yesterday I read to my hon. friend all the leaves that I know about: coal mining, railways—no, I think it was, detailed for duties on railways—farming, lumbering. I do not know of any others.

With regard to the N.R.M.A. personnel strength, the strength as of March 31, 1943, as given to me, was approximately 65,000 enrolled in that time. My hon. friend said 30,000, did he not? Nineteen thousand is what I have here.

Mr. GREEN: What year is that?

Mr. RALSTON: I beg pardon—enrolled during nine months up to December 31, 1943, 19,000; making 84,000.

Mr. GREEN: Of course the minister cannot state the figures for the full year.

Mr. RALSTON: No, I cannot tell my hon. friend yet. Then, to general service, 3,000; that is to say, men who enrolled and afterwards enlisted for general service; discharges, desertions, deaths, 8,000; making 11,000; leaving the strength as of 31st December, 1944, 73,000, and on leave under these different leaves, about 5,000; leaving the effective strength 68,000. It is estimated that about 50,000 of these are of a category suitable for overseas. At that rate, taking in the 12,000 planned for this year, I would not think there would be very much increase in the number eligible for overseas; there might be some by taking in the 12,000. The wastage here was 11,000 for the year; at least, the reductions from N.R.M.A.: 3,000 men enlisted and there were 8,000 desertions, discharges, deaths.

Mr. GREEN: How many were discharges and how many desertions?

Mr. RALSTON: I cannot tell.

Mr. GREEN: Can that information be obtained?

Mr. RALSTON: Certainly.

Mr. GREEN: Then the policy is that the number of real fighting men in Canada called up under the N.R.M.A. will not be increased?

Mr. RALSTON: What I said was that our provision this year is intended for maintenance. The strength may be increased; that is, if casualties are not in accordance with calculations; if they are, less; or it may be reduced if there are more casualties or if there are some other wastages that we do not know about. But the policy is—and that is what my hon. friend wants—to provide men on a maintenance basis for the present strength.

Mr. GREEN: There is one other question on which I should like the minister to give further information. It has to do with the retirement of officers; he has mentioned it once or twice already in the course of discussion but not in any detail. I think it is a very, very serious question, and I realize that it is a very difficult question. Apparently a large number of officers who have served, many of them since the beginning of the war,

and some of them overseas, with distinction, and have done good work, are now either being retired or being kept around the depots, told to report back once a week or just keep in touch, not knowing what is going to happen to them, not knowing whether they will be able to do anything further in the army, not knowing whether they should be getting busy about finding some place to earn their living in civilian life; and I think there should be a clear-cut announcement by the minister with regard to these men. It seems to me a tragedy that men can be brought along over this period of time, given many courses, trained until they are efficient officers, and now find that there is no use for them at the present time.

It is true that Canada has not done a great deal of fighting, and casualties—fortunately—have not been very heavy. Probably it will only be a short time until we are having heavy casualties and shall need some of these men. I think the policy regarding them should be given further consideration by the minister. Sometimes I wonder whether the department has not gone too far in the direction of arbitrarily ruling men out at a certain age. Personally I know of many cases where men have gone into the army at great sacrifice and done a good job and now are just hanging around, not knowing what is going to happen to them, becoming disgruntled, and, I think, being treated unfairly. I know the minister would not do that intentionally, but that is the result. These men feel that they are being treated unfairly. Is there not a place for some of them, at any rate, in the administration of the conquered countries, the countries which have been overrun? I believe that we have a course in which Canadian officers are trained for administration work in the overrun countries. Is there not scope here for some of these men? The situation is very serious, and the minister should give further consideration to it, not just say, "Oh, we are modernizing our army and these men have to get out; we thank them for what they have done, but they had better get busy and return to civilian life." That may have to be the answer, but it just does not seem good enough to me under present conditions, in the state of the war at the present time. If this is to be the policy in training these men there is a great deal of money as well as experience being wasted, and I doubt whether the governmental policy at the present time is a wise one. I should like to have an answer.

Mr. RALSTON: Let me give the figures with regard to the break-down of the 8,000: 6,500 were discharged, 1,500 deserted.

Mr. GREEN: That is, 1,500 N.R.M.A. deserted in the nine months of the present fiscal year?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Mr. GREEN: Are these 1,500 still missing?

Mr. RALSTON: They may be missing and other men may be picked up. There has been a more or less even flow in the last three months.

Mr. GREEN: That is a very high percentage of desertions.

Mr. RALSTON: There have been 11,000 in the four and a half years of war—a net loss of 11,000. In reference to officers, my hon. friend has spoken on a subject regarding which he is quite right in assuming that I have a very particular interest. I appreciate all that he has said and I considered all that before the present policy was put into effect. The situation is this. We must be realistic and face the hard fact that there are many officers who, as compared with other officers, are not advantageously employable; that is to say, there are officers who can better do the job and whose services are available. What is being done, therefore, is to have these boards sort out the officers, appraise their qualifications, and endeavour to find the best men for the job. That means that there is a substantial reduction in officers, and will be.

Mr. GREEN: Does the minister mean that there are younger officers?

Mr. RALSTON: There are some younger officers too. In the last week I have signed ten retirements for officers from twenty-one to thirty. The term "not advantageously employable" was used, but it meant that those particular officers simply could not do the job and it was felt that they ought to serve somewhere else.

Mr. GREEN: In most cases it is a matter of age.

Mr. RALSTON: It is a matter of age and also a matter of the job being abolished. The majority of cases are those of age. Here is the number, and perhaps this will contradict what I said. In the three months from October to January 26, 1,077 officers have been retired, and of that number 212 were recommended for retirement for reasons of age. Of the others, the 800, many were probably seniors—not senior officers but senior in point of age.

Mr. GREEN: Replaced by younger men?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON: How many retired at their own request?

Mr. RALSTON: I have not that statement at the moment. I do not want to refer to what anyone else is doing, or to give that as an excuse for what we are doing, but I have heard no statement which the Minister of National Defence for Air has made this year which has been received with as much applause as the statement he made with regard to the reduction in the number of officers.

Mr. GREEN: You cannot judge policies by applause in this house.

Mr. RALSTON: Nevertheless I thought it rather indicated that the policy was a sound one. Someone said to me, "Does that affect you?" I said, "It affects me to this extent that the army started ten months ago"—

Mr. GREEN: Do not pay too much attention to applause.

Mr. RALSTON: —and I was told that it was a good example to follow. The same situation exists in the United States. They announced a surplus of 65,000 officers and subsequently, through reorganization, the number has been reduced by about half. That is the situation. It is the same in munitions plants, and with executives who have been helping in the war effort. The time has come when we are on a maintenance rather than on a capital basis and the result is a distinct lowering in the number of jobs available. The system we have may not work perfectly, but I do take some pride in it. These officers have personal interviews, and the officers at the depots are in most cases men to whom it could be said at once, "out". At the same time, however, these boards are doing their level best to be sure that there is no job for these men before they are allowed to go. Men come to me frequently and say, "I want an answer yes or no"; but they do not want no. It is the same with these officers. Each individual case is considered by the board and passed on by the adjutant general and by the military secretary, whom I regard as the officer's friend. He goes over the cases himself, and it is only after all that is done that the retirements take place. There is a regular procedure and a notice is sent to the officer. Only this morning I gave instructions to see if we could not make that notice a little more human.

Mr. GREEN: It is not very human now.

Mr. RALSTON: It is a mimeographed notice that goes to the officer, and after he has held a post for some time it is not a particularly welcome document. We want to make it as human as we possibly can. The notice is given and the man has an opportunity of making a complaint or a protest or pointing out where he might be used. That is considered by the board, and they make a recommendation as to whether or not the representation shall be entertained, or whether that particular occupation or post which the man suggests might be made available to him. It is only after all that is done that the discharge is made. I take a view opposite to that of my hon. friend. I think officers ought to be discharged faster than they are.

Mr. GREEN: Ought to be what?

Mr. RALSTON: I say there should be more speed in connection with the discharge of officers, and I am afraid that the slowness is due to the fact that the board is working at what is an impossible task, namely, that of finding employment for all these men. The point is that these men are much better off going back to civil life now than when the rush comes. This is an opportunity for them to go back, and what is detaining them is the pride which they feel in the fact that they have worn the uniform during the war, have helped to build up the army, and have trained men, and feel, therefore, that there should be some place in the army for them while the war lasts.

There was a man of forty-nine in my office the day before yesterday. He has two boys overseas with good service in this war, and he was overseas himself; yet we sent one of these notices to him. The notice took a somewhat more human and intimate form than is usual, but he made an appeal to the minister, as it is his right to do under section 42. I am sending him a letter, as I am bound to, to tell him that I cannot find employment for him. These are tough cases—this is a particularly tough one because there are many that have not nearly the merit it has. I should like to be able to tell the committee that I will try to reconsider the policy, but I cannot reconsider it if administration is to be carried on. It would mean that we would be loaded up with a lot of officers on the payroll, and they would be at least lulled into the security of thinking there is a job for them, only to find, some day, sooner or later, that they have to be cut off. There will have to be many more retirements yet, as there have been in the United States. As regards age, in the United States they are retiring them if over thirty-eight and putting them on the inactive list. We are retiring them at sixty; that is the automatic retirement. I do not say that

in the United States they automatically retire those over thirty-eight, but those are the only ones taken into account. They look over the men of thirty-eight and see how many can be retired. We are taking them much lower than that, from between thirty and thirty-five. There are not many of these, though there are some.

That is the policy with regard to officers and it is working. That is the machinery we have set up. We have not just one board for Canada but four boards. These boards have gone out and got acquainted with these officers intimately in order to assess their qualifications and at the same time to be in touch with the districts to find out what posts there are into which they may be fitted.

Mr. GREEN: About how many officers are facing retirement? How many will have to be retired?

Mr. RALSTON: I cannot tell my hon. friend, for this reason: You take officers in the bulk. We might have what may be regarded as a reserve—this figure is a rough one—of six thousand or something like that in other words, subalterns, a great many officers who have been recently commissioned. It includes older officers as well. You have to keep a substantial reserve, and I cannot say how many of these would be facing retirement. I am not going to make any guess at the moment. Speaking of officers, I should like to make an announcement to the committee before it is made to the press. This is an announcement which will take up the slack in connection with a number of these junior officers, the men who have just graduated or who are in training centres. We are making an arrangement with the British to lend them a certain number—I am not going to say the number, but it is a substantial number—

Mr. GREEN. Junior officers?

Mr. RALSTON: Junior officers, yes. Under the plan a large number of junior officers, largely of the infantry corps, the Canadian army, are to be lent on a voluntary basis to the British army for service in the European and Mediterranean theatres of war. The plan will permit many captains and lieutenants trained in infantry for overseas duty and physically fit, who otherwise would be unlikely soon to see service abroad, to gain further valuable experience with the British army. The plan is to go into effect immediately. For security reasons the number of officers permitted to go into action with British units under this agreement cannot be disclosed, but a definite limit will be placed on the number to be accepted. The great strength in reinforcement officers which has gradually been built up in Canada since the outbreak of war makes it improbable that all officers eligible for overseas service will see early action with the Canadian army overseas. The loan plan offers an opportunity to serve with the British forces in the field. Junior officers of the Canadian army in order to take advantage of this plan must, of course, volunteer for this service; that is to say, officers will be given the option of volunteering to go to the British under this plan. They will be on loan for a minimum period of three months. However, their recall has been provided for as and when it is desirable; that is to say, recall by the Canadian government.

One effect of that scheme will be to create for the Canadian army a pool of experienced and, in many cases, battle-trained platoon and company commanders and potential junior staff officers. The Canadian officers who volunteer for service with the British army will continue to receive their pay and allowances from the Canadian government and at regular Canadian rates, as in the case of the Royal Canadian Air Force crew serving with the Royal Air Force. They will also continue to wear "Canada" badges on their shoulders while serving with the British army. It is pointed out that by volunteering under this plan, Canadian junior officers do not forego opportunities for normal promotion, but while on loan their promotion will be subject to British recommendation and confirmation by Canadian authorities. During the last war many Canadians served as officers in British units in a number of theatres of active operation. The contacts made between the Canadian officers volunteering for this service and the British army should prove invaluable in cementing the cordial relations and understanding already existing between the Canadian and British armies. The loan plan was termed by a senior British officer—that is, in correspondence with the department—as a great contribution to the united war effort.

I am afraid there is not very much more I can give in the way of details of the plan. I have already said that they are volunteers. With regard to the ranks of officers we are lending, they are ready to take one captain for each eight lieutenants. They can be recalled at any time. They are to be kept for a minimum of three months. We are asking the officers to agree not to ask for a return to Canada for at least three months. There will be special cases, of course—

Mr. GREEN: Are they going from England or from Canada?

Mr. RALSTON: Practically all from Canada. Pay, allowances and pensions will be paid by Canada. In reference to discipline,

we want to be particular about that. All adverse reports will be submitted to Canadian military headquarters in London before action is instituted thereon; that is to say, Canada feels that we should keep our hand on that particular feature of the service, particularly since they are on loan. They are subject, of course, to British military law, but in case of a court martial—and I hope there will not be any—sentence must be confirmed by Canadian authorities. We are planning to have a liaison officer at the war office to do nothing but look after postings of these officers and generally watch their interest and the Canadian interest in connection with this plan. I mentioned promotion. It will be to acting rank on recommendation of the British. Normally these would be confirmed by Canadian military headquarters after six months.

Mr. STIRLING: Is this open to officers of all infantry units in the Canadian active army in Canada at the present time?

Mr. RALSTON: I do not know. The adjutant general is working on it to-day. I do not know exactly whether he is making it to apply to other than those who are actually at corps training centres or at Brockville taking advanced refresher courses, or in camps. I rather think it might be made pretty generally open unless it is a case where in the exigencies of the service a man cannot be spared. My own feeling would be—I was talking to the adjutant general this morning—to give a chance to all junior officers who can be spared. If a man wants to volunteer let him go and substitute for somebody who does not. I may say also I do not think there is any objection in the way of security to saying this. The understanding is that the service is to be restricted to the European and Mediterranean theatres in order to facilitate return in case we should want to recall them.

This is a plan which I think bids fair to provide some outlet for the energies of a number of junior officers who at the present time are viewing with some concern the prospects of getting overseas soon, and at the same time it provides them with training.

Mr. GREEN: Would it not be wise to make the same provision for some of our officers to be trained with the Australians in the Pacific area? Sooner or later Canada will be fighting the Japanese. It is vital that there should be trained men in that type of warfare. Why are we not giving our men an opportunity to get that training?

Mr. RALSTON: Do not let my hon. friend assume we are not. I am not making any statement in regard to that at the moment. There are some arrangements along that line in hand.

Mr. POULIOT: Just a minute ago, the hon. member for Vancouver South, who asked a few questions, mentioned N.R.M.A. soldiers. I have in my hand the *Canada Gazette* of October 30, which contains the National Resources Mobilization Act, army regulations 1943. It is National Resources Mobilization Act army. By virtue of the mobilization act there are two kinds of regulations, those enforced by the Department of Labour and those enforced by the Department of National Defence proper. These regulations are something like a schedule to an act, and there is a paragraph which I intend to read to show the importance of the regulations and to show also that by virtue thereof the Department of National Defence has a priority over all essential industry. This means, therefore, that national selective service is the bunk. Here is the paragraph which is of the utmost importance; listen to this:

> In the event of any inconsistency between the provisions of these regulations and the provisions of any other statute or any orders or regulations made thereunder, the provisions of these regulations shall govern.

This is contained in order in council P.C. 7898, which was passed on October 14, 1943, and it means that the regulations established under the order in council for the Department of National Defence have priority over the regulations, also passed by order in council, administered by the Minister of Labour. This has been drafted in an ingenious way. A volunteer is no longer a volunteer according to these regulations; he is a G.S. soldier, under subparagraph (c) of paragraph 6 of the appendix to the order in council I have just mentioned. One would wonder just what is a G.S. soldier; no one ever heard of him before, but it means "general service." The provision reads:

> A "G.S. soldier" is a soldier who has voluntarily enlisted for general service during the continuation of the state of war now existing and for the period of demobilization thereafter and who has been taken on the strength of the Canadian army (active) and appointed to a corps placed on active service under section 64 of the Militia Act.

That is the act by virtue of which we have conscription for overseas, but this is the definition of a volunteer; a volunteer is a G.S. soldier. Now, what is a N.R.M.A. soldier? That means nothing. He is a draftee, a conscript or a recruit, who has not volunteered as yet. The regulation reads:

A "N.R.M.A. soldier" is a soldier who has been enrolled and who is undergoing training or performing service or duty under the N.R.M.A. or regulations passed pursuant thereto.

So that a N.R.M.A. soldier is one who has been called by virtue of the regulations giving authority to the Department of Labour. Then amendments were made to this order, but I have only the French copy of the war orders of December 20, 1943, containing the amendments to the army regulations, which were published in the *Canada Gazette*. I would ask the minister to be kind enough to complete the amendments made by order in council P.C. 9372 of December 7, 1943. I hope that to-morrow he will be able to give us a summary of the amendments to those regulations, which are of the utmost importance.

What I find wrong in this amendment is that it refers to the Army Act, which is not included in the Revised Statutes of Canada but is published in another book. It seems to me that the proper way to legislate is to pass amendments which are complete in themselves, and for the understanding of which it is not necessary to go through the whole library. This amendment contains the definition of a man who reports to a training centre following receipt of an order under the authority of national selective service, and it includes also the definition of a person. Then there is a reference to paragraph 10 of section 176 of the Army Act, and further on there is another reference to the Army Act. May I suggest that the minister tell the office of the judge advocate general that the sections of other acts referred to should be included in amendments affecting any of these orders in council. We have these war orders and regulations, but they mean nothing if each amendment or each order is not complete in itself. I am a layman; I cannot understand the meaning and purpose of that amendment of December 7, and there may be others. It seems only right that members of parliament should be familiar with the regulations affecting the boys in the army or those who may be called by the registrars, and the effect of the call. At the present time it is impossible to inform anyone; we have to write to the department, disturbing the minister or his parliamentary assistant or the other officials, to secure the information we are entitled to have at hand all the time.

Mr. RALSTON: I can give my hon. friend the information. That particular amendment just strikes out two words in section 26, if he and I are looking at the same thing.

Mr. POULIOT: If the minister will pardon me, I am referring to order in council P.C. 9372 of December 7, 1943; it is one of the first orders in council contained in the war orders which were published on December 20 last. It takes thirteen and a half lines in French.

Mr. RALSTON: I thought my hon. friend was asking me what was the effect of P.C. 9372.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes, and I should like to know what is the definition of a person according to the Army Act, as well as the meaning of the two references to the Army Act in that order in council.

Mr. RALSTON: I think I can give my hon. friend the effect of order in council P.C. 9372 on what I have marked here as order in council P.C. 7989 and the regulations attached thereto. Is that what my hon. friend is dealing with?

Mr. POULIOT: No; what I am asking for is the text of the references to the Army Act which are included in order in council P.C. 9372 and other amendments, if any, to order in council P.C. 7989.

Progress reported.

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

Thursday, February 17, 1944

The house met at three o'clock.

DOMINION ELECTIONS

CONCURRENCE IN SECOND REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE (ARMED SERVICES)

Mr. SAMUEL FACTOR (Spadina) presented the second report of the special committee on the Dominion Elections Act, 1938, (armed services), and moved that the report be concurred in.

Mr. SPEAKER: By leave of the house.

Motion agreed to.

SUGAR

PRODUCTION OF SUGAR BEETS—MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT UNDER STANDING ORDER 31

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, I ask for leave under standing order 31 to move the adjournment of the house for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the urgent need for government financial measures to stimulate greater production of sugar beets and beet sugar in Canada during the year 1944.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. gentleman let me see his statement?

Mr. BLACKMORE: Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lethbridge has asked for leave to move the adjournment of the house for several reasons, chief among which might be mentioned: (1) the fact that last week, sugar controller S. R. Noble announced that there was real danger of a greater shortage of sugar in Canada during 1944 and 1945; (2) that costs of producing beets in Canada have risen during the war by reason of a rise in the wages of labour and an increase in charges for trucking and other services; (3) that Canadian sugar beet growers have recently asked the Canadian government for a rebate of one-half cent per pound of the excise tax now levied upon beet sugar refined in Canada; (4) the contracts for growing beets are generally signed by farmers during the months of January and February; (5) that war-time conditions are making it more profitable to produce on beet land other crops to the displacement of sugar beets; (6) and the consequent fact that unless the prices for beets are rendered stimulating, much less sugar for Canada may result.

I may say that the hon. member communicated to me the contents of the statements which I have just read, and I have indicated to him, as I now indicate. that this is not a matter which is sufficiently urgent, and so needing immediate reply, as to justify my putting it to the house for leave to move the adjournment for the purpose of discussing it.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk)

TEA IN STORAGE

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. What is the quantity of tea stored in Saint John, New Brunswick?

2. What is the quantity of tea stored in Halifax?

Mr. ABBOTT: For security reasons it is not considered in the public interest to publish information regarding stocks of an imported commodity like tea, on the basis of which it might be possible for the enemy to draw inferences regarding the movement of ships on the high seas. Stocks vary considerably from day to day, and release of the figures for any particular date might also lead to unwarranted and undesirable speculation as to changes in consumer rations.

CARS OF GRAIN ON TRACKS AT FORT WILLIAM TERMINAL

Mr. BENCE:

How many cars full of grain were on the tracks in both the Canadian National and Canadian Pacific Railway terminals at Fort William on February 1, 1944?

Mr. MICHAUD: On the tracks of the Canadian Pacific Railway: For unloading, 561 cars; for movement east, 165 cars; total, 726 cars.

On the tracks of the Canadian National Railways: For unloading, 192 cars; for movement east, 143 cars; total, 335 cars.

DOMINION PUBLIC BUILDINGS, OTTAWA—WINDOW-CLEANING

Mr. STOKES:

1. Is the cleaning of windows in public buildings in Ottawa done by contract?

2. If so, what is the name of the contractor, were tenders called for, and what is the contract price or cost, (a) per window; (b) in total?

3. What was the total cost of window-cleaning of public buildings in Ottawa when done by day-labour?

Mr. FOURNIER (Hull):

1. The cleaning of windows is done partly by contract and partly by day labour.

2. The Elgin Window Cleaners were the contractors for 1943, spring and fall cleaning. Tenders were called for in each case. (a) No cost per window was furnished in tenders as windows vary in size. (b) For the year 1943 spring and fall cleaning, the cost of work by contract was $16,160.05 and by day labour $17,065.10.

3. The total cost of window cleaning in 1938 when the windows in all government buildings in Ottawa, with the exception of the national research building, were cleaned by day labour was $15,229. The cost of cleaning windows in the national research building was $200 done by contract. The number of public buildings in Ottawa requiring window cleaning has been greatly increased since 1938, due to the number of large temporary buildings constructed as well as other buildings acquired for war purposes.

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT—RED DEER CONSTITUENCY

Mr. SHAW:

1. How many soldier settlers under contract to the soldier settlement board of Canada were there in the federal constituency of Red Deer as at September 1, 1939?

2. How many such settlers were there in the same area as at January 1, 1944?

3. How many of those soldier settlers who were located upon soldier settlement farms in the Red Deer federal constituency on September

1, 1939, (a) have since that date completed payment for the farms and now hold title; (b) had their contracts cancelled by the board; (c) surrendered their contracts and left the farms?

4. How many of those soldier settlers in that area who are still under contract to the board are in good standing in that all payments have been made up to date under the terms of the contract?

Mr. CRERAR: I desire to say a word on this question. To get the information asked for in the question would take weeks, if not months, of searching through the individual files of the soldier settlers in the province of Alberta. These records are not kept by constituencies. I therefore must say that the question is not one which I think should be asked in this form. If my hon. friend is interested in any particular case I should be very glad to see him and give him the information. I suggest that the question be dropped, and perhaps he could have a word with me about it and see if we cannot meet his wishes in some other way.

Mr. SHAW: May the question be permitted to stand, and I can consult with the minister?

Mr. CRERAR: Well, the question may stand, but I can only reiterate that it would take weeks if not months to get the information.

Mr. SHAW: I desire, Mr. Speaker, to redraft the question. I would not want to see it dropped, unless the minister insists.

Mr. CRERAR: May I suggest to my hon. friend that he drop it and redraft it, and perhaps he would be good enough to have a word with me. There is no desire to withhold any information.

Question dropped.

R.C.A.F.—CONTRACTS WITH NORTHERN PETROLEUM COMPANY

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. Has the Northern Petroleum Company of Kamsack, Saskatchewan, any contract with the air force?

2. If so, what is the nature and date thereof?

3. What payments have been made to the said company to date thereunder?

Mr. MACMILLAN:

1. Yes. Two contracts.

2. (a) To purchase used aero engine oil and used cleaners fluid accumulating at the various units of Nos. 2 and 4 training commands and southern units of western air command, arranged by the salvage officer. (b) The Department of Munitions and Supply have arranged contracts on behalf of the R.C.A.F. for the purchase of re-refined aero engine oil for use in M.T. vehicles.

3. Payments to date, according to chief treasury officer (air), amounted to $14,337.83.

MERCHANT SHIP "PORT ROYAL PARK"

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Where was the merchant ship *Port Royal Park* built?

2. Who built it?

3. What did it cost?

4. When was it chartered, and who was it chartered to?

5. Were repairs or replacements made to it at the port of Saint John in 1943, and if so, what repairs or replacements were made, who made them, and how much was paid each person or corporation for such repairs or replacements?

Mr. CHEVRIER:

1. Sorel, P.Q.

2. Marine Industries Limited.

3. The final cost has not been finally determined and will not be until the renegotiation proceedings now in progress have been completed.

4. The ship was delivered to Elder-Dempster Lines Limited in November, 1942, to operate on behalf of Park Steamship Company Limited under the usual management agreement.

5. The *Port Royal Park* was repaired in Saint John at the works of the St. John Iron Works Limited during the period from September 1 to October 31, 1943. The repairs were as follows: (a) repairs to boilers because of leaky tubes; (b) cleaning boilers; (c) supplying and installing fresh water pump; (d) constructing store room in engine room; (e) repairs to winches; (f) repairs to lifeboats; (g) constructing new life raft.

The cost of these repairs was $42,217.32. The superintendent-engineer of Park Steamship Company Limited, after reviewing the whole job, decided that the builders were liable for a total of $16,091.80 which leaves a net repair bill to Park Steamship Company Limited of $26,125.52.

CANADIAN AIRMEN IN BRITAIN—UNIFORMS

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West):

1. Does the Canadian government supply the uniforms for the Canadian airmen in Great Britain?

2. If not, by whom are they supplied?

3. Is the quality of the cloth in these uniforms as good as the quality of the cloth supplied for the uniforms in Canada?

Mr. MACMILLAN:

1. No, with the exception of raincoats, cap badges and buttons.

2. With the exception of the items mentioned in No. 1 above, all clothing required

by R.C.A.F. airmen in Great Britain and in other overseas theatres of war, is supplied by the R.A.F. and is paid for by annual capitation payment from R.C.A.F. funds.

3. No official comparison or test has been made.

GOVERNMENT-OWNED COLD STORAGE PLANT, QUEBEC CITY

Mr. SENN:

1. Is there a government-owned cold-storage plant and warehouse located in Quebec city or adjacent thereto?

2. If so, how long has this plant been in operation under government ownership?

3. What are the names of the several managers who have been in charge of this plant since its inception; giving dates of appointment and release?

4. What is the name of the manager in charge during the months of January and February, 1944?

5. When was he appointed, what are his qualifications, what was his previous experience, and what is his present salary?

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. Yes, the national harbours board plant.

2. From 1924 to 1936 operated by Quebec Harbour Commission—1936 to date by National Harbours Board.

3. Name—title—appointment—release:

Arthur H. DeRome, supt., Oct. 1, 1924–March 27, 1931.

J. Herve Baribeau, supt., May 1, 1931–Dec. 2, 1935.

Alex. Chaumette, acting supt., Dec. 3, 1935.

Alex. Chaumette, supt., March 1, 1937–March 15, 1943.

J. E. Lafrance, supt., March 1, 1943.

4. J. E. Lafrance, superintendent.

5. Employed since 1925 in various capacities at Quebec harbour and promoted to superintendent, cold storage warehouse, March 1, 1943, at salary of $2,700 per annum; education commercial course and normal school, Laval university and employed as teacher prior to employment in 1925.

GOVERNMENT-OWNED COLD STORAGE PLANT, QUEBEC CITY—BEEF

Mr. SENN:

1. Was a large quantity of fresh beef stored in the government cold-storage plant at Quebec withheld from public sale?

2. Was this done on instructions of the health authorities?

3. What is the total quantity involved?

4. Was this beef owned by the government or by private firms or persons?

5. If by private parties, is the government liable for any losses?

6. Was a portion of this beef stored in a cooling warehouse commonly used to store fruit?

7. At what temperature was this cold-storage warehouse kept while the beef was in storage?

[Mr. Macmillan.]

Mr. MICHAUD: These answers are furnished by the National Harbours Board.

1, 2 and 3. 64,118 pounds of beef were withheld from public sale by Quebec city health authorities pending inspection by them and treatment if ordered.

4. Private firms or persons.

5. Conditions under which goods are accepted for storage, as set forth in warehouse receipt are as follows:—

All goods stored are held by this board as warehousemen and are stored subject to the rules and regulations of the corporation's tariff governing cold and general merchandise storage, handling and distribution, and further, are at the owner's or depositor's risk of loss or damage caused by water, heat, frost, damp, rust, dust, moths, rats, mice, vermin, leakage, odour, taste, etc. Depreciation from time or intrinsic defects, or from want of any special care or precaution or stoppage of machinery, from fire, strikes or collapse of building, by enemies of the King or irresistible force, inevitable accident, or from any cause beyond the control of the board. Quality contents and value unknown and weights or tally except as herein specified. The owners of merchandise stored with this board must pay the full storage and other charges accrued on all goods damaged or destroyed by such causes. Perishable goods or others susceptible to damage through changes of temperature or other causes incidental to ordinary storage will be accepted by this board only at owner's risk. All charges are due monthly and before delivery, and payment thereof guaranteed by the several owners or assigns. The acceptance of this receipt constitutes an agreement to all terms and conditions mentioned and referred to hereon.

6 and 7. In August and September, 1943, national harbours board cold storage warehouse in Quebec had to refuse meat and butter for storage as all the freezer rooms were filled and there was anxiety on the part of all concerned due to a lack of space in the freezer rooms. Certain investigations were made concerning a rearrangement of space to make available the use of cooler room 11-A for storing meat that already was or would be frozen prior to storage in this room. The proposed arrangement was discussed with the principal owners concerned, including representatives of a large meat packing company who were pressing for arrangements to be made by which more fresh meat could be received from them for freezing, and who in fact were the owners of the larger part of the meat eventually stored in the room. It was recognized that a temperature of 15° F. was preferable, but, in the circumstances, the principal owners considered that the temperature of 20-22° F., the lowest that could be maintained in the room referred to, would be safe and satisfactory to them. The temperature of room 11-A was therefore lowered from 30-32° F. to 20-22° F. and on

September 15 last the warehouse started to store therein meats that had been received frozen, or that had been received unfrozen and were frozen in the freezing rooms.

VETERANS' LAND ACT

Mr. LOCKHART:

1. Under the Veterans' Land Act, has the government appointed to any board, any members of returned soldiers' organizations, and if so, how many such appointments have been made, and on whose recommendation were such appointments made?

2. Has the advisory board, provided for in section 16 of the Veterans' Land Act, any power to prevent recession or resale of property acquired under the act by any veteran?

3. Has an advisory committee appointed under section 34 of the Veterans' Land Act any power to reverse or otherwise control a decision of the director?

Mr. CRERAR:

1. No boards have yet been appointed under section 16 of the act. Twenty-five regional advisory committees have been appointed under section 34 of the act. The committee personnel total 107 members, 72 of whom are returned soldiers. It is not known how many of these returned soldier committee members are members of returned soldier organizations. Appointments were made on the recommendation of the director, the Veterans' Land Act.

2. Yes.

3. No. In actual operations under the act advisory committees are required to consider and render written opinion in respect to the qualifications of veterans, the selection of lands and generally in respect to such other matters as may be referred to them by the director.

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING OF CATTLE

Mr. CARDIFF:

1. How many cattle, (a) beef; (b) dairy, were produced in Canada in each year, 1939-1943 inclusive?

2. How many cattle were marketed through the stockyards in Canada in each year 1939-1943 inclusive?

3. How many cattle were delivered directly to packers' yards in Canada in each year, 1939-1943 inclusive?

4. How many cattle, (a) beef; (b) dairy, were shipped to the United States in each year, 1939-1943 inclusive?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. Cattle Population

	Beef	Dairy
1939	4,601,100	3,873,500
1940	4,670,600	3,894,700
1941	4,911,700	3,886,100
1942	5,264,200	3,680,500
1943	5,870,500	3,794,700

2.

Cattle Marketed Through Stock Yards in Canada

1939	789,149
1940	812,405
1941	875,542
1942	861,082
1943	812,493

3.

Cattle Delivered Direct to Packing Plants in Canada

1939	278,389
1940	317,556
1941	374,472
1942	336,184
1943	382,980

4.

Cattle Shipped to the United States From Canada

	Beef	Dairy
1939	182,209	9,044
1940	131,330	9,813
1941	160,773	13,580
1942	124,077	18,961
1943	.....	36,944

FIFTH VICTORY LOAN

Mr. NOSEWORTHY:

1. What is the cost to the government of raising the fifth victory loan for, (a) publicity; (b) canvassers; (c) banks and investment dealers, commissions, etc. (d) other expenses?

2. What was the total amount subscribed?

3. What was the total number of subscriptions?

4. What was the amount subscribed and the number of subscribers in each denomination in which subscriptions were received?

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I understand that some of this information is not yet available, and would suggest that the question be dropped for the time being.

Question dropped.

SHIPMENTS OF CANADIAN BEER

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. How much Canadian beer was shipped to the United States in 1943?

2. How much of this beer was shipped in bond for transhipment overseas?

3. How much Canadian beer was shipped to Egypt in 1943?

4. How much of the beer was received by Canadian units operating in Egypt and the western desert?

5. How much Canadian beer was shipped to Ceylon in 1943?

6. How much of this beer was received by Canadian units operating in Ceylon?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West):

2, 4 and 6. No information.

1, 3 and 5. Canadian exports of "ale, beer and porter" to the United States, Egypt and Ceylon, during the calendar year 1943.

Country	Gal.	Value
United States	2,322,108	$2,038,226
Egypt	1,058,610	922,176
Ceylon	229,160	198,920

It is understood that the greater proportion of the beer shipped to the United States is transhipped elsewhere for the use of the fighting forces.

CHARTERED BANKS—PAYMENTS FOR HANDLING VICTORY LOANS, ETC.

Mr. NICHOLSON:

1. How much has been paid to the chartered banks of Canada since September, 1939, (a) in connection with ration coupon banking; (b) in connection with the sale and handling of victory bonds, war savings certificates and stamps?

2. What was the total amount of victory bonds purchased by the chartered banks of Canada during the victory loan campaigns since September, 1939?

3. What is the total value of victory bonds owned by the chartered banks as at January 1, 1944?

Mr. ABBOTT:

1. (a) In the period from September 1939 to February 16, 1944, $460,618.51 has been paid by the wartime prices and trade board to the chartered banks of Canada for their services in connection with ration coupon banking for the period March 1, 1943 to November 30, 1943.

(b) Commissions and service fees paid to chartered banks of Canada and banks incorporated under Quebec Savings Banks Act in connection with the issue and sale of war loans and victory loans, amounted to $10,197,745.88 (service fees for fifth victory loan not yet paid). No remuneration paid to banks in connection with sale of war savings stamps and certificates.

2. Cash subscriptions

First war loan	$2,300,000*
Second war loan	741,000*
First victory loan	6,740,000
Second victory loan	Nil
Third victory loan	500,000
Fourth victory loan	500,000
Fifth victory loan	Nil

*Estimated.

3. No information. The monthly returns of liabilities and assets of the chartered banks of Canada show total amount of dominion and provincial direct and guaranteed securities held by each bank.

[Mr. Sinclair.]

PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. NICHOLSON:

1. What was the total net debt incurred by the dominion government as at, (a) March 31, 1943; (b) March 31, 1939; (c) March 31, 1919; (d) March 31, 1914?

2. What was the total interest payable by the dominion government for each of the above years?

3. What was the per capita, (a) debt; (b) interest payment for each of the above years?

Mr. ABBOTT:

1. (a) March 31, 1943—$6,182,849,101.10
(b) March 31, 1939—$3,152,559,314.48
(c) March 31, 1919—$1,574,531,032.44
(d) March 31, 1914—$ 335,996,850.14

2.

Fiscal Year ended March 31	Interest on Public Debt
1914	$ 12,893,504.95
1919	$ 77,431,432.10
1939	$127,995,616.75
1943	$188,556,249.39

3. (a)

	Per capita net debt
March 31, 1914	$ 42.64
March 31, 1919	189.45
March 31, 1939	278.62
March 31, 1943	523.44

(b)

Fiscal year ended March 31	Per capita expenditure on interest on public debt
1914	$ 1.64
1919	9.32
1939	11.31
1943	15.96

C. H. CAHAN, JR.

Mr. KNOWLES:

Have any steps been taken by the Minister of Justice to order a new trial in the case of C. H. Cahan, Jr., now of Agassiz, British Columbia?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: It was decided, after this case had been fully considered, not to order a new trial.

INTERNMENTS—RELEASE OF AMIGHETI

Mr. LACOMBE:

1. Has a non-naturalized Italian named Amigheti been discharged from an internment camp?

2. Was Amigheti interned pursuant to section 25 of the defence of Canada regulations as an enemy alien?

3. If not, under what section of the regulations was he interned?

4. If Amigheti has been discharged, who recommended and ordered his discharge?

5. At what date was he interned and at what date was he discharged?

6. Was Amigheti represented by solicitor or did any person intervene in favour of his discharge?

7. If so, what are the names of such persons?

Mr. ST. LAURENT:

1. Yes.

2. He was originally detained pursuant to regulation 21, and subsequently, 9th October, 1941, it having been definitely established that he was an enemy alien, he was held pursuant to regulation 25 of the defence of Canada regulations.

3. See answer to question 2.

4. The registrar general of enemy aliens and the Minister of Justice, respectively.

5. 10th June, 1940, and 20th March, 1942, respectively.

6. He was represented at his hearing before an advisory committee in September 1940, by his solicitor, Joseph Jean, K.C.

7. See answer to question 6.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

EWOLD FRIGDRICK

Mr. McGREGOR:

1. Has the attention of the government been drawn to the case of one Ewold Frigdrick, age 30, residing at 39 East Fiftieth street, Vancouver?

2. Is the said Frigdrick of German origin?

3. Was he naturalized, and if so, when?

4. Was said Frigdrick convicted and sentenced to jail? If so, will his naturalization be cancelled?

5. Is it the intention of the government to deport persons of alien enemy origin who, though naturalized, refused to serve Canada when called to do so under the laws of Canada?

Mr. GIBSON: Return tabled.

EMERALD MINE—SALMO, B.C.

Mr. ESLING:

1. Has the government, through the Wartime Metals Corporation or any other department or agency, acquired the Emerald mine at Salmo, B.C. ?

2. If so, what price was paid for the property?

3. In whose name does the title at present rest?

4. Has the original owner been fully paid?

5. What sum has been spent in development?

6. How many tons of concentrate have been produced since the opening of the property?

7. To whom have these concentrates been sold?

8. What sum has been realized from their sale?

9. Has this tonnage been shipped or is it still stored at the mine?

10. When did this property cease to operate?

11. How many employees were on the payroll at that time?

12. For how many of these were new positions found?

SHORTAGE OF NURSES

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. Is there a shortage of nurses in Canada?

2. If so, what is the government doing to overcome the shortage?

3. Is the government offering any inducement to women to enter the nursing profession?

4. Has the government any plan to build up a nursing service for the post-war period?

WARTIME INFORMATION BOARD

Mr. WHITE:

1. As of the 31st of January, 1944, what are the names of the employees of the wartime information board?

2. What are the salaries paid to each?

3. What allowances and expenses are paid to each?

4. How many of these are full-time employees?

5. How many of these are part-time employees or special writers?

6. How are the part-time employees or special writers paid?

MOOSE JAW, SASK., AIRPORT

Mr. STOKES:

1. What firm or firms had the contract for construction of, (a) buildings; (b) runways, at the airport at Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan?

2. What was the name of the superintendent on the job?

3. Was Verne Crocket appointed as a foreman, and if so, (a) what is his age; (b) what pay did he receive; (c) what were his qualifications?

4. Was Sidney Tuff appointed as a foreman, and if so, (a) what is his age; (b) what pay did he receive; (c) what were his qualifications?

5. Was George Denny appointed as a foreman, and if so, (a) what is his age; (b) what pay did he receive; (c) what were his qualifications?

6. Did the three men named in questions three, four and five work directly under the authority of the superintendent?

7. Was Albert B. Wyley a foreman on this work, and if so, (a) what pay did he receive; (b) what were his qualifications?

8. How many men were on the payroll under the foremanship of Mr. Wyley during July and August, 1940?

9. How many additional men were placed on the payroll under Wyley during September, October and November, 1940?

SUBSIDIES TO PRODUCERS OF FOOD PRODUCTS

Mr. SENN:

1. What amount was paid out in subsidies to producers of food products during each of the fiscal years, 1941-1942, 1942-1943, and the present fiscal year to date?

2. On what food products were subsidies paid in each year as above?

3. How much was paid on each particular product in each year as above?

WARTIME PRICES AND TRADE BOARD—BUILDINGS

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland):

1. In what places in Canada have buildings been erected for the use of wartime prices and trade board?

2. What is the completed cost of such buildings and property?

3. At what points in Canada have premises been leased for the use of wartime prices and trade board?

4. What are the rental charges for each such property, stating period and date of expiration of leases?

5. What has been the cost of alterations and improvements to each such rented premises?

6. What has been the cost of furnishings and equipment supplied in, (a) special constructed premises; (b) each of the leased premises?

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL

Mr. NICHOLSON:

1. What were the total expenditures for the national research council for each of the fiscal years ending March 31, (a) 1933; (b) 1938; (c) 1943?

2. What percentage of the total governmental expenditures for each of these three years, namely 1933, 1938 and 1943, do the amounts spent for the national research council represent?

CANADIAN FORCES—PROHIBITION OF LETTERS TO NEWSPAPERS

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Has an order been issued by the government or any member thereof, to the military forces, prohibiting members thereof writing letters to newspapers or giving any information or criticism of any conditions arising in the forces or camps within Canada?

2. If so, by whom, and to whom does it apply, and is it limited to within Canada?

3. On whose recommendation was it issued in the three forces?

4. Does it cover numerous speeches across Canada by headquarters and other officers?

CANADIAN FORCES—CHAPLAINS

Mr. CHURCH:

1. How many chaplains have been appointed in each of His Majesty's forces since the war began, by provinces or military districts?

2. On what basis are they appointed; what is the unit of soldier population for each denomination per chaplain per unit; who authorized it, and what is their pay and all other allowances or emoluments?

3. Is each chaplain who enlists required to go overseas later, and what military experience is required before their appointment?

4. Are there senior or chief, or head chaplains in each military district; what are such officers' rank, pay and other emoluments, and are they required to go overseas by rotation after a certain period?

5. Are all these chaplains required in the various services for home training purposes, where in cities there are so many clergy not of the enlisted forces, who are willing to help in chaplain work in their denominations?

[Mr. Senn.]

CANADIAN FORCES—HOSPITAL ACCOMMODATION

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Is the hospital accommodation for Canada's military forces adequate in the various military districts of Canada for those in training, or is there a shortage of accommodation?

2. At what distance from the various camps established under the present system, are there civilian hospitals, and have they all adequate equipment to take care of any cases that occur that cannot be dealt with at the various camps?

3. What hospital accommodation in the various military districts of Canada has been or is to be established by the government to take care of those now overseas, if sick or wounded when they return to Canada?

4. Has any hospital accommodation survey been made since the survey dated December 5, 1940? If so, what survey?

5. What has been done to go ahead with the new hospital at Sunnybrook (Toronto), since last November 11, and when will any units thereof be started or constructed?

RADIO BROADCASTING

APPOINTMENT TO BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF C.B.C.—GENERAL MANAGER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. G. ROSS (St. Paul's): On Tuesday last the Minister of National War Services, in answer to a question of the leader of the opposition as to when the vacancy on the board of governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation would be filled, was somewhat indefinite. Can the minister give any definite information as to when we may expect the announcement of this appointment?

Hon. L. R. LaFLECHE (Minister of National War Services): May I express appreciation for the advance notice kindly sent me by the hon. member for St. Paul's? The other day I spoke as definitely as it was possible for me to do. I hope to be able to give the news of an appointment before long, and as soon as I can I shall inform the hon. member and this honourable house.

INQUIRIES OF THE MINISTRY

MINE PROP INDUSTRY IN ALBERTA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. F. D. SHAW (Red Deer): I should like to address a question to the Minister of Munitions and Supply, or, in his absence, to his parliamentary assistant. I may say that notice has been given. Have steps been taken to prevent the threatened collapse of the mine prop industry in Alberta, a condition brought about by the recent cancellation of the subsidy on mine props and government sale of props produced by prisoners of war at Banff and

Kanaskis to the mines below the figure at which they can be produced and sold by private industry?

Mr. SPEAKER: That question must be placed on the order paper.

Mr. SHAW: May I say that this is of urgent importance to the industry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: As I understood the hon. member's question, it is one which has to do with the policy of the government, and in the circumstances might not be answered to-day. Even if the minister were willing to reply I would say he was not entitled to do so, because it is a question dealing with government policy. In view of what I said yesterday I think the hon. gentleman will have to place it on the order paper.

PROCEDURE IN QUESTIONS ON THE ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (Parkdale): May I direct a question to the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. BRUCE: —regarding a telegram I have received—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. BRUCE: —about the concern that is felt over the delay in sending corvettes out of Quebec.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not hear the question.

Mr. BRUCE: It is a very simple question.

Mr. SPEAKER: But I did not hear it.

Mr. BRUCE: The question is this: Will the minister say whether corvettes have been delayed in their departure from Quebec because of the prevalence of venereal disease?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman will have to place that question on the order paper.

WAR APPROPRIATION BILL

PROVISION FOR GRANTING TO HIS MAJESTY AID FOR NATIONAL DEFENCE AND SECURITY

The house resumed from Wednesday, February 16, consideration in committee of a resolution to grant to His Majesty certain sums of money for the carrying out of measures consequent upon the existence of a state of war—Mr. Ilsley—Mr. Bradette in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

The CHAIRMAN: We are considering item 1.

Mr. POULIOT: Will the minister tell us the bearing of the amendments to the order in council referred to yesterday?

Mr. RALSTON: I have not had an opportunity to look that up. I will have it put in hand to be looked up.

Mr. POULIOT: What I complain of is that the amendments to the army regulations, by virtue of the mobilization act, are not, I would say, self-supporting. They refer to other pieces of legislation which are not included in the draft of these amendments. I have one here, P.C. 9372 of December 7, amending P.C. 7989 of October 14, 1943. It refers to the N.S.S. mobilization act regulations and changes section 26. What I complain of further is the drafting of section 26 in the original order in council, P.C. 7989. It reads:

A man reporting at a centre in consequence of an order–military training or who has been taken thereto in consequence of an order made pursuant to section 28 (1) N.S.S. mobilization regulations shall, until such time as he is enrolled or shall have been dispatched to his destination be deemed to be a person as is mentioned in subsection 10 of section 176 of the Army Act, not otherwise subject to military law, who is a follower of or accompanies His Majesty's troops or any portion thereof when employed on active service. The Army Act, to the extent that it forms part of the law of Canada, shall apply to such a man, and he shall be subject to military law accordingly. Such a man shall be deemed to be under the command of the officer commanding the centre, provided always, however, that, notwithstanding the provisions of subsection 2 of section 184 of the said Army Act, such a man may be punished by such commanding officer in like manner and to the same extent as if he were a private soldier serving on active service under the command of that officer.

It is dated December 7 of last year. Who understands a word of it? No one. Here is the Army Act referred to in that order in council. Let me quote two sections of it. The minister knows better than anyone else that the Army Act is a piece of English legislation that dates back more than half a century. The first reference is to subsection 10, the definition of "person". Subsection 10 of section 176 reads:

All persons not otherwise subject to military law who are followers of or accompany His Majesty's troops or any portion thereof, when employed on active service, subject to this qualification, that, where any such persons are employed by or are followers of or accompany any portion of His Majesty's forces, consisting partly of His Majesty's Indian forces subject to Indian military law, or consisting partly of His Majesty's Burma forces subject to Burma

military law, and such persons are natives of India, or as the case may be, natives of Burma they shall be subject to the Indian military law or, as the case may be, to Burma military law.

In the amendment it is specified that that section applies to the Canadian order in council in so far as it is possible. It would be absurd to suggest that our men should be subject to the Indian law or the Burma law.

Here is subsection 2 of section 184 of the Army Act, which in my opinion is very bad drafting:

Any person subject to military law who does not belong to His Majesty's forces shall, for the purposes of this act relating to offences, be deemed to be under the command of the commanding officer of the corps or portion of a corps (if any) to which he is attached, and if he is not attached to any corps or a portion of a corps under the command of any officer who may for the time being be named as his commanding officer, by the general or other officer commanding the force with which such person may for the time being be, or of any other prescribed officer, or, if no such officer is named or prescribed, under the command of the said general or other officer commanding, but such person shall not be liable to be punished by a commanding officer: provided that a general or other officer commanding shall not place a person under the command of an officer of rank inferior to the official rank of such person is there is present, at the place where such person is, any officer of higher rank under whose command he can be placed.

If anyone understands that, he deserves a reward. Let me summarize my point in this way. This is very bad legislation, very bad drafting, but it will be accepted by the Tory party at once. A very clever man once told me it is sufficient to say that it comes from the British war office and the Tories will adopt it at once. They will adopt it without question provided it comes from the B.W.O. It was ever thus. How is it that the bright brains of the judge advocate general's branch cannot draft legislation for this country without reference to such legal instruments? That kind of legislation has a purpose. It is similar to the plebiscite question, a question that was understood by none and which could be interpreted in many ways. It is nebulous. It is purposely foggy and nebulous. I want something clear. It seems to me it is reasonable to press for clear legislation, legislation that is complete and understandable. One should not have to go over all the shelves of the library to find out the meaning.

Now sir, there are some points that I wish to bring to the attention of the minister and the committee. It is impossible to carry on an orderly discussion without clear legislation; but I try to speak in the plainest possible English in order to be understood by all. Hon.

[Mr. Pouliot.]

members have the right to agree or disagree with me, but I want my colleagues at least to understand the point I am trying to make. I said yesterday that if the army is given priority over essential industry, national selective service is through. We have heard a lot about essential industry. Some time ago, last year or the year before, the Minister of National Defence said that he tried to urge the employer to replace men in essential industry by men who are unfit, and even by women, to release men for the army. I deny that the army is the only essential industry. I am not opposed to the army. There is no one who tries to do more to help the returned man, to help those who are in the army, who looks after them, who listens to them, who has the honour of their confidence when they come to him, than I. It is precisely for the underdog, for the one who has not the right to call upon his superior officer to speak about his grievances, that I act now. I do it in order that we may have a well-balanced war effort in this country. The idea of the imperialist Tories is to see a soldier without uniform, without shoes, without food, without weapons and without ammunition, who would swim across the Atlantic and then find some Irish confetti on Irish soil to fight the enemy. There would be no clothes for him, no transportation, no food, no arms and no ammunition for him. That is the ideal state of the soldier as seen by the Simon-pure imperialist Tories. Is it not absurd?

There has been a decrease of thirteen billion dollars in the estimates of the United States army. We have a reduction of about two hundred million. But there are very strange things happening. If anyone happens to go to the central station of the Canadain National Railways in Montreal he will see a plate inscribed with the number 17,035. That is the number of men connected with the railway, who have enlisted—men from an essential industry, carrying passengers, military and civil, food and ammunition throughout the country; and I am informed the number now is 21,000; twenty-one thousand experienced men who have been taken from an essential industry and placed in the army, and the army is not yet satisfied. What has been done? I want to have complete information, not only from the Minister of National Defence, but also from the Minister of Labour, as to the understanding that has taken place between the army and the Canadian National Railways regarding the appointment of a man named Edge, who was promoted from superintendent of personnel to the fat job of director of labour relations, and without whose signature a man who has not had ten or more years' experience has to join the colours if he has

been in a training camp for a month. What happened? To my personal knowledge officials of the railway who are right there on the spot in the division, who know the work of all the men in key positions of the railway, on the trains as operators, certify that the men are essential to the railway; but this man in Montreal, who does not answer any letters, keeps all these recommendations from responsible officials on his desk. Because he does so, because that single man, who is well paid for it, does not return the application for an extension of leave for the men to military headquarters, it is said that the men have filed no application for extension of leave and therefore they have to join the army. There is another man who does the same job on the Canadian Pacific Railway. If we are to have total war as preached by the jingoes and as preached by some other people, I will agree with them, provided that the war effort is well balanced, and provided that the soldier can rely upon the help of essential industry and of men who have particular experience in certain key positions in essential industry. I do not take this stand because we are against the war effort; not at all. I take the stand because we want the war effort to be well balanced. We want everybody to do his very best in the successful prosecution of the war. My contention is that a man with years of experience on the railway is doing more for the war effort by continuing to work on the railway than he would by going into the army, for which he has no technical experience. The man at the throttle of his locomotive, the fireman, the brakeman or the conductor, can better help his country along the road to victory by continuing in that work than by going into the army as a private, a non-commissioned officer or an officer. That is my point. I have some cases to bring to the attention of the minister. I shall not mention them now, because it would take too long, but I shall write his parliamentary assistant and give each case.

I want this system changed; I want a decentralization of this control in connection with the railways. Is not the local superintendent in each part of the country, each division, in a better position than one man in Montreal to say that Tom or Joe or Jim is essential to the railway business? The understanding between the army and the railways has gone so far that the divisional superintendents have been notified by Mr. Edge in Montreal that in future they are not to recommend anyone for postponement, that all men who have had a month's training, whatever may have been their experience on the railway, were bound to go back to the army and become soldiers. Why speak of selective service after that? If that is not disguised conscription, if it is not sabotage of our war effort, what is it? It is just as clear as spring water that it is going to have a disastrous effect. These men who are in good health, and who have had enough experience to hold these responsible positions, cannot be replaced on the railways by new men unfit for military service.

Last year, in the Hong Kong debate, thirty-four hon. members voted for reform in the Department of National Defence, while ten others who were paired said that if they had voted they would have supported the motion, meaning that in their opinion reform was needed in the department. It is all right to allow the department the number of men that essential industry can dispense with, but on the other hand it would prove most disastrous to this country if essential industry were disorganized in order to have more men in the army. I hope that in the course of this discussion the Minister of National Defence and the Minister of Labour will give a full explanation as to the understanding that has been arrived at between the army and our two great railways, and also as to what has been done by selective service in regard to the appointment of Mr. Edge and the gentleman who occupies the same position with the Canadian Pacific Railway company.

That having been said, and my time being short, I cannot allow to pass unnoticed the dispatch that appeared in today's newspapers from the pen of Mr. Shapiro. Yesterday I said I could not understand why just a few hon. members had been called in by the government to be informed as to the correspondence exchanged in regard to the resignation of Lieutenant-General McNaughton. I will ask the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services to speak behind the curtain if they are not interested in what is being said in the house. Frequently at the opening of the house, on the order for motions or on the orders of the day, a minister makes a reservation in connection with the adoption of a motion for papers by a private member. Every time that happens, some hon. members opposite, particularly the leader of the opposition and the leaders of the other groups, protest and ask how it is that the minister should be able to make his own reservations, since we are entitled to know everything. That is a democratic stand. But how can they say they are being logical with themselves—and I speak of all of them now—when they meet together to discuss matters in which we are all interested, and as to which we might be all

informed in a secret sitting? And how is it that we cannot be told here in Ottawa what is published in London and the press of this continent? It could not be told to members of parliament yesterday. It appeared this morning in all the Canadian papers. Is it not an anomaly?

There is more to it than that. If something secret comes up at a meeting of cabinet council in the east block, it must be for the members of the cabinet alone; if I am well informed they take an oath to keep all matters secret, in regard to what happens behind those doors. Then how is it that the leader of the official opposition should be called in by the government, to be told in confidence things that cannot be told to other hon. members?

An hon. MEMBER: Union government.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes, union government. How is it that the union government goes further, and that the leaders of two other groups are called in to be told things they are not supposed to repeat to other members? It seems to me if those gentlemen were imbued with a real democratic spirit, if they had not the soul of Mrs. Lot, who was the victim of her curiosity and was changed into a pillar of salt, they would have told the government: This is public business, and we alone shall not be told what it is; every member of the house has the same right as we have to be told the whole thing, and we invite you to have a secret sitting for general information of members of parliament.

If the hon. member who now leads the opposition, who represents the county of Peel, and who, outside of politics, is a personal friend of mine, sits in the house, it is not at all in the capacity of leader of the oppsition, because the leader of the opposition is an absentee; he is not a member of the house. If the hon. member who leads the opposition in the house has a right to use his desk, or to write a note, it is because he has been elected by the constituents of the county of Peel, as I have been elected by the people of Temiscouata, and all other hon. members who sit in this exclusive gathering have been elected by their own constituents. Therefore it is only in his capacity as a member of parliament that the government can call upon the leader of the opposition to inform him about secret matters. Yet the Prime Minister invites him, to the exclusion of all of us; and I may add that two other group leaders are enjoying favours from the government. I am reminded of Kemal Pasha who, in Turkey, chose his own leader of the opposition; and he was considered a very great man—both of them. Is it not a humiliation for the leader of the official opposition, and for the leaders of the C.C.F. and New Democracy groups to be considered by the government as pets who can be trusted when no other members can be trusted? I regret that my hon. friends, those leaders, have not shown a spirit sufficiently democratic to tell the government that all the members of the house should be informed about what has been going on overseas.

What about the Canadian Army? It is a very great thing. If Lieutenant-General McNaughton retired from the army because of his personal illness only, it is a very sad event, but it is the departure of one man only. But if he resigned on a question of principle, then we have a right to know.

Last year I spoke about a man who had sold the same coat three times. Nobody was scandalized; it was considered very smart. Then, what about the disaster at Bari? We have to know about that. We have to know who was responsible for the lack of protection for a convoy of allied ships carrying supplies essential to the 8th army and 5th army. Who was responsible for that? Nobody cares to know. I said that at five o'clock yesterday afternoon, but no one supported me. No one seems to be interested in that disaster, one which is probably responsible for the slow advance of our troops on Italian soil. I have revealed no secret, but I have tried to help hon. members not to forget certain essential matters.

I had occasion to discuss Lieutenant-General McNaughton at a time when as a civilian he was head of the national research council. But as soon as he took command of the army, as a loyal Canadian citizen I did my best to give my support to him, so far as I could. Last year when I asked why he had not been promoted to the rank of full general, I was told, in parliamentary language, to mind my own business. What is the use of having insignia for full generals or field marshals when they are not used? Whatever may be the disagreement between the Minister of National Defence and Lieutenant-General McNaughton in respect of military tactics, I express the feelings of many people, if not of many members of the House of Commons, when I suggest to the government that at last it should give him his full generalship, something he deserves, for the work he has done in creating an army now being dismantled.

I do not wish to quote the minister incorrectly, but if the British authorities did not ask Canada to send part of our troops to Italy, and if he undertook upon his own responsibility to send them there, against the advice of the commander in chief of Canadian

forces overseas, then it was a tremendous responsibility. It will be up to him to explain to us why our troops should suffer from the destruction of a whole convoy in an Italian port.

I leave the matter there. I do not wish to monopolize the time of the house, and I shall give hon. members the opportunity to say all they may wish to say. But in these matters let them understand well that they cannot complain about the government, and then make themselves the instruments of the Department of National Defence as it is now. There will be no reform unless they come out of the abstract and point their fingers to the reforms that are necessary. That is something which has not yet been done. I hope their remarks will be constructive and that they will tell, if not the government, then the committee where the reform of a bureaucracy shall begin. I am sick of the pronunciamentos of the Tory leader, who is stating his policy everywhere—"We will do this; we will do that." How will he do it? What will be the work of his party in the House of Commons to improve the Department of National Defence? If someone is to be fired, who is he? Let them say that, or not speak about reform at all. How often, when I complained of certain people, did I see the previous leader of the opposition rise in his place and complain that I was attacking faithful civil servants. He was speaking the same language as the minister. I want reform. But I cannot bring it about alone. I need some help, and there are other members who need some help. If hon. gentlemen opposite have not the support of the leader of the opposition, let them rise and make their suggestions just as I do, and then we shall get somewhere. I do not say that in any unfriendly way. I say it for the good of the country; I say it for the protection of the soldiers, and I say it for the winning of the war.

Mr. MacNICOL: Can the minister now answer the question I asked yesterday with reference to the calling up of boys of eighteen from the schools of Toronto for active service?

Mr. RALSTON: I have looked up the order in council, and the proclamation under which the age class in fixed designates:

> . . . every man who was born in the year 1925 . . . and all such men are required to submit themselves for medical examination and report at a military training centre or district depot to undergo and perform such military training, service or duty . . . but men born in the year 1925 shall not be served with orders-medical examination until they reach the age of eighteen years and six months.

This is an order in council that was passed on the recommendation not of the Minister of National Defence but of the Minister of Labour. In a word, they are required to submit themselves for medical examination and report at a military training centre, but until they reach eighteen years and six months they cannot be served with orders-medical examination. In the case my hon. friend mentioned was the boy under eighteen years and a half?

Mr. MacNICOL: Eighteen years and two months.

Mr. RALSTON: Under the order in council they were not required to serve him with an order for medical examination.

Mr. MacNICOL: Do I understand that boys just over eighteen are subject to call for examination?

Mr. RALSTON: No; they are not subject until they reach eighteen years and six months. The proclamation designates those born in the year 1925, some of whom might be just eighteen years of age, but then it limits it by saying that no one shall be served with an order for medical examination unless he is eighteen years and six months of age.

Mr. MacNICOL: Is a boy who comes within that age class and is attending a collegiate institute or university allowed any exemption to continue his educational course?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes, but he is liable to call at eighteen years and six months unless he comes within certain provisions of the national selective service regulations with respect to education. I have not those before me, and I cannot give my hon. friend the exceptions or the privileges which are permitted to boys who are continuing their education. I could bring them down here, or I could get them and send them to my hon. friend.

Mr. CHURCH: I rise to support the hon. member for Davenport in this matter. I have frequently during the past two years raised this question of calling up boys of sixteen, seventeen and eighteen who are attending school. The time has come to call a halt on this practice, because it is disorganizing the whole school system of the province of Ontario. I do not say that the matter is altogether in the hands of the Minister of National Defence. He seems to be answering on his estimates questions which belong to selective service, the navy, and the air force, as well as to the army. But as a humble representative of the city of Toronto, on whose school board I served, I must say that

school principals have spoken to me of the disorganizing effect which the call-up is having on the schools and educational systems of the city of Toronto. We used to have a cadet corps there, up to 1936, but unfortunately our board of education all went pacifist; there was to be no more war but a land of milk and honey—paradise. So they abolished the cadet corps, which had been the backbone of the militia in the city of Toronto and the county of York, and the same all over Ontario, ever since confederation. The school board had control of the cadet system. Then you went to work and created cadet committees. I saw an announcement not long ago that these cadet committees were responsible for putting from thirty to forty thousand cadets in uniform in this war. It is the school boards and the boards of education that deserve credit for that through the work that had been done in the past by the cadet corps system in the public and high schools of the city and province, where there were trained cadet officers in every school. This practice of calling up youths from school should be stopped, because it is disorganizing the whole educational work of public, secondary and high schools, so much so that the teachers do not know where they are at. If you need men, get men; but these who are being called up are, comparatively speaking, children, many of them with fathers and brothers who are already serving overseas.

Some of the students go on from the collegiate institutes to the university of Toronto. Last fall I was at a collegiate institute in my riding, perhaps the largest in the city of Toronto, and I know that 76 from one school, Danforth Technical, have made the supreme sacrifice in this war. A week ago last Saturday a list was published in the Toronto city papers showing that 596 pupils from the secondary schools, giving each school's list, had made the supreme sacrifice in this war. Some of these young people are not getting a fair show; they are not getting an education. I know four or five who have gone on to the university of Toronto, one or two from collegiate institutes in my riding. They proceed to enter their first year at the university, and then what do they do? They drill all summer, all fall and winter. As members of the C.O.T.C. they cannot even attend a rugby game in the fall. I was at a game between Winnipeg and the R.C.A.F., attended by 20,000 people; these young boys at the university were not allowed to attend the game, but almost every Saturday had to march around the streets for six or seven miles while the game was going on, and also drill every day. Then they have classes in the summer at Niagara-on-the-Lake for three or four weeks, and some had to go to Three Rivers. Then they have to go up to Petawawa in the heat of the summer. And after all this training they are told there is no place for them now as officers. They are just a lot of forgotten orphans because the army cannot find a place for them and no place can be found for them at Brockville.

Surely such a condition of affairs should not be allowed to continue. It is wasting their time and the time of the instructors, and wasting money. I do not blame the Minister of National Defence for this; far from it. He has done something to try to regulate this thing. There were too many officers, no doubt, and changes had to be made in the regulations to reduce the establishments. But surely there should be some remedy, some change made in the system of calling up these young boys from our collegiates and universities. One principal told me that it would be making communists and that sort of thing out of these young men to waste their time this way, and there is a great deal in that. I know of cases myself of hardship, and I have written to the department about this matter. The Minister of Labour is not in the house at the moment. He has a very able assistant in Mr. MacNamara; nevertheless a notice was sent by the department to students of the university of Toronto who were within one month of their examinations in arts, medicine and other subjects. The date fixed for Easter is April 9. They are going to hold examinations a month ahead. They are turning out two classes in medicine; there is a scarcity of doctors and nurses. As regards first and second year arts, law, medicine, and other faculties, not only in this university but in other universities from coast to coast, what is the position? We are notified that, after all this drilling during the fall and attendance at camps in the summer, and so forth, only fifty per cent of the class, who pass at the top and get first-class honours, will be permitted to continue; the others will have to return, like lost orphans, to the ranks. A number of them do not want to be officers. A great many would go overseas immediately if they could. This system is disorganizing the classes of the university of Toronto, so much so that the registrar announced in the press yesterday that he does not know where he is at, because there is a different type of organization in the university to-day as regards examination tests.

All I ask is a fair show and fair play for these young men. I admit that the minister has made some changes, but as I see it we are

going to wind up at the end of this war with practically no qualified men in medicine and a number of other professions. It is not so bad in the legal profession; as we know, every lawyer in the United States is called a judge when he graduates, because if he is not a judge to-day he hopes to be a judge to-morrow. It may not apply to the profession of which the minister is a member. Some of these young people cannot get to Brockville to qualify. They have worked hard for one or two years; they have done their marching and drilling each summer, and they do not think they are getting fair play.

I do hope that the Minister of Labour or the Minister of National Defence—the two seem to have concurrent and joint jurisdiction—will do something to straighten this matter out with the university before the examinations come on. I trust that, in view of an intimation we had yesterday, something will be done to put back the cadet services under the boards of education and the school boards of Canada, whose responsibility they have been since confederation. It is disrupting the classes. I see numbers of these young folk passing my house. Some of them are getting out of school; some cadet corps are outside the schools altogether, and the teachers are not able to control the situation. We are told that it is intended to reduce the establishments in the various branches of the service, especially the air. Well, there is a good deal of competition at the present time between the three services; we find recruiting officers going around the schools trying to get students to join the navy, the army, or the air force. At least from what I have seen, and I have seen a good deal of it in the schools of Toronto, my impression is that there is considerable competition amongst the services.

This matter of the universities should be straightened out, because it is not fair to the young people. In the secondary schools the fathers and brothers of many of the pupils are overseas. I know one family with three or four brothers in Italy. The youngest boy went to one of the collegiates and is now a supernumerary officer at Camp Borden. He trained at Brockville and got a commission. His two brothers are in the air in Italy and they want him to join the air force. The commanding officer at Camp Borden and other officers gave him a very fine recommendation, and the present minister arranged that there should be a transfer from the army to the air force, but now he cannot get in the air force, because, they say, there are no vacancies. That sort of thing should not happen, because he is just wasting his time where he is. One of the teachers spoke to me about the case, and that is why I mention it. I believe there should be give and take regarding these things. The graduates of the university, especially the great university of Toronto, are heavily represented in all faculties both in enlistments and in casualties, in both the last war and the present one; many of them have made the supreme sacrifice in this war; not a few are wounded and in the hospitals. So I ask that consideration be given to the universities and also, and especially, to the secondary schools in the direction I have indicated.

Mr. FACTOR: I should like to make a few remarks with reference to the observations of the hon. member for Broadview and the hon. member for Davenport. I assume that this discussion is really not in order, because it relates rather to national selective service regulations than to the Department of National Defence. I think I know the situation in Toronto pretty well, and I am astonished that the hon. member for Broadview is concerned about a disruption of the educational system in Toronto. He cited the leading public schools there as being affected. I know of no eighteen or eighteen and one-half year olds that are in the public schools unless they are mentally defective. The public schools are not affected at all by the order which calls for men of eighteen years subject to the draft. They are not called until they are eighteen years and six months old.

So far as the situation of the university of Toronto is concerned, I have studied it very carefully, and I want to congratulate the government upon the system which prevailed up to this year. All faculties except arts trained in the Canadian Officers' Training Corps, the university training companies. The engineering faculty is not subject to the draft. They take their basic training in the university companies but they cannot enlist without consent. So far as the medical profession is concerned, the hon. member for Parkdale knows the system which prevails under the medical procurement and assignment board, whereunder students are very grateful to this university for the opportunity extended to them of joining the army medical corps while they are taking their medical training at the university. They are getting paid around, I believe $75 or $80 a month, which enables them to pursue their studies, and immediately after their interneships are enlisted in the army medical corps. I want to congratulate the government upon the arrangement which was made.

So far as the arts course is concerned the system prevailing is this, that all the students take their basic training in the university

training companies. Those who are successful in their examinations are permitted to complete their full arts course, that is three years pass course or four years as an honour course in political science. Those who fail in the commencement examinations have their names submitted to the mobilization board and they are called up for service. Could there be any fairer system? In other words, what earthly use is there to permit a student who is a complete failure at the examination to go on at the university, perhaps to fail again the next year? I think he could do his duty far better in some branch of the services.

The hon. member for Broadview talks about competition at the universities. So far as the training companies are concerned, there is no competition at all at the university of Toronto. We have a Royal Canadian Air Force training company, an army training company, and a naval company. The students are given the option of joining any of the services. For instance, my boy, who is in his third year at the university of Toronto, has joined the Royal Canadian Air Force company and is taking his training, which will enable him to gain sufficient knowledge to expedite his initial training at the school.

In my opinion the statements on this matter made by the hon. member for Broadview are very much exaggerated. I have heard of no complaints. There may be the odd pupil in the high school who is somewhat backward at eighteen and one-half, who is still in the high school and is subject to the call; but so far as my experience in the city of Toronto is concerned the system which prevails was one of the best.

I want to say a word about the new regulations. I have seen them only in the press, but I have heard some objections to the regulation which lays down that fifty per cent, I think, of the successful pupils may continue their courses. It is said that the university authorities are going to have great difficulty in administering that regulation. I suggest to the government that this phase of the problem be reviewed.

Mr. CHURCH: The hon. gentleman is altogether wrong in his statement as to what I said. I did not refer to those of eighteen years in the public schools. I myself went to the public schools long before he lived in the city. What I said was that the public schools had cadet corps which had existed since confederation. The hon. member knows that; for he was on the board himself, and he knows that in the riding of ward 4 there used to be a parade of public school cadets, several thousand of them, down University avenue on Empire day. But unfortunately the cadet services were abolished about 1937 when the pacifists got control of the board. The hon. member has been in the air force and may be out of touch with local school matters as they are to-day, but I may tell him that there are many young people getting into the secondary schools at fourteen, fifteen, sixteen, seventeen and eighteen. This is true of the collegiates in his own riding and of many other schools in the district where he lives.

What I object to is this. The cadet services were under the board of education in former years; they were there from confederation until 1937. In 1942, however, there began a duplicate practice of outside cadet corps, to which I strongly objected, as did some of the trustees. These new cadet corps officers were forming separate corps in the schools with drill after school and week-ends, and parades on Sundays, usurping the usual work of the school, physical and military. These children were taken out and put into an organization to which the government contributes $25,000, a private cadet organization, the government supplying the uniform and paying for these young people for two weeks at summer camp. All this has been done over the head of the board of education and over the school board. I object further to this duplication of services. We should leave the schools alone. Hands off the public schools and the secondary schools in the province, and the same goes for the separate schools. De La Salle has one of the finest cadet corps in Canada. Why not leave them to fulfil their own functions? Some amendment should be made to take care of these young people of fifteen, sixteen, seventeen and eighteen who belong to school cadet corps and are getting physical drill, sports and military training in the high and public schools. We should leave that work where it belongs. There are too many recruiting officers for the 'teen age students. Mr. Busybody and Mr. Highbrow have been urging these new cadet services. It is a pity they go into the schools and interfere with the young people, getting them into the air force or the army or navy too early to play on sporting teams, and I have heard complaints about this matter.

I do not need any lectures from the hon. member for Spadina. Thank goodness for that. Far from it; I was here before he was and I shall be here long after he has gone. I do not say that in criticism of the hon. member because he and I have been friends for years, but he has been away at camp, where he has done good work, and has missed some of what has been going on in respect to education in Toronto. Evidently he does not

know much about the duplication of the service and the interference in education to which I refer. At any rate, he does not know as much as he used to know, because I used to see him once in a while at the parades on University avenue when he was on the board. In the old days, at the time of the South African war and again in the great war, these young school cadets were the backbone of the militia in Toronto, and we would not have had the trouble we have to-day if the cadet movement to which they belonged had been fostered.

Mr. KNOWLES: There are two matters to which I wish to call the attention of the Minister of National Defence. The first is with reference to the 13th Canadian Infantry Brigade, particularly in relation to the expedition last summer to Kiska. Before dealing with the matter that is on my mind, may I say in passing that we in Winnipeg are very proud of the part played in that expedition by the reconstituted 1st battalion of the Winnipeg Grenadiers, which was part of that brigade. As the minister knows, a great many of those included in the brigade were home defence or N.R.M.A. personnel. Credit should be given to them—and this is a chance of offsetting some of the remarks made in this house—by reference to their part in a dangerous expedition which might have resulted in serious losses if the Japanese had not left just before these men arrived. It should not be forgotten that even though the Japanese had left, owing to mines that were left behind there were casualties in the landing, and there were also casualties because of the kind of landing that was made in view of the expectation that it was a real invasion that was being effected. The point I wish to discuss relates to something which it might be said concerns another department, but I am told that this matter has been passed back and forth from one department to another, and I feel that it is the concern of the Department of National Defence to protect the interests of the men. I refer to the income tax deductions from the men in the 13th Canadian Infantry Brigade during the time they were in Kiska.

I asked certain questions on the order paper the other day and they were answered in *Hansard* of February 11, 1944, on pages 399-400. These answers simply confirmed the information which had already been communicated to me, namely, that these men while in Kiska were taxed under the terms of a rule that is to be found on page 75 of the 1943 office consolidation of the Income War Tax Act. On page 75 one will find, under schedule 1, section 3, rule 3, provision for exempting service personnel fifty per cent of their tax when serving in places in the western hemisphere other than in Canada. It is under this rule that these men were taxed while in Kiska. My contention is that they should have been taxed under the provision found on page 12 of this office consolidation. As I see it, the appropriate section on that page would be section 4 (t) (i), which is supposed to grant full exemption to personnel on the strength of overseas units outside the western hemisphere. I would point out first of all the geographical fact that Kiska is outside the western hemisphere. When I asked that question on the order paper the other day, whether Kiska is outside the western hemisphere, the official government answer was no; but according to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica,* Kiska lies between 177 and 178 degrees east longitude—in other words, two or three degrees beyond the line that geographically divides the western from the eastern hemisphere.

Mr. RALSTON: My information is that the answer to that question was based on the fact that there was a jog in the international dateline, and Kiska is in the western hemisphere.

Mr. KNOWLES: I was pointing out to the minister that geographically it seems to me there was no argument.

Mr. RALSTON: I do not know what the hon. member means by "geographically". It is quite true it is over a continuous line of longitude, but that does not necessarily make it in the western hemisphere.

Mr. KNOWLES: My understanding is this. The western hemisphere can be looked at two ways, geographically and politically. Geographically the logical thing would be to take a line of longitude around the globe and regard that as dividing east from west, but governments have their own way of arbitrarily doing things. I understand that the Canadian government is following the United States government in this matter.

Mr. RALSTON: I do not think so in the Atlantic.

Mr. KNOWLES: May I proceed for a moment? I understand the Canadian government, following the United States government, which has ruled arbitrarily that because Kiska is a possession of the United States it is regarded as in the western hemisphere—

Mr. MACDONALD (Brantford City): Was that ruling made before the present war began?

Mr. KNOWLES: I am sorry; I do not know. A moment ago when I made the point that Kiska is two or three degrees beyond the line which I say geographically separates the hemispheres, I was conscious of the fact that some might say that was a very short distance; that one should not try to make too much of a case out of that. However, I would point out not only is it a matter of Kiska being two or three degrees beyond the 180th degree of longitude; it is a considerable distance from Canada. If hon. members will look at a globe they will discover the distance from the Pacific coast to Kiska is greater than the distance from our Atlantic coast to Britain; and as the minister knows better than I do, it was a hazardous voyage that these men had to make. When they came home it was emphasized that the distance from Kiska to Victoria was such that it took a very great length of time to traverse it. I am emphasizing the fact that not only is Kiska beyond the western hemisphere, as I see it, but it is a great distance from Canada, definitely outside of Canada, and that these men were not only going into a theatre of war but embarked on an expedition that did involve casualties and might have involved much more serious loss. It also involved their living under very great hardships during the time they were there. I understand that—

Mr. EVANS: Did the hon. member not want them to go to Kiska?

Mr. KNOWLES: Mr. Chairman, I did not say anything of the kind. I am discussing one matter related to the expedition to Kiska, namely, what I regard as unfairness to the men in not giving them the full exemption of income tax as specified in rule 3 on page 12 of the office consolidation to which I have referred, and I was about to point out that the answers which had been communicated to the men as to the reasons why they were treated in this way are, first of all, that politically the United States government does not regard Kiska as outside the western hemisphere. It seems to me that is an arbitrary decision, and that in dealing fairly with the men, the government ought not stand on an arbitrary technicality.

Another argument that has come back to the men is that the Income War Tax Act in its legal terminology makes no reference to a theatre of war as having any bearing on income tax exemptions. In that connection I should like to read a few sentences from the speech of the Minister of Finance delivered when he brought down the budget on March 2, 1943. It will be found in volume 1, page 858, of Hansard for 1943. He was discussing the changes that he was proposing in the income tax regulations with respect to service personnel. One sentence will make my point clear. This is what he said:

> Because of the way in which the war has developed I think it is reasonable to make a distinction between those who are in the United Kingdom or elsewhere across the ocean and those who are in Newfoundland, the West Indies, Labrador or Alaska.

The point the minister was making at that time was that some consideration should be given in the light of the circumstances, the dangers and the conditions under which the men were living or fighting at the time. He was trying to keep away from previous distinctions which did not seem fair. The spirit of the exemption provisions in the Income War Tax Act should certainly apply to men who went as far as these men went, who ran the risk of suffering casualties, as they did, and of enduring hardships, as they did. The spirit of this provision should be made to apply in this case, and I have already tried to point out to the minister it seems to me a case could be made for giving them full exemption even under the letter of the Income War Tax Act as it stands at the present time; because the Income War Tax Act, when it speaks of the western hemisphere, makes no reference to a definition of the eastern or western hemisphere. Apparently that had to be found afterwards. I repeat, the intent of the act was surely to provide special consideration in income tax matters to men who went overseas to Britain, Europe, Italy, et cetera, and it should apply to the men who went an equal distance the other way in the war against Japan.

The fact that these men were sent out of Canada is underlined by the necessity of the special order in council P.C. 5011, dated June 18, 1943, which provided for authority to the Minister of National Defence to dispatch N.R.M.A. personnel not only to the territory of Alaska but to the Aleutian islands as well and other United States islands adjacent thereto. The provisions of the N.R.M.A. were such that in order to send home defence personnel to Kiska a special order in council had to be passed. I can assure my hon. friend across the way that I am not complaining about the passing of this order in council. I feel that complaints can scarcely be registered even with regard to the passing of the order in council after the men were away from British Columbia. I have heard protests registered in that regard. But after all, as the order in council itself says, such a decision could not be made public; for if such had been done it would

have given information to the enemy. But I am quoting the order in council to emphasize the fact that these men were sent beyond the shores of Canada, for the defence of Canada. I repeat, they went a considerable distance; they suffered casualties; they endured very great hardships during the months they were there, and it is only fair that they should be given the full exemption. I hope the minister will make a further effort on behalf of the men to see what can be done in this connection.

There are other islands beyond Kiska. One never knows what plans may be arranged, or what they may call for in the way of further expeditions to the next island or to islands farther on. Just where is the line to be drawn between the men who get fifty per cent exemption and the men who get one hundred per cent? It seems to me to be quite a question. I feel that it is perfectly in order, both in the spirit and in the letter of the Income War Tax Act, that these men who went to Kiska should be regarded as having gone over the line into the eastern hemisphere.

I said there were two matters that I wished to draw to the attention of the Minister. I should like to say a word or two about the second one. It relates to the problem that arises when men are discharged from the services at their own request on compassionate grounds and find that they are some considerable distance from their home or wherever they may have to go. I have in my hand correspondence relating to a particular case, that of a naval rating, which I took up with the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services, who of course pointed out to me that the regulations affecting naval ratings were the same as those affecting men in the other services, so that I feel it only right I should raise the question now, while we are discussing general matters relating to national defence. I would point out to the minister also that the case I have before me was brought to my attention by a former solicitor of the city of Winnipeg who is now living in retirement in Victoria, but who is doing voluntary work for the Navy League of Canada. It was in connection with his work out there that this case was brought to his attention. He wrote me about it, feeling that while this man had been looked after on a charitable basis some effort should be made to change the regulations so that this sort of thing would not happen again. In this case it became necessary for this rating, because of the condition of his wife's health, to return home to London, Ontario; but when he was discharged at Victoria he was given only $59.11, of which $35 was the allowance for clothing, leaving him $24.11, which was all the money he had to get back to London. This man was looked after through the kindness of the Navy League of Canada.

Mr. RALSTON: Did he have a clothing allowance?

Mr. KNOWLES: Yes, of $35; this was before the allowance was increased, and he was instructed that this money should be spent for clothing.

Mr. RALSTON: He was discharged where?

Mr. KNOWLES: He was discharged at Victoria on his own request, because of the condition of his wife's health. She was in London, Ontario. As I say, this case was taken care of charitably, but that is hardly a desirable situation. I know other hon. members have drawn similar cases to the attention of the minister, and I repeat that I took up this matter with the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services, who pointed out that to make any change in his department would require that a change be made in all three services, and he went on to mention our good friends of the treasury board. So I bring this matter to the attention of the minister in the hope that he may give some consideration to an endeavour to change the regulations so that this sort of thing may not happen again. When it is said that men are discharged at their own request, sometimes that language implies that the onus rests entirely upon the man; yet the very fact that, as in this case, the navy agreed to the request for discharge indicates that in their opinion it was justified and in fact necessary. In such cases it does seem to me that a man should not be left stranded, as this rating would have been in Victoria but for the kindness of the Navy League of Canada. I would appreciate it if the minister would say something in reference to the two matters I have drawn to his attention.

Mr. RALSTON: Taking the last case first, I do not think it has been brought to my personal attention before, but I am instructed that whatever the regulations were they have been amended, and provision has been made that a man is discharged from the depot at which he enlisted. I do not know whether or not there is any catch in that, but I assume that the man to whom my hon. friend refers would not have enlisted in Victoria.

Mr. KNOWLES: That is exactly the point; this man enlisted in London and was discharged at Victoria.

Mr. RALSTON: This will not be of much comfort to him, but if he were to be discharged under the present regulations he would receive transportation to London.

Mr. KNOWLES: If I may just press the point a little further, the letter I received from the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services was dated February 7.

Mr. RALSTON: I beg pardon; I am talking about the army.

Mr. KNOWLES: But the minister's colleague tells me that the same regulations apply in the navy.

Mr. RALSTON: I am told not. Here is a copy of a memorandum on the regulations which states that an officer or soldier of the Canadian army on discharge therefrom is entitled to transportation and travelling allowances as shown hereunder, except as provided in paragraph 2. If he was residing in Canada immediately prior to becoming a member of the forces, he is entitled to transportation and travelling allowances to the place in Canada where he was residing immediately prior to his appointment or enlistment. I cannot tell my hon. friend how long that has been in force.

Mr. KNOWLES: In case I did not get it straight, may I ask the minister if this applies when a man is discharged at his own request?

Mr. RALSTON: I just looked to see, but I understand it applies whether or not he was discharged at his own request; there is no limitation in the regulations I have before me.

Mr. KNOWLES: What is the date of that new order?

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend is talking about a man in the navy, and telling me that the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services said the rule in the navy was the same as in the army. I do not like to give evidence which is not in line with that of my colleague, but the information I am given is that in the army the man is discharged at the depot at which he enlisted; in other words that he is given transportation home.

Mr. KNOWLES: That being so I shall bring this case to the attention of the minister by correspondence, and we will see if we cannot get the naval department in line with the army.

Mr. RALSTON: That is a change in the army regulations; it has not been so always. Now with regard to the matter of income tax for the Kiska force. I must say to my hon. friend that I have been impressed by the same considerations he has urged, and at present the matter is under serious, active consideration, meaning that it is not settled by any means at the present moment. I think my hon. friend has put the case correctly; that is, whatever authorities there are on these matters suggest that geographically Kiska is outside the western hemisphere, but, as my hon. friend says, politically it is within the western hemisphere. By that they mean that Kiska is a possession of the United States; the United States says the island is in the western hemisphere, and we think we ought to take the statement of the country which owns the island as to what hemisphere it is in, since there is no overriding authority in the world, that I know of to argue that it is not. That is the reason for the ruling that has been given. That is in reply to my hon. friend's argument, which he has put very clearly, with regard to the question of whether or not Kiska is in the western hemisphere.

Mr. KNOWLES: The minister will recall, of course, that I pointed out that the Income War Tax Act gives no definition of eastern or western hemisphere. Surely, the United States government notwithstanding, our income tax authorities have a right to decide what constitutes the western and eastern hemispheres.

Mr. RALSTON: They have the right to decide, but I think it is fairly good practice to take the evidence of the country which owns the island, and which says it is in the western hemisphere. So far as I know there is no one who should know better, unless it is some resident of Mars who is altogether outside the discussion.

Mr. KNOWLES: The boys who have been there know.

Mr. RALSTON: And of course a resident of Mars would be a very appropriate person to decide this case. The point that impressed me was the point which has also impressed my hon. friend; that is, the matter of the engagement of this force in active operations. In addition one must consider whatever weight may be gained from the fact that it was a very long distance from home, even though politically it may have been in the western hemisphere. Do not let my hon. friend misunderstand me by thinking that I am making any pledge or promise that any exception will be made to the present ruling. What I am indicating to my hon. friend is that for some time I have been interested in the same thing. Notwithstanding the fact that it is not my department, as I said yesterday I regard these men as being to some degree wards of the Department of National Defence, and that we certainly ought to do whatever we can to see that they are dealt with justly in a matter of this kind. I have not done with it by any means.

Mr. McDONALD (Pontiac): Mr. Chairman, I have two or three questions I should like to ask the Minister of National Defence:

1. What counties in the province of Quebec are comprised within military district No. 3, with headquarters at Kingston, Ontario?

2. What number of men in these counties have enlisted for service overseas?

3. Are those men reported officially as having been recruited in Quebec?

Mr. RALSTON: The answer to the first question is that the counties in Quebec which are included in military district No. 3 are Hull, Gatineau, Pontiac, and Temiscamingue.

I am sorry I cannot give an answer to the second question, and I do not know whether it can be compiled. However, I shall see if it can be.

The hon. member asks the number of men from those counties who have enlisted for overseas service. He will know that a request for that information is made often. The hon. member for Broadview has asked for it repeatedly, as it applies to Toronto, and I do not think that information has been given. The compilation of the numbers of men from any particular counties would require an enormous amount of work. However, I have made a note of the question.

The third question was as to whether the figures for enlistments from those counties are included in the report of recruitment for Quebec. The answer is no; the figures are not compiled by provinces, but rather by military districts. These men are shown as being recorded in military district No. 3.

Mr. McDONALD (Pontiac): I thank the minister for his answers. My questions have been prompted by the fact that certain hon. members on the opposition side of the house are making it a point to use what they call official figures in an attempt to prove that Quebec has fallen behind in enlistments. As the representative of Pontiac I am in the unfortunate position to-day of not being able to stand in my place and say that so many thousands have been recruited from that county. But I can say, officially or unofficially, that in proportion to the enrolable population of men in my county, enlistments have been in as great numbers as in any other county in Canada.

Figures can be used for any purpose. If the background is not given they can be most deceiving. I recall that during the last war a certain parliamentary correspondent put a question to a gentleman who was then much in the public eye. He asked for a direct yes or no, because, he said, "Figures lie, and liars figure." In the present instance, if the figures are accepted as official they are not in accordance with the facts.

I do not wish to impute motives to anyone, but to me it is a source of deep regret that the people of Pontiac and of other adjoining counties in Quebec should be described here as having sent practically no recruits. This argument is directed particularly against French-Canadians. I represent a county which is seventy-five per cent French-Canadian; and again, having regard to the enrolable population I have no hesitation in saying that those French-Canadians have done their full duty so far as enlistments are concerned. It must not be forgotten that in Quebec we have many families in which there are great numbers of children. If I may refer to myself as an example, I am the father of ten children. Of these only one is of military age, and I am proud to state here—and I am not boasting—that he is overseas doing his duty. There are hundreds, maybe thousands of families in my county in which there are from ten to fifteen children. In many of those families none are of military age, and in others only females who are not supposed to enlist have reached that age.

When it is said that French-Canadians do not enlist I know that such is not the case. I hold in my hand a picture of six young men of a family of nine sons. Their father, Mr. Guertin, is a messenger in this building, and those boys are all serving overseas—French-Canadians, all of them. The last to enlist was only eighteen years of age, and enlistment in the navy had been previously refused him. As a member for the county of Pontiac I feel it my duty to state in this chamber, publicly, so that statement may be placed on the record, that the men enlisting from those counties of Quebec, comprised within military district No. 3 with headquarters at Kingston, Ontario, are not so officially reported. Nevertheless the young men from those counties have done their full duty.

About Christmas time the sad news reached a mother in my home village that her son had been killed in Italy. Four of the five boys in that family are now overseas. Yet there are hon. members in the house and others outside who try to make people believe that the French-Canadians in Quebec are not doing their duty.

I have before me an article which only recently I clipped from a newspaper, headed with these words, "Last Letter of French-Canadian Soldier Hero". This article is from

Arthabaska, the representative of which constituency is not in the house this afternoon, and is as follows:

Arthabaska, Que., Jan. 31.—A farewell message from their son, received several months after he had been presumed killed in a flight over Italy, is cherished by Sheriff and Mrs. Maurice Maheu of this town. It is a simple but feeling story of courage, loyalty and patriotism.

The letter is from Sergeant Francois Gabriel Maheu, a member of the French-Canadian Alouette Squadron of the Royal Canadian Air Force.

On June 28, 1943, on his thirteenth raid over Italy he failed to return and in due course was officially presumed dead. Sergeant Maheu was twenty years of age.

Some months later his farewell message was received by his parents.

"When you receive this letter," he wrote, "do not grieve over my fate. I shall already have given my life for all of you whom I love so much and for my country."

I would ask the members of the Bloc Populaire to take particular note of this, that the only thought of this young French Canadian serving in the air force was to give his life for his country. I continue the quotation.

"You will have nothing but pride and honour that one of your sons has died for the shielding of his country.

"I offer my life and my sufferings to God to make up for all the trouble I may have caused you. I have made mistakes in the past, but I repent with all my heart. Rest assured that my thought has always been with you and that it will be with you until the last moment, because from day to day I have thought of what you have been to me, and never will I be able to prove all of my affection for you. The sacrifice of my life alone, in order to assure your freedom, will be the price of what you have done for me.

"I have no money to leave you. My bequest is faithfulness to duty."

Mr. GREEN: With regard to the income tax levy against the men in the Kiska force, there is this further feature, that the United States declared Kiska a combat zone, and also that these men went there to fight, and not to act as garrison troops. There is considerable concern about the matter on the Pacific coast. The ruling already made is based on a technicality, as to which there is much doubt, and I suggest that the troops be given the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. RALSTON: That was really the point that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre made, I think, that it was a theatre of war and a combat zone, and I myself have taken that fully into consideration. But it did not need to be declared a combat zone. I think it was one without any question at all.

Mr. GILLIS: There is a matter on which I should like some clarification from the minister. I refer to order in council No. 5830, passed in August, 1941, and conferring certain wide powers on the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) with respect to the use of troops, militia and so forth in a given situation such as strikes, lock-outs, and so on. The order in council is lengthy and I shall not read it. It puts the Minister of Munitions and Supply in a position where, if he anticipates any disturbance, he may requisition troops from the Minister of National Defence merely by asking for them.

Mr. RALSTON: Having first exhausted the possibilities of using the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

Mr. GILLIS: The order in council does not state that. It states that they may be utilized too.

In addition, I notice that the Winnipeg *Free Press* of February 10 has an article headed "Stream-lining policy adopted for the Reserve Army" and it sets out five or six points, the third point of which refers to supporting the civil authority responsible for law and order, if required.

What I want the minister to clarify is this. I have seen considerable of this kind of action in the past, where the civic authorities lost control of the enforcement of law and order in a given area and requisitioned troops in the regular way, and the community or province that asked for the aid of the troops to maintain law and order had to pay the cost of the maintenance of the troops.

Mr. RALSTON: You mean, the bill was rendered.

Mr. GILLIS: Yes. There were, I agree, times when it was not paid. What I want to know is just where the Department of National Defence fit into that picture. You might have a jittery kind of chap as Minister of Munitions and Supply; it may not be the present minister. The civic authorities somewhere may wire him, "We anticipate trouble here"; then without any consultation or investigation he may, under that order in council, requisition troops from the Department of National Defence, and according to my interpretation the Minister of National Defence has no alternative but must give him the troops required. I want to find out how much control the Minister of National Defence has under that order in council with respect to the sending of troops, and in the event of troops being sent into an area for the purposes stated in the order in council, who pays the cost of maintenance of the troops in that area?

Mr. RALSTON: I have not the order in council before me. It was passed in July, 1941. I am surprised to hear my hon. friend say that the order in council does not contain a provision with regard to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. I thought it did.

Mr. GILLIS: No.

Mr. RALSTON: The order in council was passed for the purpose of preventing the possibility of destruction of our war effort, particularly in respect of the production of armament and munitions. My hon. friend will remember that a very serious situation did arise with respect to the production of aluminum, at a time when that material was exceedingly scarce, exceedingly valuable and very much needed in the allied war effort, and it took some weeks to repair the damage that was done. It was felt that this was not a situation which could be imposed upon the attorney general of the province, who would not have the same information as the federal authorities would have with regard to war necessities and any emergency which arose. Obviously, the Minister of National Defence would not be fully acquainted with the conditions of production and the effect which any disturbance might have on that production. It was therefore considered that the Minister of Munitions and Supply, who, under the Munitions and Supply Act, is responsible not only for the actual production but for the planning and the maintenance of that production, was the one in the best position to assess the situation and determine whether or not it was necessary to have the assistance of troops in order to prevent a disturbance.

I am still wondering whether my hon. friend has read the order in council carefully; I am sure he generally does read things carefully. At all events the practice is that the Minister of Munitions and Supply, finding a situation which is getting out of hand and which requires assistance in preserving order which cannot be furnished by the local authorities, applies to the commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. It is only after the commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police indicates that they are not in a position to supply the necessary constables or officers to take care of the situation that the Minister of Munitions and Supply has the right to call on the Minister of National Defence to furnish troops for that purpose; and that is the authority of the Minister of National Defence to send troops to the particular area.

Answering my hon. friend's question, the Minister of National Defence himself under the order in council is not, perhaps, called on to exercise any discretion in connection with the matter. If he refused he would assume a very grave responsibility, in view of the fact that the governor in council has placed upon the shoulders of the Minister of Munitions and Supply that responsibility. At the same time, I know the committee will believe that the Minister of National Defence, by consultation and such examination or such verification as he can make without in any way questioning the authority of the Minister of Munitions and Supply, endeavours to assure himself as far as he can that the step which is being taken is a right one and is necessary under the circumstances.

My hon. friend referred to the militia and to the announcement which had been made as to the role of the reserve army. The role of the reserve army, as my hon. friend knows, is as old as the reserve army of the N.P.A.M. They have always been subject to be called in aid of the civil power, and that is exactly what the paragraph which my hon. friend read means. There is no addition there at all. That is what it is intended for. I suppose there might be a case when the reserve army itself would be called out under this order in council to which he has referred, with respect to the production of munitions. That has not been used, as far as I remember, in connection with the reserve army.

Mr. GILLIS: I am not quarrelling with the purpose for which the order was intended when it was passed in 1941; in that particular situation perhaps it was necessary. But I am rather loath to approve an order in council that gives to one minister the amount of power and latitude, with respect to the use of troops as police, that this order places in the hands of the Minister of Munitions and Supply. I think the time has come when there should be a re-examination of that order, because if it is maintained in its present form in the future it can be used for other purposes than those for which it was intended. My object in bringing the matter up is to focus the attention of the Minister of National Defence upon it so that there may be reconsideration of the desirability of maintaining it in its present form in the future.

Mr. RALSTON: I will take note of my hon. friend's remarks, as a member of the government rather than as Minister of National Defence, because as Minister of National Defence I must recognize that the order in council is there. As I say, it was passed for a particular purpose, and having regard to the possibility of situations arising

which are contemplated in the recital. With deference to my hon. friend, I feel that the Minister of Munitions and Supply is the one in the government who is best qualified, and perhaps the only one qualified, to speak of the seriousness and the extremity of the emergency which calls for the exercise of these powers.

Mr. MACDONALD (Brantford City): May I again refer to the question of payment of income tax by the troops who served in Kiska? I am inclined to agree with the remarks made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. I thought he presented his case fairly and logically and with due emphasis. From the remarks of the minister I take it that he had been giving this matter consideration even before the question was raised in the house. When the amendment to the Income War Tax Act was passed providing that men who served outside Canada but in the western hemisphere should pay only half the income tax, I do not think it was ever contemplated that men who were going into a battle zone should pay half; I think at that time it was contemplated that any man going into a battle zone would pay no income tax. My recollection is that when that section was added to the Income War Tax Act, places such as Newfoundland and Bermuda were in the minds of those responsible. For instance, soldiers in those places are beyond the borders of Canada and in some places, particularly in Newfoundland, they are under greater hardships than in Canada itself. I think it was in those places, Newfoundland and Bermuda particularly, that it was contemplated that soldiers would pay half income tax.

With regard to Kiska, it was always my understanding that Kiska is not in the western hemisphere. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre stated that geographically it was not considered to be in the western hemisphere, but politically it was.

Mr. KNOWLES: By the United States.

Mr. MACDONALD (Brantford City): By the United States, he said. He did not know and I did not know when it was declared by the United States to be in the western hemisphere. That declaration may have been made since this war started. I do not think this government should be bound by a declaration of the United States which had been made for political purposes as to the location of Kiska.

Mr. RALSTON: High political purposes!

Mr. MACDONALD (Brantford City): I said, "political". I did not intend to say "political 'purposes'". I do not think the word "political" has anything to do with party; I think "political" is used to distinguish from "geographical".

In my view the government should take into consideration only the fact that these men were expected to go into a battle zone, and they should be given the same consideration as any men who are going into a battle zone in any part of the world. I trust the government will see fit to give them full exemption from income tax payment. The payment of income tax for the year 1943 has not been finally adjusted. No doubt a certain percentage of their pay was deducted, but the final return has not been put in, and I suggest to the government that it be made abundantly clear that when they put in their return for the year 1943 they will be allowed full tax exemption.

Mr. MacINNIS: I should like to refer for a moment to the question raised by the hon. member for Cape Breton South, and to ask the minister if this order has been invoked at any time since it was passed. The date, I believe, is July 9, 1941. Has the Minister of Munitions and Supply requested that troops be sent into any place where there was trouble, or anticipated trouble; have troops been sent into such location; on how many occasions, and to what places?

Mr. RALSTON: I have in mind that on one occasion a requisition was made, but I do not think the troops were moved at that time. I have not the record here, but I believe that is the only occasion.

For the benefit of the hon. member for Cape Breton South I think it is well to put this order on the record. My hon. friend missed something in the order. It is numbered 5830 and dated July 29, 1941: I will not read the heading, if my hon. friend will permit *Hansard* to include it:

At the Government House at Ottawa
Tuesday, the 29th day of July, 1941.
Present:
His Excellency the Governor General
in Council

Whereas the Minister of Justice reports that in order to insure without interruption the flow of supplies and munitions of war and the construction of all defence projects it may in some circumstances become necessary to authorize the Minister of National Defence to call out and employ the Active Militia to prevent or suppress riots, disturbances of the peace or other actions likely to impede or obstruct the production or delivery of munitions of war or supplies or the construction of defence projects;

Therefore, as a measure for the security, defence, peace, order and welfare of Canada, His Excellency the Governor General in council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Justice—

Hon. members will recall that the Minister of Justice has jurisdiction over the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

—and under and by virtue of the powers conferred by the War Measures Act, chapter 206, R.S.C. 1927, is pleased to amend the Defence of Canada Regulations (consolidation) 1941, established by order in council P.C. 5295, dated 15th July, 1941, and they are hereby amended as follows:

1. By adding the following to subsection 1 of section 2:

(ii) "strike" means a lawful strike.

2. By inserting immediately after regulation number 51 the following:

51A (1) The active militia or any corps thereof shall be liable for service as hereinafter in this regulation provided.

(2) In any case where a riot or disturbance of the peace or without limitation by the foregoing any other action whatsoever occurs or is anticipated as likely to occur which in the opinion of the Minister of Munitions and Supply threatens to obstruct or delay the production, transportation, storage or delivery of munitions of war or supplies or the construction, remodelling, repair or demolition of a defence project, the minister may request—

I call this to the attention of the committee.

—the commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police to take such measures as in the opinion of the said commissioner are necessary to prevent, suppress or terminate such riot, disturbance or other action as aforesaid, actual or anticipated, and the commissioner shall take such measures accordingly.

(3) If the municipal and provincial police forces and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police available for the purpose are, in the opinion of the commissioner—

Not the minister.

—inadequate or ineffectual to prevent, suppress or terminate such riot, disturbance or other action as aforesaid, the commissioner shall immediately notify the Minister of Munitions and Supply accordingly.

(4) Thereupon the Minister of Munitions and Supply may notify the Minister of National Defence of the circumstances aforesaid and the Minister of National Defence shall thereupon issue a direction that the active militia take such measures as may be necessary to prevent, suppress or terminate such riot, disturbance or other action as aforesaid and the active militia shall take such measures accordingly.

(5) The officers and men of such active militia when so employed, shall, without any further authority or appointment, and without taking oath of office, be held to have and may exercise, in addition to their military powers and duties, all the powers and duties of special constables, so long as they remain so employed, but they shall act only as a military body, and shall be individually liable to obey the orders of their military superior officer.

(6) Every officer and man of the active militia, at all times and while so employed, shall obey the orders of his military superior officer.

(7) A strike or the peaceful persuasion of a person by another to take part in a strike shall not be an action to be prevented or suppressed under this regulation.

There is a penal provision having to do with those who attempt to obstruct or delay the transportation, storage or delivery of munitions and supply. Then there is the proviso:

Provided, however, that, a person shall not be guilty of an offence under this regulation by reason only of his taking part in or peacefully persuading any other person to take part in, a strike.

Mr. BRUCE: I wish to refer for a moment to a subject which I raised earlier in the afternoon. It intimately affects the welfare of our armed forces and might therefore, I believe, be appropriately dealt with for a moment at this time. I refer to the subject of venereal disease. In order to indicate at the outset that, in asking the question, I had no desire to cast reflection upon any particular location in Canada, I would simply say that the whole subject was raised at a conference in Montreal in the early part of this week, as reported in the Montreal *Star* of Tuesday, in which Major-General Renaud, the officer commanding military district No. 4, made a statement with reference to the seriousness of venereal disease which was affecting the forces stationed in or around Montreal or who were passing through Montreal. I am aware that the defence department established, a little over a year ago, I believe, a venereal disease control department which since then has been doing excellent work under the direction of Lieutenant-Colonel D. H. Williams. I understand that the other services have each an officer associated with Colonel Williams to take care of the work in their respective fields. Since that time there has been a great improvement in the incidence of venereal disease in the three defence services. On the other hand, there has been a steady rise in the incidence of venereal disease among the civilian population, and it will be quite clear to everyone that this must also be controlled or the efforts of the army will be unavailing, because obviously the source of disease is in the communities in which the soldiers reside.

I had intended asking the minister if he would make a statement, but he has indicated his intention of doing so later on with regard to the whole venereal situation as it affects the army. I think it very desirable to call public attention to the situation that prevails throughout Canada in many communities, because it is only in this way that any cleaning-up will take place.

After I received to-day the telegram to which I referred earlier in the session, I telephoned to the chief venereal disease officer, Colonel Williams, and asked him about the situation in the city of Quebec, and he gave

me this interesting information, that the municipal authorities there had recently closed the various bawdy houses and that five days after that action had been taken there was a reduction of fifty per cent in the incidence of venereal disease in the forces in that area. Therefore Quebec may very well be an example for other communities in Canada to follow.

An hon. MEMBER: Toronto.

Mr. BRUCE: I mean Quebec city, in this respect, at any rate. I am sure the members for Quebec city will be pleased to have me make this statement.

Mr. POWER: All these stories are not about Quebec city; they are about Montreal. The hon. member read the wrong paper.

Mr. BRUCE: About what city? The stories I referred to a moment ago in the early part of my remarks were about Montreal.

Mr. POWER: I beg your pardon.

Mr. BRUCE: My statement referred to the holding up of corvettes because of the prevalence of venereal disease. Perhaps the minister did not hear that statement made earlier in the day. I made an inquiry in regard to that situation and the chief venereal officer gave me the reply which I gave a moment ago.

Mr. POWER: May I ask my hon. friend a question? Does the telegram infer that venereal disease is among civilians or workers on these corvettes or among members of the navy who would be taking the corvettes out to sea?

Mr. BRUCE: If I may, I shall read the telegram:

> Monday's papers state service civilian conference reveals corvettes delayed sailing Quebec through prevalence venereal disease my son volunteer for navy goes there Sunday imagine our and other parents' feelings. What is being done re situation.

Mr. POWER: Vessels could not leave Quebec in the winter anyway. We do claim there is winter navigation out of Quebec, but I think it is only theoretical; therefore I hardly think the vessels would be leaving Quebec. In any event I think the ice probably had more to do with it than the disease.

The CHAIRMAN: I did not want to interrupt the hon. member for Parkdale, but I believe that this discussion should take place under item 5:

> 5. Personnel. Supplies and services: food, medical and dental stores, clothing and personal equipment.

Yesterday the Minister of National Defence and the acting leader of the opposition mentioned the fact that it was difficult to keep the members of the committee in order on the general discussion. I want to follow implicitly the lead the committee will give me with regard to discussion under this item. We have had a general discussion for pretty nearly a week, and I believe the temper of the committee would be to pass item 1 in order to proceed with the other items. I do not want to curtail discussion in any way, but I should like to make the position clear.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Mr. Chairman, you say that this discussion could very well take place under item 5. Item 5 deals with medical and dental stores, it is true, but it does not say anything about medicine, disease or anything else. It is difficult for the committee to know just what item the different matters should come under.

Mr. RALSTON: I do not blame my hon. friend for finding it difficult. I must confess to the committee that if this item is taken in the broadest sense almost anything in the Department of National Defence could be discussed thereunder, because there must be civil salaries or wages paid to clerks in connection with this matter as in others. To this I have no objection whatever, Mr. Chairman. In the first place let me say I appreciate your difficulty in endeavouring to keep the committee in line in questions and discussion on the various items. The hon. member for Parkdale began this discussion, and I for one am only too pleased to have him continue it. I intend to say something about the subject this evening, if I may, because it seems to me there are many things important in the army and in the armed services, and this is one of the most important. With your consent, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the hon. member for Parkdale continue.

The CHAIRMAN: Just one moment. I wish to make the position very clear. I followed quite closely the remarks of the leader of the opposition yesterday afternoon. As the committee knows, this is really not an itemized summary, but it was accepted last year. I know you will appreciate my difficulty in trying to synchronize items and so on. It is not my desire to stop discussion.

Mr. SINCLAIR: As a member in uniform I think I should intrude on this discussion. I had not intended saying anything on the minister's estimates, but the hon. member rises in his place and makes a statement which may be used by Lord Haw Haw and Doctor Goebbels in German propaganda that the Canadian navy could not put to sea out of Quebec because it was riddled with venereal disease. I say that is a shameful thing. If

it is true, the hon. member should have gone to the minister and given him that information rather than alleging all across the country that the Canadian navy could not put to sea because of venereal disease. It is a shameful thing.

Mr. BRUCE: Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with the hon. member who has just spoken. I think this is a public question and one that could very well be ventilated here.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): This is the proper place to ventilate it.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Get the real facts.

Mr. TUCKER: An allegation is made that may not be borne out at all.

Mr. BRUCE: We shall know what the facts are very soon, when the minister for the navy replies to my question.

Mr. TUCKER: Why put it on the records of parliament until you know?

Mr. BRUCE: The fact remains, Mr. Chairman, that the country is very much disturbed about the increase in the incidence of venereal disease.

Mr. SINCLAIR: That is a very different matter.

Mr. BRUCE: Therefore I think it is a very proper matter to call to the attention of the committee at this time, because it may seriously interfere with the efficiency of our armed forces. If allowed to become rampant, it certainly will interfere with their efficiency. If the excellent work that is being done by the venereal disease control department is to be a hundred per cent effective, or nearly so, then it is necessary for the various communities throughout Canada to do their part by closing bawdy houses, as I believe has been done in Montreal and Quebec. I await with interest the report of the minister on this subject, but should like to call the attention of the committee to the way venereal disease has been handled in other countries, particularly in the Scandinavian countries. The incidence of syphilis in Denmark has been reduced to ·2 per thousand and in Sweden to ·07 per thousand.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What is Sweden doing in this war?

Mr. BRUCE: That is to say, one Dane in five thousand suffers from this disease and one Swede in 14,000. In twenty years they have been able to cut down venereal disease in these countries to the status of a rare disease. I believe that this should stimulate our people to greater activity in the hope that we may be able to stamp out this serious disease in this country to a very large extent.

Mr. GILLIS: I do not intend to occupy very much time. I also like to get the facts. I did not want to take up the time to put the order in council on record, but I do not interpret it as the minister does. In the first place, this order in council states that some strikes are legal. The minister will remember that under P.C. 9384, the last wage order, no strikes are legal. Therefore this order conflicts with the other.

Mr. RALSTON: You are not complaining about that.

Mr. GILLIS: I am not. Secondly, the authority to decide whether a community has lost control of the administration of law and order is placed exclusively in the hands of the commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Surely that is usurping the powers of the civic governments.

Mr. RALSTON: No. It has the authority to state not that they have lost control, but that the police forces are not efficient.

Mr. GILLIS: That is interfering with the powers which are vested in the municipalities, towns and cities. The mayor or council decided whether that situation prevailed.

Mr. RALSTON: I take issue with my hon. friend there. I know they have the right to decide it, they control the forces; but at the same time, where there is a federal interest, and when the commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, who ought to know something about the strength of the measures which must be taken to deal with a particular situation, is given that responsibility, it seems to me that my hon. friend cannot say that control is taken away from the municipal authorities. The commissioner simply appraises the ability of the municipal police force to handle the situation as it affects the federal project.

Mr. GILLIS: I have no objection to the commissioner doing that when he is utilizing his own forces, but I definitely do not see the matter as the minister sees it with respect to the use of troops. It is an entirely new departure; otherwise this order would not have been necessary. If in a given area, the city of Toronto, for example, or in Montreal or anywhere else, troops are necessary, it was and should be the prerogative of the city council to call them in. I think the minister will remember the last time troops were used in Nova Scotia. The town of Glace Bay refused to do what many of the other cities and municipalities did; that is, it refused to requisition the troops, and as a result they were not brought to our town. Our mayor refused to sign the requisition, and as a result

they were not called in. I think this matter requires an examination. The order may have been necessary when it was passed, but it contains unlimited powers which override civic powers in the matter of the use of troops. I know the minister cannot deal with the point to-day, but I merely want to focus attention upon it because it conflicts with the existing set-up. There are no more legal strikes, but under this regulation if the commissioner or the person responsible in a particular district desires to utilize the troops instead of his own forces he is at liberty to do so. Personally I am skeptical about a number of the people who are administering the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, when it comes to the question of deciding whether or not troops should be used under this order. I am not satisfied to leave that decision with them.

Mr. GRAHAM: I was interested in the discussion that took place between the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and the minister with regard to an individual who was discharged from the navy at Victoria and was faced with the difficulty of securing transportation home. The minister dealt with that case as far as his department is concerned, but it happens that I, together with a group of my colleagues on this side of the house, have been attempting to study these matters in order to enlighten our own minds as to what is actually being done with regard to the demobilization and rehabilitation of the men and women in our armed services. Accordingly I thought it might be profitable to give hon. members the information we have been able to obtain in regard to such cases. I think hon. members and the people of Canada generally will be very much interested in securing full information as to the policy of the government in this regard, and it is our duty to give those who are interested all the information we can. So, that, if the minister will correct me in the event that I am wrong, I propose to put on record just what is done now with regard to a person who is discharged from any of our armed services. He is given a clothing allowance of $65, which is a decided improvement over the amount mentioned by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre in connection with the individual he was discussing. In addition, the man is allowed to retain certain articles such as underwear, shoes et cetera. He is also entitled to a rehabilitation grant consisting of one month's pay, with the dependents' allowance continued for that period, and finally he is provided with transportation and travelling expenses—

Mr. GRAYDON: That is on discharge?

[Mr. Gillis.]

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr. GRAYDON: Only one month's pay.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, one month.

Mr. GRAYDON: No matter how long he has served.

Mr. GRAHAM: Well, of course I am dealing with what the defence department is doing. The man will be entitled to certain other things when he comes under the new department of veterans' affairs. I am speaking now of what happens at the time of discharge.

Mr. GRAYDON: That is not enough.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: Does that apply to those who are discharged at their own request?

Mr. GRAHAM: The minister dealt with that, and I noticed he said that in his department it applies to those discharged at their own request; at least that was what I understood.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. RALSTON: I should correct my hon. friend there. I was referring to transportation home, which is granted to those discharged at their own request.

Mr. GRAHAM: One of the reasons that moved me to speak was the fact that the regulation is a little more generous than even the minister gave himself credit for.

Mr. WRIGHT: How long must a man serve in the forces before he receives the grant of one month's pay?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have not been informed as to the limitation of time.

Mr. RALSTON: He must serve six months, or 183 days.

Mr. WRIGHT: My hon. friend should put all the information on record if he is going to give any of it.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have not occupied very much of the time of this house so far this session, but I propose to place this information on record and if my hon. friend wishes more he can secure it or I can secure it for him. As I was saying, the department is a little more generous than the minister indicated. Not only is the discharged man entitled to transportation and expenses to the point of enlistment; at his own choice he is provided with transportation to the place of bona fide residence or to any other point in Canada that can be reached without additional expenditure. That is a rather important provision, because we all know that the point of enlistment may not be the point of residence, or where the man really wants to go. Through marriage, or for some other reason, his place of residence

may have been changed during his period of enlistment. So that I am delighted to learn that the department has taken that possibility into account and has provided a choice as to the place to which the discharged man may be given transportation.

Mr. QUELCH: Only if it is without additional expenditure.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr. BOUCHER: Would the hon. member explain what is really meant by those words, "without additional expenditure"?

Mr. GRAHAM: I think the statement I made is easily understandable. The discharged man can choose transportation to the point of enlistment, or to a place of bona fide residence which may be farther away than the point of enlistment, or to any other point in Canada, provided that it does not entail greater expense than transportation to his bona fide residence.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: But if that point is farther away it will entail greater expense.

Mr. GRAHAM: I placed this information on record because I thought it might be of some assistance to those hon. members who are interested in these matters rather than in the mere political value they see in criticizing the attitude of the government. That was the sole purpose I had in mind, to give certain information not only to hon. members but also to Canadians generally who are very much interested in the welfare of the men and women enlisted in our armed forces.

Mr. McIVOR: I do not like to change the subject, but when I think of the work our doctors are doing at the head of the lakes, which includes Fort William, Port Arthur and the surrounding district; when I think of the work of Doctor Walter Hogarth, who has said that these diseases are definitely on the decrease, I think it is my duty to rise in my place and say that the doctors, both military and civilian, who are attending the air force in Fort William, the navy in Port Arthur and the soldiers in both cities, have been doing a dandy job in keeping these men clean and fit.

Mr. RAYMOND: I wish to get some information from the Minister of National Defence, and at the same time register a protest against the attitude of the Department of National Defence in calling up farmers for a second medical examination. In view of the shortage of labour in the farming communities, is it the intention of the minister to continue to call up farmers for a second medical examination, particularly when they have been classified in category "E"?

I should like to cite an example. Last September I learned about a farmer who owned 160 acres of land. This man was married, but had to look after his farm by himself. He was called to Montreal for a second medical examination. Although he had been very busy at his farm work, he had to leave his farm and go to Montreal. It is true that the trip had been made at the expense of the government, but they were useless expenses. This man had been classified in category "E".

What is the purpose of calling farmers when we need them so badly? This man was alone, and had to look after 160 acres; yet he was called for a second medical examination, despite his classification. Does the minister intend to continue this practice?

Mr. RALSTON: Once more I must explain that I do not call the farmers. I have no more to do with calling farmers than I have with calling men engaged in any other occupations. I ask my colleague the Minister of Labour, through national selective service, for so many men. National selective service provides the machinery under which those men are called up. A provision was made, one which I believe has been pretty well eliminated now, whereby men could be examined by civilian practitioners. I do not know the case to which my hon. friend refers, but I shall be glad to refer to my colleague, the Minister of Labour, what has been said, if the hon. member will give me the information. We may then ascertain if we have a record of what has been done. I do not know whether the man in question was examined by a civilian practitioner.

However, it was found—and it was bound to be so—that there is a difference among doctors as to whether a man is or is not fit, and as to what degree of disability he may have from a symptom he exhibits. The result was that a board of revision was constituted. This board consisted of doctors who had a knowledge of army requirements. They have worked under national selective service and, although I cannot give the exact title of the director, I can say that a medical officer from national selective service has in each district gone over examinations made by civilian doctors. A doctor will see what a layman would not see, and in this, that or the other case he might find it questionable whether a man should have been placed in category "E", or whether he might not have been placed in a category eligible for military service. In those instances the director issued an instruction that such men be called in

again, a procedure which was carried out in every province, irrespective of where it might be.

In one province I have in mind—and it was not Quebec—I saw figures which showed that of 2,100 men turned down and found physically unfit, medical revision disclosed that 700 were eligible for military service. I am not casting any reflection upon members of the medical profession; I am simply stating a fact. It is quite possible that these examinations have been made when there was not the same general knowledge of army requirements.

If a man were called, whether or not he was a farmer, and was entitled to exemption under the act, then of course he should not have been called for an examination. On the other hand, if he was not entitled to exemption he would have to be called for his first examination. The medical director or registrar—I am not sure as to what his correct title is—who conducted the revision might quite possibly consider that the man in question had not been thoroughly examined, and might direct that he be called up for examination by the board of revision. That is all I can say to my hon. friend on the matter, except to emphasize once more that it has been found that this screening process, in which a reexamination is conducted, has disclosed cases on both sides of the line. Sometimes men who were overseas and who had been placed in category "A" upon entering the army, have been discharged. On the other hand many more were found who, in the first instance, had been turned down by a civilian practitioner, but who later were found to be medically eligible.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): In what province was that?

Mr. RALSTON: It was in Manitoba. However, I am not picking it out particularly. I might have chosen Ontario, Prince Edward Island or any other province, because it was the same in all.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): It would appear that under this item we are to be allowed to ask questions respecting medical subjects. Can the minister tell us how many psychiatrists are engaged in the army. I am asking the question because I know of some who have been checked by psychiatrists, and as a result have received satisfactory treatment.

I have, however, a complaint to make. In my view too many are shoved through the offices in a short space of time. The examinations are made too hurriedly. I understand there is an allotted time for each man, and I do not think that is a proper procedure. I do not know whether the minister agrees with me or not, but I believe the army would have fewer desertions if the psychiatrists had a better chance to check up on some of these men. I say that because many men in the army do not know where they are going, or what it is all about. In many cases they feel that it is not worth while, at all.

I shall not give any specific cases, but I do know of instances where psychiatrists have put these men on their feet, when a check was made, and it was learned what was required. In such instances good advice has been given. It is my opinion that psychiatrists should have more time to make their checks on the boys in the army.

I should like to know how many of those psychiatrists there are, and the length of time given to check each case. In many instances I understand the check is not made until it is almost too late. In my view it should be made when they come in or shortly thereafter.

Mr. RALSTON: I know there is a psychiatrist at each reception centre, and I shall get the exact number for the hon. member. The time taken by the psychiatrist when checking each man is supposed to be the amount of time required to enable the doctor to form an opinion. I agree with the hon. member that when there are such large numbers to be examined it is possible mistakes might be made and examinations might have to be curtailed to some extent. However, while we must not preen ourselves too much, we received a distinct indication from people who visited us not long ago that our examination set-up was satisfactory, and we were congratulated upon the fact that we had not reached the assembly-line stage in connection with the entrance of men to the army.

This applies not only to men who are coming into the army, but also to those who are already in. This is a process of keeping an eye on them, and following them through. That is particularly so when men are found not adapted to some particular occupation or arm of the service. The psychiatrist or the personel selection officer is there, and he endeavours to get the man started off on the right road again. As a matter of fact we have made a great advance in this respect overseas as well. We have sent teams overseas, not for the purpose of tearing up units, but more for the purpose of seeing with respect to the reinforcement units that the men there may be picked out and tagged for jobs so that they will not get into the wrong places where their abilities will be misplaced.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): This afternoon the minister was going to let us know about the number of psychiatrists in the army.

Mr. RALSTON: I am sorry that I have been busy since I left here at six o'clock, and I have not been able to get the figures. I shall have them to-morrow .

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Another matter respecting the health of men in the army about which I should like to speak is the service of chiropodists. I understand that the air force is recognizing these people and they are doing good work, and I wondered what the army was doing to provide for chiropodists to look after the feet of the men. I understand that the army is trying to create chiropodists by a three or four weeks' course of their own, and that, of course, is causing dissatisfaction among the registered chiropodists in Canada.

Mr. RALSTON: I am afraid I cannot give my hon. friend at this stage much information. From what I know from personal knowledge, the army has chiropodists; I know some who were practising in Ottawa who are in the army, and their services are regarded as not only useful but necessary. They are not taken in as officers; they are taken in as non-commissioned officers, and the men get the benefit of their services. Is there any particular question which my hon. friend has in mind?

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Just the two matters I mentioned. The subject of diabetes has been referred to before, but could the minister tell us the different tests which the men have to go through for diabetes when they are taken into the army? Is there just one test, or are they given a blood test also?

Mr. RALSTON: I cannot tell my hon. friend now. I might point out to the committee that this is where difficulty arises in endeavouring to cover all subjects under one item. I expect to have the medical officers here when the medical item comes up, but one can see that there are a good many ramifications in the organization and one cannot have all these people here at one time. I shall have that information. I just have now the statement that there are sixty-three psychiatrists in the Canadian army in Canada and overseas.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Does the minister think that number is sufficient? Is there any chance of getting any more?

Mr. RALSTON: All I know is this, that in addition to his qualifications as a medical practitioner, the director-general of medical services is himself a psychiatrist.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): I know that.

Mr. RALSTON: I do not think there is anybody who recognizes more the usefulness of psychiatrists in connection with army work, particularly personnel selection. As probably the hon. member knows, Major-General Chisholm was in charge of personnel selection before he was appointed director-general of medical services. We were fortunate in that, so fortunate that although sometimes personnel selection is in some way an entirely different branch, we felt that personnel selection should be taken over by the medical services, and it is one of the branches of the director-general's functions. I am sure that if more psychiatrists are needed and are obtainable, Major-General Chisholm will be the first one to see that they are employed.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): The reason I asked if we have enough is that I understand, whatever is the case now, that some few months ago a psychiatrist would go into one training camp, stay there perhaps a day or two days, then proceed to some other place, and then on to another point, but never at any time did he stay long enough in one place to do a job thoroughly. He did not have time to check on these men thoroughly. Perhaps he would see a man in the training camp to-day, a man who might be moved out of there in a week's time, before the phychiatrist got back. That was not fair to the psychiatrist or to the man. Perhaps if that man had had a little more attention from a psychiatrist he would make a better soldier. All these men in the army have good stuff in them, and it is up to the psychiatrist to try to bring out the good in the men, and they are doing it. I think this is a matter which should be looked into.

Mr. RALSTON: My principal satisfaction is that not only the officers and other ranks but the minister himself are getting in a state of mind where they are not afraid of psychiatrists.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): There is a lot in that.

Mr. RALSTON: It was regarded for a while as a rather fearsome profession with a fearsome name. I did not like the sound of psychiatric tests, myself; but we seem to have advanced considerably in science in this particular war, and I have found, as my hon. friend suggests,

that the services of psychiatrists have been highly useful, not simply from a professional and scientific, but also from a practical point of view. Regarding what my hon. friend has said, I am thinking now of a reception centre where there is not a psychiatrist all the time; in that particular province he does have to move around; and I quite agree with my hon. friend that if we were able to have the personnel selection officer and a psychiatrist constantly there to consult—not in every case, because you do not need a psychiatrist in every case—it would be an advantage. I will make a note of the matter and see whether the D.G.M.S. thinks there is a possibility of increasing the number of psychiatrists. I would agree with my hon. friend. I know the work they are doing and the size of the job, and I think that more psychiatrists would be useful.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): I was glad to hear the minister say that we are not afraid of the name "psychiatrist."

Mr. RALSTON: I was—

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): We all were perhaps at one time.

Mr. RALSTON: —but I am getting over it.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): The psychiatrists really take the place of mother and father of the men in the army because they are there to listen to the troubles of these men, and also of the girls, because they need such advice as well as the men.

Mr. GREEN: In the course of the discussion on this resolution the minister made significant statements on two questions which I think are of great importance, not only to this house but also to the Canadian people. First is the man-power policy of the government, having reference more particularly to the call-up system under the National Resources Mobilization Act, and, secondly, the policy of the government in the war with Japan.

To deal first with the call-up system, it would appear from the statements the minister has made that that system is being allowed to die out. For example, the minister has shown that the numbers called up have dropped from 60,000 in the fiscal year 1942-43 to 25,000 in the fiscal year 1943-44, and in fact in the present year there have been only 19,000 called in the first nine months.

Mr. RALSTON: Enrolled, not called.

Mr. GREEN: I am dealing throughout with enrolment figures. That was to the end of December, 1943, and as against that enrolment about 3,000 have gone active, 6,500 have been discharged, which by the way seems a very high percentage, and I would ask the minister to explain the reasons for which they were discharged; then there have been 1,500 deserters in the first nine months of the present fiscal year. That is a total wastage of 11,000. The minister announced that for the coming fiscal year 1944-45 there would be only 12,000 enrolled under the National Resources Mobilization Act; in other words, less than half of the number asked for in the present fiscal year.

Mr. RALSTON: What was the last word? My hon. friend said, "in other words".

Mr. GREEN: In other words, less than half the number that the government required during the fiscal year 1943-44. The minister told us last year that he was asking for 25,000 under the National Resources Mobilization Act and 75,000 for general service. Then he said yesterday that the N.R.M.A. army is now on a maintenance basis, that there will be no increase in the numbers in that army; that there will be about 50,000 fighting men fit to be sent overseans to fight, and that was the same figure he gave last year and the year before. As I say, he admitted yesterday that the N.R.M.A. army is now purely on a maintenance basis.

In the course of his statements on this resolution he has said further that there is an extensive feeding out from the N.R.M.A. army to different industries, agriculture, forestry, and so on, the total at present being about 5,300, which is done by a system of extended leave. Men are given six months' leave with the option of renewing it for a further six months and so on, which really amounts to indefinite leave.

Mr. RALSTON: That does not apply to the N.R.M.A. alone.

Mr. GREEN: No; that is quite true. But the minister said that there are 5,300 N.R.M.A. men out on extended leave—8,000 altogether of whom 5,300 are N.R.M.A. men. If I am incorrect I would ask the minister to correct me. He said also that some men have been detailed for work in industry; in other words, they are not on leave—they had not that privilege—but have been detailed to go and work in an industry. I suggest to him that there will be more and more a demand from industry for these men in the N.R.M.A. army, particularly if those troops are not fighting and there appears to be little prospect that they will be doing any fighting. I think it is a reasonable forecast that a year from now there will be a force of fewer than 50,000 of these men who are fit for fighting. This means that the N.R.M.A. army is gradually

dropping out of sight and that eventually we shall reach the position where we have no effective N.R.M.A. army at all. This means further that Canada is getting back to a purely voluntary basis for raising troops, which means, of course, that we are getting back to all the inequalities which a voluntary system entails.

I suggest to the minister that there should be a clear-cut statement of policy on the part of the government with regard to this call-up system, telling us just what the intention is and where we are heading. It is one of the most important questions in the whole of our war effort and we should have a more clear-cut statement from him.

Mr. RALSTON: I do not know what my hon. friend means by a clear-cut statement. We are calling up men for the needs we have. What more does my hon. friend want? Will he particularize?

Mr. GREEN: I am suggesting that the government policy as it has been enunciated by the minister during the last few days shows that the call-up system is gradually being allowed to die out and that we shall be back on a purely voluntary basis.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend wants me to correct him. I will do so now. I will record here that I have not said anything that I know of which justifies that statement.

Mr. GREEN: I should like to have a clear-cut announcement from the minister so that the Canadian people will know what the government has in mind.

Mr. RALSTON: I have been as clear-cut as possible.

Mr. GREEN: The call-up system has a direct bearing on the second question, which is this: what is Canada's policy in the war against Japan? That is another question which needs clarification by the government. The two questions are related because the bulk of the N.R.M.A. army has been on the Pacific coast from the start and these N.R.M.A. men comprise the bulk of the Canadian forces out there. They were sent to replace active service men, who in turn were sent to Europe as reinforcements. This has gone so far that units which were raised originally in British Columbia have now been depleted of British Columbia men and the replacements are practically all from other parts of Canada. Eventually some of these N.R.M.A. men on the Pacific coast got to Kiska in a task force brigade, a special task force which went there with the Americans and which by the way made a very good name for itself. They are now back on the Pacific coast along with two other brigades organized in the form of task forces, the three of them making up the sixth division. In the meantime, according to the United States press, some of the American troops who took part in the occupation of Kiska have been fighting in the Marshall islands, and have been partly responsible for the victories there. As I pointed out, Canadian troops are back in Canada.

The minister said on February 14, as reported in *Hansard* at page 466, the policy of the government in regard to the war against Japan is:

> . . . that no commitments have been made at the present time as to the nature or extent of Canada's participation in the war against Japan.

He went on to say that the army recognized that there is a war on with Japan, and he made much the same statement last year. Here we have the policy of the government duly announced that Canada has no commitments whatever with regard to the war against Japan.

Mr. RALSTON: I did not say that.

Mr. GREEN: I shall read it again:

> . . . that no commitments have been made at the present time as to the nature or extent of Canada's participation in the war against Japan.

Mr. RALSTON: "As to the nature and extent". I want my hon. friend to realize what I am saying. I said, "as to the nature and extent". My hon. friend in the statement he made before he read the passage the second time said, "no commitments had been made with regard to the war against Japan". I said that was incorrect. I said, "that no commitments have been made at the present time as to the nature and extent of our participation".

Mr. GREEN: I do not want to be unfair to the minister; I admit that he said that.

Mr. RALSTON: I do not care about my hon. friend being unfair. I want him at least to be direct.

Mr. GREEN: Well, the minister seemed to be caring a whole lot; I do not know what is the matter with him. At any rate we can all agree on this one fact, that sooner or later Canadians will be fighting in the Pacific. There should be a clear-cut policy on this question and it should be announced by the government. We should not be stood off with a statement that we have no commitments at the moment as to just how, when and where we are going to fight the Japanese. There are certain features with regard to Canada's position in the Pacific which should be considered very carefully by the govern-

ment. First of all there is this fact that steadily the united nations are closing in on Japan. For example, it has been announced in the press that British troops either are now in Australia or will be there shortly. Canada, of course, has her own job of work to do in the Pacific war. I think it should be borne in mind that Canada cannot wait until the war in Europe is over before she does anything about the war against the Japanese. Take, for example, the question of what troops are to be used against the Japanese. I suggest to the committee that it is unfair to expect our men to come back after fighting and defeating Germany and then go out to fight the Japanese. After all, our army is a citizen army. When the men come back to Canada they will not be very keen about being rushed right to the other end of the country and sent to fight the Japanese. Furthermore, they are not trained for that type of warfare; they are not trained for jungle fighting or the type of fighting they would face in that part of the world.

Another side of the picture is that this N.R.M.A. army is available here in Canada. Certainly the units on the Pacific coast are trained and equipped for fighting the Japanese. Actually, as the minister admitted the other day, some of the units there have volunteered to fight the Japanese, although under present government policy they cannot be sent abroad to fight either the Germans or the Japanese. If some of these troops were sent out across the Pacific there are ample reinforcements among the N.R.M.A. troops to keep the units up to strength.

Another feature is this: the minister made quite a play the other night about not wanting to send to Great Britain any troops who were not volunteers. He did not want to mix the volunteers and the N.R.M.A. men. If the government persists in that policy it means that none of these N.R.M.A. men will ever go to Europe. On the other hand, if they are sent to the Pacific there need be no reason to mix the two forces. I realize, and the other members of the committee realize that for the government to send the N.R.M.A. forces to the Pacific it would be necesasry first of all for the government to decide to do this, and then under the present policy to ask parliament for approval of such action. I believe that N.R.M.A. men should be made available for service anywhere in the world; that is my personal belief, but I suggest that the government should give further consideration, at least, to making these men available for fighting against the Japanese. These are the two questions on which I should like to have some further information from the minister. They are of vital importance. They go to the root of our whole war effort in the coming year, and I would ask him to give us a clear-cut announcement as to what the government has in mind on these two questions.

Mr. RALSTON: With regard to the last question my hon. friend referred to, namely, Canada's participation in the war against Japan, I repeat, what I said before, that Canada as a Pacific power will remain in the war until Japan is subjugated. My hon. friend knows perfectly well, and the committee knows, that we cannot make any statement to him as to the nature and extent of Canada's participation of air forces, navy and army. I am not making any statement about that; my hon. friend would not expect it. I really do not see just what he is driving at. The point is that three brigades are on the west coast, as my hon. friend says. There, they have alternative roles; one role is to train for any necessity which may arise in connection with the Pacific situation; another role is to be, as I mentioned the other night, a backlog for reinforcements for overseas should the necessity arise and action be taken. Another role is—and it is a lesser role, it is true, just now, but a role which my hon. friend himself was most vociferous in advocating only one and a half years ago—for the defence of the Pacific coast.

Mr. GREEN: That was quite right. I do not think the minister would question the wisdom of that.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend has a very short memory. Now he says that these people are absolutely useless.

Mr. GREEN: I did not say they are absolutely useless.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend has suggested it—

Mr. GREEN: I rise to a question of privilege.

Mr. RALSTON: There is no question of privilege at all. My hon. friend was suggesting that they were absolutely useless and that they ought to be sent somewhere.

Mr. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a questior of privilege.

Mr. RALSTON: Mr. Chairman, I have the floor.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The minister has the floor and it is up to him to—

Mr. GRAYDON: The minister has not the floor when a question of privilege is raised.

Mr. RALSTON: There is no question of privilege.

Mr. GRAYDON: A question of privilege has precedence over everything else.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member explain his question of privilege?

Mr. GRAYDON: The hon. member rose to a question of privilege.

Mr. GREEN: The question of privilege is this. The minister says that in the course of my remarks I said that these N.R.M.A. men were useless. I did not say that at all; I said just the opposite. I said that they had made a name for themselves at Kiska and I advocated the government changing its policy so that these men could be sent to fight against the Japanese. The minister has no right whatever to say that I stated they were useless.

Mr. RALSTON: I had a right to say what the effect of my hon. friend's statement was, namely, that out there they were useless. My hon. friend wanted them sent either against Japan or overseas. That was the effect of what my hon. friend said. I am calling his attention to the fact that they are on the Pacific coast, the place where he was so anxious to have twice as many troops or three times as many troops a short time ago.

Mr. GREEN: I did not say they were useless there.

Mr. RALSTON: That was the effect of it; that we had better send them somewhere. I say they have that possible role of activities in the Pacific. They also have another role, as I said the other night, of constituting a backlog for the purpose of reinforcing the troops overseas should the occasion arise and the necessary action be taken.

Mr. GREEN: And should the government change its policy.

Mr. RALSTON: They have a third role; that is, the defence of the Pacific coast, and a fourth, which is always possible for troops in Canada, namely, in aid to the civil power. My hon. friend knows perfectly well that these men are training to be used wherever they may be needed.

Mr. GREEN: They are trained already.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend seems to know a great deal more about the army than I do. I know about their training; I have reports from the general officer commanding-in-chief of the Pacific command in regard to it. If my hon. friend knew anything about soldiering, as I think he does, he would realize perfectly well that a man is never fully trained, that in soldiering you go on and on, and that if a man does not keep on training, in a very short time he can become stale and require a good while to get into shape for soldiering again.

That is all I have to say about the Japanese situation. With regard to the N.R.M.A., my hon. friend rose to correct me when I said that in effect his statement was that these troops on the Pacific were useless. I did not rise to correct him when he made the statement that I had admitted the other night that the N.R.M.A. army would gradually go out of sight. I never said anything of the kind. I do not look for the N.R.M.A. men in the army to "die out" as he put it. I said yesterday that at the end of this year we shall still have about as many men as we have at the present time, which is between sixty and seventy thousand. That is a fairly sizable lot of men. It certainly does not show much shrinkage.

Mr. GREEN: Does that include—

Mr. RALSTON: Perhaps my hon. friend will permit me to finish. As I say, that is not a very great shrinkage. And I said with regard to them, as I said with regard to the general service men in Canada, that our army in Canada is on a maintenance basis, just as the munitions and supply programme is on a maintenance basis both here and in the United States. That is what is happening all over; we have built up our capital commitments; we have formed our units; we have provided our initial equipment; from now on the maintenance is what is necessary, and by "maintenance" I mean taking care of reinforcements and wastage. I have not any clear-cut statement to make with regard to the N.R.M.A. beyond what I have already said. That is to say, we expect to get about twelve thousand men this year for the purpose of relieving general service personnel in order that they may be released to go overseas, if required, as reinforcements; and the N.R.M.A. personnel in Canada will be used for the duties we have for them here and any other duties for which they are trained and which it may be decided to assign to them. So far as I know there is nothing more to be said in that connection.

My hon. friend said something else that I did not quite understand. He spoke of N.R.M.A. men being released or discharged to industry, and he said the minister knew there would be more and more demand from industry for these men. My own idea is that probably there will be less demand from industry this year than previously. From what I hear, industry is not going so full out as it

was, by any means, and it is quite possible that men may be released from industry instead of more men being taken on. I did not quite follow my hon. friend's meaning when he made that statement.

Mr. DUPUIS: I should like to mention another fact which was brought out by the hon. member for Vancouver South and which I find very hard to understand; perhaps he can explain it or perhaps the minister will clarify the situation. The hon. member said that the N.R.M.A. men on the west coast are willing to go to Europe but are prevented from doing so because they belong to that portion of our army which is made up of those recruits. I understood the hon. member to say that the government is preventing these men from going to Europe. I always understood that a recruit who belonged to the N.R.M.A. was at liberty to sign for overseas, and that as soon as he did so he became part of the active army and no one could prevent him from going overseas. I should like to be clear as to that.

Mr. GREEN: I am afraid the hon. member misunderstood me. I said that at least some of the N.R.M.A. units—I think those that went to Kiska—have volunteered to go and fight in the Pacific. They did not volunteer to fight in Europe, but were willing to fight in the Pacific; but that because they would not volunteer to go and fight in Europe, therefore they could not be sent to the Pacific unless the government changed its present policy, under which these N.R.M.A. men cannot be sent abroad without the formal approval of this house. Now does the hon. member understand?

Mr. DUPUIS: I do not understand why these men could not be sent anywhere in the world if they signed for service in the active army.

Mr. KNOWLES: This afternoon the minister and I were discussing, among other things, the question of transportation to the place of residence in the case of men discharged at their own request. It seemed to me that considerable confusion developed and that, as the record now stands, that confusion might go beyond this house. I feel that I should place on the record a portion of the letter I referred to this afternoon, which came to me from the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services, who is now in his place, and perchance we can see whether or not there is any difference in the regulations as among the three services.

Mr. RALSTON: I would appreciate that.

Mr. KNOWLES: I quote from the letter I received from the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services under date of February 7 of this year:

> . . . I may say that our Canadian naval regulations provide that when a rating or officer is discharged for reasons other than "at his own request" he may be granted transportation and subsistence to the place at which he was living in Canada at the time of entry, or to his intended place of residence in Canada, if the conveyance thereto costs no more.
>
> However, when an officer or rating is discharged "at his own request" no transportation is granted.

I call attention to this sentence:

> Similar regulations apply in the other two services.

I quote further:

> In addition to this he also receives a clothing allowance to provide him with civilian clothing. The amount of this allowance was formerly $35 but was raised to $65 by a naval order passed on the 25th of December, 1943. A rehabilitation grant, amounting to one month's pay and allowances, is also provided on discharge, except in cases where the discharge is made at the rating's own request. All these regulations are general in the three services.

I call attention to the next paragraph:

> I do not think treasury board would approve of a change in the regulations to provide for the paying of transportation in cases where the application for discharge was made by the rating himself.

That is signed by the minister. As I understood the Minister of National Defence this afternoon, however, he said that, under a recent regulation affecting the army, transportation is provided to the original place of residence, or in some cases to a newly chosen place of residence, even for men discharged at their own request. I should like some reconciliation between the statement that this has been done in the case of the army, and the statement by the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services doubting whether treasury board would agree to such a request. I hope the Minister of National Defence was correct in what he told me this afternoon and, that being so, that the same regulation will be made to apply in the other two services.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I can only say to my hon. friend that, as to the army regulations on this or on any other point, what I say cannot be taken as against the view of the minister of that department. My impression was that the three services had the same regulation with regard to men discharged at their own request, and that transportation was not provided in such cases. But if the Minister of National Defence now says that the army does provide transportation in those

cases, then that settles the matter so far as the army is concerned, and I was in error in my statement of what was army practice.

Mr. KNOWLES: When those regulations were changed with respect to the army, since we are dealing in general terms with national defence, may I ask whether the regulations were also changed with respect to the navy and the air force, and, if not, why not?

Mr. RALSTON: I shall have to answer that, because we have a solemn agreement between the three services that none of us shall put forward any recommendation for a change in pay and allowances, or benefits of that kind, without consulting the other.

Mr. KNOWLES: I would expect that.

Mr. RALSTON: And if it was not done in this case, then it must be the fault of the army. This change is made effective on January 26, 1944, and appears in section 210 of financial regulations and instructions. It provides what I read to my hon. friend this afternoon, namely:

210 (1) An officer or soldier, other than one who is a member of the permanent active militia and in respect of whom provision is made by article 208 of these regulations shall, on ceasing to serve with the force or on being discharged therefrom be entitled to transportation and travelling expenses, except as provided in paragraph (2) below.

(a) If residing in Canada immediately prior to becoming a member of the force.

(i) To the place in Canada where he was residing immediately prior to his appointment or enlistment, or

(ii) To any other place in Canada if the cost of the journey does not exceed the expenses authorized in (a) (i).

It will be noted that it states "except as provided" in paragraph 2. Paragraph 2 says:

(2) An officer or soldier who leaves the force for the purpose of joining any other of His Majesty's forces or an allied force shall not be entitled to transportation or travelling expenses.

So that exception does not cover the case of a man who was discharged at his own request.

Mr. KNOWLES: So far as the army is concerned it is perfectly clear that the man discharged at his own request is covered.

Mr. RALSTON: He is not excepted, to put it in another way.

Mr. KNOWLES: And did that request receive the approval of the treasury board?

Mr. RALSTON: Of the privy council, yes.

Mr. KNOWLES: May I take the opportunity at this time of calling it to the attention of the other two defence ministers.

Mr. POWER: In all probability it went into effect for the air force when it did for the army, unless we had some particular or very special reason against it. The Minister of National Defence has said there is a sort of agreement among the ministers that no service will give greater advantage by way of pay and allowances to its personnel. Then there is an inter-service committee. It is a very complicated matter. This inter-service committee is sitting almost constantly, and all those things must go to the committee of the three services. Normally there is a joint submission made to council and treasury board by the three services.

I cannot say off hand whether we have adopted that regulation, which the army seems to have put into effect on January 26. But I would be very much surprised if we have not. And if we have not there must be a very good reason for our not doing it.

Mr. KNOWLES: Will the minister look into it?

Mr. POWER: Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I should like to make a short statement concerning a matter raised this afternoon by the hon. member for Parkdale. Let me say first of all that the hon. member endeavoured to raise this question before the orders of the day were called. Mr. Speaker, however, ruled that he would have to place his question on the order paper, and I assumed he would follow Mr. Speaker's direction and place his question on either the order paper for tomorrow, or that of some subsequent day.

I was not in the house this afternoon at the time the hon. member returned to the question he had attempted to raise earlier in the afternoon. He returned to it while the estimates of the Minister of National Defence were under discussion, and read a telegram to the effect that corvettes were delayed in sailing from Quebec, on account of the prevalence of venereal disease. I doubt if my hon. friend was in order in bringing up the matter under army estimates, and I doubt if, strictly speaking, I am in order now in making reply to it. But I do feel that the suggestion the hon. member has made should be corrected, at least so far as the navy is concerned.

From the fact that the question was adressed to me I should gather the suggestion to be that corvettes could not sail because of the prevalence of venereal disease among members of the naval service. If that is the suggestion I should like to say I have been in touch in the last hour or two with those in the naval department who are in charge of operations, who direct the operations of our ships,

and I found that the last corvette sailing from Quebec sailed on December 26, or nearly two months ago. I also asked the operations branch whether they had any knowledge of any corvettes being delayed at any time at Quebec for the cause mentioned by the hon. member for Parkdale, and I was informed definitely that no delay at Quebec could be attributed to this cause.

But, in order to make assurance doubly sure I instructed the operations branch to go further and to communicate by telephone with Surgeon-Lieut-Commander C. M. Kirk, who is senior medical officer at Quebec. Doctor Kirk is a medical man of mature years, a man of wide experience and, I think, of very great ability. He has been at Quebec since January 15, 1943—now more than thirteen months. Therefore he must be taken to be fully familiar with medical conditions among navy personnel at that point, at least for the last thirteen months.

The direct question was put to Doctor Kirk, the Surgeon-Lieutenant-Commander, in these words: "Were any ships delayed at Quebec because of venereal disease?" To this question Doctor Kirk replied categorically, "No".

I hope that this disposes of the suggestion, one which in a certain measure I regard as reflecting upon the navy personnel at Quebec. If that was the suggestion, I hope it is disposed of now. I wish to say that, so far as I know, neither at Quebec nor elsewhere has any ship at any time had to delay its sailing for the reason referred to in the telegram read to the house this afternoon by the hon. member for Parkdale.

Mr. BRUCE: Mr. Chairman, may I thank the minister for his statement, which I am pleased he has been able to give, in which he denies the newspaper report that evidently inspired the telegram to which I referred in the house. This newspaper report will be found in the Montreal *Star* of February 15, and it occured to me that I was doing a distinct service in giving the minister an opportunity of replying to this at the earliest possible moment, instead of allowing it to stand for a couple more days.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. GRAYDON: Let him finish his statement; he has the floor.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Are you running this house?

Mr. GRAYDON: No, but you are not going to run it either. No more interruptions.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): You started the interruptions.

[Mr. A. L. Macdonald.]

Mr. POWER: Why should we not interrupt? My hon. friend does not rise from his seat.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): He never gets up when he interrupts. If he wants it, he can have it.

Mr. GRAYDON: That goes double, for over here.

Mr. ROWE: The government must be getting pretty jittery when two ministers have to keep bobbing up and down.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I would ask that the hon. member be allowed to make his statement.

Mr. BRUCE: I quote:

Lengthy reports—

Mr. GOLDING: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. There is a rule of this house which prevents the reading of articles from newspapers, and I want to read to you what happened—

Mr. ROWE: What is the point of order?

Mr. GOLDING: I want to read what happened—

Mr. GRAYDON: The member has a right to raise a point of order, but he must state what the point of order is.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has raised a point of order.

Mr. GOLDING: The ruling was given in a debate in this house on March 17, 1933. Mr. Woodsworth had read an article from the Montreal *Herald* of January 19, 1933, and also an article from the Montreal *Gazette* of the same date. Mr. Bennett took exception to the reading of such articles from the press, and in his argument Mr. Bennett, at page 3105 of *Hansard*, contended that there were 245 members of the house and that by the reading of articles from magazines and newspapers an attempt was made to introduce the 246th member, and this voice had no place in this assembly.

Mr. POWER: Cheers for Bennett.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): My Lord!

Mr. GOLDING: After a full discussion, the Speaker ruled it was not permissible to read articles from newspapers and magazines.

Mr. ROWE: Your leader has been reading speeches ever since.

The CHAIRMAN: On the point of order, as I understand the statement made by the hon. member for Huron-Perth (Mr. Golding),

the ruling had reference to something that occurred on the orders of the day. The hon. member for Parkdale to-night was asked to give the source of his information, which he has a right to do.

Mr. FACTOR: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. As the minister for naval services indicated, the hon. member for Parkdale is utterly out of order.

Mr. GRAYDON: What is the point of order, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. FACTOR: Just a minute. Since he has become a big shot the leader of the opposition does not want anyone else to speak.

Mr. GRAYDON: Thank you for the compliment.

Mr. FACTOR: I submit, Mr. Chairman, that a discussion of naval affairs is entirely out of order in this debate, but the hon. member for Parkdale made a statement dragging in the navy. The minister has replied, and I submit that no further discussion of that matter should be allowed.

The CHAIRMAN: On the point of order, the committee realizes that we are dealing with matters having to do with this war. All I have before me is the resolution covering the activities of the army, navy and air force. It was decided that wide discussion should be allowed. I have, however, on various occasions tried to confine the discussion to what is before the chair, but it has been difficult because evidently it was the committee's wish to have a general discussion.

Mr. BRUCE: I continue to quote:

> Lengthy reports, including statistics, were submitted by representatives of the navy, army and air force, naval representatives on two occasions referring to the fact that infection of naval personnel in Quebec city twice had resulted in preventing corvettes going to sea to take their places in convoys sailing from Halifax.

Mr. QUELCH: May I ask the Minister of National Defence if any steps have been taken to establish convalescent homes in western Canada? I ask because I understand that the government of Alberta offered the use of government house free of charge for the duration of the war and six months afterwards to the Department of Pensions and National Health as a convalescent home. I understand that the Department of Pensions and National Health referred the matter to the Department of National Defence. Has the minister any information on that?

Mr. RALSTON: I do not know that the name makes any difference, but we endeavour to give a name that comes more closely to describing the functions of these establishments. The army has established a casualty retraining centre, which is in the nature of a convalescent home, in British Columbia. The army has no other retraining centre that I remember until we get down to the one at Oakville, Ontario. The army has found it quite impracticable to establish convalescent homes in each province. It is felt that these retraining centres must be able to give an opportunity not only for treatment but for training as well, and it is not only much more economical but much better, from an administrative and training point of view, as well as from the point of view of morale, to have large concentrations in a few places rather than a number of small, scattered convalescent homes. The rule we have made is that there should be no fewer than two hundred at any retraining centre.

I want to say here that the department appreciates very much indeed quite a number of offers which have been made by private citizens to place their homes at the disposal of the department for use as convalescent homes. These offers have not been accepted for the reason that we believe, because of the overhead and lack of training facilities, greater efficiency is obtained by concentrating more patients at one point, that that is much more desirable from the point of view of the service itself and the morale of these men.

Mr. QUELCH: What is the size of the home in British Columbia?

Mr. RALSTON: It has over two hundred. It is the Harrison Hot Springs hotel.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): In the last two years some questions have been asked, when the minister's estimates were before the house, with reference to the Wassermann test. The minister said that this was under consideration. First, is the test being given to men entering the army? Second, is it being given periodically to men after they enter the army—every six months, or every year? Third, can the minister give the rate per thousand men, or on whatever basis the army keep their statistics, of venereal disease in Canada and in Great Britain? The reason why I particularly ask the question is that I was somewhat perturbed in reading British medical journals to see that there is concern in Great Britain about the increase in venereal disease. I should like to know if that has affected the rate as regards Canadian troops in Britain; if so, what steps are being taken to combat it; and are Wassermann tests being given to men in Great Britain?

Mr. RALSTON: I have not the figures for Great Britain. As a matter of fact, the hon. member for Parkdale asked me with regard to the steps which were being taken in the army to combat venereal disease, and I said that I would make a statement. I only had an opportunity for a very few minutes before I came into the house to get together a few facts. I am not giving them to the committee as at all complete, but perhaps the committee would be interested in the activities in which we have engaged. I am giving figures only as far as the army is concerned, but I believe that very shortly statistics will be available for all the three services.

May I say at the beginning that the three armed services are determined in every way possible, if not to stamp out, at least to minimize the incidence of this disease. It certainly causes more loss in man-days than any other one cause in the armed forces, and a determined attempt has been made, particularly during the last year, and I am speaking of the whole of last year, to deal with this matter. The lid is off. We use films with the troops, and I will indicate to the committee some other steps which we take in this regard.

I wish to preface what I say with the remark that the most important factor in connection with combatting this disease is, as hon. members understand, getting at the source of infection in civilian communities. It is of no use for the army alone to take preventive or curative measures; the point is that we have to obtain the cooperation of the civilian authorities; and, as indicated in this report, there has been a marked improvement this year in that respect.

The army took the matter up in a special way—I mean, made it a separate study altogether—in December, 1942. We then procured the services of Lieutenant-Colonel D. H. Williams, whom we appointed army venereal disease control officer. Colonel Williams had organized a very successful four-year campaign in British Columbia against venereal diseases. An officer trained in this particular branch of medicine was placed in each military district with a sub-staff of other ranks who were trained specially for the organization. That is to say, it was not left solely to the regular medical staff, but Colonel Williams had divisional officers in each district with a sub-staff for the purpose of dealing with this matter. They gave attention to setting up a basic policy of treatment. Colonel Williams consulted with the national research council of the United States, with the American army, and a specialist at Johns Hopkins university, to set up standards of treatment for the Canadian army. The ordinary treatment was too cumbersome to fit in with army activities.

For instance, the standard time for the treatment of syphilis had been eighteen months. A system of intensified treatment was instituted, which could be completed in one-third of that time. Before this programme, all gonorrhea patients had been going into hospital with a tremendous loss of duty time and cost of hospitalization. Under the new programme all patients are initially treated while on duty; they continue on duty training and, speaking generally, excellent results are obtained. There are, of course, a certain proportion of patients who do not respond to this type of treatment and who require hospital treatment and attention, and this is being provided to all who need it.

Until the system was revised, there was always the possibility of a V.D.S. patient, that is a syphilis patient, missing his treatment on account of being transferred or moved from one post to another, with the result of delaying the cure and prolonging the disability, with the consequent loss of time, and, what was much more important, the possibility of a permanent disability being incurred.

Under the revised system a rigid control was put into force by a system of records and supervision, so that, wherever the man went, the venereal disease control officer at that station had notice of his arrival and of his condition, and the system of treatment was continued without interruption there.

Previously—and this answers my hon. friend's first question—as I have indicated to the committee before, a blood test on entering the army was not mandatory. That was changed and every man entering the army is now given a blood test immediately after enlistment. This afforded a means for detecting infected cases immediately and instituting the regular regime of treatment.

The result of these tests has been perhaps more gratifying than would be expected. It has shown—and I may say that the mandatory test has not been in effect very long, because we had to make arrangements with all the provincial laboratories to cooperate with us before this could be done—that less than one per cent of the number that have been tested are suffering from V.D.S. when entering the army.

What I have said indicates very sketchily some of the measures taken to improve conditions. The results are already evident. The rate of venereal disease for the army as a whole during 1942 was 38 per 1,000. For the whole year 1943 it was reduced to 32 per 1,000. This may not sound to the public like a very striking decrease, but I am advised

by the officers concerned that it is in their opinion extremely significant; it is a reduction of about sixteen per cent, and marks a genuine improvement in conditions.

So far I have spoken of the activities in the army. The committee will realize, however, that the real work has to be done among the civilian population, since that is the source of infection.

Steps were taken to investigate in every case the source of infection and to turn over immediately to the civilian health department the information obtained, for action by them. Obviously the problem could not be solved by the armed services alone. It was a joint task of civilian authorities and of the armed forces.

As part of the programme, close liaison has been established among the armed services, the Department of Pensions and National Health and the provincial health departments; and each of the three services and these federal and provincial health departments is pooling its resources and experience to put into effect and carry out measures worked out in collaboration to deal with the disease in the communities where it has its source.

Obviously, the major target against which this campaign was directed was the brothels and other unsavoury community conditions. There is no doubt that there has been a marked increase in the attention given to this matter by the civilian authorities, and it is hoped and believed that the records and information which the armed services have been able to furnish have given stimulus to their efforts and helped them to focus attention on the conditions which were perpetuating the scourge among the civilian population.

I have spoken here only of the activities of the army, of the one service, but I can say that the resources of all three services have been put forward as a team, with what I regard as very gratifying success.

My hon. friend asked me as to whether the Wasserman test is given again. I cannot give my hon. friend that information at the moment.

The third question which I think he asked was, what were the figures in Great Britain? I shall have to get that for my hon. friend, and I shall do so.

Mr. ADAMSON: For a few minutes I wish to discuss casualties other than venereal. The annual army debate centres on two fundamental issues: first, our reinforcements, and, second, the use of the N.R.M.A. army, The minister has stated, and the committee will accept the statement, that the reinforcement situation is satisfactory, and that the use of the N.R.M.A. army is also satisfactory so far as he is concerned. All I can say is that I trust his hope is justified. The casualties for the campaign in Italy came out tonight, 36,626 British and 28,741 Americans, or a total of approximately 65,400 in five and a half months. That just about equals the total casualties the British army suffered the first day of the Somme.

The point I want to make is this. We must be prepared to find the attack on the western defences of Germany a great deal tougher than anything we have yet experienced, and we must also be prepared to find that the core of German resistance will be considerably toughened. It is extremely dangerous not to be prepared for these casualties, and I hope that the minister, when he says that the reinforcement situation is satisfactory, has really given great thought to this matter. I hope that he has not glossed over the most serious part of the task ahead of us.

There are two or three things which I think should be brought up at this time. The first is the immediate problem of the district depots, the demobilization and repatriation of the troops in the disposal wings of the district depots. It is one of the most serious problems facing the country to-day. There is no place where the soul of a man decays as much as where he is waiting around a district depot with nothing to do awaiting discharge. There develops a condition of anhedonia where every fatigue becomes a burden and every parade is an irritation. Furthermore, if these men are not put to work reasonably soon we shall be faced with a problem where a great many of them will not work again. I am not alone in that statement. That is the opinion of a great many people who have made a study of this very question.

I suggest to the minister that some immediate thought should be given to the establishment, possibly at one of the R.A.F. centres which will be closed, of a civilian training centre so that, instead of keeping these men in the district depot, they be sent where there will be an opportunity for them to study a civilian trade. And that should be done at once. We are up against it. This is a very serious matter, particularly in No. 2 district depot. This is one of the things that should be done immediately.

Next the minister brought up the case of a number of surplus officers. Admittedly there are a number of surplus officers. I do not know whether it is true, but I have heard that there are 700 spare majors around Canada. That is the common story. If you have no use for an officer it is unfair to keep him with nothing to do. I believe these extra

officers should be given an opportunity now—I do not suggest that this should be retroactive—so that those who are willing to leave the army should not be penalized by being disallowed their bonus or army-leaving grant. That is an essential matter at this time.

There is much opposition from officers in the army who are thinking of getting out because they feel there is nothing for them to do. They do not want to leave because, if they leave on their own request, they do not come in for the bonus payment which is given to the man who is normally retired. I suggest that the minister should consider that point. That is my second point.

I would ask the minister a question with regard to the function of certain parts of the army overseas. We have a corps with headquarters in Italy; we have a corps with headquarters in England; we have an army headquarters in England. But besides that we have a Canadian military headquarters in England. In other words, we have three headquarters in England. I do not know whether it is possible, but it would seem to me that if there is any possibility of reuniting the two corps of the Canadian army, an army set-up will be needed. If there is a chance of reuniting them, then the Canadian military headquarters in London is the fifth wheel to the coach. We could deal through national defence headquarters direct with the army and C.M.H.Q. would become for a great many purposes redundant and merely an extra establishment in connection with the overseas army set-up. A great deal of money could be saved by dealing directly with the army, because after all Great Britain is an operational field still, and if the two corps are not united we could deal directly with them. That is a suggestion regarding which I would ask the minister for his opinion.

There is a third question which concerns a matter that I have brought to his attention. Perhaps it should be taken up under pay and allowances, but I bring it up here because I think it should be aired in the house. If a soldier of the Canadian army personnel is undergoing detention, after a period of six months the dependents' allowance is cut off from his dependents. We are unique in Canada in this respect. No matter how long a man is in detention in Great Britain, Australia or New Zealand, dependents' allowances continue to be paid. The situation in Canada is one of the greatest hardships that the dependents can possibly face. Through no fault of theirs the man is kept in the army gaol and their whole source of sustenance is cut off. I have seen a number of cases. I have one in my hand now and it is one of the most tragic cases I have known. The entire family has been forced virtually to go on relief because of a misdemeanour of the husband. It was a simple act of striking a military policeman, which, of course, must be punished, but the consequent hardship imposed on the family constitutes one of the greatest injustices Canadians are suffering under the present act. I ask the minister to consider amending the regulations so that the penalty imposed on men justifiably, because of some crime they have committed, will not reflect itself on their dependents. It is extremely bad for the morale of the people at home as well as the soldiers overseas.

I had intended to bring up the question of hospital allowances, but I shall wait until the next item comes up because it is rather long and involved.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. GILLIS: No. I shall not take more than a minute. Last evening someone discussed with the minister the fact that in most of the depots there is an accumulation of men awaiting discharge. May I make a suggestion to the minister? My information is that it is not national defence that is at fault in discharging men. The trouble is with pensions and national health. That department is understaffed. National defence is handling the men satisfactorily, but because pensions and national health are not able to take them as they are boarded out through the depots there is a backlog piling up. Is there a possibility of using in the Department of Pensions and National Health some of the examining personnel in the Department of National Defence in order to break the jam that apparently is developing in some of the depots. That would partly solve the problem that the member for York West raised, that there is a large number of officers in the depots with apparently nothing to do, who are considering the possibility of getting out. It seems to me that is one place where the minister might be able to use them to advantage by lending them to the Department of Pensions and National Health in the meantime. I merely offer that as a suggestion.

Item agreed to.

2. Pay and allowances, $547,256,061.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): I should like to mention a matter that has been mentioned before. I feel very strongly about this. I refer to the fact that when men are away without leave in Canada as well as overseas their wives have been getting along with the pay and allowances and have made certain commitments, and all of a sudden, without any

notice whatever, the allowance is cut off. It means that their children have to go without clothes and without food. If it had not been for the children's aid societies throughout Canada many of these children would have suffered and some would have starved. These people hesitate to go on relief because they feel it is a disgrace to have perhaps a husband or a son absent without leave. Some of these cases run for months. In fact, I know of one that is over a year old. That family is still being taken care of by the children's aid society. I believe that when men are away without leave some means should be found for looking after the family, giving them something to carry on with.

Mr. RALSTON: Does that mean, absent without leave.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Yes, absent without leave. There are many such cases, as the minister knows. Dependents' allowances are immediately cut off. There are also cases where a husband is overseas and there is a child born in the family here. The allowance is then cut off and the other children naturally suffer. There should be some adjustment there. At the present time the mother's allowance is cut off immediately.

Mr. RALSTON: I do not follow my hon. friend. I thought he was speaking of cases of dependents' allowances paid to dependents of those who were A.W.O.L.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Yes.

Mr. RALSTON: I think my hon. friend knows what the practice is. I discussed it last year. The practice is that if a man goes absent without leave, dependents' allowance, plus the assigned pay, is continued for twenty-one days. If the soldier was in Canada payment then ceased. My hon. friend is right about that. Overseas the dependents' allowance board have taken advantage of a pretty general sort of section and they have felt that they could do more than that. What they do is this. When a man overseas is absent without leave they give dependents' allowance for three months. Then they make inquiries, but three months is the limit. Overseas they give dependents' allowance for three months in the case of a man absent without leave. If he goes absent without leave longer than that, dependents' allowance ceases to be paid.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): What I am getting at is this. The wife at home does not know anything about the husband being absent without leave. She continues to get her cheque, but perhaps does not hear from her husband and suddenly the cheque is cut off. There should be some way of notifying the wife. I know it is an awfully ticklish job and something that is pretty hard to do. But the wife should be notified that her allowance will be cut off unless the husband is found, or the son in the case of a mother. I know it is something that the minister hesitates about. I do not know how it could be worked out, but there should be something there to look after the family. Does the minister understand what I mean?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes, it is a case of the humanities. One would not want to notify her at once because of the hope that he might turn up, or for fear she might get the idea that something had gone wrong domestically, or something of that sort, but I agree with my hon. friend that there must come a time, and not too late, when she should have some warning of the fact that this allowance is not going to continue forever. I am told that the dependents' allowance board does make an effort. I shall inquire into it; I think it is just a human touch that might be carried out. I am not quite sure how it could be done; I think it would have to be done differently in individual cases.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Yes; each case would have to be handled separately. Then how about the illegitimate child; how about the dependents' allowance in that case, where the husband is overseas and there is an illegitimate child born to the wife? The allowance is cut off.

Mr. RALSTON: No; there is no allowance granted if the husband is overseas.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): It is cut off.

Mr. RALSTON: It is not given. I understand my hon. friend to refer to an illegitimate child born while the husband is overseas?

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Yes. In that case the mother's allowance is cut off.

Mr. RALSTON: It is not automatic; there is always an inquiry into the case. I just happen to remember that, because I had a case on my desk the other day in which the dependents' allowance board wanted to find out about the mother's reputation in the community. Representations were made by responsible citizens that the time had come when they thought the allowance should be paid, and finally the allowance was paid.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Is that done in every case now?

Mr. RALSTON: The investigation is made in every case. I am informed also that the husband is consulted; that is, if he knows about it and condones the situation, of course that is an important contributing factor.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): In some cases naturally the husband overseas objects, and then I understand the mother does not get the allowance.

Mr. RALSTON: I am sorry I cannot say what the board does in circumstances of that kind. I know it investigates the merits of the case, not only from the point of view of morals but from the point of view of the need, and that in a number of cases payments are made.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): In some cases there are other children in the family and it works a hardship on them. The children get their allowance, of course, but the mother does not get hers.

Mr. RALSTON: The children, of course, do get the allowance.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Their allowance keeps on, but the mother's $35 is immediately cut off.

Mr. RALSTON: The other children get the allowance; that is to say the children who were in the home when the husband went away, and some increase is made in their allowance.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Not in all cases.

Mr. RALSTON: In some cases. It may be done; the board has discretion.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): But the minister will look into the question of men overseas who are away without leave?

Mr. RALSTON: A note has been made of that.

Mrs. NIELSEN: I do not altogether agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Peterborough West. In the case of a woman whose husband overseas is absent without leave it seems to me a most unfair proposition that the woman who is left in Canada should be told after a while that her cheque will not be forthcoming any more. After all is said and done, if that man had not had to go to war perhaps he and his wife would have lived together in this country for many years, in fact all their lives. Many of our men who have had to live in England for two or three years now may find themselves in the position that they are seeking other companionship, and it is a terrible situation for all concerned.

[Mr. G. K. Fraser.]

But I do not see why the woman left in this country should be penalized on that account. In my opinion any woman whose husband is in that position should at least receive her cheque until the war is over and her husband is brought back again, when the army authorities can find out what relationship is to be maintained in the future. It may be that these men will resume living with their wives in this country. They may not, but in the interval those women are certainly entitled to protection because this country needs their men somewhere else, in England or some other theatre of war, and they should have their cheques until the war is over.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): I agree with what the hon. member has just said: I think it would be wonderful if the dependents' allowance board would do that.

Mr. MACDONALD (Brantford City): But she does not agree with you.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): I know that; some ladies do not agree with me. My idea was that if the dependents' allowance were not going to be continued, they should let the wife know some time before the cheque was to be stopped, and I think the hon. member will agree with that.

Mrs. NIELSEN: Quite so.

Mr. RALSTON: She does not want that time to come, though.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): The hon. member is quite right; I agree that the dependents' allowance board would be doing a wonderful thing if they would continue the payment of those allowances until the end of the war.

Mr. GRAYDON: When I made way for the hon. member for North Battleford I realized that she would make a much more eloquent appeal in this matter than I could, but I think we should lend whatever emphasis we can to the plea made by the hon. member and supported by the hon. member for Peterborough West. I think this is a matter to which the minister should give attention as soon as possible. I have never been able to see why, because a soldier or a sailor or an airman is absent without leave, the wife at home should have to suffer. It is not her fault; it cannot be traced in any way, directly or indirectly, to her. In our regulations with respect to dependents' allowances we recognize that while a man is away from home in the forces, this country has an obligation to look after his wife and family, meagre though that assistance may be in some instances. The principle has been

adopted under which she is taken care of financially to a certain extent. Surely that principle is not interfered with because of something the husband does. I could readily understand that something the wife might do would interfere with her allowance being granted, but surely we could not argue that something the wife did here should interfere with the pay of the man overseas. If that be a sound argument, then of course we ought to apply it in reverse as well. Therefore I am going to ask the minister if he will not give consideration to some change in the regulations so that the wives of those men who have gone absent without leave may have their allowances continued until the end of the war, as suggested by the hon. member for North Battleford. I cannot make that plea too emphatic at this time. I think most hon. members have had some distressing cases brought to their attention in this regard, and I should be surprised if most hon. members would not lend their support to this suggestion. I do not wish to labour the point at the moment, but I should like to impress upon the minister as strongly as possible that this is one change in the regulations to which the government ought to give immediate consideration.

Mr. RALSTON: I do not want to be on the defensive in connection with this matter but, as is usual in cases of this kind, it is not quite as obvious as it may appear. I have been affected in the same way as my hon. friend has by the apparent merit of a case of this kind, and it has merit. It is an appealing case; there is no doubt about that. In the first place, however, we have to come back to the theory of dependents' allowances. Dependents' allowance is not granted as compensation to a wife because she has lost the comfort of or association with her husband. It is paid to the wife in order to promote the well-being of the service, and to relieve the anxiety which husbands overseas would have, if such payment were not being made. Instead of the payment being made to him over there, he knows it is getting to her, and the provisions in the dependents' allowance regulations sets that out. It states:

> A dependents' allowance may not be claimed as a right. The allowance is for the purpose of promoting the well-being and efficiency of the military forces of Canada by providing a means to alleviate the financial anxieties of temporarily enrolled members with respect to the domestic welfare of dependents while they are in the service of His Majesty.

That is the first point. The second point that the committee does have to remember is that if a man can just go absent without leave, not having any worries at all about his family, then certainly there is no disciplinary effect whatsoever. He just simply goes. There must be some deterrent effect, encouraging his staying, or causing him to stay, in the service if he knows his family will suffer if he goes out. If a man could simply walk out and say, "Oh, I know the government will take care of my family anyway, notwithstanding the fact that I am not serving", he is no good to the service. He will take dependents' allowance, go absent without leave, avoid the provost corps, and his family be looked after, and he will think, "Well, I am all right."

Mr. GRAYDON: If we take the principle the minister has now stated, are we not really using the condition in which a wife may find herself as a means of disciplining a man in the armed forces?

Mr. RALSTON: No.

Mr. GRAYDON: Actually there are penalties and regulations within the armed forces to take care of the very situation, without penalizing the wife and children at home.

Mr. RALSTON: No, it is not that, at all. I am saying the argument the other way is that it makes the position entirely too easy for the man, and that is not quite fair to the service which, after all, is the thing of paramount importance. If the provision were that a man could simply go absent without leave and be assured that the dependents' allowance would nevertheless be kept on for his family, it would almost be putting a premium on delinquency or at least it removes a deterrent.

There is one other feature I am surprised someone has not mentioned. I noted it a year ago. Perhaps you may think I have not worked very hard at it, or I should have had something done about it. However, there is a certain inconsistency in this respect that I never could understand. I am saying this in the presence of the chairman of the dependents' board of trustees, namely, that the wife of a man who goes absent without leave will continue to get three months' dependents' allowance at the most, but the wife of the man who is in detention will continue to get the allowance for six months. I never could quite understand why there should be that difference. That caused me to look over United States regulations, and when I have looked at the regulations for that country and for Australia, I find there is a distinct difference in those cases. The theory may be that at least it is positive in the case of the man who is in detention, that the man will come back to the army some day, whereas in respect of the man who is absent without leave he may never turn up again.

I wish I could promise the committee favourable consideration, but I will say that I shall study it again. It might be pointed out, however, that we in the army are just a little bit careful in considering these provisions, particularly in a case of this kind, where a man is not serving, and where he has offended against regulations with the result that we have lost the benefit of his training, and everything else that has been done for him. There is a tendency to break down discipline if one were to act too leniently in these cases. This may sound hard-hearted, because it will be said that the wife is concerned. At the same time it is for the good of the service that we are acting, and it is not much encouragement to the good soldier to "stick it" when he knows that another man can quit and still have his dependents' allowance continued to his family. However, I shall look into the matter again, to see if anything further should be done about it.

Mr. LOCKHART: Would it not be possible for the minister to devise some way whereby the penalty would be imposed against the man?

Mr. RALSTON: If we could find him.

Mr. LOCKHART: There must be military discipline which would make him feel his obligations, rather than penalize those who are at home, who are totally innocent. I cannot see the argument which has been made.

Mr. RALSTON: We are not penalizing. We are not supporting them; that is all.

Mr. TUSTIN: May I add something to what has been said. I have one case in my own constituency concerning a man who has been overseas since 1939. Possibly a year or fifteen months ago he was supposed to be away without leave. His wife received dependents' allowance for ninety days. She has three small children, and since that time has had to depend upon relief payments from the municipality. That man has been absent for much more than a year. He has not yet been apprehended, and, as I have said, his family are now on relief. Surely he should have been apprehended in less than twelve or thirteen months. I point out to the minister that a case of that kind should receive favourable consideration, for the simple reason that this woman believes her husband may have been killed in the blitz over England, and that he has never been a deserter. Perhaps the minister might give consideration to a case of that kind.

Mr. SHAW: There are one or two matters I would draw to the attention of the committee, and in doing so I agree whole-heartedly with the hon. member who has just taken his seat. A couple of cases have been brought to my attention in which soldiers are presumed to have deserted in England. It becomes extremely difficult for one who is probably not personally familiar with the type of organization existing over there to prevent the landing of subversive aliens and to prevent sabotage, to understand how these desertions can continue for so long. We have always been led to believe it would be extremely difficult for a man to be at large in England for a period of eight or nine months or a year, and not be apprehended. I should say a good deal of responsibility must rest upon the military authorities for a man's not having been apprehended in less than ten or twelve months.

Several branches of the legion are keenly concerned about this matter. I would ask the minister to indicate to the committee the number of desertions presumed to have taken place in England, the number of such deserters who have been apprehended, the number who have not been accounted for, and the number who have been discovered dead either through suicide or, as another hon. member has suggested, through the blitz.

Two or three cases have come to my attention where a man, who married a widow with a family, has enlisted. For a period of two or three months that man has not been able to secure dependents' allowance. In each case he was told there was every possibility that those children were illegitimate. That is a most unfair suggestion. I am very much afraid my personal reaction would have been one leading to violence, under conditions of that kind. One soldier who came to me was extremely bitter, as a result of the officer telling him point-blank that there was every reason to believe the children were probably illegitimate. Three months elapsed before that case was cleared up.

Then the minister indicated that where the wife at home has probably not conducted herself as it is believed she should have, inquiries are made in the community. I do not know just what that implies, but I do know that in many instances it is virtually impossible for a soldier's wife to appear at a dance without having some of the community talking about it for a week afterwards. I am very much afraid that if you go into a community and try to secure an impression from some of the people there how a soldier's wife is conducting herself, you may in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred not get a very favourable impression.

Mr. RALSTON: I do not believe anything of the kind. I do not agree with that at all.

Mr. MUTCH: I would have moved if I lived in a community like that.

Mr. SHAW: I base myself on a case in the district of Red Deer.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend bases his statement about ninety-nine people on one particular case.

Mr. SHAW: That is not fair at all. I said to the minister that I would refer to one case that comes to my mind. I am not basing my assertion on the one case at all.

Mr. RALSTON: If my hon. friend will permit me, I want to take issue with him at once when he states that in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the reports given by neighbours about a soldier's wife would give an unfavourable impression.

Mr. MUTCH: This will make nice reading in England.

Mr. RALSTON: I do not believe anything of the kind. I think it is a slander on the wives of the soldiers.

Mrs. CASSELMAN: It is a slander on the whole community.

Mr. SHAW: I am not particularly impressed by the remarks which I am hearing because they are improperly interpreted. I was a bit concerned when the minister said that we can go into a community and make inquiries. Why should the minister not be more explicit? If I am wrong as to the type of inquiry that is made, I am the first one to admit it. But in cases of this kind where a wife is accused perhaps of not conducting herself as she probably should, I ask, what type of inquiry is made? Who carries on the investigations and what constitutes proof? If a soldier disclaims paternity of a child, do they accept that as evidence? I have a case where that was done. The soldier simply refused to claim the child and the mother has been deprived not only of an allowance for that child but of the separation allowance also. The soldier is stationed within approximately eighty miles of where the home is located. Would the minister comment on the situation with respect to desertions in England?

Mr. RALSTON I have not the figures here. I do not think I should give the figures with regard to desertions in England and the number apprehended; I do not think it would be in the interest of the state to give them. I am sure it is a very small number compared with the desertions in Canada, but I do not think it is a figure I should give in the house. I do not mind giving it to my hon. friend or to any other hon. member privately.

Mr. MUTCH: The whole question of pay and allowances for the forces overseas introduces one aspect about which I should like to say a few words, particularly since the question of soldiers serving detention is linked up with it.

I have had an opportunity to see and interview a considerable number of soldiers under sentence for military crimes, to some extent in this country, but more so on the other side. I wonder if the minister would not be inclined to agree that one of the strong contributing factors to habitual delinquency in the forces is the system of pay deductions, under financial regulations and instructions which have been adopted almost holus-bolus from the British army, and which, so far as I am able to discover, go back to pre-Wellington days in some respects at least, when soldiers were regarded hardly as citizens of the country but were pressed-men and, generally speaking, were less well regarded than they are to-day.

I am satisfied from what observations I have been able to make myself and from conversations with senior officers in the service, particularly in the army, that the problem of habitual delinquency in the army ties up with the system of pay deductions. It is possible for a soldier to go absent without leave, let us say for purposes of illustration, for fourteen days. When he is apprehended he loses his pay for those fourteen days. If he is sentenced by a court-martial, as he is likely to be, if his desertion takes place in the field, he may be fined some additional days pay as part of his punishment, and of course he loses his pay during all the time he is undergoing his court-martial sentence. I do not suggest for a moment that a soldier who, having made a contract with His Majesty to serve in the forces, deserts and fails to perform his duties should be paid for the days he is absent. I do not suggest that a soldier who is punished by undergoing detention, during which time he is unable to perform his military duties, should be paid during the period of his detention. But I do think that some more modern and equitable system could be worked out in the interests of the service itself than the present system under which the soldier, when he has served his sentence and expiated his crime in that manner, comes out of detention owing considerable sums of money so that when he begins to draw pay again he can draw, if he is in England, only thirty shillings a month, which is scarcely enough for cigarettes if the mail is held up, as it often is. And so, finding that he cannot hold up his end with his fellows he commits some army crime again, perhaps steals a pair of army boots or a tin of butter, knowing full

well that he will get it in the neck if he is caught, as eventually he must be. I interviewed in England one man who lost 1,191 days' pay for army crimes, and he deserved it. This war will not last long enough for him ever to get what he owed paid off.

If a soldier commits a civilian crime to-day and he is apprehended by the civilian authorities—I know one man who served twelve months in Wormwood Scrubs, which is a rather unpleasant prison—when he comes out he may properly be charged with being absent without leave; being absent as a result of a felony; and, if he is sentenced to serve an additional ninety days by court-martial, that would cause him some further financial difficulties. So that the man who embarks on a career of army crimes is considerably handicapped in his chances of reform by the present archaic system of pay stoppages. I do not wish to labour that point. The minister and the department are fully aware that many highly placed personages in the army, who have never been in detention and are not likely to be, are not sympathetic to the present system and feel that a system more in the interests of the service itself could be devised.

There is another type of thing which I would mention, not as a criticism, but simply to bring it to the attention of the authorities with a view to a remedy being found which would be to the improvement of the service. I know a man personally who at the time he enlisted stated that his wife was his common-law wife and that he had lived with her and supported her for two years, and that as such she was entitled to separation allowance, and he also made over to her assigned pay. About the time I went to England last fall his legal wife, having discovered that he was in the service and that the government might be approached with a view to assisting her financially, did make such a request. I understand that the request was turned down; that she then attacked the arrangement with the common-law wife, on the basis that they had not lived together for the required period of time and that consequently, in this particular case, they had received the assigned pay and separation allowance fraudulently. An investigation was carried on—I am sorry I am not able to say by what agency it was carried on—but I understand that the approach as to whether or not this chap had lived with his common-law wife publicly as such, was made through the near relatives of the man himself, and if so, I am not surprised that they should deny the allegation, since he comes from an exceedingly good family who are very proud of their reputation and would not condone such a thing.

[Mr. Mutch.]

In any event, what I began to take exception to was that, when this sergeant was brought before his commanding officer, under instructions, he was informed that he, having received separation allowance for his common-law wife for a period of two years or thereabouts, obtained it fraudulently, and now owed thirteen hundred and some odd dollars which he would have to pay back out of his share of his pay. When I investigated this matter—(I can give my hon. friend the name and the particulars if he wishes, but I choose not to at the moment)—a little further, as to whether it would be possible to waive this sum already in excess of $1,300—I was told—not by a member of the government, for I have not brought it to the attention of the department, since at the moment I only want to use the episode to illustrate the inequities of the system—that it was no use, that nothing could be done about this because the government could not condone a fraud, and could not forgive the money he owed, so that consequently nothing could be done about it. And this, even though I pointed out that in 1936 it was established as government practice that with regard to a pension received fraudulently or in error, while it could be stopped, there could be no recovery. The man did what I think I would have done, although I think I would have done it better than he did. Under those circumstances, with a load like this around his neck, and reduced to the ranks, realizing that this war will not last long enough to enable him to pay back this money, and that he could not soldier on thirty shillings a month, he "went over the hill". He did not make a good enough job of it, because he was subsequently arrested, and at the time I last saw him was undergoing a sentence. When he comes out of detention he will have an additional load of financial debt, and his situation is increasingly hopeless. The man was an excellent sergeant. I am satisfied that he made the contract in good faith, and even if that could not be established, I think that a system of stoppages, which permits that type of penalty to be hung on that man, after a period of two years, a man who as a soldier must have cost the people of Canada $3,500 as an absolute minimum to train to be an efficient sergeant; a man who to-day is and for some months to come will be in detention and lost to the service, simply does not make sense.

While we are on this subject of detention and of people who are absent without leave, I might remark that there are people in England belonging to the Canadian army who have been absent without leave longer than

twelve months, who have not been apprehended, who have not been blitzed, and who, indeed, have been occupied in lucrative positions in civilian life during that time. I know of one case which I may cite by way of illustration to allay the fears of my hon. friend here, of a young lad who "jumped ship" in the city of Halifax. He joined the Canadian army and was sent overseas shortly afterwards on a draft. When he got overseas with the draft they said to him, "You are too young to fight; you will have to wait—" I think it was a year at that time, or a year and one-half. He had been a sailor before; so he went to London and soon got a job on a merchant ship, and for thirteen months he plied the seas. He was at Dunkirk, and he was in and out of the Mediterranean a number of times during that period. He came back to England to visit his parents and they said to him, "You plan to go to Canada after the war. What kind of future will you have as a deserter? Give yourself up." He went to Canada House to give himself up. They said, "Go away; you are crazy"; they would not believe him. Finally he convinced them, went back to camp, asked to take some courses when in camp, but he could not get them, and decided that he might as well fight at sea until he was old enough to fight on land. So he went away for eleven months, and then again surrendered himself formally to Canada House, did his punishment for being absent without leave, and did it proudly, because he carries from the shipping authorities a very fine record of service at sea. He was, as I said, at Dunkirk, in the Mediterranean and to Russia; he has seen more war than most of our senior officers, or for that matter anybody else in any army. The last time I saw him he was waiting to get out of the "clink" to go to Italy, where I expect he is to-day. I hope he survives to come back to Canada, because he is the kind of man we need.

I have not said this to condone absence without leave but to illustrate the fact that it is not particularly difficult to get away and be away for long periods of time. The English people are very hospitable. They treat our boys very well. They treat them too well. You can live longer in England without money if you are absent without leave than anywhere I know of—and you do not have to swim the Irish channel to find security, as was suggested to us sometimes in the last war.

If we are concerned about the problem of army crime, and I think we are, we ought to adopt a system of pay stoppages a little more in line with the sort of equity we hand out in the courts in Canada and as they do in other countries. I suggest to the minister that if he wants anybody or anything to strengthen his hand when he puts this matter before the military council, I know where he can get somewhere between five and six hundred cases to establish for him the cumulative effect of pay stoppages as one of the great influences in making fellows into habitual army criminals.

On the subject of army criminals I have had some experience with cheeky young fellows who have had detention time after time. When I was engaged in the job of salvaging some of these fellows, most of whom are young lads, one of them remarked to me that he did not have any great consciousness of sin. I spoke to him firmly and inquiringly, with a straight face. I said, "What are your crimes?" He said, "They are all absence without leave." I spoke to him of the seriousness of that. He said, "I have a brother a little older than I am. He has been trying to get into the army for four years, but he was an automotive worker, and he cannot get into the army because they will not release him from the plant where he works in Canada. He is living comfortably at home, making good money. If he gets drunk on Sunday night and doesn't feel like working Monday and doesn't go back until Tuesday, the boys there simply say, 'I guess Bill is working out his income tax'. So there he is, nice and secure at home. I am a volunteer. It is not my fault that I was not killed or wounded three years ago. Yet if I take a day off I become a criminal." That argument does not make sense, and you cannot control an army on the basis of condoning that type of thing. But when you come to examine into why a lad like that takes months off and he feels he is not a criminal when he does that sort of thing, I think you will find, back of a great number of these so-called habitual cases, the fact that he went "on the loose" two or three times and came back in debt.

In the case of every man in detention whom I have had an opportunity to examine, I have demanded particulars, and got them from the commanding officers in every case. I have asked, "How much money will this man owe when he comes out of detention?" And the number of men whom I found that would not owe money—I am talking about married men—I believe I can count on my fingers. When a married man deserts and is caught and punished, not only the separation allowance but his own assigned pay are paid to his wife for a period not in excess of six months. We continue to pay $20 a month to his dependents in the case of a private. I differ a little from some of my friends, who see no reason why we should not continue

to pay to the family even though the man has deserted. I conceive it to be the responsibility of the government, when it takes a man out of his job, away from his family and his environment, and puts him into the service, to look after his wife and children until such time as it is determined what has happened to him. But in my opinion that is not properly chargeable to the army. If a man has a job in civil life and he quits that job, or if he goes to gaol in consequence of a felony, his pay is stopped and any contribution he makes to his family is also stopped. If the cutting off of the allowance that is given in the army is to be made a deterrent, I suggest it would be a better deterrent if the man knew that, in the event of his quitting the army in this manner, the allowance to his family would be stopped. If it is intended to be a deterrent, let us make it a real deterrent and cut off his pay the day he quits. I would not relieve the Canadian people, through their institutions, of the responsibility of looking after a man's dependents until I knew whether or not something in the military history surrounding that man had contributed to his delinquency.

Sometimes, I think, we do contribute to such delinquency by this obsolete system of pay stoppages, and sometimes we contribute by bad man-management. I do not suggest for one moment that it is possible for the Canadian people, through the government, to escape some measure of responsibility for the man's family, but I would not pay a nickel of his straight army pay from the minute he was in detention or absent without leave. If the minister wants support for that view I am ready to give that as my opinion. I would not say that these people should not be subject to care and welfare, but that is not a charge which is properly chargeable to the army, when a man has ceased to function in the army, with which he has a contract, unless it can be shown that the army has contributed to his delinquency. Sometimes that can be shown. There are cases of men who were unsuited to the service through no fault of their own. They should not have been there. There are numerous situations that enter into this question, contributing to the desertion of many men. In such cases the family would not have been deserted if the soldier had not left home, and we should treat the man's wife and family just as if he were the good soldier he promised to be when he enlisted. We cannot escape responsibility for looking after these dependents until such time as we can find out the degree to which we have contributed to the man's delinquency through our institutions, selection and management.

[Mr. Mutch.]

Mr. RALSTON: I appreciate my hon. friend's contribution to the debate. He has first-hand knowledge of the subject, acquired both in Canada and in England. On the first point, there are at the present time before the department certain recommendations from Canadian military headquarters with regard to the cumulative effect of charging assigned pay in respect of a soldier who is in detention.

Mr. NEILL: I wish the minister could give me an explanation about the discrimination shown between the mothers of soldiers and their wives. I have no doubt the matter has often been brought to his attention, and I have applied to many officials for an explanation that would square not only with my sense of justice but with anyone else's, an explanation that one could fairly put up to the woman concerned. The soldier's wife gets $35 a month and an allowance is made for children. The soldier's mother who is a dependent gets at most $20.

Mr. RALSTON: $25.

Mr. NEILL: Call it $25. For a long time, three years at any rate, it was $20 as against $35. Various reasons have been given me by different officials. On one occasion I was told that the same thing was done in Britain. Well, in my opinion, that is a poor reason. Another time I was told that a man had a greater responsibility to his wife than to his children. I cannot see that. Another reason was given, namely, that the wife was looking after the children. Yes; but the wife is paid extra for looking after the children. They get the children's allowance.

Here is the point as people, as the women and as I see it. The soldier's wife is generally a young woman and she has around $70 in the way of ordinary allowances. She is able to do her own chores, her own housework, chop her own firewood perhaps, and keep a garden, and on occasion I have known them to work in plywood factories getting seventy cents an hour. But the mother is probably an old woman. She is not able to work and needs medicine, which is expensive. She needs doctoring, and that, too, is expensive. In my opinion she is in more need of support from the government than the wife, because she is less able to take care of herself.

As regards the argument that a man's responsibility is greater toward his wife than it is toward his children, the answer is this. It is not a question of responsibility; it is a question of dependency. If they are both dependent they are dependent to the same extent. You cannot make a distinction between the dependency of the one woman and the dependency of another, and in fact it takes

more to keep a dependent mother than a wife. I have never been able to see any justification for the principle. I have been corrected; I have been told they are getting $25 but the mother cannot demand even $25. It is at the decision of the committee. Well, why was it made $25? That was done as a belated attempt to justify the low amount that was given before. The thing is either right or wrong and $25 is not enough as compared with $35, even if the amount has been raised from $20. I should like to have something that I can tell these people who want information on the subject. They ask this question: Why do I get $25 as compared with the soldier's wife who gets $35? I have never been able to obtain from any official or anyone else an answer that would jibe with anyone's common sense and sense of justice, and I would be very much obliged if the minister could give me something satisfactory that I could pass on to these women as fair and reasonable.

Mr. RALSTON: I have tried several times to tell my hon. friend all I know about this, and that does not take very long. The relationship is different legally as between the wife and the mother. As a matter of fact, we have said, and have stated in the house, that regardless of the fact that dependents' allowances are not payable as of right, we regard the dependent's allowance to the wife as being payable as of right to the full amount. The mother's allowance is based on dependency. That is why what is sometimes called the means test is applied. The mother is entitled to dependents allowance up to $25. In order to get that $25 the son has to assign fifteen days' pay to her which would amount to about $23. The two together come to $48.

Mr. NEILL: The mother is not entitled to demand even $25; it is only possible at the whim of a committee.

Mr. RALSTON: It is possible, but my point is this: if she does not establish her right or her need for $25, does my hon. friend suggest she ought to receive it. She must establish her need. She may get up to $25, but she only gets that provided the son assigns pay. There is one exception to that. I said the son assigns fifteen days' pay.

Mr. LOCKHART: Is it the same for the wife?

Mr. RALSTON: If the son has assigned fifteen days' pay to his wife, he must assign an additional five days' pay to his mother in order to qualify the mother to get dependents' allowance. The reason for the difference between wife and mother allowances is that there is a different relationship. I have mentioned that on previous occasions. Secondly, there is the fact that the mother is put in the dependent class. But she has to show dependency, whereas the wife normally receives the $35 allowance automatically. If she were a millionaire or had an income of her own, she would still get the $35 allowance. On the other hand the mother does not get any dependents' allowance unless she is in need of it. The third point which does not apply to dependents allowances only, but it applies to pensions under the Pension Act is that somehow or another our pension people from the very beginning have always made a distinction between the mother and the wife. Under the Pension Act dependency in the case of the mother has to be shown, as must be done in the case of any relative other than the wife. It may be that that rule is wrong too, that these acts are wrong. They have been revised in this house many times, but that provision has always stood, the provision for the mother being based on actual dependency and the provision for the wife being based on need. I do not think I can add anything more to what my hon. friend has said.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): How many days' pay would a girl in the army have to assign to the mother?

Mr. RALSTON: It is on the same basis as for the men.

Mr. LOCKHART: Would the minister indicate—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. LOCKHART: May I ask one question?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Bow River has the floor.

Mr. LOCKHART: I should like to ask one question while it is fresh in my mind. Is the dependents' board of trustees entitled by regulation to deal with mothers?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes, if the mothers are in receipt of dependents' allowance. The dependents' board of trustees, as the committee knows, is empowered to supplement allowances in meritorious cases, and the board is entitled to deal with mothers as dependents just the same as children or wives.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): There are two things I should like to mention to the minister. I want to join with those who have already spoken with regard to wives of soldiers who are away without leave. A year ago I had occasion to have one of those cases brought to my attention. I brought it to the attention of the department, but was unable to have any satisfactory arrangement arrived

at in regard to that particular case. I think it is very unjust that a wife, whose husband has served in the armed forces for probably a year or two and then deserts the army, is thrown absolutely on the mercy of charity. I believe the army or the government—I will put it in that way so that I shall not get at variance with the hon. member for Winnipeg South—should pay the allowance. I do not care who pays the allowance so long as somebody does. I think the government has the responsibility in a case like that. The case that was drawn to my attention in Calgary a year ago was that of a young girl only nineteen years of age. They both agreed that the husband should join the armed forces and do his share in the defence of this country. He did it and spent about a year and a half overseas in the armed forces. If my memory serves me aright he served for nearly a year in England on active service. Then for some unknown reason he went away without leave. He was never heard of by either the army or his wife. She was left absolutely on charity, on the hospitality of the Salvation Army. She had two little children. She arranged in some way or another to have those children taken care of by one of the neighbours and she went to work. Then the child welfare authorities came around and made her quit her job and go home to take care of her children. That woman was in a terrible position. I think the government has a definite responsibility. I do not think that woman should be allowed to depend on charity. That is only one case of many that hon. members have had brought to their attention in this house. I think it would be well worth the government's while, and the minister's as well, to give this some very, very serious consideration to see what could be done. I know the minister does not like to see these cases. I am quite convinced of that. The thing is to bring pressure to bear upon those who are responsible, to alter this regulation and see if some assistance cannot be given to those wives whose husbands are away without leave.

The other matter I wish to bring to the attention of the minister is that of dependent mothers. I brought this up the other day. The minister said he was going to make a statement about it, but he has not yet done so. According to regulation 101, section (c), subsection (iii):

> Mother or foster mother, whose husband is alive but totally incapacitated from earning a living if the officer or soldier is her "sole or partial support."

The case I brought to the government's attention just about a week ago has a direct bearing on this clause. Because of the wording of the clause the dependents' allowance board takes the stand, and rightly so, that the mother is not entitled to any dependents' allowance whatsoever unless the husband is totally incapacitated. The words "totally incapacitated" should be changed. If the father gets an amount as small as $5 a month the mother is not entitled to dependents' allowance because the father is not totally incapacitated. I do not think that was the intention of the government; nevertheless the regulation is there, and the dependents' allowance board, interpreting the regulations, must refuse the mother any assistance. I think that is wrong. I ask the minister if he will make a statement in regard to the assigned pay in a case like this. A soldier is on active service and assigning a portion of his pay to his mother or to his wife in the hope that when he comes back he will have sufficient laid aside for him to take advantage of the rehabilitation plan whereby he can take up a farm, if he has ten per cent of the cash value to put up. He hopes that his wife or mother will take this assigned pay and put it in the bank for him and not use it as a means of livelihood. But if that assigned pay were used it would make it decidedly unfair. I do not think the assigned pay should necessarily have to be used in order to keep the wife or mother. I think the dependents' allowance should take care of that. There should be a distinction as to whether or not the dependents' allowance must be classed as income. I do not think it is clear in the regulations, and certainly there should be some clarification of the regulations with regard to total incapacitation. The minister promised to make a statement on that matter, but I suppose it has slipped his mind.

Mr. RALSTON: The only statement I can make is that at the present moment we have under consideration an amendment making that definition of "totally incapacitated" less restrictive, and dealing also with the amount of income which the mother and father jointly may be permitted to receive.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I think that is a good thing.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I should like to support the remarks of the last speaker, and also those of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni. I think a widowed mother who has in the armed forces a son who has been her sole support should be entitled to the same amount of allowance that is given a wife. As one hon. member pointed out, in many cases the mother is not able to earn a living as easily as a wife without children might. I

know of many such cases, and I trust that the minister will use his influence to have these allowances increased. When we discussed this matter last year the allowance was only $20; now it has been increased to $25, and I hope it may be increased still further. As I have said, many widowed mothers are in greater need of this allowance than are many young wives who are able to work and support themselves. I realize the force of the reasons given by the minister, but I hope he will use his influence to have the amount increased.

I should like also to support what has been said by other hon. members, that the state is responsible for the wife and children of a soldier who goes absent without leave. Certainly it is no fault of the wife and children, but in many cases a distinct hardship results, and I hope some changes will be made in that respect.

There is another question I should like to ask the minister, dealing with the case of a man who enlists at a time when there is some domestic or family trouble. His wife happens to be of a very independent nature, and he does not assign any pay or ask for the dependents' allowance for his wife and children. She goes on working for many months, but finally illness overtakes her and she is not able to keep on providing for herself and the children. Is there any means by which the dependents' allowance may be put through in such cases? I know of such instances, and at the present time these people are finding it very difficult to get along. I have one or two other questions to ask, but perhaps the minister would clear up these matters first.

Mr. RALSTON: As I understand it, even though the man has not assigned his pay in the first place he may do so at any time. In addition, there is a provision under which the board in effect can bring about a compulsory assignment and give the wife the status of a dependent for the purpose of receiving the dependents' allowance.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): There is no time limit?

Mr. RALSTON: No.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Could the minister tell us approximately what it costs to clothe an individual soldier? This has a bearing on the clothing allowance. If there is anything that has gone all out of kilter under the wartime prices and trade board set-up, it is the cost of clothing. I am sure no one would rise in his place in this house and say that to-day you can purchase clothing of the same quality or at the same price as when we entered this war. In order to give some comparison, I think the minister might tell us what it costs in dollars and cents to clothe a soldier to-day, because that has some bearing on the allowance given the soldier when he is discharged.

Mr. RALSTON: I do not think that is quite relevant. My hon. friend does not want to find out the cost of military clothing; he wants to find out the cost of civilian clothing, and it seems to me he would know as much about that as I do. The fact that a man gets a uniform, an outfit and certain equipment in the army does not prove anything in regard to the cost of getting a civilian outfit.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I think it would be well to have those figures anyway, because I have an article before me which states that clothing now costs 121 per cent of what it cost formerly, and I think the minister will agree that you cannot fit a man out for $65. A step has been taken in the right direction by increasing the clothing allowance, but it is still not nearly enough.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: There is one other point with regard to the mothers' allowance that I wish to bring to the attention of the minister, though probably it has been mentioned already. I refer to the ceiling that is placed upon the earnings of a dependent mother. I understand that a mother may receive up to $25, provided she is not earning more than $40 in addition.

Mr. RALSTON: That is $40 exclusive of the assigned pay.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: Yes, so that the ceiling is $65.

Mr. RALSTON: Plus the assigned pay.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: Yes, but that means she cannot work at a job paying more than $10 a week. If she is to receive the dependents' allowance she must earn less than $10 a week, which in most cases means that she cannot work at all.

Mr. RALSTON: Oh, no; the $25 would be reduced, that is all.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: She would get $15, $10 or even $5, making $65 the maximum she may receive, with her allowance. There must be thousands of mothers across the country who are supporting younger children. The son in the army is perhaps the oldest, and she has come to depend almost entirely upon his income. I have personal knowledge of numbers of such cases, where the mother still has to support younger children. There is a

feeling that there should be no ceiling, that the mother should be permitted to earn what she can and still receive her allowance. I am also told that the mother gets no cost-of-living bonus, which is paid to wives. I should like to know the basis for that discrimination. In the first place the mother gets an allowance of $10 less than the wife; in the second place there is a ceiling placed on her income, and in the third place the mother is not given the cost-of-living bonus. I think that is discrimination.

Mr. RALSTON: Of course the ceiling placed on earnings is because of the feature of dependency which is required to be shown in the case of a mother and which does not need to be shown in the case of a wife. The idea is that the country does not contribute if the mother is earning $65 a month; that means she is not in a dependent condition, and that is the reason. I tried to explain to the hon. member for Comox-Alberni—I am afraid not very successfully—why there is a difference in principle between the allowance to the mother and the allowance to the wife. The one has what is not very popular, the means test, while the other has not. I think perhaps in that one sentence I have dealt with the question of the ceiling and the matter of dependency. What was the other distinction?

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: The cost of living bonus.

Mr. RALSTON: I cannot tell my hon. friend why that is not given; I do not know.

Mr. ADAMSON: Do the wives of all members of the armed forces, except those who are also members of parliament, receive the dependents' allowance?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes; all wives whose husbands assign pay and who are living in the usual marital relations receive dependents' allowance.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I want to support what has just been said in regard to mothers' allowances. Although the minister has said something about it just now, I protested last year by stating that I never could quite see why a mother who is absolutely dependent upon her son, a mother perhaps with two or three children, did not come in the same category as a wife. However, I hope something may be worked out in that connection.

I should also like to support the hon. member for Souris and several other hon. members who have spoken respecting wives whose husbands have been absent without leave.

[Mr. Noseworthy.]

There are one or two other questions I should like to ask the minister. The first refers to a man who has been discharged from the army, at his own request, because of sickness, or some other reason along those lines. Is such a man entitled to clothing allowance?

Mr. RALSTON: He is entitled to clothing allowance, but not to rehabilitation allowance.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): That would seem unfair in some cases. I have in mind a man who was discharged because his wife was unable to take care of his family. Perhaps he should not have been in the army, to start with, but the fact is that he was in the army. I was wondering if those cases are reviewed, or if there is a hard-and-fast rule concerning it. Are they ever given an alternative?

Mr. RALSTON: No. My hon. friend will understand that the rehabilitation grant is exactly what it states, namely a grant for the purpose of refitting a man into civilian life. The assumption is that if he takes the option and requests a discharge, he has somewhere to go, some occupation at which he may be engaged. Otherwise he would not be asking for the discharge.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Under the circumstances, when he comes back he has to find somewhere to go. Is that a hard-and-fast rule, or would those cases be reviewed? In such cases I should think the few dollars he would get as rehabilitation allowance would be very acceptable to his family, in fact, would be a godsend.

Mr. RALSTON: Could he earn more money out of the army than in it?

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): He did not earn any money for a couple of months after he came back.

Mr. RALSTON: Why was he discharged, then? Was it just a matter of having to keep a house?

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): He had to come back to look after his family. His wife was suffering from a heart condition.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend will understand that, generally speaking, a discharge at his own request is for the purpose of taking a job.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I have another question respecting a man who is sick with an illness which may affect him for a long time. This man would go to Christie Street hospital. It seems to me that as soon as the authorities find out he suffers from an incurable disease he is discharged from the army. The man I

have in mind was a major, and the result was that he had to live on $85 a month. It was his initial sickness; he is still in Christie Street hospital. As I understand it, under the amendment to the Pension Act he receives the pay and allowances of a lieutenant for some time, the length of which I do not know. How long would he be allowed to be there?

Mr. RALSTON: I think while he is hospitalized.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): He would be there for a considerable time, perhaps extending into a year. It seems very unfair that a man coming from the army and hospitalized is discharged as soon as possible from the army when it is learned he cannot go back to the army because of a disability. True, he will receive a small pension, but it is pretty hard on his family. Certainly he should receive consideration during the time of his initial hospitalization.

While I am on my feet may I point out to the minister the difficulty we had in connection with those soldiers who were discharged after the last war, after having received wounds. They wanted to get out of the army as quickly as possible and in leaving the army they did not care about anything. They did not find out whether anything was physically wrong with them. After the expiration of some time difficulties would develop. I have no doubt all members of parliament have had many cases of that kind to take up with the pension authorities, and we have had much difficulty in such cases. We would receive the reply, "Disability not accounted for by active service."

To-day men are being discharged from the army every day because of disabilities. They do not know where to go or what to do, and are not familiar with their rights. They do not realize that at some time in the future they may be pensionable, and may need that pension. I am wondering if a full record of the reasons for discharge is made, or whether a history of each case is kept and given to them upon their discharge, so that they will know where they stand. I have in mind the case of a young man who was supposed to be in A-1 condition. Examinations, however, are not always correct because, while this man was entered in the army as A-1, it was found upon X-ray that he had a congenital deformity of the spine. This condition showed up on service.

In fairness to this man, and in view of the difficulties members of parliament have had in connection with pensionable cases, I say that the very fullest explanations of reasons for discharge should be given to each man who is discharged.

Mr. RALSTON: To the men themselves?

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): They should also receive histories of their cases, setting out the reasons for their disability, and the immediate cause of such disability. For instance, a man might be sent to perform duty in pouring rain, and following that might catch cold. Bronchitis, developing into a chronic bronchitis might be the result. If possible, there should be an attempt to pin it down to the reason for disability, thereby providing a full history of the man in question. Surely in fairness that is the least that could be done. I tell the minister that if such action were taken we would rid ourselves of endless troubles. Then, if a man were told that his discharge was for such and such a reason, and that he would probably be entitled to a pension, he could then be informed where to go, how to make his application, and be given all necessary details. The man would not be placed in the position where he would say, "Oh well, I will forget all about it." His disability may be a serious thing for him in future life, and it is not fair to neglect taking a full history.

Mr. RALSTON: The hon. member complains that in the cases to which he has referred discharges were made quickly. Then, in the last case he pointed out that sufficient information was not given at the time of discharge.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): That is right; it was not given to him.

Mr. RALSTON: I understand that. May I repeat to the committee what I said last night, namely, that the hon. member has touched upon one of the most sensitive times in a man's army life, that is the time he is discharged. I have tried with all my power to impress that upon my officers. We have had liaison with the Department of Pensions and National Health, in an effort to have an officer from that department and one of our own officers at a hospital, or a board room, or wherever it may be, so that a soldier may be advised of his rights, and where he ought to go. This is most important. This is one of the many things the R.C.A.F. do particularly well, in connection with their repatriated men. When they bring them back, they try to look after them. Anything that I can do to meet that situation I assure my hon. friend will be done. A case occurred quite a while ago of an officer that I found in hospital who had been discharged and had not been told either by the army or by the Department of Pensions and National Health what his rights were.

The case was brought to my attention immediately, and I saw that everything was done in order to make up for what was, in my judgment, crass indifference. We are doing everything we can to tighten that up and see that the men are given information promptly, particularly as to what their rights are and where they can go. My hon. friend is quite right in saying that when a man gets out of the army he does not know where to go next. He expects somebody to send for him, and they are apt to send for him after the papers have been signed and he has gone away.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): The reason why I brought the matter to the minister's attention is that I do not think as much care is taken as should be taken. I had a case within the last month.

Mr. RALSTON: Is my hon. friend thinking of the case of an officer from Hamilton?

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): No; of two or three cases from Christie Street hospital, Toronto. I do not want to go into the details because it is not necessary. But I wish to impress upon the minister that greater care should be taken to inform the men what their rights are.

Mr. RALSTON The system is no good unless it works. I will look into it.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I have been in touch, as many of the Toronto members have, with the pension advocates in Toronto. I know them well and they are very good men. They have impressed upon me the necessity of getting all the information out to the soldier promptly so as to save a whole lot of trouble later on.

There was another case of a man at Christie Street hospital for observation. He really did not know why he was there until he was discharged. He never was told why he was there. He was discharged, and then he came back later on for a pension.

Mr. QUELCH: I wish to add my voice to those that have been raised in protest against the stoppage of pay and allowances. The minister did not, I think, make out a very good case in defence of the present practice. He may have so far as the army is concerned, but from the point of view of the people I do not think he did, because in reality what he was saying was that the army is holding the wives and children of the soldiers as hostages against the soldiers' good behaviour. In the case of a soldier serving a sentence for desertion, the practice is to stop the pay and allowance at the end of six months. I do not think the minister could possibly defend that, for this reason: The army has the body of the soldier, and as long as it has the body of the soldier it can get enough work out of him to pay for the dependents' allowance.

The argument has been made that it is no different from similar cases in civilian life, where a man is put in gaol, and his salary stopped. But industry has not the body of the soldier. The army has the body of the soldier, and the army can get enough work out of him to pay for the dependents' allowance, or wait until he is out of gaol and then take it out of his pay. At least in cases where the soldier has been captured and sentenced to gaol, the dependents' allowance should be paid continuously.

I want to refer to article 102 (d) of the financial regulations and instructions respecting dependents in T.B. sanatoria and mental institutions. This memorandum is marked "confidential" in big type. Am I at liberty to quote from it?

Mr. RALSTON: Is it from the department?

Mr. QUELCH: Yes, a memorandum from the dependents' allowance board. It reads:

> Dependents in T.B. sanatoria and mental institutions
>
> 1. Article 102 (d) of financial regulations and instructions provides—"No allowance shall be granted to a person who is maintained in an institution at the expense of a public authority."
>
> 2. In order that dependents who become patients of these institutions may be eligible for dependents allowance the board has an arrangement with most of these institutions whereby they agreed to accept $20 per month for the maintenance of an adult dependent and $12 a month for the maintenance of a child of a member of the armed forces.

I have in mind the cases of several wives of soldiers who are in T.B. sanatoria in Alberta and $20 a month is being deducted from their dependents' allowance and paid to the T.B. institution. But in Alberta, T.B. treatment is free, and so the provincial government are prepared to return the $20 to the soldier's dependent. But if the provincial government returns that $20 to the dependent the Department of National Defence takes the stand that they would have to deduct another $20 from the dependent. Surely provision should be made whereby the provincial government is able to return that money, because otherwise you have this peculiar situation, that while T.B. treatment in Alberta is free to the people at large, the only one who has to pay for it is the wife of a soldier. For everybody else the treatment is free. That is a very undesirable situation. The dependents' allowance

board have told me that the only way to get around it would be for the provincial government to pay the money to the dependent and not tell the dependents' allowance board that it had done so. I was not quite satisfied with that because I could not get it in writing. I then took it up with the Minister of Finance, and he referred me to the comptroller of the treasury. I wanted to know whether the government would guarantee, that in case the provincial government returned the money to the dependent, no inspector would be sent out to try to find out if the money had been repaid. The Minister of Finance said that the comptroller of the treasury was the only person who could guarantee that, and he would not do it. When you have an absurd situation of that kind the regulations should be amended. The minister must agree that it is a most undesirable situation when the soldier's wife is the only person in Alberta who cannot get free hospital treatment for the soldier patient.

Mr. RALSTON: Strangely enough, a case of that kind came to my attention last Sunday afternoon when I was clearing up a few matters. There was a letter from the Hon. Mr. Cross of Alberta, making the offer which my hon. friend has just mentioned. The solution appeared easy to the dependents' allowance board, namely, that the province would just pay back to the person in the institution the amount which had been paid to the province for maintenance. I must say that I generally try to cut red tape, but I saw a little difficulty in doing that under the regulations. I immediately inquired from the board if there were not some other way of working the thing out. I am thoroughly in accord with my hon. friend's objective that we must find a way of working it out. It is a case of the soldier's dependents being discriminated against to the extent that they do not get the benefit of the provincial contribution. I am trying to work it out and I think I can do it.

Mr. HANSELL: Will the minister make an announcement when he has worked it out? We have some cases pending.

Mr. RALSTON: I am in correspondence with the Hon. Mr. Cross and perhaps I should correspond with him first. I shall make an announcement to the committee as soon as possible.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

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

Friday, February 18 1944

The house met at three o'clock.

THE WAR

SINKING OF UNITED STATES TRANSPORT—MESSAGE OF SYMPATHY TO PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

On the order for motions:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should like to read to the house a telegram which I sent this morning to the President of the United States, a message which, I believe, the house will very warmly approve:

The President,
The White House, Washington.

The people of Canada have learned with feelings of deepest regret of the loss, through enemy action in European waters, of a thousand American soldiers. The sinking of this transport comes all the more as a shock because of the rarity of such losses. The loss of these brave lives is one which has aroused a widespread feeling of sorrow, in which the government and people of Canada share. On behalf of the government, I should like to express to you, and to the people of the United States, our sympathy in this national loss. Linked with our expression of sympathy is an ever-deeper realization of our comradeship-in-arms in the unrelenting effort to save the world as largely as may be possible from the continued inhuman acts of barbarous enemies seeking to dominate the world.

W. L. Mackenzie King.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WAR EXPENDITURES AND DEFENCE OF CANADA REGULATIONS COMMITTEES—PROPOSAL THAT HOUSE SHALL NOT SIT WEDNESDAYS

On the order for motions:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words to hon. members about the business of the house for to-day and for next week. It was announced last night that this afternoon we would take up the civil estimates of the Department of National Defence and later, the estimates of the Department of Agriculture. Also it was stated that the house would sit this evening.

There is on the order paper a notice of motion in the name of the Minister of Justice to constitute a select committee of the house to consider and review the defence of Canada regulations. There is another notice of motion in the name of the Minister of National War Services with respect to constituting a committee on radio broadcasting. Hon. members will see in the *Votes and Proceedings* of yesterday that I gave notice last night to the Clerk of my intention to move for a com-

mittee on national war expenditures. Notice of this motion will appear on the order paper on Monday next.

The wish has been generally expressed that we should constitute all committees as rapidly as possible, and I believe it will further the wishes of hon. members if we do not delay any longer than is absolutely necessary in setting up these committees. The select committee on the defence of Canada regulations I would hope might be constituted this afternoon. I suggest that on Monday the house consider the war expenditures committee resolution, also the resolution regarding the committee on radio broadcasting. With respect to war expenditures a desire was expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite to be given an opportunity to debate the third report of the committee presented at the close of last session. Hon members will have noticed that I introduced the other day and the house approved a resolution permitting a discussion of that report. Concurrence in the report will have to be moved, and I should think the best way of proceeding would be to have concurrence moved on Monday and the debate on war expenditures take place on that resolution. I do not wish to restrict hon. members from debating the resolution to set up the committee if they so desire. It might be understood however that, on one or the other motion, whatever hon. members may wish to discuss could be discussed. In that way we would be expediting the business of the house.

Also on Monday the government would like to get one or two more departments into supply, to call an item, so that the estimates of those departments may be taken up on any day.

Hon. members have said that they thought, and I think rightly so, that the proceedings of the house might be expedited if more work were done by committees than has been the case in the past.

With that view the government is in accord. We believe that a good deal of discussion that takes place here in debate might be avoided if some matters were threshed out a little more fully in committees in the first instance. To help to meet that objective, I mentioned when speaking in the debate on the address that at a later stage in the session I would propose that the house do not sit on Wednesday afternoons but that Wednesday be kept free for members to give special attention to the work of committees.

The government proposes that from now on that the house should sit on Friday evenings unless it otherwise orders, so that in reality the time to be devoted to discussion in the house, if the procedure I have outlined is carried out, will be the equivalent week by week of what it was during the last session, the difference being that we shall be sitting on Friday evenings instead of on Wednesday afternoons. More should be accomplished as there would be more work done in committees than would otherwise be possible.

One objection that hon. members have to the committees meeting from day to day is the difficulty of their being in two places at the same time, especially in the early part of the session. Toward the end of the session permission has been given committees to sit while the house is sitting, but the proposed procedure will enable members for the most part to give their attention to the work in committees for an entire day in addition to whatever further time may be necessary, thereby obviating the necessity of their being absent from the house when important discussions are taking place.

There is a further reason which I mentioned. I should like to have the house approve the procedure I have referred to because it is absolutely necessary for the government, I mean the cabinet, and in particular the war committee of the cabinet, to have at this stage of the war more time to discuss and very carefully consider the weighty questions that are coming before us not only from week to week but from day to day. Hon. members will realize that at the present time scarcely a day passes that does not bring some unexpected subject for consideration by the government as a whole. Unless the government has opportunity to have unbroken sittings over a considerable length of time—we shall not be in a position to give to some of these measures the careful thought and attention they demand. Members of the government cannot do that in cabinet council and at the same time be present in the house to follow its proceedings. The procedure I have in mind has been framed so as to enable these two objectives to be met, and to be met in a way which will, in the end, I think, expedite the business of parliament and protect the interests of the public.

When the time occupied by sittings has come up before for discussion, reference has been made to the parliament at Westminster. I believe it has been said that in the United Kingdom the House of Commons sits for a much longer time. As a matter of fact, the parliament at Westminster until this year, while holding regular weekly sittings, has sat only three days in the week since the war began. The Prime Minister has announced at the close of the sittings of each week, which has been on a Thursday at 5.30 p.m.,

when the house will meet in the coming week and which has been usually on the following Tuesday, and has indicated some of the measures that would likely be brought forward in the following week. As I say, during most of the past four years the house has not met until Tuesday, and during that time it has been customary for the house to adjourn on Thursday. This year, I understand, because of special reasons, the house is meeting on Friday as well as on the other three days, but it does not meet until Tuesday.

Another matter I should mention in connection with the sittings at Westminster is that the House of Commons does not sit at night but adjourns at 5.30 p.m.; it has also morning sittings. It meets, I understand, at eleven o'clock in the morning, and adjourns at five-thirty in the afternoon. That has been because of the black-out. I doubt, however, whether hon. members realize that the whole business at Westminster has been carried on with sittings on an average of three days a week, and with only morning and afternoon sittings. I have a compilation of the days of sitting of our parliament and of the British parliament, and I think it will interest hon. members for me to give a tabular comparison of the length of time occupied in the sittings of the British and Canadian houses respectively:

Comparison of length of sitting of the British and Canadian parliaments in the period since the Canadian parliament met after the 1940 elections

	Sitting days
British parliament—	
May 21, 1940–Nov. 20, 1940	62
Canadian parliament (complete session)—	
May 16, 1940–Nov. 5, 1940	61
British parliament (complete session)—	
Nov. 21, 1940–Nov. 11, 1941	113
Canadian parliament (complete session)—	
Nov. 7, 1940–Jan. 21, 1942	105
British parliament—	
Nov. 12, 1941–Nov. 10, 1942	116
Canadian parliament—	
Jan. 22, 1942–Jan. 27, 1943	124
British parliament—	
Nov. 11, 1942–Nov. 23, 1943	122
Canadian parliament—	
Jan. 28, 1943–Jan. 26, 1944	120

It is an interesting fact that in this House of Commons we have actually occupied the same amount of time each year in our discussions over the last four years as the British parliament. Of course, the explanation in part is that at Westminster they have more frequent adjournments and sit fewer days in each week.

I had intended, with the permission of the house, to move this afternoon that when this house adjourns on Tuesday, the 22nd instant, it stand adjourned until Thursday, the 24th instant, and unless otherwise ordered, when the house adjourns on Tuesday evening it shall stand adjourned until the following Thursday, and that standing order 2 be suspended in relation thereto for the present session.

This is a motion that does not require notice and could be proceeded with at once, but I imagine hon. members may wish to give it a little consideration and I shall not press it today. I shall let it stand as a notice and will move it on Monday next. I do hope that hon. members will find it possible to comply with the wishes of the government in this matter, our wishes being based entirely upon what, after very careful thought, we believe to be advisable, for the reasons I have mentioned, at this stage of the war, and believe will prove to be of advantage in the expedition of business of this house, and equally of advantage to the country in the understanding of its business and the greater care which it will be possible to give to the all-important problems of our day.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): With respect to the matter dealt with by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) I should first of all like to say a word on the point he raised touching the war expenditures committee, and, coupled with that, the suggestion he made relating to the motion for concurrence in the three subcommittee reports of the committee, which I believe were contained in the final and third report which he mentioned a moment ago.

I think it would be preferable from every angle if matters relating to the war expenditure committee of last year and the setting up of the committee this year were dealt with in one debate. There is an objection to proceeding otherwise which I think will be sustained by most members of the house. I do not think we should have two debates on war expenditures; they might involve considerable repetition. I should like to point out, in connection with the procedure to be adopted in the setting up of the war expenditures committee and the motion for concurrence, that in order to regularize the proceedings the house might be agreeable to discussing first the motion for concurrence in the reports and agreeing that the debate thereon should be sufficiently wide to cover the setting up of the committee. This could be done immediately after discussion on the motion for concurrence is concluded.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That was my suggestion.

Mr. GRAYDON: I wish to make that clear. I believe the Prime Minister left it in such a position that either one or the other might be dealt with.

So far as the other matter dealt with by the Prime Minister is concerned, I am pleased that he did not insist on pressing his motion to-day. I thank him for that, because our party are desirous of giving more consideration to the point raised. I think we shall be in a position on Monday to deal with it. There are rather serious and momentous questions involved in connection with the motion proposed by the Prime Minister. I desire not to go farther than that at the moment, except to point out that we do want to give the matter every possible consideration and examine every angle. The proposal is perhaps more far-reaching than appears on the surface. It is our desire that whatever decision is arrived at, at least due consideration will have been given to the problem.

NAVAL SERVICES

TABLING OF CERTAIN NAVAL ORDERS

Hon. ANGUS L. MACDONALD (Minister of National Defence for Naval Services): I should like to table certain naval orders dated February 12, 1944. May I say to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) that the orders contain a provision with respect to transportation similar to that existing in the army orders. When I wrote my hon. friend on February 7 they had not been passed.

DEFENCE OF CANADA REGULATIONS

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER AND REVIEW REGULATIONS AND AMENDMENTS THERETO

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Minister of Justice) moved:

That a select committee of this house, consisting of the following members:—Messrs. Bertrand (Laurier), Black (Yukon), Claxton, Dorion, Dupuis, Hazen, Hlynka, McKinnon (Kenora-Rainy River), Martin, Maybank, McGeer, Noseworthy, Ross (Calgary), Slaght, Stirling, be appointed to consider and review the defence of Canada regulations (consolidation) 1942, and amendments thereto; with power to send for persons, papers and records; to examine witnesses under oath; and to report their opinions and observations from time to time to the house.

Mr. H. C. GREEN (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, this motion gives the proposed committee power to deal with the defence of Canada regulations only. I suggest that it should be extended to give power to deal also with the questions of naturalization and deportation, which are related to the defence of Canada regulations. These regulations override naturalization in many respects, and they bring up the question whether or not the people who have been interned under them can be deported after the war.

This is the fifth year in which we have had a special committee of this type. In each of the other years, with the exception of 1942, the committee was given power to deal with naturalization and deportation in addition to the defence of Canada regulations. Last year, as hon. members will recall the motion as originally brought in was restricted, as it is this year, to the defence of Canada regulations. An amendment which was moved extending its scope to include naturalization and deportation was accepted by the government and duly passed. What happened after that was this: the committee did not deal with the defence of Canada regulations at all; it dealt only with the two questions of naturalization and deportation. It held seven meetings, and each one of those meetings was devoted to the two questions I have just mentioned. I hold in my hand the *Votes and Proceedings* of July 23, 1943, in which the hon. members will find the report of the committee. The last paragraph reads as follows:

Your committee is of the opinion that further study should be given to the whole subject of naturalization, deportation and admission to Canada with a view to the revision of the law relating thereto, and recommends, to that end, that a special committee of the house be appointed at the next session of parliament.

Therefore I intend to move that the motion be amended to extend the powers of the committee. In other years the meetings of the defence of Canada regulations committee have been held in camera. I suggest that this year consideration be given by the committee to throwing its sittings open to the press and to the public. It may be necessary to meet in camera when dealing with the regulations, but when dealing with the questions of naturalization and deportation I believe it would be advisable to throw open the doors. It may be advisable also to invite representations from certain of the naturalization judges in Canada. They have had very extensive experience in naturalization, and I think there is a good deal of discontent with the law as it stands at the present time. I believe many of the judges feel that some improvements should be made.

Representations should also be invited from clubs that are interested in the subject. Take, for example, the Canadian clubs of Canada. Two or three years ago they made representations to the committee which was considering the subject; they showed a great deal of interest in the matter, and they should be invited to send representatives.

Naturalization and deportation are of great importance. They become of greater importance as the end of the war draws nearer. I believe they are more important this year than the defence of Canada regulations. Hon. members will be interested to know that four or five times as many persons have been naturalized in Canada as in all of the other parts of the empire put together. Some steps have been taken to meet the situation. As an example, last year it was provided by order in council that an applicant for naturalization must give a year's notice of his intention to apply. It was also provided that the oath of allegiance must be taken in open court rather than before a notary public or a justice of the peace and then mailed to the Department of the Secretary of State. The effect of this change is, of course, to attach more solemnity to the actual giving of citizenship to the new Canadian.

There are further steps that might very well be taken. For example, it has been suggested that there should be naturalization schools, that applicants for citizenship should be given an opportunity to get instruction with regard to our history, our laws, our constitution and so on; that there should be a test to ascertain whether or not they have acquired sufficient knowledge of those subjects to entitle them to citizenship, and that some provision should be made for text books. Then the suggestion has been made that successful applicants should be given an official welcome into citizenship, and I think it would be very well worth while to provide that when our own young Canadians become twenty-one years of age they too should be welcomed into citizenship along with applicants for naturalization who have been granted certificates. Steps such as these would lead to the making of better Canadians, and that should be and I know is the objective of every hon. member of this house.

Another very practical question which arises is the question of dual citizenship, such as we have in the case of the Japanese in Canada. Many of them, we feel, are mentally citizens of both Japan and Canada, and that position should be remedied. When a person becomes a Canadian citizen he should drop his citizenship in any other nation. This present session is the time to bring our naturalization laws up to date. After all, the way a nation looks upon naturalization shows the value it places upon its own citizenship, and also shows the degree to which it will accept the new citizen. If very little importance is attached to naturalization —and I am afraid that has been the view of the average Canadian for many years— then citizenship means very little to the new citizen, and as a result he is perhaps never really accepted as a Canadian. That condition is entirely wrong. When a man becomes naturalized he should be accepted as a Canadian together with those of us who were born here and whose ancestors have resided here for generations.

So much for the naturalization law. The question of deportation of course has to do with the Immigration Act which, according to my understanding, provides that if a person has lived in Canada for five years and is considered to have Canadian domicile, to all intents and purposes he cannot be deported. We are in this position, that we have in Canada certain nazis whom we had to intern because they were a menace to the state. We also have certain Japanese who have been interned for the same reason; yet under our present immigration laws they cannot be deported after the war. I believe that after the last war an order in council was passed to deal with that situation, but so far nothing of the kind has been done in the present war. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Canada cannot get rid of these people too soon. There is no reason at all why they should be kept here a day longer than is absolutely necessary. The trouble is that once the war is over they will all choose to remain here. They will not want to go home; why should they? We should make up our minds that they are to go out at the first opportunity, and to do that, amendments must be made to the immigration laws. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Black), that the motion be amended by adding after the word "thereto" in the sixth line, the following:

and the law relating to naturalization and to deportation.

Mr. J. W. NOSEWORTHY (York South): Mr. Speaker, I shall not delay the house long, but I want to support the amendment; and in so doing I should like to direct attention to a statement made by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green), that last year the committee concerned itself entirely not with the subject of the original motion but with the subject of this amendment. I would recall also that last year the committee recommended that a committee be set up this year for the purpose of giving further study to the questions of naturalization and deportation.

In supporting this amendment, however, I should like to remind hon. members of the fact that in the spring of 1942 a committee studying these matters made a report, which never came up for discussion in the house, in which attention was directed to the fact that at that time there were in this country certain organizations which had been declared

illegal, and the committee recommended that this ban be lifted. Since that time much has been done in this direction by the government, through the Department of Justice, and I think this would be an appropriate occasion for the minister to tell us just which of those organizations which were formerly considered illegal have been legalized since that time. In the report to which I have referred reference was also made to the confiscation of the property of one of these organizations, the Ukrainian Farmer Labour Temple Association, and I understand that steps have been taken to return some or all of that property. I think this would be a suitable occasion for the house to be informed as to the steps that have been taken in this connection.

A third matter was referred to in that report; that is, the internment camps. From time to time questions were asked with regard to people interned in those camps, and I understand that many have been released in the interval. I have received notices from the department concerning some individual cases about which I have been writing, and I am informed that these internees have been released on certain conditions. I think we should know just what is the present situation in our internment camps and who have been released. Perhaps the minister would care to tell us in some detail just how many are still interned in these camps. Personally I should like to know under what conditions these people were released from the internment camps. These are matters of public concern, and this motion affords an opportunity for the government to give us a report on the steps taken in regard to the defence of Canada regulations up to the present time.

Mr. LIGUORI LACOMBE (Laval-Two Mountains) (Translation): Yesterday, in reply to an inquiry I had made about the detention of Mr. Camillien Houde, the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) laid some documents on the table of the house. However, no mention is made in *Hansard* of any statement by the Minister of Justice or of the said documents.

Such an omission seems strange to me. Therefore, I request that the documents tabled by the Minister of Justice be recorded in the House of Commons Debates. The minister's reply was as follows:

The hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains asked me on February 15 whether the Department of Justice had received a letter dated January 26, 1944, in which Mr. Camillien Houde requested his release, through an order in council, from an internment camp, and it was added in the question "in view of the fact that his internment was carried out by means of an order in council."

[Mr. Noseworthy.]

I have found, on looking up the file, that on January 26 Mr. Houde wrote to the deputy Minister of Justice a letter, copy of which I am tabling, and which contains this sentence:

That statement of Mr. Houde is not in accordance with the facts. The procedure followed when he was interned was not "through an order in council"; he was interned, as hundreds of other persons, through an order made by the then Minister of Justice under section 21 of the defence of Canada regulations. The matter of his release must be determined in accordance with the procedure laid down in the said regulations.

No case within the purview of the regulations has been dealt with through an order in council and the regulations do not involve such a procedure.

Mr. Speaker, in order that many points relating to this particular case and several others may be cleared up, I shall support the amendment moved by the hon. member.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the amendment is superfluous, but I am in favour of it. I cannot recall now whether we have before us the exact wording of the motion made last year when the committee was set up. I am informed by one of my colleagues the amendment is made so as to make the motion read in exactly the same terms as last year's motion. I am heartily in favour of that, because as a member of last year's committee I recall our work was not finished, so far as a discussion respecting naturalization, deportation and related matters was concerned. These are big subjects, and their consideration will require a lot of time. Not only are we concerned with our own laws, the subject is often complicated by corresponding laws in other countries.

We shall vote for this amendment. In my view we have reason at least to some extent to revise the naturalization regulations. I have in mind particularly the fact that naturalization has been refused on account of applicants not being able to read and write English. I agree with what has been said by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) respecting a school of preparation for those to be naturalized. In my view those who seek naturalization should be able to speak and write English, but there should be a dead-line set. I am under the impression there is no provision in the naturalization laws which compels one to be able to read or write English. It would appear that the judges who hear these cases use their own judgment, and that many applications have been refused on this ground. Years ago many persons came to Canada at our invitation and the invitation of those who were sponsoring great immigration movements, and among the number were

mothers and fathers who brought their families. I am sure the older people found the learning of English a laborious task, and in many instances they have not continued their studies to the point where one could say that they can read, write and speak English. They have reared their families, and the members of their families have become good Canadians. Some of them are fighting in this war. Among these older people there are those who feel they would like to become naturalized, and they make their applications. Judges hear their cases, and simply because some of them cannot read or write, their applications are refused and they cannot become naturalized.

If this regulation is to be enforced we should tell people who are coming to this country that if they want to become naturalized they will have to be able to read and write and understand some of the principles of Canadian citizenship and nationhood. My observations this afternoon are more particularly on behalf of those who have been here for some years. Some of the older people who have raised their families and have contributed to the welfare of our country have applied for old age pensions, and because they have been good Canadians their applications should be granted. In the legal sense however they are not Canadians, with the result that without their naturalization certificates they cannot draw pensions. Their naturalization is not considered favourably because decisions are made against them on the ground that they cannot read and write. To many people this may not be a vital point, but it is vital to some who have been in this country for years and who now desire to become naturalized. If the amendment is accepted, and the committee pursues its work along the lines suggested, I would ask that this matter be considered.

Mr. ANTHONY HLYNKA (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a word in support of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) because I believe naturalization and deportation should have been included in the motion.

The hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell) touched on a matter I have discussed in the house on two earlier occasions, namely, the position of Canadians who have lived here for many years but, because they happen to live in groups and have not had an opportunity of learning either English or French, have been refused naturalization certificates. I represent a constituency in which are found many such pioneers. They are loyal citizens, many of them with sons in the armed forces of Canada. Quite often a son finds that he has to leave behind an unnaturalized mother or father who would like to apply for an old age pension. But these old people have not that privilege, because they do not understand the English language. The result is that they have to go on relief. Surely a condition of this kind should be remedied.

For a period of ten years, stretching from 1929 to 1939, the people of Canada suffered a depression. In those years many of our best citizens were unable to earn a living and were forced to accept relief. It so happens that the municipal, provincial and federal governments add up the amounts advanced to relief recipients and when any of these people apply for naturalization certificates they are refused on the ground that they are not good citizens because of certain amounts of debt outstanding against them. These people found themselves in that position through no fault of their own, but rather because of the faulty system under which they have had to exist.

Naturalization certificates should not be refused on this ground. I know of cases where men have been tracked by the police. Charges were laid against them because they had not admitted they had been on relief. They were made criminals and were refused naturalization certificates. All this results in a most unsatisfactory condition. Therefore I should like to support what the hon. member for Vancouver South and the hon. member for Macleod have said.

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Minister of Justice): I am not unmindful, Mr. Speaker, of the remarks you made last year when a similar amendment was moved to a motion to set up a committee to inquire into the defence of Canada regulations. It seemed to me last year that it was the desire of the house that the jurisdiction should be extended to permit the examination of naturalization and deportation matters, and Your Honour agreed to permit the amendment to be put to the house. The situation this year appears to be the same. I did not include this particular matter in the motion because it is not something that comes within the scope of the Department of Justice, but my colleagues have no objection to its being included in the matters to be investigated by this committee. If Your Honour has no objection to allowing the amendment to be put, I have no objection to accepting it.

With respect to the matters that have been raised—

Mr. SPEAKER: The minister is speaking to the amendment now, but if he speaks to the main motion he will close the debate. With regard to the amendment, I wish to point out

to the house what I stated last year when a similar amendment was moved to a similar motion. I pointed out that in the ordinary course the amendment could not be accepted by the Chair because it introduced a subject not relevant to the main motion. I stated then that I could not admit the amendment of my own volition, but the expression of opinion that came from all parts of the house appeared to be that it should be part of the original motion.

My fear then was, and it was exemplified in less than a month after that amendment had been agreed to, that this would be considered a precedent. At the moment I have not the particulars, but my recollection is that an amendment was moved which was foreign to the subject matter of a motion. It was then pointed out to me that I had agreed to an amendment of a similar character. I pointed out then, as I point out to-day, the danger of altering the rules of the house to permit of something foreign being introduced by way of amendment to the subject matter of a motion. I said then, as I say now, that if the house wished to have the amendment made a part of the main motion I would have no objection, but I now state that the house must not treat it as a precedent for any similar amendment in the future. In that latter instance I took the position that the amendment was not relevant to the main motion and therefore ruled it out of order. The house could pass the amendment at a later date as an instruction to the committee, but as the sense of the house seems to be that it should be passed now, I shall allow it now in order to save time.

If the minister speaks now, he will close the debate.

Mr. W. A. TUCKER (Rosthern): Mr. Speaker, I have just a word or two to say before the minister closes the debate. I want to support what has been said with regard to the rigidity of our naturalization laws which result in excluding some worthy citizens from the possibility of having some comfort in their old age. As has been pointed out, people have come to many districts in western Canada and have worked hard, raised families and made a considerable contribution to the building of that section of the country. Many of these people did not think about being naturalized until this war commenced. Others did not think of it until hard times came along and in their old age they found they would have to apply for old age pensions.

Quite often these people were able to speak English, but when they came before the judge he would ask them, "You are pretty close to seventy years of age, are you not?" The answer would be "Yes." The next question would be, "When you get to that age you will probably apply for an old age pension?" Then the person being questioned would answer truthfully, "Yes," and his application for naturalization would be declined. There is no appeal from the decision of the judge. If a judge happens to be hostile to such people getting old age pensions; if he happens to be hostile to people of non-English speaking origin being naturalized at this time of war; if he feels he is called upon to protect the public purse or something of that nature, he can make a ruling by virtue of which the application is refused. The result is that a man who may have lived in Canada for most of his life, raised a splendid family and made other contributions to the country, will be deprived of the protection for which this parliament has provided in its old age pension legislation. Consideration should be given to changing the act in some way so that such people will not be absolutely debarred by decisions of the kind. During the last war many people came from countries which were under enemy control. They were unable to be naturalized, but in order to give them title to their homesteads they received a certificate which was known as form K. Many of them thought that that naturalized them and did not find out otherwise until they came to apply for old age pensions. Then the same question was put to them and they were refused naturalization and were thus unable to get old age pensions.

There are many cases of the kind, but I should like to give you another illustration, that of two old people, a husband and wife, who are both over seventy years of age. In spite of a real effort the husband has been unable to learn English, although the wife can speak it quite well. They are both good citizens and have made a real contribution by raising a splendid family. Because the husband cannot learn English this woman cannot get an old age pension or become naturalized, and that will be the state of affairs as long as her husband is alive.

I submit that this committee should consider cases like these and try to introduce a certain amount of flexibility to provide for such cases. When the granting of old age pensions is dependent upon the persons being naturalized, some provision should be made to take care of cases like these. In particular there should be some procedure under which the decision of the judge could be reviewed. I have known cases of naturalization having been refused in one district whereas I am quite certain it would have been granted in another district. A man living in one district is refused

a naturalization certificate which he might have obtained if he had lived across the line in another judicial district. There should be some uniformity in regard to these matters.

Mr. DUPUIS: Just for the purpose of putting the record straight: the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell) mentioned that one of the conditions of naturalization was the ability to read and write English. I am sure that he would be ready to rectify that and say, "English or French language."

Mr. GROTE STIRLING (Yale): I must confess that I am not clear now as to where we stand with regard to this matter. I listened to the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) and, after expressing his opinion with regard to the introduction of a subject which fell not under his department but under another, he appeared to be ready to refrain from objecting to this amendment, and I took it that we had government consent to the amendment introduced by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green). I then listened to Your Honour, and at the conclusion of your remarks I took it that you were ruling the amendment out of order, subject—

Mr. SPEAKER: No.

Mr. STIRLING: Oh; the amendment then is now being debated? I merely wish to say that I am in support of it. The committee was called late in the session last year. It did not sit very often. Its entire time was taken up on this matter of naturalization, which I consider is linked with both the defence of Canada regulations and, in a sense, deportations, and I think the three can very well be discussed together. Furthermore, from all sides of Canada there was evidence that the public is deeply interested in this question, and I would say that there is a strong desire that a more uniform method should be adopted in considering whether naturalization should be granted, and the granting of naturalization. To ventilate the matter in this way before a committee of the house will serve a very useful purpose.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me make it clear. No point of order has been raised by an hon. member with regard to the relevancy of the amendment. If that point of order were raised I would rule the amendment out of order. But the sense of the house seems to be that they wish it to be passed on the main motion, and I am agreeing to it, on the condition that the house must understand that I will not be bound by this act as a precedent when any similar amendment to a motion is brought before the house.

Mr. G. H. CASTLEDEN (Yorkton): I wish to say just a few words in connection with this matter. I too have had experiences, similar to those who have spoken with regard to persons who have come to this country and tried to make their contribution. A great deal of misunderstanding has resulted from the lack of information; indeed, I feel that no proper effort has been made to enable these people, particularly the older ones, to realize to the full what the regulations require in making their citizenship. These people are from different parts of Europe. In my own constituency there are large numbers of Ukrainian people who have made valuable contributions to Canada. They have taken part in our democratic institutions; they led in respect of voluntary enlistments of Saskatchewan in the early years of the war. They have mixed their blood voluntarily with men of Canadian and British blood in the battle for freedom; they have taken over their duties and responsibilities in respect of municipal institutions, and their names are recorded among the members of the legislature and of this parliament. Many of these people who came to this country and took up homesteads believed, when they received title to their homesteads, that that granted them the right of citizenship. There are instances in which they have found that that is not so; after living for years under the illusion that they were Canadians they found that they were not entitled to all the rights of Canadian citizenship. When these people are making an effort to add their contribution to the rich mosaic which should be Canada, is it not time that we of this house passed legislation to make it possible for Canadian citizenship to be registered on the census records? Surely the time has come when we can be called Canadians, not "British Canadians" or Canadians of some other particular nationality or kind. The time is long past when we should have welcomed these people and assisted them in adding their contribution to this nation.

Mrs. DORISE W. NIELSEN (North Battleford): May I add one other word in support of what has already been said? It seems to me there is need for the committee to discuss the question of making special provision for the naturalization of those who happen to suffer physical disabilities which make it almost impossible for them to comply with existing regulations. I have in mind a certain case up in my part of the country. In the year 1903 a man and his wife came to Canada from the Ukraine and brought with them the wife's sister. She was then a young girl, and she was deaf and dumb. In 1905 the man

became naturalized, and so automatically his wife and children became naturalized, but the deaf and dumb sister was not included; she is not a naturalized citizen of Canada. To-day she is seventy-one years of age, and her brother-in-law wants to know if she is eligible for the old age pension. I found out that she had first to become naturalized, and I suggested that he go to the court in North Battleford to see about it. The judge made a ruling that this woman must learn to write. For a woman of seventy-one who has been deaf and dumb all her life to be told that she must learn to write before she can become naturalized seems an absurdity. It appears to me that in cases of physical disabilities of that kind special provision should be made, because in my opinion the contribution of a woman who has been in this country since 1903 gives her the right to the old age pension.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: If the minister speaks now he closes the debate.

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Minister of Justice): I do not intend to discuss the many interesting questions which have been suggested as proper matters for the committee to look into. I understand they will be very carefully considered and, I hope, reported upon to this house by the committee.

There are one or two questions which were asked with respect to information that I can perhaps give the house at this time.

The hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains (Mr. Lacombe) referred to the fact that a statement I tabled yesterday in respect to the question he asked on February 15 did not appear in *Hansard*; but if the hon. member will look at page 99 of *Votes and Proceedings* he will find that the statement is there noted.

Mr. LACOMBE (Translation): The reply is not recorded in *Hansard*.

Mr. ST. LAURENT (Translation): The reply is recorded on page 99 of the *Votes and Proceedings*.

Mr. LACOMBE (Translation): I admit that the reply is recorded in the *Vates and Proceedings*, but that is not what I said, Mr. Speaker. I said that it was not recorded in *Hansard*.

(Text)

Mr. St. LAURENT: The hon. member for York South (Mr. Noseworthy) inquired as to what organizations had been deleted from regulation 39C of the defence of Canada regulations. He will find them enumerated in the order in council of October 14, 1943, P.C. 8022, which has already been tabled in this house. They are: the Ukrainian Labour Farmer Temple Association, the Finnish Organization of Canada, the Finnish Society of Toronto, the Finnish Society, Technocracy Incorporated, Jehovah's Witnesses.

He also inquired as to what had been done about the property of these organizations which had come by virtue of the regulations under the control of the custodian of enemy property. By the same order in council it was provided that—

> . . . all property, rights and interests in Canada, or the proceeds thereof, vested in and subject to the control and management of the custodian pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (4) of regulation 39C of the defence of Canada regulations (consolidation) 1942, be released to the organization or person from whom it was received where the name of the organization has been deleted from subparagraph (a) of paragraph (1) of the said regulation 39C.

In order to bring that about in a manner that might be fair to each of these organizations, I understand that the Secretary of State as custodian set up an advisory committee similar to the committees that had been advising the Minister of Justice in respect of the application of the defence of Canada regulations, to assist him in making a proper return or accounting to the person or persons from whom property had been received by him.

The hon. member also inquired as to the number of persons who had been released or were still interned. I am sorry I have not the exact number here. Most of those who have been interned have now been released, and orders for release are constantly being made as the advisory committees make favourable recommendations to the Minister of Justice. Exact information can be prepared in tabulated form and made available to the committee, of which I am glad to note the hon. gentleman is himself to be a member.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

PENSIONS AND ALLOWANCES

WIDOWS OF VETERANS OF FIRST WORLD WAR—INQUIRY AS TO LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. S. H. KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Pensions and National Health. Will he tell the house whether it is intended, before the close of the present fiscal year, to introduce legislation providing a statutory basis for the payment of allowances to widows of veterans of the last war?

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Pensions and National Health): No decision has yet been arrived at.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Bradette in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

Normal services—

176. Grants to military associations and institutes as detailed in the estimates, $10,575.

Mr. GRAYDON: I do not know whether the minister had in mind making a special statement in connection with these estimates. If he has, I shall be glad to give way to him.

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): I had not intended making any statement. Each item and its purpose is quite familiar to the committee. These items cover the functions of the department in peace time, and the estimated expenditures, except in one case, are slightly below those of last year.

Mr. GRAYDON: Has there been any increase in this vote?

Mr. RALSTON: Some of the institutes have become dormant because of war conditions and we have found that there was no necessity for even providing for the grant. No payments have yet been made under the 1943-44 vote, although accounts are generally presented near the end of the fiscal year. Many of the associations have ceased activities entirely, and unless they can show activities that are regarded as substantially in the interests of the war effort, payments are not made.

Mr. GRAYDON: I suppose a large number of these people are overseas in the armed forces?

Mr. RALSTON: That is quite right.

Mr. STIRLING: Judging by the amount not required last year I take it that some of these are not continuing this year.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend is quite right.

Item agreed to.

177. Miscellaneous maintenance and adjustments (war of 1914-1918), $22,770.

Mr. GRAYDON: What will be covered by temporary assistance, which will be found at page 129 in the details of services? I note that vote 177 covers temporary assistance amounting to $6,820; cost of living bonus and other pay-list items, $555; an item for the purchase and erection of headstones in Canada, $13,500, and sundries amounting to $1,895. Perhaps the minister will give us some additional information.

Mr. RALSTON: As its name indicates, this is a composite item. The principal activities under it are connected with war graves in Canada, to which are related the expenditures my hon. friend has mentioned in connection with headstones in Canada, the activities of the Canadian war museum, and payments for temporary assistance. The payments are to Mr. Reiffenstein, the secretary of the war museum, $2,400, and Mr. Salmon, handyman, $1,080. The payment to Colonel Osborne, secretary of the war graves commission, is $1,500. Provision is included this year for a museum assistant, the amount being $1,600. That makes $6,580, and there is an amount of $240 for casual labour. The additional museum assistant is necessary because of the considerable interest that is taken in the war museum. Something like 44,000 people saw the exhibit last year, and the secretary has been busy a good deal of the time taking visitors through the institution. It is thought therefore the expenditure for the assistant is justified.

Mr. GRAYDON: What is the extent of the war graves commission's work so far as it affects the operations in this war?

Mr. RALSTON: There is no expenditure here in connection with operations in this war These headstones are all for burials in Canada. I think I am right in that. Deaths in England may be included—I am not sure about that—but I think it would be only deaths in Canada.

Mr. GRAYDON: What about the attention being given to the cemeteries in Sicily, Italy and North Africa?

Mr. RALSTON: The cemeteries in Sicily and Italy are a purely service activity at the present time, and come under the department. The cemetery at Agira was built by the Royal Canadian Engineers and is being maintained by the army there. It will not be taken over by the imperial war graves commission until some time later, when activities cease there. As my hon. friend knows, the imperial war graves commission gets contributions from Canada.

Mr. GRAYDON: Have we a representative on the imperial war graves commission?

Mr. RALSTON: Colonel Simson is on the imperial war graves commission, or is liaison officer with them. I should say also that Colonel H. C. Osborne, who is here, is secretary-general of the imperial war graves commission (Canada).

Mr. STIRLING: A little while ago I was approached by someone who asked me what steps should be taken with regard to a relative

of his who had not received a medal to which he was alleged to be entitled. He did not know what he should do to get it. I told him to give me the information in detail and I would pass it on. In a case such as that, what steps are taken?

Mr. RALSTON: The application ought to be made direct to the department. The adjutant-general deals with it and passes it on to the records branch of the department. Is the hon. member referring to a medal of this war?

Mr. STIRLING: No. I take it it was the first great war.

Mr. RALSTON: If my hon. friend will give me the name I shall see to it at once.

Item agreed to.

Normal services—
178. Battlefields memorials, $5,700.

Mr. COLDWELL: I notice there are two small salaries here. What is being done with regard to these battlefields memorials? They are not accessible to us at the moment. Is a skeleton organization maintained?

Mr. RALSTON: The amount expended so far from the 1943-44 vote is $3,300, although the vote was $5,700. We make a contribution of $1,500 toward the salary of Colonel Osborne and $720 to his assistant. They keep in touch with the imperial war graves commission. We make provision for personnel in occupied countries to be paid when they can be paid. We have not been able to pay them this year, but we have paid out altogether $3,300.

Mr. COLDWELL: You will have some obligations to meet at the end of this war.

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Mr. GRAYDON: I know the minister will be guarded in his reply to the question I am about to ask. Has the minister any information as to whether or not the Vimy memorial is still intact?

Mr. RALSTON: I have no official information about it, no. I have reason to think it is. The Vimy caretaking personnel is scattered in occupied countries. We know the caretaker and the assistant caretaker are in an internment camp. They have been in the employ of the commission for approximately twenty years. We are making provision here in case they should find their way to Great Britain in order that we may be able to look after them.

Mr. GRAYDON: You put aside their payments?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Pensions and other benefits—
179. Civil pensions—Robert Allen, $269.52.

Mr. GREEN: Will the minister tell the committee what protection there is for a member of the reserve army who is injured while carrying on his military duties? There seems to be some concern about that question. In these days men of the reserve army are getting far more training than they did before the war, and they are dealing with many types of weapons. In some cases they are getting battle training, and apparently there are many accidents. My understanding is that there must be a court of inquiry where a man is hurt. The report is referred to the brigade and eventually to Ottawa. In some cases men are not allowed any compensation at all. In all cases there is a long delay. I have been told that at best all they can get is hospital treatment and reserve army pay. The suggestion has been made to me that when they are in hospital or while they are laid up, the least they should get is active service pay and allowances for themselves and their dependents, or there should be some scheme similar to workmen's compensation to protect them. Will the minister tell us what the situation is in that respect?

Mr. RALSTON: I remember a case in New Brunswick. I am under the impression that such provision is made in these cases, and that the personnel are pensionable if the accident is attributable to service. I shall look into the matter. It really does not come under this item. My hon. friend may ask me about it later. I shall furnish the information to him. It really comes under the department of my colleague, the Minister of Pensions and National Health. I am quite satisfied they are provided for in case of accident occurring in training. I shall tell my hon. friend what are the provisions.

Mr. GRAYDON: The various items are composed of pensions which would not ordinarily go through, I presume, and for which some good reason has been advanced.

Mr. RALSTON: That is so. They are civilian employees.

Item agreed to.

184. Civil pensions—Mrs. Alice Smuck, $480.

Mr. GRAYDON: None of these are new items, are they? They were passed last year and are the same this year?

Mr. RALSTON: The first one relates to an accident which occurred in 1916. The pension has been paid ever since. The last one

relates to an accident which occurred in 1935. They have all been voted for a number of years.

Mr. COLDWELL: I think these are old pensioners. Has anything been done to assist them?

Mr. RALSTON: No; these are civilian employees who were not pensioned.

Mr. COLDWELL: They are not pensioned employees, but they have had long service; is that right?

Mr. RALSTON: They have had long civilian service and are paid compensation on account of accidents.

Mr. COLDWELL: Compassionate?

Mr. RALSTON: As a matter of grace.

Mr. COLDWELL: In view of the increase in the cost of living, has any adjustment been made to assist them? These pensions are very small; two of them are less than what is paid under the Old Age Pension Act. I wondered if any consideration had been given to granting these old employees—I take it they are old employees—something to assist them in view of the increase in the cost of living.

Mr. RALSTON: No. Take, for instance, the Allen case. That accident occurred in 1916; the Pettipas accident in 1916. My hon. friend will realize that the dollar is worth more now than it was then. I do not think there is any doubt about that, as far as purchasing power is concerned. The Walker case occurred in 1927, the Townsend case in 1917, the Mountain case in 1926 and the Smuck case in 1935. To answer my hon. friend directly, no consideration has been given to making any change.

Mr. COLDWELL: I hoped we had reached a more generous spirit in this war than in the last.

Mr. GRAYDON: Has consideration been given by the treasury board to the question of cost-of-living bonuses for pensioners?

Mr. RALSTON: There has been consideration given; that is all I can say to my hon. friend. I do not like to speak for that august body.

Mr. GRAYDON: I fancy it is more popular not to be its champion. I understand that.

Mr. MacNICOL: This is the last item of these particular estimates, and I should like to ask the minister a question. I do not expect an answer now; it will take some time to get the information, but would he later on advise the committee where in the auditor general's report I can find the details as to the names and so on of the persons referred to in these various items, and the amount in each case?

Mr. RALSTON: I shall find that out.

Mr. MacNICOL: I want to congratulate the government and the particular officials responsible for again giving the house such explicit reports as are now contained in the public accounts. I wish also to thank the hon. member for Temiscouata who first brought the matter up in this house and requested that greater information be given. I supported his request, and I believe the hon. member for York-Sunbury also asked that the information be full and complete. I just cannot see in the public accounts the exact details of these items, however, and I should like to have that later.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I notice that last year and again this year the contribution to cadet corps comes under the war appropriation. Will the minister tell the committee why that has been done?

Mr. RALSTON: Because that was regarded distinctly as a war activity.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I was just wondering if it was considered that this grant would not be continued after the war. It seems to me it should be part of the civil estimates, and I do not quite understand why it should be dealt with in this way—

Mr. RALSTON: That is the answer.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): —unless it was very much enlarged.

Mr. RALSTON: By the same reasoning the fact that active army pay and allowances and engineering services were taken out of the civil estimates and put under the war appropriation might indicate to my hon. friend, if he were suspicious, that we were not going to have any active army or engineering services after the war, but that is not the case. I assure him that the cadet services have been put under the war appropriation in order that they might receive recognition as part of our war activities.

Perhaps the committee would permit me to refer to something I said yesterday which I should like to elaborate, because I am afraid the way *Hansard* has it—and I am sure *Hansard* has it the way I said it, because *Hansard* does not generally make mistakes—a wrong impression might be given. I was speaking in reply to the hon. member for St. Paul's, as to the activities we were carrying on to see that at the time of their discharge men were

given information with regard to what were their rights. At page 624 of *Hansard* I said:

> My hon. friend is quite right in saying that when a man gets out of the army he does not know where to go next. He expects somebody to send for him, and they are apt to send for him after the papers have been signed and he has gone away.

I do not want that to be taken as a statement of the picture as we have it now. That is a statement of the situation we have done everything we can to cure. I want the committee to realize that my colleague the Minister of Pensions and National Health and I both feel that it just is not good enough to send for a man after his papers have been signed and he has gone away. What we want is to see that the officers of both departments try to give the man all the information in plenty of time, so that he may know exactly what are his rights, as far as we can help him to do so, and what are the possibilities of getting employment or getting pension or getting treatment, under the regulations.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I thank the minister for his statement. The reason I brought up the question was that I felt in the past there had not been sufficient contact between pensions and national health and national defence in regard to this matter, and I am glad to hear that this situation is being corrected.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I can assure my hon. friend that we are working together closely now.

Mr. RALSTON: The Minister of Pensions and National Health tells me that in addition to being interviewed each man is given by his paymaster a little slip which has been prepared, indicating the rehabilitation benefits for men of all three services. What I was trying to deal with, however, was what I regarded as the army's obligation not only to see that pensions and national health does what has been arranged, but also to see that we did our own job before the man went out of the army altogether.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Administration service—
1. Departmental administration, $130,406.

Mr. PERLEY: I think it is customary for the minister to make a general statement before any discussion takes place on his estimates. Is he going to follow that procedure to-day?

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): I had not intended to make any extensive statement, Mr. Chairman. I think it will be remembered that I did not do so (last year) and I do not recall what I did the year before. I should like to call attention to the fact, however, that the estimates for this year are almost identical with those of last year. They are some slight changes, but not to any great extent.

Mr. SENN: Except for one item.

Mr. GARDINER: I presume the one item to which my hon. friend refers is the wheat acreage reduction. Even last year the estimates did not show the amount to be paid out under wheat acreage reduction; that was provided in the legislation itself. I should like to say, however, that the decision has been reached this year not to continue wheat acreage reduction, so that while the amount is shown in the estimates in exactly the same way as it was shown last year, when we indicated that some $26,000,000 would be paid out for this purpose, this year I shall indicate to the committee that no amount beyond what is shown in these estimates is expected to be paid out under this item. In other words there are some payments that will have to be made after the end of this fiscal year, and they will come out of this amount.

In addition there are expenditures made by the department of Agriculture out of the war appropriation, which of course are not shown in these estimates. If at all possible I should like hon. members to confine their discussion to the estimates now before the committee. There may be overlapping in some cases, which may require that the same questions be answered twice, but I think we can give more intelligent answers if we stay pretty close to these estimates while we are discussing them. The other matters can be fully discussed when the other items are under consideration by the committee. Apart from this I have nothing in particular to say at this time.

Mr. SENN: I wish the minister would elaborate a little on the connection between the war estimates and these civil estimates. After all, under the war appropriation a number of boards have been set up which are connected closely with the department of Agriculture, and it is difficult to know exactly when we are referring to the one and when to the other. Could the minister let us know a little more definitely the relationship between these estimates? There are a number of these boards; it is not necessary for me to mention them. If the minister does not wish us to go into the war estimates at all, he might explain the situation a little more fully, so that we may know just where we stand.

Mr. GARDINER: One board which has been in existence ever since the war started is the agricultural supplies board. It is true that the officials of that board are officials of the Department of Agriculture. We shall be discussing personnel in connection with these estimates, and that personnel will be found on those boards, or connected with them. But the expenditures actually made in connection with the different agreements made with Britain are amounts provided under the War Measures Act, and I think we would discuss those at another time to better advantage than we can while these estimates are before the committee.

Under the agricultural supplies board comes the bacon board, now known as the meat board. For the first three years of the war it was known as the bacon board, but the name has since been changed. Then we have the dairy products board, and the special products board, all of which operate under the agricultural supplies board, and with funds provided out of the war vote. The only other board about which we might speak in that connection is the food board, which has as its chairman the Deputy Minister of Agriculture. The food board, however, carries on its activities with funds provided from other sources. The officials in the Department of Agriculture naturally have the information respecting these other matters. They may not have it with them when we are discussing these items, but to the extent that questions are asked, the answers to which may be necessary for a reasonable discussion of the estimates, we shall try to answer. I hope, however, that there will not be an extensive discussion on the other items until we reach them.

Mr. SENN: The minister of course in his department assumes responsibility for what is done by these different boards.

Mr. GARDINER: Yes.

Mr. SENN: And to a very great extent the Department of Agriculture is responsible for the information supplied to those boards, and upon which they render their decisions.

Mr. GARDINER: Yes.

Mr. SENN: So that I cannot understand how some overlapping could be avoided.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I should like to ask a question with respect to the food board. The minister may decide that my question would more properly relate to the agricultural supplies board. I have in mind the conference held last fall, under the supervision of the agricultural supplies board, to decide upon the various amounts of agricultural productions for 1944. I believe it was decided at that conference that Canada in 1944 should not increase her wheat acreage production, but should endeavour to maintain the acreage she had in 1943. At the same time our neighbours to the south in the United States were asked to increase their wheat acreage production in 1944 by at least twenty-four per cent. When one considers that the four major wheat exporting countries, according to estimates published, used approximately 464,000,000 bushels of wheat for feeding live stock in 1942, on account of the shortage of usual feeding supplies, one wonders at this condition. I believe it is agreed among our experts that if we have a dry season in western Canada the best cereal crop is wheat, and that we would have much better success in attempting to grow wheat, even if used for feeding purposes, than in attempting to grow oats or barley.

Our own wheat storage has been greatly decreased. In fact, figures for the past year show that the decrease is approximately twenty-five per cent. While a year ago the wheat storage was more than 463,000,000 bushels, the present storage is only 348,000,000. At the same time our storage supplies of coarse grains have increased by twenty-three per cent from more than 61,000,000 bushels to 75,000,000. As I have pointed out, the United States have asked for an increase. On January 1, 1943, they had in storage about 268,000,000 bushels of wheat and on January 1 of this year that amount had been reduced to 92,000,000. Only a few days ago in the house the Minister of Trade and Commerce announced a sale of 175,000,000 bushels of wheat to the United States, for the current year 1944. It must be clear to anyone that there will be a very small carry-over of wheat this year, either in the United States or in Canada.

Moreover, the last issue of the *Economic Annalist*, published in February, 1944, and reaching my desk in to-day's mail, points out that—

> The conference of the united nation's relief and rehabilitation administration which took place at Atlantic city during the latter part of November, 1943, was the second important international gathering held in the United States during world war II. The first, the conference on food and agriculture had already established a working basis for close and continued collaboration among all the united nations. In setting up the UNRRA, the united nations agreed to bring relief to victims of war immediately upon liberation of the countries enslaved by the enemy. According to the estimates, total import requirements for Europe from all sources will amount to over 45 million tons of foodstuff, feeds, oils, fat, chemicals, fertilizers, rubber, wood, paper, hides, leather, clothing, coal, metals, minerals, machinery,

vehicles, seeds, drugs and hospital supplies. One of Canada's major contributions will be food—especially wheat.

In the same issue Doctor Black summarizes his analysis of food production by saying that—

If labour is short as at present, we should get our calories so far as possible from cereals.

I do not like to take issue with the able experts on the board, or with the gentlemen before the minister to-day. It does seem to me however that in view of these facts, when our western wheat producers can produce wheat under natural land and climate condition much more easily than they can produce anything else, they should now be asked to increase their wheat acreage. In view of the weather conditions in these winter months it would not appear to me that we will have anything like as much precipitation or moisture in 1944 as we had in the last two years. I should like to have a more complete statement from the minister. I do not know what his personal views are about the present situation, but our producers are preparing for their spring operations, and any information they could get would be useful at this time. If the minister believes some change should be made, the producers should be told. If there is any reason why they should not increase their acreage, he should tell us why, because it must be apparent to all that the production could be used both for the winning of the war and for the feeding of people in the overrun countries immediately after the war.

My namesake, the hon. member for Moose Jaw, pointed out about a year ago that before the end of the next year we might easily have a shortage of cereals in North America. Judging from these figures I should think his prediction might not be far wrong.

Mr. GARDINER: The statement made respecting the facts related to the conference are pretty much as indicated by the hon. member. The acreage under wheat in 1943 was 17,488,000 acres. The objective for 1944 is 17,500,000, or 100 per cent of the 1943 figure. The production figure for 1943 is the actual acreage we had in that year. The figures for oats are 17,405,000 acres for 1943 and 16,377,000 for 1944. For barley the figure is approximately the same; the 1944 acreage is 101 per cent of the 1943. For mixed grains the figure is 120 per cent of the 1943 acreage; for rye, 87 per cent, and for corn, 153 per cent. For hay and clover we are asking the same, and also for alfalfa.

Those are the figures with regard to wheat and feed grains and forage crops. We are asking approximately the same for all important crops. Corn for husking is not a big crop in Canada. There were 257,000 acres in this crop in 1943 and we are asking for 393,000 acres in 1944. While that is up 53 per cent it does not represent a considerable acreage. In answering the question asked by the hon. member if I were confining my discussion of grains largely to the first three items, I think I shall have pretty well covered the picture. The wheat and oats and barley acreages will be approximately the same as far as this country is concerned. The wheat acreage will be 100 per cent of the 1943 acreage; the oat acreage, 106 per cent, and the barley, 101 per cent. Those are the main crops we utilize for feeding purposes.

The suggestion has been made that at a conference held in the United States certain decisions were reached. An agreement has been signed by the four exporting nations, namely, Australia, the Argentine, the United States and Canada together with Britain. That agreement was signed some time ago and was announced through the press. Under it certain provisions were made for the establishment of price levels toward the end of the war and as to acreages in the different countries. The most important feature of the acreage agreement is the one which relates to wheat acreage reduction. We were parties to that agreement; we signed it at the time.

Since that time there have developed some changes in Canada and the United States which have perhaps made it necessary in certain areas to depart from a strict interpretation of the terms of the agreement. It is possible that this is true in the United States. If I recall correctly, in the United States they asked their farmers to increase their acreage in wheat and feed grains by some 14,000,000 acres. In some places that has been interpreted as an expressed desire on the part of the United States government that the wheat acreage should be increased by 14,000,000. As I understand it, the intention in the United States was that 14,000,000 more acres of land should be seeded this year in order to provide feed for live stock. In so far as the growing of wheat to be used to provide food for human beings is concerned, I assume that they are following very much the idea contained in the agreement signed two or three years ago.

As the hon. member for Souris has stated, it is true in certain sections of western Canada that as many if not more pounds of feed can be grown in a dry area by seeding wheat rather than oats or barley. I think I can say that is true from experience. I do not think any objection would be taken—I suppose it would not make very much difference if we did take objection—to farmers seeding wheat.

Certainly no serious objection would be taken to the seeding of wheat as a substitute for barley for feeding purposes. That was the intention of the United States request to their farmers—to get more feed for live stock.

However, that is not what was in our minds when we discussed the matter in the conference. What was in our minds was whether we required more wheat for the purpose of providing flour with which to feed human beings. The hon. member for Souris has said that it is stated that the greatest contribution Canada is to make under U.N.R.R.A. is to supply wheat, but that contribution is to be only 25,000,000 bushels. Anyone looking at the figures of wheat supplies in Canada or wheat production will realize just what little effect one way or another the provision of 25,000,000 bushels of wheat would have upon our supply. At the time these discussions were being carried on we had 604,000,000 bushels carried over from preceding years. That represents about two years of average crops. At that time we had another crop which was being marketed and which is still being marketed. Therefore it was not considered wise when we had about three years' supply of wheat on hand to say to people this year that they should seed a greater acreage of wheat than they had last year. As a matter of fact, we asked them to seed the same acreage as they had last year. In so far as we have been able to study the statistics that come before us from time to time, we have not seen any reason up to date for changing that position. We thought it wise that our farmers should not seed more acreage this year for the production of wheat to be marketed for human consumption than they had seeded in 1943.

The question of feed is a different matter. We are asking our people to seed approximately a million more acres in oats, and we are asking them to seed approximately the same acreage in barley, or just a little more. We believe that with the carryover we have in the country at the present time our position will be well taken care of if our people follow these directions for 1944.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Will there be a carryover if we supply the United States with what they require in feed and wheat?

Mr. GARDINER: The other day the Minister of Trade and Commerce pointed out that the United States were prepared to take 175,000,000 bushels of wheat if we could get the shipping facilities to take it to them. Up to date no transportation organization has been able to assure us that facilities can be supplied to handle 175,000,000 bushels. It will be apparent that 175,000,000 bushels, plus the 25,000,000 bushels spoken of a moment ago, total only 200,000,000 bushels, or one-third of what we carried into this crop year. Assuming that we have a poor crop next year—no one in the west ever assumes that until we actually have it; we always assume we are going to have a fair crop—the figures might look different next fall, but they certainly would not look sufficiently different to put us in the position of being short of feed in Canada.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): That carryover already has been greatly reduced.

Mr. GARDINER: It is being reduced by certain wheat that is being shipped out.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Will the European market be larger than it was?

Mr. GARDINER: We are hoping it will, but we are, of course, not the only suppliers of that market.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Could the minister give the committee any figures with regard to the world picture of production—stocks, and probable demand?

Mr. GARDINER: The best information which can be had under war conditions is that there is no indication from crop conditions throughout the world this year that there is any pending shortage of grain. Of course we all know that, with armies moving, weather is not the only thing which counts.

Mr. GRAYDON: We are now dealing with the first item, within the purview of which, naturally, may be discussed the general ramifications of the Department of Agriculture.

I have no desire at the moment to take the time of the committee with any general observations in connection with the matter. I rise for the single purpose of pointing out that during the last session of parliament, in the discussion of the agriculture estimates, there was brought to the minister's attention a matter which merits a little more consideration than the estimates would indicate it has received. I do not suppose that in many years as much interest has been shown in any suggestion respecting a vote in the house as there was in the suggestion last year that half a million dollars should be put aside for research laboratories and facilities for agricultural research in Canada. Many communications were received from agricultural sections regarding suggestions for the expenditure of this money in research for the benefit of agriculture. There is a feeling throughout the country that agriculture has not been able to

keep abreast with other lines of industry in regard to improvements and development. It is all very well to say that urban industry looks after its own research. Industry is in a very much better position to look after its own research than agriculture is. First of all, manufacturing industry is much more concentrated. Then, much of the money expended for this purpose is set aside by large concerns having their own research facilities. Further, the advantages of this research are sooner or later extended to branches of industry which perhaps are less fortunately placed. So far as the farmer is concerned he is not organized to the same extent to do that. It may be that in the future there will be some organization of a nature which will enable the farmer to make his contribution in a collective way to the advancement of research facilities, but for the moment that does not seem possible, at any rate on a very large scale. So that it becomes pretty definitely the obligation of the government to see that research facilities, laboratories or whatever may be needed, are provided through government assistance.

I noticed that last year a good deal of interest was taken in, and much support given to, the suggestion that a sufficiently large sum of money be set aside for this purpose. In the debate, which took place much nearer the end of the session than the present debate, many hon. members representing agricultural constituencies rose to express approval of the suggestion which was made. But as I look through the items of the estimates, both in the war appropriation measure and in the civil estimates which are now before us, I have not been able to find anything of a satisfactory or comprehensive nature with respect to any advance so far as those science services are concerned under which, I assume, the vote would occur. I notice a paragraph in the speech from the throne which says that "provision will be made to expand research activities." I have not a great hope that the speech from the throne, when it is brought down to earth, will look quite as attractive as when it remained up in the skies, in the clouds. Nevertheless I urge the minister and the government not to let the session pass without a substantial amount of money being set aside for agricultural research purposes. We must not under any circumstances fly in the face of agricultural opinion, which is insisting, in a way that agriculture seldom insists, upon this action. I want to summon every bit of emphasis I can to impress upon the minister the importance of his dealing with this matter. There may be a ray of hope in the paragraph of the speech from the throne which calls for an expansion of research activities. If that expansion covers other lines of activity as well as agriculture, I think agriculture should be given the very top place.

I leave the matter with the minister this afternoon. I was unable to discover in the details of the estimates where this vote is to be found. For that reason I rise on the general item in order that the minister may be apprised of this urgent necessity. I do not think a day's delay should be countenanced in seeing to it that this most important contribution by the government to agriculture is made. It may be that the government does not want to go as far as was suggested in the session last year, but in my opinion not only is it justified in going that far but, if necessary, should go farther. The government must recognize that for many years the need has existed for this move to be made. It is strange that the governments of to-day and of yesterday have not recognized the urgent and essential nature of such provision for our agricultural populations. I am ready to lend every possible encouragement to the government in seeing to it that research for agriculture is not neglected, but that proper provision is made for it during this session.

Mr. GARDINER: The paragraph following item 32, namely, "appropriation not required for 1944-45, $200,000", is the item which was placed in the supplementary estimates last year to provide for certain research work and the putting in of pilot plants relative to research in connection with agriculture. That item was only partly spent last year. Provision was made for the expenditure of some of it, but the expenditure is not yet completed. It may be necessary to bring down supplementaries later on to cover the expenditures which will be made this year in that connection. But on page 44 of the estimates there appears, under "trade and commerce", item 358, "expanded research on the utilization of farm crops, $325,000", one of two items under "national research council". That $325,000, together with what is expended under the other item when we come to deal with it in supplementaries, will make up a total somewhere between $325,000 and the $500,000 which has been spoken of.

Mr. GRAYDON: Is that the carrying out of the provision in the speech from the throne?

Mr. GARDINER: Yes; that is the intention, and I will explain why it is found where it is. Some years ago—I have not the exact date, but it was long before my time in Ottawa—the research council was set up. The objective which I understand that those who

set it up had in mind was to bring all research under one national research council. That organization was supposed to have taken over a great deal of the research work which previously had been carried on in the Department of Agriculture, and all research work generally that had been carried on by the different departments of government, and considerable new research work was added to its activities.

There has always been a certain amount of discussion as to whether agricultural research can be as successfully carried on in an organization of that kind as it would be under a purely agricultural set-up. I was not present in the committee last year when the matter was discussed and it was recommended that half a million dollars be expended on research in connection with agricultural products, and I am therefore not in a position to say what views hon. members expressed on that question. Finally, however, $200,000 was put in the agriculture estimates last year, and in the meantime a committee was appointed which was composed of persons right across Canada, under the chairmanship of the president of the university of Alberta, and of which the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Ross) served as a member. They made certain recommendations as to how moneys voted for this purpose might be expended, or on what works they might be used.

Out of these discussions there has grown this vote which is placed in the Department of Trade and Commerce under national research council for the purpose of doing research work in connection with farm products to determine exactly what is stated here—"research on the utilization of farm crops." On the question whether there should be additional amounts in the estimates of the Department of Agriculture to carry on some more practical work in connection with the development of ideas found by research, that is something which perhaps the members of the committee might wish to discuss, but any money voted for that particular purpose would have to be voted this session in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. GRAYDON: The reasons why I expected to find the vote in the estimates for agriculture were very well grounded, and that was the plan or scheme which was suggested by the hon. member for Moose Jaw, who brought up the question last year and was strongly supported by many members of the committee. The idea was to have a chain of laboratories across Canada for the purpose of doing this agricultural work. It had not occurred to me, but perhaps the minister, on consideration, may have felt that the vote could be more effectively spent by utilizing it through the research council.

I am not sure that the government's judgment on that point was very good. I am rather inclined to think that agriculture, at least as I understand from the general leanings, would like to have had, not only the amount here but whatever extended vote might be required, for work to be carried on through their own operations and within their own field. The minister will see why that should be, and I would point out that perhaps, in a reconsideration of the whole research field, that might be done.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: There are a few general remarks I wish to make on agriculture. When the minister, with much gusto, proclaims that the farmer finds himself in a splendid position, and tries to create the impression that everything is well with agriculture, I think we should remember that it has only been in the fifth year of the war that the farmer's return for his labour has begun to show any proper relation to his cost of production.

The farmer in this country is to be complimented upon the work he has done. The production figures for Canada are figures to which we can point with pride and satisfaction, and the fact that labour shortages have existed only reveals the extent to which the older people have taken on the burden of producing food for our men as well as for the civilian population in this time of stress. If, however, we visited the farm homes across Canada we would find the people living in those homes not as well cared for as one would suppose they would be, looking over the slight increases in the farmer's income over the past year.

For twelve years, in most parts of Canada, this industry has suffered from a depression from which it will take years and years to recover. For the past twelve years there have existed in Canada conditions that should not exist in any country. In New Brunswick there are farmers who delivered barrels of potatoes containing over three bushels and sold them at twenty cents a barrel, and in many cases they could not sell their potatoes even at that price. Over long periods of depression agriculture finds itself in the position where it has constantly to meet debt costs, production costs and taxation, and these are not cancelled at the end of each year but are carried on indefinitely so that there has been irreparable loss which years of prices above parity will not offset.

The figures placed on the record the other evening by the hon. member for Melfort showed the extent to which farmers and farming communities have lost equity in their homes. Farm homes which were previously the property of the men who did the work have been taken over by the mortgage companies, and in far too many cases these people will

continue renting from the mortgage companies and will remain from now on tenants on their land. These losses can never be restored.

We must remember that our prosperity to-day is the result of a world conflict. The prices which we receive now are due to the fact that in Canada we have a market and that there are unusual circumstances at the present time. This machinery of ours, the system under which we operate, works all right in war time, but we are paying the price to keep the machinery working. There is the blood of our young men, the flower of our youth, which is being sacrificed from day to day, and which makes possible war, and the prices received at this time.

Agricultural prosperity is the very basis of national prosperity. We have not recognized that in the past. The Canadian wheat market has lagged for some time far behind the markets of the world; it was only in the fall of 1943 that we saw the Canadian markets catching up with those in the United States, and then the government stepped in and by order in council closed the grain exchange on wheat and prevented the farmer from receiving the value he might have obtained from the sale of his product.

It seems to me what we need in this whole set-up of agriculture itself and all those industries which are dependent upon it, is a new outlook, a new purpose. The purpose has to be the welfare of the producers and consumers who make up the majority of the population of our country. The basis upon which we should judge the success of the Department of Agriculture should be the living conditions of those engaged in that industry. If we were to use that as the basis of our judgment of the Department of Agriculture there is no doubt as to the verdict. It has failed entirely. If it is to be judged by the standard of living of the operators of the grain exchanges, those who run and operate the packing houses, the millers, the finance and mortgage loan companies, the bank directors and machine companies, then we can say that the agricultural industry of Canada has been a great success. The farmer who produces the product has no control at all of the price at which it shall be sold. The grain exchange, which was permitted to operate for years in the city of Winnipeg, dictated to him the price he was to receive for his toil. The milling industries, closely interlocked with the banking and financial interests of this country through directorships, received the product of his toil, sold it to the consumers east and west, placed a price on bread to the baker, and the consumers paid their price for the farmer's product. The consumer and the producer should be working together in cooperative organizations, interlocked with wholesale cooperatives, to see that each got his proper share of the toil of the other, to exchange their toil on equitable terms and not allow those in the middle to clean up.

The farmer who raises stock must hand his product over to the packers and they control the prices. Recently a group of farmers in western Canada had a large quantity of feed cattle—cows in this case—ready for the market. They were told that there was no price on the market, no market there. The impression was created among those people that there was no room in the packing plants for those cattle. But we find that the packing companies were around offering seven and a half cents a pound for them. There must have been room somewhere. The packers tried to create the idea that there was a scarcity of room in the packing plants, or that there were no facilities for transportation, or something like that, but all the time there was a below-market price being offered by the packing companies. That seems to point to the fact that there is need of some control somewhere. Apparently they can create surpluses when they are required, and all kinds of excuses can be used.

The milk producers find themselves in the same position when they try to sell dairy products to the large private monopolistic organizations that handle dairy products in the cities. The fruit producers found, although they did organize a cooperative in the Okanagan valley, that when they came to sell their products there was only one avenue through which to sell them and at a low price, in most cases a price below the cost of production. When the consumer comes to buy that commodity in the market the price is at the top. The same thing applies to farm machinery. When the agricultural producer goes to buy anything in the way of farm machinery he finds that apparently there is an agreement between companies with regard to prices. These things should not be. When it comes to repairs the price continues to rise year after year. Apparently there is no control, no price ceiling. The farmers should have cooperative organizations whereby they could manufacture their own farm machinery and own their own factories. That seems to be about the only solution.

When the farmer requires financial aid he has to go to the bank or the mortgage company. When wheat is at $2 a bushel money is loose. The farmer may borrow a couple of thousand dollars and believes he will need only 1,000 bushels of wheat to pay off the debt.

But he finds when he comes to pay off the debt a few years later, that the price has gone away down. Instead of 1,000 bushels taking care of the debt he finds he has to grow 5,000, 6,000 or 8,000 bushels. Interest rates are away beyond what they should be. Mortgage and loan companies make him sign agreements containing clauses that are almost criminal. Legal fees are permitted which are disgraceful. The farmer finds himself constantly in debt. There are clauses in the agreement which make it almost impossible for him to meet his obligations, and foreclosure is usually the ultimate result.

When war broke out the government froze the price of commodities at one level and left the farmer's cost of production away higher than the price at which the commodity had to be sold. The farmer, realizing how he was the victim of so much exploitation, organized cooperatives in an attempt to solve the problem. Large groups organized cooperatively and said, we must enter into the purchasing field and control the sale of our commodities; we must have something to do with the sale of our products. The first thing they found was that it was opposed in almost every direction. The history of the Saskatchewan Cooperative Wheat Pool is a record of attempts by farmers to solve this problem in the marketing field in a cooperative way. They attempted to sell their products and return the actual sale of the products to those who produced them, so that all would share equally in the fruit of the toil. However, they found there were regulations set up against them. The grain board decided to step into the field. Storage facilities were required. Government regulations soon stepped in and prevented the farmer from delivering his grain to his own elevator at his own point. He was told there was a shortage of cars when he wanted to sell his grain to his own pool elevator. He was told: "You cannot sell your wheat to your own elevator. Since your elevator is filled you have to sell to those other line elevator companies. We will not permit you—"

Mr. GARDINER: He did not have to sell it at all.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: "We will not permit you to sell it there because the elevator space is used up."

Mr. GARDINER: He did not have to sell it; the government took it over at an advance.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: He still has to deliver the grain to the line elevators.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Is there not a shortage of cars?

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Why should that distribution be used to militate against the farmers cooperative organization?

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): It has not.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Why did they not allocate the cars in proportion to the business which these companies did in 1938, 1939 and 1940?

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): They received their fair share.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: No, they did not. If you look over the records you will find that during the past year, instead of the cooperative business increasing as it should have year by year, and as it had done since 1935, the percentage of grain handled by the Saskatchewan pool elevator companies has gradually decreased. That decrease has taken place since the wheat board regulations came in, and the regulations with regard to the allotment of cars were put into force. Had the normal trend of business continued its upward graph their increase should have been almost sixty per cent of grain handled in 1943.

Mr. GARDINER: The distribution is based on 1938-39.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Are they getting cars on that rating?

Mr. GARDINER: At the present time, yes.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: No. That is what they were informed was going to happen last July, but suddenly an emergency situation developed. The government said: We must have six million bushels out right away, the railway companies will take it wherever they can; and the car allotment cycle was all broken up. Then they said they were going to use the 1938-39 basis, and apparently the allotment committee has ceased to function. They are permitting the railway officials at each point to distribute cars as they see fit. We are told that the thing is to be handled on a quota basis, and that the quota system has been put in operation. But, though they fixed quotas for various points throughout the west, we find that cars are not available at these points even to fill those quotas. However, I believe this comes under the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and I can deal with it when his estimates are before the committee.

It seems to me that through government boards the advantage has always been given to the ordinary grain trade, to the line elevator companies and the milling companies which have their elevators buying grain at country points. It seems that assistance is always given to the operators of large businesses on the

grain exchange. The same thing appears to be true in the packing industry. There is a floor placed under beef and pork, but there is no floor placed under cattle or hogs, which are what the farmer has to sell. If we could have an independent investigation of what has been happening in the meat packing industry in Canada; if we could ascertain the facts in regard to costs, processing, the returns to the packing firms—which in recent years have been amalgamating so that there are fewer and fewer companies in the business—and so on we would find out things that would shock every producer and consumer in this country. If the department and the government were operating in the interests of the producer and consumer they would curtail the activities of those who are exploiting the producers of this land. Apparently the government is not only condoning the actions of these people; in its legislation and regulations it appears to aid and abet and legalize their operations. The result has been quite a rapid deterioration of the rural areas across this dominion, these small rural places which were the centre of good living in this country. What is required is the establishment of parity prices, not only for the duration of the war and six months after, but for three or four years ahead at a time. There should be proper producer representation on the marketing boards. We should not have the government pick out some people they want to have representing the producers; we should have the producers themselves meet democratically and select from their own organizations those who would represent their point of view and their interests on these boards.

I think one of the most effective contributions that could be made by the government to assist agriculture at this time would be the setting up of government or cooperative abattoirs throughout the country, where large surpluses of meat could be properly processed and held in storage, so that a large bank of food might be built up for the years of world scarcity which must necessarily follow this war; for the longer the war lasts the greater will be the need for such relief.

We should have the establishment on a cooperative basis of credit corporations and marketing and processing plants for each branch of agriculture, and assistance should be given those farmers who have endeavoured to organize their own cooperative farm machinery plants.

Governmental machinery should be set up for the proper estimation of the world supply and the world production. We know that in Argentine and other parts of the world cattle production is being increased to an extent almost equal to the increase that has taken place in Canada. A long-range view must be taken of the possible world requirements and world production, in order to see what may be Canada's part in supplying the world with the food it is going to require.

I believe we should also take into consideration the nutritional standards and needs of this country of ours. Recent surveys made by service organizations and clubs throughout the country reveal some shocking conditions in regard to the nutrition of our people. Surely a country which can produce in one year ten times more wheat than it can eat should not be a land in which malnutrition and want prevail. What is wrong with this country of ours, when in almost every city we had thousands of people in need of food? Just before the war we found that in a place like Saint John, New Brunswick, there was considerable want and privation because the people were unable to obtain the food they required, while within a hundred miles of that city farmers growing potatoes could not get rid of them at fifteen or twenty cents for a three-bushel barrel. When we see things like that we realize that there must be something wrong with the distribution of foodstuffs in this country. There seems to be no purpose at all, no definite aim in connection with providing our people with the things they require. It seems to be a matter of enterprise, saying, "Well, let us get control of the food and we will deliver it if there is money in it. If we cannot get our price the people will not eat. If the people cannot pay for it or if we cannot get our profit from both the producer and the consumer, then they can do without".

In regard to the matter of research, government assistance in this connection is long overdue, but there is something more needed. For far too long the benefits of the work done by the research laboratories of this and other countries have not been made available to the people themselves. Some private concern gets hold of the patent rights to a particular process and holds it up, saying, "Well, if it is going to interfere with our own industry we shall not let it be used". In other words, if synthetic rubber is going to interfere with rubber business, stop it; if the making of alcohol is going to interfere with the oil business, do not make the process available except at our price. But there are countries that are making progress along this line, and Canada had better wake up. There are countries where the benefits of science and research are being made available to the people as a whole. There are countries that are beginning

to use their natural resources for the benefit of all the people, where the concern of the department of agriculture and other government departments is the welfare of the people and not the profits of the few. We should be setting our house in order now.

The experience of those people who laboured so hard for so many years, only to see their homes deteriorating and their equities disappearing, has created bitterness and resentment against those who have been responsible for the policies of this dominion in the past. A few promises made at election time or a few increases in prices every four years are not going to allay their fears or restore their faith in those who have been responsible for the policies of this country for so many years. The agriculturists of Canada have lost faith. It is plain that there must be a new purpose and new concern on the part of those who govern. The interests and welfare of those who work on the land must be considered before the interests of a few privileged people.

Increased tenancy across this land must be stopped. The welfare of agriculture is too closely linked up with the economy, health and social welfare of the people of Canada to be longer neglected. We have to stop the exploitation of those who to-day, apparently assisted by government regulations, are able to make themselves affluent at the expense and the toil of the producers in agriculture across this land.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Before we commence a detailed discussion of the items I should like to bring to the attention of the minister two telegrams received from my own constituency, because they indicate that out there conditions in respect to the marketing of live stock are far from satisfactory.

The first of these telegrams is dated at Lethbridge, Alberta, February 16, and states:

> Our information indicates could conservatively expect 1275 to 1375 for lambs f.o.b. Choice fed lambs selling St. Paul 16 cents less duty two fifty freight one dollar add exchange 125. Our price now eleven cents and orders light only a few ewes moving at five cents which is ruinous. Cow situation materially improved but offering price for top steers has slipped to 1150 on instructions from Toronto heavy steers very draggy. Feed grain situation deteriorating rapidly due to heavy movement east and United States will be shipping grain back here before fall or else live stock will be liquidated. Government meddling seems to have no end but chaos. If moisture conditions do not improve beyond reasonable hope western stock men face a major disaster as result of this grain policy.

This is signed by C. O. Asplund, for the Lethbridge stock feeders' association.

I have another telegram which reached me this morning. It is dated at Magrath, Alberta, February 17, and is as follows:

> Lambs selling two dollars hundred less than last year little demand approximately twenty five thousand Welling Magrath and Spring Coulee lambs heavy should have gone weeks ago no buyers for fat ewes at any price serious situation heavy steers wanted last year this year small cattle wanted choice steers difficult to sell at lower price demand for cows slightly improved no hay oats or barley obtainable wheat prices out of line with live stock prices.

This is signed by E. Pingarie Tanner and Mayor H. Tilston Jones, president of the board of trade.

I have had this matter of selling finished live stock before parliament now for several days. I believe I first mentioned it on February 7. A few days ago the minister dealt with the matter in a rather optimistic manner, indicating that all was well. I point out that if we are to maintain our food production at a standard which will provide plenty for our people, and enable us to contribute as we ought to the rehabilitation of the conquered countries, certainly we must have more intelligence prevailing in the Department of Agriculture than has prevailed thus far in connection with live stock.

I do not know just what is the matter. I hate to think there is neglect or stupidity. I hate to think there is lack of vision; but certainly there is something dreadfully wrong, when we realize that there are 25,000 lambs in Welling, Magrath and Spring Coulee, just three places in my constituency, and that those lambs cannot be moved, although they should have gone long ago. When one thinks of the loss occasioned to feeders who have to keep that live stock in their corrals, awaiting sales, one realizes the extent to which public confidence is being destroyed.

In Canada we have a strange situation. We have had meatless Tuesdays for I do not know how long. We have had meat rationing, and people have been led to believe that there is a shortage. Now look at this! What are we to gather from a situation of this kind? I find myself utterly at a loss to understand. I have not discussed the question of sheep sales on other occasions, but have confined my remarks to beef. It seems to me that these two telegrams indicate a serious situation.

Another condition has evidently developed in western Canada as a result of what appeared to be a wise provision, namely, that of sending a quantity of our surplus grain to the east. I presume, for reasons which no one would have been expected to foresee, shortages have developed. We find one telegram complaining that they are unable to buy hay, oats or barley, to keep their cattle in good condition. That telegram comes from an area in which vast quantities of

oats, wheat and barley are produced. Yet the grain has been moved out to the extent that they are now unable to buy it, and a serious condition has developed.

Before taking my seat I wish to discuss one other question, namely, that related to the beet sugar industry in Canada. I find myself completely confounded by the lack of interest in the welfare of our country manifested by many people in high places, so far as sugar production is concerned. I pointed out in 1936, and again in 1937, 1938 and 1939 what ought to be done in Canada in connection with sugar. But there was a number of wise smart Alecks who thought they knew all about it, and would not listen to anyone, in the belief that we had plenty of sugar. Now we see the position we are in! Sugar rationed painfully! Only five or six days ago the sugar controller announced that we might expect a worse condition, so far as sugar supplies are concerned, in 1944 and 1945. How can men who will allow conditions like that lay claim to having ordinary intelligence?

On behalf of the beet growers in western Canada requests have been made for a rebate of part of the excise tax levied against them, so as to enable them to cover the additional labour costs, trucking and other expenses which have grown out of the war. Thus far we have not had a word from the government. The Minister of Agriculture has not condescended to give us any information in the matter, and the Minister of Finance maintains a strict silence.

Mr. GARDINER: The Minister of Finance had intended at the opening of to-day's sitting to make a statement with respect to sugar. However, other matters intervened. He had to leave the chamber, and upon leaving he asked me if I would stand aside at eight o'clock long enough to permit him to make that statement. He will be here at eight o'clock to make it.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I certainly appreciate that, because I am disturbed with regard to this matter. In Canada we are able to produce sugar of a very high quality, and at a very low price. There is no reason in the world why the people of this country should be short of sugar or should have to pay a high price for it. As I pointed out to the house in 1941, in 1937 the Canadian sugar factory at Raymond received less than four cents a pound for its sugar, and at that price made substantial profits for itself and the farmers. When hon. members compare four cents a pound with the price we have been paying for sugar, not only in 1937 but in subsequent years, they will realize that something is terribly wrong. Somebody is mismanaging the whole show. I am glad the minister announced that something is going to be done and I hope the rebate is to be given.

Mr. GARDINER: I did not say what was to be done; I said an announcement would be made.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I hope the announcement will indicate that the people in charge of the sugar affairs of Canada do not intend to penalize the Canadian people and make them go short of sugar when we can produce it in great abundance. I wished to bring these two matters to the attention of the minister and let him comment upon them as he sees fit. I do not think I shall say anything more at the present time.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I have one or two observations to make in connection with what was said a little while ago by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) about research. It is well understood that the prosperity of agriculture and of industry is dependent upon the prosperity of each other. One hundred years ago four-fifths of the products of the farm were used by man; at the present time I understand only about one-third of these products are consumed by the people. Perhaps that is one of our difficulties to-day. We must get more people back on the farms and consume more.

I should like to point out that the chemical industry of the United States invests between two and four per cent of its receipts from sales in research. Agriculture in that country invests only one-seventh of one per cent of its revenue. That is an interesting comparison. In 1938 an act of congress established four regional laboratories in the United States which were to consider the problem of the industrial utilization of agricultural surpluses, by-products and waste products. The discoveries were to become the property of the nation under the general service patent regulations. I mention that only to indicate that the amount of money proposed to be spent by the minister on research is quite small. The results of such research affect not only the farmer but also the industrial worker in the city.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): I should like to refer to some of the remarks of the hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. Castleden). As I remember, his first statement was that Canada had lagged far behind the rest of the world in the price of wheat.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I said that the Winnipeg grain exchange had lagged behind.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): At any rate, that our price of wheat had lagged behind the rest of the world. A moment later the hon. member mentioned the price of wheat in the United States. I admit that the price of wheat in Canada is lower than the price in the United States, but it has been higher than in any other country during all the time the hon. member was speaking of.

Mr. GARDINER: Except Great Britain.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Except in Great Britain where it has been subsidized quite heavily.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I suppose European conditions would be satisfactory to the hon. member? I was just talking about the western hemisphere.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): No doubt the hon. member does not remember what I say in this house at times, but last year I endeavoured to set out what I thought was the position in regard to the world grain situation. One of my hon. friends across the floor of the house mentioned that to-day and said I was about right in what I said last year. I am a little more careful about statements I make in regard to grain and farming and I think I know a little more about those things than my hon. friend. He has made some of the wildest statements in regard to all these things. Many such statements are made from the other side, or at least from that corner. The other day the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Douglas) put a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, as reported on page 302 of *Hansard,* of February 9. He said:

> I want to remind the Minister of Trade and Commerce that about fifty-four per cent of the 1942 crop was sold by the farmers on the open market, and that they will get no benefit out of the participation certificates, or any increased price for that wheat.

One would think the hon. member for Weyburn knew what he was talking about when he said that, but that is not the fact. I doubt if my hon. friend knows more about the actual figures than I do, but I should like to make a prediction and I think it will be as true as any I ever made. I would say that there was under forty per cent of the 1942 crop sold on the open market and over sixty per cent sold to the wheat board. The farmers will get participation certificates on that sixty per cent or more sold to the wheat board. That is considerably different from fifty-four per cent.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): That is the information the chairman of the wheat board gave the agriculture committee last year.. The hon. member was a member of that committee.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): I do not remember the chairman of the wheat board giving any such information as my hon. friend says he did. I do not think anyone has given the information he is speaking of. The wheat was not delivered at that time.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): The 1942 crop.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): The 1942-43 crop; that is the 1942 crop. Every time the minister's estimates come up we have criticism year after year by my hon. friends. They have always criticized the policies brought down by the Minister of Agriculture. If they will go back and consider the position of agriculture in years gone by when different policies were brought down by the then Minister of Agriculture they will find that the present minister has been dead right all the time. When he brought down his policy of subsidizing the growing of coarse grains in western Canada my hon. friend and others criticized him sharply, but where would this country have been if he had not brought down such a policy and emphasized the growing of coarse grains for the feeding of live stock?

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Who criticized that?

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Members on that side of the house; many of them.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): No.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Just look at *Hansard.* The hon. member for Yorkton has criticized the wheat board, but let me say that that board has done a remarkable job in handling the wheat of this country. The same can be said for our railway companies.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: A good job for the line elevator companies.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): My hon. friend does not know the difference between the line elevator companies and the Winnipeg grain exchange. A moment ago he said that the Winnipeg grain exchange set the price of wheat. The Winnipeg grain exchange is simply a trading place for traders to get together and it has nothing to do with setting the price of wheat. It is the traders who come there who set the price of wheat when they trade one against the other. No one can set the price of wheat in this country when there is an open market. If we get into the position where we have the policies in force which my hon. friends want to put into force, they will be able to set the price of wheat and then—I was going to say, "God help the farmer if they ever do."

At six oclock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Progress reported.

EXCESS PROFITS

MODIFICATION OF LIMITATION OF TAX ADVANTAGE IN RESPECT OF CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS BY BUSINESS CONCERNS

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): There are two brief statements which I think I should make to the house. The first is in respect of charitable donations.

The house will recall that on January 31 I made a statement indicating the government's intention to introduce at the time of the budget a measure limiting the tax advantage which may be obtained by a business concern making contributions to charitable organizations. I announced at that time that in respect of contributions subscribed after January 31, 1944, the tax advantage obtainable by a business concerned, whether corporate or otherwise, should not be greater than that obtained by a comparable business not subject to tax at the 100 per cent rate.

In the meantime I have received many representations from various organizations asking for clarification and expressing great concern over the possible effect of this proposed amendment on their ability to secure the funds needed to carry on their activities. As a result of these representations, and the quite widespread comment on this subject in the press and elsewhere, I should like to make a further statement on the matter.

First of all I should like to explain more fully and restate to the house the facts of the present situation relating to tax deductions in respect of charitable contributions which, to the government, seemed clearly to call for some safeguarding measure.

Mr. GRAYDON: Is this only in connection with excess profits tax?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. GRAYDON: Not income tax?

Mr. ILSLEY: Oh, that is right; it only affects business concerns. I think I had better not interject anything; it is quite clear.

The present law allows a business concern as a deduction in computing profits subject to tax an amount not exceeding 5 per cent of its income which has been paid by way of donation within the tax year to any charitable organization in Canada operated exclusively as such and not for the benefit of private gain or profit of any person. As a result of allowing this deduction in computing profits for tax purposes, the government forgoes collecting tax which would otherwise be due. In effect, then, the government can be said to be subsidizing charitable activities. Before the war, when the corporation income tax rate was 15 per cent, the government relinquished 15 cents of tax revenue on every dollar contributed to charity by the ordinary industrial corporation. To-day, when the minimum tax payable by corporations is 40 per cent, the government gives up at least 40 cents in tax for every dollar of charitable contributions made by the corporations. The minimum tax advantage to-day in making contributions to charity is more than two and one-half times greater than it was pre-war. It can scarcely be argued, then, I think, that the government incentive towards charitable giving is ungenerous or that the importance of maintaining the flow of donations is overlooked. It is true, of course, that the heavy weight of taxation, both on business concerns and individuals, leaves fewer dollars to devote towards charity, but while the weight of taxation has increased the incentive towards giving has likewise increased.

I have just referred to the case where a company is paying a 40 per cent tax rate. No problem can be said to exist in this situation. In making a contribution towards charity of, say, $100, the company is parting with $60 of shareholder money. The situation which gives rise to the problem, however, is where the business concern is paying tax at the rate of 100 per cent on excess profits. In this situation a contribution to charity reduces the company's tax bill by exactly the same amount. Under these circumstances the company which ostensibly makes a donation to charity is doing so entirely at the expense of the treasury. The company, of course, loses its right to a subsequent 20 per cent refund on the amount contributed. In the light of this situation it is easy to understand the statement which I made in the house on January 31 that business concerns are being solicited on a wholesale scale to make unusually large contributions to various non-profit organizations.

I think I need do no more than mention this situation in order for the house to see the necessity for some safeguarding provision beyond that now obtaining in the law. Otherwise the way is open for an abuse of the privileges in the law which could result in a very serious diversion of public funds into channels which, while extremely desirable in themselves, can in the war period scarcely be regarded as of an urgency equal to that of finding funds to finance the war.

For the reasons I have just stated the government does not feel it can depart from the general principle of the proposed limitation on the tax advantage to be secured by business concerns in making charitable contributions. The government is willing, however, to make a modification which I think effectively removes any possible criticism of the proposed restriction. The modification is intended to enable business concerns to continue without loss of tax advantage, the level of charitable giving which they had established prior to the coming into force of the 100 per cent excess profits tax rate.

I wish, therefore, to announce that the limitation of tax advantage which I proposed on January 31, 1944, will not affect any business whose total contributions in any year are not above the average of its donations in its last two fiscal years ending before July 1, 1942, which was the date when the 100 per cent excess rate came into effect.

For example, if a company made charitable contributions totalling $8,000 in one of these two years and $12,000 in the other, its average annual contribution for the two years would be $10,000. It will then be allowed to continue to receive the full tax advantage on $10,000 of contributions in fiscal periods ending after January 31, 1944.

The proposed limitation which I announced on January 31 will apply, however, when contributions made are above the average established by the record of 1940 and 1941, as referred to in what I have said. That is, the limitation will apply to that portion of the amount of contributions not subscribed on or before January 31, 1944, which results in the total amount contributed in the tax year of the business being in excess of the average amount contributed in the last two fiscal years of the business concern ending before July 1, 1942.

The present five per cent limitation with respect to the total volume of deductions allowed will, of course, continue to operate.

Mr. GRAYDON: In other words, this means, prior to the time the tax went on, you are taking the previous two fiscal years as your base?

Mr. ILSLEY: That is right.

Mr. GRAYDON: And upon that base you are making your average so far as charitable welfare donations are concerned?

Mr. ILSLEY: Well, yes. It goes further than that, though. I do not want to muddy the waters by impromptu explanations of what I have said, because every word has to be weighed. That base is taken, and if the donation is kept within that base, the full tax advantage is obtained in respect of the donation, just as the law has been up to now; but for any excess, the tax advantage is limited to 40 per cent of the donation.

Mr. GRAYDON: The balance, then, comes under the same category as the minister's statement indicated to the house some weeks ago?

Mr. ILSLEY: That is right.

Mr. GRAYDON: It is difficult to assess the exact amount of the advantage or modification which the minister has mentioned. I should not like to express myself with respect to that at the moment. At any rate it is not debatable, and I have no intention of doing more than simply making an observation with respect to it. But I am glad he has made an announcement, for the sake of many of the institutions that have been in touch, I know, with the minister and with hon. members generally, and have felt pretty keenly and severely changes which were being made, because I fancy that, apart altogether from the position in which they found themselves, the fact that it came very quickly upon them involved them in a good deal of difficulty in making their adjustments. I am hopeful that, if the minister finds that this is not a sufficient amount by way of modification, he will not close the door entirely against any adjustment which might conceivably require to be made.

Mr. ILSLEY: I feel that this is the final notice of budget modifications in this regard. I think there has to be some finality about it, and I feel that this is the final notification.

SUGAR

PRODUCTION OF SUGAR BEETS—MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): There is one other matter. During the past few weeks the government has received representations from various parts of the country regarding sugar beets, and the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) has also drawn the matter to the attention of the house on several recent occasions. Sugar concerns both the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Finance, and I wish it to be understood that I am speaking also on behalf of my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner).

The representations to the government have been along two lines. On the one hand there have been requests for additional dominion

assistance. On the other hand the government has been asked to give, not additional assistance, but assurance that the present price structure will be maintained until the 1944 crop has been marketed.

It will be recalled that during the past two years substantial assistance has been given to the sugar beet industry by way of reductions in the excise tax. The first reduction of half a cent a pound was made in the budget of 1942, and a further reduction of half a cent by order in council, effective September, 1943. These reductions added directly to the price received by growers for their sugar beets, the increase in two years amounting to approximately twenty-five per cent.

In Alberta and Manitoba higher prices resulted in a substantial increase in acreage. In Alberta, plantings in 1943 were the largest on record, and there is every reason to believe that if weather conditions had been normal at harvest, the crop would have taxed the capacity of the two factories in that province. Unfortunately, there was considerable spoilage, the loss being estimated at around fifteen per cent. In Manitoba, acreage was slightly less than the year before, but in spite of some loss at harvest there was a record yield.

In Ontario, the situation was quite different. The increased price, which was supplemented by assistance from the Ontario government of fifty-five cents per ton, failed to stimulate plantings. Instead, acreage declined from over 20,000 acres in 1942 to less than 10,000 in 1943. Farmers preferred to raise other crops requiring less labour.

I am bringing these facts to the attention of the house because they illustrate some of the considerations which must weigh with the government in arriving at a decision in this matter. For some time the government has been encouraging the production of soy-beans and white beans, crops which are needed urgently, but which in Ontario compete with sugar beets. This is one of the reasons for the decline in sugar beet production in that province. The hon. member for Lethbridge also spoke of sugar beet growers turning to other crops in Alberta. The point I wish to make is that at this stage in our war effort a choice must be made between alternative uses of land and labour, taking into consideration the relative importance of the various products.

I might also add that even though, as some believe and as is probably true, the world outlook for sugar is less favourable now than a year ago, this does not necessarily mean that Canada should divert land and labour to the production of sugar beets in an effort to offset a possible decline in imported supplies if there are other equally or even more important uses to which these resources can be put.

The experience last year illustrates the variation between conditions in various parts of Canada. In the West, prices were sufficiently attractive to stimulate maximum plantings and should continue to be fairly satisfactory; in Ontario, the existing price level, plus the provincial subsidy, had little effect so far as can be ascertained.

After careful consideration the government has therefore come to the conclusion that it would be inadvisable to increase dominion assistance on beet sugar. Provincial governments have always taken a special interest in sugar beets, and of course I do not know whether they intend giving additional assistance to their growers.

As I said at the outset, some growers have asked for assurance that prices will not be lower during the 1944 crop year. In order to remove any fears that the government might reduce returns on sugar by altering the excise tax, I may say that the government does not intend to propose any increase in this particular tax in the forthcoming budget, nor does it intend revoking the order in council by which the latest half-cent reduction was effected, at least before the 1944 sugar beet crop has been marketed.

The dominion government, through the sugar administrator, controls the importation and sale of cane sugar, and, as additional assurance, I am in a position to say that on the basis of our present commitments and prospects there is no danger of a reduction in the price of sugar within the period during which the 1944 crop is being marketed.

I hope that this statement will provide the necessary degree of certainty as to price levels during the coming year.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): Are steps being taken by the government to reopen the sugar factory at Halifax? The Acadia Sugar Company has been closed for two years. This matter has been brought up in the house from time to time by the member for Halifax (Mr. Isnor), and it means a great deal to the province of Nova Scotia as well as to the sugar supply in Canada.

Mr. ILSLEY: It would not increase the supply of sugar in Canada by a pound. I am not aware of the authority under which the refinery at Halifax was closed or whether it was by governmental direction at all, but so far as I know no steps are being taken to open it. However, I will make inquiries and inform my hon. friend if I find that any change is planned.

Mr. ADAMSON: What is the present subsidy on sugar in Ontario?

Mr. ILSLEY: Last year it was fifty-five cents a ton.

Mr. ADAMSON: And this year?

Mr. ILSLEY: I do not know.

Mr. ADAMSON: It has not come down yet?

Mr. ILSLEY: I do not think so.

SUPPLY

The house resumed in committee of supply.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): At six o'clock I was endeavouring to answer one or two remarks of the hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. Castleden) in the speech he made prior to my rising. He was speaking of the wheat board and the way they had handled the wheat crop of the western farmer. I said I thought, and I am sure I am right, that the wheat board had done an excellent job this year in handling Canada's wheat and also all grains for the farmers not only of western Canada but also of eastern Canada and far western Canada. It must be remembered that, following the policy laid down by the Minister of Agriculture of subsidizing the shipment of grain to eastern Canada and to British Columbia for the feeding of live stock a year ago, besides all exports to the old country and to the United States, the wheat board and the railway companies were able to move some fifty-eight million bushels of grain for feed to other parts of Canada from the west. This year, from the 1st of August, the start of the crop year, to the end of December there has been moved forty-five million bushels, or seventy-six per cent of the total movement of last year. When one considers that millions of bushels are being shipped to the United States, great credit is due not only to the wheat board but to the railway companies and the railwaymen for handling the grain in the way they have done throughout the past year or two. They have had to do this while moving thousands of troops from one end of the country to the other and thousands of civilian passengers besides millions of tons of freight needed for the war. The record made by the wheat board and the railways of this country has never been surpassed, and I think they should be given credit instead of being criticized by the hon. member and others.

The hon. gentleman spoke of the government taking over wheat and not allowing the price to go up. Surely he knows better than that; he knows that was not the case. He knows that when the government took over the wheat they first of all set a price of $1.23¼ a bushel for all wheat that was in the hands of the board from 1940, 1941 and 1942 crops, and intimated that a participation certificate would be paid on that basis, less cost of handling that grain. Up to the point of taking over at a price of $1.23¼ none of that wheat is to compete with wheat of successive years. That wheat goes as lend-lease or is sold for feed or shipped to some of our allies and does not compete in any way with the crop of 1943. The crop of 1943 was taken over at $1.25 a bushel advance price and a participation certificate to the farmer, so that when the wheat is finally sold, whatever price is received for it by the government will be returned to the farmer by the participation certificate, the difference between $1.25 and whatever price the government gets for that wheat.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Why did you not do it four years ago?

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): We have always done it.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): You have never done it.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): There was always a participation certificate, and we have always told the farmer that if he sold through the wheat board he would get the participation certificate. We have not done as my hon. friends have done—gone and told the farmers that they would never get anything for it. We told them they would get something for it and they are going to get something for it.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Why did you not close the grain exchange?

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): The Minister of Trade and Commerce stated in the house the other day that the wheat now being sold to the United States was being sold at an advance, and the figures he gave are equivalent to from sixteen to twenty-two cents a bushel over $1.25. These were the figures he gave, from $1.41 to $1.47 for No. 1 northern. Each year the policy of the Minister of Agriculture has been criticized in this house, but it has paid dividends to the allies in this war. Year by year he has arranged matters so that the farmers of Canada could produce more food, and that food could not only be sold to the people of Canada but be shipped overseas for the use of our allies. He asked for meats and dairy products mainly. He asked the western farmer to cut down the growing of wheat, to increase the growing of coarse grains in order that the western farmer and the eastern farmer could produce more meat

and dairy products. How successful that policy has been is again shown by the very criticisms that come from hon. members of this house. That is why we are unable to handle all the cattle, hogs and sheep that are coming on the market. It is a physical impossibility to handle them unless you can get sufficient shipping to take the stuff out of the country as it passes through the packing plants.

I am a farmer, and I do not believe that anybody ought to rise in his place in this house and try to make out that the packers are nothing but robbers. The farmers have done a great job in producing live stock, and the packers and the men employed by the packers have done a great job in handling live stock during the war.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): The minister said it was on account of the packing plants that they could not ship.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): My hon. friend is babbling away again. The hon. member for Yorkton then went on to try to prove that the farmer was paying excess prices for practically everything that he had to buy, and that his position was not getting better, as the Minister of Agriculture said it was.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I did not say that.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): The hon. member intimated that. Let me say this: My hon. friend should have read the pamphlet that was quoted this afternoon by the hon. member from Souris, the *Economic Annalist*. The first paragraph reads:

> Preliminary figures make it possible to access the trends of prices and production in 1943. The index of wholesale prices advanced 4·3 points over that of 1942 or 4·5 per cent. The urban cost of living index was 1·6 points higher. The cost of farm family living rose 2·3 points. Wholesale prices of Canadian farm products averaged 13·4 points or 16·2 per cent higher than in 1942. The index of prices of field products was 15·1 points or 22·7 per cent higher and that of animal products was 8·0 points or 9·8 per cent higher than a year earlier. . . . The total index of Canadian farm product prices was 104·6 in December. It will be observed that this is 2·1 points above the index of wholesale prices of all commodities.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: What was it in June?

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): What was it ten years ago? What is the use of saying that?

Mr. CASTLEDEN: What was it in June?

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): As a farmer I buy and sell.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: What?

[Mr. J. G. Ross.]

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): I buy the things the farmer has to buy and I sell the things the farmer has to sell. Let me tell my hon. friend this, that there is nothing in the Dominion of Canada that has risen more in prices in the last two years than farm products.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Farm machinery has.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Farm machinery has not. Farm products have risen higher than anything during this war. When this war began I was producing hogs and getting seven cents a pound for them. Take a look at the figures to-day and see what you are getting. Take the figures for cattle and compare them with what they were at the beginning of the war. Take a look at the figures for grains, butter, cheese, every product that the farmer has to raise in this country. The price has gone up farther in comparison with that of anything else in this country, and it is to the credit of the Minister of Agriculture and this government that that has happened.

My hon. friends rise in their places in this house day after day and paint a picture of fear and trembling as to what will happen when this war is over. I am not a bit afraid of what is going to happen when the war is over; not a bit. People have short memories. Many of them think there was a great depression after the last war. There was no such thing. After the last war there were twelve years of the most prosperous times that the world has ever seen; twelve years, and most of it under a Liberal regime in this country.

Mr. GRAYDON: In spite of a Liberal regime.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Most of it under a Liberal regime. My hon. friend, if he were a farmer, would know that when a Liberal regime is in power he gets good prices for his products and the reverse is true when the Liberals are out of power.

Mr. GRAYDON: I live in a town just like my hon. friend.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): There were reasons for that prosperity after the last war, and the same reasons will hold good after this one. The men who have gone from Canada to the army, navy and air force have received a much better education than any of us in this house ever received. They have been taught to take responsibility. They have seen much more of the world than most of us have seen, and they are coming back when this war is over to take charge of this country and run it as it

should be run. I am not a bit afraid of our young people coming back here, and I hope they will take charge and run this dominion as it ought to be run. After the last war there was prosperity. Why? Because Great Britain and the United States made some billions of dollars available to the countries in Europe for the purchase of food products and raw material to rehabilitate themselves. That started the prosperity. Then during the last war many new processes and new inventions were developed which were put into commercial use after the war. These things in commercial use created more buying power, more distribution of wealth, and that prosperity continued for twelve years. We know now that when this war is over there will not be a few billions but hundreds of billions of dollars of credits made available by the united nations in ordered to rehabilitate the unfortunate countries of the world. We know also that science and invention have worked out new processes and inventions in this war a hundredfold compared with the last war. I am satisfied that when this war is over we shall have prosperity for at least twenty-five years. But you must have a policy to help it along.

After the last war we had trouble with wheat. We had been asked to place every available acre in wheat during the last war, and the farmers in western Canada based their economy on wheat. When the war was over there was apparently more wheat than could properly be handled in the world wheat trade at that time. After this war it is going to be not only wheat but cattle, hogs, sheep, butter, cheese, eggs and poultry, and practically every farm product that one can think of, barley, oats, rye, flax. We are going to have a surplus of every one of them in this country when the war is over, because we have all of these commodities at the peak of production. What are we going to do with them when the war is over? What is the solution? If this government and other governments do not agree to follow out the Atlantic charter, do not agree to drop tariffs altogether, and allow trade to flow freely from one country to another, then there will eventually be chaos and trouble in the world. But if we will follow sound Liberal policy when this war is over, then prosperity can continue throughout the world and everyone can have more of the world's goods.

The leader of the opposition, the hon. member for Peel, spoke of the discussion that took place last year in regard to research laboratories. I was very glad to note that everyone in the house agreed with the suggestion made at that time that we should go farther into agricultural research in this country, and I am pleased to see that this year the government has increased the amount of money available for that purpose. I agree with the hon. member for Peel, however, that this amount is not large enough even yet. After parliament adjourned I had an opportunity of going to the United States and being shown through one of the large laboratories set up by the government of that country. Of course it had to handle a great many more products than would be handled in any one of our regional laboratories.

Mr. GRAYDON: Might I ask where that was?

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): This one was at Albany, California; and the hon. member will realize that with the varied production on the west coast of the United States, they have many more matters to deal with than we would have in any single section of Canada, since their products range all the way from practically tropical fruits to the things grown in the temperate zone. This laboratory cost something in the neighbourhood of a million dollars, while the equipment cost something like half a million dollars. Of course we would not have to expend that amount of money, but if we desired to put up a proper laboratory we would have to spend more than two or three hundred thousand dollars.

A great deal of this work in Canada has been done in the past by the research council, by universities throughout the country and by the Department of Agriculture at its experimental farms. A good deal of research work can be carried on in that way, but if you are really going to get down to the business of research in agricultural products you must locate one laboratory somewhere to get started with, and there is a very good reason for that. In this laboratory you will have different branches, with men working on different products. In order to run it economically and well you will require, above all these different departments, an analytical branch with highly trained men and very intricate machines which cost a great deal of money. Therefore, in order that all the different branches may get the benefit of these highly trained technical men and these machines, it is necessary that the work be carried on in one laboratory. That organization should not be part of the research council here; it should be separate and apart, for

agricultural research. We must see to it that the newest types of machines are purchased for this laboratory, and I would suggest that before the remainder of the $200,000 runs out on March 31, the minister should see if he cannot purchase some of the machines that are needed, and at least we shall get that far along. Then we can use the money which is to be voted this year, and possibly more in the supplementary estimates, to carry research work farther.

Mr. GRAYDON: Are these machines readily available?

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): I am not so sure of that. I do not know. I should think some of them would be hard to get, but I am sure some machines and some equipment could be procured now. No doubt some of the more intricate machines will be very difficult to obtain until after the war.

Mr. SENN: May I ask the hon. member if he has any knowledge whatever of the workings of the National Chemurgic Society. Has he made any study of the work of that society?

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): I have read some of their pamphlets dealing with the set-up of the laboratories which have been established in Washington, but I have not attended any of the conventions of the National Chemurgic Society. The work of these laboratories has been considerably changed since the beginning of the war. When they were first started they were intended to work on agricultural products, to find new uses for them; but since the war a large part of their work has been in connection with the dehydration, freezing and packaging of goods in order that they may be used during the war.

Mr. WOOD: I should like to supplement the remarks of the hon. member for Moose Jaw. I wish to thank him for his most vigorous speech in defence of the cause of the farmer. I believe that if farming is to retain its rightful place in this country we need more people with faith in that branch of industry, rather than people who are always crying about it. After all, farming is not an easy job; it takes strong, virile men, men with ambition, men who are prepared to pit their physical energies against all the elements. Farming is only for capable people, so that we expect to have sharing in the joys of agriculture only those of our citizens who are ambitious and physically able to do a hard job.

However, this is not really what I intended to say. I was interested in the remarks of the hon. member for Yorkton, who complained because farm prices in the United States were so much higher than in Canada. Well, you know, it is only human to magnify fault and belittle virtue, and sometimes distant pastures seem green. Let us analyse the situation for a moment. Only about three weeks ago I happened to have a farmer from Michigan in my stable, looking at the hogs I was producing, and I asked what he was getting for hogs in his state. He told me he was being paid $13.90 at his farm, live weight. Well, I was getting close to $13 for my hogs, live weight, and he had to pay a good deal more for his feed than I did. We have had the advantage of the subsidy of $4.50 on freight from the west, and we have had the benefit of the price ceiling, which they do not have in the United States. This man was paying almost fifty per cent more for his feed than I was paying, so that when the hon. member for Yorkton makes a statement of the kind he did he should at least qualify it by pointing out the different conditions that exist. Farmers in the United States may be receiving more for some of their products, but it is costing them far more to produce those commodities than it costs in Canada, due to our price control policy.

There is another thing I should like to bring to the attention of the committee. In consequence of this unpopular control policy which was inflicted upon us, let us see what is happening. I notice a question was asked by the hon. member for Mackenzie as to the public debt of Canada. The farmers to some extent are responsible for the payment of that debt. The answer to the hon. member's question, as it appears at page 574 of *Hansard,* shows that on March 31, 1943 the per capita public debt of Canada was $523.44.

I hold in my hand a statement from the *Herald Tribune* of New York. This issue of February 14 sets out the gross public debt and guaranteed obligations in the United States. The figure is $183 billion, or a per capita debt of $1,410, when spread over their population of 130 million. That is their debt, compared with ours of only $523.44. Our debt will probably increase to some extent, but I am prepared to say that the per capita debt of the Canadian farmer, in so far as his contribution to the total amount is concerned, is only one-half the load carried by farmers in the United States.

Does that mean anything to the hon. member for Yorkton? I think he would show a great deal more wisdom if, when analysing these economic questions he would lay both sides of the question before the people, instead of trying to show only those things he wished to show, or attempting to have the people believe only those things he wishes them to believe.

In his analysis he leaves out important facts which have contributed to the general welfare of the people of Canada.

This evening I intend to discuss these estimates at somewhat greater length than I have in the past. First I would draw the attention of the committee to some newspaper clippings I sometimes tear out of a local newspaper, the *Globe and Mail*. I used to take it regularly, and even now I read it occasionally. I got a copy this morning before I had breakfast, because I do not like to read it after I have had a full meal.

Mr. GRAYDON: That shows the hon. member's poor judgment; do not blame the *Globe and Mail*.

Mr. WOOD: I will give my judgment of the hon. member in a moment or two. This Winnipeg dispatch states:

> Farm Mortgages being Cleared Up
>
> Prosperity among farmers is reflected in the number of mortgages, some of them of many years standing, that are being retired. . . . The Manitoba Farm Loans Association announces that farmers are clearing their holdings faster than ever before, and in this respect the record for the year was about fifty per cent better than for the previous year.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): That is where they have had good government for twenty years.

Mr. WOOD: Here is another newspaper clipping which is headed "Farm incomes at high level", and states that farm incomes in 1943 totalled $1,397 million, or almost double what it was at the beginning of the war. That is about five times as much as it was when the party of hon. members opposite had put us in the last depths of degradation and poverty in 1932, as a consequence of their judgment.

I have before me another short item bearing date of February 16, and headed "Farm income from milk up $28 million in 1943." I am not saying the farmers are getting too much, but I do share the view of the hon. member for Moose Jaw who has said that in consequence of policies in force to-day we are making rapid progress, and going ahead probably just as fast as any other country.

In 1932—and I hate to mention this, but I believe I must do so, following the interjection of the hon. member for Peel—I sold pork for $3.25 a hundredweight. To-day I can get as much for one pig as I got for six of them in those days. Of course we know that at that time prices were lower in Canada than they had ever been. One would have to go back to the time of Queen Elizabeth to find a parallel.

In 1930, when the Liberal government was turned out of office, our trade stood fifth among the nations of the world. That is, there were only four nations which had a greater volume of trade than did Canada. In 1932 we had gone down to seventh place, and we stayed there until 1935, when a Liberal government was returned to power. Some may say that that was a period of world depression. True, there was a world-wide depression; but it was only incidental that Canada belonged to that same world both before and during the depression, and that she was shoved down from fifth to seventh place in consequence of policies in force at that time?

Mr. GRAYDON: Is the hon. member sure of his facts?

Mr. GARDINER: Yes; certainly he is.

Mr. GRAYDON: I would like to challenge that.

Mr. WOOD: The hon. member has the same source that I had from which to get his information.

In 1935 we stood seventh among the trading nations of the world. By the time war broke out in 1939 we were back to fifth place, and to-day we stand fourth.

Mr. GARDINER: Third.

Mr. SENN: First.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Yes; make it first.

Mr. GRAYDON: Be generous.

Mr. WOOD: There never was a time when the people of Canada exported as much as they did in 1943. The export trade for January is $64 million higher than it was in the preceding month. My only regret is that so much of that has had to be trading in weapons of destruction, and human slaughter machinery. We do not gloat over that kind of trade.

The fact remains, however, that in 1943 we shipped $775 million worth of agricultural products. That is, we are one of the nations which has been in a position to feed itself, and at the same time sell food products to the value I have mentioned. And on top of that, as Madame Chiang Kai-shek said, we have made the greatest contribution per capita in munitions that has been made by any of the united nations—as well as in our manpower. These things do not happen by accident.

Mr. GRAYDON: That was an afterthought.

Mr. WOOD: They result, of course, from some of the unfortunate regulations to which we have been committed. But we as Liberals believe we should share the happiness and enjoyments of our country in times of peace with the great masses of our people and by the

same token, in time of distress, when 775,000 of our boys are regimented into fighting for your liberty and mine, we should share with them some of the burdens and hardships they are asked to bear.

Mr. BOUCHER: "Regimentation" is a good word to use.

Mr. WOOD: Exactly. When a soldier goes to war he expects regimentation. I think that we civilians should accept with better grace than some of the opposition have the restrictions that have been put upon us. I hope that six months after the war they will be as few as possible and we can get back again where under honest Liberal policies we can carry on with as little a measure of restriction as possible.

Mr. GRAYDON: You should not have sounded that last unhappy note. Otherwise your speech was pretty good.

Mr. WRIGHT: I do not propose to make an omnibus speech at this time and try to cover the number of subjects hon. members who have preceded me have tried to cover. I was rather amazed to hear the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Wood) try to explain that during the ten years before this war it was only the Progressive Conservative party that had created hard times. I think most of us who were farmers during the period between the two wars remember that there was a lot of hard times.

Before taking up the subject with which I wish to deal, I should like to say a few words in reply to the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Ross). I judged from his remarks that the prosperity the farmer is enjoying at the present time—he is enjoying a certain amount—a great deal more than he has done for a long time is due entirely to the Department of Agriculture and the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): A good part of it.

Mr. WRIGHT: I have an idea that there was a war on and that had considerable to do with the present position of agriculture. The same Minister of Agriculture was in power from 1935 to 1939, four years during which we did not have a war and during which, as I remember, agriculture was not too prosperous. The hon. member also stated that the twelve years after the last war were the most prosperous as far as agriculture was concerned.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): As far as the whole country was concerned.

Mr. WRIGHT: I served four years in the last war. I came back from overseas, took up land in western Canada and bought my seed wheat in 1920 for $2.60 a bushel, and in 1921 when the Liberal government were in power I got 67 cents a bushel for my wheat.

Mr. GARDINER: There was no Liberal government in power in 1921. Mr. Meighen was in power all through 1921.

Mr. WRIGHT: They were in power shortly after that and prices did not increase very much.

Mr. GARDINER: Prices went up.

Mr. WRIGHT: I sold my wheat at the same price in 1922 when they were in power.

The matter I wanted to discuss was in connection with the price of grass and clover seeds. This year the special products marketing board has taken over the complete marketing of grass and clover seeds, all domestic requirements being handled through that board. The result is not very satisfactory as far as the producers of clover seed is concerned. Last fall when the board took over the marketing of these seeds they intimated to the cooperatives and to the buyers of grass seed that they should give the farmers participation certificates. Some of the buyers complied with this request, but there were others who did not.

The price received by the growers of alfalfa seed—I am dealing with alfalfa seed more particularly, but I think my remarks apply equally well to red clover and alsike seed—last year in the district from which I come was thirty-eight cents a pound for No. 1 commercial seed, and forty cents a pound for No. 1 registered seed, when they were marketed through the cooperative. Last year the ceiling price on alfalfa seed was thirty-seven cents a pound, but there was no restriction as far as export was concerned. Out of a total crop of some 4,500,000 pounds of alfalfa seed, somewhere in the neighbourhood of 2,000,000 pounds were exported. The additional price received on export balanced the domestic price and gave to the producer approximately thirty-eight cents a pound for No. 1 commercial seed.

This year the government has taken over the export of seed and has established certain prices. According to a return tabled yesterday on the motion of the hon. member for York East (Mr. McGregor), the export price is 34½ cents a pound. According to information which I have, approximately ten per cent of the crop available in Canada this year will be exported. If these figures are correct, and I believe they are approximately correct, it means that this year the producer of alfalfa seed will receive at the farm only from thirty

to thirty-one cents a pound for the grade of seed for which he received thirty-eight cents a pound last year.

I realize why the government has taken the step it has this year. Last year a large proportion of our seed was exported, and in the spring of the year we found that we did not have enough to meet our domestic requirements. The result was that we had to use a lot of second and third grade seed. I imagine that it was to prevent the same thing occurring this year that the government has taken over the whole crop and is controlling export. However, I do not see why the producer of alfalfa seed should bear the brunt of this action. He is facing a loss of from eight to ten cents a pound.

In almost every other case where the government have acted in a like manner a subsidy has been paid to the producer to give him something near the price he would receive had he been allowed to use the export market. I understand that the government are sending most of their exports to Great Britain. If they were using the United States market they could get a much better price than 34½ cents a pound. I have no objection to the government supplying the British market because I think that is as it should be, but I do not think the producers of alfalfa and clover seeds should be asked to take a rap of that kind. A subsidy should be paid to these growers which would give them a price which would approximate what they received last year for their seed.

The growing of alfalfa seed is a hazardous business because it is only once out of every three years that you get a reasonable crop, and sometimes not that. When one considers the hazards and cost of production a price of thirty-eight cents a pound is not unfair. If the figures which have been tabled are correct I would think that the prices received this year will not be such as to encourage men continuing in the production of seed. I happen to represent a district which produces probably more alfalfa seed than any other place in the Dominion of Canada, and I know that because of the cost of production and other hazards the acreage has been reduced during the last two or three years. Encouragement must be given to these people to continue in production because this seed is essential to agriculture in eastern Canada and in other parts of the world. There is a real demand for alfalfa seed outside Canada, one which we will be able to supply if we encourage our producers. I should like the minister to make a statement as to the situation with regard to clover seed and grass seed at the present time, and what the producer can likely expect to get as a return on his participation certificates if the prices are realized.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I did not intend to make any extended remarks. I had one or two questions I wanted to ask the minister; but I do want to refer to one or two things said by the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Ross). The hon. member for Moose Jaw takes the hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. Castleden) to task for referring to the Winnipeg grain exchange as setting prices. Well, the hon. member for Moose Jaw ought to know something about the grain exchange. I think he had a good deal to do with some of the grain brokerage firms in days gone by, and probably got to know something about the grain exchange.

Mr. GRAYDON: Surely not!

Mr. MacNICOL: Was the hon. member for Moose Jaw a grain broker?

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I believe so, although he always tells the committee he was a farmer.

Mr. MacNICOL: I always heard him say that.

Mr. GRAYDON: I thought he grew sunflower seeds.

An hon. MEMBER: Maybe he did more farming the farmer.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): That is mere talk without any knowledge. I was never a broker in my life. I was always a farmer.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Well, the hon. member spent a lot of time in a grain brokerage office.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): I may have done that, and the hon. member might have learned more about the business if he had.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I know a lot of farmers who were "broken" after coming in contact with the hon. member's brokerage office. One of the things that the hon. member for Moose Jaw and the Minister of Agriculture like to do when they rise in their places is to twit those of us who are not farmers with not being farmers, yet daring to discuss agriculture. I make no apology for not being a farmer. The committee may be interested to know that the Minister of Agriculture is not really a farmer either. He supports a farm; he does not make the farm support him.

Mr. GARDINER: The farm would support me better than anything you have ever done supports you.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): He was a schoolteacher who got into politics and then decided he would do better if he had a farm, in order to be able to call himself a farmer. He has been able to support a farm as a very expensive hobby rather than make a living at it.

Mr. GARDINER: I got to be a schoolteacher by farming.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): And he got to be a farmer like he is now by being a politician and a very good one.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): The hon. member had better get a farm.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Well, I do not intend to try to "kid" the public that I am a farmer.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): No; you would not get away with it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): The Minister of Agriculture or the hon. member for Moose Jaw have not fooled very many people. The hon. member for Moose Jaw took exception to the statement which I made regarding the fact that about fifty-four per cent of the 1942 crop was sold by the farmers on the open market. I want to refer the hon. member to the report of the Canadian wheat board for the crop year 1941-42, the year which ended July 31, 1942.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): That is the 1941 crop.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): 1941-42.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): The 1941 crop.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): The crop year ended July 31, 1942. On page 4 I find this statement:

> Of the total marketings of 227·9 million bushels in the west during the crop year 1941-42, producers delivered 100 million bushels to the board, or about 44 per cent of their marketings. In the previous crop year producers delivered 395 million bushels to the wheat board out of total marketings of 456 million bushels.

Mr. BOUCHER: You were in the right church but the wrong pew.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): In other words, the figure was actually lower, but I had in mind that the producer delivered forty-six per cent. As a matter of fact, he delivered only forty-four per cent to the wheat board that year.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): That is the 1941 crop. The hon. member said 1942.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I say that fifty-six per cent was sold in the open market for the crop year 1941-42.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): No, 1941.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Let the hon member hold his horses a minute.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Let the hon. member for Weyburn hold his horses for a minute.

Mr. BOUCHER: As I say, he was in the right church but the wrong pew.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): The figures on page 4 show what the board price was during that year and what the cash price was on the Winnipeg exchange, and the fact that the market price was higher than the board price accounted, of course, for the fact that fifty-six per cent of the wheat that year was sold on the open market rather than to the board. The fact remains that, while we have not the figures for the 1943 crop, or the 1942-43 crop, the market price during a good part of that year was higher than the board price. The hon. member for Moose Jaw thinks it is probably sixty per cent. I imagine he will find that the figure is much lower.

Mr. GARDINER: I have the exact figures in my pocket, and they are more than sixty per cent.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): If the minister has the figures I should be very glad to have them.

Mr. GARDINER: I am not permitted to give the exact ones, but they are more than sixty per cent.

Mr. PERLEY: When are we to get the report?

Mr. GARDINER: I do not know.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): It will be very late.

Mr. GRAYDON: Surely; it is "not in the national interest".

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): As I have said, in the 1941-42 crop year the farmers who sold fifty-six per cent of their wheat on the open market did not receive any participation certificates; and unless the government and the wheat board make some change in policy and revise their arrangements, those people will not get any of the benefit of the subsequent increase in price. Whatever the hon. member for Moose Jaw may argue about 1941 or 1942 does not alter the cogency of the argument that for all of that fifty-six

per cent of the crop which was sold on the open market, the people who sold it will not get any of the benefit of the increase in price. The hon. member for Moose Jaw is entirely wrong when he says that the members of this group went out and told people they would not get anything on their participation certificates.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Did I say "the members" from that group? I said "your people."

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Well, I do not know whom the hon. member means by "our people." I cannot tell what all "our people" said.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Your machine.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I can speak only for myself.

Mr. BOUCHER: There are just two machines in Saskatchewan.

Mr. GARDINER: No, three. You people have one, too.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): At any rate, I never went travelling around the province with P.F.R.A. and P.F.A.A. inspectors accompanying me on my travels.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Neither did I. But I went around to see that the farmers in my district got a proper deal.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I did not know that was your duty.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): You will learn after you have been here for a while what a member should do for his constituency.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I am sure the committee will be interested to know that a Liberal member of parliament considers that the inspectors hired by the Minister of Agriculture are so incompetent that they cannot give the farmers of his constituency a square deal unless he travels with them to see that they do give his farmers a square deal.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): I never travelled with any inspector.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): It certainly would be a new form of government.

I wish to support those who have suggested to the minister that there is need of a great deal more money being spent on research into the use of agricultural products for industrial purposes. All of us supported last year the hon. member for Moose Jaw, who, I think, did a real service to the house and to the country in bringing this matter to the attention of the house on many occasions, and, I think, has made a thorough study of the question.

I was surprised when I saw that, of the $200,000 that had been voted, not all had been spent. I imagine, of course, the minister will have the explanation—and I should think the explanation is reasonable—that it is very difficult to get machinery for pilot plants, and to procure the proper laboratory equipment. For this reason there can be no serious criticism, because in war time, naturally, war plants have priority. But I believe the government should, in the hope that they can get the equipment, make a much larger appropriation than is now proposed. The figures stated by the minister as being expenditures by his department and the Department of Trade and Commerce are somewhere between $400,000 and $500,000. It is a mere bagatelle compared with what has to be done. We are spending millions in other fields.

Mr. GARDINER: I should make myself clear on that point. No part of the $200,000 voted in these estimates is to be carried into the next year. If any amount is supplied it will have to be brought down as a supplementary estimate.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Yes. But I think the minister will agree, as most members of the committee will, that if the government were to bring down an estimate for ten times what is now provided it would not be a bit too much. From three to five million dollars is not a large amount of money considering the tremendous era that chemurgy and the use of synthetics open up for both farming and industry in western Canada. I am hoping therefore that, especially as we come closer to the end of the war, the government will be prepared either to vote large sums of money to go into research work itself or to make grants to the cooperatives, for instance, who would be only too anxious to take up research along these lines. I had the privilege of attending a meeting with the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. McNiven) in Saskatoon a year ago last fall, called by the cooperative organizations in Saskatchewan. They were studying the feasibility of going into the making of synthetic alcohol from wheat, and had they been able to get a substantial grant from the government the cooperatives in Saskatchewan would have been prepared to invest considerable sums of money in research along the lines I have suggested. If the government itself does not feel like undertaking research on such a large scale, I suggest that it might be prepared to grant assistance to some of the cooperatives and the farmer organizations, who I am sure would be ready to do this work.

In regard to departmental administration, I notice in the auditor general's report, page A9, expenses of the Minister of Agriculture

amounting to $2,661.42. I should like the minister to break that down and give us an idea as to how much is travelling expenses and so on. The reason why I ask this has no reference particularly to the Minister of Agriculture. I ask the question because there is a matter I have been wanting to raise for several years during the war, namely the fact that in every department there is a vote of $2,000 to every cabinet minister for a car. Originally, I understand, cars and chauffeurs were supplied to cabinet ministers, but that practice was discontinued, and in lieu of that the ministers were given $2,000. During this war time some of the ministers do not drive cars. Indeed, many of us have put our cars away, and so have some of the cabinet ministers. I doubt very much, therefore, whether that grant is still necessary. I have no objection if the government wants to add the $2,000 to a minister's salary because I am not suggesting that we should take anything away from them, but in my opinion a grant of $2,000 for a car is a rather unnecessary expenditure at a time when we are talking to people about economy.

The $2,000 for a car also raises a very delicate question which the minister himself placed before the house the other day when speaking on a question of privilege. As reported at page 423 of *Hansard* he said:

> This leaves the car which is at headquarters in Regina, No. 20456, and which is placed at my disposal when I am in the province. I drove this car to the constituency, used it on certain occasions while there and drove it back to Regina later. I paid for my own gasoline while it was out, as I always do. The government did not pay for any gasoline in any car used for political purposes during that election, and no one of the cars listed above excepting 20456 was used for political purposes to my knowledge.

It seems to me that to make a grant of $2,000 to cabinet ministers for a car, then place another car at the minister's disposal while he is in the province, and then have estimated expenses of $2,600, makes a considerable amount for travelling expenses at a time when we are talking about cutting down expenditures.

I wish the minister would enlarge on the statement he made with reference to grain crops during the coming crop year. I was not quick enough to catch the figures he gave, but he wanted the same amount of wheat acreage and 102 per cent of barley and 106 per cent of oats.

Mr. GARDINER: 101 per cent of barley and 106 per cent of oats.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): How does he propose to get that acreage? What are his plans to get the farmers to sow approximately the acreage he wants? The reason why I put this matter before the minister is that my impression, after going over a considerable part of the province of Saskatchewan this fall, is that ever since we have had the announcement of the new price there is every indication that a good many farmers will go back to increased wheat production. I wondered what the minister had in mind in order to keep the farmers growing the amount of coarse grain he wants them to produce for the purpose of raising live stock and also supplying feed to eastern Canada where the farmers may raise the live stock which we have pledged ourselves to produce for Great Britain.

I noticed, in the brief which the federation of agriculture presented to the government a week or two ago, that one of the things they asked the government to do was to make a statement as early as possible with reference to the price which would be paid this fall for coarse grain. I think that is important. I do not believe that even the subsidy of fifteen cents a bushel on barley and ten cents on oats will be enough to persuade the farmer to sow coarse grains as against wheat, even with the delivery quota on wheat.

Mr. GARDINER: The ten cents on oats and fifteen cents on barley are not a subsidy. The plan by which that ten cents on oats and fifteen cents on barley is raised is this. We sell a certain proportion of oats and barley in the United States and a certain amount in the eastern part of Canada; the amount obtained for both lots of grain is pooled, so to speak, and we guarantee that there will be ten cents earned on what we sell to the United States in order to be spread over all oats sold. The same is true of barley. But at the same time a participation certificate is given which will net the farmer more if the grain is sold for more; that is to say, the price plus the ten cents and fifteen cents constitute the floor return, but any additional price for which it is sold the farmer will also get.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I understood that, but while I know that this has to do with the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in view of the fact that the Minister of Agriculture is charged with production and with the task of getting the kind of production he thinks is most necessary for the war effort, it seems to me that the government ought to make some announcement in the not far distant future as to what prices will obtain for coarse grains; that is the initial price plus whatever price will come from this fund, and then of course the participation certificate. I think if the government would make an announcement of a floor price and what it is likely to be, whether

it will be the same as last year or better, and make it before the farmer starts to seed, the minister is more likely to get the acreage announced this afternoon than he will otherwise.

There is one other point. The minister has made no announcement—at least not while I was here; I came in a moment or two late; I was called away while he was speaking—as to whether or not the wheat acreage bnous is to be dropped—

Mr. GARDINER: I announced it while the hon. member was out of the chamber.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): If we may judge by the estimates it is to be dropped, which means a drop of about $28,000,000. The wheat acreage reduction bonus was paid to the farmer mainly to encourage him to go into the growing of coarse grains, and also to summer-fallow. But it was also paid in lieu of the fact that from that time on there was to be a restriction as to how much wheat he could sell. That is, he was to be allowed to sell only sixty-five per cent of his basic acreage. It was a compensation. It was not a bonus in the sense of a gift or a subsidy. It was a compensation to him because, instead of being able to sell all of his wheat, or even all of his basic acreage, he could now sell only sixty-five per cent of his basic acreage. It seems to me if the government are going to drop the wheat acreage reduction bonus and thereby reduce the agricultural income by roughly $28,000,000, they ought to give consideration to announcing to the farmer that they will take all of his basic acreage, that they will take all the full quota and that it will be based on his entire 1940 acreage or whatever the minister considers to be a fair basic acreage. It seems to me that to continue to take only sixty-five per cent of his basic acreage and to remove the wheat acreage reduction bonus looks very much as though the government have given the farmer a $1.25 price with one hand and have taken away the $28,000,000 compensation from him with the other hand. I ask the minister to give some thought to that.

Mr. WEIR: This general item gives one an opportunity to say a few words of a general nature with respect to the estimates of the Department of Agriculture. From the observations made so far it is readily apparent that there is not the same degree of criticism from members of the house with respect to agriculture as has been the case on previous occasions. I believe that bears out the statement that has already been made in this debate to the effect that the policies of the Department of Agriculture, particularly during this period of war and leading up to it, have been sound. I believe that when the history of this period is written, so far as agriculture in this country is concerned, those who are fair-minded will admit that the minister's approach to the general agricultural problems from one end of the country to the other has been sound.

Mr. GRAYDON: That shows the influence of John Bracken.

Mr. WEIR: In every instance where it has been necessary to deal with specific problems and specific products these problems and products have been dealt with in a reasonable manner. May I point out that at the outbreak of the war all the facilities in this country were jammed full of wheat. Facilities were tied up; there was no apparent place to which to move the wheat, and at the time the sensible thing seemed to be to turn our production from wheat to some other form of production. A demand was undoubtedly coming for live stock products. The minister announced his policy in that regard. I recall that I looked up some figures at one time—I think it was three years ago—with respect to the general feed situation on the North American continent. I found that from the point of view of feeding units per animal unit on the north American continent the tendency was to show a lessening of feed supplies. Now, with the greatly increased live stock production on the north American continent that situation has developed to a much greater extent than any of us thought possible at that time. Therefore the development which has taken place in that regard and the policies carried out by the department have proven to be sound.

I wish to say a word with respect to a matter that is of particular interest at this time, namely research. I notice that my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, immediately jumped into the debate to make a speech on the necessity of agricultural research. That is all right; that is to be expected; but I am bound to say that I think all hon. members who have taken part in this debate to-night have failed to recognize the research activities that have been carried on by the Department of Agriculture over a long period of time. If they look at the estimates tabled they will find that we have experimental farms, which are largely research, one might say almost entirely so. Science services are largely research, and even under the prairie farm rehabilitation vote there is a great deal of research work undertaken.

That brings me to say one other word with respect to the prairie farm rehabilitation

organization. I come back to the very fine speech made a few days ago by the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) on reclamation policies for western Canada. I think he might have included in that address some of the wonderful work that has been done under our experimental farm system and under the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act. I have before me a rough statement which indicates that the number of large projects undertaken in water conservation in the western provinces amount to 64; dug-outs, 14,108; irrigation projects, 785; or a total of all projects of 18,278. I asked the official who gave me this information particularly about the community pastures, and as to the number of live stock that might be provided for in those community pastures. The estimate given was fifty thousand head. I know that in the section of the country from which I come the live stock population would not have increased nearly to the extent it has had it not been for the work done in water conservation, and particularly the development of those small dug-outs on the various farms. I think that applies to a large part of Saskatchewan as well. It certainly applies to a large part of Manitoba. Therefore, hand in hand with the government's policy has been the work carried on under the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act, particularly with respect to the development of water supplies.

May I return to the question of research? Last year officials of the Department of Agriculture appeared before the agriculture committee and outlined some of the research developments undertaken by the department. I am prepared to say here to-night that I do not think the officials of the Department of Agriculture have been given sufficient credit for the research activities they have carried on. Much of their activity has been linked in with the national research council, and I fear that some of the credit has gone there that more properly could have been directed to the Department of Agriculture. Be that as it may, it is all directed in the proper way. In addition to the matter of research, I do not think anyone connected with the government can start out a research policy and have it completely divorced from the research activities of other similar bodies under other institutes in different parts of the country. We have a vast variety of conditions throughout Canada. All of our agricultural colleges and universities are carrying on certain types of research work, particularly applicable to their own communities. That is research work. We hope it may be continued and linked together.

In the discussions taking place to-night it seems that most hon. members in speaking of research have in mind a vastly expanded programme, a programme that will undertake the processing of agricultural products for non-edible purposes and try to develop new uses for them, new methods of preserving them and taking care of them, and perhaps the introduction of new varieties and things of that kind. That is all to the good; and we hope that the minister's efforts in this regard may be fully carried out. I point out in passing that we have a very creditable system of agricultural research activities being carried on at the present time. I recall, looking back over the reports that were secured last year, some of the developments that have taken place during the period of war which, as in many other instances, has given an impetus to things of this kind.

I point particularly to the developments that have taken place in connection with the drying of eggs, a completely new operation which was not carried on in this country to any great extent before the demand of war forced it upon us. That is a brand new development which may completely revolutionize the poultry industry of Canada. The same can be said for the dehydration of fruits and vegetables, particularly potatoes and things of that kind, and the evaporation of milk. All these things mean increased use of agricultural products, and their wider distribution. If our activities can continue along these and other lines, I am sure Canada stands to gain much from research work of this sort.

I want to go on and say a word or two with regard to the speech delivered this afternoon by the hon. member for Yorkton. I do not know what impression he intended to leave with the committee, but I am bound to say that the impression I was given was one of absolute pessimism as far as agriculture in his part of the country was concerned, and I do not believe that is right. If that is the sort of argument he puts forward with respect to conditions in his part of the country, it is no wonder his people are dissatisfied and complaining about matters in general. I do not live so very far from his constituency, when one considers the country as a whole, and I am bound to say that the situation in Manitoba is not like that he pictured here this afternoon. In this connection may I refer for a moment to figures recently released showing the cash income of the farmers of Canada in 1943. The figure given is $1,396·6 million dollars, the highest on record as far as the agricultural income of this country is concerned. That income is given by provinces, but I shall not take time to place those figures upon record. That was the cash

income of agriculture, without any of the bonuses that have been paid through government subsidies or otherwise. Just here I should like to ask the minister if he would be good enough to place on record the various bonuses that have been paid on agricultural products through the various government agencies, for any convenient period of time.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Has the hon. member the percentage that represents of the total national income?

Mr. WEIR: No; I do not think that is relevant. Again, when the hon. member goes ahead to argue about parity prices in the same breath, I do not think it is fair to take individual items in an attempt to establish parity prices. I believe that when you take individual items you fail to recognize changed production conditions, the introduction of new varieties and things of that kind. But I point out that even in regard to that feature, and having regard to the argument of many hon. members that the parity period is the average for the period from 1926 to 1929, while unfortunately my figures only go up to 1942, still they show that receipts from the sale of farm products for that year, on an index basis, were 112·2. In Manitoba alone they were 124·2.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): What was the cost of living index?

Mr. WEIR: I can say to my hon. friend that every major agricultural product with the single exception of wheat is at parity or better at the present time, and that the increase in the prices of agricultural commodities has been in advance of the increase in the cost of living.

I want to go one step farther, having particularly in mind the observations of the hon. member for Yorkton. I hold in my hand a statement, applicable to Manitoba only, dealing with the Winnipeg division of the Canadian farm loan board, showing that first mortgages in arrears on April 1, 1941, totalled $99,500; on the same date in 1943 such mortgages in arrears totalled only $43,200, while on February 1, 1944, that total had dropped to $14,300. Second mortgages in arrears on April 1, 1941, totalled $119,500; on April 1, 1943, they amounted to $30,100, and on February 1, 1944, they amounted to $8,500. Moreover, there were only ninety-seven first mortgages in arrears as at February 1, 1944, of which thirty-one were for less than $50, twenty-seven for between $50 and $100, and fifteen for more than $200. At the same date there were forty-four second mortgages in arrears, of which seven were for less than $50, ten for from $50 to $100 and twelve for more than $200. Between April 1, and December 1, 1943, 260 first mortgages had been fully repaid, and during the month of January alone there were two mortgages repaid in full for every day of the month including Sundays. I also looked at the record of the land titles offices. I am sorry that only goes up to 1942, but it shows a continuous improvement in the number of mortgages discharged through those offices in the province of Manitoba. These include mortgages on farms as well as on business and residential property, and the total number so discharged between 1939 and 1942 was 18,367. So that I cannot stand quietly by and ignore a speech such as that made this afternoon by the hon. member for Yorkton, leaving such an impression as he left, while I know the facts as they are shown in the statements I have presented this evening.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): For years they have had a different government in Manitoba from the one they have had in Saskatchewan.

Mr. WEIR: But you did not do very much toward helping that government in Manitoba.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Did you?

Mr. WEIR: Why not?

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I am always willing to reason it out.

Mr. WEIR: There is another feature which my hon. friends appear to like to play up. They try to make the people believe they are the sole supporters of the cooperative movement in this country. As I stand here to-night I take second place to no one in my sympathy for and interest in the cooperative movement. But I suggest to my hon. friends that this movement is not built on a dollars and cents policy alone, or on any advantages it may obtain from governments or otherwise as compared with other kinds of business. The cooperative movement is more than a business; it is a sentimental affiliation as well. There is an attachment to it; it is a mode of doing business which is entirely different from the ordinary method; but I point out that while hon. gentlemen in the far corner attempt to take credit for their interest in the cooperative movement, that movement has progressed in this country on a very sound and sensible basis, and has done so under the so-called capitalist party system of government. What more does the cooperative movement need in that regard? I look back to the time following 1921 when there was established in the Department of Agriculture here a cooperative branch. The men affiliated with that

branch have constantly given encouragement and assistance to the cooperative movement, and have done much to help build it up to the point it has reached at the present time. So that I hope the time will soon come when our hon. friends will no longer attempt to say they are the only people interested in the cooperative movement.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Is the hon. member in favour of charging the cooperative movement income tax?

Mr. WEIR: That is not part of the discussion at the present time. Is my hon. friend in favour of that?

The hon. member for Yorkton referred to the farm implement business, and I thought he tried to make out that on account of the unduly high prices of farm implements the farmers of Canada were being exploited. He failed to say that the farm implement business, as does all business in Canada, operates under a price ceiling, and that there has been no increase in prices of agricultural implements during the time of war. I will go this far with my hon. friend and say to him that I believe there is a more economical method of retailing agricultural implements than now obtains. From that I hope the cooperative movement can develop something more economical in merchandising procedure.

Here again, however, I say to the hon. member for Yorkton that if he will go back to the report of the farm implements inquiry of 1936, he will find the record shows that the greatest reason for the increase in prices of farm implements was that of increased labour cost.

I want to go one step farther. The hon. member for Melfort by way of interjection referred to his coming back after the last war and buying wheat for seeding purposes. He said that at that time he paid something over $2 a bushel for it, but had to sell it for sixty cents. That just shows how loosely figures are handled. I am not saying he did not have some misfortune with his crop; probably it was frozen or damaged. But I have the fact noted here, and I am bound to say it, that I have before me the average prices by months, and by the year for both 1921, 1922 and other years. I find the lowest price of wheat in the 1922-23 crop year was 99·9 cents a bushel. I realize, of course, that that is basis Fort William—

An hon. MEMBER: And No. 1.

Mr. WEIR: No doubt the hon. member would be selling at a local point, and he may have had low-grade wheat. But I am saying to him that he left the impression, so far as the majority of members in the house were concerned, that the Fort William price of wheat for the year was sixty cents a bushel.

Mr. WRIGHT: No, no.

Mr. WEIR: I have the floor, and I am just saying what the impression would be to a man who did not know what it meant.

Mr. WRIGHT: I rise to a question of privilege. The hon. member has stated that I had quoted the Fort William price. I was quoting the price at my local point, with respect to wheat sold in the fall of 1920 at my own station. That price was $2.57 a bushel. The price of No. 3 wheat in the fall of 1921 was sixty-seven cents a bushel at that station.

Mr. WEIR: My hon. friend says it was sixty cents a bushel. I leave it to hon. members to figure out what they thought the price was set at. I admitted to my hon. friend that perhaps he was quoting the local price, but I am saying that the impression he left in the minds of the majority of members in the house was that he was talking about the Fort William price.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): The hon. member cannot speak for the majority.

Mr. WRIGHT: And I did not say sixty cents; I said sixty-seven cents.

Mr. WEIR: Then my hearing is faulty, and I regret it. One could go on and say much more with respect to the policy of the Department of Agriculture, and at a later time I hope to have an opportunity to do so.

Before taking my seat, however, I should like to suggest to the minister some of the possibilities of recent new developments in the field of agriculture. Particularly in Manitoba we have seen a wide diversification in respect of such crops as black-eyed rape, soya beans, sunflowers and, of course, corn, which has been grown with considerable success in southern Manitoba for some time. I believe all those crops have a future, and I am hoping further attention will be given to them.

The main point, however, with respect to such crops as sunflowers and, to some extent, rape seed, is the development of what are known as expelling plants, so that the oil may be extracted more readily. These are bulky products, and it seems unfortunate they have to be moved to eastern Canada for further processing. Having regard to post-war development and to the need for such products, I suggest to the minister that there should be greater diversification in the form of local

industries in western Canada, and that particular attention should be given to processing plants for these new crops. I think further that the present situation in respect of the meat and live stock industry affords opportunity for the establishing of a general policy which would have for its purpose the development of quick-freezing plants, and other improvements of that kind, so that our products could be utilized to greater extent locally, and further processed. I believe the west needs something of that kind as much as it needs anything, and I am hoping the minister will use his influence to see that in any research activities consideration might be given to offering further assistance in the development of local processing plants for specialized crops in western Canada.

Mr. PERLEY: Madam Chairman—

Mr. BRYCE: Madam Chairman—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mrs. Casselman): I saw the hon. member for Qu'Appelle.

Mr. PERLEY: The ladies generally see me. To-day when the item was first called I suggested that the minister might facilitate matters by making a general statement covering most of the items in a general way. He did not see fit to do so, but I think he will now agree with me that it would have been better if that course had been followed—with the exception, of course, of those estimates contained in the war appropriation measure.

I would say the discussion has got almost out of bounds. We have heard members from different parts of Canada discussing almost everything one could imagine. One would have thought that part of the time we were discussing the estimates of the Department of Trade and Commerce, because we heard a great deal about wheat shipments, wheat prices, wheat board activities, participation certificates, the international food conference, and matters of that kind. One could have gained the impression that two or three departments were before the committee at one time. I will agree that there are some parts of the Department of Trade and Commerce which might better be handled by the Department of Agriculture—and in saying that I believe I am paying the Minister of Agriculture a compliment. I refer particularly to the production of grains, and their marketing on the domestic markets. Possibly some time in the not too distant future we shall see a consolidation of those two departments.

This evening we listened to one or two stirring speeches. The hon. member for Moose Jaw came to the rescue of the minister. He seems to be the pinch-hitter, so to speak, for the minister, and the Minister of Agriculture seems to be the pinch-hitter for the government. Whenever the government needs to have a speech of that kind delivered, he is generally the one called upon to make it. The hon. member for Moose Jaw, together with the hon. member for Macdonald came to the rescue of the minister, but there is not very much to reply to in what they said.

The hon. member for Moose Jaw referred to the fact that a price of $1.25 a bushel had been set in September. He said that that was a pretty good price, and I agree, but it might well have been set much earlier. That price could have been set in July. The government had all the information as to what was likely to happen, they knew they were going to do it, and they could have saved some of the discussion that has taken place to-night in connection with the farmer delivering to the open market had they set the price in July. If that had been done, all the 1943 crop would have gone to the wheat board. The hon. member for Moose Jaw came to the defence of the packing plants, and he tried to give credit to the Minister of Agriculture for the increase in prices. He said that these advances were due to the policies of the minister. However, I think he has been answered by some of the hon. members to my extreme right who mentioned the fact that the war had brought about this condition. No matter who was Minister of Agriculture, we would be getting better prices for our farm products to-day. I think the farmer should be given credit for the way in which he has changed his methods of production, his system of farming so to speak, in order to meet the need.

The hon. member for Moose Jaw was most encouraging when he forecast that there would be prosperity for the next twenty-five years. I hope he is right and perhaps he can see farther into the future than most of us. But if we have that prosperity I am afraid he will not be around to give credit to the present government. Before many years we shall have another government and, if we have the prosperity he forecasts, it will be some other government that will get the credit.

The hon. member for Macdonald made a very good speech, with much of which I agree. I do not take a back seat to anyone as far as farming experience is concerned. I started out in 1900, and in 1906 my brother and I produced 65,000 bushels of grain. We have not done that very often since, but that was a good production for that time. We were forced to build an elevator in order to accommodate our crop, and we got into that business. I learned a lot about the elevator business from 1906 on. I might say also that along with many other farmers in the west I made a few trades; I bought a few

options. At times I traded in a certain office with which the hon. member for Moose Jaw was connected for a time. There were lots of brokers in those days and many farmers gained a lot of experience.

Mr. MacNICOL: Was the hon. member for Moose Jaw a broker?

Mr. PERLEY: I leave that for him to answer. The hon. member for Macdonald made some very sound statements. To-day the farmers in the west are better off financially than they were three or four years ago. I know that from my own experience. I am not a calamity howler; I do not believe in standing up and giving the people of Canada the impression that the farmers are all down and out. But our farmers should have had better prices years ago, better even than what has been received this last year. I have maintained right along that we should have a broader basis for all farm products. I do not want to repeat, but I do think the farmers are entitled to a better price.

The initial price of $1.25 a bushel could easily have been made $1.40. The hon. member for Moose Jaw referred to what has happened within the last three or four days. We understand that 175,000,000 bushels of wheat are going to the United States at a price considerably above the initial price. Then we know what the British farmer is receiving for his grain. So that I say that our farmers are justified in asking for a better price. All they want is a square deal. We should be getting a parity price. As the hon. member for Macdonald says, we are getting parity prices for everything but wheat. Give us a parity price and we shall be fairly well satisfied, but give us that price for a term of years, not just for one year.

Both hon. members referred to the benefits derived from the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act. I should like to ask who initiated that legislation, who made those benefits possible in Saskatchewan? The hon. member for Moose Jaw cannot recall, but I think the hon. member for Macdonald will because he was sitting back here somewhere when that act went through this house. The Minister of Pensions and National Health, the hon. member for Wood Mountain and other hon. members will recall the opposition there was at that time to the bill. That legislation was passed to create water storage and furnish supplies of water to parts of Saskatchewan which were what one might call deserts. I take considerable credit for the fact that that legislation was initiated by the government I had the honour to support from 1930 to 1935.

We are supposed to be discussing the minister's estimates in a general way, but we seem to have got far afield. I would not have been so far afield had it not been for the two or three speeches we have heard. I have been waiting to hear the minister give a reply to the one or two speeches which seem to have caused so much irritation on the part of the two hon. members. These estimates are practically the same as we had last year. There is a reduction of about $43,000 in the main estimates, and then when the specials come down there will be a reduction of $28,000,000. This reduction has been referred to already. The minister has stated that in the agriculture part of the war appropriation there is a provision which he does not want to have discussed while we are discussing the main estimates.

Later on, supplementary estimates will be brought down. It is possible the minister may be going out to Saskatchewan during the Easter recess, or he may have occasion to go a little sooner if certain developments out there require his presence. I understand that certain things have been suggested in the Saskatchewan legislature and that there is to be a rebate or write-off of the seed grain debts where they have been paid to the extent of $4,000,000. There will have to be supplementary estimates to take care of that, as well as other items about which we do not know.

The speech from the throne referred to certain measures that will be introduced in connection with floor prices. There is no question that the Minister of Agriculture will play a very important part in any legislation dealing with agricultural matters, and in this respect he can have a considerable say to ensure that justice is done as far as having a price somewhere near parity, or a just price, the floor price. There are 138,700 farmers in Saskatchewan—the third largest number of any province in the dominion. All our Saskatchewan farmers want, as I have said, is a square deal. They have not had their proper proportion of the national farm income. If they can be assured of it by the establishing of a floor price, and it is on a parity basis, I think it will be fairly well received, provided that it extends over a term of years so that they will have the assurance of some security.

Much has been said about cooperative organizations. The hon. member for Macdonald became quite heated in his remarks on this subject in reply to members of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party. I do not find any fault with them on this score; I think they are on sound ground when they plead for fair treatment of all cooperative organizations. We have some in Saskatchewan. I think all credit and assistance possible should be extended by the government to these organizations if they are

properly operated. Having some knowledge of their accomplishments, I say that they have been marvellous, and any government should give them all possible assistance to carry on that sort of work. Nobody has more experience of the workings of this kind of organization as it pertains to agriculture than the farmers themselves, and on behalf of our 138,000 Saskatchewan producers, a great many of whom belong to cooperative organizations, I make a special plea that they be given every assistance possible, and hope that the minister will be just in that respect.

It is also my hope that the minister will give consideration to setting up a board of live stock commissioners. The time has arrived when such a body could do a lot of good. It should, of course, include proper representation of the producers, because no one knows better than they do what is just and proper in these matters. Such a board could do a lot for the marketing of live stock products at the present time. We need enlarged markets; we want to create a demand for agricultural products, including the expansion of the home market. I believe a live stock marketing board could do much in that direction.

I believe it was the hon. member for Macdonald who referred this evening to diversified farming. We have to consider some policy which will diversify farming operations in western Canada. There is great room for it. Many more people could be given employment and established on farms if the system were more diversified. I need only cite my own case. Last year we had only two men on our farm: a farmer and his son operating a combine harvesting fifteen or sixteen thousand bushels of grain. Do you not think that, by a system whereunder other products than grain were grown there, many more people could be employed, real farm homes established, and adequate facilities for farm life created, with lasting benefits to agriculture? It is something to keep in mind.

There are other matters which can be discussed later, item by item, but I have one short reference to make at this time. Last year—the hon. member for Macdonald might listen to this—the agriculture committee met long after the house opened; we heard from a good many chairmen of boards and officials of departments; and we western members were asked to give way to the eastern members. They said they had heard too much about the west, about wheat and other grain, and they blamed this condition on two or three C.C.F. members of the committee and myself in particular. They said "Forget about wheat and so on this year and let us have a chance." We did it, and did it gracefully, but I will say that we had to come to their rescue quite often to keep the thing going properly. With all due respect to the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Senn) who is sitting in front of me, we knew as much about eastern farmers' problems—producing the same products that they do in eastern Canada—as the eastern members themselves. However, we had a very interesting time, because we heard such a variety of witnesses and evidence. We drew a report on July 16, 19 and 20, and then we did not have the courage to rise and move its adoption, although we had advocated many of the things which have been advocated here to-night, such as research laboratories and so on.

Mr. WEIR: The minister must have read the report, then.

Mr. PERLEY: Maybe he did, but the chairman of the committee did not have the courage to rise in his place and move that it be adopted.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): That was not the only report which was not moved.

Mr. PERLEY: That just shows you.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): What is the point?

Mr. PERLEY: What is the use of members going to work for two or three months and drawing up a report, leaving it until the last day or two, and then not moving the adoption of the result of all that work? What is the use of taking up our time?

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): You learn something. You just admitted that you learned a lot.

Mr. PERLEY: The chairman did not even move the adoption of the recommendations. I have the report in my hand; it contains several sections. I myself moved three amendments of the report. Two of them were turned down and not put in the report, but the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Trade and Commerce have adopted them

Mr. GRAYDON: They knew a good thing when they saw it.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): The hon. member knew what was coming up.

Mr. PERLEY: Therefore I hope the Minister of Agriculture will insist on this committee getting to work in good time. We can gather much more information similar to what we had last year, carry on from there, and do some useful work.

To get back to these estimates: the details of the items on page 4 are given on pages 54, 55 and 56 and pages following. I grant that there is not much change since last year except under "special"; but if you examine these pages you will see a large item, for travelling expenses, set out at the end of each section. For example, "publicity and extension, travelling expenses, $5,000"; "departmental administration, travelling expenses, $8,000"; "science service, travelling expenses, $900"; "animal and poultry pathology, travelling expenses, $4,000"; "bacteriology and dairy research, travelling expenses, $1,300"; "botany and plant pathology, travelling expenses, $15,500". In one division, namely entomology, travelling expenses are shown as over $39,000. I contend that in every branch the travelling expenses are absolutely out of all reason and could be curtailed to a very considerable extent.

I have the auditor general's report here and the figures with regard to the P.F.R.A. are illuminating. It gives the number of men employed, field men, and so on. In one branch there are 281 and in another branch 300, and the expenses run from $300 to $1,800, besides salaries.

Mr. McNIVEN: Many are part-time men.

Mr. PERLEY: Nevertheless they draw expenses running from $300 to $1,800 a year. I submit that that branch could be cut in two, especially when, as the minister says, they will not have the wheat acreage bonus this year.

Mr. GARDINER: Is the hon. member referring to the P.F.R.A. or the prairie farm assistance?

Mr. PERLEY: It gives P.F.R.A. and prairie farm assistance.

Mr. GARDINER: The hon. member gave the P.F.R.A. alone. The figures sound large for that particular activity.

Mr. PERLEY: I can get them in a minute.

Mr. GARDINER: I think it is about right for prairie farm assistance.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): It is the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act.

Mr. PERLEY: That is the one with 281 and the expenses are given. Then there is the wheat acreage reduction outfit. They have a large expense account running from $300 to $2,000. In my opinion these are branches that could be considerably cut down in their expenses. That is one great saving the minister could make. I do not want to take up more time, but when the estimates are called item by item I shall have something to say. In the meantime I think the minister should answer some of the questions that have been put to him to-night.

Mr. BRYCE: I am not a parliamentarian but a dirt farmer. I am not familiar with the rules of the house and I want to take this opportunity, while the discussion is broad, to say what I have to say. Listening to some of the hon. gentlemen who have already spoken, I was reminded of the fact that I am an immigrant to this country. I read a book that brought me to this country, and when I heard the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Ross) I thought he was the author. Then when I heard the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Wood) I thought the book might have come from Ontario. But when my hon. friend the member for Macdonald (Mr. Weir) rises in his place and says the same things, I know it was the Liberal party.

Mr. GARDINER: Are you sorry you are here?

Mr. WEIR: You didna go back.

Mr. BRYCE: I never made enough to go back.

I have tried many times to become better acquainted with the Minister of Agriculture, and in fact on one occasion I drove 200 miles to make his acquaintance and to ask him some questions, but I had to be satisfied with a shake of his hand. He expressed his sorrow that he could not spend any more time with me. In the house a few days ago the Minister of Agriculture talked about how well off we were in Canada—in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and other provinces engaged in mixed farming. I should like to call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to a few facts. I could take steers I sold in Winnipeg for 11¾ cents a pound and send them to St. Paul and make $35 dollars more on each of them. I could run steers to St. Paul for seventy cents a hundred and the exchange in my money would pay the duty.

Talking about cattle, I want to ask the minister why he always argues that I do not need a spread in feeding my steers. When I buy a steer I want a spread on it. I want a two cent spread to enable me to break even. To take simple figures, we will say that the feeder market is ten cents. If I buy a steer of 700 lbs. at ten cents, that is $70. I have to put 300 pounds on his back before I can put him back on the market, and that will take me 180 days. I do not know whether other farmers can do better than that, but that is the best I can do. That steer will eat two tons of hay which, at $7.50

a ton, means $15 added to the $70. When I take that animal home he will eat five pounds of chop a day, and when I put him away he will have increased that to fifteen pounds a day. However, suppose we strike a happy medium and say ten pounds a day; that means he will eat 1,800 pounds of chop. I can get $1.25 per 100 pounds for my grain at the elevator and another twenty-five cents to crush it and handle it. That comes to $1.50, so that you have to add another $27. To keep him in good shape and put a good shine on his coat I have to give him oil cake meal, and he will use fifty pounds in those 180 days. He will need bone-meal and salt. Put on $1 for that and the steer has cost me $114.25. If I sell him on a twelve cent market at Winnipeg I will get $120. I have only $5.75 left for transportation, commission, insurance, labour and depreciation on my buildings. I want to ask the minister how that can be done without a spread. I can buy cattle in the spring at ten cents and sell at ten cents and make more money feeding them grass, because I do not feed them inside. I want the minister to answer these questions.

I want to say something about hogs too. In the new regulations we are to get $27.45 for select hogs, $3 premium paid by the government. On a "B-1" hog we will get $26.45, a $2 premium. We are to get $23.45 for a "B-2" hog, which is a dollar reduction. I should like to know why there should be this dollar reduction. A "B-1" hog is a light hog, a hog that the packer is willing to pay more money for because when you go into a restaurant and ask for pork chops you do not get them off a 200-pound hog, you get them off a hog dressing around 120 to 135 pounds. If this is a penalty or a fine to the farmer for selling a light hog, why put it into the pocket of the packer? Why not give it to the Red Cross? A "B-2" hog will bring $23.45; a "C-1", $22.95; a "D-1", $22.45. These five grades can go into the export trade, or at least a part of them. There are eight different grades from the producer to the packer. There are twenty-four grades from the packer to the meat board, and from the meat board to the British food ministry there are two grades "A" and "B". If the hog that I produce is fit for export bacon I should get that export bacon price for it. The way it stands to-day it is to the advantage of the packer, not the farmer.

I should like to make another comparison. There is only an imaginary line between Manitoba and that portion of the United States situated to the south of it. The United States farmer raises hogs and sells them at from 200 to 300 weight. His hogs average 250 pounds. We have all these penalties on this side of the line. If I get a hog up to 200 pounds, I can put from two and a half to three pounds a day on him. He will make very rapid gains at this weight. The United States farmer is paid $26.90 for his hog, and he has the extra weight. If you follow this hog along you will find that it could go to the same packing company as the Canadian hog and they are both sold to the British market at the same price. Because of the way grading is set up now, only about thirty per cent are select hogs. This new grading puts a penalty on the average producer. I am not satisfied with the new system. The hon. minister knows that. I have made quite a study of this problem. The man who grades a hog has only six seconds in which to do it. He has to satisfy himself that it is twenty-nine inches from the hip bone to the shoulder bone, that there is no more than two inches of fat on the shoulder. There has to be no more than one and a half inches on the loin and a little less on the hips. These hogs pass steadily before the grader. I have timed them repeatedly and the time is six seconds. I claim that is one of the reasons why when I send a lot of hogs in and the returns come back I get nine or ten selects, and from the very same boar and the same brood sows I get only two the next time. There is something wrong with the system. I have spoken to one of the big packers about it. He says that if he cannot kill 500 hogs an hour he will shut down his plant. Let us get two graders in there and give the farmer a square deal.

Another serious grievance that I should like to mention is the price of grain. There is a subsidy on grain. When a man is feeding his own grain he does not get that. I should like the Minister of Agriculture to do something about that, because unless that position is cleared up there will be fewer hogs by October. I know throughout my own settlement people are not going to feed the grain. It is at a good price, and they will not feed it to the hogs when they can get the price for it. I know arrangements have been made whereby a man who is feeding hogs can go and get the bonus back, but the man who produces the grain is not getting the benefit of that.

The hon. member for Macdonald spoke about the experimental farms. I have received quite a lot of benefit from them, but there is one thing I should like to say here. If those experimental farms could be brought more in line with the conditions that the average farmer has to face in producing his hogs they would be more educational. Hogs are raised by the agricultural college in Winnipeg, but they are pampered hogs. You

could not work in the field all day and give hogs care like that. If we had conditions on these experimental farms similar to those on the average farm a better comparison could be made. I had the pleasure of taking one of my constituents around the agricultural college. I said to him, "How would you like this, or what would you do with it?" He said: "The wife and I would move in right away." The conditions to which I have referred must be improved so that they will be of some benefit to the rank and file in the country.

I should like to say to the hon. members who have spoken that I have not been one of fortune's favoured few since I came to this country. I sold hogs in some of these good years for $2.65 a hundred. I sold steers for two and a half cents a hundred.

Mr. GRANT: The Tories were in then.

Mr. BRYCE: You are all tarred with the one brush. I sold butterfat for twelve cents a pound. If we wanted a packet of matches we sent two dozen eggs to the store. Do not forget that. We had twelve years of that.

Mr. McCUBBIN: I was very much interested in the remarks made by the hon. member for Selkirk, a Scotsman with a Scotch tongue. I know he knows something about cattle, because I come from a Scotch constituency. These people came out from Scotland many years ago and settled in what I think is the best riding in Ontario, that of West Middlesex. There we have some of the best cattle feeders in the Dominion of Canada. In the little village of Ailsa Craig, near where I live, there were more cattle shipped out in the old days than anywhere else in Canada with the exception of the city of Calgary, Alberta. The coming of the trucks interfered with that shipment and we have not been able to keep up that record for that point. After listening to the remarks made by my hon. friend with respect to cattle and the feeding of cattle, I say in all sincerity that a Scotch farmer knows how to feed steers. I think the hon. member for Selkirk knows something about it. I agree with the hon. member that it is impossible for feeders to go out and buy cattle unless there is some spread, though the producer who fattens that steer is all right with the prices we are receiving to-day. In the district from which I come, however, where the producers depend upon the feeders to buy up these stockers in the fall, feed them during the winter and sell them in the spring or summer, we believe there must be a spread. At the present time the spread is not as great as it should be, but the feeders of cattle in my district are going ahead, believing that they will receive a good price for their product during the coming summer.

I must admit that there is a little consternation at the present time among the cattle feeders and those who have steers to sell, because the packing houses in Toronto, where we in western Ontario sell our steers, have sort of lain down and are not buying. The drovers who buy cattle from the farmers and ship to the Toronto market are having difficulty in selling their cattle; as one of the commission men claimed, if the offerings were light, say, only two hundred head of cattle, the prices would remain just the same. On that market there seems to be a tendency on the part of the packers—I may not be right in this, though I believe I am—to reduce the price of cattle. Hon. members may wonder why I say that. Well, the government has told us that if the packers reduce the price below the floor price, then the producer or feeder can send in his cattle to be slaughtered and the government will take care of it. I quote what the secretary of the meat board said last year to the committee on agriculture: "We are giving some consideration to one system which might be adopted, based upon the fact that on almost every main market there are public slaughter houses. If a producer of cattle felt that the prices offered by the packers were not fair, under this system we would be prepared to have these cattle slaughtered at these public slaughter houses." That is something we in western Ontario fear. We feel that the packer to-day is endeavouring to force the producer or feeder to send his cattle in so that they may be slaughtered on a rail-grading basis, and that is one thing we do not want. The cattlemen of my district, at any rate, will not stand for that. We will not have the rail-grading of cattle, and I hope and trust that at the proper time the government will step in and see that this is not made necessary. I have every faith that this will be done.

There is one thing in connection with the shipment of cattle to the stock yards that has often bothered me, and perhaps the minister can enlighten me in this regard. When a drover ships cattle there is condemnation insurance kept off the price. I think that insurance varies in different parts of Canada, but it runs into several hundred thousand dollars every year. The producers had nothing to say about that; the condemnation insurance is collected under an agreement between the packers and drovers which dates back to 1910 and which is still in effect. In Ontario the rate is twenty cents a head on steers and fifty cents on cows, while in the west it is

one-half of one per cent. In the United States there is no condemnation insurance. I should like to know if the packers ever gave an accounting of that money, which came out of the drovers and producers in the first place. Perhaps the minister can explain that to me.

I am completely in agreement with what has been said regarding the movement of cattle across the line into the United States. No one could be more in favour of that than I am. I am a free trader; I believe in the free movement of goods from Canada to the United States and back again. I hope the day is not too far distant when our cattle may once more move across that line to the stockyards and packing-houses in Chicago, St. Paul, Buffalo and other cities.

Mr. WARD: And not only cattle.

Mr. McCUBBIN: No; at the moment I am only referring to cattle, but it applies to other products as well. At the present time, however, that may not be possible; if we need the meat in Canada, or if the mother country needs it, we are in duty bound to send it where it is needed. I think it is the feeling of all Canadian cattlemen that if Britain needs the meat they are willing to take their loss and send it over there. But again I express the hope that the day may not be too far distant when our cattle will move freely across the line once more.

One thing to which we in the eastern part of Canada object strenuously is the freight bonus paid to the packer on dressed meat coming from the west. We in Ontario feel very much incensed about this, when our own stockyards and packing houses are not able to take care of the cattle coming on to the markets here. We feel that this bonus should be removed. It was taken off once, but was restored later on. I believe that no class of people in this country have done a better job than has been done by the farmers. They are always willing to do their part. I will admit that in the early days of the war prices were not as good as they should have been, but now those prices have reached a level where I believe most of the people are satisfied. I realize that we are all human and that we like to get the highest possible prices for our farm products, but I feel that the majority of Canadian farmers are satisfied. There may be some inequalities, but they will be looked after.

In southwestern Ontario, from which I come, we are getting more and more into diversified farming, and there is one product on which we are now counting a great deal. I refer to the growing of turnips, which is being done by a great many farmers in that district. We are able to ship them under permit across the line, but I think a great deal could be done to increase the market in the United States. I believe an educational programme should be carried on throughout the length and breadth of both Canada and the United States to promote the consumption of turnips, because I feel that this product offers a great future for many Canadian farmers. The same may be said of beans and other products, of course; but if you go to the United States and ask some of the leading people there, they will tell you they have never tasted turnips. If you go to Philadelphia, Washington or New York you will find that turnips are not even on the menus of the leading hotels, so that I believe a great deal could be done by way of an educational programme in regard to certain of these farm products. I want to repeat in all sincerity that no group in Canada is more willing to do its part, under great difficulties through lack of help, than Canadian farmers, who will do everything possible to see that this war is brought to a successful conclusion.

Mr. GARDINER: A few moments ago the hon. member for Qu'Appelle made some reference to the expense accounts of officials of my department, and the hon. member for Weyburn made some references to my own expense account. I desire to give the same explanation in connection with the expense accounts of the minister and those of the inspectors and officials of the department. As hon. members know, this country extends from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and in each province there is a considerable agricultural area. As long as I could satisfy the Prime Minister of this country that I ought to remain as Minister of Agriculture I could hold down the position much more easily by remaining here and simply administering the department from my office. But I venture to say that while there has been criticism to-night of some things that have or have not been done in the department, if I had been in the Department of Agriculture—as I have been for eight years—and had never gone out through this country in order to learn at first hand what the problems of the farmers are, there would have been a great deal more criticism than there has been up to the present time. That is the only explanation I wish to make in connection with the expense accounts, so far as my own expense account is concerned. Incidentally, it has been throughout those whole eight years one of the highest expense accounts among ministers of the government, and I am rather proud of that fact. The nature of the department requires that from time to time I visit all of the activities which have been spoken about to-night, and concerning some of which some kind things have been said.

For example, the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act administration is scattered throughout the southern part of the three prairie provinces. Many of the activities connected with fruit production are carried out in British Columbia, in the maritime provinces or in the southern part of Ontario. Activities in connection with stock raising, generally, are carried on throughout the whole length and breadth of the Dominion of Canada. Anyone who desires to become familiar at first hand with the problems of the farmers, and the people who deal with them, must of necessity from time to time and, indeed, quite often more than once in a year, visit the different parts of Canada to understand the problems confronting the farmers in the different seasons of the year. Therefore I make no apology whatsoever for having an expense account of $2,600 for 1942.

Having said that, may I add that there is no inspector in the Department of Agriculture who is inspecting agricultural activities throughout the rural areas who would be worth his salt if he did not have a high expense account. His work is to travel, and if he does not travel and see what is going on on the farms throughout the country, and make his inspections at first hand, then I say he is not doing the job for which he was employed. Generally speaking, a good man on the road spends at least as much on his expense account as he receives in salary—and quite often he is required to spend more than that. So that I make no apologies for the expense accounts found in the estimates for this year. I only compare them with what has been spent in preceding years under all governments, in provinces as well as in the dominion, and I suggest that our expense account will compare favourably with those for similar work, no matter where that work is carried on.

There has been some discussion to-night with regard to hogs. The hon. member for Moose Jaw and the hon. member for Macdonald called attention to the fact that it is very easy to make statements respecting one's personal experiences, or based upon statements heard here and there throughout the country, and it is possible to make the complaints sound plausible. But when one gets down to actual statistics having to do with the matter under discussion he sometimes finds a picture very different from that which the general statement would lead one to believe.

For example, a few moments ago the hon. member for Selkirk left the impression that a great many hogs grading other than "A" and "B-1" entered into the export of bacon and hams from Canada. I have in my hand the last statement which came out dealing with the preceding week in connection with the marketing of hogs, and it is a statement which would be borne out by any week one might wish to choose throughout the year. This is what it says:

> Hog marketings eased off somewhat in the week ended February 12, showing a decrease of approximately 10,000 head below the previous week; nevertheless the increase over the same week last year was more than 125,000 head.

That is, we are down 10,000 in the week ending February 12, as compared with the previous week; but we are up 125,000 head as compared with the same week in the preceding year. The statistical statement continues:

> In the week ended February 12, exporting plants slaughtered 224,763 head—

And here are the important facts in that connection, as related to the statement made a few moments ago:

> (94·7 per cent of all inspected slaughterings.)

That is, this number slaughtered in exporting plants, namely, 224,763, is 94·7 per cent of all inspected slaughterings. The statement continues:

> —and included 215,151 regular hogs. Carcass gradings for the same week total 235,364, of which 26·5 per cent were grade "A", 47·3 per cent were "B-1".

That is, 73·8 per cent of all hogs taken into the plants during that week graded "A" or "B-1." The hon. member left the impression a few moments ago—if he was attempting to leave any impression whatsoever—that there was a very considerable number of hogs of the lower grades entering into these plants, which of necessity had to be taken into the export quantities, in order to make up the export going from this country. Let us look at the facts. This statement says that six per cent were "B-3" and 3·5 per cent were sows—which bears some relation to statements which have been made in the house since the opening of this session respecting the number of sows going on the market. It is shown here that 3·5 per cent of this very large total of more than 235,000 hogs graded that week—which, by the way, is about 11,000 more than were actually slaughtered during the week; some had been held in from the preceding week—were sows. Here we have this enormous total of somewhere between seventy per cent and seventy-five per cent of "A" and "B-1," carrying right through the year, and all slaughtered in the plants which kill hogs for export purposes. The statement continues:

> Warm dressed carcass weights—

And then it goes on to deal with the matter of weights, showing that these hogs were com-

ing in at weights around 155 pounds. Following the statement as to weights the prices are given. And let me indicate to the committee that the price at Winnipeg, the market which was under discussion a few moments ago, for hogs on that particular week was $16.30. The price in the preceding week was $16.30. The price for the whole of January was $16.30. I repeat those prices in order to indicate that what members at every session of the house since the beginning of the war have been advocating, and have been saying this government should bring about, namely, that there should not be a great variation in prices from day to day and from week to week, has actually happened under the system now in effect in connection with the marketing and grading of hogs.

Therefore it is clear that since the beginning of this year and down to the present time the price has remained constant, despite the fact that 125,000 more hogs were inspected in those plants last week than were inspected in the same plants in the corresponding week one year ago. If that kind of thing had happened at any other time or under any other system than what we have in this country, every member of this committee knows what would have happened to the price of hogs. But the price of hogs remained constant throughout that period.

Let us look at the next fact with regard to export. During the week ended February 12, 20·3 million pounds of product were secured for export, including 19·6 million pounds of current put-down, 661,487 pounds of regular freezer and 50,000 pounds of blade-in Wiltshires. The total of 20·3 million pounds compares with 20·8 million pounds the previous week and 9·3 million pounds for the same week last year. That means twice as many animals are going through the plant now. If you take the figures with regard to quantities going through, what do you find? Export bacon secured in the week ended February 5 was equivalent to the yield of 170,000 carcasses, and that total of 20·8 million pounds is taken from those carcasses. When you look at the figures I gave a few moments ago you will see that there are more than 170,000 hogs that graded into those plants as "A's" and "B-1's". In other words, there were more hogs graded into those plants as "A's" and "B-1's" than were necessary to make up the total export to Great Britain. The capacity for storage regulated that; there could have been more put down for Britain if there had been more storage capacity.

I submit that it is not reasonable to suppose that these great quantities of low-grade hogs suggested by the hon. member are being put into bacon to be exported to Great Britain when the figures which I have just placed upon the record are the facts in connection with the situation. I think it is important when we are discussing questions of this kind that we get all the facts.

Mr. BRYCE: Is it not a fact that "B-3's" and "C-1's" can go into export bacon?

Mr. GARDINER: "B-3's" may, but not "C-1's". The fact that they can go in is not proving that they do go in.

Mr. BRYCE: Where do the hogs go?

Mr. GARDINER: If my hon. friend will read the agreement which was made with Great Britain he will find that if "B-3's" do go in they do not bring the same price, either to the packer or to anyone else.

Mr. BRYCE: Is it not a fact that when a carload of hogs is graded at shipboard they pick out one or two bales and that satisfies the inspector that it is export bacon?

Mr. GARDINER: I have only five minutes and perhaps my hon. friend will permit me to answer the question. I have not the privilege of being a Scotsman although my ancestors came from Scotland, but I think any Scotsman coming from Scotland will know that no inspector is going to take every bale out of a shipload and make individual inspection. If he did that, the bacon would never get out of the country.

With regard to cattle, my hon. friend says that he needs a margin in order to produce steers during the winter time. I am not going to argue that question with him, but I should like to tell him that there is not ten per cent of the beef produced in this country that is produced in commercial feed lots or from cattle purchased from someone in the manner described by the hon. member for Selkirk and converted into beef.

Mr. BRYCE: Then I can sell my grain.

Mr. GARDINER: Ninety per cent of the beef produced in this country is produced by people who breed live stock, who raise their own grain to feed to that live stock. What I have said since the beginning of the war and what I continue to say is that we are not going to get a proper policy upon which to handle ninety per cent of the beef produced in this country if that policy is based upon the needs of the people who undertake the commercial feeding of cattle. My hon. friends across the way try to leave the impression that I am just a poor schoolteacher who never farmed.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Not a poor school teacher.

Mr. GARDINER: I can go into the Moose Jaw or Regina market and buy a steer in competition with any hon. member over there and pay at least one cent a pound more than he can afford to pay if he is a commercial feeder. I can take that steer to my farm and feed my own grain and make more money than he can. That is the reason why commercial feeders are not able to buy cattle on the market under the present condition. They are not able to get them because the farmer, the man who produces his own live stock, the man who produces his own grain, the man who carries the whole operation right through, can do the job at a lesser cost and make more money than the chap who goes into it in the other way. He can buy a few steers and put them in with his own and take the cattle away from the commercial feeder.

I know there are fellows who live outside large cities like Winnipeg who pride themselves upon being farmers, but they spend most of their time in Winnipeg sitting on boards of one kind or another. They boast considerably about what they are able to do. Probably they can go on to the market and buy some of the poorer fed cattle, cattle which are well bred but which were not fed before they were sent in; they can pick them up at a low price and freeze out the farmer in the country who sent them in and who did not know just exactly what he was doing. They can take them out, buy some grain, feed them, take them back in and make some profit. But one reason why that is becoming less possible is that we have our inspectors and our agronomists going around the country advising farmers how to finish their stock, how to feed them, how to put them on the market in the proper form.

Some of our hon. friends who are connected with farm organizations would be doing a better job for the farmer if they were to advocate the setting up of local markets into which a farmer could go to purchase cattle before they are put on trains and shipped hundreds of miles to a central market. After reaching the central market they are then shipped fifty, sixty or 100 miles to be finished, and the shipping costs and the cost of feeding are added before the cattle get back on the market again. Markets should be organized in different areas so that the farmer who has not sufficient grain to finish all the cattle he has can take them to that market in order that some neighbouring farmer who has the grain may buy them and feed them.

[Mr. Gardiner.]

The next time my estimates come up I am going to place on *Hansard* a letter written by a farmer in my constituency which I read in a newspaper a short time ago. I am not sure but that he was a Scotsman. He said that he could give some lessons on feeding to some farmers who talk like some hon. members in this house who talk about farming. He knew they would be very helpful. For instance, he said that he raised and fed two pigs for $25, and sold them for $25 each. Then he says that he takes steers, just the same as my hon. friend said he did, weighs them, weighs the feed, feeds them and puts 200 pounds on them in less than six months.

Mr. BRYCE: I said 300 pounds.

Mr. GARDINER: After he had fed the steers he made $1.25 a bushel on his oats. I would rather listen to stories of that kind than listen to the kind of stories we have heard to-night coming from men who claim they know all about feeding live stock, men who spend their time going around the country telling farmers how they ought to run their farms and how hard up all the farmers are. I would rather listen to farmers who are home farming. They have spent their time feeding cattle and feeding hogs and growing grain with which to feed them, and then they have seen to it that they are marketed at the proper time and thus have secured the highest possible returns for them.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

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

Monday, February 21, 1944

The house met at three o'clock.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT ON TUESDAYS UNTIL FOLLOWING THURSDAY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That when the house adjourns on Tuesday, the 22nd instant, it stand adjourned until Thursday, the 24th instant; and, unless otherwise ordered, when the house adjourns on Tuesday evenings, it stand adjourned until the following Thursday, and that standing order 2 be suspended in relation thereto for the present session.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): When the Prime Minister mentioned on Friday his intention of introducing this motion I was of the opinion that, under

the rules of the house, the motion was one that required the usual notice, and subsequent inquiries, I think, have substantiated that view. The Prime Minister, however, was good enough in any event to allow the matter to stand over until to-day for discussion.

The question raised by this motion is one that goes perhaps a little farther than its phraseology would indicate. So far as our party is concerned, we are opposing the motion, and we do so after very careful consideration of its merits and demerits. May I indicate some of the reasons why we have arrived at that conclusion.

I think it will be readily apparent that there is need in this house for a better division of the average private member's time. If our party were of the opinion that this motion would in some way contribute to that end, we should be of course more inclined to give it favourable consideration; but when it is proposed that we should suspend sittings on Wednesday, many points naturally occur to one's mind as to the advisability of such a change. In the first place, I believe that Wednesday will be generally regarded by the members of the house, putting it on a comparative basis, as a particularly active parliamentary day. Coming in the middle of the week, it is a day on which the business of the house is usually given great care and attention, and that is not to reflect upon any other day on which we sit. It does seem to me that to take Wednesday out of the week, as this motion would do, even for the express purpose indicated by the Prime Minister, namely, to enable the committees to meet instead of the house, would be a backward rather than a forward step, if we have in mind the expedition of the work of the House of Commons.

In support of that contention, when we speak of the committees utilizing Wednesday for their sittings while the sittings of the house itself are suspended, I would point out that for years—I do not know whether there is any special reason for it—the committees in the main have not made use of their Mondays and Fridays to the full. While therefore that is the situation it does seem to me that there is a very strong argument against taking away one of the principal days of our sittings and utilizing it for committee work until at least the committees have found that the time allotted to their operations, from Monday until Friday night, has been entirely filled. That, I think, is one of the matters which the government ought to consider seriously before suspension of these sittings takes place.

There is another reason which must not be lost sight of, although I do not place special emphasis upon it. Since the government has asked private members to suspend the initiation of such matters as are normally introduced by them, it is not in the public interest to take away another three hours of an important day in the week when private members can have these deliberations.

Nor is it sufficient for the Prime Minister to indicate in introducing this motion that we are getting three hours on Friday evening. That is hardly in accordance with the fact, and although I know the Prime Minister was not making a special point of it, I want to clear it up in case it is in anybody's mind. There is no justification for our not sitting on Friday night, because that period is always available, according to the rules, for the house to sit. That is to say, we do not depart from any custom when we sit on Friday nights, and it should be our regular habit to do so, particularly in time of war. So that what we are really doing is taking three hours off our regular weekly sessions, at a time when, I believe, the public expect this parliament to give a full week's attention to a full week's job. For these reasons I trust the Prime Minister and the government will reconsider this proposal.

I now come to a consideration which is important from the point of view of the government, but not of parliament. We may as well face the fact that one of the main reasons why the suspension of Wednesday afternoon sittings is sponsored by the government is that the cabinet finds itself at certain times very much overworked. I am not going to dwell upon that, but I suggest, before the Prime Minister decides we should give up these important three hours, that he might well give thought to a reorganization of his ministry. I say this in the most kindly and friendly spirit. I notice two ministers applauding; I hope the Prime Minister does not see either of them, for I am bound to say that I do not think the work of the cabinet ministers is very equitably divided, if we on this side are in any position to judge. I am not reflecting on any cabinet minister, but there are some ministers who work very hard and others who do not have any more, to say the least, than enough work to do. That being the view, I believe, of parliament and the country, it seems to me that some way should be found whereby the cabinet's work could be so apportioned that it could spare enough men to handle Wednesday afternoon sittings to the satisfaction of the house, the government and the public.

Here is another strange thing. Last year seven parliamentary assistants were appointed, and we were asked to vote money for the

purpose. My understanding was that this step was taken to relieve ministers in their parliamentary work. It was stated quite freely, I believe, in this chamber, that these men were not to be simply glorified deputy ministers, but were to be parliamentary assistants, as their title implies. Some very good men have been appointed, and I do not intend to criticize any of them. What I do criticize is the system under which they are operating. We have not noticed that to any great extent they have taken the places of ministers, except on very rare occasions, in debates in the house. Seldom does it happen that ministers are not here just as they were before, answering questions. It seems strange therefore that if pressure of work on the cabinet is the reason for suspending Wednesday afternoon sittings, the change was not proposed before these parliamentary assistants were appointed. On this point I come back to the question of distribution of work in the cabinet. I do not want to make any reflection on the Minister of Justice, or to contrast his work with that of the Minister of Agriculture. But it has always been an open question to us why, for instance, the Minister of Justice should have a parliamentary assistant. If he needs one I have no objection; both he and his parliamentary assistant are held in very high esteem and regard in this house. Anything I say is directed against the system rather than against those who hold the positions. But there does not seem to be much argument about this, that if the Minister of Justice needs a parliamentary assistant, the Minister of Agriculture, who has a tremendous burden to carry, should also have one. I mention this so that the whole problem of the distribution of government work may engage the attention of the Prime Minister from now on.

Further, if Wednesday is set aside as a day for committee meetings only, there arise such questions as provision of rooms and staff for the committees, and whether the committees will sit all through the week. More particularly this point must be in the minds of hon. members. Before the special committee on rules and procedure have held more than two sittings, this announcement is made. It seems to me that the government might have referred to that committee the question of Wednesday afternoon sittings in order that we might have expert advice as to how it would fit in with the general scheme of changes in rules and procedure which may be recommended to the house.

If a better system of expedition and dispatch in the work of the house can be devised, I am all in favour of it, and so is our party. We have called incessantly for a better system whereby the work of the chamber may be facilitated, but it does not seem to me that the taking away of some of the time of the house in the middle of the week is the right way to achieve this laudable object. And, having in mind that so far as the house is concerned Wednesday is one of our active days in legislation, I express my own views and the views of the party which I lead in this house as opposed to the adoption of the motion of the Prime Minister.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): Mr. Speaker, this is one occasion on which I am sorry I shall not be able to support the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon). I am rather in favour of the motion. Personally I find, as I think every other hon. member finds, that if I do my work properly a parliamentary session is a tremendous grind. I have often told my constituents that if a member of parliament is to do his work as it should be done he can be the busiest man in the world; or, on the other hand, if he does not want to do his work properly he can be the laziest man in the world. I am under the impression that there should be a complete change in the hours of parliamentary sittings. Sometimes it is hard for us to break away from custom, but I should be delighted to learn that the committee being set up to consider the rules of procedure was to review the matter of the sitting hours, in order that we might facilitate the business of the house and also facilitate the work of members of parliament. We meet at three o'clock in the afternoon and sit until eleven o'clock at night. Some may regard that as a short day because it involves only six hours, but many of the provincial legislatures sit only in the afternoon. When I tell some of my people that we sit at night, they are quite surprised. When I tell them further that one gets down here at nine o'clock in the morning, or thereabouts, and looks after his correspondence, then goes into a committee at ten or eleven o'clock and stays there until one, then attends the sittings of the house beginning at three o'clock and again at eight o'clock, that seems like a pretty good day's work. Before I am here very long I begin to feel the effects of that work.

I do not believe we should have to sit so late at night in order that hon. members may properly represent their constituencies in this house. I am sure we all want to facilitate the business, but at the same time we want to retain our health, and there is something in that. I believe we should let up a little on these hours. Therefore I am in favour of the motion to do away with the Wednesday sitting. It does not necessarily follow that this will help us very much, because I know that the

committees will sit that day, but they may meet in the morning and afternoon and still leave us Wednesday evening free.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, there are a good many reasons, I think, why the motion of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) should be supported by the house; most of them have been given already. We fear, however, that if we do not sit on Wednesday that day may not be utilized as well as it might be. At the present time Mondays and Fridays are off days; usually we try to avoid taking votes on those days, because many hon. members who live in the vicinity of Ottawa go home for the week-end. If we had another day, Wednesday, without a sitting of the house, my colleagues fear that we would be simply prolonging the session and not utilizing that day so as to get the most out of it. Personally I must confess that I would welcome being relieved of house duties on Wednesday. I agree with the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell) that those of us who have very heavy correspondence, who are trying to operate something of a major political movement, without facilities and from one small room under this roof, would from that point of view welcome an additional day.

With the position of the government I think every hon. member of this house must have a great deal of sympathy. I often wonder how the ministers manage to attend the meetings of cabinet council, which must be a great strain upon them, and at the same time attend in the house as frequently and as assiduously as they do. I agree with the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) that hon. members who last year supported the proposal to appoint parliamentary assistants hoped that these assistants would relieve the ministers of constant attendance in the house, and would be able to speak for them on more occasions than they have in the past year.

Our fear, sir, is that this day may not be utilized in the manner in which it ought to be utilized, and for that reason some have grave doubts as to the wisdom of the proposal now made by the Prime Minister.

Mr. J. S. ROY (Gaspe): It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to argue the wisdom of the motion of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), or to discuss the question of facilitating the work of the cabinet or of hon. members who are serving on committees. I should like to submit that if our sittings must be suspended one day during the week, it might be more practicable and more advantageous to hon. members if that day were Friday. As the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) has just pointed out, many hon. members go home on Friday for the week-end and, since half the membership of the house does not serve on committees, to suspend the sitting on Friday would give those hon. members a chance to go home and look after their business during the week-end. I submit that Friday would be a better day than Wednesday. I shall not move any amendment to the motion of the Prime Minister, but if my suggestion is approved by the house I hope the government will agree to it.

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, on April 20, 1943, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) introduced his motion to appoint parliamentary assistants to the ministers, and I opposed that motion as best I could. I was satisfied at that time that I was right, and I am now doubly satisfied, because the Prime Minister has to come along with this motion notwithstanding the fact that, as my leader has said, we have appointed six parliamentary assistants. I do not want these parliamentary assistants to feel that anything I am about to say is intended as a reflection on them, for they were perhaps the best the Prime Minister could have selected from his side of the house, and my remarks have no reference to them or the work they have been doing. Personally I could not see why any red-blooded minister would want to be bothered with a parliamentary assistant. In this regard I am happy to hold up the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) as a shining example to other members of the cabinet. Last year when the Prime Minister introduced his motion for appointment of parliamentary assistants he said, at page 2346 of *Hansard* of April 20 of that year:

> I need not elaborate upon the necessity of securing assistance for the ministers of the defence departments, of the Department of Munitions and Supply, the Department of Labour and the Department of Agriculture.

But the little Napoleon from the west does not need a parliamentary assistant, and I doubt if any minister in the cabinet has a more responsible or more difficult job to handle. I congratulate him upon his ability to handle his department. I have said that he is a little Napoleon; I might have said as well that he is a walking dynamo, and I congratulate the government upon having in the cabinet a man with the capacity of the Minister of Agriculture. I do not want anyone to think I am supporting what he does; I am speaking of his ability in handling his department.

I can picture a minister having a parliamentary assistant come to him for information. The minister will tell his assistant what to say in the house, and must take the responsi-

bility for what is to be said. Naturally this takes the time of the minister. He would be much better occupied in attending to some other business. I never could see why, in this country of merely 12,000,000 people, and with its nineteen or twenty ministers—more I believe than we ever had before—parliamentary assistants were required. I was opposed to the whole business, because it was a useless expense to the country.

Mr. McIVOR: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MacNICOL: Order. Will the hon. member remain in his seat? I had begun to say that I was for many years a business man; I was connected with big business for many years, and I ought to know something about how to run a business. It would seem that the Prime Minister now finds he has to cut out Wednesday sittings. What will happen? Many members do not come to Ottawa until Tuesday night. Under the new arrangement there will be no necessity for them to come until Wednesday night. Then, many of them go back on Thursday, and the result will be that they will be in Ottawa one day in the week. If it is necessary that we have more time for committee work, why not take the whole of Wednesday night and Friday night for committees?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I do not want to work every night.

Mr. MacNICOL: I realize the Prime Minister wants to have more time. Those two nights are available, and I should think he could use them for committees.

What do we find? In the list before us are some fourteen parliamentary committees, and I think the country ought to know just what those committees are. First there is the committee on privileges and elections. Well, it may meet once in a session, but I doubt if it meets at all. The next is the committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines. Railways are not being built any more, so that that committee is likely to sit only infrequently.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It has not sat for several sessions.

Mr. MacNICOL: The hon. member for York-Sunbury says it has not sat for several sessions. That crosses that out, so far as work goes. The next is the committee on miscellaneous private bills. What time does that take which would interfere with the House of Commons?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It is just a matter of considering divorce bills.

[Mr. MacNicol.]

Mr. MacNICOL: And divorces are handled by the other house. The next is the committee on banking and commerce. This year that committee may have a good deal to do, because of the revision of the Bank Act. So far in the list that is the first committee which will have anything to do.

The next is the public accounts committee. I do not know whether that is the same as the committee of which the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Cleaver) is chairman. If not, then the public accounts committee has nothing to do. I realize of course that the other committee about which I have spoken has much to do.

The committee on agriculture and colonization, next on the list, I presume has much work to do, although I do not know. The committee on standing orders would need to sit only about once a month. Then, what is done by the committee on marine and fisheries?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Nothing.

Mr. MacNICOL: Surely the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Bertrand) is capable of looking after that business.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It should meet, but it never does.

Mr. MacNICOL: Then there is the committee on mines, forests and waters. Again these matters are under the control of a very able minister, the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Crerar)—and I pat him on the back as being one who does not require a parliamentary assistant.

The next is the committee on industrial and international relations; is it meeting any more? I have been in the house for years, and for a long time I have not noted any sittings of that committee.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Eight years ago.

Mr. MacNICOL: The committee on debates —has that anything to do? The committee on printing—well, what does the printing committee have to do? The Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) smiles. I must tell him right now I was most surprised that he accepted a parliamentary assistant. I thought he was a big, strong, red-blooded man, and could quite easily take care of his department by himself. I am sorry I was disappointed.

The next is the committee on the library of parliament. Has it anything to do? Then, the committee on the restaurant. I do not suppose it has much to do. The committee on railways and shipping—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It has a lot to do.

Mr. MacNICOL: It does not do much. Then the committee on the revision of standing orders. I presume that was the special committee appointed this year. Then the committee on The Dominion Elections Act. That committee has little to do; I hope our work will not take long.

The last on the list is the committee on reconstruction, which is now meeting. Out of that list of committees, how many are going to meet on Wednesdays, occupying the whole of that day?

I should like to support the Prime Minister, because he has a terrific job. I have no desire to add to his burdens; rather I would have them lessened. However I cannot see how the turning over of Wednesdays to the meeting of committees would relieve the congestion in parliament. I should like to see my own work lessened. I represent a large industrial riding, and I have a heavy correspondence. Rarely do I get away from these buildings until twelve o'clock at night. I am in my seat every sitting day, and I find that all my time is occupied. Certainly I should like to have more time to myself, but I am satisfied that the proposed arrangement for Wednesdays would not help me. In fact I would be afraid it would lengthen days which are now altogether too long.

The house knows where I stand, and I shall vote against the proposal.

Mr. DANIEL McIVOR (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, I do not question the right of the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) to speak; but from a sign I thought he gave me I concluded that he had finished his remarks. However, in that I was mistaken.

I do not agree with the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) when he says Wednesday is the most important day in the house.

Mr. GRAYDON: I did not say that.

Mr. McIVOR: Perhaps I am wrong. To my mind Friday is the most important day, because, with the Tuesday-and-Thursday men at home, we get some business done. The leaving of Wednesdays for committees is a good suggestion, but to those in charge of making arrangements for committees I would say they should see to it that every hon. member is on a committee, so that no one may be idle. I believe the suggestion with regard to Wednesdays is wise, because no hon. member wishes to sit in committee when the house is sitting. Every hon. member who speaks in the house is worth hearing, no matter from which side he may speak. For these reasons I support the proposal.

Mr. J. A. ROSS (Souris): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that I am opposed to this motion to suspend Wednesday sittings of the house for the present session. As has been so well pointed out, the passing of this motion would mean that there would be only two days in the week which would be available from the private members' point of view. As is known, many eastern members go home on Thursday evening or Friday morning and come back on Monday evening, and some understanding seems to have grown up in the house that important votes and important discussions will not take place except from Tuesday to Thursday inclusive of each week. If we do not sit on Wednesdays we shall have only two days for important matters.

The Prime Minister has pointed out that the sessions are strenuous for the cabinet ministers who must attend cabinet meetings and do their parliamentary work as well. I understand that when the parliamentary assistants were appointed a year ago it was done to relieve the ministers of much of their work in the house I agree with some of the remarks that have been made as to there being no necessity for some of these parliamentary assistants, although I think others of them were quite necessary.

I am convinced that this proposed arrangement will lengthen the session of parliament. I am one of the many who come from a considerable distance to attend the sessions. We are forced to stay in Ottawa over the long week-ends. We are faced with the expense of keeping up our homes in our constituencies. The cost of living in Ottawa is high, and we are not allowed to make deductions on our income tax returns for living expenses when we are away from home, as is permitted some of these dollar a year men who advise the government.

An hon. MEMBER: And the ministers.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Never mind the ministers just now. I think all in all that the motion of the Prime Minister is a most unfair one. Private members are just as anxious as the government that we get on with the business of the country, but we are faced with the fact that our rights as private members are being whittled down. We cannot challenge the answers given to questions asked on the orders of the day; we must accept those answers as given. The other day my namesake, the hon. member for Hamilton East (Mr. Ross), a supporter of this government, was referring to the labour order, and is reported to have said at page 365 of *Hansard*:

> The government is run by a bureaucracy, the members are nothing and I frankly admit it. If the order had gone through the house, it would have been better prepared.

The hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Corman) is reported on the same page to have said:

> The members of parliament are dead guinea pigs. I have never been consulted or called in on these matters. I admit there are powers behind the government. I think most of them are necessary, but I cannot see why the members should not be consulted.

Both those members are supporters of this government.

An hon. MEMBER: It is dead.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): That may be. On many occasions the Prime Minister has set forth his great respect for parliamentary traditions. I am satisfied that the people of this country have great respect for the worth-while traditions of parliament, but I must confess that during the past few years under this regime parliament has fallen into disrepute in the minds of many of the people across this country. I think we should be careful not to allow further progress to be made in this respect. Just the other day the Prime Minister rose in his place and pointed out the trend that had taken place in connection with the formation of new groups. He stated that we were simply repeating what had happened in France. I would remind him that all this has taken place under his leadership and with so-called Canadian unity.

One hon. member pointed out this afternoon that he finds the long hours he has to put in on his parliamentary duties a strain on his health. I would point out that our men overseas must work much longer hours and under more difficult conditions than we do in this country. They should be considered when we think of ourselves in these times of stress and strain. In a period of war we must all make many sacrifices, but since coming here in 1940 it has become apparent to me that if present conditions continue we shall have a state of affairs in Canada under which only the very wealthy or those who have no substantial incomes or businesses will be able to come here as members of parliament. The average business man or farmer could not afford to make this sacrifice in ordinary times, but as I say we must all be prepared to sacrifice to the limit during war time.

I am opposed to the motion, because I do not think it is in the interests of the country. It will certainly lengthen the session and not help us with our legislative programme.

Mrs. DORISE W. NIELSEN (North Battleford): Mr. Speaker, with all due respect I suggest that perhaps we are wasting the time of the house by continuing this debate. I think we would be very sensible to fall in with the idea suggested by the Prime Minister. We should support his motion and see how it works out. If after a time the committees should feel that their work was progressing satisfactorily, we could resume our sittings on Wednesdays.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Before the Prime Minister closes the debate I should like to ask him a question. Is it his hope that by taking Wednesdays he will be able to accomplish more on Fridays by retaining the membership of the house on those days? We might as well face the situation and admit that Friday is usually a lost day, except for the discussion of agriculture estimates. My observation over a long period of years is that all that takes place is a debate between the Minister of Agriculture and the western members opposing the administration, and it really is a lost day.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Nothing much is decided in those debates, and I have listened to them for twenty years. It is "wheat, wheat, wheat," and what the government did not do that they should have done; and for the most part I say it is a lost day. If the Prime Minister entertains that hope, then we may have some trading offset for the loss of Wednesdays, but I think it is a faint hope. I believe these week-enders will still go out on the four o'clock train on Fridays.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Thursdays.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Let us be fair. I sometimes have to go home myself, and that is what happens. If that could be remedied; if those members would remain here on Fridays and that day could be made a real parliamentary day, then there would be some offset for the loss of Wednesdays. Otherwise I fear the Prime Minister is going to defeat the object he has in mind; Wednesday afternoons will be a loss in the work of the session, and we shall not be any further ahead.

With reference to the cabinet ministers attending the house on Wednesdays, I should like to say that I have sat over here and watched the cabinet ministers. I do not want to say anything derogatory about them, but after the orders of the day are completed those gentlemen scurry out of the chamber like rabbits to their warrens. At times I have seen not more than two cabinet ministers in the two rows of front benches. There may be a good reason for this, but the fact is that cabinet ministers spend more time out of the chamber than they spend in it. I think this is against the Prime Minister's contention that he should have Wednesday afternoons for cabinet consultations.

The Prime Minister said that this will speed up committee meetings, but over a long period of years my observation is that the committees do a tremendous volume of work under high pressure and tension for a limited period of time, usually beginning about the middle of the session. During the early part of the session they do not meet. How many standing committees have already met this session? So far as I know, not one of them. Some of the special committees have met. The committee on the rules has had two meetings—very good meetings, I would say.

An hon. MEMBER: You were on that committee.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Yes; perhaps that is why they were good. But none of the other committees has done any work yet, because there has been no work for them to do. Why have we not had the Bank Act before the banking and commerce committee? I suppose there is a good reason for that. I know that my good friend the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. McGeer) is loaded with ammunition and is going gunning on that occasion. On the whole I think we are going to lose, on balance, by adopting this motion, and I should like the Prime Minister to give a better reason than he has given before I can convince myself that I should vote for the motion.

Mr. W. F. RICKARD (Durham): Mr. Speaker, I feel that I should make my position clear on this motion. I am not particularly opposed to the motion, because I have every sympathy with the cabinet ministers in the work they are doing; but as has been already pointed out, parliamentary assistants have been appointed who we thought were going to take some of the burden from the shoulders of the cabinet ministers.

As far as the general committees are concerned, it has been the custom since I have been in the house for them not to begin to meet until the middle or latter part of the session. I understand that it is the special committees that will meet on Wednesdays, and anyone who looks over the membership of this house must know that a great many members are not members of any special committee. The brains of this house are not all concentrated in a few people. I think every hon. member has his part to play and something to contribute, and I do not see why every member of the house could not be put on one of the special committees. Take the committee on reconstruction and rehabilitation. Probably no one is more interested in that committee than the farmer members, but there are only four farmers on that committee out of a membership of thirty-five. It seems to me that that is hardly a fair distribution.

Some of us who are not members of special committees will have nothing to do if the house does not sit on Wednesdays, except perhaps our ordinary work. We might of course devote the time to something of educative value, but so far as the work of this house is concerned we shall have nothing to do. If it were going to shorten the work of parliament I would be all in favour of the motion, but personally I cannot see it that way.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I agree that we are spending a little too much time in discussing the motion. I think it would be much better to take a vote now and let the members decide what they want. For myself I am not in favour of prolonging this debate. I wish to warn the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), however, that the adoption of the motion is not going to facilitate very much the work of the house, by having the committees sit on Wednesdays. What the Prime Minister needs to do is to appoint one of his ministers, who may not have so much to do as some of the others, to organize the work of the house and of the committees so that as many committees and as many private members as possible will be working every day. No one wants to be sitting around this house without something to do. Personally I have plenty to do whether the house or the committees are sitting or not, but I can understand that others may not have enough to do. The work of the session should be so arranged, and it should be someone's responsibility to so arrange it, that after a committee is appointed it should be set expeditiously to work and continue at its work until it has completed whatever piece of legislation is referred to it.

I support the motion and I hope that we can soon get on with the work of the house.

Mr. A. R. ADAMSON (York West): Mr. Speaker, I do not think this motion will have the effect of either aiding the government or shortening the session. On the contrary I think it will tremendously increase the length of the sessions. I think it will do other things as well.

The three most important committees of this house, in view of the speech from the throne and the possibility of new legislation, are the social security committee, the reconstruction committee, and the banking and commerce committee. If we have all Wednesday for the social security committee to sit, I am quite certain that every individual in Canada with his own pet theory on health or security

or social planning or some other panacea will wish to be heard before that committee, and a tremendous amount of irrelevant and extraneous information will be put before the committee, so that when the committee gets down to its work of making a report and perhaps helping to draft legislation, there will be such a volume of material before it, and so much of it, with all due respect, quite useless, that we shall not be serving the country as well. I believe that to get a committee functioning properly there should be a sense of urgency pervading it; but if this motion goes through we shall be inclined to sit back and say, "We have all Wednesday", and people will come before us and present everything. That is why I oppose this motion.

Last year the house spent over a month in the debate on the speech from the throne, and approximately a month on the budget. Fortunately this year the debate on the speech from the throne has ended. But I suggest that the government might limit the debates on the address and on the budget so that the house will retain its function as a deliberative and legislative assembly, and so that we shall not have members speaking for certain special and local interests in order to get their speeches on *Hansard*.

I think this motion will lengthen the sessions, will not make the committees more efficient, and will not assist the government in the efficient prosecution of this country's war effort.

Mr. T. C. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this motion because, contrary to what the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) expects, I think its tendency, if adopted, will be to lengthen the session, and that has serious repercussions for those of us who live a long distance away from Ottawa. The other day the Prime Minister referred to the fact that in Great Britain parliament for a great part of the session sits from Tuesday to Thursday. But in Britain the distances are so short that a member can go home over the week-end and mingle with his constituents and come back on Tuesday with something of the point of view of the people he represents. We are in a totally different position because of the vast distances in Canada. We are here five or six months of the year, and those of us who live a long distance from our constituents seldom can get back home during the session and get their point of view and discuss their personal problems which they want us to bring before the House of Commons.

I do not think Wednesdays should be taken away. It is true the Prime Minister says that we have three hours on Friday night, but I think we should have that time anyway, and I think we should do committee work on Saturday, so as to allow members to get away by June or July. Last year it was the 2nd of August before I left the city, and many other members were a day or two later than that. That is a long time to be out of touch with the people whom one represents.

The second point is this. I have every sympathy with the main contention of the Prime Minister, that the cabinet ought to have more time. I agree with that, but some other arrangement could be made. I suggest that on one day of the week, either Thursday or Friday, or whatever days the government may choose, the war committee of the cabinet could meet, and that day could be devoted exclusively to estimates or other matters concerning departments whose ministers are not on the war committee of the cabinet; ministers who are on that committee could be represented by their parliamentary assistants. This would give one day of each week to the war committee of the cabinet for the discussion of matters which they are called upon to consider in carrying the great burden which each of us recognizes they are called upon to bear.

Mr. E. E. PERLEY (Qu'Appelle): I am in accord with the views expressed by one or two hon. members who have spoken before me, especially those from the west. From my experience, a great deal of time is wasted, and it is a mistake to cut out Wednesdays. The last speaker referred to committees. If on Wednesday six or seven committees are meeting, you will have the whips running around and there will be great difficulty getting quorums together, because certain members are on two or three committees. Many of us are on two committees, and last year I found it difficult when attending one committee in which I was interested to find time to attend another committee meeting which I should like to have attended.

It is very unfair to members west of Fort William to ask us to forgo Wednesday sittings, because they never get a chance to go home. We used to sit on Friday nights, and as hon. members will recall, one or two ministers generally opened up their estimates earlier in the session than others and took advantage of that night. In that way we have accomplished a good deal. It would have been a good thing if many of the members who are present now had been in the house on Friday night last, because we had a very informative discussion and obtained much information which I am afraid half the members who were absent will not take the time to read. In my

opinion it would prolong the session to adopt this motion and it is not fair to keep the western members here six and seven months. In the 1942 session we were here nearly seven months and last year about six months. From that point of view I am opposed to the motion.

Mr. J. W. NOSEWORTHY (York South): There are just two points I wish to discuss for a moment. First of all, I intend to follow the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) in this vote, and in view of the peculiar circumstances under which I was elected I should explain that statement. I am voting against this motion because, from my short experience in the house, during which time I have served on a number of committees, I am not satisfied that the work in any committee on which I have served warrants a suspension of the work of the house in favour of committees. Most of the reports of these committees are tabled in this house but few if any of them are ever brought to the house for consideration. If the estimates or other matters are passed on to committees, the majority of the members of the house will have no opportunity of discussing them.

The second point on which I wish to protest is this. Suggestions have been made in this house that members, particularly from the Toronto area, are accustomed to absenting themselves from the house on Mondays and Fridays. I would ask hon. members to look over the house this afternoon. If they do they will find that practically every member from Toronto and the Toronto area is in his place. I want that made quite clear. Because we come from Toronto or the Toronto area does not by any means indicate that we are not here in our places on Monday or Friday.

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): I am glad there is sufficient elbow room in this group to permit us to disagree with one another. Personally I am in favour of the motion presented by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). I do not think it is going to extend the session five minutes, for the simple reason that we have not been sitting on Wednesday nights, nor have we been sitting on Friday nights. The proposal before us definitely states that we shall sit on Friday nights.

The reason, however, why I am in favour of the motion is that I am anything but satisfied with the way the committee work is conducted, and I refer particularly to the special committees. We have the reconstruction committee, the social security committee, and the committee on war expenditures. The work being carried on by these committees is just as important as, if not more important than, the business of this house, because these committees are actually planning the future of Canada, giving the house guidance as to the legislation that will go through. My experience in the past two years, so far as committees are concerned, has been this. You leave a stenographer at eleven o'clock or at ten-thirty and rush to a committee with a file full of papers which you have not had a chance to read. Then you sit in and listen to a presentation from the manufacturers' association, the chamber of commerce or some other organization with a battery of experts, and the committee is doing nothing but listening. The chairman is watching the clock to see when twelve-thirty arrives so as to announce the adjournment of the committee and then you bundle your file under your arm and go back to your office and before you get a chance to read it you meet someone else. That is not satisfactory.

My conception of the motion which the Prime Minister proposes is that we shall set aside Wednesday specifically for that committee work, and then it will be the responsibility of the chairmen of committees to see that their work is so organized that these committees will meet from ten in the morning until any hour in the evening necessary for them to complete their business. If the time is utilized in that way I think it will be a step in the right direction. But the responsibility will rest on the government side of the house to see to it that the chairmen of the respective committees so organize the work as to give those on the committees an opportunity of properly preparing their case, analysing the evidence, and getting some understanding of the deliberations of the committees.

I am in favour of the motion on the understanding that that time be properly utilized and the committee work be properly organized so that the committees may be in a better position to advise the house with respect to the matters that they are called upon to consider.

Mr. D. G. ROSS (St. Paul's): I want to thank the hon. member for York South (Mr. Noseworthy) for what he has said, and I also agree with some other hon. members who have spoken. There are one or two points I wish to put forward. If we sit from now on, through March, April, May and June, that will give us nineteen weeks, and if we have one meeting of a committee each week, that will be nineteen meetings. I do not know of any committee which has nineteen meetings. If we have two meetings a week,

that provides thirty-eight mornings when these matters can be discussed. I think it would be a great mistake to cease to sit on Wednesdays. It is true that Wednesday evening is free, and this gives the private member a little time to do necessary work. I shall have to oppose the Prime Minister's motion.

Mr. G. H. CASTLEDEN (Yorkton): In opposing this motion I wish to point out that the debates on the speech from the throne and on the budget usually include a number of forty-minute speeches. These debates generally take place at the beginning of the session. The committees begin their sittings and occupy a good deal of the time of most hon. members in the latter part of the session. In July, when the estimates are brought down and discussed, the house finds it possible to sit in the mornings from eleven to one o'clock, in the afternoons from three to six o'clock, and frequently, towards the end of the session, as late as midnight or one o'clock in the morning. Thus far this session we have been sitting about twenty-four hours a week; last week we sat, I believe, twenty-seven hours. It seems to me that we should be able to sit now, at the very least, six hours a day for five days a week and three hours on Saturday, and try to get our work finished.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): We used to sit all night. How about that?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: I would remind hon. members that if the Prime Minister speaks now he will close the debate.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: First of all, may I say to the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) that he was quite right when he directed the attention of the house to the fact that I was under the impression on Friday last that this motion, being one which related to the procedure of the house, did not require notice. The rule is that where the motion relates to the time of the sittings of the house it does not require any notice; but the interpretation of the word "time" is to hours rather than days, and, this motion having to do with day sittings, required notice in advance. I am sorry that I made the slip which I did at the time, but I am pleased my hon. friends have accepted my explanation with regard to it.

May I at once thank hon. members who have spoken in support of the motion. I am deeply appreciative of their having taken cognizance of the reasons which I gave when, on two previous occasions, I spoke of the desirability of this change; I am very grateful to them for their support.

I notice that I was supported in the matter by the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell), who is closely associated with the leader of the Social Credit party. I was a little surprised that the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross), who followed him, should have taken occasion to bring him—of all members—to task on the score that at a time of war we should all be prepared to make an equal sacrifice. I assume my hon. friend was not aware that the hon. member for Macleod had lost a son in this war, and in that regard has suffered a greater sacrifice—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Why bring that in?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:—than many others. I have a right to speak, as well as hon. gentlemen opposite, and if one of their number undertakes to take an hon. member of this house to task on any score of war service, it is part of my duty to point out where it becomes necessary for purposes of the record that the hon. member referred to has suffered no light sacrifice in respect to the war.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have the floor.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I think the remarks of the Prime Minister are quite uncalled for. I had not the slightest thought of any personal attack on the hon. member.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I should certainly not have drawn the attention of the house to the fact if the hon. member had not made a specific reference in replying to the hon. member for Macleod, in respect to equality of sacrifice at this time of war. I wish to say to my hon. friend from Macleod, and to some four or five other hon. members who have also lost their sons in this war, that I desire to take advantage of this moment to extend to each and every one of them the sympathy of this house in the supreme sacrifices which have been made by a member of their respective families—a sacrifice which is very real to themselves. I hope that hereafter hon. members will not make references of the kind without fully considering their bearing.

To the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) I would say that I am glad to reply immediately to his question, whether I believe that more would be accomplished in the long run by the house sitting on Friday night and

giving up the sitting on Wednesday afternoon and having the Wednesday free to be devoted entirely, if hon. members so desire, to the work of committees. I certainly do, and I made that statement previously when I spoke on this matter. I cannot see why this house should not accomplish more by having two sessions on Friday than by having one afternoon session on Wednesday and one afternoon session on Friday with all of Wednesdays left free for attendance by hon. members upon committees. The time, in hours of sitting, as has been pointed out, will be the equivalent, but I believe that more will be accomplished by virtue of the longer continuous sittings with extra time in addition for committees.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I had in mind the absence of so many on Fridays.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend has touched a point which I am glad he brought up. He has in mind the absence at certain times of a number of members. I ask him what this house is here for, whether it is here to get through business or to accommodate members who wish to be absent one day and present another? I am not the keeper of the consciences of hon. gentlemen in this house. If a member is not sufficiently interested to attend the different sittings of the house, that is his affair and the concern of his constituents; it is not the affair of the government. The government's concern is to try to get through all the business we possibly can. To ask that we should consider arranging the business of the house so as to accommodate those who wish to be absent part of the time instead of being present all the time is to prefer a perfectly unreasonable request.

May I say again that I hope the public at least do not believe that the amount of work which is accomplished in this parliament is to be estimated by the amount of talk, the amount of discussion. As a matter of fact, one of the hopes I cherish is that, having Wednesdays free, some hon. members at least will take advantage of that day to prepare themselves for debates which they expect may follow later on and will thereby be able the better to express themselves in a few words, instead, as so often happens, of getting their first knowledge of a matter which is being discussed when it comes up upon the orders of the day.

If hon. members will stop for a moment to consider how the parliament at Westminster conducts its affairs, they will realize that it is an absurdity to talk about the work of this parliament being dependent upon the number of hon. members that are in the house from day to day. I take it that every hon. member knows that in the British House of Commons they have seating capacity for something like 400 members, and that there are 615 members returned to the House of Commons. It would be just as reasonable to suggest that no meeting of the British House of Commons should be held to discuss important matters until the whole 615 members could be brought into the chamber. But Britain has realized that what counts is not talk but argument and the importance and the weight of argument, and that the important thing to accomplish in parliament is the business of the country, and to expedite the business which parliament has been summoned to consider. Perhaps that is one of the reasons why this house on different occasions has got through so much business on a Friday evening —because there have not been present others than those who were really interested in the matters under discussion. I think that disposes sufficiently of the matter of attendance in the house.

As to committees, if there can be an organization of the committee work in a way which will make it more effective, the government will be only too happy to lend itself to further that particular end. I ask hon. members, has there been a session of this parliament at any time when the work has been better organized than it has been from the beginning of this session up to this moment, and when more has been accomplished in an equivalent period of time? I say there has not been; and I believe that if hon. members will cooperate with the government in its work, much more in the way of expedition can be attained.

Mr. GRAYDON: Better put in a good word for the opposition on that.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am coming to the opposition in a moment.

Mr. GRAYDON: We will be ready for you.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: And I tell my hon. friend right now that one of the questions I intend to ask him in a moment is whether or not his leader is a part of the opposition. I want him to answer that question.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): If you want cooperation from the opposition you had better drop that line.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I may tell my hon. friend from York-Sunbury that I shall have a word to say about cooperation, too, before I am through. This house is not going to be run in the interests of opposing groups who wish to embarrass the government rather than cooperate with and help the government. It is not going to be carried on very long in that way; I can tell my hon. friend that right now.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That was your attitude from 1930 to 1935, wasn't it?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): This is the real opposition.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Now just keep quiet.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Let me come to the real question. I have spoken twice in the house on this matter; if that had not been the case, I would have taken a different attitude now. I have told hon. members quite frankly that at this time of war, with the great issues that are facing the government and the world and the tremendous responsibilities that are on the shoulders of the government in dealing from day to day with these vast problems, the government needs more time to devote to the careful study and consideration of war problems than it has when parliament is in session, with the sessions carried on as they have been in the past. I made that very clear both times I spoke, but I noticed that this afternoon most hon. gentlemen carefully avoided that side of the question. It was not the government that was being considered in any particular, though I would impress upon this house again that the government has the responsibility of carrying on the war effort of this country at this time. In turn each hon. member who has risen has for the most part spoken about what would suit his particular convenience. Well, it is very human for all of us to think about ourselves first, but I do submit that at a time of war such as this, when hon. members know the responsibility that is upon the government, it is very little to ask that when we are dealing with these questions the government should receive consideration, perhaps in the first instance, in the matter of the business of the house.

Perhaps I can say what I have to say pretty much in this word. Since the beginning of this war the prime minister of Britain has told the House of Commons what time he felt the government required to conduct the business of the country in a time of war, and he has arranged the sittings of the Commons accordingly. Mr. Chamberlain did that; Mr. Churchill has done it. Each of these prime ministers told the House of Commons in Britain that at a time of war the responsibility on the government was so great with regard to the questions which the government alone could consider if it was to deal with them properly in an executive way, or deal with them efficiently when coming before the House of Commons, that the government needed so much time; and, as I pointed out here, since the beginning of the war the House of Commons in Britain has sat an average of only three days a week. That is, the House of Commons in Britain has found it necessary to sit only three days a week, not that committees may sit or that others may do this or that, but that the prime minister and his colleagues and those who have to do with the executive part of the work of carrying on the war may have opportunity adequately to discuss the great questions that are before them, and have the necessary time for consultation. If the prime minister of Great Britain has found it necessary to say this to the Commons and the Commons has accepted his word, I think I might claim that, having undertaken to see if possible that this government will carry on until the end of the war, my colleagues and I are entitled to the consideration of this house in the matter of the conditions under which we are to carry on.

I do not want hon. members of this house to forget that, enjoying the confidence of this country as we do; having had it from all sides, from the opposition as well as from the press of this country practically with one voice, that we should continue to carry on until this war is over, I believe we are entitled to have our request immediately met when we say to hon. gentlemen opposite that we need an extra afternoon to confer on the great questions that are coming to us day by day. If we cannot get that cooperation, then we shall have to consider what our responsibility is. I must say that what has taken place this afternoon has not made me believe any more strongly than I did hitherto in the cooperation we can expect from hon. gentlemen opposite. I hope the citizens of this country will take today's *Hansard* and read the debate that has taken place this afternoon—

Mr. GRAYDON: So do we.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:—and see how many hon. gentlemen opposite have spoken in terms of what is needed on account of the war effort of this country at this time, and how many have dealt with petty politics which they thought would be helpful to them and obstructive to the government.

There was some talk about parliamentary assistants. Again hon. gentlemen seem to take the point of view that the service of a parliamentary assistant is to be measured only by the number of times his voice is heard in the House of Commons. Well, it only shows how completely lacking is their appreciation of what the duties of a minister and his assistant are, even to assert anything of that kind. A parliamentary assistant is busy from morning to night dealing with matters with which the minister is concerned, just as are the officials of his department. To suggest that his service

to the country is to be measured by the number of times he appears in the house, or to say that he must be here instead of the minister, is entirely to mistake the purposes for which he has been appointed. And may I add that instead of reducing the number of parliamentary assistants I am going to find it necessary very soon to add to the number, just because the work that is on the shoulders of some of the ministers is becoming so much heavier at this time than it has been heretofore. I think I am entitled to say to hon. members of this house that they must remember that we are now in the fifth year of war, and that those of us who compose the government, particularly those who are on the war committee of the cabinet, have had over four very heavy years in dealing with these questions. Our position is not made any easier or our burden any lighter by the fact we know of circumstances affecting the future now hanging over our heads and the heads of others in similar positions the like of which have never before hung over the heads of members of any ministries in the world.

These matters cannot be dealt with lightly. Take the position this very day, this very week; and when I speak of myself I speak for my colleagues as well. I began my work at nine o'clock this morning, trying to deal with some matters that are of immediate importance, trying to consult officials of the departments over which I preside, trying to make sure that at least some acknowledgment was made of some of the most important letters; I had to be in the cabinet council with my colleagues at twelve o'clock, and we were kept there until a quarter to three this afternoon. I had then to be in this house at three o'clock to debate the present motion. One of the questions we were discussing in cabinet council to-day was a question on which we are expected to give Great Britain an answer by Thursday of this week. It is a very, very important question, which we could not settle in the two and a half hours we met to-day, a large part of which time was devoted to a discussion of it. When I say that the government needs time to consider some of these matters, so that it can have an uninterrupted sitting of the necessary duration without feeling that its members must jump up in the next five minutes and rush off to be in the House of Commons to answer questions, I think I am entitled to have my word in that respect accepted.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Why not dispense with parliament altogether? You have pretty nearly done it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, I think parliament could very well dispense with my hon. friend.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury:) I venture to suggest to my right hon. friend that this country would not agree with him.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend is fond of talking about dispensing with many things, but I want to tell him that when he makes remarks of this kind he must expect to get back what is coming to him.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am not worrying about anything the Prime Minister may say. I leave it to the people of this country.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I come back to the position of the British parliament. There the ministers have their parliamentary secretaries, their financial secretaries, and many more assistants than our ministers have. It is true that they have many more important matters with which to deal, but the decisions that have to be made there are not more important relatively. The weight of responsibility is not any less, and I wish to say now to the house as Prime Minister of this country that it is not possible for the government of Canada at this time of war; knowing what lies immediately before the Canadian people and our armies in the field, to give the time required to the consideration of those problems which are coming up before us, the time which they should have, and which the interests of the country and of the war demand, unless we find it possible to have more time for continuous consultation while parliament is in session. I can think of no way in which that end can be achieved which would be less of a handicap to anyone than that of taking Wednesday afternoons for that purpose, and resuming the practice of having sittings of the house on Friday nights.

When my hon. friend interrupted me, I was speaking on some of the matters which we have to consider and how time is taken up in unexpected ways. Something has been said in the house about the wages control order. On Wednesday of this week the government is to meet with representatives of some of the railway brotherhoods, and I understand is to hear their representations, on this and other matters. Can my colleagues be excused from that? If they are absent, then there is comment on the fact that the government is not as respectful as it should be to the railway brotherhoods.

On Friday of this week we have an engagement to meet with representatives of the Dominion Trades and Labour Congress. After that we have a meeting with representatives of the Catholic Syndicates, to discuss also with them matters pertaining to the wage

order. I hope that all my colleagues will be present with me at both these meetings. This will take most of the entire morning, and past the hour at which the cabinet meets. This is all apart from ordinary business which we have to take up independently.

Reference has been made to the absence at times of ministers from the house. Hon. members when they look up and see a minister absent ask, "Why is he absent?" The likelihood is that he is meeting with a delegation which has been waiting for days to see him, or conferring with regard to some of these matters which have to be left to the government, and which the cabinet has to decide.

I repeat that we are asking this house to give the government what it feels is necessary by way of time to consider matters which relate to the war, and other important matters which are coming up. And I am quite prepared to have a vote taken, if hon. members feel after what I have already said that they wish to vote on the matter.

Now I come to what my hon. friend has said. At the beginning of his remarks—and I am referring to the leader of the opposition—he referred to "our party" as opposing this motion. "Our party is opposing the motion," he said. "Our party"—what I wish to know is, and what I want the house to know, and the country also to know, is whether his party means the Progressive Conservative party; and if it does mean the Progressive Conservative party whether Mr. John Bracken, as leader of the Progressive Conservative party, is taking the attitude that he will not cooperate with the leader of the government in helping to get the time necessary for the government to deal with matters pertaining to the war. I ask my hon. friend that question now. When he speaks about "our party" does he include in that statement Mr. Bracken, who is leader of the Progressive Conservative party?

Mr. GRAYDON: If the Prime Minister wishes me to make a speech, when he has finished I am going to do it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Answer yes or no to the question.

Mr. GRAYDON: The Prime Minister has no right to ask a question about what I am going to reply to him when he finishes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: You cannot. My hon. friend has spoken already and he has exhausted his right. He has not answered the question yet.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Let him answer now, whether when he speaks about "our party" he included Mr. Bracken?

Mr. GRAYDON: I object to being abused in the House of Commons. The Prime Minister has lost his temper this afternoon, and I wish him to calm down a bit before he loses it further. As to this question of asking me yes or no, I am not under cross-examination with respect to that matter and I do not propose to be put under cross-examination. More than that, the Prime Minister has raised one straw man after another to be knocked down this afternoon, and he cannot do it this time.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, all my hon. friend has said will be read with interest.

Mr. GRAYDON: I hope it will be.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: And I am very glad it is all on the record, because anyone looking at that record will see how the leader of the opposition sidestepped and carefully avoided answering the question as to whether Mr. Bracken and his party is attempting to cooperate in this house.

Mr. GRAYDON: You have not asked the question yourself yet.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This comes back to what I said at the opening of the session. We have to discover whether we are going to let hon. members opposite change the character of the parliamentary institutions in our country by having one office in the House of Commons for the leader of the opposition, and another for the leader of the party in opposition in some mysterious place far away. In this matter the country has a right to know where Mr. Bracken, as leader of the Progressive Conservative party, stands.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): He is upstairs.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What I wish to emphasize is this, and it should, I think, be remembered, that in stating that the government would seek to carry on until this war is over, the steps necessary to that end, I expected to take with the cooperation of leaders of all parties.

Mr. GRAYDON: You wish us to agree with everything?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, I never expected that.

Mr. GRAYDON: We have facilitated the work of the house as it has never been facilitated in years before.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Would my hon. friend please sit down?

Mr. GRAYDON: Thank you!

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: And may I say to my hon. friend, as leader of the opposition, and certain of his followers, that he would be much better to address the Chair when he is speaking.

Mr. GRAYDON: You did not address the Chair yourself.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): When you put the question.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have been addressing the Chair all along.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): You did not address the Chair when you put the question—when you insulted me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Coming back to what I said on the address, this procedure was first proposed in the debate on the speech from the throne. A few days ago I made a further reference to it at some considerable length. I showed hon. members, by statistics which are now recorded in *Hansard*, that the sittings of this house for the last four years had equalled in number the sittings of the British parliament. We had actually given as much time, given as many hours in the year, as the British parliament had given. I repeat, the British government has found it necessary, in the administration of the government of the country in a time of war, to shorten somewhat the proceedings of the House of Commons and parliament, and to be accorded by the house a longer time in which they might fulfil their great responsibilities. And so I appeal again this afternoon to the house to give this government that opportunity, and I leave it to the house to decide whether we shall be given it or not.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Mackenzie King) which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Bertrand (Terrebonne)	Crerar
Blackmore	Cruickshank
Blanchette	d'Anjou
Bradette	Donnelly
Casselman, Mrs. (Edmonton East)	Edwards
Chevrier	Evans
Clark	Fair
Claxton	Farquhar
Cleaver	Ferland
Coldwell	Fournier (Hull)
Corman	Gardiner
Gershaw	Gibson
Gillis	MacLean (Cape Breton North-Victoria)
Gladstone	McLean (Simcoe East)
Golding	McNiven (Regina City)
Goulet	Marshall
Graham	Martin
Grant	Maybank
Gray	Mayhew
Hansell	Michaud
Hanson (Skeena)	Mitchell
Henderson	Mulock
Hill	Mutch
Hlynka	Nicholson
Howden	Nielsen, Mrs.
Hoy'e	Nixon
Hu tubise	O'Neill
Ilsley	Pinard
Isnor	Poirier
Johnston (Bow River)	Power
King, Mackenzie	Purdy
Kirk	Quelch
Kuhl	Ralston
LaFlèche	Reid
Leader	Rennie
Leger	Rickard
Little	Roebuck
Lizotte	Rose
McCann	Ross (Calgary East)
McCubbin	Ross (Middlesex East)
MacDiarmid	Ross (Moose Jaw)
Macdonald (Brantford City)	St. Laurent
Macdonald (Halifax)	Sanderson
Macdonald (Kingston City)	Shaw
McDonald (Pontiac)	Sissons
McGarry	Slaght
McGeer	Taylor
McGibbon	Tripp
McIlraith	Tucker
MacInnis	Turner
McIvor	Veniot
MacKenzie (Neepawa)	Ward
Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre)	Warren
MacKinnon (Edmonton West)	Weir
McLarty	Whitman
	Winkler
	Wood
	Wright—113.

NAYS

Messrs:

Adamson	Harris (Danforth)
Black (Cumberland)	Homuth
Black (Yukon)	Jackman
Boucher	Knowles
Bruce	Lockhart
Bryce	McGregor
Burton	MacKinnon (Kootenay East)
Cardiff	MacNicol
Casselman (Grenville-Dundas)	Neill
Castleden	Noseworthy
Choquette	Perley
Diefenbaker	Ross (St. Paul's)
Douglas (Weyburn)	Ross (Souris)
Esling	Roy
Graydon	Senn
Green	Stirling
Hanson (York-Sunbury)	Stokes—34.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the chief whips.)

Messrs:

Turgeon	Rowe

WAR EXPENDITURES

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN SECOND, THIRD, FOURTH AND FIFTH REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. HUGHES CLEAVER (Halton) moved:

That the third report of the special committee on war expenditures, presented to the house on January 26, 1944, be now concurred in.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I ask my hon. friend whether the second and fourth reports are also to be included for concurrence?

Mr. CLEAVER: I was just going to ask, Mr. Speaker, before making any remarks in support of the motion that the scope of the present debate should be clarified. A discussion took place on Friday, and I understand that the intention was to ask for the leave of the house to discuss concurrence not only in the third report but in the other three reports which have been tabled, and discuss also at the same time the motion of the Prime Minister to set up the committee this year.

Mr. SPEAKER: That would require the leave of the house.

Mr. GRAYDON: In order to clarify the matter, may I say that I think the Prime Minister and I are both somewhat responsible because I am quite sure that he did not understand when I raised the question the other day that the third report was only part of the report of the war expenditures committee. My understanding, and I take it that it would be his, was that the motion would include all the reports of all the subcommittees of the war expenditures committee, and my suggestion to him and to the hon. member for Halton was that concurrence be moved in all the reports brought down by the war expenditures committee, that we should discuss them first, that a debate with respect to the whole matter of war expenditures should come within the scope of the motion, and that, having dealt with that, we should then proceed to deal with the Prime Minister's motion to set up the war expenditures committee this year. My sole object was to avoid repetition and to save time.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say to my hon. friend that I had understood, when he asked about the third report, that the one report which hon. gentlemen opposite wished to discuss was the one which had to do with the Shipshaw development and power; that was the third report. However, I have since learned that there were other reports which were tabled at the same time. So far as the government are concerned we are perfectly willing to have all the reports discussed that were tabled on the last day of the last session.

Mr. GRAYDON: To regularize matters perhaps the hon. member would amend his motion.

Mr. COLDWELL: When I suggested originally that this report should be dealt with this session I had in mind that we would deal with the whole report of the war expenditures committee, and certainly not with only one part of that report. I must take my share of the responsibility for not being sufficiently alert when the motion was made and included only the third report. I think there was a misunderstanding. It is unusual to discuss just one subcommittee's report without discussing the whole report of the war expenditures committee.

Mr. CLEAVER: I would ask, Mr. Speaker, for leave of the house to amend the motion to include all the reports.

Mr. SPEAKER: The standing order requiring notice will also have to be suspended. Is it the pleasure of the house that the hon. member shall have leave to amend his motion to read that the first, second, third, fourth and fifth reports of the special committee on war expenditures be concurred in?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Mr. KNOWLES: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I draw your attention to the fact that the first report was agreed to during the last session of parliament, on July 19, 1943. It simply asked that certain powers be conferred on the committee, to keep a record of its proceedings, and so forth.

Mr. SPEAKER: The third report was presented last session and the house resolved that it be considered this session. The proper procedure would be that the reports presented last session should now be presented to the house in order to take them out of the last session, and then concurrence moved. Is it the pleasure of the house that the hon. member for Halton shall have leave to amend his motion accordingly, that the second, third, fourth and fifth reports of the special war expenditures committee be now concurred in?

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. HUGHES CLEAVER (Halton): The committee on war expenditures, as the house will recall, was not set up until July 17 of last year. The committee was immediately convened. We held three meetings of the main committee between the 17th and the 24th of July when the house adjourned. The committee did not meet in August. Most members

had been away from their ridings for many months and required to return to them. The committee, however, reconvened in September and worked continuously through the fall until the middle of November, and it reconvened again a week before the house opened, for the purpose of completing its reports. During this period the main committee and its various subcommittees held ninety-seven meetings at Ottawa in addition to many visits to war plants across Canada.

During the recess our meetings were exceptionally well attended this time, and I think it is only fitting that I should now pay a well-deserved tribute to the members of the committee and to the committee staff for the loyal and efficient way in which they carried on their duties and for the substantial results achieved.

Members of the house will have noticed from our reports that subcommittee No. 1 reported on shipbuilding, both as to cargo and the shipbuilding programme and as to naval vessels. Subcommittees Nos. 2 and 3 were grouped together for the aluminum inquiry. That was an exceptionally heavy inquiry and the committee thought it wise to assign that work jointly to those two subcommittees. Subcommittee No. 4 made the inquiry into the supply of agricultural implements and brought in a report with respect to that subject.

While the committee worked very diligently and lost no time, from the time it was appointed, and worked continuously throughout the fall, much of the work which we should have done has not yet been completed, and we are consequently much pleased that the house has taken notice of our fifth report, which was a recommendation that the committee this year should be set up as promptly as possible on the opening of the session.

Since most of our meetings have been in camera, the work of the committee has received little publicity, and I think it is only fair, only right that I should say that the war expenditures committee, much maligned as it is by some of our daily press, has saved many millions for Canada's war effort. This saving has been effected both directly and indirectly. A reference to the reports will disclose many of the direct savings that have been brought about, but in addition to the direct savings the indirect influence, I am convinced, is quite as important.

I believe it is commonly agreed now that the very fact that a war expenditure committee is sitting and is vigilantly watching government expenditures has a most salutary effect. While no major scandal has occurred in connection with Canada's war effort, and we are all very proud of that fact, yet many mistakes have been made—honest mistakes. War is wasteful. I will say this, however, that whenever mistakes have been made and whenever waste has occurred the mistakes have been remedied and the waste checked as soon as it was brought to the attention of the minister in question; and in the few instances where actual wrongdoing has occurred the wrongdoers have been punished.

Quite recently one of the Toronto dailies criticized the war expenditures committee for referring, through the minister, to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, criminal charges for investigation and for prosecution if prosecution proved to be justified. I was amazed to read that editorial because, speaking for myself and, I believe, for every member of the house, I do not know of any other way in which a crime, even though connected with the war effort, should be treated than by reference to the R.C.M.P. for investigation and to our criminal courts for punishment if crime actually was committed.

During the last year the committee followed its established practice of holding most of its meetings in camera. We have already had debates in three previous sessions of this house with reference to the practice of holding most of the meetings in camera, and the merits both for and against such meetings have been fully discussed in these debates. In Great Britain, as hon. members know, all meetings of the war expenditures committee are held in camera. In Great Britain also the subcommittees have not even the power to hold any of their meetings otherwise than in camera. In Canada, while the committee has full power to decide itself on the type of meetings to be held, our practice in the main has also been to hold most of our meetings in camera.

As to our subcommittees, we have not tied their hands, and every subcommittee that has been appointed by any war expenditures committee since 1941 has had the fullest power to decide whether its meetings shall be held publicly or in camera. In view of the fact that our Canadian practice as well as the British practice is so well established, I had hoped that there would be no further discussion about the matter. However, in listening to the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) in his opening speech this session, I became fully aware of the fact that the point must be argued all over again.

May I call attention to the actual words used by the leader of the opposition. They are quite expressive though perhaps not too dignified, and I just wonder if, when the leader of the opposition uttered those words, he fully appreciated the fact that he was speaking to the British House of Commons in regard to their conduct of war expenditures—

Mr. HOMUTH: They are not running Canada.

Mr. CLEAVER: —and in an equal degree, speaking to our own House of Commons in regard to our own war expenditures.

Mr. HOMUTH: Oh, nonsense!

Mr. CLEAVER: Those are his words.

Mr. GRAYDON: There is not quite a difference, of course!

Mr. CLEAVER: The hon. member says, "Nonsense". That is the hon. member's own opinion. If he thinks it is nonsense I am very much encouraged to go on in the same train of thought. These are the words, *Hansard*, page 26:

> It is about time that the lid was blown off these in-camera sessions of the war expenditures committee. It is little short of a national disgrace that the people of Canada should not know something about the investigations of these contracts. I am opposed to the whole system of pulling down the blinds, closing the shutters and locking the doors when public contracts are being investigated.

You will notice that the leader of the opposition has accused the war expenditures committee of this House of Commons of acting in a manner which constitutes a national disgrace. These words demand a frank answer, and I welcome the opportunity of giving it. I say that no one knows better than the leader of the opposition, the Toronto *Globe and Mail* and the others who are carrying on this agitation against in-camera sessions of the war expenditures committee, the reasons why they are carrying on that agitation. They know there are good and sufficient reasons for the meetings being held in camera, and I shall be pleased to enumerate them a little later on.

I suggest that this whole campaign, led by the Toronto *Globe and Mail*, is politically inspired, is harmful to Canada's war morale, and is without any foundation in fact.

We are accused of having something to hide. That is assigned as the reasons for the in-camera hearings. We have nothing to hide, and what is more, we could not hide it if we wanted to. Every fact brought out in a meeting of the war expenditures committee is brought out with a member or two of the opposition sitting right there and listening to it.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): And with his mouth sealed.

Mr. CLEAVER: Now, while it is true that the meetings are in camera, and while my hon. friend from York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) says, "and with his mouth sealed", I would like to give you an illustration which perhaps answers that statement about the mouths being sealed. I say with every confidence that every word of evidence given in any sitting of a war expenditures committee is known within a few hours to the Tory board of strategy.

Mr. HOMUTH: Mr. Speaker—

An hon. MEMBER: Sit down.

Mr. HOMUTH: I rise to a point of order.

An hon. MEMBER: A question of privilege.

Mr. HOMUTH: A question of privilege. I do not like taking privileges with him because I do not like his brand of politics anyway. But the hon. member has made an insinuation against the Conservative members of these committees, that they have broken confidences. Now the hon. member had better prove his statement or withdraw it. He is not going to get away with that.

Mr. CLEAVER: If my hon. friend had just been patient I was proceeding to prove my statement. I am prepared to prove it.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): As a member of the war expenditures committee, I wish to take exception to the statement of the hon. member for Halton. I was opposed to these in camera sittings, but the majority of the members of the committee decided on in camera sittings, and I complied with their request. And no one, not even my colleagues, my associates in this house, has had access to the evidence as far as I am concerned, and no one outside the house has had access to it. I ask the hon. member to withdraw his accusation.

Mr. BOUCHER: I, too, rise to a point of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the same point of privilege?

Mr. BOUCHER: Yes. But I might base it on different facts. As a member of the war expenditures committee of last year I sat under similar circumstances when the committee was sitting in camera. I made the request that copies of the evidence taken from day to day be handed to hon. members, and that was declined. As a member of the committee I call it an infringement of my honour as a citizen of Canada to have it inferred that I, sitting in camera, would break a confidence and bring to a board of strategy of any party or even to my colleagues in the House of Commons anything that I am in honour bound to keep within the precincts of my own conscience. I do ask the hon. member for Halton immediately to retract the accusation he has made.

Mr. CLEAVER: I am obliged to the hon. member who has just taken his seat for joining the procession, but I would remind him of this one thing—

Mr. HOMUTH: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. I ask the hon. member to withdraw without any qualifications whatever the statement he made. I ask it as my right as a member; not that it matters much, as far as his mentality is concerned.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was not in the chair, and did not hear the statement. I would be glad to know what the statement was.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): In effect, he said, Mr. Speaker, that members of the committee—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): If I can inform Mr. Speaker of what took place—and I do not want any pack of wolves over there howling at me—may I direct to Your Honour's attention the allegation to which exception has been taken. It was to this effect: the hon. member for Halton has stated in express terms that all the evidence or most of the evidence taken before these committee meetings held in camera had been communicated by the members of the committee from this party to the board of strategy of the Tory party.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is what he said.

Mr. CLEAVER: If I may be permitted—I have the exact text of what I said and the proof of what I said. The hon. member for Carleton was one member who sat on our committee, and eventually the information reached the public accounts committee, and he was very active in prosecuting it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will you give me an idea what the statement was?

Mr. CLEAVER: Every fact brought out at war expenditures meetings can be known to the Tory board of strategy, and they are quick to take advantage of anything which they think should be publicized; and I am prepared to prove right now that they did take advantage—

Mr. HOMUTH: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. The hon. member did not use those words. The hon. member made the statement that there were members of the opposition on those committees and that everything that was done at those committees was known within a few hours to the Tory board of strategy; and I want him to withdraw those insinuations. If he says those are not the words, let us read *Hansard* back.

Mr. SPEAKER: I suggest that the hon. member continue his speech. I shall see what *Hansard* has stated and I shall deal with it later.

Mr. HOMUTH: I do not like to object to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but at the same time the hon. member did make his statement in very clear words. I think *Hansard* should read them, and I think they should be withdrawn at once.

Mr. SPEAKER: If I see the statement as it was given I shall be in a position then to say whether or not the statement was made as stated, but until I get the report of the exact word I cannot do so.

Mr. CLEAVER: With your permission, and so that there shall not be another fifteen-minute interruption—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Do not cast any more slurs.

Mr. CLEAVER: —I should like to ask for the privilege of reading the next page or page and a half of my text.

Just a little over a year ago, subcommittee No. 1, when making an inspection at an aircraft plant in Montreal, unearthed an expenditure made by the company which the company obviously planned over the years to charge to excess profits, and wrongly so. The hon. member for Carleton was present at that meeting. The matter was referred to the commissioner of taxation and was caught in time to prevent loss to the treasury. The Conservative members of the subcommittee did not appreciate the fact that the matter was caught in time. The officials in question were by them called before the public accounts inquiry, and while our Conservative friends did not achieve the political advantage which they had hoped for out of the incident, yet it did serve this useful purpose: it proved beyond any doubt that evidence given before the committee, even though in camera, cannot be hidden, and that if anything occurs in the way of evidence of a questionable nature it can be and it has been brought before the public accounts committee.

Mr. BOUCHER: Again I rise to a point of privilege. The hon. member for Halton has stated what the Conservative members hoped for, which is far beyond his mental capacity to state, and I ask that he immediately withdraw it.

Mr. CLEAVER: The very fact that our hearings are held in camera and that the witnesses are not subjected to trial by press and press headlines leads to the greatest possible frankness and greatly assists the committee in pursuing its work. From the incident I have just related I can assure hon. members that if any evidence comes out in the war expenditures committee that is of

particular interest, there is not the slightest danger of its being hidden. In the light of past experience we have nothing to fear from bashful reticence on the part of the opposition if anything comes up which they think will advance their political fortunes.

With apologies to the house I should like to outline briefly why the British war expenditures committee as well as our own committee have found that better work is done when the meetings are held in camera. In the first place there is much information brought out which, if disclosed, would give either aid or comfort to the enemy, and at the time you are taking evidence in regard to war contracts you never know when a witness is going to blurt out something which would have that result. In the second place we have found that witnesses, when giving evidence as to contentious matters or matters where honest mistakes have occurred, become very reticent and practically "freeze up" if the meetings are open to the public. They know in advance that the meeting is going to be in camera and that they are not going to be subjected to trial by the press, so they frankly tell the story. Some people may question that; some may say the witnesses should have more courage, and so on. However, we must face up to the fact that this state of affairs does exist; and if we want to do a thorough job as a war expenditures committee; if we want to acquire all the evidence we need as to contentious matters or matters in which mistakes have been made, we simply must hold our meetings in camera. In the third place—and this reason applies to all members of the house—in public meetings hon. members are prone to make speeches. When we are engaged in serious, hard work as a committee the same progress is not made if hon. members are making speeches in order to get in the headlines.

For these reasons we believe we achieve better results by having our meetings in camera. We know we get no publicity; we get nothing but hard work and results.

An hon. MEMBER: And abuse.

Mr. CLEAVER: Speaking of abuse, when we made that decision some three years ago we had two choices before us. We had to choose between doing a good job, knowing in advance that we would be criticized, or doing a mediocre job and escaping criticism. The great majority of the members of that committee, and they were not all Liberals, chose the hard road but the right road.

Mr. HOMUTH: And everyone else was wrong.

[Mr. Cleaver.]

Mr. CLEAVER: Well, I have not the confidence that my hon. friend has, but he has a right to his opinion. Just here I should like to remind hon. members once more why the war expenditures committee was set up in the first place. It was distinctly understood by all parties in this house that the committee was not to be a propaganda committee or a scandal-hunting committee, but that its sole duty would be to search for economies in order to help Canada's war effort.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: There is one question I should like to ask the hon. member who has been on the committee for a long time and has acted as chairman for the last two years. Has that committee as it is now constituted any power to report such wrongdoing as may come to its notice to the membership of the House of Commons?

Mr. CLEAVER: Well, my hon. friend can read the order of reference as well as I can, but on several occasions I have heard the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) indicate that if the war expenditures committee found any wrongdoing we were at liberty, and it was our duty, to report the matter either to the House of Commons or to the public accounts committee. Last year we were given the further right to make confidential reports to the Prime Minister if any wrongdoing should be discovered which in the public interest should not be disclosed.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Has there been any change in the powers of the committee since it was first set up?

Mr. CLEAVER: I trust, Mr. Speaker, that this time will not be charged against me, but I believe I can find the reference for my hon. friend. The only change of which I am aware was the change requested in the report tabled on July 19, 1943, paragraph 5 of which reads as follows:

> In cases where consideration of national security precludes the publishing of certain recommendations and of the arguments upon which they are based, to address a memorandum to the Prime Minister for the consideration of the war cabinet, providing that the committee shall, whenever it has exercised such powers, report the fact as soon as possible to the house.

As I understand the British practice, it is this. If any matter arises which for reasons of security should not be tabled as a house report, a confidential report is made to the Prime Minister for consideration by the war cabinet. The war expenditures committee must notify the house, however, that it has made such confidential report, though not indicating the contents of it. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that in requesting this additional

power the committee adopted exactly the wording that is contained in the reference to the British war expenditures committee.

When the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) asked this question I was about to say that another reason for setting up the committee on war expenditures was to permit private members of the House of Commons actively to take part in Canada's war effort, and to make a contribution to that effort. If hon. members will be good enough to read the debate which took place in the spring of 1941 I think they will find the answers to most of the charges—in my opinion unfair charges, though other hon. members may not agree with me—which are now being levelled by some of the daily newspapers and some members of the opposition with respect to the functioning of the war expenditures committee. I would suggest to my hon. friends of the opposition that if they want the lid blown off, as their leader mentioned the other day, or if they want fireworks, there is another committee to which they should go rather than the war expenditures committee. It is quite true that the fear of losing the war has passed, and that we can confidently look forward to final victory. But I suggest to yourself, Mr. Speaker, and to the house, that the need for economy in the war effort is just as great as it ever was, and that if there are any members who must indulge in fireworks, and who must regale themselves with charges about $400 rugs, which never did exist, and with other pieces of fiction, they can satisfy this desire for public stunting before the public accounts committee.

But why harm the war expenditures committee, a serious-minded committee which was set up for the express purpose of saving money in this country's war effort? Why attempt to hamper them in their work by putting on a demonstration of that kind?

Just to-day the Toronto *Globe and Mail* published a very misleading editorial in which they soundly criticize the committee upon its shipbuilding report. I should like to take the time of the house for a moment to refer briefly to our shipbuilding report. Late in 1940 Great Britain, on account of the submarine menace, needed cargo vessels very badly. Representatives from the British government came to this country and surveyed the possibility of building cargo vessels in Canada. For fifteen years prior to the war no steel cargo vessel had been built in this country, and we had little in the way of shipbuilding facilities.

As a result of that survey the British representatives found three firms in Canada with possibilities. Prices were negotiated with those firms. The final agreement was that $1,859,000 was to be spent for cargo vessels to be built on the Pacific coast, and $1,784,000 for cargo vessels to be built in the St. Lawrence. The shipping problem became progressively worse, and in April, 1941, an order in council was passed authorizing the incorporation of Wartime Merchant Shipping Limited. Canada then branched out on an aggressive policy of cargo shipbuilding. We had only three suitable yards. The industry was expanded to the greatest possible extent; new yards were built, and contracts were awarded to eleven shipyards in Canada. The prices in these yards were agreed upon as the prices which had been negotiated by the British representatives. The result was that by the end of 1943 Canada had built and delivered 232 cargo vessels, in addition to something over 400 naval ships.

In September, 1943, Sir Oliver Lyttelton, British Minister of Production, told a press conference that Canada was launching ships, exclusive of the larger types of war ships, to an extent equal to the volume of launchings by Great Britain. Ships were urgently needed. We had little in the way of shipbuilding facilities; we had little in the way of trained personnel, but we did produce the ships.

What about the cost? Some of the daily press and some of our hon. friends in the opposition are commencing entirely to forget the emergency, and to criticize the costs? Well, what about those costs? All of the original contracts were negotiated and signed at the price which had been arranged by the British delegation. That is the first item on cost.

Mr. McGREGOR: Was that carried out at the price the hon. member mentioned a few moments ago, both on the Pacific coast and on the St. Lawrence?

Mr. CLEAVER: The answer is yes. I will not get into an argument with my hon. friend.

Mr. McGREGOR: You bet you will not—but you will.

Mr. CLEAVER: The answer is yes.

Mr. McGREGOR: You will!

Mr. CLEAVER: These prices proved to be much too generous. Canadian shipbuilding firms and Canadian workmen apparently were more efficient and better producers than the British thought they could be. In the fall of 1942 subcommittee No. 1 visited a number of the shipbuilding yards, and checked production and production costs in those yards. We found that, in our opinion, their profits were too substantial.

Your committee on war expenditures made an interim report in that regard. I now read from page 94 of the minutes of proceedings of the committee on war expenditures. This is dated January 27, 1943, and dealing with 1942 states the following with respect to shipbuilding:

The subcommittee has heard the evidence of departmental officials and has visited many of the shipbuilding yards engaged in the construction of naval as well as cargo ships but has not completed its inquiry into this subject and consequently makes no general report at this time with respect to it.

Then follow the recommendations, and we did make a recommendation in a general way in regard to profits. Paragraph 3 at page 95 in the same report states:

As a result of its investigations to date the subcommittee makes the following recommendations. . . .

3. That as soon as company financial statements are available for the year 1942 a special study should be made of profits, accelerated depreciation and corporate taxation. The question of excess profits and accelerated depreciation has caused the subcommittee considerable concern.

That does not sound as if the committee is pulling its punches, as the *Globe and Mail* suggests. The recommendation goes on to say:

Very substantial profits are being earned in some instances far in excess of normal profits. . . .

Some months afterward—

Mr. BOUCHER: Would the minister continue reading that recommendation?

Mr. CLEAVER: My hon. friend may read the entire report, running into many pages, if he wishes to do so. I have read the part I require for the purpose of making my point. If my hon. friend wishes to add anything, he is within his rights in doing so.

Profits made by these companies were too high, and subsequently all the shipbuilding contracts with respect to cargo vessels were renegotiated. They were renegotiated back to the date of the first cargo vessel built in Canada, and at a saving of between $30,000,000 and $40,000,000 on the ships already built.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): I think the hon. member will agree we were not furnished with a full statement of accelerated depreciation with respect to cargo ships, at the time of our inquiry during the last year.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has been interrupted considerably. If any questions are to be asked, his consent is necessary.

[Mr. Cleaver.]

Mr. CLEAVER: Subcommittee No. 1 completed its investigation into the shipbuilding programme, and tabled its report on the 26th of last month. I refer hon. members to that report and ask them to read all of it. It is not long, and I should like to read into the record one paragraph with respect to cost to show that we did bring to the attention of the public in the fullest possible way exactly what had happened. I read from page 140 of the committee's minutes of proceedings as follows:

The original contracts for cargo ships were for a fixed price but when it was found that a ship could be built cheaper than anticipated renegotiation of contracts was undertaken. At the time renegotiation commenced about eighty ships had been delivered and about forty-five more were in various stages of construction. A flat fee of $50,000 for each North Sands ship was agreed upon and as to shipbuilding firms performing additional services, certain additional allowances were negotiated. This, it was reported to your committee, resulted in a reduction of approximately $300,000 per ship. These renegotiated contracts were made retroactive and were effective back to the date of the first ship, with a resulting reduction in cost of between thirty and forty million dollars.

It is all very well for my hon. friends of the opposition to say now that we were too generous in the prices allowed for these ships, but I would remind them that we had not yards, that we had not constructed a steel cargo vessel in the fifteen years prior to the outbreak of the war. We knew nothing of what it would cost to build these ships, but we did know one thing—we needed ships. What did this government do? Mr. H. R. MacMillan was appointed the head of the shipping company, and I challenge hon. members to give the name of any other man who would have done a better job of heading up this merchant shipbuilding company. He was an aggressive man, and he carried his aggressiveness and his insistence that we have ships almost to the point of ruthlessness. But we got the ships.

There are other points I should like to cover which were referred to inferentially in the editorial in the *Globe and Mail*. The suggestion was made in that editorial that we were trying to conceal facts, that we had not produced evidence in regard to the cost of some naval vessel and that we had not produced comparative costs as between the government-owned yard and a privately owned shipyard. I take it that the editorial refers to two motions moved by the hon. member for York East (Mr. McGregor) in the subcommittee. They were negatived and I am told that only the hon. member voted for them. They were then brought before the

main committee. The first motion appears on page 17 of the minutes of proceedings of the committee, and I quote:

Mr. McGregor moved in amendment to the report that schedules submitted as part of the evidence and relating to figures quoted in the report (para. (e) "cost") at the bottom of page 8, be incorporated in the report.

That motion was defeated by the committee. I am told that those figures were given to the committee in confidence. Many times the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) has indicated to this house that it is not in the public interest to disclose contract prices with respect to ships. In order to leave the correct impression you must give considerable qualifying material because no two yards do the same amount of work on a ship and without the qualifying material a correct impression cannot be given. My first reason as to why the motion was defeated would be that the figures were given to us in confidence. The next objection to releasing the figures was that they had been compiled by company auditors and were not subject to an independent audit. We had no assurance that the two sets of figures were properly comparable because different firms of auditors have different methods of setting up head office costs, weighting overhead and the like. That was the second reason why the motion was defeated. I might state also that the hon. member's confrere on the subcommittee did not support his motion. The next amendment moved by the hon. member reads:

Mr. McGregor moved that paragraph 2 on page 13, entitled "Tribal class destroyer" be amended by adding further information including cost of construction in Canada as compared with cost in other countries.

This government has never to my knowledge given comparative costs in the countries of any of our allies, and certainly no war expenditures committee should hand out such costs even though they had them. Another objection to complying with that motion, which was defeated, was that Canada had not yet delivered one destroyer of the Tribal class. We had no costs of construction; all we had were estimates. There is another factor to be considered. It is most unfair to hand out costs of constructing the first ship or the first plane or the first intricate article of any description. Members of the house know that the first Hurricane plane built in Canada cost four times what the last one built in Canada did.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. COLDWELL: Go ahead and finish.

Mr. SPEAKER: Only with unanimous consent.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. SPEAKER: Agreed.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Are the figures given by the hon. member with regard to aircraft correct, that is, that the last aircraft cost one-quarter what the first one did?

Mr. CLEAVER: That is common knowledge. I have seen a return tabled in this house.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I have not seen anything like that.

Mr. CLEAVER: I will say that it is substantially correct. I do not think I should give the house the actual figures, but I do say that the statement I have made that the first plane cost four times as much as the last one is correct within the matter of a few hundred dollars.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Did the committee have evidence on that?

Mr. CLEAVER: No, that evidence was not before the committee.

I should like to conclude with just one thought. The work on the war expenditures committee was interesting, but it was hard. Members of the committee spent two or three or four months of their time between two long sessions and they made real personal sacrifices. I would hope that in this debate on the setting up of the committee we might lose perhaps a little of the spirit of the arena and retain more of the spirit of the workshop. With practically no exception every member of the committee cooperated to the fullest extent. I never asked any member of the committee, be he Conservative, Social Credit or Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, to perform a task which was not willingly and efficiently performed. I would ask hon. members, especially those who were not on the committee, to keep before them the reasons why the committee was set up. It was not a propaganda committee and it was never intended to be such. It was not a scandal-hunting committee. Our sole job was to look for economies and try to save money in carrying out this country's war effort.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received a transcript of the statement made by the hon. member who has just sat down (Mr. Cleaver). It is as follows:

Now, while it is true that the meetings are in camera, and while my hon. friend from York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) says, "and with his mouth sealed", I would like to give you an

illustration which perhaps answers that statement about the mouths being sealed. I say with every confidence that every word of evidence given in any sitting of a war expenditures committee is known within a few hours to the Tory board of strategy.

The hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Homuth) and the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Boucher) have denied that, as members of the committee. It seems to me an imputation against the honour of these gentlemen which I must ask the hon. member to withdraw.

Mr. CLEAVER: Mr. Speaker, in so far as it may be construed as any imputation against any hon. member I unreservedly withdraw that statement. But I would like to state—

Mr. HOMUTH: Mr. Speaker, his withdrawal should be without any qualification whatsoever.

Mr. CLEAVER: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I am unduly encroaching on the time of the house. I would like to state that the reason I made the statement was—

Mr. HOMUTH: No, Mr. Speaker. All he has to do is withdraw what he said.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. gentleman should be allowed to finish his sentence.

Mr. CLEAVER: The only reason I made the reference I did was to assure the public of Canada that notwithstanding the fact that these meetings are in camera, if any wrongdoing is discovered it will be brought to light.

Mr. HOMUTH: I ask the hon. member to withdraw that last statement. He is imputing something against the honour of the members of that committee, and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member in the first instance made his withdrawal, and so far as any hon. member of the house is concerned, he withdrew his statement absolutely. I do not see any imputation in the latter part of his statement.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, for reasons that I shall give I want to oppose concurrence in the report of the war expenditures committee now before the house. I do this because the conclusions, at least in the matter of my criticisms of the aluminum agreements, are borne out neither by the evidence itself nor by the body of the report submitted to this house. The subcommittee dealing with the Aluminum Company of Canada finds that none of the allegations I made in this house is substantiated by the facts. I will endeavour to show, and I believe I can show, on the contrary, that the main allegations not only were substantiated by evidence placed before the subcommittee but are in fact in the main confirmed by the report itself.

To the extent that I erred, I erred in important respects in understating the case. Only in one particular would I modify what I said about the agreements last session, and that is when I said that the labour conditions in the plant were both scandalous and inhuman. What I would say now, after having seen the conditions in the plant, is that the labour relations of the corporation have been and are bad.

My allegations fall under several main headings. First, I stated that the aluminum group had, and continues to have, a monopoly in the production of this important metal in Canada. The New Oxford dictionary defines "monopoly" as "the exclusive possession of the trade in some commodity." Now for forty years the aluminum group has been the sole producer of raw aluminum in Canada, and it has had the exclusive possession of the trade in this commodity. There is no question then that my allegation, that the Aluminum Company of Canada was and is a monopoly, is proven conclusively.

The report takes refuge in the hope that there might be future competition in this metal in Canada. This is as improbable as it is irrelevant. The fact is that there is a monopoly and we ignore it at our peril. Yet the report says that none of my allegations is substantiated.

As to future competition, the huge tax and other concessions given the company during this period of war have enabled it to tighten its strangle-hold upon this vital metal. It has acquired, as the report clearly shows, vastly expanded modern plant and equipment, all fully paid for out of war production, and a power plant three-fifths paid for to enable it to produce the cheapest electrical power in North America. The report tries to minimize these advantages by suggesting future competition from plastics or from secondary aluminum. As to plastics, they will probably enter many fields; but without a knowledge of comparative costs and relative uses no intelligent appraisal can be made, and neither the evidence nor the report attempts any such appraisal.

As to the competition from secondary aluminum, raw aluminum must be made before scrap aluminum is possible. There is no second-

ary aluminum industry in Canada, and if they were, scrap aluminum, I am advised, could be used only for low-grade castings. It is therefore not a competitor with the virgin metal.

I said that restrictive clauses were included in the power contracts. The report confirms this, but explains that they had never been used. The fact is that they were there, and this, in my opinion, was a sufficient deterrent to any possible competitor, particularly in the earlier years of the company's history and development.

In the Shawinigan power contract, to which I specifically referred, the clause remained until December, 1943, after the subcommittee had adjourned; yet the report concludes that none of my allegations was substantiated.

I said last session that our minister at Washington had been counsel for the Aluminum Company of Canada up to the time the agreements between the governments and the company were made. That was admitted in this house. I said, too, that he was still vice-president and director of the parent company, Aluminium Limited. This was confirmed last session; yet the report declares that none of my allegations is substantiated.

I said, too, that the aluminum group had paid many millions for the water rights which had been alienated in the province of Quebec twenty-six years before for $40,000. The evidence and the report confirm it; yet the report states that none of my allegations is substantiated.

I said that Aluminium Limited, the parent or holding company, was an important member of an international cartel, the organization of which was arranged in Canada. I said that this cartel was formed to establish a production quota and to fix buying prices. This was amply confirmed by the evidence. I stated that Aluminium Limited was set up in 1928 and that the Aluminum Company of America transferred to the new Canadian company all its foreign holdings. I alleged that the share capital of the new company was distributed to the shareholders of the Aluminum Company of America as stock dividends. That was admitted in the evidence, which also shows that in 1939, the latest year for which we have records, the officers and directors and their immediate families, together with the important Mellon interests, held fifty-six per cent of the share capital of the United States company and over fifty-one per cent of the share capital of Aluminium Limited, the owner of the Aluminum Company of Canada. The president and five of the six directors are United States citizens; yet the report says that none of my allegations is substantiated.

As to the cartel itself, the Alliance Aluminum Company of Basle, Switzerland, the report now before this house confirms everything I said about it. Let the report now before the house speak for itself in this regard. This is what it says:

> An agreement was entered into to limit the production of the members of the group.

The group which form Alliance Limited, the cartel.

> In addition, an agreement was reached as to the price at which the group would purchase aluminum from its members; Aluminium Limited subscribed approximately 28 per cent of the total stock. The other members were the aluminum producers of Great Britain, Germany, France, Italy and Switzerland.

Later, the report now before the house adds that the Alliance corporation, the cartel, is still in existence. Aluminium Limited carries its shares in the cartel on its own books at the present time as an asset. The German nazi-controlled interest is still there and its shares are apparently unaffected. The report says, and the evidence amply confirms the statement, that this cartel set a world-buying price; yet the report draws the remarkable conclusion that prices were unaffected by this cartel and declares again that none of my allegations, including my charge that Aluminium Limited was a partner in a world cartel, was substantiated.

To-day at noon in the city of Toronto, speaking before the Canadian club, the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Turgeon) said this:

> International cartels which control markets and rob the people of legitimate benefits of inventions must be ruthlessly destroyed by government.

The same afternoon we are asked to concur in a report which attempts to whitewash one of the largest cartels in the world. Now, whatever miracles of production the aluminum group has accomplished, with united nations funds, since 1940, my statement that they jeopardized the war efforts of the united nations still stands. They restricted production before the war while Germany's domestic production greatly expanded. Under a cartel agreement the Aluminum Company of Canada supplied Japan with large quantities of metal, enabling her to destroy Chinese cities. In 1940 and 1941 our nations gathered aluminum pots and pans while our Chinese allies and our own kin paid with their blood the price of the cartel agreements. High prices and scarcity quotas are the ways of these irresponsible privately-owned cartels. They are above governments; they are above human suffering, and they conclude private treaties for their own advancement among their own members; and the Aluminum Company of Canada,

through its parent company, Aluminium Limited, and the aluminum interests of nazi Germany are, as I said, at this moment fellow-members of the aluminum cartel. The report says so, and then, extraordinarily enough, goes on to declare that none of my allegations is substantiated.

Next, I said that the price of aluminum to the united nations is exorbitant and completely out of line with production costs. I alleged that in 1937 the cost was at least as low as 8·943 cents a pound. The report confirms this figure. The Price Waterhouse figures establish the cost in 1939 at 8·31 cents a pound. This was a figure which, I cannot understand quite why, was omitted from the report; and may I say that that figure is higher than one would have expected with the greatly increased output of the new and more modern facilities. But of course we had to accept Price Waterhouse figures throughout, in the absence of any other auditor. Let us remember that Price Waterhouse, an internationally famous auditing firm, has been declared guilty of gross negligence by a United States commission in connection with the auditing of the financial operations of another internationally known firm. I do not propose to elaborate this; but I have the data, the official report of the securities exchange commission, Washington, under my hand. I was not aware of this until recently, or I would have been still more insistent that the committee in its deliberations engage independent auditing advice. Be that as it may, the cost of producing aluminum at Arvida in 1939 was, according to Price Waterhouse, 8·31 cents a pound. The evidence shows that Great Britain that year paid twenty cents a pound for it. There were no advertising or selling costs to be added, so that the profit in that year was apparently 140 per cent of the cost price. Yet my allegation that prices were exorbitant is included among those declared to be entirely without foundation.

In the war contracts the company was protected against increases in costs by an escalator clause whereby the price rose in proportion to increased costs of transportation, labour and so on. In 1942, according to the auditors, the cost had risen to 11·56 cents a pound, with, as I said before, a vastly increased output of aluminum. The selling price that year was 21 cents a pound, a mark-up of 9·44 cents a pound.

Mr. HOWE: Is my hon. friend quoting the findings of the committee?

Mr. COLDWELL: I am quoting the findings of the committee.

[Mr. Coldwell.]

Mr. HOWE: I must say I do not know what the findings of the committee were, but I know that the cost of bauxite delivered at Arvida was about 8 cents, to begin with.

Mr. COLDWELL: I am talking of the costs which were given by Price Waterhouse and the witneses. The mark-up included 5·44 cents a pound special depreciation. The government allows this sum to be set aside from the profits to create the new facilities. Thus the company is given under the contracts, whether deliveries of aluminum are made or not—the cancellation clause in it—$164,000,000.

Mr. HOWE: Who gives them that?

Mr. COLDWELL: Just a moment. The minister will hear what I say about it in a moment. This, as I say, is profit; for it would have been taxable but for the order in council of December 31, 1942. Indeed, if it were not profit there could be no special depreciation. Yet, in spite of what I have called this great gift, through the rebate of taxation, of $164,000,000, and not $154,000,000 as I had stated last session, the report again declares that none of my allegations is substantiated.

Let us remember that in June, 1939, this house passed the Defence Purchases, Profits Control and Financing Act. True, certain manufacturers would have none of it and it has long since been repealed by order in council, but this house sought to limit war profits to five per cent of the capital employed. The capital employed in 1939 by the Aluminum Company of Canada was given in evidence as $26,000,000, and on that basis that year its net earnings would be fifty-seven per cent on the capital employed. It was given in evidence that in 1942, excluding profits rebated as special depreciation, these net profits amounted to 21·9 per cent of cost. This is enormous on an output of some 300,000 metric tons. Yet again it said in the report that none of my allegations is substantiated.

In the same break-down of ingot costs, given in the report for 1942 placed before the committee, the cost before interest and taxes, but including special depreciation, which, as I have stated, must be derived from additional profit, was given as 17 cents a pound. The average price to the United Kingdom was given as 21·01 cents a pound. The profit on the United Kingdom contracts before taxes, not already rebated under special depreciation clause, was 3·75 cents a pound. However, the profit on the United Kingdom contract

was 2·75 cents a pound or sixteen per cent, after all taxes were paid and the special depreciation allowed.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Are these Price Waterhouse figures?

Mr. COLDWELL: Yes, the figure I have used was given by Price Waterhouse.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is not your interpretation of them?

Mr. COLDWELL: No, I am taking these figures directly from the break-down which will be found as part of the committee's report, on page 112. On this basis the public pays for the plant extensions during the war—

An hon. MEMBER: What public?

Mr. COLDWELL: The public engaged in the war against the fascist and nazi aggressors and the Japanese imperialists; that is the public who pay for it. The public grant rebates, special depreciation and allow for income and all other taxes, and then the company makes for its owners a further profit of nearly sixteen per cent, or, to be exact, 15·93 per cent of the ingot cost. Even the attempt of witnesses to minimize the extent of the profits still showed an enormous return to the owners of the Aluminum Company of Canada; that is to its owner, the Aluminium Limited; yet the committee declares that none of my allegations is substantiated.

The prospectus of the company, placed in evidence and available to any member of the committee who wishes to obtain a copy, states that at the end of the war the company's new plant facilities will have no funded debt; all extensions will be paid for during the war, whether the governments take the amount of aluminum contracted for or not, and this was confirmed in the evidence and is confirmed by the report. I said last session that the company took no financial risk in regard to these new facilities. The evidence confirms this; yet the report charges that none of my allegations is substantiated.

In the report much is made of the cost of carrying Shipshaw and the Arvida facilities by the company, should we encounter a post-war depression, which I submit the committee report implies will be inevitable. But the company's own prospectus, placed in evidence, has this to say:

> Facilities being brought into production are financed partly out of earnings and partly out of the aid of various allied governments on the principle that such facilities should be substantially self-liquidating in the period of the war.

Later, the prospectus adds these words:

> Many unprejudiced authorities also believe that the age of light metals is just beginning. If it is not, we will have unneeded facilities which we can either demolish without loss or hold for eventualities, and a business of pre-war dimensions which always managed to earn a profit for its shareholders.

That is the opinion of the company itself. In other words, it is a case of "heads we win, tails you lose". The chairman of the war contracts depreciation board told us that there was very likely to be a post-war value in connection with Shipshaw as a power project, altogether aside from the production of aluminum. Yet the report, in order to defend the vast concessions made to the company, tries to say that they may have little or no value, and upon that assumption declares that another of my allegations is not substantiated.

As to Shipshaw, this power development was planned as long ago as 1925, when aluminum production was neither as important nor as voluminous as in recent years, particularly during this war period.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Where is the evidence of that? Was that before the committee?

Mr. COLDWELL: Yes, that was given in evidence; I was just going to say that.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Then you are referring to the evidence which was given before the committee.

Mr. COLDWELL: Yes, I am.

Mr. GRAYDON: Can you do that?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): If the hon. member can do it, everybody can.

Mr. HOWE: This was a private discussion between members of the committee. I do not know about it, and no one in the house other than members of the committee knows about it.

Mr. COLDWELL: I think the minister should know; and may I just say this to the house—

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask hon. members to address the Chair. I cannot hear what is being said when there is a general discussion going on.

Mr. COLDWELL: I submit that I have used the figures and the evidence given to the committee and quoted in the report before the house. I have also, in a very few particulars, referred to the evidence which was given in the committee. That evidence was given not in secret but in camera, and there is a very well defined rule that evidence given in

camera is not given in secret, that a member has to be guided by his own conscience as to what he will subsequently divulge. I want that to be clearly understood, because that is the difference between secrecy and in camera.

Mr. CLEAVER: Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a ruling of the Chair on that point. I recall that a year ago, and, I believe, prior to that, objection was taken to this being done, and I would ask for a ruling on the matter of evidence given in that committee being quoted in the house. As I recall them, the previous rulings were that the only evidence taken in camera which could be used in debate in this house was evidence which the committee had released and incorporated in its report. To the extent that the hon. member has referred to evidence released in the report, I would say he is quite within the rules; but in quoting from evidence taken in camera which has not been released by the committee, I submit he has gone beyond the rules.

Mr. HOWE: I do not think anyone in this house objects to the evidence being taken in camera, for reasons which I think are sound, but once all the evidence is in I see no great objection to discussing the evidence as a whole. However, I do think every hon. member should know what the evidence is.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. HOWE: My hon. friend is telling me of evidence given before the committee which seems to be incredible. That evidence may have been given; I have no way of knowing whether it was or was not. I can hardly credit it, but nevertheless I do think that if hon. members are to rise in their places in this house and quote evidence given to the committee, we should have an opportunity of checking that evidence.

Mr. GRAYDON: You think it should be tabled, in other words?

Mr. HOWE: Yes, I think so; and I would suggest to the chairman of the committee that he move to have the evidence in this particular case tabled in the house.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I have before me an amendment in the words which the minister has just used, that this evidence be tabled; and had I not given way to the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), by this time that amendment would have been before the house.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I speak to the point of order?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The minister has washed that out pretty well.

[Mr. Coldwell.]

Mr. COLDWELL: Oh, no, not yet. I am giving my understanding of the committee's work, and the evidence which was received.

Mr. HOWE: I think every man should have a chance. The hon. member has said he was quoting evidence; now he says he is giving his understanding of it.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Which is quite different.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I say this, that we have a report before the house which is based on evidence taken before the committee. Am I to have my lips sealed, when the whole of that inquiry was directed against statements I made in the house? No, sir; I contend I have a perfect right to refer to this evidence as the committee in its report has done. I have referred to nothing that in any way will interfere with the security of Canada, nor have I referred to anything which would be of benefit to any enemy of our country or to any competitor of this company. I contend, as I am discussing a report based on certain evidence, that my lips cannot be sealed in this house in regard to evidence of the description to which I have been referring.

Mr. CLEAVER: If the hon. member is through with his remarks in regard to the point of order, I as chairman of the subcommittee should like to speak to it.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): The hon. member has already spoken to it.

Mr. CLEAVER: The point of order is raised by the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe).

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): He did not raise a point of order.

Mr. CLEAVER: He suggested that the evidence taken in camera before the war expenditures committee should now be tabled. In the first place I suggest that every hon. member of the house knew, by notice on the order paper, that this report would be under debate, and I suggest that proper notice should have been given to the house, and that the house cannot entertain the motion as suggested by the Minister of Munitions and Supply, without proper notice.

Mr. GRAYDON: He did not make a motion; he just made a suggestion.

Mr. CLEAVER: I call to the attention of the minister one thing, that this evidence was taken before the war expenditures committee, and was given by the witnesses on the understanding that the evidence was being taken in camera.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): But not in secret.

Mr. CLEAVER: And as chairman of the committee I cannot take the responsibility for saying that I will waive any in camera ruling, or waive the protection which we had. It should be dealt with by the house only, and only the house can deal with it. And it should not be dealt with, except by notice.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) was speaking, I was debating in my mind the position with respect to the remarks he was making concerning the evidence. I was deliberating whether I should call his attention to the fact that the evidence of the committee has not been tabled in the house. Therefore, when reference is made to evidence it should be made only in the proper way, namely, by a specific reference to that evidence—which, in this instance, the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar could not do, because the evidence is not tabled.

The other question I was deliberating was as to the references he made respecting his information as to things which happened in the committee. That appeared to me to be relevant, but I would say that the hon. member cannot refer particularly to any particular item where evidence has been given in camera, with the distinction the hon. member has placed upon it. Yet the fact is that it was taken in camera, as suggested by the hon. member for Halton, simply because they could not get the evidence unless it was given in camera. Therefore consideration should be given to that.

But as I listened to the hon. member I was convinced he had transgressed paragraph 568 in the third edition of Beauchesne's "Parliamentary Rules and Forms", where it states:

> Until the report and evidence have been laid upon the table, it is irregular to refer to them in debate, or to put questions in reference to the proceedings of the committee.

Then it points out in paragraph 569:

> That when the evidence is before the house it may be debated at length, but members will not be permitted to discuss the conduct or language of members of the committee, except so far as it appears on the record.

My conclusion, therefore, is that as long as the hon. member is referring in general terms to his interpretation of the evidence given in committee, he is entitled to do so. But he is not entitled to discuss the evidence seriatim and in detail, as it was given before the committee, for the reason that it is not before the house.

Mr. COLDWELL: Mr. Speaker, I shall abide by your ruling, as I invariably do, and I shall refrain from referring specifically to the evidence. But may I say this, that the few pieces of evidence to which I have referred are not included in the report now before the house, and have been very carefully documented from public records. I know the pages from which every statement I have made comes, and each one of them can be documented and corroborated.

But I was going to say that in 1925—and this is a matter also of public record—the engineer employed by the company at that time, when transmission was far less efficient than now, said that power could be shipped to eastern Ontario and the United States economically from the Shipshaw falls. And Mr. Morris P. Davidson, the commissioner of the New York state power authority confirmed this with me in conversation that I had with him as lately as January 15 of this year, namely, that long-distance transmission of cheap power is economically feasible, as proven in our own country, so I am advised, where power is transmitted to Toronto from Montreal, via Hull, a distance of—I have not measured it—about some three hundred miles.

Mr. GRAHAM: Why did the hon. member not lay that evidence before the committee?

Mr. COLDWELL: I did lay it before the committee. I told the committee upon my return from New York, and I remember one of the members objecting to my having information that other members of the committee did not have. I said I had been so advised when I was there on January 15. And may I say that that power used in Toronto, and supplied from the source I have mentioned, gives Toronto to-day very cheap power indeed.

As to Shipshaw's creating new unusable power, may I point out that in 1939, when there were 400,000 workers unemployed in this country, a large number of whom were in Quebec, that province of Quebec had a surplus of power of only thirteen per cent. Yet the report bemoans the fact that we should have this great new source of power available, one which I contend ought to be used for rural electrification and for industry after the war, and again states that none of my allegations is substantiated.

In conclusion, I wish to make it abundantly clear, as I said at the outset of the inquiry before the subcommittee—if I may refer just this once to anything that happened there—my criticisms are not for one moment directed against the administrators, the technicians and the workers who planned and executed this marvellous project. This, though, in my opinion they could have done equally well for the people and for the government of Canada. On the contrary I have nothing but the highest praise for the industrial miracle

they accomplished. And my high hope is that we may, as a Canadian people, through our democratic institutions and for our people devote equal energies and equal abilities to the development of our country in the post-war years.

My criticisms have been and are directed against the financial interests in the background who, as I said, were in a position to hold a pistol at the heads of the united nations in their extremity. I have been told, for example, that the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe), the Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Power) and the metals controller all wanted to see this project started early in the autumn of 1940, a year after the outbreak of war when Britain was being heavily bombarded from the air and needed aluminum to make planes. But the company refused a fifty per cent write-off offered on Shipshaw, so that it was not started until April, 1941.

The committee in some particulars relied upon and quoted extensively from a decision of a United States district court, as is indicated by the report. But that decision did not concern itself with economic realities but with definitions of company control embodied in existing United States law. The court failed to take into account several common holders of stock in both companies. Furthermore, the decision is under appeal and would have been decided by now but for the fact—this will appear curious to Canadians—that the supreme court of the United States cannot get a quorum together to hear the appeal. Why? Too many of the judges are disqualified because of their participation in earlier indictments of the Aluminum Company of America. Thus for this house to rely on this decision of a lower court in a foreign country, no matter how friendly the country may be, would be to say the least most remarkable.

I, therefore, say without reservation that all my major statements regarding this project were amply confirmed by the witnesses appearing on behalf of the company and the government. Indeed, I would say to hon. members of this house that if they will take the trouble to read the report now before the house they will find that it confirms those statements. Yet the same report says that none of my allegations is substantiated. To vote concurrence in a report so obviously designed to whitewash the deal and the company would be in my opinion to do violence to one's own intelligence. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this house dare not approve the report submitted to it on behalf of the war expenditures committee.

[Mr. Coldwell.]

Mr. J. H. HARRIS (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Stirling):

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

"Be not now concurred in but that the house instructs that the evidence upon which the said reports are founded be tabled and that consideration of the reports be postponed until the house has had sufficient opportunity to study the said evidence."

The situation which has arisen in the house to-night is of a kind that has arisen not only in this honourable chamber but in the main committee from its very inception and in the subcommittees from the time they convened. I expected that we would hear this afternoon from the chairman of the committee a resume of some of the work accomplished, but all we are asked for is concurrence in a report based upon evidence which I doubt one member out of three in this house has gone over or is in a position to cast an intelligent vote on. Hon. members are being asked to decide on a very serious matter, one of the most important matters that have come before this House of Commons by way of committee.

When we first thought of having a war expenditures committee each and every hon. member believed that he was going to have an opportunity to be of some service to his country and to help out with the war effort. How well I remember when three short years ago we were told before we went into the committee room that politics would be left right at the door, that they would not enter into the deliberations on war expenditures. How well I remember the same day after this profession of faith was made that hon. members voted down on a straight party basis one, two, three, four, five, six different motions that I had the pleasure of putting forward to the committee. The whole gamut of the evidence offered in those first few days was of a kind that would have given us a change to examine into war expenditures, but I think the resume of abuse, as I would call it, of the opposition groups that came from the chairman is an indication of how the committee conducted itself.

Why is it necessary to malign the members of the opposition who tried to do a job? Why is it necessary to put an interpretation on these in camera meetings which will not permit us to discuss even among our fellow members what occurred in the committee? The subcommittees themselves were quite free to decide whether or not they should sit in the open, but the subcommittees were constituted by the main committee in camera. After that

they could get their own members to agree to sitting in open session, if that was possible. But what actually happened? Let me take some of the time of the house to read what happened when a subcommittee did resolve to sit in open session. I quote:

Thursday, August 7, 1941.

Members present: Messrs. Graham, Gladstone, Harris, Hansell, O'Neill, Picard, and Sissons—seven.

Mr. Harris read into the record a letter from the chairman, Mr. R. T. Graham, addressed to himself, and also expressed his disapproval of the committee sitting in camera.

The chairman replied to Mr. Harris, assuring him that he would, with the other members of the committee, consider the points raised by Mr. Harris. The chairman then invited all members of the committee individually to express their opinion on the question of open or in camera meetings. All members of the committee replied, expressing their views on the question raised by Mr. Harris.

Mr. Hansell moved, seconded by Mr. Harris —That this morning's sitting be regarded as open and that anything considered to be of a delicate character be kept off the record.

On the question being put, Mr. Harris asked for a recorded vote; the names being taken down were as follows: Yeas, Messrs. Gladstone, Harris, Hansell, and Picard—four; Naes, Messrs. O'Neill, and Sissons—two.

The motion passed in the affirmative.

Then the chairman adjourned the meeting forthwith. That motion passed at 12.02 p.m., and the chairman adjourned the committee at 12.05 p.m. He refused any discussion on the motion to adjourn, walked out and left the committee. When the committee next met we found ourselves again in camera. Is that any evidence that the members of the subcommittee were permitted to sit not in camera? It is just the reverse. Then I quote from the proceedings of the next meeting.

Mr. CLEAVER: May I have the page number?

Mr. HARRIS: Page 11.

Mr. HOWE: May I call attention to the fact that my hon. friend is reading, I understand, from the minutes of a committee meeting held in camera, minutes which have not been tabled.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): No.

Mr. GRAYDON: It has been tabled.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): Let me make it abundantly clear that at no time did I serve on a committee sitting in camera. I attended no secret meetings, no camera meetings. Everything I have been able to do on behalf of the committee was done wide open, and without any cost whatsoever to the country, not even the per diem allowance or anything of that kind. It was done as a war service, and I was hoping that would be the attitude the others would take.

Again, two weeks later, on August 22, 1941, I moved that the evidence be printed so that we would have it on the table. That was ruled out of order.

Again, we thought that our subcommittee should have the selection of its chairman. That was ruled out, was defeated on a division, six for the motion and ten against—another party division.

We asked for an increase in the minority representation. That was defeated on a straight party vote of fourteen to four.

We had another situation where one hon. member supporting the government moved, on July 17, 1942, that we sit through with the same industry in 1942 as we had done in 1941. That carried, seven yeas, six nays. Yet in spite of that the committee adjourned until September 3.

Mr. CLEAVER: May I have the page number of your quotation, please?

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): July 17, 1942, is the date. You will find the page number in the evidence.

Again, we had our friend the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) asking that the committee be open unless otherwise ordered by the committee or by the subcommittee. That motion was negatived.

Throughout the entire proceedings of this war expenditures committee there has been a definite move to keep the evidence away from the members of this house. The only committee that was able to give to the members of this house any evidence of any consequence was subcommittee No. 2. The rest just consisted of reports which came down to this house, and the net result is that this chamber now finds itself in a position of having to vote on a motion by the chairman for concurrence, and the members do not know what they are voting on. Hon. gentlemen opposite will just answer to the whip's call, with the net result that the government will carry the motion for concurrence and some of their members will find themselves embarrassed by concurring in something which they know nought of.

What emphasizes the situation more is the fact that on page xiv of the proceedings of January there is a reference to certain irregularities alleged before this house in connection with No. 2 shell filling plant at Pickering. The chairman of the committee is here and I do not need to take time to read it. The chair-

man stated that the committee was recalled for the consideration of its reports to the house and so on and eventually he ruled that the matter be referred to the minister. So that in the light of that decision—

Mr. CLEAVER: On a point of order, the hon. member who has the floor has made a direct statement. He says that when the McGregor charges as to No. 2 shell filling plant at Pickering were brought up—then he mumbled some words and then—

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. member to withdraw the word "mumbled." I am not in the habit of mumbling in this chamber.

Mr. CLEAVER: I withdraw the word "mumbled" and I say that he used a few words I could not hear which were a jumble. My hearing is fairly good. He did not read what happened in the committee. He made the statement that the chairman had ruled that the Pickering matter could not be dealt with then. The chairman made no such ruling, and I would like to read to the committee just what happened.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): You have no right to do that.

Mr. CLEAVER: The hon. member made a statement which I say is entirely incorrect, and I ask the right to correct his statement.

Mr. CASSELMAN: You do not correct a point of order. You just state it.

Mr. CLEAVER: The hon. member stated that the chairman ruled that the matter could not then be considered. I say that I did not so rule, and the minutes of the committee bear that out.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know that there is anything on which to rule. There is a difference of opinions on the facts. I understand that the hon. member was reading from the record, and the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Cleaver) says that his statement as quoted was not correct.

Mr. CLEAVER: It is only a deliberate misstatement of fact; that is all.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): I ask that that statement be withdrawn.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The hon. member must withdraw the word "deliberate".

Mr. SPEAKER: I request that the hon. member withdraw that statement.

Mr. CLEAVER: I insist that he said that the chairman ruled that the Pickering charges could not then be considered, and I say that that is incorrect, and it was intentional or he would have read from the minutes.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I rise to a point of order. No member can impute improper motives to another.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): No member can misconstrue the evidence which is on the records of this house.

Mr. HOMUTH: The hon. member ought to withdraw the statement that the hon. member for Danforth made a deliberate misstatement of facts.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): The record speaks for itself.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member for Halton did say that the hon. member for Danforth had made a deliberate misstatement of facts. That is a statement which should be withdrawn.

Mr. CLEAVER: Very well, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the word "deliberate" and anything else that offends the hon. member, but I will say this, that he did make a misstatement of facts.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): I am sorry to delay the house, Mr. Speaker, but I will put it on the record, word for word, the way it reads. I am quoting from page xiv of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 19, 1944:

> Mr. McGregor made a statement alleging certain irregularities in connection with the construction of No. 2 shell filling plant at Pickering, and submitted that the matter should be inquired into by this committee.
>
> The chairman stated that the committee had been recalled for the consideration of its reports to the house with the understanding that no further evidence would be taken at this time.

I pause to ask the house to put its own construction on that statement, that no further evidence would be taken at this time, and on the previous paragraph with regard to the McGregor allegation of irregularities.

> He invited Mr. McGregor to submit a memorandum to the chairman or clerk of the committee indicating the nature of the alleged irregularities in order that any action deemed necessary might be taken.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): Would the minister like me to read that over? It states, with the understanding that no further evidence would be taken at this time. Say "hear, hear" to that.

An hon. MEMBER: Yes, sure. Read slowly.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): Then on page 15—I will try not to mumble my words—the chairman presented a report of the agenda subcommittee:

The subcommittee on agenda begs leave to present the following report:

That the text of press reports issued by Mr. McGregor stating that with respect to the construction of No. 2 shell-filling plant at Pickering, there has come to him evidence of serious allegations, of payroll padding and misuse of materials, be forwarded to the Minister of Munitions and Supply forthwith. In view of the fact that it would be a physical impossibility to make a complete investigation of the balance of Mr. McGregor's statement respecting "mismanagement" before Wednesday next, when the present session ends and the life of the present committee terminates, that the matter be given prompt consideration, when the war expenditures committee is appointed next session.

Now that is another example of what I was trying to convey to the members of this house, that we are not competent now to concur in this report because we as members of the house do not know enough about the evidence which is at present available although not tabled.

That, sir, is why I have the honour to move this amendment which asks that the evidence be tabled. It would have been a very happy situation had I been able to have the Minister of Munitions and Supply second my amendment. That would have cleared the air and we would have had the evidence on the table and would have proceeded in an orderly way with this responsibility which is ours in the conduct of this war expenditures committee and its great work.

On another occasion I shall have something else to say with regard to the general conduct of these committees. I will say this now, that I am of the opinion that this house is supreme over any committee, and even though the chairmen of days gone by have used the chairmanship perhaps to help some get judgeships and others a portfolio, I am afraid the hon. member who leads the committee now is using it as a stepping-stone to the basement in the way that he has conducted the affairs of that committee.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I regret that I was not present in the earlier part of the evening, but I have been trying to catch up on some engagements which it was impossible to meet earlier in the day. Discussion however, it is apparent, has arisen over the question whether or not evidence which is taken in camera by one of the select committees—the committee on war expenditures—may be disclosed and, in the words of the amendment, "be tabled."

This is the third or fourth session at which we have had occasion to appoint a war expenditures committee. On each occasion I have pointed out that it was necessary, as suggested at the outset, by the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson), I believe, to have a committee of this house to examine war expenditures for the purpose of guarding against extravagance, waste and any kind of fraud or wrongdoing. In speaking on the appointment of the committee I have on each occasion drawn attention to the fact that it was a very simple matter for this house to decide whether or not it would have such a committee and how the committee should function, because there was at Westminster, and had been not only throughout the present war but during the last war as well, a committee appointed at Westminster to deal with national war expenditures. I stated on each occasion that the motion which was being brought forward in this house was in identical terms with the motion which had been adopted in the house at Westminster. In a time of war there are a number of considerations many of which are not apparent on the surface, of which the government, the House of Commons and parliament must take very full account. In connection with the methods of procedure and the evidence taken before the committee on war expenditures, I submit that there must be the best of reasons for having sittings held in camera or the parliament at Westminster would not have followed that procedure in the last war and insisted upon it in this.

Hon. members last year had the opportunity of meeting with the chairman of the war expenditures committee of the British house. He was attending the British empire parliamentary association gathering and many hon. members questioned him as to procedure, why it was that the committee on war expenditures in the British house held their meetings in camera, and why it was that there was so little or nothing at all in the way of debate on its reports. The answer which was given has already been stated in this house and is to be found in *Hansard* of last session. It was to the effect that the committee exists not for the purpose of trying some case, or seeking out scandal or to prosecute someone for some wrongdoing, but rather that it is a committee appointed for the purpose of assisting the treasury at a time of war, in seeing that in war expenditures waste is avoided and that economies are effected wherever possible. In the course of its inquiries members may come across matters which are evidence of wrongdoing, and in such cases the procedure at Westminster is to have the committee report at once to

the minister whose department is concerned. Without any attempt to do things in public which might divert the mind of the people from the major issue, namely, that of the prosecution of the war itself, the minister of the department concerned is given an opportunity to see that errors are immediately corrected. There is the further procedure, that if a matter serious enough comes to light and the committee feels that it should be brought to the attention of the Prime Minister, this opportunity is afforded and indeed it is the committee's duty to bring the matter to the Prime Minister's attention so that the government itself may take it in hand immediately to ensure that nothing further is done which may be contrary to the public interest.

The reason why the committee holds its sessions in camera is first of all that the evidence itself can be so much more readily elicited than it could be if the proceedings were held in public. To further the efficiency of its work is one of the reasons why the committee proceeds in camera. I need not repeat what was said this afternoon by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Cleaver), the mover of the resolution for concurrence, because all hon. members know that officials will not come forward and give evidence in public in the manner in which they are prepared to give it in private. The war expenditures committee is free to call anyone —experts, officials of departments, any person they please. Hon. members will also know that evidence which is disclosed in one direction may be of great assistance to competitors of the concerns affected, and that in a public hearing witnesses will refuse to disclose evidence which they know is going to be of advantage to a competitor.

A further consideration, and a very important one, applies directly to this particular industry which is being referred to at the present time. The expenditures being examined into frequently involve questions of contract with other governments. I am not at all sure that this particular industry has not contracts to which the governments of the United Kingdom, Australia, and the United States are parties, and I have reason to believe that some of these contracts might not have been made had these governments understood that their part in the matter, and the interests which they are seeking to conserve and to hold secret, at all events for the time being, would be disclosed.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): May I suggest—

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, my dear friend, I have never made a speech in this house which my hon. friend has not interrupted. I am going to ask him, please, once and for all, just—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The company itself disclosed these contracts.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: —to try to possess his soul in patience until I get through. He said this afternoon I was a little rough. I am trying to be smooth this time.

I come back again to what I was saying. In addition to the reasons for the in camera proceedings which I have presented, there is the further one of what may be given, wholly unexpectedly, in the nature of aid or comfort to the enemy. Witnesses cannot be examined in public without some of them saying something, quite innocently to them, seeming to have little or no significance, and yet, watched as proceedings are from every side by those who are seeking to further the interest of the enemy rather than the interest of the country, may lead to something being disclosed which may be at least a clue leading in directions very injurious to the war effort. These are all good, sound, substantial reasons.

There is no parliament more desirous of upholding its own supremacy than the parliament at Westminster. There is no parliament which has sought more eagerly than has the parliament at Westminster to preserve the utmost frankness and openness in all discussions. But when one looks through the list of the public men who have given their support to the present procedure at Westminster of the war expenditures committee and finds such names as those of all the prime ministers of Britain during the period of the last war and the present war, and all the leaders of the opposition in the last war and the present war, I feel that to oppose views which these gentlemen all agree must prevail in matters of this kind requires very substantial reasons.

One thing further. At Westminster, so carefully is the whole situation guarded that the reports themselves are never debated. I do not know whether hon. members are aware of that. I am perfectly sure that if some service was not thereby being rendered the country an attitude of that kind would not be taken by the British parliament. That has been its position from the beginning. The reports are tabled, and never once have they been a subject of debate since this war has commenced. That seems to be a surprise to some hon. members, but the reasons for it are apparent. It does not mean that those who are members of the committee may not come across evidences of wrongdoing which

they think ought to be exposed, and which they might even feel it their duty to expose. Where there are cases of that kind, and an hon. member who is a member of a committee that has been holding its sittings in camera feels that a wrong has been done which the committee is unwilling to investigate, or that the government is seeking to conceal something because it is unwilling to make public proceedings held in camera, that hon. member may rise in his place and prefer a charge against the government, and the government thereupon appoints a committee of inquiry. There is in such a case some responsibility assumed with respect to the charge that is made. A member is not supposed to make a charge that is not capable of being substantiated; rather is he expected to be so sure of his ground that he is quite prepared to substantiate his charge. There were many times in the last war when the government of the day had to consider whether it was going to investigate rumours and accusations which might be put forward by its opponents, and the government of the day—quite rightly—took very strongly the position that it was not the business of the government to take up the time of the country and parliament in discussing rumours and running down this and that for the purpose of obtaining what little bit of political or party advantage might be gained by some party, but that if an hon. member rose in his place and seriously preferred a charge in the manner I have referred to, an inquiry would be granted.

Then there is always opportunity for hon. members to discuss matters before the public accounts committee if they have reason to believe that there are situations which should be discussed there. But I wish to make it clear that it would not be possible for the war expenditures committee to function as it was intended to function unless its sittings were held in camera; and being held in camera it is not proper that the proceedings should be made public.

I understand that my colleague the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) would welcome all the evidence being made public. His wishes in that particular are shared by every member of the government, but so far as the adoption of that course is concerned it would be a proceeding directly contrary to the procedure which has been laid down at the time previous committees were appointed, and on the basis of which this committee has been constituted.

Let me repeat that the committee, as the wording of the motion indicates here, is to—

examine the expenditure defrayed out of moneys provided by parliament for the defence services, and for other services directly connected with the war, and to report what, if any, economies consistent with the execution of the policy decided by the government may be effected therein.

In other words, this committee is viewed in Britain, and it should be so viewed here, as an adjunct to or ally of the treasury; it is to help the treasury of the country to see that public funds are protected. If there are to be inquiries on other matters, they ought to proceed in accordance with the procedure of this house in such matters.

Therefore I hope, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friend opposite will not press his amendment, but if he does, I hope the house will support the government in opposing it.

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): In view of my previous remarks perhaps I should explain the position. I was listening to my hon. friend the house leader of the C.C.F. party (Mr. Coldwell) make statements as to the nature of the evidence taken before the committee. His statements were so contrary to the facts as I understand them and to the facts as I have stated them in this house that I felt I would like very much to see the evidence taken before the committee. Of course I have not seen it and have no idea what that evidence was. But I did not intend to have my remarks taken as meaning any more than that. I am quite aware that it would be a breach of confidence, and particularly a breach against myself, if that evidence were tabled.

The committee, in investigating all aspects of the aluminum situation, went very much outside its terms of reference. It investigated expenditures made by the British government in this country by direct negotiation, and investments made by the British government acting through myself as its agent. The terms on which I was appointed agent of the government of the United Kingdom for the transactions I entered into on their behalf were that such transactions would be entirely confidential as between myself and the British government.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): In that connection may I ask the minister one question? The Prime Minister objects, but I am sure the minister will not when he hears the question.

Mr. HOWE: Very well.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Is it not a fact that in its prospectus concerning the sale of its preferred shares the company itself revealed, in a measure at least, the terms of the

arrangement with the British government, and that this was the first the public knew about it?

Mr. HOWE: That may be so, but if so, the company acted on its own responsibility. Nevertheless I cannot do so; at least I feel that I cannot. The same applies to the Australian contract. Consideration had to be given to the investigation of the aluminum contracts in the light of our arrangements with the United Kingdom and with Australia. It was my desire that every aspect of the aluminum transactions should be examined; I was anxious that this should be the case, and to permit that to be done I took the responsibility of applying, through the high commissioner of the United Kingdom, for the consent of the British government to permit the details of that contract and of the negotiations leading up to it to be placed before the committee. The United Kingdom government was extremely reluctant to give that permission, but, after an exchange of several cables, permission was given with the definite understanding, so stated in the cable, that the hearings of the committee would be in camera and the evidence would not be made public. The consent of the government of Australia was given in exactly the same terms.

Let me point out that the war expenditures committee was appointed to examine into the expenditures of the Canadian treasury, and that the expenditures of the Canadian treasury for aluminum represent a very small percentage, certainly less than five per cent, of the expenditures that were examined. Had we not been able to get permission from the British and Australian governments, I would have had to ask my officers to reveal only the facts concerning purchases by the Canadian treasury, and in doing so I would have only asked the committee to keep within its terms of reference. However, the committee has examined the whole situation; the committee presented to the house a report that is unanimous, with the exception of one hon. member, and I think the house can feel safe in adopting that report without going back into the evidence, which is known to only a few hon. members of this house, and is completely unknown to members of the government and to by far the greater proportion of hon. members.

Mr. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Munitions and Supply): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate for the purpose of considering, to at least some extent, some of the charges that have been repeated by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) as far as the Department of Munitions and Supply is concerned. During the discussion of the war appropriation resolution last year the hon. gentleman made certain charges. These charges were referred to the war expenditures committee and, as the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) has just stated, in essence they were boiled down to some five charges. The hon. gentleman had an opportunity of giving or submitting evidence, since he was a member of the committee; but on none of the five charges has the committee found for him. On the contrary the committee has found against the charges, but that is not the purpose I have in mind in rising this evening; there are other members of the committee, I am sure, who will deal with the charges generally, as repeated this evening by the hon. member.

I should like to discuss two main issues, concerning which the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar repeated his affirmations this evening. Those two issues concern the direct purchases of fabricated aluminum by the government, and the question of special depreciation on the Shipshaw power development. The Department of Munitions and Supply is not concerned with the British, American or Australian contracts, for the very good reason that it had absolutely nothing to do with them save and except as agent for those governments in the negotiation of one contract and in the finality, I believe, of the Australian contract. Neither did the department have anything to do with the plant expansions at Arvida, because these were brought about by the contracts to which I referred a moment ago.

Canada's purchases of aluminum, as everyone knows, in comparison with those of Britain and the United States were very small, and I hope to be able to establish that Canada's war administration certainly was not at fault in connection with any purchases of fabricated aluminum. I hope also to be able to show that the special depreciation which was granted at Shipshaw was the only logical thing to do at the time, and that had it not been done serious harm would have befallen the war effort.

Canada's purchases of aluminum have been entirely related to fabricated items, such as sheet, rod, tubing, bars, structural shapes, forgings and castings. Direct government purchases from the outbreak of war to August 20, 1943, total less than $900,000. Again I say that in comparison with the British and American purchases this amount was very small. These purchases were made for the government itself, either on behalf of crown companies or as requisitions were sent in by the service departments. There were other purchases made, of

course, by contractors such as aeroplane manufacturers, which were of a far more important nature. In the two and a half years to June 30, 1943, total sales of fabricated items were $33,984,093, and on these sales Alcan made the modest profit of $714,569. This was made before taxes were computed, and the company made a loss of $1,482,180 after a pro rata share of income taxes had been applied. Again with reference to these purchases, it is difficult to see where and how Canada's war administration has been at fault with reference to purchases of fabricated aluminum.

With the permission of the house, Mr. Speaker, I should like to place on *Hansard* a condensation of sales for 1941, 1942, and the first half of 1943. This condensation may be taken as reliable. From this it will be seen that the profit of the Aluminum Company of Canada before charging off any interest or any taxes was 3·6 per cent on its cost of sales, and 3·4 per cent on its sales. Surely no one in this house can complain that in the purchases of aluminum by Canadians there has been any improvidence, there has been any gross profit, or there has been any carelessness in the negotiation of profit margins.

The next question which has to be decided—

Mr. HOMUTH: May I ask a question?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Order, order.

Mr. HOMUTH: I have a right to ask a question. Are those figures the hon. member was about to give in part of the evidence?

Mr. CHEVRIER: The figures I gave are to be found in an audited statement which I have before me, and which I shall be glad to send over to my hon. friend.

Mr. HOMUTH: Again I ask the hon. member: Was it not submitted to the committee as evidence?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I was not a member of the committee, and I do not know what the evidence was. But I do know that the statements I hold in my hand are public property, and they are for anyone to see. They indicate exactly what I have said, namely a profit of 3·6 per cent and 3·4 per cent on sales. The next question—

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member leave to put the table on *Hansard?*

Mr. HOMUTH: May I ask a question? put on *Hansard,* if it is part of the evidence —and I believe that it is.

Mr. HOWE: Mr. Speaker, it is a public document. It is part of the file of the Department of Munitions and Supply. If it was put in evidence, it was probably put in by one of my officers.

Mr. HOMUTH: Why not put all the evidence, from your officers, on the record?

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any objection to the placing of this document on *Hansard?* There being no objection, it is agreed.

Mr. CHEVRIER: This is the analysis of profit and loss accounts:

Aluminum Company of Canada Limited
Domestic Business
Analysis of Profit and Loss Accounts

	1941	1942	First half 1943
Sales	$10,474,628	$13,385,765	$10,123,700
Cost of goods sold	8,380,833	12,320,364	11,429,010
Gross profit	$ 2,093,794	$ 1,065,401	$ 1,305,310*
Administrative and general expense	241,820	277,281	177,464
Profit or loss before interest, income taxes and inventory reserves	$ 1,851,974	$ 788,120	$ 1,482,774*
Pro rata share of interest	148,624	178,294	115,833
	$ 1,703,350	$ 609,826	$ 1,598,607
Pro rata share of taxes	1,234,032	668,402	294,315
Net profit (or loss)	$ 469,318	$ 58,576*	$ 1,892,922*
Total sales (2½ years)	$33,984,093		
Profit before interest and taxes (2½ years)	$ 1,157,320		
Per cent profit (before interest and taxes) to sales (2½% years)	3·4%		
Per cent profit (before interest and taxes) to cost of goods sold	3·6%		
Loss after pro rata share of interest and taxes (2½ years)	$ 1,482,180		

* Loss.

The next question which has to be decided is whether or not the transaction granting special depreciation was a provident one, and whether the government discharged its responsibilities to the people of Canada for the production of aluminum for war purposes with appropriate regard (1) for maximum output at maximum speed (2) economy in expenditure (3) equitable treatment and (4) long-term implications.

Aluminum, as the house knows, is in great demand for war purposes, chiefly in the manufacture of aeroplanes. It is estimated that from forty per cent to eighty per cent of an aeroplane is made of aluminum. Aluminum is made, as the house equally well knows, from bauxite, cryolite and fluorspar, and the resultant aluminum ingot is fabricated because of a tremendous amount of electrical energy which is put through these three commodities. Aluminum production requires three and one-third horse-power of electrical energy per metric ton of output. For each person employed in the production of aluminum over 100 horse-power is required, as compared with about one-half horse-power per person employed in the Bren gun plant of the John Inglis company at Toronto, and about one-eighth horse-power per person in the average of textile manufacture.

The capacity for production of the Aluminum Company of Canada at Arvida from the years 1927 to 1937 was 45,000 metric tons, and its actual production in those years ran as high as 42,600 tons in 1937 and as low as 15,000 tons in 1934, with an average of 28,200 tons, or an average production rate of 62·6 per cent. The normal place of aluminum in the world market ran usually fourth and fifth, and its production generally ran about 11 per cent of the total, with the United Kingdom by far the largest taker, Japan next at 20 per cent, then the United States, and small demands from twenty other nations.

In 1937 a world race for aluminum began to develop, as it now appears for war. Germany, Russia, Japan and Italy had led the way, with Germany reaching first place in the world by 1938. Influenced by these insistent demands Alcan laid plans to increase its capacity greatly, and in 1939 it turned out 75,200 metric tons, and in 1940, 99,000 tons, which was more than double its pre-war capacity, or over 260 per cent of its output in its best year, which was 1928, prior to the pre-war scramble for raw aluminum.

It should be pointed out that this expansion was initiated and financed by the company itself without any assistance from or intervention from the government.

[Mr. Chevrier.]

Then there came three quick successions of contracts by the British government, one in February of 1940, a second in June of 1940 and a third in February of 1941. In these contracts the United Kingdom government contracted with the company to expand its production facilities very much more, and contracted to take the whole of the output of the new additions, plus all the output of the company's previous facilities, reserving only Canada's small demands, and thus until the year 1941 with provision for renewal of the arrangements if the emergency continued thereafter.

These contracts were financed by loans from the United Kingdom to Alcan totalling $55,600,000. They were 20-year three per cent loans. Again the Canadian government had absolutely nothing to do with any of these arrangements.

Next came a succession of four contracts with the United States, commencing with one for 170,000 metric tons, of May 2, 1941, and ending with one for 167,800 tons, of April 1, 1942. These contracts totalled 621,436 tons. The United States contracts called for four further plant extensions involving estimated deliveries when complete as follows:

Year	Tons
1942	94,474
1943	146,283
1944	326,216
1945	54,463

This makes a total United States expansion of 621,436 tons, or 1,370,000,000 pounds of aluminum. Again the Canadian government was not a party to these contracts, nor did it know their terms until after they were signed.

But after the first contract which was made with the United States government in 1941 it became quite evident that Alcan could not fulfil it without an arrangement with the Canadian government which would permit capital expenditures for plants being charged off as a production cost over the expected period of the war. Otherwise the Canadian government would be expropriating in taxes money provided by a friendly government without which that government's imperative needs of aluminum could not possibly be provided. The same was true with respect to the three succeeding United States contracts. Refusal to agree to this understanding would have been unthinkable, so far as the Canadian government was concerned. The first two United States contracts, totalling approximately $120,000,000 in United States funds, with $50,000,000 in immediate payments, came at a time when Canada's balance with the United States was very unfavourable.

Thus they were extremely welcome and clearly fell within the scope of the War Exchange Conservation Act, section 8 of which reads in part as follows:

The governor in council in order to increase Canada's supply of foreign exchange may, on the recommendation of the Minister of Finance, enter into agreements with individuals, partnerships or corporations to grant assistance by way of special tax credits and/or special allowances for depreciation or depletion under the Income War Tax Act and/or the Excess Profits Tax Act, if, in the opinion of the governor in council, such assistance is necessary in order that an expansion of the exports of any individual, partnership or corporation receiving such assistance may take place or that the exports of any such individual, partnership or corporation may be maintained at levels higher than would otherwise obtain.

The proposal that the cost of the further plant additions should be charged to production costs was thus completely in keeping with the laws of Canada. This would have been equally true of the two subsequent United States contracts. In June, 1941, the United Kingdom government arranged with the Department of Munitions and Supply to take over the administration of its aluminum contracts. About the same time the government of Australia, which had already been negotiating a contract for a certain quantity of aluminum, arranged for that department to also take over the administration of its aluminum purchases.

As agent for the United Kingdom government the Department of Munitions and Supply subsequently negotiated for a further extension of Alcan plant facilities for the production of raw aluminum. Later the Minister of Munitions and Supply succeeded in reducing the average price for 1942 and 1943 of the British contracts to the same level as the base price of the United States contracts for 1942 and 1943. The successive two United States contracts, the Australian contract, and the last United Kingdom contract and the two final United States contracts, all calling for increased facilities, were superimposed one upon the other, before the previous plant expansion could be completed. Thus there never was a time at which a cut-off could be made, the plants being in a state of continuous expansion on an ever-increasing scale. Therefore it became impossible to segregate either the funds advanced by the various governments or the plants themselves.

The United Kingdom and the Australian contracts clearly could not come within the meaning of the War Exchange Conservation Act and, accordingly, it was decided, some months after the work had been under way and when very heavy commitments had been made by Alcan, that the matter should be dealt with by the war contracts depreciation board. This applied also to expenditures for completion of the Shipshaw power development with which I shall deal in a moment. So much for the facts.

I have dealt with this first in order to establish the tremendous expansion which took place almost overnight at Arvida. The plant at Arvida which had been producing at the rate of 62·6 per cent of its capacity had its production raised to 1,100 per cent over its pre-war capacity, an increase from a production capacity of 45,000 tons a year to 500,000 tons a year. This leads one naturally into a consideration of the Shipshaw power development project.

This was a purely Canadian matter. Neither the United States government nor the United Kingdom government had anything to do with it. The Shipshaw power project was not a new plant or a new project; it was the completion of one started in 1928 and held in suspense since 1931. It was forced on Alcan as a vital necessity to the means of fighting an air war. The down payments on account of the United States contracts referred to a moment ago were not sufficient to cover the full cost of the facilities for the production of the required additional raw aluminum, let alone provide anything for power development. The completion of the Shipshaw project was urged by the power controller as far back as 1940 in the clear vision that this was an air war, that there could not be enough aeroplanes without a greatly increased aluminum production and that such a production would imperatively demand a greatly increased power production as well. The construction of the Shipshaw canal and powerhouse in about eighteen months as compared with a normal construction rate of three years for such a work was an extraordinarily fine accomplishment. In the opinion of the power controller of Canada it was the greatest contribution made by this country to the war effort.

As the house knows, almost every war contract involves some additional capital expenditure, such as for new plant, new equipment, new buildings, new machine tools, jigs, fixtures, gauges and the like. It is a very rare exception for the Department of Munitions and Supply to find a contractor who has everything he needs with which to undertake a war contract. The required capital expenditure is usually put up to the department as something that it must find a way to take care of. There has developed over a period of time the following five methods, any one of which or any combination of which the department has to use.

1. By normal or accelerated depreciation granted to the contractor by his own expenditure in his own plant as a part of his production cost.

2. By special depreciation granted to the contractor through his own expenditure in his own plant under a ruling of the war contracts depreciation board, again as part of his production cost.

3. By capital assistance through government expenditure in the contractor's own plant.

4. By the government building an entirely new plant and appointing an entirely new organization to manage it for them, or setting up a crown company to manage it without fee or profit.

5. By the government purchasing or expropriating an existing plant, enlarging it to suit the requirements, and setting up its own management by way of a crown company or management fee arrangements.

These are the methods that have been used from time to time in the department. These, or a combination of these methods, are the only means by which the department can come to the assistance of a war contract.

The house will agree with me at once, I am sure, that because of the huge commitments required on the part of certain contractors it is impossible for the government to expect of them that they should, or could, finance their undertaking in all cases. Such certainly was the case with the aluminum company. The government of the United Kingdom realized it from the first when it made to the company the substantial loan of $55,600,000. If the company had not had this money to put up plant expansions, it could not have proceeded. Similarly, the government of the United States made down payments aggregating $75,350,000. The total cost of the whole undertaking, including plant expansions, and power developments, was roughly $250,000,000. When it is considered that the cost of the project was so huge, I think it will be admitted that the United Kingdom and the United States governments were well advised, as was the Canadian government, in coming to the assistance of the company as they did.

This leads me to a discussion of depreciation. Depreciation has, to my way of thinking, three meanings. First, there is the wear and tear of an asset or of an article, the common usage by hand or the use that is brought about by the elements; such, for instance, as the annual depreciation in a motor car. Depreciation has also another meaning called obsolescence; that is, the asset is losing its value in the industrial field because other assets are superseding it in the sense of greater production, greater utility at less cost. For example, should aluminum be displaced by magnesium after the war, aluminum will have depreciated because of obsolescence. There is the third phase that has crept into the law, namely, that the asset is entrusted to facilitate our war purposes under the apprehension that should the war suddenly cease—call it what you will—the asset as a value has depreciated to the owner and it becomes of no use in peace time.

Depreciation, therefore, can occur through wear and tear, obsolescence or disappearance of demand. If, for instance, the demand for aluminum after the war reverts to the position it occupied prior to the war, say, in 1937, depreciation of that plant will be great, because of obsolescence or disappearance of demand.

The principle of allowing depreciation as an item of cost is universally applied in every country which has an income tax act. It is so recognized in Great Britain, the United States, Australia and Canada.

Generally speaking, depreciation is threefold; that is, normal, accelerated, and special.

Normal depreciation is that which is granted to every citizen by virtue of the income tax laws. As an illustration, machinery is deemed to have a life of ten years, working one 8-hour shift a day, and usually gets ten per cent depreciation per annum, as an allowance which it may charge as an item of cost. This is normal depreciation. If, however, the machinery works twenty-four hours a day, the life of the machinery is deemed to be much shorter, and an increased rate is allowed by the Department of National Revenue, which is called accelerated depreciation. The usual rate allowed in such cases is twenty per cent per annum, as the maximum, even though the machinery may be working three shifts. At the rate of twenty per cent per annum, a perfectly new plant would be written off in five years. I should point out here that there are many expenditures on a plant which are handled under normal or accelerated depreciation, which are made without any reference to the Department of Munitions and Supply.

Special depreciation is that which is granted under the regulations of a board called the war contracts depreciation board. Where it appears that a manufacturer having a war contract or a subcontract is able to establish that part or all of his assets would have no post-war value, he may apply to the board for special depreciation, and if it is granted, that part which has no residual value may

be written off. It is explicit that this privilege can be allowed only when the essentiality of the expenditures can be demonstrated, and then only to the extent to which the plant additions could be shown to have no reasonable post-war value.

In the case of Shipshaw, in the year 1925, the Aluminum Company of Canada filed with the Quebec government an application for authority to complete the Shipshaw power development. This application included the cost of a canal of much the same nature as that which now exists, sufficient to permit of the ultimate development of 800,000 horsepower years, at an estimated cost of $20,000,000 with only three 80,000 horsepower generators installed, out of an ultimate installation of ten such generators.

The company's plan was to instal these additional generators one by one over the years as and when the needs of its aluminum business so required. It estimated that each of these turbines installed would cost another $1,000,000, making the ultimate estimated cost $27,000,000.

The Canadian government, under the dire necessities of the war situation, compelled the company to complete this power development on the larger scale of 1,020,000 horsepower years. This it did under war-time conditions, with high wages and costs of every description greatly magnified, involving a total expenditure of over $70,000,000. How then, I ask, in equity could the Canadian government refuse to protect the company against a difference in cost between its normal expected expenditure of $27,000,000 and this extraordinary war-inflated expenditure of $70,000,000? That is all that the Canadian government did with reference to that project.

The impression has been created in the country that the whole of the power development was paid for by the Canadian government. This is not so. Actually it has cost the Aluminum Company of Canada every penny which it would have cost if it had been undertaken by the company in days of peace, namely $27,000,000 to $30,000,000.

As to the special depreciation on the facilities for the production of aluminum, the house should clearly bear in mind that not a single Canadian dollar went into the plants of Alcan. It all came from the United States, the United Kingdom and Australia—with the United States taking much the greatest share. The Canadian government had nothing to do with the way in which these governments chose to finance their needs of aluminum production. They alone decided the method which in their judgment could produce the aluminum they needed with the least loss of time and at the lowest price.

It is not for us Canadians, whose needs for aluminum were always more than adequately provided for, to criticize the decisions of these other nations. It was for the Canadian government to cooperate with these nations and to facilitate their decisions in every way possible. All that the Canadian government really did was to agree not to expropriate in taxes the funds provided by these allies in time of need, without which their needs could not be provided.

The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar spoke of the great amount of power which would be created in that north country, and how that power would affect eastern Ontario. I say to him that experts who have studied this question say that it is impossible to transport power to Montreal from the Arvida area at a reasonable cost and that because of the distance, which is 340 miles, it is outside the limit of the economic transmission of power, and power at Beauharnois would compete so greatly with Shipshaw power that there would not be the slightest inducement to Alcan to transmit its power there.

It would have been unthinkable for the Canadian government to have expropriated in taxes the very funds expressly provided by the governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and Australia for the erection of the plants, without which there was no possible way for these nations to get the aluminum they required when and as they required it.

I submit to the house that the Canadian government would have been recreant to its trust and false to its duty as a member of the united nations had it pursued any other course than that which it did with reference to the purchase of fabricated aluminum, with reference to the Shipshaw power development, and also with reference to the expansion of plant.

It will be apparent, too, to the house that the charges in connection with the Shipshaw development completely fail of substantiation. In the whole transaction the Canadian government moved quickly as regards production, and on a maximum scale. It moved economically for the completion of a half-developed plant, saving money as well as time. It allowed all that and no more than was equitable in the circumstances, and I submit with deference that no situation inimical to the Canadian position and long-term interests was created by these arrangements.

Mr. A. M. NICHOLSON (Mackenzie): In rising to support the amendment, may I say that all members of the house were in agreement with the general principles which the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) outlined in 1940 when the first war expenditures

committee was set up. No one in this house wanted to discover war-time scandals, and I think it was recognized that any individual or corporation who would profiteer during these dark days was undermining confidence not only in this administration but in our democratic institutions. The Prime Minister outlined then and he repeated to-night the advantages of having these committees sit in camera. All the opposition members of the house, I think, were opposed to having the committee sit in camera in previous sessions, unless it could be demonstrated that the evidence to be produced would give comfort to the enemy or would cripple our war effort. On all other occasions it was felt that the committee should sit openly and all information be made available to all members of the house and to the public.

The Prime Minister intimated to-night that if the committees sat in camera evidence would be elicited much more easily and that the members of the committee would be free to call anyone they chose. A year ago I sat with one of the subcommittees while the investigation was made in connection with the administration of wartime housing. Hon. members will recall that on various occasions I discussed the activities of wartime housing and advanced the general position that the taxpayers of the country were not receiving good value for the expenditures that were being made. I argued that the activities of wartime housing had been conducted in too many places in communities where there was a shortage of permanent houses.

Mr. CLEAVER: I rise to a point of order. I believe it was distinctly understood, when the unanimous approval of the house was given this afternoon regarding the scope of this debate, that a debate would not take place on the reports tabled in 1941 and 1942. The hon. member is dealing with the report in regard to wartime housing which was tabled in 1942.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I am not referring to the report. I am reciting an incident which occurred in 1942 and I am doing so in support of my argument, which in turn is in support of the amendment of the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Harris). I submit, therefore, that I am in order. In my discussions in connection with wartime housing I felt that we should be willing to satisfy the taxpayers of the country that the houses being built would not become slums of to-morrow and that temporary houses would not be put up where permanent dwellings were needed.

[Mr. Nicholson.]

Mr. CLEAVER: Mr. Speaker, I ask for a ruling. My hon. friend is continuing to discuss the wartime housing report.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. member to bring his remarks to the point.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As a result of the statements I made in the house on various occasions, which were supported by returns tabled by the Minister of Munitions and Supply, one of the subcommittees was instructed to investigate the whole business of wartime housing. In the discussion certain charges were made by an official of wartime housing regarding the administration of another department and—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. What the hon. member is now saying is not relevant.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw a conclusion. Not being a member of the subcommittee I was denied the right to have information placed before this subcommittee by another department of government even while we were sitting in camera.

Mr. CLEAVER: Did my hon. friend move for it? I say he did not.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I was not a member of the committee, but through the courtesy of the chairman and all members of the committee, in view of the fact that I had spoken on wartime housing in the house, I was invited by the chairman and the members to appear. I was not permitted to make motions. We were not permitted to call a civil servant who was in a position to give information.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have given my ruling and I hope the hon. member will abide by it. The present discussion is not relevant.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Let me conclude by saying this. The purpose of meeting in camera was, in my opinion, defeated, and I think the public interest would be best served by having all the evidence made available to all members of the house and to the public except in cases where that evidence if produced would give comfort to the enemy or would cripple the war effort.

Mr. T. J. O'NEILL (Kamloops): As a member of one of the subcommittees that inquired into the aluminum contracts and the allegations made by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), possibly I had better read from *Hansard* just what the hon. member said in those days. As reported in *Hansard* of June 14, 1943 at page 3619, the hon. member said:

I have placed the facts before the committee without invective, I am certain without exaggeration, and I know without misrepresentation. These are the facts as I have accumulated them. I have got them first hand from first-hand sources. I have no doubt that there are certain people who know the people I visited when I was in Washington and know the offices where I got my information. I assure the committee that my information is authentic and gathered from those who were able to give me the information.

All through the hearings of that committee, the chairman, I can say, was very fair. I believe that every member of the committee will say that. The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar had every opportunity to bring before the committee that evidence which he said he received at first hand. He did not bring in any of that evidence. He brought no evidence with the exception of one witness, and the committee waited two days after we were ready to rise in order to permit him to bring in that witness, a Mr. Lipkowitz. Mr. Lipkowitz did not give any evidence that in my judgment would support the allegation made by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar.

The hon. member goes on to speak of cartels, monopolies and what-have-you. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the main idea in bringing these matters before this house was to create in the minds of the people the belief that because of the existence of cartels, monopolies, or what-have-you, the people of this country were being fleeced out of millions of dollars on the purchase of aluminum. To support that I read this in the paper:

> The peoples of the united nations are being sold down the Saguenay river, said Mr. M. J. Coldwell, leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation.

What paper? The *C.C.F. News*, of Vancouver, dated February 3, 1944. I do not think the *C.C.F. News* of Vancouver would misquote Mr. Coldwell. In the same paper Mr. Coldwell has this to say:

> The report of the special subcommittee on aluminum, composed wholly of Liberals and Progressive Conservatives except for myself, is a very obvious attempt to whitewash the whole affair.

We have heard a lot of things here about imputing motives and so forth; but I consider that a statement like that, from a man who holds the high position of the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar, is an insult to every member of that committee. He does not even give us the credit of being intelligent enough to get the point. He says that the committee was composed of Liberals and Conservatives and that a deliberate attempt was made to whitewash the evidence which was given before that committee. If ever there was an imputation of motives, I think this is one. It imputes the motive of dishonesty to the hon. members composing that committee, and as one of the members let me inform the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar that I am not dishonest. I tried to view the evidence as it was submitted and to give my findings accordingly.

To support my statement that the intention was to create in the minds of the people that they were being fleeced, I will read a little more of what the hon. member said. He stated:

> Cheap labour, cheap power and high monopoly prices for their product have brought the aluminum interests untold wealth and economic power.

Then he went on to make some remarks with respect to labour. He has since said that he would like to retract the words he used on that occasion, that the treatment of the men at this plant was "scandalous" and "inhuman." But a great deal of publicity and a great deal of importance were attached to the statements the hon. member made at that time in this house; they have been echoed and reechoed over this country. I submit to you, sir, that in so doing a well-known method now used in Europe is being followed, the method of hammering and hammering and again hammering on a certain subject; it does not make any difference what the facts are, if you repeat a statement often enough, whether there is anything in it or not, the public will begin to believe it. But having said these things, the hon. member tonight said he would retract these expressions and would say that conditions were bad.

But he said a lot more than describing conditions as scandalous and inhuman. He said:

> Men in the pot-rooms rarely last long amidst the poisonous fumes, and the labour turnover in that part of the plant is appalling.

As regards the fumes, it is well known now that the company has done everything humanly possible in the way of modern appliances to correct that condition. It is also a well-known fact that years ago the work of the pot-room men was very severe and arduous and the fumes were terrific. But today, so far as I have been able to determine, there is no record of any occupational disease in that plant. That should be a fair indication of whether the fumes are there in sufficient quantities to injure health.

As for wages, I do not definitely know the rates, but I am told that the income of a pot-room man is around $2,000. But there are other conditions besides wages to be re-

garded. Everything is now being done to reduce the labour of these men. As an indication that conditions are not as outlined by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar, when the strike took place last fall at Shawinigan Falls, there were, so far as I could find out through reading the papers, only two matters in dispute. One was, whether those men were to look after six pots or seven pots. They were supposed to look after one more pot in the winter time because the weather was cooler, than they had to do in the summer. One question in dispute was whether they should revert from six to seven pots in the winter time. The other point at issue was a jurisdictional dispute. They were not complaining about working conditions or about wages; what they were concerned about was whether they would have to look after six or seven pots, and whether one union or another union would attend to the interests of the workers.

A word as to housing. This committee visited Arvida and Shipshaw. The housing conditions there were very good. The company builds houses, which the men can either buy or rent, as they choose. They are very fine houses. They have good schools; they have hospitalization, and they have a retirement fund which, of course, is contributory. I found that the washrooms, lockers and such equipment are very much better than we have on the Canadian Pacific Railway. I worked for the C.P.R. for a long time and I know that conditions in this respect are not so good as those at the aluminum plants; yet as an old C.P.R. engineer I never considered that we were unfairly dealt with by that company.

It would appear from statements of the sort I have quoted that they may be inspired by another motive. I noticed that just after the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar made his allegation last fall, this appeared in the Ottawa *Citizen*:

> Shipshaw is one of the most valuable pieces of ammunition for the C.C.F. in the forthcoming elections.

That was said by a prominent member of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party, now an M.L.A. in British Columbia.

An hon. MEMBER: Who was it?

Mr. O'NEILL: Mrs. Grace MacInnis, wife of the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis). As a further illustration of what is going on, I have in my hand the Kamloops, B.C. *Sentinel*, January 12, 1944.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I must call the attention of the house to the fact that we have a motion before us along with an amendment. The discussion should really take place on the amendment; that is the subject matter we are discussing now. Also, the reading of excerpts from editorials is not in order.

Mr. O'NEILL: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and will refer to the amendment, which I believe is that the evidence should be tabled. As far as I am concerned I should like nothing better than to have tabled in this house the evidence submitted to the committee of which I was a member, because I believe it would completely vindicate the report brought in by that committee. When the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Harris) was speaking he gave as one reason for asking that the evidence be tabled that it had reference to a certain meeting of the committee which took place some time before that. The hon. gentleman called attention to the fact that he had never attended a meeting of the committee which was held in camera. To the best of my knowledge and belief that is so; but I can say at once that I am sorry he did not, because he is an able man and if he had seen fit to sit with the committee he could have given it a great deal of help. However, he did not see fit to join us when the committee was sitting in camera.

Hon. gentlemen will realize that it is the business of the chairman of a committee of this kind to bring in the witnesses. Our chairman, a very able gentleman, arranged with a gentleman in another city to come here and give evidence. This was a man whom we could not bring here unless he came of his own free will. He was requested to attend and give certain evidence, and the chairman gave him the guarantee that his evidence would be given in camera. Then the hon. member for Danforth moved that the evidence be heard in public. Well, a discussion developed, and I voted against the motion.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): If the hon. member will permit an interruption, the discussion to which the hon. gentleman has referred occurred two meetings after the meeting to which I made reference. Will the hon. gentleman not verify that statement?

Mr. O'NEILL: The discussion to which I have reference occurred right at the meeting I am speaking of, and the man who was supposed to give evidence sat in the committee room for two hours while the discussion went on as to whether it should be in camera or in public.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): No.

Mr. O'NEILL: That is the way I remember it.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): The fact of the matter is that the meeting to which the hon. member refers was on August 8, and the meeting to which I referred was on August 7.

Mr. CLEAVER: At what page of the evidence is that?

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): Page 11.

Mr. O'NEILL: I have not the proceedings before me, but I recall the meeting vividly. If that is not the meeting to which the hon. member was referring I hope he will pardon me if I keep on with the meeting to which I am referring. The motion was made that the meeting be held in public, after this gentleman had been told that it would be held in camera. I voted against that motion, because quite obviously you cannot ask some gentleman to come to Ottawa and give evidence in camera, and then tell him the evidence is to be given in public. You would never get any evidence from him; he is a private citizen, and there is no way of making him come here and give evidence. The meeting was adjourned, for the reason that it was noon before we finished discussing the question of whether it should be held in camera or in public. We came back after lunch and the meeting was proceeded with in camera, as it was supposed to be. I see nothing wrong in that, and I have no apologies to make.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): I think I am correct in saying that the afternoon session was held in public.

Mr. O'NEILL: I am speaking of my meeting, not the one about which the hon. gentleman is talking. The hon. member said he would not sit in camera at any time, and he did not; I do not recall seeing him in the committee at any time we were sitting in camera. The point is that we would not have been able to get that evidence at all unless we did sit in camera. You must hold your meetings in that way; you cannot do it otherwise.

Since you called me to order, Mr. Speaker, for having gone off the track, I do not think I have anything more to say at this time except to repeat that as far as I am concerned I would rather have that evidence tabled. In view of all the circumstances, however, I shall not vote in favour of the amendment, because there are other strings attached to it which make a proposal of that kind impossible.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): I shall be very brief in my remarks, Mr. Speaker; I intend to speak only to the amendment and the tabling of the evidence heard by the war expenditures committee. I was a member of that committee when it was first organized in 1941, and I believe the policy of hearing evidence in camera was the proper policy to adopt, particularly at that time. I think there were many things in its favour then that could not be said in its favour now. Some matters might come out which would give comfort to the enemy and interfere with our prosecution of the war, and so on, so that at that time I was in agreement with the majority of the committee that the meetings should be held in camera. But I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that if the committee wishes to have its meetings held in camera it never should make a report such as was tabled in this house on January 26. The committee presumed to take the allegations or charges made by a certain individual and hold hearings on them; then it brought in a report, based on the evidence adduced before it, finding that the charges had not been substantiated in any degree whatever. When a report of that kind is brought in I submit that the evidence must be placed before this house, because there is no way in which hon. members can satisfy themselves as to the correctness of the report except by reviewing the evidence. Either that evidence should be tabled or the report should be withdrawn. We cannot have a report placed before us, the correctness of which is denied by one party—whether it be made up of one man or a dozen—and which is supported by others. There is no way in which members of this house can vote intelligently unless they have before them the evidence taken in that inquiry. Think of a judge being asked to pass sentence in a case where he did not hear the evidence, where the evidence had been taken in some other place, and when he did not hear it! Then think of his being asked to base a judgment upon such evidence! We are in an impossible position. Either, as I said before, that evidence must be placed upon the table of the house, or the report must be withdrawn.

Mr. R. H. McGREGOR (York East): Mr. Speaker, I think we have had enough aluminum for the time being, and that it would be a good time to go for a little boat ride. In the first place we have a report here, as submitted by this committee. I want to say to the house that this is not the evidence as submitted before the committee. And if I may be allowed the time I would prove that. I think the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) made a little statement a while ago that anyone who wished to lay charges in the house could do so. I suppose he insinuated that the hon. member's seat would be at the

peril of whether or not he could prove those charges. I say to the Prime Minister that I will make charges to-night, and if I cannot prove them in the very evidence we have received, then he can do as he wishes as to sending me home.

In the first place I wish to make a little comparison between the Toronto shipbuilding yard, which in the first place was known as the Dufferin Construction company, and the Port Arthur yard. And I might say, just before making that statement, that in the draft report which I have in my hand, in the first place that comparison was made. It was struck out of the final report because some said that the figures were not exactly right—or for some other reason; I do not know just what the reasons were.

Mr. CRERAR: May I ask my hon. friend a question, before he gets into his speech? Do I understand that on his responsibility as a member of this house he is proposing to make certain charges against the government?

Mr. McGREGOR: I said I was going to make charges, as far as this boat work is concerned. Does the minister understand that? If he does not we will try to tell him what it is.

Mr. CRERAR: I do not understand it.

Mr. McGREGOR: The Dufferin Shipbuilding company, when the war started, began to build boats. They got a contract, and at the time they received the contract there were four other companies which received contracts for boats.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order. You cannot discuss the evidence.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I had to call attention of the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. O'Neill) to the matter before the house, namely, that there is a motion and an amendment. The discussion must take place upon the amendment, not the motion. The motion cannot be discussed until the house decides whether the evidence shall be tabled or not.

In the third edition of Beauchesne's "Parliamentary Rules and Forms" I find this at page 769, as the ruling of the Hon. L. P. Brodeur, Speaker at that time:

When an amendment is proposed to a motion, the discussion should be strictly confined to the subject matter of the amendment.

This is the quotation:

Mr. Speaker: I would call the attention of the hon. member (Mr. Porter) to the fact that he is not discussing the question before the Chair. When an amendment has been moved to a motion for Committee of Supply, the discussion should be restricted to its subject-matter. That is a well established rule.

[Mr. McGregor.]

Mr. Porter: I was addressing myself to the question upon the subject of expenditure by the administration in connection with the Post Office Department.

Mr. Speaker: The question of that expenditure does not come within the scope of the motion now before the Chair, which is the amendment moved by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) concerning the tariff and the preference with England. I read this passage from Bourinot, page 549:

"When an amendment has been moved to the question for the Speaker to leave the Chair, the discussion should be confined to its subject-matter."

Mr. Porter: I would draw the attention of the hon. members of the house to this ruling.

The fact is that now we have a motion and an amendment, and the discussion is on the amendment moved as follows:

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

"Be not now concurred in but that the house instructs that the evidence upon which the said reports are founded be tabled and that consideration of the reports be postponed until the house has had sufficient opportunity to study the said evidence."

When the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar was speaking he was making reference to the evidence, and that was on the motion. I ruled then that I thought he was speaking relevantly to the motion before the house, but that he should not deal with the evidence submitted before the committee.

Now the question to which the hon. member must address himself is the amendment.

Mr. STIRLING: May I draw to Your Honour's attention the fact that the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Chevrier) in his speech which might have been conceived to be a reply for the government, covered a very great deal of territory with regard to the aluminum company and its subsidiaries. He did not deal with the amendment. He dealt with facts and figures, in a most interesting manner; and I submit to Your Honour that it will be your desire to give the same latitude to one side of the house as was given to the other.

At the present time the hon. member for York East (Mr. McGregor) is explaining his position with respect to the subcommittee, of which he was a member, and which dealt with shipbuilding, leading up to the question: Shall the evidence in support of that contention be laid before the house?

Mr. HOMUTH: Speaking to the point of order, I say that the hon. member is perfectly in order, aside from what the hon. member for Stormont might have been allowed to do. The hon. member for York East is pointing out to the house that the only way he can discuss

these matters is to have the amendment carried, so that the real evidence can be placed upon the table, due to the fact that the report of the committee does not bear out the evidence given. I say the point is well taken.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, before giving your ruling may I speak to the point of order by bringing again to the attention of the house what occurred on Friday. The Prime Minister used these words:

> Concurrence in the report will have to be moved, and I should think the best way of proceeding would be to have concurrence moved on Monday and the debate on war expenditures take place on that resolution. I do not wish to restrict hon. members from debating the resolution to set up the committee if they so desire.

I bring this to Your Honour's attention to show that it was the general feeling in the house when this debate commenced we should speak with respect to all phases of it.

Mr. GRAYDON: Mr. Speaker, may I have a word? I was out of the chamber when Your Honour intervened in this matter. I would point out, however, that I understood considerable latitude was to be given in this debate, the idea being that we would not debate the motion for concurrence and the motion to set up the committee on war expenditures on two different occasions. For that reason I think Your Honour will see at once the fairness of a decision which would allow the hon. member for York East (Mr. McGregor) to continue. Surely the intervention of an amendment should not prevent an hon. member from discussing the whole matter. After all, it was not his amendment; it was the amendment of another hon. member.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I am inclined to agree with the leader of the Progressive Conservative party. I believe it would be much better if Your Honour were to look upon this amendment in much the same way as we look upon an amendment to the budget, allowing all hon. members to have free discussion on the amendment, just as they would have on the main motion. I say this, having in mind particularly the points of disagreement which arose in the conduct of this committee. I think we would feel a lot better about it and get along much further if we permitted the discussion to go on quite freely.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Harris) referred to what the Prime Minister stated as to the conduct of the committee. At that time the Prime Minister was dealing with the report, not knowing that there was going to be an amendment moved. As I take it, the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Chevrier) was speaking as to why it was not possible or feasible for the evidence which had been before that committee to be brought into the discussion in the house. I admit that he was permitted to deal with the matter with more latitude than perhaps I should have allowed him. No objection was taken, and I understood the basis of his remarks was that it was not possible for the government, in view of their commitments to governments of other countries, and others, to submit that evidence, and the house apparently desired to hear his statement. The question was raised when the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. O'Neill) was speaking. An amendment was moved and the house will recall that when the Prime Minister spoke to the amendment he confined his remarks absolutely to its subject matter. The hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) also addressed his remarks wholly to the amendment. It will be recalled that when the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) was speaking his attention was drawn to the fact that he was then speaking on the main motion and I would not permit him to deal with the evidence. The rule is clear. When an amendment is before the house, the subject matter of the debate must be the subject matter of the amendment.

Mr. McGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to infringe on the rules of the house, but I take it that the other hon. members who have spoken have spoken along lines similar to those I intend to follow. I do not see why I should be treated any differently from any one else. It is not very often that I take up the time of this house for the simple reason that I think this is the greatest hot-air joint I have seen for many years.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member means that, and he must not use that language.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Withdraw.

Mr. McGREGOR: As I was saying before, I wish to make—

Mr. CRERAR: Do I understand that the hon. member has withdrawn that remark?

Mr. GRAYDON: He did not mean anything personal.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would point out to the hon. gentleman that when the amendment is disposed of he will have the right to speak on the main motion and the latitude given to

those who have spoken on the motion will be given to him. At the moment we are dealing only with the amendment.

Mr. McGREGOR: The other hon. members who have spoken have given reasons why it should or should not be tabled and I want to go on and try to prove to this house in my own humble way why this evidence should be tabled. It is not in the report. To do this I must quote some figures and make some comparisons of the cost of building ships in different yards. That cannot be done any other way.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I ask the hon. member if what he proposes to say concerns the evidence given before the committee?

Mr. McGREGOR: I understand that we cannot refer to the evidence given before the committee. Hon. gentlemen have spoken tonight who belong to the department and who have access to the files of the department. They have given speeches, and I venture to say that ninety per cent of the evidence they submitted to the house was given before the committee. They were not on the committee and they can rise in their places and say what they like, but a member who was on the committee cannot do that. Is that a fair deal?

Mr. CLEAVER: My hon. friend can move for the return of any of this material he wants which would bring it quite within the discussion of the house.

Mr. HOMUTH: That is what we are moving for.

Mr. McGREGOR: As far as I am concerned, I want this house and this country to have the material. I should like to have a ruling as to whether I am allowed to proceed.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have intimated already to the hon. member that he is entitled to speak only on the subject matter of the amendment. After the amendment has been disposed of and the main motion is before the house, the hon. gentleman will then have the right to speak and will be granted more latitude than he is being given at the moment. Does the hon. gentleman understand that?

Mr. McGREGOR: I do not know whether I am allowed to speak or whether I am not.

Mr. SPEAKER: I believe the hon. gentleman has not heard what I said. I have ruled already that the subject matter of the amendment is the matter under discussion now by the house. The hon. gentleman is entitled to speak now on the subject matter of the amendment. If the hon. gentleman wishes to speak on the main motion after the amendment is disposed of he will have the right to do so with more latitude than he is given now.

Mr. ADAMSON: On the point of order—

Mr. SPEAKER: I have given a good deal of latitude to the opinion of hon. members, but I have ruled.

Mr. HANSELL: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member for York East (Mr. McGregor) finished?

Mr. GRAYDON: The hon. member for York East feels that he cannot go any further. There is nothing left for him to do but to sit down.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): Mr. Speaker, I think I can confine myself to the rules of the house in respect to the present amendment. What I have to say will take only a few minutes and I shall be finished before eleven o'clock. I agree with the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) when he says that the members of this house find themselves in a strange position. They are being asked to vote concurrence in a report or to vote against concurrence without having access to the evidence upon which the report is based. We cannot do that very well. Personally I find myself in a strange position.

A report has been presented to the house which I understand is unanimous, with the exception of one member of the committee. When the report was presented I was not in the house; I was on a train. I read a bit in the newspaper and, as I gathered from the newspaper report—and I suppose this would be the reaction of the public—the report had been presented but nothing had been said. The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) gave a statement to the press to the effect that the report was a whitewash. My amazement was considerable. I wondered at the time why the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar did not present to the house a minority report.

Mr. COLDWELL: The rules would not allow it.

Mr. HANSELL: I understand since coming here that the rules will not allow it. I think it is a strange rule because I believed at the time that the hon. member should have had an opportunity of presenting a minority report. Then it would have been all in the one report. The statement that it was a whitewash seemed at that time to be a

bit of a reflection upon all the other members of the committee. What happened? The first opportunity which the hon. member had of bringing in what might have been tantamount to a minority report was to-day. The speech of the hon. member simply means, if we are to believe what he said, that his charges are correct and that the report was a whitewash. Therefore we have to decide whether to vote for or reject concurrence, and we have to do it on the basis of what we hear discussed in this house because we have not had the evidence presented to us. That is a strange position in which to place the members of this house.

I quite understand, on the other hand, for I have acted on the war expenditures committee in years gone by, that all the evidence submitted to the committee cannot be made public property. At least, if the evidence given before the committee on war expenditures last year is similar to some that was submitted in the year I was on the committee, I doubt whether it should be revealed because it would divulge certain matters in connection with our military operations, in Canada it is true, but which we could not possibly have divulged to the enemy. At the same time, however, when it comes to matters such as the charges which the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar has made, I cannot see that there could be anything in that evidence that would give comfort to the enemy. Surely it would give no comfort to the enemy to know whether we paid one million dollars for something or whether we paid ten cents for it. That has nothing to do with military operations or military strategy. On the other hand, the public has a right to know how we are spending public money, especially when it is spent for things that have nothing to do with actual military operations. Therefore, if the government refuses to place the evidence on the table for the scrutiny of members of parliament, and if the hon. member's charges are not refuted satisfactorily to my mind, I am afraid that I shall have to join with the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar and refuse to vote for concurrence in the committee's report. Although he has been wrong so many times, I am afraid this would have to be one time when I would have to agree with him. If the charges are not refuted, there is nothing else we can do. Personally I think that when the charges were made last year the whole matter should have been sent immediately to the public accounts committee, and not be made necessarily a part of the work of the war expenditures committee.

So as not to embarrass the government in respect of evidence being laid on the table which it may not be in the best interests of winning the war to table because it might reveal something of value to the enemy, I have a subamendment to move. I move, Mr. Speaker, that after the word "evidence" where it first occurs in the amendment, the following words be inserted:

respecting aluminum contracts and relative subjects thereto.

That would mean that the entire evidence taken by the committee would not have to be put on the table but simply the evidence relating to the charges which have been made by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar. It seems to me that we have to make some distinction. I feel certain that if the evidence taken by this committee is like some of the evidence that was submitted to the war expenditures committee in years gone by it must contain some things that it would not be wise to reveal. But so far as aluminum contracts are concerned, that is a matter of dollars and cents, contracts, work done, and we have no reason to fear that that is going to give comfort to the enemy.

Mr. NEILL: Mr. Speaker, how will the amendment read with the subamendment?

Mr. SPEAKER: It will read as follows:

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

"Be not now concurred in but that the house instructs that the evidence respecting aluminum contracts and relative subjects thereto upon which the said reports are founded be tabled and that consideration of the reports be postponed until the house has had sufficient opportunity to study the said evidence."

As it reads with the subamendment, it says: "the evidence respecting aluminum contracts and relative subjects thereto upon which the said reports are founded." I would point out that the reports are not founded simply upon evidence dealing with aluminum contracts and relative subjects thereto. I am afraid that the subamendment is out of order. If it was adopted the main motion would not be intelligible or consistent with itself.

On motion of Mr. Jackman the debate was adjourned.

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

Tuesday, February 22, 1944

The house met at three o'clock.

GASOLINE RATIONING

STATEMENT AS TO STOCKS IN HAND AND POLICY FOR COMING FISCAL YEAR

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): Some two weeks ago I was asked to make a statement on the gasoline and oil situation. As our rationing year ends on March 31, I will do so at this time rather than wait until the work of my department is subject to review under the war appropriation bill.

I have stated before, and now state again that rationing of gasoline in Canada is based wholly upon stocks of gasoline in hand and our estimate of the forward position. Our stocks in hand at this time are less than fifty per cent of normal. The forward position must depend on the tempo of the war, and there is every indication that the situation will not improve until the European war is ended. Whereas rationing was imposed as a result of sinkings by enemy submarines, rationing is still necessary due to the vastly increased requirements for aviation gasoline and motor gasoline in the combat areas. A further factor in the situation arises from the fact that supplies of crude oil in the United States are diminishing with the result that we must go farther and farther afield to obtain crude oil for our refineries. The crude oil now being obtained yields larger proportions of asphalt and heavy fuel oil with correspondingly smaller proportions of gasoline and domestic fuel oil. While we have obtained the assistance of United States owned tankers to meet our transportation requirements, and while we have built and are now operating a number of Canadian tankers, we have been unable to improve the position of the motorist.

Use of heavier crudes does permit relaxation in the use of heavy or bunker fuel oils and asphalt. Restrictions on the use of asphalt have been removed entirely. As regards the use of heavy or bunker fuel oil, in all provinces except British Columbia all users who converted from heavy fuel oils to substitute fuels may now return to using heavy fuel oil, the only restriction being that the consumer must obtain a permit from the office of the oil controller, this for the purpose of record. British Columbia cannot be permitted relaxation for the reason that demands for heavy fuel oil from the west coast for the fleets of the united nations require the full production of west coast refineries.

[Mr. Speaker.]

The plan to be followed in rationing gasoline for the year commencing April 1, 1944, will be practically the same as that now being followed. Each motor car registered for use in each province may, upon application, receive a category "AA" gasoline licence and ration coupon book containing forty units, which at the present value of a unit, namely three gallons, amounts to 120 gallons of gasoline. This "AA" gasoline licence and ration coupon book may be obtained from the issuer of motor licences at the time a provincial motor licence is obtained.

The special categories remain basically the same as established for this year. Each individual who, by reason of the essentiality of his vocation, believes that he is entitled to a special gasoline allowance must make a new application, upon forms provided for that purpose, to the regional office of the oil controller for his district. The rationing officials of the oil control office will then determine his special allotment, if any.

During the past year many of our motorists have looked upon their "AA" allotment as one for pleasure driving. It was not our intention last year, and certainly it is not our intention this year to provide gasoline for pleasure driving. The category "AA" is an allotment for emergency requirements. While we do not intend to define pleasure driving, I wish to make it clear that the man who uses his category "AA" for week-ends and other non-essential driving can expect no more should an emergency arise after his allotment is exhausted. By the same token, the motorist who receives a special category in addition to his "AA" book must consider the aggregate gallonage provided by the two categories as essential, and all that he can obtain throughout the year.

It is hoped that the few inequalities that occurred this year can be eliminated next year. With the information on record for nearly every car and information obtained through checks on highways and at summer resorts, this should be possible.

I cannot stress too strongly the need for conserving gasoline. Gasoline is an essential munition of war. It has been said "To that country which has the last barrel of petroleum will go the victory".

WAR EXPENDITURES

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN SECOND, THIRD, FOURTH AND FIFTH REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. H. R. JACKMAN (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, in speaking on the amendment, I wish to say first of all that I was happy to

be associated with the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) in moving that the hearings of our subcommittee be held in open and not in camera. That of course was subject to the usual provision, that should any of the evidence touch upon matters which might give comfort to the enemy, then the committee should hold its sittings in camera. It may be of interest to this house to know that that motion was overwhelmingly defeated, that only three members supported it, namely the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar, the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Homuth) and myself, and that all government supporters were against it. However, the hearings were held in camera, and on the day when the committee published its report there appeared in the press at the same time a statement issued by the leader of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation. That statement said, among other things:

> The committee, in its attempt to whitewash the aluminum deal, succeeded only in making itself ridiculous.

Sir, I believe that that almost rises to a point of privilege on behalf of the members of that committee, apart from the hon. member who uttered the statement.

An hon. MEMBER: It certainly does.

Mr. JACKMAN: I believe therefore that, in supporting the amendment, there is good reason to be advanced why the evidence should be tabled in order that the public of Canada should be able to say how the committee was conducted and how the individual members carried on. In the first place, perhaps as a sop or compromise, the committee voted unanimously to issue interim objective summaries of the evidence of various witnesses. The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar and the vice-chairman of the committee and myself were appointed on that publicity subcommittee, and the evidence of the first witness, Mr. F. H. Brown, the financial adviser to the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe), was gone over and an objective summary was issued to the press. The next day the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar said that he could no longer serve on that publicity subcommittee because he had had several telephone calls which had proved embarrassing.

Mr. COLDWELL: Oh, no. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I said no such thing at any time.

Mr. JACKMAN: I have not checked the evidence, but my memory is indelible on the point and I shall have to accept if necessary the denial of the hon. member. However, the actions may indeed indicate whether or not what I said had the gist of truth or whether it was a fabrication of my faulty memory. The result was that the hon. member withdrew from that subcommittee, and yet he had no objection to the committee continuing to issue these reports from time to time.

Mr. COLDWELL: I did object, as the evidence will show.

Mr. JACKMAN: I shall come to that point presently. The hon. member, if my memory serves me correctly, had no objection and in the best of good nature was quite agreeable to the committee continuing to function at that time. But what is to be the position of any party in this house, much less any prospective government, if we find that the leader of a party advocates and subscribes to a policy of publicity one day, or any policy, no matter what it may be, and yet for certain reasons finds that it is no longer comfortable to serve on that committee and wishes to withdraw from it and to reverse his policy? We wonder, if the Prime Minister is a little embarrassed because the official leader of the party to which I belong has some hand in the direction of the policy of my party. What his embarrassment must be if he knows that there are powers behind the official leader of the party to my left, which must be a very peculiar position—

Mr. COLDWELL: Explain that. That is a dirty innuendo.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): He has not the courage to back it up by saying something.

Mr. JACKMAN: One thing I do not lack, I hope, is courage.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): You have demonstrated it.

Mr. JACKMAN: I have said exactly what to my memory went on in that committee. The hon. member refused and I asked other members of the committee to be with me or against me when I say that the member for Rosetown-Biggar refused to serve on that subcommittee one day longer.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I rise to a point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Oh, no. The hon. member has made a reference to some leader other than the leader of this group dominating the policy of this group. That is an innuendo which ought to be either substantiated or withdrawn.

Mr. JACKMAN: Further witnesses—

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I ask for a ruling on that point of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The hon. member has made a statement which can be denied afterwards, but there is no point of order.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I did not rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I rose on a question of privilege. There is an imputation of motives which ought not to be permitted in this house.

Mr. SPEAKER: Any imputation of motives of course is not allowed in the house, but I did not understand that there was such an imputation in the hon. gentleman's statement.

Mr. JACKMAN: Further witnesses were called of whose evidence these objective summaries were issued. The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar became, shall I say, increasingly hot under the collar because the evidence in all cases was not apparently satisfactory from his point of view.

Mr. COLDWELL: Statements or evidence?

Mr. JACKMAN: He then suggested, in fact he was very emphatic about it, that the proceedings of the committee—even though he and I had been associated together in demanding that these hearings should be in the open—should be either in camera or in open, and that this was a half measure that should not be permitted. In fact, he reminded one very much of his colleague in British Columbia, Mr. Harold Winch, who has no regard whatsoever for half way measures.

Mr. COLDWELL: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. It is true that I objected to having the meetings held in camera, and the issuing of public statements by the committee from those meetings, either in camera or in public. I wanted them in public, and I object to the innuendoes being cast by the hon. member's reflection upon me personally.

Mr. JACKMAN: It is not easy for me to cast reflections, if they may be so called. I consider them a plain statement of fact in regard to the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar. Nevertheless when he characterizes me, as he did the other members of the committee, in the press across this country, as having attempted to whitewash the aluminum deal, and having succeeded only in making itself—namely, the committee—ridiculous, then I think I am within my rights, in speaking to this amendment, to speak on a matter of privilege.

The next point had to do with the scope of the inquiry. The Prime Minister read to the house yesterday the terms of reference which had to do with war expenditures; and it was in connection with war expenditures that many of us volunteered to serve on the committee, at great cost to our time and to our pleasure, taking us away from our families, and so on. We did it because we thought we might in some small degree render a service to the war effort of this country and of the united nations. We did not wish therefore to be led far afield into matters which were not in the least relevant.

We know that at an early stage the matter of cartels, in particular the Alliance Corporation, was brought forth. It had nothing whatsoever, I submit, to do with war expenditures. The cartel, it is true, still exists to-day, but it has been inoperative for some years, and therefore it could not have had anything to do with war expenditures. Yet, what do we find? I read to the chairman the terms of reference, because I wished to keep the committee on a fairly straight track, so that we could get our work done, and not be as they were in the United States when these things came up. There the trial lasted two years. Evidence was taken much greater in extent than the material which fills the Encyclopaedia Britannica, and the judgment finally rendered by the court of appeal was such as to clear the Aluminum Company of America and also the Canadian company on all counts—

Mr. COLDWELL: In a lower court.

Mr. JACKMAN: —including the charge of being a monopoly, or infringing the anti-trust laws of the United States. So that the house may see just what fear was in the minds of some of us, if we were allowed to digress to something entirely outside the orbit of the terms of our reference. Yet when I made the suggestion that we should remain on the track the hon. member said—I have not looked up his words, but the gist of them was, "Well, if that is the case there is no further use in the committee sitting."

Mr. COLDWELL: I did not say that.

Mr. JACKMAN: We members of the house have some regard for the rules under which our proceedings are constituted. Yet we find that unless some hon. members, particularly, can have their own way, they are not willing to abide by the rules.

Mr. COLDWELL: There is another statement; I would ask the hon. member to give me the reference. Give me the page of the evidence where I made any such statement as that.

Mr. GRAYDON: We cannot produce the evidence.

Mr. JACKMAN: The reason I am asking that the evidence of the committee be tabled is that all members may see for themselves whether or not the statements I make upon my responsibility as a member of the house are justified.

An hon. MEMBER: Give the page number.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Or whether your imagination is running wild.

Mr. JACKMAN: I do not think my imagination is running wild.

Mr. DUPUIS: It is not running red, anyway.

Mr. JACKMAN: The next point indicating whether or not the whole committee or merely one member of it was ridiculous, is in regard to cost figures. When the statement was put in evidence by Price Waterhouse & Company as to the cost of producing a pound of aluminum, the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar, if my vision was any clear indication of what was going on, was taken aback by the figures which he thought, I believe, would be much more nearly in line with those he suggested, and which he stated without any qualification whatsoever—in fact he stated it with great emphasis in this house—were very much lower, or somewhere about six cents. When he found they were very much higher he was really in a state of consternation. What did he do? Although he may have been oblivious to his own actions, he alternately raised his hand up and down on the desk and said, "But they can't be right. They are not in accordance with the information I have." Naturally the rest of the committee felt—

Mr. COLDWELL: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Last night the objection was raised to my referring to the evidence. The hon. member is drawing upon his imagination. Not only is he speaking of evidence, but he is describing what he alleges to be certain actions on my part, after a period of four or five months. I submit that that kind of thing is neither evidence nor debatable, and transgresses the rules of order of the house.

Mr. ROWE: It has been going on here for twenty years.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would point out to the hon. member that he is coming very close to the position I took last night with regard to the amendment before the house. No hon. member has the right to criticize the conduct of other members of the committee. In this instance reference is being made to the evidence, and it is not before the house. I wish hon. members who speak to-day would realize that the amendment is under discussion, and that they should address themselves to it only. Any reference to the evidence given before the committee would be irrelevant.

Mr. JACKMAN: May I rise to a question of privilege? The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar has said that members of the committee succeeded in making it ridiculous. Surely an hon. member in the house has a right to bring forth evidence to show whether or not that is correct.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has made certain statements with regard to a statement made by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar. The hon. member now denies that he was a party to the whitewashing of the committee in connection with the matter under discussion in the report.

Mr. JACKMAN: I am not concerned with the whitewashing aspect of it. That stands on its own feet. But I am concerned with whether or not the committee acted ridiculously, and I should like to have Your Honour's ruling on that point.

Mr. SPEAKER: The statement made by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar outside the house, which the hon. member has now quoted and which he repudiates is, I think, sufficient justification for the hon. member.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go ahead.

Mr. JACKMAN: I left off by saying that according to my humble judgment of the proceedings the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar was rather in a state of consternation that the published costs should be as high as they were shown to be in the certified statement of Price Waterhouse & Company.

Then, as I said, the rest of the committee felt that there was perhaps something in the nature of amusement in the way in which he took this statement, because there was a certain amount of mild laughter. The hon. member then said to the chairman that if there was any joke he wished to be let in on it. One of the members said, "What you say is the joke,"—whereupon the hon. member said, "If the committee thinks I am not asking intelligent questions" he had no further place there. And although the committee had been sitting only a short time that afternoon he picked up his books and hied himself away to his office—and the rest of the committee were left sitting there, like the chorus with the prima donna gone.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is quite a compliment.

Mr. JACKMAN: I wonder what would happen to the ship of state if every time it ran into a squall the skipper sought the seclusion of the cabin grand? However, next morning the prima donna was not nearly so highfalutin' and he came down and the work of the committee was proceeded with.

Mr. BURTON: I should like to raise a point of order. Are we to have the evidence tabled, or are we to have individual members giving a minority report?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Mr. JACKMAN: The matter of the cost of producing a pound of aluminum was raised on numerous occasions during the proceedings of the committee. With many other members of the committee, I was concerned as to the real cost of producing a pound of aluminum. I think it was last June that the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar stated that the cost was quite low, that he had information from first-hand sources. I shall read his words so that I shall not be accused of drawing upon my imagination. He said:

> These are the facts as I have accumulated them. I have got them first hand from first-hand sources. I have no doubt that there are certain people who know the people I visited when I was in Washington—

Mr. SPEAKER: May I interrupt the hon. gentleman? Is he reading from something which was given in evidence?

Mr. JACKMAN: I am reading from *Hansard*, or rather from a pamphlet printed under the imprimatur of the House of Commons. It is entitled "Aluminum" and contains speeches on the Shipshaw power development and the Arvida expansion of the Aluminum Company of Canada by M. J. Coldwell, leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, Stanley H. Knowles, hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, and J. W. Noseworthy, hon. member for York South, delivered in the House of Commons on June 14, 15 and 17, 1943. I take it that this is an official publication, and it is in handy form for my purposes as well as for those of other people

Mr. COLDWELL: And paid for by ourselves.

Mr. JACKMAN: The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar says "paid for by ourselves." I purchased this in the lobby of the Windsor hotel in Montreal some time during the summer for the sum of five cents, which price is marked on it. I suspect the document did not cost more than two cents at the government printing bureau, in which case the profit would be 150 per cent.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already directed the hon. member's attention to the fact that we have a motion and an amendment before the house. The amendment is with regard to the production of evidence, to the effect that until the evidence is produced the report should not be dealt with. Last evening I confined the speeches of hon. members to the terms of the amendment. If I allow the hon. member for Rosedale (Mr. Jackman) to continue I shall have to allow every hon. member who follows him to deal with matters which may be pertinent only to the motion. I presume that the hon. gentleman is laying a foundation for his contention that the evidence should be produced, but I ask him not to trespass too much in laying that foundation.

Mr. JACKMAN: It would grieve me to offend against the rules of the house, and particularly, sir, against your ruling, but I was only endeavouring to answer your question. I mentioned an official or semi-official document; Your Honour asked me if I was reading from the evidence of the committee, and I had to explain what I was reading from.

As I say, the matter of the cost of producing a pound of aluminum came up at various times. The members of the committee wanted to get the whole picture. We had heard in the house the original charges, and that the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar had first-hand information from first-hand sources. I began to get considerably worried about information being in the hands of one hon. member which was not available to all members of the committee; therefore I again asked the chairman if he would not insist on witnesses being called in order that we might have evidence which one member had and which was not available to the other members. The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar then asked whom he could call. I am not quoting him exactly, but it is in my mind quite clearly. He suggested that he could not call the government, because his allegations were against the government. He said he could not call the officials of the Aluminum Company, because they were a party to it. He said he could not subpoena the officials of the United States government who might know something about aluminum matters. I suggested that if he wanted any witnesses he could get any number of the executives of the Reynolds Aluminum Company in the United States, who were known to be bitter enemies of the Aluminum Company of America and I suppose of the Canadian company. However, no witness was forthcoming.

Finally, after we had sat for several months —this will be in the record—and the other subcommittees were ready to depart for home —we ourselves had made transportation arrangements in advance, as we had to—the hon. member suggested to the chairman that he would be able to get a witness from the United States, a Mr. Irving Lipkowitz, who was formerly economic adviser to Mr. Thurman Arnold, who is now I believe a member of the Supreme Court of the United States, and who was at that time attorney general. Mr. Arnold had conducted the suit against the Aluminum Company of America, to which the Canadian company was a party. Mr. Lipkowitz is now labour relations adviser—this is rather important—to the office of war production in Washington.

I certainly am no supporter of the Liberal government of this country, although like all my colleagues I participate heartily in cooperating with them in furthering the war effort. I looked with suspicion, not to say chagrin, at the calling of an employee of a friendly power to come to our country to testify against our government. Of course he came in his unofficial capacity. This gentleman gave certain evidence which will be found on the typewritten pages numbered F-1, F-2 and F-3 of the evidence of November 9, 1943. I should read from that if I did not feel I might be transgressing the rules. So I turn to the original source, which is *Business Week*, a publication I suppose of some hundreds of thousands of circulation every week. We find there the type of evidence which this young man gave. He was saying what a great future there was for aluminum, the amount that would be used in motor cars, and so forth. I shall not take up the time of the house by reading it. I also have the original document in front of me, and on a subsequent page I find information which the witness did not give. It was to this effect. Steel, for example, has shown a tendency to counterattack in markets previously blitzed by the light metals. Steel streamliners were being sold before the war in direct competition with the shining new aluminum models, which first rolled out in 1933.

I would go on with this but I see you are doubting, Mr. Speaker, whether it is relevant to the question before the house. But the point I bring out is this, sir, that the evidence which we have, not only from this particular witness but from all the witnesses who appeared before the committee, was of such a nature that it was no more confidential, I think, than is the evidence that appeared in *Business Week*. However, this young man was a little bit loquacious, and, apropos of nothing at all, certainly of no leading question on our part, he put new ideas in our minds, when he quoted, for instance, from editorials in dailies in northern New York state that there was a feeling down there that the United States government had made possible the development of this great Shipshaw power enterprise in the Saguenay district when there were still undeveloped power resources in northern New York, and this was made a matter of political consequence. But even more important was the fact that on no less than three or four pages of evidence, F-1, B-7 and C-1, 2, 3 and 4—

Mr. SPEAKER: The evidence is not before the house and I have already ruled several times on that point. I have given considerable latitude to the hon. gentleman but I think he is exceeding reasonable latitude in the grounds upon which he bases his case. I must ask him to confine himself to the amendment.

Mr. JACKMAN: Sir, I will cut short immediately what I have to say about the conduct of the committee, although I do think it is very important that the people of Canada should know just what their members do when they sit in committee, and they are entitled to have this evidence. This young man went on to say that while he was labour relations officer to the office of war production in the United States, the C.I.O. aluminum workers of the Pacific northwest were very much concerned at the extent of the Arvida development, where the costs, and in particular the labour costs, were lower than they were in the Pacific northwest. I said to him—

Mr. COLDWELL: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. If we are to have the evidence tabled, and I should like to have it tabled, it will then be in order to refer to it, but this business of an hon. member of the house rising in his place and supposedly reciting directly from his memory of the evidence is not, I submit, within the rules. Last evening when I was called to order I was not even doing that. I obeyed your ruling immediately, although there were several other points I wished to make.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think this is the fourth time I have had to rise in this connection. I must ask the hon. member to confine his remarks solely to the amendment that is before the house. I cannot permit him to quote the evidence or even to refer to what witnesses may or may not have said.

Mr. JACKMAN: I was only endeavouring to show the importance of getting the evidence tabled.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have refused permission to other hon. members to make quotations from the evidence or deal with matters coming before the committee, on the ground that there is only one issue before the house at this moment, and that is the production or non-production of the evidence.

Mr. JACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I shall not only cheerfully accept your ruling, as I always do, but rest happy in the expectation that the evidence will be tabled, so that the evidence in regard to C.I.O. workers in the United States as against our own people in the Arvida district will be known to the people of Canada.

Coming once again to the amendment, I take issue with the arguments advanced by the Prime Minister yesterday when he said not only that the hearings should be in camera but that the evidence in this particular case should not be tabled. At page 709 of *Hansard* he said:

> I submit that there must be the best of reasons for having sittings held in camera or the parliament at Westminster would not have followed that procedure in the last war and insisted upon it in this.

I believe that in Canada we are too prone to follow blindly the practice not only of Westminster but of the people of Great Britain. Certainly I take second place to no one in my admiration for the people of Great Britain. But I do think that faced with the same circumstances as those we have to consider here they would not do as they do now in the circumstances which prevail over there, and I think we must always bear that in mind. I have sufficient confidence in the ability not only of this government, if you like, but of the membership of this house, to make our own rules for our own conditions without borrowing too largely from across the water or across the line. There are differences between the situation here and the situation in Great Britain. There they have a national government; we have not a national government here. Furthermore, the division of the parties in the house is much more nearly equal there than it is here. Arising out of that fact is the constitution of this committee. Here we have six members belonging to the official opposition and the two groups to my left out of a total committee of twenty-four. That makes it impossible to carry on the work, because it is not possible to be present at the committee at all times.

My time is running short. I should like to have quoted the Prime Minister's own remarks regarding the suggested British commonwealth council when he said that he went over there alone and had to face all the cabinet ministers of Great Britain, with their secretariats, and so forth. It is a difficult position for members to be in when they are greatly out of balance, one way or the other, in membership on a committee. While I feel that the Prime Minister has adhered strictly and even generously to the parliamentary proportions in appointing members to the committees, nevertheless he might well feel, as I hope he will feel, that the interests of the country and the interests of the war will be better served if the opposition groups are given greater representation on committees.

There is, moreover, in Great Britain the closeness of the enemy. We here are removed by many thousands of miles from the enemy, and protected not only by our own navy but by the Royal Navy, the R.A.F. and the R.C.A.F. But if we are to borrow our ideas from other places and not think them out for ourselves, as we are quite capable of doing, we might borrow from the Truman committee in the United States, which carries on like work in the open. Nothing is done there behind closed doors. The public may know for themselves exactly what goes on in that committee. The Prime Minister said further, yesterday—*Hansard*, page 710:

> I come back again to what I was saying. In addition to the reasons for the in camera proceedings which I have presented, there is the further one of what may be given, wholly unexpectedly, in the nature of aid or comfort to the enemy.

We have had the evidence taken in this aluminum subcommittee; we know what is in it. The Minister of Munitions and Supply yesterday said he was quite agreeable to tabling it; and I sometimes feel that if there were more business men and fewer politicians in this house we would get things done more effectively. I challenge the government and any member of the committee to put his finger on one iota of the evidence the disclosure of which is contrary to the public interest or would give any aid or comfort to the enemy.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. VICTOR QUELCH (Acadia): I intend to be brief in my remarks, but I wish to say a few words, because it seems to me that hon. members are in a very difficult position. It is almost impossible to vote intelligently on this question. Personally I was not a member of the committee; I have not seen all the evidence; and after listening to a number of hon. members who were on the committee I find

that there is wide disagreement among them as to exactly what the evidence was and what took place. The report states that none of the allegations of the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) was substantiated, and yet I must admit that yesterday, on the basis of the evidence which he referred to, he made a pretty strong case. Apparently the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) was astounded at some figures quoted by the hon. member, because this is what the minister stated in the house—*Hansard*, page 704:

My hon. friend is telling me of evidence given before the committee which seems to be incredible. That evidence may have been given; I have no way of knowing whether it was or was not. I can hardly credit it, but nevertheless I do think that if hon. members are to rise in their places in this house and quote evidence given to the committee, we should have an opportunity of checking that evidence.

Then the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) said:

You think it should be tabled, in other words?

The minister replied:

Yes, I think so; and I would suggest to the chairman of the committee that he move to have the evidence in this particular case tabled in the house.

Later on he changed his point of view, and I think gave as his reason that it would be a breach of faith towards some of the witnesses who were brought before the committee if that were done. Personally I doubt very much if anything could be gained by tabling the evidence. I understand it is voluminous, and if all hon. members wanted to see it, it would probably be three or four years before the last member had a chance to look at it. Therefore I doubt if very much could be gained by such a procedure. For that reason I should like to move the following subamendment, seconded by the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Johnston):

That all the words after "founded" in the amendment be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"be referred to the public accounts committee for examination and that consideration of the reports by the house be postponed until the public accounts committee reports back."

If that were done it would be possible for the committee to call before it the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar, and he has stated that he can give the pages upon which his statements are founded. The other speakers could also come before the committee and challenge his statements; and I think in that way and in that way only will it be possible to separate the false from the true in this matter. By the time the committee completed its investigation it should be in a sound position to report back to the house what the actual situation is.

I know that several hon. members have time and again stated that no substantial profits are being made in this war, and that even if profits are being made they are taxed away. Personally I think most of us to-day realize that substantial profits are still being made. I do not think there is any doubt about that. If anybody has any doubt about it, just let him read the reports of the victory loans. Take the third and fourth victory loans, and what do we find? That one-third of one per cent of the subscribers purchased sixty per cent of the total loans—an average of $60,000 per subscriber. Now, where does the money for these subscriptions come from? Some, true, from insurance companies. But there is no doubt that a very large amount of these purchases represents profits which are being made in this war, and I think we are all agreed that it is not a desirable state of affairs when large profits are made in the war whilst on the other hand our troops are sacrificing their lives. If we had adopted a pay-as-you-go policy it would not be quite as obnoxious, but unfortunately we have not done so, and as a result of these profits we were greatly expanding our debt. The national debt has expanded from 3½ billions to around 11 billions, and in reality that is nothing more or less than a misappropriation of funds of future generations.

I say again that I think it desirable that this evidence be placed before the public accounts committee. They may meet in camera. Let them call before them the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar and the hon. member who spoke the other night on the matter of shipbuilding. We shall be in a position to vote intelligently on this report after the public accounts committee has reported back to the house.

Mr. SPEAKER: The subamendment asks "that all the words after 'founded' in the amendment be struck out and the following substituted therefor," so that the amendment would be amended to read:

be not now concurred in but that the house instructs that the evidence upon which the said reports are founded be referred to the public accounts committee for examination and that consideration of the reports by the house be postponed until the public accounts committee reports back.

The subamendment proposes that the evidence be referred to the public accounts committee for examination. But the evidence is not in the possession of the house, and the house cannot refer something to a committee which it has not got. The original amend-

ment was that the evidence be tabled and that consideration of the reports be postponed until the house had had an opportunity to study it. The house cannot deal with the evidence until it has disposed of the amendment, which asks that the house shall have the evidence tabled. For that reason the subamendment would be inconsistent with the facts as we have them, that the house has not the right to refer to the public accounts committee evidence which is not in the possession of the house. I therefore rule the subamendment out of order.

Mr. W. H. GOLDING (Huron-Perth): I want to say just a few words on the amendment, as a member of No. 1 subcommittee, which made a study of the shipbuilding and aeroplane industries in Canada. I wish to assure the members of this house that we did have witnesses before that committee who gave us evidence only after we had assured them that that evidence would be confidential. I am quite sure they would have not given it had they known or believed that it would be spread across the country.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I ask my hon. friend a question? Were they assured in writing or verbally in the evidence? Would that be shown in the evidence?

Mr. GOLDING: I may tell my hon. friend they were given that assurance by the chairman of the committee before they gave the evidence.

Mr. GRAYDON: Would that appear in the evidence?

Mr. GOLDING: I think some of it would. I am not quoting the evidence. In any event, I know there was evidence given by witnesses before that committee that would not have been given, as I said before, if they knew it would be spread across the country. One particular aspect of the matter is the disposition of the ships. It is very important that that be kept absolutely secret. I want to say further that in examining those contracts we were examining contracts for the British government, the United States government and the Canadian government. These contracts were filed. I sincerely hope that the members of this house will have enough confidence in the members of the committee to accept the report as we gave it, and will try to keep away from the evidence which I know should not be given to the public.

Further than that, the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) made this statement when speaking last night as reported at page 712 of *Hansard*:

[Mr. Speaker.]

It was my desire that every aspect of the aluminum transaction should be examined; I was anxious that this should be the case, and to permit that to be done I took the responsibility of applying, through the high commissioner of the United Kingdom, for the consent of the British government to permit the details of that contract and of the negotiations leading up to it to be placed before the committee. The United Kingdom government was extremely reluctant to give that permission, but, after an exchange of several cables, permission was given with the definite understanding, so stated in the cable, that the hearings of the committee would be in camera and the evidence would not be made public. The consent of the government of Australia was given in exactly the same terms.

I ask any member of this house, if he wants to be fair to the Minister of Munitions and Supply who gave that assurance, if he thinks he is fair in asking that the evidence be now tabled. I feel as sure as I do that I am standing here that if the present leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) in the house were on this side of the house he would do exactly what we are doing with these war contracts that have to do with three countries.

Mr. GRAYDON: I think I could make a little improvement here and there.

Mr. GOLDING: I am satisfied you might do that, but I am satisfied also that you would do exactly as we have done in holding these meetings in camera.

Mr. GRAYDON: I think I would follow the Minister of Munitions and Supply and ask that the evidence be tabled.

Mr. GOLDING: The quotation I just read was taken from the remarks of the Minister of Munitions and Supply. My hon. friend can laugh at it if he likes. If he has no more regard than that for the word of the Minister of Munitions and Supply and the word of the chairman of the war expenditures committee, I can tell him that I have. I have regard also for the feelings of the British and Australian governments. These are serious matters. I hope that the members of this house are not going to ask us to betray the confidence of witnesses who gave their evidence. I am serious about it.

Mr. C. E. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the amendment to the amendment presented by the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch) would be in order, but it has been ruled out of order; therefore we cannot consider it. To me it is amazing that this house cannot direct evidence taken in camera to be turned over to the public accounts committee. Our desire in asking that the evidence be turned over to the public accounts committee is based on the

request of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) to keep it secret. The mere fact that the evidence is now placed in such a position that it cannot be tabled, and cannot be placed before the public accounts committee, puts the members in an exceedingly embarrassing position. We have heard statements made by members on both sides of the house with regard to that evidence. For example, we had a statement made by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell). These statements were made directly from the evidence. He so stated in his speech. We then had contradictory statements made by the parliamentary assistant. The statements were so astounding that the members are in an impossible position.

I will not support the motion for concurrence in the report. I cannot possibly do it. How can I? I have not the slightest knowledge of what the evidence is. We have had one hon. member saying one thing and a member of the government saying another. Listen to what the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) said. I am not going to read what the hon. member for Acadia said a moment ago in regard to the remarks of the Minister of Munitions and Supply on page 704, but on page 711 the minister, referring to the statements made by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar, used these words:

> His statements were so contrary to the facts as I understand them and to the facts as I have stated them in this house that I felt I would like very much to see the evidence taken before the committee. Of course I have not seen it and have no idea what that evidence was.

When the minister makes a statement such as this and says that the statements made by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar are not in accordance with the facts, and the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar says he is stating evidence given before the committee, how in the world can you, Mr. Speaker, expect members of this house to vote intelligently? I recall that a year ago I spoke on the setting up of the war expenditures committee. I said at that time that I thought the representation on that committee was wrong. I pointed out that such parties as the Social Credit party and the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party had only one representative each on that committee. I remarked that when the committee met it was divided into subcommittees one, two and three, and if we as a Social Credit party had one member on that committee and that member was on subcommittee one, he could not possibly be on subcommittee two, which dealt with the question of aluminum. The member who was on the war expenditures committee, representing his group, is not in possession of the information. He could not possibly be. I am not going to be put in the position of voting for or against something of which I have no knowledge. I think it is an unfair position in which to be put by the government. The Minister of Munitions and Supply recognizes that fact, despite the fact that he changed his statement a little after the Prime Minister spoke.

I think there should be fairness in this thing, and that is why I advocated that the evidence be turned over to the public accounts committee. It was my hope that all parties would be satisfied; that we as members could get authentic information and vote intelligently on it after the public accounts committee had reported back to the house. Apparently that is not to be; therefore we shall vote for the amendment, and if the amendment carries, then I think we shall have to move that the evidence be turned over to the public accounts committee for examination. I do not see what other position we can take. I certainly am not going to put myself in the position of voting for something that I do not know anything about.

Mr. McNEVIN: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Yes.

Mr. McNEVIN: My hon. friend referred to the desire to have the matter dealt with on a fair basis. Does he think it would be fair to a witness, who was properly before the committee and informed that he was giving his information in camera, later to divulge that information to the public?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): That was exactly why we wanted this turned over to the public accounts committee. Talk about evidence being given before that committee! Let us not confuse the matter. That was not evidence in the ordinary accepted sense of that term. It was not evidence as given in a court of law. These men could get up and give opinions, and on many occasions something would be stated one day as a fact and another day it would be changed. I know that this was not the kind of evidence that is given before a court of justice. I know, and members who were on the committee know, that statements were made as so-called evidence and were taken back to the offices and revised before they were put on the official record. I repeat, it was not evidence as taken in a court of law. I was informed when I was on the committee that there was a distinct difference between meetings in camera and meetings in secret. It is certainly true that

when you have a report tabled in the house it is based on evidence. They were violating the oath of secrecy if that is what it was. We have heard here on all sides that parts of the evidence were given from the committee's report and the rest of us did not know whether it was right or wrong.

I must say again that we shall have to vote for the amendment and against the motion, and then we will move to have the matter turned over to the public accounts committee.

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): Personally I intend to support the amendment. In my opinion no more important debate has taken place in the house, in this or in any previous session of this parliament, than the one in which we are engaged at the present time. My reason for that statement is that the trend during the last few years in this parliament is towards a gradual diminution of the rights of the membership of the house. While not entering into any controversy at the moment as to what the evidence may have been, or whether it supports or does not support the contention of the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), I suggest that we as members have the right to know the evidence upon which statements made by any member of this house, as a responsible member, have been found not to have been in accordance with the facts.

I for one, Mr. Speaker, do not intend to support any committee that will come before the house and submit findings so general and sweeping as were made in reference to committee No. 3. The words used were these:

> For the reasons set out in the foregoing report your subcommittee finds that none of the allegations is substantiated by the facts.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) yesterday said that this was the practice in Westminster, that the committee there met in camera. That is true. But there is a difference between the committee at Westminster and what this committee is endeavouring to do. The committee at Westminster does not move concurrence, nor does any member of that committee do so.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The moving of concurrence was to oblige hon. gentlemen opposite, so that they might have this opportunity of discussion. The government would not have moved concurrence but for that reason.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: They were very anxious to move concurrence so far as No. 3 report was concerned. The only question that was raised by the opposition was this, that in moving concurrence in No. 3 report there should at the same time be brought in the other reports so as to enable hon. members to discuss them.

An hon. MEMBER: Even that was at the request—

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I never interrupted the hon. member except to ask a couple of very simple questions. I wish he would be quiet until I get through with my argument and then he can make any speech he pleases.

Here we as members of the house are asked to find that a member made statements that were false, and we are so asked by a committee which does not bring before us the evidence that was taken before it. Instead it brings before us, and I ask hon. members to read the evidence of that committee, only such portions of the evidence as have been extracted and which point conclusively to the conclusions arrived at by the committee. Subject to the circumscription that is necessary by reason of public safety, we have the right to the evidence unexpurgated by any committee. For if we do not demand it in this case—and I am entering into no controversy as to the rights or wrongs of the matter—there is not a member of this house, making a statement in the house, who might not, if the government saw fit to submit the matter to a favourable committee, be found not to have stated the truth, or to have made false allegations. The independence of members of this House of Commons is at stake. We have lost many of our rights in recent years. There has been a diminution of those rights all along the line, and I know that when I take this stand the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), as was the case yesterday, may suggest the possibility of an election unless we are servile and support what the government places before the country and the house, whether it meets with or without our approval. But, Mr. Speaker, we as members of this house, regardless of political considerations, must uphold the rights of other members no matter whether agreeing with those other members politically or not.

It is in that spirit that I approach the discussion of this matter to-day. I was one who believed in the constitution of this committee. I was one who supported this committee at its inception, and I was one to whom the former chairman, now a distinguished judge of the exchequer court, paid a tribute for the contribution I endeavoured to make.

I believed, Mr. Speaker, that economies could be effected, that economies could be maintained by continual watchfulness of expenditures. I believe, as was mentioned yesterday, that the committee should forget

political considerations, should look, criticize and recommend. Now we find ourselves in this position. The chairman of the committee moves concurrence in the report. He says the report is based upon certain evidence. The committee quotes certain evidence—or at least a summary of it—and it asks me as a member of the house to find, with that committee, that statements made by a member of the house are not in accordance with the facts.

Much is made of the fact that the meetings of the committee were in camera. That is no excuse for the non-production of the evidence. Three years ago in the house the then chairman pointed out the difference between "in camera" and "in secret"—and there is a very great difference, one which has been pointed out on more than one occasion. "In camera" simply means not in open court; in a private room. "In secret" means—and this was not a secret committee; it was a committee in camera—"private, unrevealed, not to be known or exposed to view."

A moment ago the hon. member for Huron-Perth (Mr. Golding) mentioned that there were certain witnesses who would not have given evidence if they had not been assured that their evidence would not be used. Committees of parliament, Mr. Speaker, have the power to subpoena witnesses and to enforce the giving of testimony. Just because in these particular cases certain witnesses were called without being subpoenaed is no justification for the stand taken by the hon. member that they would not have given evidence had they not received that protection.

Mr. GOLDING: Just speak for yourself; that is your opinion. It is not mine.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am supported by the rules in that connection. The committees set up in Great Britain in this as in the last war report, but their reports are merely laid on the table of the house; they are not debated. No member of the House of Commons in Great Britain can be convicted of a falsehood or fault found with him, without a trial, but that will result from this motion being passed, although the evidence is not before us, and without our being able to see for ourselves whether or not there was evidence upon which the conclusions in question could be made.

As a matter of fact it is impossible for us in this house to come to any conclusion without the evidence. Unless we have it we are dependent upon the conclusions arrived at by a committee of parliament. I am supported in that view by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Cleaver), now the chairman of the committee, who when he spoke in this house in July of 1943, as reported at page 4990 of *Hansard*, used these words:

> It is obvious that the committee cannot intelligently debate a committee report founded on evidence taken in camera—evidence which is not before the house.

This is a statement made in the debate on a report by the hon. member who now, as chairman of the committee, asks the house to do what he said he could not have done less than eight months ago.

Mr. CLEAVER: Purely as a matter of courtesy to the opposition to permit discussion of the report.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am merely calling as a witness in support of my contention the hon. member who is now chairman of the committee, and who has moved concurrence in the report.

In addition to that, I asked him yesterday to say whether there was any reason why he might have changed his opinion, or whether there had been any change in recent months in regard to reports to be made by the committee. At page 696 of *Hansard* we find his reply in these words:

> Mr. Cleaver: Well, my hon. friend can read the order of reference as well as I can, but on several occasions I have heard the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) indicate that if the war expenditures committee found any wrongdoing we were at liberty, and it was our duty, to report the matter either to the House of Commons or to the public accounts committee. Last year we were given the further right to make confidential reports to the Prime Minister if any wrongdoing should be discovered which in the public interest should not be disclosed.
>
> Mr. Diefenbaker: Has there been any change in the powers of the committee since it was first set up?
>
> Mr. Cleaver: I trust, Mr. Speaker, that this time will not be charged against me, but I believe I can find the reference for my hon. friend. The only change of which I am aware was the change requested in the report tabled on July 19, 1943, paragraph 5 of which reads as follows:
>
> "In cases where consideration of national security precludes the publishing of certain recommendations and of the arguments upon which they are based, to address a memorandum to the Prime Minister for the consideration of the war cabinet, providing that the committee shall, whenever it has exercised such powers, report the fact as soon as possible to the house."

So that there has not been any change. To-day conditions are the same as they were in July, 1943, when the hon. member gave us the benefit of his views on the subject.

I pass now to a more serious objection, namely, that the committee has no power to report wrongdoing to the house or to the people of Canada. That is a very serious matter. To-day we have a high level of

taxation, by which tremendous amounts are being raised, and we have a responsibility to assure the people that full value is being received for expenditures made in the conduct of our war effort. The people have a right to demand that wasteful and extravagant expenditures shall be investigated, and what is more important, reported upon. To-day, in the fifth year of the war, the committee has had four years of operation. There is no power in the war expenditures committee as yet to report wrongdoing or to report examples of extravagance, either to the people or to the house. What we did in the house in 1940 was to appoint a watchdog to guard the treasury and then muzzle him for the period of the war. That is exactly the position of the war expenditures committee. It is set up, leading the people to believe that extravagance and wrongdoing can be reported; then it is muzzled, and it is denied the right to report such wrongdoing as it may find.

This statement might appear to be contrary to the facts, but again I call as my witness the chairman of the committee, the hon. member for Halton, who, following me in the debate on June 10, 1941, as reported at page 3753 of *Hansard*, said this:

> The next point covered by the hon. member for Lake Centre was that the committee had no power to report as to wrongdoing. Possibly that is right, but whether we had the right to do it or not I wish to inform the house that their subcommittee No. 1 headed into every complaint of wrongdoing of which we as a committee had notice.

It might have headed in, but the people of Canada demand more than heading in; they demand the revelation of wrongdoing if it is present, and the punishment of those who are guilty.

Mr. CLEAVER: Does my hon. friend suggest that any subcommittee of the war expenditures committee found any wrongdoing anywhere without reporting it promptly?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. CLEAVER: Because if he does, he is entirely in error.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: My hon. friend, being a lawyer, first asks a question and then answers it.

Mr. CLEAVER: Exactly what you were doing.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: But I was corroborated by the rules and regulations of this house. I remember well that in 1941 I ascertained a situation in regard to certain civilian flying schools and disclosed the fact that full value was not being received by the people of Canada from the operation of these schools.

Mr. CLEAVER: These remarks refer to our committee work in 1941. So long as I am in order in replying, I am quite content that my hon. friend should refer to it.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I cannot hear my hon. friend; I do not know what he is saying. I do know that as a result of the facts I had obtained I personally brought before the House of Commons certain evidence on which I had secured corroboration. In the middle of May, 1942, during the debate on the air estimates, I brought out the fact that these civilian schools were making profits on their investment, as I remember now, of from 41 to 100 per cent. At that time the minister for air castigated me for having brought out that evidence; he could not believe it was possible; but the next day he got up in the house and said that things were going to change. The minister for air promised a change; he acted and the thing ended. But this action was not attained because of the activities of my hon. friend over there, who all through the piece endeavoured to convince the people of this country that all was well in connection with civilian schools and their operation.

Mr. CLEAVER: Mr. Speaker—

An hon. MEMBER: Sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must consent to the asking of a question.

Mr. CLEAVER: I was rather generous yesterday in connection with interruptions.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The hon. member may ask a question, but I do not want his argument along with it. What is the question?

Mr. CLEAVER: My hon. friend has stated that the subcommittee did not act. I know he does not want to make a misstatement, and I should like to refer him to the committee's report.

An hon. MEMBER: What is the question?

Mr. CLEAVER: I want to refer the hon. member to the report of the committee which dealt with the matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member for Lake Centre has the floor.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. CLEAVER: Perhaps he will permit a question.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member does not wish to be interrupted, he should not be.

Mr. CLEAVER: Will the hon. member permit me?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am perfectly courteous at all times in debate.

An hon. MEMBER: Put your question on the order paper.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am willing at all times to answer questions, but I am not prepared to permit my hon. friend to produce self-serving statements instead of asking questions.

Mr. CLEAVER: In future we will make it mutual.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I pointed out the seriousness of the situation. If we accept concurrence in this report we shall be blindly and without knowledge making findings in this supreme court of parliament not based on any evidence. What we are being asked to do is to make a finding in regard to a member of this parliament. We shall be supporting the findings of a committee which are based upon evidence about which we know nothing and which we are denied the opportunity of seeing. We are being asked as the high court of parliament to agree to the findings of a committee, to come to the conclusion that those findings, which are based on secret evidence are correct, evidence about which we have no inkling and in respect to which there is no agreement among the participants on the committee.

This is a serious matter. I am not thinking for the moment of the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar, with whom I do not often see eye to eye; what I am thinking of is how our rights have been diminished and how we are gradually being placed in the position where if we dare to speak out, if we show our independence and fail to display the necessary servility, we are faced with the threat that we are not cooperating in this war effort. We have rights as members of this house. I appeal to the members on all sides not to give approval to this motion of concurrence, which is just another step along the road to a denial to the members of this house of the right of independent speech.

I remember last summer when the hon. member for York-Sunbury, then the leader of the opposition, made certain statements in regard to a situation in the grain trade. They were brought before a committee, and, according to the report of the committee, which was founded entirely on political faith, he was found not to have been correct in his statements. I make an appeal to the Prime Minister which I have made before. Do not ask us to concur in a report that condemns a member of this house of having deceived the house and the country. I appeal to the Prime Minister to have the motion withdrawn, and not to ask the members of this house to line up blindly to support a motion which in effect says to the people of the country that an hon. member of this house has stated what is untrue. If an hon. member states what is untrue he deserves condemnation from every member of this house. But to condemn him without giving him the opportunity of having placed before this house the evidence upon which he is to be condemned is unfair, unjustifiable, un-British—yes, Mr. Speaker, it is a farcical position in which to place the parliament of Canada.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Just before my hon. friend concludes, may I say that he has asked the government to withdraw this motion. The purpose of the government in bringing forward the motion was to meet the request of hon. gentlemen opposite. If the house will give its unanimous consent the government will withdraw the motion immediately.

Mr. GRAYDON: Mr. Speaker, some clarification may be necessary in view of what the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has just said. It is all right for hon. members to indulge in hilarity, but this is not a subject for hilarious discussion. Moreover, what the Prime Minister has just said is apt to leave a wrong impression. I want to give a right impression to the Prime Minister and to the house, and it is this. Earlier in the debates of the house this session, the question of the time that would be taken in constituting the committees of the house was a subject of discussion between the Prime Minister and myself, and I am not so sure that other hon. members did not participate in the discussion. In any event, the Prime Minister and myself took part in a discussion, and at that time I mentioned why the setting up of the committees last year took so long. There were several committees which it took considerable time to set up. The social security committee took a day and a half, and the reconstruction committee took something like two or three days. At all events it was considerably longer than I or the Prime Minister himself had expected. One of the reasons I advanced at that time why it was taking so long to set up the committees was that there were so many matters dragging over from the previous session to be discussed. Then the whole question came up of the reports of committees of the previous session. The report of the war expenditures committee was one report which was tabled at the end of last session, on the 26th day of January. I pointed out to the Prime Minister at that time that when the war expenditures committee or any of these

committees were being set up, one might normally look for an extension of the usual time of discussion because the reports of the previous session would naturally be discussed on the motion to appoint the committees.

The first intimation I had of a motion for concurrence in the report of the war expenditures committee was when its chairman, the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Cleaver), approached me with respect to the whole question of concurrence in its reports. If my memory is correct—it is only a recollection, and I do not want in any way to colour it—I am inclined to think that the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) was anxious that concurrence should be moved in at least the third report, which had to do with aluminum. That was the impression I got. I made it very clear that I would take up the matter of concurrence with members of our own party, and I think the hon. member for Halton will bear me out when I say I told him that so far as our party here was concerned we were not pressing for concurrence in these reports. I think that is a proper and correct account of what took place.

When the Prime Minister moved that the reports be considered at this session of the house, only the third report was mentioned by him, but as one report was to be concurred in, I suggested that there was no reason why all the reports should not be concurred in at the same time. That is the position so far as we are concerned, and we ought to have that put on the record. So far as the facts go, I do not think there is any real distinction between our positions.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not see that what my hon. friend has just said matters very much one way or the other in regard to the statement made by the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) just before taking his seat. He then said, and it was to that suggestion I addressed myself, that he hoped the government would not ask the house to vote concurrence in these reports. I then rose and said that the only reason the government had permitted the resolution asking concurrence in the reports was that it was necessary to bring forward such a motion in order that the house might debate matters referred to in the committee's reports. Hon. gentlemen opposite had said that they wished to debate these reports. It was to oblige them that this resolution was introduced from the government side. It was impossible to debate these matters generally unless there was a motion to concur in the reports. I want to make it very clear that the reason the motion was brought forward to concur in the reports at the time it was, was to enable hon. gentlemen to discuss freely the whole question of matters affecting the war expenditures committee, to discuss what was in the report of last year and any other matters they might wish to discuss. My hon. friend himself was one who suggested that instead of having two discussions we have the whole discussion in the first instance, namely, on the reports, and that this discussion once concluded the war expenditures committee would be appointed at once.

I desired to have the committees, in accordance with the wish of the house, set up just as early in the session as possible. To permit of this was the reason for permitting the present discussion. It was necessary to precede the motion to set up the committee on war expenditures by this resolution to concur in the reports if we were to have that preliminary discussion in that way.

I repeat, if hon. gentlemen opposite do not wish to be asked to approve these reports, I am perfectly prepared and the government is prepared immediately to have the resolution withdrawn and end the discussion here and now. But my hon. friends cannot have it both ways. They cannot both ask that we should give them the opportunity to discuss indefinitely, and not be asked to approve the reports, and at the same time suggest that we should withdraw the resolution and not ask them to vote upon it. I say that I am quite prepared to have the resolution withdrawn at once, if that is the wish of hon. gentlemen opposite, and if, having regard to the necessary procedure, the house will give its unanimous consent.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I say with respect to that, it was not entirely a matter of accommodation or convenience to us. That should be made clear at the outset. The Prime Minister knows that it was only by way of regularizing matters that the discussion was held on the motion for concurrence, so that it would not come upon the motion to set up the war expenditures committee. The government would have found itself in an awkward and embarrassing position if the discussion had come upon the motion to set up the committee. So that it was not a matter of accommodating us but of accommodating the house generally. Moreover, I would say to the Prime Minister that to withdraw his motion now would be tantamount to shutting off any discussion of the reports of the war expenditures committee. The opposition is anxious to have the evidence taken by the committee brought down. But the motion for concurrence has been made, and an amendment has been moved to it, and we at least have the right to discuss the question whether the evidence shall be tabled.

May I make it very clear to the Prime Minister that having listened to the statements that have been made by one member after another of the war expenditures committee I can see no reason of security or national interest which would prevent the tabling of the evidence. For that reason, and since I certainly am opposed to the government making any move now to discourage the discussion, I say this: when the discussion has taken place, let the government withdraw their motion. That is the proper way. The government must not ask that the debate should now cease.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): It is your suggestion.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I assume that a discussion between the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) and myself is out of order, but, Your Honour having permitted the leader of the opposition to speak as often as he has, I might be allowed one further word in reference to the matter we are discussing. I would remind my hon. friend and the house that the report was tabled at the close of last session. When this session began its proceedings I was asked whether the report would be discussed at this session, and I replied—and my words will be found on *Hansard*—that reports which were made in a previous session died, so to speak, with the session and that they were not to be taken up at a new session. That was the position which I took, and took rightly, on behalf of the government. Then it was that the request was made that there should be a chance to discuss some of these matters which were referred to in the report and which hon. gentlemen opposite wished to discuss. I was led to believe that if they were given that opportunity it would probably shorten discussion on the motion to establish a committee on war expenditure. It was then to oblige hon. gentlemen opposite the government took the only means possible to that end, namely to have a resolution brought in which would enable the report to be discussed at this session and later a motion for concurrence, and thereby allow this discussion to take place. Of course it requires the unanimous consent of the house to withdraw a motion, and the leader of the opposition evidently takes a different view of the matter from that taken by his distinguished follower from Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker).

Mr. GRAYDON: No, I did not. The Prime Minister cannot say that.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): It is obvious.

Mr. GRAYDON: It may be obvious to you, but—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Just allow the record to speak for itself and leave it at that.

Mr. GRAYDON: I would like, Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. GRAYDON: Well, if the record is going to speak for itself the record is going to be there.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The record is there now.

Mr. GRAYDON: I just want to say this to the Prime Minister, that at a proper time in this debate, after the country has heard the pros and cons of this, we will consent, as my hon. friend suggested, to the government withdrawing the motion. But it is a question of time. There is no distinction or difference on this between the hon. member for Lake Centre and myself, although the Prime Minister now tries to put words into my mouth in order to show a difference between us.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. GRAYDON: Just a minute. The hon. member was telling me yesterday that it is a bad thing to be interrupting. I want him to take his own advice. I say to the Prime Minister, let us get the record clear. If the government wants to withdraw this motion, when the debate is concluded, without a vote, I am quite agreeable, and that will also meet the wishes of the hon. member for Lake Centre; there is no difference between us.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Withdraw it after they have refused the evidence.

Mr. SPEAKER: This whole discussion, I need not point out to the house, is entirely out of order.

Mr. HOMUTH: It is interesting, though.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to draw the attention of the house, with reference to the discussion which has taken place, to citation 383 of Beauchesne:

> Where an amendment has been proposed to a question, the original motion cannot be withdrawn until the amendment has been first disposed of by being agreed to, withdrawn or negatived, as the question on the amendment stands before the original motion.

Mr. GRAYDON: Then the Prime Minister is out of order.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): So were you.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In good working order!

Mr. SPEAKER: Standing order 53 provides that a member who has made a motion may withdraw same by leave of the house, such leave being granted without any negative voice.

Mr. A. G. SLAGHT (Parry Sound): I desire to address myself briefly to the amendment before the house. I had not intended to speak on this motion at all, but I wish to call the attention of hon. members to what I regard as a very unfortunate position that we have drifted into by reason of the presentation of this amendment. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Harris), seconded by the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Sterling) asks that the evidence taken in camera be tabled. Let me say in passing that I have formed no opinion one way or the other on the merits of the real dispute here. I should hesitate, indeed, speaking for myself, to reach a conclusion that my friend the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) has deliberately made any misstatement to this house. I wish to record that. But I am impressed with this situation. The committee, sitting in camera by their own choice and motion, desired to have before them in evidence certain contracts, as is apparent from this debate and as all members of that committee—of which I was not a member—are aware. On their behalf, the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe), instead of wanting to hold back anything, took the course of asking the government of the United Kingdom and the government of Australia to permit the contracts made by them with the Aluminum Company, and the circumstances under which they were made, to be placed in evidence before the committee. Those governments at first declined, and upon being pressed by the Minister of Munitions and Supply, reluctantly consented to these contracts being placed in evidence on the definite understanding and condition that they should be received by the committee in camera.

Mr. HOMUTH: There is no evidence of that.

An hon. MEMBER: It is all in the record.

Mr. SLAGHT: It is in the record in this debate. I do not know whether the hon. member was a member of the committee.

Mr. HOMUTH: I was.

Mr. SLAGHT: Will he rise in his place and say that they were not procured on that understanding?

Mr. HOMUTH: So far as I know, no.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. SLAGHT: Then the hon. member must have been away. It is not permissible perhaps to read from a current debate, but the Minister of Munitions and Supply stated here yesterday definitely, in effect, that he procured these documents and this evidence for that committee on that understanding; they were placed before the committee on that understanding; no member of the committee in this house rose to question that statement, and I accept it as true in substance and in fact. I do not desire to be controversial in this matter; I repeat, I have formed no opinion on the merits of this question. But I do think we ought to have some regard in the parliament of Canada for the solemn undertakings of the government of Canada; and if the hon. member for Danforth, supported by the hon. member for Yale, and praised by the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker)—a member of my profession—and by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon)—a member of my profession—will pause for a moment to see the position in which they propose to place the Canadian government, if their amendment should carry, in the eyes of our mother country and our sister commonwealth nation of Australia, then it seems to me that they will take a grave responsibility so to act in the name of the Canadian parliament, and I shall oppose it as long as I am able to. Let there be no doubt about that. These documents were forthcoming, and the evidence surrounding them was given on the distinct pledge of that committee, given through the Minister of Munitions and Supply, who helped the committee to get them. The pledge was that the secrecy of in camera would be preserved with reference to them. Need a Canadian parliament go any farther? Personally I should like to have had all the evidence placed before this house. I should like to have read it and to have discussed it.

Mr. BOUCHER: Would the hon. member permit a question at this time?

Mr. SLAGHT: When I am through, if my hon. friend will wait.

I say, therefore, that it would be a gross breach of an undertaking by Canada to the mother country and to Australia to give effect to the amendment now before the house and to table the contracts with the evidence surrounding them. My reason for saying that is that the committee received them on the understanding that they were to be received in camera. Now, what is your question?

Mr. BOUCHER: Would my hon. friend tell the house what "in camera" does mean,

or if he agrees with the meaning put on it by the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker)?

Mr. SLAGHT: Yes, I do, and it certainly means this: that the motherland and Australia provided, for their own protection and for their own purposes, with which we are not concerned, that the evidence and documents would not be tabled in the Canadian House of Commons and made available to *Hansard* and open for discussion and reading in this house. It certainly means that. Because of that I appeal to the mover of the amendment, the hon. member for Danforth, than whom no one in this house has a higher reputation in the industrial world for keeping his word, for refusing to breach an undertaking, and the hon. member for Yale, an outstanding member with the reputation of not going back on an undertaking to which he is a party. The same reference with regard to reputation applies to all hon. members who have spoken and who were members of that committee, including the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Homuth). If the house has a true realization of what we would place ourselves in were we to pass the amendment, let us drop this controversy. I appeal to the mover and the seconder to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. HUGHES CLEAVER (Halton): Mr. Speaker, I did not have an opportunity to receive an answer from the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) in regard to a statement which he made respecting the work of subcommittee No. 1, during the year 1941 when it investigated the British commonwealth air training plan. I know that my hon. friend would want me to put the record straight. What I am about to say clearly illustrates once again that human memory is often frail. My hon. friend stated that civilian companies operating air observer schools were inquired into in 1941; that the committee was remiss in its duty in not taking steps to remedy some conditions which should not have existed at that time; that as a result the hon. member for Lake Centre felt impelled in 1942 to bring the matter to the attention of the Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Power) and that he did so during the session of 1942.

I hold in my hand the report of subcommittee No. 1, dated November 3, 1941. This report was tabled in the house on that date. I call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact, first, that the report was tabled in the house the session preceding the one during which my hon. friend states he brought the matter to the attention of the Minister of National Defence for Air. I wish to thank my hon. friend for bringing up this point, because it clearly illustrates the manner in which the war expenditures committee functions, a helpful and vigilant manner, seeking to redress wrongs, seeking to find waste and to cure waste, seeking to do that without taking political advantage or do anything that would be harmful to the war effort. I am reading from page 556 of *Votes and Proceedings*, Monday, November 3, 1941:

> The subcommittee fully appreciates the fact that the air observer schools are being very efficiently managed and that these schools are performing an important war task. . . .

Mr. NICHOLSON: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member who is now speaking took exception last night to my making some comments regarding what had taken place at a previous session, and the Deputy Speaker, who was in the Chair, called me to order. I was not permitted to continue my speech. I see no reason why the hon. member for Halton should be permitted to discuss this question, particularly having regard to the rule that was drawn to my attention.

Mr. CLEAVER: I believe Your Honour was in the Chair when the hon. member for Lake Centre raised this point. I believe it was understood I would have an opportunity to answer it.

Mr. MacNICOL: Understood by whom?

Mr. SPEAKER: There was no understanding you have the right to reply to the hon. member, as far as I am concerned. The hon. member has the right to speak on the amendment because he has not spoken previously. I have been following the argument of the hon. member very carefully. I presume he is endeavouring to show to the house the reason for the actions of the committee with regard to the matters under consideration, and also the subject of the amendment, namely, the production of the evidence. He has not dealt with that, but I assumed he was leading up to that point, and I am bringing it to his attention.

Mr. CLEAVER: Let me continue the quotation from our report:

> The subcommittee fully appreciates the fact that the air observer schools are being very efficiently managed and that these schools are performing an important war task and also appreciates the fact that measures of economy should not be permitted to slow up our war effort but as the actual circumstances have altered sharply since the contract was first entered into the subcommittee decided that a conference should be called of executive officers representing all of the schools, that the facts should be frankly placed before them and their cooperation invited. The conference was held on June 4—

That is the June preceding the year 1942 to which my hon. friend referred.

—and as a result the operating companies have all voluntarily offered to agree to a reduction of what is described in the agreement as flying hour profits from $1 per flying hour to 35 cents per flying hour.

That was a reduction of sixty-five per cent in the profit to the air observer schools. And the contracts were re-negotiated and re-signed with the sixty-five per cent reduction. That was all done the year before my hon. friend raised the point in the House of Commons.

I do not intend to delay the house long, but since my name has been drawn into the discussion I should like to make a brief statement. The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) mentioned my name in the statement which he made, and I should like to make it abundantly clear—I do not think he did, though I am not suggesting that he did it intentionally—that I never at any time suggested that a motion for concurrence in a war expenditures committee report should be voted upon.

The problem arose in the past. Your Honour had already ruled at previous sessions that a motion to set up a committee is a motion to set up a committee and that members cannot discuss, on a motion to set up a committee, anything that had to do with committee reports or other extraneous matters of that kind, that the debate was restricted purely to the motion before the house, namely, the motion to set up the committee. That had the effect of restraining members of the opposition who wished to criticize the work of the committee and its reports and preventing that criticism from taking place, and I well remember the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross) wanting a year ago to discuss the report on a particular matter and the Chair ruled the discussion out of order on that ground.

Then we are faced with the other problem, that under the rules of the house the committee reports are dealt with in the session in which they are tabled, if at all. So that when the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), who was deeply interested in the aluminum report, mentioned in his first speech in this house at this session that he intended to discuss the aluminum report, or words to that effect, on the setting up of the committee, obviously if that debate were to take place something had to be done to regularize it. Then, too, later on there were some suggestions from members of the opposition that they wished to debate the aluminum report.

On one or two occasions I asked the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) if there were any other reports of the 1943 committee which the opposition wished to debate, because, while I have not receded at all from the position which I have always taken, that the house cannot intelligently debate a committee report based on evidence taken in camera, yet I do not wish to be accused for a moment of attempting to stifle or to prevent hon. members of any of the opposition parties from expressing themselves freely with respect to any work done by the war expenditures committee. The result of the entire problem was that, as it appeared, the only way we could regularize the debate with respect to the full work of the war expenditures committee was that a motion should be made that the reports tabled in the previous year should be considered at this session, and then bring on the actual debate on a motion for concurrence.

I do not think it was in anyone's mind that a vote would be taken and that the matter would be pressed to a vote on the motion for concurrence. Certainly it was not in my mind, and the sole purpose of the present motion is to permit hon. members of the opposition groups to make any and all and sundry complaints which they wished to make with respect to any part of the work of the war expenditures committee.

Mr. A. W. ROEBUCK (Trinity): The question before the house at the moment is simply whether the evidence should be tabled, and it is to that question I desire to direct my remarks. It seems to me that the argument that should impel our minds is a very simple one. I wish to join in the strongest possible terms with the forceful statements made by the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Slaght). The honour of the house is the highest argument that can be pleaded. My hon. friend has shown that to table this evidence would be to break faith with our sister parliaments in England and in Australia. That should be sufficient. But there is a further point, almost as forceful as that, which I should like to lay before the house.

It has been stated by hon. members who know the facts that witnesses have come before this committee and have been assured by the chairman that their remarks were in camera, and they were given to understand that their evidence was secret. It is not possible for any member of that committee to say that statements of the kind were on the responsibility of the chairman alone, and bound him only, because every member of that committee, no matter to which party he may belong, who sat and listened to the evidence given by the witnesses, as the result of and following the assurance given, bound himself by his silence to the undertaking given by the chairman. And for any hon. member

of the house, I care not to which party he belongs, whether it be government or opposition, now to vote to break the pledge of the chairman, is to vote to break his own pledge, tacitly given to the witnesses.

I would not for one moment presume to teach ethics to the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker). He is a member of the same high profession to which I belong. I would recall to his mind, however, that when we were students at school the consideration which we were told was the highest that could actuate the doings of a solicitor was that of keeping faith, being honourable and decent and proper in one's conduct. The hon. gentleman has said that this committee is a watchdog for the house. Well, a watchdog is a rather poor dog that is not an honest dog. I say that if this committee violates its pledge and its assurance to the witnesses it is not an honest committee. And any member who violates a pledge of that kind is not an honest member, or at least he is not dealing honestly with witnesses before the committee. I go one step farther. The members of this committee are representatives or I might say agents of this house. They are commissioned by this house to make the inquiry on our behalf, and so a pledge given by that committee is binding upon the house itself and, I submit, upon every hon. member of this house. For any hon. member to vote to violate a pledge of that kind—well, it is unthinkable. I am sure it will not be done by any hon. member of this house if he simply thinks about what he is doing.

I know it was arguable at one time whether or not evidence should be taken in secret or in camera. That is a subject which is open to argument. I am inclined to think the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) put the argument so strongly that it should carry most minds. Still, the question as to whether the evidence should be taken in private or in public is a matter of argument. But once it has been taken in secret, it is no longer a matter of argument; it is beyond argument whether we should then later on make it public. I say, that is beyond argument.

They say that honesty is the best policy, the wisest course to pursue. I suppose that is open to argument, but I do not propose to argue it. I have been taught that and I accept it, that honesty is the best policy. Philosophically it may be different; I do not know, but I am not going to enter into that question. It may be possible for one to grow wealthy by being dishonest, but I for one am not in that business. I do not argue that question. I accept the principle of honesty. So, too, one may convenience himself, as it has been suggested we should do. I would like to see the evidence and read it. There may be other reasons as well why, as a matter of expediency rather than of principle, this evidence should be brought down.

But I come back to my principle, and I say that keeping good faith with those with whom one is associated is a far more important consideration than mere expediency or convenience. I say, therefore, the arguments I have heard in support of bringing down the evidence are aside from the point; they are futile. They should hardly be expressed. Our hands are bound, irrespective of our convenience or our expediency, as a matter of honour. I would like my constituents to know that I voted against this amendment, upon my honour as a member of this house.

Mr. M. J. EDWARDS (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, I must confess that as one whose name is proposed to be added to the list which will constitute this committee at the next session, I have not been greatly exercised or greatly disturbed in my mind about the facts in connection with the case, but rather as to the *modus operandi* of our committee. The more so was my anxiety aroused by reason of the principle enunciated in the house last night by the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, when he said, as reported at page 703 of *Hansard:*

> That evidence was given not in secret but in camera, and there is a very well defined rule that evidence given in camera is not given in secret, that a member has to be guided by his own conscience as to what he will subsequently divulge. I want that to be clearly understood, because that is the difference between secrecy and in camera.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is the case. Evidence which has been given secretly cannot be divulged.

I was greatly exercised to hear that principle announced as the one which should be followed, and I assume it is the one followed by the leader of the C.C.F. and that his followers feel they are entitled to follow. It is obvious, from what had preceded, in the discussion, that the chairman of the war expenditures committee did not put that interpretation upon the words "in camera". Hon. members will recall that when he chided some members of the committee for having divulged some of the evidence given before the committee in camera, all the members of the war expenditures committee from the official opposition, with one exception, were prompt to rise in their places and repudiate the suggestion that they had in any way broken this pledge, or the implied promise of secrecy

involved in the fact that the meetings at which they sat were held in camera. No such protest was heard from the members of the C.C.F. That was hardly necessary because I understand the constitution of the committee was such that only one member of that party, the one who happens to be its leader, was at that time its member of the committee. He announced an entirely different principle, stating, "True, the meetings were held in camera, but that is different from being held in secret. And what I shall reveal or may say after the hearing would be entirely within my own discretion, or as my conscience dictates."

Is that the principle to be adopted? Is that the principle approved by the house in regard to the conduct of the proceedings in the house and in committee? If I am to sit on any war expenditures committee, or any other committee, I for one would like to know what is meant when it is said that we may hold or shall hold our meetings in camera. Does that mean that I may be the sole judge, according to the dictates of my conscience, of what I shall reveal to the outside world? Surely that is not the position? Surely that is not the principle to guide us in our deliberations in the house? If so, then I for one will not be a party to sitting in any committee held in camera.

I admire the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Harris). He certainly had that idea, namely, that when he sat in a committee "in camera" he could not discuss or reveal any of the information he obtained therein. He said, in effect, "I will refuse to sit in the committee when it is sitting in camera, because my mouth would be sealed with regard to any information disclosed therein".

Mr. GOLDING: That was his opinion.

Mr. EDWARDS: The amendment proposes in effect and in fact that the house shall reverse the decision made by the committee itself, the committee to which it gave full judisdiction and control as to the method in which it would conduct its proceedings. I for one would disapprove, on principle, any such proceeding by the house, not alone for the very high ground taken by the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Slaght), namely, that international relationships may be affected, but on what to my way of thinking is an equally high ground, namely, our own national security, and the honour and integrity of our own membership.

It does seem to me that if no rule is laid down we shall never get anywhere, in so far as having any effective work done by these committees is concerned. I suggest that this afternoon we have been more concerned with personalities and personal reputations than with the object for which these committees were set up. If we were to view the work of these committees objectively rather than subjectively, and not in so far as the reputation of individuals is concerned, I submit that there would be little or no discussion about the report. I for one deplore the fact that it was found necessary to move concurrence in these reports. I certainly would not have expected the leader of the C.C.F. group or any of his supporters to vote concurrence in that report. Why? Because the report refers specifically to charges made by him and his personal reputation for probity and maybe honesty is involved in this report.

Mr. COLDWELL: I rise to a question of privilege. It has been said several times to-day that my personal integrity, my personal honour and my personal probity are involved in this report and that I am on trial. I was a member of that committee which inquired into aluminum, not into me personally. Had that happened, the investigation would have taken an entirely different line. While I am on my feet may I say that as far as the evidence is concerned I believe now that it has to be tabled. The speech I made last night was on the report, not on the evidence, as I can show by the documentation of everything I said.

Mr. EDWARDS: May I draw to the hon. member's attention the paragraph from which I quoted, to be found on page 703 of *Hansard*. The hon. member said:

> I submit that I have used the figures and the evidence given to the committee and quoted in the report before the house.

Mr. COLDWELL: And quoted in the report before the house.

Mr. EDWARDS: Yes, but I ask the hon. member to listen to his next statement:

> "I have also, in a very few particulars, referred to the evidence which was given in the committee."

Not in the report.

Mr. COLDWELL: But I did not quote it.

Mr. EDWARDS: You referred to it.

Mr. COLDWELL: You will find in the public records the statement I referred to last night.

Mr. EDWARDS: I leave it to any fair person to draw his own conclusion in regard to that. The third report, under the heading "Genesis of Inquiry" states:

> The necessity for the inquiry arose as a result of certain statements or allegations made in the House of Commons by Mr. M. J. Coldwell, M.P.—

Mr. COLDWELL: Was that in the order of reference?

Mr. EDWARDS: This is in the opening paragraph of the committee's report.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is not in the terms of reference and I oppose that sentence.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am only stating what the report states.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is why I am opposing it.

Mr. EDWARDS: I continue:

—leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party, and particularly on June 14, 1943.

Then the allegations are set out. The conclusions of the report contain the following paragraph:

For these reasons set out in the foregoing report your subcommittee finds that none of the allegations is substantiated by the facts.

I submit that the opening and the conclusion of that report are offensive to the hon. member, and they should be. I further submit that the committee did something that it should not have done. It dignified the hon. member's allegations and gave them prominence to which they were not entitled. If that practice is adopted every private member will be able to rise in his place and make some allegation, true or untrue, and perforce it will be sent to one or another of these committees for investigation and approval or disapproval of the allegation. That individual or the party to which he belongs would be the matter in issue rather than that which is the main function for which these committees were set up, namely, the investigation and report on what economies may be effected Surely these committees were not set up to vindicate or discredit an individual's reputation or allegations. As I conceived it, and as I believe was understood by all members of this house, and as is stated in the terms of reference, these committees were set up to examine expenditures defrayed out of moneys provided by parliament for the defence services and for other services directly connected with the war. Their job was to report not what they found, but to report what, if any, economy could be effected. Their job was not to prove or disprove any charge made by a member of this house or by somebody outside or to justify or discredit the position taken by any individual or group.

A minister of the crown has given his solemn undertaking to Great Britain and Australia, and possibly to the United States, that this evidence would not be divulged to the public, and to take this action would be to accomplish a breach of his obligation. It would also be a breach of the undertaking expressed or implied to every man who appeared before the committee to give evidence.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): Does the hon. member think the witnesses who appeared before the committee would not have told the truth if the sittings had been open sittings?

Mr. EDWARDS: That is a matter of opinion for my hon. friend to answer in his way and for me to answer in my way. If you will produce the witness and let me examine him I shall form an opinion. As I say, it is purely a matter of opinion whether certain individuals will tell the truth under a given set of circumstances.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): I consider it to be a reflection upon the witnesses and I think it is also a reflection on our house and this parliament when it is said that we cannot get honest evidence from witnesses who appear before a committee set up by this parliament.

Mr. EDWARDS: No one even suggests that. Does the hon. member suggest that every witness who appeared before the committee told nothing but the truth and the whole truth?

Mr. GRAYDON: You have to assume that, do you not?

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not think you have to assume that. None of them was sworn.

Mr. GRAYDON: Was none of the witnesses sworn?

Mr. EDWARDS: No; I have not heard of any.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Yes, they were sworn.

Mr. GRAYDON: If they were not, it would be a strange thing.

Mr. EDWARDS: I for one, Mr. Speaker, would be glad to have the direction of some wise person, from yourself, as to what the term "in camera" means as used in the records and proceedings of this house. I have found in the parliamentary debates of the British House of Commons, under date of May 21, 1941, that the very same question arose, and with your permission, sir, I should like to refer to page 1541 thereof, where before the house Sir H. Williams rose in his place and said:

On a point of order, I should like your guidance, sir, in a matter which affects myself incidentally, and a number of other members of the select committee on national expenditure.

The very same committee in the British house that we are now discussing in the Canadian house. He went on:

> There is to be a supply debate to-day in which I am hoping to take part. Our evidence is taken in secret and is not published. When a member of a select committee takes part in a debate, I assume that he should confine himself to matters on which reports have already been presented to parliament, and that it would be improper to deal with matters which have come before him in evidence on which a report has not been presented. It would be helpful to members of the select committee if you would give some guidance.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that that is the case here, namely, that evidence which has been given secretly cannot be divulged; and I submit that that is the rule which does and should apply in so far as this house and its committees are concerned with reference to proceedings in camera.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I wish for a few moments to refer to the text of the resolution setting up the war expenditures committee and to the amendment which has been moved by the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Harris) to the motion for concurrence. When the hon. member for Danforth moved his amendment, as reported at page 707 of *Hansard,* on February 21, he referred to the appointment of the war expenditures committee in 1941, the first year it was appointed, and to its reappointment in 1942, when there was a long debate in the house on the text of the resolution setting up the committee. I objected at that time to the text of the resolution; for I felt, in view of the statements made in the house by the government, that the committee when appointed would have its hands tied behind its back, having being committed to the exact text of the resolution, which prevented the committee from deciding on questions of government policy such as those to which the hon. member for Danforth referred.

Talk about giving comfort to the enemy! Why, Mr. Speaker, the enemy knows all about it; there is no doubt about that. I read the record of the debates of congress at Washington which I receive almost every day, and there they have an extensive debate on the cost of power, the aluminum deal, the work of United States companies in Canada, the large capital expenditures made by these companies here in peace and war, the development of the national resources, and so forth. All these matters have been discussed publicly. Nobody wants to give comfort to the enemy. There is not a member on this side of the house who wants to do anything except help the government to carry on the war effort as long as it is doing so efficiently.

Addressing myself to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Danforth, I wish to quote what I said on March 5, 1941, as reported at page 1259 of *Hansard* when I predicted and objected to the very state of affairs that has come about in this war expenditure committee, which reminds me almost of the committee of one hundred. The committee seems to have turned itself into a Tower of Babel. It is purely a partisan committee. I predicted just what would happen in the remarks I made in the house on March 5, 1941, in view of the text of the resolution appointing the war expenditure committee of that year. I said then, as reported at page 1259 of *Hansard:*

> I have already expressed the hope in this house that this committee will not be in any sense a whitewashing committee but will deal thoroughly with Canada's war effort. I hope it will consider the whole war effort, not from any partisan point of view but for the purpose of letting the people know the real facts with regard to what Canada is doing, and be in effect a fact-finding committee. If the committee is intended to be a business committee, appointed to go over all expenditures incurred since the war—expenditures past and current—in connection with defence and all that sort of thing, very well and good. But I hope that the committee when appointed will cover all the ground and will see to it that the Canadian people are given the real facts about our war effort.

I added that I hoped the committee would see to it that the Canadian people would get value for their money. That has not been done. What happened at the first meeting of the committee? They passed a resolution that the committee had nothing to do with past war expenditures. In other words, as the mover of the amendment, the hon. member for Danforth, showed, and as I said in 1941, the committee just holds postmortems on war expenditures. That is all it does. It has nothing to do with government policy.

In further support of the amendment I wish to read one or two other paragraphs from the remarks I made when speaking of an appointment of the committee on war expenditures in 1941. I said, at page 1257 of *Hansard* of March 5, 1941:

> What is the object of having a select committee if it is going to have its hands tied behind its back through the failure of the government to give it the power which any committee should have in order to function properly regarding war expenditures, manpower, recruiting, munitions and overseas policies?
>
> I notice by the explanation which the Prime Minister gave of the resolution last night that the committee has no power to go into any question of government policy.

Then what is the use of the committee? I went on to say, at page 1258:

So far as this war is concerned the committee will have its hands tied behind its back because it has no power to deal with any question of government policy regarding the war. . . . My second point is this. The government has decided that it is to be the tutor, custodian and guardian of the committee.

And so the government is, when it refuses to allow the evidence to be produced upon which the committee's report is based. I continued:

The committee is not to be allowed to do anything but what the government allows it to do. The government will decide, so far as its war efforts is concerned what information shall be kept secret and what not.

I went on to object to the lack of parliamentary control.

The men who have been nominated to the committee are all good men. I have served on the committees with some of them, but they have failed to carry out their functions, the majority of them who are government members, because their hands have been tied by the government of the day so that they cannot decide questions of government policy.

The aluminum transaction in which the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) is particularly interested was investigated at Washington by a committee, and the newspapers of the United States were full of all the ins and outs of this particular deal. The enemy could have found out all about it from the newspapers of the United States. As I see it, Mr. Speaker, we owe a duty to our allies in this war in reference to these war contracts. Somebody will have to pay for them some time, and after the war there will be a demand for the payment of war debts by the various nations of the allies. There is no doubt that objection will then be raised to some of these contracts and accounts as excessive. For that reason I think it would be advisable to adopt the amendment of the hon. member for Danforth and table all the evidence. In this war so far we have made one fatal mistake. We have surrendered too much financial, political, military and economical control and initiative over these expenditures for war to Washington, and surrendered too much power and initiative in a military sense as well.

The people of Canada are paying for this war, and they should have something to say about it. Three hundred years ago a civil war was fought in England—for what? To gain control of expenditures. If this is the best we can do in the way of running a secret war expenditures committee, the sooner the committee is abolished the better. It would be preferable to appoint five business men. I do not criticize the members because I believe they are bound by the text of the resolution and it is very difficult for them to do their duty. But as Burke said long ago, when a man becomes a member of parliament he is not a member for his constituency, he is a member for the whole country. He should be here to protect the taxpayer, the man who to-day is groaning under the heavy debt of the war—a large part of which expenditure, as I observe in connection with the war appropriation bill, in fact about one-third, is really not for the war at all. Recently the chairman of the war expenditures committee of Great Britain spent about a week here. A number of hon. members saw and conferred with him, as I myself did. I read the British *Hansard* and know something of the reports of their expenditures committee since the war started. I find that they conduct their business in a wholly different way. Under our system, the auditor general has no control over the war appropriation bill. The government has appointed what they call a comptroller of the treasury, and as long as he finds that the accounts which this expenditures committee are investigating are within the four corners and the five subsections of that bill he has to put upon them the stamp of his approval. I contend that there is wide dissatisfaction through the country with the work that the war expenditures committee has done and left undone. That is the view of the business men to whom I have talked; they are asking why we stand for this thing; and history is going to condemn this parliament for the haphazard manner in which this three or four billion dollars a year is being spent and the dead hand of the treasury. I repeat that a good part of it has nothing to do with the war at all.

Hon. members who belong to the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation are trying to persuade the country that they are the only people who have supported the policy of protecting our natural resources in respect of light, power and transportation. In this they are not altogether correct, because those of us on this side of the house have supported in season and out of season the principle of developing our natural resources in light, heat and power for the benefit of the people.

Regarding other clauses of the agreement, I fail to see why any member of this house has a right to go to the United States and give an opinion on contracts of this kind, because after all the defence of Canada regulations apply to us as well as to our constituents. I have no objection at times to any member going over there. I believe, however, having looked into the agreement and the text of it, that some of the provisoes were improvident.

No doubt the agreement was entered into at an acute stage of the war, and of course Ottawa had nothing to do with the power angle and huge cost of it, which is controlled by Quebec, who had already arranged the terms and created a private monopoly in power.

I believe it would be better if the government disclosed all the evidence herein and the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth about what is in the evidence. I saw and read some of the testimony given in Washington, and I may say I could find nothing in it which would help the enemy, who knows it all anyway.

I believe the people want the facts. If we are to have a war expenditures committee, let us have one which will not do any whitewashing but will let the people know the whole truth about the conduct of the war. In this respect I believe the committee has failed. and I hope that before the house closes this year some other system will be adopted whereby war expenditures accounts will be looked into more carefully and under a really modern system, with a view to protecting the taxpayer. Let it never be forgotten that it is the taxpayer who is paying for the war.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. THOMAS REID (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, as a member of the war expenditures committee I wish to say a word or two on the amendment at this stage of the discussion. It is not my purpose to deal at any great length with the amendment because I hope that I may have the privilege of speaking later on when the motion itself comes before the house. As a member of that committee, however, I am and have been, surprised at many of the speeches that were made in the house this afternoon. I cannot help coming to the conclusion that the amendment itself is somewhat beclouded. To my way of thinking there are in the amendment before the house two issues and they have caused different speeches to be given by various members, and particularly members on the opposition side.

There is a great deal of room for argument as to why the proceedings of the war expenditures committee should be in camera or in secret, and I shall have a word to say regarding the words "in camera" and "secret" in a moment or two. But surely after the war expenditures committee has, by deliberation, decided to hold its meetings in camera and after we have had the various officials and high authorities before us and they were told by the chairman of the committee, acquiesced in by every member of the committee, that they were speaking to us in secret and off the public record, I am just wondering how members of the opposition side who sat on that committee and gave that assurance to those officials can now support, tacitly at least if not openly, the demand that all the information and all the evidence be now tabled.

The hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Slaght) dealt this afternoon with the tabling of evidence from the point of view of giving assurance to Great Britain, Australia and other countries that the evidence submitted to the committee would be in camera or in secret. I am speaking to-night as a member of the committee who gave his assurance and his word, tacitly it is true, to those witnesses that they were to speak to us in confidence and in secret. While I realize it is every man's right to settle what he himself will do—he is the keeper of his own conscience—yet I for one am not going to be a party to going back on my word. I want that known clearly and distinctly. I want no accusations made that I am doing it because I belong to the Liberal party. When I have an opportunity to speak on the main motion I intend to deal particularly with my own stand in regard to it and perhaps with the stand of other members, but at the moment I am speaking to the amendment.

This afternoon the hon. member for Rosedale (Mr. Jackman) challenged any member of the committee to rise in his place and say if the evidence were produced on the floor of the house or made available to the public it would injure our war effort. As hon. members know I was on subcommittee No. 1. That subcommittee dealt particularly with the building of ships, both naval and cargo. I, therefore, was not a member of the committee which deliberated on aluminum and I am not in a position to know all the evidence or the assurances given by the members who dealt with that subject. But I do know this, and so does every hon. member who sat on the subcommittee, that there was evidence given to that committee in secret, and I ask hon. members who were on the committee to put to themselves this question before they vote when they are speaking about tabling the evidence before the entire membership of the house, or making it available to the public by placing it before the public accounts committee. Evidence was given us as to the number of landing barges, the number of Algerines, the number of mine-sweepers and the number of other naval vessels. Admiral Stevens appeared before that committee, and no member of the committee, to my knowledge was inter-

fered with in any way at that time. Everyone of us was permitted to ask of Admiral Stevens any question he liked. Are we going to ask now, Mr. Speaker, that all the evidence relating to naval ships, where they were built, the speed of them, the armament and all other matters pertaining to them, should be placed before the public accounts committee—and just on the eve of an invasion? Take the number of landing barges; that was given to us in secret. Is this House of Commons going to demand that the number of landing barges, the make, shape and size, cost and where built, be revealed to the country at large? I say to you, Mr. Speaker, if that situation applies you can rule me out of that committee. I will not sit on it any longer. I am not going to be a party to that; and I repeat I do not want any accusations made that I am doing so because I am a member of the Liberal party.

Then we had information given to us as to the number of Canadian merchant ships in existence compared with the number that Australia, New Zealand and South Africa had. Are we going to reveal that? Is that what the opposition wants? In addition to that we had a man come before us who is in charge of the Park Steamship company. Before he gave his evidence he asked us if it was in secret and he was told it was. Then he told us the number of ships at sea. He told us where those ships were going, the ports they sailed from. He told us the number that had been sunk. Are we going to place that before the public accounts committee? That is what the amendment means.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Yes, it does.

Mr. REID: I am placing it squarely before the members of this house. Do not let us confuse the issue. If we are asking the committee to sit openly let us argue that way, but if we are arguing now that all of the evidence be made public after each and every member has given his word that it would be kept secret, then I for one will do the utmost I can to defeat the amendment.

Mr. B. M. HILL (Charlotte): As a member of subcommittee No. 1, the shipbuilding committee of the war expenditures committee, I wish to place before the house my views on the amendment. Some of the matters which I had intended to place before the house have already been dealt with by the previous speaker, and I agree with everything he has said. Forty-three witnesses were called before our committee. Each and every one of those witnesses, before he gave evidence, was assured that the evidence would be given in secret and that he could speak freely; that any evidence which was given would be used only in making a report to the government, and would not be given publicity. Each and every member of the committee gave his assent to that undertaking, and that the evidence should be given in that way. It has been said in this house that much of the evidence given would not give comfort to the enemy I agree with that. In fact the evidence given before our committee dealt largely with the marvellous production of naval ships and merchant ships by Canada in her war effort. That certainly would not give comfort to the enemy. As, however, the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Reid) said, there was a good deal of other evidence which would certainly give comfort to the enemy and might be detrimental to the war effort of this country. As he said, we were told where all these merchant ships were going, the ports between which they were plying, and practically the dates of sailing. We were told when they might sail. Could that evidence be given to the public and the press? Not at all.

I agree that if you wish to debate the question whether evidence should be given in secret or in camera that is a matter of argument, but we should abide by the decision of the house. And after the house has decided that evidence shall be given in camera, then I submit that hon. members have no right to demand that the evidence be tabled.

I am surprised that a member of the house should move such an amendment. I do not believe that the hon. member who moved it realized its implications. I would ask him to reconsider the amendment and to withdraw his motion. I am sure that if he carefully considers the implications of the amendment he will withdraw it and not ask for a vote on it.

When I pledged my word to these witnesses, that the evidence they were giving was being given in secret, I gave that word with the understanding that it would be honoured. I believe that a man's word is still of some value, and I say to hon. members who sat on the committee that each of them is in the same position. I do not believe that they can possibly vote for this amendment after having so pledged their word. I say further that the amendment implies that if the members of the house vote for it they are violating the moral obligation given by a committee set up by this honourable house and composed of honourable members of the house, and that to my mind is a very serious matter.

I call on the members of the house, if this question goes to a vote, to weigh it very

carefully, realizing exactly what they are voting for. I ask them to realize that they are simply voting to violate a moral obligation given by an honourable committee of this house set up by this honourable assembly.

Mr. G. K. FRASER (Peterborough West): I did not intend to say anything on this amendment, but since the two previous speakers have addressed the house in the way they have done I cannot help taking part in the discussion. They have tried to tell the house that this amendment means that we are going to spoil the war effort. My hon. friend nods his head.

Mr. HILL: You are violating a moral obligation.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): The hon. member must know that the amendment simply means that evidence taken regarding expenditures that are out of proportion to anything reasonable should be tabled.

An hon. MEMBER: All the evidence.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Hon. members may say "all the evidence," but they know that everyone must use a little bit of discretion.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): There is no discretion in the amendment.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): The government themselves have introduced motions that one could pick holes in, but I submit that this amendment is one that should be carried. I will tell the house why. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Cleaver) said last night:

> My hon. friend can move for the return of any of this material he wants which would bring it quite within the discussion of the house.

I do not know whether he was speaking with authority; I doubt whether he was. But if he was, then I should like to read to the house a motion I had on the order paper of February 11, No. 4. It was an order of the house for a return showing cost of materials, cost of labour, amount of overhead cost, of each ship of 10,350-ton class and of the 4,700-ton class constructed since the beginning of the war in, first, the government-owned yards and secondly privately owned yards. This motion was dropped. I submit that the taxpayers are entitled to know where their money is going and I am sure that if the hon. members who have spoken were in our position instead of on the government side they would demand the same thing and hammer their desks, as they often do, in support of their claim.

I do not know whether the hon. member for Halton, who was chairman last year, speaks with authority, but he may, because I notice that the other night he evidently spoke for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley). I have here a clipping dated February 18, 1944, from the Toronto *Telegram*:

> M.P. promises sixty per cent tax cut as war ends. Sixty per cent reduction in taxation immediately after the war if the King government remains in power was pledged last night by Hughes Cleaver, M.P. for Halton and chairman of the House of Commons war expenditures committee.

The hon. member went on to say this:

> In spite of the fact that I represent the most unpopular government in the world, I am going to suggest some things that we plan to do.

I do not believe that the taxpayers of Canada know how the war expenditures committee was set up. The government members are trying to make it appear that there was an absolutely even distribution among the members of the house.

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Oh, yes, you are. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it was absolutely lopsided, because the opposition had very few members on the committee—four out of twenty-four.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): You did not elect enough.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): That is not a fair democratic thing to do.

Mr. HOMUTH: The distribution of ability was much more even.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): When hon. members say that since it was in camera the evidence should not be brought forward, the amendment means that when expenditures are made and there are millions of dollars spent for ships—I am going to say for ships, because that is what we have been dealing with—we should know something about it. Millions more have been spent than should have been spent. One firm, I believe, spent six or seven hundred thousand dollars more than another firm. I know we had to have the ships, but I honestly think the people should know why one firm can get six or seven hundred thousand dollars more for building a ship than another firm, and for exactly the same type of ship. Why should wages be lumped, and material the same way, in the building of a ship? I do not think hon. members who talk about secrecy have put it before the house in just the way it should have been put.

Mr. A. R. ADAMSON (York West): Mr. Speaker, I am a very simple man—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. ADAMSON: —but not as simple as the government thinks, and I represent about a hundred thousand similarly simple and direct-minded people. The charge has been made, as I see it, that the Aluminum Company of Canada produced aluminum for between eight and nine cents a pound, and sold it for twenty-one cents. That is the inescapable conclusion one can draw from what has been said. The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) has made these direct and specific charges. They have not been refuted by the government.

The government makes one charge and the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar makes another. Unless the report and the evidence are tabled, we are going to have a continuation of this debate from now on. It is going to take place on every public platform in Canada from Halifax to Vancouver.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Is that a threat?

Mr. ADAMSON: It has to be settled; either the government is right and the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar is wrong, or the government is whitewashing the aluminum company. I do not know; I am not on the committee. But it appears to me that in the argument of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) this afternoon he was employing the holier-than-thou tactics he employed against Byng in 1926, where a report was coming up that was going to be unfavourable to the country, and he wanted to kill that report before it was given publicity.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): And the people backed him up.

Mr. HOMUTH: Backed who up?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): The Prime Minister.

Mr. HOMUTH: No, they have not had a chance yet.

Mr. ADAMSON: The same tactics were being employed this afternoon in the house. Apparently there is nothing in the evidence particularly secret or likely to give aid or comfort to the enemy, and furthermore I understand that the majority of the statements were sufficiently documented in the report itself. I wish to warn the people—and I am speaking directly to the amendment—that either we get the evidence in this case, or the government must stand accused, without answer, of whitewashing this company. I do not believe the government has done so, but unless we do get that evidence I shall be forced to accept that conclusion.

One thing more. Shortly we shall have a discussion as to the relative costs of the production of ships. What is correct I am unable to say, and the country is unable to say. The charge has been made that the cost of ships was away out of proportion in the government plant. We have to have the whole evidence on those cases. The people of Canada are not interested in tortuous legal arguments, or whether discussions were in camera or in secret. They want to know whether the money they are spending in taxation is properly spent. They want to know whether the arms, vehicles and equipment we are sending our troops are good arms, good vehicles and good equipment—and that is all they care.

The government has to make that point clear, and it cannot make it clear if the report is not tabled. That is all I have to say.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): The report is tabled.

Mr. ADAMSON: The evidence, I should have said. This is one of the most serious charges which has been made. Either this committee is set up purely as a means of covering up, or it is a committee set up to serve the interests of the Canadian people. The government will have to make the decision and it will have to make that decision fairly soon.

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

YEAS

Messrs:

Adamson	Hanson (York-Sunbury)
Anderson	Harris (Danforth)
Bence	Homuth
Black (Cumberland)	Jackman
Black (Yukon)	Johnston (Bow River)
Blackmore	Knowles
Boucher	Lockhart
Bruce	McGregor
Bryce	MacInnis
Burton	MacKinnon (Kootenay East)
Casselman (Grenville-Dundas)	MacNicol
Castleden	Marshall
Choquette	Nicholson
Church	O'Brien
Coldwell	Perley
Diefenbaker	Quelch
Dorion	Raymond
Douglas (Weyburn)	Ross (St. Paul's)
Esling	Ross (Souris)
Fair	Rowe
Fraser (Peterborough West)	Roy
Gauthier	Stokes
Graydon	Tustin
Green	White
Hansell	Wright—50.

NAYS

Messrs:

Abbott	MacDiarmid
Bertrand (Prescott)	Macdonald (Halifax)
Blair	McGarry
Blanchette	McGeer
Bonnier	McGibbon
Bourget	McIlraith
Bradette	McIvor
Brunelle	MacKenzie (Lambton-Kent)
Casselman, Mrs. (Edmonton East)	MacKenzie (Neepawa)
Chevrier	Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre)
Cleaver	MacKinnon (Edmonton West)
Cloutier	McLarty
Corman	MacLean (Cape Breton North-Victoria)
Coté	McLean (Simcoe East)
Crerar	Macmillan
Cruickshank	McNevin (Victoria, Ont.)
Denis	McNiven (Regina City)
Donnelly	Martin
Dubois	Maybank
Dupuis	Michaud
Durocher	Mills
Emmerson	Mitchell
Eudes	Moore
Evans	Mullins
Factor	Mulock
Farquhar	Mutch
Fauteux	Neill
Ferland	Nixon
Ferron	O'Neill
Fontaine	Parent
Fournier (Hull)	Pinard
Fulford	Purdy
Furniss	Reid
Gardiner	Rennie
Gershaw	Rhéaume
Gibson	Rickard
Gingues	Roebuck
Gladstone	Ross (Calgary East)
Golding	Ross (Middlesex East)
Goulet	Ross (Moose Jaw)
Graham	Ryan
Grant	St. Laurent
Gray	Sanderson
Hanson (Skeena)	Sissons
Healy	Slaght
Henderson	Soper
Hill	Taylor
Hoblitzell	Tripp
Howden	Tucker
Ilsley	Turner
Isnor	Veniot
King, Mackenzie	Ward
Kirk	Weir
LaFlèche	Whitman
Lafontaine	Winkler
Lalonde	Wood—118.
Leclerc	
Leger	
Lizotte	
McCann	
McCubbin	
McCulloch	

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the chief whips.)

Messrs:

Stirling	Ralston
Aylesworth	Howe

Mr. SENN: I was paired with the hon. member for Hamilton East (Mr. Ross). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

[Mr. Adamson.]

Mr. STIRLING: I was paired with the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston). Had I voted I would have supported the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is on the main motion.

Mr. R. H. McGREGOR (York East): Mr. Speaker, I was called to order last night for referring to the evidence, and I suppose I shall not be able to speak about the evidence to-night. My remarks will therefore be brief. I believe it will be quite in order for me to refer to what is in the report itself.

I wish to refer to a statement in the *Globe and Mail* of yesterday morning which the chairman of the committee, the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Cleaver), insinuated, as I understood it, had been given to that paper by a member of the committee. But what was contained in the *Globe and Mail* is contained in the report itself. So that I do not see how the hon. member could take it for granted that any member of the committee divulged the information to the *Globe and Mail*.

I asked the hon. gentleman yesterday, when he made the statement that it had been agreed upon by the British and Canadian governments that the price of 10,000-ton boats on the Pacific coast should be $1,825,000 and on the St. Lawrence $1,760,000, whether that had been carried out, and his answer was yes. I would ask the hon. gentleman what he has to say about the contract that was let to a contractor in the province of Quebec for $60,000 more than the $1,825,000 and $125,000 more than contracts were supposed to be let for on the St. Lawrence. That is one question he can answer.

It has been said that $300,000 per boat was the saving made when the contracts were cancelled and everything was put on a cost-plus basis. I should like to know how they figure that out. According to the report of the committee, the price of these boats was $2,046,000.

An hon. MEMBER: What boats?

Mr. McGREGOR: The 10,000-ton boats. The price of the boats built on the coast was $1,422,000. That is a difference of $624,000. If you allow the contractor $50,000 profit on the boat, the price was $574,000 higher than it should have been. Yet in spite of the fact that the contract was approximately $575,000 higher than it should have been, they say they saved $300,000 per boat.

Mr. MacNICOL: That is kind of backhanded figuring.

Mr. CLEAVER: I rise to a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member misquoted what he said yesterday and what I said yesterday in reply to him. I submit that I have the right to read the question and answer which appears at page 697 of *Hansard*.

Mr. McGREGOR: Perhaps the hon. gentleman will go ahead and quote what he said yesterday.

Mr. CLEAVER: Here is the question and answer:

Mr. McGregor: Was that carried out at the price the hon. member mentioned a few moments ago, both on the Pacific coast and on the St. Lawrence?

Mr. Cleaver: The answer is yes.

And, Mr. Speaker, the answer is still yes. The figures to which my hon. friend is referring—

Mr. HOMUTH: Order. The hon. member can make a speech another time.

Mr. ROWE: He can make his own speech later.

Mr. CLEAVER: The figures—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but I must point out that he is merely making a contradiction, and I think that is all that is necessary.

Mr. CLEAVER: It is a misquotation of the report.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): It affects the privileges of this house, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CLEAVER: Your Honour, if I may, I have referred to the question of privilege and read from *Hansard*. I am now stating that the hon. member has misquoted the committee's report. The figures which the hon member has quoted are the actual cost figures, and in the one yard in question where the ships cost—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CLEAVER: —$1,969,000, that yard made a loss.

Mr. ROWE: That is not a question of privilege; that is a speech, which you should make later.

Mr. CLEAVER: No; it is a misrepresentation.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman states that he is raising a question of privilege. There is no privilege; it is a matter of fact; and in this connection I would read the following excerpt from Beauchesne, page 54:

111. If a member desires to ask a question during debate, he should first obtain the consent of the member who is speaking. If the latter ignores the request, the former cannot insist, even if he thinks he is being misrepresented. He cannot make a denial during the speech, but he must wait until the member has resumed his seat and then he may ask leave to make a statement, or he must wait until his turn comes, to address the house. Standing order 12 is compulsory. No one has a right to interrupt a member who is addressing the house, by putting a question to him or by making or demanding an explanation. A member may allow interruptions through a sense of courtesy, but it is entirely at his option to give way or not to an immediate explanation. The Speaker in the United Kingdom house has warned a member that if he continued disorderly interruptions, he would name him as disregarding the authority of the Chair. On the 24th May, 1881, a member persisting in disorderly interruptions was named by the Speaker, whereupon a motion was made that the member be suspended from the service of the house.

Mr. ROWE: He should have known that, too.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. With all due respect to Your Honour, you have absolutely misconstrued the entire suggestion by the hon. member.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I wish those howling dervishes of the Tory party would keep quiet while I state my point of order.

An hon. MEMBER: The Speaker has given his ruling.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I am rising to a new question.

An hon. MEMBER: It is not debatable.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): There is no Tory who ever lived will make me sit down.

Mr. ROWE: Mr. Speaker's ruling is not debatable.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I am not speaking to Mr. Speaker's ruling; I am speaking to a new point entirely.

Mr. ROWE: Is the minister taking exception to the ruling? It is not debatable.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is rising to a point of order, and he is entitled to state his point of order.

An hon. MEMBER: Your ruling is not debatable.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not a question of the ruling. I want to hear the point of order.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): The position taken by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Cleaver) was not a point of order; it was a question affecting the privilege of this parliament, and I so state now. I say that if any hon. member misquotes any report of this parliament or any report of a committee of this parliament, it is a matter affecting the privilege of every single member of parliament, and the hon. member has every right in the world to explain thoroughly the actual facts of the report. Hon. members know I am right.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

An hon. MEMBER: Go into your foxhole.

Mr. ROWE: Nobody should know better than you.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has stated what he says is a point of order. I do not agree that it is a point of order. I repeat what I have already read:

If a member desires to ask a question during debate, he should first obtain the consent of the member who is speaking. If the latter ignores the request, the former cannot insist, even if he thinks he is being misrepresented. He cannot make a denial during the speech, but he must wait until the member has resumed his seat and then he may ask leave to make a statement, or he must wait until his turn comes, to address the house.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): May I say another word, Mr. Speaker? This is not a question of—

Mr. STIRLING: Order. Mr. Speaker is on his feet. Have you any manners?

Mr. ROWE: Out of order again!

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish the house would come to order. This is a serious matter. The hon. member stated that he rose on a question of privilege. I have not noticed, nor do I recognize that it was a question of privilege he was raising.

Mr. ROWE: Nobody thought so but himself.

Mr. SPEAKER: He has a right to make a correction in the manner I have stated. When the hon. member who is speaking resumes his seat, he may then ask leave to make a statement, or he must wait until his turn comes, to address the house.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): May I say another word?

Mr. SPEAKER: No. I have given my ruling.

Mr. ROWE: You are through.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for York East (Mr. McGregor) may continue his speech.

Mr. McGREGOR: I regret to have raised the temper of my hon. friend, but I just wish to clear up this point as to whether I was right or wrong. The hon. member for Halton said that that was the cost price of the boat. What I did say was that the cost price of that boat was, on the coast, $1,825,000.

Mr. CLEAVER: You said, the contract price.

Mr. McGREGOR: And I said that the contract price of the boats being built on the coast by the Burrard Dry Dock Company was four hundred thousand odd dollars.

Mr. GOLDING: No, a million.

Mr. McGREGOR: After giving them a fee of $50,000 on each boat. Then the difference on the boat was—I have it some place here—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. McGREGOR: The difference was $574,000 on a boat. That is what I said. That is right, and I will defy the hon. gentleman to contradict it.

Mr. CLEAVER: I am prepared and will be pleased to contradict it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CLEAVER: The hon. member, I submit in all charity, is hopelessly confused.

Mr. HOMUTH: We do not want any of your charity.

Mr. CLEAVER: There are two things involved in this report, and my hon. friend has simply confused them.

Mr. GRAYDON: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Surely the hon. member has no right to make a speech.

Mr. CLEAVER: I was asked to, and I will make it very short.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): The hon. member was not asked to.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for York East (Mr. McGregor) who has just spoken made a statement and challenged the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Cleaver) to contradict his statement.

Mr. CLEAVER: There are two factors. One is the contract price at which these ships were to be built, and the contract price on the west coast was fixed at some $1,800,000, and on the east coast at a little lower amount.

Mr. GRAYDON: You are just as confused as he is. You do not know the figures either.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Abide your answers.

Mr. CLEAVER: What has confused my hon. friend is this, that in the report the committee has indicated the actual cost to two shipbuilding firms of building these ships. The cost to one firm was $1,399,000. That firm made a very substantial profit, more than it should have made. The cost to the other firm, as mentioned in the report, was $1,969,000, and that firm made a loss. That is all there is to it.

Mr. McGREGOR: Of all the arguments that have ever been put forward in this house that is the stupidest. It is all right for the chairman of the committee to try to draw a red herring across the trail, but he is not going to get away with it. I spent a couple of months on this boat-building business. I want the hon. gentleman to understand that I know as much about these boats, or a little more than he does, and I still say that the difference between the high and low is $624,000. I defy him to contradict me, and he can get up on his feet again if he likes.

Mr. CLEAVER: Mr. Speaker, I have tried my best to explain to my hon. friend so that he will understand it.

Mr. ROWE: You do not understand it yourself.

Mr. CLEAVER: Perhaps I ought to read to him paragraph 2 of the committee's report. It will be found on page 773, of *Votes and Proceedings* of January 26, 1944:

> The most nearly comparable costs your committee could get were those for a ship delivered in July/August 1942 from each of eight yards and these costs ran from a low of $1,399,000 to a high of $1,969,000.

That is not the contract price; that is the actual cost of the company building the ship. The second company, where the cost was $1,969,000, made a loss. It was higher than the contract price.

Mr. McGREGOR: Are you reading from page 773?

Mr. CLEAVER: Yes.

Mr. McGREGOR: Well, now, I shall read from page 773. The $1,422,000 is the low. If the hon. gentleman will look at the paragraph above the one he is reading he will find the following:

> . . . going all the way from $1,422,000 to $2,046,000 for the 10,350-ton ship. . . .

I come back again to the difference of $624,000 and, as I said before, give the people who built the boat a profit of $50,000 and the boat is still $574,000 too high. The hon. member had better sit down for a little while because I think his blood pressure is up a little. There is more than that to the matter. That is not the full cost of the boat. There is no depreciation in that. There are yards in this country building boats in which there should be $135,000 to $140,000 depreciation added to the cost of the boats. Then they tell you they are building boats at a reasonable price. I say there are some yards in this country that deserve credit for the work they have done, but no credit has been given to them. I think we should just go over the list now and tell the people and the hon. members of this house those who are building the boats at a reasonable price and those who are not.

Mr. CLEAVER: I object.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are the boats the hon. member is referring to contained in the report that is now before the house?

Mr. McGREGOR: I am afraid they are not, Mr. Speaker. We shall continue with something that is contained in the report. The report states that this committee went into costs comparable with those of the United States and Great Britain.

Mr. CLEAVER: Page, please?

Mr. ROWE: You do not need the page; read it to-morrow.

Mr. McGREGOR: It speaks of an agreement made and the price agreed on by the British government. That was, as I said before, $1,760,000 on the St. Lawrence and $1,825,000 on the coast. It was said that the cost in Britain was $1,100,000. As a matter of fact the Trueman report says the cost in Britain was $800,000.

Mr. CLEAVER: Mr. Speaker, I understood your ruling was that the hon. member must confine his remarks within the four corners of the report, must confine himself to figures given in the report. I understand he is now quoting from some British figures.

Mr. ROWE: You made the same speech twice. Do not interrupt him again.

Mr. McGREGOR: I do not suppose we are going to get very many ships built to-night, and I shall not be able to quote any evidence. I wish to say to the house that shipbuilding in most of the privately owned yards is a credit to this country. But I say further that in regard to any yard that the government have anything to do with, in regard to any yard that the government control, I cannot

find words to express myself; therefore, I will say it is bad, and they know it. In spite of that they draw a red herring across the trail. They say they do not want to table the report on the aluminum company. It is not the aluminum company. They know what it is; it is the shipbuilding company's report that they do not want to table. They know they dare not do it. I ask the house to investigate the Toronto Shipbuilding company. I ask the house to investigate Marine Industries. This company got a contract that was supposed to be for $1,760,000. In spite of the fact they say that the agreement was made between the British government and the Canadian company and that the price would be so much on the St. Lawrence and so much here, the price on the St. Lawrence was let to this particular firm for $60,000 more per boat than the price set by the government.

Mr. CLEAVER: Page?

Mr. McGREGOR: Let them investigate Burrard's. Burrard's have done wonderful work. At the start of the war the government laid down a policy—and I think a resolution was passed in the house—that no firm could make more than five per cent. Let them check into that. Let them tell the people that Burrard's made a profit of thirty-seven per cent on one batch of boats and twenty-three per cent profit on another. Let them tell the people something about the Yarrow's contract. We know it.

Mr. CLEAVER: Your Honour, once again the hon. member is deliberately transgressing your ruling. I do not want to weary the house by constantly objecting. He knows better than that.

Mr. McGREGOR: It must be worrying you.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): The government must be proud of it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member said that he would discuss only what was in the report, not the evidence. I do not find in the report any reference to what he is now stating.

Mr. CLEAVER: There is not any such evidence.

Mr. HOMUTH: Why worry about whether he is referring to evidence?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman may continue, but he must deal, as he said, with what is contained in the report.

[Mr. McGregor.]

Mr. McGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, I have been called to order again. I do not see anything fair in this thing at all. The hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Chevrier) spoke yesterday for forty minutes and, as I said yesterday, I venture to say that ninety per cent of the speech he made was taken from the evidence; yet I cannot say anything about the evidence. Probably I can say something about what I know. Everybody knows that they are building boats at the Yarrow yards in British Columbia. I should like the chairman of the committee to explain the contract with the Yarrow yard. I should like the chairman of the committee to explain the contract for the building of 4,700-ton boats in the Foundation Maritime Limited yard at Pictou.

Mr. CLEAVER: The hon. member has asked me to explain—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

Mr. ROWE: He did not ask you to do it right now. You have just made one speech.

Mr. CLEAVER: Does the hon. gentleman want the explanation now or not?

Mr. ROWE: Sit down until he is through.

Mr. McGREGOR: We know the hon. gentleman is probably heading for the senate if he makes good on this job and we congratulate him if he does. However, let us take the Yarrow yard where there was a contract for $1,280,000, and they were not supposed to get a fee on that unless they earned it by quick delivery and lower costs. Well, in spite of the fact that the contract is for $1,280,000, the first boat they built cost $1,600,000 and the next one cost $1,700,000.

Mr. HOWE: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Where did he get those figures?

Mr. McGREGOR: From documents from the minister's own department.

Mr. HOWE: Presented through—

Mr. McGREGOR: If the minister wants to see them I will show them.

Mr. HOWE: Presented from what source?

Mr. McGREGOR: From your genial friend Mr. Geoffrion.

Mr. HOWE: Appearing before the committee?

Mr. McGREGOR: Trying to catch me again?

Mr. HOWE: I just asked you a question. Suppose you tell me. I ask you this question: how did you get that? From the committee?

Mr. McGREGOR: I am making the speech.

Mr. HOWE: I ask you a question.

Mr. McGREGOR: You sit down and I will answer the question.

Mr. HOWE: I suggest that my hon. friend is using confidential figures given the committee sitting in camera.

Mr. McGREGOR: I should like to know, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. CLEAVER: I want a ruling on the question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

Mr. CLEAVER: That is all right; you will not make me sit down. The hon. member is using figures which for security reasons should not be disclosed.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. ROWE: Security for what—the Liberal party?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Tory tactics!

Mr. CLEAVER: On several occasions I have raised the same point. The hon. member, Mr. Speaker, deliberately violates your ruling and I submit it has gone far enough.

Mr. ROWE: Beginning to hurt, is it?

Mr. CLEAVER: Not a bit.

Mr. ROWE: I think so, a little bit.

Mr. McGREGOR: We will leave the Yarrow yard, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. An hon. member has raised the point of order that the hon. gentleman who is now speaking is dealing with matters which are not contained in the report. We are confined to the report and everything that the hon. member says must be within the four corners of the report. When he is dealing with figures regarding other matters I wish he would give me the quotation showing where, in the report, the matter which he is discussing is dealt with.

Mr. McGREGOR: I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, if all the speeches that have been made in this house yesterday and to-day are within the four corners of the report, because—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. gentleman yesterday was proposing to speak along the lines he is now discussing and I told him then that he could speak only to the amendment, and that he would have more latitude when the motion came before the house. I also indicated, however, that when the motion came before the house all that could be dealt with was what was contained in the report. The hon. gentleman recognized that at the beginning in that he indicated that he would refer only to matters within the report and not to the evidence. Apparently he is now referring to matters outside the report and from documents which are not a part of the report. I will therefore ask him, when referring to matters in the report, to give me the quotation, citing the page from which he is quoting.

Mr. McGREGOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But as I understood yesterday, the Speaker said that we would have much more latitude if we spoke at this time than on the other motion. Be that as it may, I suppose we can speak of things about which we know, whether they are in the report or not. I wonder, would the house like to have the story about the 4,700-ton boats built in Pictou and a comparison with those built in the Davies yard. I say that this is a real scandal, to have a 4,700-ton boat in one yard costing more than a 10,350-ton boat in another yard, just because one yard is operated by the government and another by a private concern.

I will say a word or two about destroyers as mentioned in the report and then I am through. It states in the report that we are building four destroyers in this country. I should like the chairman of the committee to tell the members of this house the cost of destroyers in Canada, the cost of destroyers in Britain, when this contract was let, and when the first one will be delivered. I venture to say, sir, that unless this war lasts until 1950 the destroyers will not be delivered.

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I missed the greater part of the address given by my hon. friend, but I assume from the bit he gave yesterday and the bit I heard to-day that he has been comparing costs of ships in various yards. One remark that I heard him make to-day was that costs in government shipyards were very high and costs in private shipyards were reasonable. Let me tell him that the lowest-cost shipyard we have in Canada to-day is government owned and operated.

Mr. McGREGOR: Where?

Mr. HOWE: At Montreal, the United Shipyards.

Mr. McGREGOR: Will you let me tell the story on the government shipyards in Montreal?

Mr. HOWE: If my hon. friend will sit down I will continue. We are launching 10,000-ton ships from that yard at the lowest cost of any shipyard in Canada.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Is that in the report?

Mr. HOWE: Yesterday the hon. member was comparing the cost of ships from the Port Arthur shipbuilding yard and the cost of ships from the Toronto yard. He was rather complimentary to me, because I represent Port Arthur and he represents the constituency of Toronto—

Mr. McGREGOR: Oh, no.

An hon. MEMBER: Sit down.

Mr. McGREGOR: York East.

Mr. ROWE: You got him wrong.

Mr. HOWE: It is very close to Toronto. I believe the Port Arthur Shipbuilding company is a very efficient yard and I believe that the costs there are the lowest costs of ships which are built on the great lakes, of the type of corvettes and mine-sweepers. I believe that the labour in the Port Arthur district is as efficient as any labour that can be found in Canada. In fact, I know of no better labour anywhere, and I know the management of that yard is excellent. I agree with everything he said about the Port Arthur yard. But when he gets nearer home, I hardly think he does his subject justice. There are harsh words said about the bird that fouls its own nest, and I am afraid he has been coming very close to doing that. I will tell the house something about the Port Arthur Shipbuilding company. The Port Arthur Shipbuilding conmpany was organized in 1909. It has a dry dock; one of the most expensive, and certainly the best dry dock on the Canadian great lakes. It has a machine shop capable of building any engine that goes into the ships and corvettes that are built at that yard. It has one of the best boiler plants in Canada, and builds its own boilers. It has been building ships since 1909, and—

Mr. SPEAKER: I must point out to the minister that I have endeavoured, as far as I can, to see that the debate is carried on within the four corners of the report, so that extraneous statements will not have to be replied to by others.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): This is a reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the minister is making reference to the report, I would be glad to have him speak. But I must know that the matters are dealt with in the report, the matters about which he is now speaking.

Mr. HOWE: The report certainly compares the cost of ships in various shipyards. It speaks of the cost of ships at Pictou and the cost of ships at Toronto, and it certainly drew to the attention of my department matters of comparative shipbuilding costs which we have been trying to correct. I believe I am certainly within the terms of the report, and certainly in the speech by the hon. member which I heard yesterday he compared Port Arthur costs with Toronto costs. I am finishing up the analysis.

Mr. SPEAKER: If, as the minister informs me, these are matters within the report, then I accept it, and he may continue.

Mr. HOWE: They are definitely matters within the report.

I am simply saying that in Port Arthur we have a long-established shipyard with the very finest facilities. We have there men who have been building ships for a good many years, a nucleus of trained shipbuilders. I would expect that yard to do well. I am delighted that it is the best yard; but certainly it should be as good as the best, because it has better equipment than any other shipyard on the great lakes, and it has a personnel which I think is fully the equal of any other.

What is the situation at Toronto? In Toronto the yard was started on a bit of waterfront wholly undeveloped for shipbuilding purposes. Berths were built there and sheds were put up in which certain steel work could be fabricated. The equipment of that yard is not a patch to the shipyard at Port Arthur—no boiler-making facilities, no engine-making facilities, and only the crudest type of steel fabricating facilities. There were few trained shipbuilders in Toronto.

Mr. McGREGOR: On a question of privilege—

Mr. HOWE: Sit down, sit down.

Mr. McGREGOR: On a question of privilege.

Mr. HOWE: There is no question of privilege.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Order.

Mr. McGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, I made an attempt yesterday to explain the Toronto yard, and I was not allowed. If the minister has that privilege, then surely I have it.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): The minister is speaking to the motion; the hon. member was speaking to the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yesterday the hon. member was speaking to the amendment.

An hon. MEMBER: He does not know the difference.

Mr. HOWE: As I say, this Toronto shipyard was carved out of nothing, in the progress of this war, and the men were collected from anywhere. The number of trained shipbuilders in the Toronto yard one could count on the fingers of his two hands. It is natural, I believe, that the costs in the Toronto yard should be high. There has been no neglect on the part of the government. We have made two changes in the management of that yard, and each time for the better. We had the original contractor who bid for the ships, just as any other contractor bid for them, and was awarded the ships on the basis of being the low tenderer. He did not do well. Then we formed a crown company and put in charge of it seven of the leading businessmen of Toronto, men who I believed had the necessary business experience to carry out successfully a project of that kind. Still our costs did not come down satisfactorily, and we made another change in that management. We now have an experienced builder in charge of the yard, and I may say that the costs of the last ships are vastly better than the costs of the earlier ships. But let us admit that the costs in the Toronto shipyard are higher than the costs at Port Arthur or Collingwood or Kingston, all of which were organized yards, with a background of experience, and with some adequate equipment. What does my hon. friend wish me to do? Does he wish me to close the Toronto yard? The Toronto yard is doing the best it can. We are giving it all the support we can, to bring it in line with established yards. But let me say this—the Toronto yard has turned out a number of corvettes and mine-sweepers. Had it not been for the Toronto yard those ships would not have been afloat, and our navy would not have had them. Those are factors that we must consider. If we are to close every yard that cannot do as well as every other yard, then it means that the production of that yard cannot take part in the war.

If my hon. friend says there has been anything improper, or anyone trying to do other than his best in any yard, then he has a case against my department. But he has not suggested that. He just says the yard has not done well. But the yard has done the best it could; it has turned out a very considerable number of ships, and it has turned them out in a time of great crisis.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that as late as last February I was called to a meeting in Washington, when the problem of that day was how to get sufficient escort ships to check the submarine menace in the north Atlantic. That was one year ago to-day. I came back to Canada determined I would get the last possible ship out of our Canadian shipyards. I did not think a difference in price should be sufficient to stop my using every facility in the Dominion of Canada for that purpose.

The same situation occurs at Pictou. The Pictou yard is a high-cost yard. Why? Because it was started with no background, no trained workmen and only very limited facilities. Prior to the war there was at Pictou only a small repair yard. When the need for merchant ships became tremendously urgent those in the department who were responsible in the matter surveyed all the locations in Canada which seemed to be suitable for the expansion of our merchant-shipbuilding programme. They chose Pictou because it had a favourable location, and because there was a nucleus of trained men at that point.

The facilities were provided. We built four berths there. Here again may I say we had no dry dock and none of the facilities which surround old-established shipyards. We simply went on the beach at Pictou and scratched together four building berths. We have changed the management at Pictou because we felt the management there was not doing all it could to build the ships in the time required, with the reduction in costs that we could expect even from a yard that was using wholly untrained personnel. There again, what would my hon. friend have us do? Would he have me close Pictou because it is a high-cost yard?

Mr. McGREGOR: I never suggested that.

Mr. HOWE: It has turned out a type of ship vitally important at this time; and I can say to the house that within the last three weeks we have had most urgent cables for help in delivering 4,700-ton ships to Great Britain, urgently needed for operations within the next three or four months. Pictou has turned out practically all of the 4,700-ton ships which have been built. I think two or three were built on the St. Lawrence, two or three at Saint John, and the rest at Pictou. But we were able to supply a considerable number of 4,700-ton ships to meet those very urgent demands from the United Kingdom, and I am glad we were able to do so. I am willing to take the full responsibility for having ships built in a high-cost yard at a time when they could not be built in any other yard in Canada. We have had to build where we could; we used the facilities that were available. We

have had to move into second-grade facilities when first-grade facilities were not available. If there is any tapering off in the programme we shall be able to move from second-grade facilities into good facilities. That is what we will do in shipbuilding. As long as this urgent war-time demand continues I am going to build these ships anywhere I can, and pay whatever price I must.

My hon. friend has spoken of the condition when the committee's examination was made. That was at least six or seven months ago. I can tell him that the position has improved greatly since that examination was made. I invite the committee on war expenditures to return to the same shipyards it has criticized in its last report, and examine the situation anew. I know its members will be surprised at the improvements in cost that have been effected in these yards.

Mr. HOMUTH: Then the hon. member was right.

Mr. HOWE: What is my hon. friend suggesting now?

Mr. HOMUTH: I am saying the hon. member was right in the report of six months ago.

Mr. HOWE: Did I say that he was not right? Where did this argument start? It occurs to me to wonder what the people of Canada will think of this committee, which is supposed to safeguard the treasury in the expenditure of government moneys for war. My department is doing the same work as this committee. We have an investigation branch and we investigate anything that comes in, in the nature of a complaint or criticism. We even investigate anonymous letters. Several people are in gaol to-day because of the investigations that have been carried out by my department. We are investigating continuously. We have a staff not quite as large as the membership of the committee, but that staff is engaged continuously on investigations and have been for three years. I have expected a great deal of help from this committee, and it has been a help. The investigations of the committee have acted as a spur to our people toward making sure that the situation is in hand.

Let us examine this aluminum situation. The Canadian treasury is a buyer of fabricated aluminum. Less than one million dollars worth has been bought directly by the government, and indirectly through contractors about $40,000 worth of fabricated aluminum has been bought. My officers tell me that in 1941 the results to the aluminum company showed a net profit of 3·7 per cent on sales to the dominion government and its contractors, while in 1942 there was a substantial loss on the books of the aluminum company in carrying out these contracts. These contracts do not carry an escalator clause, and the increased costs of aluminum were for the account of the aluminum company and not for the account of my department. These are the only transactions affecting the Canadian treasury in the whole aluminum company picture.

What do we find? We find that this committee has investigated the question of cartels, the question of whether the aluminum company was a member of a cartel. Does that affect the Canadian treasury? We find that it has gone into the question of government ownership as against private ownership. Does that affect the Canadian treasury? I may say that subject was looked into very carefully before we made any decision in connection with the expansion of the aluminum company. We took account of the fact that part of the operations of the aluminum company were in British Guiana, that other operations were in Newfoundland and others in Canada. We also took account of the fact that when we entered the aluminum picture the British government had already made a great investment in this country, using its own capital.

We decided that it was not a situation calling for government ownership. We made that decision knowing all the facts, and it was a decision purely by the government. It is all very well for the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) to say that we should have built aluminum facilities as a public enterprise, but that was a decision for the government to make. Once that question is accepted, I think everything else falls into place naturally. In the matter of special depreciation, we did everything that had to be done in order to keep faith with other governments which wished to purchase aluminum in this country. Neither the British government nor the Australian government nor the United States government were able to buy aluminum from any source at a price lower than aluminum was bought by them in the Dominion of Canada. I think those members of the committee who heard the evidence will admit that at once.

I ask why the committee spent weeks of its time investigating aluminum when that fact was well known to them. Purchases by other governments were made by government agencies when those governments knew all the facts. Those governments believed they were being fairly dealt with by the aluminum company in this country. There were private transactions between a government agency in the United States and the Aluminum Company of Canada, and between an agency of the

British government and the Aluminum Company of Canada. The fact that in one or two transactions I happened to act as the agent for the British government has nothing to do with the Canadian treasury, because anything I did in that connection was done for the British treasury and not for account of the Canadian treasury.

It may have been necessary to go into the cost of ingot aluminum as a factor in the case of fabricated aluminum, although I think even that is rather far-fetched. The committee has obtained reams of evidence on the cost of ingot aluminum. I reiterate that the aluminum situation as it affected the Canadian government was a simple one. We bought about $45,000,000 worth of aluminum, not directly by the government but mainly through contractors, and the report of the committee states that, on balance over the whole transaction, the aluminum sold to the Canadian government by the aluminum company was sold at less than the cost of production. We have bought fabricated aluminum for our aeroplanes cheaper than any other government has been able to buy fabricated aluminum for its aeroplanes. I have ample evidence to support that statement.

I suggest for the future guidance of the committee that it accept the place intended for it, namely, that it act as an assistant to the treasury of the government of Canada in time of war, in an effort to make sure that improvident transactions are not entered into. My department will welcome any help we can get of that kind. We have in the past, and I can assure hon. members of the committee that we will in future take active steps to correct any situation that the committee may bring before us. If it can bring us an example of dishonesty I shall be the most delighted man in the world. Members of the committee can regard it as scoring off the government if they like, but I will regard it as a means of recapturing money that has been taken wrongly from the public treasury. I am looking for that sort of thing constantly myself and I shall be very glad to have the help of the committee in that direction. I welcome their investigations of comparative prices. Perhaps we may know of them, but if they are brought forward by a committee we shall take still more energetic steps to correct discrepancies. It does not seem to me that this should be treated as a game in which the effort must be to score against the government. Rather it is a question of getting behind the treasury and helping the Department of Munitions and Supply to save every last dollar that can be saved. I appeal to all hon. members to stop the type of debate we are having here to-night. This is no time for a contest between one party and another. The situation is that we have a committee, its members drawn from all parties in the house, faced with a common task and we hope working toward a common objective. If the committee will work in that spirit, I can assure its members that their work will be more effective, and that the work of my department will be more satisfactory to the people of Canada.

Mr. J. A. ROSS (Souris): Mr. Speaker, I have been ruled out of order at other times in trying to discuss the war expenditures committee, and I shall take only a few moments now.

First, I wish to express my disapproval of the manner in which the committee has sat in camera. The committee is composed of twenty-four members—eighteen government members and six for the opposition, all told. The committee has sat in camera, and a wrong impression has been created in that regard because the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) speaking yesterday, after citing the manner in which a similar committee sat in camera at Westminster, stated:

> There is always opportunity for hon. members to discuss matters before the public accounts committee if they have reason to believe that there are situations which should be discussed there.

All I have to say in reply to that is that on May 19 of last year the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) moved and I seconded a motion that the subject of the wartime information board be brought before the public accounts committee for investigation. A lengthy argument ensued in the house, led by the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Crerar), the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) and the chairman of the war expenditures committee, the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Cleaver), supported by the government, and the motion was voted down. They stated that the proper place to investigate that matter was before the war expenditures committee. That was the government's attitude at that time. That was over nine months ago. As I stated, the chairman of war expenditures committee argued that the matter should be investigated, if anywhere, before the war expenditures committee. Yet to my knowledge the matter has never been investigated before that committee.

There are many other matters to which I should like to refer, but since they are not mentioned in the report I might be ruled out of order. There was the purchase of

property at exorbitant prices. There has been wasteful and extravagant expenditure of the taxpayer's money in these years of war.

An hon. MEMBER: What do you recommend?

Another hon. MEMBER: How do you know?

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I have all the details of the purchase of Gimli airport in Manitoba. The statement was made here that the government paid an average of $72 an acre for that property.

Mr. GOLDING: That is not true.

Mr. HOWE: The hon. member is going back to 1941. What report is he referring to? Certainly not the 1943 report.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): An hon. member asked me how I knew that there had been extravagant expenditure.

Mr. GOLDING: The hon. member's statement a moment ago was not true.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I will prove before this session is over, if we complete the session, that it is still true. I will produce the evidence at the proper time. I say that there have been many other such matters which are not included in this report which we have never had an opportunity to investigate properly. The point I was trying to make clear was that the Prime Minister stated yesterday that we could discuss matters before the public accounts committee if we had reason to believe there were matters that should be discussed there, and I have already cited one example which occurred last year which the government refused to let us consider before the public accounts committee.

Mr. CLEAVER: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I take it that when a member misrepresents a report to this house it is distinctly the privilege of any member of the house to call Your Honour's attention to it. The hon. member has stated that the wartime information board was not referred to a subcommittee for investigation. I ask him to read the minutes of the committee of July 22, 1943, where he will find that the matter was referred to subcommittee No. 3 and on account of the length of the aluminum inquiry it simply was not reached. The members of that committee worked hard—

Mr. ROSS (Souris): That is exactly the statement I made, that it was not investigated by the war expenditures committee, and the chairman has just borne out my statement.

There is a statement in the report with respect to agricultural implements. I do not know how much time the committee spent in investigating this matter or how much it cost the taxpayers of this country, but I do know that the average farmer, at least in western Canada, knew the condition with respect to shortage of agricultural implements long before the committee investigated. We have known for some time that agriculture, despite a reduction of twenty-three per cent in labour, has increased agricultural production of this country by some forty-eight per cent. Only thirty-eight per cent of our Canadian farm machinery is produced in Canada, sixty per cent being used in the west and forty in the east. I wish that the committee had spent some of their time in investigating wasteful and extravagant expenditures of the taxpayers' money. If they had gone about that in proper fashion they might have brought about a very great saving to the taxpayers.

I am utterly opposed to sitting in camera, and the very fact that the committee sits in camera is a green signal to those people in this country—and I am sorry that we have them—who are looking for easy money from the public treasury to go ahead and get this easy money where it is possible to get it. If they knew that all these matters would be investigated in the open many of them would never attempt to get this easy money in the fashion in which they got it in the past. The Truman committee in the United States sits in the open, and I think that if we conducted our sittings in Canada in the open we could bring about a tremendous saving in war expenditures to the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Mr. Speaker, there is a question of privilege which I wish to raise. This afternoon while I was speaking regarding air observer schools in this dominion the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Cleaver), who throughout the day has been rising on all kinds of questions, made the statement that what I had stated was not in accordance with the facts and that all difficulties connected with the air observer schools and the very large profits which they had been receiving had been entirely settled in the summer of 1941. I had made the statement, Mr. Speaker, that the matter was not settled until May, 1942, when I brought the matter up in the house, and up until that time the only assistance I received from the hon. member for Halton was interference when I endeavoured to show in this house that these schools were receiving exorbitant profits. I now refer to the pages in question which establish that what I said was in accordance with the facts and that it was not until May, 1942, that this matter was brought before the house by myself.

I refer first to page 2357 of *Hansard* of May 12, 1942, where I pointed out the profits these companies were receiving. Then at page 2370 I went on to discuss the set-up of these companies, and I showed where certain parent companies were receiving from $12,000 to $15,000 from the companies that had contracts with the government. Then I referred this afternoon to the fact that while the Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Power), thought the statements that I was making were not in accordance with the facts, because he relied upon statements made by the hon. member for Halton which were subsequently established to be far from in accordance with the facts, the minister stated the following day, as reported in *Hansard* for the same year, at page 2391:

I owe an apology to the hon. member for Lake Centre for having to some extent doubted the statement which he made with respect to air observer operating companies having a parent company.

Then the matter was continued until the minister investigated it, and as I paid a tribute to him this afternoon I stated that he put an end to this condition of affairs that was wrong but was defended by the hon. member for Halton, who stated all too frequently while I was bringing the matter before the house that the profits to which I referred as exorbitant were non-existent. At page 2701 of *Hansard* of the same year there is a complete answer given by the Minister of National Defence for Air, setting out in detail, on pages 2701 to 2705, the profits that these various companies were receiving. It was not until after May 25, 1942, after I had brought the matter before the house, that finally the minister, recognizing in all fairness that the thing was wrong, put an end to it.

Mr. G. RUSSELL BOUCHER (Carleton): I did not at first contemplate entering this debate to-night, but, having heard the accusations of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Cleaver), the present chairman of the war expenditures committee, in connection with the partisanship of this whole expenditures committee, I feel that as a member of the 1943 war expenditures committee it would ill befit one to hold a seat and not rise on this occasion.

I think the debate so far has amply illustrated the confusion, the confounded confusion of the public of Canada and the members of the House of Commons over the whole existence of the war expenditures committee, when you have the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) start up to-night as he did in this house and ask the war expenditures committee what they were doing in this investigation, what a nuisance they were to him, and what trouble they were raising.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BOUCHER: I think the very words of the Minister of Munitions and Supply indicate clearly that the war expenditures committee has been functioning as an obnoxious organization for this parliament to have. And then, when we turn around and find that members of this house are being asked to vote concurrence in a report brought in by twenty-four members, eighteen or whom are on the government side and six on the opposition; when 245 members who cannot hear a word of the evidence, who cannot be told a thing about the evidence, who can be given a report and not given an ounce of material wherewith to judge the wisdom or the folly of the recommendations or the truth of the allegations set out are asked to put the seal of their approval, as elected representatives of the people in a democratic state, on a report of this kind, that is to deny the existence of democracy. I say that hon. members have been elected to the House of Commons to perform a function on behalf of the people who sent them there. If the members of the House of Commons are denied the privilege of looking into the expenditures in this great time of expenditures, this time of war, and to report to the House of Commons itself, simply because witnesses are called by the chairman of the committee and told it would be in camera; that is, because they were told it would be in camera the members of the house cannot be given the data, then there is something wrong with the supremacy of parliament. We are denied the privilege of acting and functioning as we should, as representatives of the people, according to a truly British-Canadian institutional procedure. To think that 245 members of the house, less twenty-four, cannot go into such matters as wartime housing, the manufacture of aluminum, and the building of the Gimli airport, and that such things must be kept secret for fear they should console the enemy; in other words, that we must vote blindly and ignorantly concurrence in the report, does not add up.

I say to the members of this house through you, Mr. Speaker, that when a member of parliament elected to represent not only his own constituency but Canada at large, cannot compare costs, cannot get evidence, whereas the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) and the parliamentary assistant to the minister (Mr. Chevrier) can rise in their places and give facts from the department which the members of the committee are denied the right to give, there is something wrong with democracy.

Mr. CHEVRIER: On a point of order, if the hon. member will read the remarks which I made yesterday he will find that everything contained therein is contained in the report and these are not statements which are not available to the committee.

Mr. BOUCHER: Last year I was privileged to sit as a member of the war expenditures committee, subcommittee No. 1. I do not hesitate to say that an industrious time was spent by all members of that subcommittee. Some sixty-nine sittings were held, some forty-seven witnesses heard, and many plants were visited. All the sittings were held in camera, even those dealing with housing for the people of Canada. The members could not even get a copy of the evidence which was taken, the day after it was taken, for their own perusal or to assist them in coming to their conclusions, except that they could go to the clerk of the committee's room, look at the report there, read it there, or return it within a short time. Members were served from the department of government and the corporations that were investigated with prepared briefs, handed to us members of the committee to read, and then picked up, after they told us what was in the brief, before we had a chance to read it. I say also that in most, though not all of the meetings of the subcommittee to which I belonged in 1943, representatives of the Department of Munitions and Supply, and at times, representatives from companies we were investigating sat in at our committee to tell witnesses what they could say and what they could not say; and on one or two occasions we had difficulty in proceeding with our investigation by virtue of the solicitor of one of the companies we were investigating objecting to witnesses answering questions.

Mr. CLEAVER: Mr. Speaker, just how long are we going to be subject to a breach of the rules of the house?

Mr. BOUCHER: We have had the hon. member for Halton attempting to make about fifty-two and one-half speeches this afternoon.

Mr. CLEAVER: This is a breach of the rules of the house, Your Honour.

Mr. BOUCHER: The hon. member does not want to hear the rest of it, but I should like to give him a little more, if he will kindly remain in his seat. I do not want any questions or any speeches or any interruptions from the hon. member for Halton.

Mr. CLEAVER: Am I not entitled to raise a point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Cleaver) has raised a point of order. The hon. member who is now speaking should confine his remarks to the report itself. That has been the contention all evening. I will ask the hon. member to abide by the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. BOUCHER: Perhaps I misunderstood the conditions under which we are discussing the motion, Mr. Speaker. As I understood it, the motion for concurrence in this report was introduced by the Prime Minister.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, it was not.

Mr. BOUCHER: It was introduced by the chairman of the committee. The Prime Minister stated that it would be followed by a motion to set up the war expenditures committee for another year, and that great latitude would be granted the house. In making my remarks to-night I am not stating anything that happened in the way of evidence in the committee of last year, because I was not a member of it. I am stating circumstances which by analogy, I should say, have a direct bearing upon whether or not we concur in this report. I do not feel that we can decide whether or not to concur in the report without the evidence on which it is based, without the facts upon which the reports were formulated and unless we know the nature of the sittings, the type of sittings that were held, and the investigations that were carried on. I say that is very apropos so far as the members of this committee are concerned when they are asked to concur in or reject the committee's report.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has made a statement. I think his remarks would be more appropriate when the resolution for the appointment of the committee is before the house. We shall then be dealing with the committee and his experience on it. At the moment we are dealing with the report, and all hon. members have been confined within the four walls of the report this evening. I should like to ask the hon. member to confine his remarks within the limits of that report.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say a word in regard to what Your Honour has just said? Perhaps at the same time I may be able to clear up a certain amount of confusion; that is, by way of explanation, not to enter into debate. From what my hon. friend has just said I gather he is assuming that the government proposes to insist on hon. members voting on this question of concurring in the report. Perhaps my hon. friend was not in the house this afternoon when the mover of the resolution (Mr. Cleaver) indicated that he was quite prepared to withdraw his motion once hon. members had concluded their discussion. The government does not intend to

insist upon having the resolution put to a vote. The purpose of this discussion—and now, Mr. Speaker, I refer more particularly to the remarks Your Honour has just made—has been not merely to discuss the report and the question of the approval of the report. There was an understanding that a certain latitude would be allowed to discuss war expenditure matters generally as the house would were its members discussing the appointment of the war expenditures committee. By allowing that latitude it is assumed that when this present discussion is concluded the motion constituting the committee will be voted upon without further discussion. For that reason it has, I believe, been generally and rightly assumed that a certain latitude would be allowed in debate in order that once the discussion on the present motion was concluded, we would be in a position to have the committee appointed in the quickest possible time, I hope this evening.

Mr. BOUCHER: I thank the Prime Minister for the words he has just spoken. I do not feel I should have to ask the government whether they intend at a future date to withdraw the motion now before the house in order to decide whether I should speak on it. The fact of the matter is that the motion is now before the house, and whether the Prime Minister sees fit to withdraw it or is willing to withdraw it matters not, until such time as he exercises his prerogative to withdraw it. Meanwhile, it is in debate. That being the case, may I proceed?

The members, as I said before, were dealing with matters of a very intricate nature, dealing with some things that undoubtedly would give assistance to the enemy if they were publicized. The main committee consisted of twenty-four members. It was divided into three subcommittees. I think the subcommittee on which I served had eight members. I had the privilege of recommending to the main committee that the members of the subcommittee be granted the assistance of cost accountants and counsel to help them carry on their investigations. In 1943 our subcommittee formulated certain reports which were brought before the house that year. I do not wish to read them in detail, but I should like to indicate to the members of the house that some pointed suggestions were made to the department and to this house, matters such as accelerated depreciation, shortage of accountants in the Department of Munitions and Supply, increasing costs, absenteeism, labour conditions and so on. All of these things require intensive research.

I do not think it is proper for a member of the subcommittee to say that when the committee has brought in a report its work is done. That is not true, until the work is thoroughly done. I ask the hon. members of this house to realize that there have been terrific expenditures made by this government for temporary buildings for private concerns as well as for public concerns. Many of these buildings are for war purposes only. When the war is over or a short time thereafter they must be disposed of. There are millions of Canadian dollars invested in them. The assets are there, and according to present arrangements they must be salvaged in some way before this war is over. Millions of dollars have been spent on private enterprise in the enlargement of plant and production facilities necessary for war production. This has all been paid for out of the taxpayer's money, put up by the government of Canada. That must be all salvaged in some way in post-war disposition of such assets. The question is whether it shall be returned to private industry or carried on as a government enterprise. I do not feel that information with regard to these matters should be denied members of parliament, when one considers that they have been entrusted by their constituents with the job of looking after their interests in the parliament of Canada. I do not feel we can shirk our responsibility by saying we can sit in camera. The hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Slaght) this afternoon agreed with the definition of "in camera" as laid down by the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker). The hon. member for Lake Centre said that "in camera" meant leaving the membership of the committee the privilege to use their own judgment as to what evidence should be disclosed.

I see rank confusion in the minds of the hon. members of this House of Commons with regard to the functions of this committee. I think I am corroborated in that by the statement of the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe). When we consider that millions of dollars have been spent, investigations have been authorized and held by the members of this house in the war expenditures committee, and when we consider that the government has had protection in this committee by reason of the large number of government members on it, so amply illustrated this afternoon by the hon. member for Halton, the chairman of the committee, showing rabid partisanship, I say there is nothing to inspire confidence in the people of Canada in the war expenditures committee, and that it is time the government cleaned house and stepped in and looked upon the matter as a businessman would look upon a business proposition.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): Mr. Speaker, before the question is put I wish to

make one or two slight observations. We seem to be in the same embarrassing position now as we were in when the debate started yesterday afternoon, the position of having to vote upon a report based upon evidence which we have not been able to peruse. This would be quite all right if the report had been a unanimous report; but it was not a unanimous report. There was one hon. member who dissented. His dissension was in the form of a speech, and it is tantamount to a minority report in substantiation of charges which he made last year. I do believe that the government should, if possible, provide some way or another by which the charges that were made by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar can once again be reviewed. The position that we are in is simply this. We have to satisfy our own minds in voting on this question. I should like to vote concurrence in the report because, when we set up a committee to undertake a work of this kind, to investigate war expenditures, I like to have confidence in that committee. Evidently all the groups in this house except one have been more or less satisfied with the report, apart from one or two things brought out in the debate. As I say, I should like to vote concurrence, but I must confess that I cannot see in the process of the present debate that the charges of the member for Rosetown-Biggar have been entirely and satisfactorily refuted. On more than one occasion he has made the statement that the report is a whitewash. That was brought out, when the report was first submitted, by going into the press, and it was said two or three times when he spoke yesterday. He is perfectly convinced, it seems, that the report is a whitewash. What I have to satisfy myself of is whether the report is in fact a whitewash or whether his charges are eyewash. It must be one or the other, and I cannot entirely satisfy myself on this matter.

Here is another thing I want to say, and in saying it I do not want the member for Rosetown-Biggar to carry away any inference from my remarks. I do not direct this to him; I am speaking of the matter in general. The position we are placed in is this—and perhaps I should not refer to the hon. member in this connection. I am doing so only by way of illustration. He could go out and say that his charges were not refuted and he could say that the government refused to produce the evidence because they were afraid to do so. He could say that he urged the production of the evidence. Furthermore, speaking in general terms now and not referring to him, a member could take the position that he urged the production of the evidence, as a sort of bluff to hide behind, knowing very well that the evidence would not be produced.

I have been told that the evidence submitted on behalf of my hon. friend fell completely flat. I am not prepared to accept that on the basis of his speech of yesterday, and yet what can I do? I cannot do anything in the matter for the reason that I have not access to the evidence; and so long as I have not access to the evidence I am afraid I shall have to vote against concurrence, much as I should like to vote concurrence. I urge upon the government, if at all possible, in order to allay any suspicion, that the charges made by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar should be refuted in some way or another, and that can be done perhaps by having the matter reviewed again by the war expenditures committee that is to be set up for this session. I do urge something of that kind. I believe it would be protection for them besides having all the cards laid on the table in order that all members might be satisfied.

Mr. VINCENT DUPUIS (Chambly-Rouville): Even at this late hour of the debate, since I was a member of the subcommittee of the war expenditures committee I think I would not be doing my duty if I kept silent and did not give the reasons why I am in favour of the motion, because in normal times I am so absorbed in the spirit of freedom that I would not allow anything to be hidden not only from this House of Commons but from the public in general.

The spirit of liberty, as we all know, is so strongly entrenched in our minds that we consider it as an inalienable right. As a matter of fact, we can trace the origin of our mentality on freedom as far back as the sources of our culture. But we are engaged in a struggle against the most dreadful enemy of all times; and if on the one hand it is repugnant to our love of freedom to follow his despotic attitude, on the other hand, should we not at least refuse to give him unwittingly all the information which he no doubt is so anxious to get from us?

This should not be an occasion where opportunists should try to derive political benefits out of such decisive questions. The lives of our sons and our national security as well are at stake; nay, the civilization of the world is more than ever in the scale. The result of this gigantic upheaval depends not only upon the success of our armed forces but upon victory, and especially upon the fruits of victory. A peace based on Christian principles will be

obtained by our common effort, by the collective sacrifices of our personal interests, and by the obliteration for the time being of our political ambitions.

For fifteen years I have had the advantage of following the deliberations of this house. It has enabled me to get acquainted with most hon. members, irrespective of political affiliations, and it is indeed a great pleasure for me to say that I do not know of anyone who would not in the bottom of his heart be ready to help his neighbour. I do not know of anyone whose nature would be so low as voluntarily to hurt even an opponent in such a way as to do him personal harm. I am convinced that everyone of us is anxious to do his share according to the means given him by Providence, to foster the great future which is the destiny of our own country. In fact I know of many of the people's representatives, irrespective of race or religion, who for many years have sacrificed their personal ambitions and legitimate family interests for the public weal. More than that, I am in duty bound to declare, in justice to many of my colleagues, that I know of not a few who are so imbued with Christian principles that these words of the poet might rightly be applied to them:

> He doeth well, who doeth good
> To those of his own brotherhood;
> He doeth better who doth bless
> The stranger in his wretchedness;
> Yet best, oh, best of all, doth he
> Who helps a fallen enemy.

It is true that sometimes we witness in this house exhibitions by word of mouth which are foreign to the lofty sentiments of the soul. Generally, however, these expressions are uttered in the course of a hot debate, and I am sure that if we could look within the conscience of the one who did it, we would soon discover that he is the first to regret his action. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I can say without fear of contradiction that each and every one of us is big enough in these critical circumstances to put on the altar of his country his personal ambitions, his legitimate pride and his political advantages for the sake of the national exigencies of the hour.

If I dare speak for the party to which I belong, at any rate if I can speak for myself, I may tell you, sir, that the publicity of the deliberations of the war expenditures committee would undoubtedly turn to the advantage of the Liberal party. I contend that the publicity of the report would show that, notwithstanding the strenuous, not to say the laborious effort of some of our opponents to discover scandal, they absolutely failed to do so. Far from my mind is the intention of proving that everything was perfect. After all, those who are engaged in war production are only human beings; as a matter of fact, most of them were lacking in experience in the production of war implements. In some industries, it took more time to acquire the proper skill, and so the cost of production was higher. But in no case is there to be found any wilful intention to defraud the crown.

As a further argument I should like to remind hon. members of this important fact, that when the motion was put before the house to institute the war expenditures committee, it was agreed by a large majority, if not unanimously, and after a long debate, that the deliberations of this committee would be in camera. So that if according to the rules of our democratic system the committee was constituted with that very condition of secrecy, how can we go back on our decision and ask, now that it is done, to demolish what we have so cautiously built? We would not be fair with ourselves. We cannot logically change our minds. Among the many reasons given by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) in his speech last night, as to why the deliberations of this war expenditures committee should be kept in camera, the most conspicuous one is that we should not give comfort to the enemy. If it is permissible for me to express my opinion concerning our conduct in the house about this question of secrecy since the outbreak of the war, I would tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I have always been astounded by the imprudent manner with which all sorts of details have been freely given about our war effort.

Listening to the innumerable questions and answers about this subject, I very often fancy what would happen if Adolf Hitler had been allowed to sit within the precincts of the house, and the following question had been put to him: "Which would be the most agreeable to you, that the details of our war effort be rendered public, that the deliberations of our committees dealing with our war production be handed to you, or that all this information be kept under cover and the deliberations of our committee dealt with in camera?" Where is the hon. member in this house who has not already the answer in his mind? Where is he who would not say, for Hitler, "Most decidedly, please give me these details." Surely at this psychological time, when Hitler is confronted with ultimate defeat, if he could speak to his secret agents who, no doubt, are still to be found in our midst, surely he would tell them, "Do the utmost to obtain from the House of Commons of

Canada any details about their endeavours, so that even in my desperate situation I may do my best to overcome their deadly production."

In conclusion, may I be permitted to entreat each and every hon. member in this house, imbued as we all are with the spirit of patriotism, to examine the present state of our war aims, to put aside our political quarrels and to show that we are big enough to take a wise decision, even if we are bound to give the benefit of the doubt to the present administration, and to decide once and for all until the ultimate victory that no detail, no matter how small it may appear to us, be rendered public, lest, through unknown and mysterious channels, such information might contribute to help our enemies.

At any rate, speaking for myself, if my attitude, if the humble share I have taken in our war effort, if the very imperfect contribution I have taken in this debate could have the result of saving the life of one of our soldiers or even of protecting him against the slightest wound, I should consider this as the greatest gift granted me by Providence in reward for the whole of my public life.

Mr. NORMAN J. M. LOCKHART (Lincoln): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to delay the house for more than a few minutes.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LOCKHART: I will speak for forty minutes if I hear many interruptions like that. This is a serious matter. Like the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell), after sitting in the house for the last day or so and listening to the discussion I have to ask myself many questions.

We are being asked now to approve a resolution for concurrence in the report. One might take back to his constituency the report of the committee, and might pin to it *Hansard* for yesterday and today. He might lay all that before the people, who are interested to know what is being done with public moneys. We hear arguments presented pro and con, trying to convince the house that, vague though it is, the report should be passed, and almost at the same time we hear members who sit on each side of me, members in different parts of the house, who distinctly make the bold statement that the report is not based upon the evidence disclosed before the committee. There is nothing left for one to do but oppose the motion for concurrence in this report. One must find a reason for taking that action. When the ayes and nays are called for on this motion, if they are called for, I propose to vote against it. As a member of the house who did not sit on this committee I intend to go back to my constituents, whoever they may be, and lay before them the evidence as I see it. I cannot reach any other conclusion than that I must agree with the hon. member for Macleod, that perhaps it has been a whitewash all the way through.

Ever since the housing investigation—I assume I cannot bring that in—I have been bitterly opposed to secret sittings except when there is the reservation which has been expressed in this house that the evidence would give comfort to the enemy. I do not intend to go into the details of this housing investigation, but that was one of the first exhibitions of this committee's work. When I consider the evidence given in the committee; when I consider the report and what little has been told the public; when I read the statements pro and con made by hon. members, my honest conviction is that it must have been a whitewash. Therefore I intend to vote against the motion.

I intend to show my people exactly how members of this house have spoken. I am strongly of the opinion that when they consider the words uttered, not only by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) but by other members of this house, the public of this country will not be too well pleased with the conduct of the war expenditures committee. I suggest to the Prime Minister that he had better have a house-cleaning in this committee or provide other conditions under which they are to work before he submits to them business which is of such utmost importance to the taxpayers of Canada. This committee is to investigate how money has been spent, and we must make sure that it does not come back with a report such as we have had. We who did not sit on the committee are being asked to vote concurrence, but I intend to vote against the motion for concurrence in the report.

Mr. P. C. BLACK (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take up very much time because I understand it is the wish of the house to dispose on this matter this evening. I have been a member of this committee since it was organized three years ago. While I have not agreed with all the decisions of the committee I have endeavoured to work with them and be of some service. The report being discussed to-night is a majority report. We were not allowed to submit a minority report, but I wish to say that I am not in agreement with all that is contained in the report. Matters which I think could have been

incorporated in the report have been excluded, but it is the report of the committee as a whole.

As I have stated in the house, in meetings of the main committee and of the subcommittee, I am opposed as a general rule to sitting in camera. Such sittings should be the exception. The members of that committee should be trusted to see that no information was made public which might prove detrimental to our war effort or bring comfort to the enemy. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lockhart) has referred to the investigation into wartime housing. When that matter was referred to the committee a year ago I took a definite stand that the meetings should be held in the open and that the evidence should be available to other members of the house and the public. I made a motion to that effect, but I was overruled. The choice then rested with me of deciding whether I would continue to sit on the committee or whether I would retire and I decided that I would sit in with the committee and serve the best I could.

The same might be said with regard to the inquiry into cargo shipbuilding. There was hardly a bit of evidence which came before the committee in connection with this subject which could not have been made available to the members of the house and the people of Canada, the taxpayers. They certainly paid a high price in some of the yards compared with what was paid in other yards. It may have been that certain matters in connection with the cargo ship investigation should have been withheld, but again I say that the members of the committee should have been trusted to see that no evidence was divulged to the public which should not be divulged.

I was not a member of the subcommittee which carried out the aluminum inquiry, but from the information submitted to the house by the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (Mr. Coldwell), by the hon. member for Rosedale (Mr. Jackman) and other members of that committee, I cannot see that any information disclosed before that committee could not be made available to this house and the public. If there were contracts or undertakings which the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) had entered into with other governments and which he wished withheld, there was not a single member of that committee who would not have approved his request. I think it is in the interest of the minister, of the government and of the people of Canada that all the information with respect to the aluminum industry should be made available. At least it should be made available to hon. members of this house, even if in a secret sitting. They are entitled to full information in connection with these large expenditures.

I was a member of subcommittee No. 1 last year which inquired into naval and cargo shipbuilding. I am ready to admit that there were certain matters with respect to naval shipbuilding which should be withheld from the public, but I would like every hon. member to have the same information with respect to that matter that I had myself. Most of the information, even in connection with naval shipbuilding, could have been made available to members of the house and the public.

I was surprised when the Minister of Munitions and Supply refused to support a motion submitted by the hon. member for Peterborough West (Mr. Fraser) asking for comparative prices on the 10,350-ton ships and 4,700-ton ships as between private yards and government yards. I think the house is entitled to that information. If the costs are higher in some yards an explanation should be given, as the minister did to-night. I am disappointed that the minister did not agree to that motion.

The chairman of the committee, the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Cleaver), has made the statement which appeared in the report of our committee, although I did not favour having it put in, that there was a saving of from thirty to forty million dollars through the reduction in prices paid for cargo ships. I do not think that is a fair statement. Contracts for the first cargo ships were at a very high price placed with inexperienced yards. I go farther and say that if the lower costs due to greater competency and efficiency in private yards were compared with that in government-operated yards, even after the stated reduction of from thirty to forty million dollars, there would be a real and additional saving of from thirty to forty million dollars by having the cargo ships built in private yards.

Information has been submitted on behalf of the war expenditures committee—and this also is contained in the report—regarding the cost of the 10,350-ton ships. The average cost was given at $1,632,000. The cost of the first six ships built in private yards was $210,000 below this average price I have just mentioned. The private yards did excellent work and credit must go to the workmen and the management.

I wish also to pay my respects and express my appreciation to H. R. MacMillan, who was president of Wartime Shipbuilding and to his

assistant, Mr. C. F. Dewar, now president of the crown company. I believe on the whole they have done a good job.

Our committee carried on under the greatest handicaps. Very few of us were lawyers. Some hon. members keep repeating that members of the opposition were looking for scandals and that we did not find any. The hon. member for Chambly-Rouville (Mr. Dupuis) has just made such a statement. So far as my colleagues and I were concerned, we had no such thoughts. All we were concerned about was to get information and point out where savings could be made and greater efficiency obtained. As I said, we were handicapped in our investigations. We were without a solicitor, without an accountant, and with no secretariat to assist the members of the committee in assembling evidence. The witnesses who came before our committee were usually supported by outstanding counsel representing the Department of Munitons and Supply. We had not been in session for ten months when we started the 1943 sessions, and we have not been in session now for the purpose of taking evidence for about three months. We did the best we could, but we were able to touch only the mere fringe of war expenditures. If the members and public expect that we were checking up on all war expenditures in order to safeguard the country's interests, any claim of the kind is merely to beguile the public, for no complete study could be made of any single branch of war expenditure.

Our committee, No. 1, was assigned certain specific lines of investigation. We investigated naval and cargo shipbuilding and spent most of our time on that. We also had assigned to us "R.C.A.F. services and aircraft production"; "contracts with civilian flying clubs, associations or companies"; "airport, aerodrome and air force buildings construction, specifications and designs for such projects, and inspection thereof during construction." We had only one day's evidence under all of these three heads. Mr. R. P. Bell, Director General of Aircraft Production, who I believe has done excellent work, appeared before us one day only and gave merely a general résumé. The appropriation for "air services" for the fiscal year 1943-44 totalled the enormous sum of $1,129,421,414. The responsibility of checking this huge expenditure of over $1,000,000,000 was assigned to our committee, and we had only one day's hearing to deal with this huge expenditure. For the next fiscal year, 1944-45, the appropriation for air services is the enormous sum of $1,090,000,000. We have a responsibility to this house and to the public to investigate this to see that there is reasonable efficiency and no waste in its expenditure, but as I say we were barely able to touch on this huge expenditure of over one billion dollars for last year for air services. I say again that if the public or the members of this house think we are safeguarding their interests, to suggest it is simply beguiling the public, for no matter how determined we might be, we simply were not capable of making the investigation in the time at our disposal.

I wish to point out some other things. At a meeting of the general committee on war expenditures on October 14, I made the following suggestion, as reported by the committee to the house:

> Mr. Black suggested that the disposition of war products and the allocation of the billion dollar mutual aid appropriation be inquired into by the committee.
>
> In order to proceed with the subcommittee meetings called for htis day, the chairman suggested that the committee meet again tomorrow to consider the question raised by Mr. Black and any other matters to be brought before the committee.

On the following day it was reported as follows:

> . . . it was agreed that subcommittee No. 2 had the power under the terms of its reference dated July 22, to inquire into the disposition of war products. The question of inquiring into the allocation of the billion dollar mutual aid appropriation was referred to the agenda subcommittee.
>
> Mr. McGregor submitted that the committee should inquire into the salvage of government-owned construction equipment not in use. This was also referred to the agenda subcommittee.

Again I say it is my opinion that the war expenditures committee, having the responsibility of checking the expenditure of one billion dollars for mutual aid, should at least have examined into it, but we were not permitted or were not able to do so. In any event, no information under this heading was placed before us, and yet it was one of the major expenditures.

Tremendous quantities of war materials were being piled up along railway sidings and in storage, but no inquiry was made into their disposition or to ascertain whether any economies could be effected. Yet that was the responsibility assigned to this committee. Again I say we were unable to do it, and if the members of this house or the public think we did it, I say that they are just being beguiled.

In our 1943 report submitted to this house on January 27, 1943, this is one of the recommendations that was made:

> That as soon as company financial statements are available for the year 1942 a special study should be made of profits, accelerated

depreciation and corporate taxation. The question of excess profits and accelerated depreciation has caused the subcommittee considerable concern.

That is a recommendation to the house and to our committee, I presume, that we should look into accelerated depreciation. We had some evidence of accelerated depreciation. I think there must be accelerated depreciation, but I feel that this committee should have this information placed before it. We had references by some of the witnesses to certain of the shipbuilding companies. Notwithstanding that I asked for this information and other members of the committee wanted it, it was never placed before us, although it was recommended the previous year that it should be inquired into. Again I point out the futility of this house or the public expecting our committee to discharge all that was expected of us.

We inquired to a limited extent into taxation on workers in shipyards. Dissatisfaction with respect to taxation on the "cost of living bonus," excessive taxation on overtime and full time, and no receipt when deductions were made of refundable taxation, were the main causes of absenteeism. We made some recommendations with respect to that in our report now before this house. I think that is a very important matter, to keep up the morale of our workers not only in shipbuilding yards but in mining industries and wherever war work and other work are being carried on. That situation has not been satisfactory, and we were not able to go into that to the extent that we should have liked.

I should say a word with respect to the programme of building the 4,700-ton Gray type ships. As the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) pointed out, there is great necessity for a larger number of ships of this type, ships drawing 20 ft. 10½ inches of water, fully loaded. While the larger, 10,350-ton ships have a twenty-seven foot draught and can use only the larger national ports and the St. Lawrence, the 4,700-ton Gray type ships can use the outports, many of which are in the maritime provinces.

I am pleased to learn to-night from the minister that the programme of producing a larger number of these ships is being proceeded with.

Our report submitted to the house with respect to the 4,700-ton ships is as follows:

> There is also variation in prices of the 4,700-ton ships from a low of $1,063,000 to a high of $1,854,693. In the yard, however, where the highest price obtained it was found this was the price of the first ship and the actual price of its eighth ship was $1,422,440 with an estimated price in the same yard of $1,235,279 for the tenth ship. The attention of your committee was arrested by the higher cost prevailing at Pictou, Nova Scotia, for the 4,700-tonners and made strong representations in that regard and during the course of our inquiry we were pleased to note that the cost had been reduced. The costs given above do not include capital expenditures or special depreciation.

We found there was a spread of eighty per cent in the cost of building this one type of ship in different yards. That information was placed before the house to-night by the hon. member for York East (Mr. McGregor), and as I interpret the remarks of the Minister of Munitions and Supply, the hon. member was severely criticized because he pointed out the excessive costs in the government yard at Pictou. If there is a spread of $800,000 in the cost of a ship that in private yard costs $1,063,000; if this committee is going to be of any service to the taxpayers of this country why should we not point that out? Why should we not have misgivings with respect to that?

But that does not tell the whole story. There was a capital expenditure at Pictou—I do not know whether I am permitted to give these figures, but I will give them only in round figures—of nearly $3,000,000. There was an expenditure on building a wharf there, the contract being, I think, for $156,000. I do not get those figures through our committee's report, but from other sources. That contract was awarded to the Fundy Construction Company. When the money was pretty well expended the wharf slid into the harbour; the contractors were paid off, and the work was completed on a cost-plus basis at an estimated cost, I believe, of $383,000 at the time of our investigation, although less than that sum has been expended. That is all added to the cost of building ships in these government yards. Again I say, if the members of our committee are going to consider seriously our responsibility, why should we not give attention to these terrific costs in government yards such as the one at Pictou?

I might also refer to the information which came before us at the Montreal government yard. The costs there were staggering in comparison with the cost in some private yards; and I say it was our simple duty to make recommendations with respect to these excessive costs. We endeavoured to do so, and I believe that the representations we made, and indeed the mere fact that we were making these inquiries, induced the government, the minister, and those who were responsible in these yards to give better value, better service, better efficiency, so that our inquiries resulted to a very considerable extent in a reduction of the cost in these government yards.

The hon. member for York East gave certain figures to-night with respect to the cost of

naval ships in Toronto in comparison with the cost in other yards. I believe that the figures are set out in our report, otherwise I would not mention this. The cost in the Toronto yard, as I remember, was almost half a million dollars, nearly fifty per cent higher than the cost in other yards. If we are going to function at all, why should we not take those figures seriously, and have some apprehension as to these excessive costs in what was a government yard, in comparison with other private yards?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will not follow this any further. There is much more that I might say. As I remarked earlier, I was reluctant to go on this committee. I disapproved the procedure of having most of the inquiries in camera. I was outvoted; I subscribed to the wishes of the majority of the committee. I endeavoured to work with them as individuals; I endeavoured to be of service to the committee and to the taxpayers. I find that my name again appears on the list of members of the committee which is to be set up by this house when this debate is over. I am not anxious, as I said, to go on the committee; I should like to be relieved. On the other hand, if the membership of this house feels that I can be of service, I believe it is my duty to place myself at the disposal of the committee and I will again endeavour to work with my associates. But again I make an appeal through you, Mr. Speaker, to the government and members of this house that investigations of matters which are not injurious to the war interests of this country and our allies, and which cannot be of comfort to the enemy, be held in the open and not in camera, not in secret, because the members of this house and the taxpayers of this country should have the benefit of the information which is placed before the committee.

Mr. GRAYDON: I rise to make one observation only, and that is to put our party on record. I understand that the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Cleaver) is about to withdraw his motion, as was arranged. In view of the fact that there will be no vote and in order to place our party on record, may I say that if there were a vote our party would have voted unanimously against concurrence in the report for the reasons which have been given by the members of our group.

Mr. CLEAVER: Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the house I now ask that the motion for concurrence in the report be withdrawn, for reasons I have already given.

Motion (Mr. Cleaver) withdrawn.

[Mr. P. C. Black.]

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That a select committee be appointed to examine the expenditure defrayed out of moneys provided by parliament for the defence services, and for other services directly connected with the war, and to report what, if any, economies consistent with the execution of the policy decided by the government may be effected therein, and that notwithstanding standing order 65 the committee shall consist of twenty-four members, as follows: Messrs. Black (Cumberland), Cleaver, Donnelly, Dupuis, Edwards, Fauteux, Ferland, Gladstone, Golding, Hill, Homuth, Hurtubise, Jackman, Knowles, McGregor, Nixon, O'Neill, Picard, Pinard, Pottier, Reid, Shaw, Tripp, Winkler, with power to send for persons, papers and records; to examine witnesses and to report from time to time to the house.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put to the house I wish to take a moment to place our position on record. As the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) proposes the constitution of the war expenditures committee, I wish to make it very clear that in so far as our party is concerned we are going to oppose the setting up of the committee. We opposed it last year and we are opposing it this year for the reason that we have felt the committee's work has been rendered largely unimportant because it has continuously sat in camera. That being the case, we wish to oppose the setting up of this committee. I wish to caution the government and the house by this reservation. Our members who have been named on this committee reserve their rights to refuse to sit on it if it or its subcommittees decide to sit in camera. That is the reservation which we desire to make. May I say to my hon. friend and to you, Mr. Speaker, that we feel in making this protest and by reserving our rights so far as refusing to sit on the committee if it sits in camera, we are doing something that is worth while in bringing out into the open the whole question of war expenditures in Canada. I make my position clear in connection with this at this time, so that there will be no doubt in anyone's mind as to the stand our party is taking with respect to this question.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): I shall take only one minute. We approve the setting up of this committee. We believe it can and does perform a useful function. We share the view that this committee should sit in public except when information concerning the security of Canada or our allies is at stake. Then we believe that the committee itself should decide to sit, not in camera, if you like, but in secret. We want to see things open to

the public except when something affecting security arises, which I think is not likely at the present time.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE: (Lethbridge): The members of our group are also heartily in favour of the setting up of the committee, but we feel also that the committee should be so managed that a large percentage of its sessions could be open. Those that should be held in camera we feel could be held in camera without doing harm to the war effort, and with no disadvantage to the country.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): There is just one observation I would make in this connection. I believe that though meetings are held in camera or in secret—there seems to be some difference of opinion as to the terminology or the definition of one or the other—there is a verbatim report made of the committee's proceedings. I believe that that report should be kept in the secretary's office and accessible to all members of parliament. I believe that we could trust the members of parliament just as much as we can trust the members of the committee. If that were done, we would not have what we have had in the last couple of days.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I shall take only one moment. First of all, I would direct the attention of the hon. members to the fact that the two parties, the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation and the Social Credit party have expressed their approval of having a committee on war expenditures. The Progressive Conservative party propose to vote against the instituting of such a committee. I hope the attitudes will be clearly understood by the public. The purpose of the committee is to assist the treasury in effecting economies in war expenditures. That is the sole purpose of it, as set forth in the motion. But the Progressive Conservative party is unwilling to assist the treasury and the government in effecting economies in war expenditures.

Mr. GRAYDON: The Prime Minister is not going to put words in my mouth again.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am making my own statement and I have the right to make it.

Mr. GRAYDON: Make your own statement, but do not put words in my mouth.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am not putting any words in my hon. friend's mouth at all.

Mr. GRAYDON: You certainly are.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No; I am saying that the leader of the opposition has said —I believe I am entitled to speak—that his party proposes to vote against this motion.

Mr. GRAYDON: Right.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The motion is for the purpose of establishing a committee to effect economies in war expenditures. To do so, the committee is free to inquire into any war expenditures that are taking place in the country. I can draw only one conclusion from that, namely that the party represented in this house by my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, is unwilling to assist the treasury in effecting economies in war expenditures. That is the purpose of the motion. May I say that I am amazed, inasmuch as hon. members have before them the example of Westminster, and I make no apologies for citing Westminster as an example. The expenditures with respect to war at Westminster are very, very great indeed. When the members of all parties at Westminster are quite prepared to serve in assisting the treasury in effecting economies in war expenditures I can find no reason in the world why hon. members of this parliament should take a different attitude. However, in taking that different attitude they assume responsibility for the attitude which they are taking. While I may question and regret the course his party is taking I am glad that my hon. friend has made it so clear that his party is not prepared to cooperate with the government in a measure intended to effect economies and save waste in war expenditures in Canada on a motion which is identical in every particular with a motion which has been adopted year in and year out at Westminster.

Much has been said in the discussion by hon. gentlemen opposite to create the impression that the rights of private members in some way are being taken away because some matters are referred to the committee and because its members sit in camera. May I assume for a moment that there is no committee at all? The rights of private members will remain just exactly what they have been at all times in this parliament. By appointing the committee we are not taking away the rights of a single individual. What we are doing is giving to all hon. members of this house an opportunity to make inquiries into public expenditures, which they would not have but for the existence of the committee which we are establishing at the present time. That I want to have clearly understood. There is no right of an hon. member being taken away by the appointment of this committee. Every hon. member has the same right that he has always had with respect to any matter that

should be investigated. He has the same rights to-day as he had in this parliament before the war began. But if this committee is appointed additional rights will have been given to hon. members inasmuch as there will be a committee which will be sitting in camera and which because of its sittings being in camera will be afforded an opportunity of carrying out investigations wider and broader than has ever been given to any committee in this parliament of Canada.

In regard to sitting in camera, I am not going to repeat the arguments that I have already given. They are set out in what I have said speaking to the amendment and in what has been said by other hon. members. I should like to bring up one point, however, which has escaped attention thus far, and it is an important one. When a committee begins an investigation in public, instantly the public gets the idea that there is something wrong about the matter which is being investigated. There are, let me assume, a dozen different industrial establishments in Canada that are carrying on similar classes of business, making munitions and other war supplies, others having to do with shipbuilding and the like. This committee has the power to go into all these concerns and investigate them fully, and if they find anything that is wrong they can take immediate steps to have it remedied. But every one of these concerns is surely not to be placed before the public as an institution that has been doing something contrary to the public interest and must therefore be investigated by a government committee. That would be the effect of having sittings held in public instead of in camera.

Honest firms in this country are entitled to the protection of the government when they are serving the country in a time of war. If the government were to take the position that every firm that is assisting in the war effort, conducting its business honestly, doing the best it possibly can, is to be held up for public investigation, I do not know what would become of the industrial establishments of Canada and of the reputation of our industrial leaders. Surely we have a right to begin with the assumption that men are honest, that they are not all dishonest; and being honest that they are entitled to protection until it is shown that they are doing something wrong. That is the purpose of having the proceedings conducted in the way that has been followed. I hope it will be remembered that the businesses that are being investigated are assisting in the winning of the war.

There is a further point to be kept in mind and it has been repeated over and over again

in the old country in many connections. The Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Churchill himself, said to me one day, and he has said the same thing publicly: Until this war is ended, so far as the public is concerned, do all you possibly can to have them keep their eye on the ball; and the ball that the eye has to be kept on to-day is the winning of this war, the most terrible war in the history of mankind. I say, therefore, that if you begin a series of investigations in public with respect to different war industries before you know whether any wrongdoing has been done, before you have given any chance to concerns that may have taken some steps which they should not have taken, to correct the mistakes they have made and to make amends, and do this at a time when our armies are fighting as they are at the front, and when the war effort of the united nations is at stake, you take a position that cannot possibly be defended.

Investigations by government committees attract no end of public attention. They are the sort of thing that the press naturally makes the most of in headlines. Begin a series of investigations from now on, conducted in public, and you will have every day the papers of the country filled with sensational headlines whether there is ground for believing that there is any wrongdoing or not, and the people will be reading that sort of thing instead of paying attention to the war effort of the country.

Mr. GRAYDON: Do you think the Trueman committee is a bad committee?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am not making any comment on what is taking place in other countries, but I say to my hon. friend that when it comes to choosing between the method of carrying on parliamentary business in the United Kingdom and in the United States respectively, I prefer to follow the British practice.

Mr. GRAYDON: That is what you did not do.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The hour is late, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not go farther into the matter, but I wish to repeat that we are in times that are very grave indeed, much graver than hon. members have yet begun to realize, and we are heading rapidly into a situation which will be the most desperate this world has known. I say, therefore, that for any body of gentlemen to refuse to assist the government in every way they possibly can in this war effort, in effecting economies, or to ask the government to take a step which

will confuse the public mind and divert it from the winning of the war, into an effort to win elections and make political capital—

Mr. GRAYDON: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: —is to take a step—

Mr. GRAYDON: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege and I want the Prime Minister to sit down.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will tell my hon. friend—

Mr. GRAYDON: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, a member always has the floor. The Prime Minister knows that.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What is that?

Mr. GRAYDON: A question of privilege always has the floor. I have the floor and I am asking the Prime Minister to sit down.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will not sit down at my hon. friend's request.

Mr. GRAYDON: At the request of the Speaker.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Certainly; and so far as His Honour the Speaker is concerned I am quite prepared to follow the rules of this house. But I am not going to—

Mr. GRAYDON: I have the floor on a question of privilege.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): You haven't got it yet.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend is not going to tell me to sit down.

Mr. GRAYDON: I have asked you to sit down.

An hon. MEMBER: Sit down yourself.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. gentleman wish to rise to a question of privilege?

Mr. GRAYDON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and the question of privilege is this. The Prime Minister again, of course, has become very much exercised—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

An hon. MEMBER: What is the question of privilege?

Mr. GRAYDON: The question of privilege is this. The Prime Minister has made a very serious charge against me and against this group which I at the moment lead, and that is, that instead of confining our efforts to winning the war we are now bending our efforts towards the winning of elections.

An hon. MEMBER: That is right.

Mr. GRAYDON: I want him to withdraw that remark. It is not becoming the Prime Minister, and I know that if he were not in such a heat he would not make such a statement.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): That is something he would not do, of course.

Mr. SPEAKER: The statement of the Prime Minister, as I heard it, was not a charge against the leader of the opposition—

An hon. MEMBER: No personal motives at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: —nor against the hon. gentleman representing the Conservative party.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Who represents that party?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Bracken. He is not here.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The statement was an expression which is very common across the floor of the house and I do not think a question of privilege arises out of it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. SPEAKER: There should be no applause when a statement is made from the Chair. It is the duty of the Chair to look after the interests of both sides of the house and I deprecate deeply any applause given when a statement is made from the Chair.

Mr. GOLDING: Just before the vote is taken—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the house adjourned at 11.20 p.m. until Thursday, at 3 o'clock p.m., pursuant to special order made Monday, February 21, 1944.

Thursday, February 24, 1944

The house met at three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRIVILEGE, MR. ROSE—ROOM ACCOMMODATION IN PARLIAMENT BUILDING

Mr. FRED ROSE (Cartier): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. For a month or or more I have been waiting patiently to be assigned a room in this building. I did not want to bring up this matter in this house, believing that there were many more important matters which should be dealt with but I

have pleaded with you, Mr. Speaker, and with the Clerk of the House without being able to get any satisfaction. I have had the job of mailing out my speeches; I keep my mail in a box somewhere in one of the rooms, but I have no proper accommodation, and I feel that the time has come when I must speak up, since apparently there is no other way of getting satisfaction. We talk about complacency. I have found a great deal of it, with people unwilling to move their desks in order to make it possible for another hon. member to do his duty to his electors, and I am afraid that reflects another sort of complacency among many hon. members here. As I say, I have waited patiently, but now I bring this matter to the attention of the house in the hope that I may get satisfaction. I do not believe it should have been necessary to mention it in this house; the matter should have been attended to the day I arrived here, and I should not have had to wait four weeks without result.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has a grievance which I think he has a right to express. I would point out to the hon. gentleman and to the house that I have been endeavouring to see that a room was provided for the hon. member, which would mean that changes would have to be made in the rooms at present occupied by other hon. members of the house. I have met with very little cooperation on the part of hon. members when these necessary alterations were suggested, but now that the hon. gentleman has placed the matter before the house I may state that I shall have to exercise the authority resting with the Speaker of the house, and I expect to receive cooperation from hon. members. There may be some inconvenience, but the hon. gentleman is entitled to the use of a room, and he must get it.

WAR EXPENDITURES

First report of special committee on war expenditures.—Mr. Cleaver.

SOCIAL SECURITY

FIRST REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE—MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE STANDS

Hon. CYRUS MACMILLAN (Queens) presented the first report of special committee on social security and moved that the report be concurred in.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Is this urgent? This report was presented only to-day, and concurrence cannot be moved without consent.

Mr. MACMILLAN: There is some urgency, because we desire to reduce the number necessary for a quorum. It will make it much easier to get a quorum. If the hon. member objects, we can let it stand.

Motion stands.

PUBLIC SERVICE

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO SETTING UP OF EMPLOYER-EMPLOYEE COUNCIL

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an announcement which I think will be of interest to hon. members.

In conformity with the government's announced policy of promoting employee representation in private industry and the improvement of industrial relations generally, the treasury board has decided to provide for the setting up of an employer-employee council in the public service of Canada. In working out this policy the treasury board will accept as its general model, with the necessary adaptations to suit Canadian conditions, the pattern which has been evolved in the United Kingdom through the application of so-called Whitley councils to the British public service. The board is therefore providing immediately for the establishment of a national joint council of the public service of Canada equally representative of the official and staff sides of the public service, but, as it is desirable that the new organization and procedure should evolve as a result of consultation and general discussion rather than being imposed from above in any cut and dried fashion, we are immediately suggesting a tentative constitution of the new joint council and wish to have the council itself give the fullest consideration to all questions relating to its permanent organization and procedure and to make recommendations for a permanent constitution to the treasury board within a specified period.

Initially, the national joint council is to consist of six representatives of the official or employer side of the public service, and six representatives of the staff or employee side. The Civil Service Federation, the Civil Service Association, the Amalgamated Civil Servants, the Professional Institute, and the Dominion Customs and Excise Officers' Association are each being asked to name one representative to the council, and the three organizations which represent the postal employees are being asked to select one representative to

represent them. The treasury board will itself nominate six senior civil servants to act as the representatives of the government, included amongst whom will be a representative of the Civil Service Commission.

The national joint council will act in an advisory capacity to the treasury board in all matters affecting the conditions of work in the public service. In certain fields their recommendations may appropriately be made directly to the Civil Service Commission. The council will, of course, not have any executive powers which would impair the responsibility of the cabinet or treasury board or Civil Service Commission, or possibly infringe upon the authority of parliament. While the council's functions will therefore be advisory only, it is clear that if both sides take their responsibilities seriously and endeavour to make the new organization a means of promoting better understanding, improved morale and greater efficiency in the civil service, any recommendations of the council reached by agreement should carry great weight with the treasury board and the Civil Service Commission.

The general purpose of the national joint council will be to secure a greater measure of cooperation between the state in its capacity of employer and the general body of civil servants in matters affecting the civil service, with a view to increased efficiency in the public service combined with the well-being of those employed; to provide machinery for dealing with grievances and for making suggestions for improved efficiency; and generally to bring together the experience and different points of view of representatives of the administrative, clerical and manipulative sides of the civil service.

More specifically, the duties of the national council will be:

(a) to recommend to the treasury board the best means for securing to the staff a greater share in and greater responsibility for the determination and observance of the conditions under which their duties are carried out, and in particular to consider and report to the treasury board not later than June 30, 1944, on a permanent constitution for the national joint council of the public service of Canada, on the advisability of providing for the establishment of various departmental or district joint councils, and, if such are recommended, on the organization and procedure of such joint councils and their relationship to the national joint council;

(b) to make recommendations to the treasury board or the Civil Service Commission, as the case may require, regarding the general principles governing conditions of service in the public service of Canada, including recruitment, training, hours of work, promotions, discipline, tenure, remuneration and superannuation;

(c) to recommend to the treasury board or the Civil Service Commission, or both, the best means for utilizing the ideas and experience of the staff;

(d) to make recommendations to the Civil Service Commission regarding the encouragement of the further education of civil servants and their training in higher administration and organization;

(e) to make recommendations to the treasury board or the Civil Service Commission, or both, regarding the improvement of office procedures and organization and the provision of opportunities for the full consideration of suggestions by the staff on this subject; and

(f) to make recommendations to the treasury board regarding proposed legislation in so far as it has a bearing upon the position of civil servants in relation to their employment.

In the tentative constitution which is being provided for the national joint council, provision is being made for the holding of regular and special meetings, for the appointment of a chairman (who shall be a representative of the treasury board) and a vice-chairman (who shall be a representative of the staff side and chosen by the staff representatives), for the filling of vacancies, and for other procedural and organizational matters.

DAIRY PRODUCTS

ANNOUNCEMENT OF GOVERNMENT POLICY FOR COMING MILK YEAR

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): I desire to make an announcement of government policy on milk and other dairy products covering the milk year which begins May 1, 1944, and continues until April 30, 1945.

I should like at the outset of my remarks to record the appreciation of the government of the splendid job which the dairy producers of Canada have done and are continuing to do on production in spite of difficulties. The season of 1942-43 was unusually favourable and a record production was secured. The latter half of the season of 1943-44 has been very unfavourable and milk producers have done a remarkably good job in maintaining milk production at high levels.

The chief difficulty beginning in November was related to a short supply of feed in eastern Canada, resulting from the poorest crop which

eastern Canada has harvested in fifty years. Realizing the danger of a drop in supplies the government increased the subsidies on all dairy products between October 1, 1943, and April 30, 1944. This, together with assistance given toward the movement of feed grain from the West, has resulted in fair supplies under extremely difficult circumstances.

It is hoped that weather conditions will be more favourable throughout 1944, although it is recognized that to the extent that grain feed is required an improvement in the position cannot come until a new crop is harvested in the east. By far the greater part of dairy production will, however, depend upon pastures during the early part of the season, and to that extent costs will be reduced as compared with the winter season.

The new subsidy levels are therefore placed on a lower plane in the first five months than they were during the last seven months of the preceding year, but on most items will be placed at the same level for the last seven months.

The subsidies for the year 1943-44 were as follows:

	May 1, 1943 to Sept. 30, 1943	Oct. 1, 1943 to April 30, 1944
Fluid milk	25 cents a hundred	55 cents a hundred (excepting in certain districts where it is 25 cents)
Cheese (milk)	Nil	30 cents a hundred
Butter	8 cents lb. butterfat to Dec. 31	10 cents lb. butterfat Jan. 1 to April 30
Concentrated whole milk	Nil	30 cents a hundred

The subsidies for the year 1944-45 will be as follows:

	May 1 to Sept. 30, 1944	Oct. 1, 1944 to April 30, 1945
Fluid milk	35 cents a hundred (except in certain districts where it will continue to be 25 cents)	55 cents a hundred
Cheese (milk)	20 cents a hundred	20 cents a hundred
Butter	10 cents lb. butterfat	10 cents lb. butterfat
Concentrated whole milk	15 cents a hundred	30 cents a hundred

It will be noted that in respect of fluid milk there are some districts where there are exceptions to the subsidies suggested. In certain districts subsidies have been 25 cents throughout the year, and those subsidies will be continued.

We are at present negotiating a contract with Great Britain for cheese, which we hope will provide for Britian to take all the cheese we can provide during the next two years. Any surpluses of butter or canned milk which may result can be marketed in Britain.

We think these subsidies, along with the floor under prices already provided through our agreements and otherwise for dairy products, should result, if weather is favourable, in a record production in dairy products in 1944.

We therefore feel justified in urging the highest possible production of cheese in the cheese producing areas, the highest possible production of butter in the butter producing areas, the utilization of duplex plants for cheese in summer and butter in fall and winter seasons where duplex plants exist, and the production of whole milk tributary to cities and processing plants turning out commodities desired in our war effort.

We are taking authority through the food board to direct plants to depend upon the same sources for milk supply as in a previous year. We are most anxious that butter and fluid milk supplies should meet domestic requirements, and that cheese should be available for both domestic and allied markets.

Mr. TUSTIN: Does the twenty cents per hundred for cheese milk apply for the whole year?

Mr. GARDINER: That is right.

Mr. SENN: Would the Minister of Agriculture clarify the statement he has just made by saying in what years or under what conditions the subsidy on fluid milk will not be paid?

Mr. GARDINER: I think that would be too long a statement to make, Mr. Speaker, under any circumstances, but I could not make it at the moment with the information at hand.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT

FREE RAILWAY TRANSPORTATION FOR MEMBERS OF HIS MAJESTY'S FORCES

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview) moved for leave to introduce bill No. 6, to amend the railway act.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. CHURCH: This bill proposes to amend the Railway Act in order to provide certain concessions in railway fares to our soldiers during this war. At the present time the Railway Act does not provide any special concessions for soldiers; it applies only to civilians. The board of transport commissioners has no power to order any special rates for soldiers. During the last war soldiers were carried for half fare during week-ends and during this war they are carried for half fare on all days. However, the camps are located all across Canada and there should be some body such as the transport commission which should have power over it, to see that fares are reasonable, grant any necessary concessions, and eliminate any discrimination against our soldiers.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

SAINT JOHN-HALIFAX AIR SERVICE

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Did the Canadian Pacific Air Lines Limited apply to the government or the board of transport commissioners for permission to institute an air service between Saint John, New Brunswick, and Halifax, Nova Scotia?

2. If so, when was such application received?

3. Did the applicants state when the service would be started if permission were granted?

4. Was an exclusive franchise asked for?

5. Was the request of the company granted?

6. Did the boards of trade of Saint John and Halifax make a joint application to the board of transport commissioners in November last to grant a licence to responsible persons to operate a commercial air service between the two cities?

7. Did the board of transport commissioners grant the licence?

8. Has the governor in council named Saint John, New Brunswick, and Halifax, Nova Scotia, as places between which the board of transport commissioners may license aircraft to transport passengers and goods under the provisions of part 3 of the Transport Act, 1938, and if not, why has it not done so?

9. Is it the intention of the government to establish an air service between Saint John, New Brunswick, and Halifax, Nova Scotia, and if so, when will the service commence to operate?

Mr. HOWE:

1 and 2. Yes. To the board of transport commissioners, under date November 6, and to the Department of Transport, under date November 11, 1943.

3. No.

4. This point was not raised.

5. No.

6. Yes.

7. No.

8. No. By order in council, P.C. 976, of April 27, 1939, part III of The Transport Act, 1938, was made applicable to transport by air by means of interurban air transport services between "Moncton-St. John-Halifax". Subsequently the Maritime provinces were declared a prohibited flying area under the defence air regulations, and for this reason, said order in council was rescinded by order in council, P.C. 4040, of December 8, 1939.

9. Trans-Canada Air Lines has been authorized by order in council, P.C. 6256, of August 6, 1943, made pursuant to the "Trans-Canada contract" authorized under The Trans-Canada Air Lines Act, 1937, to establish a service between Blissville, N.B., and Halifax which will be placed in operation immediately upon the completion of a radio range now under construction at an intermediate aerodrome on the route between Saint John and Halifax.

PERSONNEL RECRUITED IN ONTARIO AND SHOWN AS RECRUITED IN QUEBEC

Mr. WHITE:

1. Have any persons recruited in Ontario since the beginning of the war to date, and sent to Quebec without being given their regimental number, been shown as recruited from Quebec?

2. If so, what is the number of such recruits?

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax):

1. See answer to question No. 2.

2. There are no records which show the number of persons, if any, recruited in Ontario for Quebec or the number, if any, sent from Ontario to Quebec without being given their regimental number.

The records maintained at national defence headquarters do not give the number of men who may have gone from Ontario to Quebec to enlist. An examination of all the enlistment papers in the military districts of Quebec which would involve a tremendous amount of work, and then would not show those recruited in Ontario but would only show the number of those enlisting in Quebec who gave Ontario as their home address and such men would not necessarily have been recruited in Ontario.

BOOKLET "THE COMPLETE FLYING COURSE"—N. ROY HARBEN, D.F.C.

Mr. McGREGOR:

1. How many copies of the book entitled "The Complete Flying Course", by N. Roy Harben, D.F.C., were purchased?
2. What was the date of the original order, and who authorized the purchase?
3. What was the cost per copy?
4. How many copies were distributed, and how was its distribution effected?
5. By whose authority has the salvage officer, J. C. Kelley, called for tenders for 3,844 copies, as per circular No. G.S. 6066?
6. What is the official status of N. Roy Harben, D.F.C.?
7. Was he in the employ of the government?
8. If so, what salary or remuneration did he receive, and is he in the government service at this time?

Mr. MACMILLAN:

1. 5,325.

2. 27th January, 1940 by acting air member for organization and training, air commodore now Air Marshal L. S. Breadner.

3. $1.50.

4. 5,191 copies were distributed according to scale of issue for various schools—75 copies to initial training schools, 60 to elementary flying training schools and 105 to service flying training schools.

5. By memorandum of 21st December, 1943 from deputy director of publications concurred in by director of staff duties. Eighty per cent of those offered for sale have been returned from units after being used in training.

6, 7 and 8. When this publication was produced in 1938, Mr. Harben was the owner and civilian manager of Air Schools Ltd., Derby, England. His company carried on the elementary training of pilots for the R.A.F.

On the outbreak of war Mr. Harben, a reserve officer of the R.A.F., was brought back to active duty as a wing commander R.A.F. and as such carries on his peacetime profession of training R.A.F. pilots in elementary flying.

He has never been an employee of the Canadian government.

WARTIME PRICES AND TRADE BOARD—PROSECUTIONS

Mr. BENCE:

1. How many charges were laid in Canada for violation of the wartime prices and trade board regulations and orders, and administrators' regulations and orders in, (a) 1942; (b) 1943?
2. How many of such charges were abandoned before proceeding to trial in, (a) 1942; (b) 1943?
3. What was the total number of convictions obtained as the result of such charges in, (a) 1942; (b) 1943?
4. What was the total amount of fines collected as the result of such convictions in, (a) 1942; (b) 1943?
5. What was the total amount of lawyers' fees incurred by the government as result of such charges in, (a) 1942; (b) 1943?

Mr. ABBOTT:

1. The number of persons charged in Canada with alleged violations of wartime prices and trade board regulations and orders including administrators' regulations and orders was: (a) in the year 1942, 1,285; (b) in the year 1943, 3,792.

2. The number of the foregoing charges abandoned before proceeding to trial was: (a) in the year 1942, 91; (b) in the year 1943, 206.

3. The total number of convictions obtained as a result of such charges was: (a) in the year 1942, 1,107; (b) in the year 1943, 3,369.

4. Total amount of fines collected and deposited to the credit of the receiver general as a result of convictions and charges laid for violation of the wartime prices and trade board regulations and orders was (a) in the year 1942, $53,633.23, (b) in the year 1943, $185,-534.61.

5. Total amount of lawyers' fees and disbursements paid by the wartime prices and trade board as a result of charges laid for violation of the wartime prices and trade board regulations (a) in the year 1942, $27,483.46; (b) in the year 1943, $100,972.54.

ENEMY ALIENS—APPLICATIONS FOR NATURALIZATION CERTIFICATES

Mr. SHAW:

1. How many enemy aliens have made application for certificates of naturalization since September 1, 1939?
2. How many such applications have been approved and certificates issued?
3. How many certificates of naturalization have been issued since September 1, 1939, to enemy aliens who made application for naturalization prior to the outbreak of war?
4. How many certificates of naturalization have been issued to enemy alien members of the Canadian armed forces since January 1, 1943, who, (a) made application prior to enlistment; (b) made application following enlistment; (c) made no application?

Mr. McLARTY:

1. Statistics are not compiled on the basis of dates of applications for naturalization but only in respect to certificates issued.

2. See answer to No. 1 above.

3. For reason stated in answer to No. 1 it is not possible to state what certificates have been issued in respect to applications prior to the outbreak of war. The certificates issued to former nationals of enemy countries are shown in the following statement:

	Finland	Germany
Sept. 1/39.....	...	263
1940.....	...	477
1941.....	...	152
1942.....	155	107
1943.....	80	146

Hungary	Italy	Roumania	Japan
...	...	...	...
...	362	...	...
...	266	...	...
158	132	222	...
91	226	126	...

4. (a) Finland, 2; Germany, 2; Hungary, 2; Italy, 3; Roumania, 2. (b) Finland, 8; Germany, 5; Hungary, 3; Italy, 6. (c) None.

METALS CONTROL

Mr. ESLING:

1. How many properties in Canada are being operated by the metals control board?

2. What is the total tonnage recovered as from January 1, 1940?

3. What is the value thereof?

4. How many properties in British Columbia were developed by the metals control board?

5. What was the total expenditure on each of these properties?

6. For what period was each property operated?

Mr. HOWE:

1. Wartime metals corporation have operated or are operating twelve properties.

2. 3,046,355 tons treated to December 31, 1943, to produce 80,943,472 lbs., recoverable metals.

3. The value of the contained metals at current market prices approximated $10,000,000.

4. Four.

5. To December 31, 1943:

	Capital expenditure	Operating expenditure
Twin "J".....	$270,445	$158,680
Kootenay Florence	181,681	140,241
Emerald Tungsten	838,175	154,295
Lava Talc	22,947	

6. Twin "J"—December, 1942, to present; Kootenay Florence—December, 1942, to present; Emerald Tungsten—October, 1942, to September 15, 1943; Lava Talc—October, 1943, to present.

R.C.A.F. AND R.A.F.—CANADIANS DECORATED FOR GALLANTRY

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. How many members of the R.C.A.F. have been decorated for gallantry in the present war?

2. What are the names and home addresses of the recipients of each of these awards for gallantry?

3. How many Canadians in the R.A.F. have been decorated for gallantry in the present war?

4. What are the names and home addresses of the recipients of each of these awards for gallantry?

5. How many members of the R.C.A.F. and Canadians in the R.A.F. have been decorated for gallantry by allied governments in the present war?

6. What are the names and home addresses of the recipients of these awards for gallantry from allied governments?

Mr. MACMILLAN: In honour of the more than 1,200 young Canadians who have received awards for gallantry, this somewhat extensive information is given as an ordinary answer rather than as an order for return. It is believed that every hon. member would wish to have printed on *Hansard* the names and home addresses of these gallant young Canadians in tribute to their splendid achievements, of which Canada is so proud.

1. At 17th February, 1944, members of the R.C.A.F. decorated for gallantry in the present war numbered 1,080.

2. See appendix "A".

3. At 17th February, 1944, Canadians in the R.A.F. decorated for gallantry in the present war numbered 164.

4. See appendix "B".

NOTE:—The R.C.A.F. can assume no responsibility for the correctness of appendix "B". However, the list has been compiled from official documents provided by the R.A.F. Home addresses are included where available.

5. At 17th February, 1944, members of the R.C.A.F. and Canadians in the R.A.F. decorated for gallantry by allied governments in the present war numbered 17.

6. See appendix "C".

APPENDIX "A"

(Bars to D.S.O. & D.F.C. for personnel indicated by *)

George Cross

Number—Rank—Name—Home Address

R97644, LAC Gravell, K. M., 1585-W. 15th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

R179314, LAC Spooner, K. G., 19 Smiths Falls Ave., Smiths Falls.

Military Cross

J4919, F/O Marting, H. F., 1116 W. 34th St., Indianapolis, Ind.

Distinguished Service Order

J2976, A/W/C *Chadburn, L. V., Aurora, Ont.

C1278, F/L Christie, R. M., 392 MacIntyre St. W., North Bay.

C1399, A/W/C Fauquier, J. E., 233 Metcalfe St., Ottawa.

J5795, A/S/L Lane, R. J., 1468 Begbie St., Victoria, B.C.
J5302, F/O Layton, M.S., 1563 MacGregor St., Montreal, P.Q.
J9346, F/O McCarthy, J.C., Three Sister's Rd., St. James, Long Island, N.Y.
J8817, S/L Powell, P. G., Sorrento, B.C.
J9929, A/F/L *Sale, D. J., 89 Forest Hill Rd., Toronto, Ont.
C835, W/C Scott, J. C., 45 Lansdowne Rd., North Galt, Ont.
J17203, A/F/L Sneger, W. J., St. John, N. Dakota, U.S.A.
J8429, A/F/L Stickell, J. H., Gilson, Ill., U.S.A.

Distinguished Flying Cross

J9584, F/O Adams, E. A., Omemee, Ont.
J5783, A/S/L Adams, W. H., 4 Dewbourne Ave., Forest Hill Village, Toronto, Ont.
J4889, P/O Ahalt, R. M., 4808 Middaugh Ave., Downers Grove, Ill., U.S.A.
J7460, F/O *Aikman, F. A., 178 Albertus Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J15842, F/O Alcorn, D., 470 Ave Rd., Apt. 15, Toronto, Ont.
J2833, F/L Alexander, R. W., 39 Dumphries St., Paris, Ont.
J17472, P/O Allcroft, F. C., 1112 Harwood St., Vancouver, B.C.
J16423, P/O Allen, D. F., 2 Warren St., Lennoxville, Que.
J5295, F/L Allen, E. E., 9 Tennyson Grove, Cleethorpes, Lincs., England.
J7543, A/F/L Anderson, L. S., 908 Sifton Blvd., Calgary, Alta.
J16379, P/O Anderson, P. M., Union Point, Man.
C1099, A/S/L Anderson, W. A., Suite 12, Whitehall Apts., Osborne St., Winnipeg, Man.
J13558, F/O Anderson, W. R. W., 315-10th St. E., N. Vancouver, B.C.
J16350, P/O Angus, T. A., 219 St. Helen's Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J8128, F/L Armstrong, W. A., Carp, Ont., c/o Mrs. J. M. Kennedy.
J16435, P/O Annand, F. C., Milford Station, N.S.
J3508, A/F/L Archer, P. L. I., Clovelly 8th Ave., Belleville St. Michael, Barbados, B.W.I.
J16907, F/O Ardis, V. D., South Main St., Belfast, N.Y., U.S.A.
J13470, A/F/L Arnot, D. M., 19 Benlamond Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J17890, P/O Ashton, J. H., Virden, Man.
J15254, P/O Austin, L. F., 78 Jackman Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J10503, A/F/L Avant, A. F., Hughton, Sask.
J6377, F/O Avent, G. H., Apt. 6, 490 Prince Arthur W., Montreal, P.Q.
J9412, F/O Bain, D. T., Agassiz, B.C.
J6027, P/O Bain, J. D. N., 321 Lonsdale Rd., Toronto, Ont.
J5060, A/F/L Baker, E. D., 39 Olebar St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.
J5090, F/L Baker, E. S., 630-7th Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.
J5702, F/O Baldwin, D. G., White St., Alexandria, Louisiana.
J15169, A/F/L Baldwin, W. H., 182 Fifth Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
J16116, P/O Barry, W. A. R., Russell, Man.
J17784, P/O Basarich, G., 679-18th Ave. S., Clinton, Iowa, U.S.A.
J10594, F/O Batchelor, E. T., 3425 Oxford St., Vancouver, B.C.
J15187, P/O Beach, A. M., 4474 W. 4th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

[Mr. Macmillan.]

R101280, W/O Beals, W. F., 904 Sully St., Vernon, B.C.
J21277, F/O Beare, B. J., Port Perry, Ont.
J11103, F/O Beckett, H., 300 South Brodie St., Ft. William.
J6827, F/O Beckwith, I. C., Sturiza 673, D to C, Olivos, Buenos Aires, Argentina,
J10432, F/O Belanger, M. J., 4479 Blenheim St., Vancouver, B.C.
J11221, F/O Bell, J. D., 37 Golding St., Saint John, N.B.
J7020, F/L Bell, J. W., 125 Renfrew St., Winnipeg, Man.
J16345, P/O Bell, J. K., New Glasgow, N.S.
J9673, A/F/L Bell, R. G., 127-W-12th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J11564, F/O Bellis, A. R. B., 400-21st St. W., Prince Albert, Sask.
J15035, P/O Benitz, F. M., Estancia "La California" La California F.C.C.A., prov. De Santa Fe, Argentina, South America.
C1376, A/S/L Bennell, R. J., Hayes Ridge, Oldbury Rd., Nuneaton, Warwickshire, England.
J22565, F/O Benner, K. J., Box 208, Cobalt, Ont.
J15248, F/O Bennett, G., 396 Home St., Winnipeg, Man.
J15826, F/O Beresford, D. A., 47 Edina St., Ottawa, Ont.
J15939, P/O Bernard, S., 410 Crawford St., Toronto, Ont.
J15759, P/O Berry, J. P., 1217 Market St., Parkersburg, Va., U.S.A.
J16128, P/O Berry, R. C., 351 Emerald St. N., Hamilton, Ont.
J6396, F/O Bertran, R. H., Stevensville, Ont.
J15070, S/L Beveridge, M. W., 3241 Cedar Ave., Westmount, Que.
J9659, F/O Bezer, J. M., 2058 Griffiths Ave., New Westminster.
J17040, P/O Biech, A. T., Gunn, Alta.
J15465, P/O *Bing, L. P. S., Graystone Arms, 383 Assinaboine Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
C775, S/L Birchall, L. J., 170 Princess St., Saint John, N.B.
R60572, WO.1 Birkenes, R. H., Armada, Alta.
J7747, F/O Bishop, A. A., Erskine, Alta.
J4551, F/L Blakeslee, D. J. M., Fairport Harbour, Ohio, U.S.A.
R58524, WO Bloom, R. J., 4323 Oxford St., Vancouver, B.C.
J16226, P/O Blumenauer, C. R., Enderby, B.C.
J17098, P/O Boczar, S., Saskatoon, Sask. (319 Ave. J. South).
J17669, P/O Bodnar, B. O., Fort Frances, Ont.
C1220, S/L Boomer, K. A., 1365 West 11th, Vancouver, B.C.
J17928, P/O Booth, G. G., 453 Somerset St. W., Ottawa, Ont.
C1090, S/L Boulton, F. H., P.O. Box 61, Coleman, Alta.
J17049, P/O Bouschard, A. D., 31 Hamelin Rd., Leicester, Eng.
R76385, WO Boutilier, E. H., Chester, N.S.
J15064, P/O Bowen, R. D., 10748-126th St., Edmonton, Alta.
J6279, F/O Bracken, W. J., Seeley's Bay, Ont.
J5994, A/F/L Bradley, C. W., 4444 Beaconsfield Ave., N.D.G., Mont.
C166, W/C Bradshaw, D. A. R., 259 George St., Belleville, Ont.
J7619, F/L Brenner, A. B., 71 Avenue Rd., Toronto.
J2975, A/S/L Bretz, N. H., 2 Playter Blvd., Toronto, Ont.
J17370, P/O Brisbin, L. I., Cold Springs, Ont.

J17601, P/O Brousseau, J. H. N., 18 Loranger St., Cap-de-la-Madeleine.
J17162, P/O Brown, E. L., 490 Pembroke St. W., Pembroke, Ont.
J13055, F/O Brown, H. T., Box 79, Biggar, Sask.
R63935, WO Brown, J. A., 48 Keppel St., Buffalo, N.Y., U.S.A.
J11145, F/O Brown, L. N., Paradise Valley, Alta.
J8771, A/F/L Brown, M. G., 2490 Mt. Royal Ave. E., Montreal.
J17907, P/O Brunet, A. G., 22 Arthur St., St. Thomas, Ont.
R110822, WO Bryson, H., Manitou, Manitoba.
J17456, P/O Buchanan, D. J. A., 10533-127 St., Edmonton, Alta.
J15246, A/F/L Buckham, R. A., Box 1036, Vancouver, B.C.
J16558, F/O Burton, G. R., 12308-104th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.
J10420, F/O Campbell, P., Tyra, Claremount St., Londonderry, N. (Ireland)
J15594, F/O Campbell, R. J., Pawling, New York, U.S.A.
J8198, A/F/L Campbell, R. G., 10711-98th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.
J18179, P/O Card, H. C., Newburgh, Ont.
J16480, F/L Carey, D. M., 748-10th St., Brandon, Man.
J4531, F/O Carmichael, D. W., 4373 W. 12th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J17078, P/O Carrere, J. P. H., Cochrane, Ont.
C168, W/C Carscallen, H. M., 104 Young Ave., Halifax, N.S.
J15673, F/O Carter, A. R., 713 Dufferin St., Toronto.
J11213, F/O *Carter, G. H. F., 85 Parkway Rd., Bronxville, N.Y.
J15862, F/O Carter, R. G., Apt. 3, 2 Manor Rd. E., Toronto.
J4432, F/O Casey, G. A., Mitchell, Ont.
J9066, P/O Cavanaugh, L. M., 23 Drake Apts., Calgary, Alta.
J2976, A/S/L Chadburn, L. V., Aurora, Ont.
J15044, A/F/L *Chisholm, W. L., 18 Orchard Rd., Kentville, N.S.
J15369, F/O Chittenden, F. J., R.R. No. 1, Cansville, Ont.
J17256, P/O Christie, J. O., 2213 Toronto St., Regina, Sask.
J3266, F/L Church, R. D., 338 Elmwood Dr., Rockcliffe, Ottawa.
J6993, F/L Clark, D. H., 526-7th St., New Westminster, B.C.
J15167, A/S/L Clark, J. F. P., 600 York St., London, Ont.
J17004, P/O Clark, R. J., Box 74, Vulcan, Alta.
J10883, F/O Clark, R. J., 11038-81st Ave., Edmonton, Alta.
J15084, A/F/L Cleveland, J. B., 3 Clarendon Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J4470, F/O Clifford, A. W., Gleichen, Alta.
J9501, F/O Cline, R. E., 3224 W. 1st Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J16202, P/O Clinton, R. S., Whitney Point, New York, U.S.A.
J14011, F/O Clow, W. R., 111 Wellington St. S., Hamilton
J16276, P/O Cobb, N. A., Tillsonburg, Ont.
J18560, P/O Coburn, G. W., Box 192, Beeton, Ont.
J17277, A/F/L Cochrane, R. H., New Richmond Stn., P.Q.
J2937, F/L Colborne, F. C., 1507-25th Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.
J16833, P/O Coles, M. W., Milton, P.E.I.
J8207, F/O Colledge, W. W., 3699 Osler Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J6276, A/F/L Cook, R. G., 15 Chicora Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J5083, F/O Coons, H. L., Morrisburg, Ont.
J17003, P/O Cooper, F. C., Foxwarren, Man.
J5023, F/L Conrad, W. A. G., Richmond, Ont.
J16770, P/O Copenhaver, L. B., 109 South Vincent St., Salem, Ill.
C299, S/L Corbett, V. B., 760 Upper Lansdowne Ave., Westmount, P.Q.
J15709, P/O Cosburn, S. C., 222-25th Ave., West Calgary, Alta.
J9495, F/O Cowan, I. C., Box 298, Montague, P.E.I.
R67128, WO Cox, J. E., 621 Johnston St., Kingston, Ont.
J15233, F/O Coyne, J. P., God's Lake, Man.
J16010, P/O Cozens, E. B., 442 Old Lancaster Rd., Haverford, Pa.
J15524, F/L Crabtree, G., P.O. Box 37, Pugwash, N.S.
C15705, P/O Craddock, G. R., 91 Royal York Rd., Toronto.
J17170, F/L Crew, B. G., 1764 Lulie St., Victoria, B.C.
J16533, P/O Crimmins, W. D., 94 McDonnell St., Guelph, Ont.
J17501, P/O Crossman, G. T., Sackvile, N.B.
J12975, F/O Crowther, G. C., 25 Goodwood Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J15153, P/O Croxton, B. D., 3643 Turner St., Vancouver.
J16758, P/O Cuddington, L. F., Crawford Hotel, Carlsbad, New Mexico, U.S.A.
J16384, P/O Cuelenaere, M. R. C., Leask, Sask.
J9754, F/O Cunningham, R. H., 35 Gifford St., Toronto, Ont.
C2645, F/L Curry, J. H., 3719 Miramar Ave., Dallas, Tex., U.S.A.
J9340, P/O *Curtin, D. J., New York City, N.Y. (208 Alexander Ave.)
J21889, F/O Curtin, J. P., Govan, Sask.
J15807, F/L Cybulski, M. A., 511 Gladstone Ave., Ottawa.
J15531, P/O Cybulski, S. J., 402 MacKay St., Pembroke, Ont.
J15608, P/O Dabbs, H. E., Daysland, Alta.
J15042, P/O Dale, R. G., 84 Woodlawn St. E., Toronto.
J16385, P/O Danahy, S., Riverside, Albert Co., N.B.
J15992, F/O Dark, W. L., 9918-108th St., Edmonton, Alta.
J17211, P/O Dashper, F. B., 506 Langside St., Winnipeg, Man.
C325, W/C Davoud, P. Y., 161 King St., Kingston, Ont.
J11555, A/F/L Day, W. S., Aylesford, N.S.
J15717, P/O De Bartok, E. A. F., 3152 St. Antoine St., Montreal, P.Q.
J17245, P/O Dearing, G. A., 208 Belsize Dr., Toronto.
J15145, F/O Dehoux, L., 639 Huron St., Toronto, Ont.
J16655, A/F/L Delisle, J. C. H., 6738 St. Denis St., Montreal, Que.
J16008, P/O Dennison, B. C., 1134B Kensington Rd., Calgary.
R88017, WO D'Eon, A. L., South Park St., Yarmouth, N.S.
J16968, P/O Derry, F. C., 48 Lappin Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J15678, P/O Dickson, J. D., Hampton, Kings Co., N.B.

J15123, A/F/L Dierkes, W. J., 3003 Observatory Rd., Cincinnati, Ohio.
J10896, A/F/L Dilworth, L. C., Box 269, Kelowna, B.C.
J3598, F/O Dingle, C. E., 182 Furby St., Winnipeg, Man.
J6011, F/O Dobbin, W. L., Box 500, Kamsack, Sask.
J15740, F/O Dodd, W. G., English River, Ont.
J17608, P/O Dolby, E. G., 3 Western Tce., The Park, Nottingham, England.
J8302, P/O *Donkersley, H. W., Moosomin, Sask.
J15960, P/O Doucette, J. A. T., 94 Cedar St., Sudbury, Ont.
J3710, P/O Dougall, D. C., Box 127, St. Anne de Bellevue, P.Q.
J16027, F/O Dowding, H. J., 162 John St., Sarnia, Ont.
J6008, A/F/L *Dowie, C. S., Leader, Sask.
J10159, F/O Draper, J. W. P., Apt. 27, 9 Humewood Dr., Toronto.
J17405, P/O Dube, R. A. H., c/o Clark Ruse Aircraft, Moncton, N.B.
J17479, P/O Duffield, G. W., Lloydminster, Sask.
J3116, P/O Duncan, J. A., 124 Church St., Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.
J17017, P/O Dundas, E. G., Miami, Man., Box 52.
J17742, P/O Dungey, E. B., Collingwood, Ont.
J17626, P/O Eager, W. H., 151 Ferndale Ave., Norwood, Man.
J16274, A/F/L Earl, W. H., Balcarres, Sask.
J17551, P/O Easson, J. K., 110 Delaware Ave., Toronto.
J9563, P/O Eastcott, P., 400 Laurier Ave. E., Ottawa, Ont.
J16077, A/F/L Edwards, J. F., Battleford, Sask.
J17276, F/O Einarson, J. W., Shellbrook, Sask.
J15056, F/L Ellis, R. A., 61 Nelson St., Montreal West, P.Q.
J11442, F/O Ellwood, G. B., Box 673, Portage la Prairie, Man.
J15585, P/O Emberg, C. R. J., 2310 Regent Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
J15421, F/O Emery, J. A., Ledger Corner, Moncton, N.B.
R57927, WO English, E. T., 3771 Main St., Vancouver, B.C.
J3264, P/O Erly, J. P., 4256 Westhill Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
J16071, P/O Eustace, R. S., 26 Lowther Ave., Toronto.
J17548, P/O Evans, E. R., 601 McIntyre Blk., Winnipeg, Man.
J17183, P/O Ewan, G. M., 883 Dunsmuir Rd., Esquimalt, B.C.
J17088, P/O Fairley, J. A., 25 Dunbar Rd., Toronto, Ont.
J15734, P/O Falls, F. M., 3740 The Boulevard, Westmount, P.Q.
J16461, P/O Farrell, W. H., 433 Rhodes Ave., Toronto, Ont.
C1399, A/W/C Fauquier, J. E., 233 Metcalfe St., Ottawa, Ont.
C773, S/L *Fee, J. C., Frood Mine, Ont.
J9247, F/O Fee, W. B., 527 2nd Ave. W., Swift Current, Sask.
J16787, P/O Fenton, H. W., 278 Second Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
J15790, P/O Fenwick, H. E., Sioux Lookout, Ont.
J16467, P/O Ferguson, D. C., 252-7th St., Weyburn, Sask.
C1351, W/C Ferris, W. D. S., 12704-102nd Ave., Edmonton, Alta.
J1095, P/O Finnie, G. K., 117 Strathcona Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

[Mr. Macmillan.]

J4690, A/F/L Fisher, G. C., 2332 Montague St., Regina, Sask.
J17232, P/O Flanagan, E. F., 3782 Marcil Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
J2834, F/O Florence, D. S., 9844-113th St., Edmonton, Alta.
J15718, P/O Foderingham, C., 115 Felbrigg Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J4786, S/L Forbes, H. A., Tatamagouche, N.S.
J3712, F/L *Ford, L. S., Liverpool, N.S.
J11188, F/O Forrest, H. L., 112 Lichfield Court, Richmond, Surrey, England.
J15380, P/O Fowler, G. P., Victoria, Carleton County, N.S.
J15095, A/F/L Fowlow, N. R., 131 King St., Windsor, N.S.
J15609, F/O Foy, J. H., 136 Belgravia Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J8166, F/O Foyston, F. S., Invermere, B.C.
J15758, P/O Francis, J. E., 215 Josephine Ave., Windsor, Ont.
C1283, W/C Fraser, L. G. D., General Delivery, Port Dover, Ont.
J6659, F/O Freberg, P. G., 3719 Willingdon Ave., New Westminster, B.C.
J4752, F/O French, W. M., Fairview, Alta.
J15331, P/O Francis, A. J., 835 Main St., Saskatoon, Sask.
J17758, P/O Fulsher, J. L., Middlechurch, Man.
C1352, F/O *Fumerton, R. C., Fort Cologne, P.Q.
J17528, P/O Gabel, G. W., Didsbury, Alta.
J10133, F/L Ganderton, V. F., Leduc, Alta.
J7527, F/L Garbutt, D. A., Duncan, V.I., B.C
J15252, P/O Gardiner, G. P., Merlin, Ont.
R67228, W/O Gardiner, L. H. C., 473 Johnston St., Kingston, Ont.
J15548, F/L Gardiner, R., c/o Mr. John Prues, Elmwood, Ont.
J16208, F/O Garland, S. F., City View, R.R. No. 1, Co. Carleton, Ont.
J9779, F/O Garrett, E. A., McMasterville, P.Q.
J15529, F/L Gattey, H. B., Stettler, Alta.
J2822, F/O Gellner, J., Y.W.C.A., Simcoe, Ont.
J13802, F/O Gerrard, G. E. D., 355 Armstrong Ave., Kildonan, Man.
J6942, A/F/L Gibson, J. V., St. Andrews, N.B.
J9443, F/O Giggey, D. L., 245 Millidge Ave., Saint John, N.B.
J7766, F/O Gill, W. T. H., 56 Lynd Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J17233, P/O Gillis, W. E., Beech St., Sydney Mines, N.S.
C1036, S/L Gilmore, E. G., 125 Robina Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J15890, P/O Gimbel, E. L., 2845 N. Burling Ave., Chicago, Ill., U.S.A.
J5329, A/F/L Glazebrook, E. H., 5600 Hutchinson St., Outremont, P.Q.
C3422, A/F/L Glazer, A. E., 210 Glenayr Rd., Toronto, Ont.
J17142, P/O Glover, G. L., 18 Alport Rd., Whitchurch, Shropshire, England.
J3701, A/F/L *Godefroy, H. C., 15 Patricia Ave., Newtonbrook, Ont.
J26272, P/O Godfrey, C. O., Coleman, Alta.
J16260, P/O Gordon, W. C., 568 Third Ave. E., Owen Sound, Ont.
J9359, F/O *Gosling, L. C., Box 39, North Battleford, Sask.
J17018, P/O Gowan, H. A., R.R. No. 1, Jarvis, Ont.
J5982, F/O Grant, D. M., 356 MacLaren St., Ottawa, Ont.
J10401, F/O Gray, K. G., Stoughton, Sask.
J15071, A/F/L Green, F. E., 32 Belhaven Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J5683, S/L Grierson-Jackson, W. R. F., 52 Wellington St. E., Guelph, Ont.

J22090, P/O Grudzien, J., 603 Northern Ave., Fort William, Ont.
J3741, F/O Gubb, A. W., Kingsmere, P.E.I.
J22541, F/O Hackett, D., 69 Ordnance St., Kingston, Ont.
J26846, P/O Haddlesey, E. F. G., 865 Water St., Peterborough, Ontario.
J9656, A/F/L Hagerman, D. C., Surbiton, Saskatchewan.
J8601, F/O Haines, A. R., 1238 Vista Heights, Victoria, B.C.
R101669, W/O Hales, A. R., Box 173, Virden, Manitoba.
J18149, P/O Hamilton, W. B., 599 Homewood Ave., Peterborough, Ont.
J17229, P/O Hammond, H. W. E., 1418 Davenport Rd., Toronto, Ont.
J15539, P/O Hammond, L. S., 639 Lansdowne Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J10116, F/O Hanton, F. E. W., 616 Third Ave. S., Kenora, Ont.
J16700 P/O Harding, A. C., Galetta, Ontario.
J18021 P/O Harding, M., Norris Point, Nfld.
J4691 F/O Hardingham, R. J., Surrey, England (Lerryn, The Chase, Kingswood.)
C16909 P/O Harling, R., 192 Honue St., Winnipeg, Man.
J16415, P/O Harrower, H. G., 804-6th Ave., N.W., Moose Jaw, Sask.
J8419, F/O Hartman, P. A., R.F.D. No. 2, Readfield, Me., U.S.A.
J16420, P/O Harvey, H. K. C., Kamsack, Saskatchewan.
J9521, F/O Haugen, E. J., Pelly, Sask.
J15707, P/O Hay, H. B., 82 Rice St., Edmundston, N.B.
J16801, P/O Heaton, P., 2656 W. 5th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J16788, A/F/L Helmsley, A. F., 56 McNairn Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J15093, A/F/L *Henry, D. W., Kincardine, Ontario.
J17441, P/O Henry, R. A., 38 Poucher St., Toronto, Ont.
J18175, P/O Heselton, G. W., 2461 East 21st Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J6720, A/S/L Hess, C. B., Iroquois, Ontario.
J17979, P/O Hewson, K., 43-10-44 St., Long Island City-4, New York, N.Y., U.S.A.
J7080, P/O Higham, J. B., Assiniboia, Sask.
J15522, P/O Hill, H. S., 10606 Sacred Heart Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
J8345, F/O Hilton, W. J., 19 Edgerton St., Brantford, Ont.
C807, W/C *Hodson, K. L. B., 2050 Barclay St., Vancouver, B.C.
J15427, P/O Holmes, G. A., 2340 McIntyre St., Regina, Sask.
J17343, P/O Hoover, H. C., Yeoman, Sask.
R62459, W/O Horan, J. M., 2040 University St., Montreal, P.Q.
J15033, P/O Hosea, R. L. G., Miami, Man.
J4887, F/O Houle, A. U., Box 54, Massey Station, Ontario.
J8971, A/F/L Howell, A. B., Boissevain, Manitoba.
J15514, F/O Howey, E. L., Exeter, Ontario.
J15661, A/F/L Hudson, J., 2012 Oak Bay Ave., Victoria, B.C.
J11498, F/O Hunt, R. G. F., 236 Brock Ave., N., Montreal W., P.Q.
J3994, F/O Hunter, A. G., 254 Kenilworth Ave., S. Hamilton, Ont.
R68534, W/O Hunter, A. R., 530 North Brodie St., Fort William, Ont.
J5445, A/F/L Hutchinson, R. T., Box 700, New Liskeard, Ontario.
J15652, P/O Hynam, G. S., 1044 Dayton St., Akron, Ohio.
J3525, F/L Imrie, A. A. T., 2001 Bloor St. W., Toronto, Ont.
J4771, F/O Ingalls, R. B., Danville, P.Q.
J13372, F/O Ingram, K. E., 193 Pim St., Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.
J21204, F/O Jackson, B. G. D., 2 Pigeon Hill Rd., Weston, Mass., U.S.A.
J15950, P/O Jackson, L. T., Riverside, Ont.
C1629, S/L Jacobs, D. S., 78 Lynwood Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J3500, A/S/L Jacobsen, G. F., 108 Lansdowne Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
J16817, P/O Jennings, H. J., 117 Glendenan Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J3117, P/O Jennings, W. L., 93 Eastbourne Ave., Hamilton, Ontario.
J17291, P/O Jensen, M. G., Woolford, Alta.
J18070, P/O Johnson, J. A. L., R.R. No. 1, Box 8, Ponoka, Alta.
R78489, A/W/O Johnson, L. A., St. Paul, Minn., U.S.A. (130 E. Cook St.)
J15429, F/O Johnston, B. E., 523 Stiles St., Winnipeg, Man.
J15430, F/O Johnston, J. D., River Hebert, Nova Scotia.
J15327, F/L Jones, F. E., Abbotsford, B.C.
J14034, A/F/L Jones, J. A. L., 1428 Queen Anne Ave., Seattle, Wash., U.S.A.
J6016, F/O Jones, T R., 203 South Norah St., Fort William, Ont.
J7433, A/F/L Jost, B. N., 55 S. Bradford St., Dover, Delaware.
J6366, F/O Jowsey, M. E., Box 17, Aylmer E., P.Q.
J16191, A/F/L Julian, T. A., 621 Travis St., Shreveport, Louisiana, U.S.A.
C1075, T/S/L **Hill, G. U., Box 55, Shubenacadie, N.S.
J6494, A/F/L Kallio, O. C., Box 76, R.R. No. 2, Ironwood, Michigan, U.S.A.
J15337, P/O Kay, F. A., 4191 Melrose Ave., N.D.G., Montreal, P.Q.
J12824, A/F/L Keddie, W. N., Evelyn Grove, Southall, Middlesex, England.
J5022, F/L Keefer, G. C., 167 Euston St., Charlottetown, P.E.I.
J17489, P/O Keen, G. F., 114 Robert St., London, Ont.
J15654, F/O Keene, N. A., White Rock, B.C.
J15374, F/O Keith, G. N., Taber, Alta.
J16326, F/O Kelly, G. J. F., 52 Dragon Rd., Harrogate, Yorks, England.
J7455, F/L Keltie, I. G. S., 10022-116 St., Edmonton, Alta.
J6648, A/F/L Kendall, E. C., Brentwood Auto Court, Brentwood Bay, B.C.
J15273, F/O Kennedy, I. F., Cumberland, Ont.
C4801, A/S/L Kenney, D. H., 93 Colborne St., Lindsay, Ont.
J8441, P/O King, W. E., Alton, Ontario.
J15250, A/F/L *Klassen, W. C., Lilac, Sask.
J2972, S/L Kelly, F. W., 85 Braemar Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J16824, P/O Ker, E. A., Fonthill, Ont.
J17067, A/F/L Klufas, W. J., Radway, Alta.
J17037, P/O Knapp, K. R., 100 N. Negley Ave., Pittsburg, Pa., U.S.A.
J16251, P/O Knights, J. K., 1415-25A St. W., Calgary, Alta.
J8341, A/F/L Koester, G. D. S., 2146 N. Court House Rd., Arlington, Virginia, U.S.A.

J17723, P/O Kohut, J., Parkerview, Saskatchewan.
J7931, P/O Kropf, L. E., 4 Fisher St., New Hamburg, Ontario.
J15595, P/O Kusiar, G. W., 24 McDonald St., Mimico, Ont.
J17674, F/O Laberge, J. A. R., 1929 Des Erables Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
R88754, W/O Lafrance, J. F., Lock No. 1, Trenton, Ont.
J4896, F/L Laird, G. J., 168 Eglinton Ave., W., Toronto, Ont.
J1326, A/F/L Lambert, A., 187 Germain St., Saint John, N.B.
J15596, P/O Lancey, G. W., 46 Albany Ave., Toronto, Ont.
R93370, W/O Landale, C. W., 24 McDonald Ave., Mimico, Ont.
J5795, A/F/L Lane, R. J., 1468 Begbie St., Victoria, B.C.
J15834, A/F/L Lane, T. H., Austin, Manitoba.
J18169, P/O Lang, J. C., 4493 W. 12th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J4772, F/O *Langstaff, W. C., Holloway, Ontario.
J22525, P/O Laskey, D., 271 Regent St., Fredericton, N.B.
J16969, P/O Lauckner, I., 102 Wellington St., London, Ont.
J20434, F/O Lauro, J. W., 6008 So. Wood St., Chicago, Ill., U.S.A.
J6409, F/O Lawrence, A. G., Box 110, Bowsman River, Man.
J16669, P/O Laws, J. R., 393 Savoy St., Sarnia, Ont.
J17478, A/F/L Leddy, G. B., 701-3rd Ave., Calgary, Alta.
J20727, F/O Lees, J. S., Box 9, Chilliwack, B.C.
J3756, F/O Legge, H. T., 134-30th Ave. N.E., Calgary, Alta.
J15201, P/O Leith, P. E. M., c/o Royal Bank, Yonge & Richmond St., Toronto, Ont.
J14788, F/O Lenihan, J. F., 15 Victoria St. W., Saint John, N.B.
J16111, P/O *Lewis, T. W., 257 W. Miller Ave., Akron, Ohio, U.S.A.
J10317, F/O Lewis, F. E., 390 Rutland St., St. James, Manitoba.
J11224, F/O Lewis, J. F., 77 Wilson Ave., London, Ont.
J4762, A/F/L Lindo, H. L., New-Hall Bog-Walk, Jamaica, B.W.I.
R79065, W/O Lindsay, G. A., 556 Victoria Ave., Westmount, P.Q.
J17110, P/O Livingston, R. A., Rosebank, Man.
J18385, P/O Love, J. N., 2935 Regina Ave., Regina, Sask.
J15409, P/O Lovelace, J. C., 155 Argyle St., Sydney, N.S.
J16130, P/O Loving, L. R. B., 87-3rd St., Box 40, Mission City, B.C.
J16573, P/O Lymburner, J. A. L., 7085 Boyer St., Montreal, P.Q.
C1359, S/L Logan, L. E., 47 Lees Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
R86155, W/O Lumgair, R. O., Thornhill, Man.
J16310, P/O Macdonald, A., R.R. No. 1, Angus, Ont.
J14691, A/F/L Macdonald, D. A., Rockglen, Sask.
J15644, A/F/L Macdonald, H. B., Sackville, N.B.
J15467, A/F/L *Macdonald, H. D., 30 Croydon Ave., Toronto, Ont.

[Mr. Macmillan.]

J8170, F/O MacIntosh, C. E., 655 Sherbrook St., Winnipeg, Man.
J11962, F/O MacIntosh, I. F., 160 William St. N., Lindsay, Ont.
J5998, F/O MacIntyre, D. P., No. 7 Orange St., Saint John, N.B.
J10976, F/O MacKenzie, A. R., 3831 Melrose Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
J5050, F/O MacKenzie, K. A., 16 Heather St., Toronto, Ont.
J15492, F/O MacKenzie, M. G., 225 Main St., Kenora, Ont.
J17755, P/O MacKenzie, R. E., Ste. 14, Sellar Block, Regina, Sask.
C1107, F/L MacLean, J. A., Beaton Mills, Lewis, P.E.I.
J17712, F/L MacLean, R. S., Box 685, Summerside, P.E.I.
C15711, F/L MacMillan, A., 157 Mallifont St., Cardiff, South Wales.
J18337, P/O MacMillan, G. J. S., Coleville, Sask.
J5975, F/L Magwood, C. M., 414 Dovercourt Rd., Toronto, Ont.
C1635, A/W/C Mair, A. C., 81 Nelson St., Brantford, Ont.
J15521, P/O *Malkin, H., 422 Argyle Ave., Verdun, Que.
C1072, S/L Malloy, D. G., 251 Gladstone Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J8779, F/O Maloney, G. H. E., 180 Carrie St., San Jose, California, U.S.A.
J15638, P/O Mann, L. R., 11 Centre St., Truro, N.S.
R77063, W/O Marcotte, J. H. A., 7163 St. Hubert St., Montreal, P.Q.
J15643, A/F/L Marsh, F. P., 30 Sighthill Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J15225, P/O Martin, S. S., 1225-12th Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.
J8628, F/O Martin, T. J., 2992 Marine Drive West, Vancouver, B.C.
J17624, P/O Mason, J. H., 312 E. 5th St., North Vancouver, B.C.
J8428, P/O Mathews, W. H., c/o Devoe & Raynolds Co., Inc., 44th St. & First Ave., New York, N.Y., U.S.A.
J17114, P/O Maxwell, W. M., Leamington, Ont., R.R. No. 2.
J17536, P/O Meilleur, J. A. F., 2716 Beaubien St., Montreal, P.Q.
J18989, P/O Metheral, R. K., Wapella, Sask.
J11069, F/O Merrifield, L. A., 3334 Yonge St., Toronto, Ont.
J15683, P/O Metheral, K. J., North Edmonton, Alta.
J18559, F/L Midgley, D., 21 Capron St., Paris, Ont.
J16720, P/O Miesen, J. J., Judsonia, Arkansas, U.S.A.
J6946, F/O Miles, H. T., 8 Idyllwood Crescent, Toronto, Ont.
J17077, P/O Miller, E. V., 2154 Windsor Rd., Oak Bay, Victoria, B.C.
J17195, F/L Mills, J. G., 6101 La Salle Blvd., Verdun, Que.
J10255, S/L Millward, J. B., 155 Victoria St., Sherbrooke, Que.
J18923, P/O Mitchell, H. W., 55 Saunders St., Fredericton, N.B.
J16799, F/L Mitchner, J. D., 221-5th Ave., Saskatoon, Sask.
C1170, S/L Moffit, B. H., Apt. 105, 50 Gloucester St., Toronto, Ont.
J18042, P/O Montgomery, D. A., Box 786, Weyburn, Sask.
J17897, P/O Morabito, A. B., Creston, B.C.
C1063, A/S/L Moran, C. C., R.R. No. 4, Trenton, Ont.

J17527, P/O Morey, C. L., Box 102, Cumberland, B.C.
J17009, P/O Morgan, E. E., 98 Ruskin Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
J7021, F/O Morgan, O. H., 1034 Battle St., Kamloops, B.C.
J7459, F/O Morris, J. A., 84 Clifton Hill, London, N.W.8, England.
J15475, A/F/L Morrison, D. R., 634 Millwood Rd., Toronto, Ont.
J15523, P/O Morrison, J. R., 143 Canora St., Winnipeg, Man.
J9764, F/O Morrison, R. G., 1858 W. 1st Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
C1238, A/S/L Morrow, R. E. E., c/o Mrs. C. Bishop, 599 Besserer St., Ottawa, Ont.
J16333, P/O Morton, E. F., Three Mile Plains, N.S.
J16482, A/F/L Morton, J. A., Delisle, Sask.
J15927, F/O Mossip, H. T., 70 Madrid Rd., Baines, S.W.13, London, Eng.
J16247, P/O Moyer, R. C., 329 Earl St., Kingston, Ont.
J4757, A/F/L Mulhall, V. A., Weyburn, Sask.
C16708, A/F/L Mulligan, E. H., 42 Riverside Drive, Sudbury, Ont.
J17499, P/O Munro, J. F., Fitzroy Harbour, Ont.
J15366, A/F/L Murchie, B. D., St. Stephen, N.B.
J7228, F/O Murphy, K. C., 575 Lisgar St., Ottawa, Ont.
J16832, P/O Murphy, M. J., 10 Rix St., Falconbridge, Ont.
J15476, P/O Murray, G. B., 61½ Victoria Pd., Halifax, N.S.
R79421, W/O Murray, G. F. D., 2365 Hampton Ave., Apt. 10, Montreal, P.Q.
J16203, P/O Murrell, S. L., R.R. **6**, Gainsville, Texas, U.S.A.
R58214, W/O Mylrea, F. H., 432 Government St., Victoria, B.C.
J4761, F/L *McAuley, V. C., Centreville, Carleton Co., N.B.
J6661, A/F/L McCaffery, E. H., Miami, Man.
J14907, F/L McCaig, L. N., Ormstown Sta., Que.
J9346, F/O McCarthy, J. C., Three Sister's Rd., St. James, Long Island, N.Y., U.S.A.
J15104, P/O McCarthy, J. P., 160 Midland St., Toronto, Ont.
J5078, F/O McCaul, J. L., 224 Bloor St. W., Toronto, Ont.
R75461, W/O McClelland, R. C., Herbert, Sask.
J9737, F/O McClure, A., 167 Ross St., Welland, Ont.
J15505, F/O McClure, J. E., 37 Victor St., London, Ont.
J6134, A/F/L McCormack, J. E., Estevan, Sask.
C15018, F/L McCrae, J. S., 119 Lewis St., Winnipeg, Man.
J15174, A/S/L McCullach, M. R., Rocky Rapids, Alta.
J15174, A/S/L McCutcheon, J. T., Hudson, Que.
J17898, P/O McDaniell, H. H. L., 3557 W. 6th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J16989, P/O McDonald, C. P., 1384 King St. W., Toronto, Ont.
J5059, P/O McDonald, J. G., Islington, Ont.
J7978, P/O McDonald, J. R., 631 Langford St., Victoria, B.C.
J8812, F/O McDougall, T. R., 373 Klock Ave., North Bay, Ont.
J7230, F/O McElroy, J. F., 196 St. Paul St., Kamloops, B.C.
J17116, P/O McGavock, J. J., 680 St. John's Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
J9482, A/F/L McGee, P. D., 27134 Beverly Rd., Inkster, Mich., U.S.A.
J6843, F/O McGladrey, G. G., 657 Broadview Ave., Toronto, Ont.
C936, W/C McGregor, G. R., R.R. No. 1 W. Rd., Sidney, B.C.
J16889, F/O McGregor, W. K., 103 Peter St., Port Arthur, Ont.
J3596, F/O McIver, B. G., 440 Bay St., N. Hamilton, Ont.
J11107, F/O McIver, M., 151 Mortimer Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J17371, P/O McLaren, F. E., Ste. 7, 705 Westminster Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
J17691, P/O McLellan, W. G., Economy, Col. Co., N.S.
J4912, A/F/L *McLeod, H. W., 2311 Garnet St., Regina, Sask.
R50824, W/O McLeod, R. A., 825-4 St. N.E., Calgary, Alta.
J17117, P/O McMenemy, G. S., Apt. 2, 1041 Main St. E., Hamilton, Ont.
J17955, P/O McMillan, D. J., Landis, Sask.
J10231, F/O McMillan, L., Miami, Man.
J6005, A/F/L McMills, C. R., 7215 Seward Park Ave., Seattle, Wash, U.S.A.
C134, W/C McNab, E. A., 706 Melrose Ave., Saskatoon, Sask.
J9201, A/F/L McNeill, J. G., R.R. No. 4, Calgary, Alta.
J9405, F/O McRae, D. F., 7679 Fraser Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J17664, P/O McSorley, B. F., 160 South Grand Ave., Baldwin, Long Island, N.Y., U.S.A.
J6389, F/L McQuoid, D. J., Summerberry, Sask.
J4745, S/L **McNair, R. W., 1462 Edward St., N. Battleford, Sask .
C1640, F/L Neal, E. L., 26 Richardson St., Beauharnois, P.Q.
J5293, F/O Neilson, A. R., 397 Grove Ave., Windsor, Ont.
C1327, S/L Nesbitt, A. D., 1296 Redpath Cresc., Montreal, P.Q.
J16193, P/O Newitt, R. M., 1537 Haro St., Vancouver, B.C.
C983, S/L Newson, W. F. M., 1092 Transit Rd., Victoria, B.C.
R76180, W/O Nicholl, A., 23 Radford Rd., Leamington, Spa., Warwickshire, England.
J9647, F/O Nielsen, E. L., 921 E. 14th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J17729, P/O Nixon, R. W., 306 Salem Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J15088, S/L *Northcott, G. W., R.R. 1, Box 47, Minnedosa, Man.
J7206, F/O Nutter, W. S. G., 17½ Rosewarne Ave., St. Vital, Man.
J15311, P/O O'Connell, L. J., Box 279, Middleton, N.S.
J15059, P/O O'Connell, W. J. J., 205 Henderson Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
J17770, P/O O'Handley, J. J., George's River Station, N.S.
J4735, P/O Oleinek, P. J., 10127-95th St., Edmonton, Alta.
J5028, P/O Ormston, I. C., 119 Kenaston Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
J16022, F/O Owens, K. H., 495 Metcalfe St., Ottawa, Ont.
J16778, P/O Paddock, C. W., 122 Hargrave St., Winnipeg, Man.
J6007, P/O Paige, E. F., Bridgeport, Ont.
J15818, P/O Palmer, C. W., Dundalk, Ont.
J12982, F/O Palmer, R. W., 294 Second St., Nanaimo, B.C.

J15087, S/L Parker, F. W., 295 Scotia St., Winnipeg, Man.
J7544, P/O *Parks, W. F., Verwood, Sask.
J16704, P/O Parry, A. W., Ste. 2, Eaton Blk., 734 Broadway St., Saskatoon, Sask.
J17328, P/O Parsons, W. C., Cayuga, Ont.
J17080, P/O Patterson, J. W., 198 Davenport Rd., Toronto, Ont.
J9918, F/O Patterson, E. W., Moose Jaw, Sask.
C957, S/L Pattison, J. D., 38 Crescent Rd., Toronto, Ont.
J16114, P/O Paulton, E. A., 423 Bruce Ave., Windsor, Ont.
J4780, S/L Pearson, G. T., 135 Atlas Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J5303, F/O Peel, R., 1630 O'Connor Drive, Toronto, Ont.
J15979, F/O Perkins, C. D., Fonthill, Ont.
J3512, F/L Peters, H. P., 9548-105th St., Edmonton, Alta.
J15000, P/O *Peterson, H. V., 2517-16A St., Calgary, Alta.
J15517, F/L Pettit, W. R., 57 Murray St., Brantford, Ont.
J16060, F/L Pettit, M. W., 291 Glenholme Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J16145, F/L Phillip, R. D., 207 Strathmore Blvd., Toronto, Ont.
J9648, F/L Phipps, R. T., Strome, Alta.
J8608, F/O Pierce, T. W., Box 233, Bracebridge, Ont.
J9694, P/O Pledger, T. O., 86 Kenilworth Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J16530, P/O Pool, G. R., Edrans, Man.
R94737, W/O Porter, G. H., Saltcoats, Sask.
J15339, P/O Powell, L. W., 19 Fry St., Rice Care, Darlington Co., Durham, Eng.
J8817, F/L Powell, P. G., Sorrento, B.C., (Notch Hill Stn.).
J15527, F/O Philpotts, L. E., 69 Hawthorne Ave., St. John, N.B.
J16259, P/O Price, J. R., Indian Head, Sask.
C920, S/L Price, L. B. B., 64 Fordin Cresc., Westmount, P.Q.
J17739, P/O Pridday, R. G., Port Carling, Ont.
J16848, P/O Probert, R. H., 929 Alder Ave., Moose Jaw, Sask.
J6150, F/O Proctor, C. S. W., Apt. 5, 248 Heath St., W., Toronto, Ont.
J16969, P/O Quinlan, B. A., 19th Ave., W., 21 Athlone Apts., Calgary, Alta.
J16157, P/O Quinn, R. N., Bromptonville, P.Q.
J15493, F/L Rae, J. A., 760 Spadina Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J12973, F/L Ramsay, D., Box 53, Alberni, B.C.
J10982, F/L Rawson, B. F. N., 51 Robinson St., Hamilton, Ont.
J16268, P/O Reeves, T. H., 669-13th Ave., New Westminster, B.C.
J9750, F/O Reneau, G. L., 13 Newmarket Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J15356, P/O Reynolds, J. W. B., 418 Isabella St., Pembroke, Ont.
J8421, P/O Reynolds, J. A., 165 Montrose St., Winnipeg, Man.
R93698, W/O Ritchie, J. W., Ste. 20, Derwas Court, 121 St., Edmonton, Alta.
J15098, F/L Roach, N., 2039 West 47th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J10302, F/L Robertson, O. B., Innerkip, Ont.
J12571, F/O Robin, C. E., South Hazelton, B.C.
J9200, F/L Robinson, E. L., 975 Bute St., Vancouver, B.C.

[Mr. Macmillan.]

J10676, F/O Rolfe, V., 101 Queen Victoria St., London E.C. 4, England.
J6166, F/O Roper, F. A., 4212-201 St., Bayside, L.I., N.Y.
J23524, P/O Ross, W. D. F., 2419-14 A. St., W., Calgary, Alta.
J16574, P/O Rowe, A. G., 623 Pape Ave., Toronto, Ont.
C1362, S/L Roy, G. A., 322 Roslyn Ave., Westmount, P.Q.
J16411, P/O Rubin, H. B., 261 Bannerman Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
J16205, P/O Rublee, W. O., Wilkie, Sask.
J12980, F/O Rudeen, H. M., Parkbeg, Sask.
C1319, S/L *Russel, B. D., 607 Clarke Ave., Westmount, P.Q.
J8972, P/O Russell, A. H., Box 123, Tofield, Alta.
J15160, F/O Ruttledge, A. J. D., Box 202, Simcoe, Ont.
J3519, F/L Sabourin, J. J. P., St. Isidore de Prescott, Ont.
J16791, F/L Sandgren, H. W., c/o Pioneer Sash and Door Factory, Vernon, B.C.
J21942, F/O Sattler, M., 811 Victoria Ave., Regina, Sask.
J9149, S/L Saunders, H. L., Fort Qu'Appelle, Sask.
J13415, F/L Savage, C. R., 1514-22nd Ave., S. W. Calgary, Alta.
C1664, S/L Savard, J. L., c/o Robin Hood Flour Mills Ltd., 300 St. Sacrament St., Montreal, P.Q.
J7336, F/O *Schmidt, D. W., Millet, Alta.
J18121, P/O Schmitt, W. H., Arborfield, Sask.
J15092, F/L Schoales, R. A., Ste. 3, Donald Block, Fort William, Ont.
J16359, F/O Schultz, R. D., Bashaw, Alta.
J10224, F/O Scott, D. G., 79 Barnesdale St. N., Hamilton, Ont.
J15509, S/L Semple, G. C., 275 Hastings Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J17203, P/O Senger, W. J., St. John, North Dakota, U.S.A.
J7224, F/O *Shapiro, H., 4865 Queen Mary Rd., Apt., 36, Montreal, P.Q.
J8405, F/O Shemilt, G. L., Keewatin, Ont.
J16137, P/O *Sherk, W. S., Emerson Rd., Fort Erie South, Ont.
J7035, P/O Shoemaker, A. A., 11 Richmond Ave., Kitchener, Ont.
J13018, F/O Shuttleworth, D. D., 29 Newell Apts. Regina, Sask.
J15700, P/O Sibbald, W. J., 36 Grenadier Rd., Toronto, Ont.
J11110, F/O Simpson, D. W., 4899 Dundas St. W., Islington, Ont.
R137108, WO1 Simpson, W. J., 1383 Cadillac Blvd., Detroit, Mich., U.S.A.
C1491, S/L Sinton, C.B., North Shore, Pembroke, W., Bermuda, B.W.I.
J16999, P/O Skilleter, E. A., 506 Vaughan Rd., Toronto, Ont.
C1379, F/L Small, N. E., 4524 West 11th, Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J16325, F/O Smart, D. S., 13 Roslyn Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
J15771, P/O Smith, A., Fairport Beach Rd., Dunbarton, Ont.
J15203, F/O Smith, A. I., Box 167 Islington, Post Office, Ont.
J5690, F/L Smith, F. D., 936-19th Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.
J17639, F/L Smith, F. S., Lake Ave., Selkirk, Man.
J6960, P/O Smith, J. G., Guatemala, C. A. (Finca Moco, Guatalon,).

J15959, P/O Smith, K. C. A., 438-6th St., Saskatoon, Sask.
J16734, F/L Smith, N., Arnprior, Ont.
J17080, P/O Smith, R. F., 175 W 10th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J4561, F/L Smith, R. I. A., 3052-18th Ave., Regina, Sask.
J16159, F/O Smith, S. T., 10313-124th St., Edmonton, Alta.
J15257, S/L Snider, J. D., 20 Haddon Ave. S., Hamilton, Ont.
C18909, P/O Sondergaard, A. C., Ponoka, Alta.
R70517, W/O Sorsdahl, C. E., Midale, Sask.
J16825, P/O Souch, G. A., 104 Wolverleigh Blvd., Toronto, Ont.
J15722, F/O Spanner, F. G., 7 Ridout St., Toronto, Ont.
J27366, P/O Spence, C. E., 1115 First Ave., Verdun, P.Q.
J3995, F/L *Spence, J. A., 95 Gordon St., Guelph, Ont.
J16535, P/O Spence, P. E., 95 South Bentinck St., Sydney, N.S.
J18223, P/O Steinberg, O., 4007 Marlowe Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
J5831, P/O Sterne, J. R., 10159-118th St., Edmonton, Alta.
J5306, F/O Sterns, W. M., 63 Cartier St., Ottawa, Ont.
J17321, P/O Stevens, G. A. H., South St., Bridgetown, N.S.
J5104, F/O Stevens, W. J., 490 Broadview Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
J18013, P/O Stewart, D. K., 1825-1½ Ave., W., Prince Albert, Sask.
J15536, P/O Stewart, H. W., 7064 De L'Epee Ave., Montreal, P.Q.
J8429, P/O Stickell, J. H., Gilson, Ill., U.S.A.
J8418, F/L Stinson, H. K., 64 Bond St., Lindsay, Ont.
J13597, F/O Stovel, A. B., 124 Grenfell Blvd., Tuxedo, Winnipeg, Man.
J16835, P/O Stovel, C. C., 44 Hindes Rd., Harlow, Middlesex, Eng.
J8760, F/O Striebel, J. H. Jr., 5802 London Rd. Duluth, Minnesota, U.S.A.
J16178, P/O Stutt, R. A., 792 Bloomfield Ave., Outremont, P.Q.
J18830, P/O Suarez, E. H. J., 146 Sherbrooke St., Winnipeg, Man.
J15131, S/L Suggitt, W. R. 250 Cedarvale Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J3722, P/O Sutton, R. H., 10246 Wadhurst Rd., Edmonton, Alta.
J8420, F/O Sutton, W. W., Gibsland, Louisiana, U.S.A.
J9783, F/O Sweany, G. A., Myrtle, Manitoba.
J15176, F/L Swetman, W. H., c/o A. M. Dewar, Metropolitan Bldg., Toronto, Ont.
J15119, P/O Swingler, J. E., 351 Wolseley St., Port Arthur, Ont.
J16507, P/O Symons, J. H., 138 Parkview Ave., St. James, Man.
J16688, P/O Taerum, T. H., 334-15th Ave., Calgary, Alta.
J16517, P/O Tait, G. B., 2598 W. 33rd Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J10715, F/O Taschereau, J. L., 68 Maisonneuve Ave., Quebec, P.Q.
J15535, P/O Taylor, R. W., 87 Cambridge St., Victoria, B.C.
J15223, P/O Tett, J. K., 29 Classic Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J10506, F/L Thompson, W. R., P.O. Box 214, Fraser Mills, B.C.
J17743, P/O Thomson, J. S., 1775 Blanca St., Vancouver, B.C.
J16938, P/O Thornton, G. M., 532 Spence St., Winnipeg, Man.
J9525, F/O Thorp, N., Ste. 18, Linwood Court, St. James, Winnipeg, Man.
J15011, P/O Tilley, R. F., Clearwater, Florida, U.S.A.
J7343, F/O Tilson, H., 17 McCallum Block, Regina, Sask.
J17133, P/O Towse, J. F. W., 82 Coldwater Rd. W., Orillia, Ont.
J5678, F/L Trickett, R. I., Box 123, Humboldt, Sask.
J10163, F/O Trilsbeck, T., 58 Pauline Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J17603, P/O Tripp, P. C. H., 5483 Boundary Rd., Vancouver, B.C.
J15777, F/L Troke, G. W., Wolfville, N.S.
J17428, P/O Tupper, B. H., 902-10th St., Saskatoon, Sask.
J17533, P/O Turenne, D. J., St. Pierre, Man.
J6663, F/L Turnbull, H. B., 208 South Mitton St., Sarnia, Ont.
J6211, F/O *Turnbull, J. H., 109 Stanley St., St. Thomas, Ont.
J7326, F/O Turner, G., Minaki, Ont.
J18430, P/O Usher, C. J., 5949 Willingdon Place, Vancouver, B.C.
C873, W/C Van Camp, W. C., 113 Rennies' Mill Rd., St. Johns, Nfld.
R69035, W/O Van Rassel, A. J. G., Box 164, Arnprior, Ont.
J17326, P/O Vandekerckhove, G. P. C., Stoney Mountain, Man.
R56103, W/O Vanexan, W. C., Box 75, Smiths Falls, Ont.
J17099, P/O Vinish, G. A., Box 229, Wakaw, Sask.
J17351, P/O Vogan, G. L., Millbank, Ont.
C827, W/C Waddell, R. C. A., Box 1055, Peterborough, Ont.
J5680, F/L Waggett, H. A. S., 80 Roslin Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J14553, F/L Wagner, R. J., Spruce Grove, Alta.
J15457, F/L Wainwright, L. A., 20 Woodcroft Crescent, Toronto, Ont.
J3205, F/L Walker, B. R., 189 John St., London, Ont.
J15336, F/O Walker, D. R., Blairmore, Alta.
R74078, W/O Walker, H. A., 98 Hamilton Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
J3199, F/L **Walker, J. E., 10804-98th St., Edmonton, Alta.
R107273, W/O Walsh, C. A., 52 Union Terrace, Gilly-Gate, Yorkshire, Eng.
J18398, P/O Warren, M. W., Geraldton, Ont.
R102093, W/O Warne, D. E., Kennedy, Sask.
J7520, P/O Waterbury, O. R., Birtle, Man.
J6362, F/O Waterman, F. C. E., Princeton, B.C.
J5689, F/O Waterman, T. J. D., 4553 W. 14th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J5300, F/O Watts, A. I., Brentwood Auto Court, Brentwood, V.I., B.C.
J4688, F/L Watts, J. V., 150 Catherine St., Hamilton, Ont.
J4956, F/L Webster, A. E., 1210 Harwood St., Vancouver, B.C.
J11598, F/O Webster, M. D., 5421 Hutchison St., Montreal, P.Q.
J10519, S/L Weedon, P. G., Paddockwood, Sask.
J10822, F/O Weiser, W., 1475 Grant Concourse, Bronx, N.Y., U.S.A.
J6650, F/L Westerman, C. F., 1236 Athol St., Regina, Sask.
J4813, F/L Wheeler, A. B., Leedstown, Morton, N.Z.

J15484, F/L White, P. B., 9 Lyndale Ave., London, England.
J16419, P/O White, W. J., 223 Kilbride Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
J15281, F/L Whitham, J., 11121-125th St., Edmonton, Alta.
J17846, P/O Whyte, G. B., 19 Central St., Battle Creek, Mich., U.S.A.
J17957, P/O Wilby, P., Pyramid Mountain Lodge, Jasper, Alta.
J15138, F/O Wilby, T. R., 81 Regent St., Fredericton, N.B.
J10026, F/O Wilhelmson, S. W. R., Elbow, Sask.
J6026, F/O Wilkin, R. P., 10304-123rd St., Edmonton, Alta.
J6991, F/L Williams, D. J., 1874-W-10th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
J15604, P/O Williams, J. W., 548 McConnell Rd., Chilliwack, B.C.
J17821, P/O Williams, R. J., Knowlton, P.Q.
J9577, F/O Williams, V. A., 132 Cavell Ave., Hamilton, Ont.
J9871, F/L Wilson, C. A., 4 Melbourne St. W., Lindsay, Ont.
J15542, P/O Wilson, D. C., 41 Strath Ave., Kingsway Park, Toronto, Ont.
J17520, P/O Wilson, L. G., 489 Philip St., Niagara Falls, Ont.
J15778, P/O Wiseman, D. R., 895-4th Ave., N.E., Moose Jaw, Sask.
C1653, S/L Woods, W. B., 69 Wychwood Park, Toronto, Ont.
J15195, P/O Wright, J. G., Liverpool, N.S.
J7233, F/O Wright, J. G., 18 Tormey St., Ottawa, Ont.
J17434, P/O Yackman, F. W., 191 College St., Sudbury, Ont.
J16906, P/O Young, G. W., 7 Westmoreland Ave., Toronto, Ont.
J17392, P/O Young, W. J., 522-21st Ave. West, Calgary, Alta.
J17230, P/O Zee, J. A., 53 Slater Ave., Jewett City, Conn.

Distinguished Flying Medal

Number—Rank—Name—Home Address

R90244, F/Sgt. Aitcheson, G. D., R.R. 3, Stratford, Ont.
R58623, F/S Alexander, E. S., 3519 26th Ave. W., Vancouver, B.C.
R64131, Sgt. Anderson, H. J., 120 Robinson St., Hamilton, Ont.
R101990, Sgt. Anderson, L. L., 547 Sherbrooke St., Winnipeg, Man.
R86915, Sgt. Anderson, M. B., General Delivery, Calgary, Alta.
R76463, F/Sgt. Anthony, E. H., Port Williams, N.S.
R95996, F/Sgt. Armstrong, H. T. B., 201 Powell Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
R72341, F/Sgt. Back, S., 39 Wolsely St., Toronto, Ont.
R69847, F/S Baker, J. B., 16 Balsam Ave., Toronto, Ont.
R83899, F/Sgt. Balkwill, S. H., 974 College St., Toronto, Ont.
R85860, F/S Ballantyne, J. H., 1529 Bathurst St., Toronto, Ont.
11620, F/S Banks, J. S., c/o Mrs. N. Marchant, East Angus, P.Q.
R67788, Sgt. Barrick, J. F., P.O. Box 3267, Odessa, Texas, U.S.A.
R104782, F/Sgt. Barsalou, J. A. J., 2770 St. Catherine Rd., Montreal, P.Q.
R68061, Sgt. Bebensee, D. G., Bothwell, Ont.
R91903, Sgt. Beckwith, H., 436 McLeod Ave., East Kildonan, Man.

[Mr. Macmillan.]

R61216, F/S Bell, H. C. D., 11231 St., Albert Rd., Edmonton, Alta.
R76955, Sgt. Bell, R. G., R.R. No. 1, Victoria, B.C.
R83055, F/S Bent, W. T., Sikeston, Miss. U.S.A.
R107194, Sgt. Bergey, E. K., Guernsey, Sask.
R106299, Sgt. Berven, B. M., Fort Qu'Appelle, Sask.
R92610, F/Sgt. Betty, J. W., Box 32 Hanna, Alta.
R93566, F/Sgt. Bigoray, W. W., Redwater, Alta.
R76038, F/Sgt. Bishop, A. A., New Mines, Kings Co., N.S.
R95321, F/S Bissett, J. M., 25 Rosewarne Ave., St. Vital, Man.
R56057, Sgt. Blanchet, J. P. G., 853 Cloutier St., Three Rivers, Que.
R64618, F/S Boucher, L. J., Grand Falls, N.B.
R77285, Sgt. Bouvier, J. M. L., c/o Miss Moise Handfield, Vercheres, P.Q.
R124853, Sgt. Bowlby, A. T., Wilmot, Annapolis Co., N.S.
R110387, Sgt. Boynton, B. D., 1505-15st East, Calgary, Alta.
R128254, Sgt. Booth, R. J., 1319-8th Ave. N., Saskatoon, Sask.
R78203, Sgt. Bray, C. L., 40 Hazelton Ave., Toronto, Ont.
R104908, Sgt. Breakwell, G., Dannevirke, N.Z.
R71563, F/Sgt. Brichta, P. S. O., Sutton West, Ont.
R60150, F/S Broomfield, J. O., Turner Valley, Alta.
R54826, Sgt. Bruyere, G. J. R., 7154 Nancy St., Montreal, Que.
R79195, F/Sgt. Bullock, C. H., 17A-20th Ave., Lachine, P.Q.
R76052, Sgt. Burke, J. R. A., 128 Arthur St., Truro, N.S.
R82285, F/Sgt. Burpee, L. J., 111 Powell Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
R92979, Sgt. Burton, J. R., Acton, Montana, U.S.A.
R66602, F/Sgt. Burton, R. J., Box 2, Smooth Rock Falls, Ont.
R72557, F/Sgt. Butler, C. T., Yorke Point, P.E.I.
R88361, Sgt. Butts, Nolan, Mira Gut, Cape Breton, N.S.
R97038, Sgt. Carleton, E. B., 584½ De Grassi St., Toronto, Ont.
R79113, Sgt. Carlon, T. E., 6406 Henri Julien St., Montreal, P.Q.
R127907, Sgt. Canter, W., 252 Grace St., Toronto, Ont.
R115419, F/Sgt. Charters, R. B., 60 Scott St., Brampton, Ont.
R117497, Sgt. Chepil, M., Edwin, Man.
R69511, F/S Chrisholm, D. A., 332 Spadina Rd., Toronto, Ont.
R83457, Sgt. Chretien, G. T., 10 Wolfe St., Penetanguishene, Ont.
R134085, Sgt. Collins, L. G., Marchwell, Sask.
R126312, F/S Connell, P. F., 77 St. James St., Saint John, N.B.
R80203, F/S Cook, B., Arden, Man.
R102446, Sgt. Cornish, D. M., Scout Lake, Sask.
R84492, F/S Craft, R. G., 14 Bowes Ave., Brantford, Ont.
R54334, Sgt. Craig, K. W., City View, Ont.
R74224, F/S Craig, W. D., R.R. No. 1, Westboro, Ont.
R64432, Sgt. Creeden, J. W., 100 Grand River St., Paris, Ont.

R65465, F/S Crosby, K. E., R.R. No. 1, South Ohio, Yarmouth County, N.S.
R84062, F/S Crozier, D. M., Walkerton, Ont.
R58307, F/Sgt. Cumberland, D. A., Britannia Beach, B.C.
R56257, Sgt. Curtis, R. E., 251 Preston St., Ottawa, Ont.
R56902, F/S Dagg, F. G., 121 Ethelbert St., Winnipeg, Man.
R60726, Sgt. Dalphond, M. H. J., Morinville, Alta.
R67606, F/S Darby, C. E., Harrow, Ont.
R90395, Sgt. Davey, R. R., Durham, Ont., R.R. No. 2.
R117353, F/S Davis, K. G., 38 Munro Park Ave., Toronto, Ont.
R55311, F/S Delany, C. E., 11 Murray Ave., Quebec, P.Q.
R87600, F/S De Marco, F. V., 507 Ewen Ave., New Westminster, B.C.
R88360, Sgt. DeMone, H. E., Bridgewater, N.S.
R110183, Sgt. Dempster, J. M., 1657 Barclay St., Vancouver, B.C.
R140664, F/S Dennis, P. W., 1407 Murray Ave., Fort William, Ont.
R95950, F/S De Silva, D., 49 Hadfield St., Georgetown, British Guiana, S.A.
R73246, F/S Dickson, J. D., Rothesay, N.B.
R96009, F/S Dimma, T. W., 436 Albert St., Ottawa, Ont.
R72835, F/S Dockendorff, G. G., North River, P.E.I.
R69718, F/S Donahue, C. J., 60 Lindsay St., Lindsay, Ont.
R71704, W/O Donelly, T. H., 304 Silverthorne Ave., Toronto, Ont.
R111679, F/S Dorie, J. E., 536 Bedford St., Cornwall, Ont.
R80737, F/S Dorland, R., 14 Rotfield, Islington, Ont.
R75287, F/S Drechsler, W. W. A. J., 48 Lake Shore Rd., Mimico, Ont.
R114911, F/S Dubois, R., Coderre, Sask.
R64743, Sgt. Duffield, H. C., Woodstock, N.B.
R125456, Sgt. Duval, J. P. A. J., Gracefield, P.Q.
R75188, F/S Edwards, J. F., Battleford, Sask.
R87920, F/S Egri, W. E., R.R. No. 2, Abbotsford, B.C.
R87302, F/S Einarson, J. W., Shellbrook, Sask.
R90093, Sgt. Elliott, R. C., 194 Gamble Ave., Toronto, Ont.
R113675, Sgt. Ellis, R. W., Rothesay, N.B.
R114226, F/S Evans, J. H., Waterloo, Ont.
R62201, Sgt. Falloon, G. H., 1160-4th St., Brandon, Man.
R101037, F/S Fast, A. P., R.R. No. 1, Brown Rd. N., Langley Prairie, B.C.
R61629, F/S Fay, A. E., Lebret, Sask.
R117536, Sgt. Ferrell, G., 117 Beach St., Belleville, N.J., U.S.A.
R71000, Sgt. Finlayson, S. F., Broadview, Sask.
R107186, Sgt. Finnerty, G. P., Rosetown, Sask.
R82738, Sgt. Fisher, C. A., Iroquois, Ont.
R62101, Sgt. Fisher, D. S., Biggar, Sask.
R70951, F/S Franciscone, A., 2058 MacTavish St., Regina, Sask.
R157764, F/S Fussell, A. C. W., 3614 Turner St., New Westminster, B.C.
R64480, Sgt. Galloway, J. E., Milton, Ont.
R120080, Sgt. Gaunt, S., 10 High St., Pascoag, Rhode Island, U.S.A.
R122162, F/S Gibb, A. P., 1939-W-42nd St., Vancouver, B.C.
R64935, F/S Gill, H. L., South Devon, York County, N.B.
R93824, F/S Gillmore, J. H., Picardville, Alta.
R70096, F/S Goodall, G. L., 12 Helen Ave., Brantford, Ont.
R66493, F/S Goodwin, H., 168 Fernbrook Ave., Wyncote, Penna., U.S.A.
R139157, Sgt. Goudy, C. M., Campbellford, Ont.
R106620, F/S Gray, M. F., 2892-W-28th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
R56500, Sgt. Greenshields, J., Senneville, Que.
R86893, F/S Halkett, A. M., Peace River, Alta.
R85430, F/S Hamilton, F. F., Mazenod, Sask.
R92421, Sgt. Harris, W. F., 4369 Cypress St., Vancouver, B.C.
R111540, Sgt. Harrison, A., 134 First St. West, Cornwall, Ont.
R67197, F/S Haunts, L. W., 412 Albert St., Kingston, Ont.
R135881, F/S Hicks, R. B., Pierrepont Manor, New York, U.S.A.
R78427, Sgt. Hiley, F. S., 80 Courcelette Rd., Toronto, Ont.
R98109, F/S Higgins, F. J., Amherstburg, Ont.
R87742, F/S Hill, W., 1320 Government St., Penticton, B.C.
R123276, F/S Hill, W. L. H., 1115 Wellington St., Ottawa, Ont.
R101822, F/S Hinke, E. A., 1830 Daisy Ave., Long Beach, Calif., U.S.A.
R75448, F/S Hobson, D. P., 621-6th Ave., North Saskatoon, Sask.
R87652, Sgt. Holland, J. S., 829 Obispo Ave., Coral Gables, Fla., U.S.A.
R96080, Sgt. Holtby, L. M. M., Hawkesbury, Ont.
R76770, F/S Horne, A. M., 11902-94th St., Edmonton, Alta.
R72099, F/S Horricks, G. E., 265 Withrow Ave., Toronto, Ont.
R70985, F/S Hosick, B. B., Webb, Sask.
R175947, F/S Hughes, R. F., 1235 Kelowna, Vancouver, B.C.
R83615, F/S, Humphrey, L. W., 1 Clarendon Ave., Toronto, Ont.
R151677, Sgt. Hurst, R. N., Box 332, Duncan, B.C.
R109784, Sgt. Jackson, F. M., Jr., 419 Venable St., Apt. 71, Atlanta, Georgia, U.S.A.
R130765, F/S Jackson, W. C., 10123-123rd St., Edmonton, Alta.
R88329, F/S Janes, A. J., 19 Inglis St., Halifax, N.S.
R55378, F/S Keane, W. H., 20 Julia St., Quebec, P.Q.
R86106, Sgt. Kernaghan, S. J., Cartwright, Man.
R53757, F/S Kerr, H. J. F., Russell, Ont.
R91887, F/S King, D. B., 259 Kitson St., Norwood, Man.
R149596, Cpl. Knelson, H., Bladworth, Sask.
R86096, F/S Kruger, F. C., Bede, Man.
R87727, F/S Lancaster, G. H., 21 Preston Rd., Queen's Park, Bedford, Eng.
R94742, F/S Larson, F. H., 2310 8th St. W., Calgary, Alta.
R103284, F/S Laughland, A. M., 9 University Ave., Guelph, Ont.
R72828, Sgt. Leavitt, W. H. C., Alberton, P.E.I.
R133390, Sgt. Leckie, J. C., R.R. No. 1, Osoyoos, B.C.
R98963, Sgt. Ledford, W. H., 2138 Lorne Ave., Saskatoon, Sask.

R122464, Sgt. Lee, J. P., Box 221, Cashmere, Wash., U.S.A.
R77120, Sgt. Leet, R. J., 420 Grosvenor Ave., Westmount, P.Q.
R77184, Sgt. Lepine, J. H. C. A., 84 Rue Ste. Anne, Ste. Anne de Bellevue, P.Q.
R56328, F/S Lewis, W. T., 6133 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal, P.Q.
10083, F/S Lockhart, R. C., Newport, N.S.
R63680, Sgt. Long, E. R., 246 Thames St. N., Ingersoll, Ont.
R105598, Sgt. Low, G. H., 11428-87th St., Edmonton, Alta.
R96467, F/S Lowans, E. J., 182 King St. E., Gananoque, Ont.
R87366, F/S Lundeen, C. P., Preeceville, Sask.
R68535, FS MacDonald, D. M., 424 N. Marks St., Fort William, Ont.
R140676, Sgt. MacDonald, R. J., Basswood, Manitoba.
R92109, FS MacFarlane, R. E., 295 McSween Rd., Chilliwack, B.C.
R78574, FS MacKenzie, A. G., Lucknow, Ont.
R83959, FS MacKenzie, G. T., 44 Oakwood Ave., Toronto, Ont.
R112723, FS MacLean, D. A., 111 Wallace Ave., Toronto, Ont.
R70978, FS MacLennan, I. R., Gull Lake, Saskatchewan.
R83335, FS MacMonagle, W. D., 875 Ardmore Ave., Akron, Ohio, U.S.A.
R64116, FS MacNab, B. C., Milton, Ont.
R74901, Sgt. Maitland, W. J., 4489 Angus Drive, Vancouver, B.C.
R70100, FS Marsh, C. S., R.R. 3, Milton, Ontario.
R64125, Sgt. Martin, D. C., 46 Balfour St., Brantford, Ont.
R101644, FS Matheson, S. G., Stonewall, Manitoba.
R103101, FS Matthews, J. L., 486 St. Patrick Sq., Port Arthur, Ont.
R103566, Sgt. Matthews, L. W., 1228-13th Ave. W., Calgary, Alta.
R55325, FS Meagher, J. M., Mulgrave, N.S.
R110157, Sgt. Mellin, A. A., Jaynee Rd., Duncan, B.C.
R104847, FS Merchant, J. F., Sturgeon Falls, Ontario.
R83305, FS Merrick, W. T., 318 S.E. 8th St., Evansville, Ind., U.S.A.
R80314, Sgt. Mitchell, B. E., 579 Rathgar Avenue, Winnipeg, Man.
R74313, Sgt. Mitchell, G. E., 74 Clarence St., Sydney, N.S.W., Australia.
R124098, FS Mitchell, P.D., Kamloops, B.C.
R54030, Sgt. Morin, P. E., c/o Bank of Montreal, 144 Wellington St., Ottawa, Ontario.
R79681, Sgt. Moritz, F. J., Gull Lake, Sask.
R69362, FS Moroney, B. H., 344 Elm St., W., Sudbury, Ont.
R54068, FS Morris, A. W., Merrickville, Ont.
R80521, Sgt. Morrison, D. R., 634 Willwood Ave., Toronto, Ont.
R100533 Sgt. Morrissy, H., 512 Ryers Ave., Cheltenham, Pa., U.S.A.
R101074, FS Morton, C. L., 3039 Deakin St., Berkeley, California, U.S.A.
R69580, Sgt. Moss, D., 261 Keewatin Ave., Toronto, Ont.
R61626, FS Mullen, R. G., Canora, Sask.

[Mr. Macmillan.]

R77162, FS McArthur, E. M., 17 Lake Avenue, Strathmore, P.Q.
R107825, FS McAvoy, J. K., 761 Broadway, Ave., Winnipeg, Man.
R128527, Sgt. McBeath, H. L., c/o Mrs. Wilson, 3236 W. 10th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.
R74814, FS McCabe, D., 1039 Foul Bay Rd., Victoria, B.C.
R98555, FS McCoy, D. J., Carruthers, Sask.
R97376, FS McDonald, C. P., 1384 King St. West, Toronto, Ont.
R67064, FS McIlquham, T. O., Carleton Place, Ontario.
R82852, FS McIntosh, W. P. M., St. Andrews West, Cornwall, Ont.
R81480, FS McKinnon, L. M., Box 560, Revelstoke, B.C.
R101601, Sgt. McNamara, R., Carman, Man.
R61684, FS Neale, K. F., 1025 Downing St., Winnipeg, Man.
R83384, FS Nitz, A. F., 317 East St., Flint, Gennerso, Mich.
R87404, FS Nutting, S. H., Radisson, Sask.
R114949, Sgt. Oancia, S., Stonehenge, Sask.
R51831, FS Oates, R. J., 31 Grove Road, Leighton Buzzard, Beds., England.
R95724, FS O'Connor, H. J., 16 Jenkins St., Kingston, Ont.
R85461, Sgt. Osler, E. E., 2238 Montague St., Regina, Sask.
R64466, Sgt. Paige, B. C., P.O. Box No. 146, Bridgeport, Ont.
R65307, FS Parker, D. H., Lower Granville, Anna. Co., N.S.
R113939, Sgt. Parker, D. F. G., Dalhousie, New Brunswick.
R93694, FS Patch, Harry Eugene, 169 Beacon Rd., Broadstairs, Kent, England.
R98024, FS Paulton, A. C., 423 Bruce Ave., Windsor, Ont.
R86900, FS Pearce, D. R., 11138-70th Street, Edmonton, Alta.
R100368, FS Peck, C. W. W., Suite 201, St. George's Manor, Port Arthur, Ont.
R55241, FS Pichette, J. E. R., Restigouche, Bonaventure County, Que.
R58718, FS Pierce, E. M., 2401 Alberta St., Vancouver, B.C.
R134264, FS Pollock, J. R., 235 Avenue J North, Saskatoon, Sask.
R58432, FS Porritt, W. J., 8707 French St., Vancouver, B.C.
R84592, Sgt. Price, E. G., Canterbury, N.B.
R79417, Sgt. Price, G. R., 2664 Moreau St., Montreal, P.Q.
R136383, Sgt. Quesnel, J. H. L., Orchard Ave., Port Credit, Ont.
R64433, FS Quinn, C. J., Box 106, Liberty, Sask.
R55373, FS Rainville, G. H., Grande-Allée, Quebec City, Que.
R66130, Sgt. Ratcliffe, J. T., R.R. No. 2 Thorold Road, Welland, Ont.
R67906, FS Reid, D. G., 69 Hanna St. East, Windsor, Ont.
R68070, Sgt. Reinhart, W. L., 148 Rebecca St., Stratford, Ont.
R101393, FS Richardson, H. H., 523 Rosedale Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

R55971, Sgt. Rivard, J. J. N., 14 Scott St., La Tuque, Laviolette Co., Que.

R60727, Sgt. Roach, M., 2039 W. 47th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

R115536, Sgt. Roach, W., R.R. No. 2, Duncan, B.C.

R133383, FS Roberts, F. J., 2906 W. 36th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

R54188, Sgt. Robillard, J. L. G., 15 Elm St., Ottawa, Ont.

R65749, FS Robinson, C., 2043 Belgrave Ave., N.D.G., Montreal, P.Q.

R65063, FS Robson, C. A., 72 Chamberlain St., Ottawa, Ont.

R95492, FS Ross, A. L., Holland, Man.

R58820, Sgt. Runner, J. M., Treheime, Man.

R64894, FS Rutledge, E. E., Canterbury, N.B.

R61810, FS Schauenberg, B. L., Verwood, Sask.

R98788, Sgt. Schofield, N. L., 833 Ave. C., N. Saskatoon, Sask.

R128113, Sgt. Schmidt, E. F., Herschel, Sask.

R70877, Sgt. Scott, C. G., Bowness P.O., Calgary, Alta.

R80023, FS Shannon, R. A., Suite 2, 189 Kelwin St., Winnipeg, Man.

R84134, Sgt. Shellington, W. R., 82 Erie Ave., Brantford, Ont.

R79864, FS Shirley, C. A., Carlyle, Sask.

4190NP, Sgt. Skebo, T. H., 164 Bertrand St., Winnipeg, Man.

R79352, FS Skillen, R. L., Saguenay Inn, Arvida, P.Q.

R112604, Sgt. Smale, J. L., 118 Pacific Ave., Toronto, Ont.

R91243, Sgt. Smith, A. G., 232 Bain Ave., Toronto, Ont.

R106305, Sgt. Smith, D. M., 380 Vernon Rd., St. James, Man.

R70152, Sgt. Smith, D. V., 25 Sandford Ave., Toronto, Ont.

R83451, FS Smith, J. F., 134 Lorne Ave., Chatham, Ont.

R60902, Sgt. Smitten, L., 9912-84th Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

R121611, FS Sneddon, J. A., 12218-80 St., Edmonton, Alta.

R95447, FS Soderquist, D. D., Washburn, North Dakota, U.S.A.

R78542, FS Spence, R. L., Highgate, Ont.

R86855, FS Spraggs, L. A., Didsbury, Alta.

R67059, FS Stephenson, W. H., 105 Great St. James St., Belleville, Ont.

R116291, Sgt. Stevens, L. C., Rapid City, Man.

R69116, FS Stewart, A. W., 138-5th St., Noranda, P.Q.

R86828, FS Stewart, E. C., Camrose, Alta.

R77295, FS Stewart, W. E., 14 Newton St., Sherbrooke, Que.

R80154, FS Stewner, R., 625 Belmont Ave., Westmount, P.Q.

R86215, FS Storms, D. W., Emerson, Man.

7812, FS Strutt, G. J., Shawville, Que.

R85849, FS Sutherland, F. A., 1344 Mount Pleasant Road, Toronto, Ont.

R86095, FS Sutherland, G. G., 802 Governor Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

R77522, FS Swanson, M. L., 9852-81st Ave., Edmonton, Alta.

R87620, Sgt. Switzer, A. W., Revelstoke, B.C.

R81075, Sgt. Taylor, E. A., 7544 Heather St., Vancouver, B.C.

R60723, Sgt. Taylor, H. A., Halkirk, Alta.

R98213, FS Taylor, R. E., R.R. No. 6, Boonville, Ind., U.S.A.

R61012, FS Templeman, T., 7726-107th St., Edmonton, Alta.

R92293, FS Thomas, E. H., 715-16th Ave., New Westminster, B.C.

R88221, Sgt. Thomas, L. I., Hillcrest Ave., West, Richmond, Va., U.S.A.

R65039, Sgt. Thomson, G. H., 369 Brunswick St., Fredericton, N.B.

R64242 FS Tice, H. F., Grimsby Beach, Ont.

R91742, Sgt. Tod, R. E., Lot 39, St. Vital Rd., St. Vital, Man.

R71763, Sgt. Townley, W. B., 49 St. Clair Ave. West, Toronto, Ont.

R62971, FS Trask, W. P., Carleton, Yarmouth County, N.S.

R69565, Sgt. Trebell, J. G., 180 Geoffrey St., Toronto, Ont.

R128945, Sgt. Tribe, D. F., P.O. Box 33, Courtney, B.C.

R62270, FS Turnour, N.C., c/o Mrs. Thom, 2930 Heather St., Vancouver, B.C.

R120945, FS Trotter, E. J., Tuberose, Sask.

R86544, FS Tutton, F. M., 12121-94th St., Edmonton, Alta.

R61603 Sgt. Turnbull, R. S., Govan, Sask.

R79229, FS Vachon, E. T., R.R. No. 2, Ayer's Cliffe, P.Q.

R67655, FS Vander Dasson, W. L., 710 Giles Blvd. E., Windsor, Ont.

R114511, Sgt. Warren, E. F., 2133 Rae St., Regina, Sask.

R66150, FS Watlington, H. F., Hamilton, Bermuda.

R117523, Sgt. Watts, J. D., 4406-West 8th Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

R53903, FS Weatherall, R. L., 33 Ann St., Eastview, Ontario.

R83374, Sgt. Weaver, C., 1201 N.W. 38th St., Oklahoma City, Okla., U.S.A.

R115098, FS Welch, H. R., 303 McDonald Ave., Belleville, Ont.

R134479, FS Werbiski, M. N., Rorketon, Man.

R70619, Sgt. Wertzler, E. E., Red Deer, Alta.

R59107, FS Wheatley, R. J. A., 115 Furley Street, Winnipeg, Man.

R84748, FS White, M. E., Centreville, N.B.

R82447, FS White, R. J., 24 Harvy St., Perth, Ont.

R62400, FS Williams, G. E., 1202-13th St. East, Saskatoon, Sask.

R99773, Sgt. Williams, J. M. M., 150 Henderson Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

R75610, FS Withington, T. D., R.R. No. 4, Kitchener, Ont.

R149155, FS Wobick, H. A., 822-7th St. S., Lethbridge, Alta.

R54201, Sgt. Woodburn, J. D., Cyrville, Ont.

R87951, FS Wooley, J. R., Cottage Inn, Whytecliff P.O., B.C.

R83562, FS Wortley, W. H., 330 Gladstone Ave., Toronto, Ont.

R75288, FS Wright, R. W., 903 6th Ave. N., Saskatoon, Sask.

R67165, FS Yates, G. P. A., Delta, Ont.

R53177, Sgt. Yule, A. C., 102 McPherson Ave., Toronto, Ont.

R90297, FS Zulauf, F. R., Milverton, Ont.

Conspicuous Gallantry Medal

R107483, Sgt. Bailey, J. C., 1390 Granville St., Vancouver, B.C.

R94567, FS Brown, K. W., 106 Hochelaga St. E., Moose Jaw, Sask.

R70142, Sgt. Cardy, W. H., Centre Road, Port Credit, Ont.

R90883, FS Larden, A. W. J., 100 Ferguson St., North Bay, Ont.

R191205, Sgt. Meadows, G. W., Bowsman River, Man.

R120651, FS Russell, J. V., R.R. 2, Speers, Sask.

R107665, Sgt. Williamson, L. F., 2204 McIntyre St., Regina, Sask.

George Medal

R54730, Sgt. Baily, F. M., 4572 W. 2nd Ave., Vancouver, B.C.

R78103, FS Coates, D. M., R.R. 2, Woodbridge, Ont.

J15822, P/O Jenner, R. deF., 30 Melgund St., Ottawa, Ont.

C8721, F/L Lindsay, E. J. A., c/o Gordon Hendry, Drayton, Ont.

J11843, F/O Link, H. D., Box 687, Swift Current, Sask.

9867, Sgt. Lummis, F. B., Frankford, Ont.

R82698, Cpl. Lyon, G. F. W., 155 James Street, Ottawa, Ont.

C2201, F/L McCombe, R. J., 4 Martin Avenue, Dorval, P.Q.

R64816, Sgt. Miller, T. B., 26 Beaconsfield Ave. West, Saint John, N.B.

R75862, FS Moore, D. C., Box 137, Albert St., Durham, Ont.

R139022, Sgt. Pudney, C. L., 306-15th Ave., Belmar, N.J., U.S.A.

J13042, P/O Williams, J. F., c/o O. Fletcher, R.R. 3, Port Dover, Ont.

Military Medal

R67749, Sgt. McDonald, C. E., Shreveport, La., U.S.A.

Supplementary List of Awards Recently Announced

Distinguished Flying Cross

Number—Rank—Name—Home Address

R82627, W/O Abbey, J. E., 7 Fifth Ave., Ottawa, Ont.

J10806, P/O Armstrong, W. N., Box 137, West Summerland, B.C.

J15362, F/O Moody, V. K., West Middle Sable, Shelbourne County, N.S.

J17785, F/O Cameron, T. H., Sylvan Lake, Alta.

J19308, P/O MacIntosh, B. A., Not available.

J18812, P/O Spink, T. B., 5251 Hoy St., Vancouver, B.C.

J9863, S/L Strachan, W. W., 2246 Daniel St., Trail, B.C.

J21435, F/O Allen, E., 215 S. Normandie Ave., Los Angeles, Calif.

R96703, W/O Coulombe, J. A. R., Not available.

J6857, S/L Taylor, C. J. W., Box 3010, Winnipeg, Man.

J6002, F/L Kerrigan, H. F., Ridgewood Park, Goderich, Ont.

J22545, F/L Matthews, H. L., Comox Rd., Courtenay, B.C.

[Mr. Macmillan.]

C626, W/C Richer, D. B., 5854 Durocher Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

J11552, S/L Epps, R. F., 306 Parkview St., St. James, Man.

C4002, F/L McKay, D. K., Kintail, Ont.

J3523, F/L Patterson, D. S., 337 S. Archibald St., Fort William, Ont.

J17945, F/O Miller, K. S., 739 Roslyn Ave., Montreal, P.Q.

J20394, F/O Mitchell, T. M. L., 33 Chester Hill Rd., Toronto, Ont.

J18597, P/O Rowe, E. L. L., 475-8th St. E., Owen Sound, Ont.

J18198, P/O McIntosh, J., 1163 Balmoral St., Medicine Hat, Alta.

J18986, P/O Coutlee, M., 9 Norwich Ave., Woodstock, Ont.

R109505, W/O Hawks, E. S., 73 Victoria Ave., Leamington, Ont.

R99253, W/O McLeod, E. T., 66 Metcalf St., Saint John, N.B.

J12855, F/O Banks, H. C. C., Ste. 6, Colgrove Apts., Calgary, Alta.

J10313, F/O Cloutier, W. B. B., 35 Parkway Ave., Toronto, Ont.

J17793, F/O Craddock, B. A., Not available.

J16306, F/O Drimmie, R. G., 1547 Comox St., Vancouver, B.C.

J11113, F/O Massey, C., 530 E. 7th St., Plainfield, N.J., U.S.A.

J16135, F/O Keane, H. W., 20 Julia St., Quebec, P.Q.

J14578, F/O Simpson, D. H., Little Langdale, East Horsley, Surrey, England.

J22570, F/O Wheeler, E. F., 418 Adolphus St., Cornwall, Ont.

J14783, F/O Pritchard, L. T., 229 High St. E., Moose Jaw, Sask.

J18143, P/O Brown, J. F. C., 185 St. Cyrille St., Quebec, P.Q.

J18127, P/O Coburn, L. G., 400 Ketchen St., Temiskaming, P.Q.

C18596, P/O Johnston, F. E., 283 Besmarchais Blvd., Verdun, Que.

J18381, P/O Mayou, F. D., 5427 York St., Montreal, Que.

J19161, P/O Davidson, A. M., Not available.

J19034, P/O Middlemiss, K. R., Hearne, Sask.

R134906, W/O Farmer, A. C., Box 93, Pine Falls, Man.

J22778, F/L Laing, G. H., 351 Assiniboine Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

J13112, F/O Thomson, D. C., Fort Assiniboine, Alta.

Distinguished Flying Medal

R181818, Sgt., Qualle, R. E., Beverley, Sask.

R142144, F/S Coiberry, E., 753 Rea St., Regina, Sask.

R69999, F/S Irwin, R. B., South River, Ont.

R132080, F/S Hyde, R. C., R.R. No. 1, Manor, Sask.

R121529, F/S Hardy, A. V., Not available.

R136215, F/S Della Stua, A., Not available.

R136237, F/S Moriarity, J. E., Not available.

R128227, F/S Weaver, H. D., c/o R.R. Oliver, R.R. No. 1, Victoria, B.C.

R71968, Sgt. Ireland, G., 52 Stewart St., Toronto, Ont.

R153882, F/S Angus, J., 66 De Grassi St., Toronto, Ont.

Distinguished Service Order

J12483, F/O Shulemson, S. S., 5150 Decarie Blvd., Montreal, P.Q.

Appendix "B"

Canadians in R.A.F.

Gallantry Awards

Number—Rank—Name—Home Address—

40281, F/O Angus, A. B., McCreary, Man., D.F.C.
39012, F/L Arnold, K. F., Saskatoon, Sask., D.F.C.
W/C Atkinson, L. V. E., D.F.C. and Bar.
37929, S/L Avent, J., Kartney, Man., D.F.C.
755030, Sgt. Bain, J., Hamilton, Ont., D.F.M.
S/L Banks, D. K., Nova Scotia, D.F.C.
62268, P/O Barnes, C. A., D.F.C.
39928, F/L Bartlett, C. S., Fort Qu'Appelle, Sask., D.F.C.
37664, S/L Barton, R. A., Penticton, B.C., D.F.C. and Bar.
118131, F/L Bazalgette, I. W., D.F.C.
42788, F/L Bigelow, A. E., D.F.C.
1267053, Sgt. Beurling, G. F., Verdun, P.Q., D.F.M. and Bar, D.F.C., D.S.O.
39778, F/L Bissett, R. C., Edmonton, Alta., D.F.C. and Bar.
37715, W/C Blatchford, H. P., Edmonton, Alta., D.F.C.
37079, S/L Bocking, A. L., Winnipeg, Man., D.F.C. and Bar.
42095, F/O Boudoux, E. L., Stellarton, N.S., D.F.C., D.S.O.
37032, S/L Brown, A. C., Winnipeg, Man., D.F.C.
37904, F/L Brown, M. H., Glenboro, Man., D.F.C. and Bar.
798506, F/O Brown, R. W., D.F.C.
978860, Sgt. Burgess, E. J., D.F.M.
F/L Burnett, W. J., Fredericton, N.B., D.F.C.
102986, S/L Campbell, C. F., Margaree Forks, N.S., Can., D.F.C. and D.S.O.
41252, S/L Campbell, G. C., D.F.C.
P/O Campbell, H. D. R. L., Vancouver, B.C., D.F.C.
39492, F/O Campbell, J. A., Nelson, B.C., D.F.C.
37835, F/L Campbell, W. W., Victoria, B.C., D.F.C.
42672, F/L Carlyon, P. W. W., Cumberland, B.C., D.F.C.
139386, F/O Carmichael, F. E. G., Sudbury, Ont., D.F.C.
F/L Carriere, J. C., Montreal, P.Q., D.F.C.
937815, F/S Challen, G. S. W., D.F.M.
36918, F/O Charles, E. F. J., Lashburn, Sask., D.F.C. and Bar, D.S.O.
40081, F/L Christie, G. P., Westmount, P.Q., D.F.C. and Bar.
43106, P/O Clark, H. P., Brandon, Man., D.F.C.
41664, F/O Clayton, A. C. P., Victoria, B.C., D.F.C. and Bar.
51212, Sgt. Cleland, C. C. E., Montreal, P.Q., D.F.M.
42195, F/L Cochrane, A. C., D.F.C.
40991, F/L Cochrane, H. P., Vernon, B.C., D.F.C.
40892, P/O Connor, C. A. H., Toronto, Ont., D.F.C.
39211, F/L Corbould, K. B., New Westminister, B.C., D.F.C.
33133, W/C Coventry, H. R., D.F.C.
Sgt. Cox, A. B., Halifax, N.S., D.F.M.
41000, F/O Crispin, K. V. D., Dundas, Pelly, Sask., D.F.C.
40678, P/O Crooks, D. A. C., D.F.C.
44054, W/C Crooks, L., D.S.O.
580647, Sgt. Deyell, D. K., Alameda, Sask., D.F.M.
S/L Donaldson, E. M., D.S.O.
37414, F/L Donaldson, O. R., Revelstoke, B.C., D.F.C.
39073, F/O Dyer, J. P., Minnedosa, Man., D.F.C.
41566, F/O Edy, A. L., Winnipeg, Man., D.F.C.
43830, F/O Elliot, G. A. L., Salt Springs Island, B.C., D.F.C.
F/L Ellis, L. E., Sioux Lockout, Ont., D.F.C.
37763, S/L England, D. L., Goderich, Ont., D.F.C.
43032, S/L Fawcett, R. E., Duncan, B.C., D.F.C.
40380, F/L Fleming, J. G., Calgary, Alta., D.F.C.
39975, W/C Fleming, M. M., Ottawa, Ont., D.F.C., D.S.O.
37280, S/L Fletcher, A. W. C., Lethbridge, Alta., D.F.C. and Bar.
41573, S/L Forsythe, K. C., Fort Garry, Man., D.F.C.
62271, F/L Foulis, M., D.F.C. and Bar.
S/L Fowley, F. A., Kelowna, B.C., D.F.C.
42212, F/O Fraser, C. V., Claresholm, Alta., D.F.C.
612282, AC1 Frost, E. R. C., Quebec City, P.Q., G.C.
905015, Sgt. Frost, S. R., Vancouver, B.C., D.F.M.
994224, F/L Frowde, R., D.F.C.
37095, W/C Fulton, J., Kamloops, B.C., D.F.C., D.S.O.
Sgt. Gardiner, F. J., Halifax, N.S., D.F.M.
37632, S/L Gaunce, L. M., Derwent, Alta., D.F.C.
80446, P/O Gaunt, D. B., D.F.C.
37776, S/L Gibbs, S. R., Calgary, Alta., D.F.C.
37348, S/L Gilchrist, P. A., Weyburn, Sask., D.F.C.
968152, Sgt. Gilpin, W. G., D.F.M.
F/L Grant, G. F., Ottawa, Ont., D.F.C.
41579, F/L Grassick, R. D., London, Ont., D.F.C.
F/O Green, J. H., Vancouver, B.C., D.F.C.
45202, S/L Greenslade, W. R., D.F.C.
24037, W/C Griffiths, J. F., Niagara Falls, Ont., D.F.C.
42221, F/L Harper, C. W., D.F.C. and Bar.
F/O Harper, R. H., Bassano, Alta., D.F.C.
107809, P/O Harris, St. John, C. D., D.F.C. and Bar.
106193, P/O Henderson, J., D.F.C.
P/O Henderon, S. J., Winnipeg, Man., D.F.C.
10525, P/O Hooey, G., Trenton, Ont., D.F.C.
F/L Illsely, D. M., Nictaux Falls, D.F.C.
110952, F/O Ince, C. H., D.F.C. and Bar.
41293, F/L Jackson, A. S., D.F.C.
103488, F/O Jacobs, C. R., D.F.C.
S/L Jardine, A. M., Vancouver, B.C., D.F.C.
40542, F/L Jones, L. L., Saskatoon, Sask., D.F.C.
50584, Kaye, T. C., D.F.C.
39535, S/L Keddy, W. B., Cornwall, Ont., D.F.C.
37106, W/C Kent, J. A., Winnipeg, Man., D.F.C. and Bar.
G/C King, C. K., Wallace, Man., D.F.C.
F/O King, S. L., Regina, Sask., D.F.C.
42008, F/O Latta, J. B., Victoria, B.C., D.F.C.
1027207 F/S Lavack, R. F., Vancouver, B.C., D.F.M.
42238, F/O Leavitt, R. F., Regina and Saskatoon, Sask., D.F.C.
41188, F/O Lewis, W. J., Port Hope, Ont., D.F.C.

42465, F/O Lewis, W. M., Battleford, Sask., D.F.C.
Sgt. Little, F. B., Tisket, Yarmouth County, N.S., D.F.M.
42718, F/L MacIntyre, G. L., D.F.C.
F/L Mackid, J. G., Calgary, Alta., D.F.C.
1006443, Sgt. MacLean, A. D., D.F.M.
F/O MacRae, W. J., Regina, Sask., D.F.C.
F/O McIntosh, D., Regina, Sask., D.F.C.
41937, P/O McKnight, W. L., Calgary, Alta., D.F.C. and Bar.
39019, F/O McLaren, A. H., Montreal, P.Q., D.F.C.
41443, F/L Manahan, J. R., Winnipeg, Man., D.F.C.
515903, F/Sgt. Marshall, J. R., Ottawa, Ont., D.F.M.
41447, F/O Mitchell, H. T., Port Hope, Ont., D.F.C.
102996, F/O Morgan, A. C. B., D.F.C.
41450, F/O Murray, G. B., Carberry, Man., D.F.C.
Sgt. Neale, E. F., Regina, Sask., D.F.M.
39675, F/O Nelson, W. H., Montreal, P.Q., D.F.C.
F/O Nicholson, A. J., Windsor, Ont., G.M.
37267, F/L Niven, R. H., Calgary, Alta., D.F.C.
33329, S/L O'Brian, P. G., St. George, Toronto, Ont., D.F.C. and Bar.
42872, F/O Ogilvie, A. K., Ottawa, Ont., D.F.C.
41457, F/L Patrick, R. C., Richmond Hill, Ont., D.F.C.
612426, AC1 Patterson, G. N., Woodrow, Sask., D.F.M.
P/O Philpot, O. L. S., Vancouver, B.C., D.F.C.
S/L Prior, G. W., Indian Head, Sask., D.F.C.
P/O Purdy, P. H., St. Stephen, N.B., D.F.C.
37508, S/L Raphael, G. L., Brantford, Ont., D.F.C., D.S.O. and Bar.
43042, S/L Reardon, J. D., Charlottetown, P.E.I., D.F.C.
Sgt. Redfearn, G. B., Hudson Bay Junction, Sask., D.F.M.
P/O Rigler, T. G., Toronto, Ont., D.F.M.
39031, F/L Ring, S. L., Regina, Sask., D.F.C.
40141, F/L Robertson, D. S., Calgary, Alta., D.F.C.
39568, F/L Robertson, H. M., D.F.C.
42265, F/O Romans, D. A. A., Halifax, N.S., D.F.C.
1375548, Sgt. Ross, M. H., Montabello, P.Q., D.F.M.
128492, F/O Rowley, W., D.F.C.
106175, F/O Sanders, E. A., D.F.C.
37831, S/L Schwab, L. G., Niagara Falls, Ont., D.F.C.
49268, F/O Service, W., D.F.C.
41747, F/L Simpson, A. J., D.F.C.
F/O Sinclair, G. L., Bagot, Man., D.F.C.
F/L Skey, L. W., Toronto, Ont., D.F.C.
102564, F/O Smith, D. T., D.F.C.
41483, W/C Smith, D.W.M., D.F.C.
40952, F/L Smith, R. R., D.F.C.
42272, F/O Stansfield, N.K., Vancouver, B.C., D.F.C.
34252, S/L Stickley, L. J., Lethbridge, Alta., D.F.C.
42906, F/L Sturdy, W. R. N., Vancouver, B.C., D.F.C. and Bar.
119916, F/O Sutherland, H., D.F.C.
40862, F/L Tamblyn, H. N., North Battleford, Sask, D.F.C.
108048, F/O Teetenborn, A. R., D.F.C.
104415, P/O Thomas, R. P., D.F.C.
S/L Thompson, J. R., Atwood, D.F.C.
39046, W/C Timmerman, N. W., Kingston, Ont., D.S.O., D.F.C.
F/O Trickett, C., Port Albert, Ont., D.F.C.
P/O Tudhope, W. F., Montreal, Quebec, D.F.C.
40767, F/O Tweddell, W. O. D., Toronto, Ont., D.F.C.
37775, S/L Turner, F. W. S., D.F.C.
F/L Turner, P. S., Toronto, Ont., D.F.C. & Bar.
Sgt. Turner, R.S., Winnipeg, Man., D.F.M.
42281, F/O Urwin-Mann, J. R., Victoria, B.C., D.F.C. & Bar.
41225, F/O Valachos, P. J.. Brantford, Ont., D.F.C.
39803, F/L Walker, G. E., Gleichen, Alta., D.F.C.
40768, F/O Walker, J. A., Gleichen, Alta., D.F.C.
43421, F/L Walsh, A. P., London, Ont., D.F.C.
759223, P/O Webb, C., D.F.C.
W/C Weir, T.C., Toronto, Ont., D.F.C.
40330, F/L Whelan, J. R., Saskatoon, Sask., & Bathurst, N.B., D.F.C.
533230, LAC Whitehead, G. W., Toronto, Ont., D.F.M.
42549, S/L Whiting, S. G., Whonock, B.C., D.F.C.
S/L Widdowson, R. P., Winnipeg, Man., D.F.C.
42931, S/L Wigmore, W.S., D.F.C.
62281, F/O Wilkerson, D.S.S., D.F.C.
40276, F/L Williams, A. T., Toronto, Ont., D.F.C.
40331, F/L Willis, D. A., St. Boniface, Man., D.F.C.
39805, S/L Wolfe, D. L., D.F.C.
F/L Wood, C. P., D.F.C.
39806, W/C Woodruff, P. H., D.F.C.
41092, F/O Woodward, V. C., Victoria, B.C., D.F.C. & Bar.

Appendix "C"

R.C.A.F. Personnel Decorated by Allied Governments

United States Distinguished Flying Cross

J15246, F/L Buckham, R. A., Box 1036, Vancouver, B.C.
C807, W/C Hodson, K. L. B., 2050 Barclay St., Vancouver, B.C.
J5998, F/O MacIntyre, D. P., East Saint John, New Brunswick.
C786, W/C St. Pierre, J. M. W., c/o Hon. A. Sauve, St. Eustache, Que.

United States Army Air Medal

C1220, S/L Boomer, K. A., 524 Golden Ave., Ottawa, Ont.
R86558, Sgt. Galliver, W. T., 11914 95 A. St., Edmonton, Alta.
J8356, F/O Gohl, J. G., Boissevain, Man.
J10608, P/O Gooding, H. O., 19 Morris St., Ottawa, Ont.
J8354, F/O Lynch, R., 18 Humboldt St., St. Vital, Man.
J8786, F/L McKenzie, D. M., Stellarton, N.S.
J16477, P/O Myles, J. R., 13 Lewin Park, West Saint John, N.B.
J15101, F/L Prest, W. A., 235-22nd St. East, Prince Albert, Sask.
J10231, F/O McMillan, L., Miami, Man.
J10224, F/O Scott, D. G., 79 Barnesdale St. N., Hamilton, Ont.
J4524, F/L Elliott, E. B., Sutherland, Sask.

Croix-de-Guerre Belge 1940

J18746, P/O, Higgins, J. H. P., 354 Fifth Ave., Verdun, P.Q.

R.A.F. Pensonnel (Canadians) Decorated by Allied Governments

United States Silver Star

36918, F/O Charles, E. F. J., Lashburn, Sask.

UNEMPLOYMENT, 1943-44

Mr. KNOWLES:

How many persons, by provinces, were registered as unemployed on January 31, July 31, October 31, November 30, December 31, 1943, and January 31, 1944?

Mr. MARTIN: As the local employment and selective service offices report weekly, the information asked for is given as at the nearest dates to the end of the month.

Total applicants registered at employment and selective service offices by provinces and specified dates were as follows:

	January 28, 1943	July 29, 1943	October 28, 1943	December 2, 1943	December 30, 1943	January 27, 1944
Prince Edward Island	743	269	276	483	343	369
Nova Scotia	2,866	2,587	1,924	2,401	1,611	2,143
New Brunswick	2,391	1,799	1,974	2,024	1,441	1,698
Quebec	28,457	20,719	17,560	20,877	16,870	25,502
Ontario	30,419	22,466	24,852	22,505	15,379	21,287
Manitoba	9,328	4,167	3,544	4,445	2,619	4,346
Saskatchewan	4,048	2,430	2,829	3,040	1,875	2,629
Alberta	3,489	4,894	3,230	3,229	2,071	3,163
British Columbia	14,058	10,637	8,596	7,980	5,737	8,731
Totals	95,799	69,968	64,785	66,984	47,946	69,868

Total applicants referred to jobs were as follows:

	January 28, 1943	July 29, 1943	October 28, 1943	December 2, 1943	December 30, 1943	January 27, 1944
Prince Edward Island		140	117	257	220	219
Nova Scotia		1,210	1,202	1,387	652	784
New Brunswick	Figures	955	1,239	1,271	844	886
Quebec		18,449	15,592	14,940	11,024	14,290
Ontario	not	14,461	15,565	14,046	9,685	11,433
Manitoba		1,499	1,986	2,294	899	1,196
Saskatchewan	available	981	1,250	1,001	665	750
Alberta		2,263	1,517	1,437	1,003	1,049
British Columbia		4,968	4,122	3,458	2,117	3,166
Totals		44,926	42,590	40,091	27,109	33,773

Net registrations in process of placement were as follows:

	January 28, 1943	July 29, 1943	October 28, 1943	December 2, 1943	December 30, 1943	January 27, 1944
Prince Edward Island		129	159	226	123	150
Nova Scotia		1,377	722	1,014	959	1,359
New Brunswick	Figures	844	735	753	597	812
Quebec		2,270	1,968	5,937	5,846	11,212
Ontario	not	8,005	9,287	8,459	5,694	9,854
Manitoba		2,668	1,558	2,151	1,720	3,150
Saskatchewan	available	1,449	1,579	2,039	1,210	1,879
Alberta		2,631	1,713	1,792	1,068	2,114
British Columbia		5,669	4,474	4,522	3,620	5,565
Totals		25,042	22,195	26,893	20,837	36,095

Requests for employees in process of being filled were as follows:

	January 28, 1943	July 29, 1943	October 28, 1943	December 2, 1943	December 30, 1943	January 27, 1944
Prince Edward Island	76	281	458	431	259	173
Nova Scotia	6,722	12,606	13,900	10,789	8,149	6,324
New Brunswick	3,450	6,683	9,792	9,294	6,873	4,894
Quebec	78,294	84,533	77,932	73,932	57,005	56,174
Ontario	57,142	85,011	95,948	74,625	61,172	59,312
Manitoba	3,514	8,469	7,196	5,508	4,509	4,173
Saskatchewan	1,912	4,272	4,288	3,616	3,016	2,815
Alberta	3,697	8,290	10,873	8,906	6,199	4,276
British Columbia	8,021	24,044	16,566	13,208	10,394	10,576
Totals	162,828	234,189	236,953	200,309	157,576	148,717

It is inevitable that a certain number of people should always be registered as unemployed with local selective service offices. There are those who are regularly seeking and accepting short term or casual employment. There is also the group of people who are changing jobs.

CANADIAN FORCES—ALLOWANCES ON DISCHARGE—INCOME TAX

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Is the clothing allowance of $65 paid to other ranks on honourable discharge from the services regarded as taxable income for the year in which it is granted?

2. Is the gratuity of one month's pay and allowances granted to officers on retirement and other ranks on honourable discharge regarded as taxable income for the year in which it is granted?

Mr. GIBSON:

1. Not taxable income to recipient.

2. If the recipient, officer or other rank, is, as such, a taxable person, then the gratuity if paid in respect of services rendered is taxable.

LOANS BY BANK OF CANADA TO CHARTERED BANKS

Mr. McGEER:

1. What amounts of money have been loaned by the Bank of Canada to, (a) the Bank of Montreal; (b) the Royal Bank of Canada; (c) the Canadian Bank of Commerce; (d) the Bank of Nova Scotia; (e) the Bank of Toronto; (f) the Dominion Bank; (g) the Imperial Bank of Canada; (h) Barclays Bank; (i) Banque Canadienne Nationale; (j) Banque Provinciale du Canada, during each of the following years: 1934, 1935, 1936, 1937, 1938, 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943?

2. What was the period of time of each loan?

3. What was the rate of interest paid?

4. What was the amount of interest paid by each of the said banks in each of the said years?

Mr. ABBOTT: I spoke to the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard, who asked this question, and he has agreed to allow me to reply to it by showing the total amounts of money advanced by the Bank of Canada to the different banks and the Quebec savings banks, rather than the amounts advanced to the individual institutions. It was not felt proper that the bank should disclose its transactions with individual clients. Similarly, we are showing the rate of interest prevailing on such advances during the period for which he is asking but not the amounts paid to the bank by each individual institution.

1, 2 and 4. The following table shows the total amount of loans or advances to the chartered banks and Quebec savings banks as reported in the weekly or monthly statements issued by the Bank of Canada during the years 1935-1943:

Advances Reported on Statements Issued by Bank of Canada, Covering Advances to Chartered and Savings Banks

1935		
May	8	$1,750,000
"	15	1,750,000
"	22	750,000
July	3	1,000,000
"	10	1,000,000
1936		
June	17	$ 300,000
"	24	300,000
1938		
Oct.	5	4,000,000
"	12	5,000,000
"	19	5,000,000
"	26	5,000,000
"	31	5,000,000
Nov.	2	5,000,000
"	9	5,000,000
1939		
Sept.	27	1,000,000
"	30	1,000,000
Oct.	4	1,000,000
"	11	1,000,000
"	18	1,000,000
"	25	1,000,000
"	31	1,000,000
Nov.	1	1,000,000
1940		
Feb.	28	300,000
"	29	300,000
May	29	1,000,000
"	31	1,000,000
June	5	1,000,000
"	12	1,000,000
"	19	2,000,000
"	26	3,000,000
"	29	3,500,000
July	3	3,500,000
"	10	3,500,000
"	17	3,500,000
"	24	3,500,000
"	31	2,500,000
Aug.	7	1,500,000
"	14	1,500,000
"	21	1,000,000
"	28	1,000,000
"	31	1,000,000
Sept.	4	1,000,000
"	11	1,000,000
"	18	1,000,000
"	25	1,000,000
"	30	1,000,000
Oct.	2	3,000,000
"	9	2,000,000
"	16	2,000,000
"	23	1,000,000
"	30	1,000,000
"	31	1,000,000
1941		
June	18	1,500,000
"	25	3,000,000
"	30	3,250,000
July	2	3,250,000
"	9	3,250,000
"	16	3,250,000
"	23	2,750,000
"	30	2,500,000
"	31	2,500,000
Aug.	6	2,500,000
"	13	2,000,000
"	20	2,000,000
"	27	2,000,000
"	30	2,000,000
Sept.	3	2,000,000
"	10	1,000,000
"	17	1,000,000
"	24	1,000,000
"	30	1,000,000
Oct.	1	1,000,000
"	8	1,000,000
"	15	1,500,000
"	22	1,500,000
"	29	1,500,000
"	31	1,500,000
Nov.	5	500,000

1942		
Mar.	11	$ 1,000,000
"	18	1,000,000
"	25	1,000,000
"	31	1,000,000
Apr.	1	1,000,000
"	8	1,000,000
"	15	500,000
"	22	500,000
"	29	500,000
Oct.	28	500,000
"	31	1,000,000
Nov.	4	1,000,000
"	11	2,750,000
"	18	3,250,000
"	25	3,250,000
"	30	2,250,000
Dec.	2	2,250,000
"	9	2,250,000
"	16	2,250,000
"	23	1,750,000
"	30	1,750,000
"	31	1,250,000
1943		
Jan.	6	1,250,000
"	13	750,000
May	5	625,000
"	12	625,000
Nov.	10	500,000
"	17	500,000
"	24	500,000
"	30	500,000

3. The Bank of Canada's rediscount rate was 2½ per cent from March 11, 1935, the date on which it commenced operations, to February 7, 1944, as of which date the rate was reduced to 1½ per cent. This was the rate of interest charged on all advances granted to chartered banks and Quebec savings banks during the years 1935-43.

OFFICERS' TRAINING CENTRES

Mr. LOCKHART:

1. Is the training of officers for the Canadian army being carried on at the present time in officers' training centres in Canada?

2. If so, how many men are now in training in the various officers' training centres in Canada?

3. How many officers, graduates of officers' training centres in Canada, are now awaiting appointment to active duty?

4. Have all the officers who have graduated from officers' training centres in Canada and who are still awaiting appointment to active duty volunteered for service overseas?

5. Have all the men now in training for officers in officers' training centres in Canada volunteered for active service overseas?

6. What portion of available officers whose training is completed will be required for service overseas?

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax):

1. Yes.

2. 978, of which 97 are officers such as medical officers, dental officers, chaplains, etc., who are appointed to the active army in commissioned rank and are required to undergo special courses on appointment.

3. All qualified officers on the strength of the Canadian active army, who are not disabled by injury or sickness or are not on leave, are on active duty.

4. See answer 3. All officers on the strength of the Canadian active army have volunteered for overseas service.

5. Yes.

6. Portion of officers required for overseas is dependent upon future operations and the exigencies of the service. All who are qualified by age and physical fitness are at call for service overseas as required.

WARTIME HOUSING—CONTRIBUTIONS TO COST OF CONSTRUCTION

Mr. LOCKHART:

1. What was the total or over-all cost per unit of houses erected under the wartime housing plan in the districts of Hull, Quebec; Oshawa, Hamilton, St. Catharines and Niagara Falls, Ontario?

2. Has any portion of the over-all cost of such houses in any of these centres been paid for by authorities or persons other than the Wartime Housing Limited?

3. If so, at what place or district, and what is the amount of such contribution in each case and in total; and by what authority were such contributions made?

Mr. HOWE:

1.

	No. of Units	Total Cost
Hull, Quebec		
H1 and H2.....	25	$2,794
H11 and H12.....	100	4,199
H21 and H22.....	25	2,970
Oshawa, Ontario		
H1 and H2.....	25	2,545
H11 and H12.....	18	3,100
H21 and H22.....	7	2,767
Hamilton, Ontario		
H1 and H2.....	626	2,788
H11 and H12.....	225	3,462
H21 and H22.....	100	3,136
St. Catharines and and Merritton, Ontario		
H1 and H2.....	506	2,620
H11 and H12.....	177	3,242
H21 and H22.....	92	2,778
Niagara Falls, Ontario		
H1 and H2.....	140	2,670
H11 and H12.....	39	3,242
H21 and H22.....	71	2,742

NOTE—The above costs are all-inclusive figures which include land acquisition, services, grading, landscaping, etc.

2. No.

3. Answered by 2.

MUNITIONS AND SUPPLY—PROFITS ON WAR CONTRACTS

Mr. STOKES:

1. Has the Minister of Munitions and Supply exercised his power under subsection 4 of section 13 of the Department of Munitions and Supply Act, chapter 8 of the statutes of Canada, 1943?

2. If so, what contract or contracts were found by the minister to be yielding "an unreasonable profit", as set forth in the said act.

3. What sums have been paid to the receiver general on the ditrection of the minister as authorized in the said act, and by whom were such sums paid?

Mr. HOWE:

1. In no case has it been necessary to exercise the powers given under subsection 4 of section 13 of the Department of Munitions and Supply Act. It has been found preferable to enter renegotiation proceedings on a less formal basis and in all cases in which the negotiations have been completed, a satisfactory price adjustment has been made on an amicable basis. Excellent cooperation has been received from the manufacturers and in a number of cases the initiative leading to important refunds has come from the contractor himself.

2. In the above circumstances and as unreasonable profits frequently stem from cost reductions due to the discovery of new manufacturing techniques or to other causes creditable to the contractor, it is not deemed equitable to disclose the names of the contractors concerned. There are, however, approximately sixty-seven manufacturers whose contracts have been or are the subject of renegotiation of one type or another.

3. It is not possible at this time to give an accurate statement of the amount recovered, and to be recovered under renegotiation arrangements, as the final figures will be subject to determination by the treasury cost accountants whose work in this matter is not complete. Moreover, renegotiation of certain ship contracts included an abandonment of the right to claims for extra and increased costs under the escalator clauses for amounts not easily calculable.

MONTREAL LAKE INDIAN RESERVE—TIMBER LIMITS

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. What timber limits have been put up for tender in each year since 1939 in the Montreal lake Indian reserve?

2. Were any tenders received? If so, by whom, and what was the amount of each?

3. To whom were sales made, and at what price?

4. Were any sold or disposed of without tender? If so, to whom, and at what price?

[Mr. Howe.]

5. Have any logging or lumbering operations been conducted on any of said timber limits during the said years? If so, (a) by whom; (b) how much has each of the operators removed?

6. Have the Indians occupying said reserve been asked to surrender any of their rights in the said limits?

7. Were any of said limits sold without public tender? If so, why?

8. What check, if any, is being made by the departent on the timber being cut on each of the said limits?

Mr. CRERAR:

1. 1939, Nil; 1940, Timber berth No. 4; 1941, Nil; 1942, Nil; 1943, Timber berths 1 and 2; part of timber berth No. 3.

2. Yes.

For berth No. 4:

By Wm. A. Bear, Indian, for spruce timber, at $3 per M f.b.m.

By Lumber Manufacturers Limited, Saskatoon, as follows—Spruce, $3.02 per M f.b.m.; Pine and birch, $2.50 per M f.b.m.; Balsam pulpwood, 75 cents per cord; Ties, jack pine, 10 cents per tie; Tamarack or jack pine piling, 2 cents per lin. ft.; Posts, tamarack, 2 cents per post; Cordwood, 25 cents per cord.

For berths Nos. 1 and 2:

By Brooks Construction Company, Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, for white spruce timber, at $3.75 per M f.b.m.

For part of berth No. 3:

By Prince Albert Lumber Company, Limited, Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, for spruce saw timber, at $4.50 per M f.b.m.

By Hertzog Bros., Tweedsmuir, Saskatchewan, as follows—White spruce saw timber, $5.75 per M f.b.m.; White poplar saw timber, $1.75 per M f.b.m.; Birch saw timber, $2.75 per M f.b.m.

3. Berth No. 4: To Wm. A. Bear, Indian, at $3 per M f.b.m. for spruce timber.

Berths Nos. 1 and 2: To Brooks Construction Company, Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, at $3.75 per M f.b.m. for white spruce timber.

Berth No. 3: This block of timber was not sold, and has been retained for the Indians at their own request.

4. No.

5. Yes (a) and (b): Wm. A. Bear on berth No. 4, 448,440 f.b.m. to date; Brooks Construction Company, on berths Nos. 1 and 2, 315,755 f.b.m. to date.

6. Yes, and surrender accepted by governor in council by P.C. 298, dated February 9, 1939.

7. Yes. In order to save time the firms operating in the district were asked by wire if they were interested in submitting a tender to purchase the spruce timber on berths Nos.

1 and 2, this timber being urgently required for war purposes. The only tender received was from the Brooks Construction Company. The price offered was $3.75 per M f.b.m. and was accepted after being certified to be fair and reasonable by the supervisor, prices division, timber control office.

8. Returns are in the form of affidavits and are signed by qualified scalers. Cutting operations are under the supervision of the Indian agent.

WHEAT AND COARSE GRAINS—CARLOADINGS IN PRAIRIE PROVINCES

Mr. CASTLEDEN:

What was the number of carloadings for each of the prairie provinces for, (a) wheat; (b) coarse grains, for each month from July until December, 1943, inclusive?

Mr. MICHAUD:

Canadian National Railway Company:

Manitoba—	Wheat	Coarse grains
July	1,152	1,686
August	1,418	2,236
September	854	1,933
October	2,020	1,589
November	3,623	1,027
December	408	1,959
Saskatchewan—		
July	3,369	2,008
August	2,380	2,761
September	3,787	2,621
October	3,121	2,416
November	6,120	1,679
December	2,333	3,054
Alberta—		
July	912	762
August	1,066	993
September	1,629	980
October	1,317	891
November	963	674
December	1,023	1,319

Canadian Pacific Railway Company:

Manitoba district—	Wheat	Other grains
July	1,018	1,630
August	1,819	2,161
September	1,255	2,538
October	2,119	2,128
November	6,048	935
December	681	2,138
Saskatchewan district—		
July	2,093	2,371
August	2,457	2,369
September	3,621	2,378
October	4,204	2,820
November	6,625	1,836
December	3,069	3,763
Alberta district—		
July	2,010	1,317
August	2,408	1,363
September	2,567	1,354
October	2,032	1,095
November	2,018	772
December	2,457	1,493

* This company's records are compiled on the basis of the three prairie districts of the company's western lines. The principal terminals marking the limits of their districts are as follows:—

Alberta district—

West	Field, B.C.
"	Crows Nest, B.C.
South	Coutts, Alta.
North	Edmonton, Alta.
East	Lloydminster, Sask.
"	Hardisty, Alta.
"	Kerrobert, Sask.
"	Swift Current, Sask.
"	Shaunavon, Sask.
"	Valmarie, Sask.

Saskatchewan district—

West	Lloydminster, Sask.
"	Hardisty, Alta.
"	Kerrobert, Sask.
"	Swift Current, Sask.
"	Shaunavon, Sask.
South	North Portal, Sask.
East	Bredenbury, Sask.
"	Neudorf, Sask.
"	Broadview, Sask.
"	Arcola, Sask.
"	Estevan, Sask.

Manitoba district—

East	Port Arthur, Ont.
West	Bredenbury, Sask.
"	Neudorf, Sask.
"	Broadview, Sask.
"	Arcola, Sask.
"	Estevan, Sask.
"	Lyleton, Man.
South	Gretna, Man.
"	Emerson, Man.

MEAT AND BACON BOARDS

Mr. CASTLEDEN:

1. Are any members of the meat board employed by or connected with the meat packing industry?

2. If so, in what capacity?

3. What was the amount of, (a) pay; (b) allowance; (c) travelling expenses, paid to each member of the bacon board during its operation?

4. Was any complete audited report of the operations of the bacon board published by the government?

5. Is any arrangement made for the publishing of a report of the operations of the present meat board?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. S. E. Todd.

2. Managing-director, industrial and development council of Canadian meat packers.

3. (a) Nil, (b) (December, 1939 to June, 1943), allowance for living expenses incurred during board meetings and to and from such meetings: J. G. Taggart, $2,130; L. C. McOuat, $2,164; S. E. Todd, $1,674; A. Morin, $324; (c) (December, 1939 to June, 1943), transportation to and from board meetings: J. G. Taggart, $1,351.82; L. C. McOuat, $98.50; S. E. Todd, $836.08; A. Morin, $171.75.

4. No.

5. No.

CONVERSION OF DREDGE "FIELDING" INTO OIL TANKER—COST OF FREIGHTERS

Mr. GILLIS:

1. What was the cost of converting the dredge *Fielding* into an oil tanker?
2. What is the cost of one of the 4,000-ton freighters built in the Saint John, New Brunswick, drydock?

Mr. HOWE:

1. The work of conversion on this dredge was not completed until November, 1943, and the final cost has not yet been determined.
2. The final cost has not yet been determined.

DISTRIBUTION OF RAW SUGAR LANDED AT HALIFAX

Mr. ISNOR:

1. In connection with the raw sugar landed in Halifax in January, 1944, what are the names of firms and locations to whom sugar was distributed, and what amount to each?
2. Was the sugar ordered by the sugar administrator or by individual firms? If the latter, give names of firms with quantities ordered.

Mr. ABBOTT:

1. It is not considered desirable to disclose current transactions relating to the business of individual firms. To do so would give information of value to competitors. Revelation of the total amount of sugar landed at Halifax in this period might make it possible for the enemy to draw inferences regarding the movement of ships on the high seas.
2. All importations of sugar into Canada are ordered by the sugar administrator.

COST OF QUEBEC CONFERENCE, 1943

Mr. CASTLEDEN:

What was the total cost to the Canadian government of the Quebec conference held during August and September, 1943?

Mr. McLARTY: Including expenditure in connection with the visit of the President of the United States to Ottawa, $366,596.27.

BATAWA, ONT., POSTMASTERSHIP

Mr. McGREGOR:

1. Is there a post office at Batawa, Ontario?
2. If so, when was it opened?
3. What is the name of the postmaster?
4. When was he appointed, and by whom?
5. Is the postmaster a returned soldier?
6. If not, were returned soldiers considered for the position?

Mr. MULOCK:

1. Yes.
2. 7 July, 1943.
3. James Arnold Stickle.
4. 7 July, 1943; by the Postmaster General.
5. No.
6. No returned soldier applied.

[Mr. Gardiner.]

LABOUR DEPARTMENT—GEORGE HODGE—P.C. 9384

Mr. ROSE:

1. Has George Hodge, a C.P.R. executive, been in the employ of the labour department at any time since the beginning of the war?
2. If so, since when, and in what position?
3. How much salary and how much expense money has he received since his employment?
4. What were his duties in different positions he has held?
5. If he is not now in the employ of the labour department, to what government bodies is he attached?
6. Was it within the scope of his responsibility to assist in the preparation of wage control order P.C. 9384?
7. If so, on what points in the order was his advice taken?

Mr. MARTIN:

1. Yes.

2. Mr. Hodge was a member of an industrial disputes inquiry commission which was appointed in June, 1941. Mr. Hodge has not functioned on this board since the national war labour board was established in November, 1941.

In November, 1941, at the request of the then Minister of Labour, Hon. N. A. McLarty, the Canadian Pacific Railway made Mr. Hodge available, without salary, to act as a member of the national war labour board. He subsequently became a member of the executive committee of three.

Since the national war labour board was reconstituted in February, 1943, Mr. Hodge has served as a technical adviser to the board, a full-time post; as a member of the national war labour committee, and as a member of the national selective service advisory board.

Mr. Hodge was a member of the former national labour supply council. As such Mr. Hodge was not technically in the employ of the Department of Labour.

3. Mr. Hodge has at no time received any salary from the Department of Labour. He has been paid only actual expenses incurred by him as undernoted:

Number of days: fiscal year 1941-42, 142; fiscal year 1942-43, 362; fiscal year 1943-44 (to January 31, 1944), 304; total, 808.

Total expense: fiscal year 1941-42, $1,458.79; fiscal year 1942-43, $3,955.91; fiscal year 1943-44 (to January 31, 1944), $2,820.36; total $8,235.06.

Average per day: fiscal year 1941-42, $10.27; fiscal year 1942-43, $10.93; fiscal year 1943-44 (to January 31, 1944), $9.28; total, $10.19.

It should be noted that fees paid to Mr. Hodge as a member of the industrial disputes inquiry commission under order in council P.C. 4020 are not included in the above figures. These amounted to: remuneration at $20 per day, 1941-42, $1,440; actual travelling expenses, 1941-42, $707.27.

4. As a member of the industrial disputes inquiry commission, Mr. Hodge was required, together with other members of the commission, to make a preliminary inquiry into all disputes referred to the commission by the Minister of Labour.

In respect to the national war labour board, Mr. Hodge fulfilled the normal functions of an executive officer while a member of the executive committee. He now serves as a technical adviser to the board and is a member of the national war labour committee.

As a member of the national selective service advisory board, Mr. Hodge participates with other members in matters affecting national selective service.

5. See answers to questions 1 and 2.

6 and 7. It was not within the scope of Mr. Hodge's responsibility to assist in the determination of the provisions of wage control order P.C. 9384. Departmental officers of finance, justice and labour, whose duty it was to prepare draft of order in accordance with instructions, consulted others, among them Mr. Hodge in view of his experience in the administration of previous wage control orders, in regard to the phraseology of operative provisions of the order for their application in practice in accordance with regulations to be made effective as already determined upon.

CANADIAN ARMY—DESERTIONS

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

1. How many of the 11,000 deserters from the Canadian army who have been apprehended have been tried by court-martial?

2. How many of them have been executed?

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax):

1. 3,215 men have been tried by court martial on charges of desertion in Canada from the outbreak of war up to February 15, 1944.

2. No men have been executed for desertion from the Canadian army since the outbreak of war.

TOTAL ESTIMATES AND REVENUE

Mr. LACOMBE:

1. What were Canada's total estimates for the years 1937, 1938 and 1939?

2. What was the total revenue of Canada in the said years?

Mr. ABBOTT:

1. Fiscal year ended March 31:

1937	$560,947,332
1938	554,496,828
1939	548,914,746

In addition to the amounts provided in the estimates, expenditures were incurred in these years under the provisions of other statutes. The total expenditures of the dominion of Canada in these years were as follows:

Fiscal year ended March 31:

1937	$532,005,432
1938	534,408,118
1939	553,063,098

2. Fiscal year ended March 31:

1937	$454,153,747
1938	516,692,749
1939	502,171,354

GRANTS FOR ROADS TO AND FROM COAL MINES

Mr. MARSHALL:

1. Were any grants made to provinces, municipalities or coal mining companies during 1943 for the purpose of constructing all-weather roads to and from coal mines?

2. If so, what was the nature of such grants, and to whom were they paid?

Mr. HOWE:

1. Yes.

2. During 1943 the folowing moneys were granted by the emergency coal production Board:—

	Amount Approved by Board	Amount Paid
(a) The Bulkley Valley Collieries Ltd., Telkwa, B.C. (part cost surfacing and gravelling of subgrade—½ mile from highway to property)	$2,100	$2,000
(b) Consolidated Mining & Smelting Co., Trail, B.C. (paid to Department of Public Works, B.C.) (part cost of reconditioning of 14 miles of road from McGillivray to property)....	2,000	2,000
(c) Sturgeon municipality district (part cost of gravelling road to several properties—2½ miles west of Namao, Alberta)....	1,500	
Total	$5,600	$4,000

VETERANS' LAND ACT—ALBERTA

Mr. SHAW:

1. How many parcels of land have been purchased in the province of Alberta under the Veterans' Land Act to date?

2. What was the average price paid per acre for such land?

3. How many veterans or discharged men have been settled in Alberta under the Veterans' Land Act?

4. How many applications made by veterans or discharged men for settlement in Alberta under the Veterans' Land Act have been refused?

Mr. CRERAR:

1. 56 comprising 46 full-time farms and 10 small holding parcels.

2. $15.91 including existing buildings for full-time farms. $106.50 including existing buildings for small holding parcels.

3. 8.

4. 45 applications for qualification have been dealt with by regional advisory committees of which 23 have been certified as qualified, 11 declined certification and 11 are pending. Nine applications for loans have been received from veterans certified as qualified, 8 have been approved and one is pending.

GASOLINE RATIONING—SASKATCHEWAN

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn):

What are the names, addresses and occupation of all persons in the province of Saskatchewan who, up until December 31, 1943, have been given a gasoline ration book in, (a) C category; (b) D category?

Mr. HOWE: There were 89,742 motor car owners registered for gasoline ration books in the province of Saskatchewan as of December 31, 1943.

Number of registrations for C category—440
" " " " D " —156

It is not the policy of the department to give names, addresses and occupations of citizens possessing ration books.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn):

1. What is the total number of persons registered for employment under the selective service, (a) in Canada; (b) by provinces?

2. What is the total number of persons receiving unemployment benefits from the unemployment insurance funds, (a) in Canada; (b) by provinces?

3. What was the total amount paid out in unemployment insurance benefits during the calendar year ending December 31, 1943, (a) in Canada; (b) by provinces?

Mr. MARTIN:

1. Total number of applicants registered at employment and selective service offices in Canada, by provinces, as of January 27, 1944, was as follows:

Total Canada	69,868
P.E.I.	369
Nova Scotia	2,143
New Brunswick	1,698
Quebec	25,502
Ontario	21,287
Manitoba	4,346
Saskatchewan	2,629
Alberta	3,163
British Columbia	8,731

	Total applicants referred to jobs during month of January *	Net registrations in process of placement *	Requests for employees in process of being filled *
P.E.I.	219	150	173
Nova Scotia	784	1,359	6,324
New Brunswick	886	812	4,894
Quebec	14,290	11,212	56,174
Ontario	11,433	9,854	59,312
Manitoba	1,196	3,150	4,173
Saskatchewan	750	1,879	2,815
Alberta	1,049	2,114	4,276
British Columbia	3,166	5,565	10,576
Total	33,773	36,095	148,717

*These figures include only the first 27 days of the month.

2. (a) 2,226—as at December 31, 1943; (b) Prince Edward Island, 8; Nova Scotia, 245; New Brunswick, 30; Quebec, 664; Ontario, 479; Manitoba, 250; Saskatchewan, 114; Alberta, 171; British Columbia, 265.

3.(a) $929,219.33; (b) Prince Edward Island, $6,101.64; Nova Scotia, $44,787.01; New Brunswick, $37,727.18; Quebec, $403,282.19; Ontario, $143,167.94; Manitoba, $100,372.31; Saskatchewan, $48,037.62; Alberta, $69,165.31; British Columbia, $75,412.38; Yukon, $1,165.75.

SHIPMENTS OF WHEAT TO SPAIN

Mrs. NIELSEN:

1. What shipments of Canadian wheat or other grains have gone to Spain in the years 1936 to 1944 inclusive?

2. Has the British government put an embargo upon shipments of Canadian wheat or other grains going to Spain in any of these years? If so, in what years?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West):

1. No shipments of Canadian wheat or other grains have gone to Spain in the years 1936 to 1943. Information for 1944 not yet available.

2. No information.

CENSUS—PERSONS OF JAPANESE ORIGIN

Mr. MacINNIS:

1. As at the 1941 census, what was the total population of persons of Japanese origin in Canada?

2. Of these, how many were, (a) Japanese nationals; (b) persons of Japanese origin naturalized; (c) persons of Japanese origin born in Canada; (d) persons of Japanese origin whose citizenship is other than Canadian or Japanese?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West):

1. See table below.

2. See table below.

Persons of Japanese Origin in Canada, Census of 1941

Province	Racial Origin	born in Canada	Born in other British countries	Japanese Nationals	Citizenship other than Canada or Japan	Japanese Naturalized
Canada	23,149					
Prince Edward Island	....	....	....	....	....	....
Nova Scotia	2	1	....	....	2	....
New Brunswick	3	2	....	....	1	....
Quebec	48	....	....	....	....	....
Ontario	234	122	8	37	24	48
Manitoba	42	12	1	13	5	11
Saskatchewan	105	53	1	21	1	29
Alberta	578	374	....	89	....	115
British Columbia	22,096	13,509	2	5,751	18	2,932
Yukon	40	....	....	....	....	....
Northwest Territories	1	....	....	....	....	....
Total 8 provinces	23,060	14,073	12	5,911	51	3,135

NOTE.—Details regarding the 89 Japanese in Quebec, Yukon and N.W.T. are not yet available.

WOOL BOARD—ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Mr. WRIGHT:

1. Are the administrative expenses of the Canadian wool board a charge against the products handled by this board?

2. What profits have accrued to the board as a result of its handling of wool in each of the years 1940, 1941, 1942 and 1943?

3. What disposal has been made of these profits?

4. What have been the expenses of this board in each of the years 1940, 1941, 1942 and 1943 under, (a) salaries; (b) office expenses; (c) travelling and other expenses?

Mr. ABBOTT:

1. The administrative expenses of the Canadian Wool Board Limited are not charged against the products handled by the Canadian wool board, but are charged against the funds provided to the Canadian wool board from the war appropriation.

2. The Canadian Wool Board Limited was incorporated on March 18, 1942. No profits have accrued to the board in either of the years 1942 or 1943.

3. Answered by 2.

4.

	Year ending March 31, 1943	9 months ending Dec. 31, 1943
(a) Salaries	$19,142 53	$24,761 71
(b) Office expenses	9,123 79	12,735 08
(c) Travelling and other administrative expenses	5,488 87	5,165 87
	$33,755 19	$42,662 66

WHEAT TAKEN OVER FROM UNSOLD STOCKS

Mr. WRIGHT:

What was the total number of bushels of wheat taken over by the government on September 27, 1943, from unsold stocks in each of the board years 1940-41, 1941-42 and 1942-43?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): The total number of bushels of wheat taken over by the dominion government as at September 27, 1943, from unsold stocks in each of the board years was as follows: 1940 crop, 57,464,763·25 bushels; 1941 crop, 20,152,146·05 bushels; 1942 crop, 63,906,141·30 bushels.

Note: The answer to this question gives advance information which is not usually released until the annual report is tabled.

WHEAT BOARD—PARTICIPATION CERTIFICATES—ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Mr. WRIGHT:

1. Are the administrative expenses in connection with the operation of the wheat board deducted from the price received for the sale of wheat before payment on participation certificates is made?

2. What are these expenses for each of the crop years 1939-40, 1940-41 and 1942-43 under, (a) salaries; (b) office expenses; (c) travelling and other expenses?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West):

1. The actual administrative expenses chargeable to the board years will be a deduction from the proceeds of grain before payment is made on the producer's certificates.

2. Expenses as at July 31, 1943, as shown hereunder, were:

	1939-40	1940-41	1941-42	1942-43
(a) Salaries	$467,281.00	$ 663,412.89	$290,118.00	$398,958.10
(b) Office expenses	161,749.76	222,548.50	89,044.44	115,469.18
(c) Travelling and other expenses	85,543.77	115,763.41	46,073.66	53,803.61
	$714,574.53	$1,001,724.80	$425,236.10	$568,230.89

MEAT BOARD—ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Mr. WRIGHT:

1. Are the administrative expenses of the bacon and meat board a charge against the products marketed under this board?

2. What has been the profit or loss in connection with the operation of the bacon or meat board on each of the contracts made with Great Britain on bacon since the outbreak of the war?

3. If profits have accrued, what disposal has been made of same?

4. What have been the expenses of the board in the years 1940, 1941, 1942 and 1943 under, (a) salaries; (b) office expenses; (c) travelling and other expenses?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. No.

2. The net operating margin under the first three bacon agreements were as follows:

First agreement (1939-1940), surplus, $1,317,912; second agreement (1940-41), deficit, $509,671; third agreement (1941-1942), deficit, $807,536.

Final figures are not yet available with respect to operations under the fourth agreement (1942-43).

3. Any moneys which have accumulated in the reserve fund of the board have been eventually disbursed through increases in the price paid for bacon for export to the United Kingdom. Hog producers benefited by this action through securing corresponding increases in hog prices.

4. Bacon and Meat Board Expenses

	1941-1942	1942-1943	1943-1944[2]
Salaries	$25,537.41	$28,681.39	$24,149.52
Office expenses[1]	17,832.59	6,935.10	7,103.92
Travelling and other expenses	9,988.31	9,344.29	9,861.66
	$53,358.31	$44,960.78	$41,115.10

[1] Includes telephone, telegraph, printing, stationery.

[2] Up to January 31, 1944.

CANADIAN FORCES—OVERSEAS UNITS BROKEN UP OR DISBANDED

Mr. HAZEN:

1. How many units of the Canadian army have been broken up or disbanded after their arrival overseas?

2. What are the names of these units, and at the time of being broken up or disbanded who commanded each of them, and what was the approximate strength of each of them?

3. What was done with the non-commissioned officers and men of these units after they were broken up or disbanded?

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, for security reasons this question cannot be answered, and I ask that it be dropped.

Mr. SPEAKER: Dropped.

COAL CONTROLLER—COST OF POSTERS

Mr. REID:

1. What amount of money has been expended by the coal controller during the present fiscal year, up to the end of January, 1944, for posters?

2. In this connection, (a) what amount of paper was used; (b) what was the cost of such paper; (c) what was the cost of printing?

Mr. HOWE:

1. $5,623.25.

2. (a) 15,990 pounds; (b) $1,430.97; (c) printing, freight and tax, $4,192.28.

CHARTERED BANKS—ENLISTED EMPLOYEES—LIFE INSURANCE

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. Are the following employers maintaining or discontinuing the life insurance policies of their individual employees insured under group insurance plans when such individuals secure leave of absence from their employment for the purpose of enlisting in the armed forces: Bank of Montreal; Royal Bank of Canada; Canadian Bank of Commerce; Bank of Toronto; Bank of Nova Scotia; Imperial Bank of Canada; Dominion Bank; Barclays Bank (Canada), and Banque Canadienne Nationale?

2. In cases where the answer to question one is "yes", which of the above-noted employers pay the premiums?

Mr. ABBOTT:

1. This information is not of official government record. The Bank Act does not require the chartered banks to furnish the Minister of Finance with details of their group insurance funds.

2. Answered by No. 1.

SPECIAL PRODUCTS MARKETING BOARD—ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Mr. WRIGHT:

1. Are the administrative expenses of the special products marketing board a charge against products marketed under it?

2. What products have been exported to Great Britain under this board, and what are the amounts of each in the years 1941, 1942 and 1943?

3. What have been the expenses of the special products marketing board in the years 1941, 1942 and 1943 under, (a) salaries; (b) office expenses; (c) travelling and other expenses?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. No.

2. Fruit and Vegetable products:

Export in 1941 out of 1939 and 1940 crop:
Canned apples, 702,511 cases (10's)
Evaporated apples, 61,997 cases (50's)
Apple pomace, dried, 931,106 lbs.
Fruits in SO-2 for jam, 6,428 bbls.

Exported in 1941-42 out of 1941 crop:
Fresh apples, 1,199,990 boxes (bushel)
Fresh apples, 111,044 bbls. (3 bushel)
Fresh onions, 880,000 lbs.
Evaporated apples, 116,147 cases (50's)
Dried apple pomace, 2,104,334 lbs.
Concentrated apple juice, 3,982 bbls.
Canned tomatoes, 300,000 cases (24's)
Assorted fruits in pulp for jam, 6,491,915 lbs.

Exported in 1942-43 out of 1942 crop:
Dehydrated vegetables, 7,814,905 lbs.
Strawberries in SO-2, 3,260 bbls.
Tomato puree, 28,798 4-gal. cans.
Tomato pulp, 51,779 cases (12's)

Exported in 1943-44 out of 1943 crop: (Shipments to January 31, 1944, only)
Fresh apples, 199,998 boxes (bushel)
Fresh apples, 155,900½ bbls. (3 bushel)
Dehydrated vegetables, 2,231,530 lbs.

Poultry Products:

Year	Shell Eggs doz.	Dried Eggs lbs.	Dressed Chicken lbs.	Dressed Turkey lbs.
1941	15,336,600	—	—	—
1942	4,133,460	11,567,149	—	—
1943	—	12,000,000	190,565	67,064

Seeds:

Exported in 1941—Nil.

Exported in 1942-43 out of 1942 crop: Alfalfa, 180,120 lbs.; corn (Comptons early), 400 bus.; flax, bison, 150 bus.; flax, royal, 200 bus.

Exported to date out of 1943 crop: Alsike, 411,900 lbs.; alsike and white, 139,050 lbs.; alfalfa, 224,250 lbs.; timothy, 325,800 lbs.; beans, 5,843 lbs.; lettuce, 1,673 lbs.; onion, 5,680 lbs.; radish, 10,000 lbs.; tree seeds, 500 lbs.

Flax fibre:

Processing and Agreement year	Amounts of flax fibres (all grades) pounds
1940-41	nil
1941-42	1,721,536 (Aug.12-Sept.15, 1942)
1942-43	7,571,990 (complete year)
1943-44	2,737,464 (Sept. 15, 1943 - Jan. 31, 1944)

3. Expenditures:

	1941-42	1942-43	1943-44 to Jan. 31
Salaries	$ 1,312 02	10,118 60	20,173 11
*Office Expenses	6,213 98	7,641 16	9,780 41
Travelling and other exps.	6,182 89	8,495 49	9,539 87
Total	$13,708 89	26,255 25	39,493 39

*Telephone, telegraph, postage and printing and stationery.

DAIRY BOARD—ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Mr. WRIGHT:

1. Are the expenses of the dairy board a charge against the products marketing board under this board?

2. What products have been exported to Great Britain under this board, and what are the amounts of same in each of the years 1940, 1941, 1942 and 1943?

3. What has been the profit or loss in the handling of these products?

4. What has been the amount of butter purchased by this board in each of the years of its operation?

5. What profit or loss has accrued as a result of these purchases?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. No.

2.

Cheese

Agreement	Total No. Lbs.
1940-41	86,372,144
1941-42	115,393,090
1942-43	142,044,855
1943-44 (To Jan. 31, 1944)	114,426,337

[Mr. Gardiner.]

Concentrated Milk

	No. Cases
1940-41	106,682
1941-42	607,357
1942-43	668,402
1943-44 (To Jan. 31, 1944)	253,476

Note: Practically all concentrated milk was shipped to different theatres of war under contract with the Ministry of Food.

Butter

1943-44 (To Jan. 31, 1944).. 7,088,506 lbs.

3. There has been neither profit nor loss in handling cheese and concentrated milk and the price received for butter exported was calculated as closely to cost as possible. Any profit or loss would be negligible.

4. 1943-44 (To Jan. 31, 1944) .15,674,282 lbs.

5. Profit or loss cannot be determined until all butter purchased by the board has been sold.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

Mr. WINKLER:

1. How many conscientious objectors to military service, by provinces, are performing alternative service in, (a) their own province; (b) in provinces other than origin?

2. How many of the above are farmers or farmers' sons?

Mr. MARTIN:

1. The number of conscientious objectors to military service by provinces performing alternative service in—

(*a*) Their own province:

Prince Edward Island	2
Nova Scotia	20
New Brunswick	—
Quebec	6
Ontario	1,800
Manitoba	2,453
Saskatchewan	1,460
Alberta	793
British Columbia	556
Total	7,090

(b) In provinces other than where they were postponed:

Prince Edward Island	1
Nova Scotia	6
New Brunswick	—
Quebec	15
Ontario	148
Manitoba	194
Saskatchewan	141
Alberta	127
British Columbia	—
Total	632

2. Approximately 80 per cent of the above are either farmers or farmers' sons.

VETERANS' LAND ACT—ONTARIO

Mr. WHITE:

1. How many parcels of land have been purchased in the province of Ontario under the Veterans' Land Act to date?

2. What was the average price paid per acre for such land?

3. How many veterans or discharged men have been settled in Ontario under the Veterans' Land Act?

4. How many applications made by veterans or discharged men for settlement in Ontario under the Veterans' Land Act have been refused?

5. Have any applications from Ontario been refused because the veteran or discharged soldier was unable to make the cash down payment as provided under the act?

Mr. CRERAR:

1. 157 parcels approved and under negotiation for purchase comprising 101 full time farming parcels and 56 small holding parcels. Sixteen full time farming parcels and 9 small holding parcels have been actually purchased.

2. $40.23 including existing buildings for full time farms. $179.23 including existing buildings for small holding parcels.

3. Three.

4. 41 applications for qualification have been dealt with by regional advisory committees of which 31 have been certified as qualified, 5 declined certification and 5 are pending. Nineteen applications for loans have been received from veterans certified as qualified, 3 have been approved, one declined and 15 are pending.

5. Nil.

PENSIONS AND NATIONAL HEALTH—HOSPITALS

Mr. CRUICKSHANK:

1. How many hospitals are operated by the Department of Pensions and National Health for members and ex-members of the armed forces?

2. Where are these hospitals?

3. What is the bed capacity of each, (a) normal; (b) emergency?

4. At the outbreak of war, what was the bed capacity of hospitals of the Department of Pensions and National Health for treatment of former members of the forces?

5. Has provision been made for further enlargement of any of these hospitals?

6. If so, what additional accommodation, expressed in numbers of beds, (a) is under construction; (b) is in an earlier stage of development?

7. Has the Department of Pensions and National Health reserve stores of hospital beds and hospital equipment available?

8. What number of hospital beds could be equipped out of such stores in an emergency?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre):

1. 10. (In addition the government has paid the cost of construction on Veterans' pavilions at University Hospital, Edmonton, and at Ottawa Civic hospital, Ottawa, and the Department therefore has accommodation guaranteed at these institutions. Also, the Department, by providing equipment for a part of the Toronto East General and Orthopaedic hospital, secured guarantee of accommodation there.)

2 and 3.

Location	Normal Bed Capacity	Emergency Bed Capacity	Total
Halifax, N.S.	783	213	996
West Saint John, N.B.	291	89	380
Quebec, Que.	260	73	333
Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Que.	1,110	284	1,394
Toronto, Ont.	1,409	128	1,537
London, Ont.	1,122	380	1,502
Winnipeg, Man.	542	191	733
Calgary, Alta.	429	102	531
Vancouver, B.C.	880	361	1,241
William Head, B.C.	48	315	363
and			
University Hospital, Edmonton	100		100
Ottawa Civic Hospital, Ottawa	297		297
Toronto East Gen. and Ortho. Hospital	250		250
	7,521	2,136	9,657

4. 2,595.

5. Yes.

6. (a) 1,958; (b) 2,210.

7. Yes.

8. 8,404 additional to number shown in answer to 3 (b).

MUNITIONS AND SUPPLY—PETRECO PROCESSES

Mr. WHITE:

What companies or persons have been authorized or permitted to use the petreco processes, equipment and information, in addition to those specifically designated and approved by the Hon. Minister of Munitions and Supply, viz., the Cannar Oil Limited, Vermilion Refinery Company Limited and the North Star Oil Limited?

Mr. HOWE: The Lloydminster Refining Co. Ltd., Lloydminster, Alberta, and the Goodrich Refining Co. Ltd., Port Credit, Ontario.

WAR PENSIONS

Mr. CRUICKSHANK:

1. With respect to, (a) service in Canada only; (b) service outside of Canada during the present war, how many pensions for disability have been awarded respectively to ex-members of the Canadian navy, army, air force?
2. In each classification, what is the estimated annual liability?
3. With respect to, (a) service in Canada only; (b) service outside Canada during the present war, how many pensions to dependents of members of the Canadian navy, army, air force, have been awarded arising out of death?
4. In each classification above, what is the annual estimated liability?
5. With respect to how many Canadians serving in or attached to imperial forces in the present war, has the Canadian pension commission awarded augmentation of imperial pensions?
6. With respect to augmented imperial pensions (as in No. 5) what has been the total outlay by, (a) the Canadian government; (b) the imperial government?
7. How many pensions have been awarded arising from, (a) disability; (b) death, under section 11-3 of the Pension Act?
8. What is the total annual liability with regard to pensions awarded under section 11-3?
9. To what other classes and groups have pensions been awarded by the Canadian pension commission?
10. What are the numbers and annual liability with respect of each such class under the headings of disability and death respectively?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Return as of December 31, 1943:

1 and 2. Disability pensions, including awards under section 11 (3) of the Pension Act.

In Canada

	Number	Estimated Annual Liability
Navy	48	$ 26,349
Army	1,267	472,423
Air Force	241	105,808
Total	1556	$ 604,580

Outside Canada

Navy	274	$ 119,585
Army	4,222	1,524,727
Air Force	122	56,022
Total	4,618	$1,700,334

3 and 4. Death pensions, including awards under section 11 (3) of the Pension Act.

In Canada

	Number	Estimated Annual Liability
Navy	30	$ 23,012
Army	513	327,179
Air Force	342	237,869
Total	885	$ 588,060

Outside Canada

Navy	351	$ 259,228
Army	1,574	1,223,697
Air Force	173	134,024
Total	2,098	$1,616,949

5. 1,192.
6. (a) $775,974.00.
   (b) $363,316.86.
7. (a) 583.
   (b) 377.
8. $489,731.00.

9 and 10.

	Disability		Death	
	No.	Estimated Annual Liability	No.	Estimated Annual Liability
Mariners	26	$12,335	337	$195,737
Fishermen	1	370	21	9,392
Auxiliary services	—	—	1	1,244
Civilian employees	—	—	6	5,284
R.C.M.P. special constable gds.	3	1,134	—	—
Civilian defence	3	1,224	—	—
Corps of civilian fire fighters for service in the United Kingdom	5	1,410	1	900
Total	38	$16,473	366	$222,557

ELEMENTARY FLYING TRAINING SCHOOLS

Mr. CRUICKSHANK:

1. What are the names of each company operating elementary flying training schools?

2. Is all equipment used in operating such schools supplied by the government? If not, what items are supplied by the companies?

3. Who pays for the servicing and repairs of equipment?

4. Does the government supply all food, clothing, medical and dental treatment, gasoline, oil, lubricant? If not, what items are supplied by the companies?

5. Are all the salaries and wages paid by the government? If not, which ones are paid by the companies?

6. What is the total cost paid the companies for training each student?

7. What is the total amount paid to date to each company operating such a school?

Mr. MACMILLAN:

1. Elementary Flying Training Schools Under the B.C.A.T.P.

School	Name and Address	T.C.	Manager	Secretary-Treasurer	President
No. 2 E.F.T.S. "A" Class (90)	Thunder Bay Air Training School Limited, Fort William, Ontario.	2	H. F. Dougall.....	E. M. Wilson, Asst..	H. F. Dougall
No. 4 E.F.T.S. "A" Class (90)	Windsor Mills Flying Training School Limited, Windsor Mills, P.Q.	3	J. K. M. Green.....	C. S. Deakin.....	A. S. Dawes
No. 5 E.F.T.S. "D" Class (240)	High River Flying Training School Limited, Airport, High River, Alberta.	4	D. K. Yorath.....	H. G. Richardson, C.A.	D. K. Yorath
No. 6 E.F.T.S. "C" Class (180)	Northern Saskatchewan Flying Training School Ltd., P.O. Box 810, Prince Albert, Saskatchewan.	2	E. A. Rawlinson, C.A.	E. A. Rawlinson, C.A.	H. M. Sibbald
No. 7 E.F.T.S. "A" Class (90)	Windsor Flying Training School, Limited, Windsor Airport, Windsor, Ontario.	1	A. A. J. Pelzer.....	E. Holmes.....	W. H. Cantilon
No. 10 E.F.T.S. "D" Class (240)	Hamilton Flying Training School, Limited, Pendleton, Ontario.	3	G. Moes.....	G. V. Sanders.....	S. S. MacNaughton
No. 12 E.F.T.S. "C" Class (180) (Naval)	Huron County Flying Training School, Limited, Sky Harbour Airport, Goderich, Ontario.	1	J. R. Douglas.....	Harry B. Weir, Asst. B. C. Straughan	J. R. Beaton
No. 13 E.F.T.S. "C" Class (180) (Naval)	Eastern Ontario Flying School, Limited, St. Eugene, Ontario.	3	W. Davidson.....	C. K. Swerdfager...	G. T. Byshe
No. 15 E.F.T.S. "C" Class (180)	Regina Elementary Flying School, Limited, P.O. Box 86, Regina, Saskatchewan.	4	G. C. Rooke, C.A..	M. I. Chase, C.A...	G. C. Rooke, C.A.
No. 19 E.F.T.S. "D" Class (240)	Virden Flying Training School, Limited, Virden, Manitoba.	2	J. R. Morgan.....	D. P. Carmichael...	W. E. Sellers
No. 20 E.F.T.S. "C" Class (180)	Ontario County Flying Training School, Limited, Oshawa, Ontario.	1	S. R. Bernardo.....	W. Turnbull, C.A...	Alex. G. Storie
No. 24 E.F.T.S. "D" Class (240)	Vancouver Air Training Company, Limited, Abbotsford, B.C.	4	Stewart McKercher, K.C.	Fred Graham.....	Maj. Austin Taylor
No. 25 E.F.T.S. "D" Class (240)	Central Manitoba Flying Training School, Limited, Assiniboia, Saskatchewan.	4	C. W. Nicholl, O.B.E., C.A.	J. J. Pope.....	C. W. Nicholl, O.B.E., C.A.
No. 26 E.F.T.S. "D" Class (240)	Miramichi Flying Training School, Limited, Neepawa, Manitoba.	2	J. W. Humphrey....	R. Mills.....	Wm. V. Creoghan
R.A.F. No. 31 E.F.T.S. "D" Class (240)	De Winton Flying Training School, Limited, De Winton, Alberta.	4	W. M. Alexander, D.F.C.	.....	W. M. Alexander, D.F.C.
No. 32 E.F.T.S. "D" Class (240)	Edmonton Flying Training School, Limited, Bowden, Alberta.	4	Frank Burton.....	P. F. Heal.....	

3 "A" Class. 5 "C" Class. 8 "D" Class.

Revised: 6th December, 1943.

2. All equipment supplied by the government.

3. The operating companies.

4. (a) Food—Catering is the obligation of the operating company, the government supplying rations.

(b) Clothing, etc.—Clothing, medical and dental treatment—for service personnel, these are the obligation of the government.

(c) Oil, lubricant—Prior to 1st July, 1942, the operating companies were obligated to supply gasoline and oil, both aviation and motor transport. From that date the government is obligated to supply aviation gasoline and oil and the operating companies supply motor transport gasoline and oil.

5. All salaries and wages of employees of the operating companies are paid by them.

6. From the date of commencement of operation to the 2nd Jan. 1944, the average cost per pupil graduate is $911.55 while the cost per pupil intake $702.12.

7. Total amount paid to date to each E.F.T.S.:

No. 2 E.F.T.S., Fort William, Ont., Thunder Bay Air Training School, Ltd., $1,354,986.66.

No. 3 E.F.T.S., London, Ont., London Elementary Flying Training School, Ltd. (to closing date of school, 3rd July, 1942), $764,777.34.

No. 4 E.F.T.S., Windsor Mills, Que., Windsor Mills Flying Training School, Ltd., $1,377,684.48.

No. 5 E.F.T.S., High River, Alta., High River Flying Training School, Limited, $2,292,273.30.

No. 6 E.F.T.S., Prince Albert, Sask., Northern Saskatchewan Flying Training School, Ltd., $1,951,132.43.

No. 7 E.F.T.S., Windsor, Ontario, Windsor Flying Training School, Limited, $1,343,084.73.

No. 8 E.F.T.S., Sea Island, B.C., Vancouver Air Training Company, Limited (to closing date of school, 4th January, 1942), $537,663.38.

No. 9 E.F.T.S., St. Catharines, Ont., St. Catharines Flying Training School, Limited (to closing date of school, 11th January, 1944), $1,672,510.63.

No. 10 E.F.T.S., Pendleton, Ontario, Hamilton Flying Training School, Limited, $1,946,376.36.

No. 11 E.F.T.S., Cap de la Madeleine, P.Q., Quebec Airways (Training) Limited (to closing date of school, 14th February, 1944), $1,763,147.30.

[Mr. Macmillan.]

No. 12 E.F.T.S., Goderich, Ontario, Huron County Flying Training School, Limited, $1,691,476.85.

No. 13 E.F.T.S., St. Eugene, Ont., Eastern Ontario Flying Training School, Limited, $1,753,766.91.

No. 15 E.F.T.S., Regina, Sask., Regina Elementary Flying School, Ltd., $1,703,488.63.

No. 17 E.F.T.S., Stanley, N.S., Nova Scotia Flying Training School, Ltd., (to closing date of school, 11th January, 1944), $1,154,801.45.

No. 19 E.F.T.S., Virden, Man., Virden Flying Training School, Limited, $2,048,662.32.

No. 20 E.F.T.S., Oshawa, Ont., Ontario County Flying Training School, Limited, $1,873,983.08.

No. 24 E.F.T.S., Abbotsford, B.C., Vancouver Air Training Company, Ltd., $298,053.03

No. 22 E.F.T.S., Ancienne Lorette, P.Q., City of Quebec Elementary Flying Training School, Ltd. (to closing date of school, 3rd July, 1942), $355,714.49.

No. 31, E.F.T.S., De Winton, Alta., Malton Flying Training School, Ltd., $1,958,801.19.

No. 32 E.F.T.S., Bowden, Alta., Edmonton Flying Training School, Ltd., $1,835,700.42.

No. 33 E.F.T.S., Caron, Sask., Boundary Bay Flying Training School, Ltd. (to closing date of school, 11th January, 1944), $2,149,586.84.

No. 34 E.F.T.S., Assiniboia, Sask. (Now No. 25 E.F.T.S.), Central Manitoba Flying Training School, Ltd., $1,867,415.47.

No. 35 E.F.T.S., Neepawa, Man. (Now No. 26 E.F.T.S.), Miramichi Flying Training School, Limited, $1,650,364.47.

NAVAL SERVICES—ADMIRAL NELLES

Mr. GILLIS:

1. Why has Admiral Nelles been transferred outside of Canada to a post in the United Kingdom?

2. To what extent is the policy of the Royal Canadian Navy directed from the said post in the United Kingdom?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City):

1. In view of the larger number of R.C.N. ships and men serving in the European theatre and in view of impending events there, it was considered desirable that an officer of flag rank be sent to the United Kingdom, and Vice-Admiral Nelles was accordingly selected to fill this post.

2. The policy of the Royal Canadian Navy is directed entirely by the government of Canada, the war committee of the cabinet of Canada, and naval service headquarters at Ottawa.

INCOME TAX—INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATION EXPENSES FOR ADVERTISING, ETC.

Mr. COLDWELL:

1. To what extent are expenses for the maintenance of public relations counsel deductible from the income of persons or corporations, (a) in respect to public relations counsel employed by such persons or corporations; (b) in respect to contributions to independent public relations counsel?

2. To what extent are expenses for advertising of a political nature deductible from the income of persons or corporations before taxation thereof?

3. To what extent are expenses or contributions in respect to political parties deductible from income before taxation thereof?

Mr. GIBSON:

1. (a) and (b) To the extent necessarily incurred to maintain and earn the income of the payor, along with other necessary expenses, but not to the extent that they are deemed to be in excess of what is reasonable or normal for the business carried on by the taxpayer.

2. Not at all.

3. Not at all.

POST-WAR AVIATION CONFERENCE

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. Has the government been advised of a proposal to hold a conference on post-war international aviation matters in the United States in the near future? If so, where will the conference be held, and on what date?

2. Will Canada be represented at this conference? If so, by whom?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. The government knows of no proposal to hold a conference on post-war international aviation matters in the United States in the near future. The Canadian government is now taking part in discussions with the United Kingdom and the United States regarding the holding of exploratory conversations on international air transport. The date, place and other details of these conversations have not yet been settled.

2. Canada is taking part in the present discussions and expects to take part in the subsequent exploratory conversations. No decision has been taken as to who the Canadian representatives in those conversations will be.

PENSIONS AND NATIONAL HEALTH—TORONTO HOSPITAL ACCOMMODATION

Mr. MAYHEW:

1. Is the Department of Pensions and National Health establishing a new hospital in Toronto?

2. If so, how many beds?

3. Are plans of such institution in course of preparation? If so, by whom?

4. Where is the hospital to be situated?

5. What is the area of the site?

6. What is the cost to the department of such site?

7. Are utility services and transportation facilities available at the proposed site?

8. If not, how are such services to be provided?

9. Is a health and occupational centre contemplated for construction on the same site?

10. If so, for what type of patients is such health and occupational centre intended?

11. What is the estimated cost of, (a) the proposed hospital; (b) the proposed health and occupational centre?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre):

1. A new hospital is planned just outside Toronto City limits.

2. 1,400 patient beds, plus nurses' residence.

3. Yes. Messrs. Allward and Gouinlock, Toronto.

4. On a part of Sunnybrook Park plus additional land to be acquired.

5. The area of Sunnybrook Park is approximately 177½ acres.

6. No cost expected as to Sunnybrook Park. The City of Toronto has offered and is preparing to deed the property to the dominion government as a gift.

7. Officials of the city of Toronto have offered to arrange the necesssary extensions to the site.

8. Answered by No. 7.

9. Yes, on a part of Sunnybrook Park plus additional land to be acquired.

10. For persons who, at completion of usual medical treatment, are found to have suffered a loss or lessening of their ability to earn a livelihood and in whose cases there is a reasonable probability that, under appropriate supervision, such ability can be restored.

11. (a) $5,000,000; (b) $1,000,000.

MEAT BOARD—SHIPMENTS OF BEEF TO BRITAIN

Mr. SENN:

1. Has the meat board purchased and stored beef for shipment to Britain?

2. If so, in what quantities?

3. What quantities have been exported to the United Kingdom?

4. Has any beef been exported to other countries? If so, in what quantity?

5. How much beef purchased by the meat board still remains in storage?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. Yes.

2. 11,490,741 pounds.

3. 2,852,741 pounds.

4. None by the meat board.

5. 300,000 pounds in storage. Balance purchased is in transit to seaboard.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS—CANADA'S CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. KNOWLES:

What is the total amount of Canada's contributions to the expenses of the league of nations in each year since the organization of the league?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The annual contributions by Canada since the organization of the league have been as follows:

League Year	Total Contributions
1919-20	$ 87,728 58
1920-21	223,730 09
1921-22	209,427 07
1922-23	223,177 66
1923-24	200,356 66
1924-25	195,620 30
1925-26	195,345 83
1926-27	190,268 08
1927-28	204,213 77
1928-29	216,507 14
1929-30	234,808 96
1930-31	251,694 46
1931-32	311,600 67
1932-33	277,936 52
1933-34	389,891 97
1934-35	404,732 02
1935-36	423,572 29
1936-37	397,251 37
1937-38	328,638 08
1938-39	311,318 61
1939-40	292,417 23
1940-41	258,610 63
1941-42	189,920 76
1942-43	184,255 74
1943-44	235,094 61

PUBLIC SERVICE—EMPLOYMENT OF OTHER THAN CANADIANS

Mr. BLACKMORE:

1. Is Edouardo A. Astorga Barriga, a native of Chile, in the employ of the Canadian government at the Ottawa experimental farm? If so, at what salary, and since when?

2. What number of persons, other than Canadians, have been appointed to the civil service of Canada or taken on the federal government payroll in any capacity at a salary higher than $1,200 per annum from September, 1939, to February 20, 1944?

3. From what countries are such persons, to what positions were they appointed, and at what salary?

Mr. McLARTY: There will be no difficulty in answering the first question, but to answer the other two questions would involve a tremendous amount of work, because the files since 1939 would have to be gone over. I wonder if the hon. member would be willing to consider redrafting the question so that he could get the information he desires more promptly but in a more limited form.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I shall be glad to do that.

[Mr. Gardiner.]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

CANADIAN FORCES—SENIOR OFFICERS

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West):

1. What are the names of all officers who have been appointed to the acting or substantive rank of lieutenant-general, major-general and brigadier in the Canadian forces since September 1, 1939?

2. What was the date of each such appointment?

3. Where are each of the above officers now stationed?

4. What duties are each of the above officers performing?

5. What pay, separation and other per diem allowances are being paid to each officer?

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax): Return tabled.

MOBILIZATION ACT—REQUISITIONS, POSTPONEMENTS, ETC.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. How many men in each military district, (a) have been requisitioned by the army under the National Resources Mobilization Act since March 20, 1941; (b) have reported for medical examination; (c) have been granted postponements?

2. How many military training notices have been sent out in each military district?

3. How many have reported?

4. How many men have been enrolled in each military district?

FLOUR-MILLING BY-PRODUCTS—WHOLESALE PRICES

Mr. LACOMBE:

1. What are the present wholesale prices, by carload and per ton, of flour-milling by-products, delivered to Montreal and Quebec?

2. What are the prices of the same by-products delivered to Sherbrooke, Three Rivers, Rivière du Loup, and Toronto?

Mr. ABBOTT: Return tabled.

BEET SUGAR—EXCISE TAX

Mr. BLACKMORE:

1. How many pounds of sugar were produced in Canada during each of the years 1941, 1942 and 1943?

2. What amount of excise tax was collected on beet sugar by the federal government during each of these years?

3. How much of such tax was returned to the beet growers as a rebate in each of the above years?

PRAIRIE FARM ASSISTANCE—FIELD MEN AND SUPERVISORS, 1943

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn):

1. What are the names and addresses of the fieldmen and supervisors hired under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act during 1943?

2. What is the total amount received by each for, (a) salary; (b) expenses?
3. What was the total amount of time each of the above named was employed by the government during the calendar year 1943?

WHEAT ACREAGE REDUCTION—FIELD MEN AND SUPERVISORS

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn):

1. What are the names and addresses of fieldmen and supervisors hired in the province of Saskatchewan under the wheat acreage reduction administration?
2. What is the total amount paid to each for, (a) salary; (b) expenses?
3. What length of time was each of the above named hired by the government?

HON. SIR EUGÈNE FISET

Mr. DORION:

1. At what date was the Hon. Sir Eugène Fiset appointed Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Quebec?
2. What amounts have been paid to him by the dominion government each year since his appointment either by way of remuneration or for other expenses in connection with the office of Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Quebec?
3. What amounts have been paid to him by the provincial government of Quebec each year since his appointment either by way of remuneration or for other expenses in connection with the office of Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Quebec?
4. At what date did the Hon. Sir Eugène Fiset become entitled to an annual pension of $6,300 pursuant to the Militia Pension Act?
5. During what years has this amount of $6,300 been paid to the Hon. Sir Eugène Fiset?
6. What is the case which is to be brought before the Exchequer Court of Canada referred to in paragraph 3 of order in council P.C. 9380, dated the 7th December, 1943?
7. Has this case been actually brought before the Exchequer Court of Canada? If so, has a judgment been rendered, and what is the said judgment?
8. What are the additional expenses incurred by the Hon. Sir Eugène Fiset in the exercise of his office as referred to in paragraph 5 of order in council P.C. 9380, dated the 7th December, 1943?
9. Was the amount of $4,000 per year provided by order in council P.C. 9380 of the 7th December, 1943, actually paid to the Hon. Sir Eugène Fiset? If so, when, and for what fiscal years?
10. (a) What are the extraordinary expenses incurred by the Hon. Sir Eugène Fiset and caused by the war; (b) what provision of the War Measures Act, referred to in order in council P.C. 9380 of the 7th December, 1943, provides for payment of the said extraordinary expenses to the Hon. Sir Eugène Fiset?

LABOUR CONDITIONS—TEXTILE WORKERS

Mr. RAYMOND:

1. Has the Department of Labour made inquiries to ascertain whether textile workers had received the salary rates fixed by the various orders in council or other orders relating to the minimum salary rates to be paid to wartime workers?
2. If so, what did the Department of Labour find as to the payment of salaries fixed by the said orders in council or other orders?
3. What companies have been required to pay back to the workers the salary to which they were entitled, and what was the total amount in each case that the companies had to pay in this manner to the workers?

MOBILIZATION ACT—POSTPONEMENTS

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn):

1. How many men in each military district, up to December 31, 1943, have, (a) been called for military service; (b) applied for postponement; (c) been granted postponement for six months or longer?

PRAIRIE FARM REHABILITATION—FIELD MEN—ADMINISTRATION COSTS

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn):

1. What are the names and addresses of fieldmen in Saskatchewan hired during 1943 under the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act?
2. What amount was paid to each for, (a) salary; (b) expenses?
3. What is the total amount of time for which each was hired by the government?
4. What is the total cost of administration during the calendar year ending December 31, 1943?

ATHABASKA TAR SANDS

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River):

1. What amount of money was spent on the development of the Athabaska tar sands last year, 1943?
2. What amount was authorized and/or spent for the year 1944?
3. What office buildings have been built up to date, and what is the cost?
4. What residential buildings have been built up to date, and what is the cost?
5. How many of these residences are occupied?
6. How many persons are employed in these offices?
7. How many persons are employed in other occupations at this plant?
8. Has the pilot-plant been started yet? If so, how long before it will be completed?
9. When is it expected that this pilot-plant will be in operation, and what will be its capacity?
10. What plans are there for further development this year?
11. Is it expected that gasoline will be produced in quantity this year?

FUEL WOOD—JAPANESE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. REID:

1. What amount of money has been paid by way of subsidy or assistance for the production of wood for fuel?
2. By provinces, how has this money been distributed?
3. How many cords of wood for fuel have been produced or obtained under assistance during the calendar year 1943?
4. What has been the total expenditures for the production of firewood by persons of

Japanese origin in the province of British Columbia, (a) in wages; (b) by way of other assistance?

5. How many cords of such firewood have been produced from August 1 to December 1, 1943?

6. To what points has the firewood produced in British Columbia been shipped, and in what quantities?

7. Per cord of wood, how much has the production cost, up to December 31, 1943?

8. How many cords of firewood have been shipped to Vancouver under the Japanese wood-cutting operations?

9. What has been the cost of all firewood shipped to Vancouver?

10. Under whose jurisdiction or ownership is such firewood?

11. If not owned by the government, has the government received payments for any of the firewood shipped to Vancouver, and what amounts have been received?

12. Has any agreement been entered into with the Vancouver city council regarding sale or disposal of firewood shipped to that city?

13. If so, what are its terms?

SUBSIDY ON MINE PROPS AND MINING TIES

Mr. SHAW:

1. Was an order in council passed at any time since the outbreak of war authorizing the payment of a subsidy on mine props or mining ties? If so, what was the number of the said order, upon what date was it passed, and what was the rate of subsidy established?

2. What was the purpose of passing an order in council authorizing the payment of a subsidy on mine props or ties?

3. What was the total amount paid to producers of mine props and ties in Alberta by way of subsidy between the date of the passing of the said order authorizing the payment of such subsidy and January 19, 1944?

4. Was a ceiling price placed on mine props and ties at any time between January 1, 1942, and January 19, 1944? If so, what was the ceiling price in Alberta?

5. Have prisoners of war been engaged in cutting mine props and ties in Alberta at any time between January 1, 1942, and January 19, 1944? If so, where were they engaged in such work, and what was the total number of thousand lineal feet cut by such prisoners?

6. Were the mine props and ties cut by prisoners of war in Alberta sold? If so, by whom, to whom, and at what price per thousand lineal feet?

7. Was the subsidy paid on mine props and ties which were cut by prisoners of war in Alberta?

8. Were the mine props and ties cut by prisoners of war in Alberta sold at the prevailing rate for such materials?

9. Upon what date were the producers of mine props and ties in Alberta who were receiving subsidy payments notified that the subsidy was cancelled, and upon what date did the cancellation order become effective?

10. Did the cancellation prevent the collection of the subsidy for mine props and ties which were cut prior to the cancellation date of the subsidy but not sold?

[Mr. Reid.]

11. Were the producers of mine props and ties notified at any time since January 1, 1944, that they might increase the sale price of same? If so, by what amount could the price be increased?

12. Has the government or any government board increased the sale price of mine props and mine ties produced by prisoners of war since January 1, 1944? If not, why not?

PAYMENTS TO CANADIAN PACIFIC AND CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Mr. CHURCH:

What has been paid by the government to, (a) the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; (b) the Canadian National Railways, during this war for each of the years 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943?

CANADIAN FORCES—MEDICAL SERVICES

Mr. GILLIS:

1. Would there be any saving of personnel or increase of efficiency if the consultant, hospital and medical organizations of the three armed services were united?

2. When will the Archer report on medical services be made available to the public?

3. What number of medical officers in each of the three armed services who are qualified to practice medicine are engaged in clerical work only?

CANADIAN FORCES—CLOTHING

Mr. PURDY:

1. Does each one of the three armed services supply the same units of clothing to non-commissioned officers and men? If not, what are the exceptions?

2. Does each service have the same regulations with respect to replacements? If not, what are the major differences?

RADIO LICENCES—REVENUE AND EXPENSES OF C.B.C.

Mr. REID:

1. What number of radio licences have been issued during the present fiscal year, up to January 1, 1944?

2. What amount of money has been collected by the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Corporation during the present fiscal year, up to January 31, 1944, by way of, (a) radio licences; (b) all other sources, giving details?

3. What have been the total expenditures on behalf of and for the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Corporation during the present fiscal year, up to January 31, 1944?

PRODUCTION OF FLAX

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. Was there a bonus paid by the government to the growers of flax during the 1942 season? If so, how much a bushel, and what was the total of the bonus paid?

2. How many bushels of flax were produced in Canada during the 1942 season?

3. How many bushels of flax were processed in Canada during the 1942 season?

4. How many bushels of flax were exported to the United States due to lack of machinery to process same in Canada?

OIL-BEARING SEED PLANTS

Mr. WINKLER:

1. What was the estimated, (a) acreage; (b) yield, in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta in 1943 of the following crops of oil-bearing seed plants: flaxseed, sunflowers and Argentine rape-seed?

2. What is the target acreage in these seeds for 1944?

3. To date, how much has been processed in these provinces, and at what points?

4. To date, how much from these has been processed in Ontario and other provinces?

RENTAL OF SPACE IN SAINT JOHN, N.B.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury):

1. What space, if any, has been rented by the Department of National Defence from J. Clark & Son, Limited, in the city of Fredericton or elsewhere in the province of New Brunswick?

2. What rent is being paid for each such space, and what are the terms of the rental arrangement with respect to time, termination of the rental contract, renewal arrangements, and other like conditions?

3. What space, if any, has been rented by the wartime prices and trade board from J. Clark & Son, Limited, in the city of Saint John or elsewhere in the province of New Brunswick?

4. What rent is being paid for each such space, and what are the terms of the rental arrangement with respect to time, termination of the contract, renewal arrangements and other like conditions?

Mr. McLARTY: Order for return.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): No; I want the information on *Hansard*. There are just four short questions requiring four short answers.

Mr. McLARTY: But two departments are involved, the Department of National Defence and the Department of Public Works. That is the only reason for making it an order for return.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): To cover it up.

Mr. McLARTY: That is not the purpose at all. It is purely by reason of the fact that two departments are involved, and no one department could answer the whole question. If the hon. member wishes to separate the questions, they could be answered, but it is impossible for one department to answer the whole question as it now stands.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Questions 1 and 2 refer to one transaction, and questions 3 and 4 to another. They could easily be answered. But if you do not want to do it that way, I will get it to the public in some other way.

MOBILIZATION ACT

STATEMENT AS TO PROCEDURE IN ISSUING CALL-UP NOTICES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, on February 7, as will be noted on page 205 of *Hansard*, the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) brought up the case of a soldier who had been in the army since 1942 but recently received a call-up notice under the National Resources Mobilization Act.

I have made inquiries about this case and I find that the master registration card of the man in question shows that on registering he gave the date of his birth as July 18, 1925. It has been ascertained that he enlisted on March 30, 1942, at Petawawa, stating at that time that he was born on November 22, 1923. Consequently, at the time of enlistment he was under seventeen years of age.

Registration cards in the divisional registrars' offices are kept in order of the year of birth and the registrar would not be in a position to prevent the issuance of a call-up notice to a man reaching the age of eighteen and a half years against a notice of enlistment from the armed forces giving a birth date that would make the callee twenty years of age. It will be realized that this difference in ages would cause considerable confusion as to identification. The recent call-up of this man went out because he had reached the age of eighteen and a half years based on his registration record.

I might add that in November, 1942, a change was made in the method by which the armed forces advise this department of enlistments, and under the present system the registrar receives copy of a pro-forma for each man enlisted through very definite channels.

While there is always the possibility of clerical error there would be relatively few cases under the present system whereby a man already enlisted would receive a call-up under mobilization regulations, unless, of course, the information provided by the man at the time of enlistment was contrary to information given at the time of registration.

I return to the hon. gentleman the documents he gave me, with the exception of the railway ticket and warrants for meals, which will not be required.

CANNING FACTORY CROPS

INQUIRY AS TO PAYMENT OF SUBSIDY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. J. TUSTIN (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question

to the Minister of Agriculture, based on the policy of the government for the last two years of paying a subsidy on the canning factory crops, The question is urgent, because this is the season at which the growers and processors are entering into contracts for crop production. I might add that rumours are going around that the announcement of subsidies will not be made until late in March. Is the minister in a position to make a statement as to whether or not a subsidy will be paid, and if so, in what amounts? If he is not in a position to do so now, can he tell us when he will make such a statement?

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): I cannot make a statement to-day, but we shall be in a position to do so very shortly.

POTATOES

SHIPMENTS FROM UNITED STATES TO CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. A. CRUICKSHANK (Fraser Valley): I should like to ask a question of the government arising out of a headline in yesterday's Ottawa *Citizen*.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I am not quoting the article, Mr. Speaker. Hon. members over here are always calling somebody else to order. They are generally out of order themselves. I should like to ask the government the following question: Which government officials arranged to allow the dumping of surplus American potatoes in Canada when Fraser Valley potatoes have to pay a duty of $7.50 per ton on certified seed potatoes and $12.50 per ton on commercial potatoes entering the United States? Has any effort been made to alter the situation?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a question which should be placed on the order paper.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: If I do that it will never be answered.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

WARTIME LABOUR RELATIONS REGULATIONS, P.C. 1003

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): Is the Minister of Labour aware that some employers, particularly in the province of Ontario, in industries where a vote has already been taken to determine the bargaining agency, and where negotiations with the bargaining agency so determined were entered into, are refusing, since the tabling of the wartime labour relations regulations order, P.C. 1003, to continue negotiations on the pretext that they are not clear what the status of the bargaining agency previously determined will be under the new order? Is the minister in a position to make a statement that would clarify the order as it relates to the situation I have described?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of the hon. member for Vancouver East, I should like to make a statement regarding the application of the wartime labour relations regulations, P.C. 1003, particularly in those provinces where legislation is at present in force providing for certification of bargaining representatives before collective bargaining is commenced. The provinces of Ontario and British Columbia have such legislation. So has Quebec, although I am under the impression that machinery has not yet been completed to administer the labour relations act recently passed by the Quebec legislature.

Hon. members will be aware that the wartime labour relations regulations, approved by the governor in council on February 17, are not yet in force. Section 48 provides for their coming into force on a day to be fixed by the governor in council. We first must set up the wartime labour relations board and the machinery to carry out the regulations. However, I can assure the house there will not be unnecessary delay in doing so.

In those provinces where machinery exists for the certification of bargaining representatives, and pending the coming into force of the new federal regulations, I would say that employees and employers should observe the terms of the existing provincial legislation and bargain in good faith after the bargaining representatives have been certified. If as a result of this bargaining a collective agreement is consummated before our regulations come into force, the collective agreement should be regarded as a valid one. If on the other hand the negotiations following the certification of bargaining representatives under provincial laws fail to produce a satisfactory agreement, either party may make application to the Minister of Labour for the establishment of a board of conciliation and investigation under the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, provided the industry is one coming within the scope of that act as extended by order in council P.C. 3495.

It should be noted that the suspension of the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act occurs only when the wartime labour relations regulations come into force. In other cases provincial legislation may provide for

further reference to the competent authority when agreement on the terms of a collective agreement cannot be reached.

Where certified bargaining representatives are in negotiation with employers when our federal wartime labour relations regulations come into force, there might be some apprehension that certification of such bargaining representatives will again have to be sought.

Section 36 (2) of our regulations empowers the Minister of Labour, with the approval of the governor in council, to enter into agreements with the governments of the provinces to provide for the administration, within those provinces, of the regulations. I would say that when the terms of these agreements are under consideration by the provinces and ourselves all questions which may arise, such as that of the recognition by the board of the decision of the labour court of Ontario or other provincial authorities with regard to certification of bargaining agencies or representatives, will be fully considered and adequately covered.

I make this statement at this time because I realize that some uncertainty is bound to exist in the minds of trade union officers and officials of employing companies, engaged in proceedings initiated under provincial regulations, as to their status under the national regulations; uncertainty which might tend to delay the current negotiations until our regulations are effective.

The interests of industrial peace and of the war effort will best be served if parties to negotiations now in progress continue their negotiations with a genuine desire to reach a satisfactory outcome.

Mr. ADAMSON: The Industrial Disputes Investigation Act is still in force?

Mr. MITCHELL: Absolutely; it is in force until the new labour code is proclaimed by the governor general in council.

Mr. GILLIS: Will the new labour relations regulations be printed for general distribution? There is a widespread demand for them.

Mr. MITCHELL: We have arranged for the printing of many thousands. I understand the first copies came to my office this morning. My hon. friend can rest assured that there will be a widespread circulation of the order, and it will also be printed in the *Labour Gazette* of this month.

Mr. MacINNIS: Will the report of the war labour board be printed?

Mr. MITCHELL: I have made arrangements for the printing of both reports as an appendix to the *Labour Gazette* of this month.

CANADIAN FORCES

SERVICE PERSONNEL—TRANSPORTATION—RAILWAY FARES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Will the Minister of Transport or the government give some consideration to the large number of resolutions of municipalities and other public bodies regarding soldiers' fares? Could not the question and the bill I introduced be turned over to the railway committee or some other committee? This is a very important matter.

Hon. J. E. MICHAUD (Minister of Transport): I shall give consideration to that.

WAR APPROPRIATION BILL

PROVISION FOR GRANTING TO HIS MAJESTY AID FOR NATIONAL DEFENCE AND SECURITY

The house resumed from Thursday, February 17, consideration in committee of a resolution to grant to His Majesty certain sums of money for the carrying out of measures consequent upon the existence of a state of war—Mr. Ilsley—Mr. Bradette in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE—ARMY SERVICES

2. Pay and allowances, $547,256,061.

Mr. KNOWLES: Mr. Chairman, despite the statement of the minister concerning the matter of the amount of allowances payable to mothers of men in the armed services, I should like to press him to give the matter further consideration. It seemed to me that there was an inconsistency between the statement which the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) made on page 613 of *Hansard* and that which he made on page 619. On page 613, when he was discussing the reasons for cutting off the allowances of dependents to any soldier who is absent without leave, he made this statement:

> Dependents' allowance is not granted as compensation to a wife because she has lost the comfort of or association with her husband. It is paid to the wife in order to promote the well-being of the service, and to relieve the anxiety which husbands overseas would have, if such payment were not being made.

In passing, I do not agree altogether with the spirit of that statement. It seems to me that dependents deserve some consideration in their own own right rather than simply on behalf of the men in the forces. But even taking the statement at its face value, I emphasize these words of the minister:

> It is paid to the wife in order to promote the well-being of the service, and to relieve the anxiety which husbands overseas would have, if such payment were not being made.

On pages 619 and 620, when we were discussing the difference between amounts allowed to wives and to mothers of soldiers, the minister pointed out that in the case of a wife, the $35 is given to her as of right, whether she has nothing or is a millionaire; and then he went on to say that the mother received the $25, not necessarily the whole of that amount, only if dependency could be established. There is also the further regulation that her total income outside assigned pay must not exceed $65. As all hon. members know, there are many men in the forces who have a deep anxiety because of the economic position of the mother at home, and if the minister is going to take the position which is set out on page 613 in regard to the morale of men in the services, I submit it ought to apply to mothers of men in the forces. If it is desirable for the morale of the forces to pay $35 to wives, it is at least equally desirable that the maximum payable to mothers should be raised to that figure, $35.

I hope that the minister and the government will give this matter further consideration, because it affects a great many men in the forces. Many a young man is just as much concerned about the economic circumstances of his mother, particularly where there is invalidity on the part of the father, as married men are for their wives and families. At the same time I should like to press further this point with regard to the regulation that sets $65 as the ceiling on income for mothers in this class. It has the effect of discouraging mothers who might otherwise get some kind of work as a means of stepping up their income, because when they do they are cut down in the amount of the allowance they receive. It should be remembered that in hundreds, perhaps thousands, of cases the mother is called upon to put up with conditions inferior to those under which she lived when the son was at home working and contributing to the upkeep of the home.

I bring to the attention of the minister and of the government these two points—the desirability of increasing to $35 the maximum allowance paid to mothers, and of raising the $65 ceiling to, I would say, $75, or better still, $100.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I support the very reasonable plea made by the member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). If a soldier can establish the fact that he was contributing to the support of his parents prior to his enlistment, I submit that automatically one of the parents ought to be entitled to dependents' allowance. Let me give an instance I came across the other day of a widow on a farm who had her youngest son helping her to operate it. The boy joined the army. The mother cannot possibly continue working the farm without men to help her, and at the present time she cannot hire reliable farm help. She therefore leaves the farm and goes to teach school, though she is not by any means a young woman. This boy had been contributing toward her support during all the years he was working on the farm. Now, because his mother is teaching school, she is not allowed the dependent's allowance. He can assign part of his pay as a contribution, but she cannot get dependent's allowance. If she stayed in town and sat around, she would get it, but because she teaches in a small country school, where teachers are hard to get, and receives $75 a month, she cannot get the dependent's allowance, since her income is in excess of $65 even without the dependent's allowance.

As the regulation stands at the present time, this woman could not get the full dependent's allowance if her income were more than $40. Her total income could not be more than $65. The government have set a very low figure if they think that the mother of a man in the services can live on $65 a month. It is far too low. This boy has been contributing for years to his mother's support; now he dons the king's uniform, and I suggest the government should underwite that boy's responsibility and shoulder the provision for the dependency of his mother, which the boy has been doing throughout the years. I ask the minister to consider the matter further.

Mr. RALSTON: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre was referring to two different passages of mine. What I was dealing with on page 619 was not the matter of the ceiling for dependent's allowance, but the necessity of showing need. There are two different principles with which the committee has been dealing and in which there is a difference between payment to mothers and to wives. In the case of the wife of a private the maximum dependents' allowance payable is $35, and in the case of the mother, $25; moreover, in the case of the wife the $35 is, in practice, paid automatically, whereas in the case of the mother, dependency has to be shown—that is, that the mother was receiving support from the son before he enlisted or that, owing to circumstances beyond his control, it was impossible for him to contribute.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It is an entirely different principle.

Mr. RALSTON: Yes. These are the two different matters with which I was dealing in

the two replies. I take it that my hon. friend and the hon. member for Weyburn were both really dealing with the question of dependency, though the hon. member for Weyburn did deal with the matter of the ceiling as well. I do not think I can add anything on this question of dependency. The principle is that the country takes the place of the son who has supported his mother, up to $25 a month, exclusive of the assigned pay—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is a condition precedent?

Mr. RALSTON: That is right; and the assigned pay may amount to as much as $23, which means that the mother may get up to $48 from the son and the country together in order to take the place of whatever contribution the son was making before he enlisted. In addition the mother is entitled to earn up to $40 before any reduction is made in the allowance. This means she could receive $88 in all, of which the country would continue to contribute the full $25.

Mr. LOCKHART: How long has that been in effect?

Mr. RALSTON: The allowance was increased from $20 to $25 as of the first of January, 1943.

Mr. GREEN: Is any cost-of-living bonus paid to the mother?

Mr. RALSTON: No.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Following that up I should like to ask one other question, based upon a case that came to my attention. This was the case of the dependent mother of a soldier who, subsequent to his enlistment, married. What happens to the mother?

Mr. RALSTON: If the soldier assigns an additional five days' pay, then the mother may be granted the dependents' allowance.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): And the wife also?

Mr. RALSTON: The wife also.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is the condition precedent in both cases?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am glad I asked that question, because the minister has clarified the situation. The position, then, is that if the soldier has a dependent wife to whom he must assign some money, I have forgotten how many days' pay—

Mr. RALSTON: Fifteen days.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): —she automatically gets the dependents' allowance of $35?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): And if he further assigns five days' pay to his mother, then his mother will get the $25?

Mr. RALSTON: That is so.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am glad to have that information; it clarifies a position which has given me a good deal of trouble. I thought the position was that once the soldier married the mother was out, and I believe the hon. member for Comox-Alberni had the same impression. The minister now states definitely that if, in addition to the pay assigned to the wife, five days' pay is assigned to the mother, she still gets her dependents' allowance?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes, but not automatically, of course.

Mr. REID: I have a case I should like to bring to the attention of the minister, and I would say at once that there will always be exceptional cases no matter how well the act is framed. I think there is a principle involved in this case and, since a change must be brought about in the regulations, I believe this is the proper place to bring the matter to the attention of the minister. A man with a wife and one child assigned fifteen days' pay to his wife who was in receipt of dependents' allowance for herself and the child. Then the wife died and the child was placed in care of a home. Immediately the allowance for the child was cut off, and the reason given by the dependents' allowance board was that the pay assigned by the soldier more than covered the cost of keeping the child in the home. The soldier contended that he was as much entitled to dependents' allowance for his child as any other soldier was entitled to it, and that there was no reason for the dependents' allowance being reduced merely because he was continuing to assign pay to the home which was looking after the child. There may be many similar cases throughout the country, and I believe the point is well worth looking into.

Mr. RALSTON: If I understood my hon. friend correctly the situation was that there was a wife and child, the wife died and the child was then placed in a home?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. RALSTON: The child would be in the same position as the soldier's mother, in that the fact and extent of dependency would have to be shown. In the particular case cited the assigned pay was sufficient to care for the child and provide for its support.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): And nothing more was allowed.

Mr. RALSTON: No.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): In the case of a soldier who is not married but who has a dependent mother, is it a condition precedent that he shall assign the full fifteen days' pay, or would five days' pay do in that case?

Mr. RALSTON: It would be fifteen days.

Mr. KNOWLES: Apparently the minister did not quite understand my reason for making reference to his two statements in *Hansard*. In the statement at page 613 I felt that the minister had laid down as the government's reason for the dependents' allowance the desire to relieve the anxiety of the soldier in the forces. I felt there was some inconsistency between that statement and the one appearing at page 619, because in the second case the minister tried to draw a line between the needs of wives and mothers.

Mr. RALSTON: No, not the needs.

Mr. KNOWLES: At least the minister pointed out that in practice the wife gets the allowance as of right, whatever may be her economic position, while the mother gets it only if dependency can be established and then to an amount not exceeding $25 per month, which can be reduced if she is making any other money, though this condition does not apply in the case of the wife.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): She is allowed to make $40.

Mr. KNOWLES: My point is that if the statement on page 613 is correct and it is the desire of the government to relieve the anxiety of the man in the forces, it should be realized that in thousands of these cases there is as much anxiety over the condition of the mother as there is over the condition of the wife, and I cannot see any reason for making the difference ironclad. I might agree to one difference being allowed, namely that the wife should get the maximum amount as of right while the mother's allowance should be up to a maximum, but at least it seems to me that the maximum should be the same in both cases. Again, I do not see why the mother should not have the privilege of earning other income, even beyond the $40 to which the hon. member for York-Sunbury refers, the same as the wife may.

Mr. RALSTON: I believe my hon. friend is mixing up two things. The relief from anxiety, or some similar term, was the principle laid down in the passage I read from article 98 of the dependents' allowance regulations, but relief from anxiety does not depend on whether the amount is $25 or $35. Relief from anxiety depends on whether the need is relieved; and if the need is relieved by $25 there is relief from anxiety. If the need is not relieved, then the dependents' board of trustees comes in, in any special case of emergency and hardship, and makes a supplementary grant The theory of the assistance to the wife is, I grant, on a little more generous scale; but in each case the board has sought to establish, and they believe have established, a reasonable ceiling for the purpose of seeing to it that anxiety is relieved.

The hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Douglas) has left the chamber; I wanted to have a word with him about the case he mentioned. But let us say a mother is earning $40. This, with the $25 of dependents' allowance makes $65. In addition, there is an assignment of pay of possibly as much as another $23, giving a total of $88. My hon. friend can see that that is a fairly respectable situation. On the other hand if the mother had no outside income and was not able to do anything it is possible that the anxiety would not be relieved, and in such circumstances the dependents' board of trustees might have to consider any emergency needs specially. The anxiety is not relieved simply by fixing a dollar sign. Each case must be considered on its merits.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): In respect of the wife there is the question of marital relationship, which cannot be ignored.

Mr. RALSTON: That is so, and that is different from the relationship of the mother.

Mr. MacNICOL: I should like to present certain facts respecting the treatment of soldiers who have returned from the old country, and particularly those who participated at Dieppe. Am I in order?

The CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. member's question deal with pay and allowances?

Mr. MacNICOL: I am asking if I have the right to ask my question. I shall be only a moment or two. I shall not give the names of the men or of the detention barracks they are in.

I fear a certain condition surrounds soldiers who have returned from Dieppe, which may

not have been handled in the best possible way—and I am not blaming anyone. These men who were on the Dieppe beaches, as was the one I have in mind, and were wounded—the one in point was wounded in three places—may not be as easy to get along with as would be the trainee troops.

Mr. RALSTON: And the hon. member would not blame them.

Mr. MacNICOL: Well, I have been thinking that when they return to Canada they should be put with other men who have served in active warfare. The case I have in mind is that of a young man who, upon returning from overseas was sent to a barracks. Having been there only a few days he found he could not stick it any longer. Apparently his nerves were wrought up, with the result that he went away A.W.L. That young man came to see me, and I said to him, "Why are you here in uniform?" He said, "I am away without leave." Then I said to him, "My dear boy, I think you ought to go right back to barracks and report." He replied, "I am now away four days." I pointed out to him that that did not make any difference, that he could not take the law into his own hands, and urged that he report back to his superior officer. The young man did go back, and he was put into the clink for four days. When he got out his nerves again got the better of him, and he went away for a period of sixty-five days, returning to his home in Toronto. Apparently no effort was made to find him. After he had been away those sixty-five days he went back to barracks, and told me that when he returned to barracks his name was written off the rolls. I had suggested to him that he go back and tell his full story. This time he was put into the clink for twenty-eight days.

After that detention—and I shall not say whether it was inflicted rightly or wrongly; I do not know, and I have no fault to find—he went away again, and stayed away without leave for a further number of days. Upon his return he was put into the clink for another twenty-eight days. Upon his release he went away again. When I was home I went to see him in barracks, because he had written me a letter. I said to him, "You should not do this. When you get out you ought to act fairly with the officials." "Well," he said, "I cannot stick it; my nerves are so shot that I cannot do otherwise." Then he showed me wounds on his hands, another on the side of his head, and he told me that he had suffered a third, and pointed out that he could not stand it. I told him I was going to report his case to the officials, and that has been done.

I have mentioned the matter because I have felt that there might be other cases of a similar kind. I do not wish to give this man's name or barracks, but I should like the minister to look into the matter as presented in my letter and see what can be done when he comes out again on or about March 4 after a total of 128 days' detention. I am only a layman, but I was convinced that his nerves were in bad condition. I have no fault to find with the treatment he has received from the officials. But if this is a condition which applies to other soldiers returning from actual warfare, they should be placed in separate camps and ought not to be in close association with the young men who are coming in, particularly in view of the fact that they do not seem to get along well when they are placed together.

Mr. RALSTON: I am advised by the official sitting in front of me that the hon. member's letter has been received. I believe as a matter of fact this case has already been referred to the medical authorities. My hon. friend is quite right when he points out that this does not seem like the actions of a normal man. I must add that I am greatly surprised that steps were not taken earlier to have an examination made. I can only assume that steps were taken, and that it was felt that this boy was incorrigible—although my hon. friend's description would not lead me to that conclusion. I shall certainly have the case investigated, from a point of view altogether removed from that of disciplinary treatment.

Mr. MacNICOL: It does not look normal to me.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: May I return to the matter of mothers' allowances, and ask two questions of the minister? First, do I understand if the $25 allowance is not sufficient to cover a mother's needs, in the event of her having smaller children dependent upon her, there is a provision under which more than $25 can be paid? My second question is this: Will the minister undertake to reconsider the ceiling price placed upon earnings? This is working an unfairness. The effect is that no mother can take a full-time job, paying $10 a week or more, without losing part of the $25 allowance. There are no full-time jobs for women to-day for which less than $10 a week is offered, although in depression days one might have found that

condition. The result is that if a mother works at all she must forfeit a part of her $25 allowance. She will see others who work only two or three days a week but who receive the full $25. On the other hand if she works five days a week she must forfeit a part of the allowance. Surely that is unfair. Will the minister consider raising the ceiling on earnings to the point where a mother can work five or six days, if she chooses, and still receive the $25?

Mr. RALSTON: I believe it is the other principle with which my hon. friend is quarrelling, the principle of need.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: That will take care of it.

Mr. RALSTON: If the mother is earning money and wants to work five days a week—God bless her if she does—and if the principle is based upon need, then the basic condition for dependents' allowance in respect of mothers does not arise—or, at least, it is reduced to the extent that she is earning from other sources. The anxiety of the son is not there, because he knows his mother is being provided for. He knows, in other words, that she is looking after herself, and that the country is making up the difference, to the total of $65, plus assigned pay.

My hon. friend asks me to reconsider this matter. He makes his request of one who is most sympathetic to the mothers of these men. All I can say to him, however, as I have said to the committee before—and it does not mean anything more than I am saying—is that the position of these mothers is always under consideration. When I say it does not mean more than what I am saying, I mean just that; if there are cases or situations which really justify intervention, then we endeavour to intervene.

I should like the committee, if it will, to remember that what we are endeavouring to do is to take the place of the sons with regard to mothers' earnings. The hon. member for Weyburn referred to a mother, a daughter and a son on the farm, and pointed out that the son had been contributing to his mother's support for many years. I was going to ask him, not to give me the name in question, but to tell me how much a month the son had contributed through the years, and how much the mother was getting for teaching in the school instead of doing the work she did on the farm. It looked to me as if she must have been getting $25 a month dependents' allowance and at least $40 a month additional from the school. In fact I take it she was getting more than that, because my hon. friend said that she could not get any dependent's allowance at all, having taken a position at the school. She must have been getting at least $65 at the school, and then she was getting her son's assigned pay, whatever that was. I wondered if she was not better off financially under the circumstances than she had been, having regard to the amounts which the boy had been contributing when they were on the farm. We must remember that the country is taking the place of the boy so far as supporting the mother is concerned, but only up to limits which are considered reasonable. However, the dependents' board of trustees is able in meritorious cases to step in and to provide a supplementary grant to that given by the dependents' allowance board.

Mr. BENCE: I believe I have a still more to the point case than any suggested so far. A man is receiving an old age pension of $25 a month, and his son assigns so much pay to the mother. Both the father and mother are totally incapacitated and are unable to earn any money. Their only income is their old age pension and the assigned pay. The mother is entitled to have an income up to $40 a month, but because her husband is receiving an old age pension he cannot receive a dependent's allowance. There is conflict between the old age pension authorities and the dependents' allowance board. The old age pension regulations provide that if a man has an income, or if there is an income in the family, the old age pension is reduced proportionately. I ask the minister to take up this matter and see if some agreement cannot be reached between the dependents' allowance board and the old age pension authorities in the respective provinces in order that hardships such as this may be obviated. It is obvious that a case of the kind is outside the principles which govern the dependents' allowance regulations.

I should like to say a word or two about dependents' allowances generally, and to draw to the attention of the minister what I think are anomalies in connection with their application. The principles which govern the granting of dependents' allowances are set out in regulation 98, and it is stated that a dependent's allowance may not be claimed as a right. As the minister has put it, the reason for the granting of dependents' allowances is to relieve the anxiety of soldiers who have enlisted. There is another principle involved in connection with the relationship of a man and a woman to which I think the dependents' allowance board should pay more attention.

I refer to possible legal rights as between the two parties. It seems to me that more attention should be paid to the actual legal rights of a woman. Let me give one case as an example. A man deserted his wife, ran away with another woman and set up a separate establishment. They were living in northern Saskatchewan under circumstances where he did not have any property. It was impossible for his wife to obtain a court order under the provincial jurisdiction. This man had lived with the other woman for three or four years. His legal wife was guiltless, but when her husband enlisted she was unable to get a dependent's allowance. The other woman, of the type commonly described as a common-law wife—I do not recognize the term—was able to get a dependent's allowance. It is true that some adjustment was made under which the soldier assigned a certain amount of his pay to his legal wife, but she could not get a dependent's allowance or anything like what she would have been entitled to if the soldier had not gone away with the other woman.

There are other similar cases. A wife may have a husband who is continually badgering her, and things reach the stage where he no longer contributes to her support. She finally loses her temper and puts him out of the house. He goes away and joins the army. Despite the fact that she has legal rights and could obtain a court order for maintenance, the dependents' allowance board still will not recognize her claim. It seems to me that in considering these cases the dependents' allowance board should depend more upon what are the legal rights of the wife. Like all other hon. members I have had considerable experience with individual cases. I believe the practice is to send an investigator, generally a member of a federal government department, into the community. He makes an investigation and presents a report upon which the dependents' allowance board makes its decision. This practice seems to me to be unfair. Because of an investigation carried on by one man, a woman may be deprived of her legal rights. If a woman is able to obtain a court order against a man, then she should be entitled to a dependent's allowance, and the report of a man appointed by the board to look into her case should be disregarded. The judge sitting on the case is in a position to hear the evidence and determine the rights as between parties.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend has given me three cases?

Mr. BENCE: Yes. Here is another one along the same line. A wife divorces her husband because he has committed some statutory offence which entitles her to a divorce. She is guiltless but just as soon as the decree nisi is granted the dependents' allowance board arbitrarily reduces her allowance, so that she is receiving less than she would be entitled to receive if she continued in her married state. This condition is brought about through no fault of her own. Her husband has been unfaithful, and the result is that she is left in a worse position than she was before. I suggest that that is an unfair position to put her in. A woman may not feel like going to court to obtain a divorce, because she knows that if she does, the amount she receives will be drastically reduced. The woman may be elderly and not able to earn anything; she may be depending entirely upon her legal rights in the civil courts, and yet the dependents' allowance board rules that she is entitled to considerably less than she would receive if she continued in her married state.

Could the minister give us some information as to the number of cases in which duplicate dependents' allowances have been paid?—that is, where a wife has been receiving more than one allowance because she is married to more than one man. There are one or two other points I should like to draw to the attention of the minister. I understand that this is a general item under which we can discuss matters which do not come specifically under other items.

The CHAIRMAN: No.

Mr. BENCE: Where in the agenda can I discuss general matters?

The CHAIRMAN: It could only be with the consent of the committee, because we had a general discussion under item No. 1.

Mr. BENCE: It was restricted to the particular item. I do not think there is a specific item covering prisoners of war but I wish to ask a question on that. It has come to my attention directly from men who are prisoners of war that they are concerned because, being prisoners of war, they are not entitled to obtain promotion as the years go by, while men who serve in Canada, by sticking to their job, are entitled practically automatically to promotion in the ordinary course of events. I have seen communications from prisoners of war with respect to this matter. I would not say that they feel bitter, but they are concerned because they are kept in statu quo as to rank, while the men who joined up at the same time with them and are back in

Canada are receiving promotions by being made squadron leaders and wing commanders while the prisoner of war stays in his present rank. I realize that no such promotions are recognized by the German authorities, but so far as the Canadian authorities are concerned I think the minister should take into serious consideration whether prisoners of war should not automatically be raised in rank as the years go by, in the same manner as the men in all branches of the services who serve in this country.

I also have a question to ask with respect to the men, and particularly officers, who are returning from overseas. I would ask the minister to give serious consideration to the possibility of placing in positions here in Ottawa these men who have been overseas for three, four or five years, and have been retired or returned on account of age or for other reasons. I do not think they should be necessarily discharged, but advantage should be taken of positions available in Ottawa to place some of these men who have served overseas for three, four or five years in posts which have been occupied by men serving in comparative comfort as compared with the men overseas.

Mr. RALSTON: Dealing first with the old age pension case raised by my hon. friend, I will look into that. I think he has stated the situation correctly, that the old age pension is taken into consideration as income.

Mr. BENCE: It is the other way round. If they took it into consideration as income, that would be only $240 a year, and the mother would be entitled to the dependents' allowance. But the position is this. If the mother is given a dependents' allowance, the provincial and dominion authorities in charge of old age pensions would reduce the old age pension. If it were the other way round, as the minister says, the matter would be simple. It would be only $240 or $300 a year, as the case might be. But the situation is just the reverse, and the mother cannot get anything extra at all.

Mr. RALSTON: Even at that I would not throw up my hands. It is the action of the provincial authorities administering the old age pensions which results in the situation whereby both the dependents' allowance and the old age pension are not receivable. But I will look into the matter and see if there is anything from the federal point of view that can properly be done and that ought to be done.

Mr. BENCE: In view of the fact that the federal government pays seventy-five per cent of the pension.

[Mr. Bence.]

Mr. RALSTON: But the provincial authorities administer it.

My hon. friend's next case was that in which a man had left his wife to live with another woman, and the wife could not get a separation. I presume she had not the money, or something of that sort. The common-law wife, so called, was receiving a dependents' allowance. I am told that the board have power in such cases to make a grant to the legal wife. But I would point out to the committee that it is pretty hard to blow both hot and cold in this matter. I do not suggest that my hon. friend is doing so. But we have one member saying that we should reply on the principle in the regulations to the effect that this soldier shall be relieved from anxiety while serving, which is really the reason why the country is paying the allowance. Apparently, however, this man was completely relieved from anxiety by leaving his wife and going and living with the other woman. His legal wife's situation is not worrying him in the slightest and his service is not affected at all by the fact that she happens to be in want. I do not know whether the country is called on to provide for the legal wife in this case, but the dependents' allowance board have power to do this in individual cases, under the proper circumstances. Has my hon. friend a particular case in mind?

Mr. BENCE: I have a case in mind, but I wish to deal with the principle, rather than with any particular case. The common-law wife has no rights at law to proceed against a soldier for support. She takes that risk when she goes to live with him. I suggest that we should pay more attention to the rights of the legal wife than we are doing.

Mr. RALSTON: That is contrary to the principle which was argued for the other night. It seems to me that to-day the discussion is getting into the right groove. The other night I listened to pleas on behalf of those who were absent without leave, on behalf of those who were in detention, and on behalf of common-law wives and illegitimate children. Now we are talking about mothers of soldiers and my hon. friend has put the case of the legal wife. While the fact that the woman is his legal wife does not disturb the soldier's sleep at all or interfere with his service, and while it is true that he has escaped a moral and legal responsibility, the country is being asked to help him—

Mr. BENCE: It is a position which has been determined all through the centuries.

Mr. RALSTON: But remember this, that the wife is not in any way worse off because

her husband is a soldier. The man my hon. friend speaks of had run away with the other woman before he enlisted. If he were not a soldier she would be in exactly the same position.

Mr. BENCE: No. Because the man is a soldier she cannot proceed against him and get an order in the courts and collect, whereas if he were in a civil job she would be able to get an order against him. No money was available at the time the desertion took place. Now the man is a soldier, and the soldier is given protection by the law of the land against the wife's proceeding against him and having an order made against him which will procure some of the money the soldier is earning.

Mr. RALSTON: I think my hon. friend is stating the principle rather too broadly. There are actions being brought all the time against soldiers for divorce.

Mr. BENCE: An order against a soldier's property cannot be enforced.

Mr. RALSTON: Certainly.

Mr. BENCE: Can you garnishee his wages?

Mr. RALSTON: It is not a matter of garnisheeing. It is a matter of getting a separation order. That brings me to the next case, where the wife left because conditions were such that she could not live with the man any longer, and she got a separation order of some kind. I am instructed that the board will pay attention to that separation order and will pay the amount the man is obligated to pay under that order, first, out of the assigned pay and the remainder out of dependents' allowance up to the maximum amount payable under the regulations.

Mr. BENCE: I may not have put the position as clearly as I intended to. In that particular case there was no court order. The wife was in a position where she would have to apply to the court for judicial separation which, as the minister knows, is a rather expensive piece of litigation. She was not in a position to do that. My suggestion is that the dependents' allowance board should take the position that until the husband has paid the minimum of the court's order the payment should be made notwithstanding.

Mr. RALSTON: I think my hon. friend is putting a pretty heavy burden on the dependents' allowance board. That is really trying a case of marital relations between a husband and his wife.

Mr. BENCE: They do that, anyway.

Mr. RALSTON: They do on the question of whether husband and wife are living together, but apparently not on the question of whether the husband has deserted the wife or the wife has deserted the husband. On the question of paying the wife's dependents' allowance when the husband has deserted the wife, the situation as I understand it is, if a separation order is made the dependents' allowance board pays the amount which the man is obligated to pay. I am instructed further that there are, shall I say, escalator clauses which permit payment to be made in what are considered to be meritorious cases. I come back to this. I am assuming my hon. friend is right; that conditions are perfect in every way. The wife's position is no different from what it would be if the man were not a soldier. My hon. friend asked another question which had to do with duplication of the wife's allowance.

Mr. BENCE: There was another question before that, the question of a wife divorcing her husband.

Mr. RALSTON: I thought that was a case in which a separation order was obtained, or at least where an order for alimony was obtained—

Mr. BENCE: The point I made was that the dependents' allowance board put a ceiling on it which is considerably lower than what she would be entitled to if she were living with her husband.

Mr. RALSTON: The dependents' allowance board does not necessarily carry out the order to the full extent.

Mr. BENCE: They will not pay the full order of the court.

Mr. RALSTON: As I understand it, they do not pay the amount which the husband is obligated to pay under the alimony order up to the amount of the dependents' allowance and assigned pay.

Mr. BENCE: I can produce correspondence with the dependents' allowance board which says that is not so.

Mr. RALSTON: I shall appreciate seeing that. These are the instructions. I shall be very glad to get the details of the case, if that is not so.

My hon. friend spoke of cases in which the wife's allowance has been duplicated. He asked for the number. I cannot tell him the number. I can tell him, however, that the total amount of overpayments, on all counts, is less than one-twelfth of one per cent of the amount of money paid.

My hon. friend raised the question of prisoners of war. I am very sympathetic to that, as a matter of fact. What is done in so far as prisoners of war is concerned is that acting

ranks are confirmed. Up to date there has been no provision for promotion. I shall look into that matter further.

My hon. friend referred also to officers returning from overseas and retired on account of age. He asked that they be not discharged but be put in places of men here who could be sent overseas.

Mr. BENCE: That consideration be given to some of those officers, at any rate.

Mr. RALSTON: I say to my hon. friend that we act on that basis constantly. If my hon. friend has any cases in mind I invite him to bring them to my attention. I do not want him to go too far in my department, but I shall be very happy indeed to receive any suggestions in regard to any cases of that kind, where he thinks a man returned from overseas can handle a job that somebody else is doing. That is exactly what we are looking for all the time. I know some people are sceptical about it, but I believe the committee will believe me when I say that men doing national defence jobs are just as anxious to get overseas as the cases that have come to the attention of my hon. friend. We are not keeping them from going overseas. Every man who comes up for appointment has a limit on the time during which he can hold the appointment. I am talking, of course, of men of the age and category for going overseas. He goes overseas whenever the opportunity offers itself. We do give them a certain amount of training here, and we do keep them here for administrative work. That applies particularly to ordnance work.

Mr. BENCE: I was thinking of positions held by men who are in a category which would entitle them to go overseas. They are allowed to continue in their positions, and I think those positions should be held by men who come from overseas. They should be given the opportunity to fill some of those jobs.

Mr. RALSTON: I say to my hon. friend that every time I initial an appointment—I do not initial in all cases, particularly junior positions—both the military secretary and the adjutant-general who look at it first know that I look first to see whether or not the man is fit for overseas service. If he has not had overseas service I make inquiry as to why and raise immediate question as to why recommendation is made.

Mr. MAYBANK: I wish to express agreement to a certain extent with what I understand to be the principle enunciated by the last speaker. I believe it would be better for the dependents' allowance board to be given authority to pay attention to and be guided by the rights of the wife, as between her and the husband. I realize the overriding principle in connection with these cases is that of freeing the soldier's mind from worry; but in the great majority of cases there is no violence done to that by recognizing also the rights of the wife with respect to the soldier. I am not suggesting that the dependents' allowance board give no attention to that, but I should like to bring to the attention of the committee the fact, as I believe it to be, that there is a tendency on the part of the dependents' allowance board to get away from recognizing the wife's rights as much as possible. I do not mean that it is done all the time. It has seemed to me in the last year and a half that in dealing with questions where there was something in the way of a dispute between husband and wife the dependents' allowance board was moving with much greater reluctance than seemed to be the case before. Of course I speak only from my own experience. It may not be in accord with the experience of other hon. members. I have seen a sense of tightening up on the part of the dependents' allowance board. I wish to draw to the attention of the committee two or three cases which have passed in front of me. I do so only for the purpose of citing them as typical of several. I am not interested in taking up the time of the committee with any particular case; I refer to it only as a type in order to illustrate the more or less mild complaint that I am making at the moment.

Before I mention the cases I wish to protect myself against you, Mr. Chairman, and the committee thinking that I am very critical of the dependents' allowance board and that I have had a bad experience with them. That is an impression I would not wish to convey because the contrary is the fact. I find in general that the dependents' allowance board are excellent people to get along with. They are doing an extremely fine job, but I think it would be a good thing if some directive could be given to them by the minister in connection with one or two matters.

May I illustrate the difficulty by giving the following case? A man and his wife got into trouble, the one with the other. They separated and had a case in court. The man was not working. There was no possibility of making an order against him for maintenance for the wife. The only thing the court could do in the circumstances was to give an order of separation and to give the custody of the child of the marriage to the wife. That having been accomplished, the husband departed from the neighbourhood for some little time at any rate. Later on he was found to be in the army. Of course, the wife always had the

right to apply for maintenance from this man, if, as and when she could catch up with him and he was in a position to maintain her. No order was given, for the simple reason that there was no use giving an order to get blood out of a stone. But when he is found in the army application is made for two things, the wife's maintenance and the child's maintenance. The dependents' allowance board follow the procedure whereby a soldier in such a case can be required to make an assignment. I think it is called D.A.B. form 14. This woman demonstrated the soundness of her position and the forms were filled in. This is many months ago. It was made perfectly clear by a certified order of the court that this was a proceeding between husband and wife, where they were both present and both represented by counsel. It was not a case where a wife sues her husband after he has enlisted and gets an order *ex parte*. They fought it out in court and she established her position. The custody of the child was granted her. She has the child and is supporting it.

The procedure that was adopted was to endeavour to get the man to make an assignment, but he said he would not make an assignment. Apparently no further pressure was put on him, on behalf of the wife or the child, to make an assignment, except this. He said, "I will make an assignment in favour of the child if you put that child in such-and-such an institution". There the dependents' allowance board stood still. They said, "He will make an assignment if the child is put in such-and-such an institution", and that is as far as the woman can get. No dependent's allowance is paid either for her or for the child.

The case with respect to the child is unarguable. They fought out the question where the child ought to be; they were both present in court, and the court decided where the child should be. But this lad takes the position that he will pay the allowance for the child, which he has admitted he ought to pay, only if they will do something different from what the court ordered on behalf of the woman. I am giving this as typical of some others, and I suggest that such a case requires some direction either from the minister in charge or from some other person on the government benches. I am quite sure of the facts. I am not stating anything hearsay; what I have said is absolutely correct. There is not the slightest variation from what is factual.

Mr. RALSTON: As I understand the situation, an application was made for allowance for the wife and child. The board said, "You must have an assignment of pay in order to found that application". The man said, "I am not going to make any assignment of pay". Finally he said, "I will make an assignment conditional on one thing, namely, that the child shall be put in a certain institution or school". The board did not treat that as an assignment. The wife does not accept that condition, I suppose, while the board on the other hand refuses to order a compulsory assignment. Is that the condition?

Mr. MAYBANK: Yes, but there is one important step left out in the minister's repetition of what I stated or intended to state; I may have left something out myself unintentionally, though I do not think I did. The board made it clear that the power resided either in them or in some other arm of the service, through which they would work, to force an assignment from the man, and it was that action of the government agency upon which the woman relied. She relied upon the assistance which the board could give her, and indeed it was the board that pointed out that it would be done. I was told that. But they did not follow it through. That is one very important point that the minister did not state.

Mr. RALSTON: I stated it the other way, that, the woman having refused to consent to the conditional assignment which he had agreed to give, the board refused to make an order for an unconditional assignment.

Mr. MAYBANK: I am not quite sure that we are at one yet. The steps are these. There is an application to the board, showing the board that she is resting under the benefit of a certain court order; the board make it quite clear that they have power to force an assignment and will undertake to do so, and they get in touch with the officer commanding with a view to doing that. But when the soldier makes answer to the king's officers that he will make an assignment on such-and-such a condition, the board say in effect—they do not put it down this way in black and white, but they say it by inference: "If you will place that child in the institution we will see that you get the allowance for it". I have not pressed the case with regard to the wife's own allowance because there is a little more argument there, and I do not want to press anything that is not open and shut; but with respect to the child, there can be no argument that a man is required to support his own child. Probably we are completely at one now.

Mr. RALSTON: Did the husband give any reason for imposing the condition?

Mr. MAYBANK: No reason whatever, though I may say that the dependents' allowance board did for its own purposes effect a very careful investigation into the life of the young woman. There was a real examination of that sort, something which I am sure every person will agree was quite the proper thing to do, and the result of that examination was entirely to the credit of that young woman. I think that is what the minister had in mind. No problem of that sort arises at all.

Another sort of difficulty I have come across from time to time involves also a domestic problem. A soldier marries a woman who already has one or two children by a former husband, or at any rate she has them whether by a former husband or not. It is perfectly clear that under provincial law that man marrying that woman with those children is responsible for the children of his wife just as he is responsible for the childen of himself and his wife. I find this curious development now, that although the soldier is admittedly liable for the upkeep of these children and is perfectly agreeable to maintaining them—whether he is agreeable or not he is liable at any rate —the board are now saying, "We won't give you dependents' allowance for the children of your wife unless you go through the procedure of adoption". Very often, and I think probably in the great majority of cases, the husband is quite agreeable to adopting the children, though I can conceive many instances in which the mother might not desire to have that done. But it does not make any difference whether or not one is agreeable; there is no reason why the dependents' allowance board should say, "We know you are liable for the maintenance of these children, but we will not grant any allowance for them unless you go through the courts in your province and become the foster father". That was not the situation formerly. I know of instances where it was suggested that the man should become the foster father—this was some three or four years ago—but he was told that he did not have to go through that procedure in order to have this allowance paid. I have come across two or three cases of that kind. Knowing what the practice was in the past, therefore I was greatly surprised recently to find that the board would not give these allowances unless the procedure I have mentioned was gone through, and I submit there is no reason why that should be the situation. I believe a directive should be given to the dependents' allowance board that in cases such as I have mentioned the allowance should be paid, so that the matter may be settled on proper legal grounds. There is no use in having one law with respect to liability while we follow a completely different course.

[Mr. Ralston.]

There are other typical cases which I wanted to bring to the attention of the committee. I cannot do so at present because in a very short time I must get away to attend a committee meeting, but I should like the opportunity of presenting further cases a little later on.

Mr. RALSTON: If my hon. friend has to leave I should like, before he goes, to say a word or two with respect to each of the cases he has mentioned, and I understand what he has said, namely, that he regards them as type cases. I am not so sure that the first would be a type case; I should not think that type of case would occur very often. I think my hon. friend is right in connection with the second case; there is a principle involved in connection with the requirement that the child should be adopted.

With regard to the first case, I should like to examine into it. I am sure my hon. friend knows far more about the circumstances than I do, and I am sure he has stated all the salient facts that he thinks are necessary; but as I see it from the statement he has made there must be some reason why the dependents' allowance board did not exercise what is, after all, a discretion; that is to say, why they did not decide what allowance should be granted and the number of days' pay per month which should be deemed to be compulsorily assigned for the benefit of the dependent. That can be done under article 100 of the regulations, and I shall have to find out from the board why they did what they did, and ascertain whether or not there is need for any change in the regulations. I wish to say that I have never yet given a directive to the dependents' allowance board. I think it is a wrong thing to do, because it seems to me that if the board has a discretion it should be allowed to exercise that discretion, while on the other hand if you intend to make a provision mandatory you should do so.

Mr. MAYBANK: Will the minister permit me to say that I am not suggesting at all that there should be a directive in a particular case; I should like to make that perfectly clear. Sometimes, however, we get type cases, which may indicate the need for some change in the law or the regulations, and that was what I had in mind. I was not advocating any interference with the board.

Mr. RALSTON: I realize that. It seems to me, since we all have to read these regulations, that it would produce a serious situation if hon. members or others interested in dependents' allowance came to read the regulations and were not aware that some directive had been issued which was really interpretive of

the regulations and which to some extent at least substituted the minister's discretion for the discretion conferred upon the board. I would rather see a regulation made mandatory if it is a case where mandatory action is required. I think the same thing applies to the second case referred to by my hon. friend. In that connection I should like to read, for the benefit of the committee, article 97 (e) of the dependents' allowance regulations. It will be remembered that my hon. friend said this soldier married a woman who had two children and the soldier thereby became legally responsible for the maintenance of those children.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Is that the law in all the provinces?

Mr. RALSTON: That would depend entirely upon provincial law; in some provinces it might be so and in others it might not. In section 97 (e) the regulations provide that the definition of the word "dependent"—

—shall, at the discretion of the board, include a child, even though not legally adopted, providing a married applicant has assumed in his own home the care and maintenance of said child for a reasonable period prior to his appointment or enlistment, during which period he has continuously wholly maintained such child and was so maintaining such child at the date of his appointment or enlistment, and continues to do so after his appointment or enlistment.

The important words in that provision are "at the discretion of the board". Apparently the board exercised its discretion and decided not to grant the dependents' allowance in this particular case unless the man legally adopted the children. I do not know why that was done. That was why I said I agreed with my hon. friend that this was a type case. It may be that in this case there should not be discretionary but mandatory provisions; I shall have to inquire into the matter before I can give any opinion that would be worth anything.

Mr. LOCKHART: I do not wish to bring particular cases to the attention of the minister, but I think it will be helpful if the minister can clarify matters of policy in one or two instances. At the outset I want to say that I could bring many cases before this committee; I have had many cases before the dependents' allowance board, and it has been my experience that if all the details are laid before the board they try to interpret the regulations as fairly as possible. I know they have been very lenient in many matters I have brought to their attention, and have done their best to straighten them out satisfactorily.

I have in mind a matter of policy in connection with the power of the regional board of trustees with respect to mothers of soldiers overseas. As I understand it, these regional boards have power to deal with such cases, and I should like to inquire whether there is any limit or ceiling upon what may be done for a mother. The second point I wanted to bring up is in connection with soldiers' wives. In the beginning of the war soldiers' wives who were receiving dependents' allowances for themselves and their children were restricted in the amount they might earn. Later on I believe the regulations were changed, but in the beginning a soldier's wife could not earn more than a certain amount of money.

Mr. RALSTON: I am advised that this limitation applied only where the money was received from some public authority, but that the wife could earn any amount while employed in a private capacity.

Mr. LOCKHART: There was some conflict of opinion in the case I have in mind, but I think the point is pretty well established now.

Mr. RALSTON: I was sure my hon. friend would want me to correct him on that point, because what I have said constitutes a serious limitation on the statement he made.

Mr. LOCKHART: I assume that at present, if a soldier's wife has special training, and some service to which she may apply herself, particularly in connection with the war effort, there would be no limit to her earnings, and she would still receive the whole of her dependents' allowance. Would the minister explain why the policy of his department is not to allow the same latitude to the mother? I should like to have that cleared up definitely.

Mr. RALSTON: I understand there is a limitation on the wife's earnings to the extent that if she is earning more than $3,000 in the civil service her separation allowance is affected.

Mr. LOCKHART: I understand that.

Mr. RALSTON: An amendment was made last year which permitted that extra earning. Outside of that, however, there is no limit at all. I have explained a number of times, and I can only repeat to my hon. friend that in the case of a mother, as distinguished from a wife, both in these regulations and under the Pension Act of 1917 the mother has been placed in a position different from that of the wife. The principle has been, as I tried to enunciate a short while ago, that in respect of the mother we are simply trying to take the place of the son, with regard to support, whereas in respect of the wife the country pays the amount for which provision is made, regardless of whether or not the wife needs it.

Mr. LOCKHART: I understood that before. My understanding is that under no circumstance is that latitude given to the mother. I could cite certain extenuating circumstances, but there would be no necessity to detain the committee by such procedure. The fact is that the mother is definitely restricted, despite any circumstance which might obtain in any given case. It is a definite restriction.

Mr. RALSTON: That cannot be so. The circumstance to which my hon. friend has referred is the very circumstance which the dependents' board of trustees would take into consideration in deciding whether or not a mother is in need. To answer my hon. friend's question directly, one could say that if there was a case where a mother had no need, then there are no circumstances which would give her any amount.

Mr. LOCKHART: That is clear.

Mr. RALSTON: And by "need" I mean a need, having regard to the necessary comforts.

Mr. LOCKHART: There is another question which has not been answered, in connection with the regional board of trustees, dealing with mothers. I understand the board is allowed a certain latitude in those cases.

Mr. RALSTON: The regional committees, as I understand it, are given a limit for direct immediate grants which may be necessary in any emergent situation. They do not even have to refer it to the board itself.

Mr. HOMUTH: But there is a ceiling on it?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes, there is a ceiling for the regional committees, but in the case of grants by the dependents' board of trustees there is no ceiling.

Mr. LOCKHART: What is the ceiling in the other instance?

Mr. RALSTON: It is $35, without reference to the board.

Mr. GILLIS: I wish to discuss this matter respecting the position in which the mother who seeks employment is placed. I do not think it is possible to lay down any hard and fast regulations with regard to these allowances. There are many different cases which can crop up, each of which may have different angles. To my mind, before there can be complete satisfaction the dependents' allowance board will have to be given administrative latitude where extenuating circumstances are shown. If the discussion has shown anything surely it has thus far shown that.

I believe the mother who has some earnings is definitely discriminated against. The minister makes the statement that the allowance is established on the basis of replacing whatever earnings a son may have had, or what he may, prior to enlistment, have contributed toward the support of his mother. That is not a fair premises from which to work, because prior to enlistment employment conditions were such in this country that the great majority of these young men, on account of lack of employment, were not contributing anything.

In my opinion the proper light in which to view the situation would be that of present employment possibilities. We would decide what a boy would be contributing, where the mother now seeks to augment her income. Many of these mothers are placed in the position where they must maintain homes. I have in mind a case where the father is incapacitated and has no earnings. There are two or three small children, and the only income the mother has is the $25, and the allowance granted by the board by virtue of assigned pay. At the outside it does not exceed $50 a month. In order to support the home the mother is obliged to take work.

One case I have in mind is that of a mother who works as a waitress at one of the local airports, and receives approximately $80 a month. Prior to enlistment the son was employed, and was maintaining the home. Her allowance is cut off on the ground that she is earning more than the ceiling permits.

Mr. RALSTON: No, not what the ceiling permits; with respect, I suggest my hon. friend is putting that incorrectly.

Mr. GILLIS: If she earns more than a certain amount a month—$40, I believe it is—no allowance is indicated.

Mr. RALSTON: No. If she is earning over $40, the amount by which her earnings exceed the $40 is deducted from the dependents' allowance. But that does not affect the assigned pay.

Mr. GILLIS: She is permitted to have an income of $65 a month.

Mr. RALSTON: Plus assigned pay.

Mr. GILLIS: That is the decision which was made in the case I have in mind.

Mr. RALSTON: I am instructed that if the facts are just as the hon. member has set them out, the decision was not correct. This is what we find in section 102 (c):

> 102. No allowance shall be granted . . .
> (c) To a person, other than those entitled to receive allowances under paragraphs (a) and (b) of article 101, who has income (from any source other than pay assigned by sons who are serving in the naval, military or air forces of Canada) greater than $65, but if the person has income less than $65, any allowance awarded together with such income shall not exceed $65.

That is apart from the assigned pay.

Mr. GILLIS: The case I have in mind was on the ground that she was exceeding the amount permissible under the regulation.

Mr. RALSTON: Was the dependents' allowance cut off entirely?

Mr. GILLIS: Yes. I do not think, in view of the many ramifications connected with allowances, that we should have hard and fast regulations. Every case cited in the house has had merit, and in order to have any kind of satisfaction it is my view that the board will have to have more administrative latitude. It is not possible to draft hard and fast regulations. In this particular case where a home is being maintained I do not think the earnings of the mother should be restricted by the regulations. I realize that a blanket order cannot be made that the government will pay sufficient to maintain a home regardless of the income of the family, but where circumstances exist such as those I have described I think the board should be given some latitude.

Another matter to which I should like to refer has to do with those cases where soldiers get into difficulties overseas. Under the regulations the allowance is paid for six months, and if a man gets into trouble with the military authorities he may be restored to his former status later on. I am referring particularly to the soldier in England who may have some difficulty with the civil authorities and receive a prison sentence of from eighteen months to two years.

In the case I have in mind the sentence was eighteen months. In this case the wife was notified that her allowance would be cut off at the end of six months, which would leave her without any allowance for a period of twelve months. I understand that a man such as this is automatically discharged from the service. That is not a nice prospect for a wife to face who has a family to take care of in Canada. She is to be put on her own resources after a certain period. If that man were in Canada there are ways and means of taking care of the woman and helping her out with her family obligations, but because the soldier is in England she is cut adrift without any assistance after the six months period. I do not think the wife and family in Canada should be forced to pay for any trouble the husband may get into in England. We have some responsibility for that family. I am not going to suggest what it should be—I have my own opinion—but I leave this with the minister, so that he may take it up with his officials and see if some relief cannot be given to families who find themselves in circumstances such as I have described.

The next matter I should like to deal with has to do with trades pay. I understand that the regulations are not working as satisfactorily as we would like to have them work. Some of us who went through the last turmoil will remember that for twenty years we carried on a fight for tunnelers in particular in connection with trades pay. I have received several letters from men who were overseas and who claim that they have worked at occupations which entitled them to trades pay. They have returned to this country and have been discharged from the service, but up to date they have not received the trades pay which was promised them at the time. The same complaint is made by men serving in Canada. They say they have taken the necessary trades tests but that trades pay has not been paid as yet. I realize that this matter is pretty much in the hands of the commanding officer and that certain recommendations must be made by him, but there would appear to be considerable laxity.

I should like to cite another case of a soldier with foster parents. I have taken this case up with the department. This boy was taken by foster parents when he was six months old and raised to the age of twenty-two or twenty-three years. Apparently no legal adoption papers were taken out. The boy has made a good record in the service and has been promoted to a fairly high position. He made application for a dependents' allowance for the parents who gave him the opportunity to grow up and serve his country, but the claim has been disallowed because no adoption papers were taken out. There should be no doubt about a case of this kind. The parents who have raised such a boy should be entitled to the same consideration that is given to a mother under similar circumstances.

Mr. RALSTON: Was the boy supporting the foster parents?

Mr. GILLIS: Yes. The department rendered a decision against this case.

Another matter to which I should like to refer concerns the notification sent to the next-of-kin when a soldier is killed overseas. In many cases insurance has been carried by the soldier, and his widow or mother make application to the insurance company. I know of cases where the next-of-kin have had to wrangle for months with the insurance company before the insurance was paid. It was claimed that there was no official notification of death from the Department of National Defence. The insurance companies do not accept a telegram as official notification; they say they must have an official death certificate from the department. I took up one or

two cases of this kind and they were attended to, but the department should send out some form which would be acceptable to the insurance companies.

Mr. RALSTON: The hon. member began his remarks by saying that there were so many different kinds of cases and such diverse sets of circumstances that it was impossible—I think he rather indicated that—to have hard and fast regulations to govern such cases. We do have to have regulations. We do have to have some principles laid down and some rules to guide the dependents' allowance board. The hon. member said that there should be some administrative latitude where there were extenuating circumstances. I have read some sections to-day which I think indicate pretty clearly that there is administrative latitude and in great degree. In extenuating circumstances the board has the discretion to give special consideration. In order further to extend those principles of equity we have established the dependents' board of trustees. This is another body which also has wide discretion in connection with cases considered to be meritorious. I should like to refer the committee to two sections in the dependents' allowance regulations which indicate the extent to which the board has discretion to exercise the administrative latitude to which my hon. friend refers. I refer first to proviso (vii) of article 101 on page 15 of the pamphlet, "Assigned Pay and Dependents' Allowance Regulations," which states:

> In dealing with applications for allowances for "other dependents relatives", described in clauses (i), (ii), (iii) and (vi) of subparagraph (c) of this article . . .

Those clauses provide that "other dependent relatives" shall mean: (i) widowed mother or widowed foster mother; (ii) mother or foster mother whose husband has deserted her; (iii) mother or foster mother whose husband is alive but totally incapacitated; clauses (iv) and (v) refer to mother or foster mother having two, or three or more sons in the forces, and (vi) applies to father or foster father whose wife is dead. Proviso (vii) then continues:

> . . . an allowance may be granted to such dependent relative provided that, in the opinion of the board, such relative is in a dependent condition and that the applicant has contributed wholly or to a substantial extent to the maintenance of such relative during a reasonable period of time immediately preceding enlistment; provided further that, even where the applicant has not actually so contributed, the board may in its discretion make a special allowance (not in any case exceeding the maximum amount specified in subparagraph (c) of this article) in a case where, in the opinion of the board, the applicant would have so contributed but was prevented from doing so by circumstances beyond his control.

That is a fairly wide section to allow the board to take in dependents who are not included in the regular provisions of the act.

Let me refer now to article 119 of the regulations, which is even wider in scope and can be regarded as a superstructure built on all the regulations. It says:

> Notwithstanding any provision of these regulations, whenever the board is of the opinion that a state of dependency exists—

A "state of dependency" does not mean only full dependency but also includes partial dependency:

> —and that the granting of an allowance is in the public interest, but the board lacks authority to make an award, it may make a recommendation to the treasury board, and if that body concurs, the matter shall be decided by the governor in council, but no such grant by the governor in council shall be construed as broadening the terms of these regulations.

That is another article in the regulations, and in addition there is the dependents' board of trustees. So that I find it difficult to see how we can widen the terms of the regulations themselves and at the same time keep any principles on which all of us can work, least of all the board, if we go farther than the regulations which already confer so much discretionary power.

My hon. friend referred to one other matter, the question of mothers. I wish to make myself clear on this because my hon. friend took something that I said as indicating that the country would provide only the amount which the son had been contributing at the time he was supporting the parent. He said that I had said it was only a replacement of the son's contribution that the country was paying. I did not intend to convey that impression. It is not any replacement of the son's contribution so far as the amount goes. But the country does say, even if the son was not contributing at all to the parent's support, the question of an allowance may be given consideration. I want to point out that all that is required in order to qualify a widowed mother to receive a contribution from the board is to show that the officer or soldier was her sole or partial support. Even if he contributed only partially—I do not mean one dollar a month or something like that—the board may pay an allowance and need not limit its contribution, as I understand it, to the actual number of dollars which the mother lost by reason of the soldier going into the army. The board can say: We will pay in case of need up to $25 a month to the mother notwithstanding the fact that the son may

have contributed only five or ten dollars a month. I mention the point so that the committee will not get the idea that the allowance is just a meticulous replacement of the son's contribution and that nothing more can be provided. Whatever is granted must be within the limit set out in the regulations.

My hon. friend came back to the detention cases to which he referred the other night. I have every sympathy with the wife and with the children. I say to my hon. friend that he made a case the other night for this particular set of circumstances, but I do feel that he is not on very strong ground when we come to the matter of dependents' allowance. If the dependents' allowance is being paid in order that the man may be a good soldier, and the man is in detention and is not earning, then if the country pays the dependents' allowance for six months altogether, it seems to me that the country has contributed substantially toward the maintenance of the dependents and toward making whatever provision should be made for the wife and the children. My hon. friend was very careful in his suggestions. He did not say: I am suggesting a particular amount or a particular rule; but he did hope that the minister and his officials would take the matter into consideration to see if better provision could not be made than the provision which is here. I do want my hon. friend and the committee to bear in mind that we have to think of the good soldier too, as well as the soldier who is in detention for eighteen months and is going to be discharged afterwards. The good soldier stays on the job day in and day out; he does his training; he is ready to go overseas and get into the show; he makes his assigned pay, and he knows his wife receives dependents' allowance. It is not much of an inducement to keep him at his job to know that the other fellow who has deserved detention, who is absent without leave, or who has gone to gaol for eighteen months, is having dependents' allowance paid to his wife and children. One hon. member suggested the other night that in addition the country ought to pay the soldier's assigned pay which he would have assigned himself if he had stayed on the job, and that it should not be charged against him when he comes back to his regular duties. I suggest that is not quite a fair deal to the soldier who is trying to do his duty. I know it is tough on the wife and tough on the children, but at the same time a reasonable amount of consideration was shown them when six months provision was made. Nevertheless, as I said the other night, and I repeat, these matters are always open for consideration. This class of case, and the absent without leave case which was brought up by my hon. friend and by some other hon. member, I am looking into and will keep before me.

My hon. friend also mentioned trades pay. I will look into cases of that kind at any time and keep on examining them. If a man has not received trades pay to which he is entitled, I am the last to say that that should be denied to him. Quite the reverse. I will try to see that payment is made if entitlement is shown.

Lastly, with regard to the sombre case of the casualty and parents having to make proof of death, if there is anything in that respect that can be done to speed things up, I assure my hon. friend that it will be done. I am constantly impressing that on my officers, not only with respect to the formal proof of death for purposes of insurance claims but also that all information with regard to casualties should be given just as speedily and as carefully and as sympathetically as it can possibly be given.

Mr. QUELCH: On February 15, at page 533 of *Hansard* I drew the minister's attention to the practice of the old age pensions branch in refusing a man old age pension because the wife was receiving dependents' allowance and assigned pay, in spite of the fact that the wife was investing the full amount of the assigned pay in victory bonds in the name of the soldier. I thought that where the total amount of the assigned pay is being held in trust for the soldier upon his return it should not be taken into consideration in figuring out the wife's income. If the assigned pay were not taken into consideration then the amount of the dependents' allowance itself would not in any way affect the full payment of the old age pension. I should like to draw the attention of the minister to a letter that was written by the deputy minister of pensions to Mr. MacFarlane, director of old age pensions. The letter is dated January 20, and in part reads as follows:

> During the time the writer was chairman of the war veterans' allowance board we established the policy of exempting assigned pay where such was placed in trust for the return of the soldier or used to keep insurance in good standing or to meet taxes or payment on property owned by him. Where it is a veterans' allowance case and it was established to the satisfaction of the board that the moneys from the assigned pay were not being used for the maintenance of the parents of the soldier but kept in trust for the soldier himself, such sum would not be taken into consideration.

It does seem to me that the ruling of the war veterans' allowance board with regard to assigned pay invested in the name of the soldier is a good one. There is no reason why

a similar attitude could not be adopted by the old age pensions branch. I would suggest to the minister that perhaps he, in collaboration with the Minister of Pensions and National Health, get in touch with the Minister of Finance to see whether or not this matter could be reconsidered. When I brought this matter to the attention of the minister on February 15, he stated that he would reply on the following day. It no doubt skipped his memory on the following day and I did not have a chance to bring it to his attention.

There is another matter to which I should like to refer. Would the minister clarify the situation with regard to the rights of men receiving their discharge at their own request? As I understand the situation, a soldier receiving discharge at his own request does not receive the rehabilitation grants, namely, one month's pay and clothing allowance. This matter was discussed the other day, but I am still not clear with regard to it. I have three different classes in mind: first, the soldier who is brought back to Canada because his health has deteriorated and who has received a discharge at his own request. I understand that in that case he is eligible for the rehabilitation grant. Second, there is the case of a soldier overseas who receives his discharge on compassionate grounds. As an example let us assume that the father dies and the mother asks that the soldier be brought back in order to run the farm. I understand that in that case the rehabilitation grant is not paid. I have had two or three cases along that line referred to me. The third class refers to the soldier who has not gone overseas but who has had two or three years' service in Canada, and who applies for his discharge on compassionate grounds for reasons similar to the one I just mentioned. Would the minister clarify these three cases?

I should like to mention again the question of reductions from the dependents' allowance of dependents in T.B. sanatoria. The minister said the other night that he would be taking up that matter. I am wondering if he has had an opportunity to get any information in that connection. I received three more letters this morning regarding these cases. I hope I can get a reply that consideration has been given to them.

Before I sit down I should like again to mention the question of dependents' allowances, particularly the question of the assigned pay of soldiers serving sentence. I believe in a case where a man is serving a sentence and where the government have the man's body they should be able to get enough work out of him to continue dependents' allowance. If the minister feels that that cannot be done, at least the dependents' allowance ought to be continued and deducted from the man's pay after he has completed his sentence. I think the government should be able to do that in view of the fact that they have full control of the man, rather than to see the wife and the children penalized and put in a position where they have no money. In any event, the government could very well continue the allowance and take it out of the pay of the man when he has completed his sentence.

Mr. RALSTON: I think my hon. friend referred to the first point the other night. I confess to him and the committee that I have not had a chance to look into it. If I understand my hon. friend correctly—I did not understand him correctly the other night—he is asking that I take up with the war veterans' allowance board, the Department of Pensions and National Health and the Minister of Finance the question of old age pensions to endeavour to see if possible that the assigned pay can be set aside and used for the purpose of investing it in bonds instead of for the purpose of maintenance.

Mr. QUELCH: I realize this comes under the old age pensions branch, but I thought, if the minister could get in touch with the Minister of Pensions and they to get in touch with the Minister of Finance, they might be able to get the old age pensions branch to change their attitude.

Mr. RALSTON: I shall talk this case over with my colleagues; that is all I can say to my hon. friend. My hon. friend knows that so far as the dependents' allowance board is concerned it is required that the assigned pay shall be used for the maintenance of the dependents; otherwise, what the soldier does is to evade—I am not saying he does it culpably—the provisions which we have for deferred pay overseas. Overseas a man's pay is deferred if he does not assign pay; it is not deferred if he assigns pay. The effect is the same really. He gets the benefit of the money, but instead of deferring his pay he is having it come over here and it is invested in bonds, thereby building up a fund.

Mr. QUELCH: Under the Veterans' Land Act he is eligible, provided that he has saved enough money to pay down an amount equal to one-tenth. If he has to assign pay to his mother he will not be in a position to save any money and is thereby debarred from that privilege.

Mr. RALSTON: The point in assigning pay to his mother is that it is for the purpose of supplementing the dependents' allowance which also goes to her. I say to my hon. friend that

I shall discuss the matter with my colleagues, the Minister of Pensions and National Health and the Minister of Finance. That is as far as I can go in connection with that case.

As one of my colleagues points out, if the soldier does not send his pay over here it is deferred over there. He has built up a fund and it could be used under the Land Settlement Act.

Mr. QUELCH: If he did not make an assignment no dependents' allowance would be paid.

Mr. RALSTON: That is the point.

The next case had to do with the rights of a soldier receiving rehabilitation grants under three categories. As I understand the rule, he does not get a rehabilitation grant when he is discharged at his own request. If the discharge is at his own request in any one of the three cases mentioned, then it seems to me that the rehabilitation grant under the present regulations would not be payable.

Mr. QUELCH: I have a letter here which cites the case of Jossul. This man had been overseas for three years. He was returned to Canada on account of his health. He asked for his discharge because he said he had nothing to do. He has now been paid one months' pay and the clothing allowance. That is the only case I know of in which it has been paid.

Mr. RALSTON: If it is a case of health, although there may have been a request, he may have been found ineligible anyway and therefore dischargeable and not properly in the service; that is to say, they do not regard that discharge as being at his own request. He would have to go out anyway. The other two cases refer to compassionate grounds, in which the request is, of course, an element. In these cases the rule I have spoken of would, under present regulations, preclude payment of a rehabilitation grant, but would not, as my hon. friend knows, preclude payment of the clothing allowance.

With regard to the sanatorium matter, I find I have given the dependents' allowance board a good deal to think about. The board had what they thought was a very easy way out of the situation, but I am not sure that it is really quite so easy, notwithstanding the fact that both they and I are anxious to meet the same objective. I wrote to the Hon. Mr. Cross, minister of health of Alberta, and told him I had taken the matter up with the board and was seeing it through as quickly as possible. My hon. friend cannot write any more than that to his correspondents. It may be only a little to be able to write; but, if I may say so with respect, he can send them *Hansard* to-night so that they will know that he has not been neglecting their interest and that I have taken account of the matter.

With regard to the detention case, I cannot add to what I have said to the hon. member for Cape Breton South.

Mr. QUELCH: Will the minister give further consideration to the payment of the rehabilitation grant to the man who is discharged at his own request? The man will not be discharged at his own request unless there is good reason for it. Any man who has served for three years is entitled to as much consideration as the man who enlisted one year before the end of the war and has seen only nine months' overseas service. Surely the man with three or four years' service is entitled to the grant. He would not ask for discharge unless there was good reason for his doing so.

Mr. RALSTON: I will certainly give the matter further consideration along with my colleagues. My hon. friend realizes, as has already been announced, that certain matters are now under discussion with regard to rehabilitation and it is impossible to make an announcement at the present time. However, the representations which have been made in this respect will be taken into consideration in formulating measures.

Mr. GREEN: There are two matters about which I should like to ask the minister some questions. The first has to do with the enactment of some measure similar to the Sparkman act in the United States, which is in effect an act to protect the civil rights of men in the forces. As the minister will remember, this subject was thoroughly discussed during the last session. It came up on May 26, 1943, and members from all parties in the house advocated that some such measure should be passed quickly. I understood the minister to say then that the question had been given consideration by a committee, that recommendations had been made and that he hoped to be in a position to take action shortly. For example, at one stage in his remarks he said:

> I can only assure the committee that every study will be made of the matter and that active consideration will be given to it.

That is almost a year ago and, so far as I know, no action has been taken. It does seem to me that the matter is of vital importance to the men and women in the forces. As hon. members know, the Sparkman act contains different provisions which protect the fighting men. For example, it protects life insurance contracts up to the sum of $10,000

against cancellation for non-payment of premium. It protects the man against foreclosure of mortgages and against cancellation of instalment contracts and also sets a ceiling on interest that may be charged on any loans made to the soldier. It also provides for suspension of action against him in respect of debts and gives certain protection in respect of leases. I think it may be summed up as providing that where a man's ability to perform a civil contract has been impaired by his enlistment the state shall step in and protect him, provided, of course, that there is no bad faith. In other words, if he is able to pay he does not receive protection. It was pointed out during the discussion last year that there is protection of a type given men in some of the provinces.

Mr. RALSTON: All now, I think.

Mr. GREEN: Do I understand the minister to say that there is provision of some sort in all the provinces?

Mr. RALSTON: I think so.

Mr. GREEN: But there is no standard protection, and I suggest that the dominion government should provide for at least standard protection. The Americans took this step in 1940 before they were in the war at all at a time when they were raising their forces, and yet, though we have been at war for over four years, we have not enacted any such measure. I would ask the minister to explain to the committee why it is that protection has not been forthcoming during the last year.

The other matter on which I should like to have an explanation has to do with the clothing allowance given men on discharge, and the rehabilitation grant. I propose to say something about these after the dinner recess. My question really mounts to this: Why are these two allowances not adequate?

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. GREEN: Just before the committee rose for the dinner recess I had asked the minister why the government has not yet enacted a measure for Canada similar to the Sparkman act of the United States, under which men and women in the forces are protected in respect of their civil obligations. Then I went on to ask my second question, which was why Canada is not giving an adequate clothing allowance and rehabilitation grant to the men and women of the forces upon their discharge.

As I understand it, the clothing allowance was $35 until about December 1 last, when it was increased to $65. Surely the allowance should be large enough to accomplish its purpose, which I understand is to enable a man who has been discharged to outfit himself with civilian clothes. I do not suppose any hon. member will contend that $65 is sufficient for that purpose. It is not sufficient even in the balmy part of the country from which I come, out on the Pacific coast, let alone being sufficient back here in these arctic wastes. I find it very hard to understand why these young men and women are not given a proper clothing allowance.

The rehabilitation grant consists of one month's pay, together with whatever allowances the man was receiving at the time of his discharge. That, too, is insufficient. We must remember that many of these men have been in the forces for more than four years, and they should be given a grant large enough to afford them a reasonable chance to become reestablished. I know it may be said that provision is made for the training of these young men and women, that they may take certain courses and, while taking those courses, receive certain allowances. I do not wish to quarrel at all with the training provisions; I think they will be very beneficial, but the allowances paid during the training period are also ridiculously small. It may be contended also that these men can get unemployment insurance for a certain time if they are unemployed, but I suggest to the minister that in the majority of cases our young men and women who are being and will be discharged from the forces merely want to get jobs, to get back to work. That will be the wish of the great majority, and I think they would ask for only a fair amount of help from the government. Probably they would believe that if they could get six months' pay, say, that would be fair. Perhaps not; they might want a greater amount. I see it was suggested by the national council of veterans' associations last December that the rehabilitation grant should be one month's pay and allowances for every six months of service, irrespective of the length of service.

The point I wish to make is that the grant should be such that these young men and women will feel that it is fair. Then their outlook will be friendly and cooperative. They are all good sports. If they received a fair grant, spent it as they saw fit and then, through any chance, failed to become reestablished, I do not think they would blame anyone but themselves. It is so important that these young men and women should believe and be

convinced that they are being treated fairly, and I do not think that is the situation at the present time. Certainly many of them believe that these allowances are not fair; that the government is chiselling, and so on. Not only do many of the men who are being discharged believe that; their friends believe it also, and I must admit that I do.

The outlook of these young men and women is vital to the future welfare of this nation. They are the most important portion of the Canadian population at the present time and will continue to be such after the war is over. I say that because of the sacrifices they are making, because they are young and fit and keen and disciplined and trained, and because leaving the forces they do so feeling proud of Canada, feeling proud that they have worn the name "Canada" on their shoulders. I believe the great majority of them have that idealism about their country which comes from serving it and being willing to make sacrifices for it. I believe further that they are prepared to take their full part in the life of the nation, asking and needing first of all only a little understanding on the part of the remainder of the Canadian people, and second, a fair chance to become reestablished. In many cases the effect of the smallness of these allowances, and also the inadequacy of our present pension law—which unfortunately I cannot discuss under this item—is to shatter their vision of a new Canada.

That is a most unfortunate situation, and I suggest that the government and parliament must take the lead in remedying it. There is a great need right across Canada for an awakened and determined public opinion with regard to these young men and women. I am afraid that across the nation there is a great deal of indifference about what may happen to them, which reminds me of the indifference with which we all treated the young men who were picked up and sent to gaol during the depression days because they went around shaking tin cans, trying to get enough money to keep themselves alive. We did not like that; we felt that it offended our dignity a bit; but as a people, by and large, we did not rise in our wrath and say, "This thing has to stop. We are prepared to give up anything in order to see that these young men get enough to live on." We did not feel like that as a Canadian people, and I am afraid that as a Canadian people we are not feeling deeply enough now about seeing that these young men and women are properly resettled when they leave the forces. Everyone is busy; everyone is working; there is the excitement of war events every day; men who are being discharged now are able to get temporary war jobs, and therefore the people do not see why they should bother.

I am afraid that is the general tendency, and I think it is a tragedy; I think it is something about which parliament should take some steps, for in my opinion parliament should give the lead. We need in Canada now—right now, not after the war, though we shall need it then as well—a determination to see to it that these young men and women are resettled no matter what the cost, and that they are given an opportunity to take a prominent part in the life of the nation. We have many problems in Canada to-day, and we shall have far more after the war. They will become increasingly serious, and we need the help of these young men and women if we are to solve those problems. I believe our hopes for a better Canada are based almost entirely upon those young men and women who are now in our fighting forces.

And so I say, in summing up, that I do not consider these allowances or the present Canadian pension law fair to these young men and women. I believe that this committee, regardless of party lines, should insist upon fair treatment—in fact, upon generous treatment for these young folk, something that is more worthy of our country. If we will insist upon fair treatment I am convinced the people of Canada as a whole have only to be shown the need, and they will follow. They will make every necessary sacrifice in order to see that these young people get a proper start.

Mr. RALSTON: I shall not trouble the committee by going into details in respect of the matters to which the hon. member has referred. He has really used, as the basis of his remarks, two measures, one of which he has said is the Sparkman act which, if I may put it this way, is not a major measure of rehabilitation or relief for ex-service men.

The remaining feature to which he has referred has been the matter of the clothing allowance given to the men on discharge. I share with my hon. friend—and he knows it, and I think the committee knows it, too—a full appreciation of the seriousness and the importance of looking after the men and women of our fighting forces. I can assure him that I am determined—and this is more than words—that every effort which can be put forward by the department over which I have the honour to preside shall be put forward.

First, of course, comes the winning of the war, as has been pointed out time and again. Second, and along with that, is the endeavour to ensure that we bring down and put into effect such measures as will make, not only

for the peace but for the happiness and security of the men and women who will have made victory possible. I say to my hon. friend when he asks for a lead in this regard—and I do not say it in any petty, party way, at all, nor do I suggest that he has done so—I agree that all of us have to be united in taking the lead in order to awaken this nation to the necessity for receiving these men and women some day, and helping to make Canada a country fit for heroes, both men and women, to live in.

I say to my hon. friend this, that we must put first things first. The first thing is to ensure that there is a post-war; that is to say, to ensure that there may be an end to the war, and to ensure that it is a successful conclusion. We are making every effort to make that just as sure as possible. When I made my short statement to the house I indicated the activities of the army in that respect, and I know my colleagues, the Minister of National Defence for Air, the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services, and other ministers who have to do with activities connected with the war will indicate what has been done in their departments to help to make victory certain.

But I wish to remind the committee and my hon. friend that the government has not stopped there. I have said, and I repeat that sometimes I am concerned with the thought that perhaps there is too much talk and thinking about post-war, about rehabilitation, and about all the things which will come after the war when peace has been secured. We hear that talk when we have not yet reached our goal. At the same time I realize that, as is their right, people are thinking about these matters, and are looking forward to a future which will be brighter than the conditions we find to-night. I realize, too, that the men and women in our forces have similar thoughts. They are not professional soldiers; they are clerks; they are men from the farms; they are men from the factories and men from every other civilian occupation. They are Canadians who have turned aside from their real jobs, that of making Canada a great and prosperous country, to the job of making Canada free and secure. Those young people have a right to expect us to think of their welfare, and to endeavour to make plans for their future.

The government is trying to do that, and it has tried to give the lead to which my hon. friend has referred. That is mentioned in the speech from the throne, although it is not discussed in detail. There are a number of things to be done post-war, in the larger sphere, to which I shall not take the time to refer this evening. It will be sufficient to mention them: the matter of export markets, the matter of world security and general prosperity.

After his excellency announced that "the winning of the war clearly remains the first of all objectives", we find these paragraphs in the speech from the throne:

> Post-war planning falls naturally into three broad fields: preparation for the demobilization, rehabilitation and reestablishment in civil life of the men and women in the armed forces—

I say to my hon. friend that the government is trying to give a lead in that respect. I thank him for his support, and I believe the people of Canada generally will support that objective in every possible way. Then the paragraph continues:

> —the reconversion of the economic life of the nation from a war-time to a peace-time basis, and its reconstruction in a manner which will provide opportunities for useful employment for all who are willing and able to work—

Let me say to my hon. friend here that I believe I am speaking the mind of the men and women of our forces when I say that they are not as much concerned with the actual amount of a rehabilitation grant as they are with the question as to whether they will be able to find useful employment in this Canada of ours, and where they will get it. The paragraph continues:

> —and the provision of insurance against major economic and social hazards.

Then, speaking particularly of the subject to which my hon. friend has referred, we find this paragraph:

> A broad programme has already been developed for the reestablishment of veterans of the present war, and for the care of disabled veterans and the dependents of our fighting men and merchant seamen. You will be asked to approve a measure to provide war service gratuities for all who have served in the armed forces, and also measures to supplement the existing rehabilitation programmes.

I refer to these matters because they cover the things to which the hon. member has referred. The matter of the Sparkman act, of which he has spoken, is one for the welfare of dependents. The matter of the clothing allowance given to men at the time of discharge is another matter of rehabilitation. The matter of one month's grant is still another rehabilitation matter. The objective is indicated by the programme I have read. It is indicated there that during this session the house "will be asked to approve a measure to provide war service gratuities for all who have served in the armed forces, and also measures to supplement the existing rehabilitation programme."

Mr. GRAYDON: Would that be in one bill?

Mr. RALSTON: I cannot tell my hon. friend at the moment. I would say this, that all these matters are being considered and taken into account in connection with these rehabilitation measures. The hon. member will understand that the rehabilitation measures which have already been taken are those which have seemed necessary, as time has gone on. If I may say so, there has been a remarkable programme of various items under which men are given assistance in a vocational way in the matter of treatment, in the matter of out-of-work benefits, and in the matter of employment in some particular vocations, but not in all. It is felt that the time has come when that programme should be broadened and when there should be some further announcement and development toward the objective we are all seeking, namely, the assurance of assistance to get back to civil life when the time comes and that employment is provided for all those who are willing and able to work.

I say to my hon. friend that the matters to which he has referred will be studied. They have had and are having attention. I am not saying that they will be what he considers sufficient, but I think he will find, when the house is asked to approve the measures which will be brought down, that they will meet the objective which we all have in mind. not only to recognize but to give assurance to the men and women who are fighting the battles of Canada to-day.

With respect to the Sparkman act, may I say that its principal feature is a provision of moratoria or of some sort of arrangement by which men who have insurance premiums to pay may not lose altogether the benefits of their policies in case they are not able to meet the premiums at the time they come due. A complete study has been made of this whole matter. There is one rather remarkable fact about the lapses in policies which have occurred during the years of war. According to the information we have, these lapses have been less proportionately for the men in the service than they have for the civilian population.

Mr. GREEN: There should not be any lapses.

Mr. RALSTON: I think my hon. friend will find that there has been very little request for this particular form of legislation. The situation when premiums are not paid is different in Canada from what it is in the United States. I understand that when a policy lapses in the United States they issue term insurance for the years or months which the cash surrender value of the policy would cover and that there is no provision for reinstatement. As my hon. friend knows, under our system the cash surrender value of a policy that lapses is devoted to the payment of premiums. So long as the cash surrender value lasts the policy is kept in good standing. Whether we should have had a Sparkman act or moratoria before is another matter. I have some opinion on that, but I think my hon. friend will find that the principle of the Sparkman act would be almost impossible of administration now. If policies have lapsed, they have lapsed, and there would seem to be almost insurmountable administrative difficulties in handling the situation in order to secure equitable treatment for holders of these lapsed policies, as well as equitable treatment for dependents.

I mention this to indicate to my hon. friend and the committee the serious doubt as to whether the principle of the Sparkman act would be workable in this country. As my hon. friend knows, the matter of moratoria is, strictly speaking, within provincial jurisdiction. He belongs to a party which claims to be fairly strong on provincial autonomy.

Mr. GREEN: I advocated a standard protection which the dominion would enact so that if the protection in any province did not come up to that standard, then the dominion provision would apply.

Mr. RALSTON: A provincial legislature having undertaken to enact a law along certain lines, the dominion walks into the province and enacts a law along different lines on the same subject. That is only one feature of it, but that is one feature which is different in this country from that in the United States. As everybody knows, their division of legislative jurisdiction is different from ours.

When the amount of the clothing allowance was fixed at $65, there were a number of items of clothing which would be retained by the soldier. I think one item is boots, and another is also underclothing.

Mr. GREEN: You could not go very far in civilian life in army boots.

Mr. RALSTON: I will undertake to say that when the boys come home they will wear army boots just as long as they can get them. I say that with some assurance. I know a good many civilians would like to have them. The returned soldiers are allowed to retain one pair of boots, their underclothing, their necessaries such as shaving kit, tooth-brush and other items in the hold-all, shirts, canvas

shoes, socks and gloves. Whether the amount is enough will be considered in connection with the matter of rehabilitation.

The rehabilitation grant itself will be considered in connection with the measures to which I have referred and which are now under consideration by the government. I cannot announce the policy to-night, nor can I announce the details. I say to my hon. friend that a note will be taken of what he has suggested and the whole matter studied. The programme will be brought before the house in due time.

Mr. GREEN: Are we to take it that the government has decided that there is no need of a Sparkman act in Canada?

Mr. RALSTON: No; distinctly no. I was indicating some of the difficulties there would be with regard to adopting the principle of the Sparkman act in Canada, and I questioned whether or not it would be as effectual as my hon. friend and I would like it to be.

Mr. GREEN: Would there be any objection to furnishing us with a summary showing the advantages and disadvantages of the Sparkman act as applied to Canada, showing why it might not be effective in Canada?

Mr. RALSTON: That will be discussed when the measure is before the house. At that time my hon. friend will have an opportunity to present any objection or argument he has to offer. I do not think any advantage would be gained at the moment by launching on an argument as to the value of the Sparkman act, having regard to the fact that it would be only one of literally many factors in a rehabilitation programme.

Mr. GREEN: Is some legislation along that line to be brought down?

Mr. RALSTON: I can only say that when the legislation is brought down. I am unable to make any announcement as to policy.

Mr. FACTOR: There is one small problem I should like to submit for the consideration of the minister. A non-commissioned or commissioned officer holding an acting rank is discharged on medical or other valid grounds. The gratuity which he receives is based on his former rank. I submit that when a man is discharged under those circumstances, either he should be confirmed in his rank before discharge or the gratuity should be based on his acting rank. I know of an actual case where a man overseas was killed while holding an acting rank and the allowance paid to his dependents was based on his former rank. This may be a small problem, but it is proving irritating to both the service men and their dependents.

[Mr. Ralston.]

Mr. RALSTON: I understand that at least in the case of other ranks, the acting rank is confirmed before the man is discharged.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I should like to take exception to what the minister said about the clothing allowance. A pair of boots might be quite valuable to a farmer in the Fraser valley, but I should like to see a lawyer on St. James street wearing a pair of army boots after the war. I do not think the argument is consistent at all. I do not think anyone in Canada can buy a pair of shoes for less than $7.50 or a shirt for less than $2, and I think I am conservative in those figures. Surely a man coming out of the army who is going to compete in professional life as a doctor or a lawyer will need three shirts; that would be at least $6. You cannot get a suit under $35, and where can you buy a hat for less than $3.50 or an overcoat for less than $25? That makes $77. I have every deference for the minister and for the legislation in contemplation, but the only possible place where the rank and file coming out of the army have for their claims to be presented publicly before the department is here through private members. It is all very well to say that a man coming out of the army is to have a carry-all, a suit of underwear and so on. His wife, I suppose, will look after putting the buttons on if he has a carry-all. But a man coming out of the army has to be properly dressed to compete with his fellow citizens, and I do not think that can possibly be done on $65. It is all very well to say that legislation is in contemplation; it was under contemplation when the government allowed $35 per man. This is the only place, I repeat, where the rank and file, the soldiers of my riding who will be coming out of the army, have to bring this up. So much for clothes.

I think that both this house and the Dominion of Canada owe a debt of gratitude to a member of this house who brought to my attention and, I think, to the attention of ninety-five per cent of the members, that a soldier coming out of the army—and this applies to all three branches of the service—was not allowed to keep his uniform. It is very important to me that the soldier—and again I have reference to all three services—should be allowed to keep his uniform, and so far as I have any say in the matter these estimates are not going to be carried until the government gives a clear-cut decision in the matter. We have been at war for a few years now and I can see no earthly excuse for the Department of National Defence, in all three of its branches, still having under consideration whether the soldier is to be allowed

to keep his uniform. Surely the government can give a decision in a matter of that kind. They do not need to bring in all their experts to advise them on details. It is a simple question requiring an answer yes or no. Is the soldier to be allowed to keep his uniform, and I mean all three services? I say through you, Mr. Chairman, to the minister that I intend to keep these estimates going until we have a decision in the matter. I do not think it involves any detailed information. Is it the treasury board that is to say whether a man can keep his uniform or not? I ask the minister, before he asks us to pass these estimates, to tell us whether a decision has been arrived at.

Mr. RALSTON: I can say to my hon. friend that he need not hold the committee up for one minute, for as a matter of fact the decision has been made that a man in the army, navy, or air force may keep one uniform. Let me tell my hon. friend, who is rather scornful of the difficulties and wants a simple yes or no, that I do not think he quite realizes all the difficulties that are involved. Does he realize that it means that a man who is out of the service and wears the uniform and gets into difficulties is likely to run foul of the provost? There may be a great deal of trouble regarding that very matter. But I am not disposed to cavil at all. We shall do the best we can. I like the idea of giving the man his uniform, not for the purpose of ordinary everyday wear, but because of the sentiment attached to it and for wearing on special occasions. As far as I am concerned, I think there should be some idea of having that rule observed, because otherwise you are going to have men going to work and doing some job which sometimes may not be a very pleasant one, may be even more or less menial, and then people will say, "See that soldier in uniform working at that mean job." My idea is that the uniform ought to be kept for special occasions, and I think most of the men will feel the same way about it. But I do say that during this time of war when you have the number of men in uniform that we have in Canada, and the number coming back from overseas and being discharged, it will not be an easy matter by any means for those who have to do with discipline in the three services to handle the situation, because you will have men on the street in uniform, some of whom will be soldiers and some not. If my hon. friend thinks a simple yes or no answer can be given, I am afraid he does not realize the implications. However, we are prepared to undertake that every man shall receive his uniform. We shall do what we can to see to it that the restrictions upon its use are as limited as possible, having regard to the necessity of ensuring that the distinction is properly preserved between men in uniform who are soldiers and men who are not. We shall endeavour to give those who have to do with discipline instructions in regard to the matter. I say to my hon. friend that perhaps we can continue with the discussion in committee now that I have answered his question.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I thank the minister for his explanation. I believe the minister knows what I think about the soldiers. I am glad that the men in all three services are to be allowed to keep their uniforms, and that out of the discussion arising in this corner this decision has been made.

Mrs. CASSELMAN: I have had cases of pay and allowances brought to my attention and I have taken them up chiefly with the officials of the department rather than bring them up on the floor of the house, and I must say that I have had consideration and fair treatment in every case, with the reasons assigned when requests were refused. Of course not everything asked was granted. But I do think conditions with respect to pay and allowances in this war are much better than they were in the last war. Then there were no mothers' allowances and no grants for the children, but we have gradually broadened the basis since the beginning of this war.

I should like to say to this audience composed chiefly of men—I have not worked it out mathematically, but the composition of the chamber must be 99·9 per cent men—that the disabilities that hon. members are now bringing to the attention of the committee are disabilities under which women have suffered from the dawn of time. It has always been the case that when a man has been sent to prison, or has been A.W.O.L., or has deserted his family it has been his wife and children who have suffered, and when the war is over we shall have to consider giving a little fairer treatment right across Canada to the women and children involved in these cases.

I think the soldier's wife has had a larger percentage of the family's income to spend than the civilian's wife has had down through the years. I do not want to make the share of the family income which the soldier's wife receives any less. I want to see the fairest and most generous possible treatment of the soldier's dependents. I think the new provision for family allowances that is to be discussed this session is something along the line of what I am thinking, where the woman will have more of the family income to handle.

I should like to say also that since the dependents' board of trustees has been set up I have had far fewer cases brought to my attention. The dependents' board of trustees has been one of the best things the department has set up. This board has been able to handle cases according to need, after investigation. It has been able to give not only financial help but advice, which has been very helpful to those who want it at this time. With the elasticity that the minister spoke of this afternoon to deal with other cases that are brought up, I think we shall have even better results from the dependents' board of trustees.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The minister announced this afternoon that other ranks will be permitted to keep their uniforms on discharge. I should like to ask him one or two questions along that line, since I was the first member to bring it before the committee. First of all, how long service must the man have before he is permitted to keep his uniform?

Mr. RALSTON: No regulations have been made with regard to that. I indicated a few moments ago that we must have regulations with regard to it.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The decision has been made that the men can keep their uniforms?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON: I should like to bring one or two matters to the attention of the minister, because I think the debate has shown the need for them. I understand that the Whitelaw committee has recommended the doing away with, or has actually done away, with the office of the district welfare officers in the military districts. I think that was a very unwise move, because the district welfare officer is an officer given authority by the district officer commanding. His judgment carries a great deal more weight with the civilian authorities than does the opinion of the auxiliary services themselves. In view of the increasing number of cases that are brought to the attention of hon. members by soldiers' dependents and by soldiers themselves, I think the district welfare officers should be reestablished. I anticipate that the difficulties will become worse as time goes on. I wish to make that point quite definite. This officer, who is responsible to the district officer commanding, has a very important function to perform.

The second point I wish to make is that a number of soldiers are at present classed as deserters because they have been absent without leave, struck off strength, or lost to their units sometimes for many, many months or even years. A case was brought to my attention while my own unit was outside Liverpool during the bad blitz. Our headquarters was a transit depot. A number of troops were passing through, and when the blitz was on, these troops, who were not part of the unit, and not known personally to our officers except by name and number, went out and helped the civilian authorities and A.R.P. workers in putting out the fires and removing bomb damage. In Liverpool, and in a number of other cities, there are still air raid shelters and cellars where, because of the lack of workers, there are unidentified bodies which have been sealed in. I wish to ask the minister if anything has been done in that regard. We may have a soldier whom we now class as a deserter who may actually have been killed while engaged in the heroic duty of A.R.P. work during the bad blitzes. That situation was brought to my attention while I was in Liverpool. I do not know how many cases there are. I do not think there would be many, but I believe that there may be some soldiers who are now classed as deserters who may have died an heroic death.

I come back to the case of the soldier undergoing detention and having his dependents' allowance stopped. I do this because I have had some first-hand experience in the matter. While passing through the district depot at Aldershot I spent a day in the Aldershot military prison. I was in good company; I had a member of the cloth with me. This prison is used only for soldiers serving sentences of two years and upwards. I understand it is the supreme military prison in England. In a discussion of the matter with the commandant, the intelligence officer and the psychiatrist it was stated that our regulation was acting as a deterrent to making soldiers out of the Canadians in their custody. They pointed out that the families of the British, the Australians, the New Zealanders and the men of the Royal Marines received dependents' allowance, while our men were discriminated against, and our men were very bitter about it. Instead of accepting training willingly—and I may say that the prison was magnificently run and an excellent institution; it contained some of the most modern equipment and some of the most excellent training instructors I have ever seen were there—the Canadian soldiers in the prison were disgruntled and had a grievance. They were likely to try to escape. When they came out, instead of adopting the attitude, "I will never go back there again but try to become a good soldier," they had a grievance against the army generally and frequently were found to be repeaters. I believe that simply for the sake of the soldier himself and the psychologi-

cal reaction that he undergoes while serving a prison sentence, some thought should be given to this particular matter of dependents' allowance being paid on behalf of men undergoing detention. That is all I have to say about that particular question, but I think it is an angle that has not been emphasized sufficiently in this house.

When the United Kingdom soldier comes out he is smart and he is very likely to be non-commissioned officer material because the training is good, the rules in the prison are excellent and he receives intensive instruction; whereas when our man comes out he has a grievance because of the discrepancy or differential in his treatment as compared with that of his brother in arms.

There is just one other point that I wish to bring to the attention of the minister, and that concerns him jointly with the Minister of Pensions and National Health. It concerns the question of hospital allowances. When a soldier or an officer—and it is particularly hard on the officers—is discharged and is sent to hospital, when he is struck off strength he is put on hospital allowance, and the rates which I shall give to the committee constitute a great handicap to the officer undergoing hospital treatment. I should like to quote from the report of the Toronto rehabilitation committee with respect to hospital allowances under P.C. 91.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): What is the date?

Mr. ADAMSON: The date of the letter I have here is February 3, but I do not know the date of the report. However, it is some time in January or February. It is the most recent one. I will give it to the minister afterwards. I wish to put the figures on the record to show the serious discrepancy to which officers are subject when undergoing treatment in hospital:

Immediately upon his transfer to the Department of Pensions and National Health, his service pay and allowances, including assigned pay and dependents' allowance, is stopped and he is placed under clause 20 of the regulations of the departmental order in council P.C. 91, whereby he becomes entitled only to the special hospital allowance, which is the same for all ranks, and in the case of a single man, is $44.20 per month less $30 per month maintenance, and in the case of a married man $62.40, with any deduction for maintenance, of which he gets $10 and his wife $52.40 plus $12 for the first child, $10 for the next two children and $8 each for the next three children; provided that if the man and his wife have a private income this is up to $50 a month and if the wife is working and earning $40 per month there is a further deduction up to $18.20 per month.

Mr. RALSTON: What is the date?

Mr. ADAMSON: This was sent to me just the other day from the Canadian legion.

Mr. RALSTON: Order in council P.C. 1/602 of January 31, 1944, changed all that.

Mr. ADAMSON: What are the rates now?

Mr. RALSTON: I have a statement with regard to special hospital allowance which I will read:

(c) D.P. & N.H. allowances—Numerous post-discharge benefits are available to personnel subsequent to discharge which are summarized hereunder—

My hon. friend is not dealing with men in the army but with men discharged, which does not come quite within the item before us but comes under the Department of Pensions and National Health.

Special Hospital Allowance

(a) Where institutional treatment is continued uninterruptedly from date of retirement or discharge, a hospital allowance may be awarded at a monthly rate equal to

(i) 30 days' pay of rank, including tradesmen's pay, at the rate he was being credited as at the date of retirement or discharge, plus an amount equal to the monthly rate of dependents' allowance which was being paid on behalf of any dependents,

or

A monthly rate equal to 30 days' pay, plus dependents' allowance on behalf of such dependents for the rank of lieutenant, whichever is the lesser rate.

The foregoing allowances are only payable for a period equal to period of service or one year whichever is the lesser.

(ii) Where disability for which treatment is furnished is attributable to service, hospital allowances at the following scale may be paid in lieu of the monthly allowances set out in (i) hereof if more beneficial—

Former member of forces—

Single	$ 45 00
Married	86 00
With 1 child	95 00
2 children	104 00
3 "	112 00
4 "	120 00
5 "	128 00
6 "	137 00
Each additional child	10 00
Parent, where full dependency is established	15 00

(iii) Additional allowances may be awarded on behalf of a dependent (other than a brother or sister) who has become a dependent of a former member of the forces subsequent to his discharge from the forces, at a rate equal to the monthly rate which would have been awarded had he continued to be a member of the forces.

(b) (i) Where a former member of the force does not require continuous treatment from date of discharge, but who is admitted to hospital or whose treatment has been authorized and commenced upon a date not more than 365 days subsequent to date of discharge, a special hospital allowance may be payable to the former

member of the force and his dependents at the following monthly scale, subject to such conditions and regulations as are determined—

Former member of the forces.....	$44 20
Additional allowance for:	
Wife	18 20
Person in lieu of wife.....	18 20
Parent or parents.....	15 00
First and second child, each.....	12 00
Third child	10 00
Fourth, fifth and sixth child, each	8 00

Provided that the above rate for a former member of the forces who is in hospital and who has no dependents or other obligations may be further reduced by $30 per month or by such lesser amount as to the department seems right; provided further that in no case shall the special hospital allowance, reduced if necessary as herein provided, be paid at a rate in excess of the rate of pay plus dependents' allowance of which he was in receipt at the date of his discharge.

(ii) The foregoing allowances may be payable for a period not exceeding the period of service or one year, whichever is the lesser, reduced by any period during which treatment has been furnished under any other class, and in no case shall treatment be furnished beyond a date more than eighteen months subsequent to date of discharge.

(iii) Treatment shall be granted in Canada only.

Then it provides for men who go to the Department of Pensions. The Minister of Pensions and National Health called my attention to the fact that he tabled that order in council on February 1 as shown in *Hansard* of this session, on page 63.

Mr. ADAMSON: I had a letter to-day and that is why I brought the matter up. I understand that the maximum is the pay of lieutenant.

Mr. RALSTON: Yes, plus dependents' allowance.

Mr. ADAMSON: That is, $195 a month is the maximum irrespective of rank?

Mr. RALSTON: It depends on the number of children.

Mr. ADAMSON: Is this retroactive?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Only to the first day of February, 1944.

Mr. MAYBANK: There are two matters to which I wish to direct the attention of the minister. The first relates to the clothing allowance already spoken of. It may be true that $65 is not sufficient for clothing. Frankly I subscribe to that view, and I should not be surprised if the minister himself does. At the same time, while we are talking about $65 not being the proper allowance, I do not think we should fail to give credit for the fact that the government has but recently made the increase which it has. It is all very well for us to talk about such-and-such an amount not being enough, but we might also pay particular attention to improvements that have been made, and I should like to preface anything I have to say by commendation along that line.

The only other remark I have to make with reference to clothing allowance is this. I understand it is not given to the officers, and I submit that there is just as much reason for giving a clothing allowance to officers, particularly in the lower ranks, as there is for giving it to those men in other ranks.

The problem of rehabilitation for lieutenants and like officers will be probably just as great as it will be for men in the ranks. I would seriously submit to the minister that further consideration should be given to this question, with a view to granting these men a suitable clothing allowance on demobilization, as is now given the other ranks.

The other proposition I wish to mention to the minister is something entirely different. A number of years ago an organization was started in Winnipeg on a strictly non-profit basis for the purpose of hospitalizing people who would subscribe in groups. This is generally known throughout the country as the Blue Cross organization; the minister's department has some knowledge of it, because a good deal of correspondence concerning it has passed back and forth. Briefly, this organization arranges hospitalization for those who subscribe, but will take only groups of people. They will go to an electric light company and take in several hundred employees, but they will not take individuals as such. They have always wished to enroll people who were steadily employed, to make sure there would be an income, and of course it was necessary that they have some organization for the purpose of bookkeeping, in order to make sure of their collections. I hold in my hand a letter from the executive director of the organization from which I read one paragraph which should be of interest to the committee and the minister:

> Immediately at the outbreak of war, the Canadian Hospital Association with vivid recollections of the headaches this service had given them in the previous war waited on the federal government and urged the adoption of a policy of a monthly deduction from the payroll of enlisted men to cover medical and hospital care. This plan was refused. Subsequently interested groups vainly endeavoured to have such a policy adopted. I have never been able to understand why such reasonable action could not have been taken.

I believe that since that time this and other organizations have striven to secure the co-operation of the Department of National Defence in working out a hospitalization

scheme for the dependents of men in the forces. As a class they do not come strictly within the rules of the organization, but if the government would cooperate, some of the necessary conditions could be met; that is to say, there would be certainty of collection and they would all be in the one class, or in other words the risk would be similar in all cases. At any rate the organization was willing to work out a suitable hospitalization scheme for the dependents of men in the forces, but it has not met with any success in working with the government. I have had some communications with the department; frankly I thought the suggestion might be accepted and that some such hospitalization plan would be worked out, but that has not been the case. In another paragraph the writer of this letter says:

> It is only within the past month that the women's auxiliaries and other bodies interested in families of enlisted men came forward with a proposal which might be entertained. It has now been decided to offer a contract to these families on the basis of enrolment through groups arranged by the auxiliaries, or a community or common employer group, meeting the usual enrolment regulations, subscription fees to be collected by a remitting agent, with payments to be made not less frequently than one-half yearly in place of the usual monthly collection.

Then he goes on to speak of the fee, which is extremely small. I would ask the minister to have the proposition of this Blue Cross organization carefully looked into, with a view to seeing if it would not be possible even yet to cooperate with the organization in order to effect the hospitalization of these dependents. It must be borne in mind that this organization is in no way interested in profit; it is simply an organization of forward-looking citizens of Winnipeg who have worked out this plan for the mutual benefit of all, and I understand that the scheme has been widely imitated. It must be borne in mind also that there is no suggestion at all that the government should be put to any expense. The principal thing would be for the government, upon request by or upon the authorization of a dependent, to do the necessary bookkeeping in regard to the remittance to the organization. From many conversations I have had with women who are dependents of soldiers, sailors and airmen, I know that if they could get into a scheme of this sort it would relieve them of a great deal of worry. Large numbers of these people came under the scheme when their husbands were home at work. Then, when their husbands joined the army they, having left the insured group, for a time lost the value of this service. I might add that where a man had been insured and then went into the army, thereby losing his group insurance, this organization made a special contract; but large numbers of people who know about this service desire to be relieved of the worry incidental to the fear of illness, and a great deal would be accomplished if the department would extend the cooperation that I have asked. I know the matter has been looked into, but I would recommend that it be examined further, because I am quite sure that in this way we could be of great help to many of these people throughout the country.

Mr. RALSTON: I can tell my hon. friend that this matter has been examined by the department more than once, and particularly by the Department of Pensions and National Health. It is not a closed matter, and I shall have it looked into again.

Mr. MAYBANK: What about the officers?

Mr. RALSTON: I do not wish to be put in the position of constantly resisting demands with regard to allowances for men in the armed forces, but I do feel constrained to put to the committee the other side of the picture. The position is not that officers are entitled to an issue of clothing. Officers get a clothing allowance at the beginning. It was never intended, I think, that this allowance should cover the full cost of their clothing, but it has been increased so that it does cover the cost of the initial outfit. Now my hon. friend is suggesting that when an officer comes out of the army he should be put in the same position as an other rank, to whom there is a free issue of clothing all the way through, and that the officer should be given a clothing allowance. I say to my hon. friend that he is dealing with two altogether different classes of people as far as pay and allowances are concerned, and at the moment I am not prepared to say that anything can be done along the line he suggests. There also has been quite a bit of talk about the maintenance of clothing by officers, as though an annual allowance should be made for this purpose. An officer is paid at a higher rate than the enlisted man and, at least in my time, the officer maintains his own uniform. As I say, he does get the clothing allowance originally. But, so far as pay and allowances are concerned, there has been no suggestion that he should be reimbursed for the cost of upkeep of his clothing, in addition to his pay and his regular allowances.

Mr. GILLIS: I am going to discuss an entirely different matter. This is about the only item under which an opportunity would be afforded to speak about this matter. I shall

be brief and explicit. I have not had an opportunity of taking it up with the minister's department, although I like to have a decision from that source before discussing any matter in the house.

The question I have in mind is one of discipline, and its application. I intend at some time in the future to go into this matter thoroughly with either the minister or his deputy. The fact is, however, that I happened to be in Camp Borden area yesterday morning and part of yesterday afternoon, and I had the privilege of sitting in on a magistrate's court. I was amazed to find that the Ontario provincial police had brought in a corporal from Camp Borden who was alleged to have committed an infraction of the regulations within the camp area. This corporal was in charge of one of the camp stores, and it was said that a revolver was missing. The provincial police were called in to make an investigation.

The point which arouses me is that that was an offence which took place within the precincts of the camp area. The boy was a clean-cut young fellow of about nineteen years of age and, in my opinion, instead of being taken to a civilian court by the civilian police, and instead of being placed in the hands of a rather tough crown prosecutor, without any representations being made from his unit, he should have been placed in a more favourable position. In this instance he had to hire the services of a civilian lawyer to defend him, and the amazing fact was that at least seven or eight members of his unit, headed by his company commander, and followed by his sergeant-major, his quartermaster-sergeant, and down to one of the troopers, took the stand and gave evidence against the boy. He was alone, with the exception of the civilian defence counsel he was obliged to hire.

The point is that if that young corporal is convicted in a civilian court and is sentenced to a term in a civilian gaol, he is a criminal and is automatically discharged from the army. He leaves the service with the record of a convict. Having had some little experience in the service, and with an understanding of the experience the minister has had, I think he will agree that if that is the esprit de corps being developed in that camp area—because I do not think it happens anywhere else in Canada—it does not speak very well for those who are in charge of that camp.

My question is this: Are the people responsible for discipline in that camp administering the policy of the minister's department with respect to an important matter of that kind? There is a lot more to this than what I have said. This is not the only case, but I have no intention of delaying the committee, or of arguing the matter further. What I have said is based on what I saw myself, yesterday. In my opinion it is a most unfortunate mess. If it is not the policy of the department, then those who have placed the boy in that position should be called to account immediately. And if it is the policy of the department—and I do not believe it is—then I am sorry for the mothers and fathers of Canada who are placing boys of seventeen, eighteen and nineteen years of age under the control of people of that kind. Would the minister say if that is the policy of his department?

Mr. RALSTON: I do not think I propose to answer yes or no to the recital of facts regarding what the hon. member has said he saw, but with regard to which I have no information whatever. I cannot say what policy was being administered in connection with that matter until I have the full facts. From what my hon. friend has said, it would seem that the provincial police were seized of the case, for some reason which I do not know, but which may have been as a result of policy in that particular case.

I thoroughly agree with my hon. friend that a young man who is in the army should be defended in connection with a serious offence. But I do say that in connection with civilian offences, offences which are strictly civilian—and I say this straight from the shoulder—I have felt it was much better that civilian authorities should deal with such civilian offences, and that the army should deal with army offences. I have felt very often that discipline in the army to some extent has been rather flouted by the idea that we have had to have sometimes as many as seven men try a court martial, for weeks on end, on account of procedure which is laid down, and which has been in force so long that it is almost like the laws of the Medes and Persians. Then we might have an acquittal, and have the public wondering whether justice had been done, or whether something was being covered up.

With regard to civilian offences, I say to my hon. friend I have rather leaned toward the idea of having offences under the criminal code dealt with by the civilian authorities, even though committed by a soldier. On the other hand, with regard to army offences I have taken exactly the opposite position, because I consider offences such as neglect to the prejudice of good order and military discipline are matters which should properly be dealt with by army authorities.

In this instance I do not know what the case was about. From what the hon. member

[Mr. Gillis.]

said it would seem to me that this might have been a plain charge of theft; I do not know what else it could be. If it was theft, then I say to him that theft is a civilian offence. These are cases which I believe the public will be better satisfied to have dealt with by civilian authorities. They are offences against the laws of the land, although committed by soldiers. Courts are set up for that purpose, and it seems to me that they could probably deal with such cases to better advantage. Then no suggestion could be made that the army is covering up something in connection with its own administration.

Before I could give my hon. friend a categorical reply as to whether or not that particular case represents the policy of the department, I would want to know all the facts, and the reasons for what took place. He can be sure of this, that I will know before this time to-morrow just what the circumstances were, and be prepared to tell the committee about it.

Mr. GILLIS: I agree with the minister.

The CHAIRMAN: I allowed the hon. member for Cape Breton South to put his question, although he said he realized it might be out of order. We have had a general discussion on item No. 1, and we are now on item No. 2, dealing with pay and allowance. It will be readily realized that I must ask the committee to remain within the item.

Mr. GILLIS: Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of transgressing the rules of the house, but the minister did say that this item was sufficiently broad to permit of discussion of almost anything. It will be realized that in the matter I have brought to his attention I have touched only a very small part of the situation which exists at that point. I realize that the minister has not the facts, and cannot get them unless he approaches the authorities at Camp Borden. However, as I saw it, the matter was entirely a military one.

A box of revolvers was shipped to the camp. This boy was in charge of the stores and one of the revolvers was found to be missing. There is the provost corps, the unit police and other machinery for investigation within the camp, and I cannot understand why the provincial police were called in to investigate something that happened within the confines of the camp. I am not concerned with the boy being charged with a military offence because that would be something between him and the army, but when he is tried and convicted in a civilian court he is given a criminal record. He is then automatically discharged and he carries the stigma of that record for the rest of his life. I agree with the minister that anything of a civilian nature should be tried in a civilian court, but anything that happens within the confines of the camp should be handled there.

Mr. RALSTON: I do not think the camp area is the thing that is the determining factor; the nature of the offence is more properly the principle which should guide.

Mr. ADAMSON: Do I understand the minister to say that the new regulations with regard to hospitalization provide that irrespective of a man being a captain, major or colonel, he receives only a lieutenant's pay as allowance?

Mr. RALSTON: I think that is right, but I have learned too well that one cannot summarize three or four pages of a departmental memorandum in a sentence or two.

Mr. TUCKER: The hon. member for Cape Breton South has just brought up a question that I think raises a question which is of interest to this whole House of Commons. He feels that in considering these estimates he is justified in bringing up the case of a soldier who is being tried in a civilian court and asking the minister to answer for what is being done there. He has taken up the time of this committee to discuss such an individual case. If he can do that, then every hon. member is entitled to do the same thing and if they did so, it would take up so much time that our whole system of parliamentary government would break down. I have heard the hon. member say that every case he has put up to the minister has received careful, considerate, generous and sympathetic attention, and there is no reason in the world that I can see why a case like this should not have been taken up privately with the minister. On his own admission it would have received the same sympathetic attention given to other matters and the time of this House of Commons would not have been taken up in dealing with this individual case.

Mr. NICHOLSON: On a point of order, what item is being discussed by the hon. member for Rosthern?

The CHAIRMAN: This goes back to what I said a few moments ago. I thought the hon. member for Cape Breton South was out of order for the moment, but I allowed the question to be put and the minister had to answer. I believe the hon. member for Rosthern is in order now.

Mr. GILLIS: He is creating a lot of discussion on this.

Mr. TUCKER: This is not the first time that the hon. member for Cape Breton South

and members of his group have brought up individual cases. On their own admission any cases they bring to the minister's attention receive careful attention and I ask them why they bring them up in the house. I think most members of this House of Commons are tired of their bringing up individual cases in this house for purposes which we all understand.

Mr. GILLIS: I rise to a question of privilege. I brought up this question to avoid a possible wrong being committed to-morrow, or to offset a possible wrong which may have been committed to-day. I make no apologies to the membership of this house or to any hon. member for taking up the cudgel on behalf of the underdog.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no question of privilege.

Mr. GILLIS: My question of privilege is this—

The CHAIRMAN: There is no question of privilege raised. You may answer what has been put forward, but it is not a question of privilege.

Mr. GILLIS: The hon. member for Rosthern definitely stated a few moments ago that I raised the matter for political purposes.

Mr. TUCKER: I said nothing of the sort. I said that the hon. member raised it for reasons which we all understood.

Mr. GILLIS: The hon. member is committing an infraction of the rules of the house by imputing motives. I brought this matter to the attention of the minister to-night because I expect that he will now get in touch with Camp Borden and a soldier may be prevented from being designated as a criminal to-morrow, or a sentence of a court may be offset.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre raised the question of hospitalization. Where a dependent wife or child of a soldier serving on active service becomes ill and hospitalization is necessary, does the department become responsible? Where a man is on active service I think it is unfair that the municipality should become responsible for the cost of hospitalization of his dependents. Has anything been done to correct this situation in any way?

Mr. RALSTON: I would say that assistance in connection with the hospitalization of dependents makes up from fifty to seventy-five per cent of the expenditures of the dependents' board of trustees. That does not mean that the department becomes responsible—to use my hon. friend's words—automatically for the hospitalization of the dependent, but it does mean that this particular item has been regarded by the dependents' board of trustees as being a proper one to be considered and in connection with which assistance should be given under the special powers granted to the board if the conditions under which the board acts exist. As I say, large amounts have been paid out on account of families who are in need and who require hospitalization.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Is that a recent amendment?

Mr. RALSTON: No; it has been in practice since January 1, 1942.

Mr. JACKMAN: I should like to ask a question with regard to the issuing of official notices of presumed death. I have one case in my riding where a claim for pension is being made by the parents of a young man who was presumed to have lost his life at Dieppe. The first letter from the Department of National Defence is dated March 4, 1943, and it reads in part:

> It is with deep regret that in view of the lapse of time and the absence of any further official information regarding your son, since he was reported missing as a result of the action at Dieppe on the 19th day of August, 1942, it is now proposed to take action to presume his death for official purposes.

The parents of this boy are in necessitous circumstances and have applied for a pension because they need some means with which to carry on. On January 11, 1944, the best part of a year later, the pension commission replied, and I quote one paragraph as follows:

> I have to-day received notification from the Department of National Defence to the effect that the marginally named is still listed as missing in action. Under the circumstances, the commission are unable to take any action to have a claim considered on behalf of the parents until such time as the soldier is officially reported dead or a presumption of death may be issued.

The parents cannot proceed with their claim for a pension until official notice of presumption of death is issued. I would ask the minister what the policy of his department is in such a case, so that the parents may proceed with the Department of Pensions and National Health?

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend understands, in the first place, that pay and allowances are continued all the time?

Mr. JACKMAN: Unfortunately this was a case where there was no dependents' allowance because of certain circumstances. But there is a claim for a pension.

Mr. RALSTON: Generally speaking, the practice under K.R. and O. is to have what

may be the final examination of the facts within six months after the man is first reported missing. I cannot tell my hon. friend about this particular case, but I shall certainly look into it. If my hon. friend will permit me, I should like to put on the record what the provisions are with regard to dependents' allowance and presumption of death:

Pay Account. Pay and allowances are credited to the end of the month in which an officer or soldier is reported dead or missing.

Dependents' Allowance and Assigned Pay. The dependents' allowance board may make monthly payments to the dependents comprising the dependents' allowance in issue and a supplement up to fifteen days' pay of rank.

Should dependents' allowance not be in issue to persons to whom pay had been assigned at the time the officer or soldier is officially reported dead or missing, the board shall investigate and if dependency is established may put into effect the monthly payments referred to above. If at the end of the period of six months the officer or soldier is still reported missing, or should the eligibility of his dependents for pension be undetermined, the monthly payments referred to shall be adjusted to the amount of the maximum pension rate which would be payable on the death of the officer or soldier and may be paid to the dependents until status is determined.

That seems to me to fit the case of which my hon. friend speaks. There is an adjustment to the amount of the maximum pension which would be payable on the death of the officer or soldier if at the end of the period he is still reported missing. May I ask if any payment was made at all?

Mr. JACKMAN: I have not had an opportunity of taking up the case with the department. The family did not have any dependents' allowance; I am not certain about assigned pay. The case came to me in the mail and I have not yet had an opportunity of following it up, but I shall be glad to follow the suggestion of the minister.

Mr. RALSTON: They wish to apply for a pension?

Mr. JACKMAN: That is right.

Mr. RALSTON: I was saying that the board was required to pay the maximum pension rate up to the time the actual decision was made that the officer or soldier must be presumed dead. I am very much interested in the case because I want to see how these regulations are working out. They were framed after a good deal of thought after Hong Kong and Dieppe. The memorandum I was reading continues:

If pension is awarded to such dependents prior to the expiration of six months, the monthly payments of dependents' allowance and fifteen days' pay of rank shall cease—

That is, if definite evidence comes that the man has died before the six months, then, of course, the monthly payments cease and pension is taken on. The memorandum continues:

—but if the pension awarded is less than the monthly payments a grant amounting to the difference between the monthly payments and pension for the remainder of the six months period shall be issued in a lump sum to the dependents.

Should a pension be granted retroactive to date of death the monthly payments, referred to herein, shall be recovered from such pension but only to the extent of the amount of pension payable for period during which the monthly payments were made, i.e., if monthly payments were in excess of amount of pension awarded no refund of difference is called for.

That is, if the monthly payments were in excess of the pension awarded, no refund of the difference is called for. They get monthly payments, which comprise the dependents' allowance and fifteen days' pay of rank, and that is payable up to six months at least. If pension is awarded before that, the amount of money which is represented by that dependents' allowance and fifteen days' pay of rank continues up to the end of six months, notwithstanding that the pension awarded may be smaller than the amount.

Mr. CARDIFF: I would ask the minister to clarify a statement he made a few minutes ago. If a theft takes places inside a camp, is that considered a civilian crime?

Mr. RALSTON: It is an offence against the criminal code.

Mr. EMMERSON: This afternoon there was a discussion of pay and allowances, and unfortunately I was not able to be present for the first few minutes of the discussion this evening when the minister may have covered the point I wish to raise. It has to do with a dependents' allowance for a widowed mother. The mother is dependent upon the father at the time the soldier enlists. The father dies. Prior to death he had been living on a retirement allowance, which of course ceased upon his death, leaving the widow in needy circumstances. Is a dependents' allowance granted in a situation of that kind, where it is really needed?

Mr. RALSTON: I cannot put my finger on the exact regulation, but the board interpret dependency to mean this: if at the time of the application the soldier was the logical support of the mother and was willing to support her, then she would, even though at the time of the enlistment the soldier's father was her support, be entitled to a dependents' allowance and assigned pay. I am saying that subject to correction, but I think that is the

principle they work on. I take it that my hon. friend has had some difficulty in a case of that kind and that it has not turned out that way. If he will give me the particulars I shall be glad to look into the case.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I understood the minister to say a little while ago that a bill was to be brought down dealing with a gratuity allowance after discharge, and that at that time the one month's pay and allowance would be under review and would likely be increased. Will the clothing allowance be also under review? We have had the clothing allowance increased from $35 to $65, but the higher rate was not made retroactive. It seems to me very important that something should be done about this soon, because otherwise those who are now being discharged will not benefit unless the provision is made retroactive. I do not think $65 is sufficient for clothing allowance, because a man has to buy a whole new outfit. It certainly does not go nearly far enough to take care of him.

Mr. RALSTON: I say to my hon. friend that I cannot tell him what will be in the new measures with regard to rehabilitation and gratuity. I have indicated that returned soldiers' problems and veterans' welfare will be considered, and when it is brought down my hon. friend will have an opportunity of seeing it and discussing it. I cannot make any further announcement now. I assure my hon. friend that there will be more features in it than simply the feature of war service gratuity alone. May I say something else? It seems to me that the farther we go—and I am not taking any particular credit for it—the farther some hon. members feel we should be pressed. If I were talking about retroactivity I would suggest that we make it retroactive to the last war. I want to remind my hon. friend that all the way through the last war the clothing allowance was $35. It was $35 at a time when $35 were not worth what $35 are worth in 1944. I should like my hon. friend to remember that. There seems to be considerable criticism and strictures about the amount of this allowance, as if it were something that nobody had ever heard of before. The clothing allowance was put into effect in this war because it was the clothing allowance of the last war, and it was known that the purchasing power of that sum to-day was more than its purchasing power of 1914-18. Whether the increased clothing allowance should be made retroactive I cannot tell my hon. friend at the present time.

Mr. FAIR: What happens in the case of a soldier or an airman who is captured and held as a prisoner of war? Do the assigned pay and allowances continue to be paid to his dependents?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Mr. GREEN: Some days ago the minister dealt with the question of the retirement of officers. Would he tell us whether there is any distinction made with regard to retirements between the officer who is a permanent force officer and the officer who is not a permanent force officer? Some people have made the suggestion that non-permanent officers are being retired in some cases and their places taken by permanent force officers who perhaps have not had the experience in that particular work or who may not be as efficient, or perhaps are older than the man who is going out. There is a feeling that it is very unfair during the war and after these men have served so well, that regardless of whether officers are permanent force or non-permanent force there should be no distinction made in the retirements. In other words, if a man is no longer needed and could be retired he should be retired even though a permanent force officer. Can the minister tell us whether or not that distinction is made?

Mr. RALSTON: I do not know of any such policy, although I can say from the treasury point of view that policy might very well be put into effect because the permanent force officer is entitled to pension, and goes out on pension to which, of course, he has contributed over the years; whereas the non-permanent officer does not. There has been no such policy put into effect. If my hon. friend has any case in mind and he would care to mention it to me personally I should like to know of it. I know what is sometimes said with regard to permanent force and non-permanent force personnel, that there is generally a disposition in this war, as was said also in the last war, of course, to suggest that non-permanent men are not receiving the recognition they should. I assure my hon. friend I have been alive to that possibility and criticism and have endeavoured to check all instances. I have endeavoured to check it with the officers who I think would know. Notwithstanding the fact that a great deal has been said along that line, I do not think my hon. friend will find that that policy exists. As far as I know, merit has counted in appointments in this war.

Mr. GREEN: I am not dealing with the question of appointments so much as the question of retirements.

Mr. RALSTON: Well, the same thing applies. I do not think my hon. friend will find—

Mr. GREEN: The suggestion is that the non-permanent officers are not given the consideration to which they are entitled.

Mr. RALSTON: I do not know of any such policy. Let me say frankly to the committee what I think I would do in a case where there were two men of equal merit. I would favour the retirement of the non-permanent man because he is going into civil life one of these days. He is not going to stay in the army permanently; whereas the permanent force officer is. He is in the army. The non-permanent man ought to go and become reestablished in civil life as soon as he can. On the other hand, if you retire the permanent force officer you would subject the country to a considerable obligation on account of pension. As my hon. friend knows, in a number of cases we have retired permanent force officers on substantial pension because the 60-year rule came into effect. We felt we ought to carry it out, and non-permanent officers have been given appointments in some cases to take the places of permanent officers.

Mr. ADAMSON: Has any consideration been given to paying an officer who retires at his own request. In some cases officers are retired automatically or imperatively. We know of a lot of officers who might be willing to retire if that clause could be put into the act. I think it might be easier not only for the officers in the army—

Mr. RALSTON: And for the minister.

Mr. ADAMSON: —but for everybody.

Item agreed to.

Army services—

3. Travel, transportation and freight, $92,957,866.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I presume that this item gives me an opportunity to ask the question which I brought up some three weeks ago, with respect to which there has as yet been no answer. The question whether or not consideration has been given to the establishment of a rotating system of furloughs for our men overseas, so that after the expiry of a given period of active service they will be enabled to come home to their loved ones. In bringing this matter up I realize that difficulties would be encountered, but I do not believe that they are insurmountable. A system of rotating furloughs is now being brought into effect in the United States. I think this is a matter that would do much to improve the morale of the men who serve in the army. In so far as those who serve in the air force are concerned, after a period of tour of duty an opportunity is given them to come home on furlough. The men who serve in the navy are given opportunities of furlough; after a period of service they are permitted to return home on furlough.

The system that has been considered over a period of time and is being adopted in the United States is one that is enabling men in the armed forces, particularly in the army, to return home. I think I can do no better than to quote from a periodical some of the provisions and the comments on the provisions that are made in respect thereto:

> The military services are giving more and more attention to the problem of rotating men who have served long periods overseas. Plans already have been worked out by the war department to provide trips home and furloughs for men serving in certain areas, and consideration is being given to similiar rotation for men in some of the foreign theatres.

I point out that many of our men have spent five Christmases overseas.

> A limited number of men in the North African theatre, who have eighteen months' foreign service behind them are being rotated home each month. The marine corps tries to bring home each month three per cent of its men serving overseas.

I realize there are difficulties. One of the difficulties would naturally be the question of reinforcements. We have the assurance of the minister, if I understood him correctly, that the necessary reinforcements are available. Another difficulty would be the question of the necessary shipping. I do not think that is an insuperable difficulty any longer, having regard to the production of ships. Quite a number of the loved ones of these men who have been overseas for four and a half years have asked me whether it would be possible to bring into effect in Canada a system similar to that now being put into operation in the United States, to the end that men in the army shall receive a measure of the consideration in this regard as do those who serve in the navy and the air force. It is a matter which I am sure would meet with the favour of the men who have been overseas and are denied the opportunity of being with their loved ones for a long period. I would like a statement from the minister in this regard.

Mr. RALSTON: I am not in a position to make a statement on a matter of that kind, and the committee will understand why. Great

events are pending and, if I took down correctly what my hon. friend said, he refers to a plan for rotating furloughs from certain areas and consideration being given to some foreign theatres. My hon. friend knows the location of our troops generally speaking, and I am not in a position to make an announcement of that kind to-night.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I endorse the remarks of the hon. member for Lake Centre. I am one of those, from all quarters of the house, who have been rather keen about free transportation under certain conditions for members of the armed forces. From the start of the war I advocated that consideration be given the men in this regard, because I think the members of the armed forces in Canada are in much the same situation as those of us who were situated in the British isles in the last war. We travelled free on warrants issued in that war. I do not say that members of the forces should travel free at all times, and I want to say a word in appreciation of the Minister of National Defence because, having argued with him for some time that these men should be given free transportation and having finally asked him in March, 1941, if he would negotiate with the railway companies with a view to having some arrangement put into effect between the government and the companies for a reduction for the men, steps were taken to bring this about. At that time civilians were granted week-end excursions at reduced rates, and I am happy to know that, as a result of the representations made, members of the armed forces can travel to-day to their homes at greatly reduced rates. Notwithstanding all that, however, I submit that they should be allowed free transportation on their annual furloughs and embarkation leave. It would not add greatly to the cost at this time if the minister could bring this about in regard to annual furlough and embarkation leave. It should be done if at all possible.

Mr. RALSTON: I do not want to give my hon. friend a short answer, but I have dealt with the question two or three times and I will not take up the time of the committee further to-night. I did indicate that there was one matter very much in my heart, though it did not go to the extent my hon. friend has indicated. I am working out something, and as a matter of fact I have it under consideration now, but I am not making promises. However, it has to do with the railways, the government and my colleagues. I refer to the possibility of a ceiling. I have not given further consideration to the matter of free transportation, for the present at least.

[Mr. Ralston.]

Mr. FAIR: As another member who has advocated for quite a while the granting of free transportation for annual leave and embarkation leave, I support what other hon. members have said in this connection, and I wish to thank the minister for what he has done.

Item agreed to.

4. Construction, purchase, repairs and operating expenses of properties—

(a) Capital expenditure, $28,987,000;

(b) Repairs, operating expenses and rentals, $51,059,856.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I am not sure whether the matter I wish to discuss comes under this item, since it is involved with the Department of Pensions from the point of view of hospitalization. I refer to the casualties from Dieppe and other places. I know of some hospitals where these casualties are placed in the same ward with very sad cases of human wrecks from the last great war. In fact I have been told that there are casualties from that war who are placed in the same wards with men from this war and who have passed out. That is rather an unfair state of affairs. Surely at this time these chaps who have gone through the stress and strain of the war and have become casualties should not be put in such a situation. I believe that happens sometimes. I am wondering if in the building of these hospitals to-day provision will be made to obviate such conditions. I hope that the men will not be placed in such locations as Christie street hospital, in the midst of all the din of a manufacturing centre. They should be put in some quiet isolated part of the country where they can enjoy the peace of the countryside. Certainly they should not mingle with casualties of the last war. I realize that the matter is involved with the Department of Pensions, but probably the minister will have something to say in this connection. I hope he will use his influence to ensure that proper conditions are established for the care of the casualties of this war so that they may be placed by themselves and every opportunity be taken advantage of to nurse them back to a state of health.

Mr. RALSTON: I will take note of what my hon. friend says. I thought at first he was thinking that such a situation exists in army hospitals. Such a situation does not exist in army hospitals unless it is the odd case of a member of the veterans' guard who happens to be ill.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I realize there is a difference.

Mr. RALSTON: I will bring the matter to the attention of my colleague.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. RALSTON: The next item, No. 5, includes medical and dental stores and services. The hon. member for Souris rather ingeniously got in his remarks under construction, though they should perhaps properly come under the next item.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I realize that, but I was thinking of the construction of hospitals.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: My question was along the same lines.

Mr. ADAMSON: Is this $80,000,000 for construction in Canada, or does it apply to overseas as well? It seems a lot of money.

Mr. RALSTON: The actual construction item is $28,000,000. repairs $11,000,000. operating expenses $40,000,000. The operating expenses include rental of properties as well.

Mr. ADAMSON: Can the minister give a break-down of items of $5,000,000 and up or $2,000,000?

Mr. RALSTON: I will break this down again. Of this amount $15,000,000 is for construction that was started in 1943-44 and will not be completed or paid for by April 1 next. Then $5,000,000 is for C.W.A.C. accommodation if required.

Mr. ADAMSON: That is a contingent item.

Mr. RALSTON: Then $1,200,000 is for ordnance buildings; my hon. friend knows as well as anyone the need in this connection in Toronto, where they are using the post office building.

Mr. ADAMSON: That is so.

Mr. RALSTON: Now to break down the figure in another way, about $2,000,000 is for overseas; $4,800,000 is for operational units in Canada; about $5,000,000 is for home war establishments in Canada, that is the non-operational units, and miscellaneous activities and equipment not included elsewhere account for $16,000,000. I can give my hon. friend a break-down of that if he desires it.

Mr. ADAMSON: Would such items as fire damage and repairs at Camp Borden come under this vote?

Mr. RALSTON: In connection with fire damage we put in an item for repair construction, looking forward to the sombre possibility that there will be fires.

Mr. ADAMSON: Would this item include the repairs necessary after the fire at Camp Borden?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes, it would.

Mr. GREEN: Would the minister explain why it should be necessary now to devote practically $29,000,000 to capital expenditures during the coming fiscal year; and when he does so, would he also explain whether any consideration has been given to what is to be done with the army camps in various parts of the country that are becoming vacant?

Mr. RALSTON: As to what has been done?

Mr. GREEN: Has any consideration been given to what is to be done with the army camps as they become vacant? There has been a large expenditure on these camps, and I am wondering if any plans are on foot for making use of them.

Mr. RALSTON: There are three or four ways in which these camps could be used. In the first place some of the camps are stand-bys for operations in connection with demobilization—I think of two large camps in particular in that connection—and that is one thing for which they can be used. Then they can be used by the Department of Labour in connection with instructional programmes and vocational training.

Mr. GREEN: After the war?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes. Then they can be used by the Department of Pensions and National Health for the same thing, and in the fourth place they can be used by the Crown Assets Corporation, about which my hon. friend knows, if it should become necessary to dispose of them. However, I am not anxious to plan for the simple abandonment of many camps in Canada, in view of all that is ahead of us. Some camps are closed down either permanently or temporarily, but generally speaking use is being made of most of them in some capacity, if not actually for the purpose of training.

Mr. GREEN: The minister did not answer the first question, as to why it should be necessary to spend $29,000,000 during the coming year.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend was not in the committee when I dealt with that. Some $15,000,000 is for finishing items which were started and which will not be paid for by April 1 next. About $5,000,000 is for C.W.A.C. accommodation if required. Then $1,200,000 is for ordnance buildings. Then $2,200,000 is for overseas and $4,800,000 for operational units in Canada; that is for finishing some camps.

Mr. ADAMSON: Has the minister resolved his differences with the Postmaster General in regard to ordnance?

Mr. RALSTON: This does resolve the difference.

Mr. STIRLING: The minister referred to $40,000,000 for operational charges.

Mr. RALSTON: $39,000,000.

Mr. STIRLING: Practically $40,000,000.

Mr. RALSTON: That is right.

Mr. STIRLING: Would the minister give us a little information in regard to the expenditure of that amount? Does it cover the expenses of ordnance used for operational purposes?

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend means ordnance equipment?

Mr. STIRLING: Yes.

Mr. RALSTON: I would not think so.

Mr. STIRLING: How is it to be expended? Would operations in connection with the ordinary military camp in Canada come under this $40,000,000?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes, and it covers fuel, light, water, disinfectant, barrack services, all sorts of rentals which we have to pay all over Canada, and so on. All rented buildings are included here, ranging from the Sun Life building in Montreal, which is used as headquarters in that city, to C.M.H.Q. in London and the building in Prince Rupert.

Mr. STIRLING: And all the Ottawa buildings?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Mr. GREEN: Is any of this money intended for internment camps in which prisoners of war are kept?

Mr. RALSTON: No.

Mr. GREEN: I understand that the care of those prisoners comes under the Department of National Defence. Could the minister tell us whether or not there has been any change in the handling of prisoners in view of the fact that so many of them are now allowed to work on farms? As I understand it, the discipline within camps is handled entirely by the nazis themselves; they have a little gestapo inside which handles all the occupants. I understand there have been certain cases of men being murdered in the camps and of other men who have come running to the wires for help. I am just wondering whether there has been a change in the administration or in the sort of control that is exercised over the nazis in the camps.

[Mr. Ralston.]

Mr. RALSTON: I want to say to my hon. friend that I do think the statement he makes is a bit ill-advised. I have not heard of the occurrences of which my hon. friend speaks. Within the last three weeks a representative of the protecting power has visited internment camps all over Canada. Of course he will make his report to the German government, and we endeavoured to show him everything there was to be seen. I have not heard of any such events as those to which my hon. friend refers.

Mr. GREEN: That has nothing to do with the guards; it is all within the camps.

Mr. RALSTON: As my hon. friend knows, a certain number of these men are out on parole, and I think they have done very good work; but that is a comparatively small percentage of the number we have in camp. There has been no change in the camp organization to which he refers; and that organization, under which there are camp leaders, is the organization that has been adopted from the very beginning, the usual organization in connection with internment camps. In fact, I think it is by all means, so far as I can find out, the best way to run an internment camp, namely, to have the camp leader responsible to the camp commandant, or to his staff, for order and discipline among the men.

Mr. GREEN: The German leader inside is responsible?

Mr. RALSTON: He is the one who represents the wishes, representations and complaints of his fellow prisoners of war. Everything to be brought to the attention of the camp officials is done through the camp leader. Generally he is the one who deals with the representative from the protecting power, when that official visits the camp to ascertain what the conditions are, in order that he may report to the German government. On the other hand, we also get a report from camps in Germany.

Mr. GREEN: The German leader in the camp is responsible for the discipline?

Mr. RALSTON: I would not say he is altogether responsible for the discipline, because he has not himself any power to enforce. However, he is the head of the organization in the camp, and the one who is regarded as the representative of the men. I suppose they have the same troubles as similarly organized democratic bodies have. Sometimes a leader does not always represent everybody in a camp. But it seems to me that this is eminently the most desirable and the best way to run these camps efficiently.

Mr. ADAMSON: Do these men have to give parole?

Mr. RALSTON: As a matter of fact, I think there are different conditions in different places for different work and different classes of internees. As my hon. friend knows, there are some prisoners who are first class, and others in different classes. There are different nationalities, and even within one nationality these are different types.

Item agreed to.

5. Personnel supplies and services: food, medical and dental stores, clothing and personal equipment, $159,566,238.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Could the minister tell us how much of this amount is to be spent on military hospitals within Canada. Then, can he tell us what is now being taken care of in army hospitals?

Mr. RALSTON: The number?

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Then will the minister give us the government's policy with regard to the discharging of men from hospitals. How long do they keep the men in the army before they are discharged and passed over to the Department of Pensions and National Health?

Mr. RALSTON: I believe my hon. friend asked with respect to the building of hospitals. The buildings themselves would be included in item No. 4. Have I misled him in that respect?

Mr. CASTLEDEN: No.

Mr. RALSTON: If not, shall I give a break-down of the item?

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Yes.

Mr. RALSTON: The break-down is as follows:

Object of expenditure	Estimate 1944-45	Change	
		More than 1943-44	Less than 1943-44
Clothing and necessaries	$40,574,900	.....	$10,479,344
Personal equipment	17,229,120	.....	8,870,779
Camp, barrack and miscellaneous equipment	14,015,459	.....	10,992,587
Supplies—food, forage	64,502,018	$3,969,783	.....
Medical stores and services	16,571,556	.....	387,076
Dental stores and services	3,227,535	712,291	.....
Laundry	1,657,290	.....	542,710
Casual labour	1,788,360	288,360	.....

It will be noted that this is a table showing personnel supplies and services, including food, medical and dental stores, and services, clothing and personal equipment. The objects of expenditures are listed as follows: Clothing and necessaries; personal equipment; camp, barrack and miscellaneous equipment; supplies, food and forage; medical stores and services; dental stores and services; laundry and casual labour.

The estimates for clothing and necessaries, personal equipment, and barrack camp and miscellaneous equipment show considerable decreases because the initial equipping of the army is now largely complete; it is now chiefly necesary to provide for original issues to new recruits and for wastage. The decrease in laundry services is due to increased activity of mobile and static laundries overseas and to the reduction in the size of the army in Canada.

Shortage of military personnel in ordnance depots has necessitated employing civilians, and an increase in casual labour.

The increase for supplies of food can be attributed to an increase in the army overseas, and to the higher cost of rations in Canada.

Medical stores have increased slightly due to the necessity for quantity ordering in advance and to a slight increase in basic costs. That is a general statement of this item.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: What are the facilities for military hospitals in Canada? How many cases are we dealing with under the army system, and what are the facilities for increase?

Mr. RALSTON: I cannot answer my hon. friend, because I have not the aggregate before me showing the total accommodation in military hospitals. From memory I could speak about hospitals across the country from Cogswell street in Halifax to hospitals on the coast. However, I know that would not suit my hon. friend, and I would prefer to have a statement with respect to it. I shall get the information for him under another item.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Shall I be able to get it later?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes. I am not sure when I say this, but I do not think the Department of Pensions and National Health is giving the capacity of hospitals. I do not mind giving that information privately to hon. members, but it just occurs to me that perhaps I should not give the total hospital accommo-

dation in Canada. However, I can give the locations, and anyone who wishes to ask me privately as to the accommodation available will be given the answer.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I presume that under this item one might discuss the matter of army boots. I should like to secure a statement from the minister in regard to allegations made in the press early in February.

Mr. RALSTON: Perhaps this is not the correct item; however, we can hear it now. This involves the inspection board, and would come under sundry services.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Would not boots come under this item?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes, that is correct.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Although I am not going into details in the matter, I desire to ask certain questions with regard to one James Clark, a former chief inspector of the inspection board of the United Kingdom and Canada, and allegations made by him, to which reference has been made in the press to the effect that in the supplying of shoes for the Canadian army materials were not in accordance with specifications, in connection with about a million pairs of boots, and that 30,000 pairs were made on lasts contrary to specifications.

My questions are these: Have these allegations by the former chief inspector been brought to the attention of the minister? What investigation has been made by him of the allegations made by Mr. Clark? Will the minister lay on the table the findings of any investigation that was made? Finally, what does the government intend to do toward having a judicial investigation into the allegations?

Mr. RALSTON: I cannot believe that my hon. friend really understands the genesis of this matter when I consider the questions he has asked.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What does the minister mean by the genesis?

Mr. RALSTON: The genesis of this inquiry. These allegations were made by a man who was dismissed last August. As I remember it, he started out with the allegation that he had discovered, I think in November, 1942, nine months before, that some other inspector had received a bottle of liquor as a present from one of the contractors, and he admitted that he himself had participated. Having been dismissed in August, 1943, Mr. Clark has several times since insisted that he be reinstated because, as he says, that he was wrongly dismissed. He has accompanied that request with certain charges. In November or December, 1942, he alleged that there were irregularities on the part of other inspectors nine months; that was about nine months before he was dismissed. The allegations he made with regard to the boots were with regard to boots that had been inspected—I have not the dates before me—I believe in 1941 and 1942.

It is necessary for the committee to understand that the board for which Mr. Clark was working was the joint inspection board of Canada and the United Kingdom. That board was set up in 1940 under Major-General Sir Robert Lock, a British officer, and it has approximately 15,000 employees. It does the inspection in the United States of munitions and supplies purchased for the United Kingdom and Canada, and in Canada of munitions and supplies for Canada, China, Great Britain, Russia and other countries purchasing Canadian goods. It is a joint board which reports to the British government through the Right Hon. Malcolm MacDonald, the High Commissioner for Canada, and to the Canadian government through the Minister of National Defence. Neither the Minister of National Defence nor Mr. MacDonald have interfered in any way with the administration of that board. All we have done is to follow the terms of the order in council with regard to salaries and appointments of employees and to see that the financial commitments were within the terms of the order.

I feel it is necessary to say this because my hon. friend has asked whether the minister made an investigation of these charges. I say at once that the minister did not make an investigation of these charges. The matter was referred to the board and the board made an investigation. I understand that Colonel Currie, my deputy minister, went into the matter again so far as the Canadian government was concerned, and the board later filed a categorical answer to each one of the allegations made by Mr. Clark.

When these charges were made, Mr. Clark felt that he had not received satisfaction from the minister, from the Department of National Defence or from the board, and he intimated that he was going to publish his charges. It was felt that it would be distinctly against the interest of our war activities if allegations of this kind were made, particularly in connection with boots, the quality of which I think has been par excellence so far as I can find out from the troops themselves. It was thought that possibly the publication of this article would be reconsidered when the report of the board was received. Therefore Mr. MacDonald and I took the unusual course of furnishing such information as the board had at hand on

each of the points mentioned in the draft article submitted We did that instead of allowing the article to be published and the matter to be plunged into the maelstrom of controversy.

As I say, this board has some 15,000 employees and it inspects guns, Bren guns, tanks and all sorts of equipment purchased by the allied nations in Canada and the United States. To have a statement made by an employee of the board that there had been wrong inspection or something of that kind would undermine confidence, and it was felt that the examination which had been made indicated that publication perhaps would be unwarranted. At the same time as I have said, full information was given by the board.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Who made the examination?

Mr. RALSTON: The examination was made by the board, by Brigadier Howard, who is now chairman of the board since Major-General Lock has resigned, and his officials. The result was that a full statement was made with regard to these matters. I shall just give my hon. friend an answer to two of them.

Mr. STIRLING: Was the reply published?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes. The first thing my hon. friend mentioned was that about a million pairs of boots were made with inferior material.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I said that was the allegation.

Mr. RALSTON: Mr. Clark's allegation was that about one million pairs of army boots had been made with ground cork mixed with resin used as a filler between the outer sole and the inner sole in place of tarred felt filler that had formerly been used. Then follows a statement in brackets:

(Mr. Clark explains that heat from summer pavements and the heat from the soldiers' feet combined with the weight of the body when walking caused this ground cork to creep into mounds as large as two fingers inside the boots.)

The answer was:

Tarred felt or leather filler was specified and supplied until May 28, 1940—

That is nearly four years ago.

—on which date specification was changed to ground cork and resins compound (as a filler between the middle and inner soles) as the felt was unobtainable when stocks on hand were exhausted. Furthermore, skilled workmen were not available to process the leather filler, which was not in general commercial use. On December 16, 1941, when tarred felt again became available, the specifications were changed back to tarred felt. After this change in specifications had been implemented no further boots were accepted with the cork and resins compound filler.

That is the first allegation my hon. friend has made. The answer, to make it short, was that because of a lack of materials the specification had to be changed in May, 1940. The changed specifications were in effect until December 16, 1941. After December 16, 1941, tarred felt again became available and the specifications were changed.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I do not understand what the minister means when he says, "the first allegation my hon. friend has made". I said that that was the allegation made by Mr. Clark.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend has taken the responsibility for bringing it up in the house.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am asking what the government is going to do.

Mr. RALSTON: He has taken a serious responsibility. I was going to bring down the papers which have been asked for by my hon. friend, but he has seen fit to bring it up and he will have to have the statement; that is all. I do not propose to have anybody get the idea that there is anything wrong with the boots being inspected by the joint inspection board for Canada, which board has, I think, done as magnificent a job in the way of inspection of Canadian equipment as any institution anywhere in connection with this whole war. For my hon. friend to bring this up now, a two-year old complaint, made by a man dismissed in August, 1943, is for him to take quite a responsibility, and I do not blame him for trying to get out from under by saying that this is Mr. Clark's allegation.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I only asked questions which the people of Canada have the right to have answered.

Mr. RALSTON: They have been answered already in the newspapers.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: My hon. friend does not answer them by not answering them.

Mr. RALSTON: I have answered them just as my hon. friend has asked them. My hon. friend is bringing into this house an allegation made by a dismissed employee of the board, dismissed last August, and this dismissed employee himself admits, in November, 1942, that he received presents of whiskey, an irregularity which he says occurred nine months before that. That is the man my hon. friend now cites as making these charges. I am pointing out that the first charge is just two years old now, and has to do with boots the last of which were supplied two years ago. I have given the statement which was given

me by the board and which I have verified through the Department of Munitions and Supply, that on account of lack of materials a change was made in the specifications. That is the million pairs of army boots as to which Mr. Clark, my hon. friend says, makes changes, but I say that my hon. friend is in effect making the charges himself and taking responsibility for them. According to the report of the board these million pairs of inferior boots were delivered according to specifications, the specifications having had to be changed because of a lack of material.

What was my hon. friend's other question?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: It had to do with thirty thousand pairs.

Mr. RALSTON: The statement was:

More than thirty thousand pairs of army boots were made by one contractor on lasts contrary to the specifications. These lasts had hunks of leather called cheaters built on them to give the approximate measurements of the proper lasts. This practice, he says, is wrong and would produce ill-fitting boots, and is never adopted by manufacturers of good quality boots when proper fit and comfort are demanded.

And this is the answer of the board to that:

One contractor was permitted by the inspection board to use so-called "increasers" for a period of approximately three months early in 1941 as a temporary expedient at a time of change-over in lasts because he could not obtain new lasts in time to meet urgent delivery requirements.

That charge is in regard to 1941, and my hon. friend knows it. He has read this statement, and yet he stands here to-night and makes himself the mouthpiece of Mr. Clark in connection with this charge. The board's answer continues:

During that period it is estimated that he produced on these altered lasts less than—

How many?

—4,500 pairs of boots.

That was early in 1941.

. . . The fit of such boots was considered satisfactory by the inspection board.

There are the two charges to which my hon. friend has referred. The matter was brought to the attention of the department. As I say, the minister never investigated the charges. I have not time to investigate charges of that kind under those circumstances. I handed the matter over to the deputy minister; the deputy minister had the inspection board examine it, and there is the board's answer with regard to it. I say to my hon. friend that if he wants an investigation—I have consulted the Right Hon. Mr. MacDonald, the High Commissioner, and regrettable though it is that this matter should be brought up under these circumstances and at this stage two or three years after the thing occurred, Mr. MacDonald did concede that if my hon. friend wants any investigation he is welcome to it and we will see that the papers are furnished to the war expenditures committee or whoever is the proper authority to deal with it.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, I have one complaint against this item. It is like a salad, made up of things that are not supposed to go together. There is first of all: Personnel supplies and services; then food, medical and dental stores; then clothing and personal equipment. There should be a separate item for each. We should know how much is to be spent for food, how much for medical stores, and how much for dental stores.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend was not in when I gave the break-down.

Mr. POULIOT: We should not have to ask for it in the house. It should appear in the estimates before us. It should not be necessary for the minister to put it on *Hansard*. The estimates should be complete in the first place. Moreover, I complain because the minister appears to think he is gracious to give us this information. We are entitled to it; we have a right to it. He is not doing a favour to any hon. member by giving the details. We have a right to get them at firsthand, in the estimates themselves. It should not be necessary to give them in the house. They should appear in the estimates, I repeat, as was done in the last war. Why has this change been made? The minister is responsible because he is perpetually the acting Minister of Finance. It is nothing to make a joke of, and if it is to be treated as a joke I will tell again the story of Barclay's bank—and even about the empty bottles of John de Kuyper "compound gin." All these items I have mentioned are mixed up together, instead of appearing separately in the estimates, and they are mixed up deliberately in order that members of parliament may remain in a fog.

I do not agree often with the hon. member for Lake Centre, although he is a friend of mine; but he was right, from the start, in bringing forward the case he did to-night. Every member who has asked for information was right. I do not agree with their political opinions; but if an hon. member is thirsting for information, he has a right to have his thirst quenched. It is not a matter for laughter; it is nothing funny. We are responsible to the electors of this country for the expenditure of this money. Moreover, we are responsible to the army for the expenditure of this money, in order that the army

may get the most benefit from it. That is my point. It is no joke; it is a very serious matter.

The other day I mentioned to the parliamentary assistant to the minister the case of a young man who suffered with heart trouble, and who asked for a doctor and was refused a doctor, and who died that night. Then there was a case at Barriefield, where soldiers do not have the proper care they are supposed to receive. How is it that members of parliament have to complain of these things? It is a real shame that they have to be aired in the House of Commons of Canada, when there should be no complaint at all about the medical services being provided for our army. When I complained about that last year I was jeered at by the minister, but afterwards I made my case and established clearly that I was not exaggerating. Here again I should like to praise the parliamentary assistant to the minister, and I give credit to the minister, too, for understanding afterwards that the case was serious and deserved special consideration. It is not fun for me to rise now and mention these things. There is no excuse for that in our country. Soldiers should not be dealt with by the medical corps as they have been. There have been numerous instances like those I have mentioned, and it is not only in the province of Quebec that they take place. It happens also in the Simon-pure province of Ontario. You have only to go to Barriefield, and many other places to see that.

For the edification of my colleagues from other provinces I will say that in the province of Quebec we have at least fifteen non-Aryan doctors, some with names that are not even Jewish. There are some with names like Ashkezany, and other names I cannot spell. Where do they come from? They are not British. They are not French Canadian. Where do they come from? They are the doctors who examine our boys. There are at least fifteen non-Aryan, to use classical language. At least one-third of the doctors in the province of Quebec are English-speaking. When I complain that the boys have not been attended to as they should have been I put the blame on the organization as it is. It is impossible to get reforms in the province of Quebec unless the district medical officer there is fired. I have complained, but he is kept there by political strings. That is why there is no order in the medical corps in the district of Quebec.

I can speak about Montreal, too, and about the way young men are dealt with at Longueuil, how they were attended to by the non-Aryan doctors. I am thinking of a young man who suffered from a heart condition and who was told to shovel stones in a cart for a whole day. I looked after him. I fought his case for a long time. The parliamentary assistant to the minister must remember the case. He helped me. I thank him for that, but I, as a member of parliament, should not have been forced to go to the parliamentary assistant to the minister to have that wrong redressed. It is a shame that I was forced to go there. The father and mother were so thankful that after the boy, who had a weak heart and could hardly walk, was discharged from the army, they told me that they had no objection at all to the boy staying in the army if he was well enough, if his health permitted it. But when a fellow is sick like that, why should he stay in the army? He should be discharged at once, if he were examined by competent doctors.

I am not exaggerating now, but the father and mother were so thankful that they motored from Montreal at six o'clock in the morning and came to see me at Rivière du Loup the same evening. They came there to thank me for what I had done. I had not done anything except brought to the attention of the department the incompetence of some doctor.

I have other cases. I recall a boy who was staying on the farm for some time due to some misunderstanding. He was brought to the camp, and this is what happened. He was confined to barracks as a deserter, condemned to ten or twelve months. I fought his case again, and successfully. They finally decided to free him, and after months and months they found that he was unfit. He should not have been called into the army. He should not have been put in the C.B. He was unfit. Why was he a prisoner, and why did he have the shame of a deserter on his brow? It was precisely on account of the incompetence of those doctors.

Not only that, but they are snobs. Why is it that dentists and doctors have commissions and druggists have not? The druggists are snubbed by the medical corps. They are not considered as doctors although they could kill the whole German army with poisons they could prepare, and they could cure lots of our boys by giving them the proper treatments. I bring this to the attention of the minister. I hope he will reconsider it. I hope he will realize that the druggists are suffering an injustice by not receiving the same commissions as the medical doctors, the dentists and the nurses in the army. The nurse is an officer. Why should not the druggist be an officer? He is a responsible man. When somebody prescribes without being qualified the consequences must be serious. These men are leaving a profession which is honourable

and which deserves the same credit as the medical profession. I do not see why they are snubbed, why they are given the cold shoulder in the army. Those who get easy promotions in the army are those who are backed by powerful drug companies. I do not know what strings they pull, but when they belong to some big drug-making organization then they are sure to be captainized and majorized, made captains and majors. Everybody knows about that. Is it fair for a man who has taken the same course of study, incurred the same expenses to be a dentist and who belongs to that honourable profession to be treated like that? I have sent letters to the parliamentary assistant to the minister from the president of the society of druggists in the province of Quebec. I hope that matter will be considered and that the letters will be answered in due course.

Now I shall scandalize you, Mr. Chairman. There is an item in the estimates for clothing. For several years while the present Minister of National War Services was deputy minister of the Department of National Defence and when his successor, a very good man, Colonel H. Desrosiers, was in office, I succeeded in getting some second-hand clothing, especially long coats that had been worn by the soldiers, for the poor and needy, and one year just before New Year's I obtained 300 coats like that which I divided in two. I gave 150 to the needy families at Rivière du Loup, one for each family. I then had bales made of the second group, and this second-hand clothing was sent to the settlements and distributed by the parish priest or the mayor to needy families whose children could not go out in the winter because they had no clothes. I paid the freight from Quebec or Ottawa to Rivière du Loup and from Rivière du Loup to the other places where it was distributed. That clothing was of no use to the Department of National Defence. It was worn, but it was still good when it was tailored by the mothers for little children who are poor and could not go out in the winter, could not breathe fresh air, could not play in the snow. The present Minister of National War Services did it very well and so did the present deputy minister of National Defence. But finally I had a lot of difficulties on account of what had been decided by the war expenditures committee of the house. With all their learning the members of that committee decided, on the advice of some outsider, naturally an expert, that it was better to sell that kind of clothing; but there was an exception. The Indians have a right to it, but the whites cannot have it. It has gone to the Indians because if they did not get that clothing the government would have to purchase some new clothing and give it to them. They are given the second-hand clothing. If it is good for the Indians, why is it impossible for the good, red-blooded Canadians to have it? There is something else. It is sold at 12½ cents a pound to the Jews. I have been informed, and I wish to inform the minister, that some clothing has been sold to the Jews for 12½ cents a pound, some changes made and re-sold to the government afterwards as new. I do not say that as a definite matter, but I hope that the department will make an investigation into it.

I will go further than that. A friend of mine, who is the head of the colonization department in my county, wrote to someone who looks after the distribution of war material after the war and asked him if he would be given the same privilege as the Jew and if he could buy these clothes for 12½ cents a pound to distribute to the needy settlers and the poor, and he was told that he could have an answer only after the war. Well, after the war the quantity of military clothing will naturally be much less. If Canada decides to occupy the whole of Europe then we may have some old clothes, but it will be pretty hard to bring them back here.

I hope that this matter will be considered. I do not believe in these pink soap-bubbles of future felicity. If we are to have a post-war that will not be worse than the present we must organize the present at once and realize that the health of little children, not only in the cities but also in the settlements and in any other part of the country, is most valuable and is a great national asset. What is the use of thinking of doctors and of remedies when the illness of the future can be prevented? Is it not better to prevent it than to cure it? The minister would be playing the role of Good Samaritan if he would see to it that this stupid recommendation of the war expenditures committee is overruled. I do not blame the members of the committee for that; they did not know. It was suggested to me that I should get in touch with all the members of the cabinet and I waited for a time to put the matter before the committee and to bring the committee to a consideration of brass tacks and the reality of facts.

This country will never be saved by dreams, however beautiful they may be. We must realize that there is poverty in our midst and that those who are poor deserve help. It is not a pleasure to go around the departments asking for old clothes; but when it helps even a few of our fellow citizens it is worth doing; and at the present time when wool is so scarce,

when it is impossible to get good woollen clothing for the little ones, is it not reasonable to ask for the crumbs that fall from the table of the rich? Is it not reasonable to ask for the clothes that do not serve the army any longer, but which could very well serve another purpose for the betterment of living conditions in this country?

It is a serious problem. It is not a problem of rags. It is a problem of giving the needy as much as possible under the hard circumstances we are going through, and I insist upon it. I am sure that what I have said has been a revelation to many hon. members who honour me by listening to what I am telling them. But there is no humiliation in speaking of these matters when good comes out of it. Is it not possible to come to an agreement about it?

I have no objection to the Indians having their share; they were the first citizens of the country. But when they get something I do not see why the whites cannot have it too. Moreover, let us not live in the future but in the present; and let us try to improve present conditions before discussing the future. The future will be what the present is. If the present is chaotic the future will be chaotic, and there will be no order in the future unless there is order now. But we can make the present orderly, provided we have no fancy schemes suggested by brilliant economists to make us forget what the present is. We must look the present in the face and try to do our best to remedy what is wrong by using sometimes the very simple means which are at our entire disposal. The only thing for the cabinet to do is to say yes; then to-morrow the matter will be settled for this year and for the year after, and every member will be in a position, if he needs it, to have some help for his constituency. This must not be neglected; it is important.

There is a lot I could say about the health of the boys in the army, and I am greatly surprised that it was left to a layman to speak about it. I waited for a long time because I expected some doctor to raise the point. I expected some doctor to explain how the pulhems system is working. It is a most absurd concoction from the British war office.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend does not know what he is talking about. It was not invented by the British war office.

Mr. POULIOT: I will tell the minister it is very dangerous to speak to me in that way, and to-morrow I will take the trouble to explain to him what the pulhems system is. I will ask him to explain to us—

An hon. MEMBER: Address the Chair.

Mr. POULIOT: I will ask my hon. friend to keep quiet. It is a question of geography, and he is not interested in anything except the civil service and increases in salaries. I hope he will give me an opportunity to fight for my own people while he does his best to increase the salaries of the civil servants.

Progress reported.

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

Friday, February 25, 1944

The house met at three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO ASSIST MR. SPEAKER IN REVISION OF STANDING ORDERS—REQUEST FOR SUGGESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: May I address the house for a moment? This morning a meeting was held of the committee considering the rules of the house. We have proceeded to some considerable extent in our deliberations. It was thought however that some hon. members who are students of parliamentary procedure might wish to place their views before the committee at its meetings. With this in mind I would ask that any hon. member who wishes to place his views before the committee might forward a letter addressed either to me or to the Clerk of the House of Commons before Tuesday next, when any such letters as may be received will be considered by the committee.

RADIO BROADCASTING

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER ANNUAL REPORT AND REVIEW POLICIES OF CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Hon. L. R. LaFLECHE (Minister of National War Services) moved:

That a select committee be appointed on radio broadcasting to consider the annual report of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and to review the policies and aims of the corporation and its regulations, revenues, expenditures and development, with power to examine and inquire into the matters and things herein referred to and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, and to send for persons, papers and records; and that the said committee shall consist of the following members: Messrs. Bertrand (Prescott), Boucher, Casselman (Mrs.) (Edmonton East), Coldwell, Diefenbaker, Douglas (Queens), Durocher, Hansell, Hanson (Skeena), Hazen, Isnor, LaFleche, Laflamme, Macdonald (Brantford City), McCann, Martin, Matthews, Mullins, Picard, Rennie, Ross (St. Paul's), Tripp, Veniot,

and that the presence of at least nine members shall be a quorum of the said committee and that standing order 65 be suspended in relation thereto.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Does the minister purpose making an explanation first? Or does he expect us to go ahead and make some suggestions?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): He should speak.

Mr. LaFLECHE: The purpose of the motion is very well put in its present form. It is the same as it was last year, and I have no introductory remarks to make.

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to this motion I wish to place before the house for the consideration of the committee certain views and suggestions. I do this with only one thought in mind, namely, the wishes, welfare and interests of the Canadian people as a whole.

I accept the cardinal principle that radio, as an important medium of enlightenment and entertainment, should in its major aspects be national in scope, and should be and continue to be free from control by private interests. Experience over the years has shown that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has not been able to fulfil its functions without the assistance of private radio stations. I believe some seventy-six of these stations are permitted to operate subject to certain limitations in respect to increase in number, and increase in power of those already in existence. Their facilities have been used throughout the last few years for the distribution of many of the programmes of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. There is an advantage in the national system and the privately-operated stations working in cooperation; it provides stimulated competition, mutual competition, if I may say so, in the improvement of programmes.

The report of the committee which sat last year was tabled but not concurred in. Page 656 of *Votes and Proceedings* of July 22, 1943, contains a summary of the recommendations which had been made by previous committees. With your leave I should like to run over the various recommendations, to the end that I may be able to discuss the suggestions I have in mind. In 1932 they emphasized the paramount importance of a single national authority to control all broadcasting in the public interest. There can be no argument about that recommendation, but later on I shall submit that, since the national radio in recent years has become ever increasingly commercial in its scope and activities, there must be set up a new type of national authority to control broadcasting in this country. In 1932 it was recommended that the public ownership of all high-powered stations under a national system of broadcasting—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The motion before the house is to set up a committee; it is not to discuss the report of a previous committee. I would say that the discussion should be confined to the motion. Earlier in the week we spent two days trying to get a committee on war expenditures appointed. Time was taken up, not in discussing the merits of having such a committee appointed but in discussing a previous report. I do not think the time of the house should be further consumed in that way at this time. There will be an opportunity to discuss the whole radio broadcasting question on supply or on other occasions, but in the setting up of a committee I submit that the discussion should be limited to the motion. I hope my hon. friend will pardon me for having interrupted him. If he is permitted to discuss the report of a previous committee, others will wish to be given like latitude, and the time of the house will be taken up with a discussion altogether apart from the motion before the house.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: On the point of order, with due deference to the Prime Minister may I say that I was not discussing the provisions of the report. I was summing up the recommendations which were set forth in last year's report to the end that I might make certain suggestions as to what the committee should take into consideration once it is convened.

Mr. GRAYDON: The report of the last radio broadcasting committee—I think the same applies to the previous report—was brought in during the last days of the session and there was no opportunity to discuss it. While it would facilitate the work of the house not to go into too great detail in discussing this report, I fancy the house will want some latitude shown the discussion which has now arisen. I do not think it will take very long, but there are certain points that have not been discussed and I believe the house generally would wish to have them brought out. As I understand it, that is what my hon. friend is attempting to do.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Is it the idea of the Prime Minister that hon. members who were not members of the broadcasting committee will not be permitted to suggest certain questions that the committee should study during its sittings? For instance, I have some strong views about commercial advertising over the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. I am sick and tired of hearing about soap and laxatives, and I just turn off those programmes. There will be no opportunity for me to discuss these matters if the report of the committee is tabled at the end of the session and concurrence is not moved. So far as I know this is the only opportunity to discuss these matters. The Prime Minister speaks about supply. At the moment I have not in mind the item he may be thinking of, but it seems to me that this is a proper occasion upon which private members could intimate to the committee certain topics which they think should receive consideration.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend has asked me a question. Replying to the two leaders of the opposition may I say that my point is simply that there is a time for everything, and that time is governed by the rules of the house. The rules of the house afford ample opportunity to discuss all questions relating to radio broadcasting. If one wishes to do so, he may discuss radio broadcasting on the speech from the throne, at an appropriate time on supply, and on the budget and there are other occasions. The purpose of the motion is to get a committee appointed at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): To do what?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend says, "To do what?" It is to consider the annual report of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and to review the policies and aims of the corporation and its regulations, revenues, expenditures and development. The committee is to be appointed for that purpose, but that certainly does not mean that this is the time to discuss a report tabled in a previous year, or matters other than those that come strictly within the terms of the resolution.

Mr. MacINNIS: Mr. Speaker, before you give your ruling I should like to point out that there is no way in which the debate on this motion can be limited except by arrangement between the government and the opposition. It seems to me that this motion is wide open for a debate on everything connected with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. That is quite clear from a reading of the terms of reference:

> That a select committee be appointed on radio broadcasting to consider the annual report of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and to review the policies and aims of the corporation and its regulations, revenues, expenditures and development, with power to examine and inquire into the matters and things herein referred to.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that every item there is a matter for discussion in this debate—that is, if the members want to carry on a debate. I am not advocating a debate on this motion. I have nothing to say on it personally, but there is no way in my opinion, under the rules of the house, in which debate can be limited on the terms of reference here set up. The question is whether the committee shall be appointed or not. What is a member to discuss if not the matters mentioned in the terms of reference?

Mr. HANSELL: I did not quite hear what the leader of the opposition or the hon. member for York-Sunbury said, and I trust that my observations will not be repeating what they have said. They still seem to be a "still small voice crying in the wilderness."

If we are to confine our remarks to the setting up of the committee, there is nothing we can talk about. All we can do is to look over the names proposed: Messrs. Bertrand, Boucher, Mrs. Casselman, Mr. Coldwell, Mr. Diefenbaker, and the rest, and discuss the colour of their eyes and what they are wearing, and so forth. It seems to me that when a committee is being set up, hon. members of parliament have the right to express in parliament, which is supposed to be the voice of the people, what they expect of our government-owned broadcasting corporation, and of broadcasting in general in Canada, in order that the committee, when set up, may take into account the matters that have been brought before parliament by the people's representatives. I do not see how we can discuss that fully without discussing the report that was made last year.

We all know that these committee reports come down to the house in the dying hours of the session. Perhaps my hon. friends of the Progressive Conservative party were talking about that; I could not hear. But very often we have asked in the committee itself whether concurrence would be moved when the report was brought down. Sometimes concurrence is not moved on the understanding that when the committee is set up the following year we might be able to discuss further the matters

contained in the report. That is why some of us do not insist on moving concurrence in the report in the dying hours of the session. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that on this motion a review of broadcasting in Canada is entitled to discussion.

Mr. McCANN: Speaking to the point of order, among the other purposes for which this committee is being set up is to review the policies and aims and development of the corporation. In the various reports which have been submitted to parliament in the last number of years, the committee on radio broadcasting has made certain recommendations which, if carried into effect, would constitute the development of the corporation. I submit that the proper place to discuss the report of last year is before this committee when it is set up, when it can be determined whether or not the recommendations which have been made in former years have been put into operation and whether or not there has been development in any particular lines.

Mr. GRAYDON: I hope my hon. friend is not suggesting that the report of last year's committee is to be considered by this year's committee. That is what he seemed to intimate, and it strikes me as a strange suggestion.

Mr. McCANN: I see nothing strange in that. So far as development goes, I think it has been the practice to review, perhaps not minutely, what has been accomplished from year to year in putting into effect the various recommendations which have been made. I know that last year in the committee many of the recommendations which had been made by the 1942 committee were reviewed, and comment was made as to the progress and development which had been made by the corporation over the past year.

So far as moving concurrence in the report goes, it is a question of just what concurrence means, whether it means merely acceptance of the report or endorsation of the report. A report such as the committee made last year or the year before, in my judgment, might be concurred in, in the sense that it would be accepted but not necessarily endorsed, because a great many of the recommendations would take a long while for implementation and the government or corporation would have to be given considerable time to put the recommendations into effect. I submit that any member of the house could appear before the committee and give his opinions there with reference to the policies and regulations and development of the corporation, and so forth, and that the time of this house would be saved by having the discussions there rather than before the house.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, may I add, with the consent of the house, one word to what I have already said because of the Prime Minister's reply? Under the terms of reference as incorporated in this motion it is open to any hon. member to discuss each of the substantive matters referred to, that is to say, the report of the corporation; to review the policies and aims of the corporation; its regulations, revenues—and under that I suggest I could discuss soap—expenditures and development, and so on. Surely it cannot be held under the Prime Minister's suggestion that we cannot discuss those matters. If so, we might as well fold up again. The mere setting up of the committee does not confer any opportunity for discussion that is worth while for the country. What we want to discuss are the terms of reference and the subject matters to which they refer.

Mr. SLAGHT: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that confusion has arisen in the minds of some hon. members, particularly the hon. member for Macleod, who said that if we are to confine our remarks to the setting up of the committee some dire result—I did not catch just what it was—would follow. He seemed to think we ought not to confine our remarks to the question whether or not we should set up a committee, and I apprehend that the hon. member for Lake Centre is bursting with a magnificent speech on the problems to come before the committee. But is not this the point? This house could take unto itself by an appropriate resolution the consideration of the annual report and a review of the policies and aims and regulations of the corporation, and so on and so on, or it could follow the established procedure and refer these problems to a committee. I find on that committee the hon. member for Lake Centre, the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson)—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): No, I am not on it.

Mr. SLAGHT: Pardon me. That is my colleague who represents the distinguished constituency of Skeena.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): A good name, you know, but—

Mr. SLAGHT: It is. I can understand the urge in the minds of many hon. members to discuss this matter, and at the appropriate time I want to discuss it as well. But after all we are facing to-day, with reference to the problems involved in this resolution, the simple question, shall we have a committee set up? What for? To hear witnesses, receive evidence, delve into the facts regarding the

matters which will ultimately be dealt with? Or shall we do all that in the House of Commons? Now, surely it was never intended under our rules that you should turn a resolution on the question of a committee or no committee to consider a given project like this, into a matter for a round debate on all the problems on which the committee itself will have to take evidence and ultimately report back to the house.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that your ruling should be that hon. members confine themselves to the question whether the personnel of the committee is or is not satisfactory. I understand, although I do not know definitely, that it has been usually chosen after conference with the whips; that gentlemen who have special knowledge of the subject are placed on the committees. Or are we to have a debate here and now for a day or more or less on the very problems as to which the committee is appointed to take evidence? You do not ask juries to bring in their verdicts before they have heard the evidence. I suggest to hon. members that if they stifle their appetite to talk, as the hon. member for York-East (Mr. McGregor) described it the other night—I do not agree with him—

An hon. MEMBER: The minister did.

Mr. SLAGHT: —we shall have an opportunity of rendering a considered judgment after they get all the facts which the committee will seek to obtain during its operations. You can multiply debate in this house; you can discuss it now and discuss it all over again in committee and again on the report. May I point out that any hon. member has a right to move concurrence in a report. In this case the complaining members have never so moved; any of the hon. members who have spoken could have placed upon the order paper a resolution asking a review of the policies of the corporation, and so could have got a debate on them. This has not been done. I suggest the rule is plain, the situation is clear, and we should not delay the many important war measures to come before this house by an auxiliary or preliminary and supplementary debate, when the evidence and the facts can all be investigated in the committee and the matter debated at the proper time.

Mr. POULIOT: Let us come back to fundamentals. The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation committee will be composed of twenty-three members. The membership of the house is 245. Is it right to say that 222 members will be prevented from expressing their views on the motion to appoint this committee in order that the committee may have the advantage of the wisdom of the 221 members?—excluding myself; that is why I say 221 instead of 222. But I have listened carefully to what has been said. It is true that we have important war problems to discuss, but public information is one of them, and if hon. members are precluded from expressing their views at the time of an appointment of a committee which is to supervise the work of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, there is no use in members of parliament expressing their opinions in these matters. Naturally, the report of the committee may be discussed in this chamber when it is brought up. But when is that? As a rule it is at the last stage of the session, when everything is railroaded, when hon. members are told that it is time to go home, that it is very warm in Ottawa, that everybody is sick of the session and has had enough of it. Besides that, sir, what is the use of appointing the committee without discussion when the committee's report, naturally, —for it cannot be done otherwise—is not discussed until after it is brought before the house?

Besides this, sir, I am a traditionalist. From time immemorial when hon. members had anything to say about the appointment of a committee they had the right to say it, and unless the rules of the house are changed I do not see how such a practice could be changed.

I ask you, sir, kindly to weigh the pro and con in your wisdom, upon which we rely, in order that the best national use shall be made of the C.B.C. No one will deny the importance of that organization to keep the home front well informed and in good spirit. For all these considerations, sir, I hope you will give a ruling which will be in accordance with the jurisprudence that you have established during your occupancy of the Chair.

Mr. KNOWLES: Speaking to the point of order raised by the Prime Minister, I should like to refer for a moment to *Hansard* of 1943, pages 931-937. At that time there was before the house a similar motion, one for the setting up of a select committee to examine and report on a plan relating to social security. The Prime Minister, who moved the motion, made a speech covering six pages dealing with the speech from the throne, which we had already debated; the war effort, dominion-provincial relations, the Atlantic charter, and quite a number of other matters. I felt at the time that they did pertain to the matter of setting up a committee on social security, and did not, nor did anyone else, raise a point of order, feeling that he was perfectly in order in debating the whole subject of social security at that time. There followed a debate which

lasted two or three days, because of the precedent set by the Prime Minister, and I feel that the precedent he set at that time is one that we should be right in following to-day.

Mr. SPEAKER: I could wish that I had more time for deliberation on a point, which is so important, which has been raised as to the procedure of the house. It has been the practice in the past in the setting-up of these committees that a debate ensue, in some cases with wide latitude; in others, more restricted. I find in May, 13th edition, page 307, that:

> On a motion for the appointment of a select committee or for determining the number of its members, the merits of the matter referred to the committee have not been allowed to be debated.

In the motion before the house both the appointment of the committee and the order of reference are included. The terms of that motion almost invite discussion:

> That a select committee be appointed on radio broadcasting to consider the annual report of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and to review the policies and aims of the corporation and its regulations, revenues, expenditures and development, with power to examine and inquire into the matters and things herein referred to and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, and to send for persons, papers and records. . . .

As I say, the terms of the motion almost invite discussion, but I do not think it would be well for the discussion to take the latitude that has been allowed in the past, in similar proceedings, especially if a report, the property of the house, tabled in a previous session, should now be made the subject of discussion. I may feel disposed later on, after further consideration, to reconsider the view I am now stating, but at the moment my inclination is to allow hon. members freedom to discuss the motion, for the purpose not of dealing with matters that belong to the past, arising out of the report of the committee of last year, but of considering exclusively the aims and objects of the committee now to be set up. I realize, of course, how difficult it will be for hon. members to make the distinction between what is actually past and what pertains to the moment; nevertheless I hope that hon. members will confine their remarks as precisely, as simply and as briefly as possible, to the purposes of the motion, which is to set up the committee. The hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) intimated that he was referring to the recommendations of the report of last year in order to lay the foundation for a discussion of the aims and objects of the committee that is to be formed, and on that ground I would rule that he may proceed.

[Mr. Knowles.]

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The point I was endeavouring to make, Mr. Speaker, is that there are certain salient principles which we all accept, irrespective of party in this house, in connection with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. One of these is the coordination of all broadcasting in Canada through the vesting of exclusive control in a nationally-owned system, and the independence of the corporation from partisan control, to be ensured by its constitution. We urge that the independence and flexibility of the national broadcasting authority be thus established.

I wish now to refer to these cardinal principles, to apply them to the situation as it exists to-day, and to ask whether or not the policies and aims and regulations of the corporation, to use the words of the motion, have actually been carried into effect.

First, the general manager, according to the by-laws of the corporation, is the chief executive officer, and is responsible for the carrying out of the provisions of the Canadian Broadcasting Act. For a long time this important corporation, which can contribute so much to the war effort of the nation, has had no general manager, no executive head. In recent months, owing to failure on the part of the government to appoint a general manager and administrative head, chaos has resulted. One of the greatest dangers facing this corporation is the possibility that it may become a political football. Many are apprehensive that because of the lack of directive in the last few months, their fears regarding the corporation may be justified.

In my opinion the present board of governors as such has lost the confidence of the people. On that board there are men of ability, and I compliment the government on its recent appointments giving representation to labour and agriculture. But in order that the confidence of the people in the corporation and in its members may be restored, all the members of the board of governors should put their resignations in the hands of the government, and the government should reappoint such of them as it believes will carry out the great principles of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as enunciated in the reports of the committees of the house in successive years. To do otherwise at this time is to endanger the future of the corporation.

When I look at the situation that has obtained during recent months, I ask myself this question: Why has not the government acted? President Thomson of the university of Saskatchewan has long since returned to the university. Months have passed by and

the corporation moves without direction, without the controlling influence of a man of the calibre necessary to fill the position of chairman of the board.

I know that members in all parts of the house will demand, as they have a right to do, that this corporation shall not be permitted to become a political instrument; nor must it be permitted to get into such a position that anyone can suspect such a thing as possible. That is why it is so necessary at this time, in the midst of war, when there is no greater institution than the radio for mobilizing public opinion, that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation should have directive leadership.

Radio is one of the great instruments for the mobilization of a nation; it can do more than any other to arouse public opinion. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and other ministers often speak, and the influence of their addresses is immeasurably enhanced by the dissemination afforded by the facilities of the corporation and of private companies affiliated therewith.

A national radio system must be available to all political parties. It must not be subject in any way to governmental control in that regard. If it is, then the sources of educated public opinion are destroyed. This corporation can carry out its great responsibilities and duties only if it commands the confidence of the people, only if it is free, untrammelled and devoid of any influence exercised by the government either directly or indirectly.

I have referred to the appointment of a representative of agriculture and one of labour. The leader of the opposition, over a period of years, has advocated representation for these two great bodies, and I suggest now for the consideration of the committee, seeing that the radio and the press are complementary, that one of the appointments to be made to the board of governors should be a representative of the press of Canada. I have advocated in the past that there should be a representative of the Canadian Daily Newspapers Association on the board of governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Because the press of Canada works so generously in cooperation with the broadcasting corporation, and because the activities of the corporation should be correlated to bring them in line with the activities of the press, I believe such a step should be taken.

The appointment without further delay, of a general manager and a strong board of governors would restore confidence in the corporation, and the independence of this great instrument as a benefit to the Canadian people would be safeguarded.

I come now to my second point. I believe in the necessity of a government-owned national corporation. I do not need to go into the arguments in support of that. I do not believe in monopoly. The private stations, whose contribution to public and civic service is beyond praise, have also a necessary place in our set-up. When you think of the privately-owned radio stations in this country you think of community effort. In the Prime Minister's constituency of Prince Albert there is a privately-owned radio station, one that has done much, as have all the others across the country, in behalf of the community and the welfare of the people as a whole. It has made an important contribution to the victory loan campaigns, and to charitable and patriotic drives. The private radio stations give their facilities to the broadcasting corporation for the benefit of the tastes of their own listeners. They represent the epitome of unselfish public and civic service in whatever towns and districts they happen to be located. To-day the position is that all the private radio stations are under the control of the broadcasting corporation.

May I refer to sections 21 and 22 of the Canadian Broadcasting Act in order to place before the house the power that the broadcasting corporation has over the private broadcasting companies in Canada:

21. No private station shall operate in Canada as a part of a chain or network of stations except with the permission of, and in accordance with the regulations made by, the corporation.

22. (1) The corporation may make regulations:

(a) to control the establishment and operation of chains or networks of stations in Canada;

(b) to prescribe the periods to be reserved periodically by any private station for the broadcasting of programmes of the corporation;

(c) to control the character of any and all programmes broadcast by corporation or private stations;

(d) to determine the proportion of time which may be devoted to advertising in any programmes broadcast by the stations of the corporation or by private stations, and to control the character of such advertising.

(6) In case of any violation or non-observance by a private station of the regulations made by the corporation under this section, the corporation may order that the licence of such private station be suspended for a period not exceeding three months and any such order shall be forwarded to the minister who shall forthwith communicate the same to the licensee of the station and shall take such steps as may be necessary to carry out the terms of such order.

These provisions may have been fitting and proper when the Act was passed, having regard to the conditions then in existence, but tre-

mendous changes have since taken place. The broadcasting corporation has become strongly commercial in its offerings over the radio. There has been a pronounced change in that regard. It was originally intended that advertising should not bring in more than $500,000 a year. In 1940 the commercial revenue of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation was $700,000; in 1941, it was $895,000; in 1942 it was $1,019,000; in 1943, $1,204,000. No doubt an equal or a greater amount will be taken from advertising during the current year.

In the interests of all I believe the time has come when some limitation should be placed on the extent of commercial advertising over the facilities of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Altogether too much time is being devoted to the sloppy sentimentality that often characterizes some of the radio advertising. These and other things will not be controlled under the law as it now stands; because the corporation now makes the decisions that affect not only itself but the rights of the private stations. I therefore suggest that the committee should study the question with a view to preventing monopoly, with a view to protecting the rights of all parties, public and private, and in particular the rights and powers of private stations in relation to the public corporation. An independent body should be set up, a body similar in legal standing to the board of transport commissioners, or, as my hon. friend from York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) suggests, similar to the radio commission in the United States.

The situation to-day is peculiar. The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is more and more becoming a commercial corporation, its board of governors enjoying almost monopolistic control over its competitors. The private stations, in competition with the broadcasting corporation, are subject to the provisions I have already mentioned. Where the private stations bring their objections to the corporation to be adjudicated they find that they are bringing them to a competitor. In other words the radio corporation exercises of itself a semi-judicial function. In determining the rights as between private and public corporation, the broadcasting corporation is in the position of being both litigant and judge, both investigator and jury. It is in the position of being, as someone has said, a cop and a competitor. Therefore I suggest that in order to restore confidence it is absolutely necessary that a body such as I have advocated be established.

I come now to the question of censorship. I should like the minister to explain one thing. To what extent is there censorship? To what extent is it applicable to the commentators who use the facilities of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and are in receipt of payment from the corporation for the services they render? I find considerable interest in this matter. Do those who speak as commentators submit verbatim statements of what they intend to say before they use the national facilities? Are they in any different position from political speakers, if you like, representatives of the different parties who utilize the facilities of the corporation from time to time? Must they submit manuscripts? On February 20 an outstanding commentator from Vancouver, Mr. Elmore Philpott, in a broadcast dealt with the case of the former commander in chief of the Canadian Army, Lieutenant-General McNaughton. He made certain suggestions and certain statements. I have not before me the verbatim report of what he said, and in my summary I do not wish to be unfair, but it left the impression with those who heard it that he was stating that Canada had been fighting two wars, not only one with the enemy, but another with the war office over the question of the right of the Canadian Army to operate as a unit. After the government had said it was not in the public interest to discuss the matter, parliamentary leaders refrained from doing so. Yet, after that agreement, based upon the question of public safety, this commentator over the facilities of the corporation was able to discuss matters which by reason of public interest were not considered a proper subject of discussion.

I should like the minister to explain this: Was this broadcast made with the approval of the broadcasting corporation? Was it submitted to any representative of the board? Was it subject to censorship? If it was subject to censorship, by whom was the manuscript censored, and when? These are questions which I believe must be answered by the minister on behalf of the government.

There are various other matters with which I could deal, but they can be discussed later. To sum up, I say that we, all of us, must rebuild the highest confidence in the corporation, first, by the appointment of a board of governors having the confidence of the people of Canada, with representatives as at present of agriculture, labour, the press, and others; second, by the appointment now of a general manager; third, by the setting up of a semi-judicial body to adjudicate upon the claims of the corporation and those of the private operators, and, finally, by giving the people knowledge of the basis upon which broadcasts are made and the degree of censorship applied thereto.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, the appointment of this committee affords one the opportunity to review, not the matters discussed by earlier committees, but those which should be considered by the committee about to be set up. For a number of years, the house has annually reiterated certain fundamental principles in relation to our broadcasting system. We have endorsed the paramount necessity of setting up a single authority which will control broadcasting in the public interest. Every year we have supported the public ownership of all high-powered stations, to be operated under that single national authority. We have endorsed also the principle that the local or community stations fulfil a useful function and serve a useful purpose in the Canadian broadcasting picture. We have approved the coordination of broadcasting in Canada through the exclusive control being vested in the nationally owned system. Control of what? Of the character of all the programmes, political or otherwise, broadcast by all stations, and of their advertising content. We have approved the national control of all wire networks used to carry broadcast programmes.

Year after year, ever since the establishment of the corporation, the house has endorsed these principles. Undoubtedly in the country to-day there is a powerful attempt to upset the very basis of the act which established the corporation, indeed to destroy that corporation itself, a national organization which laboriously this parliament has built up. Sometimes I fear that even hon. members, perhaps unconsciously, lend themselves, to that kind of propaganda. In recent days we have heard accusations in the house that certain people in the corporation favour, we will say, the C.C.F.—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. COLDWELL: On the other hand the C.C.F. believes that, as a matter of fact, we have been discriminated against—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. COLDWELL: —in the dissemination of news. Now, just a moment. The other day certain specific statements were made in the house. The hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell) rose in his place and made the statement, for example, that in the night bulletin of February 4 undue prominence was given the leader of the C.C.F. over the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon). So, as was my right, I sent for the script, and I am going to place it on record. This is a copy of the official script from the broadcasting corporation.

Mr. GRAYDON: Did the hon. member hear the broadcast?

Mr. COLDWELL: I did not hear the broadcast, but I got the official script from the broadcasting corporation.

Mr. GRAYDON: That might not be proof.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The hon. member knows that is not evidence of what was said.

Mr. COLDWELL: I beg my hon. friend's pardon. This is the official script from which the announcer gave the news broadcast on that particular evening.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is what the hon. member is told, but it is no evidence that he used that script.

Mr. COLDWELL: I am prepared to take the statement of the responsible officials of the corporation, besides those who listened to the broadcast that evening told me the statement made in the house by the hon. member for Macleod was incorrect.

Mr. HANSELL: I heard it.

Mr. COLDWELL: I am prepared to take the statement of those who heard the broadcast, and I place the script on record as follows:

> In the House of Commons to-day Prime Minister Mackenzie King indicated that the government might have a statement to make regarding General McNaughton when the Minister of National Defence (Colonel Ralston) spoke on the war appropriation bill.
>
> Mr. King made this suggestion after two party leaders of the opposition asked that the government make a statement on General McNaughton's resignation.
>
> The Progressive Conservative house leader (Mr. Graydon) said he was amazed at the position taken by the government. He said the government had said that General McNaughton had left the command of the Canadian Army overseas because of ill health, but General McNaughton had been quoted in the newspapers as saying that he was in good health. Mr. Graydon said the government should explain immediately.
>
> The C.C.F. leader (Mr. Coldwell) suggested that the whole question be discussed next Monday, but Mr. King replied that he would have to consider the length of time the debate on the speech from the throne would continue.

There is a fair and accurate statement of what actually occurred in the house that afternoon. The script simply recites the facts as a news item.

I have a much longer one, having to do with another occasion. A broadcast of the national

news on February 9 was criticized in the house on the ground that undue prominence was given to the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Douglas). I am not going to read that script, because it is too long. May I point out however that fifty-two lines are given to members of the government and of the opposition. To the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Douglas) —and I have counted every part line I could— six lines are given. Let us try to keep a proper perspective in these matters, and see to it that we in the House of Commons, in making criticisms without first of all having a basis for them, do not ourselves undermine the corporation in the minds of the people.

Throughout the existence of this corporation this parliament has urged support for a single national authority, and that the affairs of the corporation be conducted by a general manager and an assistant general manager responsible to the board of governors. Parliament itself—the corporation is a creature of parliament, not a department of government— has endeavoured on every occasion to enact legislation to safeguard the complete independence of the broadcasting corporation. As a trustee for the people of Canada and of those who pay licence fees, the board of governors reports to this parliament through the committee we are to set up to-day.

We have been told that the ministers of the crown are merely channels of communication between the board of governors and the government of Canada. That has been iterated and reiterated before the committee on numerous occasions. As late as last June 9 I questioned the minister closely on this point, and I have a transcript of that evidence before me. I did so because I had some doubts as to whether the minister was carrying out the intentions of the act and not interfering in any way with the broadcasting corporation. My concluding question was whether there had been any interference, and the minister said:

> There has not been any exercise of any political pressure or any attempt made to dominate the board politically and I believe the same goes for those who were in the position before I was.

Since that time there has been evidence of direct political interference with the broadcasting corporation. On November 17 last the Minister of National War Services (Mr. LaFleche) issued a statement to the press in which he indicated clearly that he had interfered directly with the management of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. He announced that a series of broadcasts planned by the corporation had been suspended. I use the word "suspended," because while most of the newspaper reports used the word "cancelled," subsequently it was shown that the series had been suspended. I think this is the first time on record that any minister has taken unto himself the right to interfere with the management of the broadcasting corporation. The minister's statement was:

> The acting general manager of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation recently discussed with me an item of Things to Come which have been proposed for the CBC programmes.

It matters not whether hon. members were or were not in approval of that programme; the fact remains that the management of the corporation is in the hands of the board of governors; the minister had no right to issue any statement suspending a programme of the corporation, nor had the assistant general manager any right to place this matter before the minister instead of before the board of governors. The board of governors was the only authority that should have been called together if there was any doubt about this programme. As I say, the general manager should not have consulted the minister, or, if he did, the minister should have refused to give any opinion. The act is quite clear as to the functions of the minister, and, as I say, at no time has any other minister misunderstood its provisions.

This house has always recognized the danger of political interference and has endeavoured to safeguard the corporation in every way. The minister had no more right to interfere with the programmes of the C.B.C. than he had to interfere with the programmes of any private radio station. His authority is strictly limited by the broadcasting act. The government itself must to a large extent assume responsibility for the condition into which the broadcasting corporation has fallen. They retained, I think inadvisedly, the board of governors against which the committee of 1942 made very strong recommendations. I say without fear of contradiction that a great deal of the difficulty and the undermining of the corporation was due to the kind of person who was general manager up to the middle of 1942. We know now from his own written record that that gentleman admitted that in his activities in Great Britain before he came here he went to the British Broadcasting Corporation in order to safeguard the rights of what he called private enterprise, in whose employ he is to-day.

I am not going to pursue that. During the following year the gentleman who was appointed as acting general manager, Doctor Thomson of the university of Saskatchewan, did a job upon which we can well congratulate him. He raised again the standard of the

C.B.C. and restored it considerably in the public esteem. The failure of the governors to appoint a competent general manager since he left is in my opinion responsible to a large extent for the condition in which we find the broadcasting corporation now. I am certain that the people of Canada are anxious that this parliament and this government shall safeguard this great vehicle of information, this great educational arm, against private interference of any sort.

The dangers of handing over the control of such a corporation or of its facilities to purely private profit-making organizations are recognized even by those in the employ of some of the great private profit-making radio corporations. If hon. members will look up page 247 of appendix No. 1 of the proceedings of the special committee of last year they will find recorded a remarkable address given by Doctor James R. Angell, public service counseller of the National Broadcasting Company of the United States. I noticed in the newspapers that he was in Quebec a few days ago attending a radio convention. He said that the first concern of private broadcasting companies in the United States was that of making money, and of making as much of it as possible. If I may quote his speech in part:

> Critics of the system are also disposed to raise the question as to who really owns our broadcasting. The obvious answer would be the stockholders or the individual owners and, from the legal point of view, this is undoubtedly the correct answer. But when one gets behind the scenes and discovers what part is played by sponsors and by agencies who act as middle-men between the sponsor and the broadcasting company, this answer may be regarded as not quite telling the whole story. If, by leasing the facilities of a broadcasting company for a given period of time, an agency or a sponsor can in fact largely determine what the public shall hear, the practical effect is much the same as though the sponsor and the agency actually owned these facilities. Naturally, the management of a company exercises final control over the programme which goes on the air. Nevertheless, there is still a measure of truth in the old adage—that he who pays the piper can call the tune.

A little later he said this:

> No one can think it strange therefore that, as compared with the ringing tones of the sponsor and the advertising agency, the voices of the church and the school, to mention only these two, are often going to sound rather distant and faint in the broadcaster's ears.

In discussing the soap programmes, to which the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) indicated some objection or dislike, and which I myself have often criticized, Doctor Angell said this:

> Now there are many who deplore the fact that an industry in which truly enduring and basic public interests are involved, one potentially capable of doing so much to educate taste, to increase understanding, to deepen and strengthen the foundations of our national life, should so often yield to the itch for money and, in consequence, should so frequently indulge in puerile forms of entertainment appealing to the very low brackets of intelligence, on the assumption that only by programmes of that kind can the goods be sold that chiefly support radio.

Just one more quotation from the same address: He said:

> I have met a great many owners and managers of American broadcasting stations in my time and found them fine upstanding business men, but I have infrequently met any whose concern for the public service they were rendering could be mentioned in the same breath with their interest in making money.

I think we should profit by the experience of this man, who has been so closely associated with the National Broadcasting Company. When I have time I listen to radio programmes, and while there is much in our national broadcasting programmes that we may criticize, I say without fear of contradiction that the absence of advertising on so many of our programmes and the attempts that are being made by the broadcasting corporation over the national network to raise the standards of tastes in music, drama and so forth, deserve favourable comment. They have done and are doing a job of which, in many respects, we may be well proud. Some programmes we can criticize, but on the whole the absence of advertising and the type of programme produced compare very favourably with the constant advertising content of the programmes of the great American broadcasting chains. Remember, the words I have quoted this afternoon are not mine but those of the public service counsellor of the greatest privately-owned broadcasting organization in the world, and it was to ensure for the people of Canada radio services that would be freed from the influences to which Doctor Angell refers, that our broadcasting corporation was established.

It is the duty of parliament to see that this corporation is not destroyed. Money-making interests are anxious to undermine it. It appears to me, as it does to many others, that the government has failed in some instances to appoint the right kind of persons to the board of governors. It has appointed persons not sufficiently interested in the subject even to attend, as we found in the broadcasting committees of former years, a sufficient number of the meetings of the board of governors.

Speaking of the board of governors and the right kind of appointments thereto, I congratulate the government upon having appointed recently to the board of governors a man of the type of Mr. Parker of the Mani-

toba wheat pool, the head of a great cooperative farm organization. I am sure that he will bring to the corporation the point of view of the large number of people who want to cooperate in maintaining this great and effective national service. Of course, there are others of the same type on the board; I am not saying it is true of the whole board, because it has seemed to some of us that some have not taken a sufficient interest in the corporation to do what was required of them.

There are other matters I have in mind, but since I am a member of the committee I shall not detain the house to discuss them now, they can well be brought before the committee itself. I want to say, however, to the government, that the committee of last year and the year before were anxious that Canada's voice should be heard across the air waves of the world, and that to this end a short-wave broadcasting station might be built as rapidly as possible. I do not know just at what stage it is, but in the final analysis it is a matter of money, and at this stage of the war, when we are hoping that within a measurable time we may see its end—although it may be further away than some of us hope—it would be well that Canada's voice be heard on occasion by the oppressed peoples of Europe, by the people of South America and other parts of the world. It is of vital importance that Canada, of which we can well be proud, a country which has attained first place among the smaller nations, should maintain the closest contact with other nations, particularly the small nations, and I am therefore most anxious to see our short-wave broadcasting station completed at the earliest possible moment. We make heavy contributions in mutual aid to our allies. It seems to me a relatively small thing to ask that the necessary equipment for this Canadian short-wave broadcasting station should be given special priority. Construction has been delayed now for some months. I appeal to the government to see to it that the station be completed soon.

These are some of the matters I wished to place before the house, because I feel we have a duty not only to ourselves and to the people of to-day, but also to posterity. A former leader of the Conservative party, Right Hon. R. B. Bennett, said on more than one occasion in this house he was quite sure that if the people of Canada had to do things over again, such as the building of great railway systems, they would never allow these railways to get away from the public control; and, he added, how much more important it is that we should not allow the air and the air waves to be alienated from the complete control of the people of Canada. I concur entirely in that opinion.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): I am prompted to say a word or two with respect to the setting up of this committee on radio broadcasting and the matter of broadcasting generally. The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) has referred to a statement I made the other night in respect to a certain proportion of publicity being given his party. That has need for some comment; for since making that statement I have had numerous requests for further information. I have had letters and telephone calls asking me for an explanation; many have congratulated me on the statements I made in bringing this matter to the attention of parliament, and of course it goes without saying there were some who severely criticized me. I shall not deal with that matter at the moment. I will come to my hon. friend a little later.

I know there are views held in Canada in respect to greater control of radio, and there are views in respect to government ownership. Some people believe in government ownership because they hold that the profits that accrue to private industry should be turned back to the public. I am sure that this principle under the present economic system is very greatly misunderstood. However, even granting for argument's sake—I say, for argument's sake—that the principle has some merit, I am certain that when it is applied to national radio broadcasting it becomes only a pretext to focus public opinion on a less important principle, without recognition of the real danger, namely, that of national radio gradually becoming a huge monopoly of government propaganda. Imagine a situation in which a government has the sole right—excluding all others, the government being the only authority—to mould public thought; and may I interject that I should not like to see that day come with a socialist government in power.

Mr. COLDWELL: Or any other government.

Mr. LaFLECHE: There won't be.

Mr. HANSELL: No, or any other government. I will add that, but I am making a distinction by emphasizing a socialist government, because our socialist friends do believe in control.

Mr. COLDWELL: Democratic control—which you do not have under private enterprise.

Mr. HANSELL: My hon. friend likes to interject, and I have no objections. In his speech this afternoon he advocated a greater measure of government control of radio broadcasting.

Mr. COLDWELL: Public control.

Mr. HANSELL: However, for the moment I am not dealing with that. I was talking about profits; and, since the matter of radio profits has been brought to the attention of this country by discussion at previous sittings of the radio committee, I am going to suggest that some investigation be made of that part of commercial broadcasting where profits accruing to the sponsors are involved. I do not now refer to profits which might be made by private stations, although I have no objection to investigation there also. I am not so strongly convinced that huge profits are being made by the private broadcasting stations of Canada. I refer in this respect particularly to profits of commercial sponsors in relation to advertising costs. Commercial broadcasting is essentially a business of advertising, and these advertising costs, paid for by commercial sponsors, I am told run into hundreds of thousands of dollars, or, taking the whole continent, millions upon millions of dollars a year. These advertising costs must be written into the price of products advertised, with the result that the consumer pays the shot. I know that it does not always work out that way, because I realize there is the principle that when a product has sufficient advertising to give it a sufficient volume of distribution it can be produced at a less cost than otherwise. That factor enters into the matter, but it does not make any difference in respect to some investigations which I think should be carried on in that respect. I do not know that it is the duty of the radio committee to do that. It might be the duty of the banking and commerce committee or some other committee of the kind. But I believe that such an investigation would throw quite a light on that subject.

For instance, I have a chart here which gives the talent cost of certain radio programmes. This talent cost is not the whole cost which a sponsor will have to pay. The talent cost of the Jack Benny programme is $20,000 for one programme.

Mr. MARTIN: Jack Benny gets $25,000 a week.

Mr. HANSELL: I do not know what his salary may be.

Mr. MITCHELL: Is that the Canadian cost or the international cost?

Mr. HANSELL: No, he is paid by the sponsors of the products, General Foods.

Mr. KNOWLES: We all pay for it.

Mr. HANSELL: Well, you may. That is my argument. The talent costs for the Bob Hope programme are $11,000.

Mr. MARTIN: He is worth it.

Mr. HANSELL: I am sorry; I do not agree with my hon. friend. I do not believe any man is worth $10,000 to read—I am going to say this in spite of the risk of unpopularity—a lot of silly gags which some other men behind the scenes have written up for him.

Mr. MARTIN: What about Charlie McCarthy?

Mr. HANSELL: Well, Charlie McCarthy, the wooden-head, gets $10,000 every time he broadcasts. The Lux Theatre gets $10,000 a programme; Bing Crosby, $10,000; Abbott and Costello, $10,000, and so forth and so on.

Mr. MARTIN: What does Mortimer Snerd get?

Mr. HANSELL: I would not mind being a comedian myself if I were able to get such a salary. But what I was saying is that these are the talent costs, and commercial sponsors have to pay for radio time besides that, on, I believe, anywhere from 100 to 200 stations.

While I am talking about this talent might I make this observation, and I do it on behalf of a minority of people. There are some of us who like to regard the Sabbath as the Lord's day, and yet I find that four of the most outstanding comedians, namely, Fred Allen, Jack Benny, Bob Hope and Charlie McCarthy—perhaps I should say Edgar Bergen—come on the air on Sunday; and since the new network has been set up in Canada some of them have crowded out church services. I do not like that. I know that Sunday is a good day for broadcasting because people are at home and listen to the radio and they naturally listen to these programmes. But we are permitting the commercialization of the Sabbath.

Mr. FAIR: The destruction of Christianity.

Mr. HANSELL: It is one instance of the thin end of the wedge to destroy our great Christian principles, and I abhor it. I am not going to say that we should make them come on the air on some other day because we have no control over that. They are United States broadcasts and there is not very much we can do about the matter. I understand, however, that representations have been made for other programmes to come over Canadian stations. For example, the Tabernacle choir of Salt Lake City is, I believe, one of the greatest on the North American continent. I have heard it. It would come in the east here about twelve noon on Sunday, but I am quite certain that people in eastern Canada do not get it. They might get it from a Buffalo station or some other station in that vicinity, but the people

in this part of the country cannot get that programme, and yet it is one of the best, one of the highest types. I mention that in passing.

I come back to the argument with regard to the cost of broadcasting being put into the price of goods, or otherwise. There is another thing that happens. I understand that the advertising costs of a corporation are written into its cost sheets and therefore are not subject to taxation. They are hidden. If I am not right I stand corrected.

An hon. MEMBER: There is a limit.

Mr. HANSELL: Perhaps so. If there is it is a good thing. But I am simply saying that any taxation which might accrue to the public treasury by reason of the lowering of advertising costs would be a good thing; or conversely the public are paying by reason of a loss of revenue, a part of the advertising costs of these corporations. All these things enter into the picture.

I must spend a little time commenting on the matter my hon. friend the member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) brought up. I do not blame him for raising it because it has been mentioned. I call the attention of the house to what my hon. friend said about my remarks the other night. I said he had been given undue publicity, as I thought, on a certain night when, over the air, came the news that the leader of the opposition had asked about the McNaughton affair. Of course, when I mentioned it my hon. friend had to trot down to the office of the corporation and dig out the news broadcast to see if I was right. He claims, of course, that I was not right. There is one question I will ask him. If, when reading that news broadcast, he had found that I was right, would he have read it here this afternoon? However, there is one thing he did not do. He did not check the statement I made. Oh, no; he runs to the C.B.C. This is what I said:

> I might make a further comment—and I am not blaming my hon. friend for this; perhaps he wanted to get a little publicity, and believe me he got it. I happened to listen in on the radio to the two programmes that night.

I did not say that the C.B.C. mentioned him twice. You see, my hon. friend was wrong again. I said further:

> The leader of the opposition was mentioned once in connection with the McNaughton question and my friend the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar was mentioned twice.

That is what I heard when I listened to these two broadcasts and I might make this observation. This is a very minor matter perhaps, and I would not bring it up had it not been for the fact that this matter of the C.B.C. publicizing my good friends the C.C.F., and particularly my hon. friend the member for Rosetown-Biggar, had been brought to my attention before by many people. I went home after the last session. After driving home from the station I went down town. The first man I met put out his hand and said, "How do you do, Mr. Hansell? Glad to see you back." Then he said, "How is it that the C.B.C. are always talking about this man Coldwell?" That was man number one. I talked with this gentleman for a moment or two and when I moved on a pace another gentleman met me and, of course, shook hands, "How do you do, Mr. Hansell? Glad to see you back; been away a long time?" I said, "Yes, six months or so," and he, too, made the same comment about my hon. friend. I thought to myself, this is rather strange. However, when I went a few paces farther a third gentleman met me, and lo and behold he made the same comment. Incidentally he said, "When was this man elected?" I said, "In 1935." "Well," said he, "where has this man been all these years? I didn't hear very much about him until the past few months or so."

An hon. MEMBER: He wasn't good news.

Mr. HANSELL: Maybe he was not. My friends are jibing me now. Now they say he is good news. Well, he may be, and so are the Katzenjammer Kids. I was not particularly alarmed when the third man spoke up in that way; but living in Ottawa and attending the parliamentary session I must confess I do not listen to the radio news a great deal, because it comes on at an hour when we are sitting or when we are not in our offices. When these men made this comment I recalled a certain incident that occurred during the last session of parliament. The debate in the afternoon was on the estimates of the Minister of Finance and we were discussing an appropriation of half a million dollars in respect of the woollen industry. The hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) is quite a student, and when he undertakes to master a subject he gets his books and he masters it. I think I can say that on that afternoon the hon. member for Lethbridge was master of the situation; when for an entire afternoon he engaged the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) in a debate on one of the most important subjects in this country, the woollen industry. That is all right. At eight o'clock that night the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) came on and during the course of the debate the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar walked

in, rose and made a little speech, which recommended that medical services should be distributed a little more adequately throughout the country. It did not take any brains to figure that out.

Mr. COLDWELL: None whatever.

Mr. HANSELL: The hon. member did not need a variety of books around him to figure that one out; yet he rose and spoke as others did. I recall I went up to my office at ten o'clock; I switched on my little radio unconsciously; I was not expecting to get anything in particular, and the C.B.C. news came on. Lo and behold, what did they report on parliament? "Mr. Coldwell"—it is always Mr. Coldwell—"the leader of the C.C.F. advocated to-night that the government make a more adequate distribution of the medical services of the country." I thought, is that news?—and I listened and listened for the name of Blackmore, but I suppose I could still be listening; nary a sound of the name of Blackmore came over the air. I will invite my hon. friend to trot down to the C.B.C. again and dig that one out.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is your business.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: The world never does appreciate genius.

Mr. HANSELL: I do not want to bother about that; but I will say this, my hon. friend's speech on that occasion occupies half a column of *Hansard,* and the speech and discussion of the hon. member for Lethbridge that same afternoon occupies eleven pages of *Hansard.*

Mr. CASTLEDEN: That should be pretty clear.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): They could not find what he was saying.

Mr. HANSELL: My hon. friend can go down to the C.B.C. and dig out the information that was given over the air on February 22, if he wishes. On that day we were discussing the war expenditures committee. What happened that afternoon? My hon. friend did not talk at all, but the C.B.C. talked about him. He did not talk at all except when somebody rose and irritated him. Of course, such had to be corrected. Something ought to be said. I thought the hon. member for Rosedale (Mr. Jackman) made a speech in the house that threw some light at least on what took place in the committee with respect to my hon. friend's charges. In fact I gathered from reading the speech and listening to it that he attempted to show that my hon. friend's charges were weak. I am not saying whether he proved anything or not, but I am saying that when the C.B.C. reported it, though my hon. friend had not spoken at all, they took about one-half a minute about him. Maybe I should not exaggerate; maybe it was only twenty-nine seconds. You must be exact, you know. They gave this hon. gentleman from Rosetown-Biggar a lot of mention. My hon. friend, the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Chevrier) was mentioned quite a little bit as were also a few other people. While many may think they are good speakers, they just got honourable mention that night, and the hon. member for Rosedale never got a word. They never said a thing about him.

I do not want to continue in this vein; perhaps it is not worth mentioning. Perhaps these are just tiny little items in news broadcasts. It may be that I have dug out the wrong ones; but I do say it is my belief, notwithstanding what my hon. friend says, that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is giving undue prominence to our hon. friends, and to the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar in particular. Sometimes I feel like saying, "Who is this superman?" He likes to rise in parliament and say he is the leader of a major political party. I do not know whether this is so or not.

Mr. GILLIS: You are giving him a lot of advertising now.

Mr. HANSELL: Maybe I am. I may want to join your party some day, but I do not think so. I say that because I believe it. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, the C.B.C. cannot dangle the name of Coldwell in front of the people of this country almost every day without its having some effect on them. I believe in some way or another—do not ask me to prove it because I cannot; I have only the same belief that many others have—the hidden hand is there trying to build up the C.C.F. party.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): We have news value; that is all.

Mr. HANSELL: You say you have news value.

Mr. REID: That is why he is in favour of it; he is all for it.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Do not be envious.

Mr. HANSELL: To get back to the corporation itself; my hon. friend has said that he wants the C.B.C. to control all programmes in Canada; he wants a greater measure of con-

trol placed in the hands of the C.B.C. I do not believe that would be a good thing for Canada. I do not believe we should have a body set up to control anything that the public really wants. I do not think it will work out. I am certain it will not. The public are going to make their demands; and furthermore it is a very dangerous thing to have such authority centralized in a body that is so powerful in respect of propaganda.

The hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) has talked about the board of governors and has mentioned some changes that should be made here and there. I do not think he went far enough. My opinion is that the whole organizational structure of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation should be revamped. That is my view. If you want a board of governors, then let them be the governors of the C.B.C. and not the governors of all radio broadcasting in Canada. That is my firm conviction. I have nothing against the corporation; I believe it is a great asset to Canada. But I say that the C.B.C. should operate on a competitive basis with private broadcasting stations. I believe there should be a separate body, a sort of semi-judicial body—not administrative; we may call it a board, a three-man commission, or whatever we like—to which the C.B.C. would nominate one member, the private broadcasting stations another and the government the third, who would be chairman. Let that body administer radio in Canada—and I should not use the word "administer" because I have said it should not be an administrative body.

Let that body supervise, and issue rules and regulations in the best interests of broadcasting; not in the best interests of any corporation or any private station; but rather in the best interests of the Canadian people. That is what we want and what we should have. If we do not have something like that, what are we going to have? We shall have something the same as we have to-day. Some of us have said that if we are to have a board of governors we should have on that board someone familiar with agriculture. I agree with that principle, and I believe the government was wise in listening to our suggestions in that regard. Someone else advocates that on the board we should have a representative of labour. That is all right. The first thing we know someone will suggest that there should be a representative of the professions, and someone else will say that the janitors and office boys should be represented on the board.

Where are we to stop? Let the government name its board of governors for the broadcasting corporation, but revise the rules and regulations so that the supervision of all broadcasting will be placed in the hands of an entirely separate body composed of men with some knowledge of radio, some knowledge of business, some knowledge of art, and some knowledge of what the people want.

This is what I advocate. I do not believe broadcasting in Canada will be satisfactory until something along this line is done. In my view broadcasting in our country under the rules and regulations set out under the present act is not suitable even to the government. They may say it is, but I do not believe that is so. It is a sort of sore spot or irritation, so far as the government is concerned. Let us revise those rules and regulations; let us have a new broadcasting act, and put broadcasting where it belongs.

That is what I ask, and what I would advocate when I sit as a member of the committee.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, after all is said and done, if the programmes had a little more of the humour of the hon. member who has just taken his seat it would not be such a headache to turn on the radio and listen to those programmes broadcast across Canada. The people of Canada are humorous; they understand humour. The corporation, however, seems to be under the impression that the humour of Charlie McCarthy is all that is worth transmitting across the international boundary line.

Many of the United States programmes carry out the policy of those who were in control between 1936 and 1939, and who have been in control since the beginning of the war in 1939. That was a policy of surrendering too much political, economic, social, financial and military initiation to Washington.

After all is said and done, we must look at the constitution of the board. We have before us the original act of 1936. Before that, committees met in 1934 and 1935. The formation of the board was supported by a former prime minister, Lord Bennett, who was leader of the party to which I belong. It was under him that the commission of 1934 was created, and through him that investigations by a royal commission were made in Japan and many other places, before the report was presented. It was never intended that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation should be outside the control of parliament, either as to policy, name, regulations, expenditures, revenue or development. It was never intended it should be a law unto itself, or that it should operate over the heads of the high court of parliament.

In my opinion the mistake made was that we should ever have had a board. We should have had one chief administrative officer who, with the help of his assistants, would administer the affairs of the board. What are these boards? Undoubtedly any board appointed by the government is a political board. The government of the day appoints the members of the board. Former governments have done the same thing, and the government after this one will probably do the same. Under the act why should clergymen sit on the board? I say the whole administration of the C.B.C. should be administered from the commercial aspect. Why should sectional interests be considered in making appointments? Why should the policy of the board be sectional, rather than national in scope? Why should certain people be appointed only because they represent certain localities, or because they represent a church or some other society?

Should not a commission be a public body administering public funds, and should it not be operated under public ownership, and alone from the commercial aspect? Should it not be free from any of the errors I have mentioned? One section in the report of the committee says:

> Members of the board of governors to be persons of broad outlook, having knowledge of the tastes and the interests of the listening public, and able to make a definite contribution to the solution of the problems before the corporation.

If one looks over the list of those who have been appointed through the corporation can it be said, even by the widest stretch of the imagination, that those who have been appointed have received their appointments for the reasons of efficiency set out in that section?

In addition to that, I believe that nominations to the board should be abolished, and that a chief executive officer should be appointed, who alone will administer the C.B.C., and we would get better results from radio, this mysterious instrument of modern society, than are being obtained from radio operated in the present way. The executive, however, should be completely under parliamentary control.

Another principle laid down by the committee which considered radio broadcasting was this:

> The independence of the corporation from partisan control to be assured by its constitution. As a trustee for the people of Canada and the payers of licences, the Board of Governors should render an account of its stewardship regularly to parliament and be **subject to ultimate parliamentary control.**

In my opinion we have had too many managers and temporary managers; we have not had a long-term policy of administration, and politics in the C.B.C. have been rampant. The policy has been one of drift, particularly in the last two or three years. I believe that those who are paying $2.50 for licences would receive better results and better programmes and would have more confidence in the system if we had one chief executive.

The political provision was violated in connection with the Winnipeg convention, when Mr. Meighen was not allowed to speak. Again at Hamilton Mr. Bracken was not allowed to speak. If there is no humour in the corporation, there should be some sportsmanship and those who are leading parties should be allowed to give their views on the political situation. The hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains (Mr. Lacombe) should be allowed to give his views, and also the leader of the Bloc Populaire (Mr. Raymond). There are other leaders of groups in the house; in fact there is a noble seven at the other end of the chamber. Why should not they all be given equal rights? Some of them may provide some humour. The other day the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains provided considerable humour when he was discussing another matter and his remarks were taken up by the humourists all over the country. He might entertain certain views on some of these public questions.

From 1936 to 1939 when disarmament was taking place, when we were losing our friends and when the causes of the present world conflict were shaping up, this corporation seemed to misjudge the whole situation. Since 1939 they have continued to misjudge things. For these reasons I think the board should be reconstituted and made up of those who have some knowledge of present day matters.

There is a kindred body which seems to be quite a favourite of this board. I refer to the Gallup poll. As I said last year, it is all gallop and no poll. This is one of the most mischievous institutions there is in the country and the Canadian Broadcasting Corportation seems to have a particular fondness for it. The Gallup poll endeavoured to obtain an opinion as to what different countries had done toward winning the war. No one gave any credit to Germany, but the returns showed the following percentages:

	Per cent
Russia	50
Great Britain	42
China	5
United States	3

The same question was asked in the United States with the following results:

	Per cent
United States	55
Russia	32
Great Britain	9
China	4

I cannot understand why this mischievous organization should have so much influence by radio special speakers with the board of governors. This is shown by the announcements that are made. Mr. Gallup, the founder, is a United States citizen and his work seems to be a repetition of Mr. Al. Smith's celebrated "straw vote". Announcements are made which in my opinion should not be allowed during the war. This is just political propaganda, and there should be some censorship or control over this corporation to prevent their sending out political propaganda of this or other description.

The public of Canada are beginning to lose faith in this corporation, not only because of their programmes but because of their failure to do what they were supposed to do. The board of governors, the general manager and the acting general manager have never properly or efficiently taken up the question of education as applied to public broadcasting. This corporation could be a great instrument for furthering education and national unity as well as providing entertainment. They could not draw ten people into a theatre with the humour and entertainment they send out over the radio. On Sunday nights at eight forty-five o'clock the speakers who are to talk on public questions give at times only half truths to the public. More use should be made of the radio as an instrument of education.

The time has come when there should be a reorganization of the whole system. Those who pay licence fees should be given value for their money. Certain sections of the act and of the regulations have not been enforced. Toronto seems to be a dumping ground for officials from all over Canada, and some of the programmes they put out are certainly not up to date. I hope this house in the year to come will see to it that we get a permanent organization with a continuity of policy as intended by the founders of the system. The system we have to-day does not commend itself to the wisdom and judgment of the country. There is wide dissatisfaction throughout Canada, not only with regard to the programmes but with regard to the administration.

Mr. W. A. TUCKER (Rosthern): I should like to draw attention to something which I think is of importance to this parliament. We are in a time of war, and it seems to me that the administration of this country and the activities of this parliament should be of greater interest to the people than anything else that happens at any other place within Canada. I am told that the news of what happens in this parliament is edited by a board in Toronto, the members of which do not observe what occurs. They are attempting to interpret to the people of Canada something which they have not seen, something which they can judge only by what is sent to them from Ottawa.

Perhaps this is one reason why at night the ten o'clock news broadcast sent out from Toronto does not seem to us who have been here to portray accurately what has taken place. I most urgently suggest that the doings of this house are important enough to warrant their being edited by people who observe the house in session.

Just to give an example of what this leads to I should like to refer to the news broadcast sent out at ten o'clock on February 21. Before I go on with this may I say that I have been and still am a believer in the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation operating as a nationally owned and controlled public institution. I have been a believer in that ever since radio came into existence. The reason why I speak is that the people I come in contact with claim that there is a shading of the news in favour of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. The leader of the C.C.F. party (Mr. Coldwell) is continually being held up as the leader of the future, as the man who is to lead us into the promised land and all that sort of thing. They claim that, to the extent the radio can do so, it is tending to build up a feeling throughout the country that the leader of the C.C.F. is a man of destiny. There is a widespread belief that the C.B.C. is continually shading the news in that way.

If the C.B.C. is to be used as a political instrument of that kind, then something must be done. People who believe in the C.B.C. just as much as anyone in this house have said that to me. If that opinion exists all over the country, then there must be something wrong and it is not for me or anyone else to prove it by going deeply into the matter. To come to this broadcast of February 21, it outlines in full the charges of the leader of the C.C.F. party in regard to the aluminum contract, and he is given about twenty-five lines. I will now read from the transcript of the broadcast and leave it to the judgment of

the house whether it gives a true picture of what actually happened. The transcript goes on to say:

> The Minister of Munitions—Mr. Howe—said that some of the statements which Mr. Coldwell had quoted as having been given in evidence appeared incredible. He thought that the evidence should be tabled in the house.

Then it goes on to speak of the Progressive Conservative member for Danforth, (Mr. Harris) and says:

> The Progressive Conservative member for Toronto Danforth—Joseph Harris—suggested an amendment to Mr. Cleaver's motion for approval of the committee's report. The amendment would require all evidence to be tabled, and discussion of the motion postponed until it had been studied.
>
> As the Speaker was about to put a motion by Mr. Harris, Mr. King said there were the best of reasons for having the committee sit in camera. He added that the government would welcome full discussion, but that the committee could not fulfil its function if the evidence were made public. Mr. Howe said he was aware it would be a breach of confidence if the evidence were disclosed.

In other words, it starts off with the charges of the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) and deals with them seriatim and at great length, and as the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell) has stated, the next night the broadcast repeated the charges he had made, apparently to make quite sure that the people would know what the charges were.

Then it creates the impression that just as Your Honour was about to put the motion, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) stepped into the breach and saved the motion from being put to the house, and it makes out that the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) then changed his mind after the Prime Minister had stepped in. But we who were here in the house know that it was made plain, taking all his remarks together, that the Minister of Munitions and Supply never had any intention that the evidence should be tabled. Here is just one statement of others which should have made it plain. At page 711 of *Hansard,* he is reported as saying:

> I am quite aware that it would be a breach of confidence, and particularly a breach against myself, if that evidence were tabled.

Can anybody who sat in the house say that the Minister of Munitions and Supply seriously intended that the evidence should be tabled when he had said that it would be a breach of confidence against the government of the United Kingdom and particularly against himself to table it? It was obvious to all that he had no such intention; but here in this broadcast it is held out to the country that the Minister of Munitions and Supply had the idea that the evidence should all be tabled and that then the Prime Minister stepped into the breach, the Minister of Munitions and Supply then fell in line. That is the way it struck me when I heard it. It was held up to the people that the Prime Minister stepped in and stopped him. The fact is it was quite clear that the whole house felt that the evidence should not and could not be tabled. It was not a matter at all of the Prime Minister suddenly stepping in and stopping the evidence being tabled. It was a matter of confidence, trust and good faith toward others, particularly the government of the United Kingdom.

There are people throughout this country, thousands of them in the armed services, who are too busy to follow the daily newspapers carefully, and there are thousands of farmers who take only a weekly newspaper. But they do follow very carefully what comes over the C.B.C. They feel that that is one thing they can rely on to be absolutely unbiased and fair. The reason why I am speaking this afternoon is that it is the duty of this house to see to it that these people's trust is not betrayed and that we do not permit some unknown persons in Toronto, who are not following the proceedings of this house, to shade their reports in such a way as not to give a true picture of its proceedings, and particularly they should not convey to the listeners a wrong impression of what happened in this house. Therefore, I urge that these news broadcasts be absolutely fair and impartial. If they are not; if the idea gets around that these reports are being shaded, what is to become of the people's confidence in national broadcasting? What is to become of their confidence in the nationally owned and controlled radio institution? We had better see to it, if we want to maintain the people's confidence in the national radio system, that such items as this are not repeated and that what happens in this House of Commons is portrayed to the people, not in such a light as this report from which I have quoted, but in the true light, reflecting faithfully the deliberative proceedings of this legislative body of a great nation conducting its business in parliament in a dignified manner worthy of the great nation that Canada is.

Mr. G. RUSSELL BOUCHER (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, after listening to the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker) and the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell) make their accusations against the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, it does seem to me that we should not let this occasion go by before

we in this house give the national radio system our fair consideration and look upon the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and radio broadcasting generally, from the point of view of what it should mean in our national life. I do not think the man on the street, the average Canadian, has any opinions about radio other than it is one of the greatest organizations for improving human welfare and one of the worst organizations for destruction, if it is used in that way, that this country could ever produce. Taking that into consideration, I think that in setting up the radio committee this year we should try to appreciate the immeasurable importance to Canada of the necessity of national control of radio, having due regard to the importance and efficiency of private radio stations as well. We should take a long-sighted and broad-minded view of radio, realizing the leadership it can give in culture and education, in action, and in insight into future development, instead of being merely the interpreter of the views of any one man or any one party. It is abhorrent to me to think the Canadian government has allowed a regulation of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to ban political discussions over the air. What is political? What is not political, I ask? Surely the banning of political discussions by the foster child of the government of Canada casts a slur upon that which is political, a slur which we members of the House of Commons should not stand for. Surely things political should not be represented as being some sort of scurvy generated here which the government cannot allow to be cast out over the air to the people of Canada through the national radio system.

Mr. CRERAR: If the hon. gentleman will allow a question, without agreeing or disagreeing with his point of view, do I understand him to take the position that the government should have issued an instruction to the board of governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation on the matter of broadcasts?

Mr. BOUCHER: I am very glad to answer that question. Here we have the government of Canada and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation still without a head; it has an incomplete, inefficient and incompetent board of governors, and the government takes no steps to amend that situation at the earliest possible date. Surely that responsibility rests on the government.

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend is not answering my question.

Mr. BOUCHER: I answered it very clearly, I think.

[Mr. Boucher.]

Mr. CRERAR: No; there is a point of principle involved in it. Does my hon. friend take the position that the government should on occasion, when it thinks it advisable, instruct the board of governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as to their duty?

Mr. BOUCHER: My answer is certainly no. But I also say this, that the government cannot shirk its responsibility by having as its nominees men who cannot reflect its opinions to the people of Canada.

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend earlier in his remarks criticized the government because it had not given an instruction to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

Mr. BOUCHER: Because the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation have carried out a policy that was not consistent with Canadian thought and Canadian desires. As a matter of fact, what has happened to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in the past year? I do not think there is anybody in Canada who would not say that the policy of the board of governors, and indirectly of the government, has been a policy of drift. I do not think the leadership has been shown by the C.B.C. in the national, cultural and educational life of the country which the people expected of it. As I see it, cultural and educational matters, as well as music and entertainment, should have priority over commercial or partisan subjects.

We learned last year that the board of governors were pleased over the fact that their income was supporting their programme, so that the C.B.C. was not involving the government in any expense. It does not seem to me that that is to the credit of the corporation. We all realize that in Europe the radio has been used as one of the greatest propaganda machines on the fact of the earth, and that in some places it has had a very evil influence. It is true that in many private stations, particularly to the south of us, where commercial interests preponderate over the radio, another undesirable extreme is reached. Canada set up the C.B.C. with a national network to give an example and to provide leadership to the people, but that leadership has not been forthcoming.

I agree with the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) that some board should be set up which would coordinate and adjudicate in an impartial manner upon the multifarious problems of radio, not in the roles of judge, jury, prosecutor and accused, but as an impartial body. I believe the board of

transport in its dealings with the railways is performing an important function in an impartial way, permitting public ownership and private enterprise to run side by side to the benefit of the people of Canada. In the C.B.C. a similar rule could be applied, but that is not possible while control is confined to one power with a national station, operating at once as judge and jury, as accused and prosecutor.

I am sure the average Canadian citizen is anxious to see the tone of radio broadcasting much higher than it is. He would like to be able to look upon the board of governors of radio as men not only inspired by the national viewpoint and beyond partisan, local or community influences, but having a far-sighted national and international vision, men ready to give leadership and encouragement, men not afraid to delve into the problematical or to engage the best authorities on current problems to broadcast their views, even though those views might savour of something political; for, after all, politics is in our very being, and we must keep our eye on the political ball and the factors of political progress. It is not enough that the C.B.C. has a policy of propagandizing accepted ideas more or less confined to one group or one community. It is my contention that the public are not represented as they should be on the board of governors. Why cannot we have a board unhampered by political, sectional and other prepossessions, prepared to deal with matters on a basis which will give a proper place to commercial, cultural and educational matters, while dealing adequately with news and amusements? Will anybody say that our present board of governors has done that? Can anyone feel that parliament has enabled the board to perform these services, when there has been for so long no governor, no managing director, and a shortage on the board itself?

I do not believe that the C.B.C. has risen to its opportunities. Canadians have not the respect or admiration for the corporation or for the board of governors that such bodies should be able to command. Surely, in relation to matters of current interest, the C.B.C. could broadcast the leads which are given, instead of merely repeating their version of these events. As a member of the house, I reflect the viewpoint of the men I meet when I say that if government enterprise, as exemplified by the present management of the C.B.C. has done the best it can, we want no more of such a board of governors. The time has come, with the war at so critical a stage, with conditions in Canada as they are, to raise the standards of the C.B.C. to a much higher level and to make much greater use of it.

Mr. BERT H. SOPER (Lanark): Mr. Speaker, we have heard a good deal of criticism this afternoon, some favourable and some unfavourable, of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. The hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church) raised the old complaint that Mr. Bracken was not allowed to speak over the radio. I should like to ask you and this house why Mr. Bracken should be allowed time on the radio of Canada. Whom does he represent? He does not represent this house; he does not represent anybody; he is neither a member of the House of Commons nor a member of any provincial legislature. It seems to me that any member of this house has more right to ask for time over the C.B.C. than Mr. Bracken has. If anybody is to be granted time to express his political views, let those who are privileged to represent the people of this country come first. If Mr. Bracken wants to "sell" himself to the Dominion of Canada, let him get elected to this house. This is where he should be. He should not be going up and down the country criticizing and trying to defeat every piece of constructive legislation which is put before us. It is easy to go out and criticize; let him come here and take an interest in what is going on and show the people of Canada what he can do.

Mr. S. H. KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): I feel it is only common courtesy that some member of this group should rise to express a word of sincere thanks to the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell) and the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker) for the opportunity they have given to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to-night to mention the name of Coldwell. I suggest to Your Honour that a radio might be brought into the chamber this evening at ten o'clock in order that too many hon. members may not yield to their curiosity to go and find just what is reported on the news.

Before I deal with the one specific point which I wish to mention, I think I should correct the hon. member for Rosthern when he tried to create the impression that the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) did not actually change his mind the other evening on the matter of tabling the evidence which we were discussing at that time. The hon. member quoted from the remarks of the minister after, as we feel, he had changed his mind. But the hon. member did not quote the earlier statement when, in response to the question of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon)

whether he felt the evidence should be tabled, the minister said quite clearly, as reported in *Hansard* at page 704:

> Yes, I think so; and I would suggest to the chairman of the committee that he move to have the evidence in this particular case tabled in the house.

A little later the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) came into the chamber and spoke to the matter, as reported on pages 709-711. The Minister of Munitions and Supply then rose again to explain his position, and it was at that time that he gave the opposite view which the hon. member for Rosthern has already quoted.

However, I rose for only a moment or two to refer to one matter in connection with the work of the committee which is to be set up under the terms of this motion. It is my privilege in the city from which I come to have fairly extensive contact with trades union organizations and to be at many meetings of trades union bodies. These organizations naturally discuss matters mainly relating to labour conditions, matters closely affecting their own work. But there are many occasions when these bodies discuss other matters of public interest. I know of no matter of public interest which has caused so much discussion in trades union circles over a long period of time, apart from actual labour questions, as the alleged interference by the Minister of National War Services (Mr. LaFleche) in connection with the programme "Of Things To Come," which took place last November. As many hon. members know, many protests have been made by labour bodies as well as by others; and I urge, not only on my own behalf, but on behalf of organizations such as those to which I have referred, that this committee, when set up, go into the matter thoroughly. A full investigation should be made to determine what actually happened at that time, and responsibility for any interference should be definitely fixed. One reason for this inquiry and for fixing the responsibility should be to make sure that this kind of thing will not occur again.

Mr. G. B. ISNOR (Halifax): As a member of the committee for several years I had intended to inquire of the last speaker (Mr. Knowles), the moment he stopped speaking, whether he was making the charge that the Minister of National War Services (Mr. LaFleche) interfered in connection with the broadcast of a programme known as "Of Things To Come." Was that his charge?

[Mr. Knowles.]

Mr. KNOWLES: If the hon. member wishes to check the record he will find that I insisted that the committee should make an inquiry into the "alleged" interference.

Mr. LaFLECHE: Why don't you be plain about it?

Mr. KNOWLES: If he checks the record he will find the word "alleged" there.

Mr. LaFLECHE: Back-door stuff.

Mr. ISNOR: I am willing to accept the correction.

Mr. KNOWLES: There is no correction.

Mr. COLDWELL: Somebody interfered and we want to know who.

Mr. ISNOR: This debate has taken a rather different turn from that which I expected it would in the discussion of a motion of this kind to set up a committee to inquire into and report upon the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in respect of its regulations, revenues and expenditures and all matters coming within the scope of the committee.

In following the several gentlemen who have spoken I was greatly impressed with the remarks of some and not so much impressed with the remarks of others. Perhaps it was a good thing that this debate was brought on instead of having the whole matter referred to the committee without such a discussion, because the public will be able to judge of the attitude of certain speakers. The public will know what their stand is concerning public ownership and private ownership. I have particularly in mind the words used by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) in which he said: We have every year endorsed a single broadcasting system, and no effort should be made to destroy our present system. Then he went on to refer to the one single public broadcasting system, indicating in other words that, as far as he was concerned, he was simply saying what he had said in public, that he stood wholly for public ownership.

Mr. COLDWELL: I rise to a point of order. I happen to have before me a copy of my speech for correction and the hon. member is not quoting it accurately.

Mr. ISNOR: I can only trust to my memory. If the hon. member says I am not quoting correctly—

Mr. COLDWELL: I have the script.

Mr. ISNOR: —I would not wish to do anything that was not right in that respect. I was under the impression, and the great majority are under the impression, that the

hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar has repeatedly stated that he stood for public ownership and was more or less against private ownership.

Mr. COLDWELL: That was not involved. As a matter of fact, I was quoting the report of last year's committee when I said that every year we have endorsed public ownership of all high-power stations to be operated under a single national policy.

Mr. ISNOR: I bring the matter to your attention, Mr. Speaker, because of the stand which the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar has taken. As a member of the committee of last year he took a very active part in making known his views. He was a good member of the committee and he made it quite clear that he recognized that there was a place for private enterprise and private broadcasting.

Mr. COLDWELL: I did to-day.

Mr. ISNOR: Not as clearly as in this perhaps:

> I think we should put this with our record. It is a very interesting criticism of private broadcasting. Now, I am not opposed to private broadcasting. I believe, as I said this morning, that the community station performs a real function.

Mr. COLDWELL: I said that to-day.

Mr. ISNOR: I think we should have that on the record because of the feeling throughout the country, which the hon. member this afternoon has created in the minds of the great majority, that he and his party are for public ownership entirely and against private ownership. For my part, I take the stand that we have a good organization in the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. I cannot agree with those who criticize it on the ground that there is no head. It is true that at the present time the position of general manager is not occupied, but it must be remembered that this organization has existed for twelve years. We have always had a head, a board of governors, a general manager, and an assistant general manager. In private life, in a commercial business or in any other organization, when there is a vacancy the duties of the vacant office are discharged for the time being by the next in charge, and in this case that happens to be the vice-chairman or assistant general manager, who, I may say, is an exceptionally efficient operator, whose ability I believe is recognized throughout the country. He has done very good work in carrying out the duties of assistant general manager. I refer to Doctor Frigon. I say, therefore, that it is hardly fair for hon. members to rise in their places and say that we have no head, as did the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker). He said that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has moved ahead without direction and without a head. We have the same control as though we had a general manager to-day. I believe that on the whole the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has shown business ability, as reflected in its financial reports each year. It is true there has been some criticism in regard to the revenue derived from commercial advertising. At one time we thought that $500,000 would be the limit. It has grown to $700,000, $895,000, and over a million dollars in 1942. There might be criticism that that is altogether too much, because it reflects a lot of time devoted to advertising and not sufficient time, as the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell) said, devoted to other programmes which would be of a nature that would perhaps be more helpful to our morale.

If there is one criticism that could be offered I believe it should be directed toward the manner in which the news is placed before the public. I do not wish to deal with the matter in a partisan manner. If the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar has been able, by some method or system or organization either within or without the ranks of the employees of the C.B.C., to bring about the result which has been mentioned to-day, the receiving of greater prominence than other hon. members—

Mr. COLDWELL: I rise to a point of order or privilege, I am not sure which. If the hon. member is suggesting that by some means of organization or otherwise, without or within the corporation, we have special privileges I wish to deny it emphatically and conclusively. I believe that such a statement reflects on the organization I represent and on the corporation. For my part, I wish to deny it explicitly. These unsupported charges against individual members ought not to be made without proof.

Mr. ISNOR: I said I did not wish to make any charge. I say I give my hon. friend a certain amount of credit if he has been able to bring about an organization to supply the news and to have it broadcast in such a way as to receive headlines. I say that because that has been possible during the past month or so it may lead one to think—and perhaps I join with the group—there is a weakness

somewhere in the C.B.C. I think that is a matter which could very well be looked into by the committee on radio broadcasting.

Mr. COLDWELL: Hear, hear.

Mr. ISNOR: I feel it should be dealt with if for no other reason that to clear the name of the hon. member in the feeling—

Mr. COLDWELL: Mr. Speaker, I object to this. The hon. member suggests that my name needs to be cleared before this committee. I should like to know what you think of that? I rise to a point of privilege. I am not under a cloud; as far as I know no charge has been made against me. I want that withdrawn.

Mr. ISNOR: I do not know what the hon. member wishes withdrawn. I did say that if there were such an impression existing in the minds of a great many—and apparently there is because of the remarks made by the various hon. members who have taken part in this debate—then in fairness to the hon. member perhaps it might be well for the committee to look into the matter, investigate and clear up the whole thing.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is a very different matter.

Mr. ISNOR: I am pleased—

Mr. COLDWELL: The hon. member does not need to have his name cleared anyway.

Mr. ISNOR: I am pleased to reword the thought I had in my mind to meet with the approval of the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar. The fact still remains, Mr. Speaker, that I believe a large number of people in the country are not entirely satisfied that impartial reports were made in connection with the proceedings of this house during the past several months, shall I say?

The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar quoted at some length from an address given by Doctor Angell. If I interpreted his remarks correctly, he wished to place before us the views of Doctor Angell as applied to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. I believe the situation existing in the United States is altogether different from that which exists in Canada. We have a broadcasting corporation, publicly owned so-called, paid for by the country, in competition with privately owned broadcasting stations. I do not think the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar carry much weight.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I say that when I placed Doctor Angell's views before the house I referred to him as being the public service counsellor of the National Broadcasting Company of the United States.

Mr. ISNOR: I was not quoting the hon. member. I pointed out that the reference he made might apply to the system under which they operate in the United States, but it does not apply in the same way to the system under which we operate in Canada.

Mr. COLDWELL: I tried to make that clear.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. ISNOR: Mr. Speaker, when the house rose at six o'clock we were dealing with the resolution moved by the Minister of National War Services (Mr. LaFleche) in respect of the appointment of a special committee on radio broadcasting. During my remarks I made reference to statements made by hon. members who had preceded me in the debate. I referred particularly to the observations of the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) who, in a brilliant, legal manner, and making the most of a poor case, endeavoured to show that at the present time the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation was moving forward without any real direction. He made reference to the fact that it has no general manager, owing to the Reverend Mr. Thomson having resigned from that position.

I then endeavoured to point out that, notwithstanding the resignation of the Reverend Mr. Thomson as general manager, the corporation was still able to carry on in its usual manner. It has an assistant general manager whose duties have been defined and laid down in the by-laws of the corporation, a man who perhaps had a more thorough knowledge of the organization than did the general manager. Possibly the assistant understood the broadcasting system better than any other one person in Canada. Not only has he technical knowledge, but he is known for his judgment, his ability to organize and his thorough knowledge of financial affairs. Therefore I say to the hon. member for Lake Centre, and to others who have voiced similar thoughts, that their contentions in that connection are not well founded.

The hon. member also referred to the appointment of a board of governors who would have the confidence of the people of Canada. In this connection the hon. member for

Carleton (Mr. Boucher), who blew hot and cold when referring to the efficiency of the administration, expressed similar views, and he was supported by the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church). The hon. member for Broadview said that the public was beginning to lose faith in the C.B.C. Those remarks, as applied to the individual members comprising the board of governors, or as applied to the board as a whole are uncalled for and ill-timed. We know those men as having sound business ability and judgment. I hold no brief for them, and I know very few of them personally. However, they have appeared from time to time before the committee and have shown by their judgment, their actions and their interest in the affairs of the corporation, that they are well versed in those matters which relate to the corporation's business.

I have in mind particularly the able report presented from time to time by the chairman of that board. Hon. members know he is an outstanding businessman from Montreal. He, in a public-spirited manner, along with the other governors, has shown a willingness to give up his time to work for something he believes to be of real benefit to Canada. The same observations would apply to all the members of the board. I do not believe the people of Canada will welcome the criticism to which we have listened this afternoon.

Just before six o'clock I was interrupted by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell). Apparently I had misunderstood his remarks in one or two instances. I was pleased to be able to correct any impressions I may have gathered from his speech. However, during the evening recess someone said to me, "Apparently the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar is not very consistent. In one instance he and his followers make a strong plea for public ownership of practically everything affecting the Canadian economy. Then he takes an altogether different stand, when occasion arises, by stating that he has no objection whatsoever to private enterprise." It is difficult for the average person to understand the position taken by the leader of a political group who on one day leans over backwards to proclaim his strong belief in public ownership, and the next day, seeking to make his position clear in respect of public ownership, as far as the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is concerned, states, "I like competition, and we can have it only through privately owned stations." He and I are in accord in that thought. I believe in competition and in free enterprise. I believe firmly that that is the only way in which we can build up the best possible system and bring about the greatest possible good. We can do that only by having and using private enterprise in a way which will help our Canadian economy.

The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar quoted a United States authority in reference to certain matters. I stated just before the evening recess that I did not believe his references would apply to Canadian broadcasters in the same way that they would apply to the systems operating in the United States. It must be remembered that two distinct systems are involved. One is a so-called public ownership system, and the other private ownership. One is largely subsidized by fees from the Canadian public which, in 1942, amounted to $3,485,331.92. That is the size of the subsidy which is being passed on to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to use against the private companies, which are obliged to carry all their overhead expenses and do their broadcasting without any outside assistance whatsoever. That is a real handicap.

We are reminded that the commercial broadcasting revenue or income of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation amounts to over a million dollars, with miscellaneous income of about $19,000. We see from this that the corporation had about $4,500,000 with which to carry on its work in the year ending March 31, 1942. Its total expenditures, which I shall not detail, amounted to about $4,000,000, leaving an operating net surplus of $299,321.36. I have placed this net operating surplus on record to show that the corporation was able to carry on in a successful manner. Therefore, once again I return to the remarks of hon. members sitting in opposition who have said that this was not an efficient administration, and that the corporation's affairs were not carried on in a manner befitting an organization of that kind.

The balance sheet of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation demonstrates its business abilities. I do not wish to take up the time to go into all the details, but the balance sheet shows that there are assets of $2,478,518.45 which have been created during the period of their operations. It is true that there are liabilities, but the operating surplus is shown as $1,725,000.

The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar quoted a United States authority. I want to repeat that I think there is a place for private broadcasting in Canada. If we are to get the best out of our publicly owned system it will be achieved through the competition given by private broadcasting. I should like to refer to a statement made by Mr. Joseph Sedgewick, K.C., in which he states that there is a place for both publicly and privately owned broad-

casting facilities. He said that the private station has a vital place in Canadian broadcasting which would suffer severely if it were driven out of existence. For some years Mr. Sedgewick has been general counsel for the Canadian broadcasters' association. He goes on to refer to their usefulness. For years the democracies have prided themselves upon having free speech, free broadcasting facilities and so on, and I contend that nothing should be done to hamper the private stations in fulfilling their duties and carrying out their functions. I question if there has not been too much restriction placed upon private broadcasting.

I am inclined to agree with hon. members, particularly the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell), who have suggested that a small commission should be set up. I believe I would support such a system. The corporation could carry on with its board of governors, but their duties would be directed more particularly to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. There would be another small board or commission having jurisdiction over all broadcasting in Canada. This board would be similar to the board of transport commissioners. The Canadian National Railways, a publicly owned system, and the Canadian Pacific, a privately owned line, both come under the jurisdiction of the transport commissioners and their rates are fixed and other matters attended to by that body.

I would direct the attention of the committee to the manner in which the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has expended certain moneys during the past year, and especially to what it has written off in the way of depreciation. I should like to draw this to the attention of the minister under whose department the C.B.C. operates. While the policy of the government has been to restrict expenditures they have allowed the C.B.C. to make some rather large expenditures. I have in mind particularly the new secondary network which has been established. I realize that there may be a need for such a network, but I think it would have been as well to hold up any such expansion until the close of the war.

In the eyes of the average business man the write-off for depreciation by the corporation appears to be altogether too large. In ordinary business we are allowed to write off two and a half per cent or five per cent on property and ten per cent on fixtures, but the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation have, I understand, written off as much as fifty per cent. These are matters which could very well be considered by the committee being set up.

I believe the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is doing a good work in Canada. It has done much to advertise our victory loans. Without its work the public would not have known of the benefits to be derived from subscribing to these loans, and the loans might not have been as heavily subscribed. It has made it possible for outstanding speakers from different parts of the world to make known to our people what other countries are doing. At times these speakers have complimented Canada upon the excellent work done during the present war. This committee has an important job to do. Having worked with the members in previous years, I am satisfied that they will carry out the duties entrusted to them in a very able manner.

Mr. WILFRID LaCROIX (Quebec-Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, in reading over this motion I see that one of the objects of appointing this committee is to have them review the policies and aims of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as well as its regulations. There is one point I wish to emphasize in particular. This committee should lay stress on the necessity of more control over the broadcasting of lectures through the private stations. As an example of what I mean I should like to give particulars of a case which has been submitted to me in connection with lectures broadcast over station CHRC in Quebec by two individuals, Jean Bourget and Jean Duval, organizers of the Progressive Workingmen's party.

It may be said that the Progressive Workingmen's party is a political party, it having a representative here in the house in the person of the hon. member for Cartier (Mr. Rose), but everyone is aware that this party is the communist party and is recognized as such by its leader Tim Buck. To permit people to lecture over the radio and insult the religious feelings of the larger part of the population of Quebec is working against the unity of Canada. These two cases have been submitted to the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent), but he has replied that he has no power to stop this.

May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in framing future regulations the committee should see to that point and emphasize the necessity of not permitting any lectures that may be an insult to a large portion of the people and their respected traditions. I have every confidence that the Minister of National War Services (Mr. LaFleche), who is also a member of the proposed committee, will see to that very important point.

Mr. J. W. NOSEWORTHY (York South): Mr. Speaker, I wish first of all to compliment the hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Isnor) upon his able defence of this great publicly owned enterprise notwithstanding his declaration of faith in private enterprise.

There has been much criticism of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation during the course of this debate. That criticism is, I think, good for the C.B.C. It is a safeguard against that eventuality which some hon. members visualize, the growth of a powerful publicly owned system becoming an instrument of political propaganda. But so long as the C.B.C. and other government-owned enterprises are subject to criticism and control by this parliament, elected by the people, I think we are on safe ground. Those who are afraid of that situation are in reality expressing their fear of democracy in action. They are afraid of putting democracy into action. They are afraid of leaving in the control of a parliament elected by the people an institution such as the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

The corporation has been criticized on account of its earnings, because it has been a commercial success. I am confident that if the corporation had not shown a favourable balance some of these same critics would have criticized the corporation for being inefficient. Actually most of the criticism this afternoon boils down to this, that Mr. Bracken and the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) did not get enough publicity over C.B.C. and that the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) got too much. One hon. member has already questioned before the house just why Mr. Bracken should be entitled to so much publicity. Let me remind the house that Mr. Bracken has not yet a single Progressive Conservative elected to this house; there has not yet been elected to this parliament any member as a Progressive Conservative. Every member of that party sitting in this house was elected as a member of another party or a party that went by another name. I have no objection to the hon. member for Lethbridge getting more publicity. Actually I think the country could profit if the C.B.C. did carry some of the things that the hon. member has told us in this house.

I do not see why the C.B.C. should be criticized for giving publicity to the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. The C.B.C. is not alone in giving publicity to the C.C.F. I recall being in New Brunswick last summer, a province which had scarcely heard of the C.C.F., and yet one of the papers of that province carried the name of a provincial leader of the C.C.F. on its front page for nearly two weeks.

Mr. GRAYDON: Who is he?

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: As a matter of fact, during several months last summer the press of this country gave more publicity to the provincial leader of the C.C.F. in British Columbia than to either Mr. Bracken or to the premier of that province. Actually it will be found that the press of this country is constantly keeping the C.C.F. before the public. Look over the records of *Hansard* for this session and you will find that the same hon. gentlemen who have criticized the C.B.C. for publicizing the C.C.F. have done very little else during this session but publicize the C.C.F. You will find pages and pages of *Hansard* devoted to nothing but to publicizing the C.C.F. party. So that you cannot blame the C.B.C. for publicizing a party that is so much in the news to-day.

I should like to compliment the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, not upon the publicity they have given to the C.C.F., but upon the good work they have done in helping the Canadian people to appreciate the finer things of life. During this war the C.B.C. have struggled against numerous obstacles and the difficulty of securing good talent in war time. I think they have done a remarkable job in maintaining the morale of the people and giving us an opportunity of appreciating some of the best in literature, art and music and in the discussion of public and social affairs. I compliment the corporation upon that good work.

There are one or two points I should like to call to the attention of the committee before I take my seat. They are not serious. I found last summer, while in New Brunswick, considerable criticism of the fact that a great many people there who were paying licence fees to the broadcasting corporation were unable to get the broadcasting station at Sackville. My information, gathered from radio engineers, some of them employed at that station, is that because of the land area of the maritimes it is practically impossible for one high-powered station to cover that territory adequately, and consequently there are a great many people living in parts of New Brunswick who find it difficult to get that station.

My attention has been called by a number of correspondents to the fact that some of the privately owned stations which have been changing hands during the past few years have in reality been coming under the ownership of private chains contrary to the act. Theoretically these stations are supposed to be

privately owned; actually, I am told, a considerable number of them are in reality owned by the same interests. I am quite confident that the committee will look into this matter.

Mr. J. J. McCANN (Renfrew South): The setting up of this committee to-day for the purpose of inquiring into the activities of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is but an implementation of recommendations which were made by the committee last year and the year before. I am sure that, in taking the course which they have, the government are taking a course which will renew the confidence which the people of Canada have, and which the parliament of this country should have, in this great public utility.

The criticism which we have heard this afternoon and this evening with reference to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has been mostly of a destructive nature. Criticism, we all agree, can be of two kinds; it can be either constructive or destructive. So far I have not heard from those who would criticize the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation many suggestions which, if put into operation, would tend to make that body better or to have more of the confidence of the Canadian people.

I am not disturbed about the place of prominence which appears to have been given to the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (Mr. Coldwell) in some of the news broadcasts which are made, because I fully realize that the more prominence which is given to the hon. member and his party and the policies of that party, the more clearly will the people realize what they would come to if that party should by chance ever come into power.

He complains of the "soap programmes". What will happen if his party should come into power? Not only would the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation become publicly owned and publicly operated, but all the private chains and stations in this country would be taken over, and not only the soap advertising but the "baloney" advertising as well would be paid for by the people of this country through the licence fees which they pay. Let me say to him that our people are not so gullible as all that. So that the more prominence that is given to Mr. Coldwell and the policies of the party he represents, the more it will work to their detriment and to the advantage of the system which is in vogue in this dominion at the present time.

I am sure that all realize that radio is a vital organ in Canada's national life, and the people are convinced of the soundness of the policy of publicly owned radio as an instrument of education, information and entertainment. Above all, in war time no greater instrument of building up and sustaining public morale exists.

It is very easy to criticize. While we are making that criticism, would it not be well if we had some knowledge of the accomplishments of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation? I think it can be fairly said that the corporation has a fine record of accomplishments in the last six or eight years. Radio coverage has been extended from 46 to 92·4 per cent of the population. Four high-powered stations have been completed across Canada. Interference from United States and Mexican stations has been limited by wise agreements. Programmes have been most materially improved and extended by fostering native talent and securing the best programmes from the United States and Great Britain. Since we last met, a new type of news service has been inaugurated. The C.B.C. subscribes and pays for a news service which is supplied by the Canadian Press and the British United Press. That has given greater coverage. More particularly, the corporation's contribution to war publicity in every phase has been outstanding and has formed a valuable link between the soldiers overseas and their relatives at home. In addition, we have with the armed forces at the present time in Italy, as we had in Africa, a mobile unit which has operated continuously throughout the different theatres of war.

In addition to these achievements, since the last report was given to parliament there has been started the building of a short-wave station. Also another network, known as the Canadian network, has been established.

These, Mr. Speaker, are achievements which the Canadian people ought to know of, and I am sure that they have accrued to the benefit of the listening public throughout Canada.

Criticism has been made with reference to the directorate. That directorate has been considerably strengthened. The directors who have been added are Mr. Chase, Mr. Parker and Mr. Crawford. These men are outstanding in their particular lines of endeavour or of business; they are men who enjoy the confidence of the people who know them, and who bring to the directorate years of experience and good judgment.

It is true that the position of general manager has been vacant, as such, for a number of months. There cannot be any great criticism in that particular regard. The hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) says that that has brought about chaos in the direction of the management. There is nothing at all, in my judgment, which would

indicate that there has been chaos of any kind with reference to the management of the C.B.C. The assistant general manager, Doctor Frigon, stepped up to the position—temporarily—as general manager of the corporation. There is not a man on the North American continent who has greater technical knowledge of radio than has Doctor Frigon. I submit that the direction of the management of the corporation has actually been bettered by stepping up Doctor Frigon to that position than if a new man had been appointed to it.

With reference to the managerial set-up, I believe the time has come when it would be advisable to have a full-time, well-paid general manager of the corporation, a man who would have the same rank as a deputy minister and would have under him a general manager who would be his executive head. In that event it would probably be possible to have a much smaller directorate. I realize very well the difficulties there are in this country with reference to a directorate of such an organization as the C.B.C. Canada's geographical position, the various national aspects and, if you wish, religious aspects of the undertaking, and other considerations make it extremely difficult to secure a directorate which will work in harmony all the time. Since the last report of the committee, the directorate have been meeting much more frequently than they formerly did. Meetings are held every two months, but I would suggest that if there were a smaller board of governors it might be well to have regional advisers for the four different sections of the country, the maritimes, Quebec, Ontario and western Canada. We could easily have managerial or regional advisers in these four sections who would give the benefit of their experience, and they would probably be much more conversant with the problems that confront radio management in their own particular sections.

Let us, however, face the facts. There will never be a radio set-up in this country which will entirely satisfy all sections. In the very nature of things that is not possible, because there is such a diversified interest in the public. One part of the public wants sports; another part wants music; another part wants some kind of intellectual lectures, and when they turn on the radio and do not get the particular programme which they like they think the radio is to be condemned for that reason. We have to cater to a great population with a diversified interest, and as long as the national system is making an attempt to cater to that diversified population, with its various tastes, we cannot please all at the same time. That might just as well be borne in mind when there is criticism of the corporation.

Some mention has been made of the amount of commercial work which is carried on by the organization; I mean the fees which are collected from industry for advertising purposes. It was never contended, as has been stated in some of the newspapers of the country, that the C.B.C. could carry on entirely on licence fees collected from the public. It was always thought there would have to be some revenue from commercial advertising. It has been said that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation was originally constituted on the altruistic basis recommended by the Aird commission, that all revenues which the publicly-owned corporation required were to be provided by the licence fees. Mr. Morin, chairman of the board of governors, answering a criticism by a newspaper in this country in that regard, has this to say:

> This statement, though completely erroneous, has been circulated so assiduously and continuously by critics of the corporation and especially among the newspapers, that many who have never consulted the record have come to believe it. The Aird report says definitely: "It is rather difficult to estimate what revenue would be collected for the rental of time, but we think that an amount of approximately $700,000 annually could be expcted at the beginning." Note, the Aird commission says "at the beginning", which indicates clearly that the commissioners expected this sum to increase from year to year.

The second error has to do with the revenues of the C.B.C. from advertising. It was stated as $1,800,000 a year in 1943. As a matter of fact, that is exactly $500,000 or nearly forty per cent more than the estimated revenue for 1943-44, which is $1,300,000. Then Mr. Morin goes on:

> Even this revenue, however, is not net. There are numerous items which must be deducted from it to obtain a net figure to the corporation. Moreover, it includes a very substantial volume of governmental war advertising which is obligatory and transitory.

That is to say, when the C.B.C. do a certain amount of advertising for the government they are paid for it and that is business which they cannot look to continuously from year to year, so that it is of a transitory type which the organization cannot count on.

> If all these are considered it will be found that C.B.C. revenues from commercial broadcasting even after several years of operation do not greatly exceed the figures originally set in 1928 by the Aird commission. There is no enormous jump in advertising revenues as suggested.

I see no harm in the C.B.C. getting a certain amount of revenue from advertising. All organizations having to do with broadcasting in the United States are privately owned and obtain their entire revenue from commercial

advertising, and the revenue of some of these organizations is very high. That of the national Broadcasting Company is $80,000,000 a year, and that has something to do with the type of programmes we are bound to have. Any organization that has a revenue of $80,000,000 a year and a population of 130,000,000 from whom talent can be drawn is in a much better position to give programmes that are considered better than those we are able to provide in this country.

What we want to do is to build up in Canada a type of programme that will be indicative of our Canadian people and Canadian culture, and it is folly to think we can have programmes put over the C.B.C. network that will compete with those in a country in which bigger organizations with much more money to spend are operating.

It has also been said that there is conflict between the C.B.C. and the privately owned stations. I do not think anything could be farther from the facts. The C.B.C. and the privately owned stations are made to appear as competitors, implying beyond question that there is unfair competition and disaffection among the privately owned stations. The facts are anything but as represented in that type of statement. The relationship between the C.B.C. and the privately owned stations is one of cooperation, not competition. Of the eighty-nine private stations that are on the air, seventy are on one or other of the C.B.C. networks and share in the revenues from network advertising, and they share on a very fair and equitable basis. They receive every day many programmes which they could not otherwise broadcast and which listeners in many parts of the country could not hear were it not for the C.B.C. network programmes which enhance the prestige and greatly increase the audiences of the privately owned stations.

I submit that were it not for the C.B.C. with their two extensive networks across the country, the manner in which they feed the privately owned stations with programmes, and the contribution they make to the revenues of those stations by passing on advertising to them, these privately owned and operated stations could not exist. It is because of that fact, because they are willing to cooperate with this great national and publicly owned utility, that the relationship between the privately owned station and the nationally owned station is as harmonious as it is.

In conclusion, I see a great future for radio in Canada. Let us remember that it is only in its infancy. I hope that the government will continue to maintain it as a strong public utility and a great instrument for education, information and entertainment. I hope that the committee, which is about to be set up, will give the affairs of the corporation earnest and sincere consideration and will make without fear or favour such recommendations as are considered to be in the interests of this public utility of the Canadian people.

Mr. DANIEL McIVOR (Fort William): I should like to support the hon. member who has just taken his seat; but in the words of another we might well say that "the half has not been told". I have appreciated the work of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in many ways. We have fun for the children; we have beautiful swing music for the young people and the help in the home, and we have relaxation for those like ourselves who have a good deal to think about when we can turn on the radio and listen to the broadcast of a hockey match. If we turn down the lights we can visualize ourselves witnessing a really thrilling game.

But that is not what I want to speak about. I should like to say, in support of the management of the C.B.C., that they are doing a great job in putting on "The Church of the Air" on Sunday afternoons. That half-hour on Sunday afternoons is better than all the rest that is put on the air on Sunday. It gives a colour that is badly needed to the citizens of Canada. Not only that but "The Church of the Air" on Sunday afternoons does two things. It permits the citizens of Canada to hear the best clergymen of the dominion, and those who listen in to "The Church of the Air" can go back and tell their own minister that he compares favourably with the best doctors of divinity in Canada.

I should like to pay my tribute to the local broadcasting stations. We are permitted to have a devotional period over our local station nearly every morning in the week, and they do not charge us five cents for it. Anybody who would not appreciate that is extremely stingy. I was one of those who tried to help along that line, and I have received more letters because of that than I ever received from giving a political speech over the radio. Therefore I say that the management have the right to be supported in giving leadership of a kind that is badly needed all over Canada, in allowing each of the denominations to have its turn on the air, to enlighten the citizens of Canada and to tell them of the Master Workman whom if they will follow, they will never come to grief.

Mr. GEORGE BLACK (Yukon): It is not my intention to delay the passing of the resolution to set up the committee; but before the motion is put to a vote I should like to suggest to the minister under whose department the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation comes, that they should be furnished with more powerful stations, stations that can send the message over the air for a greater distance than any of the stations we have in Canada can now send them.

In the Yukon we are not very far away from Vancouver, or Edmonton or any of those northwest cities. But in our locality it is seldom, if ever, that we can get any sound of a Canadian broadcast. We can get San Francisco, Seattle, Chicago, New York and London, England, but not Toronto, Vancouver or any of the Canadian cities.

Mr. MacNICOL: Do you get Watrous?

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): No. If the work of the corporation is to be effective in Canada it should have better equipment. Something has been said about the commercialization of the C.B.C. Advertising over the radio can be overdone, or, at least, I think it can be. There was an instance that came to my attention just a few weeks ago. Those of us who listen to the radio recall that usually when a broadcast is begun, the listeners are told the time of the day by a certain make of watch. I have never seen the watch they refer to and I do not know whether it is a good watch or a poor watch; but I do know that one listener said to me, "If I had to buy a watch and could not get any watch other than the one they advertise I would carry a sundial rather than buy one of those." As I say, advertising can be overdone, but I should like the minister to consider the suggestion that radio broadcasting stations be made stronger and more effective in order to reach the distant points in Canada.

Mr. THOMAS REID (New Westminster): Some of the remarks and speeches made this afternoon impel me to rise in my place and say a word or two regarding some of these before the resolution is passed.

The hon. member for York South (Mr. Noseworthy), in speaking about publicity, pointed out something each and every hon. member knows and fully realizes, namely, that speeches made in this house against either the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (Mr. Coldwell) or the C.C.F. have the effect of giving him or them lots of publicity; and they have had lots of publicity so far this year, due to that very method being applied. The hon. member for York South who, by the way, is one of the newer members of the house, may think he is letting the members of the house into a secret. Let me say to him in all sincerity that he is entirely wrong. Many of us have realized for a number of years that the more you attack a person or a party, the more you are publicizing that individual or party and making them better known to the world. I just wish to disillusion his mind in that respect and to tell him that many of us are fully aware of that. Three years ago the viewpoint was held by many members of the C.C.F. party that their speeches and debates in the house had the members of parliament buffaloed, but at least some members of that party have changed their minds in that respect, because they have realized this year that there are members on this side of the house who can hold their own when it comes to debating. I point that out in passing, because I should not like the impression to go abroad that the members on this side of the house are a lot of greenhorns; they are not.

Some references were made to the fear that some of us had of turning all radio over to the C.B.C.; that we were somewhat afraid of democracy. That is not an entirely true interpretation of the views which many of us hold. May I say that I am one of many other hon. members who fear a government monopolistic concern, just as much as we fear a private monopolistic concern. There is just as much danger in one as there is in the other, for this reason: we are nine provinces, and I view with some alarm much of the centralization that has taken place in Ottawa since the war commenced. Perhaps I speak as one who comes from three thousand miles away and who views with alarm this centralization; yet I say to the hon. members, let us be very careful and watchful of this government monopolistic concern. We know not what the future may hold; but, if not properly controlled or adjusted, it may be just as evil an any private monopolistic concern could be.

I have a great deal of sympathy for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, because, to my mind, they have done a great work. I do not think, however the entire picture has been put before the house this afternoon. I rather suspect the C.C.F. realize to a greater extent what the act actually contains than do some other hon. members. I was one who sat in the house in 1932 when the first radio bill was passed. I was more susceptible in those days than I am to-day, and I fell for things much more readily than I do now. I must admit that I was somewhat carried away by the statement of the then Right Hon. R. B. Bennett, who

painted a wonderful picture of what the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation would be for this country. He had in mind something which is still incorporated within the powers of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, but which is not generally understood, namely, the idea that there would be no private stations, once the corporation could operate fully.

There are those in the house who believe that everything in this country should be government-owned or state-owned. I differ from those views, and especially as it applies to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. It was pointed out in 1932 and has been pointed out since that radio in Great Britain is entirely government-owned. The statement was made further that in the United States, our neighbour to the south of us, it was entirely privately-owned.

I am one who believes we should follow neither country. This country is entirely different from the United States. We are a country of only some twelve million people. The latest report I have from Great Britain is —and it might be well for the committee to look into this—that the people over there are just waiting for the end of the war so that they can throw overboard their government-controlled radio. That is the information I have. Let us not be too easily carried away with the thought that as a part of the commonwealth we in this country might very well follow along the lines of Great Britain. I say to members of the house, and to the committee to be set up: Let us have our own system, one peculiar to this country of ours, following neither the one in Great Britain nor that in the United States.

The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), I believe by way of interjection, compared the radio with the two railway companies to-day. That is just the idea I should like to see carried out, a radio system somewhat similar to the two railway companies, one privately owned and the other government-owned, with a body supervising both. While there has been a good deal of criticism against private ownership by those who say, "criticism is just an attempt by the privately owned radio stations to throw the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation overboard," the information I have is that the owners of private radio stations have nothing but praise for the government-owned corporation. They realize, however, that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is working under difficulties, and that those difficulties are contained within the very act under which it works.

The owners of private radio stations do not want the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to be done away with. And while we give praise to the C.B.C. we must also give praise to the private stations, because it must be remembered that they were in existence long before the C.B.C. came into the picture. They would be in a better position to-day, were it not for the fact that they are circumscribed by the rules and regulations laid down by the C.B.C., the object of which in 1932, and I think in 1936 when the bill was put through, was gradually to have all radio absorbed under government ownership.

That thought and that information has not been put before members of the house, and I am taking a few minutes time just to place it clearly before them, believing that the act itself should be changed, and also that there is a place in this country for both privately owned and government-owned stations. If that change is not made, and privately owned stations are put out of business, we might have a serious monopolistic state-owned concern which none of us would like, and for which the country would suffer.

Information is given to me that on account of this very fact Canada's position will be very weak in 1946 when the conference is held at Havana, because the lines in this country have not been fully and properly developed. As is well known, the privately owned stations are held down to not over 1,000 watts. We in British Columbia can very well complain about the discrimination we suffer because, while Toronto and Montreal under the C.B.C. have 50,000 watt stations, there is no such station, or no station of that power in British Columbia. I bring this matter to the attention of the committee, and would ask that they give it consideration.

Something has been said about freedom of the air. I draw to the attention of the committee that there is some danger of allowing too many newspapers or newspaper chains to own and control private radio stations. In that lies a danger. A short time ago ex-Premier Pattulo of British Columbia introduced a measure which, I understand, has been refused by the legislature, under which he would compel newspapers to print letters sent to them in self-defence by those who have felt that they have been defamed through either editorials or letters sent to the newspapers concerned. Nothing so far, I believe, has been done about that bill, but it has some merit. It does show, however, the trend of things, and that matters of this kind will have to be considered. I would ask the committee to view that aspect of our radio set-up, and find

out how many newspapers are in control of private radio stations. More than one newspaper has taken the attitude, and so stated, that it was in control of many of the public men in this country and, by criticism, could put some of them out of public life. I, for one, do not want to see freedom of speech, either through the medium of the press or over the air, put into the hands of private monopoly, nor do I wish to see freedom of speech over the air put completely under a government monopoly, such as we are drifting to in this country.

Hon. L. R. LaFLECHE (Minister of National War Services): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon and this evening I listened to some excellent and constructive criticisms, and to others which, to my mind, were to the contrary. First, I shall say a few words, not about that which is constructive, but in answer to some of the allegations which have been made in this honourable house.

Before proceeding to do so, may I observe that we in Canada have in operation a dual system of radio broadcasting. We have a system which last year I described in the following words—words which I believe still describe the situation prevailing in Canada:

> In the matter of radio broadcasting as in so many other respects, Canada occupies a midway position between Great Britain and the United States. In Great Britain, broadcasting is controlled by the crown, whereas in the United States, radio is privately owned. In Canada we have both systems and I have not yet observed anything which has convinced me that we should be better off with either one or the other system alone. It is a matter for serious consideration whether it were wise to make up our minds in regard to this matter whilst Canada is engaged in war, or even until some time after the war is over, until victory is won, and we are well advanced in the reconstruction work which must necessarily follow this war.

I make the further observation that Canada is still engaged in a life or death struggle with her enemies. The flower of our young manhood and womanhood are fighting our enemies thousands of miles away from their homes. It might not be fair to those who have undertaken the great responsibilities of defending us so that we may live safely in peace at home to decide certain problems before they are able to return to this country. War time is not a normal time. Situations are aggravated in times of war. I am really stating my personal belief that we would do well to make haste slowly in deciding finally whether Canada is to adopt one of these two systems or whether we should try to do better with what we have.

It is possible to do better with what we have. That applies not only to our radio broadcasting system but to every other human endeavour. It is our purpose in life to progress, to do better with those things which we control. It was with real regret that I heard to-day what sounded to me like reflections upon those Canadian citizens, all persons of standing and quality, who have assumed the onerous duties of membership on the board of governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. It is indeed poor recompense to be criticized in a place where they have no voice.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I ask the minister if he has read the report of the 1942 committee because that is all that was quoted?

Mr. LaFLECHE: I do not want to lose the thread of my thought. As I say, I was grieved to hear these persons dealt with in a manner which I thought was unfair in a place where they had no voice. I want to come to their defence in all fairness and in all decency to them as well as to other persons who serve Canada and who have no voice in this house.

Some of the members of the board of governors of the broadcasting corporation have been praised and they should be praised. I believe the nominations which I had the honour to recommend were highly meritorious. Those people honoured the board of governors by accepting the positions, just as they were honoured by Canada by having those positions offered to them. A lady was named a governor in order that the women of Canada might have a representative on this board to defend if necessary the particular interests of Canadian womanhood. That lady is a jewel in the crown of the broadcasting corporation. I know of no one I would rather have on the board of governors than one gentleman who has had such a splendid and long experience in matters concerning labour—I refer to Mr. Howard Chase. He has done an extremely good job since he was appointed, as has the lady.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Who is the lady?

Mr. LaFLECHE: Mrs. Sutherland. She replaced Mrs. McClung who had to resign because of ill health. Another appointment was that of Mr. Crawford of Toronto. He is a man of affairs, a broad-minded and fair-minded gentleman. Let me say to my hon. friend who does me the honour of looking at me at this moment that there are many excellent men in Toronto.

Mr. BRUCE: I would approve your selection there.

Mr. LaFLECHE: It was my good fortune to have my invitation to join the board of governors accepted by another gentleman who for years has been actively engaged in agriculture. He is still carrying on that occupation, but his activities have increased to the extent where he has assumed responsibilities over matters concerning many thousands of his fellow farmers. I refer to Mr. Parker of Winnipeg. I suggest that that lady and those three gentlemen could not be bettered anywhere in Canada. We in this House of Commons owe those four persons a debt of gratitude for their willingess to continue to serve under what I submit are not very pleasant circumstances because of the things that have been said about them and about their work.

Mr. GRAYDON: Is there not one jewel missing from the crown you spoke of?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is going to be filled.

Mr. LaFLECHE: There is only one jewel in the crown; the others are mere gold; they constitute the setting. I was coming to that vacancy. That vacancy has caused considerable concern to some of my hon. friends in this house and to some people outside the house. I have been taken to task by a genial hon. gentleman who sits on the other side. He is such a genial and fine gentleman that I have trouble at times in believing that he can speak so harshly and drastically to me and to others of his colleagues in this house. But to relieve his feelings, to bring his blood pressure down a little, let me say that having given the house the measure of the standard of quality of the members of the board of governors as I would like to continue to choose them, I hope very soon, next week, to announce the appointment of a person who will compare very favourably even with those I have mentioned. But the board of governors have not yet made a recommendation to me in regard to the general manager. I know on good authority that the board of governors have been able to operate very successfully even though there has been one missing, No. 9. It must be remembered that the radio broadcasting act provides for the automatic filling of the position of general manager when he is absent. Therefore, there has been at all times a general manager of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Section 6 of the act makes the provision I have in mind in regard to the appointment of a general manager of the corporation. It says that the general manager shall be named by the governor in council on the recommendation of the board of governors of the C.B.C.

I know the board of governors have been giving extremely careful attention to this matter. They have wanted to make a recommendation to me, but they have not yet done so, and until they do I am quite powerless to take any action in the matter. I say that plainly, and I know that when hon. members realize the position they will be quiet in their minds in that respect.

I have heard something said in the house to-day about commercial advertising on the radio and it seemed to be in the mind of some hon. gentlemen that the C.B.C. has entered upon a field where it has no right. I do not believe that is the case. I have read the act again, and paragraph (f) of the objects of the corporation will relieve any hon. member's mind as to its being quite within the intended objects of the corporation to enter into contracts here in Canada or elsewhere in connection with programmes.

In view of what I have brought to your attention, Mr. Speaker, the position of the corporation has become weakened, it has been suggested, in the minds of the Canadian public, which is something that I do not admit or believe. But were such the case, I am very sorry to have to say that in my opinion such weakened position, such impaired reputation of the corporaton, would be due to those who have thoughtlessly or for other reasons spoken so often to the public in that vein. They themselves are responsible. In that connection I would say this. The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is a valuable piece of property. That piece of property belongs to the people of this country, and I submit that it is a piece of property the value of which should be safeguarded by all Canadians. I think all hon. members have a direct and specific duty in helping to preserve the value of that piece of property. I know of no better way of protecting that property than by each of us in this house doing what he can to preserve and enhance the reputation of those who are there doing the work.

So far as the board of governors are concerned, they are working for nothing, and again I bring that to your attention, Mr. Speaker, and to that of hon. members because I know that in the final issue this house is a very fair-minded body of men. Until we win a victorious peace, the main objective of our lives to-day, I should so much like to see in Canada some of that peace-loving here at home for which our boys are fighting so far away from us.

I have heard something said about the new short-wave station at Sackville, New Brunswick, I should like to reassure hon. members that there has been no delay in the matter of

bringing the station to completion as yet, for the reason that we have not yet reached the date first estimated as that upon which the station would be in operation. But I have to report, as was mentioned last year to many hon. gentlemen, that there is still difficulty in obtaining certain equipment necessary for the completion of the station. I know something about what has been done in an attempt to gain better priorities, which one hon. gentleman mentioned this afternoon. I would like to reassure you, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. gentleman that the authorities of the C.B.C. have been taking steps for several months to try to secure higher priorities so that there will be no delay in this matter. But there again, important as our short-wave station is going to be, I understand and believe that it is still more important that the factories should turn out the radio equipment and other technical equipment needed for our boys in the air and on the land and at sea to enable them not merely to carry on their fight for us but to preserve their lives in the face of the enemy. I think that is the correct position, and I give it to you, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) this afternoon asked the specific question of me, whether a certain article or talk on the radio had been censored. At the beginning I must confess that I did not quite understand his reference, but during the recess I did obtain some information. I take it that the hon. gentleman means: Was that speech submitted to the government, to the headquarters of the C.B.C., or was it submitted to anybody? I should like to make a categorical reply to that. It was not submitted to the government. I am convinced that it never reached Ottawa, was not submitted to Ottawa. I do not know whether the manager of the station over which it was proposed to give the talk had it submitted to him. It might have been, but if that were done I would say to the hon. member that that is quite in keeping with the regulations, because there are certain regulations which must be observed and respected. I am sorry that I have not had time to get more definite information about the local station than I have just given, I am speaking with definite assurance about the government, I am quite sure that the speech was not sent to Ottawa. It might be, though I do not think so, that the script was looked at by the manager of the local station. I trust that that will be acceptable to the hon. member.

Mr. GRAYDON: In such a case as that which was mentioned by the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) with respect to the commentator in Vancouver, can a commentator make statements of such a nature without running counter to the censorship regulations? I raise the point because, I believe, the minister is also the minister in charge of censorship.

Mr. LaFLECHE: I regret very much that I cannot give my hon. friend the answer I should like to give, because I have never read the article and I do not know really what is in it. He will agree, therefore, that I cannot give him any conclusive answer. I might say this to assist him in coming to an opinion of his own, although I am really repeating what I said, that there are certain regulations having to do with the defence of Canada regulations, the safeguarding of which is in the keeping of the manager of the radio station in question. That is all I can say. I cannot guess better than that. If he wishes, I shall be very glad to go into the circumstances with him; but I should like to read the talk in question.

Mr. GRAYDON: I am reluctant to intervene at this time, and I would not interrupt the hon. gentleman but that the matter seems to me to be so important. I do not press the minister for an answer to-night, because obviously he is not in possession of the necessary facts; but I should like him, first of all, to produce the script which the commentator used on that occasion, and which there will be no difficulty in obtaining; also, to make such inquiries and investigations as the minister can, so that at another time, perhaps during the ensuing week, we may be able to get, on the orders of the day, or on some of the estimates on the war appropriation, a satisfactory answer. I am frank to say that this has caused me no little concern.

Mr. GOLDING: Let the minister make his speech.

Mr. GRAYDON: This is a matter of grave concern.

Mr. GOLDING: It does not need half an hour to state that.

Mr. GRAYDON: Oh, well now, I am trying to be helpful on this. It is a matter of serious import so far as the country is concerned, or I would not try to intervene. I should like to have the matter cleared up. We as members of the House of Commons have respected the government's attitude on this matter, and we think those outside should not have special privileges in dealing with questions of this kind which we ourselves do not have.

Mr. LaFLECHE: I shall look into this matter as quickly as I can arrange to do so, and I shall do my best to have the information available for the satisfaction of my hon.

friend. I add that I do so with great pleasure, because what is a matter of concern in regard to what I deem to be the nature of this talk is necessarily of great concern to all Canadians, including myself.

I heard something said earlier to-day about political broadcasting. I heard something also about that classical case of absentee landlordism as represented by a very worthy gentleman, the leader of the Progressive Conservative party. That case caused a great deal of comment and a bit of interest at the time. My conception of the whole incident is that it was a piece of clever—I think, too clever—publicity on the part of the publicity staff of Mr. John Bracken. I do not believe that Mr. Bracken knew just what was being done for him or in his name. I have been informed that the publicity office in question believed that their offer could not be accepted on the script which was shown, not submitted, to the C.B.C. authorities. It has been expressed to me, and I have seen it in the press, that those responsible purposely made a gesture knowing that it could not be accepted because there are regulations governing such matters. Those regulations are known to all and sundry. They were published, and pamphlets distributed in large numbers a long time ago. Furthermore, I understand that the political party of which Mr. Bracken is the leader was a party to an understanding in regard to these particular regulations. Well, now, whatever the victory for the moment of such a good piece, sly piece of publicity might have been, I suggest—

Mr. GRAYDON: Did I catch the minister aright: he said, a "sly piece" of something?

Mr. LaFLECHE: Yes. If the hon. gentleman is affronted by that word I shall try to find another. I shall use, if you like, "too clever" publicity stunt. I do not believe that the Canadian public can possibly be impressed with such publicity work as that, for the old political party I mentioned a moment ago—

Mr. ROSS (Souris): The brand new one.

Mr. LaFLECHE: I have not succumbed to the temptation of casting sly remarks about the continued changing of the name of these hon. gentlemen. I believe that they are a legitimate party, and I would not question either their parentage or their baptism.

Mr. BRUCE: Nor their sincerity.

Mr. LaFLECHE: Nor their sincerity; but their wisdom, of course!

Something also was said about General McNaughton. That may be the Philpott article; I am not certain.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend has covered that.

[Mr. LaFleche.]

Mr. LaFLECHE: I wish to add that I respect an officer who has had the honour of commanding a Canadian army too greatly to bring him too much into the limelight in a case like this.

I heard this afternoon the term "amazement" used—and I think this was done by the C.C.F. party—at certain things that had happened. That reminds me of certain ejaculations or expressions used by spinster ladies when they are amazed at something they know full well has happened.

Something was said this afternoon about manipulations and working behind the scenes, something about working surreptitiously, and I took it to mean certain publicity for the followers of these hon. gentlemen. I recall also that the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell) repeated time after time that the hon. member leading that party was trotting down continuously to the C.B.C. If he did that he wore rubber heels, but it does not mean that he did not go. Only he, of course, would know.

I come now perhaps to the only serious thing said to-day—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. LaFLECHE: I am sorry the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church) is not here. He implored us, and I think he was right, to cultivate a more acute sense of humour. Let me say that the only serious thing—because there was an implication in it—that was said this afternoon was that there had been government interference with the C.B.C. This is an honourable house. Our conduct and our language are both governed by rules and usage. I must therefore respect the ancient custom. I shall use mild language in flatly denying that there has been any interference with the C.B.C. politically by the Canadian government. If we were in camp, honest soldier talk would permit me to use a word which Mr. Speaker will not let me use in this house. It is just as short as that, Mr. Speaker, and that is the truth. Now come along—

Mr. COLDWELL: May I ask the minister to put on the record the statement he made on November 17?

Mr. LaFLECHE: The hon. gentleman has anticipated me, sir. Yes; I shall put it on the record, accompanied by an expression of my regret that the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) felt it advisable to stop after he had read just one-third of my press release of November 16, 1943.

Mr. COLDWELL: I was diverted from it. I did not realize until I read *Hansard* that I had not read it all. I apologize for that.

Mr. LaFLECHE: I thank my hon. friend. May I read it from beginning to end:

The acting general manager of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation recently discussed with me an item "Of Things to Come" which had been proposed for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation programme. The acting general manager stated that this item had not progressed satisfactorily and, indeed, that it had never been submitted to the board of governors. He added that he deemed it necessary to refer the matter to his board and therefore, in the meantime, this item would be considered closed until the proposal had been properly surveyed and approved by competent Canadian Broadcasting Corporation authority. What the acting general manager told me was his own decision and that of no other person.

That is the end of the press release. I wish to add at this time an expression of admiration for the acting general manager, Doctor Augustin Frigon. He acted, in my opinion, as he should have acted. He acted on his own and he acted like a man. Statements made this afternoon had to do with this programme "Of Things To Come." The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar, in my opinion, and the hon. member for, I believe, Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) both levelled charges of government interference. Now, the hon. gentleman I mentioned in second place very quickly drew to the attention of you, Mr. Speaker, that he had used the word "alleged." Well, to take the trouble to protect oneself by slipping in the word "alleged" when one has nothing plain in one's heart is not the act of a brave man, and I regret very much to say this, but actions of that kind remind me that it is well in war time to act the man even though one has not chosen to go to meet the enemy. I have no admiration for men who do nothing of which I know to help to win the war, but remain at home, perhaps not willingly yet effectively, to cause trouble in a family which should remain united so that we can do a better job in helping the other united nations in downing our enemies.

Mr. COLDWELL: I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. gentleman not casting an innuendo with an imputation reflecting upon the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre?

Mr. LaFLECHE: And the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar.

Mr. COLDWELL: And the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar. Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, the minister admits that he was casting an imputation by innuendo on the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and on myself. That is clearly against the rules of this house and I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw.

Mr. LaFLECHE: May I speak, Mr. Speaker? The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar had asked Your Honour a question. I was assisting him in putting his question to you.

Mr. COLDWELL: Mr. Speaker, let us be truthful at least.

Mr. STIRLING: That is another.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not catch what the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar said last.

Mr. COLDWELL: I said, let us be truthful.

Mr. LaFLECHE: Hear, hear.

Mr. SPEAKER: It seems to me that both hon. gentlemen should withdraw. I think it should be dropped.

Mr. LaFLECHE: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. minister's time has expired.

Mr. LaFLECHE: May I ask a few moments to complete—

Mr. COLDWELL: May I ask for a ruling, Mr. Speaker. I am quite prepared to withdraw my remark if the minister withdraws his.

Mr. LaFLECHE: Of course, Mr. Speaker; if I am at fault, of course I wish to make amends. I am a law-abiding man and I am truthful.

Mr. COLDWELL: I give up.

Mr. LaFLECHE: I wish to be very, very brief, sir. I heard the hon. member for Macleod mention a subject this afternoon on which I wish to afford him all the support of which I am capable. He said that it is wise and necessary that we respect and do what we can to see that the Sabbath is respected. I believe that is a proper thing, and in that connection may I say to him through you, sir, that there was set up by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation a long time ago what I believe is termed a religious committee. I am not certain that that is its proper name, but whatever its name may be it was given all facilities to broadcast the Word.

I recall also that the hon. gentleman mentioned the high cost of talent. It is not for me to defend the C.B.C. operations in this respect; but is it not a case of the labourer being worthy of his hire? I do not believe any very great salaries are being paid in Canada. I think it is rather unfortunate, but remember that high-class talent is like a delicate flower,

it does not live long, and even if it is well paid I personally cannot follow the hon. member in that respect.

The same hon. gentleman expressed some fear that this country might some day be governed under nationalist socialism. Well, I wish to give him my assurance in that respect again. I do not think that will be the case.

Mr. COLDWELL: Nor do I.

Mr. LaFLECHE: We have now the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar expressing publicly in this house the view, the opinion, that he will never come to power.

Mr. COLDWELL: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. We are at war with the national socialists and when hon. gentlemen in this house try to apply that term to this group, the members of this party, I say that that transgresses the rules of this house and decency. I would not call any member of this house a national socialist, and I say that either it be withdrawn or you arrest me as an enemy of this country, one or the other. You cannot have it both ways.

Mr. LaFLECHE: High-class talent. My hon. friend is melodramatic.

Mr. COLDWELL: It is just about time this stopped. We are fighting the national socialists and I object to this epithet being hurled at me personally in this house.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Is this a speech or a point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has taken exception and has stated his position; there is no point of order. The hon. gentleman has made a statement denying that he is identified with the national socialists. He has stated his position emphatically, and no point of order arises.

Mr. COLDWELL: I ask that the minister withdraw the term.

Mr. LaFLECHE: I think Mr. Speaker has given me the floor. Would the hon. gentleman care to continue?

Mr. COLDWELL: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar is asking the minister to withdraw the statement.

Mr. COLDWELL: As an imputation against my character.

Mr. SPEAKER: The statement I heard the minister make was not one that identified the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar as a national socialist.

Mr. COLDWELL: Oh, yes.

[Mr. LaFleche.]

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Do not deny what the Speaker says.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps the minister would repeat the statement that he made. The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar has the right to object to a statement which he thinks imputes something which he has emphatically denied. I wish to be sure as to what the statement was. I did not so identify the statement as the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar has, and I wish, therefore, to know exactly what the statement was.

Mr. LaFLECHE: May I express regret that my voice is not clear to-night. I shall try to speak loudly enough so that Your Honour will understand me. A moment ago I attempted to give assurance, assurance in the form of my opinion, to the hon. member for Macleod that he had no reason to fear that this country would ever be governed by a party of national socialists. Then the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar hurriedly took that unto himself by saying "not us".

Mr. COLDWELL: No.

Mr. LaFLECHE: "Not I", whatever it was.

Mr. COLDWELL: I said, "nor do I."

Mr. LaFLECHE: I must be given an opportunity to make my cracked voice heard by His Honour, the Speaker.

Mr. COLDWELL: You know what you said.

Mr. LaFLECHE: I said that the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar, as I understood him, immediately claimed that I was aiming at him. He immediately—

Mr. COLDWELL: No.

Mr. LaFLECHE: He immediately came forward and accepted the name.

Mr. COLDWELL: No.

Mr. LaFLECHE: By saying, "not I" or "not us," or whatever it was.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. LaFLECHE: Then, Mr. Speaker, I gave some further good news to the hon. member for Macleod. I have been sympathetic to that hon. gentleman for a long time. I am not laughing a bit, and I trust the reason is not one for which one might laugh. This evening I agreed with him very readily, very heartily and very sincerely on the point of the Sabbath. There is then some communion between the two of us, and I wished to give him that further assurance. I did so in good faith. The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar does not like to be called, or his party to be called,

national socialists, despite what has been said many times and despite that his lieutenant in British Columbia preached the methods employed by that party in Germany of which our friend says he is not a—

Mr. COLDWELL: Mr. Speaker, I ask, if I may, to get a transcript of what the hon. member has said. This reminds me of nothing more than the hon. member's evidence when he was appearing before the committee some years ago.

Mr. LaFLECHE: Mr. Speaker, that confirms my view in regard to the hon. gentleman's position in regard to making war against the enemy in our country.

Mr. COLDWELL: I am asking, Your Honour, that you get a transcript.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have sent for the transcript.

Mr. LaFLECHE: If I may proceed, something was said this afternoon about Canadian Press and British United Press dispatches, and the editing of the newscasts. We have heard a great deal about that. I wish to enlighten the house by saying that quite a number of employees of the corporation work throughout the day. I am told that there are sixteen working hours in the day. It is in my opinion a most appropriate subject to be taken up by the committee which, I trust, will be sitting before very long.

In that respect I think it is the duty of the committee we have in mind to do everything possible to assist the governors, the officials and the members of the staff of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in making of the C.B.C. a Canadian system for the betterment of our country and all its people.

Motion agreed to.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

REFERENCE OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS AND AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT TO COMMITTEE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would ask leave to return to the order for motions. We have now appointed all the committees. In other years there has been a suggestion that the auditor general's report and the public accounts should be referred to the public accounts committee at an early stage of the session. I would therefore move:

That the public accounts for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1943, and the auditor general's report for the year 1942-43 be referred to the standing committee on public accounts.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Bradette in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

1. Departmental administration, $130,406.

Mr. REID: There are two matters I should like to bring to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture. While neither of them may come directly under his administration, still I cannot see how the procedure I am about to discuss could become effective unless through the advice of his officials, or of the minister himself.

The first item has to do with the cost of hay. In British Columbia the ceiling price on hay amounts to some $22 a ton. May I point out that I thought it was foolish to put a ceiling price on hay because, as is well known, hay is one commodity which is exchanged between farmer and farmer, and does not as a rule travel any great distance from one market to another.

What is the present situation in regard to hay in British Columbia, and particularly at points along the Pacific coast? It is maintained that the ceiling price is away below the cost of production. Many farmers have taken the attitude that they are not going to sell a product, the cost of which has been far more than would be the selling price. The result is that hay has not moved, and that there is a shortage in certain districts. I understand hay is being brought in from the prairie provinces, and that $35 to $39 a ton is being paid. Usually straw is sold for half the price of hay. However, the situation on the Pacific coast, and in the Fraser valley is that in many instances straw is being sold for $24 or $25 a ton, whereas the selling price of hay, no matter what the quality, is set at $22.

That is the situation faced by the farmers in that area, and it is a condition which is affecting purchasers of hay. I suppose the wartime prices and trade board officials have discussed this matter with officials of the Department of Agriculture. But if they did I am wondering if they took into consideration the extent of the country, and that the fixing of a ceiling price at one point may work a hardship and have no bearing whatsoever on actual conditions in another.

The other point to which I would direct the attention of the minister has to do with potatoes. The treaty on potatoes allows potatoes from the United States to enter free. But, generally speaking, all potatoes going to the United States have a duty placed upon them. We in British Columbia have been

developing a seed potato market, and it is estimated that there are about a thousand tons of first-class seed potatoes available and for sale, for which a ready market can be found in the state of Washington. But when those potatoes are exported to Washington, those purchasing the seed have to pay a duty of $15 a ton on which, to keep the record straight, I believe they have a rebate of $7.50 a ton after six months. But in effect the price given by the Washington buyers of seed to the sellers of seed potatoes in British Columbia is set, with that tariff to be paid in lieu.

I am one who believes in reciprocity. If we allow potatoes to come into this country free, then they should allow our potatoes to go into the state of Washington, or into other states free. I do not know how this situation affects the farmers of the maritime provinces, but I know the potato situation is greatly affected in British Columbia, on account of the tariff condition.

I believe these regulations are set, first of all, by the Minister of Finance, under the trade treaties, and, second, by the wartime prices and trade board, in so far as the question of hay is concerned. But I am beseeching the minister to do something about these matters. On many occasions I have said I should like to have seen the minister in charge of these matters, because I do not think the injustices and inequalities prevalent in agriculture would have been so marked, had all agricultural matters been under his control.

Since these matters have been drawn to my attention, and because they affect our people greatly, I am asking the minister to make a statement. If he has not the information at hand, I am asking if he will present the matter to his departmental officials, and to the wartime prices and trade board.

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): This is a matter under the control of the prices board and I have not before me the details with which to deal fully with it. From what has been said by the hon. member for New Westminster I understand that farmers in his district find it difficult to carry on trading in hay as between farmers in the same area, because certain price ceilings have been placed on that commodity. I am not sufficiently familiar with the regulations with regard to hay to deal with the matter to-night, but I shall bring down this information when my estimates are up at a later time.

I should think there is some argument for maintaining that where a transaction is between farmers in a district it should be pretty well taken care of as it is in connection with most other commodities upon which the price board has placed control. I understand why ceiling prices are necessary in order to maintain controls when hay is delivered to a market, or when it is shipped from one part of the country to another, but as a rule the transfer of a commodity from one farmer to another within a district is pretty well taken care of. This principle is generally applied in connection with the ceilings placed upon different products.

Mr. REID: What about potatoes?

Mr. GARDINER: They are under the control of either the customs or the prices board, and I would not care to offer an opinion at the moment without getting further information from them.

I have before me a statement in answer to some of the questions asked the other evening by the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright) and having to do with grass seeds, particularly clover seed and alfalfa seed. I think I should put these answers upon the record at this time. Under authority of order in council, P.C. 5428, dated July 9, 1943, the special products board was authorized to purchase and to become the sole exporter of surpluses of agricultural seeds, subject to determination by the Minister of Agriculture as to classes of seed to be included. The board was also authorized to arrange for the distribution to producers of each class of seed of any net profits resulting from its transactions. The reasons for the establishment of this method of control were set forth in the order in council as follows:

> That prices for certain agricultural seeds used only for seeding purposes obtainable in the United States and other allied countries are considerably higher than prices obtainable in Canada under established price ceilings;
>
> That these differences in price have rendered it impossible to control exports in a manner equitable to producers and at the same time to assure retention and distribution in Canada of supplies of seed necessary to meet domestic requirements;
>
> That to secure for producers the full advantage of export outlets for such seeds and to secure equitable allocation of supplies to allied nations which are looking to Canada as a source of supply of these seeds, it is necessary to centralize all export transactions.

In other words, all seed purchased is purchased by the board and distributed to the different allies. Up to the present time it has been found necessary to make the special products board the sole exporting agency for only the following classes of seeds: alfalfa, alsike, red clover and alsike-white clover mixtures. Subject to the securing of export permits on the recommendation of the agri-

cultural supplies board, the seed trade or producer cooperatives have been free to take advantage of any export outlet available for seeds such as sweet clover, timothy and brome grass, production of which in 1943 was greatly in excess of Canadian requirements.

Purchase by the special products board of alfalfa, red clover, alsike and alsike-white clover mixtures has been limited to quantities surplus to Canadian requirements and to supplies required, as in the case of alfalfa, to meet allocations by the combined food board to the United Kingdom. Seeds required to meet Canadian requirements are handled as in the past through regular seed trade channels.

Prices at which the board has been prepared to purchase any of the seeds brought under its control were set forth at the beginning of the season in detail by grades on an f.a.s. Halifax basis, and at levels in relation to established retail ceilings which should permit seed needed to meet Canadian requirements to move freely. These prices are materially below those available not only in the United States but in the United Kingdom at which seed exported by the board will be sold.

Net profits to the board from its transactions resulting from the difference between the prices at which seed is bought by the board and resold by it, less any cost of moving the seed other than the administrative costs of the seed export office, will be returned to producers who sold their seed on a participation plan. In other words, producers will receive in full measure any profit resulting from export sales uninfluenced by the operations of speculative interests. The value to producers of participation certificates issued for any kind of seed sold by them will be dependent upon the amount of seed of that kind exported and upon the total quantity of that kind of seed purchased by the trade on a participation basis from farmers up to March 15. That is the total statement in answer to the questions asked the other evening by the hon. member for Melfort.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: The hon. member for Melfort wished to know whether or not those who are purchasing seeds on participation certificates have been instructed to issue certificates to those from whom they purchase. It seems that some farmers who have sold seeds to these purchasers did not receive participation certificates, and they had no assurance that they would participate in the profits obtained from the sale of the seed.

Mr. GARDINER: When the statement is read in *Hansard* I think it will be found that it is made quite clear. There is a possibility that seed may be sold without its being placed in the hands of the board, and of course in such cases there would be no participation certificate. A man may make a deal with another person who desires to buy seed and he will probably not ask for a participation certificate. If he desires to deal through the board, or if the board is purchasing for export, then participation certificates will be asked for and obtained.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Who is doing the purchasing for the board?

Mr. GARDINER: Any of the approved seed houses.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: If purchases are made by persons not operating seed houses they would not have to give participation certificates?

Mr. GARDINER: The term "seed dealer" would cover practically any person in the habit of purchasing seed from farmers and selling it to others. Such a dealer would issue a participation certificate.

Mr. HATFIELD: I understand the war distribution board of the United States are now taking a great many cars of potatoes off their market in order to support the floor under potatoes and that our wartime food corporation is bringing those potatoes into Canada to supply our market when there is a surplus of potatoes in this country. Can the minister tell me how many cars have been purchased in the last few days by the wartime prices and trade board and how many they intend to bring into Canada?

Mr. GARDINER: I am sure my hon. friend will realize that it would not be possible for me to have information here as to the number of cars purchased within the last few days. That information is not available. I would suggest to the committee that these detailed questions about individual items should be asked when we reach the particular items, and then we could carry on any general discussion we wish to have from where we left off last Friday.

The CHAIRMAN: The minister is quite right. There was to be a general discussion on this item, and questions on the details of individual items should be asked when the items are reached.

Mr. REID: When I asked my question a few moments ago I could not find an item in the estimates on which I could ask about the exportation of potatoes, nor did I see any item on which I could ask about hay prices. That is why I brought those two questions up now. I said that in British Columbia there

were about a thousand tons of first-class seed potatoes available and for sale. I particularly mention that because the committee will remember that last year I had an argument with the minister and some of his officials who had said that the Fraser valley was a deficiency area so far as potatoes were concerned. I pointed out then that the Fraser valley could grow any amount of potatoes, and this year the Fraser valley producers saved the situation in Ontario, because twelve cars of good British Columbia potatoes were sent to Ontario from there not long ago, but for which the potato situation in Ontario would have been very short indeed. We are anxious that the minister will make representations soon regarding the exportation of seed.

Mr. GARDINER: The question might have been asked under the item relating to fruits and vegetables. I give the only answer I could give to the question asked a few moments ago, because it really does not touch this department at all. I just made a general statement with regard to it. I think we should discuss details about individual items as they are reached.

Mr. HATFIELD: If too many potatoes come into our market they will demoralize the market. It is up to the minister to protect the market on agricultural products.

Mr. SENN: The minister has made a statement regarding the seed situation and regarding the remarks made by the hon. member for Melfort. I think the minister's answer was fairly complete, but as I understand it the hon. member for Yorkton asked about participation certificates and whether they had been handed out to everyone who had sold seed. In my area a certain amount of seed had passed out of the hands of farmers before this order came down, and for that reason they did not receive participation certificates. I think what the hon. member for Yorkton had in mind to ask was whether these gentlemen who had sold their seed prior to the bringing down of the order which the minister read are going to receive participation certificates. I believe it is true that they did receive a higher price than that received after the order came down.

I would ask the minister to explain to the committee, just why the special products marketing board set the price for the seed for export at the levels they did. It certainly is not in line with the retail ceiling price which we can get for seeds in Canada; setting the price they did on red clover, alfalfa and alsike had the effect of bringing down the price to the farmer, and as a result the seed that was sold in the domestic trade is going to give a handsome profit to the dealer. If I understand the situation there will be little, if any, alfalfa to be shipped out of the country and no red clover at all. So that the participation certificates will not be of any value on these two classes of seed. On the other hand, there will be quite a handsome profit on alsike seed. These participation certificates will be worth a considerable amount. The primary dealers bought the seed first from the farmers, cleaned it once and resold it, and the result will be that the farmers are going to say, when the proceeds of a big participation certificate are returned to them, that the dealers have not paid them enough. They are going to say: We have been gypped for years past by those dealers. I do not think it is fair to the dealers that they should be blamed. I would ask the minister to explain, if not now, on some other item just why the special products marketing board placed these prices where they did. In my opinion they were not high enough.

Mr. GARDINER: I probably misled the committee in bringing down this answer at all at this time. The question was asked the other evening and I passed it over then. The discussion properly comes under item 19 relating to plant products, seeds, feeds and so forth.

Mr. SENN: Or else under the item for the special products marketing board in the war appropriation.

Mr. GARDINER: Either one or the other. There were two or three statements made by the hon. member for Melfort the other evening which covered the points raised and now I have specific answers for them which I should like to place on the record. For example, it was stated by the hon. member for Melfort:

> This year, the special products marketing board has taken over the complete marketing of grass and clover seed, all domestic requirements being handled through that board.

That is his statement. Now here are the facts: Up to the present time the board has not been handling all clover seeds as, for example, sweet clover, has not taken over the sole export of any grass seeds, and has not been authorized to handle seed for domestic requirements. The board is not handling much of the seed. Much of the seed is being handled by seed houses and others, unless it is being purchased for special purposes. Not all of the different kinds of grass and clover seeds are being handled by the board.

The next statement was this:

> According to a return tabled yesterday on the motion of the hon. member for York East (Mr. McGregor), the export price is 34½ cents a pound.

That is the statement already on *Hansard*, made by the hon. member for Melfort. The answer to that is: This is the price at which the board is purchasing registered No. 1 alfalfa, f.a.s. Halifax. The price at which this seed will be resold to the British ministry of agriculture will be materially higher. Therefore there will be a further distribution to persons with participation certifications.

Another statement made was this:

However, I do not see why the producer of alfalfa seed should bear the brunt of this action. He is facing a loss of from 8 to 10 cents a pound.

That was the statement made the other evening. The answer to that is this: As stated, any profits resulting from export transactions in respect to any class of seed handled by the board will be returned to producers who sold on a participation basis seed of that class ultimately used either in meeting domestic requirements or in filling export orders.

Those are the facts with regard to the matters discussed the other evening. If the committee is agreeable, I should like to have further discussion of seed matters take place when the officials are here with all the facts.

Mr. SENN: I fully agree with the minister and will make only one further remark now, and that is in the nature of a warning. This other item might not come up before a considerable time. If I am correctly informed, there is not enough alfalfa seed in Canada this year to meet our domestic requirements. It would be too bad if seed were exported from the country by the special products marketing board or any other organization and not enough seed left in the country to go around. That is particularly true of eastern Canada. We must get our supplies from the west this year. I hope the minister will take these facts into account before any damage is done.

Mr. GARDINER: That is the objective of the order in council which was passed last year. By the sixth of July there could not have been much seed exported out of last year's crop. The intention is to do the same as is now suggested ought to be done, namely, to take control over the export of seed to see that too much does not go out of the country.

Mr. SENN: Some has gone out?

Mr. GARDINER: Yes.

Mr. PURDY: When the agriculture estimates were being discussed last week and again this evening, we covered western agriculture fairly well, and got into Ontario and back to British Columbia. This evening, perhaps, we should be able to start east and work west, east being the cradle of agriculture in this Canada of ours.

These lands that I wish to speak about were growing excellent crops when the buffalo and the Indian still inhabited the western plains. In any event, we have the sun in our backs instead of in our eyes, as some of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation from the west must think when they come to our province from time to time, and try to convince those of our farmers who are chafing to some extent under controls made necessary by the war, that in the socialistic state which they advocate the farmer will not be regimented, but can continue as a free enterprise individualist as he is at present. That was all I had to say to my hon. friends from the west. We certainly appreciate what they are up against in their agricultural problems, and we wish them well.

What I desire to speak about more particularly this evening is our marshland problem in Nova Scotia. I do not know whether this is the proper item under which to discuss it. Will the minister say if it comes under some other item?

Mr. GARDINER: The proper place to discuss it is under "specials," I would say, the rehabilitation vote, if there is any place to discuss it here. The suggestion is that rehabilitation activities should be extended to all parts of Canada, and that kind of discussion of course would come up in connection with "specials," the last items in the estimate.

Mr. PURDY: What is the number?

Mr. GARDINER: Number 29.

Mr. PURDY: The minister will be able to give us some information on that item concerning this problem, what was done last year and if anything is proposed to be done this year?

Mr. GARDINER: I think I could give now all the information under the general discussion, that could be given at any time. It is not really any item in these estimates.

Mr. PURDY: That is what I thought. I thought we could discuss it at the present time.

Mr. GARDINER: Does the hon. member desire the information now?

Mr. PURDY: I had a few remarks which I should like to make at some time. There came to my desk this morning, as I think there came to the desk of all hon. members, a pamphlet regarding the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act entitled, "A Record of Achieve-

ment", and I certainly agree that it is a record of achievement of which the present government may be proud, in taking these dried-out areas from relief and converting them into productive areas. On page 13 of this pamphlet is a picture of a very extreme case, a group of buildings almost completely covered by sand. I admit that it is a dreary picture, but I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, and to this committee that it is no drearier than to see hundreds, yes, thousands, of acres of land which produced crops for many years now covered twice a day by the tides of the bay of Fundy; and that is exactly what is taking place in the maritime provinces, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

I know this problem has been before the authorities for some time. A small survey was made last year, but no actual work has taken place. I believe the suggestion was made that this was a provincial problem, or a municipal problem, but not a federal problem. On the other hand, if I understand correctly the operations of the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act, it is carried out entirely by the federal government. As is known to hon. members, the situation with respect to the maritime farm lands was studied by the committee on rehabilitation and reestablishment, and in two of their reports they have referred specifically to the situation. They recommended the extension of the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act to cover eastern Canada. That is what we from eastern Canada are looking for, because we feel that our farmers need some assistance along the general lines of this act.

I could refer to other measures which have been passed specifically to assist western agriculturists. As I said before, we have no quarrel with that policy. In addition to the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act, there is the Prairie Farm Assistance Act, the Wheat Acreage Reduction Act, and the prairie farm income regulations, all of which seem to have been aimed specifically at the western provinces, while eastern agriculturists have been left pretty much on their own. Now we are hopeful that, with the rehabilitation programme before us, we can see some constructive steps taken for the relief of our marshland problems and other agricultural problems in the maritime provinces.

I happened to be at one of our municipal council meetings this fall before I came to Ottawa. People were appearing before the council asking for reduction of taxes to almost nothing, because their dike lands had gone back to the sea and they were not in a position to build up the dikes again. The problem is now too big for the individual; there must be some other organization behind us; and it seems to me that in that respect the federal government has an excellent chance of being of some real assistance to our farmers.

Mr. GRAHAM: Would the hon. member tell us how many acres are affected and why that result has come about? I am much interested.

Mr. PURDY: The acreage, or at least the amount of marshland, is somewhere between one hundred and fifty and two hundred thousand acres. The condition which we are in now has been brought about very gradually, by the operation of the tides wearing into the dikes, and the waters carrying them out. It has probably come to a head more in the last few years on account of the great shortage of man-power. Men are not available to repair the dikes, and even if they were, I question if at the present rate of wages the farmers could afford to hire them. The marshland has been gradually going back. One piece of dike would break out and would flood a hundred or two hundred acres this year, and then more the next.

Mr. GRAHAM: When were the dikes built?

Mr. PURDY: The original dikes were built somewhere between 1600 and 1755, the time the Acadians were settling in the country. They were built by the French settlers and kept up by hand by the individual farmers right down through the generations. With the loss of our hay market, the result of losing to a large extent the export market in cattle to the old country, the farmers lost heart in the marshes and did not take the same interest in the work. Then there was the labour situation. The hand labour used to build the dikes fifty or sixty years ago has gone entirely. I was going to suggest in the meantime that prior to some general plan, if some temporary assistance could be given our farmers in repairing their dikes, through the use of machinery at low cost, perhaps in cooperation with the provincial government, perhaps in cooperation with the various defence forces, a large number of suitable machines in the adjoining areas, which for some reason or other cannot be obtained by the farmers, could be utilized to assist them in throwing up temporary dikes. This would save the situation and prevent further inroads by the sea until such time as a general plan could be worked out. I would commend to the minister some temporary arrangement whereby these temporary works could be undertaken to prevent further breaking of the dikes and prevent further land from being flooded. I would strongly urge that a study be made of the

machinery necessary to make the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act apply to all eastern Canada. I know that the introduction of such a measure would meet with approval from all sides of the house as far as private members are concerned; at least, that is the impression I get. It might meet with opposition from certain sections from the treasury benches, but I am looking to the Minister of Agriculture to overcome that.

Mr. BURTON: The problems confronting the farmers are so many and varied that in discussing them a person finds himself apt to get from one department to another. I have no wish to go beyond the Department of Agriculture, because I feel that the minister has enough to answer for without having to bother with the sins of omission and commission of some of the other ministers. When the estimates were last under consideration some hon. members had something to say about the expenses of the Minister of Agriculture and also of his department. The minister seemed ready to go to any length to show that he was not very much concerned about the matter. In fact, he appeared to be rather proud of it. I quote from page 673 of *Hansard* of February 18, where he is reported to have said:

> That is the only explanation I wish to make in connection with the expense accounts, so far as my own expense account is concerned. Incidentally, it has been throughout those whole eight years one of the highest expense accounts among ministers of the government, and I am rather proud of that fact.

To me it seems a good deal like whistling in the dark. I think the minister was more concerned about it than he tried to let on, and for that reason I intend to make a suggestion to him this evening. I suggest that when the minister finds it necessary on some future occasion to pay a visit to Humboldt constituency he should let me know. If he does I shall be pleased to make all the necessary arrangements for transportation and I shall see that he gets around the constituency. In that way I suggest he will be able to save a good deal on the cost of tires and the use of that famous car which last year carried licence number 20456, about which we heard so much.

What some of us are interested to know is whether the minister also used that car to go to Selkirk to look around in his official capacity.

Mr. GARDINER: I did not. I can answer that right away.

Mr. BURTON: Or did he have another car at his disposal there?

An hon. MEMBER: That is the time he went over the ditch.

Mr. BURTON: There are some people in Humboldt who were quite concerned when they heard that a certain car had met with a slight mishap because they were afraid that the country might have to get along for a while without a minister of agriculture. I can assure the minister that if he accepts my invitation I will drive with a great deal more care and see that he does not land in the ditch, because the policies of our Minister of Agriculture have so nearly run so many of us into the ditch that we do not want the hon. gentleman to go into the ditch along with them.

In connection with expense accounts the minister said, as reported on the same page:

> Having said that, may I add that there is no inspector in the Department of Agriculture who is inspecting agricultural activities throughout the rural areas who would be worth his salt if he did not have a high expense account.

I have found that in the Department of Agriculture there are some very fine and able men, some men who do their jobs and do them well. There are in the various branches of the department inspectors who are really inspectors and who do get around and attend to their work. But I am very much afraid that too many of the inspectors in some of the departments under the Minister of Agriculture have heard him say, or had some reason to believe, that he was proud of their large expense accounts. I know of different cases that I could relate from now to midnight, but we do not want to sit so late to-night. I could tell of inspectors who seemed deliberately to run up big expense accounts. Let me mention one instance. I know of an inspector under the P.F.R.A. who had six or seven dug-outs to inspect in one locality. He landed there between three and four o'clock in the afternoon and inspected one dug-out. He asked that man where the other five or six were—I forget whether there were six or seven altogether in the neighbourhood—and this man said, "There is one over there, another over there, and I have a couple of hours to spare, so that I can go around with you and we can have them all checked now." Oh, no; he was sorry, but he could not take advantage of that man's kindness. He had to be back in Humboldt at a certain time and somewhere else later on. That inspector made a separate trip into that neighbourhood to inspect every one of those dug-out locations. He was certainly trying to be worth his salt. And there are other inspectors I have known who have carried on in such a way that they accumulated enough salt

to pickle the whole agriculture business in that part of the country—because out of salt we make brine, and some of them believe in piling up the brine for some future occasion.

I have mentioned the P.F.R.A. I will now give another example under the P.F.A.A. An inspector stopped along the road inspecting for the dried-out bonus. I happened to be broken down with a combine alongside the road and I was trying to repair it in a hurry. This chap came along and started talking, wanting to know about this and that. Finally I looked at him and said: "Are you another one of those inspectors running around here?" He said, "Oh, yes, I am supposed to be inspecting these dried-out areas." I said, "There is the field; look it over." He said, "I am not supposed to go any farther than three hundred feet. Do you think that crop will bring twelve bushels to the acre?" I looked at him and said, "Friend, it will be just too bad for me if it does not bring more." He said, "It won't bring more than twelve bushels to the acre." I said, "I have not time to argue with you. Go out and take a look." He stayed around for half an hour talking. He said, "What do you think it will bring?" I said, "If I could make one round with this combine I would be able to give you a far nearer estimate. At the present time, I do not know." I am telling you, Mr. Chairman, the grain that we were standing in there at that time was very good. If the whole field had been like that it would have brought between thirty-five and forty bushels to the acre, and that chap was asking me if it would bring twelve. I made the first round after he had gone, after I had got the combine fixed. By the time I had the hopper filled and placed in the box I said to the chap with me, "This grain is running somewhere around twenty-four bushels to the acre at the present time." Later on, it thinned out a little bit, but it averaged somewhere around twenty-two bushels to the acre, and this chap was standing there wondering whether it would run twelve bushels to the acre.

That inspector was as useless as the fifth wheel on a wagon. He had no more idea what that crop or anybody else's crop would bring than a child. Furthermore, that year we were required by law or regulation, after our harvesting operations were over, to report to our elevator where we were making our deliveries and to give an affidavit as to the number of bushels that we had threshed. That being the case, what was the need for the inspector and others like him running around the neighborhood?

I come now to the W.A.R. I may say that the first time I had any experience with the W.A.R. was in the city of Regina when the first wheat acreage reduction bonus was on. I went there to attend a provincial session. I had a whole flock of letters from different people around the country with me, complaints about their wheat acreage reduction bonus. Finally I located the office. It consisted of a whole floor in one building. I said to myself, this is quite a good-sized establishment. They should be able to handle this. A day or two afterwards I found they had another whole floor taken up with offices somewhere else. Was there turmoil in those offices? The reports that were sent in by most of the inspectors were enough to turn anything into a turmoil. I met some of my colleagues at the buildings. They said, "Where were you; you should have been at a caucus this morning?" I said, "I was in a war office." They said, "Where is that?" I said, "Down there on a certain street in the city. It is war." I remarked that the way these fellows are going about their work we shall have a war before we get the bonus, and things straightened out. There were men running through the province drawing salaries and building up these handsome expense accounts who did not do anything else but make a heap of trouble for the people.

I admit there were some who were good and who tried to do their best.

Mr. McNIVEN: Most of them were good.

Mr. BURTON: After a whole lot of them were cleaned out, most of them were all right. I say it was a disgrace, when you think of the men who came out there and the amount of useless time and effort they put in on a lot of that stuff.

There is one more point I should like to take up with the minister. I hope he does not take it too seriously because he has been used to it for a long time.

Mr. GARDINER: Not at all.

Mr. BURTON: The minister made a statement a week ago that I was surprised to hear. I thought he was just pulling off a nice little joke when he made the reference to which I am referring. I shall quote a part of his statement which is found at page 676 of *Hansard*. He said:

> I know there are fellows who live outside large cities like Winnipeg who pride themselves upon being farmers, but they spend most of their time in Winnipeg sitting on boards of one kind or another.

First of all, I think a man who has had the experience of the minister and who has served the length of time he has in parliament and in public life would have had a little more consideration for a new member, but he used

the language I have just quoted in connection with my colleague. I think he simply could not overcome the temptation to use that little paragraph. After thinking it over more seriously I have come to the conclusion that in an unguarded moment when the opportunity arose to use that little crack the truth came out. The policies of his department and of the government have been for years that we farmers should stay out on the farm and do the slugging and grubbing and let the other fellows run our business. For too long we have let armchair farmers and swivel-necked politicians run our business. The time has come for us to do more along the line of that which the hon. member for Selkirk was doing, take an active part in our affairs and have something to say in what is going on.

I noticed throughout the evening while the discussion was going on in regard to these estimates that practically every hon. member on the government side of the house failed to recognize the main point that the hon. member for Yorkton made when he was delivering his speech, namely, that while we are prepared to admit, and no sensible person will deny that at the present time as far as the farmers are concerned they are receiving more money for most of their products than they have for a long time, the hon. member for Yorkton was pointing out something which is undeniably true, namely, that for all these years we have been so far below parity that you can go out into the homes and on the farms of the farmers and you will find that it will take a whole lot more than one or two years of fair prices before these people can get anywhere near to what they are entitled.

I believe it was the hon. member for Qu'Appelle who said that he did not believe in going around knocking. I agree with him; yet at the present time it is necessary for us to face facts. There is no person in his right senses who can say that just because we have had one or two years in which we have been receiving—in fact it is not even two years, it is not even one year—anywhere near a suitable price for our wheat, everything is all right. But admitting that, in one or two years you cannot erase the past ten or twelve years that the farmers have faced. It will take quite a number of years of decent prices for us to be able to say that now the farmers are enjoying that security to which they are entitled.

I would urge the minister in all fairness and sincerity to look upon those farmers who are doing the farming as men who are prepared also to do their share for the welfare of our country. I say that the farmers are becoming more and more concerned about what is to be done, and they are going out to see that it is done.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

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

Monday, February 28, 1944

The house met at three o'clock.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF ADDRESS IN REPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the house that I have received a message from His Excellency the Governor General, signed by his own hand, reading as follows:

23rd February, 1944

I have received with great pleasure the address that you have voted in reply to my speech at the opening of parliament, and thank you for it sincerely.

Athlone.

Government House
Ottawa.

PRIVILEGE—MR. COLDWELL

REFERENCE TO REMARKS IN DEBATE ON FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 24

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the rules of the house and as my right I wish to direct your attention to a speech made by the Minister of National War Services (Mr. LaFleche) on Friday evening. I asked you to get a transcript to see what the record had to say. At page 901 of *Hansard* the Minister is reported as having said:

Well, to take the trouble to protect oneself by slipping in the word "alleged" when one has nothing plain in one's heart is not the act of a brave man, and I regret very much to say this, but actions of that kind remind me that it is well in war time to act the man even though one has not chosen to go to meet the enemy. I have no admiration for men who do nothing of which I know to help to win the war, but remain at home, perhaps not willingly yet effectively, to cause trouble in a family which should remain united so that we can do a better job in helping the other united nations in downing our enemies.

I then said:

I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. gentlemen not casting an innuendo with an imputation reflecting upon the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre?

And the minister said:

And the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar.

I particularly wish to draw your attention to the accusation hurled across the floor of this house that we of this party are national socialists. On page 902 of *Hansard* the minister is reported as having said this:

The same hon. gentleman expressed some fear that this country might some day be governed under nationalist socialism. Well, I wish to give him my assurance in that respect again.

And I interjected: "Nor do I." Then the minister said:

We now have the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar expressing publicly in this house the view, the opinion, that he will never come to power.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I just interject to say that in my opinion this applause for that kind of statement is unseemly in this house. Then at page 902 the minister is reported as having said:

The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar does not like to be called, or his party to be called, national socialists, despite what has been said many times and despite that his lieutenant in British Columbia preached the methods employed by that party in Germany of which our friend says he is not a—

The record breaks there. Mr. Speaker, I contend that we are at war with national socialism in Germany, and to endeavour to attack any party in this country as being a national socialist movement is to accuse that party of disloyalty to this country and falsely to imply a position which is not borne out by the facts. May I say that this movement in its philosophy and outlook is exactly the same as the labour and socialist parties of Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand and other countries.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is your opinion.

Mr. REID: That is just not true.

Mr. COLDWELL: I should like to get your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. L. R. LaFLECHE (Minister of National War Services): Since the last sitting of this house I have had the opportunity of reading the official report of the preceedings of this honourable house. This afternoon I have listened to the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar, and in reply may I say that in the course of my reading I came across certain statements in *Hansard* attributed to the hon. member. In an effort to understand their position one must have recourse to what can be found. Among other things I find the following on page 545 of *Hansard* of June 5, 1940, where the hon. member is reported as having said:

. . . the secret of the recent success of the Germans is the fact that they have consciously planned their economic structure.

And then later on on another occasion he said that the prosperity built up by the socialists was a type of economy which is causing so much trouble today; and also that they did a remarkable job in a short space of time.

Mr. COLDWELL: Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. gentleman rising to a point of order?

Mr. COLDWELL: I rise to a point of order. I ask the hon. gentleman to quote the context of the remarks which I made at that time. If he does, he will find that I said the Germans did it for an evil purpose. I asked for your ruling on Friday evening, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I must have quiet in the chamber. I have to listen to the hon. member to see that his rights are protected as well as those of the house. I must say that I can see no point of order there.

Mr. LaFLECHE: I do not know whether it is in keeping, but the hon. gentleman reminds me of a cry baby.

Mr. COLDWELL: Mr. Speaker, I seek your protection against insults being hurled across the floor of this house.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish hon. members would direct themselves to the question of privilege. A question of privilege has been raised and a quotation has already been made by the hon. member.

Mr. LaFLECHE: I have attempted to give in a very few words what has been running through my mind in connection with the party, or if you like, the purposes of the small group headed by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar. If in any way I have done an injustice to anybody, of course, I would make amends.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is not good enough. I ask for your ruling Mr. Speaker, whether it is a proper term to use in this house of this party, the term national socialist.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman has risen on a question of privilege, not only on his own behalf but also on behalf of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr.

Knowles) and has asked for a withdrawal. The hon. minister has made reply and said that if he has offended any hon. member of the house he wishes to make amends, which I presume means he withdraws his statement. There is no point of order now before the Chair.

Mr. S. H. KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege, as one who is involved in this incident. I direct Your Honour's attention to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, 3rd edition, page 57, citation 123, which says:

A personal attack, by one member upon another, is an offence against the house, in the person of one of its members, which, on account of the respect due from every member to the character and dignity of the house, as well as the importance of preserving regularity in the debates, calls for the prompt interference of the Speaker.

I also direct Your Honour's attention to Beauchesne's 2nd edition, page 96, citation 295:

The House of Commons will insist upon all offensive words being withdrawn, and upon an ample apology being made which shall satisfy both the house and the member to whom offence has been given.

Without reading certain other citations, I simply draw Your Honour's attention to them: Beauchesne's 3rd Edition, page 106, citation 256—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member has risen to a question of privilege. I understood that the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar embodied in his statement the question which the hon. member is now raising.

Mr. KNOWLES: Mr. Speaker, I am stating my understanding of the situation. I understand that the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar was really dealing with the charge against him; that he arrived at that charge by indicating that it arose as a result of the attack made by the minister upon me and it is in connection with the attack he made upon me, in which he imputed motives against me and charged me with insincerity and with being cowardly, that I feel an apology is due not only to me but to this house. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), who, as leader of this house is custodian of the rules and rights and privileges of the house, to support me in this request for an apology for this unwarranted attack.

Mr. SPEAKER: As I understood the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar, he referred to *Hansard* and quoted remarks made by the hon. minister against the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. The hon. member also embodied the remarks which had been directed against him personally and asked for a withdrawal of both these statements. The hon. minister has now made a reply, and although he referred only to the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar I take it that he was making amends, as he phrased it, in respect of both the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar and that raised now by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. KNOWLES: Will the hon. minister state that his withdrawal includes withdrawal of the imputations against me?

Mr. JAMES SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): Mr. Speaker, I had not the privilege of being in the house on Friday evening, but I should like to associate myself with every word uttered by the minister as reported on page 901 of *Hansard* with respect to this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The incident is closed. The minister has made the statement that if he offended any hon. member of the house he desired to make amends.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BANK

PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL CREDIT FACILITIES FOR FIXED AND WORKING CAPITAL

Mr. D. C. ABBOTT (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce bill No. 7, to incorporate the Industrial Development bank.

Mr. GRAYDON: Explain.

Mr. ABBOTT: Mr. Speaker, I presume the house would prefer a more detailed explanation on the second reading of the bill. Briefly, the establishment of this bank represents one part of the government's programme to prepare the way for a high level of employment and of income after the war. As set out in the preamble, the bill is designed to promote the economic welfare of Canada by supplementing the activities of other lenders and by providing capital assistance to industry with particular consideration to the financing problems of small enterprises.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I ask whether farmers are to be included in the benefits under this legislation?

Mr. ABBOTT: No; this applies only to industrial enterprises.

Mr. GRAYDON: Is there to be another bill applying to farmers?

Mr. ABBOTT: The government is giving consideration to other measures having similar purposes in the field of credit for agriculture and housing development.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk)

APPEALS UNDER SECTION 42 OF ARMY ACT

Mr. HAZEN:

1. How many appeals or requests for redress have been made under section 42 of the Army Act, either to the Minister of National Defence, the army council, national defence headquarters, Ottawa, or to the Canadian military headquarters, London?

2. How many of these appeals or requests have been dealt with, and how many are pending?

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax):

1. No segregation of the number of complaints submitted prior to January, 1943, has been maintained.

From January 1, 1943, to date, 52 complaints under section 42 of the Army Act have been presented to the Minister of National Defence who exercises in Canada the powers of the army council, or to Canadian military headquarters overseas, of which 49 have been dealt with. Three are pending.

2. Answered by No. 1.

PREMIUM ON HOGS SLAUGHTERED BY LOCAL BUTCHERS

Mr. CARDIFF:

1. Is the government giving consideration to the necessity of making provision for the payment of the premium of $3 on Grade "A" hogs and of $2 on Grade "B-1" hogs to apply to hogs slaughtered in plants where government-grading is not practised and to hogs slaughtered by butchers in localities where no such grading is possible?

2. If not, will other means be provided to correct the existing situation with respect to hogs slaughtered by local butchers?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. The object of the government premiums on grade "A" and grade "B-1" hog carcasses is to encourage the production of better quality hogs for export and the channelling of such hogs through inspected plants so that the product will be available for export. An official grading service is now maintained at all inspected plants in Canada. Hogs purchased by operators supplying the domestic market only are automatically eligible for the premiums if such hogs are custom slaughtered in an inspected plant. Other than this, consideration may be given to the larger domestic suppliers who slaughtered an average of 50 hogs per week in 1940 and who have satisfactory plant facilities for the weighing, grading, and holding of hog carcasses.

2. Answered under No. 1.

RADIO BROADCASTING—SHORT-WAVE STATION NEAR SACKVILLE

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland):

1. Has a contract been let for a short-wave radio broadcasting and receiving station at or near Sackville, New Brunswick?

2. Were public tenders called?

3. If not, what firms were asked to tender, and what was the price of each tender?

4. To whom was contract let, and for what amount?

5. When was contract to be completed?

6. When will contract be completed, stating reasons for delay, if any?

7. When is it expected station will be put in finished operating condition?

8. What is the estimated total construction cost?

Mr. LaFLECHE:

1. Yes.

2 and 3. The following firms were asked to tender: Cook and Leitch, Montreal; Stewart Construction Co., Sherbrooke; Ambrose Wheeler, Moncton; Foundation Maritimes Ltd.; Acme Construction, Saint John, N.B.; John Flood & Sons, Saint John, N.B.; R. A. Corbett, Saint John, N.B.; Colette Frères, Montreal; Anglin Norcross, Montreal; Dansereau Ltd., Montreal; A. Janin & Co., Montreal; Redfern Construction Co., Montreal.

Tenders were received from the following firms: Cook and Leitch, Montreal, $254,881; Stewart Construction Co., Sherbrooke, $257,834; Ambrose Wheeler, Moncton, $298,721.19.

4. To the lowest tender, Cook and Leitch, Montreal.

5. May 1, 1944.

6. May 1, 1944.

7. It had been expected that the station would be completed in the early fall of 1944, but there will be some not great delay due to the now expected late delivery by manufacturers of essential equipment.

8. Original estimated cost was about $800,000, but the present estimated cost is $1,100,000, the difference being due to the advisability of attaining a greater efficiency of transmission, in keeping with the best practice of constructing radio installations, so that the new short-wave station shall compare favourably with other modern stations in other parts of the world.

FIFTH VICTORY LOAN

Mr. QUELCH:

1. What was the total number of subscribers to the fifth victory loan?

2. How many of these were on the special names list?

3. What was the total amount subscribed in, (a) those on special names list; (b) all other subscribers?

4. How much money was advanced by the chartered banks for the purchase of bonds in this campaign to, (a) subscribers on special names list; (b) all other subscribers?

5. What is the total amount of bonds sold in the five victory loan campaigns that still remain in the hands of the people of Canada, excluding banks?

Mr. ABBOTT:

1 and 2.

	Cash	Conversion	Total
Total number of subscriptions	3,008,336	24,715	3,033,051
Special names subscriptions	7,089	605	7,694
All other subscriptions	3,001,247	24,110	3,025,357
3. Total amount subscribed	$1,383,275,250	$188,036,300	$1,571,311,550
Amount subscribed—			
Special names	779,619,950	149,826,100	929,446,050
All other	603,655,300	38,210,200	641,865,500

4. No information. As at November 30, 1943, borrowings outstanding from the chartered banks to finance the purchase of Fifth Victory loan bonds were as follows:

Corporations	$218,456,251
Employers for employees	71,919,673
All other	71,811,644
	$362,187,568

5. No precise information is available. However, based on estimates prepared by the National War Finance Committee, holdings of Dominion Government direct domestic funded debt by non-banking investors have increased by approximately $4,900 millions between September 1, 1939 and December 31, 1943.

WINNIPEG-SASKATOON-EDMONTON AIR SERVICE

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. Has Winnipeg-Saskatoon-Edmonton been designated as a civil air route?

2. Is consideration being given by the government to the flying of this route by Trans-Canada Airlines?

3. If so, when will such service commence?

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. Under the Trans-Canada contract, made pursuant to the Trans-Canada Air Lines Act, 1937, a line of aircraft from Edmonton to Winnipeg via Saskatoon has been designated as a line of aircraft to be organized, maintained and operated by Trans-Canada Air Lines. No civil air route has been designated between these points under The Transport Act, 1938.

2. Yes.

3. As soon as the radio range and other airway facilities are installed. This work is now in hand.

WARTIME HOUSING LIMITED—PAYMENTS

Mr. NICHOLSON:

1. What amounts have been paid as at January 1, 1944, to each of the following by the Wartime Housing Limited: Hutton & Souter; Prack & Prack; W. L. McFaul; W. L. Somerville; James, Proctor & Redfern; B. R. Coon?

2. What amounts were owing to them as at January 1, 1944?

Mr. CHEVRIER:

1. The following amounts have been paid to the specified firms as of January 1, 1944:

To Hutton & Souter	$22,868 42
To Prack & Prack	7,271 17
To W. L. McFaul	7,320 00
To W. L. Somerville	10,625 00
To James, Proctor & Redfern	31,775 07
To B. R. Coon	7,600 00

2. Amounts owing as of January 1, 1944:

To Hutton & Souter	$4,791 77
To Prack & Prack	1,773 14
To W. L. McFaul	240 00

To other firms specified—nil.

TRANSIT CONTROL—SAINT JOHN, N.B. SUPERVISOR

Mr. HAZEN:

1. When was D. A. Ross appointed transit control supervisor at Saint John, New Brunswick?

2. What was his occupation prior to his appointment?

3. What are his duties?
4. What is he paid?
5. Under the terms of his employment can he engage in buying and selling secondhand cars?

Mr. CHEVRIER:

1. October 17, 1942.

2. District sales manager, International Trucks, Saint John, N.B.

3. Mr. Ross functions as a transit supervisor for the area around Saint John and Moncton, N.B., under the direction of the regional transit controller for the Maritimes, Mr. A. C. Wagner. The duties in which he is engaged are connected with street car and bus services in municipalities, the control of taxi services, the application of the wartime industrial transit plan to essential industry, and the direction, together with the provincial authorities, of the interurban bus services.

4. $2,700 per annum.

5. Yes, in the same way as he may engage in any other occupation in his own time, and providing he "faithfully and honestly fulfils his duties" as an employee of the Department of Munitions and Supply (M. & S. form 392). Refer also to P.C. 128/7359, August 1942, regarding the status of government employees engaging in spare time work outside their regular hours of employment.

WARTIME PRICES AND TRADE BOARD—MAJOR J. E. CAMPBELL

Mr. MacLEAN (Cape Breton North-Victoria):

1. Is Major J. E. Campbell employed as a member of the wartime prices and trade board at any of its offices in Nova Scotia?
2. If so, (a) when was he appointed; (b) what are his duties; (c) what qualifications and experience had he for the work he is doing; (d) what is his salary?
3. Was his appointment made through the civil service commission or the national selective service?
4. If not, who recommended him?
5. Is he allowed travelling expenses?
6. If so, what is the amount of his expenses from the date of appointment until December 31, 1943?

Mr. ABBOTT:

1. Yes.

2. (a) May 8, 1942.

(b) Major Campbell, in addition to his position as superintendent of rationing for Nova Scotia, is deputy director of rationing for the maritimes. He is responsible for the application of the machinery of rationing in the maritimes and his work embraces the supervision of rationing personnel and the local ration boards of that area.

(c) Matriculation from the Sandhurst Military Academy, England; eleven years of general business activity in the maritimes; one year with this board as local representative, Yarmouth, N.S., before assuming his present responsibilities. During that period he became familiar with all phases of the board's local work including the machinery of rationing.

(d) $3,000 plus $800 living allowance per annum.

3. Civil service commission.

4. Answered by No. 3.

5. Yes.

6. Expenses totalling $2,209.56 have been paid Major Campbell for the period May 8, 1942 to December 31, 1943.

SAINT JOHN, N.B., TAXI POOL

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Was the taxi pool at Saint John, New Brunswick, established by order in council?
2. If not, how was it established?
3. Is the pool liable for breaches of contract or torts committed, (a) by its officials and employees in the course of their employment; (b) by owners or drivers of taxi cabs that are in the pool while engaged in the work of the pool?

Mr. CHEVRIER:

1. No.

2. The pool was not formed by order of the transit control. The pool was formed at the request of a large majority of taxi operators, was concurred in by the city-appointed wartime transit advisory committee, the city council, and the transit control supervisor of Saint John, N.B.

3. (a) and (b). The published announcement of the Saint John Wartime Transit association states that "The Association is absolutely a voluntary, non-profit organization to receive, sort and transmit calls for the public benefit. The association assumes no liability for the acts or omissions of the members or their employees."

MANITOBA COURT OF APPEAL

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. Have any representations been made to the federal government by the attorney general of Manitoba relating to the Manitoba court of appeal, dated since January 1, 1941?
2. If any such representations have been made, what consideration has been given by the government thereto?
3. What are the ages of the judges of the Manitoba court of appeal?
4. Have any of the judges of the Manitoba court of appeal offered their resignations to the government? If so, which judges, and on what dates?

5. Is consideration being given by the government to the retirement of any of the judges of the Manitoba court of appeal? If so, which judges?

6. Is consideration being given by the government to the appointment of any new judges to the Manitoba court of appeal?

Mr. ST. LAURENT:

1 and 2. No.

3. 85, 79, 73, 72, 65 years respectively.

4. Yes. The Chief Justice of Manitoba by letter dated August 7, 1943.

5 and 6. The retirement of the Chief Justice of Manitoba by acceptance of his resignation and the appointment of a successor to that office are under consideration.

CANADIAN FORCES—MEDICAL TREATMENT

Mr. REID:

1. How many members and former members of the Canadian forces are receiving treatment under the Department of Pensions and National Health?

2. How many of these are members of the forces?

3. How many are discharged personnel, (a) of the present war; (b) otherwise?

4. What is the total number of patients in the departmental hospitals, including outpatients?

5. What is the total number of patients in other hospitals, including outpatients?

6. How many are outpatients?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre):

Return as of January 31, 1944:

1. 7,329.

2. 2,828.

3. (a) 2,404; (b) 2,097.

4. 4,533.

5. 2,796. (This figure includes 97 patients in the Ottawa civic hospital, Ottawa, and 118 patients in the University hospital, Edmonton, at which institutions pavilions were built by the government and a contract rate for patients is paid.)

6. 590, of total shown in answer to No. 1, receiving out-patient allowances.

WHEAT—DELIVERIES TO WHEAT BOARD

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn):

1. What was the total number of bushels of wheat marketed in western Canada during the crop year ending July 31, 1943?

2. How much of this wheat was delivered to the wheat board?

3. What percentage of wheat marketed in western Canada was delivered to the wheat board in the crop year 1942-43?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West):

1. 268,219,159 bushels (latest unrevised figures—board of grain commissioners).

2. 167,506,531·45 bushels.

3. 62·45 per cent.

MONTREAL POST OFFICE—PRINCIPAL CLERK

Mr. CARDIFF:

1. Has Mr. Stanislas Trudeau, principal clerk at the Montreal post office registration branch, been superannuated?

2. If so, has he been replaced, and by whom?

3. Has a Mr. Ducharme Olivier been appointed principal clerk at the same post office to replace Mr. Trudeau?

4. Was Mr. Ducharme Olivier an employee of the government in the city delivery branch, Montreal post office, and if so, when was he so employed, and was he discharged from that position?

5. If he was discharged, what was the reason for such discharge?

6. Were civil service examinations held for the position vacated by Mr. Stanislas Trudeau?

7. If so, when and where were these examinations held?

8. Was the postmaster of the Montreal post office or his assistant the examining officer during such examinations?

Mr. MULOCK:

1. Yes.

2 and 3. Mr. Ducharme Olivier has been selected for the position by the Civil Service Commission as a result of a promotional competition usual in such cases and in accordance with section 49 of the Civil Service Act. His promotion has not yet been confirmed by civil service certificate.

4. Yes. From 8th January, 1913, to 15th June, 1929. He was relieved of the duties of the position and assigned to another position with a reduction in rank and salary.

5. He was relieved of the duties of the position as clerk in charge of the city delivery branch for failure to properly perform these duties. He has already been sufficiently penalized and has again won promotion on merit.

6. No, but the orthodox promotional procedure was followed. See answer to question 3.

7. See answer to No. 6.

8. See answer to No. 6.

MACHINERY SERVICE LIMITED

Mr. TUSTIN:

1. Is the Machinery Service Limited, Ville La Salle, with head office on Lafleur avenue, a company that is owned by the government of Canada?

2. Is the Machinery Service Limited operated under government supervision?

3. Is one Thomas Arnold in the employ of the government, and if so, in what capacity?

4. Did said Thomas Arnold supervise or direct, or participate in equipping the plant of Machinery Service Limited, and if so, by whose direction or authority did he act?

5. What has been the total cost to date of equipping and tooling this plant?

6. What is the number of employees engaged in the plant?

7. What number of internees brought to Canada from England are employed in the plant?

8. What is the present rate or rates of pay of the various classes of labour, skilled and unskilled, employed in Machinery Service Limited?

9. Was priority accorded to Machinery Service Limited in the procuring of equipment?

10. What class or classes of products or parts are made in this plant?

Mr. CHEVRIER:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. Thomas Arnold is Machine Tools Controller for Canada, President of Citadel Merchandising Co. Ltd., and President of Machinery Service Ltd. He acts in all these capacities without remuneration.

4. Mr. Arnold in conjunction with the former general manager and vice-president and the secretary of the company assisted in the equipping of the plant. The requirements at that time were left to the general manager, Captain F. F. Cowling, who was a mechanical administrator.

5. $370,000.

6. 54.

7. 43.

8. The rate of pay is the same as in standard machine shops and is under the supervision of the Department of Labour.

9. Yes.

10. The plant is used for the reconditioning of used machine tools.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION—MILITARY DEFERMENTS

Mr. TUSTIN:

1. Has the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation applied for military deferments for any members of its staff?

2. If so, have any such applications been granted?

3. Who are the employees in whose behalf such applications, if any, were made and granted, or made and not granted, and what positions do they, or did they, occupy?

Mr. LaFLECHE:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

Employees of the C.B.C. in whose behalf application has been made for postponement of military training

Name—Classification—Declined or granted

Halifax studios:
D. J. Macdonald (on leave for military duty), news editor, grade 1, granted.
CBV transmitter, Charlesbourg:
R. Fortin, broadcast operator, granted.
CBV, Quebec:
R. Bélanger, announcer, grade 1, granted.
CBF transmitter, Verchères:
M. Guimond, broadcast operator, granted.
P. J. E. Boisvert, broadcast operator, granted.

CBM transmitter, Marieville:
P. P. Déziel, broadcast operator, granted.
Keefer building, Montreal:
W. G. Roxburgh, broadcast operator, granted.
R. E. Santo, assistant broadcast engineer, granted.
F. G. Gribben, chief storekeeper, granted.
Montreal studios:
P. Barette (overseas unit), news editor, grade 2, granted.
M. Couture, announcer, grade 2, granted.
R. Fournier, supervising broadcast operator, granted.
B. Lafleur (overseas unit), news editor, grade 3, granted.
G. F. Lefebvre, news editor, grade 2, granted.
R. Lemieux, broadcast operator, granted.
M. Ouimet (overseas unit), news editor, grade 4, granted.
G. Viau, storekeeper, granted.
M. Romanelli, broadcast operator, granted.
J. Soulière, broadcast operator, granted.
J. L. DeLorimier (on leave for military duty), clerk, grade 1, declined.
G. Beaudoin (resigned), sound effects operator, grade 1, granted.
55 York St., Toronto:
A. G. Cowan (overseas unit), producer, grade 2, granted.
N. M. Morrison, supervisor of talks, granted.
W. J. Dunlop, commercial representative, grade 2, declined.
C. Maclin, principal clerk, granted.
Toronto studios:
J. C. McCabe, producer, grade 2, granted.
C. Johns, broadcast operator, granted.
S. A. Campbell, treasurer's cashier, declined.
L. Green, announcer, grade 2, 1st request granted, 2nd request declined.
J. R. Hayward (resigned), broadcast operator, granted.
A. S. McFee (on leave for military duty), announcer, grade 1, declined.
A. C. Ellsworth, supervising broadcast operator, granted.
L. Duffey, news editor, grade 1, granted.
CBO, Ottawa:
J. A. Book, broadcast operator, granted.
C. P. Wright, station manager, grade 2, granted.
R. E. Anderson (resigned), producer, grade 2, granted.
CBK, Watrous:
G. R. Backhouse, broadcast operator, granted.
J. L. Marshall, supervising broadcast operator, granted.
V. J. Rowe, broadcast operator, granted.
CBR, Vancouver:
R. G. Dunlop, producer, grade 2, granted.
E. G. Rose, broadcast operator, granted.
A. Geluch, broadcast operator, granted.
C. M. Wilson (on leave for military duty), broadcast operator, granted.
W. J. Herbert, announcer, grade 2, granted.

CANADIAN FORCES—PENSIONS

Mr. WHITE:

1. How many discharged men from the armed forces have been examined for pension from 1939 to date?

2. How many pensions have been awarded after, (a) first hearing; (b) after second hearing?

3. How many soldiers discharged after service overseas in category "E" have not been awarded a pension?

4. At what date was the present scale of pensions set up?

5. Has there been any increase since that date?

6. Is the scale of pensions awarded under section 11-3 of the Pensions Act on the same scale as pensions awarded to soldiers suffering a war disability in an actual theatre of war?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Return as of December 31, 1943, in respect of former members of the forces of the present war:

1. The Canadian pension commission has examined and rendered a first hearing decision in the cases of 39,318 discharged men and women.

2. (a) Entitlement to pension was granted in 7,180 cases; (b) (i) entitlement to pension was granted on second hearing in 444 cases, (ii) entitlement to pension was granted on appeal board hearing in 359 cases.

3. Records do not reflect a break-down of the categories of soldiers who have not been awarded a pension. However, on first hearing, entitlement to pension was not granted in 3,258 cases of soldiers after service overseas.

4. June 27, 1925.

5. Answered by No. 4.

6. Section 11 (3) of the Pension act provides that the commission may in its discretion award such pension, not exceeding the ordinary rates of pension prescribed by the act, as it may, from time to time, deem to be adequate in the circumstances.

DOMINION SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. WHITE:

What amounts have been collected, by provinces, under the Dominion Succession Duty Act to date?

Mr. GIBSON: To January 31, 1944, there has been collected since its inception under the Dominion Succession Duty Act a total of $31,907,535 divided as follows by provinces:

Prince Edward Island	$ 49,648
Nova Scotia	666,236
New Brunswick	488,062
Quebec	11,895,315
Ontario	15,547,825
Manitoba	649,750
Saskatchewan	326,185
Alberta	690,989
British Columbia	1,591,683
Yukon	1,842
Canada	$31,907,535

MUTUAL AID, 1943—CANADIAN EXPORTS

Mr. POULIOT:

What was the value of the Canadian exports to each one of the united nations by virtue of the War Appropriation (United Nations Mutual Aid) Act, 1943?

Mr. CHEVRIER: A report to parliament will be made as provided by the Mutual Aid Act, Bill 76, 1943, clause 8:

As soon as practicable after the close of each fiscal year, the board shall prepare and lay before parliament a report of operations under this Act: Provided that such report shall not contain any information the disclosure of which would, in the opinion of the governor in council, be prejudicial to the security of Canada or of any other united nation.

HEALTH CENTRES

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland):

1. Has the government, through the Department of Pensions and National Health, authorized the establishment of five health centres at Ottawa, London, Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver?

2. Are similar health centres being established in the maritime provinces? If so, state locations, size of site and the estimated completed cost.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre):

1. The government has authorized the establishment of one health and occupational centre, near Ottawa.

2. Consideration is being given by officers of the department to the advisability of establishing similar institutions at other sites.

WAR SERVICES DEPARTMENT—WAR CHARITIES DIVISION

Mr. FAIR:

1. How many, (a) men; (b) women, are employed in the war charities division?

2. What is the general purpose and work of this organization?

3. What is the monthly payroll of the division?

4. Are any of the employees military men?

5. If so, what are their names, rank and occupation prior to the war?

Mr. LaFLECHE:

1. (a) 10 men; (b) 13 women.

2. The general purpose and work of the division are defined by order in council P.C. 8488, October 31, 1941, as follows: "To administer 'The War Charities Act and the regulations made hereunder; to cooperate with all organizations registered under the War Charities Act including such organizations as are or may become subject to the supervision of the national war services funds advisory board, and generally, to promote, organize and coordinate different forms of voluntary assis-

tance, with a view to the most effective use of personal service or material contributions for the prosecution of the war and the welfare of the nation'."

3. The February 1944 payroll is $3,093, plus cost of living bonus $165.

4 and 5. Yes. Angus Mowat, major, inspector of libraries, province of Ontario; James M. Humphrey, major, general insurance; and Malcolm J. MacLeod, major, chartered accountant. (All on temporary loan from Department of National Defence, Army.)

NATIONAL DEFENCE (AIR)—COST-OF-LIVING BONUS

Mr. NOSEWORTHY:

1. Is the Department of National Defence for Air paying its civilian employees the full cost-of-living bonus?

2. If not, what bonus per week are they being paid?

3. Is this in line with the cost-of-living bonus being paid other government employees?

Mr. POWER:

1 and 2. Civilian employees of the Department of National Defence for Air are paid cost-of-living bonus under order in council P.C. 6702 and regulations provided in accordance with the terms of that order in council.

3. Yes.

WAR VETERANS' WIDOWS—HOSPITALIZATION

Mr. KNOWLES:

When war veterans' widows in receipt of special widows' allowances are hospitalized, (a) what amount of their allowance is paid to the hospital for their maintenance; (b) what amount is paid to the widow; (c) what amount, if any, is suspended during the period of hospitalization?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): When information as to hospitalization comes to the attention of the War Veterans' Allowance board, (a) a maximum of $15 per month if amount of allowance permits; (b) balance of allowance; (c) none in any case so far dealt with.

AID TO RUSSIA

Mr. CHOQUETTE:

What aid has Canada furnished to Russia to the present date, (a) in money; (b) munitions; (c) food; (d) clothing, etc., giving the details and figures for each category and the amount in each case?

Mr. CHEVRIER: A report to parliament will be made as provided by the Mutual Aid Act, bill 76, 1943, clause 8:

"As soon as practicable after the close of each fiscal year, the board shall prepare and lay before parliament a report of operations under this act: provided that such report shall not contain any information the disclosure of which would, in the opinion of the Governor in Council, be prejudicial to the security of Canada or of any other united nation."

WARTIME HOUSING LIMITED—VICTOR T. GOGGIN

Mr. NICHOLSON:

1. What salary was Mr. Victor T. Goggin paid when made general manager of Wartime Housing Limited?

2. What salary was he receiving at the time of his resignation?

3. What is the total amount paid to Mr. Victor T. Goggin by the Wartime Housing Limited for, (a) salary; (b) travelling expenses; (c) allowances?

Mr. CHEVRIER:

1. $10,000 par annum.

2. $12,000 per annum.

3. (a) $33,047.80; (b) $9,537.58; (c) None.

The above amounts are as of February 28th, 1944.

OLD AGE AND BLIND PENSIONERS

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. Is consideration being given to increasing the maximum payable to old age and blind pensioners beyond the amount provided by order in council P.C. 6367 of August 10, 1943?

2. Is consideration being given to raising the ceiling on the income of pensioners beyond that provided in section 8 (f) of the Old Age Pension Act, 1927?

Mr. ABBOTT: These questions relate to matters of policy and it is not the practice of the government to disclose matters of policy in giving answers to questions.

*R.C.A.F.—H. M. (MARLOWE) KENNEDY

Mr. McGREGOR:

1. Is one H. M. (Marlowe) Kennedy, formerly of Winnipeg and now of Ottawa, serving in Ottawa as a member of the Royal Canadian Air Force with the rank of wing commander?

2. If so, is dependents' allowance being paid on his account, and what is the relationship of the recipient or recipients to the said Kennedy?

3. What post does he now occupy in Ottawa, and when was he named to such post?

4. Were any recommendations or references as to his qualifications or character obtained by the department from any civilian source prior to his appointment to his present post?

Mr. POWER: I should like to answer this question orally, as follows:

1. Yes.

2. Dependents' allowance is being paid on his account to Mrs. N. A. Kennedy, Barbara

Joan and Charles W. Kennedy, wife and children of Wing Commander H. M. Kennedy.

3. Wing Commander Kennedy is assistant director of Air Transport Command and was posted to R.C.A.F. headquarters on 5th October, 1943.

4. The appointment of Wing Commander Kennedy to his present post was made in full accordance with the promotion policy of the R.C.A.F. and on merit. Civilian sources are not consulted by the R.C.A.F. with regard to postings and promotions within its rank.

I answer this question orally because I would wish, Mr. Speaker, to draw your attention to the kind of question which has been asked. I have no desire to restrain hon. members from asking questions; on the contrary, I think that they should have full privilege to ask any questions they desire and place them on the order paper. But I do seriously doubt the propriety of placing on the order paper such questions as this. Any one of us, any member of this house and any member of the services, might have some skeleton in his family closet which would be disclosed or to which attention could be drawn by questions of this kind. Personally I think it is not a good practice, and I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that through the Clerk we could find some means whereby at least, when questions of this kind are to be placed on the order paper, the minister and the department concerned would be advised. It so happens in this case that Wing Commander Kennedy is one of the best officers in our service, so that I have no objection to answering the question.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I, in the absence of the hon. member for York East (Mr. McGregor) who is at the moment out of the chamber, in whose name the question appears on the order paper, say to the minister that while he has made some reference to the kind of question this is, he himself could very readily have spoken to the hon. member and have avoided unnecessary publicity in connection with it.

Mr. POWER: I am not the guardian of an hon. member's sense of what is good taste and what is decent. I simply point out that I think the question should have been submitted to me before it was placed on the order paper and a doubt cast on the integrity of one of the ablest and most conscientious men in our service.

SELECTIVE SERVICE AND UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE OFFICES, NEW BRUNSWICK

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. How many selective service and unemployment insurance offices are there in New Brunswick?

2. Where are they located?

3. What is the grade of each of these offices?

4. What are the names, positions and home addresses of each of the employees of each of these offices?

5. What are the salaries and other remuneration of each of these employees?

6. How many of these employees are returned soldiers?

7. Were all of these employees appointed by the civil service?

8. If not, how were they appointed?

Mr. MITCHELL:

1. Twelve.

2 and 3. Name—Grade

Moncton (regional); Moncton (local), Grade 2; Bathurst, Ungraded; Campbellton, Grade 1; Edmundston, Grade 1A; Fredericton, Grade 1A; Minto, Ungraded; Newcastle, Ungraded; Saint John, Grade 4; St. Stephen, Ungraded; Sussex, Ungraded; Woodstock, Ungraded.

4 and 5. See list below.

Moncton, N.B.

Name—Class—Address—Salary

Mr. R. P. Hartley, Regional superintendent, 366 Highfield St., $4,500.

Mr. Hamilton Biard, Regional ins. officer, 324 High St., $2,640.

Mr. J. P. Keating, Travelling supervisor, 66 Broadview Ave., $2,880.

Mr. E. L. Morris, Travelling supervisor, c/o Moncton Regional Office, Dominion Govt. Bldg., $2,640.

Mr. R. J. Coy, Travelling supervisor, 135 Victoria St., Saint John, $2,640.

Mr. L. J. Curry, E. & C.O., grade 5, 34 Amelia St., Sydney, $2,700.

Miss M. M. Dunsworth, E. & C.O., grade 3, 378 Robinson St., $2,040.

L. R. Ford, Clerk, grade 4, 55 Norwood Ave., $1,680.

Miss K. S. Foster, E. & C.O., grade 3, 161 Botsford St., $1,920.

A. B. McAnn, E. & C.O., grade 3, 63 Bonaccord St., $1,800.

R. S. Smith, E. & C.O., grade 1, 44 Dominion St., $1,320.

Mrs. I. M. Wilson, E. & C.O., grade 2, 102 Bonaccord St., $1,500.

Jas. M. Gibson, E. & C.O., grade 1, 77 Spurr St., $1,200.

Miss R. O. Blackmore, E. & C.O., grade 1, 35 Highfield St., $1,200.

F. H. MacDonald, Clerk, grade 4, 225 Weldon St., $1,620.

T. B. Radford, Principal clerk, 137 Gordon St., $1,920.

R. M. Beck, Principal clerk, 435 Robinson St., $2,040.

Miss I. P. Jollymore, Clerk, grade 4, 126 Steadman St., $1,680.
Miss I. M. Steeves, Clerk, grade 3, 229 Church St., $1,380.
Miss G. W. Anderson, Clerk, grade 3, 35 Mountain Rd., $1,440.
Miss H. L. Mitton, Clerk, grade 3, 260 Weldon St., $1,380.
Miss N. Goguen, Clerk, grade 3, 137 Bridge St., Saint John, $1,380.
Mrs. A. B. Trent, Clerk, grade 3, 91 Highfield St., $1,380.
Mrs. Mary Fulkerson, Typist, grade 1, 24 High St., $780.
Miss K. S. Duffy, Clerk, grade 1A, 108 Weldon St., $900.
Miss L. D. Savoie, Clerk, grade 2, 249 High St., $1,080.
Miss M. E. Keir, Clerk, grade 2, 377 Lutz St., $1,140.
Miss G. E. Savage, Clerk, grade 2, 105 Westmoreland St., $1,140.
Miss E. M. Gillespie, Clerk, grade 2, 94 Wesley St., $1,140.
Miss P. Gillespie, Clerk, grade 1, 321 Robinson St., $840.
Miss L. M. Cormier, Clerk, grade 2, 77 Weldon St., $1,140.
Miss E. K. Lutes, Clerk, grade 1A, 132 North St., $900.
S. C. Wright, E. & C.O., grade 5, 22 Portledge Ave., $2,700.
D. J. Fraser, Enforcement officer, 116 Bonaccord St., $3,000.
E. V. Moran, Enforcement officer, 212 Princess St., Saint John, $2,100.
J. E. Hebert, Enforcement officer, Edmundston, N.B., $1,800.
W. T. MacDonald, Ins. inspector, grade 3, c/o Moncton Regional Office, $2,640.
G. H. Purdy, Ins. inspector, grade 2, 71 Postlege St., $2,040.
J. R. McInerney, Ins. inspector, grade 2, Rexton, N.B., $1,920.
F. Belliveau, Ins. inspector, grade 2, 18 McAllen Lane, $2,040.
E. B. Price, Ins. inspector, grade 1, Campbellton, N.B., $1,620.
J. A. Leblanc, Ins. inspector, grade 1, Campbellton, N.B., $1,920.
W. M. Kesson, Ins. inspector, grade 2, c/o Fredericton Local Office, $2,100.
R. A. Ross, Ins. inspector, grade 2, 190 Winslow St., Saint John, $2,040.
G. E. Connelly, Ins. inspector, grade 1, 170 Brittain St., Saint John, $1,620.
C. M. Merritt, Ins. inspector, grade 1, 113 Princess St., Saint John, $1,620.
T. C. Crosbie, Special representative, 1 Fallsview Ave., $3,200.
W. Roberts, Emp. adviser, grade 1, 204 Bonaccord St., $3,000.
J. F. Munro, Investigator NSS grade 2, 221 Douglas Ave., Saint John, $2,700.
C. Shirley, Investigator NSS, grade 2, 142 Leinster St., Saint John, $2,700.
J. C. Peck, Investigator NSS, grade 2, 47 Cedar Grove Cres., Saint John, $2,700.
A. B. MacLean, Investigator NSS, grade 2, Dominion Govt. Bldg., c/o Moncton Reg. Off., $2,700.
J. P. Merrithew, Investigator NSS, grade 2, 233 Douglas Ave., Saint John, $2,700.
L. C. Jones, Investigator NSS, grade 1, 143 Dominion St., $2,400.
H. A. MacDonald, Investigator NSS, grade 1, 19 Reserve St., $2,400.

[Mr. Mitchell.]

H. S. Murray, Investigator NSS, grade 1, c/o Moncton Reg. Off. Dominion Govt. Bldg., $2,400.
B. L. Davies, Investigator NSS, grade 1, c/o Moncton Reg. Off. Dominion Govt. Bldg., $2,100.
E. J. Hogan, Enforcement officer, 261 St. George St., $1,800.
Miss M. H. Carten, Clerk, grade 2, 114 Bonaccord St., $1,140.
Miss J. E. Appleby, Clerk, grade 2, 126 Wesley St., $1,140.
Miss M. E. Gilchrist, Clerk, grade 2, 378 Robinson St., $1,140.
Miss A. M. Cooper, Clerk, grade 2, 148 Mountain Rd., $1,080.
A. M. Stevens, Steno., grade 2, 27 Victoria St., $1,140.
Miss M. A. King, Clerk, grade 1, 214 Botsford St., $1,020.
Mrs. R. B. Humphrey, Steno., grade 2, c/o Moncton Reg. Office Dominion Govt. Bldg., $1,140.
Miss A. E. Rouse, Clerk, grade 1, 144 Dufferin St., $780.
W. R. Leaman, Clerk, grade 1, Sunny Brae, N.B., $840.
J. B. F. Blight, Clerk, grade 1, 90 Dufferin St., $720.
Miss M. Z. Cormier, Clerk, grade 1, 252 High St., $720.
Miss E. A. Terris, Clerk, grade 1, Surrey, Albert County, $720.
Miss A. A. Jonah, Clerk, grade 1, Gunningsville, N.B., $840.
Miss A. M. Turner, Clerk, grade 1, Sunny Brae, N.B., $720.
A. L. Huggard, Clerk, grade 1, 271 St. George St., $720.
Miss F. Melanson, Clerk, grade 1, 59 William St., $840.
Miss M. L. S. Neales, Clerk, grade 1, c/o Y.W.C.A., $720.
Miss P. W. Lasky, Clerk, grade 1, 373 St. George St., $780.
Miss M. L. Carroll, Clerk, grade 1, Sunny Brae, N.B., $780.
H. J. MacDonald, Clerk, grade 1, Sunny Brae, N.B., $720.
Mrs. N. A. Tibbetts, Clerk, grade 1, 38 Fleet St., $780.
Miss D. L. Page, Steno., grade 3, 136 Weldon St., $1,380.
Miss E. Woodhouse, Steno., grade 2, 101 Broadview Ave., $1,140.
Miss K. M. Dixon, Steno., grade 2, 62 Cameron St., $1,080.
J. B. Clarke, Steno., grade 2, 39 Cornell St., $1,200.
Miss M. A. Hennessy, Steno., grade 2, 4 Belleview Ave., $1,200.
Miss D. K. Copp, Steno., grade 2, 95 Cornhill St., $1,080.
Miss N. M. Mazerolle, Steno., grade 1, 83 Lutz St., $780.
Miss N. K. MacKenzie, Steno., grade 2, 32 High St., $1,080.
Mrs. N. E. Gervin, Typist, grade 2, 398 St. George St., $1,080.
B. D. Brown, Steno., grade 1A, 73 Weldon St., $900.
Miss M. L. McCabe, Steno., grade 1A, 95 Brydges St., $900.
G. C. Steadman, Inv. NSS, grade 1, R.R. No., Moncton, $2,400.
N. R. M. Phail, Inv. NSS, grade 1, c/o Moncton Reg. Office, Dom. Govt. Bldg.

E. C. Vincent, Inv. NSS, grade 1, 90 Newman St., Saint John, $2,400.
T. C. McIntyre, Inv. NSS, grade 1, Box 392 St. Stephen, $2,400.
Miss M. E. Landry, Clerk, grade 1A, West Bathurst, N.B., $900.
Miss P. D. Trites, Steno., grade 1, Lewisville, N.B., $720.
Miss K. L. C. Jarvis, Steno., grade 1, 122 Archibald St., $720.
Miss E. Gunn, Steno., grade 1, 145 Cameron St., $720.
Miss R. C. Murray, Steno., grade 1, 208 North St., $720.
Miss A. Chisholm, Typist, grade 2, 48 Dominion St., $1,080.
J. W. Touchie, Office boy, 90 Fleet St., $600.
W. G. Wilson, Office boy, 27 McAllen's Lane, $420.
D. B. Herman, Office boy, 278 St. George St., $600.
W. A. D. Trent, Manager, 91 Highfield St., $2,400.
C. J. Leger, Asst. mgr., 177 King St., $2,100.
J. B. Maloney, E. & C.O., grade 3, 90 Weldon St., $1,800.
J. C. Wells, E. & C.O., grade 3, 65 Gordon St., $1,800.
J. R. O'Connell, E. & C.O., grade 2, 281 Mountain Rd., $1,620.
R. Surette, E. & C.O., grade 2, Legers Corners, N.B., $1,620.
Miss S. E. Crandall, E. & C.O., grade 2, 245 St. George St., $1,620.
L. J. Melanson, E. & C.O., grade 2, 55 King St., $1,500.
Miss D. M. Merry, E. & C.O., grade 2, 85 Fleet St., $1,500.
J. C. Stanton, E. & C.O., grade 1, 469 Lutes St., $1,200.
C. A. White, E. & C.O., grade 2, Shediac, N.B., $1,500.
Mrs. A. Sherren, E. & C.O., grade 1, 108 Archibald St. $1,440.
M. K. Blanchard, E. & C.O., grade 1, c/o Moncton Reg. Office, Dominion Govt. Bldg., $1,200.
G. C. Robinson, E. & C.O., grade 1, 16 Elm St., $1,200.
R. A. Patterson, E. & C.O. grade 1, 136 Lester Ave., $1,200.
Mrs. D. H. Hourston, E. & C.O., grade 1, 265 Botsford St., $1,320.
Miss M. I. Haley, Clerk, grade 2, Sunny Brae, N.B., $1,140.
W. I. Steeves, Clerk, grade 3, 43 Winter St., $1,440.
C. A. Craig, Clerk, grade 3, 92 West St., $1,380.
Miss R. Pond, Clerk, grade 1, 90 Pine St., $840.
Mrs. J. K. Welling, Typist, grade 2, 267 Robinson St., $1,080.
J. G. Gunn, Clerk, grade 2, 192 Dominion St., $1,080.
B. E. Perry, Steno., grade 1A, 161 St. George St., $900.
Miss M. S. Clarke, Clerk, grade 1A, 39 Cornell St., Moncton, $900.
Miss O. Comeau, Clerk, grade 1, 251 Dominion St., Moncton, $720.
Miss L. I. Oulton, Clerk, grade 1, 176 Church St., Moncton, $720.
Miss M. L. Girouard, Clerk, grade 1, 181 Wesley St., Moncton, $780.
Miss M. J. Douglas, Clerk, grade 1, Petitcodiac, N.B., $720.
Miss L. M. Leblanc, Typist, grade 2, 162 Church St., $1,140.
Miss J. W. Hedgecoe, Steno., grade 1, 237 Highfield St., $720.
Miss G. I. Ward, Steno., grade 1, 134 Alma St., $780.
Miss A. E. Freestone, Typist, grade 1, 168 Cameron St., $840.

Bathurst Local Office

M. C. Hachey, E. & C.O., grade 2, Bathurst, $1,800.
J. J. Sullivan, E. & C.O., grade 1, Bathurst, $1,380.
M. E. Hachey, Clerk, grade 1, West Bathurst, $720.
Miss M. A. Frenette, Clerk, grade 1, West Bathurst, $840.

Campbellton Local Office

A. L. Fournier, Mgr. E. & C.O., grade 1, 3 Central St., $2,100.
C. E. Champoux, E. & C.O., grade 1, Campbellton, $1,320.
W. D. Colford, E. & C.O., grade 1, Campbellton, $1,200.
Mrs. A. F. Harquail, E. & C.O., grade 1, 3 Arran St., $1,320.
G. G. MacKenzie, Clerk, grade 3, Box 623, Campbellton, $1,380.
K. H. Thomas, Clerk, grade 2, 21 Aberdeen St., $1,080.
Miss V. H. M. Campbell, Clerk, grade 2, Box 23, Campbellton, $1,140.
Miss M. I. Cantwell, Clerk, grade 1, Campbellton, $840.
Miss M. C. Shannon, Clerk, grade 1, 7 Gerrard St., $840.
Miss M. B. Lanteigne, Clerk, grade 1, Campbellton, $840.

Edmundston

H. L. Viel, Mgr. E. & C.O., grade 1A, 58 Church St., $1,800.
L. N. Cyr, E. & C.O., grade 1, 50 Church St., $1,200.
Miss M. Wortman, Clerk, grade 1A, 21 Veniot St., $900.
Miss M. Ouellett, Clerk, grade 2, 103 Canada Road, $1,080.
R. Roussel, Typist, grade 1, 9 Lynott St., $780.
Miss G. Lajoie, Clerk, grade 1, 13 39th Ave., $780.
Miss A. E. Dupuy, Steno., grade 2, 13 Dugal St., $1,080.

Fredericton

A. G. Woodcock, Mgr. E. & C.O. grade 1A, 768 Brunswick St., $1,800.
M. C. Walker, E. & C.O. grade 2, 268 Queen St., $1,620.
R. H. Colwell, E. & C.O. grade 1, 206 Argyle St., $1,200.
T. H. Rutledge, E. & C.O. grade 1, Armocto, N.B., $1,200.
F. B. Gibson, E. & C.O. grade 1, 763 Union St., $1,200.
Miss R. E. Miller, Clerk, grade 3, 159 Saunders St., $1,380.
Miss D. A. Dow, Clerk, grade 1A, 459 Needham St., $900.
Miss A. F. Miller, Steno., grade 1, 429 Charlotte St., $720.
Miss M. A. Atkinson, Steno., grade 2, 187 Brunswick St., Fredericton, $1,140.

Miss I. A. Fraser, Steno., grade 1, Nashwash Bridge, N.B., $720.

M. Fraser, Typist, grade 1, 364 Brunswick St., Fredericton, $840.

Minto

W. C. Fanjoy, E. & C.O., grade 2, Minto, $1,500.

D. C. Mockler, E. & C.O. grade 1, Minto, $1,200.

L. B. Campbell, E. & C.O. grade 1, Ripples, N.B., $1,200.

Miss E. M. Brown, Clerk, grade 2, Chipman, N.B., $1,080.

Miss G. C. McDougal, Steno., grade 1, Minto, $720.

Miss V. Millican, Steno., grade 2, Newcastle Bridge, N.B., $1,080.

Miss M. E. Gunter, Steno., grade 1, Minto, $720.

Newcastle

W. Ferguson, E. & C.O., grade 2, Newcastle, $1,620.

M. C. McMahon (Miss), E. & C.O., grade 1, Chatham, N.B., $1,440.

C. Young, Steno., grade 2, Newcastle, $1,140.

Y. M. T. Gautreau (Miss), Steno., grade 1, Newcastle, $720.

Saint John

W. J. Ryan, Mgr. E. & C.O., grade 4, 126 Douglas Ave., $3,000.

M. C. Smith, E. & C.O., grade 4, 26 Barrington St., $2,400.

W. F. Reid, E. & C.O., grade 4, 80 Gilbert Lane, $2,100.

F. M. Belyea, E. & C.O., grade 2, 122 Prince St., $1,620.

J. Laidlaw, E. & C.O., grade 3, 239 Germain St., $1,800.

W. N. Carney, E. & C.O., grade 3, 190 St. James St., $1,800.

E. G. Nelson, E. & C.O., grade 1, Fairville, N.B., $1,320.

E. Foster (Miss), E. & C.O., grade 2, 32 Carleton St., $1,620.

E. Kominsky (Mrs.), E. & C.O., grade 2, 231 Union St., $1,620.

E. C. Shannon (Miss), E. & C.O., grade 1, 136 Carmarthen St., $1,320.

A. W. Baxter, E. & C.O., grade 1, 154 Main St., $1,200.

M. A. Purchase (Miss), E. & C.O., grade 1, 248 Prince William St., $1,320.

J. W. Foley, E. & C.O., grade 1, Loch Lomond Rd., $1,200.

M. M. Finley (Mrs.), E. & C.O., grade 1, St. Andrews, N.B., $1,320.

M. M. Cronin (Miss), E. & C.O., grade 1, 227 Main St., $1,320.

M. V. McKeil (Miss), E. & C.O., grade 1, General Delivery, Saint John, $1,320.

H. E. Campbell, E. & C.O., grade 1, 260 Germain St., $1,200.

L. F. Ward, Clerk, grade 3, 410 Douglas Ave., $1,440.

W. A. Dougherty, Clerk, grade 3, 148 Germain St., $1,500.

W. C. Stanton, Clerk, grade 3, 151 Queen St., $1,440.

W. D. Davis (Mrs.), Clerk, grade 3, 5 King St., Fredericton Junction, $1,380.

G. A. Kindred, Clerk, grade 2, 163 Guilford St., $1,140.

M. T. Connolly (Miss), Switchboard op., 119½ King St. E., $900.

[Mr. Mitchell.]

R. I. McCloskey, Clerk, grade 2, 259 Duke St., $1,140.

R. M. Lamb (Miss), Steno., grade 2, 2 Harris St., $1,140.

E. M. Thomas (Mrs.), Clerk, grade 2, 218 City Line West, $1,080.

H. H. Hamilton, Clerk, grade 2, 10 Mecklenburg St., $1,080.

P. M. Evans (Miss), Clerk, grade 1, 164 Rockland Rd., $840.

L. T. Murphy, Clerk, grade 1, 254 Main St., $840.

M. E. Campbell, Clerk, grade 1, 393 Main St., $840.

J. Amero, Clerk, grade 1, 242 Lancaster Ave. W., $720.

H. E. Lyons (Miss), Clerk, grade 1, 22 Meadow St., $840.

F. M. Prime (Miss), Stenographer, grade 1, 18 Sand Cove Rd. W., $720.

G. T. McCarthy, Clerk, grade 1, 18 Woodville Rd. W., $720.

E. C. Dolan (Miss), Stenographer, grade 2, 39 Carleton St., $1,140.

H. I. Gold (Miss), Stenographer, grade 2, 174 Waterloo St., $1,080.

M. T. Powers (Miss), Stenographer, grade 2, 187 Germaine St., $1,080.

M. Babkirk (Miss), Stenographer, grade 1, 157 Market Place, $720.

R. D. McCullum (Miss), Stenographer, grade 1, 160 Adelaide St., $720.

M. Clarke, Stenographer, grade 1, 28 Victoria St. W., $780.

St. Stephen

C. A. Ryder, E. & C.O., grade 2, St. Stephen, $1,500.

L. W. O'Brien, E. & C.O., grade 1, St. Stephen, $1,200.

G. L. Monahan (Mrs.), Clerk, grade 2, Milltown, N.B., $1,080.

B. M. Leland (Miss), Clerk, grade 1, St. Stephen, $780.

P. Lyons (Miss), Stenographer, grade 1A, St. Stephen, $900.

Sussex

C. H. Alward, E. & C.O., grade 2, Church Ave., Sussex, $1,740.

L. R. Forbes, E. & C.O., grade 1, Sussex, $1,200.

P. H. Smith, Clerk, grade 2, Sussex, $1,080.

M. K. Devine (Miss), Stenographer, grade 2, Main St., Sussex, $1,080.

Woodstock

A. E. Everett, E. & C.O., grade 2, Woodstock, N.B., $1,620.

G. A. Dibblee, E. & C.O., grade 1, Woodstock, N.B., $1,200.

L. Kearney, Clerk, grade 2, Bath, N.B., $1,080.

E. M. Connell (Miss), Clerk, grade 2, Woodstock, N.B., $1,080.

6. Nine.

7. Yes.

8. See answer to No. 7.

INCOME TAX ASSESSMENTS

Mr. CARDIFF:

1. Is there a quota system for income tax collections in each inspectorate, with competitions for prizes between inspectorates or individual civil servants?

2. Are salaries and promotions in the income tax branch dependent in any way on the amounts of tax which civil servants succeed in assessing against individual citizens or corporations, or both?

3. If such a system exists or has existed in the last ten years, at what dates did it start or stop?

Mr. GIBSON:

1. No.

2. No.

3. Answered by Nos. 1 and 2.

*FLAGS ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS—NATIONAL FLAG

Mr. LaCROIX (Quebec-Montmorency):

1. Who is the superintendent of dominion government buildings in charge of the distribution of flags which fly over public buildings?

2. Has this officer a sufficient number of "union jack" flags for public buildings?

3. When his supply is deficient, does he distribute in lieu thereof "Canadian red ensign" flags?

4. Has he received an order providing for the replacement of such "Canadian red ensign" flags by "union jack" flags as soon as the stocks of "union jack" flags on order have arrived, with the further instructions that, in the future, only "union jack" flags must fly over public buildings, and that "Canadian red ensign" flags must be used solely for special decoration purposes?

5. Has the government at last decided to endow Canada with a distinctive national flag so as to replace definitively the "union jack" flag which now flies over all our public buildings?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, I had better answer this question orally. Section 5 of the question is:

Has the government at last decided to endow Canada with a distinctive national flag so as to replace definitively the "union jack" flag which now flies over all our public buildings?

I would say first of all that the question as worded is neither direct nor straightforward. However the purpose of it is clear enough: it is one which brings up the advisability or inadvisability of creating a flag controversy at a time of war. The question is similar to one which was asked on two occasions, at the last session of parliament by the same hon. member. At that time I replied to his question in the following words, on June 21, 1943, as reported in *Hansard*, pages 3823 and 3824:

A national flag is one which normally is used by a single nation only, and which is used to distinguish that nation from others at international gatherings, and to serve as a symbol of it. The red ensign, with the union jack in the first quarter next to the staff, and the Canadian coat of arms in the fly has for over seventy years been very generally used in situations where a flag specially distinctive of Canada was essential. It was first authorized by the government of Sir John A. Macdonald shortly after confederation for use on Canadian merchant vessels. Its use as a distinctive emblem on all buildings owned or occupied by the Canadian government and situated outside Canada was authorized by order in council on January 26, 1924. It has been popularly accepted as a flag distinctive of Canada.

The union jack, while not a flag distinctive of Canada, may correctly be flown on land in any part of His Majesty's domains.

I question whether this would be a suitable time at which to have parliament determine which particular flag—the union jack, the red ensign, or some other flag to be specially designed—should be declared to be the national flag of Canada.

I have nothing to add to what has been said by the ministry at previous sessions on this matter of a national flag. I should like however to avail myself of this opportunity to point out that the conference at Quebec in August last presented an occasion on which it was desirable, indeed essential, that a flag specifically distinctive of Canada should be flown. The use of the red ensign flown at the citadel throughout the proceedings of the conference as a symbol of Canada, at the side of the union jack and the stars and stripes, was widely and most favourably commented upon.

The other parts of the hon. member's question are matters of departmental detail which have little or no significance, unless discussion is to be raised on section 5 of the question as asked, and I would request therefore that what I have said be taken as a reply in full.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

DOCTOR W. A. SMITH

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. Is Dr. W. A. Smith an employee of the government?

2. If so, where is he employed?

3. What is his salary?

4. What were his travelling expenses in 1943?

5. What were his qualifications for his present position?

R.C.A.F.—MOSQUITO PLANES—TORONTO DEHAVILLAND PLANT

Mr. NOSEWORTHY:

1. On what date did the Toronto DeHavilland plant begin to tool up for the production of Mosquito planes?

2. On what date did actual production of planes begin?

3. On what date did the government take over the plant?

4. How many Mosquito planes had been completed and how many accepted by the R.C.A.F. by the date which the government took over the plant?
5. How many have been completed since the government took over the plant?
6. How many of these have been accepted by the R.C.A.F.?
7. How many planes are off the production line and resting in the grounds at the present time?
8. Why have these not been delivered to the R.C.A.F.?
9. What is the longest period of time the first of these to be off the production line has been lying in the field?
10. Has any work formerly done in the plant's machine shop been contracted out since the government took over?
11. If so, for what reason has this been contracted out?
12. What safeguards are taken to protect the government against excess charges on sub-contracts?
13. Are sub-contracts always given directly to the manufacturer, or are they sometimes given to firms who in turn sub-let them again to others?
14. Has the government discovered any instances of overcharging on sub-contracts let out by DeHavilland?
15. If so, what was the nature of the sub-contract, the firm concerned, and the amount overcharged?
16. What price was paid by the government to the DeHavilland company for, (a) land, buildings and improvements; (b) machinery tools and equipment; (c) planes and parts completed and in process of being built; (d) contracts not completed?
17. What were the terms and conditions on which the plant was taken over by the government?
18. What funds had the government made available to the company before it was taken over for, (a) building and extension of plant; (b) purchase of machinery and tools; (c) any other purpose?
19. What was the value of government-owned machinery and equipment in plant at the time it was taken over?
20. What depreciation had the company been allowed to write off against its own investment from 1939 to date on which the government took possession?
21. What percentage was this depreciation of the company's total investment in the plant?

NOBEL DEFENCE INDUSTRIES PLANT

Mr. NOSEWORTHY:

1. Has the defence industries plant at Nobel been closed down?
2. If so, how many men are still employed at the plant?
3. What was the total capital investment of the government in constructing and equipping this plant?
4. Has any study been given to the use of this plant for the production of peace-time goods?
5. If so, by what committee, board or body?
6. Have any plans for its further use been agreed upon?
7. What possibilities of use are under consideration at present?
8. What horse-power of electricity is available at the plant?

[Mr. Noseworthy.]

9. From what source was it supplied?
10. What was the cost of the government of bringing electricity to this plant?
11. What is the capacity of the water-pumping plant on this property?
12. What was the cost of installing this water system?
13. How many war-time houses were constructed on the property?
14. What was their cost?
15. What was the cost of erecting a school on the property?
16. Is that school now in use?
17. How many staff houses were provided?
18. What was the cost of these?
19. Are these now occupied, and by whom?
20. Is there a hospital on the property?
21. What was the cost of constructing and equipping this hospital?
22. What use is being made of it at present?
23. Are any plans made for its future use?
24. How was the plant heated?
25. What was the cost of installing the heating system?
26. Has the government a title to the land on which the plant was built?
27. If not, who are the owners, and on what terms has the government held the land?
28. Has any of the equipment been removed from the plant?
29. If so, by whom, and for what purpose?
30. Is the plant to be dismantled or to remain intact?

CANADIAN FORCES—NUMBER AND SERVICE OF PERSONNEL DISCHARGED

Mr. HANSON (Skeena):

1. How many members of the navy, army and air force have been discharged to civil life since the outbreak of the war?
2. Of these, how many served for, (a) less than three months; (b) more than three and less than six months; (c) more than six and less than twelve months; (d) more than twelve months?
3. How many served in Canada only?
4. How many had service in a theatre of war, as defined in the Pension Act?

CANADIAN FORCES—EMPLOYMENT OF PERSONNEL DISCHARGED

Mr. REID:

1. How many members of the armed forces have been discharged to civil life since the beginning of the present war?
2. Has a record been kept of employment placements of such discharged personnel?
3. If so, how many have been placed through facilities of national employment service and welfare division of the Department of Pensions and National Health?
4. How many are registered as out of work and seeking employment?
5. How many have received, (a) out of work benefit; (b) unemployment insurance benefits?
6. With respect to those receiving unemployment insurance benefits, has the government paid contributions into the unemployment insurance fund?
7. If so, to what amount?
8. How many discharged personnel have been awarded other benefits under the post discharge order?

BEEF INSPECTORS—CARCASSES CONDEMNED

Mr. BLACKMORE:

1. How many inspectors in Canada are charged with the responsibility of inspecting beef in the various packing plants in Canada to determine whether or not such beef should be condemned?
2. What are the names of such inspectors, and what are the names and locations of the plants each inspects?
3. How many carcasses were condemned in 1943 by each of such inspectors?
4. Was the packing plant in each case reimbursed for the carcasses condemned? If so, how much was paid to packing plants in this connection?
5. If packing plants were not reimbursed, what value did the inspector place upon carcasses which were condemned?

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION—CIVIL SERVICE COMPETITIONS

Mr. CRUICKSHANK:

1. How many competitions have been held by the civil service commission to secure staff for the unemployment insurance commission for positions of, (a) managers of local offices; (b) other grades, carrying minimum salaries of over $2,100, in which the minimum qualifications of candidates included the ability to speak, read and write the English and French languages?
2. What are the competition numbers, the position titles, the salary ranges, and the location of these positions?
3. What are the names of those appointed as a result of such competitions?
4. In which of these competitions were candidates required to pass a written examination, and what are the names of such candidates (if any)?
5. In which of these competitions were candidates who had been recommended as qualified by oral examining boards rejected by the civil service commission because of lack of the language qualification mentioned in (1), and what are the names of such candidates?

H.M.C. DOCKYARD, HALIFAX—PLUMBING WORK

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland):

1. Have labour organizations, management or others made requests since the start of the war that suitable quarters be provided to carry on plumbing work at H.M.C. dockyard, Halifax, Nova Scotia?
2. Has the government provided the desired quarters? If so, are buildings being renovated or newly built?
3. What are sizes of required buildings, type of construction, and estimated costs completed?
4. If new buildings are being erected, from what firms were tenders requested; what was the amount of each; to whom was contract let, and at what price?
5. Has machinery and equipment for plumbing work been kept in storage pending the securing of suitable quarters? If so, where?

ALBERTA COAL

Mr. CARDIFF:

1. How many tons of coal were mined in the years 1940, 1941, 1942 and 1943?
2. How many tons of Alberta coal were shipped to each province in Canada in each of the above years?
3. Is there an embargo on Alberta coal coming into Ontario?
4. If so, why?

SELECTIVE SERVICE—MEN OF MILITARY AGE IN VARIOUS OCCUPATIONS

Mr. POULIOT:

1. With the exception of those mentioned in subparagraphs 2 (a), (b), (c), (d), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k) of paragraph 3 of the national selective service mobilization regulations, how many men of military age have been declared, (a) physically fit; (b) physically unfit, in each province?
2. How many men of each province are in each one of the three branches of the Canadian army?
3. How many Canadians are in each one of the three branches of the British forces?
4. How many men of military age are now engaged in each province in the following occupations, (a) farming; (b) fishing; (c) lumbering; (d) mining; (e) shipbuilding; (f) aircraft production; (g) ammunition and gun production; (h) arsenals and small arms ammunition production; (i) automotive and tank production; (j) chemicals and explosives production; (k) gauge and cutting tool production; (l) petroleum refineries; (m) railways and telegraph lines; (n) construction and repair of locomotives and railway cars and maintenance of the right of way of the railways; (o) other transportation systems (tramways and trucks); (p) power companies (excluding tramway conductors); (q) dominion public service; (r) merchant marine; (s) the pulp and paper industry; (t) the textile industry (including the manufacture of military equipment); (u) the steel industry; (v) the rubber industry; (w) the leather industry; (x) the operation and repair of telephone lines; (y) the manufacture of alcohol for war purposes; (z) newspapers and periodicals?

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

PORK PRODUCTS—PRICES PAID TO PACKERS BY RETAILERS

Mr. ROSS (Souris):

For a copy of the report of enumerators who tabulated prices paid to packers by retailers for pork products during the month of May, 1942, and referred to in the annual report of the Minister of Agriculture for the year ending March 31, 1943, on page 124.

Return tabled.

ARMY BOOTS

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

For a copy of all letters, communications, reports or other documents dated between October 2, 1939, and August 6, 1943, wherein one James Clark, of Toronto, formerly an inspector of or in the employ of the Department of National Defence, and/or the inspection board of the United Kingdom and Canada, alleged or complained that army boots of

inferior quality or manufacture were being manufactured for or supplied to the government by the firms named by him, together with a copy of all letters received by the Minister of National Defence, or the acting minister from the said James Clark, and/or anyone on his behalf, relative to his complaints with regard thereto or requesting an investigation thereof, and the replies made thereto since August 6, 1943, to date hereof.

Mr. RALSTON: I explained to the house the other night, when the matter came up, that the inspections referred to are done by the joint inspection board of the United Kingdom and Canada, and that the British government have a substantial interest in the operations of the board because of the fact that only approximately thirty per cent of the inspections are done for the Canadian government. The board reports through me so far as Canada is concerned and through the high commissioner for the United Kingdom so far as the United Kingdom is concerned. I mention this because I have some doubt whether or not reports of this kind, by a board which is conducted as an inspection board and simply as an administrative body set up in this way, should be brought down in this house. I have consulted the high commissioner for the United Kingdom, Mr. MacDonald, and he agrees with me in having no objection in this particular case, save in one respect, and I mention it because it has to do with a general rule that exists in the house. I would not consider it in the public interest to bring down reports made by inspectors to their superiors in connection with this, or any other matter, with which the inspection board is concerned. The house will understand that the inspectors are carrying out inspection duties in connection with from 10,000 to 20,000 different items, from boots to guns, radio equipment and so on, and it would be totally irregular and highly prejudicial for the reports of the inspectors to be brought down in connection with these matters. They come within the rule mentioned by the Prime Minister the other day with reference to reports by officers of a department on matters having to do with the department and submitted to a superior officer. Mr. MacDonald and I have no objection to bringing down the correspondence mentioned, that is, the correspondence with the minister but which has not to do with reports made by Mr. Clark at the time he was an employee of the board and acting in his official position as an inspector, these reports being made to his superiors.

Mr. SPEAKER: Carried, subject to the reservation made by the minister.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

WINDSOR, N.S., TRANSIT AND EMBARKATION DEPOT

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland):

For a copy of all correspondence since April 1, 1942, between the Departments of National Defence, Munitions and Supply, Public Works, and Finance, and property holders, contractors and suppliers of equipment and material, in connection with the acquiring of property, construction of buildings and extensions or other works and improvements at the transit and embarkation depot at Windsor, Nova Scotia.

REQUISITION AND PURCHASE OF VESSELS

Mr. ROSS (Souris):

For a return showing, 1. Under whose name the following vessels were registered in August, 1939, and on August 31, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, respectively, namely, *Bricoldoc* (4364/3279), *Canadoc* (4589/2894), *Cartierdoc* (1919/1142), *Collingdoc* (1780/1285), *Coteaudoc* (1940/1160), *Farrandoc* (1925/1143), *Fort Wildoc* (4542/3055), *Ganandoc* (1924/1144), *Hamildoc* (1926/1151), *Kenordoc* (1789/), *Kingdoc* (1926/1152), *Lachinedoc* (1926/1149), *Lavaldoc* (1918/1142), *Lawrencedoc* (1924/1144), *Mantadoc* (4466/3060), *Mondoc* (1926/1147), *Newbrundoc* (1934/1152), *Novadoc* (1779/), *Ontadoc* (4467/3082), *Portadoc*, *Prescodoc* (1936/1151), *Prindoc* (3813/2837), *Quedoc* (3072/1874), *Sarniadoc* (1940/1160), *Saskadoc* (4611/2876), *Soodoc* (4575/3188), *Soreldoc* (1926/1147), *Thordoc* (2158/), *Torondoc* (1927/1151), *Troisdoc* (1925/1146), *Vandoc* (4488/2539), *Wellandoc* (1926/1151).

2. Which of the said vessels, if any, were requisitioned, (a) for use by the government of Canada, or any board or crown company under authority of the government of Canada; what compensation was paid and to whom, for same, per diem, per month or otherwise; (b) by the Canadian shipping board acting as agents for other than Canadian authorities?

3. Which of the said vessels were purchased by the government of Canada, and what amounts were paid or contracted to be paid for each vessel, showing date of purchase or acquisition, and date or terms of payment, and under what act or statute the said vessels were requisitioned or purchased?

DOMINION BOND ISSUES, HOLDINGS BY CHARTERED BANKS, ETC.

Mr. QUELCH:

For a return showing 1. A list of the Dominion of Canada bond issues since outbreak of the present war, (a) public issues; (b) issues sold to chartered banks; (c) issues sold to Bank of Canada, showing issue dates and maturity, rate of interest and amount of issue.

2. A list of Dominion of Canada bond redemptions since the outbreak of war.

3. The holdings of dominion bonds by the chartered banks as at August 31, 1939, and December 31, 1943.

4. The holdings of dominion bonds by the Bank of Canada on August 31, 1939, and December 31, 1943.

5. Canadian deposits in chartered banks as at August 31, 1939, and December 31, 1943.

6. Cash reserves of chartered banks as at August 31, 1939, and December 31, 1943.

PRAIRIE FARM ASSISTANCE—ED. ZAHORSKI

Mr. DOUGLAS Weyburn):

For a copy of all expense accounts, vouchers, receipts and forms A-101 submitted by Ed. Zahorski, employed by the Department of Agriculture under the P.F.A.A., from June 15 to August 15, 1943, inclusive.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH QUEBEC PROVINCE AS TO EMPLOYMENT OF WORKERS

Mr. RAYMOND:

For a copy of all communications or correspondence exchanged between the dominion Department of Labour and the Department of Labour of the province of Quebec since 1939 in connection with the employment of workers and the salaries paid to them.

Mr. MITCHELL: As a matter of courtesy we shall ask the provincial government at Quebec whether we may table this correspondence, and if we receive an affirmative reply it will be tabled.

ADAMO D'AGOSTINO

Mr. COLDWELL:

For a copy of all memoranda, communications, agreements, orders in council and other documents from September 7, 1939, to the present, relating to the retirement or dismissal of Mr. Adamo D'Agostino from his position as an employee of the Post Office Department at Niagara Falls, Ontario.

WAR LABOUR BOARD—BURMIS LUMBER COMPANY

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West):

For a copy of a letter from R. B. Richardson, and others, dated January 27, 1943, at Burmis, Alberta, to the national war labour board, and a copy of the reply thereto, dated February 2, 1943; also copy of a letter from the said R. B. Richardson, dated December 16, 1942, to the national war labour board, and the reply thereto, dated January 7, 1943; also copies of any letters, telegrams or other correspondence passing between Burmis Lumber Company, of Burmis, Alberta, and the national war labour board, or any of its officials during the years 1941, 1942 and 1943; also copies of reports of any inspectors or officials of the national war labour board relating to the foregoing case.

CANADIAN ACTIVE SERVICE FORCE ASSOCIATION

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West):

For a copy of a letter dated November 6, 1943, and a letter dated December 15, 1943, addressed to the Hon. the Minister of Labour and the Hon. the Minister of National Defence from the Canadian Active Service Force Association, Post 1, Toronto, together with copies of the replies thereto.

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL—WARTIME BUREAU OF TECHNICAL PERSONNEL

Mr. KNOWLES:

For a copy of all correspondence and memoranda, dated since January 1, 1943, exchanged between national selective service and the wartime bureau of technical personnel, also between each of these bodies and the national research council, relating to the retaining and/or employing of personnel by the national research council.

LOAN OF $1,000,000,000

TO MEET LOANS OR OBLIGATIONS, TO PURCHASE UNMATURED SECURITIES, AND FOR PUBLIC WORKS AND GENERAL PURPOSES

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (for the Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following resolution:

Resolved, that the governor in council be authorized to raise by way of loan under the provisions of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, 1931, an amount not to exceed in the whole the sum of one thousand million dollars for paying or redeeming the whole or any portion of loans or obligations of Canada and also for purchasing unmatured securities of Canada and for public works and general purposes.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the house.

Motion agreed to.

VICTORY LOANS

INQUIRY AS TO DATE AND AMOUNT OF NEXT LOAN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to direct a question to the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Finance, of which I have sent him a copy by way of notice. Is he in a position to indicate to the house when the next victory loan appeal will be made?

Mr. D. C. ABBOTT (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Finance): I am not in a position to give a definite date. It will be the latter part of April. I hope to be in a position to make a statement as to the definite date within a few days.

Mr. GRAYDON: Is the parliamentary assistant in a position to give an indication as to the amount that will be asked for?

Mr. ABBOTT: No.

CANADIAN FORCES

DECORATIONS FOR GALLANTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): I desire to make a request of the Minister of National Defence (Army) and the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services. On February 24 the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of National Defence for Air placed on the pages of *Hansard*

a list of members of the R.C.A.F. and R.A.F. who have been decorated for gallantry in this war. I am sure that hon. members read this list, as I did, with deep interest, and it has occurred to me that a list should also be placed upon *Hansard* of Canadians in the navy and army who have received similar recognition. I should like the two ministers to give this matter their consideration, for the names on these lists of awards are those of Canadian citizens who have made and are making for us a contribution which none of us will be able adequately to repay.

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): As a matter of fact the list has not been published because we have been waiting for the gazetting of a number of recent operational awards. The list cannot be made up until they are gazetted. I anticipate that the gazette will be published very shortly. As soon as that is done a list showing the names of those gallant and devoted men and women of the Canadian army will be tabled.

Mr. GRAYDON: I knew that later on the minister would be tabling the list, but the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Macmillan) did not table the former list; he placed it on *Hansard*. It is so important and interesting that I think the minister should do that, if he would.

Mr. RALSTON: That will be done, of course.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The Minister of National Defence and the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services intend to table, when they are ready, lists of decorations awarded to the gallant men of the army and navy. Without derogating in any way from the gallantry of these men and women, it should be observed that a large number of civilians have been decorated in this country—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Not for gallantry.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I should like to know when that list and the list of citations that must have accompanied the recommendations will be available to members of parliament. It is important to have the list of decorations and the reasons for which they were given. I add that none of these individuals are members of parliament.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

REQUEST FOR OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS ORDER IN COUNCIL P.C. 9384

On the orders of the day:

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (Parkdale): Having reference to the statement of the Prime Minister on Thursday, February 10, as appearing on page 321 of *Hansard*, to the effect that "it is the intention of the government to make certain amendments" to wartime wages control order, 1943, P.C. 9384, and to the Prime Minister's request that the matter be allowed to rest until after the government had heard the representations of labour organizations, which has since been done, is the government prepared to lay before the house its proposed amendments, and will the government provide an opportunity for discussion of the amendments?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): My hon. friend's question might stand as a notice.

RADIO BROADCASTING

ADDRESS OF MR. PHILPOTT—NEWS COMMENTATORS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National War Services in regard to a matter that was brought up on Friday with reference to the broadcast made over the facilities of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation by Mr. Philpott, of Vancouver. In the press of to-day there is a resume of what Mr. Philpott said on that occasion. I am not going to refer to what he said other than to point out that in dealing with the return to Canada of Lieutenant-General Andrew McNaughton, he said:

> I have not had secondhand access to the papers the Prime Minister showed the leaders in parliament, but I have received reliable information on this case, which shows that it raises some issues of deep national concern.

He goes on to say:

> Whatever may be the constitutional theory, the fact is that we are still in double colonial status—not just to Britain as formerly, but now also to our good neighbour the United States.

The representative of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation at the coast, Mr. Ira Dilworth, said:

> We don't act as a censorship body of news. There are certain limits placed on commentators, but they do not constitute exactly censorship.

What are the limitations short of censorship placed on the commentators who use the services of the national network? I request also that the script be tabled.

Hon. L. R. LaFLECHE (Minister of National War Services): I am sorry, but I cannot answer the question at the moment. May it stand as a notice?

CLOTHING

RESTRICTIONS ON THE MAKING OF SUITS

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport): May I ask the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott) a question in connection with wartime prices and trade board regulations? In Toronto on Saturday a prominent leader of the suit industry of Canada pointed out that on January 28, the president of the board of trade was asked a question in the British House of Commons as to when restrictions were to be removed in connection with the making of suits in the United Kingdom. He replied that following what had taken place in the United States he had issued orders that on and after March 1 all restrictions on the making of suits in the United Kingdom would be removed. Unless the wartime prices and trade board in Canada issues similar orders, our manufacturers will be at a great disadvantage.

Mr. SPEAKER: This question also will stand as a notice.

VEGETABLES

INQUIRY AS TO SUBSIDIES ON CORN, BEANS AND PEAS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. A. CRUICKSHANK (Fraser Valley): Would the Minister of Agriculture state when the subsidies on corn, beans and peas will be announced?

Mr. SPEAKER: This will have to stand as a notice, also.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: With all deference to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I have received several telegrams in regard to this matter, and it is urgent.

Mr. SPEAKER: It will have to stand as a notice.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Then if I may direct another question to the Minister of Agriculture, I am informed that the British government is very anxious to obtain corn, beans and peas in connection with the war effort. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. SPEAKER: This question will have to stand as a notice.

BORDER CROSSINGS

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT AS TO SITUATION IN NIAGARA DISTRICT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. NORMAN J. M. LOCKHART (Lincoln): An acute situation having arisen at border points in my part of the country, and the Minister of Labour having been advised of the situation, according to press reports, would he make a statement at an early day indicating just what will be the position, particularly in respect to workers who have to cross the international line?

Mr. SPEAKER: That will have to stand as a notice also.

Mr. LOCKHART: The situation is acute, Mr. Speaker, because working men are being refused permission to cross the international border, and I think the matter is important.

Mr. SPEAKER: I presume it is also important that the minister should have an opportunity to make an adequate reply to the question asked by the hon. member, so that I think he should be given notice.

Mr. LOCKHART: I am quite willing to have this serve as a notice, then, but I should like the minister to make a reply as soon as possible.

SUPPLY

WAR LOANS—STATEMENT OF MR. WRIGHT ON MOTION OF MINISTER OF FINANCE

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of supply.

Mr. P. E. WRIGHT (Melfort): Before we go into committee of supply, Mr. Speaker, there is a matter I wish to bring to the attention of the house, arising out of the question asked by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) with respect to the floating of a new war loan.

Since the beginning of the war we have raised sums of money beyond anything we dreamed possible before this war started, and that money has been raised through borrowing and taxation. Approximately fifty per cent of the money we have required has been secured through borrowing. I have before me the public accounts for the year 1943, and at page lvii I find these words:

> Furthermore, it should be noted that the second victory loan campaign had closed as late as March 7, 1942, hardly more than three weeks before the beginning of the fiscal year 1942-43, and the fourth victory loan drive opened on April 26, 1943, or less than four weeks after the close of the fiscal year. Thus, although only $991·4 million appears as receipts from victory loans during the year ended March 31, 1943, nevertheless in the fifteen months from February 16, 1942, to May 15, 1943, over $3,143 million in cash was subscribed by the general public in three loan campaigns.

And a little later:

> In order to assess the results of the borrowing programme properly, it is necessary to consider

the period from the start of the war to the close of the fiscal year 1942-43, so that accidental factors like the timing of loan campaigns and other transactions will be less important. This is done in table XXIII, which shows that from September 1, 1939, to March 31, 1943, $3,266·8 million out of total new borrowings (that is, excluding the conversion or renewal of previous issues) amounting to $5,124·6 million were subscribed by the general public, or 63·7 per cent.

Since then we have had two more victory loans, the fourth loan for approximately $1,200 million and the fifth loan for something like $1,300 million. So that when you make allowance for the amounts subscribed by the banks, the large insurance companies and various other institutions in Canada, you find that the general public have contributed something over $2,500 million through small individual subscriptions to loans since the beginning of the war.

I should like to see the government give these small investors, who have come forward so willingly, some guarantee that these bonds will not be allowed to fall below par. The large companies, the insurance companies, banks and other institutions holding large blocks of these loans, are quite able to carry them to maturity, when they will receive the par value. The government should give the small investors a guarantee that they also will be able to get par for their bonds.

Mr. GRAYDON: What about the policyholders?

Mr. WRIGHT: The insurance companies are quite prepared to carry these bonds to maturity, when they will get 100 cents on the dollar, so that the policyholders are protected. I am speaking in behalf of the thousands of small investors who are to be found in the army, in factories and on farms throughout the country, who have invested in these loans in order to build up savings which may be used for purposes of reestablishment when the war is over.

We all know what took place after the last war. I have a neighbour who served in the army for four years during that war and whose people purchased a $500 war bond for him. In 1920, when he needed money, he sold his bond, but received for it only $450. On the other hand those who were able to carry their bonds to maturity were paid 100 cents on the dollar, with interest not on $450 but on the full face value of their bonds. I have in my hand the quarterly listings on the Toronto and Montreal stock exchanges for the third victory loan, 5½ per cent bonds issued October 27, 1919 and due November 1, 1934, giving the low and high for each quarter. It will be seen that in the quarter ending March 31, 1920, these bonds sold at $97. In December of the same year they sold at a low of 88¼ and a high of 94. In March, 1921, the low was 92 and the high 96¾. In December, 1921, the low was 94½ and the high 99½. In 1922 they reached par, and from then until maturity they remained at or above par. As a matter of fact, in March, 1924, the low was 102½ and the high 103½, and they went as high as 105¾ in December of 1927.

Thousands of our soldiers who are overseas are sending home their deferred pay to be put into victory bonds. Thousands of girls in the air force, thousands of workers in factories and thousands of men on the land have subscribed to these bonds. Many of these people will want their money in the period immediately following the war, in order to reestablish themselves, and before another victory loan is floated I think the government should give some assurance that these bonds will be held at par.

I have before me the particulars of the second and third victory loan campaigns in Saskatchewan, and they show that the average subscription was approximately $168 per loan. This indicates that the bonds were bought chiefly by people in the lower income groups. The people who are selling these bonds are telling the farmers to defer their purchases of machinery until after the war and to invest their money in bonds so that when the war is over they will be able to buy the machinery they need. That is the consideration under which a great number of these bonds are being purchased, but unless some further guarantee is given we may again be in the position in which we found ourselves in 1920. At that time certain people in whose interest it was to see that these bonds came down in price were able to bring them down. We should see that that condition does not prevail again and that no profits are made out of the savings of the small purchaser of victory bonds.

It is not enough for the government to say that things are different now, that we have a Bank of Canada which we did not have in 1919 and 1920. It is true that we have a Bank of Canada and that the government have more control over the financial structure of this country than they had at that time, but having that control I think they should give some assurance to the public that they will use it to see that these bonds remain at par. They are the ones who can do this. The people of Canada are willing to contribute and they will contribute if they are given some assurance.

I have a letter from a man who is at present in a sanatorium. He had sold his farm and

wished to invest his money in bonds. He called in a bond salesman and asked if he could guarantee that when, as he anticipated, he left the sanatorium in the course of a couple of years, he would get one hundred cents on the dollar. He was told that if the war continued for two or three years he would get one hundred cents on the dollar, but if the war should end and the old law of supply and demand should again operate and people in the small income groups should sell their bonds in order to reestablish themselves, inevitably the bonds would go below par. As a result, this man did not invest his money in bonds.

I am sure that if the government would come out with a definite statement that these bonds are not to be allowed to go below par, they would find it much easier to float another war loan. I urge upon them that they take this action immediately.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I should like to endorse everything the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright) has said, particularly in view of the fact that an insidious campaign is going on in some parts of this country to the effect that should there be a change in government these bonds will not be worth anything. I agree that this government might be changed for a still more reactionary one and then the bonds would be worth much less when the war is over than they are now. That is what will happen if the present economic system remains undirected and uncontrolled in every particular when the war is over.

It seems to me that it would be in the interests of the nation if when we ask for support for the victory loan, particularly from the smaller investors, we make provision for the handling of victory bonds during the first two or three years after the war in such a way that the smaller investor who wants to realize on them to build a home or buy furniture, machinery and so on, will be assured of geting one hundred cents on the dollar. The men and women of Canada who have invested in bonds are entitled to such an assurance. Whenever I have appealed to the people of Canada to put their money into bonds—I shall be glad to do this again as a public duty —I have said to them, and I repeat it to-day, that when they are asked to relinquish their savings for this purpose, especially those who have saved and planned in order to buy bonds because they consider it a patriotic duty, they deserve the guarantee that they will receive one hundred cents on the dollar when they cash them in. I appeal to the Prime Minister and the government to give consideration to this plea.

Mr. THOMAS REID (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) has said that there is an insidious campaign going on in some parts of the country. May I say to him that in the district from which I come people have been disposing of their bonds, not because there is an insidious campaign by anyone but because of the propaganda of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation that they would take over everything and are against profits. The best guarantee that the people of this country can get that their bonds will be good is to reelect the present government.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am not able on this most unusual occasion to agree with the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Reid). The solution he has in mind is to choose between two evils, and perhaps he regards my hon. friends to the left as the lesser of the two evils.

With regard to the speech just given by my hon. friend to my left, may I say that I regard it as being in the nature of propaganda which has been abroad for some considerable time. What I desire to say to my hon. friends is not by way of supporting the government but rather to refer to a situation which I think ought to be shown up to the people of Canada. The best guarantee we can have that the bonds of Canada will be good after the war is over is to see that we have full employment and maximum production and that the full resources of Canada are put to work. I think it is generally agreed in Canada that that must be done when this war is over. When we have accomplished that—it can be done and it will be done—we shall have answered my hon. friends to my left who are taking the usual defeatist attitude with respect to the whole problem which faces us after the war is over. They talk about rationing scarcity and guaranteeing minimums, but our job is to see that maximums are provided for the people of Canada. If the proper course is followed, not only will the bondholders be guaranteed a minimum of one dollar for each dollar invested, but I am hopeful that with the increase of opportunities and prosperity in Canada the men and women who hold these bonds will receive a premium on every one of them. We have no right as Canadian citizens to think that any other condition will exist when this war is over.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): The hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright) has made out a good case for the point he raised. We have had a nice propagandist speech by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon). It is always said that this group

is carrying on propaganda, but during the present session the leader of the opposition has never risen in his place without making a propagandist speech. I wish to say to him that there is no use in telling the people of Canada what is going to happen when this war is over.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): The C.C.F. has been doing it right along.

Mr. MacINNIS: Wait until I finish. The people of Canada know what you did after the last war. The people of Canada know the promise made in 1930 by the leader of the Conservative party.

Mr. GRAYDON: You are promising now.

Mr. MacINNIS: Wait a minute. He said: We will end unemployment or perish in the attempt. They perished. They perished because they tried to end unemployment under the system that created unemployment. Because they were going to end unemployment in that way, they perished. We are making no bones about it. We are learning that unemployment cannot be ended under the present system. The only way you can end unemployment under capitalism is by making a war. You ended unemployment between 1914 and 1918, but you had unemployment again as soon as the war was over and you had it almost continuously from then on until the present war began.

Mr. HOMUTH: Oh no.

Mr. MacINNIS: The facts are against my hon. friend. Possibly he was not unemployed. But was there not unemployment between 1929 and 1939?

Mr. HOMUTH: Yes, but was there not unemployment between 1922 and 1929?

Mr. MacINNIS: Yes, lots of it. Ask those who were in office at the time. Perhaps my hon. friend has never heard about the famous five-cent piece speech.

Mr. HOMUTH: We heard about it.

Mr. MacINNIS: That incident arose at a time when the provinces needed assistance because of unemployment and other conditions and the federal government of the day was not prepared to give it to them.

The question the member for Melfort raised is this. We are asking the people of this country to invest their savings in bonds—invest, remember. It may be that we shall be met within a short time with the conditions that prevailed in the thirties, or yes, in the twenties. The price of bonds may fall and as prices fall people will rush to dispose of their bonds. What we are asking is this: since the government will pay one hundred cents on the dollar on these bonds at maturity, there is no reason in the world why they should not give the assurance now that they will protect the small investor by paying one hundred cents on the dollar if he has to dispose of his bonds at any time before maturity. It would not cost the government of this country anything, because when the bonds mature they will pay them off at one hundred cents on the dollar anyway. I am satisfied that the member for Melfort has raised a pertinent and important question, not one that should be met with sneers and hilarity in this house. People who have at heart the interests of the working man and the working woman—small investors—should realize that once they lose their jobs they are only two or three weeks away from the breadline. These are the people we should protect.

Mr. GRAYDON: The hon. member has no monopoly of interest in the working man to make him his champion.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, I believe the raising of this question in the house is timely. It is fitting that we should call on the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) to tell the house at the earliest opportunity how the Progressive Conservatives, if they came into power, would maintain total use and total employment. In the light of the tragic failure of the Conservatives between 1930 and 1935, they need to show just in what respects they have changed their policy to guarantee total use and total employment. It is utter nonsense talking about what they are going to do unless they show how that intention is to be realized.

Mr. HOMUTH: We have not the same winter as we had last year, have we?

Mr. BLACKMORE: No, but you have a whole lot of the same brains in the Conservative party, and thus far I have not seen any evidence of any different brains or of any different use of the old brains. I think the real problem which the Liberals have is to show the house and the people that they really do know how to manage the economy of this country so that they can maintain the value of its bonds at par. The problem which faces the C.C.F. is not so much to raise questions like this as it is to show the country that they know how to manage the economy of the country. We hear much talk about its being necessary only to change the system in order to achieve total employment and total use. I agree with that. But the change must be the correct change. When the C.C.F. succeed in showing us how merely

changing to government ownership of industry is going to guarantee the total use of Canada's natural resources and the total employment of Canada's people, that party will be in a far stronger position.

The hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis), with whom I have no particular quarrel, has asserted that so long as capitalism continues it will be impossible to achieve total use and total employment. I point out that the all-important thing is to provide markets internally. If purchasing power can be supplied to the people to enable them to buy a sufficient amount of the products that industry stands ready to turn out, we shall be able to employ at home, our full resources, both human and material. Until that is done, it will matter not who owns the industries. I do believe it would be an excellent thing for this house to take a few hours off, several times before the end of this session, to canvass with the greatest of care and examine with the most minute scrupulousness just exactly what we need to do to be able to guarantee security after the war is over.

Mr. VICTOR QUELCH (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, I think the best guarantee we can have that the country's bonds will maintain their value is a guarantee that the national income will be maintained at its present level. When that is done there will be no need for people to sell their bonds because then they will be receiving wages to enable them to maintain a decent standard of living. If it is the intention of the government that the national income shall be maintained at its present level, I do not think anybody would suggest that it is not within the power of the government to secure that. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), on the declaration of war, said that no financial restrictions would be allowed to impede the war effort. Is the Prime Minister prepared to make a declaration that no financial restrictions will be allowed to impede our peace-time effort, and that the only limits to the national income will be the ability of the people to produce in order to maintain the national income? I think it would be a very good thing for the country at large if at this time the Prime Minister in no uncertain way would declare that no financial restrictions are to be allowed to impede the success of the post war era; that whatever money is required to maintain the fullest development of our resources will be forthcoming.

There is a reason why there is fear in people's minds, and it is this. When Doctor James was speaking before the senate he said that after the war we would have to adopt a new budget philosophy. He said we might have to be prepared to increase the national debt every year for the next hundred years. The only exception I take to that statement is this: why say a hundred years? Why not be frank and say that as long as we are operating under this system the national debt will have to increase for ever?

On the other hand the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) has taken a different stand. He brought in a return last year in which he stated that the national debt could be paid off, and that the government would probably introduce a scientific scheme under which the national debt would be paid. What does that mean? If we are going to introduce a scientific scheme to pay off the national debt, you must have not only a balanced budget but a budget with a surplus in order to pay off the debt. There you have the adviser on reconstruction saying that you are going to increase your national debt every year for a hundred years, while on the other hand the Minister of Finance is saying that you are not going to increase your national debt, but that you are going to have a budget surplus and pay off your national debt.

I think we all realize that if we are to have again a period similar to that from 1935 to 1939, when we had a minister of finance who deliberately set himself to curtail expenses in order to have a balanced budget, very soon after the war we shall go back into the depths of depression, destroy the confidence of the people, and have unemployment increasing. If unemployment increases, people who hold small bonds will start to cash them, and the minute they begin to do so the value will depreciate. It is high time that we had a declaration from the Prime Minister assuring this country that whatever money is necessary to develop to the fullest extent the resources of this country after the war will be forthcoming.

Mr. G. G. McGEER (Vancouver-Burrard): Mr. Speaker, I had thought during the period since war was declared, those in a minority like myself who hold strong views on certain reforms would be well advised to defer the pushing of them forward until the greater and more immediate task of defeating the enemy should be accomplished. I have been accused on a good many occasions of failing to follow the course of reform which started before the banking and commerce committee of 1934, and which at times I am afraid I followed a little too vigorously, until the Bank of Canada became a publicly owned, nationally administered institution. That was a great step

towards finding solutions of all of our supply problems, but I still believe that we have to go much farther and nationalize the policy of the Bank of Canada; change it from a filling station to the chartered banks into an institution of national service that will truly accomplish the purpose of issuing national currency and national credit in terms of public need and not in terms of private gain.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, solely for the purpose of drawing to the attention of my colleagues in this house a document which I believe is probably the most significant and far-reaching that has been published in Canada this year. It is the report for 1943 of the governor of the Bank of Canada. I believe it is important because, if you will take the time to read the preamble of the Bank of Canada Act, you will find that it is established as a public utility charged with the responsibility of sustaining and advancing and expanding and regulating the economic life of the government and the people of this nation. Now, what Mr. Towers has to say, from the position which he holds and the access which he alone has to the information available, should make any pronouncement by him one of the utmost importance not only to parliament but to everyone in the dominion. Let me deal with just one or two of these statements.

At page 5 you will find a statement of the change in our national debt situation. He points out that our national debt from August 31, 1939, has risen from $4,693,000,000 to $11,302,000,000 on December 1, 1943. That is the federal debt only. It shows an increase of $6,609,000,000, and carries with it an increase in interest charges from $169,000,000 to $304,000,000 a year. Later in the report Mr. Towers attempts to sweeten that interest charge of $304,000,000 by pointing out that we might consider it reduced by offsetting the earnings of the foreign exchange control board, earnings of the Bank of Canada, and earnings of such institutions as our national harbours. But no matter what you set off against it, the fact is that the interest charge has been increased to $304,000,000 a year, which means that over the next decade the taxpayers including the men who are fighting and the men who are working to win this war and the youth of to-day must find $3,040,000,000 for interest charges alone.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. McGEER: In a decade, I said. Yes, if people would think in terms of tens of years when they think of interest they would probably be more concerned about its ultimate consequences.

[Mr. McGeer.]

What does Mr. Towers say about that debt situation? On page 11 of the report he says:

> I do not wish to suggest that public debt could be increased at the present rate for an indefinite period without placing intolerable strain on our economy. I do feel, however, that the war debt, and the increases which will inevitably take place for a time after the war ends, can be handled without serious embarrassment.

Neither Mr. Towers nor any other man alive to-day can tell when this war is going to end or what the ultimate cost may be. I believe we have every reason to be confident that victory is certain. Certainly the war power of Germany is declining, while the war power of the united nations is steadily advancing. But no one can be certain as to when Germany can be brought to unconditional surrender, if this war is to be prosecuted with a due regard for the unnecessary sacrifice of the lives and the suffering of the men in our own fighting forces. I believe that in the Pacific the Americans are successfully achieving what the Germans hoped and failed to do to the British isles. I believe that slowly but surely the American fleet and air power of the Pacific are destroying the lines of sea transport of the Japanese people, without which the Japanese cannot survive. But again no one can tell how soon or at what cost that end can be finally achieved. Certainly as we look at the future we know that this war is not going to end with an armistice and treaties of peace. On the contrary, it is going to end with armies of occupation. Reparations are not in the offing. The reestablishment and maintenance of order and the reconstruction of a world that has been bathed in the flames of devastation are to be a part of the cost of victory. How then can the governor of the Bank of Canada give any assurance that a debt unknown can be carried without embarrassment? Already the debt load of this war is placing an intolerable strain upon the economy of the nation.

There is one other feature in connection with that phase of our reconstruction that we all should keep in mind, and that is that during the last war there were accumulations of cash reserve. We have imposed a policy of taxation during this war deliberately designed to take away from the people, from business organizations, all forms of profit. That too will place a heavier strain upon the exchequer of national, provincial and municipal governments in the reconstruction period.

In addition to that, our municipalities and provinces, with their limited revenues, although they have some reserves accumulated from deferred maintenance and income from war

expenditures, are not in as good a position to expand their debts as they were after the last war ended. What does Mr. Towers say about all this? He reviews, as every man who thinks on the subject at all must do, the problems of demobilization and reconstruction. The men and the women to be demobilized from our fighting forces are not of the same type that came back from the last war. Our air force is made up very largely, if not almost entirely, in the flying forces, of men of the officer and non-commissioned officer class, and the ground forces are men who are highly-trained and highly-skilled artisans and mechanics. In our navy the same problem, probably not so intense, is to be found, while our armed forces are men largely trained in the skill of operating highly mechanized organizations. All these forces have had their standards of living in the service greatly raised above what they were during the last war. It is not going to be as easy to find the kind of employment that will be acceptable to them as it was at the end of the last war, and the problem is infinitely greater.

We have also the problem of an industrial army who have found the highest standards of pay and the best working conditions in the most modern factories. Hundreds of thousands of them will not only be looking for employment of a similar kind but will be unhappy if they have to move down into some category of employment that is inferior. Therefore when Mr. Towers says that we can look forward to carrying our war debt and the post-war costs and costs of reconstruction without embarrassment and without placing an intolerable strain upon the economy of our nation, he is moving in the realm not of factual statement but of purely theoretical speculation. Mr. Towers, however, takes that situation and leaves it upon the doorstep of the government, upon the doorstep of parliament, because in his conclusion this is what he says:

> The adjustments required will clearly be of unprecedented magnitude, and bold planning on the part of labour, farm and business organizations as well as the governments is urgently needed.

Now when the governor of the Bank of Canada tells this government and this parliament and the people of the Dominion of Canada that they face adjustments of unprecedented magnitude and that bold planning is urgently required, he makes a statement which I believe we in this House of Commons cannot ignore and should not delay in acting upon.

I do not want to be a defeatist, although I may say that I do heartily subscribe to the proposition that a fair price of our bonds should be fixed and that Canadians, many of whom, out of a pure spirit of patriotism, accumulated their savings in the form of bonds, should not be the victims of the discount market when the war ends. If the government can limit the ceiling of a man's wages the government ought to be able to guarantee him against a loss of his investment in our national securities.

There is one other thing to which I would call the attention of members of the house and of my colleagues, and that is the method of financing which we have developed, because I believe that, in owning the Bank of Canada, we have demonstrated that we have an institution of inestimable value, already proven, and one which can prove of even greater value in the difficult days that lie ahead. Yes, there are difficult days ahead, not impossible, but they are going to require the best of economic understanding, good judgment and statesmanship to see us through.

Mr. Towers at page 6 says that during 1943, Canadian deposit liabilities of the chartered banks increased by $748,000,000. That was new money created by the chartered banks by merely writing up bank deposit entries in their books and exchanging them for interest-bearing bonds. Now he says:

> Total active note circulation, including Bank of Canada notes, rose by $161,000,000, making the total expansion in the volume of money, therefore, $909,000,000.

And he goes on to review some of the things the banks have acquired in the way of government securities, but he does not give us a clear statement of what has been purchased by the chartered banks of Canada. However, he comes along with this statement:

> "Cash reserves of the chartered banks rose $82,000,000 during the year, as shown in the table on page 1. Most of the expansion was necessary in order to maintain the cash ratio position of the chartered banks in view of the $748,000,000 increase in their Canadian deposit liabilities referred to above."

What does that mean? I believe it means that the Bank of Canada has issued into circulation, which circulation eventually came into the possession of the chartered banks, $82,000,000 of Bank of Canada legal tender bills. With that $82,000,000 the banks were able to increase their deposits up to $820,000,000 and did increase them up to $748,000,000. You see what is happening. Here we have a national banking institution owned by the people of Canada, issuing Canadian legal tender as a cold subsidy to our chartered banks, and with that subsidy of cash, which is the biggest subsidy any monopoly ever received, they are manufacturing in their own books the means of buying Canadian government interest bearing bonds. Was there ever such a device and system devised and sus-

tained by sane men for the wreck of government and the benefit of private enterprise? There you have the meaning—at least what I always thought was the meaning—of issuing currency and credit in terms of private gain. That is the fundamental basis of our whole banking system that must be changed before government, which has the constitutional right and power and responsibility of issuing currency, can move along the fields of solvency and away from the bankruptcy that this false debt claim system will continue to impose upon us.

We have seen the tragedy in the republic to the south of us in the last few days. We have seen a president guided by the experts of the treasury board finding upon his hands at this critical period the greatest revolt of the Congress of the United States against bureaucracy and against oligarchy that has ever been recorded. President Roosevelt is the victim of the same bad advice, the same unfortunate advice, that brought Winston Churchill to disaster when he was Chancellor of the British Exchequer from 1925 to 1929. Standing on the floor of the House of Commons in 1932 and 1936, he pointed out that he took full responsibility for the tragedies that had occurred during that period; but he said that he had acted upon the advice of the monetary experts of England, who had assured him that in the policies they proposed they were returning to reality and stability. Yes, Churchill, in his happy ability to acknowledge an error when he makes it, said: "I made a mistake. I was the last of the orthodox chancellors of the exchequer. Look upon me as the last of the Mohicans." When that kind of thing goes on disaster is certain to follow, and if we as a Liberal government find ourselves out of tune with the people of Canada to-day, it is the encroachment of financial authority over administrative responsibility that is shaking the confidence of the people not in our ability to win the war, but in our ability to sustain full employment at any other time than when we are fighting a war.

I hope this document, of the Bank of Canada report, will be considered by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) as a document that should go at once to the banking and commerce committee; because if the governor of the Bank of Canada can warn the government of Canada, the Canadian parliament and the people of Canada that he finds that adjustments of unprecedented magnitude are required and that bold planning is urgently needed, we should have at the service of this parliament and the government all the information that Mr. Towers has to justify that statement.

[Mr. McGeer.]

Let me say to you that all the good work the committee on war expenditures is doing—it is saving a few million dollars—comes to naught when you remember that all the while the whole nation is engaged in war this false system is mulcting the nation not in millions, but in billions of dollars. No government can survive, no minister of finance can carry on under this system, and the sooner we come to a realization of what we meant in 1935 when we said we would establish a Bank of Canada and give it power, and see that the powers were enforced, to issue currency and credit in terms of public need, the better. I believe that we are close to the day when that will come about; when instead of lending our medium of exchange through the debt claim system, we shall be spending the medium of exchange required to sustain the economy of the nation in balanced proportions, free from the debt system. Then, Mr. Speaker, we shall find that debt, unpayable debt, will cease to bind the health and the freedom of the people.

Mr. A. G. SLAGHT (Parry Sound): I have just two points to lay before the house in the discussion now proceeding. My first point is that I wish to inform the leader of His Majesty's opposition (Mr. Graydon) that the polite exchanges as to what occurred from 1930 to 1935 and down to the present time, do not change the fact that the Bennett administration established not a national bank of Canada but a hybrid, half-baked bank, of which private enterprise controlled one-half of the shares and stock. The leader of the opposition very properly from his point of view desired to take credit for the fact that the Bennett administration established that bank.

An hon. MEMBER: Private enterprise owned all of the shares.

Mr. SLAGHT: My hon. friend reminds me that private enterprise owned all of the shares. When the Liberal party fought the election of 1935 they fought it in part at least upon the declaration of the principle which my hon. friend from Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. McGeer) enunciated in his address this afternoon.

Mr. HOMUTH: Now he says it is no good.

Mr. SLAGHT: My hon. friend could not have been listening.

Mr. HOMUTH: I was very attentive.

Mr. SLAGHT: My hon. friend cannot misinterpret the remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard to say that the establishment of the Bank of Canada as a wholly-

owned national institution was no good, because that hon. member made it very clear that it was the proper type of Bank of Canada that we should possess.

I remind the leader of the opposition that his colleagues of that day—I do not recall whether he was in the house or not—

Mr. GRAYDON: You and I came in together.

Mr. SLAGHT: We came in together. His colleagues of that day and his leader of that day fought the Liberal party on the question of a wholly nationalized Bank of Canada. When we came into power in 1935 my hon. friend will recall that one of the earliest acts of the government was to see to it that the bank was taken over as a wholly-owned government bank.

Mr. GRAYDON: It did not do very much good.

Mr. SLAGHT: My hon. friend does not think it did much good. I suppose he would rather have it return to the old system of a privately owned, so-called, national bank of Canada.

Mr. GRAYDON: But you people are trying an altogether new system now.

Mr. SLAGHT: Let me tell my hon. friend that it has done an immense amount of good. It has gone very far in economic reform, and it can go a step further according to my philosophy of banking. I support the request of the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard, which I feel sure will be granted, that this splendid report of Mr. Graham Towers, the governor of the Bank of Canada, dated February 10, 1944, be forthwith referred to the banking and commerce committee, so that all parties may participate in that committee and endeavour to make provision, as Mr. Towers asks us to do, for the adjustment required which will "clearly be of unprecedented magnitude and bold planning." No one can begin to plan for the future until after making adjustments which have to do with economic policy. Everyone can see that our bold planning for the future, no matter by what party it may be done nor on what particular lines it may be advocated, in the last analysis depends upon the economic system which is the foundation of our ability to employ people and to create trade relations which will deal with our surpluses, and which in fact is at the very root of our national welfare. If that be so, Mr. Speaker, let us get to work on this important problem with as little delay as possible.

I should like to deal with one other point. Let me say at once that I am wholly in favour of the suggestion that the government should guarantee the outstanding bonds at par, so that investors may not suffer loss as a result of their patriotic and saving-minded purchases of these bonds, at the instance of all of us. But let me address a word to the complaint which the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party (Mr. Coldwell) put on record in his opening remarks. If I understood him aright he voiced the complaint that there were invidious rumours afloat—

Mr. COLDWELL: "Insidious" was the word I used.

Mr. SLAGHT: Well, perhaps "invidious" will pretty well describe the idea he wanted to convey to the people of Canada. He said there were invidious rumours afloat as to what would occur if the C.C.F. party took office. By that I suppose he meant rumours which cast doubt upon the ability of his administration, if he ever got to the point of forming one, and upon the value of our good Canadian bonds outstanding, now totalling about $8,000 million, if his party came to power. Let me make clear to him that the unrest growing in a great many quarters, not only in this country but also in the United States, as to the possibility of his party gaining power in this country, is due in large part, in my judgment, to the hon. member having gone to the United States and there making a speech or speeches which received a good deal of publicity. I am not sure whether the speech was broadcast, but I think it was delivered in New York or Washington, or perhaps in both cities. At any rate he assured the 130,000,000 people of that great republic that he thought he saw the rising of the sun and believed there was a prospect of his party taking over the government of the Dominion of Canada in the near future, or something to that effect; I hope I have paraphrased with reasonable accuracy the statement made by my hon. friend. He also told his audience, in part at least, that the first thing his party would do when they came to power would be to nationalize the banks of Canada. To nationalize the banks means to politicalize them; that is, the ten commercial banks doing business with the public in Canada.

Mr. COLDWELL: How about the Bank of Canada? Is it politicalized?

Mr. SLAGHT: The Bank of Canada is a national bank in the true sense; as my hon. friend well knows, it is without power or

authority to lend money to him or to his colleagues or to any other individual or corporation in this country. So that if my hon. friend suggests that the Bank of Canada has power, as a commercial banking institution, to lend money to him or to any of his C.C.F. friends, it would indicate that he has not studied the banking system of Canada.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: The Bank of Canada lends money to the private banks, and the private banks lend it to us.

Mr. SLAGHT: All right; the private banks lend it to individuals. By his timely interruption the hon. member for York South (Mr. Noseworthy) has emphasized the very point I am going to make. I said that the C.C.F. policy of nationalizing the private commercial banks of the country means to politicalize them; and to politicalize them as understood by my hon. friends—the hon. member for York South is very keen about it—means to "C.C.F-erize" them, nothing more or less. Let us try to visualize the picture my hon. friend painted to the people of the United States. If by chance he should come to power in Canada his first act—I think it has been placed first and foremost—would be to lock the doors of the ten chartered banks of Canada. Probably then we would find standing outside the door of one of our banks, in blue uniforms with brass buttons, the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) and his absent colleague the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr Gillis), saying, "How do you do, Mr. Customer; come in. How much would you like? What can we lend you to-day?" Oh, what a picture! A modest fellow, perhaps from up my way, would come along and say, "I am one of a group of eight or ten. We have got $10,000 together and we would like another $10,000 with which to set up a plant to cut pulpwood to be sold to the railway." I can visualize one of these two hon. gentlemen, resplendent in his uniform, saying, "Well, that is very nice of you. We want to encourage enterprise, but do you belong to the C.C.F.?" Rather shamefacedly the gentleman from my part of the country would have to say, "No; I am sorry, but I am a—"

An hon. MEMBER: Progressive Conservative.

Mr. SLAGHT: Yes, a Progressive Conservative. Probably he would be told, "That is even worse than if you were a Liberal," but in any event our astute hon. friends would not, I hope, be too raw about it. They would suggest, "Just down on Sparks street is the headquarters of the C.C.F. If you have time, drop in and listen to our secretary, because he has some wonderful ideas. Then come back to-morrow and bring your membership card, and we shall be very happy indeed to reconsider your application for a loan of $10,000 to open up Canadian industry."

Mr. MacINNIS They do that in connection with the roads now; so why not in connection with the banks? You cannot get a job on the roads in British Columbia without a membership card in the Liberal party.

Mr. SLAGHT: If it were not unparliamentary to say so, I would tell my hon. friend that he has made a statement which is untrue. But since it would be unparliamentary to say that, I will tell him that he has made a statement which I do not believe.

Mr. MacINNIS: You never looked for a job.

Mr. SLAGHT: The hon. members who are trying to work that out will doubtless come to an agreement before sunset.

Let me finish if I may what I am pointing out to the house. Whether the rumours are insidious or invidious, they are well founded. The programme as announced by the hon. member in the United States is that after getting the banks under their control they are going to take over the mines of Canada. They are going to C.C.F.-erize the mines and run them. They are going to take over the Canadian Pacific Railway company and C.C.F.-erize it along with the Canadian National Railways.

Mr. HOMUTH: And run them separately.

Mr. SLAGHT: My hon. friend says, "run them separately". The railway men of Canada are laughing that one off. If my hon. friend wants to know what the railway men in the great brotherhoods of Canada think about his suggestion of C.C.F.-erizing the C.P.R., all he has to do is to ask them.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: What about the provincial elections in Ontario?

Mr. SLAGHT: Here is a man who is disappointed because he is not able to lock the bank door and go in and borrow $10,000 tomorrow morning. The railway men of Canada do not want that to happen. They believe in the competition of these great railroads. If I have understood Liberal policy in the past it has been—I do not speak for my leader—that they do not propose in the present time of great disturbances to take over and nationalize the great Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): "Competition ever, amalgamation never."

Mr. SLAGHT: My hon. friend has reminded me of a phrase. I do not know just who is the author of it.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): R. B. Bennett.

Mr. SLAGHT: We all know what happened after the great 1930-35 debacle. I was just going down the line of what was to be C.C.F.-erized. There were the banks, the gold mines, the base metal mines, the forests—

Mr. REID: What about the House of Commons?

Mr. SLAGHT: The House of Commons will be here long after the doctrine of the leader of the C.C.F. party is forgotten. They intend to control all bonds and all insurance companies with their millions of policyholders. Who are these God-given economists and industrialists in the C.C.F. party on the other side who are to be placed in charge of these great and important assets of this young country? What records have they? They may be estimable men in their own callings, but are they to replace the boards of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the ten chartered banks of Canada? Are they to take over our great forests and pulpmills? Are they to develop and run these great industries from the top? Nothing could be as disastrous to this young country as having any such a possibility happen to us.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: There is still the genius of the hon. member for Parry Sound.

Mr. SLAGHT: My hon. friend is still smarting under the disappointment of not being able to get into that bank. Imagine what a pot of gold the C.C.F. would have with which to run their elections! The hon. member for York South would say, "I have a large constituency, boys; I have to have twice as much as the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar." These are the men who are proposing to run our banks and railways. It is not a matter for levity and the people of Canada do not propose to laugh it off.

Mr. COLDWELL: We have been enjoying it.

Mr. SLAGHT: My hon. friend has been enjoying it because he knows the truth is always enjoyable. My hon. friend goes into the United States and announces that they intend to take over the great banking system of this country, practically all industry and the insurance companies in which there are millions, yes, more than a billion dollars invested by the people of the United States. He goes over there and tells them, "I will lock the doors of the banks, of the gold mines, of the industries in which your money is invested the minute we get into power, and I come here to tell you to-night that I think we shall get there fairly soon."

Mr. GRAYDON: How long ago was that?

Mr. SLAGHT: My hon. friend will tell you that it was within three months.

Mr. GRAYDON: Quite a change since then.

Mr. COLDWELL: I do not recognize that speech at all.

Mr. MacINNIS: He had a bad dream.

Mr. SLAGHT: Even if my hon. friend went back on his announced policy; even if he saw the error of his ways—this is all hypothecated upon a dream because they are never going to be in power; I accept my hon. friend's suggestion and regard the possibility of their being in power as a dream—nevertheless the fact remains that the people of the United States have taken his bold assertion rather seriously. I want to tell my hon. friend that when he speaks of insidious or invidious rumours nobody has done as much harm to future investments in this country by our friends in the United States than has the leader of the C.C.F. party by going into that republic and laying bare the possibility of Canada being turned over to an inexperienced group of socialists.

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I was not at all surprised when the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright) rose upon the motion of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) that the house go into the committee of supply and raised the question that he did, because during the latter part of last summer, when I was travelling through the northern part of Saskatchewan, I heard one of these insidious rumours which the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party has mentioned. The rumour was to the effect that those who were selling victory bonds in that part of the country were experiencing considerable difficulty in making sales because the people there had become convinced that the C.C.F. party was going to come into power. So I said, "What difference should that make? I do not know of anything that the C.C.F. party have said," I said, "which would warrant anyone in not buying government bonds because they are convinced that the C.C.F. party may at some time come into power. As a matter of fact I have not been invited to speak on behalf of the sale of victory bonds, but the leader of the C.C.F. has, and he has been out speaking on behalf of those who were trying to sell 'C.C.F. bonds—victory bonds', I mean."

Mr. GRAYDON: You would need a floor under C.C.F. bonds.

Mr. GARDINER: Judging from some of the speeches that were made, I am not at all sure that they did not even sell a few C.C.F. bonds too.

I began to inquire where that rumour started, that people were convinced that if the C.C.F. party attained power in Canada they would not acknowledge victory bonds at their full value, and I had presented to me from an individual in that section of the country a pamphlet issued some years ago by the C.C.F. party.

An hon. MEMBER: C.C.F.?

Mr. GARDINER: Yes. There was "C.C.F." at the top of it and "Farmer-Labour" underneath. Farmer-Labour being the provincial and C.C.F. being the federal party. This pamphlet was issued following conferences held by the party in Saskatoon and Regina in 1933 for the organization of the C.C.F. Here in the pamphlet is the item that was referred to a few moments ago by my hon. friend the member for Parry Sound (Mr. Slaght), and it is headed "Socialization of the banking, credit and financial system of the country, together with the social ownership, development, operation and control of utilities and natural resources." Then there follows a questionnaire with regard to that policy, and one of the questions asked is this:

Will interest be charged by a socialized bank?

The answer to that is:

There may be a service charge as it is obvious that all services of the state must be paid for.

The next question is:

What about victory bonds?

Mr. COLDWELL: Victory bonds?

Mr. GARDINER: Yes. My hon. friend had something to do with the drafting of this document and he ought to know something of its contents. That was victory bonds of the last war.

Mr. COLDWELL: Issued at 5½ per cent, income tax free.

Mr. GARDINER: The question here is:

What about victory bonds?

And the answer is:

When we set up new currency we will immediately take in the old currency and give out new currency for old. Bonds will be taken in at face value and will be discounted. As the amount of the bond increases the discount increases.

That, Mr. Speaker, is what I found to be the source of these insidious rumours that were going about the country. It was not anything that the opponents of the C.C.F. had said, but something that had been written right into the official document of the party itself.

Mr. NICHOLSON: In what year was that?

Mr. GARDINER: In 1933, the year in which my hon. friends of the C.C.F. boast that their party came into existence. These rumours were going about the country, and, as my hon. friend the member for Parry Sound showed a few moments ago, statements that had been made in the United States and in this country have given emphasis to the rumours. I agree with the statement made by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Reid) a few minutes ago, that the only way we can assure the hon. member for Melfort that victory bonds sold in this war will have their full value at any time, without any discount in proportion to the size of the bond, is to make absolutely certain that there never is a C.C.F. government in this country. I have not any doubt that the people of the Dominion of Canada have made up their minds on that now, and because they have made up their minds on that, I think the hon. member for Melfort can be assured that bonds sold to the people of this country during this war will be redeemed at their par value by a government in Canada that does not believe in the national socialization of everything—and I use that term advisedly.

We have had a great deal of discussion whether national socialism is the proper term to apply to that organization. If my hon. friends of the C.C.F. do not like that name, I am not going to quarrel with them, but I would remind them of this. Only yesterday I had the privilege of reading an article in *Liberty* based upon a question and answer interview with the leader of the C.C.F., and the last statement in it, if I remember correctly is to the effect that what we are going to have when they get into power is "democratic socialism." Well, that is not so far removed from national socialism. That, too, had its birth in the same country. That, too, preceded national socialism in Germany.

Mr. COLDWELL: In Great Britain?

Mr. GARDINER: No, not Great Britain. There is not a man in the Dominion of Canada who has condemned more often in my hearing and in meetings in western Canada the government of Ramsay MacDonald than the present leader of the C.C.F. party. One can go through the press of western Canada and find time after time—

Mr. COLDWELL: All owned by the Liberal party.

Mr. GARDINER: Not owned by the Liberal party. But the owners of the newspapers did not write the speeches of the leader of the C.C.F. party, and the record of those speeches was handed to the press by the leader of the C.C.F. party. He gloated over the fact that he did not believe in the socialism of the Ramsay MacDonald party in Great Britain because after they came into power they did not do the things he wants to do in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. COLDWELL: I have never suggested that.

Mr. GARDINER: I am saying it because I have read the hon. member's speeches.

Mr. COLDWELL: I did not like Ramsay MacDonald's union government.

Mr. GARDINER: No, because my hon. friend did not believe in his first government.

Mr. COLDWELL: Yes, I did.

Mr. GARDINER: Nor in his second government. Which one did he agree with?

Mr. COLDWELL: I disagreed with his union government, when he formed a national government in Great Britain.

Mr. GARDINER: He formed two governments in Great Britain. My hon. friend did not agree with his first one; he did not agree with his second one, and on a future occasion I shall have the clippings here to show that. He condemned that party. Why? Because they did not nationally socialize the industry of Great Britain while they were in office. There is no doubt about that in the minds of anyone who listened to the hon. member's speeches outside this house in the years up to 1935. That was his position at that time.

But what I wish to emphasize is this. One does not need to search outside the pamphlets of the C.C.F. for the source of the rumours that have been going about western Canada to the effect that if the C.C.F. party got into power in this country they would see to it that the victory bonds—and the greater the bond the greater the discount—would be discounted. So that it seems to me that if the people of this country want their l onds valued at their real face value, plus interest, they should see to it that the C.C.F. is never put into power in this country.

Mr. J. W. NOSEWORTHY: (York South): Mr. Speaker, we have gone a considerable distance from the original speech which opened this debate. Mention has been made of rumours, many of them. I cannot understand why either the Liberals or the Progressive Conservatives should be so much concerned about the C.C.F. when both those parties are so cocksure of victory at the next federal election. If the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation is all that those hon. gentlemen say it is, why do they waste the time of this house decrying the C.C.F.? Surely they can leave that question to the intelligence of the Canadian people.

Mr. HOMUTH: And how!

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: We are quite willing, Mr. Speaker, that it should be left to the intelligence of the Canadian people. If in their collective wisdom they choose the C.C.F. government or a Liberal or a Progressive Conservative government, that is their business. Tens of thousands of people in this country who have bought victory bonds are far more concerned about knowing whether under a Liberal or under a Progressive Conservative government they will get par value for those bonds if they are forced to sell them, when they are forced to sell them to carry out the purpose for which they bought them, the purpose for which they have been encouraged to buy them. Neither the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) nor the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) has indicated in any way that a government by either party is prepared to give those buyers of bonds a guarantee that they will not be forced to sell them below par The question is not whether a C.C.F. government is to be elected or what government is to be elected. These people want to know what they will get for the bonds they are buying to-day and will be asked to buy in the next victory loan. I ask the speakers for the government or the speakers for the opposition to face that question and tell us exactly where their parties stand on that issue.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): How much would they get under the C.C.F.?

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: Par value.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): They would not, because the C.C.F. would consider them capitalistic and take the bonds away.

Mr. S. H. KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): Like the hon. member for York South (Mr. Noseworthy), who has just preceded me, I should like to make a few comments on the matter which was originally raised this afternoon by the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright). Since that hon. member spoke the discussion has become quite political, and we are led to believe that there is going to be much of this kind of thing during

the present session. On future and perhaps more appropriate occasions there are statements by leaders of the present government which it might also be well to place upon the record, particularly in view of the fondness of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) for collecting C.C.F. literature.

I was interested a while ago in listening to the emphatic speech by the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Slaght). I was reminded of speeches he made last July in this house and also outside it during the latter part of the month and early in August. His speeches at that time were made with similar vigour. They seemed calculated to slay the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, which was engaged at the time in a provincial election campaign, but apparently the slaying technique came home to roost. One wonders just what his vigour at this time will produce.

However, I should like to point out that particularly the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), in speaking on this matter, have side-stepped the essential issue which the hon. member for Melfort raised. The leader of the opposition suggested that we should not be talking about a possible decline in the value of victory bonds after the war but rather we should be expressing confidence that when these bonds mature they will be worth more than 100 per cent.

Mr. GRAYDON: I was going further than you people were; that is all.

Mr. KNOWLES: We would say "hear, hear" to that. But the leader of the opposition still failed to say whether or not he would support the idea of putting in the meantime a guarantee under these bonds that their value would not be allowed to drop below par.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I answer my hon. friend?

Mr. KNOWLES: I would be very glad if the hon. gentleman would.

Mr. GRAYDON: I say to my hon. friend that I refuse to admit that the economy we have after this war is over will—

Mr. COLDWELL: If the present government is in power?

Mr. GRAYDON: I cannot speak for them, because nobody in Canada supposes that either the hon. member's party or the Liberals are going to have anything to do with the government of this country after the war is over.

Mr. COLDWELL: But "if"?

Mr. GRAYDON: May I answer my hon. friend? I should like to do so, and to say this, that in so far as we are concerned our objection to the proposal of the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright) is that it presupposes that there is going to be a need for some floor under bonds. We refuse to admit such a thing. Our position is this, that we want every holder of bonds, including every "little man" in Canada, to have a premium on his bonds. We want to go further than the C.C.F.

Mr. KNOWLES: I take it that that is the answer of the leader of the opposition, and if so, I observe that he still refuses to commit himself as to being prepared to guarantee the value of the bonds in the meantime.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I say to my hon. friend that if a C.C.F. government ever should come into power so that the bonds do go down, such a floor should be put under them.

Mr. KNOWLES I say further to the leader of the opposition that, if we have this confidence that the level of production will be maintained and that there is no need for the value of bonds to drop, certainly there is no loss to be incurred by making the commitment for which we are asking. Further, we feel that to make this definite guarantee at this time would not only encourage people in the purchasing of victory bonds but would help to convince them that we in this house are sure there will be maintenance of full employment after the war is over. On the other hand, in view of the experience of the period after the last war, when war bonds went down in value with the result that financial and investment houses profited from the situation, people cannot help feeling that the refusal to make such a commitment at the present time is simply a case of leaving the door open for the same thing to happen again if the value of these bonds does go down.

I come back to the statement I made a moment ago, that if the leader of the opposition and if the Minister of Agriculture and other members of the government are so confident that our economy will be at a high level after the war, no loss will be involved in making this commitment and we feel definitely that it should be made. We urge that not only because there will be no loss, but because of the assurance that it would give to our people. I would point out that the Minister of Agriculture—again in a vigorous and interesting speech—wandered all over the field but did not deal with the specific request which the hon. member for Melfort has brought to the attention of this house. I hope that some other minister speaking on behalf of the government will even yet rise and give this assurance to the house and to the country. The

matter was raised quite sincerely and in a straightforward manner by the hon. member for Melfort. We feel that this is something concerning which the people of Canada deserve to be given assurance, and we deplore the way in which the issue has been side-tracked, the way in which many hon. members have wandered all over the field, the way in which no real answer has been given to this question.

I should like to say a word about the remarks of the Minister of Agriculture in connection with certain literature which he had in his hand a moment ago. I do not happen to have a copy before me, but I should like to point out that we are proposing that steps should be taken now, so as to avoid the necessity of doing what in 1933 our people in Saskatchewan felt it was necessary to do. What happened then was that victory bonds from the last war had got out of the hands of the small holders; they had taken a loss, and the bonds were now in the hands of a few holders. The C.C.F. people, or our predecessors, whoever drafted the material which the Minister of Agriculture has in his hands, felt that it was high time that the profits which a few people had made at that time should be brought to a halt; and it is our contention that we should avoid that kind of a situation arising again, by making it clear now that the victory bonds which people are purchasing in this war will not deteriorate in value so far as the small purchasers are concerned. It has already been pointed out that since the government guarantees the value of these bonds at maturity, and we emphasize that point, there is no loss to be incurred by the government in guaranteeing the value of the bonds at all times. That may raise in someone's mind the obvious question: if there is no loss to the government, why is there so much opposition to our request? The answer is that if the stand we are asking for is taken by the government it will shut the door to many financial and investment houses, against the making of huge profits from the buying of these bonds if they depreciate in value after the war. We feel that this is a step that should be taken. After all, these are the savings of the people, given for the specific purpose of victory, given also with the suggestion that they might have this money on hand for rehabilitation purposes after the war. We feel, therefore, that our people should not be exploited by leaving the door open in this way to financial and investment houses.

I have done what I could to bring the discussion back to the request which the hon. member for Melfort submitted to the house, which we feel is a reasonable one and which we know is of concern to thousands of workers, farmers and soldiers throughout the country. I hope that even yet a minister or a parliamentary assistant, speaking on behalf of the government, will give us the assurance for which we ask.

Mr. D. C. ABBOTT (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Finance): I regret the unavoidable absence at the moment of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley), and on his behalf I should like to make a few observations. The question raised by the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright) is not a new question. The hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. Castleden) raised it last year and the minister answered him fully at that time. I have no doubt the question will come up again.

What we should bear in mind is this. The hon. member for Melfort asks that the government should guarantee every holder of a victory bond that he will be able at any time to sell that bond for 100 cents on the dollar. I suggest that we should remember what the government does when it issues bonds. It is issuing bonds for five, ten and fifteen years, paying a certain rate of interest in consideration of the fact that the money is lent for that term. It guarantees that at maturity of that term the holder will receive 100 cents on the dollar.

I do not intend to go into the pros and cons of the hon. gentleman's suggestion except to say that if that suggestion were accepted it would mean that there would be no difference between the rate of interest which the government would pay for thirty days or sixty days and the rate on money which it might borrow for ten, fifteen or twenty years.

As I say, this question has been fully discussed before. The Minister of Finance gave a full explanation as to why the government could not agree with the suggestion made by the hon. member for Yorkton last year, and I would not think his views would have changed in the meantime.

So much for the suggestion that the government should now guarantee the holder of every bond 100 cents on the dollar at any time. Perhaps we are taking too much for granted in assuming that the holder will not get it. A good many of these bonds now sell at a premium. They are widely distributed among a large number of small holders, far more than ever before, and I believe that the very fact of that wide distribution will make for stability in the price of these bonds on the open market during and after the war.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: It did not help the last time.

Mr. ABBOTT: That is a long time ago and a different government was in power.

Mr. GRAYDON: You should find a better reason than that.

Mr. ABBOTT: The hon. member ranged far afield. The hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. McGeer), in his usual forceful and eloquent manner, has put forward his well-known views on monetary policy. I do not think the house will expect me now to discuss those views. He says that the government is in receipt of bad advice and operates under a bad system. I have no doubt full opportunity will be afforded for discussing his particular views on financial matters, both in other debates in this house and before the banking and commerce committee.

I do not know that there is anything else that I have to add. The Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) suggests that no doubt Mr. Graham Towers, the governor of the Bank of Canada, will be before the banking and commerce committee, and that reminds me of one point which the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard made. If I understood him correctly he rather criticized Mr. Towers for referring, in the annual report of the bank, to the fact that adjustments of unprecedented magnitude will have to be made after the war. That would not cause me much surprise.

Almost any of us would agree that that was a fair statement of what will have to be done. I cannot see that Mr. Towers or anybody else should be severely criticized for such a statement in a bank report.

Mr. MacNICOL: How does my hon. friend account for the fact that the fourth and fifth victory loan bonds were selling on the Toronto stock exchange on Saturday below par?

Mr. ABBOTT: I am not aware of the fact that they were, but I venture to say it must have been a very small fraction below par.

Mr. MacNICOL: It is a small fraction. The bid on the fourth victory loan was 99¾ and the bid on the fifth victory loan was 99¼.

Mr. ABBOTT: That is the ordinary fluctuation from day to day, supply and demand. I would not think that was a permanent condition.

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

DEPARTMENT OF PENSIONS AND NATIONAL HEALTH

195. Departmental administration, $161,172.

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Pensions and National Health): The item stands.

Item stands.

[Mr. Castleden.]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Service—

242. Departmental administration, $699,070.

Hon. W. P. MULOCK (Postmaster General): Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to make a statement in regard to mail to troops overseas.

During the past six or eight weeks I have received a number of letters complaining of delay and non-delivery of mails to and from members of the Canadian armed forces overseas. Items and editorials have also appeared in the daily press.

In dealing with this matter, I can assure you that I have a sympathetic appreciation and understanding of the anxiety of parents, relatives and friends, in this country when they fail to receive news from overseas or when they hear that the letters and parcels which they have sent overseas have not arrived.

Knowing how important the receipt of mail is from a standpoint of morale, I can assure you that, despite delays which have occurred, advantage has been, and will be taken, of every means at our disposal to improve the service.

That there have been delays there is no doubt, but not delays which could be avoided. The time taken, which to anxious relatives and friends may seem unreasonable, is due to three more or less unavoidable causes:—

(1) the lack of transport, both air and surface, on account of the imperative and incessant requirements for vital operations,

(2) adverse transatlantic weather usually prevalent in the winter months,

(3) the necessary movement of personnel from unit to unit and location to location to meet the exigencies of active operations.

Last fall there were indications that shipping space for the transportation of mails overseas was becoming more difficult to obtain as some of the larger ships which had been used were being moved from the Canadian route for other purposes.

We had counted on being able to overtake this difficulty by the transmission of a large portion of the letter mails from Canada to the United Kingdom by air. Unfortunately, the aircraft which we had hoped would be available did not materialize due to the prior demands of machines for combat purposes.

On October 7 a meeting took place between the Minister of National Defence, the minister for air and myself, together with representatives of the Post Office Department and the Canadian armed forces postal services.

As a result of personal representations made by the Minister of National Defence for Air, six Fortress aircraft were obtained from the United States to be utilized for the transportation of mails for the forces. These machines were not new but had been used in varying degrees for operation and training purposes.

A Royal Canadian Air Force squadron was created to operate the mail service from Canada to the United Kingdom and on to the Mediterranean area, and return.

I should like to make it clear at this point that this service was supplementary to the facilities which existed, and despite delays which have occurred the fact emerges that this Canadian air service has carried to the United Kingdom and the Mediterranean theatre, and return, thousands of pounds of letters which would otherwise have been dispatched by surface ships.

An air service of this nature would ordinarily not have been inaugurated without an extended period of experimental flights to seek out the handicaps and difficulties and apply the remedies before the actual service flights commenced.

In our desire to take advantage of every possible means of expediting delivery, it was decided to commence the service without these usual tests and to iron out the difficulties as we went along. This we have done. Difficulties have been encountered, many of them, but I believe that I can confidently say that most of these difficulties are now behind us and that, with a reasonable break in the weather, noticeable improvements will be effected.

It must, however, be borne in mind that war-time transport cannot be compared with that enjoyed in peace times. The handicaps and the obstacles are many. Delays will occur, due chiefly to the exigencies of war. We shall, however, continue, as we have in the past, to overlook no opportunity and to take advantage of every facility to improve the service to the men and women serving overseas.

So that you will have some idea of the reasons for the delays which have occurred and the average times which it takes to handle and transport mails from Canada to the overseas forces under present conditions, I am going to place on record data taken from actual mail service operations from Canada to the United Kingdom and the Mediterranean theatre. Similar times and conditions also apply to mails moving westbound.

Airgraphs and Armed Forces Air Letters
Canada to United Kingdom

Eastbound—Carried by Royal Air Force Transport Command.

Average time from point of mailing in Canada to delivery in England—

Army	10 days
R.C.A.F.	13 days

Date of mailing	1st day
Air transport to base post office	2nd day
Handling and sortation into unit packages at base P.O.	3rd day
Transit to airport and awaiting take off (average 2 days)	5th day
Air transit Canada to United Kingdom	6th day
Rail transport from airport in U.K. to Canadian overseas postal depot	7th day
Sorting into bags and dispatch to railhead serving unit	8th day
Unloading at railhead, transport to supply point, thence to unit	9th day
Arrival at unit for delivery	10th day
Letters for personnel in the R.C.A.F., especially those at R.A.F. stations, take on an average 3 days longer as items are routed through the postal directory for location and delivery is effected through United Kingdom civilian postal channels	13th day

Airgraphs and armed forces air letters are for the present carried eastbound by the planes of the R.A.F. transport command. In a westerly direction they are carried by the Trans-Canada Air Lines or by the aircraft of the R.C.A.F. transport command. Occasionally these items have been carried for us by planes of the United States transport command.

An idea of the frequency of this service eastbound can be gathered from the fact that twelve crossings were made in November, nine in December and ten in January, which averages a crossing every three days.

The transit time from the base post office until the mails arrive in the United Kingdom varies from three to ten days. Generally speaking, an armed forces air letter mailed in Canada is delivered to the addressee in the United Kingdom in anywhere between six to fifteen days after posting. There have been occasions when letters have been delivered in a shorter time. There are also cases where they have taken longer, but this is usually due to the fact that the items had to be redirected before delivery could be effected.

The number of armed forces air letters carried across the Atlantic has now reached one and a half million per month.

Airgraphs normally take four or five days longer due to photographing in Canada before dispatch and the reproduction of the message in the United Kingdom on arrival. Occasionally the time taken is longer when the arrival in the United Kingdom coincides with a heavy volume of airgraphs received from the British forces overseas which occasionally number several million.

Letters for personnel in the R.C.A.F. cannot be delivered to units in the same way as letters for army units. This is due to the frequent changes in location of squadrons

and individuals. It has been found by experience that in most cases delays are reduced if items are first passed through the R.C.A.F. postal records.

Mr. GRAYDON: Does the airgraph system save much space?

Mr. MULOCK: Oh, yes, a great deal of space.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): It takes eight days longer for delivery.

Mr. MULOCK: It takes time to have them photographed in the first place. They formerly had to be sent to the United States to be produced, but they are now photographed in Toronto.

Mr. GRAYDON: Some are difficult to read. I have one in front of me now.

Mr. MULOCK: That is one you received?

Mr. GRAYDON: Yes.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Have there been any losses of airgraphs in transit in recent months?

Mr. MULOCK: Not between here and the United Kingdom.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: But between here and the Mediterranean?

Mr. GRAYDON: Yes.

Mr. MULOCK: Yes. The next one I should like to deal with is airgraphs and armed forces air letters—Canada to Mediterranean.

Mr. COLDWELL: Before the minister leaves the first item, I have been keeping rather careful track of the blue letters I have been receiving, and quite often they have taken three weeks or a month and sometimes longer.

Mr. MULOCK: From England?

Mr. COLDWELL: Yes.

Mr. MULOCK: That is quite possible on the westbound trip. They have run into some very bad delays on account of weather.

Mr. COLDWELL: That has been the case in December, January and this month. I received one to-day which took sixteen days; that was the quickest of all.

Mr. MULOCK: Flying conditions have been very bad.

I wish to deal now, as I said, with airgraphs and armed forces air letters to the Mediterranean. Eastbound they are dispatched by R.A.F. transport command aircraft to the United Kingdom, thence by the Royal Canadian Air Force, the Royal Air Force or United States aircraft, or any other on which space to the Mediterranean theatre can be obtained. The average time of an air letter from Canada to the airport in the United Kingdom is seven days. The average wait for aircraft space in the United Kingdom is eight days, bringing us to the fifteenth day. Delays on account of weather have averaged four days, making it the nineteenth day. Transit time from the United Kingdom to the Mediterranean theatre average two days, making it the twenty-first day. Arrival at airport, sortation and road transport to base takes two days, bringing it to the twenty-third day. Air transport to formation postal unit and arrival at unit for delivery brings it to the twenty-fourth day. Airgraphs would take approximately four to six days longer, on account of the processing at both ends of the journey, which would make it the thirtieth day.

Air letters and airgraphs from the United Kingdom to the Mediterranean theatre were formerly carried on any aircraft on which there was available space. Usually the planes of the R.A.F. transport command and the United States transport command were used. Recently the mails have been carried by the R.C.A.F. transport command, and nine round trips have been made since the first trip which left the United Kingdom on Christmas Day, 1943. As a result of the experience gained through the initial trips it was decided, in addition to the present equipment, to base a lighter type of transport aircraft at a western Mediterranean airport. This will permit a round trip service to the Mediterranean circuit every five days and oftener if the quantity of mail justifies. It is confidently expected that this will reduce the elapsed time by several days. The first of these planes has already arrived at the airport and the improved service will go into operation in the very near future. With the advent of improved weather the delays will be further reduced by possibly two or three days and, as the lighter aircraft will be able to land closer to the point where the postal base is located, time now taken up by extended road transport will be eliminated.

Changes of this kind, however, are not effected overnight. They are the result of many negotiations and preliminaries. First, planes must be obtained, having regard to the needs of combat operations and, further, aircraft cannot go rushing into zones of operations without previous measures being taken in regard to control, security and navigation. That this improved service is now ready to operate speaks for itself. I conservatively estimate that in a short while it will effect a saving in time of up to ten days between Canada and the Mediterranean theatre, weather permitting.

The average times which I have just read to you are for mails addressed to a definite unit address. When mails are addressed to reinforcement units and have to pass through the directory service the time taken is longer, as letters have to be routed through the postal tracing section for direction, sometimes on several occasions, and this all takes time.

As regards airgraphs for Italy, at the present time the original messages have to be sent to North Africa to be processed. Whenever possible the messages are sent by air but occasionally it happens that there is no air lift available and thus extra time is taken due to the four or five days which are consumed by surface transport. Consideration is being given to the establishment of a processing station on the Italian mainland and this will be done as soon as circumstances permit. It will result in a reduction in the time required for the transmission of this class of correspondence.

Next I should like to deal with surface letters to the Canadian armed forces in the United Kingdom. The average transit time is as follows:

Example—Letter mailed in central Canada to member of Canadian armed forces in United Kingdom.

Letter posted and sorted in local post office and despatched by rail to base post office	1st day
Arrival at base post office, Ottawa	4th day
Sorted and prepared for dispatch	5th day
Average time waiting for space on transport (five days)	10th day
Railway transport to port of loading (two days)	12th day
Loading on steamer and awaiting departure (three days)	15th day
Transatlantic crossing, fast ship—no convoy, or fast convoy (average ten days)	25th day
Docking, unloading and loading in mail cars at port in United Kingdom (two days)	27th day
Rail transit to Canadian Postal Corps railhead, sortation and dispatch	28th day
To Unit railhead, thence to unit supply point	29th day
Arrival at unit for delivery	30th day

During the calendar year 1943, 661,904 pounds of letters were dispatched overseas. This amounts to approximately 31,500,000 items. With a few exceptions, due to causes beyond our control, practically all of these letters have been delivered to the addressees. True, delays have occurred. Time has been taken up by redirections, and no doubt occasional errors have been made in individual cases but the percentage of correspondence undeliverable is a very small portion of 1 per cent.

Most of the surface letters have been transported by surface ships but 39,000 pounds of surface letters have been carried by planes operated by the R.C.A.F. or Trans-Canada Air Lines. This has expedited delivery by anywhere from two or three days to two weeks. These letters have been carried by air although prepaid for surface transport.

The transit times which I gave are for normal crossings. Occasions have arisen when ships have had to put back to port. Sometimes the same ship has returned more than once and the time required is increased accordingly. For example, right at the present moment there is one ship which was loaded with mails in the first days of January. It had to put back to port and has not yet reached the United Kingdom. This is not an isolated instance. I might say that the 39,000 pounds I mentioned as having been carried by air amounts to approximately 1,560,000 letters.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MULOCK: Mr. Chairman, the next matter I should like to deal with is the surface letters to Canadian forces overseas in the Mediterranean area. The example is as follows:

Average transit time

Example—Letter mailed in central Canada addressed to member of unit of Canadian forces in Mediterranean theatre.

Time elapsed between posting in Canada and arrival at Canadian postal corps railhead in United Kingdom—28 days	28th day
Checking, sortation and rebagging at Canadian overseas postal depot	29th day
Waiting space on steamer to Mediterranean area (five days)	34th day
Despatch to port in United Kingdom, loading on steamer (two days)	36th day
Ship awaiting make-up of convoy for Mediterranean (six days)	42nd day
Average time fast convoy to Mediterranean area (ten days)	52nd day
Waiting at port of arrival and unloading (three days)	55th day
From port to Canadian base post office serving units (two days)	57th day
Road transport to formation postal unit	58th day
Arrival at unit for delivery	59th day

Up to the inauguration of the mail service operated by the R.C.A.F. transport command, practically all surface letters were sent by surface transport.

During the eight weeks since the R.C.A.F. service has been in operation, 45,619 pounds of mail, approximately two and a quarter million letters, have been carried by air from England to the Mediterranean theatre. This has reduced the time of delivery in some cases by almost two weeks.

Times given are for normal items addressed to definite units. The time is appreciably increased when the mail is intended for reinforcement units or for personnel who have been routed through reinforcement depots to definite units. In such cases, the mail has to pass through the postal tracing section, sometimes on two or three different occasions, and the time required is increased accordingly.

It happens from time to time that when these mails are dispatched by surface ships the ships are re-routed to a different port from that originally intended. This further complicates the mail handling and increases the time for delivery. In addition, several incidents have occurred when ships have been damaged and have had to put back to port. On other occasions they have had to enter a port en route for repairs.

At the time of the first expedition of Canadian forces to the Mediterranean area mails were frozen in the United Kingdom until the troops were well on their way to destination. This action was taken by the security authorities in the interests of the safety of the convoy. Unfortunately when the mails were eventually dispatched one of the ships carrying them was damaged by enemy action which necessitated it putting into port for repairs. This took a considerable time and created still further delay.

The next item I should like to deal with is parcels to Canadian forces overseas in transit from Canada to the United Kingdom. The example I would give covers a cigarette parcel where the order has been placed in Ontario and it is as follows:

Order sent to tobacco company for cigarettes	1st day
Order received at tobacco company	2nd day
Average time taken by tobacco company to fill order and transfer to postal corps (two weeks)	16th day
Parcels sorted by C.P.C. tobacco unit into unit bags individually listed	17th day
Loaded in cars and dispatched, including transit to seaport (three days)	20th day
Unloaded and stored awaiting space on steamers (seven days)	27th day
Ship awaiting make-up of convoy and transit time in slow convoy to United Kingdom (average twenty-six days)	53rd day
Waiting for berth on arrival, unloading and waiting railway transportation (four days)	57th day
Railway to Canadian postal corps railhead	58th day
From C.P.C. to unit railhead	59th day
Arrival at unit for delivery	60th day
Ordinary parcels (not tobacco parcels) would take approximately fourteen days less, i.e.,	46 days

During the year 1943, twenty-seven and a half million pounds of parcel post were dispatched overseas from Canada. This represents 6,930,835 parcels. Of this number 3,008,969 were tobacco parcels which are each individually listed by the Canadian postal corps before dispatch.

As far as possible parcels are shipped in direct unit bags, which means that the bag containing the parcels and the corresponding list is sealed at the base post office, Canada, and the seals are intact when delivered to the post orderly of the unit overseas. When it is not practical to sort tobacco parcels into unit bags, the consolidation takes place at the Canadian overseas postal depot in the United Kingdom where the individual tobacco parcels are checked in and again listed on being dispatched to the units.

During 1943 losses by enemy action decreased sharply, and it is estimated that losses from all causes are only slightly more than 1 per cent while the mails are in the custody of the Canadian armed forces postal service. Losses do occur when parcels are in custody of the British postal service or after delivery to the units. The Canadian postal corps endeavours to reduce these losses as far as possible by inspection of the unit mail rooms. There is, however, a limit as to what can be done in this connection.

In most cases of complaints concerning cigarette parcels cognizance is not taken of the time actually required for a parcel to reach its destination even under favourable conditions. Representations of non-delivery are made before the parcel has had time to reach its destination. Time and again investigation has shown that the parcels complained about were delivered in the normal course of time.

It should be borne in mind that delays also occur between the time an order is placed at the corner tobacconist and the time it is received by the tobacco company, also between the time the order is received by the tobacco company and the date it is delivered to the Canadian postal corps for handling and dispatch.

Many parcels are received which are inadequately addressed. This is sometimes due to misreading of the written address when the address label is typed. Search after search is made through records in an endeavour to locate the correct addressee.

When a parcel finally fails of delivery it is turned over to the auxiliary services of the Canadian armed forces for distribution generally to Canadian armed forces personnel. In all cases where this action is taken a letter is sent to the sender advising him of the treatment given to the parcel.

A number of societies and auxiliaries in Canada are using obsolete lists. These lists contain names of men who have never left Canada. This creates avoidable searches through records and indirectly delays the handling of parcels to persons who are overseas.

In this connection I wish to thank the various persons and organizations who have given their time and talents to bring about improvements in the addressing of mail and the preparation of parcels. I might mention specially Mrs. Weeks, whose husband, Brigadier E. G. Weeks, is at C.M.H.Q. overseas. She has particularly helped in this work.

The next item I should like to deal with is parcels to Canadian forces in the Mediterranean area.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): How much more is there of this essay? We can all read it if the minister would put it on *Hansard*.

Mr. MULOCK: There are some other things in which the hon. member might be interested.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am interested in it all.

Mr. MULOCK: Perhaps some other hon. members are interested.

Mr. RALSTON: If other hon. members are not interested, the troops are interested.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): We can read it all in *Hansard* if it is put on the record.

Mr. MULOCK: Certainly they can read it. I will give another example of the average transit time.

Mr. LOCKHART: The minister will be coming back to mail to Italy?

Mr. MULOCK: Yes. The example I wish to put on *Hansard* follows:

Parcels to Canadian Forces Overseas—Canada to Mediterranean

Parcels travel via United Kingdom, are resorted at Canadian overseas postal depot, England (except unit bags) and are then dispatched from United Kingdom to Mediterranean ports.

Average transit time	
Parcel mailed in central Canada	1st day
Rail transit to base post office, Ottawa, arriving on	4th day
Sorted and dispatched from base post office	5th day
Arriving at port of dispatch on	7th day
Unloaded and stored awaiting space on steamers (average seven days)	14th day
Ship awaiting make-up of convoy (average ten days) and slow convoy to United Kingdom (average sixteen days)—twenty-six days	40th day
Waiting at port of arrival and unloading (average four days)	44th day
Loaded in cars and dispatched to Canadian overseas postal depot	45th day
Mails checked and resorted for Mediterranean area	47th day
Waiting space on ships to Mediterranean area (average five days)	52nd day
Dispatch to United Kingdom port and loading on steamer	54th day
Ship awaiting make-up of convoy to Mediterranean (average six days)	60th day
Average time slow convoy to Italian ports—twenty days	80th day
Waiting at port of arrival and unloading (average five days)	85th day
From port to Canadian base post office serving units (average two days)	87th day
By road transport to formation postal unit	88th day
Arrival at unit for delivery	90th day

The transit times which I have just read cover an ordinary parcel. If the parcel in question had been a tobacco parcel it would have taken approximately fourteen days longer, which is the average time taken by the tobacco company to fill orders.

Furthermore, had the parcel arrived in the United Kingdom during the Christmas rush period, it would have taken a further ten days to handle on account of the congestion at the docks, lack of rolling stock, overloaded facilities and additional time waiting for steamers and convoys.

During the months of November, December and January 621,440 parcels were dispatched from the United Kingdom to the central Mediterranean.

The majority of these were Christmas parcels from Canada, and it is estimated that the bulk would reach Italy some time during January.

All parcel mails do not travel from Canada to the Mediterranean via the United Kingdom. Arrangements were made in the fall of the year with the United States army postal authorities whereby Canadian mails could be dispatched through United States ports. It was provided by the United States authorities, however, that this arrangement could only take effect after their Christmas bulk had been cleared.

A number of dispatches have already been made via United States ports and it is estimated that the average transit time from the base post office in Canada to Italy is approximately fifty days. Occasionally, however, these steamers are diverted to a port other than the original destination. This generally

delays eventual arrival at destination as exceptional arrangements have to be made for the onward transmission from the point of diversion.

Our chief concern in connection with mails to Italy centres in items addressed to the personnel of reinforcement units. The difficulty eases once they have been posted to definite units, but while the men are moving from a reinforcement unit in England to a reinforcement group and depots in Italy and from one reinforcement battalion to another reinforcement battalion and then eventually to a definite unit, the possibility of expeditious handling is remote.

Items have to be routed through the records several times before the addressee is located, and often by the time the parcel reaches that location he has moved on to some other point. This difficulty is not peculiar to the Canadian army. It is met with in all forces.

Eventually the mail catches up with the addressee, and two incidents have very recently come to my attention where men had moved from one unit to another or from one location to another. One man received 107 items at one time, and another seventy-eight.

In an endeavour to give a picture of this situation I propose to read a statement of the channels through which the mails would pass in connection with reinforcement units. In case the impression might prevail that this is a hypothetical statement, I am taking the liberty of reading a letter which I have just received:

February 21, 1944.

The Postmaster General,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir:

I wish to bring to your attention a situation which, if possible, should be remedied.

My son was wounded on December 19, while serving with the West Nova Scotia regiment. His Christmas parcels were mailed before November 1, securely packed and tied and properly addressed. These parcels were addressed to him at 7 C.I.R.U. England, but he had moved to the 1st Battalion 1 C.B.R.D. in North Africa. Later he moved to the 4th Battalion 1 C.B.R.D. which station, I believe, is in Italy.

The young man wrote me under date of January 29 that he had not received a letter or a parcel since the middle of October. Since November, the family have sent him several parcels and letters, some addressed to North Africa and the balance to the 4th Battalion 1 C.B.R.D.

I know you will appreciate that it is discouraging to both the young man and his family, that his parcels and letters are not being received.

Yours very truly,

.....

[Mr. Mulock.]

Perhaps I might be allowed to put on *Hansard*, as it covers two-and-a-half typewritten pages, a description of the travel of a letter addressed to a member of a reinforcement unit recently arrived in the United Kingdom who is included in a draft for the Mediterranean theatre. If any hon. member has any suggestion to improve the service, it will be gratefully received. The description is as follows:

Brief description of the travel of a letter addressed to a member of a reinforcement unit recently arrived in the United Kingdom who is included in a draft for the Mediterranean theatre.

Letter is forwarded from Canada in the usual way, addressed to a reinforcement unit in England. Time required, air mail approximately ten days, surface mail approximately thirty days.

Letter arrived in the United Kingdom but there is yet no record at the reinforcement unit of the addressee.

Letter is then forwarded to the Canadian records in England and search made for the addressee's correct address.

Often there is no trace in records as the information is not yet complete concerning the unit to which the addressee has been posted.

The letter is held for a week and then put through Canadian records again.

If records contain information of unit to which the addressee is posted, letter is endorsed accordingly.

If there is still no record of addressee, the letter is held another week and is put through the Canadian records again at regular intervals until he is found.

The redirected letter is forwarded to the Canadian overseas postal depot, England, for sortation and dispatch.

The letter arrives at the reinforcement unit in England to which the addressee has been posted. It is sorted to the respective company by the unit mail orderly.

Letter is delivered to the addressee if he is still in the United Kingdom.

If the addressee has been included in a reinforcement draft for the Mediterranean theatre the letter is so endorsed by the unit mail orderly.

Letter is forwarded from the reinforcement unit in the United Kingdom to the Canadian overseas postal depot for sortation and dispatch to the Mediterranean theatre.

Letter is forwarded to the reinforcement depot, central Mediterranean force, time required approximately thirty days by surface, six to sixteen days by air.

Letter arrives at base post office, Mediterranean theatre, and dispatched to the postal tracing section, Canadian 2nd echelon.

Letter put through the postal tracing section to ascertain to which depot and to which battalion within the depot the addressee has been posted.

If tracing section records contain information of unit to which addressee is posted letter endorsed accordingly.

If postal tracing section records have no information letter is held and again put through the records at regular intervals.

Redirected letter forwarded to appropriate reinforcement battalion.

Battalion mail orderly sorts into companies and delivers to the addressee if he is still with the battalion.

If addressee has been posted to an advance reinforcement battalion letter is again redirected by the mail orderly.

Letter sorted by Canadian postal unit and forwarded to the advance battalion for delivery.

If addressee has been posted from advance battalion letter is put through the records to ascertain new address.

Letter redirected according to new address and transferred to Canadian postal unit for sortation and dispatch.

Letter despatched to Canadian postal unit serving the new address.

Letter dispatched by Canadian postal corps to the addressee's new unit where it is delivered by unit post orderly if the addressee is still with the unit.

If addressee has become a casualty the letter is so endorsed by competent authority.

Letter returned to the postal tracing section at Canadian 2nd echelon.

Letter put through tracing section records to ascertain where the addressee is now located.

If the records have received information letter is again redirected.

If there is no information letter is put through postal tracing section records at regular intervals until the new location is recorded, when the letter is readdressed.

After redirection letter is forwarded to the C.P.C. postal unit.

Canadian postal corps unit sorts the letter according to the new address, usually a hospital, and forwards it to the nearest Canadian or British postal unit for delivery.

It often happens that the wounded man is moved from a British to a Canadian hospital. Letter is then redirected to the new hospital by the hospital mail orderly.

Letter is forwarded through tracing section where the new address is recorded and the letter immediately sent on for delivery.

Letter is forwarded by Canadian postal unit to new hospital address.

On arrival of the letter at hospital it is delivered to the addressee if he is still in the hospital. If he has left the hospital the same procedure as outlined above is followed ad lib until the letter eventually reaches the addressee.

It will be noted that I concluded the statement just read at the point where we deal with mail for a soldier who is a casualty and in hospital.

Let me now place on record action which has been taken to improve the service to these men by short-cutting the time required for delivery.

Use of Casualty Air Mail Postcard.—To expedite mail to soldiers in hospital a special card has been introduced with the approval of the Department of National Defence.

Normally, as hon. members are aware, mail travels to the unit of address and is redirected by the mail orderly of that unit to the latest known address. This procedure is followed until the mail is delivered to the addressee. The procedure involves many handlings and frequent searches through records before it reaches a soldier in hospital.

Now, on entry to hospital if the case so warrants—if he is going to be in hospital some considerable time—a special card is filled in either by the soldier or on his behalf asking relatives and friends when writing to him to add the words "in hospital" to the unit address which they usually use.

This card after being filled in is given priority treatment throughout the whole of its transmission to the addressee in Canada. Wherever possible, delivery is expedited by air transport without charge.

Letters mailed in Canada bearing the indication "in hospital," instead of being forwarded to the man's unit, are routed direct to the records in the United Kingdom or with the central Mediterranean Force, as the case may be.

At these points the letter is endorsed with the latest known address of the soldier and it is sent to destination by the quickest possible means.

Letters bearing the words "in hospital" are given priority treatment at the base post office and are given preference in the matter of transport according to the rate paid, air or surface.

This procedure short-cuts the normal practice of delivery to the unit and the tracing through the various steps from unit to unit and eventually to hospital.

Some of the complainants have intimated that the department has endeavoured to make financial gain out of the present situation by collecting airmail fees and sending mails by surface.

Naturally I can only speak for the mail posted in Canada to which Canadian postage is affixed. Westbound mail to Canada is the responsibility of the administration in whose jurisdiction it is mailed, but I cannot imagine any postal administration endeavouring to exploit the present situation for financial gain.

Priority is unquestionably given to mail prepaid for air transport. It does happen, however, occasionally that meteorological forecasts indicate bad flying weather for several days ahead, or possibly mechanical difficulties will delay the take off for several days and there is no alternative aircraft available. In such cases, if there is a fast surface outlet and the possibilities are that the mails will reach destination earlier, the air mails are transferred from the plane to the surface ship. The determining factor is to secure the earliest possible delivery to the addressee.

Further, complaints are made that letters posted a number of days apart arrive at the same time. I am sure that hon. members will find this easily understandable from the information I have already given.

Planes loaded at different dates are held for weather. When the weather breaks the planes take off, arriving at destination at approximately the same time.

In this connection I should like to put on record extracts from the log of two aircraft engaged in the carriage of mails to and from the armed forces. With the approval of the committee, I would put them on record rather than read them, because they are rather long.

The CHAIRMAN: With the approval of the committee.

Mr. MULOCK: The extracts follow:

The extracts follow:

Extract from Postal Log (A)

29 December—expected to leave Dorval 1st January
31 December—scheduled to leave Dorval 3rd January
5 January—due out of Dorval
5 January—left at night carrying 6,207½ lbs. of mail, but had to return on account of weather
7 January—still held at Dorval—snow on runways and bad weather
8 January—left Dorval; got as far as Labrador, but returned to Dorval as the weather over the Atlantic was unfavourable
10 January—due to leave Dorval
11 January—expected to leave Dorval. Left Dorval 10.05 p.m.
12 January—arrived in United Kingdom 9.21 a.m.
17 January—scheduled to leave United Kingdom for Canada
18 January—held in United Kingdom on account of bad weather
19 January—scheduled to leave for Canada via Iceland. Plane started on its flight but had to return
20 January—departure held up on account of bad weather
21 January—departure still held up
22 January—expected to leave United Kingdom on 23rd
23 January—left United Kingdom 7.20 a.m.; arrived in Iceland 12.09 p.m. Left Iceland for Canada with 3,915 lbs. mail
25 January—arrived Montreal 27 minutes after midnight
26 January—undergoing repairs at Dorval, will not be serviceable for a week
1 February—still undergoing repairs and tests
3 February—expected to be available for flight to United Kingdom by 5th February
5 February—scheduled to leave 10.00 p.m. on 6th February
7 February—Mail loaded, plane due to leave. Later, departure delayed on account of bad weather
8 February—left Dorval 10.00 p.m. with 6,133 lbs. mail
9 February—arrived United Kingdom 10.20 a.m.

[Mr. Mulock.]

Extract from Postal Log (B)

11 January—arrived in United Kingdom. Unserviceable until 14 January
14 January—repairs not completed
16 January—scheduled to leave for Canada
17 January—held in United Kingdom on account of weather
18 January—scheduled to leave 10.00 p.m.
19 January—scheduled to leave via Iceland 7.00 a.m.
20 January—departure further delayed on account of bad weather until 10.00 p.m.
21 January—still held up by weather
22 January—plane moved to airport in south of United Kingdom in an endeavour to make trip via the Azores
24 January—still at airport in south of England held up by weather
26 January—still further delayed by weather
27 January—expected to leave 8.00 a.m. 28 January
29 January—returned to airport in north to endeavour to make trip via Iceland
30 January—left northern airport in United Kingdom, forced to return on account of weather
31 January—left for Iceland with 6,467 lbs. letters
2 February—still in Iceland held on account of weather
3 February—still in Iceland held on account of weather
5 February—still in Iceland delayed on account of weather—departure indefinite
6 February—left Iceland
7 February—arrived Labrador 12.39 p.m.
8 February—left Labrador 11.29 a.m. Arrived Rockcliffe 4.55 p.m. with 6,467 lbs. of mail.

Such delays will occur as long as we are dependent on weather and machines.

As to the personnel angle, I have nothing but the highest of praise for the courage, devotion and determination of the crews of the Royal Canadian Air Force and the Trans-Canada Air Lines, who fly these aircraft in all weathers and who are subject to all kinds of hazards and dangers.

I have purposely gone to some length in dealing with the subject of mail to and from the Canadian armed forces as I desire to place before the committee and before the public the complete picture as clearly as circumstances permit.

As I have mentioned, I have every sympathy with the anxiety of those persons who are complaining of the delay or non-delivery of letters to and from their sons, daughters, husbands and friends. I appreciate just how they feel.

The majority of complainants, as hon. members will have gathered from the particulars of the actual elapsed times required for the

various classes of mail, have not allowed sufficient time for their letters or parcels to be delivered and for an acknowledgment to be received.

The postal service, civil and military, has nothing to hide. We have no reason to seek excuses. There is no cause for blame. We have unfailingly striven to give the best possible service with the facilities at our disposal We have continuously striven to improve these facilities and to overcome obstacles and handicaps, always, however, with an abiding appreciation of the grim necessity of priority being given to vital supplies of men and materials necessary for the welfare and success of our arms.

In closing, I wish to pay tribute to the members of the civil postal service and the Canadian postal corps who have not spared themselves in their efforts to safeguard the mails and to expedite delivery.

The esprit de corps of the armed forces postal service is second to none. Every individual, whether in a postal unit operating near the front lines or in the base at home, is imbued with one dominant idea, that of service.

I ask every member of this house, if they have complaints which they wish investigated, to forward them, and I can assure them that such complaints will be given careful consideration, a thorough investigation, and that they will receive a report as to the results.

Mr. GRAYDON: I wish to thank the minister for his comprehensive statement. Perhaps most hon. members will feel that it is so comprehensive and so far-reaching in its details that some time will be required to digest all the points which it raises.

It is not my purpose to deal at length with the statement, but rather to ask the minister one or two questions which have been concerning me for some time in connection with the mails. I believe that most of us who have a heavy overseas correspondence have observed considerable irregularity from time to time in the mail service. Some letters come very quickly from far-away places, but at times the delays are very great. Perhaps I shall find when I have digested the minister's statement that this point is cleared up.

One matter of complaint by our Canadian boys, of which the Minister of National Defence may have heard something when he was overseas a short time ago, is their belief that the United States mail and postal services are much more expeditious than our own. Whether that is the fact I am not in a position to say, but the statement is made repeatedly, and I think we should have some information to show whether it is unfounded or whether there is some basis for it in fact.

Another point is this. I understand that our boys are not required to pay postage on ordinary mail coming this way, but they are charged for letters they send by air mail. I have none with me at the moment, but I received two or three such letters to-day, both from the scene of military operations and from England. Apparently the soldier has to pay airmail postage. I wish the minister would give some consideration to this matter. It seems to me that we owe it to our troops to enable them to send their letters, no matter how they are sent, without payment of any postal charges. I would not have brought this up except that I have just had one or two complaints from overseas with respect to it. It is true they were only mild complaints; nevertheless I think the matter is sufficiently important for the minsiter to deal with it.

On some subsequent occasion the minister might give us some idea of the yearly movement of tobacco from Canada to the troops overseas. I ask this question because it may be the foundation of something else which I shall want to say later on. I am not so sure that all our troops get all the tobacco that they should from Canada.

Mr. RALSTON: And cigarettes.

Mr. GRAYDON: Yes. When I said "tobacco" I used that as a comprehensive term, including cigarettes. There may be some reason to the contrary, but I do not know why the government should not provide our boys overseas with tobacco and cigarettes.

Mr. RALSTON: There is a small issue.

Mr. GRAYDON: I realize that. I wish the government would take the matter under favourable consideration. As most hon. members know, some men overseas get a lot of tobacco and cigarettes. I know that a new system has been instituted whereby at a certain stage a distribution is made more equitably throughout the units. Nevertheless I think the government might give consideration to a ration issue of tobacco and cigarettes to our men. It would be a small thing from the point of view of money but a big thing so far as our troops are concerned. Both the government and civilians should be extremely generous in these matters. To some civilians they may seem little things, but to the men overseas they are greatly magnified. I should like to think that we here are doing all we can for the men in this regard, and I include cigarettes and tobacco and such other comforts as may be needed. I

do not think it is always equitable, nor is it always just, that the men overseas should have to rely for these little additional comforts on their friends over here, because, as the minister knows, some of them have more friends here than others. I leave this suggestion with him, and when we have digested the lengthy report he has given, we shall be more competent to deal with some of the details contained therein.

Mr. MULOCK: May I reply to one or two questions asked by the leader of the opposition. As I understand the United States parcel system, the soldier must write and ask for articles to be sent him before they are sent. They have not been accorded the same facilities in the receiving of parcels that our troops enjoy. In regard to tobacco parcels, I might give the figures. There are 3,869,000 parcels averaging, as closely as we can tell, between 500 and 600 cigarettes to the parcel.

Mr. GRAYDON: On the first question the minister has answered, I do not think he quite understood my reference to United States mail. I was not referring to parcels. The complaints I have had are with respect to letters, not parcels.

Mr. MULOCK: We will let the item stand.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I should like to say a few words on the subject of airmail service to the forces. Not only have I sent mail to the forces, but, like the hon. and gallant member for Nanaimo (Mr. Chambers), I have received a fair amount overseas. I compliment the minister upon the steady improvement in the postal service to the army, the air force and the navy overseas in the last two years. Actually, the provision of a quick mail service to the men in combatant zones is not quite so easy as some armchair critics in Canada think it is.

I have one or two little suggestions to offer the minister, first of all, about airmail letter cards, which are the most effective way of getting mail to the troops. My first objection to the Canadian form is the awkward way in which it is prepared as far as writing is concerned, because of the manner in which it is folded. One writes a little bit here, a little bit somewhere else and a little bit over on the back. The British, who started the system, have an easier way. They make one fold in the paper; it is the same sized paper, and one writes as one would an ordinary letter. The second suggestion is that the minister should revise the rates for sending these things. The leader of the opposition has suggested that perhaps all soldiers' mail should go free airmail. That is an admirable suggestion, but I do not think it is a practical one. If you saw the amount of mail coming back you would realize that we would have to divert half the bomber group overseas to carry mail back. I think, however, that all Canadian service men overseas should have an opportunity of sending at the British overseas rate. The British man outside the country can send one of these things to Britain for threepence and the civilian in Britain sends one back for sixpence, just as we pay ten cents. A great number of Canadian soldiers in Britain must pay the sixpenny rate. In the far east and middle east we pay threepence to send one of these to Canada and from Great Britain sixpence. I suggest to the minister that he make an investigation to see whether the Canadian troops overseas could not send these airmail letter cards to Canada for threepence.

Mr. MULOCK: May I say to the hon. member for Vancouver North that I shall be glad to go into the matter of the form with him and also to take it up with the officials of the department to see whether the other form would not be better. In regard to the difference between the threepenny and the sixpenny rate, I would advise him that we have already done so. As he probably knows, westbound items are prepaid by British postage and not Canadian; therefore any change in rates is a matter for the decision of the British postal authorities. Representations have been made, and I am very hopeful that we shall be able to have a reduction to the threepenny rate. It is thought that the British authorities will favourably entertain the suggestion, notwithstanding the fact that it will mean a loss of approximately £7,500, or $37,500 a month to the British treasury. That is all the information I can give at the moment.

Mr. SINCLAIR: There is no rationing of these cards to civilians either in Canada or in Great Britain, but our Canadians in the middle east and the far east get a ration of only one a week. I suggest that there should be no ration. As hon. members know, the mothers and sweethearts in this country are sending bundles to Canadians to supplement the ration. I urge that there should be no ration to the men in the middle east and the far east.

May I refer to the cigarette situation. When I was first overseas there were many complaints about cigarettes, and there was undoubtedly a considerable loss both on convoy and by pilfering not only in the regular but in the army post office. I commend the minister for the way in which he cleared up that situation. Every cigarette package now coming is registered, and when it is opened by the orderly in the unit a check-up is made. Recently there

has been little loss in cigarettes delivered overseas. There is considerable delay, but, after all, parcel post going forward is not nearly as important as the letters themselves. I was interested in what the leader of the opposition said regarding the scarcity of cigarettes. It is true that some men are more fortunate than others in having more friends to send cigarettes to them, but I wish to pay a tribute to the service clubs, labour unions and various other organizations throughout the country who have contributed so heavily to provide cigarettes free for almost every Canadian overseas. If I may refer to my own experience with the Windsor City squadron, the city took such good care of us that I suggest to the minister that one of the problems which will have to be faced in connection with rehabilitation when the war is over is that of teaching our chaps to buy their own cigarettes again after getting cigarettes free for so long.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Is it open to ask the Postmaster General to-night, under this item, questions that are not akin to the immediate subject-matter of his discussion? It is not intended to carry on this discussion generally of the Post Office Department?

Mr. MULOCK: No.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): This occasion, then, has been accorded in order to enable the Postmaster General to make this statement. Is that the idea?

Mr. MULOCK: I will answer that question.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): If that is so, I will not upset the equilibrium of the sitting, although I notice some nice teamwork going on; but I give notice—

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Order.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): What is the matter? I wish to give the minister notice that I propose to ask him to make a statement at a future date convenient to himself with respect to the policy of the government and of his department relating to those members of the public service belonging to the railway mail clerks' association who did not, for reasons which seemed good to them at the time, back in 1924, 1925, 1926 and 1927, take up the offer of the government of the day regarding the superannuation fund, and who are now seeking, because of a reduction of interest rates allowed on the payments they make into the retirement fund, to have a further extension of time given for their benefit, feeling otherwise that they are being discriminated against. I am giving that as a notice of motion to the Postmaster General.

Mr. MULOCK: May I tell the hon. member for York-Sunbury that this is a matter regarding which he should give notice to the Minister of Finance?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It is up to you. I think you ought to answer it. I am going to depend upon you for an answer.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: The question that I desire to put to the minister deals with mail received by the ranks of service men in Italy. The reports I have are to the effect that men have gone as long as three weeks without any mail being received by their units. Can the minister give us, from his records, the longest period of time since December in which the men in Italy have not received mail?

Mr. MULOCK: Is the hon. member referring to air mail?

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Mail of any kind; the men have not received mail of any kind.

Mr. MULOCK: In Italy?

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Yes.

Mr. MULOCK: Could the hon. member tell me whether the people involved were in a reinforcement unit or a definite unit?

Mr. CASTLEDEN: They were in a reinforcement unit.

Mr. MULOCK: On this occasion I suggest that the hon. member read the statement which I have put on *Hansard*. If he does so, he will see some of the difficulties in the reinforcement units. When this department comes back into supply on the estimates, I suggest that he bring up the matter again. I think it would be well for him to go over my statement in the meantime. I shall be glad to get the information for him. It is not available here.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: It is true there have been some losses, of a definite nature, of mail going to Italy?

Mr. MULOCK: Yes.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I should like the minister to give the committee assurance that the mail is now being resumed and is being received at the present time.

Mr. MULOCK: Oh, yes.

Mr. LOCKHART: I suppose at some later date the minister will enlarge on one or two points in particular. I took down the sequence of dates when the minister was making a statement and I gathered that ordinarily mail takes about twenty-eight to thirty days to be delivered. I followed the mail step by step as

it progresses through Canada to destination, and I find that it gets up as high as ninety days and with some slight additions it may reach a hundred days; but I would think the average would be twenty-eight to thirty days.

Mr. MULOCK: I was referring to parcels.

Mr. LOCKHART: I took a note of the statement the minister placed on *Hansard*, and I notice that it keeps running up until it reaches ninety days. That cannot be the regular sequence of things when the average runs to about twenty-five days or thereabouts.

Mr. MULOCK: I put these different figures on the statement to show what happens with regard to parcels. Parcels are treated differently from letters. I would suggest that the hon. member look over each of the different tables. What he says about the mails is approximately correct. The parcels may not go in the same convoy or in the same ship with letters.

Mr. LOCKHART: Parcels are just the same. I have acknowledgments of many parcels and they ran around twenty days, and while there is a build-up here of ninety days I am trying to coordinate one statement with the actual experience.

Mr. MULOCK: I should like to ask the hon. member one question. Is he speaking about parcels to the United Kingdom or to the Mediterranean?

Mr. LOCKHART: I am speaking of parcels to the United Kingdom.

Mr. MULOCK: The statement with regard to ninety days applies to the Mediterranean.

Mr. LOCKHART Those run from ten to twelve days longer. May I refer to the mails coming this way, the air mail, for which a soldier has to pay. The leader of the opposition referred to that. During the past week I received four letters, two by air mail and two by regular mail. The two letters by regular mail arrived ahead of the air mail. If that is going to be the situation, I suggest either making it free to the men or cut it out altogether.

Mr. MULOCK: Just on that subject, I might have mentioned that where we have space available when we are carrying air mail we bring surface mail although airmail rates have not been paid on them. We are going to carry all the mail we can, even if it is surface mail.

Mr. CHAMBERS: I can give the minister an example. I received a letter from Victoria, delivered right on the battlefield, which had taken only six days. I received a cable delivered in England which had taken eleven weeks. Therefore, you can take your pick.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

WAR APPROPRIATION BILL

PROVISION FOR GRANTING TO HIS MAJESTY AID FOR NATIONAL DEFENCE AND SECURITY

The house resumed from Thursday, February 24, consideration in committee of a resolution to grant to His Majesty certain sums of money for the carrying out of measures consequent upon the existence of a state of war—Mr. Ilsley—Mr. Bradette in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

5. Personnel supplies and services: food, medical and dental stores, clothing and personal equipment, $159,566,238.

Mr. STIRLING: I wish to bring a matter to the attention of the minister and ask whether he will give consideration to an improvement in the methods under which apples are being bought for the army. There used to be a ceiling imposed on prices by the Department of National Defence, which made sure that apples should not cost more than $1.65 a bushel. For purposes of this discussion we can take a box to be the equivalent of a bushel. They used to be $1.65 a bushel or a box, with the consequence that outside a certain radius from the production point it was impossible for a camp or an army establishment to purchase apples because the freight mounted up too high.

Mr. RALSTON: Local purchase?

Mr. STIRLING: In Canada, yes.

Mr. RALSTON: I mean, it was local purchase, it was not for Munitions and Supply under contract?

Mr. STIRLING: I cannot follow the minister through that because the exact method which is adopted is not clear to me. As I understand it, the restriction was put on by the Department of National Defence. As the weeks went by, storage charges, of course, mounted on those apples, and by the time they reached the point of consumption the radius was drawn back and back by the extra cost of the bushel or the box until toward the end of the season the apples were not getting outside British Columbia. I am speaking, of course, of British Columbia production. They were reaching only those

camps which were west of the Rocky mountains. When the wartime prices and trade board put on their ceiling last year the Department of National Defence ceiling was dropped to substitute for it. The restriction then was that nothing of a higher grade than grade C was to be bought for the troops. That is the third grade of apples. If there was a restriction by grade in the purchase of other foodstuffs the producer of apples would, of course, have little grievance; but that is not the situation.

When beef is purchased for the troops Blue Label is purchased. When potatoes are purchased, the highest grade of potatoes, No. 1, is purchased. It is the same with onions; No. 1 are purchased, and with oranges nothing below fancy may be bought. In connection with apples, however, the third grade is considered good enough for the troops. The United States do not look upon this matter in that way at all; they purchase the best grade of apples for their troops. Last year when, because for export difficulties, some two hundred thousand boxes were released for export to the United States, they were commandeered by the army commissary department as soon as they arrived in that country, and moreover a commissary officer was sent to British Columbia to see to it that nothing but the highest grades and the most desirable export varieties were sent. So that the United States take, shall I say, greater care of the requirements of their men in apples than we do.

Then in the United States and the United Kingdom there is a far more definite recognition of the nutritional value of apples than there is in Canada. In this country there was very little obtainable in the way of statistical information two or three years ago, but I am informed that some valuable work in nutrition has been carried on by experimental farms throughout Canada, particularly the one at Summerland, British Columbia. Officials who formerly were rather skeptical of the value of apples in regard to nutrition are now in agreement that they have a value for which nothing else can be substituted. It seems to me that an attempt should be made to place the purchase of apples on a different basis. The latest arrangement, I believe, I find in a letter sent last month by the deputy minister of national defence to British Columbia Tree Fruits Limited, in which he says:

> . . . the matter has been receiving careful consideration and it has been decided that, until the next apple crop is harvested, this department will purchase a proportion of the higher grades of apples in both western and eastern Canada.

I cannot help thinking that this decision has been induced by the shortness of the 1943 crop, which was below average; now that we are along toward the end of February it may very well be that inconsiderable quantities of apples are available for purchase.

I am bringing this matter to the minister's attention in the very great hope that this method will not be adopted in the coming year. We are heading for an enormous crop, as we think, and it seems most desirable that our men should have the greatest possible opportunity to obtain a good and plentiful supply of apples. I do not know if the minister has received complaints from the troops, as many hon. members have, and also from the parents and relatives of men in camp in Canada. They do not see why they cannot obtain a respectable apple to eat, so that I would suggest to the minister that this matter be reconsidered. It is just too bad that only the poorer grades of apples, if they are obtainable at all, should be placed before these men. I suggest that consideration should be given to allowing greater latitude on the part of the quartermaster who purchases them. He is given a certain amount of discretion in buying his beef, his potatoes, his onions, his oranges and, for aught I know, other foods, and it seems to me that it would be quite reasonable to allow him some latitude in the purchase of apples. These C grade apples are excellent apples of their sort, but for many years the Department of Agriculture has advocated buying by grade, and if you do buy by grade you get what you pay for. These C grade apples are admirable for apple pie and applesauce, but when it comes to eating apples it is much better to pay the extra money and enable the men to have at least fancy apples, which is the next grade above C.

Of course, coming from British Columbia, I am looking at this matter from the point of view of that province, but it applies also to the other two producing centres in Canada. When there is a fixed price the radius becomes so small that those outside that radius do not get their apples; and if there is the further restriction that only the third grade may be purchased, then even if the men get apples at all they do not get a palatable fruit. Would the minister give consideration to this?

Mr. RALSTON: Knowing where I come from, my hon. friend can, I think, be sure that I shall do so. The hon. gentleman has caught me quite off base; I do not know anything at all about this. I notice that he has correspondence with the deputy minister, but it has not been brought to my attention.

Mr. STIRLING: This was not a letter to me but to British Columbia Tree Fruits Limited, which was handed to me.

Mr. RALSTON: I shall look into the matter at once. I am quite satisfied that the quartermaster-general does have the discretion, but he may not have considered it necessary to exercise it. My only thought is that the C grade British Columbia apple may be as good as the first grade United States apple; that is the only suggestion I have to offer, though I hardly suppose a Nova Scotian would admit that. I have just received a note from one hon. member who tells me that the matter was taken up with my department and that just lately he was advised that the best grade is now issued to the troops. I have not personal knowledge of it, but I shall look into the matter and let the committee know. Being an inveterate apple eater myself, I thoroughly agree that the best is none too good, and agree with my hon. friend as to not only the nutritious but also the delicious qualities of an apple.

Mr. BENCE: Could the minister give the committee some information in connection with the matter of reporting casualties? I have no knowledge of the difficulties with which the army is faced in reporting casualties to the director of records, but in a number of instances with which I am familiar the bare report has come from overseas that So-and-so has been wounded in action. The message that is sent out by the director of records is to the effect that this man has been reported wounded, but the extent of the injuries is not known at the time, and it is a matter of perhaps ten days or possibly three or four weeks in some instances before any further information is obtained. Could the minister not do something to obtain more details when these first casualty reports come in from the front? In one case I have in mind the man did not even have to retire from his position; he suffered merely a superficial wound, but his next-of-kin were greatly concerned when they received a message from the director of records stating that this man was wounded. As far as they knew he might have been seriously wounded. Could the minister enlighten us on that point?

Mr. RALSTON: Naturally this matter has given me a great deal of concern, not only in connection with the time at which the wound is reported but also in connection with the report of the nature of the wound itself. I think I have gone into it all the way up and all the way down the line. It is regarded as most essential that information be sent to the next-of-kin at the earliest possible moment as to the fact of the casualty having occurred. A suggestion was made to me the other day by a father, who said, "I have a suggestion which sounds very simple, and I wonder that you have not accepted it long ago. That is, do not send your information with regard to the casualty until you are able to tell us the nature of the wound." I said, "My dear friends I know what would happen; within ten days somebody would wire or radio home with regard to that particular case and information would be given as to his wound before the Department of National Defence would have reported it."

Mr. GRAYDON: I think that has happened in one or two cases.

Mr. RALSTON: I am afraid it has happened in more than one or two cases. There was a case of four officers that gave me a great deal of concern last October. The nature of the wound is reported just as soon as the man is brought to a centre from which a report can be sent. As my hon. friend knows, these men are out in battle. They are wounded and a stretcher-bearer comes to attend them. The stretcher-bearer takes the name and makes a note of the wound, and that is sent back as soon as possible by runner or otherwise. Battalion headquarters are notified that Smith is wounded. However, I think the medical men will agree that it would be a dangerous procedure to adopt to have the stretcher-bearer attempt a diagnosis. It could happen that he would give the impression there was only a slight wound when the soldier might be suffering from something that would result seriously.

Immediately the man gets back to the dressing-station or the regimental aid post—I forget the names, but it used to be the regimental aid post in the last war—the diagnosis is made by a medical man. It may happen that the man is tagged "DNK", which means "diagnosis not known". Every effort is made then to see that the man is sent back to a hospital or a casualty clearing station where a more definite examination can be made.

That is the reason for the difference in time between reporting the actual casualty and the nature of the wound. I am gratified to be able to say that these reports as to the nature of the wound have been coming through more promptly. The practice has been and still is where a wound is superficial not to load the communication circuits with information of that kind. My hon. friends will understand that the load on the transmission circuits and

the wireless with regard to operations and things of that sort is almost impossible to handle, and to load them with casualty messages would be perhaps more than the circuits could stand. As a matter of fact, we put in a special circuit from Italy to Canadian military headquarters in England to carry these particular messages.

If my hon. friends have any cases in mind—and I am not sure that they have—they would help the service if they would refer them to me. Coming back to what my hon. friend has asked about, I do not think there is anything that can be done to make the notification of the nature of the wound concurrent with the notification of the casualty. Our effort is to report promptly any casualty, and we report the nature of the wound just as soon thereafter as we can get a diagnosis that can be reasonably relied upon.

Mr. BENCE: If the wound is obviously a superficial wound, would that fact be advised in the first communication sent?

Mr. RALSTON: They use the words "slightly wounded" sometimes, but that is as far as they go. I suppose the stretcher-bearer might be justified in making that statement. That is the only indication I have seen of anything attempted which was not a medical description of a wound.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): When air force men in Great Britain need more clothes they are provided by the British government. Does the same apply to the army?

Mr. RALSTON: Does my hon. friend mean when clothes are lost?

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): When clothes wear out the British government look after the replacements.

Mr. RALSTON: The policy is the same. If my hon. friend knows of a case where it has not been done, it is in error and it should be rectified.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Some of the men in the air force are complaining that the uniforms they get are much coarser than those they got from the Canadian government and I was wondering if the same applied to the army. Will the minister tell the committee what the limit is in connection with dental supplies. I am referring to porcelain inlays for teeth. Are the men as well as the officers allowed porcelain inlays, or is there a limit according to rank?

Mr. RALSTON: If there is a limit, the limit is the same for officers as for men. The director general of dental services is not here and the director-general of medical services is giving me this information, but he is quite satisfied it is correct.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): What is the limit on that?

Mr. CHAMBERS: It is the same whether you are a soldier or an officer; you get your teeth fixed in the same way.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): I am asking with regard to porcelain inlays.

Mr. RALSTON: I cannot tell my hon. friend whether porcelain inlays are denied to officers. If they are, they are denied to the men. If they are denied to the men, they are denied to the officers.

Mr. BENCE: Can the minister give us any information as to whether the situation in regard to sending parcels to prisoners of war has improved within the last year and whether there has been any increase in the number of vouchers or special tags that are available periodically?

Mr. RALSTON: I just have the information which comes from the Dieppe prisoners who were repatriated. They expressed appreciation of the service given by the Red Cross in connection with sending parcels. From the information I received the general impression seems to be that there has been a distinct improvement. Considering all the difficulties I think the service has been extremely good. I spoke with one officer who had been a prisoner of war and had been repatriated. I cannot give my hon. friend the number of tags or whether it has been increased. As my hon. friend knows, the number will be increased as the prisoners of war increase in number.

Mr. BENCE: I understand that the situation as far as Red Cross parcels are concerned has improved materially, but I was thinking of next-of-kin parcels and whether, now that shipping has improved, an increase will be permitted. I sincerely hope that this will be done as soon as possible.

Mr. RALSTON: The hon. member means to increase the number of parcels which may be sent? It is a question of transport.

Mr. MacNICOL: Does the word "medical" in this vote refer to the medical inspection of recruits going into the army?

Mr. RALSTON: It does.

Mr. MacNICOL I have had many cases of men who have been in the army for one or two years and then been discharged. I myself

have written about a number of them to the department. The wonder to me is how they ever got past the medical inspection in the first place. Some had flat feet; one had a broken foot, and there were many other cases which made it seem as if the army were taken in the halt, the lame and the blind. They would be kept in the army for a considerable length of time, at great expense to the country, and then be discharged. I should like to find out how they could ever have been passed in the first place if there were any medical examination whatever.

Mr. RALSTON: After my hon. friend cites a case like that, it is difficult for me to tell him what I was intending to tell him. There are very many men who are passed, and properly passed, at the time of enlistment by the medical boards, but who simply cannot take the change from a sedentary life to the activities of army life. I say this, too, in the presence of members of the air force. There are some features of army life which, as far as physical strain is concerned, are very much tougher on the man than the air force, outside of the aircrew, and some men gradually break down under the constant wear and tear of army life and of the training. That is one reason why there are many more discharges from the army than from the other services.

A second reason—and I say this advisedly—is that the requirement of physical fitness on enlistment in the army has not been so high as in the other services, particularly the air force.

The third reason—and the cases my hon. friend has in mind I think would come in here—is, as I explained to the house two years ago, that in the earlier days we had a great many civilian medical practitioners on the boards. They were doing the best they could with regard to examinations, but they were not in the army and had not had the benefit of army training, and the knowledge of army requirements. We found that a great many men who had been passed by these boards simply did not stand up, and that there were some cases such as my hon. friend speaks of who, if they had been examined by any army board such as we have to-day, would not have been passed in the first place.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Translation): Mr. Chairman, like the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot), with whom I am not always in agreement, I feel that the item we are now discussing should be divided at least in two sections. One might include whatever relates to the medical corps and the drugs needed by the army, food being also covered by that first section, and the other might include clothing and personal articles.

[Mr. MacNicol.]

Referring first to food, I must say to the honourable the minister of national defence (Mr. Ralston) that it happens but too often that soldiers are poorly fed in some camps. As regards the Quebec district especially, I must tell him that complaints are often whispered—because those who make them do not want to run foul of their officers, and some soldiers are timorous—concerning the more or less cleanly and sometimes terrible conditions obtaining in some kitchens where the odours develop anything but appetite, where the colour of the tables is too often on a par with that of the floor and where the sunshine wages a merciless but often vain struggle against the altogether too numerous microbes they harbour. As I have had an opportunity, while a member of the medical corps, to examine the rations, I have always been surprised to notice how first class food would, through the process of cooking, be transformed into some kind of stew not unlike the black broth of the Spartans. The best foods, if carelessly prepared, can give a very poor reputation to the cooks and their helpers without forgetting the contractors who are all no doubt anxious to supply at the lowest cost the best possible products. I have mostly heard complaints about the food at Valcartier camp, where some of the men claim that they have to rely on the canteen to fill up a stomach which, otherwise, might incur the rebellion of an ill-fed body. There is undoubtedly a lack of watchfulness somewhere, an unpardonable carelessness, or an inefficiency to which military authorities should put a stop. Soldiers are not all given to complaining; while in the army I have met very few men who did that and the reason why I consider nearly all of them reasonable is that I was making it a point to listen to what they had to say and to pay attention to their complaints.

Still, it would be interesting to hear from the minister whether among the contractors who supplied food to the Valcartier camp there was a concern by the name of Wesiberg which derived its fame from its sausage. It would also be quite interesting to know whether the wartime prices and trade board, which had something to do with that famous investigation which fizzled out, intends to punish the guilty and to cooperate with the health department, the mayor and the aldermen of the city of Quebec. While I have heard complaints about the food at Valcartier camp, on the other hand the news from the Montmagny camp are by far the best. The soldiers who have spent a fairly long time at those two camps have had an opportuntiy to notice the very great difference between them, despite the fact that both

are in the same district. Obviously the trouble lies in the preparation of the food, and therefore in the efficiency of the cooks. The officers of the Department of National Defence should exercise strict supervision over the manner in which kitchens are kept and over the competence displayed in preparing food. Good food brings good discipline, goes the proverb held in high honour by schoolboys. The same maxim applies equally well to the army. I recall the tour made by the Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Power) at the beginning of the war in several camps of the Quebec district and the feeling of satisfaction evinced by servicemen when they heard that delicious pork and beans cooked in molasses would stand high on the food list. Since that time, things have inevitably relaxed, and I would ask the minister to make sure, by stern means if necessary, that our soldiers are always given the food they need.

I now come to the medical and health aspects. I do not intend to quote statistics on venereal disease or to delay the sailing of a corvette, even if it should sail from Quebec. According to an official report, Montreal and Quebec are more badly hit by the venereal evil than any other city in the dominion. This same report ascribes as principle cause of the trouble the commercialization of prostitution. I believe the report is incomplete; it should have mentioned the fact that people from all over the dominion have thronged to these two cities since the outbreak of the war. Units on their way overseas, whether they come from the neighbouring province or from the western provinces do not simply pass through; they often put in quite a stay; the findings of a report cannot be established without mention of this fact. In a gathering of men hailing from the four corners of the country and often from overseas, for Canada is very hospitable, we inevitably find different temperaments, different mentalities, ways of life which do not tally with one another, all of which clash to result in an unfortunate relaxation of behaviour favoured by the traditional bottle of beer.

On this point, opinions differ as to the best means that can be used to reduce the dangers of contamination, as far as service men are concerned. Is the lack of supervision on the part of municipal authorities in cities visited by our soldiers responsible for all the misfortunes and disasters which the medical corps, whatever its reputation, never fails to discover in military hospitals where preventive and curative means outdo each other in efficiency? Or are we to infer that the numerous means of prevention and protection with which our soldiers are provided by the army medical authorities have caused a feeling of overconfidence bringing about hasty verdicts in the case of the most dangerous diseases developed by contact? I do not wish to venture on ground which lies outside the political sphere, as I do not care to state an opinion which is based on insufficient information. Over and over again, however, experience has taught me that, in the treatment of venereal disease, the army needs specialists; they should be found among medical officers, and if there are not enough of them in the army, the authorities should retain them as civilian physiciains. If the propagation of venereal disease has reached such an alarming point, I am not ready to declare that lack of moral sense among our soldiers is the main cause of that condition. There has frequently been a lack of the necessary qualifications. Indeed, all the medical men in the armed forces cannot be expected to be specialists in this particular type of treatments. The blame must not be laid upon the shoulders of the more or less competent medical officer, but upon the senior offiicers who have placed them in a service for which they were not fully qualified.

In so far as the medical officers of training centres or companies are concerned, they are frequently over-worked either by the hospital service or by what is commonly called in the army the sick parade. It is unavoidable that out of thousands of men some may have an absolute need for medicine; they are only human, and any practitioner knows that it is not necessary to be a soldier to have such a mentality. I firmly believe, however, that they are not more numerous in the army than in civil life, and too frequently soldiers are sent back to training after being prescribed pill no. 8, 9 or 10. Too frequently, men are labelled hypochondriacs, loafers, or in common parlance, malingerers. Too frequently, the medical personnel being inadequate, those who have to bear the burden cannot take the time necessary to examine thoroughly each and everyone of these cases. As a result, the old routine practice which professional men must always guard against, takes hold of these officers and they are inclined to label in advance such or such soldier according to the frequency of his appearances at the sick parade. If, in order to build up a strong army, healthy men are required, it is necessary to start by supplying the army with a personnel which is adequate, well-supervised and as well-qualified as possible. I understand that, at the beginning of the war, physicians were twitted with not enlisting in sufficient numbers. But since the government compels students to volunteer, I believe that this argument no longer applies.

Those who know something of the history of medicine are aware that another difficulty faces the medical officer who is intelligent and anxious to do his duty. At La Salpêtrière, famous French hospital, I remember the lengthy studies which we were required to make in regard to malingerers. It is hard for a layman to believe that human beings can earn their livelihood by simulating fits of epilepsy, hysteria, appendicitis, etc.; they become experts and they offer very interesting subjects to students attending that institution. It happens in the army that service men—they are few, it is true, but there are some—simulate with much less skill certain diseases which might cause their rejection. I have seen some who complained of violent pains in the region of the appendix; others complained of constant rheumatic pains in the lower limbs; still others complained of continuous stomach troubles. The experienced medical officer eventually finds out the truth. However such cases are frequently the cause of men who are really ill, being labelled as malingerers after a cursory examination. Unforgivable errors have been committed by officers possessed of a mentality which is hard to explain. If an incomplete examination does not immediately reveal a serious trouble, the man concerned is regarded as a "faker", a malingerer, and he is sent back amongst his fellow soldiers to endure his pain in silence. If he returns too frequently, C.B. is his lot.

I recall a very special case. A man who had been called up, returned home after a month's training. Engaged in wood cutting, he sprained his ankle and painfully returned to his family home. As he had neglected to report to the army authorities, military police arrested him and, in spite of his protests, took him away. For eleven days, he was taken from one medical centre to another and finally arrived in Quebec City, handcuffed, where he was given a so-called severe examination, and classed as a malingerer and sent to us to be declared perfectly fit for military service. I had refused to consider him as a malingerer, especially after the medical officer who was chairman of the board on which I was a member and myself had noticed a large ecchymosis on his external left ankle. This man was on the way to developing a chronic ailment that would have put him in category "E". The examination had evidently not been thorough or serious. Possibly one of the doctors or so-called specialists who had examined him had had to deal with a malingerer on the same day and had reasons to see a second one in this man. Another rather plausible reason of that fact was that the interested party had failed to report or was late in reporting to the army. Then it may have been thought that he was simulating a sprained ankle, a rather difficult thing to do, as it is difficult to stand the pain caused by a real sprain accompanied by ecchymosis. The next day an argument arose in the presence of a superior medical officer and a specialist in surgery. Finally, the man was placed in category "E", not on account of his bad foot, but as unfit for military service on grounds of mental deficiency. Here is a case of a man tagged as a malingerer due to a faulty examination and the obstinacy of a medical officer who would see malingerers everywhere. I do not claim that cases like these occur in all medical boards, but they are too frequent. It may very well be that soldiers too often simulate diseases to be rejected from the army, but, just the same, this is no reason to see malingerers in everyone.

I am trying to be as constructive as possible in my remarks, but I have to state that some medical men who have been failures in civil practice—and this is not in the nature of a criticism, I am simply stating a plain fact—have become all-powerful, through intrigue, on some army medical boards.

Speaking of intrigue, Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask you how it is that medical officers who are veterans of the first great war, and have endured years of bombing in England in the present conflict, must, to get a promotion, risk their life anew overseas, while others who are strutting with their very superior officer epaulettes are waging their second war on Canadian territory? If the minister wishes I can supply the names. This is a case of lack of elementary fairness. However, this is not the first time justice has been encroached upon. For my part, I have been arrested on the charge of having accepted money from a man to place him in category "E". But I happen to have the file of that man, who was examined by somebody else, not even in the same office, and who has been again placed in category "E" by a revising board of specialists. However, I had to spend forty-four days in gaol. That was when medical officers had been charged with selling blue slips and when the announcers of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation were bandying our names in the whole country. They have not been so energetic in the matter of the Toronto registrar.

True, some specialists were making great strides on the road to promotions. There was one who, having spent fifteen years in the lumber business, took a trip to Europe and returned a specialist; another one had been hardly a year out of the university. These remarks are not in the nature of complaints; they are a simple statement of facts.

Unfortunately, as in other professions, it happens that one or two incompetent schemers bring all the other members into disrepute and cause them all to be placed in the same class by a public disposed to be too hasty and too inclusive in their judgments. It must, however, be acknowledged that changes must be brought about so that matters may improve sufficiently to meet the approval of both military and civilian populations. For this purpose, schemers should be replaced by efficient men. No medical man who has had to get out of uniform should be found, a few days later, working as a civilian physician on a medical board of revision. What can be the reason of such a situation, if not intrigue or political influence?

I have been asked during the summer why I had not more frequently pleaded in this house for soldiers or conscripted men which the army was holding in spite of their poor health. I shall answer now by saying that I do not like noisy publicity and that I have taken up with the Department of National Defence, either verbally or by correspondence, those cases which have been brought to my attention since my return to civilian life, and I must say that I have very seldom had to complain from a lack of consideration on the part of the minister himself. The cases which I had reported to him have always been thoroughly investigated and most of the time the wrongs have been redressed. If 245 members were to bring to the attention of the house all the cases reported to them, 365 days of session each year would not be sufficient. I recognize that it is well for a member to do so now and then in order to rouse public opinion but every one must admit that those who do their work unobtrusively should not be made a target for rebukes or innuendoes. I have the satisfaction to say that when I venture in the medical field I am indeed at home.

As I said, I agree with the hon. member for Temiscouata when he complains about the difficulty of obtaining old military clothing, for our needy or our settlers without having to go to second-hand dealers who seem to enjoy a monopoly in that trade. Inevitably, those who could secure them at a reasonable price have to pay a profit to the middleman. This monopoly is not limited to the sale of used clothing. It was on the point of establishing itself in Quebec in connection with new clothing, and it has spread to other fields. I do not intend to turn the spotlight on the sausage trust, but the citizens of Quebec and the surrounding country are inclined to wonder when they hear that the calls to military service, issued by the registrar of district No. 5, come from offices located in the Pollack building. The X-ray department is headed by the son of this liberal organizer; however, his qualifications cannot be denied in view of the thorough studies he has made in surgery and his stay of many months in England during the present war. Remunerative contracts have been granted, on tenders no doubt, to this selfsame liberal organizer, who happens to be the supplier of battledress and greatcoats worn by the men who are declared fit for military service.

So true is it that there are all sorts of ways to contribute to the war effort!

I claim that, when it comes to selling used clothing, welfare, colonization or other organizations, should have preference over profiteers.

Such are, Mr. Chairman, the few remarks I wished to make on item No. 5 of these estimates.

Mr. RALSTON: There are two or three points brought up by the hon. member to which I wish to reply. The first point was the matter of messing and cooking. He spoke generally about messing and cooking in the camps and indicated that while the food was good the preparation was not all that it should be, and he spoke of Valcartier, which he said was not as good as Montmagny. I do not know the date to which my hon. friend is referring, but perhaps he means at the time he was in the service.

Mr. GAUTHIER: I am speaking of what one hears from soldiers one meets on the street.

Mr. RALSTON: I visited Valcartier last summer or fall and saw the kitchens, and I really thought a good job was being done. My hon. friend knows we are taking a particular interest in the preparation of food as well as in the quality. As he knows, we have cooking schools at Borden, and every district has an opportunity to send and does send cooks there. I do not know of any place where there could be better cooks than in Quebec where we get the benefit of the services of many cooks who have been in the lumber camps. We also have a system of messing officers in the units and not simply at headquarters, and I am disappointed to hear my hon. friend's view about Valcartier. I shall certainly look into the matter. I had an idea that under the commandant, Colonel Gaudreau, the administration was pretty good. Since cooking is a very important part of administration I shall look into the matter. I thank the hon. member for having brought it to my attention because that is the only way of knowing about it.

Mr. GAUTHIER: The complaint was not from officers but from privates.

Mr. RALSTON: I am talking about the men's mess. I did not have the privilege of a meal in the officer's mess there.

My hon. friend referred to venereal disease and correctly pointed out that there is a considerable additional load on Quebec and particularly Montreal, because of the tremendous transient population going through there. He realizes, as we all do, that it is a civilian problem and has to be dealt with, no matter where the population may come from. All I say to him is that it does put on these communities an additional responsibility. The services are endeavouring to do all they can to help in the way of tracing down sources of infection and giving information to the civilian authorities, and real progress is being made. I am speaking of Montreal particularly; I have not as much information about the city of Quebec. The manner in which the Montreal authorities took over the matter when it was brought to their attention by Major-General Renaud gives me hope that there will be substantial improvement there.

My hon. friend spoke of precautions taken and treatment given in the army as creating a feeling of confidence. It is not intended to do that. At the same time the services cannot neglect these precautions, and the result my hon. friend speaks of is perhaps a psychological result. Certainly we shall see to it that warnings are given. These are only precautions; that is all they are, and certain risks are run.

The hon. member spoke also of military medical officers not having experience in the treatment of venereal disease. It is true that up to six months ago upon the subject of venereal diseases the army itself did not give military medical officers any special instructions. They had only such knowledge as the medical profession and schools give in the treatment of that disease; but since Colonel Williams has been in charge of the matter we have had a venereal control officer in every district and his job is to instruct the medical officers with regard to treatment. My hon. friend knows far more about the treatment of those diseases than I possibly can, but I am instructed that under the regime that has been inaugurated the treatment is very much more simple than before. The suggestion my hon. friend made, that officers did not have a long enough time to treat a patient, seems to me hardly to hold, at least in connection with V.D.G., because as I understand it that treatment is not given in hospital. A man is not taken off parade but is treated by the use of sulpha drugs and tablets and things of that sort, and there does not have to be constant attention by a medical officer.

[Mr. Gauthier.]

Mr. GAUTHIER: It is all right to take pills, but direct control under a medical officer is important.

Mr. RALSTON: I am pointing out that the need for constant treatment and attention does not exist to the same degree as if a man were in hospital or in a sick bay. May I say this, and I think it is something concerning which we can take satisfaction, if one can take any satisfaction in this very serious matter. We find this record, that whereas in 1940—I am speaking now of the army—the number of infections in Canada was sixty-two out of every one thousand; in 1943 that number was brought down to thirty-two out of every thousand. Therefore, distinct progress has been made. With regard to the treatment of syphilis the treatment that is given depends, as I understand it, altogether on the particular case. One cannot lay down any rule about it. As I understand it, the treatment is intermittent and there does not necessarily have to be the constant attention of the medical officer. Many of these cases are treated in hospital where, of course, the man has constant attention.

My hon. friend spoke of malingerers. I agree with him in regard to the difficulty of telling a malingerer from a genuinely sick man. There again we have tried to do something to meet the situation. As I said the other night the term "psychiatrist" was a fearsome one. I really did not understand fully what it meant, and I was a little doubtful of introducing anybody in the profession of that name into the army. These men have come into the army. We have sixty-three of them in the army at the present time. My hon. friend is a medical doctor, and he will know better than I do whether or not they are useful. I wish to say this exactly as I understand it. In a case where the psychiatrist is called in, the medical officer examines the man who complains of a disability of some kind. The medical officer can find no reason for that disability; that is to say, by all the tests he makes he can find no reason for disability. He then has an opportunity to call in a psychiatrist. I would think the practice would be for the medical officer to consult the psychiatrist to find out whether or not in his opinion the man was a malingerer or whether it was a genuine case of disability.

My hon. friend speaks of the fact that there is danger in our assuming that men are simulating disease, are malingering, when they are really sick. He picked out the defaulter and said that the defaulter may have something wrong with him and therefore may not get a

square deal. We try to eliminate that in every way possible, by examining him mentally and psychologically, as well as physically.

Mr. GAUTHIER: Even if he is a defaulter he is entitled to the same kind of treatment as the other.

Mr. RALSTON: I thoroughly agree with my hon. friend.

Mr. GAUTHIER: That is why I submit to the minister, it is a dangerous thing in the medical profession.

Mr. RALSTON: I thoroughly agree with my hon. friend. I said my hon. friend picked out the worst case, not the best case. But I agree with my hon. friend that the defaulter is entitled to as good a medical examination as anybody else.

My hon. friend spoke of promotions overseas and of the fact that they are not made as rapidly as he would like.

Mr. GAUTHIER: Promotions in Canada, not overseas.

Mr. RALSTON: I thought my hon. friend said that promotions were not made very fast overseas, whereas at the same time promotions were being made of men in Canada who were veterans of two wars and have never been overseas. I should like my hon. friend to bring that to my attention. I do not mind his naming individuals, if he would like to name them. I know of no case of that kind, where a man is medically fit and is a veteran of two wars and has not been overseas, unless he is a specialist or something of that kind and it has been necessary to keep him here. I should like to know of such cases.

Mr. GAUTHIER: What I wish to know is why a man who is a veteran of two wars and who has been overseas twice cannot get the promotion he deserves when he is absolutely medically fit, absolutely bilingual and has the experience.

Mr. RALSTON: I got my hon. friend completely wrong. My hon. friend has put up a very good case now. My only answer to him can be that the officers under whom the man works either have not considered that he was qualified for promotion or have considered that there was someone who could better fill the job even though he had not had the same experience. The fact that a man is a veteran of two wars does not necessarily qualify him for promotion if the job can be better filled by somebody else.

If my hon. friend has a case in mind I should appreciate it very much if he would bring it to my attention, because I should like to look into it personally. I have dealt generally with most of the points my hon. friend has raised.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Has the Canadian army set up a typhus commission in Italy similar to the one set up by the United States government, in order to combat typhus in the country they are occupying?

Mr. POULIOT: Before the minister answers, may I say a word? I am delighted that the hon. member for Portneuf has awakened. It is quite a miracle, because he has been sound asleep for two years with regard to the medical officer business in Quebec.

Mr. GAUTHIER: I thank the hon. member for Temiscouata.

Mr. POULIOT: I need no thanks.

Mr. GAUTHIER: He is very intelligent, polite and delicate.

Mr. POULIOT: It is the law of nature.

Mr. GAUTHIER: Oh, yes, but you have some nature.

Mr. RALSTON: I undertsand that there is no typhus commission as such. There is a special branch of preventive medicine under the director-general of medical services, and typhus comes under that branch. Of course, my hon. friend understands that there are other diseases of a similar nature to those which are dealt with by that same branch.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Does that branch treat the civilians as well as the men in the army?

Mr. RALSTON: In an area like Italy?

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Yes. The United States commission went into Naples and they treated 1,300,000 people.

Mr. RALSTON: The answer is in the negative.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): What is going to happen in the territory that the Canadian army occupies if the civilians are not looked after? I say that because I have had half a dozen letters from Italy from different men, two of them officers, and they claim that life in some sections is almost unbearable owing to the fact that the lice which carry the typhus fever are there.

Mr. RALSTON: I am afraid I cannot give my hon. friend any further information at this stage. I have in mind—and remember that I am only surmising this from what I saw there—that the civil government control,

which is established, might be administering that particular operation of the medical services, and that service may come under that department. In that connection we have certain of our officers there, but they are in the civilian government administration, the allied military government of occupied territory. There are certain Canadian officers who come under that body, and I would think that probably that commission handled preventive services and that as far as civilians were concerned they would come under that administration. I am going to find out something about it.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Does the army set up in Italy fumigation services similar to that which they have in some of the training camps in order to take care of the men's clothes?

Mr. RALSTON: The answer is yes.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Disinfectants?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON: Has the minister any information available as to cures of venereal disease by fever-therapy? Has he any idea of the percentage that can be treated and the results?

Mr. RALSTON: We can get statistics on that. I know of cases. I have in mind a man in regard to that matter. That treatment is given sometimes under certain circumstances. If my hon. friend wants statistics I think I can get them.

Mr. ADAMSON: I should like to know whether it can be made a universal treatment? I do not believe it can. What percentage of venereal diseases has been treated in the army by the fever-therapy method, and what results have been obtained?

Mr. RALSTON: I think we can give my hon. friend that. I cannot give it now.

Mr. ADAMSON: I think it would be of interest to the committee if we could get that information.

There is one thing more I should like to ask in connection with the induction centres at the district depots, with regard to the psychiatric examination of the incoming personnel. Could the minister say what percentage are rejected for psychiatric reasons? I refer specifically to what are termed morons, men in low mental categories. Are figures available in that connection?

Mr. RALSTON: There are figures which I should like to look up and check. I gave some figures to the committee last year. The reason for my hesitation is that I do not think it would be correct to class those who happen to be rejected as morons.

Mr. ADAMSON: I agree entirely, but I believe there is a special classification for those below a certain mental age, and I think "moron" is the official term used.

Mr. RALSTON: I will get the information.

Mr. GLADSTONE: In the case of soldiers being invalided home, is any advance notice given to the relatives where the injuries are of a very serious nature, such as multiple amputations, facial deformities and so on? I am told that some men have been met at the station by their relatives and that sometimes the meetings have had disastrous effects. Might it not be advisable in some instances to have the first meeting take place after the soldier is comfortably in hospital?

Mr. RALSTON: I am glad that question is asked, because yesterday I was chasing down a rumour that I heard, and I shall tell the committee what it was. It was stated that at a certain station here, and the station was named, a man who had both arms and both legs amputated was carried off the train, and that his relatives had not been advised of it.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I heard the same report.

Mr. RALSTON: I tried to run down that rumour, and the director-general of medical services has looked into it also. We can find no such case. I will tell the committee of what may be the case which gave rise to this rumour. That was the case of a man who lost both his arms while on manoeuvres in England; he pulled the pin of a hand grenade and it blew off both arms. I saw that man in England myself. When I came home I wrote his wife about him, and I know she was aware of the extent of his injuries. I took a personal interest in that case, with particular reference to the possibility of getting appliances for that man before he came home. If my hon. friend can give me any information that will enable me to track down that report I should be very grateful, because I do not believe such a case exists.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Of course the point is that if there should be such a case, could not precautions be taken to lessen the effect upon the relatives?

Mr. RALSTON: Certainly they could. The committee will understand that the relatives would be advised in the regular course of hospital reports just what the accident or disability was. I felt very badly about this man

coming home without appliances. The provision at that time was that appliances were not issued on the other side because they wanted them fitted here; but I cabled over and and made special arrangements so that he had the appliances and used them on the boat before he arrived here. As a matter of fact, I had exactly the same case in my own battalion in the last war. Hon. members of the committee may know that to-day this young man is secretary of the Saskatchewan law association, having put himself through college even with that disability. I felt sure I could give some comfort to the wife of this man if I called that fact to her attention.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I wish to ask the minister a question in regard to the matter of services. There is in Toronto a voluntary organization that meets casualty trains as they come in, bringing the relatives of the men on board. Sometimes it is three or four o'clock in the morning when the train comes in, but they bring the wives and children of the men to meet them. Of course there is only one way to take care of them, namely, to drive them to the station and then drive them home.

Mr. RALSTON: That is the wives and children?

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Yes. Some time ago I had some correspondence with the minister about the matter. I know the service the members of this organization are performing, and I want to pay a tribute to them for it. I was wondering if satisfactory arrangements had been made in connection with getting gasoline to carry on this work, because, after all, many of these people only have "A" ration books, and when they have to go twenty or thirty miles out into the country to get these people and take them home it means quite a lot. Has any arrangement been made so that the members of this organization may be able to carry on their work?

Mr. RALSTON: I cannot tell my hon. friend whether any arrangement has been made, but I shall see whether that is possible. I agree with him that a very worth-while work is being done by the Red Cross, the women's voluntary organizations and other organizations, depending, of course, upon which organization is functioning in a particular locality. I have particular knowledge of the work being done in Halifax when these men are brought off the boats. Just the other night I had a report from the district officer commanding in connection with the arrival of the last hospital ship, and certainly everything that could be done to give care and comfort to those men was done by these loyal people who saw these casualties of ours on board the hospital trains. However, I shall look into the matter of gasoline.

Mr. MacNICOL: What is included in the expression, "personal equipment"?

Mr. RALSTON: That is the actual personal equipment of a man. It is the steel helmet, the web equipment, the ground sheets and the anti-gas equipment.

Mr. MacNICOL: It has nothing to do with rifles, for instance?

Mr. RALSTON: No.

Mr. GILLIS: I should like to inquire a little further about this psychiatry business; it rather intrigues me. The minister stated that there were sixty-three psychiatrists in the service. How many of them are in Canada, and how many are overseas? When is the psychiatrist called in, and is that done on the advice of the medical authorities? As I understand it, a psychiatrist is not one who prescribes medicine.

Mr. RALSTON: Oh, yes, he does. They are qualified medical practitioners.

Mr. GILLIS: No doubt that is so, but they specialize in mental disease; that is their particular line in the service. What I am trying to get at is when it is considered necessary to call in a psychiatrist, and whether it is done solely on the recommendation of the medical officer who is charged with the exclusive responsibility of looking after the medical end of it. I am trying to find out just what purpose this particular officer serves. I have in mind one of the first psychiatrists to practise in Canada, Doctor Cathcart. He was brought here from England in 1920 and attached to the Canadian pension commission; and our experiences with that gentleman were not altogether happy. When the pension committee sat in 1940 this subject was thoroughly discussed, as to the application of that particular branch of medicine in connection with the determination of pensions. I think it was almost unanimously agreed by that committee that this line of service was being dispensed with because the particular clause in the act had been removed under which the psychiatrists had operated in the past. Some qualified medical men appeared before the committee and expressed the opinion that in the past it had not been a very satisfactory service. There are sixty-three of these men in the Canadian service—I assume there are not any on the other side because, if a man is mentally and physically equipped to cross the water, he should be all right. What I am trying to

determine is what makes it necessary for the medical authority in a unit or a camp to send a man to a psychiatrist. What conditions must prevail? When the psychiatrist makes a decision, to whom does he report? Who is the judge as to whether the particular examination is the last word? I know back in 1920 and 1921 many of the pensions which had been given for nervous disabilities were discontinued in a sweeping manner, but they were restored later on by the medical authorities in the different military districts. I am simply trying to determine the mechanics in connection with this. I know I am not qualified to pass judgment, but I should like to know something about it.

Mr. RALSTON: That is something of a technical nature, and it has developed, I do not know just how recently. I know Doctor Cathcart to whom my hon. friend has referred. This has developed just as personnel selection has developed, and it is an important development. It is something like the personnel manager in business who did not exist twenty years ago but who exists to-day. These men are referred to the psychiatrists as specialists, just as men are referred to chest or eye specialists. When a medical officer fears that a man may have difficulty in making a mental adjustment to life in the army he is referred to a psychiatrist.

Mr. GILLIS: He determines his mental condition.

Mr. RALSTON: Not his mental condition, his emotional outlook.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): His state of mind.

Mr. RALSTON: His state of mind and the possibility of his adjusting himself. I have not been examined myself, but the director-general of medical services is on the floor and I am sure he is listening to this discussion. He belongs to this profession as well as being a medical officer. I believe I have described correctly the use which is made of the psychiatrist, particularly in the army. I am advised by prominent medical men who are not psychiatrists that these men have performed a very useful function and that they have saved us from having a good many men discharged because of mental conditions, particularly nervous conditions. I believe Doctor Cathcart's full title is neuropsychiatrist, or something of that kind, which would indicate that he deals with nervous as well as mental conditions.

[Mr. Gillis.]

Mr. ADAMSON: Would the minister describe hypertension?

Item agreed to.

Mr. RALSTON: Hypertension is high blood pressure, and hypotension is low blood pressure.

6. Signal and wireless equipment, line construction, etc., $23,599,633.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Is radar being used by the army at all, and has it been found satisfactory?

Mr. RALSTON: It is used extensively.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): I understood that it had not been found as useful in the army as on the sea.

Mr. RALSTON: I am using the word in the generic sense of referring to the various radio equipment used for purposes of detection. It is used extensively in connection with anti-aircraft. As my hon. friend probably knows, a great number of equipment installations have been turned out in Canada at a place not far from where he lives.

Mr. MacNICOL: Does this item cover equipment for use in Canada for training purposes, or does it just cover equipment being used in Europe?

Mr. RALSTON: Both in Canada and Europe and in Italy. It covers all signalling and wireless stores, including searchlights, cable layers, fullerphones, telephone sets, switchboards, charging sets, generators, reception sets, wireless sets, wireless stations, wavemeters, radio direction finding equipment, and so on.

Mr. MacNICOL: Have many pieces of intercommunication equipment been purchased? I refer to the equipment by which an officer can talk back and forth with the field.

Mr. RALSTON: That is known as C-58. I cannot tell my friend how many.

Mr. MacNICOL: They do not need wires?

Mr. RALSTON: "Walkie-talkie" is the slang term.

Mr. McGARRY: Can the minister say whether or not his department assisted in the construction of the telephone line for Cheticamp to Pleasant Bay in Inverness?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Mr. McGARRY: Does the minister have the figures?

Mr. RALSTON: I thought it was $5,000, but the officer here tells me he thinks it was $3,000. This was to assist in the construction of a telephone line as part of the aircraft defence corps operations in that particular part of the province.

Item agreed to.

7. Ammunition and bombs, $182,194,664.

Mr. ADAMSON: Could the minister give a break-down of this item?

Mr. RALSTON: This includes small arms and other ammunition. The round figures are as follows:

Small arms	$48,000,000
Gun ammunition	86,000,000
Miscellaneous ammunition	46,000,000

The last item includes dummy bombs, grenades, demolition bombs, guncotton, ammunition instruments and gauges.

Mr. STIRLING: How does the minister explain the large reduction this year?

Mr. RALSTON: Because of the tremendous stocks we have on hand which have not been used.

Mr. STIRLING: Overseas and here?

Mr. RALSTON: Overseas and here in Canada. Perhaps I had better not use the word "tremendous." We have large stocks.

Mr. MacNICOL: I was just going to ask a question along the lines of that asked by the hon. member for Yale. When I was home I met a number of folk who had been employed in an ammunition plant. If the minister thinks he should not answer the question I am going to ask, it will be all right. They told me they had been laid off. I asked why, and the reply was that apparently there is sufficient ammunition on hand to fight a war for ten years more. I have been wondering if that reply given to me is right, and whether this reduction of $91,000,000 is an indication of what is happening in so many plants that heretofore have been engaged in making ammunition of one kind or another. I find that the same thing is taking place in other plants making machine-guns and equipment of that kind, in which there seems to be a general reduction in production, and the reduction in the vote would seem to indicate that. Will there be a continuous reduction in production?

Mr. RALSTON: Production in 1943-44 was so heavy as to cover, I think, practically all the initial requirements; that is, there is a very large stock per gun as an initial provision, and in addition there is provision for reserve and wastage. In 1943-44 we have, to some extent, produced reserves of some types of ammunition, and the production now is for reserve and wastage.

Item agreed to.

8. Armament, including rifles, machine guns, mortars and guns of all descriptions, $104,819,202.

Mr. MacNICOL: I have a question to ask on that, but I do not want the minister to answer if he thinks he should not. In Toronto a plant has been manufacturing a very large number of machine guns and other equipment of that nature. It has been rumoured—I am not able to say if it is so—that there has been a large reduction in employment at this plant, which again would indicate that a surplus has been built up and that there may be a continuous reduction in production in the goods covered by this item. Is that correct?

Mr. RALSTON: There has been a reduction in some items but not in others.

Mr. MacNICOL: That would indicate that the information given me was correct.

Mr. RALSTON: The largest reduction is in the larger guns, 25-pounders, howitzers, and so on. There is a considerable increase—I am not giving the committee the amount—in the production of machine-guns. A very large order was placed for a certain type of machine gun. I am not so sure, having regard to recent word that I have received, that that order will be filled, but provision is made for it in case the equipment is needed. As a matter of fact, I think a substitution is being made for guns already on hand. In small arms there is a very slight reduction in rifles, for instance.

Mr. ADAMSON: Can the minister, without any breach of security, give us a rough break-down of small arms production?

Mr. RALSTON: Small arms include pistols, rifles, smoke generators, anti-tank rifles, signal pistols and Piats. Does my hon. friend agree with that pronunciation?

Mr. ADAMSON: I thought the Piats were included in the mortar category.

Mr. MacNICOL: Has there been a steady reduction in the manufacture of machine-guns?

Mr. RALSTON: The provision here is for a considerable increase in the manufacture of one type of machine-gun, a large type. I was saying a moment ago that there is another of that same type of gun on hand, but word which has been received recently makes me think that possibly the amount provided here

for the manufacture of a certain number of these guns will be very considerably reduced because of lessened production.

Mr. ADAMSON: What I was wanting to get was an approximate break-down of guns and mortars, two-inch mortars, and so on.

Mr. RALSTON: The small arms are pistols, rifles, smoke generators, anti-tank rifles, signal pistols, Piats. The machine-guns include, light, medium and heavy guns and machine carbines. The light machine-gun is in the general classification of machine-gun, not in the small arms, as I may have said inadvertently. Guns, howitzers and mortars include all types of guns, howitzers and mortars, with or without mountings, and bomb-throwers, predictors—the latter being used in anti-aircraft work.

Item agreed to.

9. M.T. vehicles: trucks, tractors, trailers, tanks, A.F.Vs., and repair parts, $274,068,547.

Mr. MacNICOL: Does this item include the vehicular equipment that is piled up and has been piled up in boxes for quite a long time on practically all the sidings all across this province?

Mr. RALSTON: This does not cover those vehicles. Those vehicles are on British order and constitute a reserve which is awaiting shipment. The British keep a very large backlog. I could give my hon. friend the number of motor vehicles at present awaiting shipment on sidings. What I said about a heavy British backlog applies also to their spare parts. We have literally acres of space which are filled with boxes of spare parts which could be used over a period of two years. They are awaiting shipment and will be shipped in due course.

Mr. MacNICOL: Apparently they are motorcars of one kind or another.

Mr. RALSTON: That is right; trucks, and so forth.

Mr. MacNICOL: All that is British equipment?

Mr. RALSTON: What is stored and awaiting shipment is practically all British. I am advised that the proportion of Canadian equipment is extremely small as compared with the British. I understand that they are awaiting special ships to take that particular kind of cargo across.

Mr. MacNICOL: Where is the backlog of Canadian vehicular equipment stored?

Mr. RALSTON: We have reserves in England, and, as I say, a small proportion of what my hon. friend sees in the different locations is part of the Canadian backlog. As my hon. friend knows, a very large proportion—I would not say a majority but a substantial proportion—of British units are equipped with Canadian vehicles.

Mr. MacNICOL: Do the words "repair parts" appearing in the item, refer to repair parts in repair plants like the large plant at East London and plants in other parts of the province?

Mr. RALSTON: Is the question whether those spare parts are for use, in those plants?

Mr. MacNICOL: Yes.

Mr. RALSTON: As my hon. friend probably knows, there are two classes of spare parts. One is the box or boxes of first year's spares, accompanying the vehicle; the other is the second year's spares, which are stored separately. Those are the spares to which I referred a minute ago when I said we had literally acres of buildings filled with these spares, for the British backlog.

Mr. MacNICOL: By this time next year, if the war continues, they will be very greatly reduced?

Mr. RALSTON: It depends. Do I understand that my hon. friend asks whether or not we can expect that this year the item might be substantially reduced?

Mr. MacNICOL: No. It is reduced this year. The next year.

Mr. RALSTON: It is reduced this year because we did not use, as we expected to do, the initial equipment which was made up. Of course a certain amount of it has been used in manoeuvres and in general training, but I would anticipate that the wastage which we planned for will take place and that next year we shall have to fill in as we did this year, and replace the wastage out of reserve.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): The Department of National Defence send their orders to the Department of Munitions and Supply, do they not?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): As regards obsolescence of equipment, an order goes in and Munitions and Supply issue instructions for a certain quantity; it is being manufactured, but things are moving quite a bit these days, so what happens in order to prevent overproduction of obsolete stuff? What is the procedure?

Mr. RALSTON: That is, if there has been a change of design in the course of manufacture?

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Either a change of design or something goes out of use. It is a question of preventing waste.

Mr. RALSTON: We simply have to stop that. If a change of design comes into effect suddenly, what is done is to try to make plans for a change-over to the new design as of a certain date. We did that in connection with tanks, as a matter of fact. So many tanks were to be made of an existing pattern. In the meantime provision was made for the tooling up for a new pattern; that is, for the changes in order to turn out the new pattern; and as of a certain date we started the manufacture of the new type. My hon. friend will understand that when I say "a new type" it does not mean a brand-new turret; but if the ring was larger or the stowage space was changed or the signal equipment was changed, there might also have to be a different foot-plate. In large changes, changes which would be very difficult to make in the course of running a certain number of turrets or a certain number of tanks, it is better to have certainty and run so many rather than to change over all at once.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): What I have in mind is this. If an article becomes obsolete, does the department say to Munitions and Supply, "we don't want it any more"? Do you cancel it right away, or what?

Mr. RALSTON: I do not think the word "obsolete" is quite a fair term to use in connection with most articles of military equipment which are actually in process of being turned out. There are improvements like the rifle, Marks I, II and III; there are improvements in tanks like Marks I, II and III, but Mark III is not obsolete because of the fact that Mark IV is being turned out; Mark III can be used and is being used; and not only would it be bad economics, but the troops might be left without equipment if we said, "all Mark III is out; start manufacturing Mark IV". There has to be a gradual transition from one to the other.

Mr. ADAMSON: I do not want to hold the committee up unnecessarily, but this is an item of considerably over a quarter of a billion dollars. Could the minister give some idea of the percentage of this that goes in, say, armoured fighting vehicles such as carriers, tanks, and artillery vehicles, dragons, and ordinary M.T.? If the figures are available I think the committee would be interested, provided that the information does not transgress any security regulation.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend is asking about armoured vehicles vis-a-vis the ordinary commercial vehicles?

Mr. ADAMSON: Track vehicles and fighting vehicles and purely M.T.

Mr. RALSTON: I would say that the percentage is as three to two—A.F.Vs. three and commercial vehicles, two. When I say commercial vehicles I mean load-carrying vehicles.

Mr. ADAMSON: What the Americans call prime movers and ordinary wheeled vehicles.

Mr. RALSTON: I am not familiar with that term, but load-carrying vehicles vis-a-vis A.F.V. are two to three.

Mr. ADAMSON: Would you call the dragon or the artillery carrier an A.F.V.?

Mr. RALSTON: It is a "B" vehicle in the load-carrying vehicle class, not in the A.F.V.

Mr. MacNICOL: I have been in a number of plants lately in which I have seen considerable quantities of valuable and expensive material which now, apparently, is not to be used, and I have been wondering how in the world all this stuff was ordered. Presumably a requisition comes in to somebody in the department who in turn issues an order. On what basis does the man who issues the requisition issue it? From whom does he get the order to issue it? Are his requisitions checked? If so, how do these considerable quantities of material accumulate in plants? I have lately been in a number of plants, and from every plant in Canada, I assume, material is being turned over to this new crown company to sell. Private business could not very well pile up material like that—material which is not going to be used—and remain in business.

Mr. RALSTON: Let me say that generally changes of that kind are due to changes in war conditions which have necessitated changes in the war establishments of equipment. I will give my hon. friend one instance: I dealt with it the other night after I left the house. We had ordered 2,400 of a certain kind of gun. Requisitions were put in and material assembled, and I have no doubt that some machining was done on it. Suddenly we got a wire that a change in war establishment called for something like 366 instead of 2,400. This resulted from conditions which I could explain to my hon. friend and which would be understood readily by him and by the rest of the committee, conditions which had not been foreseen. The war has improved in that particular sphere, and as a result a change has been made. Consequently there has been a cancellatic ., which means, of course, that

there will be some wastage in machining and things of that kind. The instance I mention will not be the only one. There are on my desk all the time cancellations which involve changes of this kind. The war was going a certain way, and when certain activities were anticipated, orders were put; otherwise I would have been "on the mat" for not having the equipment. The situation has changed and, as a result, the necessity for equipment, and cancellations have been made. I would like to know that plant. Is my hon. friend sure in that case that the material is not going to be used?

Mr. MacNICOL: I do not care to give the name of the plant because all the information was given me in confidence, and I am not finding fault with it, having had a lot to do with business, so that I appreciate the fact that there will be many changes in design. It would mean, however, that much material purchased would be left lying there. The information given me is that when the new crown company is set up to sell the material—I do not know whether it has been announced in the house that it will be set up—

Mr. RALSTON: The War Assets Corporation?

Mr. MacNICOL: Has it been set up in the house?

Mr. RALSTON: I do not think it has.

Mr. MacNICOL: It is going to be, because there was something in the newspaper about it this morning. I presume that company will endeavour to sell this material. From what I saw of this material lying around, when this new company is set up it should at once get possession of warehouses somewhere, so that this material, which is first class, can be stored and sold at some future time.

Mr. RALSTON: What was set up was Crown Assets Allocation Committee, and the handling is done by War Assets Corporation, which is now being set up. That has to do not simply with equipment of properties and things of that kind, and I know that the services are busy dealing with the items referred to by the hon. member for St. Paul's, which can be regarded as completely obsolete. Those are the only items which the services feel justified in discussing with the Crown Assets Allocation Committee at the present time, because we do not know how long the war will last and we do not propose to hand over to War Assets Corporation any of that material until we know that it is obsolete.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Does the army buy the planes or gliders that carry paratroopers, or are they controlled by the air force? They are called Hannibals.

Mr. GRAYDON: Referring to the disposal of crown assets by War Assets Corporation, or whatever body will have the disposition of these assets when the war is over, or while it is on, I had two suggestions during the past month from men overseas at the front who are anxious that all the jeeps should not be disposed of before they come back. Apparently there is a considerable demand, which has gone through the forces to a great extent, because if I have had two requests I am sure that members from all parts of Canada must have been showered with similar suggestions. I think the minister ought to give consideration to this particular suggestion, because, after all, there is really nothing too good for those who have been fighting for us, and if they have a desire for some of the equipment we ought, in our arrangements for its disposal, to consider their wishes.

Mr. RALSTON: I will take a note of it.

Mr. STIRLING: Is the same anxiety exhibited by those who want tommyguns?

Item agreed to.

10. Operating cost of mechanical transport: Fuel, maintenance, etc. (not including repair parts), $30,044,487.

Mr. MacNICOL: I wish to ask a question with reference to gasoline. In visiting camps and plants of one kind or another I have observed what appears to be great wastage in the use of gasoline. For instance, if an officer or a manufacturer wants to get information in Ottawa he jumps into a plane and flies to Ottawa, and that takes a considerable quantity of gasoline. His errand might or might not be of any great importance, necessitating his coming at that speed. He might have taken a train to come here. When you take the aggregate, according to the information given me, the wastage in gasoline is terrific, through the use of aeroplanes going back and forth on journeys that may or may not be of particular consequence.

Mr. RALSTON: Heaven forbid that I should criticize the air force with regard to the use of planes—

Mr. MacNICOL: I am not speaking of the air force but of military officers.

Mr. RALSTON: The air force have been more than considerate to the army and to the minister particularly in connection with the use of planes. I do not know of any cases and I should like to look into the matter, but I may say to my hon. friend that the

instructions are definite to officers not to use planes or cars if trains can be used, unless time can be saved which it is necessary to save. I do not know what case my hon. friend refers to, but I do not think they jump into planes every time they want to go anywhere. As I understand it, flying in planes must receive the approval of national defence headquarters except in the case of the minister, who gives his own approval. This is a new one. I expected my hon. friend to complain of the use of military cars, because I hear that all the time; but I did not know that military officers were using planes excessively.

Mr. MacNICOL: I do not mean an officer on active service, but an officer stationed at some plant—

Mr. RALSTON: Speaking at some plant?

Mr. MacNICOL: Stationed at some plant. I am not referring to the fighting service.

Mr. RALSTON: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. Does he mean a civilian officer?

Mr. MacNICOL: I would not know whether he was a civilian or not, but an officer associated with the government in some way in a plant that has to do with the making of planes. He might be an inspector.

Mr. RALSTON: He uses a plane to go from there to somewhere else?

Mr. MacNICOL: He flies here or elsewhere, wherever he may wish to go.

Mr. RALSTON: That is not my family; that is all I can say.

Mr. ADAMSON: Has the minister come to any set routine about accidents between military and civilian vehicles? There used to be a great deal of trouble. Has any formula been worked out? At one time the crown assumed no obligation for an accident. I do not know whether fiat had to be obtained to sue the crown. Has this matter been settled, and, if so, what is the formula?

Mr. RALSTON: Either by passing an order under the War Measures act, or by statute, I do not remember which, that situation was altered last year and provision was made so that action can be brought, as I remember, as if the soldier were the employee of a private corporation. That is the effect of it, but I shall have to look up the act. I am sure, however, the change has been made and we have had the greatest success in the settlement of claims. We have a procedure which is working well whereby meritorious claims are settled without action at all. In England we have a claims commission; in the United States we settle in a similar way, and they have been successful from the point of view both of the claimant and of the department.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I ask what part of item No. 10 is gasoline?

Mr. RALSTON: It is all gasoline, oil, grease, anti-freeze. That includes not only load-carrying vehicles, but tanks and other armoured fighting vehicles as well. As my hon. friend sees, there is a decrease of about $5,000,000; that is attributable to reduction in the number of vehicles in the home war establishment, and a reduction in operating cost.

Mr. GRAYDON: As I understand it, there is nothing in this item which has to do with overseas operations?

Mr. RALSTON: Eighty per cent is for overseas.

Mr. GRAYDON: That is the entire vote for fuel and mechanical transport cost, operating cost, maintenance, et cetera, not including repair parts.

Mr. RALSTON: It includes overseas and all theatres of operation.

Mr. GRAYDON: In that amount how much is for fuel?

Mr. ADAMSON: The minister mentioned water transport. Does he mean assault landing craft and tank landing craft?

Mr. RALSTON: I mean the little boats for water transport. We have one of them at least in Halifax harbour, I think.

Mr. ADAMSON: There was a mail service in Nova Scotia as well?

Mr. RALSTON: There is a boat up the British Columbia coast from Vancouver, too.

Mr. ADAMSON: Yes; it does not include the tank landing craft and the assault landing craft?

Mr. RALSTON: It will include that, I think, yes. As a matter of fact, about eighty per cent of this item is for overseas. I would think it would include that.

Mr. GRAYDON: The minister said that he would get me some information.

Mr. RALSTON: Did my hon. friend ask another question?

Mr. GRAYDON: I asked what part of item No. 10 was fuel?

Mr. RALSTON: I am sorry I cannot give my hon. friend the information at the moment. As a matter of fact, the gasoline, oil, grease and anti-freeze for overseas are all under a

capitation rate with the British government; that is to say, it is all paid on a per diem basis. The cost of fuel gasoline in Canada is something like $4,000,000. Part of the oil is for fuel and part is for lubricating, but I cannot break it down.

Mr. GRAYDON: I was not anxious to have any special break-down, but I should like to have some idea as to how much fuel is being used, perhaps for other reasons, as the discussion progresses.

Mr. RALSTON: I cannot give my hon. friend what proportion of that big item for overseas is fuel as compared with the other. It is all lumped together.

Mr. GRAYDON: I think the minister has given me sufficient information now.

Mr. MacNICOL: Did I understand the minister to say that the amount of fuel, gasoline, is only $4,000,000?

Mr. RALSTON: In Canada, yes.

Mr. MacNICOL: This is not for outside Canada?

Mr. RALSTON: I said the item was $30,000,000 altogether; of that, $24,000,0000 represents estimated overseas expenditures. I cannot break that down for the committee into oil, gasoline and anti-freeze, because that $24,000,000 is based on what we call a capitation rate, which we pay the British government for servicing our troops at so much a day. They provide the oil, lubricants, and everything else. They do not measure out the gallons. They say, "We will provide you with oil, lubricant, anti-freeze and so on at a per diem rate." I have here the amount for gasoline in Canada. It is $4,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. MacNICOL: Mr. Chairman, you are getting along very nicely. We have voted almost $1,500,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN: I am doing the best I can. I do not want to urge the committee in any way, shape or form. However, when I think the time is ripe to call an item I call it.

Mr. MacNICOL: We are doing our best to help you. It struck me that the amount of $4,000,000 was a very small amount if it includes the fighting equipment in Italy and the ships at sea everywhere.

Mr. RALSTON: Not ships.

Mr. MacNICOL: Not the ships; but it includes all the theatres in which our men are fighting?

[Mr. Ralston.]

Mr. RALSTON: It includes the fighting material.

Mr. MacNICOL: It does?

Mr. RALSTON: It is a capitation method.

Mr. MacNICOL: I thought it would have been very much more; we have so many troops there.

Mr. RALSTON: The amount of $24,000,000 is all that is chargeable under this head by the British government.

Mr. MacNICOL: That covers the whole business?

Mr. RALSTON: That is right.

Mr. MacNICOL: So far as gasoline and oil is concerned with respect to Canada's war effort in the old country and in Europe?

Mr. RALSTON: I have the exact rate and the number of days. It is all charged on a capitation rate.

Item agreed to.

11. Sundries, including printing, stationery, telephones, telegrams and other costs not included in above items, $24,246,593.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I have a question I should like to ask and I do not see any other item on which to ask it. What has been the actual cost of recruiting for the army? If we have the actual cost for the army we might break it down per capita. I do not know whether it is figured out on that basis or not. I had in mind recruiting officers, their offices and staffs. I think the whole business has been rather costly to this country for the results obtained. I have in mind recruiting parties that go through the country. They have an officer, an N.C.O. and in some cases two or three C.W.A.C.s. They come into a community and operate dances in it. They hire a hall and pay for an orchestra. In some instances they do not get any recruits. These are actual facts. That, coupled with the coloured posters and the printing, I am sure, costs this country quite an item. I believe there should be a different system worked out, a system which would not be nearly so costly in man or woman hours or dollars and cents per recruit obtained. I should like to have those figures.

Mr. RALSTON: I have not the figures of the number of men who are involved. But I wish to say to the committee and to my hon. friend that I do not agree with him for a single instant. I say that it costs this country two or three million dollars every time there is a loan to influence and to persuade the peo-

ple of Canada to subscribe their money to the loan. I suggest that if it costs $1,500,000 to get 48,000 or 50,000 men to volunteer who may be called upon to give their lives for this country it is worth it.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Hear, hear.

Mr. RALSTON: I say to my hon. friend that I do not think it lies in the mouths of any one of us to say it is too much. It seems to me that we underrate the value of recruiting and the value of volunteering. If we had half the effort put into recruiting that is put into those war loans to get people to subscribe their money for a perfectly good bond, we would have a good deal more recruiting than we have. When I see what is done in the way of war loans—and I do not deprecate it in the slightest, for it is a fine thing to have us stir up the enthusiasm of our people—I do not think too much is done for recruiting. In war loans we lend our army equipment; we do everything we possibly can. What for? In order to influence our citizens to subscribe for a perfectly good bond with the promise of the Dominion of Canada to pay it back in twelve or fifteen years. If we do a little of that sort of thing in order to persuade men to enlist in the army, to give their lives for their country, I do not think parliament should be at all niggardly in the way of voting that money.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): What did the minister say the cost was?

Mr. RALSTON: I thought the figure just included the posters, and that sort of thing, but it includes the personnel as well, and the cost in 1942-43 was $1,290,000 in round figures. The cost for the first nine months of the current fiscal year, as it has been figured out here, including personnel, was $1,138,000. That is about half the cost of one war loan.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): How many recruits were obtained?

Mr. RALSTON: About forty-eight thousand.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Would the minister say why this item is up $10,000,000 this year?

Mr. RALSTON: The increase in the cost of printing and stationery is due to higher per man cost overseas; special training equipment has been increased, and there is a large increase in sundries, due principally to an increase of $6,500,000 for telephone and wireless construction and maintenance, which was formerly included under operating expenses of property. That $6,500,000 is the big item in the increase of $10,000,000.

Mr. LOCKHART: Are these elaborate recruiting huts which are stationed all over the country still in use? There is one near the cenotaph in Ottawa, and I wondered if they were all still in use.

Mr. RALSTON: I understand that the one in Ottawa to which my hon. friend refers is the recruiting hut for the C.W.A.C.

Mr. LOCKHART: That has been changed over, has it?

Mr. RALSTON: It has been used for that purpose for the best part of a year, at least.

Mr. LOCKHART: Are they being used for that purpose all over the country?

Mr. RALSTON: I do not know; I have not seen any others.

Mr. LOCKHART: The minister has not a break-down of the cost of operating those huts?

Mr. RALSTON: No, but I think the cost would come under this item.

Item agreed to.

Sundry services, $22,315,827.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to know from the minister and the committee whether the sub-item should be considered individually, or whether the items will be taken together.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Will the minister explain this item?

Mr. RALSTON: Certainly. There is an experimental station at Suffield, for which $1,916,810 is provided. Internment operations will cost $3,730,717; the inspection board of the United Kingdom and Canada, $10,589,000; departmental administration, $1,774,000; dependents' allowance board, $805,300 and dependents' supplementary grants fund—that is, the dependents' board of trustees—$3,500,000. The total is practically the same as last year. It is pointed out to me that these figures are not strictly comparable, due to changes in accounting procedures resulting in different groupings of expenditures in the various years, and this really applies to all the items with which we have deen dealing.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Is the experimental station new this year?

Mr. RALSTON: No; that was bought two years ago. This is the operating cost.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): This is the first time it has been shown in the item.

Mr. RALSTON: It was included last year in part A—army services.

Mr. GERSHAW: I should like to ask a few questions with regard to the Suffield experimental station. In the first place, it is presumed to be a permanent station, and the question of building a few cottages as homes for the officers has come up from time to time, but nothing has been done. Then there is a rather more serious problem, in that the block takes in quite an area where the grass is fairly good, while the grass outside that area has been eaten off. A large part of this area is not being used for experimental purposes, according to my information, and those on the borders of the block who are so short of grass find it very exasperating, when they cannot get grass, to see that the grass within this field is not being used. There is also a more serious problem agitating the minds of the people of that locality, that is, the two prairie fires which were started within the area and which spread far beyond it. I personally saw a fire over a distance of forty miles, at least twelve to fifteen miles deep, which burned a lot of valuable grass. These people feel that they should be compensated for the loss of this grass, but month after month goes by and no compensation is given. I should like the minister to offer some indication as to whether their case is in good standing and whether they can hope to get any compensation for their loss.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend has spoken of two things. I shall look into the matter of cottages. In point of fact I have not been near Suffield for nearly nine months at least, perhaps longer, but I shall look into that question. When he speaks of compensation on account of fire I presume he means fire which started within the area?

Mr. GERSHAW: Yes.

Mr. RALSTON: That matter has not been brought to my attention previously. Certainly it sounds as if it had some merit, but I do not want to say anything definite. I shall look into it personally.

Mr. GERSHAW: It has been before the officers of the department.

Mr. RALSTON: There must be some "catch" in it that I do not know about, but I shall look into it personally.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): What would be covered in the last item of $3,500,000 for the dependents' supplementary grant fund?

[Mr. G. K. Fraser.]

The CHAIRMAN: I asked the minister and the committee whether these subdivisions of the last item should be discussed separately or all together.

Mr. RALSTON: I have read all the items and, as I understand it, hon. members are asking questions about them. I am perfectly satisfied with that procedure. The item of $3,500,000 is to provide for the amounts to be paid out by the dependents' board of trustees by way of supplementary grants. As I said, this is a round figure. The amount paid out last year was $1,285,000.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I just wondered if it came under the trustees.

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Mr. LOCKHART: Under what section could I discuss the matter of proving ranges? I have been trying to find the appropriate item, though I suppose I could have asked the question at almost any time.

Mr. RALSTON: I think that would come under the inspection board, which is included in this item.

Mr. LOCKHART: Then what will be done in cases where damage is being done to property in close proximity to these ranges? Has any policy been laid down? There is a matter I want to take up seriously in that connection, and I should like a little guidance on it.

Mr. RALSTON: Another hon. member asked me the same thing. Is my hon. friend talking about the proving range near Hamilton?

Mr. LOCKHART: No, it is near St. Catharines.

Mr. RALSTON: If my hon. friend will take it up with me I shall be very glad to look into it. As a matter of fact, I have not dealt with any of these cases at all; they have been dealt with by the inspection board. Any case that is thought necessary to be referred to the department comes to the deputy minister, but I shall look into anything my hon. friend cares to take up with me. Damage has been done by what; by concussion?

Mr. LOCKHART: Yes, damage to nearby property by the concussion.

Mr. RALSTON: I shall look into it.

Mr. GRAYDON: I think the minister will agree that we have made pretty good progress

on his estimates to-night. A number of questions may arise to-morrow, as we finish with his department, but I should like to make a suggestion which may facilitate the discussion and bring it to an end more quickly. Would he mind giving a statement in a simplified form as to how many N.R.M.A. men there are in the Canadian army. I have listened to my hon. friend give details of the duties performed by these men, but I am not just clear as to the actual total.

Mr. RALSTON: I will make a guess now which I will confirm later. There are between 70,000 and 73,000; I think I said over 70,000 before, but I will confirm that. The committee does not want to pass this item to-night?

Mr. GRAYDON: I think not. We have made pretty good progress. Do not kill the goose that lays the golden egg.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

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

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

The house met at three o'clock.

ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

TABLING OF CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE PRIME MINISTER AND THE PREMIER OF ONTARIO

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I notice that Premier Drew has tabled certain correspondence which has taken place between himself and myself respecting the wartime alcoholic beverages order. I should like to table the correspondence in this house.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Who is right?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not know that there is any difference between us in the correspondence.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

SOCIAL SECURITY—CONCURRENCE IN FIRST REPORT

Hon. CYRUS MACMILLAN (Queens) moved:

That the first report of the special committee on social security, presented to the house on the 24th instant, be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

WAR EXPENDITURES—CONCURRENCE IN FIRST REPORT

Mr. HUGHES CLEAVER (Halton) moved:

That the first report of the special committee on war expenditures, presented to the house on the 24th instant, be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

NORTHWEST STAGING ROUTE

EDMONTON TO ALASKA—AERODROMES AND INTERMEDIARY FIELDS—PERMANENT FACILITIES OR IMPROVEMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a statement regarding that series of airports from Edmonton to Alaska known as the northwest staging route.

One of Canada's most important airways is the northwest staging route, composed of a chain of main aerodromes, with intermediary fields, extending from Edmonton to Alaska. Pioneering for this airway was carried out by Canadian bush pilots, who first operated in that area, in seaplanes, in the early twenties.

In 1935, a survey of several alternate routes to the Yukon and Alaska was made by the Department of Transport of Canada, and the route from Edmonton via Fort Nelson and Whitehorse was chosen as the most favourable. Detailed engineering work was authorized in 1939 for aerodromes at Grande Prairie, Fort St. John, Fort Nelson, Watson Lake and Whitehorse.

The initial development called for landing strips 3,000 feet in length by 500 feet in width, with provision for suitable future extension for a full size modern airport. Radio range stations were also located, to provide a radio beam, which is an essential part of any modern airway. Survey parties were still in the field at the outbreak of war, and some consideration was given to abandoning the project, but the government decided to expedite its completion, a decision which has been fully justified by subsequent events.

Thus Canada was able to provide the United States, when that country entered the war in December, 1941, with an airway to Alaska removed from the Pacific coast, relatively free from danger of enemy attack, and connected with air and ground communication networks at Edmonton and Vancouver.

The Canada-United States permanent joint board on defence, meeting in Victoria, B.C., on November 13, 1940, decided to recommend to its respective governments that the air route from Edmonton to Fairbanks,

Alaska, be developed on the basis of the plans then being carried out by the Canadian government. A month later, funds were released for the completed project, the Canadian government undertaking the work at its sole expense. Firm orders for necessary equipment, and contracts for the work itself, were placed without delay.

The rapid construction of facilities at Fort Nelson and Watson Lake involved movements of supplies and equipment for both airports through very difficult country, a distance of hundreds of miles. By the beginning of September, 1941, seven months after contracts were authorized, and three months before the United States entered the war, the airway from Edmonton to Whitehorse was usable by daylight. By the end of 1941, radio range stations had been built, and the radio beam was in operation from Edmonton to the Alaska boundary.

Later, the United States decided to build the Alaska highway, following the general route of the airway, and connecting the main landing fields along the airway. The fact that the airway was then operating greatly facilitated the construction of the highway, and, similarly, the existence of the highway has greatly aided the operation of the airway. The two projects, one being carried out by Canada, and the other by the United States, are complementary to each other.

While the Canadian airway facilities were in operation at the time of Pearl Harbor, it soon became apparent that war traffic would necessitate substantial additions to the original programme, involving longer landing strips, improved hangar facilities, and extensive living and office accommodation. The need for the larger project arose almost entirely out of the requirements of the United States military forces.

When the United States proposals for more extensive facilities were under discussion in the early months of 1942, the Canadian government informed the United States government that it felt Canada should properly pay for the construction of new landing strips, or other permanent works of continuing value to the airway, and that the United States should pay for such additional facilities as were required by the United States forces, over and above Canadian standards and requirements.

Recently, the Canadian government has reviewed the probable future requirements of air transport in this area, and has come to the conclusion that the standards required for a permanent installation are very substantially above those first considered necessary. In consequence the Canadian government has recently informed the United States government that it will not expect payment from the United States government for the construction of any permanent facilities or improvements, which have been carried out by the Canadian government at the request of the government of the United States, and for the account of the latter government. Further it has been decided that the Canadian government will reimburse the United States government for its expenditures on construction of a permanent nature, carried out and paid for by the United States government, on air routes in this area.

This decision applies to all air fields on the northwest staging route, including work in the 1943 construction programme undertaken by the United States government, using its own contractors and its own labour. Early in 1943, it was decided that to complete the project in a manner that would satisfy United States requirements, both equipment and labour from the United States would be needed.

The decision to pay the United States for all permanent improvements built by that government also applies to the fields and landing strips on the Mackenzie River route, and all other airfields, landing strips, and permanent air route facilities constructed by the United States government in northwest Canada, in accordance with arrangements made from time to time, between the two governments, for the joint defence of this continent.

The total cost to the Canadian government of the staging route from Edmonton to Alaska will be about forty-six million dollars. In addition, other war-time development for aerodromes in the Canadian northwest cost about eight million dollars, of which six million dollars covers the cost of flight strips along the Alaska highway, and two million dollars covers the cost of flight strips along the Mackenzie River route. Canada has also spent about four and a half million dollars, during the past two years, on improvements to aerodromes and airways from the United States border to Edmonton; this on three airways, one passing through Kamloops and Prince George, another through Lethbridge, and a third through Regina.

In September, 1942, control of the aerodromes along the northwest staging route was transferred from the Department of Transport to the R.C.A.F., and the latter now operates the chain of airports, from the headquarters of the northwest staging route at Edmonton. The Department of Transport continues to provide meteorological services, and operates and maintains the radio range stations and

certain communication facilities. The Department of Transport engineers also coordinate any new work, and for this purpose continue to be stationed at each aerodrome along the route. The control towers of the airway are staffed by R.C.A.F., which force is responsible for maintenance and repair work at all aerodromes, including snow removal. The R.C.A.F. is solely responsible for security, and operates a system of airway traffic control for all aircraft using this route.

In brief, the northwest staging route is Canadian property, owned and operated by the Canadian government. It was built and developed by Canada, with the cooperation of the United States army engineers and workmen. The cost of the project is to be borne wholly by the government of Canada. The total cost of the northwest staging route alone up to the end of 1943, will be about forty-six million dollars, while the total cost of war-time development of the airways of the Canadian northwest will be about $58,500,000.

The route is the main artery for air traffic between the United States and Alaska, and beyond Alaska to northeastern Asia. Its aerodromes, hangars and communications facilities are suitable to accommodate the maximum amount of traffic that can be foreseen at this time. The route is one of the most important in the world, both in relation to the war against Japan and, subsequently, as part of an international air route.

In arranging for the post-war use of the northwest staging route, the government of Canada will pursue a liberal policy of cooperation with other nations. We hope that the right to use the route will become part of a general scheme of international cooperation in air transport matters, which will provide greater freedom of movement of aircraft, and of air traffic, within a suitable international framework.

It is my intention to give hon. members a statement of Canadian policy with regard to such an international development, and this at an early date.

WAR APPROPRIATION BILL

PROVISION FOR GRANTING TO HIS MAJESTY AID FOR NATIONAL DEFENCE AND SECURITY

The house resumed from Monday, February 28, consideration in committee of a resolution to grant to His Majesty certain sums of money for the carrying out of measures consequent upon the existence of a state of war—Mr. Ilsley—Mr. Bradette in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

Sundry services, $22,315,827.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, I have just a few cases to bring to the attention of the committee and of the minister. If he can answer now, I shall be thankful to him; if he cannot answer me now, I hope that he will do so at the earliest possible opportunity.

I have the case of a young man from the military district of Toronto; the Toronto file is T-30-S-521 (Res.) It is the case of a young artist who joined the militia before the war and got his commission by working his way up from the ranks. He offered his services in the active army in September 1939, being then under thirty years of age. He was not needed then; he was told that he would be called when needed. He was called in 1943, being then thirty-two. After being wrongly drafted as a private he protested, in order to be given his rank as an officer, under king's regulations; he was discharged as a veteran after ten days of active service. He bought his uniform and incurred other expenses. He was ordered to Three Rivers to follow an officers' course, and then was ordered back to his military district for disposal because he was then considered too old for overseas duty as an officer. He was then redrafted for service overseas as a private. I would ask the minister to look into this case and decide whether Major General Potts has been fair to this man.

There is another case that will perhaps surprise the minister; I refer to G-49086, who is in the "clink" at Petawawa. He deserted the first time and was sentenced to eight months, and that was the knowledge he had of the army; it is far from surprising that he jumped again, to use the language of the camp, for twenty-six days, whereupon he was sentenced to two years in the "clink". This again seems to me an exaggerated punishment. What is the use of keeping a man for two years in the "clink" for jumping only twenty-six days? Here is the case of another fellow who is now at Longueuil. He is in the "clink" too. He complains of bad treatment and the answer that is given to the department in the matter is that everything is rose-pink. He is not well. He underwent a medical examination. His number is D-635718. I was told by someone in the department that unless authority were given by that man it would not be possible to have a copy of the medical report that was made in his case. I prepared a draft letter which I sent to his brother to be signed by him, the soldier. The brother went to the place of detention but was not admitted to

see him. This is a case where we should have a copy of that medical examination with the signature of the man concerned, but the brother cannot reach him to get that signature. This again I bring to the attention of the minister as an instance of abuse.

There are men in the ordnance corps who are qualified mechanics and who receive supplementary pay of 25, 50 and 75 cents. They work at their own trade and are therefore helpful in repairing trucks and all that. But in Newfoundland, and I presume it is the same in other places, the practice has started of pushing aside the older men who have done their work for years and who are skilled. They know their trade well and are thoroughly experienced but they have to give way to new men and they are returned to the ranks. If the army has too many mechanics, let the minister say so. They are needed everywhere. They are needed in the making of munitions and arms in civilian life, and there is plenty of room for them.

Here again it is wrong to keep in the army as a foot private a man who is skilled and who can render service to the army, but who is unable to do so because of some decision made by the commanding officer.

With regard to the guards at Valcartier and St. Malo, there are guard rooms at the arsenals, and those are the only two places in the whole country which are not heated. The winter is not over yet and I would ask the minister to be kind enough to look into this matter. He will appreciate the grounds of my complaint.

Hon. gentlemen who are listening to me now probably know that the regulations of the civil service do not apply to the army and what was said by the Minister of Labour concerning the draftees who have not undergone any training yet, the number, and so on, does not apply to the draftees who had some previous training even for a month, and if the number of experienced men in the forest is not large enough I could give the Minister of Labour quite a number of names of good lumberjacks who are retained in the army and are not working in the forest.

You know very well, Mr. Chairman, that our task here is not always pleasant. It was far from pleasant for me to rise in my place to-day and speak of these cases, but if we want reform we must facilitate the work of the government by pointing out what is wrong so that there may be redress. There are two schools of thought in this country, one of them comprising absentee voters and the knights of silence, and for those people silence is golden. So far as they are concerned, members of parliament should not have the right to voice the grievances either of their constituents or of any citizen who may come to them in all confidence seeking the redress of any wrong. That is one point of view.

The other point of view is that of other members of parliament, who are listening to their electors, to the difficulties that they have, who observe the effect of the application of the wrong, and who do their best to improve the condition of everyone as much as it is humanly possible to do. We are rewarded. I hold in my hand the file of P-100585, H-25405, F-2505. This is the file of a young man who suffered from sinus trouble. He was classified category "A" before leaving for England. When his father wrote to me about him I told him to obtain sworn certificates from the specialists who had examined him. He obtained three certificates from specialists attached to the Quebec hospital. I sent them to the Department of National Defence. The certificates were sent to England and the man has come back. I do not complain to the minister about that. The right thing has been done, but I do complain about the carelessness of the medical doctors who classified that man as category "A" when he should have been category "E". It is clear the country has paid for the trip of that man overseas, for his return, for his care in the hospitals there. We need reform. When I ask for reform it is not a matter of personal votes; it is not a matter of being in the limelight; it is not a matter of having a grudge against anybody. It is a question of fulfilling a sacred duty, not only to my constituents but to any citizen of this country who comes for help.

Having said that I shall add some more. Here is the case of a young man—I have not his regimental number, but I have his registry number F-144428. He is a fine looking fellow but is in delicate health. The army doctors did not pay any attention to the medical certificates of the family doctors. He went to the army, contracted pneumonia, was looked after in a civilian hospital and then returned to the camp. He remained in cold quarters, was very ill and finally he was discharged. I hope the minister will see to it that definite instructions are given to the army doctors to pay some attention to the certificates, especially when they are sworn certificates, from family doctors. Those certificates should be and must be most valuable to the army medical corps as far as the medical history of any recruit is concerned.

I was greatly surprised this morning to read in *Hansard* what the hon. member for Port-

neuf (Mr. Gauthier) said about his humility. I wonder about his humility, when I consider that he did nothing for the recruits while he was in the army. If I judge correctly what he said, after he resigned as captain a little more than a year ago he started to look after cases of a type similar to those that I have already mentioned in the house. If his efforts were rewarded by the Department of National Defence, was it not precisely on account of what members other than those of his group had done to help the physically unfit in the army? While they were busy collecting funds for the Bloc Populaire on St. James street, we were doing our duty here as members of parliament, and we were fighting the cause of the privates in the army. While they were getting funds to pay for blackmail that was coming from a rascal who is their mouthpiece and their loud speaker,—a man whom I kicked out of my office and who is practising blackmail to a high degree in their paper, who was so bad that once he was banging the door of my office in the house, so much so that I had to call a constable of the house to take him to the press gallery—we were doing our duty towards the privates in the army. That is the kind of man who teaches the people how to behave, who passes judgment on the members of parliament. It is time that the readers of *Le Devoir* knew who is the parliamentary correspondent of that paper, and that I kicked him out of my office for cause. I tell you, sir, that there is no inducement, no blackmail, no brutal force which will persuade me to change the kind of work that I am doing for the underdog in this house.

Mr. RALSTON: In the first place may I point out to the committee that I thought when the hon. member rose he was speaking of cases under the item which we are considering here, such as the dependents' allowance item. The cases he has referred to are all medical cases which come under item 5. In view of the fact that the hon. member had started on them I did not interrupt. I am as anxious as anybody to get on with the business, but I am just as anxious to see to it that the reform which my hon. friend suggests is effected, if reform is needed. He spoke of the case of an artist. I have no particulars with regard to that, but I shall look into it. He spoke of a man in Petawawa who had been a deserter, a man who was first sentenced to eight months and afterwards to two years. He suggested that the punishment was too heavy. I say to him in the first place that the sentence is not determined with regard to the individual alone. Punishment has to be exemplary as well as disciplinary. According to the hon. member's statement, that man was guilty of two instances of desertion. Petawawa camp contains thousands of men, and it is necessary that substantial punishment be meted out. That does not mean that there is no opportunity for remission of the punishment in the case of good behaviour.

The hon. member referred to the case of the brother of a man in Longueuil. He said the brother was refused admission to secure the signature to a letter authorizing the hon. member to get access to medical documents. I say to the hon. member that rules with regard to detention camps are necessary, and provision is made as to when visitors are allowed. We do not allow anyone to go and see those who are in detention, whenever they like. That is so even in institutions of a very much gentler type such as hospitals; it is the same, and enforced much more rigorously, in regard to those who are under detention. If the hon. member desires to have any communication sent to this man, or to arrange that the brother may see him, I shall certainly see that the opportunity is afforded.

The hon. member spoke of the case of a man who was a qualified mechanic and who, he said, was returned to the ranks. I take it that the man was in the ranks from the start, and that my hon. friend was referring to the fact that he was getting a mechanic's pay for a while, and was then cut off the mechanic's pay because there was no employment for him as such. May I tell the hon. member that we pay mechanic's pay to the full number of mechanics allowed for in the establishment. In addition there is a quota for mechanics, even though they are not provided for in the establishment, under which so many men may be paid mechanic's pay, in order to encourage men to keep up their training in mechanical work, as the hon. member suggests. I presume the suggestion of the hon. member is that this man should have been returned to civil life the moment he could no longer be employed as a mechanic. That is not the practice. He may be needed as a mechanic at any time, and when he is so needed he will be put at the work of a mechanic and given the pay of a mechanic; and if he comes within the quota he can be given a mechanic's pay even though there is no room in the establishment for him.

Then the hon. member spoke of a man with sinus trouble who was sent overseas. I am not a medical man; I do not know anything about sinus or these other diseases. I understand that this boy was sent overseas, that later representations were made as to his sinus trouble, and according to the hon. member

he was sent back. Whether he came back as a result of the sinus trouble I do not know, but I understand that it is quite possible for a man with sinus trouble to have it apparently completely cured so that he may be placed in category "A" and considered fit for overseas service, and that later a situation may arise in which the sinus trouble flares up again, in which event he may be considered unfit for service and returned to Canada. That may be the explanation in the case mentioned by the hon. member. I have not been given the number of that man, but I shall get it from the hon. gentleman and look up the case.

Then the hon. member said no attention was paid to the certificates of civilian doctors. I say to him that the army doctors do examine the certificates of civilian doctors, but after all, the army doctors are responsible for the examination and it would not do for them to say, "We took the certificate of a civilian doctor." They are there to conduct these examinations; and in carrying out their responsibility I take it that they accepted this man who later was discharged, as the hon. member says, after he contracted a cold while at camp.

I think those are the cases to which the hon. gentleman referred. In this same connection, since he discussed medical matters, I want to deal with just one other matter he mentioned a day or two ago. He made what I considered to be an entirely unjustified attack on a very efficient officer and on the officers of this department as well, when he referred to the medical officer of military district No. 5 and suggested that he was kept there because of political considerations. The service of the officer in question dates from November 1, 1920, when he was appointed a provisional lieutenant. He became a lieutenant on December 1, 1922, a captain on May 1, 1925, and a major on October 18, 1935. In August, 1938, five years ago and a year before the war, he was recommended by the district officer commanding military district No. 5 for appointment as deputy district medical officer.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Was he a permanent officer?

Mr. RALSTON: No; he was in the militia at the time, I understand. The report on him reads:

> Major J. Mercier is an active officer, popular with all the other medical officers. He takes a keen interest in the training of the non-permanent active militia and has a valuable experience in administrative work in military hospitals, having been employed as acting officer in command, Quebec military hospital, for six months in 1937-38. His service during the present war dates from the 2nd September, 1939.

[Mr. Ralston.]

In December, 1939, it was recommended that he be appointed district medical officer, effective 8th January, 1940. The report I have on him is that he is spoken of very highly by the district officer commanding district No. 5. There is no suggestion anywhere that his appointment was influenced in any way, or that his retention in his position is influenced in any way by political considerations of any kind, nor is there any suggestion that his work has been affected by political considerations. I may add that the director general of medical services has always held a high opinion of the services of this officer. I happen to know the officer in question, as a matter of fact; I met him on one or two occasions while on inspection trips to Quebec, and I want to pay tribute to Lieutenant-Colonel Mercier as a conscientious, efficient and loyal officer, absolutely detached in his work and doing everything possible for the good of the services, with no other motive whatever in mind.

There is another matter on which I may speak, since I am dealing with the remarks of the hon. member. The other day he asked me to give him the reference to the Army Act which was included in order in council P.C. 9372 of December 7, 1943, and any other amendments to the order in council. The part of the Army Act to which he refers is section 176, which lists all persons subject to military law as soldiers and to whom the Army Act applies. Among those persons described in subsection 10 of the order in council are the following:

> All persons not otherwise subject to military law who are followers or accompany His Majesty's troops, or any portion thereof, when employed on active service; subject to this qualification that, where any such persons are employed by or are followers of, or accompany any portion of, His Majesty's forces, consisting partly of His Majesty's Indian forces subject to Burma military law, and such persons are native of India or, as the case may be, natives of Burma, they shall be subject to Indian military law or, as the case may be, to Burma military law.

The reference to that section is for the purpose of indicating that persons who are called up under the National Resources Mobilization Act and have not yet been enlisted are, for the time being, subject to military law; and particularly included as persons not otherwise subject to military law are followers of or those accompanying His Majesty's troops. The hon. member asked the effect of this amendment. I endeavoured to point out while he was speaking—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Would the minister say something more about that? I found it very difficult to follow. What is the subject matter?

Mr. RALSTON: The subject matter is the National Resources Mobilization Act and regulations, and the question is: what do you do with a man, and under whose jurisdiction is he, when he has reported for training but has not been actually sworn in. For the time being he is made subject to military law by this section, by the incorporation of a reference to the Army Act. The effect of the amendment to which the hon. member referred is very slight, as I endeavoured to point out. It is merely to delete the word "training" in two places in section 26 of order in council P.C. 7989, so that the references therein to training centres are made to apply to centres generally. The inclusion of that paragraph gives the army control of the individual during the time he is at a military establishment pending enrolment or rejection.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I should like to put on record the answers to some inquiries which have been made, and which I think should be answered before we conclude the discussion of these estimates. The hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church) asked that we put on record a table similar to the one put on record last year, showing the rates of pay in the corresponding ranks of the army, navy and air force. I have had a copy prepared and, with the consent of the committee, I would ask that it be placed on *Hansard*. It is useful for the purpose of reference, because there are changes from year to year.

The CHAIRMAN: With the unanimous consent of the committee it may be placed on the record.

The statement follows:

Rates of Pay and Allowances—Canadian Army (Active)

Rank	Rate	Allowance per Diem			Single per Diem		Married per Diem		
							In Quarters		
	Pay per diem	Sub-sistence	Dependents' allowance for wife	Dependents' allowance for 1 child	In quarters	Out of quarters	No children	One child	Two children
Major-General	$20.00	$1.70	$2.07	$ .46	$20.00	$21.70	$22.07	$22.53	$22.93
Brigadier	16.00	1.70	2.07	.46	16.00	17.70	18.07	18.53	18.93
Colonel	12.00	1.70	2.07	.46	12.00	13.70	14.07	14.53	14.93
Lieutenant-Colonel	10.00	1.70	2.07	.46	10.00	11.70	12.07	12.53	12.93
Major	7.75	1.70	1.90	.46	7.75	9.45	9.65	10.11	10.51
Captain	6.50	1.70	1.74	.46	6.50	8.20	8.24	8.70	9.10
Lieutenant	5.00	1.70	1.57	.46	5.00	6.70	6.57	7.03	7.43
2nd Lieutenant	4.25	1.70	1.57	.46	4.25	5.95	5.82	6.28	6.68
Warrant Officer Class 1 "A"	4.20	1.25	1.40	.46	4.20	5.45	5.60	6.06	6.46
Warrant Officer Class 1 "B"	3.90	1.25	1.40	.46	3.90	5.15	5.30	5.76	6.16
R.Q.M.S., S.Q.M.S., Q.M.S.	3.10	1.25	1.24	.46	3.10	4.35	4.34	4.80	5.20
Sqdn., Bty. or Coy. Sgt.-Major	3.00	1.25	1.24	.46	3.00	4.25	4.24	4.70	5.10
Sqdn., Bty. or Coy. Q.M.S.	2.50	1.25	1.24	.46	2.50	3.75	3.74	4.20	4.60
Staff Sergeant	2.50	1.25	1.24	.46	2.50	3.75	3.74	4.20	4.60
Sergeant	2.20	1.25	1.24	.46	2.20	3.45	3.44	3.90	4.30
Lance Sergeant	1.90	1.25	1.24	.46	1.90	3.15	3.14	3.60	4.00
Corporal or Bombardier	1.70	1.25	1.24	.46	1.70	2.95	2.94	3.40	3.80
Lance Corporal or Lance Bombardier	1.60	1.25	1.24	.46	1.60	2.85	2.84	3.30	3.70
Trooper, Gunner, Pte., etc., (after 6 months service)	1.50	1.25	1.24	.46	1.50	2.75	2.74	3.20	3.60
Trooper, Gunner, Pte., etc., (after 4 months (service)	1.40	1.25	1.24	.46	1.40	2.65	2.64	3.10	3.50
Trooper, Gunner, Pte., etc., (on enlistment)	1.30	1.25	1.24	.46	1.30	2.55	2.54	3.00	3.40
Boy	.70	1.25	.....	.....	.70	1.95	.....	.....	.....

NOTE:—

Officers—Command Pay at $1.00 per diem and Additional Pay at $0.50 per diem for Adjutants and Officers

Other Ranks—Warrant Officers, N.C.O's and men employed as tradesmen in capacities and under such limita- the Unit to which they belong, are entitled to receive tradesmen's pay at .25¢ or .50¢, or .75¢ per diem

NOTE:—

Dependents' Allowance (Officers)—Dependents' Allowance to wife is payable monthly, Major-General to Lieutenant $47.20 per month. Dependents' Allowance is also payable on a monthly basis at the following fourth, fifth and sixth child $8.00 each per month.

Dependents' Allowance (Other Ranks)—Dependents' Allowance is payable monthly, for W.O. I $42.20 per Officers.

Office of the Paymaster-General,
OTTAWA, Ontario,
February, 1944.

Rates of Pay and Allowances—Canadian Army (Active)

Married per Diem			Single per Annum		Married per Annum					
Out of Quarters			In quarters	Out of quarters	In Quarters			Out of Quarters		
No children	One child	Two children			No children	One child	Two children	No. children	One child	Two children
$23.77	$24.23	$24.63	$7,300.00	$7,920.50	$8,046.40	$8,213.44	$8,357.44	$8,666.90	$8,833.94	$8,977.94
19.77	20.23	20.63	5,840.00	5,460.50	6,586.40	6,753.44	6,897.44	7,206.90	7,373.94	7,517.94
15.77	16.23	16.63	4,380.00	5,000.50	5,126.50	5,293.44	5,437.44	5,746.90	5,913.94	6,057.94
13.77	14.23	14.63	3,650.00	4,270.50	4.396.40	4,563.44	4,707.44	5,016.90	5,183.94	5,327.94
11.35	11.81	12.21	2,828.75	3,449.25	3,515.15	3,682.19	3,826.19	4,135.65	4,302.68	4,446.69
9.90	10.36	10.76	2,372.50	2,993.00	2,998.90	3,165.94	3,309.94	3,619.40	3,786.44	3,930.44
8.27	8.73	9.13	1,825.00	2,445.50	2,391.40	2,558.44	2,702.44	3,011.90	3,178.94	3,322.94
7.52	7.98	8.38	1,551.25	2,171.75	2,117.65	2,284.69	2,428.69	2,738.15	2,905.19	3,049.19
6.85	7.31	7.71	1,533.00	1,989.25	2,039.40	2,206.44	2,350.44	2,495.65	2,662.69	2,806.69
6.55	7.01	7.41	1,423.50	1,879.75	1,929.90	2,096.94	2,240.94	2,386.15	2,553.19	2,697 19
5.59	6.05	6.45	1,131.50	1,587.75	1,577.90	1,744.94	1,888.94	2,034.15	2,201.19	2,345.19
5.49	5.95	6.35	1,095.00	1,551.25	1,541.40	1,708.44	1,852.44	1,997.65	2,164.69	2,308.69
4.99	5.45	5.85	912.50	1,368.75	1,358.90	1,525.94	1,669.94	1,815.15	1,982.19	2,126.19
4.99	5.45	5.85	912.50	1,368.75	1,358.90	1,525.94	1,669.94	1,815.15	1,982.19	2,126.19
4.69	5.15	5.55	803.00	1,259.25	1,249.40	1,416.44	1,560.44	1,705.65	1,872.69	2,016.69
4.39	4.85	5.25	693.50	1,149.75	1,139.90	1,306.94	1,450.94	1,596.15	1,763.19	1,907.19
4.19	4.65	5.05	620.50	1,076.75	1,066.90	1,233.94	1,377.94	1,523.15	1,690.19	1,834.19
4.09	4.55	4.95	584.00	1,040.25	1,030.40	1,197.44	1,341.44	1,486.65	1,653.69	1,796.69
3.99	4.45	4.85	547.75	1,003.75	993.90	1,160.94	1,304.94	1,450.15	1,617.19	1,761.19
3.89	4.35	4.75	511.00	967.25	957.40	1,124.44	1,268.44	1,413.65	1,580.69	1,724.69
3.79	4.25	4.65	474.50	930.75	920.90	1,087.94	1,231.94	1,377.15	1,544.19	1,688.19
.....	.....	.....	255.50	711.75	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

extra-regimentally employed is also payable.

tions and conditions as authorized by the Minister, if qualified and approved by the Officer Commanding in addition to rates shown above.

Lt.-Colonel $62.20 per month; Major $57.20 per month; Captain $52.20 per month; Lieutenant and 2nd rates—for the first child $13.92 per month; second child $12.00 per month; third child $10.00 per month;

month, W.O. II and below $37.20 per month. Allowances for children are same as listed above for

Pay and Allowances—Royal Canadian Navy—Army—Air Force

—	Allowance per Diem				Single per Diem		Married per Diem		
							In Quarters		
	Pay per Diem	Subsistence	Dependents	Two Children	In Quarters	Out of Quarters	No Child	One Child	Two Children
Captain.....(N)	$15.00	$ 2.10	$ 2.07	$ 0.86	$ 15.00	$ 17.10	$ 17.07	$ 17.53	$ 17.93
Colonel.....(A)	12.00	1.70	2.07	0.86	12.00	13.70	14.07	14.53	14.93
Group Captain.....(AF)	13.00	1.70	2.07	0.86	13.00	14.70	15.07	15.53	15.93
Commander.....(N)	10.00	1.85	2.07	0.86	10.00	11.85	12.07	12.53	12.93
Lieutenant-Colonel.....(A) Wing Commander.....(AF)	10.00	1.70	2.07	0.86	10.00	11.70	12.07	12.53	12.93
Lieutenant Commander..(N)	7.50	1.70	1.90	0.86	7.50	9.20	9.40	9.86	10.26
Major.....(A) Squadron Leader.....(AF)	7.75	1.70	1.90	0.86	7.75	9.45	9.65	10.11	10.51
Lieutenant.....(N)	6.00	1.70	1.74	0.86	6.00	7.70	7.74	8.20	8.60
Captain.....(A) Flight Lieutenant.....(AF)	6.50	1.70	1.74	0.86	6.50	8.20	8.24	8.70	9.10
Sub-Lieutenant.....(N) Lieutenant.....(A) Flying Officer.....(AF)	5.00	1.70	1.57	0.86	5.00	6.70	6.57	7.03	7.43
Prob. Sub-Lieutenant...(N) 2nd Lieutenant.....(A) Pilot Officer.....(AF)	4.25	1.70	1.57	0.86	4.25	5.95	5.82	6.28	6.68

Navy Officers

Allowances to Officers specialized in certain branches of the service and Command and Staff pay are authorized in addition to basic pay. Rates vary according to the rank of the Officer and degree of responsibility and qualifications.

Army Officers

Command Pay at $1.00 per diem and Additiona Pay at $0.50 per diem for Adjutants and Officers extra-regimentally employed, is also payable.

Paymaster-General's Branch,
Ottawa, Ontario,
February, 1944.

Pay and Allowances—Royal Canadian Navy—Army—Air Force

MARRIED PER DIEM

IN QUARTERS				OUT OF QUARTERS						
Three children	Four children	Five children	Six children	No child	One child	Two children	Three children	Four children	Five children	Six children
$18.26	$18.52	$18.78	$19.04	$19.17	$19.63	$20.03	$20.36	$20.62	$20.88	$21.14
15.26	15.52	15.78	16.04	15.77	16.23	16.63	16.93	17.22	17.48	17.74
16.26	16.52	16.78	17.04	16.77	17.23	17.63	17.96	18.22	18.48	18.74
13.26	13.52	13.78	14.04	13.92	14.38	14.78	15.11	15.36	15.63	15.89
13.26	13.52	13.78	14.04	13.77	14.23	14.63	14.96	15.22	15.48	15.74
10.59	10.85	11.11	11.37	11.10	11.56	11.96	12.29	12.55	12.81	13.07
10.84	11.10	11.36	11.62	11.35	11.81	12.21	12.54	12.80	13.06	13.32
8.93	9.15	9.41	9.67	9.44	9.90	10.30	10.63	10.89	11.15	11.51
9.43	9.69	9.95	10.21	9.94	10.40	10.40	11.13	11.39	11.65	11.91
7.76	8.02	8.28	8.54	8.27	8.73	9.13	9.46	9.72	9.98	10.24
7.01	7.27	7.53	7.79	7.52	7.98	8.38	8.71	8.97	9.23	9.49

AIR FORCE OFFICERS

The above rates for Air Force Officers are for Non-Flying List; General List $2.00 per diem more.

Command Pay at $1.00 per diem and Additional Pay at $0.50 per diem for Adjutants and Officers extra-regimentally employed, is also payable.

Pay and Allowances—Royal Canadian Navy—Army—Air Force

—	Allowances per Diem				Single per Diem		Married per Diem		
							In Quarters		
	Pay per diem	Sub-sistence	Depen-dents	Two children	In quarters	Out of quarters	No child	One child	Two children
Warrant Officer.....(N)	$4.75	$1.70	$1.40	$ .86	$5.75	$7.45	$6.15	$6.61	$7.01
W.O. 1st Class "A"..(A) / W.O. 1.....(AF)	4.20	1.25	1.40	.86	5.45	5.45	5.60	6.06	6.46
Chief Petty Officer...(N)	2.80	1.25	1.24	.86	2.80	4.05	4.04	4.50	4.80
Quarter Master Sgt...(A) / W.O. II.....(AF)	3.10	1.25	1.24	.86	3.10	3.35	4.34	4.80	5.20
Petty Officer.....(N)	2.40	1.25	1.24	.86	2.40	3.65	3.64	4.10	4.50
Staff Sergeant.....(A) / Flight Sergeant.....(AF)	2.50	1.25	1.24	.86	2.50	3.75	3.74	4.20	4.60
Leading Seaman.....(N)	2.10	1.25	1.24	.86	2.10	3.35	3.34	3.80	4.20
Sergeant.....(A) / Sergeant.....(AF)	2.20	1.25	1.24	.86	2.20	5.45	3.44	3.90	4.30
Able Seaman.....(N)	1.85	1.25	1.24	.86	1.85	3.10	3.09	3.55	3.95
Corporal.....(A) / Corporal.....(AF)	1.70	1.25	1.24	.86	1.70	2.95	2.94	3.40	3.80
Pte., etc. (after 6 months).....(A) / Leading Aircraftsman (AF)	1.50	1.25	1.24	.86	1.50	2.75	2.24	3.20	3.60
Pte, etc. (after 4 months).....(A) / Aircraftsman, Class I.(AF)	1.40	1.25	1.24	.86	1.40	2.65	2.64	3.10	3.50
Ordinary Seaman....(N)	1.25	1.25	1.24	.86	1.25	2.50	2.49	2.95	3.35
Pte. etc. (on enlist-ment).....(A) / Aircraftsman, Class 2.(AF)	1.30	1.25	1.24	.86	1.30	2.55	2.54	3.00	3.40
Boy.....(N)	.50	1.25	.....	.....	.50	1.75	.....	.....	.....
Boy.....(A) / Boy.....(AF)	.70	1.25	.....	.....	.70	1.95	.....	.....	.....

Navy Other Ranks

Non-substantive pay and miscellaneous allowances for special duty are authorized for certain ratings. Rates vary from 5c. per diem to 50c. per diem according to rating, qualification and experience. Skilled tradesmen are entered in their own branch on rates of pay which exceed the Seaman's rate by from 10c. to $1.00 per diem.

Army Other Ranks

Warrant Officer, N.C.O's and Men employed as tradesmen in capacities and under such limitations and conditions as authorized by the Minister, if qualified and approved by the Officer Commanding the Unit to which they belong are entitled to receive tradesmen's pay .25c., .50c. or .75c. per diem, in addition to rates shown above.

Office of the Paymaster-General,
Ottawa, Ontario,
February, 1944.

Pay and Allowances—Royal Canadian Navy—Army—Air Force

MARRIED PER DIEM

IN QUARTERS				OUT OF QUARTERS						
Three children	Four children	Five children	Six children	No child	One child	Two children	Three children	Four children	Five children	Six children
$7.34	$7.60	$7.86	$8.12	$7.85	$8.31	$8.71	$9.04	$9.30	$9.56	$9.82
6.79	7.05	7.31	7.57	6.85	7.31	7.71	8.04	8.30	8.56	8.82
5.23	5.49	5.75	6.01	5.29	5.75	6.15	6.48	6.74	7.00	7.26
5.53	5.79	6.05	6.31	5.59	6.05	6.45	6.78	7.04	7.30	7.56
4.83	5.09	5.35	5.61	4.89	5.35	5.75	6.08	6.34	6.60	6.86
4.93	5.19	5.45	5.71	4.99	5.45	5.85	6.18	6.44	6.70	6.96
4.35	4.79	5.05	5.31	4.59	5.05	5.45	5.78	6.04	6.30	6.56
4.63	4.89	5.15	5.41	4.69	5.15	5.55	5.88	6.14	6.40	6.66
4.28	5.54	5.80	6.06	4.34	4.80	5.20	5.53	5.79	6.05	6.31
4.13	4.39	4.65	4.91	4.19	4.65	5.05	5.38	5.64	5.90	6.16
3.93	4.19	4.45	4.71	3.99	4.45	4.85	5.18	5.44	4.70	5.96
3.83	4.09	4.35	4.61	3.89	4.35	4.75	5.08	5.34	5.60	5.86
3.68	3.94	4.20	4.46	3.74	4.20	4.60	4.93	5.19	5.45	5.71
3.73	3.99	4.25	4.51	3.79	4.25	4.65	4.98	5.24	5.50	5.76
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

DEPENDENTS' ALLOWANCE

Dependents' Allowance for the three Services is the same. Payable on a monthly basis the allowance to wife of a W.O.I and similar rank in the Navy is $42.20 per month. From W.O.II to Private, and corresponding ranks in the Navy and Air Force, the allowance is $37.20 per month. Allowances for children is the same for all three Services—First child $13.92 per month, 2nd child $12.00 per month, 3rd child $10.00 per month, 4th, 5th and 6th child $8.00 each per month.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Does that take in members of the C.W.A.C.?

Mr. RALSTON: I do not think it does, but I can have that information looked up. As the hon. member knows, they receive eighty per cent of the pay received by the men.

A question was asked by the hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. Castleden) as to the facilities for military hospitals in Canada. He asked how many cases are being dealt with under the army system, and the facilities for increase. If the committee will permit, I shall file a list of the military hospitals in Canada. I am not filing a list of the individual bed capacity. I am saying to the committee however that the aggregate bed capacity is about 12,000.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is a ratio of about five per cent.

Mr. RALSTON: About six per cent.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: That is exclusive of the Department of Pensions and National Health.

Mr. RALSTON: Yes. This paragraph will be noted:

Recent surveys of several camps and training centres in Canada have been undertaken to find where hospital bed space could most satisfactorily be provided in case the existing resources should become overtaxed. The five casualty retraining centres presently being developed can quickly and easily be taken into hospital accommodation if that should become necessary and the soldiers under casualty retraining moved to other quarters which can be made available. Sufficient hospital facilities can be made available for any likely need.

The detailed answer to the question of the hon. member for Yorkton, which with unanimous consent will be placed on *Hansard*, is as follows:

A—Camp Hospitals

Military district—Hospital:

M.D. No. 1—Kitchener M.H., Woodstock M.H., Chatham M.H., Ipperwash M.H.

M.D. No. 2—Niagara M.H., Camp Borden M.H., Brantford M.H., North Bay M.H., Newmarket M.H., Brampton M.H., Orillia M.H., Simcoe M.H.

M.D. No. 3—Barriefield M.H., Petawawa M.H., Brockville M.H., Cornwall M.H., Peterborough M.H.

M.D. No. 4—St. John's M.H., Longueuil M.H., Farnham M.H., Joliette M.H., Sherbrooke M.H., St. Jerome M.H., Sorel M.H.

M.D. No. 5—Valcartier M.H.

M.D. No. 6—Aldershot M.H., Sydney M.H., Debert M.H., Mulgrave M.H., Shelburne M.H., Yarmouth M.H., New Glasgow M.H., Charlottetown M.H., Dartmouth M.H.

M.D. No. 7—Sussex M.H., Edmundston M.H., Utopia M.H.

M.D. No. 10—Brandon M.H., Shilo Camp M.H.

Pacific Command—Nanaimo M.H., Vernon M.H., Gordon Head M.H., Prince George M.H., Chilliwack M.H., Alberni M.H., Terrace M.H.

M.D. No. 12—Dundurn M.H., Prince Albert M.H., Maple Creek M.H.

M.D. No. 13—Calgary M.H., Red Deer M.H., Camrose M.H., Peace River M.H., Suffield M.H., Wetaskiwin M.H., Vermilion M.H.

B—Internment Camp Hospitals

M.D. No. 2—Internment Camp No. 20, Internment Camp No. 23.

M.D. No. 3—Internment Camp No. 30, Internment Camp No. 33.

M.D. No. 4—Internment Camp No. 42.

M.D. No. 7—Internment Camp No. 70.

M.D. No. 10—Internment Camp No. 101.

M.D. No. 13—Internment Camp No. 130, Internment Camp No. 132, Internment Camp No. 133.

C—Casualty Retraining Centres

No. 1 Casualty Retraining Centre.
No. 2 " " "
No. 3 " " "
No. 4 " " "
No. 5 " " "

D—Other than Camp Military Hospitals

M.D. No. 1—London M.H.

M.D. No. 2—Hamilton M.H., Chorley Park M.H.

M.D. No. 3—Kingston M.H., Rideau M.H.

M.D. No. 4—Montreal M.H.

M.D. No. 5—Quebec M.H., Arvida M.H.

M.D. No. 6—Halifax M.H.

M.D. No. 7—St. James M.H., Gaspe M.H., Fredericton M.H.

M.D. No. 10—Fort Osborne M.H.

Pacific Command—Vancouver M.H., Victoria M.H., Prince Rupert M.H., York Island M.H.

M.D. No. 12—Regina M.H., Saskatoon M.H.

M.D. No. 13—Edmonton M.H.

E—Facilities for Increase of Hospital Beds

Recent surveys of several camps and training centres in Canada have been undertaken to find where hospital bed space could most satisfactorily be provided in case the existing resources should become overtaxed. The five Casualty Retraining Centres presently being developed can quickly and easily be taken into hospital accommodation if that should become necessary, and the soldiers under casualty retraining moved to other quarters which can be made available. Sufficient hospital facilities can be made available for any likely need.

GS-SD3-258
29 Feb. 44

Of course that is hospital accommodation for those in the army. The accommodation for those discharged is provided by the Department of Pensions and National Health.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I thank the minister for his answer.

Mr. RALSTON: The hon. member for Yorkton referred to another matter, and I mention it now only because it occasioned some public interest, and I do not wish the record to remain as it is without indicating what the facts were. This referred to a man who had been prosecuted in Montreal for appearing in uniform.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): There was a case of the kind in Halifax, was there not?

Mr. RALSTON: I shall not go into the matter extensively, except to say that the record shows the man enlisted a first time and, upon discharge, received the $35 clothing allowance for which provision was then made. He enlisted again, and had sixteen months' overseas service. He was discharged again and received $65 clothing allowance. When discharged in January, 1944, he was wearing civilian clothes and had actually turned in his uniform. When arrested he was wearing army battle dress, which had been made for him by some local firm and decorated with R.A.F. wings, cadet shoulder badges, and signal corps overseas patches. So that there was not much he had missed. He had represented himself as being overseas for four years, and being in Canada to take an officer's training course. Actually he had been overseas sixteen months, and of course he was not in Canada to take a course. He is reported to have been charged by the military authorities on two different occasions with the impersonation of warrant officers, while in civilian clothes, and several other minor charges were laid against him. This, of course, was a civilian case. The hon. member for Yorkton was attracted by the newspaper publicity which was given, in which it was suggested that this was a case in which a man who had been a soldier was being persecuted by the civilian authorities. Of course the prosecution was not brought by the army at all; it was brought by the civilian authorities.

The hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) referred to a man in Camp Borden whose case was being dealt with by the provincial police. I believe the hon. member felt that the soldier in question was being harshly treated. I suggested at the time that it sounded to me as if the charge would be one of theft under the criminal code. I find that that is so. The charge was that he did on or about January 14, 1944, steal one 38-calibre Smith and Wesson revolver, the property of the Department of National Defence. The case was investigated and the charge was laid by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. A military charge by court-martial might have been made against him. But when a case is referred to the R.C.M.P. and they intimate a desire to prosecute, it is customary to leave it to them if the offence is civil. That principle is recognized in the manual of military law. I believe I gave the committee my judgment with regard to that principle the other night.

The paragraph in the manual of military law is:

> But in the United Kingdom, in the dominions, and in most of the colonies, where there are regular civil courts close by, it is, as a general rule, desirable to try by a civil court a civil offence committed by a person subject to military law if the offence is one which relates to the property or person of a civilian, or if the civil authorities intimate a desire to bring the case before a civil court.

In this case, as a matter of fact, the R.C.M.P. did not refer the case to the military authorities. If they had done so, and intimated the desire to bring the case before the civil courts, the suggestion would have been concurred in, because the investigation had been handled by the R.C.M.P. and they had obtained the evidence. The case had a definite civil aspect. On the hearing of this charge, as on the hearing of any other criminal charge, the witnesses, whether they be civilian or members of the armed forces, are represented to the civil authorities, and attend and give evidence, and can be compelled to do so.

In this instance the hon. member indicated he did not see any officer present. My information is that the officer of Corporal Pavlov namely, Lieutenant J. A. McPhail, did attend at the trial. Under the provisions of K.R. & O. 484, it is provided that in case of a civil offence, where a trial takes place anywhere in the vicinity of where a man's unit is situated, the commanding officer shall detail an officer to attend. The officer does not attend for the purpose of defending the man, but rather attends for the purpose of giving the court all possible information. I believe the practice is that officers who attend help to see to it that the man is informed of what his rights are. I know the provisions of K.R. & O. are such that an officer is forbidden, for instance, to give any information with regard to minor offences which an accused might have committed, because such information might prejudice his case. That information is regarded as privileged.

It is not the policy to employ civil counsel at the expense of the public for a soldier charged with committing a civil offence, but my information is that this corporal was defended by a civilian lawyer whom he himself

employed. No request was made by him for assistance from his commanding officer to obtain counsel.

The hon. member for Yale asked with regard to men who had taken an army course, and who had either been selected or not been selected as potential officer material. I indicated to him that men who were not selected as potential officer material were informed of the fact, but were considered for technical or specialist training, and would be given the opportunity to take that training if possible. I said I did not find in the regulations the same provision with respect to those who were selected. I find that the regulation has been amended. I cannot tell my hon. friend whether I was reading the amended regulation or not. In the statement that was given me I find that that phrase was omitted. It is the fact that those who are selected may be considered for technical or specialist training in such work as surveys, radio direction finding, signals, et cetera, and they will be given the opportunity, if selected, of commencing or continuing such training. I said that I did not find that in the statement I read to my hon. friend, but it is there.

Mr. STIRLING: That covers army training courses Nos. 1 and 2?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes. The hon. member for Yale (Mr. Stirling) also asked for a breakdown by districts of deserters. I will put it on the record:

Breakdown of Deserters by Districts

Military district	General service	N.R.M.A.	C.W.A.C.	Total
M.D. No. 1	766	61	11	838
M.D. No. 2	1,106	256	30	1,392
M.D. No. 3	441	151	8	600
M.D. No. 4	1,699	2,077	18	3,794
M.D. No. 5	862	1,541	3	2,406
M.D. No. 6	108	32	2	142
M.D. No. 7	147	80	..	227
M.D. No. 10	331	248	..	579
Pacific Command	385	92	3	480
M.D. No. 12	164	126	4	294
M.D. No. 13	220	120	1	341
United Kingdom	1	....	..	1
Total	6,230	4,784	80	11,094

Note—The above figures do not include those employed under G.O. 139/39.

The hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) asked me with regard to the Edmundston training centre. I told him I did not think it had been closed, and I was correct in that. It was reduced from a two-company training centre, with a capacity of 500, to a one-company with a capacity of 250 in October, 1943, as part of the general reorganization.

Somebody asked last night in regard to dental treatment accorded to officers vis-à-vis other ranks. The particular question was whether porcelain inlays were provided. My information is that where porcelain inlays are indicated the standard treatment in the army is to use synthetic porcelain, which is what is generally used in civilian practice. I also confirm what I said last night, that there is no difference between the treatment given to officers and to other ranks. In certain cases alternative treatment is obtainable, but that is open to all ranks.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mr. Chairman, I have not taken up much time on these estimates and I do not intend to do so at this stage, but there are a few inquiries I want to make. First, what steps are being taken by the medical services of the army to see that such an occurrence as took place last autumn in the city of Fredericton is not repeated? I do not intend to go over that particular case again. The damage has been done; the man is dead; he left no dependents, and it would not do any good to rake up the situation to-day. It would only harrow the feelings of his relatives. But if nothing better comes out of it than that there has been a reorganization of the medical services in connection with the induction of volunteers and draftees into the army at Fredericton, I shall have been at least in some degree rewarded for the trouble I took in connection with this matter. The fact of the matter is, I think, that there were not sufficient medical men on duty, and I have

grave doubts as to the calibre of some of those who were there. I should like the minister to tell me whether the position has been corrected so that there is no possibility whatever of any repetition of what I consider—I was going to say gross negligence, but I will not use that term; I will say negligence in connection with the reception of men into the army at Fredericton. If the minister is not able to answer to-day he can do so at a later stage.

The second inquiry I desire to make of the minister is in connection with Camp Sussex. This is an old military camp in New Brunswick. It has been in the ownership and operation of the department for annual drill and that sort of thing since the days of Sir George Foster, which go back prior to 1896. Sir George Foster was member for Kings when the camp was established. When this war came on, Camp Sussex, of course, was greatly extended and over a period of time a large number of troops were stationed there. It was used as a depot, I suppose, for the eastern command, where the men would be readily available to be sent here, there and everywhere in case of invasion, and also could be used as an embarkation point for overseas. It served a useful purpose. In recent months the army has been pretty well evacuated from Sussex; I understand that there have been very few troops there. My attention was called to an article in a Saint John morning paper of yesterday in which it is stated that the army is starting up a new officers' school at Camp Sussex. I thought we had a great many of these schools all over the country and that some of them were being closed. It is information I am seeking. It may be of interest to hon. members to know that the newspaper in question states that Brigadier Gregg, sergeant-at-arms of this house, is to be the commander of that school, which so far as I am concerned is quite all right.

The third question I desire to ask, and I am curious that it has not been asked before, arises out of the enlistment of so many women in the armed forces, in the army, the navy and the air force. It seems to me that the custom has grown up, in Ottawa at all events and in other centres, of buying at the public expense some of the largest and most expensive residences in the city for barracks for these young ladies, on the theory, I suppose, that nothing is too good for the Waacs or the Wrens or the Waves or the Spars, or whatever they may be called. But it is a curious policy, it seems to me, for the government to make capital expenditures of that kind on buildings which cannot possibly be of any great benefit to the country in the post-war period. My suggestion to the minister is that if these quarters are required, and I quite agree that quarters, and respectable quarters are required, they should be taken over under the authority of the government for the duration only, and compensation paid. The country should not have loaded on it these expensive homes at high prices. That is a policy that has always struck me as being, shall I say, extravagant. We have had the spectacle of the winter club at Winnipeg being taken over by one branch of the service. We had the spectacle of a life insurance company in Montreal being bailed out in connection with the Winter club there when the government took over a bankrupt institution and saved the bondholders from loss, when all the government had to do was to say they wanted the Winter club in Montreal and take it over, pay compensation for it and hand it back to the owners when the war was over. That, it seems to me, would have been business, but instead of that we have these expensive buildings on Peel street, Montreal, for instance. I might tell the minister that a very prominent business man and, I think a friend of his, was shocked about that transaction.

I can name a number of others of the same kind. There is an ancient place of residence in Halifax that the minister and I and his associates know well, which forty odd years ago was a boarding house called Hillside Hall. It must be at least a hundred years old. It was taken over by one of the army services. If it was necessary to have that building, why was it purchased? Why was it not just rented for the duration, and then handed back? But now we are to have Hillside Hall off the assessment rolls of Halifax, just as is happening with properties here at Ottawa and elsewhere that have been taken over by the government. That policy is bad policy, I suggest to the minister, and there ought to be some explanation of why such a policy is pursued. I am not suggesting that these young women, many of whom, indeed all of whom, come from good homes, do not need good barrack room and living conditions. But I might contrast what is being done for them with what I understand is the plight of thirty young men, every one of whom is a potential flying officer now under training in this city at either Rockcliffe or Uplands—I am not sure which—for whom no barrack room has been provided. This is not in the minister's department but in that of his colleague.

Mr. RALSTON: I have got 900 of them in Ottawa.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): For whom no barrack room is provided?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Well, that is a sad situation. I do not know what the minister is going to do about it. These young men should not be brought here if you have not proper living accommodation for them.

Mr. RALSTON: We have to have them.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I will tell the minister what happens in this case. These young men, all of whom of course are volunteers, get the per diem allowance which every enlisted man receives. There is no place for them to eat or sleep, as there should be under the regulations and in accordance with what this country is supposed to provide, but they have a sustenance allowance of $1.25. How can any respectable young man live in Ottawa and pay for a room and three square meals a day on $1.25? It just cannot be done. What is the result? One of these lads told me personally that the allowance is so small that for the last four days in the month they have one meal a day, and they double up, perhaps treble up, in their rooms. I do not think that that is creditable—really I don't.

Mr. RALSTON: This is the air force.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): This is the air force; but I am satisfied from what the minister said that there must be conditions of the kind in the army.

Mr. RALSTON: None of my officers has told me that.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Perhaps the minister will find out if he makes inquiries. This may have a reecho from some person who is in that condition. I am not apologizing for bringing the matter forward, because I was shocked to find that a fine young man, a potential flying officer, one who will probably do a grand job, who perhaps is going to give his life for this country, is asked to live on $1.25 a day and find board and lodging in Ottawa. It just cannot be done. I verified the facts through the minister himself, and he did not offer any explanation. I am going to call public attention to these conditions; for I know that the people of Canada, who give so willingly in taxation and in loans, do not want this sort of thing to happen. I am not finding fault, but somebody is responsible. I do not suggest for a minute that the minister is; probably he did not hear of it until I called his attention to it, but somebody down below knew about it and has not corrected it. I think I know what the answer is, that this is the standard allowance for the living out ration—I do not know whether I am using the right term—

Mr. RALSTON: Subsistence.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The subsistence allowance for living out. A boy might, although I doubt it, get along on $1.25 a day in a country town, but he could not get along on it in Fredericton or in Ottawa and live respectably. That is that; I am not going to say any more about it.

The other matter I have is a case which has puzzled me in connection with the dependents' allowance, and I am not sure that I should take up time to deal with an individual case; it might be better for me to go to the dependents' allowance board, as has been my practice. In this case I cannot identify the soldier by his number. I have here a letter from a woman who lives in the small town of Devon, opposite Fredericton. She represents that she was the daughter of an Indian squaw by a white father. I knew the father. They resided on the reserve, but under the Indian Act she is not an Indian—I believe that is correct. If the father is an Indian and the mother is white, she would be an Indian, but under the law she is not an Indian; she married an Indian, but he was not on the reserve; he was an Indian from the United States. She has an illegitimate child. I am putting this on record so that it may be understood. It is the most complex situation I have yet run up against in connection with dependent's allowance, and when I get through you will see that it will take more than the proverbial Philadelphia lawyer to unravel it. The woman had an illegitimate child a year prior to her marriage—I am not sure whether it was by the man she married or by somebody else. But when the husband married her, he, she says, legally adopted this child and the appropriate regulations were complied with. I am sending the minister a copy of the letter so that he can hand it over to his officials. The child is adopted. But she cannot get dependent's allowance. She is ill; she cannot get medical attendance from the Indian department because technically she is not an Indian although her mother was an Indian and she is married to an Indian and her child, surely, is an Indian.

What are we going to do about this case? Surely it calls for the exercise of common sense. Her husband is a signaller and is about to proceed overseas. If the facts are as I have stated them—as yet I have had no opportunity of verification, but they may easily be verified through the Indian agent or

through the department—she is entitled to dependent's allowance for herself, also to medical treatment from the Indian department and anything else that this government may properly give her. That is all I have to say, and here is the letter.

Mr. RALSTON: I will deal with the different points which my hon. friend has made. First, with regard to the Fredericton case. I share fully the concern expressed by my hon. friend with regard to that case. I took a personal interest in it. I saw to it that the president of the court martial and at least two of the members were men who had nothing to do in any way with the district or with the administration of medical services. The president of the court was Colonel Gilbert S. Stairs, of Montreal, king's counsel, and formerly of the 87th battalion. One member of the court was Colonel C. M. Edwards, of Ottawa, formerly of the 38th, an Ottawa battalion; and another member, Colonel K. R. Marshall, was one of the staff officers of the 4th division in the last war. I think that is sufficient assurance to those who know these gentlemen that they brought to the trial of this case a detachment, a fairness and an unbiased judgment which would commend itself to everyone.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Will the minister answer one question?

Mr. RALSTON: Certainly, if I can.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Was there any man on the court martial who ever tried a lawsuit in his life or knew anything about the law of evidence?

Mr. RALSTON: I think Colonel Stairs does.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I do not think he ever did try a lawsuit, and he would probably tell you so.

Mr. RALSTON: I believe Colonel Stairs has been practising law for thirty years.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Yes, but I do not think he ever tried a lawsuit.

Mr. RALSTON: He has a very large practice.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I do not want to reflect on him at all; he is a friend of mine. But what I could say about these courts martial would not be fit to print, and that is why I am refraining.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend has said about all he can when he has said that. I do not think he has restrained himself very much.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Oh well, I am restraining myself.

Mr. RALSTON: What I would say to my hon. friend about Colonel Stairs, and I say it in the presence of a good many barristers, is that no barrister in Canada stands higher at the bar in point of professional accomplishment or personal integrity.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Oh, I agree with that. But as to his experience in—

Mr. RALSTON: And I do not think there is any question in connection with those courts martial of the admission or non-admission of evidence. The matter was one of reasonable doubt which is to be given in these cases to the accused, and my hon. friend is not quite fair to the court, to the officers charged or to the administration of justice if he suggests anything else. These were cases of very grave concern to me and I myself directed the courts martial in all three instances.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I asked the minister to do so.

Mr. RALSTON: That has been done. The court has been held and the verdict rendered. I wish that something more could be done. There was only one possible avenue of further activity on the part of the department and I am considering that now.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I do not suggest that the minister can do anything more, except to correct the situation.

Mr. RALSTON: As regards the correction of the situation, all I can say is this. If there is anything that can be done by correction on the part of the administration, it is in the way of allocating as definitely as possible to each officer, in connection with the examination of men who are coming into the army, specific responsibility so that his particular job may be discharged and he may be chargeable if that job is not properly done.

Let me say to my hon. friend, that it is not the easiest thing in the world to get medical men to take on this job. Many of them come from exceedingly good practices, but they are doing the job in the interests of their country, and you cannot keep on attacking prominent men in the medical profession and expect the profession to stand for that sort of thing. It was done in Toronto, and there again I personally directed the court martial in connection with a case that was brought up against a medical officer. I believe the medical profession generally and some of the officers in the service felt that it was pretty harsh. As a matter of fact the medical officer was discharged in that case, and I felt it was absolutely necessary in order

to promote confidence in our medical services that the public might realize that we were not attempting to hide anything in connection with the medical administration, so that it was gone through in the full light of day, with the floodlight of publicity and newspaper reporters present. That officer was also tried by a court which was eminently fair and the case was dismissed. The same is true in the Fredericton case. I have nothing more to say about it, except this. I hope that the house will temper its judgment with consideration for the fact that we have in this country a system of justice which has worked reasonably well in civilian cases and in the army as well. I know some medical men, prominent, reputable and skilled in their profession, who consider that these courts martial at Fredericton should not have been held; nevertheless they were brought because it was considered that the medical men engaged in that matter, the man having died, would have at least to be put on their trial so that all the facts might be investigated and justice done.

In the first place, steps have been taken to see that the responsibility of every man who has anything to do with the examination of men on admission to the army is distinctly and clearly defined. I may say to my hon. friend further that we have officers travelling continually from headquarters meeting with the officers on the boards and instructing them with regard to their responsibilities and with regard to the requirements of the army as well as regarding the care, skill and thoroughness they must exercise in the examination of these individuals. My hon. friend says he thinks there should have been more men.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): More medical men.

Mr. RALSTON: From my examination of the case I do not think I agree with him. That is only an opinion—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is all mine is.

Mr. RALSTON: —and probably the medical officers will agree with him. But it seems to me there were enough medical officers there at that time to look after that case.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Does the minister have to confirm the findings and did he agree with the finding in this court martial?

Mr. RALSTON: You do not confirm the finding of not guilty, but where the finding is "guilty" that finding and the sentence have to be confirmed on the recommendation of the minister by the governor in council.

[Mr. Ralston.]

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): May I observe that I never thought there was the slightest negligence on the part of the commanding officer of the hospital, and I was astonished when I learned that he was charged. I want to have it quite clear that in my opinion there was no justification for the charge against him, except possibly in the minds of the administrators of the department, that, as the head of the hospital, he may have had some responsibility for treatment. But I never for a moment visualized negligence on his part.

Mr. RALSTON: Summaries of evidence were taken in every case, as is the practice in a civil case where evidence is taken on preliminary examination. The accused had the opportunity to be present at the taking of the summaries of evidence. These summaries were very carefully considered, and it was on these summaries that the charges were formulated on which the three officers were charged and later found not guilty.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): When the men are checked up on going into the army is there just one test, a urine test, or is a blood test taken also to determine diabetes?

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend asked me that question before.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Yes; I believe I did ask that question before.

Mr. RALSTON: I have here a note:

1. All G.S. recruits, as well as N.R.M.A., have urinalysis performed before enlistment or enrolment. The test used is that which is tendered in all up-to-date hospitals and medical centres. If the test is positive for sugar, it is repeated with a view to determining whether the case is one of true diabetes, or is the result of overindulgence in sugar, or due to some other extraneous factor. If it is felt after recheck to be a case of true diabetes the recruit is rejected and advised to see his family physician.

2. In case of doubt, a specimen is submitted to the nearest provincial laboratory for confirmation.

3. If the cause of the presence of sugar in the urine cannot be determined, the recruit is advised to consult his family physician, and is asked to return at a later date for reexamination.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): But no blood test is taken for sugar in the blood?

Mr. RALSTON: Not for sugar—does the hon. member mean a blood test for sugar?

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Yes.

Mr. RALSTON: No. The hon. member for York-Sunbury referred to Camp Sussex. Camp Sussex is being used at the present time and

the establishment is being opened for the purpose not of a general officers' training centre, but of giving a refresher course to officers who volunteer under the officer loan system which I announced in the house a short time ago—that is, officers on loan to the British army. There is a course of four weeks and they are reporting in quotas from different districts. My hon. friend is correct that the services of Brigadier Gregg, who was in charge of the Canadian school of infantry at Vernon, are used at that centre for that special purpose.

My hon. friend referred to the purchase at public expense of residences for the C.W.A.C.'s. He is a business man and I want to put to him this situation, as it has been put to me by the real estate adviser and by the deputy minister. Is it better to expropriate the use of property of that kind during a time of war, to make all the capital expenditures necessary on that account; to pay not only rent but also loss of profits and everything which may go with it, included in the expropriation, for a limited period, and then lose entirely the benefit of the capital expenditures? Or, where you have a property like a residence, which has real salvage value, is it better to purchase the property outright and have the benefit of your capital expenditure? That has been discussed time and time again, and the real estate adviser to the department, Colonel Gibson, who has had a long experience with contracts and agreements in connection with matters of the kind and the terms on which limited lease arrangements can be made, is distinctly of the opinion that it is better to purchase a property like that than to take a limited interest and lose all the capital expenditure which you make.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I suppose that is a matter of mathematical calculation; but let me tell the minister what they do in the United States. This came under my observation. In the city of St. Petersburg, which is a resort city, there are a large number of hotels. After Pearl Harbor they got rolling down there, so to speak. They commandeered the leading hotels. The same thing happened elsewhere. They did not make any great capital expenditure. They walked in and used the hotels.

Mr. RALSTON: Certainly.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): They walked in and used them.

Mr. RALSTON: That is very different.

Mr. McCANN: Hotels are different.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I agree they are somewhat different, but the principle is the same.

Mr. RALSTON: No.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I saw one hotel used as a bakery and cooking school. They had all the equipment in that hotel for the purpose. They made no capital expenditure. I went through the place. They used the hotel rooms for dormitories and the dining-room for eating purposes. Another hotel was used for dormitory and living accommodation for merchant seamen in training. They did not need any capital expenditure. The hotel I lived in was used largely as a dining-room. When the army moved out the proprietor took it over and all he had to do was redecorate the place. There were no capital changes at all. What I am afraid of now is this—and I leave this with the minister; I am not going to labour the question at all—that some people—and Ottawa is one place where they do it as well as any place I know—will take advantage of the opportunity offered to unload on the government property that is no longer required for their own personal purposes. That is an old game in Ottawa. I know I shall get whacked on the shoulders for saying that, but I know there is more truth than untruth in the statement. People buy property to unload on the country sooner or later. I have watched it for twenty years. They hope to unload it on the government. I see the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) laughing; he knows there is a large element of truth in what I have said. I think the policy of buying these houses is wrong. I may be wrong. It is a matter of judgment. That is all I have to say about it at the moment. I suppose the minister takes the advice of his expert adviser, and that is his justification. I cannot prove he is wrong. I am giving an expression of my own opinion. I have to go to a committee and therefore must leave.

Mr. RALSTON: I put the situation to the committee. I shall take the city of Halifax. In the city of Halifax we purchased the Hillside hotel.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): And how many more?

Mr. RALSTON: Let us stick to the Hillside hotel for the moment, because that is the one my hon. friend spoke of. In the city of Halifax we purchased the Hillside hotel and we leased the Waverley hotel.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): You bought the—

Mr. RALSTON: I am advised that the use of the Waverley hotel will cost us much more than we shall ever lose in connection with the Hillside hotel.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): You bought the Halifax hotel, one of the worst things that ever was done.

Mr. RALSTON: I know we bought the Halifax hotel, but I had nothing to do with it. I want to say to my hon. friend—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I have to go; I am sorry.

Mr. RALSTON: I do not think the dying declaration of my hon. friend as he leaves the chamber is quite fair.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I could come back and discuss the Halifax hotel. Let me tell the minister this: the people of Halifax know about that deal and they do not approve of it.

Mr. RALSTON: The person who took the Halifax hotel will discuss it. This is something new. We have the committee addressed from the back benches by an hon. member on his way out of the chamber. In the case of the Waverley hotel there were very strong representations from the city of Halifax. They did not want it taken off the tax roll. The result was—and I say it frankly—what may prove to be an improvident bargain made in connection with the Waverley hotel, not because of the amount paid, but I believe it was the wrong way to take it. At the same time so many representations were made on the part of the city of Halifax that it was felt by the department in this case they should lease the hotel and attempt to try out the two methods side by side. One method was to purchase the Hillside hotel, and the other was the leasing or taking the possession and the use of the Waverley hotel.

The hon. member mentioned the city of Montreal. I say to him that I think the crown will come out well in connection with the investment he mentioned in the city of Montreal. The investment in the city of Montreal was in connection with a house for the C.W.A.C.'s I would very much rather take that house under the terms under which we have it, the terms of purchase, than under a lease to use it and then have to return it at the end of the war, and to pay claims which would be made in the exchequer court for the use of the property, plus the cost of the capital expenditures necessary in order to make it livable for the purposes for which we want to use it.

My hon. friend mentioned subsistence allowance. May I say that the subsistence allowance was increased from $1 to $1.25 for other ranks not very long ago. The officers' allowance was $1.50 or $1.55. It was increased to $1.70. The hon. member was speaking of the officers of the air force. The army has a large number of young officers here. Some of these young officers are finding it hard to make ends meet so far as their subsistence is concerned. They are probably contributing something out of their pay in order to provide board for themselves. The situation is that in Ottawa it has been impossible to provide barracks for officers. It is a temporary situation. There will not always be that number of officers in Ottawa. The question was what was the best way to meet the situation as far as subsistence is concerned? I have had under consideration representations which have been made for an officers' mess. As a matter of fact active attention is being given to that matter at the moment. It was hoped that the situation would right itself but it has not happened. When we bring a young officer here we feel that something should be done. To provide barracks means capital expenditure and the purchase of a building or the erecting of one. The hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) complained about it; but we have to do either one thing or the other. I say to my hon. friend that I am just as fully alive to the difficulties of the younger officers as he is, particularly with regard to the subsistence allowance and to the fact that very often they have to go into their pockets to a certain extent. That applies to the C.W.A.C.'s who do not get as much pay as the men do.

With regard to the grotesque cases that my hon. friend has referred to in connection with dependents' allowances, I shall be glad to look into them. He has just touched the fringe of the many grotesque cases which the dependents' allowance board has. There are generally reasons or circumstances which members may not know and which explain the decision given. Let me say that these men on the board who are dealing with these matters all the time are men who have had experience, and men who have judgment. They are men who try to give consideration not simply to the letter of the law but to the merits of the case as well; and in instances where the allowance is not sufficient there is always the dependents' board of trustees to go to. I shall, of course, look into this case to which the hon. member for York-Sunbury has referred, and I shall bring it to the attention of the dependents' allowance board.

Mr. LACOMBE: I wish to make a few remarks concerning the second item.

(Translation): I notice that the estimates covering the operations of internment camps are $4,700,178 less than those of last year. Such a decrease is no doubt due to the fact that a considerable number of interned people have been released since last year. It may not be the only reason, but it is certainly one of the reasons. However, one man is still the victim of a deliberate persecution which is

tantamount to a scandal. That man has had a hearing before an advisory committee in Fredericton. During the last session I requested the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) to table all documents pertaining to that hearing. My request was turned down. Mr. Camillien Houde has asked the department of justice for a typewritten copy of the evidence he gave at that hearing.

Mr. RALSTON: I think my hon. friend is speaking of a matter which does not come under this item at all. He is speaking with regard to the rights and wrongs of the internment of an individual who happens to be in an internment camp, which is a matter that does not come within my jurisdiction. All that is covered by this item is the guarding of those in these camps. The Department of National Defence has nothing to do with the question of the merits or the reasons for internment. My department provides the buildings, the establishment, the administration and the guards, and I think my hon. friend is out of order in discussing that matter on this item.

Mr. LACOMBE: I submit respectfully that I am discussing internment operations, and that I am in order in doing so.

The CHAIRMAN: The minister has raised a proper objection. We are dealing with internment operations, and this item has nothing to do with the Department of National Defence. What I have heard discussed so far by the hon. member is a matter which pertains to the Department of Justice, so that I would ask him to abstain from discussing that subject under this item.

Mr. LACOMBE: I respect your decision, Mr. Chairman, and I shall have occasion to speak of this question later.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I have a matter I wish to bring to the attention of the minister. The only reason why I mention it in the committee is that it involves a principle and I should like to know what is being done about it. This is the case of an officer and his wife who have rented a house in the city of Toronto for nine and a half years. The owner of the house died, the property was sold by a trust company and later resold to a woman whose husband is living. She is the owner of the house, though her husband actually put up the money. This officer is in the 48th Highlanders. He joined in January, 1940, and went overseas in August of that year. He was wounded and invalided to Malta but is back with his unit again in Italy. As I say, these two people have lived in this house for nine and a half years. It is their home; it is what he is fighting for. He wants to come back to that home, and if he is lucky he will do so, but now his wife has been given notice to vacate.

The man who brought this matter to my attention has spoken to the husband of the owner, but this man has shown no sympathy whatever. Quite frankly he said that they had bought the place so that they would have a more comfortable home in which to live. When it was pointed out that there was a certain amount of uncertainty in connection with the service of this officer he simply replied that this woman was quite capable of buying a home of her own, which is not the case, and he further went on to say, "Well, he might be killed by an automobile any day." This man and his wife have bought this house in order that they may be a little more comfortable, and for that reason are going to turn out this soldier's wife who has made her home there for the past nine and a half years.

There must be some process that can be followed which would give protection to our soldiers who are overseas, and I would ask the minister if something cannot be done in cases of this kind. Surely there should be some protection for that woman whose husband is overseas fighting for us, fighting for the man who bought that house, the man who is going to take possession of the house because he and his wife want to be a little more comfortable. There must be some appeal from the rental control regulations of the wartime prices and trade board. I shall be glad to give the minister the particulars of this case; I do not want to read the letter because I do not desire to bring personalities into the discussion, but surely something can be done to protect that home.

Mr. RALSTON: On a number of occasions, in dealing with the matter of housing for soldiers, I have indicated that the dependents' allowance is paid for the purpose of putting the wife and family in funds to pay rent or meet any other expenses.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Just a moment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RALSTON: Perhaps my hon. friend will permit me to finish. I have indicated that the department and indeed the federal government have not undertaken to provide housing. I have indicated more than once that this is considered to be a municipal and provincial responsibility, and my hon. friend's appeal would be more properly directed to those authorities. The hon. gentleman asks whether something can be done, but this is a

matter concerning local rental laws. Let me say to the hon. member, as I have said to this committee on more than one occasion, that notwithstanding the fact that this is a matter of municipal and provincial responsibility, as the Minister of Finance indicated to the city of Hamilton and the city of Windsor, and as has been indicated to the city of St. Catharines, houses have been placed at the disposal of these cities from time to time in order that they might be used for the purpose of housing dependents of soldiers until other accommodation could be found. That is as far as the federal government has gone in that connection. It is all very well for my hon. friend to talk about this matter here, to ask if something cannot be done, and to speak of the plight of these worthy people, I am quite ready to take my share and more than my share of responsibility to help as far as I possibly can, but I do submit that there is some responsibility on my hon. friend, on the provincial government and on the municipal authorities. I do not think it should be all simply brought in here and put on the desk, and for us to be told that something should be done about it, regardless of the circumstances. We are doing something about it and have done something about it in a great many cases. Just here I should like to pay tribute to the community organizations in various cities which have done their level best to assist in finding housing accommodation for soldiers' dependents in these times when housing is so short. The attention, the thoroughness, the generous-heartedness with which they have gone into those cases have been remarkable, and I wonder if my hon. friend has referred this case to any of these organizations.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): For the benefit of the minister I may say that this has gone all through the process. It is not a question of getting another place in which to live; it is a question of breaking up a home which this man and his wife have had for nine and a half years. That is the situation.

Mr. RALSTON: I think I am just as sympathetic and just as open to any suggestions for assistance to a soldier or a soldier's dependents as my hon. friend is. He does not suggest that there should be a law under which a soldier's dependents would be entitled to keep the same house all the time. Surely that is not his suggestion?

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): We have at the present time a rental control order. Why can it not be extended to the soldiers?

Mr. RALSTON: Because, as I understand it, the rental control order provides for one exception, namely the case where the owner desires to use the house. Of course if there is any fraud or evasion of the act or the regulations, it may be dealt with. But it would be dealt with in any event—not only in the case of a soldier, but in those of others as well. It is a matter of general regulation; it does not apply only to dependents of soldiers.

Mr. BENCE: The observations a short time ago of the hon. member for York-Sunbury, and the answers given by the minister were of much interest to me. I am referring particularly to those which had to do with accommodation in Ottawa, and the lack of accommodation for air force recruits.

I would take this opportunity to reiterate the stand I have taken in the past, and would request the minister now before the committee and other ministers concerned with the housing of service men, and the providing of training facilities and that kind of thing, to see that they effect more decentralization than obtains at the present time. Answering me last year on a similar question, the minister stated that it is all very well to make a suggestion of this kind. He pointed out that each department agrees with the principle of decentralization, but that he has found it difficult to have any of them agree that a particular department is the one which should be removed.

In Canada to-day we find ourselves in a position of cutting down in matters of training and administration. It seems to me, however, that as far as Ottawa is concerned there is a tendency to bring into this already overbulging city more and more men for training and for purposes of administration. An example was given by the hon. member for York-Sunbury with respect to air force men who could not go into barracks, but who are in training for pilots. While this may not come within the minister's department, the same principle applies.

In other parts of Canada, and I refer particularly to Saskatchewan, steps are being taken to cut down training, and to cut down the number of training centres. In the same way, a decrease is being made in the number of training centres over which the minister now before us has supervision. For example, in Saskatchewan the training centre at Maple Creek has been cut out. My information is that the number of recruits at the basic training centre at Prince Albert, which at one time handled large numbers, has been cut down so much that there are practically no recruits there at all.

In connection with the matter of cutting down training centres in Saskatchewan I should like to ask the minister one or two questions, and to give consideration to a point which

I believe to be of the utmost importance. As I said before, the training centre at Maple Creek has been closed down, and the one at Prince Albert is not being used to any great extent. At the same time the suggestion has been made that the vocational training centre in Saskatoon should be moved to Prince Albert. I would ask the minister to give this matter careful consideration before this step is finally taken. I would ask, too, that not only questions of cost and efficiency be considered, although I agree that if cost is very much different, and if efficiency could be greatly improved the possibility of changing would have to be considered.

I would ask the minister, however, to consider the matter from this point of view. It is all very well to close down some of these centres, but I do not think this should be done if there are other types of work which could be done at those points. If the minister takes a vocational centre from one city and moves it to another, there will be a great deal of consternation among the people in the locality from which the training centre is being moved. I know that, because I feel this matter personally. As soon as a move like this is noised around, immediately the civilians in the particular locality have the impression —and I am not saying they are justified— that there is something more than military expediency behind such a move. I have heard the rumour, and understand there is substantial belief as to its accuracy, that a move is contemplated. I suggest that the minister and his department should consider the matter carefully, when it comes to cutting out a training centre in any particular locality, and moving it to another.

Mr. RALSTON: Was the hon. member referring to Calgary?

Mr. BENCE: No; Saskatoon. I am talking about the suggested move of the vocational training centre from Saskatoon to Prince Albert. I will be frank to say, as I have said to the minister privately, that this affects me. It is suggested that the training centre be moved from Saskatoon, represented in the house by a member in the opposition, to a constituency represented by a member of the government—in this particular instance by the leader of the government. The feeling develops in the constituency that there is some reason other than that of military expediency, and it is suggested that the situation should be examined very carefully before any move is made. It is pointed out that if a move must be made because of military necessities it should be made clear what the reasons are.

Would the minister give the committee a statement covering the set-up of these training centres across Canada, and the policy that is to be laid down with respect to the matter of closing them down, and switching them from one city, or from one particular part of Canada to another, and particularly in connection with the matter of recruiting in various parts of Canada?

It does seem to me that we should consider the methods that must necessarily be used in the building of civilian morale, not only for the purpose of raising funds necessary to carry on the war, but also for the purpose of obtaining the necessary recruits.

Mr. RALSTON: I have not before me the information with respect to the three locations to which my hon. friend has referred. I would refer him only to this, that basic training centres have been closed at thirteen different locations in Canada. Naturally someone's constituency has to be hit—and I say that seriously. I know of one hon. member in whose constituency there were two training centres, both of which have been closed.

No decision has been arrived at with respect to the training centres to which my hon. friend has referred. Possibly I am remiss in my duty, but I had not heard, until my hon. friend brought it to my attention, of the suggestion of moving the vocational training centre from Saskatoon. I know that the Prince Albert and Maple Creek training centres were established at the time of a peak load. A good many men have gone through those centres, and as a result of a reduction in intake there is less need for training centre capacity in Saskatchewan. As my hon. friend knows, the centre at Regina was closed some time ago. At Regina they had a training establishment and a district depot.

As I said, there have been thirteen cases in which training centres have been closed. Some of them are used for other purposes. In addition to that, there are eleven cases in which training centre capacity has been reduced. All I can say to my hon. friend is that the matter will be studied. I am just as aware as he is of the suggestion which would be made if a training centre were changed from Saskatoon to Prince Albert. Someone would suggest that it was done for other than military purposes. Although my hon. friend may not believe it, that would make the departmental officers concerned lean back in their efforts to avoid a move of that kind. However, I think military considerations must dominate, regardless of the effect in any particular constituency.

My hon. friend will understand exactly what will happen when air training centres are closed down, and we shall have to proceed with army training centres as well. All I can say to my hon. friend is that I will take his very reasonable, and—if I may say so—very moderate, representations into consideration when coming to any decision with respect to these particular army establishments.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Under this omnibus item, there is a matter on which I should like to secure information. It has to do with the political activities and candidature for parliament or legislative assemblies of members of the armed forces. The reason why I bring this up at this time is that last evening the press carried an item to the effect that new regulations had been passed with regard to the candidature of members of the armed forces for municipal office.

Mr. RALSTON: That was municipal?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Yes. Under P.C. 3205 of May 31, 1943, certain provisions were made whereby members of the armed forces could secure leave for the purpose either of attending nominating conventions and being nominated or of participating in election campaigns. The specific sections dealing with the matter state that a member of the armed forces may:

> . . . subject to the exigencies of the service, be granted leave of absence by the appropriate service authorities for a period not exceeding one month preceding the election.

Leave is also granted for the purpose of attending conventions and the like. Up until the time that order in council was passed, if I understand the law correctly, no man in the armed forces was permitted to secure leave to be a candidate for parliament or a legislature. In Great Britain to-day provision is still made under the war service regulations that while members of parliament may address public meetings in their own constituencies, they are not allowed to speak outside their own constituencies during an election campaign. I can very well understand that when an election, either provincial or federal, occurs, quite a number of men and women serving in the armed forces may be desirous of knowing their rights and what opportunities will be accorded them to attend nominating conventions and to be nominated. I have no doubt that there will be members of the armed forces overseas who will be desirous of returning to Canada to participate in election campaigns should they receive the nomination in a constituency.

The questions I would ask in regard to this order in council are these: Is provision made whereby application for leave by a man in the armed forces and desirous of becoming a candidate for parliament is entirely restricted to application through the regular military authorities, or will the minister himself exercise a supervisory position in regard to such applications for leave to participate as a candidate in an election campaign?

Second, have any applications as yet been made by members of the armed forces overseas for leave to return to Canada to participate in an election, and have any members of the armed forces been returned to Canada to permit them to participate in an election as candidates?

Finally, what is the attitude of the government in regard to the rights of members of parliament who are in uniform and in the service to address public meetings outside their own constituencies?

This order in council provides an opportunity which I think should be provided for men in the armed forces to serve not only in the armed forces but also in the parliament and legislatures of the country. It is a matter of interest to know that in this parliament there is a greater number of ex-service men, according to the information I have, than in any other parliament since the last war, and I know there are numbers of men overseas who might very well be expected to become candidates if the regulations were clarified. According to the order in council as it now stands, leave can only be granted depending upon the exigencies of the service. Some provision should be made whereby a man in the service who is nominated for parliament should have an opportunity to participate in an election campaign, with the procedure being an appeal direct to the minister himself. I would ask the minister to make a statement in regard to this order in council and to answer the questions I have asked.

Mr. RALSTON: In reply to the first question, as to whether provision for application for leave is restricted to the military authorities or whether the minister exercises a supervisory jurisdiction, no ruling has been given in that connection. As the order in council stands, the application would come in the regular way to the military authorities. If the case is of some importance I would think it quite possible that it would be referred to national defence headquarters, and quite possibly to the minister. I would not want to give an undertaking at this stage that the minister would exercise any greater super-

visory jurisdiction in this matter than over any other. I would want to consult my colleagues, the heads of the other armed services, because it affects them all, and endeavour to see that some uniform practice was observed.

My hon. friend asked if any applications had so far been made. So far as I know, no applications have been made, but that does not necessarily mean there have not been any. I have none in mind, and I do not remember any coming to my attention. I have not in mind anyone who has been returned from overseas under leave of this kind. If my hon. friend has any case in mind and wishes to bring it up, I shall be glad to hear of it.

With regard to the right to address meetings outside the constituency, the order in council provides that leave may be granted for the specific purpose of campaigning as a candidate. I take it that that would limit the candidate to campaigning in his own constituency.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is what I wanted to find out.

Mr. RALSTON: I am just reading the order in council. I never believe in offering a judicial opinion on the interpretation of a legal document without having it carefully examined, but those words strike me at the moment, as I read the order in council—and I do not pretend that it is my conclusion of the matter—that the leave intended here is for the purpose of campaigning as a candidate in his own riding.

Mr. ROWE: It does not say that, does it?

Mr. RALSTON: Campaigning as a candidate must be in his own riding, I would think. It could not be anywhere else.

Mr. ROWE: The minister was a candidate campaigning in other places.

Mr. RALSTON: Not as a candidate in the other places. I endeavoured to support a candidate, and I think my hon. friend did, too, from the same platform.

Mr. ROWE: The minister had been nominated.

Mr. RALSTON: I endeavoured to support a candidate, and I remember my hon. friend did the same, and on the same platform, too. He was supporting another candidate, I might say—lest there be any doubt. I think those words would rather indicate a restriction to campaigning in a candidate's own constituency. I will take that up and see if any clarification is needed; if so, I shall be glad to give it attention. I take it that my hon. friend is really making a representation that it should be extended beyond the bounds of a candidate's constituency.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What I am doing is endeavouring to have the minister give publicity to this order so that it will be known to the services overseas. I have had a number of letters asking what the regulations are, and while an order in council was passed many months ago, very few of the men overseas, apparently, understand the contents of the regulations as they are now.

Mr. RALSTON: I am sure that the regulations have been published in orders. Of course my hon. friend knows that we do not always read orders and sometimes when we have read them we forget them.

Mr. STIRLING: And do not understand them, too.

Mr. RALSTON: And do not understand them; but certainly the regulations will be given appropriate publicity in every way possible.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I should like to suggest, following what the hon. member for Lake Centre has said, that not only should the minister give some publicity to the regulations but the statement ought to be clarified so that men in the service may know exactly what they ought to do. I know that the position, for instance, with reference to provincial elections is one which bristles with difficulties. At the present time the group with which I am associated has two members of the Saskatchewan legislature on active service overseas. The space of time between the writs for the election being issued and the polling day is, I believe, only twenty-three days. It is manifestly impossible for these men to be brought back from overseas in that time unless some special arrangements are made to fly them back.

Mr. RALSTON: Many candidates, as my hon. friend knows, do not come back.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I know that, but there ought to be some understanding that if some are allowed to come back all should be permitted to do so. The minister is going to face quite a problem if some are brought back and special arrangements are not made to bring others back. I think the situation should be faced now instead of waiting until it happens and having the minister bombarded with wires and cablegrams asking that this man or that man be brought back. I believe that if arrangements can be made—and not many men will be affected—they ought to be brought back.

I have in mind another candidate for the provincial legislature of Saskatchewan who is stationed on the Pacific coast and who wrote me wanting information just exactly along the same lines. As he understands it, he must make application to his commanding officer. If the commanding officer does not feel that he can release him, or if the application lies around, or has to go to military district headquarters and then to national defence headquarters, there will not be many of the twenty-three days left by the time he gets to his rural constituency, and a very large rural constituency at that. I think the minister ought to make very clear what the exact *modus operandi* is to be. Will the man make application to his commanding officer; will it go straight to national defence headquarters, and can it be dealt with immediately? Or, will the political party concerned make application on behalf of the man as soon as writs are issued? It would be preferable, I think, that each political party should notify national defence headquarters of the men who are candidates, and national defence headquarters would decide whether these men could be released and arrange the releases right away. Otherwise, as the minister knows, considerable delay could occur between the time a man makes application to his officer commanding, with all the channels and red tape through which it may have to go, before he is finally released.

I think the minister ought also to clarify the position of a man seeking election as a candidate. That raises the question whether or not he can speak on the radio. When he speaks on the radio, not only the people in his own constituency hear him but the people within the entire area covered by that particular radio station may hear him. Does that preclude him from speaking on the radio? I think the minister ought to make that very clear, because that question will come up, and it is better to clarify it now than to wait until some situation arises when the minister or anybody else may be accused of partisanship or of showing favour to one candidate as against the other.

Early in the discussion of the minister's estimates I raised the question of the regulation which forbade men in the armed services writing to the newspapers, and pointed out to the minister the case of a member of the legislature of the province from which I come being forbidden to address a forum. The minister said that the regulation was under consideration with a view to modifying it. I wonder whether sometime before this discussion closes the minister could let us know if the department in the past two weeks have agreed as to what the regulation will be.

[Mr. T. C. Douglas.]

I also asked the minister earlier in this discussion if he could give us information with regard to the various camps across Canada and the various military districts and set out the number of men in the A. and T. staffs as against the number of men who are being trained as students or recruits, because I am even more disturbed about the matter now than when I rose to discuss it a couple of weeks ago. Wherever I have gone; wherever I have met men from various parts of Canada in the armed services, they kept stressing to me the fact that so many of them, as they claim, are sitting around without enough work to do, that they are in some cases overstaffed, that there seems to be a tremendously large home war establishment, out of all proportion to the number of recruits to be trained and the amount of work to be done. I do not think the solution is to do what I heard was suggested in one place. They telephoned one office and said, "You will cut your staff twenty-five per cent." Later on it did not materialize, but that was the order. I do not think you can do it in that way. There may be some places where the staff is not twenty-five per cent too large; there may be others where it is half as large again as is needed. I believe the paring-knife should be used—if my information is not entirely incorrect—on this very large home war establishment which was built up at a time when many more recruits were being trained than there are at the present time.

I asked the minister some time ago—he may have answered it, and if he did I will not pursue the matter further—with reference to the question of venereal disease. I was very glad to hear the minister say that the Wassermann test is now being made compulsory. I ask the minister if his department would give some consideration to the matter of periodic Wassermann tests. It seems to me that the danger of a man becoming infected is as great or greater after he is in the services than before, and that it would not be a difficult or cumbersome job to have a Wassermann test taken once every six months, or once every year, for the protection of the men; it is merely a matter of lining them up and taking a little blood out of each man's arm. If these tests were made I think the proceeding would pay for itself in the protection which these men would have in the years that lie ahead.

Would the minister give the committee some information regarding the dependents' allowance board and the other item, the dependents' supplementary grants fund? I take it for granted, with regard to these last two

items, that the dependents' allowance board item is the expenses of operating the board, and that the dependents' supplementary grants fund item is the money expended by that board. Is that correct?

Mr. RALSTON: The last item represents the estimate of the money to be paid out plus cost of administration of the dependents' board of trustees. In the item covering the dependents' allowance board it is cost of administration only.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Will the minister give the committee a break-down in regard to the dependents' board of trustees? How much money has been spent by the dependents' board of trustees in each province or by military districts, whichever way the minister has it, the number of cases handled in each province or military district, and how was this money, spent for the dependents' board of trustees last year, divided as between administration and the amount spent in giving some benefit to the dependents of the men in the services? I should be glad to have that information.

Mr. RALSTON: First, with regard to the matter of participation in elections, I can only say that I will discuss that with my colleagues, the Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Power) and the Minister of National Defence for Naval Service (Mr. Macdonald). I will take up with them the points the hon. member has brought up with regard to procedure, and if clarification can be given, or further details furnished, we shall be glad to give the information, because we are endeavouring to make the order in council effective and useful.

The hon. member suggested that we should face up now to what will be before us when these applications come in. He knows there is one thing to which we cannot face up, and that is the exigencies of the service. They will depend upon conditions at the time which we cannot foresee. I believe, however, that what the hon. member is asking is that as far as possible the exigencies be determined by someone who really knows what they are, instead of being left to the discretion of some junior officer to be dealt with.

In reference to the regulation about which he spoke, with respect to writing articles, that regulation has been repealed and the provisions of King's Regulations and Orders, which already exist, have been substituted. The objectionable words in that regulation with regard to prohibited articles were, "on military subjects or otherwise". Those words "or otherwise", are repealed.

Mr. ADAMSON: There is still a ban on writing military articles.

Mr. RALSTON: The ban is contained in King's Regulations and Orders and nothing more.

As regards the proportions of A. and T. staff, I am almost prepared to offer my hon. friend a reward for information which he can give me as to anyone in training centres who says that they are overstaffed, because that is what this committee, about which I have spoken so often, is checking. It is travelling across Canada to find these cases and it cannot get anyone to give evidence to that effect. The members of the committee have to dig the evidence out for themselves.

I thought I had information with regard to the exact proportion of A. and T. staff, but I may be able to give it before the committee rises. There are training centres where there is a low population at the moment, and any of these training centres may be closed and the A. and T. staff reduced or the training centre amalgamated with some other centre. Hon. members will understand that the lower the capacity of the training centre, the higher the percentage of the A. and T. staff. It is necessary, for example, to have one commanding officer, one chief instructor, and one quartermaster. I can only say what I have said time and again, that literally ruthless steps are being taken to cut down staffs wherever possible.

My hon. friend complained of the idea of cutting off a certain percentage. I agree, generally speaking, with that view, but sometimes you have to do that in order to bring home to those who are administering a particular establishment the fact that a reduction is required. What is much more desirable, of course, is to do it in a much more logical and business like way, and that is to have a committee go on the ground and find out what each man is doing and endeavour to cut the cloth according to the necessities of the particular case.

Mr. ADAMSON: That is the Whitelaw committee.

Mr. RALSTON: Yes, In reference to the dependents' board of trustees, I have a long table here which I think is probably the most informative that I could file. The columns show expenditure from January 1, 1942, to November 31, 1943, and regional dependents committees, with locations. The different committees are given at their different locations, beginning with Charlottetown and ending with Victoria. There are twenty-one different committees shown. Administration expenses are shown and single grants are given, divided

between the three services—army, navy and air force; the total grants appear, with the combined total of administration costs and total grants for each committee. The total expenditures are given in the right hand column. Then there is shown the total of recurring grants, that is to say, grants which have been authorized, in the same manner as pensions for definite periods at the rate of so much a month. That total is shown for the dominion as a whole. The total of the recurring grants is $131,000.

If the committee is satisfied I will file this statement, which will give the information needed. To give an idea of what has been disbursed in grants, the amount from January 1, 1942 to November 31, 1943, is $2,054,920.38. The total expenditure for that same period, including administration expenses as well, is $2,548,707.36. That is for two years less one month. It includes only cases actually settled or, as the chairman says, put through the books; but it does not include the many cases in transit which are being dealt with currently, or the grants paid locally and not yet recorded at headquarters. The table follows:

Department of National Defence
The Dependents' Board of Trustees
Statement Showing Expenditures—January 1, 1942, to November 31, 1943

Regional Dependents' Advisory Committees	Total Administration	SINGLE GRANTS				Total Expenditures
		Navy	Army	*Air Force	Total Grants	
Charlottetown	$ 4,705.49	$ 3,208.14	$20,461.78	$ 6,453.88	$30,123.80	$ 34,829.29
Saint John	9,198.45	2,059.53	53,498.26	8,737.21	64,295.00	73,493.45
Halifax	19,051.29	11,477.18	82,468.74	8,748.78	102,694.70	121,745.99
Quebec	36,697.77	4,009.24	111,167.01	8,667.53	123,843.78	160,541.55
Montreal	34,362.67	3,035.85	89,980.48	13,112.01	106,128.34	140,491.01
Kingston	8,746.00	609.37	24,111.35	3,171.90	27,892.62	36,638.62
Ottawa	16,789.04	1,661.05	70,035.73	9,664.82	81,361.60	98,150.64
Toronto	58,618.61	6,651.99	177,248.18	34,621.16	218,521.33	277,139.94
Hamilton	23,252.89	2,931.52	90,123.19	23,229.95	116,284.66	139,537.55
Peterborough	7,756.80	476.52	33,585.61	4,125.92	38,188.05	45,944.85
London	16,027.04	2,326.64	74,491.20	22,088.80	98,906.64	114,933.68
Windsor	6,469.26	1,538.13	38,746.72	5,796.65	46,081.50	52,550.76
Sudbury	5,962.32	411.50	44,694.23	3,210.20	48,315.93	54,278.25
Port Arthur	4,198.47	1,790.74	16,003.77	2,021.34	19,815.85	24,014.32
Winnipeg	25,198.29	2,123.75	83,930.26	26,292.28	112,346.29	137,544.58
Regina	7,125.14	1,323.63	74,656.55	21,422.37	97,402.55	104,527.69
Saskatoon	9,227.42	3,333.48	79,241.51	26,198.59	108,773.58	118,001.00
Calgary	9,944.08	2,410.76	84,660.35	25,002.04	112,673.15	122,017.23
Edmonton	7,708.70	2,134.50	60,851.80	18,901.84	81,888.14	89,596.84
Vancouver	30,091.11	7,218.77	134,672.67	35,529.67	177,421.11	207,512.22
Victoria	12,302.36	26,008.42	71,965.93	12,665.68	110,640.03	122,942.39
Sub-Totals	353,433.20	86,740.71	1,516,595.32	319,662.62	1,922,998.65	2,276,431.85
RECURRING GRANTS—Analysis by Committees not available	.....	4,586.00	113,066.07	14,269.66	131,921.73	131,921.73
Head Office, Ottawa	140,353.78	.....	.....	.....	.....	140,353.78
TOTALS	$493,786.98	$91,326.71	$1,629,661.39	$333,932.28	$2,054,920.38	$2,548,707.36

* Includes R.A.F., R.A.A.F. and R.N.Z.A.F.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Is any further consideration being given the matter of a periodic Wassermann?

Mr. RALSTON: I will take it up with the director general of medical services. I believe the medical opinion is that there is not very much benefit to be derived from that. At least that is the view held at the moment. That is to say, that the disease will manifest itself, if it exists. The periodical testing of an army of between 400,000 and 500,000 men is no light task, as my hon. friend knows. That applies not only to the men themselves, but to the laboratory equipment and services which are required in connection with it. The provincial

laboratories of this country are assisting very materially. As a matter of fact, they are providing most of the facilities.

Mr. ADAMSON: I asked the minister a question last night about fever-therapy in connection with venereal diseases. I should like to know if it is satisfactory and what the results have been. I asked a question also about psychiatric reports at the induction centres. The minister said he would get the information.

Mr. RALSTON: What was the last question?

Mr. ADAMSON: What percentage of the men rejected on psychiatric tests were classed as of low mentality? I think the term "moron" was used.

Mr. RALSTON: The information I have with reference to fever-therapy is as follows:

1. Fever-therapy has been used chiefly in the treatment of sulfa-resistant gonorrhoea patients.

2. An analysis of 500 case records, of patients suffering from gonorrhoea, revealed that approximately nine per cent require fever-therapy.

3. The results of this treatment are not available at the present time as this treatment is carried out in DP & NH hospitals. Consultation with doctors in charge of this therapy indicates that it is very effective treatment.

4. In the treatment of syphilitic infections, fever-therapy is used principally in the treatment of central nervous system complications. Soldiers suffering from this complication are discharged from the army to DP & NH hospitals.

For the benefit of the unlearned of the committee may I say that fever therapy simply means that a man's temperature is raised to a very high point with the intended effect, as I understand it, of destroying the germ. That is a very crude explanation of it, but perhaps it will do.

The figures that I have with reference to rejections on account of psychiatric conditions are based on a very small cross-section. The figure is 12·4 per cent.

Mr. ADAMSON: Of the total?

Mr. RALSTON: As I understand it, that is of the total.

Mr. ADAMSON: Is that a recent sampling?

Mr. RALSTON: For the month of January.

Mr. ADAMSON: Twelve point four per cent were rejected for psychiatric reasons.

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Mr. MacNICOL: A short time ago a situation was brought to my attention in Toronto by a relation of a service man recently returned from overseas. I thought I should bring it to the attention of the committee and the minister. It may be one case of many others. The young man to whom I have reference was highly educated. He had successfully passed his matriculation examinations and had passed through his air force training as a pilot. In due course he was sent overseas. Apparently, while flying over there something happened to him and he was taken out of his flying position. He was then trained as an observer. Altogether he trained overseas for three years. He was then sent home. I do not know what happened to him as an observer, but apparently he was not fit for the air. Recently he was sent to barracks in Toronto to join the army.

Mr. RALSTON: Called up?

Mr. MacNICOL: Called up, yes. He was thrown out of the air force and sent to the army. He is a highly educated man. According to what his relations tell me his training has cost the country many thousands of dollars. I was told it was $27,000, but I do not know whether that is right or wrong. However, he was in training for three years, and now he has been sent to the barracks in Toronto and given the job of scrubbing floors just as if he had not had any training whatever. It does not seem sensible to me for anyone who has been training for three years in the air force to be given that position. Could he not be put in some other position in the air force on the ground where the air force could make use of his training instead of sending him to the army? What is going to happen to him in the army?

Mr. RALSTON: All I can say to my hon. friend is that he is discussing a case that does not happen very often. However, there are cases of that kind. I am not making any reflection on this particular young man because I do not know anything about him. There are cases of men who are what are called waverers, and who are not suitable for air training. There are cases of men who do not try too hard in the air force, having enlisted there, with the result that they are discharged. Obviously that does not exempt them from being called up for army service.

With regard to the matter of scrubbing floors, I suppose that some of us black our own boots and do odd things like that. I do not suppose it is regarded as menial. If this is a serious case I shall look into it at once,

but I would think that quite possibly there is a fatigue to be done or something of that kind, and since this chap is able-bodied and it was his day for the fatigue, that is why he scrubbed the floors. Floors have to be scrubbed by somebody.

Mr. MacNICOL: He likely went through that three years ago.

Mr. RALSTON: Yes, I know. If he had stuck with the air force he would not have to go through it again. Would my hon. friend give me the name?

Mr. MacNICOL: Yes. I shall first ask permission from his people, and if I get it I shall give the minister the name.

Mr. POULIOT: These are cases of fatigue duty or K.P. duty. That is the title of those who do the work of scrubbing floors and washing dishes. That is all right, but it is unfortunate that in many places many of the boys who have completed their classical courses have to do that work all the time because they are supposed not to know English.

Before the minister replies to the hon. member for Davenport, I should like to ask him several questions about the pulhems system. In the first place I am sure hon. members know that "P" is for physical ability, "U" for upper limbs, arms, "L" for lower limbs, "H" for hearing, "E" for eyesight, "M" for mentality and "S" for stability. The matter of emotional stability was discussed at great length last year. Each one of those seven divisions is subdivided into classifications numbered from 1 to 5, except division "M", or the mentality test, which does not include classification 3, and division "S" which does not have classification 2. That information was given to me some time ago and I wonder if it is up to date.

I should like to ask the minister a question in this connection. If he cannot answer me today I shall be satisfied to receive the answer to-morrow. My first question is, what is each one of those classifications and each one of the seven divisions; second, why does not division "M" include classification 3; third, why does not division "S" include classification 2? My fourth question is, what is the third classification under "M" and the second classification under "S", if any? It seems there is only one classification under "S" for stability. There should be only one classification for mentality, because one is either mentally fit or mentally unfit; one is normal or not. There are no degrees of abnormality or mental unfitness; surely one cannot be partly mentally unfit. I hear that in the holy city of Toronto many boys were found mentally unfit because of the answers they gave to certain questions. I was told that they were shown a picture of an automobile with flat tires, and were told to say quickly what was wrong with the car. Instead of "flat tires" one boy said "no gas", and he was declared mentally unfit. Another question was, "What is a pudding made of?" When a boy answered, "Salt and pepper" he was declared mentally unfit. It is all very childish; they are shown pictures and asked questions. The results do not reflect upon the intelligence of the boys who have been found mentally unfit in Toronto, though the number who have failed in these tests is quite astonishing.

As my fifth question I will ask the minister to tell the committee, first, the number of officers and, second, the number of non-commissioned officers and men who have been found mentally unfit under the pulhems test, in each military district, and I would ask also for a list of the questions that are asked in order to ascertain the mental fitness of these men.

I have another series of questions. Under the pulhems system recruits are supposed to be examined by six specialists. First, there is a specialist in internal medicine; second, a specialist in the chest; third, a surgeon; fourth, a psychiatrist; fifth, a specialist in the eyes, ears, nose and throat, and, sixth, an army examiner. In each division recruits are supposed to be classified by a specialist, but the number of specialists does not equal the seven letters of the word "pulhems"; there are seven letters and six specialists. I should like to know what specialists are supposed to pass judgment in each of the seven divisions. My next questions are as follows: first, who is the specialist, already mentioned, who classifies a recruit in each division, "P," "U," "L," "H," "E," "M," "S"; second, how many pulhems boards are there in the country, and where are they located; third, who are the specialists on each board; fourth, what are the qualifications of each specialist? I will ask the minister also to be kind enough to summarize for the committee all orders, instructions and regulations concerning the "M" test.

Then we come to the "S," which means stability of the mind or of the body. Stability must be defined, since there is a test for it. We have stability of the mind and we have stability of the body, which sometimes is acrobatics. We need more information about mental stability. Here we have a fellow who is all right; all the doctors except the psychiatrist find him in good condition. We do not know much about pulhems; it is something that has been imported into this country, but everyone should know what it is. Last year

I complained that there were not enough able-bodied men for the defence of the country, and the minister was very indignant. He said my statement was unwarranted and unfair and unjust and untrue. Well, the idea behind pulhems is that they are keeping in the army men who are not physically fit, but who could do much more for the war effort if they were not in the army. So that I hope the minister will be kind enough to give us the information for which I have asked, as he has answered questions asked by other hon. members since his estimates came under discussion, and I hope he will let us know what is behind the whole thing.

Mr. RALSTON: I am going to deal only with one or two of the hon. member's questions which I think can be answered quickly. Of course the hon. member is not serious when he says there are no degrees of abnormality. I have heard of people being half-crazy or half-witted, and have always thought there were different degrees of mental disability just as there are different degrees of physical disability. Then the hon. member asks what are the five divisions for each of the classifications into which a pulhems examination falls. They simply represent the rating given to the particular candidate in the particular realm indicated by the letter. For instance, "P" or physical is divided into five classes; 1 means perfect; 2 means fit for overseas service; 3 means fit for base service; 4 means fit for service in Canada, and 5 means that the man should be discharged. It is simply a question of degree. The same would apply to a disability of the upper limbs; 1 means perfect, 2 means fit for service overseas, and so on. The same applies to a disability of the lower limbs, to a heart disability, to an eye disability, and so on.

Then the hon. gentleman asks why division 3 is left out under classification "M". This is because a classification of fit for base service, as far as mental capacity is concerned, is too fine a distinction to make when you are measuring a man's mental capacity. The figure 2 means that the man is fit for overseas service, while the figure 4 means that he is fit for service in Canada. It is too fine a distinction to attempt to put another division in between and call it 3, when you are discussing this mental classification. The hon. member asks also why division 2 is left out in reference to stability. That is because the stability required for base service and for service in Canada is regarded as practically equal to the stability required for service overseas. There is no mystery about this matter at all, and there is no doubt about the different divisions. They refer to the different classes of service for which a man may be regarded as fit or otherwise.

Then the hon. member asked for the number of men in each district rejected as mentally unfit. If the hon. member will put that on the order paper, or I will take it now as a notice, I shall deal with it in the regular way. He will understand that it might be three or four weeks before I could bring down that information. The same will apply to a number of other questions he asked. I shall look over them and advise him; and if the questions cannot be answered I shall tell him so.

Mr. POULIOT: I thank the minister, but I would ask him to be kind enough to tell us what is meant by "stability".

Mr. RALSTON: I am afraid the hon. member will have to refer to the Oxford dictionary. There is a very good classification there.

Mr. POULIOT: They give special meaning to words, and when I look at the dictionary it is not the meaning they have in the army.

Mr. RALSTON: I will answer the hon. member's next question, where he asked about army doctors. He said there are only three specialists, and yet there are seven divisions. I can tell him that the physician examines with regard to physique, which is "P." The surgeon examines with regard to upper and lower limbs, which are "U" and "L," and the specialists—there may be one or two specialists, as the case may be—examine with regard to "H" and "E," which have to do with the eye, ear, nose and throat. The army examiner examines with respect to mental capacity, and the psychiatrist examines with respect to stability.

Then, with regard to the hon. member's further question respecting the classification of stability, my reply is that it simply means a man's ability to adjust himself satisfactorily to the life of a soldier.

Mr. POULIOT: Now, here is the point: It is exactly the same thing in the civil service examinations. There were points allowed for personality. When I asked Mr. Bland, the chairman of the civil service commission, and the chief examiner, and all other witnesses, what was meant by personality, or how they defined it, they were unable to do so. But the examiner was allowed to give marks to the person examined, just for personality.

Here we have "mentality." It is the army examiner who decides upon mentality. Who is that army examiner† There is mystery in that, just as there was in the civil service examinations. We fought against it, and all hon. members complained about it. Members

of the committee, who now sit on the treasury benches, were one with us in complaining about it. It was just a catch for the examiners to do what they pleased with the candidate, through examination. Imagine that! We were discussing those matters. The matter came before the committee. There was not a single member of the twenty-five who did not protest against that "personality" business. Personality and appearance—imagine! If a man was to the liking of the examiner, he got all his marks for personality. But if the examiner had something against him, he got no marks at all. They were asked what it was, but no one could answer. A reference to a dictionary is no answer, either. We should know more about it.

Hon. members will be surprised by that. In the first place when I fought for the common civil servant in Ottawa, I was not alone. I was with the other members of the committee. But what trouble did I have at first to open the eyes of the House of Commons to what was going on in the civil service commission! We did not have much success in our recommendations. However, at least we opened the eyes of some of our colleagues as to what was going on around there.

Before we undertook that work no one had mentioned the word "bureaucracy." Now it is in the programme of one of the major parties, namely, the correcting of bureaucracy. Whether they will do it or not, I do not know. But there is bureaucracy in the army, as there is in the civil service. That is the kind of reform we want to have. To members of parliament nothing of that kind should be secret. We should be informed about it. We should be informed, so that we might prevent injustices being done. The minister renders no service to the army and renders no service to the personnel to his department by covering up what is done there, and by saying that everything is right.

It is hard at times to rise and protest, and always be told that we are wrong, and always that the other fellow is right. The minister praises the district medical officer of Quebec. Was he not a son-in-law of the former mayor of Quebec, who was under the mobilization board? And the old man was unjust to the draftees, just to boost his son-in-law. Everybody knows it in Quebec. The minister does not know the politics of Quebec city. Let me tell him that the old father-in-law was a key man in Quebec East, and he was appointed there at a time when the present minister was not minister. But he was a key man there. And now—now the boss of the board in Quebec city is precisely the daughter of one of the key men of the political clubs of Quebec East. When I speak of political strings I know of what I speak. I know that one has to make obeisance to that person in order to have service from her.

May I submit more than that, that even when the national selective service headquarters in Ottawa wrote to the chairman of the board in Quebec city, he did not answer. I had to direct their attention to the fact that Quebec did not answer when an answer was requested by Ottawa.

Mr. RALSTON: Would the hon. member permit me—

Mr. POULIOT: It is not the same thing; I am not blaming the minister for it; but I am informing the committee of the many reasons I have to say that there were political strings; and even if the minister canonizes them I will so express myself.

Mr. RALSTON: Is the hon. member charging that the medical board at Quebec is bossed by some young lady?

Mr. POULIOT: No, I did not say that. And I am not talking of flirtations, but of office routine.

Mr. RALSTON: The hon. member cannot laugh that off. I want to know whether or not he is charging the medical board in Quebec with being bossed by a certain young lady, of whom I have never heard at all? It is gross calumny, if he is suggesting any such thing.

Mr. POULIOT: Once again the minister does not understand what I say, or know that the person is secretary to one of the members of the mobilization board in Quebec. There is no love affair between them. It is not that I insinuated, at all.

Mr. RALSTON: No one suggested it.

Mr. POULIOT: If no one suggested it, so much the better. But what I say is that when we have a man in charge, he should be running the business, and the business should not be run by a secretary.

Mr. RALSTON: Does the hon. member charge that the medical officer is run by his secretary?

Mr. POULIOT: No, not a bit of it.

Mr. RALSTON: Then I suggest to the hon. member he should stick to the item, instead of talking of national selective service.

Mr. POULIOT: I told the minister five minutes ago I was not speaking of his department, but by way of comparison.

The CHAIRMAN: Order; surely we cannot have a discussion of that matter before the committee. If so, we shall never finish.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BRUCE: I have a certain amount of sympathy for the minister who has been under questioning for so long, and I would not intervene at this moment except to clear up if possible, the confusion which seems to exist in the minds of many people, even among members of this house, as to the real situation in regard to our armed forces, their dispositions, and the available reinforcements which will be very much needed as soon as we open a western front.

There has been a certain amount of discrepancy between the figures given out by the minister and by the wartime information board. The minister stated in September last that the intake of the draft boards between January 1 and September 30, 1943, totalled 30,796. But according to the wartime information board's release, the total number of men obtained during that period by conscription was only 17,264, or 13,332 short of the minister's claim.

Mr. RALSTON: What were the dates?

Mr. BRUCE: I have the statement made by the minister in September, 1943, and those were his figures. In other words, only about fifty-seven per cent of the number claimed by the minister were taken in by draft. I have a good many other figures here which show a similar discrepancy, but I do not intend to take up the time of the committee in referring to them because they will be found in the records of *Hansard* and the press.

I was under the impression that, to maintain an army overseas, eight divisions will be necessary. I think three divisions have already been broken up. Have the men so released been used as reinforcements overseas?

The minister stated a little time ago that there was a shortage of tradesmen in the army. If this is so, does it not stem back to the shortage of man-power? If there were sufficient man-power it would not be difficult to train tradesmen.

The idea of Canada being able to create and maintain an army overseas without conscription will prove to be a fantasy. It is difficult to understand how a government which would not countenance conscription would make commitments which it should have known it could not fulfil without conscription.

The situation briefly would seem to be that many of these young fit men called up under the N.R.M.A.—and I understood the minister to say last night that there were 73,000 of them in Canada—are holding non-active jobs which could equally well be filled by returned men now being boarded out. I wonder why the minister does not use these returned men to replace the fit ones now holding non-active jobs, and send the latter overseas where they will soon be needed urgently for reinforcements.

Again I would ask, what about the men who are being freed from industry? I understand that these men are under call, and therefore that is another source for reinforcements for overseas.

The minister stated the other evening that if the time arrives when it will be necessary to bring into force the conscription act by removing its restricting clauses, he would do so. I would ask him if he thinks he is justified in waiting until reinforcements are urgently needed before taking the preliminary steps to make it possible to secure them. It does not require expert army staff officers to tell us that an assault against a highly fortified position such as our troops will have to face on the western front, a position prepared over a period of three years by a resourceful enemy and fortified, I understand, for many miles in depth, will be very costly in casualties. Have we not had sufficient information of the cost in casualties that our troops have already experienced at Dieppe, at Salerno and at the present moment are experiencing at the Anzio bridgehead. Surely, therefore, we should realize what will happen when the second front is opened in western Europe. An officer of experience told me recently that in his opinion the casualties within the first two weeks of the opening of the second front will amount to fifty per cent of those engaged, and that within another two weeks the rest of our troops might have to be replaced. This would necessitate a very large number of reinforcements being available in a position from which they could easily get to the front.

I asked the hon. minister the other evening if he thought he had sufficient reinforcements in the pool in England to take care of the situation. I ask him again if, after further consideration, he thinks that reinforcement pool will be amply sufficient. If not, will it not be imperatively necessary to take steps at the earliest possible moment to have the

restricting clauses in the National Resources Mobilization Act removed so that this idle draftee army of some 73,000 men may be available for reinforcements overseas. It has been estimated that these men are costing the country $2,000 a year each, which would mean a total of $146,000,000. I presume that is a fair estimate. I believe that the minister will be recreant to the trust that is now reposed in him if he does not take immediate steps to provide the necessary reinforcements by the only possible method, the one to which I have just referred.

Mr. LECLERC: Is the hon. member favouring conscription?

Mr. BRUCE: We already have a conscription act on the statute books. I am favouring the removal of the ham-stringing clauses of that act.

Mr. LECLERC: Is the hon. member speaking for his party or for himself?

Mr. CASSELMAN: Where does the hon. member stand?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): We all know where he stands.

Mr. McCANN: At six o'clock the matter under discussion had to do with the pulhems system of examination of recruits and draftees coming into the army. I think it is generally conceded that the system in vogue is the best one that has been devised with reference to examinations. However, it has one shortcoming which I should like to point out to the minister, namely, that it is based entirely upon any objective symptoms which the draftee may exhibit. I understand that the directions to medical officers consider only those objective symptoms. Another type of symptom which may arise with reference to any abnormal condition which a draftee may have, is what is known as the subjective symptoms, and known, perhaps, only to the man who is being examined.

Take, for instance, the case in point which was referred to by the hon. member for York-Sunbury, of the man who was a diabetic and who, upon his own statement, so stated. All the evidence was there that he was a diabetic, but his word was not taken by the examining officers, and they gave no consideration as to whether or not what he said was the truth.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): They were put on notice.

Mr. McCANN: Exactly, but they did not pay any attention to it. I submit that, in examining, a medical man can tell almost by intuition whether or not the truth is being told. More consideration ought to be given to the statements of the man who is being examined than is given at the present time. I have in mind a young fellow who was admitted to the army, and his examination put him in as A-1 and he served a month in one of the training camps. He was called up under the National Resources Mobilization Act. That man was what is commonly known as a "bleeder", a haemophiliac, and there was no way of testing him. At the present time he is absent upon deferment because he is doing farm work, but he has received notice that he will be expected to return on the 1st of May. It is absolute nonsense to take back into the army a man of that type because, should any accident, even of a minor nature, happen to him, it is probable that it would be fatal. In addition to that, if he were there for six months or a year, and at a very considerable cost to the country, he would probably have to be discharged from the army, and it is quite probable that if he met with some accident while on duty he would be a pensioner, and this country would pay a pension for the rest of his life to a man who should never have been admitted to the army.

I should also like to ask the minister if further consideration has been given to the suggestion which was made in this house some time ago with reference to the amalgamation of the medical services in the armed forces; whether or not we are to continue to have three different groups of medical men, one in each branch of the armed service, or whether government policy in that regard has been changed. I would ask the minister, too, if the report of the assignment and procurement board has been given to the government and whether it is his intention to table it, and I invite him to make any comments which he may see fit at the present time with reference to whether he thinks that report should be acted upon, or whether, if that were done, it would be to the detriment of the service.

Mr. ADAMSON: Does the minister want to answer those questions now.

Mr. BLACKMORE: The minister on February 14 made some statements which are worthy of considerable attention. May I read brief records from *Hansard,* at page 442? First, speaking of the soldiers:

> They do not want charity, but they want to know how they are to be assisted and how they are to be recognized, having regard to the fact that they have been away from employment conditions in this country for a number of years.

And again, speaking of the three defence services:

> . . . all three services intend to take and are now taking a definite and positive interest in the prospective rehabliitation of soldiers, sailors and airmen.

And again:

. . . but the services want to determine what shall be a fair method of rehabilitation and demobilization; to help the men who remain in the service for a considerable time due to military duties, but duties which may not be as pressing as the duties we see before us this year; to help these men to prepare themselves, looking forward to the time when they will be discharged and return to civilian life.

And again, speaking of the men whom he proposes to put in charge of the affairs of the returned men:

. . . men who will understand the problems, the aspirations, the needs and the ambitions of these boys.

These remarks touch a responsive chord in all hearts of soldiers and soldiers' friends everywhere. The question everyone is asking is, what chance will the soldier have after the war? Will he be able to get a job? Will he be able to live in comfort if there are too few jobs to go around; that is, if he cannot get a job? Will he be able to go into production as farmer, manufacturer, businessman, and sell his product at prices covering cost of production plus enough remuneration to enable him to live and to support a family? The minister has been too vague in his expressions. Soldiers of the last war had plenty of promises—in general. They were to have "homes for heroes", and the like. Soldiers of this war ought to have commitments more specific than those. Let the minister be more specific.

Let me ask him several questions. Let him answer those questions straightforwardly, painstakingly, and precisely, as he has done the numerous other questions already asked of him.

As a plain common man, father of soldiers, and representing fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters, friends and sweethearts of soldiers, I desire to put these questions to the minister and to ask that he shall answer them in this parliament before this debate is finished.

As long as the minister may be charged with ministerial responsibility in this or in succeeding governments, first, will he here and now pledge himself to insist that his colleagues adopt such measures for stimulating and distributing production of Canadian goods and services as will guarantee, first, that every member of the armed forces of Canada shall have a job; or, being denied a job, shall have freedom from want and fear; second, that every returned man or woman, having a job, shall have a stable income, ample to provide for abundant living; third, that every producer shall be able to sell his goods at stable and equitable prices such as will render readily available to that producer prosperity and security with freedom; fourth, that Canada's national income be maintained at not less than $8,500,000,000 after the war; fifth, that these desirable results shall be achieved without additional taxes or public debt?

Again, will the minister, for the sake of those who have given their lives and those who now risk their all for freedom, pledge himself to insist that Canada, to the extent found needful to attain the desired objectives I have mentioned, shall use debt-free money, money that can be spent, not lent into circulation, debt-free money by spending which the Canadian government can, first, establish and maintain stable and equitable price and wage structures; second, stimulate production; and, third, provide adequate markets to consume Canadian production?

Will the minister pledge himself to the use of such debt-free money? I maintain that if the minister does not dare or does not feel himself free to rise in his place in this house and answer yes to every one of these questions, then he is not prepared to make good the promises which he implied in the fine passages which I quoted at the beginning of my remarks.

Mr. POULIOT: At six o'clock we were speaking of the mobilization board. It comes under this item because, very often, matters are submitted by the army to the mobilization board which are under the Minister of Labour, and the mobilization board makes a ruling which is asked for by the army, so that the board is used as an army board. Of course, there are cases of recruits sent by the district magistrate to the camp, and their case is not settled by the mobilization board. But if the recruit, the N.R.M.A. soldier, puts his application before the board for a postponement and the board declines it, he then goes to the camp and asks his commanding officer for leave, and the commanding officer may say, "We will refer the matter to the board," so that the board is the appeal court with respect to its own decisions. That is not sense.

I have received letters from headquarters in which it is stated that if farmers and lumbermen are denied leave from the army it is because the mobilization board has refused to give it. I would prefer the decision to be made by the commanding officer and the matter not submitted to the board only *pro forma* when the army is not bound to follow the recommendation of the board, as it was before. It is only a farce. It is better for the army to take its own responsibility, and then the matter would be divided between two classes of recruits, those who have already been doing some training in the camp, and those who had no training.

That being said, I come to conscription as it is understood by different people. By the

word "conscription" some people understand conscription for overseas only, while others understand conscription for overseas and for the home front, and still others—those who believe that Elliott Little was right—understand by conscription national selective service which has been established in virtue of our mobilization act.

Conscription cannot be one-sided, and the hon. member for Parkdale has been persistent in this matter. We need reinforcements for the army. Undoubtedly the more exposed the army is, the more reinforcements will be asked for. But that is not all. The idea of national selective service is this—and I am the more at ease in speaking of it because many hon. members have indulged in great praise of Mr. Little. The understanding of Mr. Little is that the war effort to be complete should be well balanced; and if it is one-sided, if conscription is only for the army, it will always be one-sided and will never be well balanced.

It is very simple; it is elementary. Many people have played on words and left others under a false impression, and that is why I have asked a question which is quite clear. Indeed, I am much surprised that it was not answered at once yesterday, because, although it seemed lengthy, all the information that was asked for in that question should have been given to each member of parliament at the beginning of each session, in order that we might have been in a position to understand the working of national selective service.

Although I have many friends in the army and some relatives, too, and I try to do the best I can for them while they are there, I have the deep conviction that national selective service is doomed unless all draftees, N.R.M.A. soldiers, whether they have had previous training or not, should be put under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Labour. And unless the Minister of Labour is the big boss of the whole show and is in a position to tell the farmer, the fisherman or the railwayman, and all others in essential industry, "You are called by the army, but you shall not go because you are required where you are now"; if conscription had been explained in that way to the Canadian people there would have been no friction or national disunity; we would have had unity.

The people are not afraid to work; they are willing to work. But they do best in jobs in which they are experienced, and when you take them away from essential war-time jobs, where they are rendering good service to the state, and put them in the army to drill the whole day, they do not give the same service.

This is the point I make, and I hope the hon. member for Parkdale, who is a leading citizen of this province, will understand our point of view in that regard. I say the same thing to hon. gentlemen on all sides of the house who are not affected by prejudice, who are open-minded enough to consider the best interests of this country. That is why I insist once more to-day that all men who have some practical experience in any essential industry, and who are not needed in a technical capacity in the army, be put under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Labour as a judge to put them wherever they will serve the country the better. Otherwise national selective service would be a farce. Would it be impossible to have useful reinforcements for the army overseas?

With regard to the reinforcements for the army overseas, what is the eighth army? It is made up of Canadians and Hindus. What is the fifth army? It is made up of Canadians and Americans. It is time that the English people brought reinforcements to the Canadian forces who are fighting overseas. I do not want to scandalize anybody, but I ask you, Mr. Chairman, how is it that Canada has to do the whole thing and the other people look from their ivory tower upon us?

Mr. ROWE: That is laughable.

Mr. POULIOT: My hon. friend laughs.

Mr. ROWE: Who would not laugh at that?

Mr. POULIOT: That shows how biased and how prejudiced the hon. member is; how blind he is, and how it is impossible for him to understand matters as they should be understood. I remember what he said about farmers. He said that farmers should be exempted, yes. He has spoken exactly as I have done in a speech he made in this house. He has spoken a lot for the farmers; but when there was a demand to act, shoo, he was voting against the farmer, and the same applies to all hon. members who have declared themselves as true friends of the farmers. The hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe and the others were all for the farmer in words when they were speaking in this committee, just the same as they have been for the farmers before; but when there was a vote on an amendment that I moved along with an hon. friend of mine; when the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains brought in an amendment supported by another hon. member, and when the hon. member for Gaspé brought in an amendment, they all voted against it. They were all for the plebiscite, all for the mobilization act. They

were afraid to act and vote for the defence of the farmer, for the defence of everybody who is engaged in an essential industry. That is why the people of this country will not believe in Bracken. They will say: "If his promises are no better than what is done by his supporters in the house, what can we expect of him? We will drop him as we have dropped Bennett, Meighen and all the others." But I want my party to do better than that. I want my party to understand the troubles of the farmers and to do something for them. That is why I make an earnest appeal to the government. If the Minister of National Defence does not accept my views now, I hope there will be a majority of the members of the cabinet who will do so in due course and, it is to be hoped, in the near future.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): I should like to ask the minister a question. I have just opened a letter which I received this afternoon and which is addressed to myself and dated February 26, 1944. It reads as follows:

Dear sir,

At the meeting of the Peterborough active army auxiliary, Thursday of this week, one of the members brought to the attention of those present the fact that the wounded in hospital in Italy and in England were not receiving their mail or parcels from home until they were discharged from hospital and had rejoined their unit. This was confirmed by other members in attendance and it was put in the form of a motion that a letter be written to you asking if you would be kind enough to bring this matter of the distribution or delivery of mail to the boys in hospital in Italy and England to the proper authorities in the hope that something could be worked out to improve this situation. The members felt that their sons and husbands had greater need of cheerful letters and consoling parcels when they were confined in hospital than when they were with their companions in camp. It was with this in mind that I was authorized to write this letter to you.

E. Alda Ovens,
Corresponding secretary of the
Peterborough Active Army Auxiliary.

I know the Postmaster General spoke on matters of this kind yesterday, but I do not think he mentioned letters going into hospitals. I wondered if it was a fact that the mail was held up and kept in the unit until the man returned. Will the minister answer that?

With regard to internment operations, last year the expenditures were about $8,430,000. This year the estimate is about $3,730,000. There is a difference there of over $4,000,000. Will the minister tell us why there is that difference and if it is caused partly by the fact that some of those prisoners are working in different camps and projects throughout this country?

The next item has to do with the inspection board of United Kingdom and Canada. Last year the amount was $10,600,000. This year it is reduced by only $11,000. I understand that production has been cut considerably in the plants. Why is the figure held as high this year?

There is another item further down that has to do with the dependents' allowance board. I know of a soldier overseas who married a woman a few years ago. This woman had a daughter by a husband who had died. At the time of the woman's second marriage her daughter was four years old. The woman is receiving assigned pay from her husband and dependents' allowance for herself. She is not allowed anything for her daughter. The dependents' allowance board say it is not the soldier's daughter, but the wife's daughter. They will not allow anything for that child. Can anything be done in a case like that?

Mr. RALSTON: I shall take my hon. friend's questions in reverse order. With regard to dependents' allowance, as I understand the regulation the board are authorized to award an allowance in the case of a child—in this case it is the daughter of the wife—if the husband has been supporting the child or has adopted the child. If I remember correctly, it is in the discretion of the board. Apparently they have exercised their discretion and for some reason they have not granted dependents' allowance on account of this child. If my hon. friend will give me the case I shall look into it.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): The soldier is overseas. It would be pretty hard for him to adopt the child now, although he has been supporting the child for eight years or more.

Mr. RALSTON: Section 97 (e) is the governing section:

. . . and shall, at the discretion of the board, include a child, even though not legally adopted, providing a married applicant has assumed in his own home the care and maintenance of said child for a reasonable period prior to his appointment or enlistment, during which period he has continuously wholly maintained such child and was so maintaining such child at the date of his appointment or enlistment, and continues to do so after his appointment or enlistment.

The discretion is there. If my hon. friend will send me the details of the case I shall look into it.

My hon. friend asked a question with regard to the inspection board and pointed out that there is no real reduction in the estimates of the inspection board, notwithstanding the fact that, as he suggests, production is down.

The estimate has been made at approximately the same figure as last year. That is simply precautionary. It is quite true that production will be down, although my hon. friend will understand that a great many things which are produced in this fiscal year will be inspected in the next fiscal year. All I can say to my hon. friend is that it is simply for the purpose of making ample allowance for the board.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Then there is a chance that the expenditure will be considerably less than this?

Mr. RALSTON: There is a chance that it may be less. Then the reason for the reduction in the estimate for internment operations and refugee camps is the fact that pay and allowances, amounting to something like $3,000,000, for the camp staff are included this year under section A, army services, under the pay and allowances item, and the further fact that the number of civilian and Japanese internees is considerably reduced this year.

My hon. friend asked with regard to letters to soldiers in hospitals. I can tell him that the practice is not to retain letters in the unit when it is possible to find the address of the soldier. The committee will understand that the soldier may be wounded and evacuated either to a British hospital or perhaps eventually to a Canadian hospital. Returns are made from that hospital first to the second echelon and then back to the unit, and it takes some time for them to get to the unit. I do not know how long this boy was in hospital; but it may be quite possible that he would not get his mail until he came out, subject to this, that if the relatives had followed the instructions which are given in the casualty telegram which is sent out, and had marked the letters to the soldier "in hospital", the mail would not go to the unit but would go direct to the second echelon or to the records office, where it would be readdressed immediately to the hospital. In any event I can assure my hon. friend that it is not the practice to hold mail in the unit.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): In the case suggested yesterday by the Postmaster General some mail took ninety days to get to the soldiers in Italy. That mail would have left here before the casualty occurred, and the persons sending it could not be guided by the casualty telegram. What would happen to that mail; would it be held in the unit?

Mr. RALSTON: No. After the man has become a casualty the unit immediately forwards the mail to the second echelon, or at least to the central record office, where they would find out where the soldier is actually situated. The Postmaster General mentioned ninety days, but he was illustrating the possibility of mail taking that long when it proceeded by slow convoy from here to the United Kingdom and from the United Kingdom to the Mediterranean. I would hope there were not very many cases of that kind.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): I believe that included parcels also.

Mr. RALSTON: That would be so in the case of parcels.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Will the minister look into the matter further and see that there is no undue delay in having the mail forwarded to these boys?

Mr. RALSTON: I certainly will keep after it. Last night the Postmaster General mentioned that preference is given, as my hon. friend knows, to casualties in hospitals, but of course he was referring, as my hon. friend points out, to mail actually marked "in hospital"; otherwise it would go to the unit.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): I was informed by Colonel Underwood, who has the responsibility for overseas mail, that it is necessary for the service man when he is transferred from one camp to another to sign a card stating where his mail is to be forwarded; perhaps that had special reference to air force personnel. If that applies to the air force, however, I presume it would apply also to the army; and if a man fails to do that, the mail continues to pile up at his last designated address. It seems to me that the service, the air force or the army if this applies there, should assume responsibility with respect to every individual at a particular address, to see that the mail is forwarded to the new address. The members of the air force are not allowed to tell their families their new addresses; they are prohibited from giving the address of the station at which they are located, let alone giving any advance notice as to where they are to be transferred. According to my information the whole responsibility rests upon the individual service man to state where he is to be moved and where his mail is to be readdressed.

Mr. RALSTON I shall leave my colleague the Minister of National Defence for Air to deal with the air force regulations, because I know nothing about them. As far as the army is concerned, as my hon. friend knows a man is entitled to give his relatives his new address, that is to say the name of the new unit to which he is going, so that that situation does not apply. Further than that, the postal corps attached to that unit will forward the mail if they find that the man has moved, so that the

mail will chase the man around until it finally reaches him. It does not pile up in the unit to which he was attached.

There are perhaps one or two other points I should mention while I am dealing with these matters. I would refer to only one point in connection with the remarks of the hon. member for Témiscouata. I do not want this house or this country to get any idea that Canadians form the majority or any large part of the fifth army. There are a certain number of Canadians attached to the fifth army, but that army is composed of British and United States soldiers, while the eighth army is composed of British and Canadian soldiers. I think the remarks of the hon. member, which would suggest that the British are not in this war in Italy, do a grievous wrong to a people who have been in this war from the very beginning, a country which has given more than any other country, I think, to help make success possible.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Are there no Canadians in the fifth army?

Mr. RALSTON: A few; one unit. At a time when Britain was short of everything she sent her men and her equipment to different fronts, though she could ill afford to do so. We Canadians are proud of the fact that the first Canadian division was in Britain and was the key of the force which was holding that citadel; but that citadel was not held simply by the Canadian forces alone. It was held because of the stout-heartedness and fortitude of the British people at that time, because of their willingness to run risks in order to see to it that the enemy was not allowed to come closer but was kept at bay on different fronts; I am thinking particularly of the Mediterranean fronts, in Greece, in Crete and in North Africa.

Then the hon. member for Lethbridge put certain questions which he wanted me to answer specifically and categorically. I only wish to say that in the first place I think the hon. member knows that the questions with which he was dealing were not germane to the items before the committee. There will be a time to discuss rehabilitation. In the remarks I made the other afternoon I was dealing with the effort which the forces themselves were putting forward in order to see to it that while men were in the army they were made as fit as possible to take up civilian avocations, and I was indicating the kind of machinery, the committees and the sort of administration being set up by the forces for that purpose. I only say to my hon. friend that if he will read the speech from the throne he will find indicated there the scope of the measures which the government intend to bring down in connection with the matter of rehabilitation. As I said the other night, I am not in a position, nor do I propose to make any announcement with regard to the extent of that policy, but the measures will speak for themselves when they are before the house.

The hon. member for Renfrew South spoke of the pulhems system. I know what he said, and when he speaks in connection with a matter of this kind I regard what he says as being entitled to special attention. He said that more consideration should be given to the man's statement. As a physician of very long standing himself, I am sure that that advice comes from his own experience in diagnosing the condition of patients. I know nothing about it, but it sounds like common sense that attention should be given to the history given by the patient. I will also agree that that history has to be checked up, having regard to the clinical treatment.

The hon. member asked whether consideration had been given to an amalgamation of the medical services of the armed forces. Further consideration is not being given to it. It has been considered many times, and it is considered that that action would not contribute to efficiency or economy in personnel. Consideration might be given to a revision of the organization of all federal medical services when the war is over. But the special needs of the three armed services make it essential that the medical officers be trained in methods of examinations and treatment peculiar to the disabilities and personalities to be served.

Another point which the committee must consider is the geographical consideration contributing to the need for a separate type of service. For instance, air force personnel are widely scattered from military camps. You cannot make a combination of those services, because it is simply geographically and physically impossible to do so. In the field of hospitalization, and the common use of medical services, the duplication of services—and I think my hon. friend will agree in this—has to a large extent been successfully avoided by means of the wartime hospitalization committee. My hon. friend knows consultant and specialist services are used in common by all four medical services.

Then, he asked with regard to the report of the medical assignment and procurement board. There is a misapprehension with regard to that matter. The report which has been handed to the government, and to me, because I happen to be the minister through whom the board reports, is not a report of the medical assignment and procurement board, but is, as

my hon. friend probably knows, a report of regional committees, appointed to make surveys on different subjects. That is, they are committees of physicians throughout the dominion.

In the document which was handed in there is no report of the board, as a board. This report consists of surveys which contain a very great deal of valuable information, and consists of a great number of recommendations which have been made by the various subcommittees or regional committees appointed to deal with each particular subject. There is a committee, I think, on nursing, a committee on hospitalization, a committee on war-time manpower and so on.

Mr. McCANN: Were those reports of the different regional committees coordinated?

Mr. RALSTON: I do not know just what my hon. friend means by "coordinated."

Mr. McCANN: Integrated.

Mr. RALSTON: The central board itself has never had each of those reports and said, "We approve this, and we do not approve that." They are all separate reports. The question as to whether they shall be tabled is under consideration. I am strongly disposed to have them tabled, because I think they contain information which will be of general value not only to the services, but also to the medical profession which has contributed in their preparation, and in gathering the data. They would also have a great value to the public.

As a matter of fact, I can tell the committee that I asked the secretary of the board if he would have prepared for the board a summary of these reports in order that they might be in readable form, with the idea that, after consideration was given, and if the decision was made to table the reports, they could be tabled in full. The summaries would be there for people to read, for the use of the press, or for anyone who cared to read them. That matter is under consideration, and I expect it will be determined shortly.

The hon. member for Parkdale spoke with regard to reinforcements. I do not think I can add anything to what I said as reported at pages 440 and 441 of *Hansard*. We have long since gone past those items. My hon. friend has brought it up to-night. I say to him I have nothing to add and nothing to take back from the information I gave the committee at that time. I shall not take the time of the committee to read what I said, but I put it as succinctly as I possibly could. It is plain, and I think it is clear. I think the only doubt my hon. friend has is as to whether or not sufficient provision has been made for casualties. On that I can only refer him to what I have already said, namely, that after consultation with those who, I think, know best, and having regard to the circumstances which are likely to arise, it is thought that the provision for casualties is sufficient. I have told him, as I told the committee, that at the present time the pool in the United Kingdom is well up to the plan, to full strength, and that that pool will be reduced as casualties unfortunately occur. In order to maintain that pool, or to replenish it, we are budgeting for 4,000 men a month during the year, and if those 4,000 men a month are realized it will mean that at the end of the year after casualties have been incurred—if they are casualties of not more than the scale which has been laid down—the pool overseas will be maintained at adequate strength, and the number in Canada will remain practically undiminished.

There is a number in Canada, as I have told the committee, of some 60,000 general service personnel suitable for overseas service, in training centres and in units as at the end of March this year. That is our estimate.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Are those volunteers?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes, those are volunteers. Then, as I say, those men will be withdrawn and gradually sent overseas at the rate of approximately 4,000 a month. We are budgeting for an intake of something like a similar amount. If that intake is realized it will mean that the pool overseas—if the estimate of casualties is not exceeded—will remain, and the number in Canada will remain exactly the same. If that intake goes down, that is to say if there is a falling off toward the end of the year, it will mean that toward the end of the year that pool overseas will be maintained but the pool in Canada will be reduced by the deficiency. I think that is as frank as I can be with regard to that.

I also add that there still remain in Canada about 50,000 N.R.M.A. personnel who would be available for reinforcements, provided the emergency arose, and the necessary action were taken. The hon. member's quarrel was that action was not taken immediately, and of course that is where he differs from some of the rest of us.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I ask one question? The minister said in connection with a question I raised last night almost at the conclusion of the sitting that there were 73,000 of N.R.M.A. men in Canada. He now says

there are 60,000. I presume there is an explanation for the difference between the two figures?

Mr. RALSTON: There is, I said 60,000, and that is a low figure. I should have said that in mentioning the number which might be available to send overseas I was counting only 50,000 of them.

Mr. GRAYDON: That is, 50,000 of the 73,000?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes, 50,000 of the 73,000. My hon. friend asked about the 73,000, and I have the figures here to give him. About mid-January there were practically 73,000 N.R.M.A. personnel on strength. Of that number forty-seven per cent were in operational troops in Canada; fifteen per cent were in non-operational troops, twenty per cent in training, eight per cent in depot reselection and disposal units and seven per cent on leave. That means that they are on extended leave, in connection with forestry, mining and so on. That seven per cent is about 5,000, so that the net number in Canada apart from those on leave is something like 68,000. Of these 68,000 I am suggesting that about 50,000 would be medically fit for overseas service.

Mr. GRAYDON: Not all of the 73,000 are A-1.

Mr. RALSTON: I should have said also, and I am now reminded that this number of which I am speaking is not simply in Canada alone. It is in the north American area, in the western hemisphere. There are some in Labrador, some in the Caribbean, some in Newfoundland and a few in Alaska.

Mr. GRAYDON: The minister has mentioned troops in other parts of the world, and in that connection there is a matter I wish to bring up before his appropriations are passed. In the newspapers of Canada this morning the Associated Press carried an interview with an army intelligence officer of the United States, on which the minister may have some information. The news item is as follows:

> A United States army intelligence officer said to-night loose talk, mostly radiating from Seattle, enabled the Japanese to withdraw thousands of men and vast quantities of material out of Kiska last August to leave invading United States and Canadian forces "with a hollow victory tantamount to defeat."

He went on to say:

> Common was the knowledge in Seattle that we planned to attack Kiska and, prior to the invasion, unauthorized persons, both military and civilian, openly disclosed the date, August 15.
>
> As a result the Japs got out, voluntarily. Not one remained on the island when our troops arrived at three o'clock in the morning. Some scattered machine-gun fire the day before, reported by our reconnaissance fliers, indicated presence of hostile troops then. Even these were gone when we got there.
>
> They knew we were coming—and when. So accurately and so far in advance were the Japs tipped off that, had they chosen to implement their forces, they might have annihilated us.

I raise the question at this time because it is apropos of this appropriation, though I was particularly pleased to note that no reference was made to any leaks as far as our Canadian people are concerned. Leaks are a matter of great concern; and I would ask the minister if he has any comment to make in connection with this dispatch, because it does seem to me that this is a good time for the minister and the government to caution the Canadian people on this particular point which is perhaps more important at the present time than any other because, not so much on account of what we are saying in Canada, but because of incorrect statements made by people in high positions outside Canada that this war will be over in 1944 so far as Germany is concerned, it is important that the Canadian people should realize that we are a long way yet from winning this war, and therefore we should as a people realize that loose talk cannot be tolerated now any more than it could be tolerated two or three years ago. I am not so sure but that people in this country are a little prone to treat the whole question of the war a little more lightly now than we as the Canadian people should. Here is a case in point of what loose talk can do. I can quite understand that loose talk may be just thoughtlessness. Nevertheless, whether it be merely thoughtlessness or by design, loose talk has the same result, and I was astounded to realize that because of loose talk in another country we might have had a very serious situation facing the Kiska expedition.

I shall have accomplished my purpose in rising to-night if I can bring to the attention of the government and of the house and of the Canadian people the importance of seeing to it that we maintain our war fervour, if you like, at this particular time because I realize, as I think hon. members and the government and the people generally do, that we are a long way from the end, and that this is no time for us to relax in our efforts. I think it is time the people of Canada recognize our responsibility in the matter of loose talk, and I should like to hear from the minister on that because I think it is important from the point of view of our morale and from the point of view of our national security as well, because

the more optimistic our people become, and perhaps without proper justification, it is only natural that the looser their talk, the more careless their utterance tends to become.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend and I very often do not agree, but I should like to go on record now as supporting everything he has just said.

In the first place, with regard to the dispatch which he has read, while I do not wish that we should pat ourselves on the back, I think we have done a particularly good job, and here I am speaking not only for the army, but for all the staffs and for the Canadian people generally, and particularly the people of western Canada, when I say that I do not think security was ever more loyally observed than it was in connection with the Kiska operation. I mean that the people who saw the boats being loaded and knew that troops were being withdrawn and who were bound to get some idea of the direction in which those troops were going, kept their mouths shut. At least it never got to the ears of our intelligence branches that there had been any leaks in connection with that expedition. That went for the relatives of the boys who missed their mail and knew that something must be doing, and for the boys themselves who loyally observed security regulations. I do think that Kiska was an example of staff work and team work by the army, the navy and the air force, because they were all in it, and civilians, too, which could well be emulated in operations of the future.

With regard to my hon. friend's other point, I endeavoured when I was making my opening statement to the committee to emphasize as strongly as I could my own conviction that the idea that the war is over is perhaps the one factor that will be the strongest in lengthening the war of any factor of which one can conceive. When people get the idea that the war is over, there is sure to be, as my hon. friend says, a relaxation, a feeling that we do not need to work quite as hard to win. That is exactly what our enemies are working for and playing for, to get us in a state of complacency or to get us tired out and tired of it all, which might give them an opportunity to force or exact or obtain some better terms than the terms now facing them of unconditional surrender. As I said at the opening of the last war loan, if I were giving a motto to the people of Canada for 1944—there used to be a preacher in our church who gave his people a text for the year on New Year's day—my text to the people of Canada in the year 1944 would be: Don't let up. I agree with my hon. friend that we can only keep up the pressure in connection with men, equipment, and money if we don't let up, and if we restrain ourselves in the matters we would like to talk about, restrain ourselves from giving any inside information that we may have and would like to communicate to somebody else to convince them that we are in on the know. We should endeavour at all times to restrain ourselves from indulging in that very agreeable form of self-exultation, and just keep any information we have to ourselves until this show is over. I do not think there is any time in history when coming events have been foreshadowed in the headlines the way they have been in this war. Sometimes I feel like deploring the amount of publicity which is given to what are regarded as future events. Of course it is so, in these days of rapid communication, and when so many people have to be "in on it", that a great many people do know, and a democratic people, particularly, demand information and consider that they ought to be "let in" as far as their leaders can let them in. I only hope that the desire to satisfy that legitimate longing to have information in a war in which people have everything invested, not only their money but their men as well, will not lead anybody to go too far and endanger lives and the success of operations by giving more information than is absolutely necessary to accomplish the purpose which I have suggested.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): There are two matters which I should like to place before the committee and, perhaps, have a statement with regard to them from the minister. The first has to do with a man in my constituency of Cumberland who was called up and placed in C category; who lived on the farm with his brother, his father being dead; who had a postponement, and who worked in the woods cutting wood and getting some logs, which he was anxious to have hauled out while the snow was still on the ground. He was called to Halifax, and it would now appear, under another number and in the name of another person. He was accepted by the army and placed in the service under the name of Harry Blake Fraser, number G15883, his real name being Harry Brenton Fraser and his number G15419. He is now in the army under this other name, although he had exemption as a farmer and, as I said, was working in the woods getting out logs and lumber. The question is whether he is under military authority, whether he must remain there or

whether he can go home. His mother writes me a pitiful letter; she herself is in ill health; there are two other brothers in the services; he has been retained in Halifax for some weeks and, as far as I know, is still there.

The other matter to which I wish to refer is that of hotel accommodation in Halifax. I have information that the Hillside hotel, which was mentioned this afternoon by the minister and the hon. member for York-Sunbury, has been vacated by the Canadian Women's Army Corps and is just barely occupied at the present time. In view of the scarcity of hotels and stopping places in Halifax, and the fact that the Halifax hotel and the Waverley hotel have also been taken over and that the King Edward hotel is used for military purposes, could not Hillside Hall be made available for the use of the public and transients, to accommodate private citizens? People who have business in Halifax, people who are going to Halifax to see members of their family sail, have no place to stay. Many of them have to stay up all night, and some are ordered not even to come to Halifax. If the facts are as represented to me, this Hillside hotel was taken over by the department at an initial cost of $50,000, plus additional expenditures bringing the total at the present time up to $89,868.63; and as I said, the information I have is that it has been practically vacated as regards the purpose for which it was first secured.

Mr. RALSTON: In reference to the case to which my hon. friend has referred, I would think that the only thing the young man can do is to make application in the regular way. It happens to be a different name, but it is the same individual.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): No; another individual and another number.

Mr. RALSTON: I did not catch it, then.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): His real number is G15419, and the number under which he is being held is G15883.

Mr. RALSTON: As I understood the matter, it was the same individual.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): I assume it is two men. He has his own number. He is not in the army with a uniform. The man is being held under another name and another number.

Mr. RALSTON: If my hon. friend will send me particulars of the case I shall look into it.

With regard to Hillside Hall, I do not know how many people it accommodates; I would think perhaps fifty at the outside.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): I think it accommodates more than that.

Mr. RALSTON: One hundred, say?

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): My return says, ten officers and 200 C.W.A.C.

Mr. RALSTON: It would not accommodate 200 civilians. I can say to my hon. friend that I do not think there is the slightest chance in the world of the department being able to give up that property. We have searched the city and done everything we possibly could in order to get accommodation for the personnel which is required there. We had a great many protests at the time this was done, but the war was on and the accommodation was needed, so that we just had to take it. My hon. friend knows we built on the cathedral grounds huts to accommodate personnel, rather than take more property of that kind. I generally try to hold out hope of consideration, but I am afraid I would not be justified in raising hopes in this case.

Mr. ADAMSON: The question came up just now about complacency. I think that is the term for it. We had a statement this afternoon in this chamber that thirteen basic training centres had been closed. Yet we are told by the Prime Minister, who goes into histrionics about it, that the war is certainly a long way from being won. I am prepared to agree, certainly, that most of the fighting is yet to come, but the statement that thirteen basic training centres have been closed simply defies analysis if we are yet to have our greatest number of casualties. It seems to me that some further statement as to the reason for the closing of these basic training centres is needed. Presumably we are to attack the fortress of Europe. This will be tough, tougher than we probably imagine at the present time. Yet we have decreased our recruiting in, I think, all three services. I am not sure about the navy, but certainly the air force has stopped recruiting aircrew. And we have closed thirteen basic training centres. It seems to me that there must be a further explanation of this very important point.

With reference to the question of internment operations, which comes under this item, the minister has given an explanation as to why we have a reduction in costs. The cost of operations is reduced five million dollars. Actually it is not reduced five million dollars, but the item is reduced by that amount because of the transfer of salaries. Are prisoners of war paid—the ones working in the lumber camps and those engaged in manufacturing operations? There are several plants in my riding—I am thinking of one in particular—where prisoners of war are actually working in industry. What base rates are they being paid, and what regulations under the Geneva convention does this come under?

Mr. RALSTON: I am talking of pay and allowances of guards.

Mr. ADAMSON: I know; that is why this item is reduced. I realize that. I know, however, these men are working in industry and presumably receiving civilian rates of pay. I came across a case the other day where prisoners of war actually had to pay dues to a union because they were working in civilian occupations. This is a United States item and it is reported in a New York paper. I quote from an editorial:

> Almost anybody would at first give way to the impulse to condemn such a situation as that in Bridgetown, New Jersey, where German prisoners are expected to pay dues to an A.F. of L. local of amalgamated meat cutters and butchers' workmen. On second thought, however, that policy has bright possibilities.

I will not read the rest of the story, but here we have a situation where German prisoners of war are actually paying dues.

Mr. MITCHELL: That is not in Canada?

Mr. ADAMSON: No.

Mr. MITCHELL: Stay back home.

Mr. ADAMSON: Nevertheless I think we should have some clarification of the method of paying prisoners of war in Canada.

Mr. RALSTON: I would ask my hon. friend, as I did the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains, to be good enough to defer these questions until the Department of Labour appropriation comes up. This has nothing to do with the item before us. This item has to do with the administration of the camps. It has no reference to employment of prisoners of war, nor has it anything to do with the policy as to why they are there. It is not under the Department of National Defence at all.

Mr. ADAMSON: The prisoners I speak of are actually in an internment camp.

Mr. RALSTON: All we are interested in is supplying the guards. The internees are sent out under order in council, and the Minister of Labour is making the necessary arrangements with regard to the matter. I only ask the committee to keep to the subject.

Mr. ADAMSON: But does that apply to men in special camps cutting wood—the forestry camps? There are special forestry camps, I understand.

Mr. RALSTON: I think so.

Mr. ADAMSON: Do they come under the Minister of Labour or under the Department of National Defence?

[Mr. Adamson.]

Mr. RALSTON: If they are receiving pay they come under the Minister of Labour; that is to say, the rate of pay comes under him. I believe my colleague will remember some discussions with regard to this matter, which has to do with external affairs and the Department of Labour.

Mr. ADAMSON: I am glad it has been brought up because we at least have that clarification of it.

Mr. MITCHELL: There are to my knowledge no prisoners of war in Canada paying dues into any union. The secretary of labour in the United States will take the onus for that situation. When this item comes under my estimates I shall be glad to satisfy my hon. friend with reference to the work done by prisoners of war in Canada.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Is the question of the cost of these prisoners of war camps a matter altogether under external affairs?

Mr. RALSTON: As a matter of fact, the arrangement is made through external affairs with the British government. The actual money spent for the building of the camps was spent by my department.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): And the manning of the camps?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON: One more question. This was discussed at some length this afternoon. I refer to the question of clothing allowance for the soldier, sailor or airman leaving the service. I was in receipt to-day of a communication from the Toronto rehabilitation committee giving what they considered the cost of adequate clothing for a soldier leaving the army, and I think it would be interesting to the committee to have that information now. One paragraph of the letter reads:

> As to clothing, you will notice the committee recommend $35 for men with less than six months' service—

Mr. RALSTON: I hate to interrupt my hon. friend again because he generally sticks closely to the text, but this has nothing to do with dependents' allowance. It is a clothing allowance.

Mr. ADAMSON: But the clothing allowance was brought up this afternoon.

Mr. RALSTON: I did not hear it brought up.

Mr. ADAMSON: Yes; it was discussed at some length.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend is mistaken. I was filing an answer to one hon. member with regard to a case in Montreal, the complaint being that the man had been arrested and was being persecuted by the civil police. But there was no discussion of clothing allowance.

Mr. ADAMSON: I will bring this up under the estimates of the Minister of Pensions and National Health. There is, however, one further thing I would suggest to the minister. It directly affects both ministers, and it is so important I feel it should be taken up on the estimates of the Minister of National Defence. A man in Italy is permanently wounded; he loses a foot. He is taken into a military hospital in Italy until he is well enough to travel. He is then put on a hospital ship and brought back to military hospital in Canada, and all that time he is receiving the pay and allowance of his rank. Then, after a certain period, he is boarded out of the army and sent to a Department of Pensions and National Health hospital where he is put on hospital allowance. The air force does not do that. When he is put on hospital allowance—

Mr. RALSTON: The air force has nothing to do with it.

Mr. ADAMSON: What happens is this. While still incapacitated, while still in hospital, the man is transferred to the Department of Pensions and National Health hospital and his pay is drastically reduced, particularly if he is an officer. I submit that a man, no matter how long he is in hospital, should be paid the full pay of his rank until such time as he is discharged as a walking case. You treat a man as a hero when he is overseas and when he is in a Department of National Defence hospital, but when you send him to the Department of Pensions and National Health hospital you cut his pay. If you are going to cut his pay when he is sent to that hospital it is logical that it should be stopped immediately he is wounded. I make this plea to the minister, and I make it seriously, until the man is completely discharged, well and able to enter into civilian life, keep him on the pay and allowances of his rank. Do not cut him off when you transfer him from—

Mr. RALSTON: Is my hon. friend suggesting he be kept on the strength of the army?

Mr. ADAMSON: No; I suggest his pay should be continued.

Mr. RALSTON: That is quite a different matter. My hon. friend, I am sure, admits he should be struck off the strength of the army.

Mr. ADAMSON: Yes.

Mr. RALSTON: May I remind my hon. friend that he was mistaken when he made a statement the other night on this subject, having overlooked the change which had been made in the hospital allowances given to a man hospitalized after he is discharged. I read those rates into the record at that time. I think most of the committee feels that the subject has been pretty well discussed under this item, even though it does not fall under my department. I would ask my hon. friend for the sake of regularizing the proceedings to bring this matter up under the appropriate item in the Department of Pensions and National Health estimates.

Mr. ADAMSON: I should like to say this as a final word. I feel that it is the function of the Department of National Defence to see to it that until the man is completely discharged to civilian life he should not be penalized after he has passed out of their hands into the Department of Pensions and National Health.

Mr. KNOWLES: Apropos of the well deserved compliment which the minister paid a few minutes ago to the men in the Kiska forces, I should like to take just a few minutes to ask a question. If the minister will recall my remarks of some time ago he will remember that on February 17 I discussed with him the matter of income tax deductions from these men. I was grateful for the studied hearing he gave to our representation at that time. Since I discussed the matter in the committee I have made additional representations to the minister by letter. I have also been in touch with the Minister of Finance and the Minister of National Revenue. My question is: have developments in this matter reached such a stage that the minister can tell us whether the men to whom I refer will have their full exemption in regard to income tax while they were in Kiska?

Mr. RALSTON: I repeat to my hon. friend what I said the other night, when the matter was under discussion, that full attention and full consideration was being given to the matter. When it has been decided upon, an announcement will be made. I do not think it will be very long before the announcement is made.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Early in the discussion I asked a question about the cost of clothing for soldiers. I thought the minister was going to bring down the answer. I think the cost of clothing a soldier when he joins the army should be figured out.

After the lengthy discussion on this department I am still very much confused about our man-power problem. I read in the press

to-day that our friends to the south the United States of America are talking of drafting another million men, fathers and married men up to quite an age. I also read that a great many more women in Britain were to be called up. With what I have been learning here of Canada it just does not add up. Our armed services are going to reduce recruiting.

Last evening the minister rather took me to task when I asked what recruiting cost annually in this country. I would remind you, Mr. Chairman, that we have a dual system for our armed services. Along with recruiting that costs $1,500,000 a year we have the draft system. I think that draft system is on the down grade at the present time. In 1942-43 we enrolled 60,000 men under that system. That dropped to 25,000 in the following year, and for the first nine months of this year it is some 19,000. Of that number about 3,000 have gone active; another 6,500 have been discharged, and there are about 5,300 N.R.M.A. men who are out on extended leave. This, along with the advice that goes out that recruiting will not be so active in future, certainly instils in the minds of the Canadian people a state of complacency; that the war is about won. I agree that the minister does not think that is so. But I say that impression is created throughout Canada. You cannot get away from it.

While I am speaking about complacency may I refer to an incident that happened when I was at home last fall? I came in from the farm one day and was informed that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation had just announced that an item had come from the office of the Prime Minister to the effect that they were going to ask Canadians to take an hour or two to celebrate the victory in Italy and Sicily. I must confess that I had a cold chill when I was told that. In fact I said, "I cannot believe it."

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): They cancelled it.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I said, "You know what I think about our—"

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That was a faux pas.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): "—Prime Minister as a war leader. I cannot credit that statement." I am happy to think that before very long another message came over the air which was —as a result of a statement from Washington that President Roosevelt had said that this was certainly no time for celebration—to the effect that the celebration was off. I am happy to think that occurred before we, as Canadians, had been humiliated.

I think it is the duty of every public official in this country, and especially those in the government, to avail themselves of every opportunity to impress upon our citizens that this war is far from won, as the minister has himself said. I feel rather frustrated about the whole situation, as I must confess. I cannot see the end of this war in sight in the near future. I think it is bad that our people are led to believe that it is nearly over. As I stated, we must keep before our people that we have a long, dark, hard pull ahead of us. I hate to think of the heartaches that I fear will take place in this country as a result of great casualties if we win this war as we should. I think that should be impressed upon the public.

As I say, the man-power situation, the recruitment for the various armed services and the draft system do not portray the seriousness of the situation. I am not able to get to the bottom of it. I am more befuddled, after listening to the remarks of the Minister of National Defence, than I was before I started, and I certainly was in a deep mystery then.

An hon. MEMBER: You always are.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): That may be. I do not profess to be an armchair strategist or anything of that kind. But I have had a little experience in war, and I am prepared to take up arms again if the opportunity should arise. But I say I am quite confused. I say we are not impressing the seriousness of this whole business on the people of Canada as we should.

An hon. MEMBER: John Bracken is.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I trust that we shall not need any further recruitment, either by the draft system or voluntarily. But, as I say, it does not add up, as far as I am concerned. Along with what has been said by the minister, the leader of the opposition, and others on various occasions, I want to impress upon the people that we have a very serious task ahead of us. I am afraid it will cost this country a lot in lives. We should be impressing that seriously upon the people. I repeat, what we have learned here in the last few weeks has not borne that out.

Mr. LOCKHART: I was out of the house for a few minutes. Did the minister take cognizance of the note I sent him across the floor, and will he let me have the information about the proving ranges?

Mr. RALSTON: I shall.

Mr. LOCKHART: There is quite a lot of damage being done.

Mr. JACKMAN: Will the minister tell the committee how many officers have graduated from the allied military school at Kingston, how many are being trained there at the present time, what the purpose of it is, and where these officers are to be sent afterwards?

Mr. RALSTON: The school is being conducted in collaboration with the British war office. I think there have been three classes so far. I am speaking from memory. As I indicated to the committee the other night I think there were twenty-four in the first class. The purpose of the training of these officers is in connection with the occupation of enemy countries. I know of some officers who are already engaged in connection with that work in Italy, and who were in Sicily. My hon. friend wants to know the type of officers. I can tell him generally speaking they are of the sort who would have some knowledge of municipal government or the management of municipal public utilities. They are men who would be engineers, people of that class. Linguistic requirements are not so much a necessity. There are also some teachers, as I understand it, in connection with some special lines. Their use, generally speaking, is in connection with occupied territories.

Mr. JACKMAN: How many officers does the minister intend to train in that school altogether?

Mr. RALSTON: I was in error a moment ago in my reference to these classes; the first group has just graduated and the second is just going in now.

Mr. JACKMAN: How large is the scheme intended to be?

Mr. RALSTON: There is a school in England, a school in Canada and a school in the United States.

Mr. JACKMAN: But how many men does the minister intend to put through this school?

Mr. RALSTON: It depends upon the supply in England. Our officers are going from the Canadian army in England to the school over there, and it will depend upon how many are required altogether. We are collaborating with the British in that respect. I cannot tell my hon. friend; it may be that this school will not continue. It just depends upon how many are needed, for all we know the school in England can take all that we have available.

Mr. ADAMSON: What is the length of the course?

Mr. RALSTON: Two months.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE FOR AIR

Hon. C. G. POWER (Minister of National Defence for Air): Mr. Chairman, I propose to-night to give perhaps a more detailed and comprehensive statement of the affairs of the Royal Canadian Air Force than has been my custom in past years. That is for two reasons. We have reached a phase in our war-time existence, as far as the air force is concerned, which marks the end of one part, and an important part, of our work, namely the air training, and we are on the threshold of beginning the more important part of the work, the fruition, the fulfilment of what has been going on for the past three years, namely the well prepared attempt—and I am almost sure the successful attempt—finally to wrest air supremacy over Europe from our enemies.

I have certain financial statements here. I do not wish to trouble the committee by reading them; if I have consent I will place them on *Hansard* and see to it that the members of the groups opposite receive copies at once. The first statement deals with the cash estimates for 1944-45, and shows that the total cash requirement of the Royal Canadian Air Force for the fiscal year 1944-45 is $1,090,000,000.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Is it broken down?

Mr. POWER: Yes, very much. The statement is as follows:

Royal Canadian Air Force

Cash Estimates 1944-1945

1. Total Requirements.—Total estimated cash requirements of the Royal Canadian Air Force for the fiscal year 1944-1945, is: $1,090,000,000.

2. Probable expenditure for the fiscal year 1943-1944 is: $1,189,402,327.

3. Detailed requirements for 1944-1945, compared with probable expenditure for 1943-1944, are:

	1943-1944	1944-1945	Increase or Decrease	Percent
British commonwealth air training plan	$ 474,200,502	$ 387,937,507	($86,262,995)	(18·14)
Western hemisphere operations	309,900,000	238,905,351	(70,994,649)	(22·9)
Overseas	405,301,825	463,157,142	57,855,317	(14·32)
Totals	$1,189,402,327	$1,090,000,000	($99,402,327)	

It will be noted from the above that, notwithstanding an expected increase in overseas expenditures of approximately $58,000,000, there is an over-all reduction of approximately $99,000,000. This means that the British commonwealth air training plan and western hemisphere operations will require approximately $157,000,000 less than in the previous year.

I also have a statement indicating the man-power strength of the Royal Canadian Air Force each year since the beginning of the war, as follows:

Man-power Strength

Strength

Royal Canadian Air Force strength for each of the following years on the dates stated, were,—

31st August, 1939	4,061
2nd April, 1940	10,598
31st March, 1941	47,920
31st March, 1942	112,759
2nd April, 1943	170,366
18th February, 1944	206,548

Man-power requirements for the next year, that is April 1, 1944, to March 31, 1945, are 26,000.

This reduction from requirements of previous years, is largely due to the fact that groundcrew requirements have been stabilized and we have again this year, owing largely to the intensive recruiting campaign of last October, a substantial aircrew reserve in hand. In addition remustering to aircrew trades from groundcrew will yield a considerable number of aircrew. Last year 6,192 groundcrew were remustered to aircrew. This, together with the fact that there will be a reduction during the course of the year of entrants into training, lowers our aircrew requirements for the year.

Now I propose to divide this review of last year's operations into three parts:

Part 1. British commonwealth joint air training plan,

Part 2. Western hemisphere operations,

Part 3. Overseas operations.

With regard to the British commonwealth air training plan, the cash expenditures from inception are:

Fiscal year 1939-1940	$ 3,298,747
Fiscal year 1940-1941	124,354,624
Fiscal year 1941-1942	244,060,067
Fiscal year 1942-1943	401,556,818
(9 months) Fiscal year 1943-1944	339,521,105
Total for above period	$1,112,791,361
Estimated additional to March 31, 1944	134,679,397
Total estimated expenditure from inception to March 31, 1944	1,247,470,758
Estimated cash 1944-1945	387,937,507
Total estimated expenditure from inception to March 31, 1945	$1,635,408,265

These figures represent the cash which has been found and estimated still to be found by the Canadian government and are additional to contributions in kind by the United Kingdom government.

The decrease in estimated cash requirements during 1944-45, for the British commonwealth air training plan from the anticipated 1943-44 expenditures amounting to approximately $86,000,000, is chiefly attributable to reductions in capital expenditures and pay and allowances. The plan has now passed its ultimate and capital expenditures have been reduced to the practical minimum.

Certain reductions in the scope of the training organization were anticipated and these estimates give effect to these reductions. Since preparation of the estimates, however, decisions have been made which will ultimately reduce the plan still further. These further reductions cannot have an early effect on recurring expenditure as training establishments must keep in operation for the completion of the training of aircrew and groundcrew now in training. It may be noted that most aircrew courses are of approximately twelve months' duration and it is obvious that the better part of the fiscal year 1944-45 will elapse before curtailment to any worthwhile extent can be accomplished in the operation of advanced schools, which, besides being the most numerous, are also the most costly to operate.

The British commonwealth air training plan has this year reached the zenith of its development, and its effect has been felt around the world. Wherever our allied airmen fly, will be found graduates of this plan: from the antipodes to the bleak wastes of Greenland, from India to Alaska, our Canadian-trained aviators perform their daily tasks as they were so well taught to do by the thousands of men in the instructional, technical and administrative staffs of our training plan.

The spectacular and more publicized part of this plan, the production of our fighting aircrew, has continued at full flow. No demands for men of the various flying categories have been unheeded, and the continuous development of this plan has kept abreast of the requirements of the fighting fronts.

The original agreement for the British commonwealth joint air training plan entered into December 13, 1939, has been amended by supplementary agreements in June, 1942, and April, 1943. A further change was made in the agreement in December, 1943, and again in February, 1944. These changes were announced to the house in a statement made on February 16, appearing at page 535 of *Hansard*. I quote:

At the present time we have the capital and the necessary immediate replacements.

Our long-term war plans entail certain reductions in the numbers of entrants to aircrew training.

Consequent upon the reduction in intake of trainees, there will be a gradual and progressive

closing of a certain number of training units, and schools in Canada, beginning with the Royal Air Force transferred schools. The process will be deliberate and extended over many months, and the reduction of training facilities will be geared to the requisite flow of pupils through the plan.

These changes indicate that we have reached the end of our air training expansion.

To quote General George Marshall, chief of staff of the United States army, in his report to the secretary of war, in his explanation of somewhat similar changes made in the United States army organization—

> Another factor is now operating to our advantage. We are reaching the end of the expansion; already it has been possible to reduce many training installations to a purely maintenance basis to furnish replacements for the present strength of the army. It also has been practicable, and it is highly desirable to lengthen the basic training period for soldiers and to extend the period of training for officer candidates; and most important of all, it is no longer necessary to drain units of their best officers and men to furnish trained cadres for new organizations or students for the officer candidates and technical schools.

This quotation refers to the United States army generally, but perhaps more particularly to the United States army air force, which has only recently closed seventy air training establishments.

The partners in the joint air training plan have agreed to modify our training programme so as to bring the greatest possible weight of air strength to bear on the German enemy during the critical year of the war.

Let it be well understood the expansion of training has been completed, but the expansion of the forces on the fighting fronts is still going on. That expansion will be provided for by the thousands now in the training scheme, the reduced training capacity being amply sufficient to look after the replacements when the front line cadre is filled.

We are not proposing a winding-up of the air training plan, even progressively, on the contrary we are providing, and have agreed with the United Kingdom for a continuation of the plan after March, 1945, the date on which the 1942 agreement expires, but a continuation with a reduced output, which reduced output will not be noticeable or in effect before eighteen months hence.

We are rolling up our training forces as we would a carpet. By this process of rolling from the rear, personnel will be automatically massed forward to increase the striking power of the fighting front.

Now, I certainly will be asked as to what schools will be closed and when. I have already stated that the Royal Air Force transferred schools will be the first to close, beginning about midsummer and running well into next year. With respect to others, there are many factors to be taken into consideration. Whether the property is leased or owned. Whether it is required for civilian purposes. A school in Quebec city, located in a leased property, for instance, will be closed this month. Another school located in an institution kindly placed at our disposal by the government of Ontario, and now required for agricultural purposes, will be returned as soon as possible.

Other factors to be considered will be travelling expense between types of schools; costs of operation, disturbance to civilian economy, geographical location; air training conditions, fog area or obscure visibility, air congestion, etc.

There are two methods which might be followed in bringing about this reduction. We might reduce our production by simply cutting down the number of trainees in each school and so keeping them all or nearly all open. On the other hand we might close and place on a care and maintenance basis a certain number of schools. The first course only brings about a postponement and besides is far more costly and less effective in our war effort. It keeps up overhead, staff, instructors, travelling expenses, etc., and holds people in Canada who would be better employed overseas. We have chosen the second alternative as being honest and efficient, even if, for the moment, less popular.

As to the use to which these can be put in the future, four government agencies are interested,—

(1) The post-war civil aviation committee, and from the standpoint of the public it is the most interested because the first question to be asked will be what use can be made of these expensive facilities in the development of post-war civil aviation. This committee, under the cabinet war committee, has already been charged with the study of possible post-war civilian utilization of aerodromes constructed for service purposes, when they are no longer required by the service.

(2) The second government agency is the Department of Labour, which has on several occasions written to ask that it be notified when any schools or institutions become vacant so that it may plan their use for vocational training and accommodation of trainees, and other purposes.

(3) Then there is the Department of Pensions and National Health, which may require accommodation for vocational training and perhaps for convalescent homes or rehabilitation purposes generally.

(4) Further, there is the crown assets allocation committee and the War Assets Corporation, Limited, charged with the disposal of assets, including lands and buildings no longer required by the services. As soon as a decision is reached as to the closing of individual schools, these various agencies will be notified.

During the past year, and since I made my last report to this house concerning these matters, a considerable change has taken place in the requirements of the flying services at the fighting fronts. We have now achieved a position of air superiority in men and machines, and are carrying the war to the enemy by way of our heavy bombers. This has caused the Germans to emphasize the defensive, and accordingly our ratio of losses in the lighter aircraft categories such as fighters, fighter-bombers, and medium bombers, has dropped. This has reflected itself in a change in the requirements for the production of different types of aircrew, in that an increasing proportion of our aircrew is now being diverted into the heavier types of aircraft, where they will make their blows on Hitler's Europe felt in the most effective way.

Last year, when making my report, I told you that we had already trained over 50,000 aircrew in Canada. I can tell you now that this number has risen to over 86,000. Similarly, the number trained in ground trades is now above 114,000 men and we have practically reached saturation in our requirements for ground trades, both for training establishments and for operational requirements in the western hemisphere of operations. In addition to the men required by the Royal Canadian Air Force, we have enlisted and trained over 15,000 in the women's division. Here again we have reached our peak and no further personnel are needed to bring our establishments to full strength beyond what have already been enlisted and are awaiting training, and accordingly, enlistment for the women's division of the Royal Canadian Air Force has been curtailed to the comparatively small numbers required for replacements.

We have had less trouble in the past year obtaining training aircraft than in any time in the past. In elementary trainers we have all we need and the same applies for the training aircraft used in our service schools. Operational aircraft used in training, are still in relatively scarce supply due to the requirements of the various operational theatres of war and the demands from our ever-increasing overseas participation.

There has been a practical completion of all construction necessary for the continuance of the plan, and from now on, relatively little in the way of further construction is to be expected. The requirements for repair and storage continue to increase and as the aircraft get larger, these requirements will continue to grow. This tells the story of the point the air training plan has reached to-day.

Now that the air training plan has reached its peak, I think I should say a word of thanks to all those who have contributed to its undoubted success. To officer and airman, to staff and trainees, to service and civilian personnel, and to the people of Canada who supported it. It was a truly national effort. Its fulfilment was the expression of the nation's will.

I now come to another phase of our operations, namely, western hemisphere operations; and again I ask consent of the committee to lay on the table of the house a statement of cash expenditures on western hemisphere operations since the outbreak of the war, indicating that the total estimated expenditures from September, 1939, to March 31, 1945, will be $963,053,377, and I would also explain how the reduction in expenditures of $71,000,000 this year as compared with last year is being brought about. The table and the explanation are as follows:

Western Hemisphere Operations

Cash expenditures from the outbreak of war are,	
Fiscal year 1939-1940	$ 28,554,447
Fiscal year 1940-1941	50,172,423
Fiscal year 1941-1942	108,694,025
Fiscal year 1942-1943	226,827,131
(9 months) Fiscal year 1943-1944	241,614,736
Total for above period	$655,862,762
Estimated additional to March 31, 1944	68,285,264
Total estimated expenditure from September, 1939, to March 31, 1944	$724,148,026
Estimated cash 1944-1945	238,905,351
Total estimated expenditure September, 1939 to March 31, 1945.	$963,053,377

This decrease in estimated cash requirements for 1944-1945 for western hemisphere operations from anticipated expenditures for 1943-1944 amounting to approximately $71,000,000, is also mainly due to reductions in capital expenditures. The improved strategic situation has already permitted the transfer overseas of operational squadrons previously considered an essential part of the air defence of Canada. Furthermore, all major construction projects have been reviewed and, where economically feasible, they have been reduced or brought to a halt. Also, where operational possibilities warrant, certain units have been placed on a care and maintenance basis. Such curtailment in operations will eventually release man-power for overseas operations, either direct or through the training facilities of the British commonwealth air training plan.

Since I last reported to the house in May of last year the situation with respect to western hemisphere air operations have undergone considerable change. The enemy has been driven, or has been forced to withdraw his forces, to a more comfortable distance from our shores. The Japanese have been chased out of the Aleutian islands on our western flank, and a greater concentration of naval and air strength, together with new and improved weapons have forced the withdrawal of German submarine raiders to a considerable distance from our Atlantic coast line and from the gulf of St. Lawrence.

I have already explained on various occasions that the Royal Canadian Air Force engaged actively in operations against the enemy in the western hemisphere theatre is a complete and separate entity distinct from the Royal Canadian Air Force overseas and the British commonwealth air training plan.

It is history now that Royal Canadian Air Force squadrons composed of British commonwealth air training plan graduates and commanded by air veterans of the battle of Britain and the battle of Europe, operated under American command in the Aleutians coastal shipping and watching for Japanese foothold on our Pacific approaches. Blinded by the eternal fog and buffeted by the fierce and whimsical gales of that bleak corner of the continent, Royal Canadian Air Force fighter bomber pilots, with their American air comrades, developed new technique in blasting the Japanese on Attu and Kiska so that United States and Canadian naval and ground forces could move in and take over those barren bits of rock away out in the Pacific.

The successful air operation in the Aleutians was pressed to a conclusion in the face of great difficulties, not only of weather but of supply and communication. Living conditions were, of necessity rather primitive and our boys suffered at times, considerable physical discomfort. A point which is not generally realized is that the personnel of our Aleutians squadrons, were more than 2,000 miles from their home bases, in other words as far from home as if they had been serving in the European or Mediterranean theatre, and the facilities of communication and supply were nothing like those connecting the home front with the latter theatre of war.

The units in the Aleutians were the only ones in the western air command who were fortunate enough to get in their own personal punch at the Japanese but there were thousands backing them up in less glamourous activities. There were squadrons patrolling the sea lanes of the Pacific coast protecting coastal shipping and watching for Japanese raiders. There were fighter squadrons poised to repel air attacks. There was a vast construction organization, very often composed exclusively of service personnel, engaged in building new air bases in British Columbia and in the Yukon. Behind this again was a vastly improved communication and administration organization. Land line and radio communications were installed on a large scale. The Royal Canadian Air Force took over the control of all flying, civil as well as military, in the entire western region as well as throughout the busy northwest staging route north and west from Edmonton to Canol and on to Whitehorse and Alaska.

Probably hon. members and the public are more familiar with our Atlantic operations, particularly those concerned with the protection of troops and supplies moving to European theatres of war and with the unrelenting hunt for enemy submarines.

From the first Royal Canadian Air Force attack on a U-boat in October of 1941 up to the end of the calendar year, 1943, Royal Canadian Air Force operational aircraft have made a total of sixty-three attacks on enemy submarines in the Atlantic including one machine gun attack by a fighter aircraft. Of the sixty-three attacks, one half were made in 1943.

Through the acquisition of 4-engine Liberator long-range bombers, we have been able to extend the radius of air-cover from Canadian bases by something more than 200 miles. Of course, it will be understood that the primary purpose of our long-range squadrons in eastern air command is to protect the valuable convoys traversing the Atlantic.

The monotony of flying protection for convoys and hunting for submarines is indicated by some figures compiled by our research office. They tell us that late in 1942 the average flying time productive of a U-boat sighting was 840 hours and that our aircrew sighted a submarine on an average of once in 140 sorties. In the first half of 1943 the average remained about the same but in the last six months of the year it took an average of 1,700 hours of flying time for a U-boat sighted or an average of 230 sorties per sighting. Of course, the U-boats may still be there, but at least they keep submerged and thereby reducing their effectiveness.

Our increasing success on the anti-U-boat campaign is due in part to improved weapons, more modern aircraft and the greater experience of our aircrews. We are constantly improving our aircraft. For instance we have now the 4-engine Liberator and we have quite a number of Vega Ventura reconnaissance

bombers which the United States Navy call the PVI. Then there are of course, the Catalinas and Canso long range flying boats and still a few of the old faithful and almost obsolescent Lockheed Hudsons.

All in all, we had engaged in western hemisphere operations almost as many squadrons as we have Royal Canadian Air Force squadrons overseas. The departure of the Japanese from the Aleutians and the improvement in the U-boat war situation in the Atlantic have so improved the general situation that we have been able to release a number of western hemisphere operations squadrons for service overseas. On the west and east coasts our western hemisphere operational squadrons, during 1942 flew 62,500 operational hours compared with 86,000 hours in 1943. This flying time is equivalent to something like 7,500,000 nautical miles in 1942, compared with 10,000,000 nautical miles in 1943. In 1942 our aircraft flew 3,579 sorties escorting shipping compared with 2,097 sorties in 1943, but of course the aircraft range was greater. In addition to this, there were 9,649 miscellaneous sorties in 1942, such as sub hunts, reconnaissance, etcetera, as compared with 21,874 miscellaneous sorties in 1943.

In order to round out still more our Atlantic coverage, one of our anti-submarine patrol squadrons has been detached from the east coast and is now operating from a base in Iceland. It can be recalled should the enemy return to his attacks on shipping or close proximity to our coasts. Whilst we rejoice in the fact that no enemy submarine was sighted from our coast line during 1943, and no attacks were made in Canadian territorial waters, we do not propose to neglect our defences. The submarines may find it more profitable to return to narrow waters, there may be a recurrence of the intensive activity near our coasts as in 1942, when they attacked convoys leaving our shores rather than in mid-Atlantic, as they did in 1943. For that reason we cannot afford to denude ourselves of convoy protection and anti-submarine patrols in home waters. Our job is to hunt submarines wherever they are to be found, and we will hunt them, whether close in shore or far out to sea.

I now come to a discussion of the overseas operations of the Royal Canadian Air Force units, and again I would ask the consent of the committee to place on *Hansard* a statement of the expenditure since the outbreak of the war on overseas operations. The total estimated expenditure September, 1939, to March 31, 1945, is $910,819,643. There is also an explanation attached to the statement showing how there has been a substantial increase in the expenditure overseas as compared with last year's expenditure. The statement is as follows:

Overseas Operations

Overseas War Establishment:	
Cash expenditures from the outbreak of war, are:	
Fiscal year 1939-1940.....	Nil
Fiscal year 1940-1941.....	$ 4,995,360
Fiscal year 1941-1942.....	13,699,336
Fiscal year 1942-1943.....	23,665,980
(9 months) Fiscal year 1943-1944	252,351,727
Total for above period.....	$294,712,403
Estimated additional to March 31, 1944	152,950,098
Total estimated expenditure, September, 1939, to March 31, 1944.	$447,662,501
Estimated cash 1944-1945.....	463,157,142
Total estimated expenditure, September, 1939, to March 31, 1945.	$910,819,643

The increase in estimated overseas cash requirements for 1944-1945 over estimated expenditures for 1943-1944 of approximately $58,000,000 is attributable to the increase in maintenance of overseas squadrons and increased personnel costs. Capital expenditure for overseas squadrons will continue as our squadrons are reequipped and rearmed with more up-to-date and more costly equipment. Provision has been made for the maintenance of forty-four Canadian squadrons overseas as against thirty-eight in the previous year.

The continued posting of aircrew and ground-crew graduates overseas, together with promotions, will continue to reflect increases in overseas pay and allowances and this item alone accounts for approximately $39,000,000 of the increase over 1943-1944.

Overseas Operations. Before speaking of the record of the Royal Canadian Air Force overseas, I shall endeavour to make a clear distinction between the various classes of Canadian air representations overseas. There has, I find, been a great deal of confusion in the minds not only of Canadians generally but also of members of this house as to just what classes of Canadians come under the jurisdiction of the Royal Canadian Air Force.

First in chronological order, though small in numerical importance, are Canadian nationals who are members of the Royal Air Force. There are men and some few women who joined the Royal Air Force in the years before the war, or in the months immediately after the outbreak of the war. Most of them were enlisted in England. A few are Canadians who have remained with the Royal Air Force in the years since the last war. None of these men whose numbers are not available but who at a rough guess might be about 2,000 have any connection with the Royal

Canadian Air Force. We exercise no authority over them, we do not pay them. They are not identified in any way as Canadians. They belong to a different service from the Royal Canadian Air Force.

It is in connection with these personnel that there has been a demand that they be permitted to transfer to the Royal Canadian Air Force. I promised last year to take it up with the air ministry, and after long negotiations, air ministry has consented to the transfer to our forces if these men and women so desire. Instructions have recently been issued by us covering such transfers.

Since they are not identified with the Royal Canadian Air Force, I do not refer to them when reviewing our overseas operations.

Another and the most important class from the standpoint of numbers, and from the standpoint of Canada generally, are the thousands of Canadians, mostly aircrew, but with a goodly number of radio mechanics who were enlisted, trained and are paid by Canada, but are now on loan to the Royal Air Force and are serving with Royal Air Force units or formations.

Let me make myself perfectly clear. These personnel to whom I referred a moment ago joined the Royal Canadian Air Force in Canada, were trained by us and are entirely paid for by us. They still retain their Canadian identity. They wear Canadian shoulder badges, and as I said before, are paid by Canada. Their welfare, promotion, repatriation, and their interests are our duty and responsibility for they are only temporarily attached to Royal Air Force. They are located all over the world. They are not in Royal Canadian Air Force squadrons because with respect to radio mechanics they are specialists and do not by the nature of their occupation readily form themselves into units of any size. These radio mechanics are spread all over southeastern Asia, Africa and the United Kingdom individually or in small detachments. My information is that they compose 45 per cent of the strength of the Royal Air Force mechanics establishment.

With respect to the other category of Royal Canadian Air Force airmen attached to the Royal Air Force, namely aircrew, they are not in Royal Canadian Air Force squadrons because there are not now, nor likely ever will be, enough Royal Canadian Air Force squadrons to fit them into. These aircrew, flying men, are widely dispersed throughout Royal Air Force squadrons. It is because they are so widely scattered, in so many different units, that we meet with some difficulty in carrying out our responsibilities and duties towards them. Nevertheless by means of liaison officers, and during the past year through pay officers, through more elaborate records, even though in some cases it means duplicating Royal Air Force records, through Royal Canadian Air Force sub-headquarters in various sections of the United Kingdom, in Italy, and in the middle east, and in India, we endeavour to keep in touch and to the best of our ability to keep track of their commissioning, rights to repatriation, and tours of duty.

The recent agreements, and better understandings with the air ministry, and more particularly with the more subordinate officers of the Royal Air Force, will go a long way to improving the situation of both aircrew and ground radio mechanics.

I believe it is better understood now that we undertake our responsibilities to these men, not with any desire to interfere with Royal Air Force organization, but because the parents of these boys, and the people of Canada generally, expect us to do so. Canadian parents have neither the channels open, nor the desire to approach the Royal Air Force and air ministry, with respect to the matters in which their boys are interested. Canadian people look to the Royal Canadian Air Force and the Royal Canadian Air Force must be organized to meet their demands.

Thirdly, and finally, we come to our own men in our own Canadian Royal Canadian Air Force squadrons. Originally there were three Canadian squadrons which went overseas as units. The number has now risen to forty-two in actual operations overseas. There are bomber squadrons, fighter squadrons, reconnaissance squadrons, coastal command squadrons, night fighter and intruder squadrons. In these forty-two squadrons identified as Canadian squadrons nearly all the aircrew are Canadian, the commanding officers are Canadian, the groundcrew are Canadian. The entire cost of the squadrons, including aeroplanes is borne by Canada, and their upkeep as Canadian units makes up a goodly part of our overseas expenditure. There are not nearly so many Canadian aircrew in Royal Canadian Air Force squadrons as there are scattered throughout the Royal Air Force. I have been asked many times why all Canadians are not in Canadian squadrons. The answer is that if all Canadian flying men were in Canadian squadrons we would require not thousands, as we have, but well over a hundred thousand groundcrew for the maintenance and service of these squadrons and their equipment. You cannot properly call a squadron a Canadian squadron, even though the majority of the aircrew were Canadians, if the ground-

crew necessary to care for, repair and maintain the aircraft were other than Canadians, for normally these groundcrew number many times more than the aircrew who actually fly the machines.

There is a story told by a newspaper correspondent of having visited a Royal Air Force squadron in Africa, and on entering the officers' mess he found a placard posted up with these words, "Canadian spoken here; English understood."

Besides, the joint air training plan was intended only for the purpose of producing aircrew. It was never intended under the original agreement that we should send any groundcrew over to the United Kingdom. It was considered that if Canada set up the ground establishment in Canada to train flyers, and that meant employment of over 150,000 people on the ground, it would have done its share in the air war effort by sending the trained flying personnel overseas to fight as member of the commonwealth air forces in any of the commonwealth units anywhere. But, because we desired further identification of our forces, and because we had some of the best mechanics and groundcrews in the world, eager and ready to proceed overseas, we set up these overseas air squadrons, and personally I am exceedingly proud of the action we did take.

To judge by the paucity of public information carried in the British and American press, and in official statements and communiques with respect to the thousands of our men in the Royal Air Force, I should judge that if we had not had these squadrons of our own, even the people of Canada, not to speak of our allies and partners, would have been almost totally ignorant of the large and important part Canada is playing in the air war and the defeat of Germany.

I am often asked, when I speak of Canadians in the Royal Air Force, what proportion of our men compose the Royal Air Force strength. In groundcrew our proportion is small since we have only supplied groundcrew for our own squadrons, the remainder of Canadian groundcrew being kept in Canada for the purposes of the joint air training plan which trains flyers for all the allies and the commonwealth forces.

With regard to aircrew, that is men who fly, the situation is different, and our proportionate strength to that of the Royal Air Force is very much higher. I have not the exact figures for overseas. I know, however, that Canada is now, and has been for many months, the largest and principal producer of aircrew for all the commonwealth forces. I know that, of the aircrew of all the partners produced in Canada, Royal Canadian Air Force graduates make up considerably more than one-half of the total. All others combined, including Australian, New Zealand and British, and all the peoples who make up the Royal Air Force quota of trainees, make up less than half the graduates.

I know how many thousands of pilots, observers bombaimers, wireless operators and air gunners we have overseas. I am fully informed as to the number of such aircrew there are at any given moment in Royal Canadian Air Force squadrons. I have not figures of the numbers of these graduates in Royal Air Force squadrons at any given time. They vary with commands, with postings, with casualties, with sickness, with leave and numerous other factors.

But with the best information I can obtain, I should say that from 22 per cent to 25 per cent of all the aircrew in the European and Mediterranean areas under British tactical command—and this includes British, New Zealanders, Australians, Poles, Czechs, Norwegians, Belgians and Free French—are Canadian boys, enlisted in Canada, trained in Canada, paid for by Canadians. That proportion will tend to increase rather than decrease as the men whom we have overseas proceed through their final courses to the operational squadrons, until Canadians comprise about one-third of the total content of these British-Dominion-allied aircrew strength.

I have deliberately omitted reference to the Indian theatre of operations; I know how many Canadians are there, but I do not know their relative strength compared to other allied forces. I have also omitted reference to the south Pacific where we have practically no representation, but where Australia and New Zealand, with very little publicity on this continent, are heroically bearing the burden on land, sea and air, along with United States forces.

Necessarily I have not the details of the operations to which Canadians loaned to Royal Air Force squadrons took part. Suffice to say that they are in almost every formation of the Royal Air Force and have been in every sortie, every raid, every operation undertaken by the Royal Air Force. I have, however, the details of the work of our men who are grouped together in Royal Canadian Air Force squadrons and this work I now propose to review.

Operations of Royal Canadian Air Force units overseas. The Royal Canadian Air Force entered the year 1944 with forty-two squadrons overseas, operating under the direction of the Royal Air Force bomber command, coastal command, fighter command, allied

expeditionary air force, Mediterranean command and India command. During the year 1943 we grouped these squadrons together within each command as far as their operational role permitted. As a result of this move we have a bomber group, fighter wings, reconnaissance wing, and a number of auxiliary units.

The following statistics will give you a general idea of the Royal Canadian Air Force squadrons' participation overseas in the war against the enemy during 1943 and to the middle of February, 1944:

Sorties flown	38,544
Operational hours flown	129,461
Tons of bombs dropped	21,990
Enemy aircraft destroyed	208
Enemy aircraft probably destroyed and damaged	162
Locomotives destroyed	150

To which must be added enemy U-boats, merchant vessels, tugs, barges, military installations, motor vehicles, transports of all kinds, et cetera.

A very large number of operational sorties were flown and a large tonnage of bombs dropped, bearing in mind that seventeen squadrons were converted from obsolescent to modern aircraft during the year, during which period they were of necessity out of the line. For example, at the beginning of 1943 the majority of our bomber squadrons were equipped with two-engined medium bombers of the Wellington class and before the end of the year had been converted to heavy four-engine aircraft. You will readily appreciate that it is a considerable undertaking to convert a squadron from Wellington to Halifaxes or Lancasters, involving as it does additional crew members and the necessity of making old crews conversant with and competent on the new equipment. Due to these conversions to larger aircraft a substantial increase in the tonnage dropped was shown during the later months of 1943. An increase which is each month being exceeded as the Royal Canadian Air Force's participation with the Royal Air Force in the round the clock attack on Germany is speeded up.

Fighter squadrons. Our day fighter and fighter reconnaissance squadrons, operating from bases in the United Kingdom under the command of the allied expeditionary air force and fighter command, are grouped together into Royal Canadian Air Force fighter wings and a Royal Canadian Air Force reconnaissance wing.

These wings are employed on offensive sweeps over the continent against the enemy. They provide protection to bombers of the air forces of the British empire and of the United States army air force on daylight attacks against continental targets. They also undertake close escort duties, convoy patrols, air-sea rescue flights, interception patrols and general reconnaissance flights.

During the period 1st January, 1943, to 11th February, 1944, these wings and squadrons flew 21,965 operational sorties, destroyed 158 enemy aircraft and probably destroyed or damaged 135 others. In addition to these successful attacks on enemy aircraft, many locomotives, railway yards, enemy ships, motor vehicles, military installations, trains, et cetera, were damaged.

Intruder and night fighter squadrons. Royal Canadian Air Force intruder and night fighter squadrons are operating under the operational control of the Royal Air Force fighter command. These squadrons are employed on offensive duties against enemy targets on the Continent and on the defensive protection of Great Britain against enemy day and night raiders.

These squadrons have carried out 2,056 operational sorties, during which they have destroyed forty-two enemy aircraft and probably destroyed or damaged twenty-four others, to say nothing of some eighty-one locomotives.

Bomber squadrons. At 0001 hours, 1st January, 1943, the Royal Canadian Air Force assumed responsibility for a bomber group within the Royal Air Force bomber command. As I have already mentioned, the majority of these squadrons were equipped with medium twin-engined aircraft at this time, and during the year converted to and are now operating on heavy four-engined aircraft.

Shortly after the formation of the Royal Air Force pathfinder force, the Royal Canadian Air Force assumed its share of responsibility in this group. The purpose of the pathfinders, is to mark the route of the main body and then to indicate the target with special flares to enable the main force to drop its bombs in the correct spot. This particular work is highly specialized and the Royal Canadian Air Force is making a name for itself in this field.

Some idea of the extent to which the Royal Canadian Air Force bomber group has participated in bomber command's devastating offensive against the enemy's vital centres of war industry may be gathered from a list of the main targets attacked during the first thirteen months of the group's existence. The effect of the high explosive and incendiary loads released by its aircraft was felt by more than forty important manufacturing and communications centres, seaports, shipbuilding yards, submarine bases, et cetera, in Germany, Italy and occupied France.

The list is of considerable length. I cannot pronounce the names and so I will place it on *Hansard*:

Aachen	Leipzig
Berlin	Leverkusen
Bochum	Magdeburg
Brunswick	Mannheim-Ludwigshaven
Cologne	Mulheim
Dortmund	Munchen-Gladbach
Duisburg	Munich
Dusseldorf	Norden (N.W. Germany)
Esens (N.W. Germany)	Nuremberg
	Oldenburg
Essen	Peenemunde
Frankfurt	Pilsen (Czechoslovakia)
Gelsenkirchen	Remscheid
Hamburg	Stettin
Hanover	Stuttgart
Kassel	Wilhelmshaven
Kiel	Wuppertal
Krefeld	

France
- Cannes (marshalling yards)
- Foret de Raismes (ammunition dump)
- Le Creusot (Schneider armament works)
- Lorient (sub. base)
- Modane (marshalling yards)
- Montlucon (tire factory)
- St. Nazaire (sub. base)

Italy
- Milan
- Turin

The list itself does not tell the complete story, for many of the targets—especially the more important and most heavily defended—were attacked not once but many times. For example, Berlin was visited eighteen times. The persistent heavy attacks on the Ruhr and Rhineland will be recalled, as well as those against the enemy submarine base of Lorient a year ago, when maximum efforts were being made to cope with the then menacing U-boat situation. In carrying out these operations, the Royal Canadian Air Force bomber squadrons flew 11,199 operational sorties, dropping 22,000 tons of bombs, of which 14,000 tons were concentrated on targets in Germany, the remainder on targets in Italy and enemy occupied countries. In addition they carried out a large number of sea mining operations.

Last spring it was deemed expedient to reinforce the bomber force in the Mediterranean theatre. The Royal Canadian Air Force was called upon and cooperated by the formation of a Royal Canadian Air Force bomber wing made up of certain squadrons in the Royal Canadian Air Force bomber group. These squadrons flew their aircraft to the new theatre, selected their airfields and set up operations in a remarkably short time. From these bases they operated under the most trying conditions. In heat and sandstorm they put up an operational effort that is surpassed by none. I should like to read a signal received from their commander-in-chief, Air Chief Marshal Tedder:

> This wing has done an exceptionally good job of work ever since it arrived and has undoubtedly contributed appreciably to our offensive. The scale of effort, in relation to the size of the force, has probably been higher than has ever been achieved anywhere in the past and included operations on 78 out of 80 successive nights.

Coastal squadrons. The Royal Canadian Air Force squadrons operating with coastal command and India command have carried out offensive operations extending over the north and northeast Atlantic, the North sea, the bay of Biscay and the Indian ocean.

Their duties include searching out and attacking enemy surface vessels, anti-submarine patrols, escorts for allied merchant shipping, naval escorts, and fighter and general reconnaissance patrols.

These coastal squadrons are equipped with Sunderland and Catalina flying boats, Wellington, Beaufighter and Albacore land planes, and in the course of their operations during the period under review flew 25,487 hours.

At this point I should like to say a word of praise for the efforts and patience of our aircrews who are operating for long hours over the sea, keeping a zealous eye for enemy submarines. You must appreciate that the maintenance of the required alertness on these patrols of twelve and fifteen hours and sometimes longer is a very great test of endurance.

The exploits I have just mentioned are indicative of the operational effort of our Royal Canadian Air Force squadrons under the direction of the Royal Air Force, as far as I am able to disclose. But I should like to impress upon you that this effort was carried out by only those Royal Canadian Air Force aircrew who are localized into Canadian units. The exploits of the other Royal Canadian Air Force aircrew who are loaned to the Royal Air Force are part, and a considerable part, of the history of the Royal Air Force.

Decorations. A return brought down in the house last week shows that nearly 1,200 of our young men have been decorated for gallantry in action.

Casualties.—The figures which I now produce indicate the cost in casualties. All told, Royal Canadian Air Force casualties have been, up to February 18, 1944, as follows:—

Dead and presumed dead	7,958
Missing, prisoners of war, and interned	3,384
	11,342

Of which 9,667 were overseas.

Eleven thousand does not seem so very great a number in a war which has engulfed so many million lives. Nevertheless every single one of these gallant lads taken away by the grisly mechanism of war was the pride and hope of some Canadian family. Every single life sacrificed represents an irreparable loss to the Canadian nation. Those boys came from families in every walk of life, from rich and poor alike, from those in high placed and those in low, from the farm, from the city, from high school and college and university. We ourselves in this house have not been immune, six of our members have lost their dearest and best. They were a cross section of the youth of a democracy. The least professional of soldiers, the most gallant of citizens. Living their young lives under varying conditions, in different atmospheres in this Canada of such divergent views and interests. They yet found a common patriotism and a common purpose.

They, on the threshold of their manhood, developed a magnanimity of soul and a lofty and heroic love of country. Looking at the future as they did, with the wisdom of ages peering out of boyish eyes, they counted the cost, they calculated the risk, yet remained through it all serene and undaunted. Let their selfless endeavour, their common patriotism, their unswerving purpose be an example to us in our Canadian task.

Now I have already said we have reached the peak of our expansion but let it not be understood that we have reached anything near the peak of our deployment against the enemy. Not all of the thousands of men we have overseas have as yet been in action, in fact many thousands are still awaiting their turn to meet the enemy in operational squadrons or immediately behind in operational training squadrons, in conversion squadrons or in finished schools or reception depots. Many, many thousands more are going through the plan, or as instructors. Our front line strength will rise higher and higher for months to come even in spite of the heavy casualties which we are bound to incur.

It is far from my wish to make any boastful statement about the part which Canada is playing in the war. It has, however, been borne upon me that the interests of the alliance as a whole may be prejudiced if its other members are left in ignorance of the Canadian share in the great events which are unfolding.

The United Kingdom government and our American allies also have the right to know that Canada is playing her part.

It is for that reason that I should like before resuming my seat to give a summary of Canada's part in the air war.

The air training plan was conceived, set up, organized, and is being carried on with one object in view, to obtain and maintain air superiority over the enemy. We have that thanks largely to commonwealth efforts and those of our allies the United States and Russia.

The next step, and I believe the allies are close to it, is complete, final, conclusive and lasting air supremacy in every theatre of war, so that our planes will flash through the skies of any part of Europe unharmed and unmolested. This seemingly unattainable goal seems now to be almost within our reach. The next few months should settle that issue. The immediate cost may be heavy, I fear it will be, but it will bring immeasurably nearer that final and ultimate goal, victory.

We Canadians have, starting from 4,000 men, raised an air force of over 200,000. We have in the midst of the throes of rapid expansion, trained 114,000 men in ground work, as instructors, staff men, mechanics, engineers and in fifty different trades. We have graduated from our flying schools, 86,000 men to fly and fight the planes of the commonwealth and the R.A.F.; more than half the total graduates in the empire forces. Of these 86,000, 48,000 were our own Canadians recruited, enlisted and trained by us.

We have managed and administered this vast enterprise with our own Canadian men and women. We have staffed it largely with our own forces, service and civilian. We have paid for a large part of this enterprise out of our own funds. We have equipped it largely with our own material, the product of our own factories, and all the while we were building in this country and in the neighbouring islands and territories defensive installations and aerodromes, and organizing an air defence system both on the ground and in the sky, in conjunction with our partner in defence of this north American continent. When this hemisphere was threatened by the advance of the yellow barbarians to American territory in the Aleutians, we were in a position in those anxious days after Pearl Harbor to offer and render assistance to our immeasurably more powerful neighbour. By our pre-Pearl Harbor activities in the construction of the northwest air staging route and the coastal chain of aerodromes, we prepared the way for his rapid transit to Alaska of troops, of munitions, of planes and materials of war.

On the east coast, we early saw the advantages for transport of aircraft to Europe and defence purposes of Newfoundland and Labrador, and the liability too if left undefended. From bases in the maritimes, Labrador and Newfoundland, we gave air coverage to

convoys and we hunted the submarine. We have stretched our coverage far beyond our own shores, and in conjunction with our Canadian navy have assumed responsibility for the northwest Atlantic. Our land planes and amphibians and flying boats sweep the north Atlantic from Labrador to Greenland and beyond. And lastly, farther overseas we have contributed thousands of our men to the global war. We are in Iceland. We are in the Hebrides. We are in Burma. We are in India. We are in Egypt. We are in Italy. We are nightly over Europe. We are attacking and beating Germany in the very heart of nazi might. This is what Canada is doing in the air war.

Canada is doing her share equal to that of any nation of the commonwealth, and in proportion to its population, equal to that of any of its allies.

That is what the world should realize.

That is what the people of Canada should know.

Canada has a right to be proud of its air war.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

MEAT

SUSPENSION OF RATIONING—STATEMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY ASSISTANT TO THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

Mr. D. C. ABBOTT (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the house I should like to make a statement with respect to meat rationing.

Three weeks ago the question of the need for continuing meat rationing was raised in the House of Commons and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) stated that the whole question would be reviewed in the light of current conditions.

The basic reasons for meat rationing in Canada should be clearly understood. Our production of meat has always been ample for our domestic requirements. The reasons for meat rationing were to create an increased exportable surplus to meet the urgent and essential requirements of the United Kingdom and to ensure equitable distribution of the supplies remaining in Canada. May I point out that our purpose is not only to help to feed the population of the United Kingdom but also the total armed forces supplied through the United Kingdom which include all the Canadian forces overseas. We intend to continue to meet these urgent and essential requirements.

[Mr. Power.]

During recent weeks, however, unusually large surpluses of meat have been developing in Canada. The mere existence of such surpluses would not be a good reason for suspending rationing provided that such surpluses could be moved to seaboard and overseas.

A careful review of the present position has satisfied the government that for the time being the excess supply of meat coming to market, over and above the amount needed to meet domestic requirements at the present rate of consumption, is in excess of our physical capacity to move it into export channels, and that the sensible and proper course to take is temporarily to suspend meat rationing.

The facts can be summarized briefly, as follows:

1. There have been unusually heavy marketings of all types of live stock during recent months, and it is expected that heavy marketings will continue for the next two or three months. During the first eight weeks of 1944 the inspected packing plants in Canada have slaughtered 780,000 more hogs, 50,000 more cattle, 10,000 more calves and 30,000 more sheep and lambs than in the corresponding weeks of 1943. These figures represent an increase over 1943 of eighty per cent in hogs, fifty per cent in cattle, twenty per cent in calves and thirty-five per cent in sheep and lambs. It has been only with the greatest difficulty that the packing plants have been able physically to handle this great increase in volume.

2. As a result of these very heavy runs of live stock the storage and transportation facilities have become acutely congested. The latest available statistics indicate that there are over 102,000,000 pounds of meat in cold storage which is nearly twice as much as at this time a year ago and 65 per cent greater than is normal at this time of year. In addition to meat storage we have to provide for the cold storage of other important products. There is at present no reserve of cold storage space to take care of any unforeseen backing up due to unpreventable delays in shipping.

3. Not only are we having a continuance of heavy live stock marketings and an acute congestion of storage space, but we are also faced with limitations on our physical capacity to move meat to seaboard and overseas. During the past eight weeks we have moved record quantities overseas—more than we have ever moved in a similar two-month period. If everything moved with clock-like precision we believe we might just be able to handle the present volume of product, but with no reserve of storage space and with a continued

heavy flow of marketings we are in a position where any serious accident or delay whether caused by weather or by the exigencies of war would put us in a very difficult position. The shipping authorities have been able to schedule sufficient tonnage to move the present supplies, but there is always the risk of accidents or other delays upsetting these schedules. But even if sufficient tonnage is put into our ports, there are physical and human limitations on the rate of loading at these ports and there is a very definite limitation on the total available supply of refrigerator cars.

Three weeks ago the whole situation was difficult and congested. Every department of this government and of other governments concerned have done their utmost to improve the position but, while not seriously worse, the position is definitely not improved and there are very real dangers of a backing up of supplies and movement to a point where actual spoilage of meat might occur.

For these reasons it has been decided to suspend meat rationing, including meatless Tuesdays, until the congestion in both storage and transportation is cleared up. However, the government is fully determined that to the extent of our ability the essential requirements of the United Kingdom and our overseas forces shall be met and it is, therefore, intended that meat rationing be resumed as soon as such a course will be helpful. I want to make it perfectly clear that meat rationing is being suspended, not abandoned.

In this connection I should emphasize that in order to facilitate the resumption of meat rationing the system of slaughter permits and the requirement that all carcasses be stamped with the permit holder's licence number will remain in full effect. It is proposed, however, for the duration of the suspension of rationing to permit individual farmers to slaughter their own live stock for sale directly to consumers without the necessity of their getting a permit or stamping the meat so sold.

Mr. GRAYDON: If I may ask one question, having in mind the information which must be available to the government alone, has the parliamentary assistant any idea as to how long we may expect this suspension to continue in operation?

Mr. ABBOTT: No; I am afraid I cannot give any indication as to how long it may be. That will depend upon any changes in the conditions which I indicated in my statement.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I ask if the present price structure is to remain?

Mr. ABBOTT: There is no change in the price ceiling.

SUPPLY

LABOUR CONDITIONS—UNEMPLOYMENT IN ALBERTA COAL MINING AREAS—STATEMENT OF HON. MEMBER FOR BOW RIVER

Hon. J. E. MICHAUD (Minister of Transport) moved that the house go into committee of supply.

Mr. C. E. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, there is a matter I should like to bring to the attention of the government, having to do with a situation which exists in my part of the country, especially in the Drumheller valley. I have received several telegrams and a number of air mail letters in the last day or so, most of which I think are copies of originals which were sent to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). The situation is that in the Drumheller valley and other mining areas of Alberta more than half the miners have been unemployed since February 1. The people are becoming very much disturbed, and I have been asked to bring this matter to the attention of the government as quickly as possible.

It seems amazing that at this time, when we are making great proposals for post-war reconstruction, when the Prime Minister has promised that after the war everyone who can work and is willing to work will have a job, we should have a large number of men who are physically fit and anxious to carry on their work, in order to help an all-out war effort, forced out of their jobs. It is estimated that in the district to which I am referring some seven hundred miners have applied for unemployment insurance, and that a number of them are now receiving that assistance. Not long ago we asked all soldiers who had been miners to go back to the mines, promising them full employment. At that time a great many men were released from the armed forces to dig coal in the mines, but now these very men are walking the streets of the Drumheller district looking for jobs. I am informed that between eight hundred and a thousand of these men received postponement from military service in order that they might dig coal; yet now they, together with others, are thrown out of employment. Is it any wonder that the people in that district are becoming greatly perturbed? These men have no prospects even for the future. If that is the best we have to offer them, when we are supposed to be carrying on an all-out war effort, what sort of morale is that going to build up in this country? Supposing that next winter we have to appeal to these men again to go out and dig coal in order to keep the rest of Canada warm; what sort of response shall

we get? If we should appeal for a greater war effort, Mr. Speaker, do you not think people will view any such appeal with a little doubt?

I think this matter should have been attended to long ago. It has been pointed out to me that these men have no hope of relief unless something drastic is done immediately. Not only will these men be out of work, but during that period of time even those who are now working will not be employed full time. Some of the provincial governments are doing what they can to assist in this crisis. For instance, I am informed that the government of Alberta has ceased operating its strip mines and has been buying coal from the Drumheller valley in order to provide jobs for these men. There is also another angle which is exceedingly disturbing. These men who have come back from the army or who have left their farms to dig coal, following the appeal of the government, are now walking the streets looking for jobs. When they endeavour to leave the Drumheller valley to search for employment elsewhere I am told that they cannot obtain releases from selective service. That makes the situation even more difficult. If that is true, as I am informed, we have these men forcibly put out of their jobs, with the selective service refusing to give them permission to leave that area. How are these men to maintain themselves?

I believe the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) should look into this situation immediately. The astonishing thing about it is that while this condition exists in western Canada it is still the policy of this government to import a great tonnage of coal from the United States. Speaking from memory, I would say that our imports are about 30,000,000 tons a year, and we are producing about 20,000,000 tons. While we are importing a tremendous amount of fuel from the United States, and miners in the United States are working six or seven days a week, here we have forced our men out of employment. That does not look good, so far as the government's policy is concerned, and it certainly will not build up the morale of our Canadian citizens. It is time the government began to establish a national fuel policy for Canada.

We are going to have conditions like this, not only now but to a greater extent as summer approaches, unless the government adopts a proper fuel policy. This is the situation to which I say the government should give immediate and serious attention, so that the men in the area to which I have referred may have some relief.

[Mr. C. E. Johnston.]

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): Mr. Speaker, coming from a constituency in which there is a good deal of coal mining, I wish to support the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Johnston) in what he has said. For the most part, however, my constituency is engaged in mining bituminous coal, and perhaps the situation there is not as acute as it is in the Drumheller mines. Nevertheless in certain parts of my territory we find mines producing domestic coal. It has been brought to my knowledge that many of those local mines have closed down, and the miners have either moved away or had to seek some other type of employment.

I know the problem is not an easy one, particularly when the weather has a habit of playing pranks on us. But the fact that we have had a mild winter does not make any difference to the situation described by the hon. member for Bow River. The fact is that conditions are such, for one reason and, I believe, one reason only, namely, that the government have not yet determined on an adequate and proper national fuel policy. They never have had one; they have never seemed to be trying to get one, and I do not know that there is much hope of the present government ever getting one.

We have unemployment in a time of war. The telegrams referred to by the hon. member reminded me of depression days. That was the kind of telegrams we used to get in those days, and it seems strange that in a time of war, when industry should be working at full capacity, there should be such unemployment in those industries. I support the hon. member, and I say the time is long past due when the government should have announced something of a permanent nature in respect of a fuel policy for Canada.

Motion agreed to, and the house went into committee of supply, Mr. Bradette in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT

359. Departmental administration, $425,590.

Item stands.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

258. Departmental administration, $191,595.

Item stands.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): May I ask through you, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Labour will make a reply to the questions I raised?

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, until Thursday, at 3 o'clock p.m., pursuant to special order made Monday, February 21, 1944.

END OF VOLUME I